

Book review *religion of peace*

Perspective

Book Review

A Religion of Peace? Why Christianity Is and Islam Isn't, by Robert Spencer (2007) Regnery Publishing, Inc., Washington, D.C., USA, pp. 264.

Having studied Islam for decades, I attest to the accuracy and comprehensiveness of this book. You must read it! Spencer does the title and cogently tells why Islam is not a religion of peace and Christianity is.

A few carping points: Spencer is somewhat weak on Galileo. Few realize that Galileo never proved what he was spouting off about – and thus the Church and social powers in those days had every right to question Galileo and condemn his inappropriate theological statements when he truly had not proven what he claimed. Galileo turned out to be correct, but heliocentricity was never proven until mid 19th Century, and it was never considered a problem until Galileo arrogantly and inappropriately made it into a direct assault on theology. He was not tortured or threatened, and he lived and did his work comfortably in a palace until he died, but he had to keep his big mouth shut about that which was out of his field.

Spencer also was somewhat weak on the Inquisition – I have said for years that I would pick for any proceedings any judge of the Inquisition before most judges currently active in the United States. One must read *Mad for God* by Sara Tilghman Nalle to recognize how the Inquisition meticulously searched for truth, kept precise ponderous records and really treated people until proven innocent. In fact, the current capital punishment rate for the United States is 20 times that of the capital punishment rate during the entire Spanish Inquisition. And, without Inquisition judges, the biggest worry for U.S. citizens in any court have always been and will always remain: (1) Is the judge competent? and (2) Is the judge interested in the truth?

Not surprisingly, Spencer with mandatory political correctness, ignores any provocativeness from Jews as a partial basis for some Christian anti-Semitism. While not kosher, it is appropriate to ask: What? Just what on earth, did Jews do to always become targets anywhere and everywhere for all times? Perhaps the not so veiled sanctimonious infallibility of Jews needs rebutting, and a few good references are: *The Culture of Critique* by Kevin MacDonald; *Jewish History, Jewish Religion, The Weight of Three Thousand Years* by Israel Shahak; and *The Hidden History of Zionism* by Ralph Schoenman (e-mail me at sam@docnigro.com for my reviews of these books). Every once in awhile over the last three millennia, unpeaceful anti-Semitism was preceded by unpeaceful anti-Goyism.

But overall, Spencer's defense of Christianity is as unimpeachable as is his ominous clarification of Islam. He does more than remember that in 922 AD, Muslim mystic al Hallaj was decapitated for preaching that Allah was a loving God because Islam denies that human sentiments such as love could be attributed to God (One must wonder if that prohibition also applies to freedom, equality, and "peace"?).

Special Issue - 2015

Samuel A Nigro M D

Retired, Assistant Clinical Professor Psychiatry, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, USA

Correspondence: Dr. Samuel A Nigro MD, Retired, Assistant Clinical Professor Psychiatry, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, 2517 Guilford Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118, USA, Tel 216 932-0575, Email sam@docnigro.com

Received: August 19, 2015 | **Published:** October 6, 2015

The promotions of Islam are addressed forthrightly and honestly. Worthy of mention is the need for Muslims to compensate by inflated claims in a United Kingdom based educational project called "1001 Inventions" (pages 159-161)—more likely better named as "1001 fabrications and lost ideas." Such reminds of claims about the discovery of the Americas: First the Vikings and recently the Chinese have made claims...but "finders keepers, losers weepers"... Overriding is the fact that Columbus never lost it once he found it. In the same light, Muslims appeared always to lose what they allegedly found such that others, independent of Islam, find it, but without losing it, give it to the world. For example, physical laws and constants were rejected in Islam as worthy of study in the 9th Century because such would "limit Allah" thereby setting back science until 12th Century Parisian Catholic clergy independently studied and found the nascent laws of physics, this time without losing them, such that contemporary science was begun. And that is the usual story: Almost all so-called advances and whatever claimed to be found from Islam, including nascent science, were nullified, ignored and aborted by Medina Allah, a god, Muslims claim, who cannot be allowed limitations by physics or rational thought...Indeed whatever Muslims find seems unacceptable by their mad loud murderous mullahs if it does not fit 7th Century Arabia and Medina Islam.

Furthermore, that 70% of world's refugees today are Muslims, proves the emptiness of Islam for most everything other than oil (which non-Muslims found, drilled, developed and use—Indeed, if it were not for oil for non-Muslims, Islam would be nowhere—For thousands of years, the capital and cities of Saudi Arabia were mostly mud huts replaced only during the last 40 years because of oil, not because of the marvels of Islam!). Overall, it is understandable why Muslims want to live elsewhere than in their homelands, but, to the

misfortune of all, they are so robotile in their bibliolatriy of the Koran, they unwittingly end up bringing to wherever they go that which they were trying to flee. So illogically and unscientifically, they end up with nothing but inflated claims and rage when what they left behind is not so welcome in the land of their invading (euphemistically called “immigration”). Prior to oil and even now, Islam has done little on its own except create power mad murderers demanding agreement and who, amazingly, take insult when you tell them their own history. Spencer’s criticisms are forthright, honest, believable, documented, and necessary to be known. It is nice to “make nice” but such should not reinforce belief in *non-being* – and the promotion of *non-being* (such as false claims and grandiose lies...and murdering people) is evil – In the long run, it will never turn out well. And Medina Islam is full of it—including the unpeaceful claim for an alleged 1001 inventions.

