

Yankee Steve's Column
for the week of September 24, 2009

Islam: A Religion to be Feared and Watched

From its inception Islam has been a hothouse of fanaticism. To the consternation of law-abiding Muslims, Islam has become the bomb-making center of the world. Just this past week another bomb plot was uncovered. Once more the target was New York City where many hardworking, financially strapped victims of the recession, who never in any way or for any reason at all ever persecuted the followers of Mohammed, was singled out for destruction.

Something so easily fanaticized has to be looked at under a microscope. What makes this religion tick? And is it something that a reasonable person would ever adopt? If we could excise the inner meaning of Islam would we want to embrace it? And if we do not choose to accept Islam will the Muslims look upon our unbelief as a defeat? They most certainly will. Knowing that provides us with an insight into the way Muslims look at the world that lies outside of Islam.

Let me explain. French political thinker Alexis de Tocqueville [1805-59] wrote that the Puritans came here “. . . in order to make an idea work.” The Muslims have come here with an idea in mind also. What that is will vary from Muslim to Muslim. Most I would presume just want to make a living. Others I am sure are hoping to create a subculture that some day will become the dominant culture in North America. Islam has never countenanced unbelief. That should not concern us but it does because certainly Islam is not just a religion. As much as anything it is a political system, a way of governing people in the hope that Muslims will some day govern the world. Islam is as much eschatology as is Communism.

Islam gets much bad press but this is not a recent phenomenon. It has always been this way. This should tell us something.

Since the seventh century, the century in which Mohammed claimed that he regularly played host to the angel Gabriel, Islam has been on the march. Harvard professor Robert M. Johnston wrote,

“Then came in the seventh century, a new and even more terrible blast of devastation. Mohammed arose, created Islam, and started the great movement of Arab conquest. Within a few years of his death the fanaticized hosts of Arabia and the East were knocking at the gates of Constantinople . . .”

From the beginning Islam wanted to force its religion on to those who refused to believe. That kind of attitude breeds fanaticism. It has been one blood bath after another. Islam's greatest missionary has been the sword.

The world has been asked to believe that a portly, little man, who could not read and whose sensual and sadistic lifestyle would never recommend him to men of reason, was the last in a long line of prophets thereby making him superior in rank to even that of Jesus Christ.

In other words faith will have to give way to credulity and when it cannot, Muslims will want to know why. How could we not look to Mohammed? He alleged that he met with an angel and that is enough!

Ethics

The prophet Mohammed informed the people of Arabia that his way of looking at ethics, or the Arab way of looking at things, would have to be exported to the rest of the world by the faithful if their mission was to be successful. Interestingly, Thomas Jefferson, the third president of these United States, ran headlong into the way Mohammed thought about ethics.

Jefferson discovered that the Muslims had declared war on all non-Muslims which can mean that Muslims will, if necessary, resort to using wartime ethics. Lying, stealing, and killing are acceptable during wartime, and militant Islam will avail itself of these things because it is at war with the rest of the world.

If accused of using religion as a cloak for dishonesty Muslims will beg to differ. This is how it was with the Barbary pirates who were raiding American ships and imprisoning our seamen. When it was discovered that these pirates were not acting on their own, but were being backed by a consortium of Muslim states headed up in Tripoli, the representatives of those states revealed to a wide-eyed Jefferson that they believed that they had every right to steal and plunder because Americans are infidels.

Christopher Hitchens [1949-] who is as much the enemy of Christianity as he is of Islam still proves helpful at this point, writing,

‘ . . . one cannot get around what Jefferson heard when he went with John Adams to wait upon Tripoli’s ambassador to London in March 1785. When they inquired by what right the Barbary states preyed upon American shipping, enslaving both crews and passengers, America’s two foremost envoys were informed that “it was written in the Koran, that all Nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon whoever they could find and to make Slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Mussulman who should be slain in battle was sure to go to Paradise.’ (It is worth remembering that the United States played no part in the Crusades, or in the Catholic reconquista of Andalusia.)

Ambassador Abd Al-Rahman did not fail to mention the size of his own commission, if America chose to pay the protection money demanded as an alternative to piracy. So here was an early instance of the ‘heads I win, tails you lose’ dilemma, in which the United States is faced with corrupt regimes, on the one hand, and Islamic militants, on the other - or indeed a collusion between them.

It seems likely that Jefferson decided from that moment on that he would make war upon the Barbary kingdoms as soon as he commanded American forces. His two least favorite institutions - enthroned monarchy and state-sponsored religion - were embodied in one

target, and it may even be that his famous ambivalences about slavery were resolved somewhat when he saw it practiced by the Muslims.

What Jefferson recognized we must realize, too. Islam wants to make war on any and all parties with which it differs. Muslims who do not agree with this kind of reasoning are more righteous than their prophet.

A Look at Religion

In all religions there are principles at work. I will highlight only one of them in order to determine why Islam has produced so many fanatics, of the more militant and misanthropic variety.

All religions have a picture in mind of what a true disciple of that religion will look like. And in all cases the true disciple will take on the image of the founder of that religion. In Islam a true disciple will look like a warrior because Mohammed was a warrior whose devotion to Allah his God was white hot.

Coming off the battle field with blood dripping from his weapon, a Muslim can feel assured that if he were to encounter Mohammed at that moment he would have his blessing. After all Mohammed participated in the slaughter of some 600 Jews in Medina, men, women, and children and he participated directly in raids on caravans owned and driven by infidels whose unbelief made them targets for self-justifying Muslims.

In Christianity a true disciple will look like a servant and not like a warrior because Jesus said that He “came not to be served but to serve and to give His life a ransom for many.” [Mark 10:45] The true follower of Christ will be a servant.

Conclusion

We have found the answer to our question, why does Islam produce so many fanatics, men and women who are misanthropes?

We know that a nation rises no higher than the religion of its people. We also know that a religion rises no higher than its founder.

If Islam wants to move ahead spiritually it will have to finally admit what some of its devotees have suspected all along; and what well-taught Christians have always known - Mohammed was not a prophet.

The thing wrong with Islam is Mohammed.

Ever yours,

Yankee Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com