Unfortunately, Spencer does not at all clarify that there are really two Islams. First is Mohammed in Mecca where he was converted by local Jews and Christians to break free and leave paganism. Mohammed’s early Mecca preachings were consistent with Judeo-Christian messages, and there are suggestions even that he was a pacifist then. Indeed, to know Mohammed in Mecca, is rightfully to consider Islam to be a heresy of the Roman Catholic Church—that is, the potential for oneness is exists—because, for both, God was a loving God.

Oneness is lost, however, by the second Islam, which is all that happened after Mecca when Mohammed himself turned pagan again preaching an ersatz pseudomonotheism, and he turned the Koran into a political text filled with satanic verses yet to be expunged and therefore always creating non-being by murder galore. I have written about this before and in dialogue with Islamic scholars whose response, after the shouting was over, said to me, “You have made us think”, and I have not heard from them since. Basically, Judeo-Christian Mecca Islam was “abrogated” by all subsequent Muslims, thereby they are the real infidels against the real Mohammed and the real original Islam of Mecca. All after Mecca is bogus Islam and filled with political and satanic verses creating murderers and monsters galore with the enslavement of people and the oppression of all humans who are not Muslims. Medina Islam is not peaceful but a distorted cancer for non-being far from what the Judeo-Christian Mohammed began.

This clarification, of course, is the answer for Muslims today: Muslims must break free as Mohammed originally did and return to Mecca without satanic Medina and realize that all after Mecca is the worst of the infidels. Medina Islam is a transparent shameless ignoring of history and an avalanche of flagrant rationalizations of all the obvious negatives in their history. Medina Islam is grotesque with obfuscations of subhuman, anti-knowledge, black holes from a god without standards because such would “limit Allah.” Medina Islam is pure dishonesty when Muslims claim insult with any honest recitation of their history. Medina Islam is sheer ignorance in the belief that what they say, preach, do and ignore are not transparent to non-Muslims. And all this is undeniably absolutely self discrediting, because their obsessional rages and compulsive threats bizarrely prove them wrong again and again. Really, what kind of God is that? Finally the presumption by Muslims of the stupidity of non-Muslims in viewing all Islam’s pretensions is so insulting to non-Muslims that it is dwarfed only by the proof of the stupidity and arrogance of the Muslims themselves that other people cannot catch on. Furthermore, non-being requires satanic violence routinely used by Muslims to

intimidate and subjugate all who disagree and want to believe and honestly with evidence conscientiously believe otherwise. Meanwhile, the unexpunged satanic verses filled Medina Koran continues its undeniable creation of destructive madmen and murderers – and as they rage, they should be told that “the proof their promotion of non-being and their obsessional satanic hatred is seen by looking in the mirror.” Also, it might also help to tell them that “The inability of Muslims to change to Truth, Oneness, Good and Beauty is to limit Allah!”

Unemphasized everywhere is the glaring difference between Muslims’ Medina god and the Judeo-Christian God. Their god is claimed to have no limitations and that nothing can be true which would set limitations upon Allah. This includes rationality, such that there could be a “squared circle” because if not, Allah would be limited. And there can be no fixed constants in the world of physics and nature because such would limit Allah. In addition, slavery, murder, decapitation, suicide bombers and teaching children to murder, are allowed as Medina Mohammed and his satanic versed Koran followers aver because, no doubt, the restriction of such would limit Allah. Basically all this is a transparent rationalization which allows political power to be unstoppable because, well, er, Allah cannot be limited, so neither can Muslim leaders. As all this is true, then clearly Islam’s god is not the same as the Judeo-Christian God (the same God of Mohammed in Mecca) who is a God of love, of natural law, of reason, of intellect and will seeking a transcendental existence of Truth, Oneness, Good and Beauty for all of God’s creatures. Indeed, to my mind, the disallowing of these constants of God would seem to restrict Allah more than anything else.

Almost all that Mohammed and his followers created after Mecca are satanic. There will never be peace ... there will never be genuine Allah ... there will never be genuine God as long as the satanic verses remain in the Koran. Until return to Mecca Mohammed and Mecca Islam, Islam will never be a “religion of peace.” And saying so may cause death...a final proof as Medina Islam undeniably intrinsically automatically promotes non-being.

What the Church needs to do is have scholars write a Christian Koran beginning with and adding to the Old Testament/New Testament verses as in my pamphlet “Is There Love In Islam, with Catholic elaborations. This true Christian Koran, traced back to Mohammed in Mecca, can then be offered to all Muslims inviting them to break free as Mohammed did and join the Judeo-Christian phylum of life without decapitation, murder, slavery, abuse of women, suicide bombers, teaching non-being, groveling on the ground to politics, et cetera and thereby finally become a religion of peace. Is it not time for love of fellow men (male and female), for promoting the transcendentals of Truth, Oneness, Good and Beauty, for shaking hands with all in peace, for singing new songs, for helping and not hurting, for virtue well shown by Mohammed in Mecca? (E-mail me for more.)

Acknowledgments

None.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.