(J.B.C. - 1996)



# ISLAM, RELIGION OR POLITICAL SYSTEM?

(Important remark: Sufism, Baahism and Ahmadeya, being not part of 'orthodox Islam', are not at all concerned in this study).

#### INTRODUCTION

Dear brothers and sisters, if this topic comes to you today, it is because, since long, I have been led to look particularly into it, this due to my very strong and old link with India, and because this country, since centuries and like ours nowadays (France), faces the problem of Islam more and more and day after day. In India, it has gone until leading to the partition of the country and the creation of Pakistan, itself now divided between Pakistan and Bangladesh.

However, before the rise of what is the good form to call 'Muslim fundamentalism', it is quite particular, in our country, to find judgments of reaction, often in cutting words, without looking for the causes, without trying to understand the meaning of the gestures of people who accomplish them. How could we judge the effects if we do not know their causes? This is only deceiving ourselves, or veiling our face, or reacting without understanding and therefore it is to do worse than better, and this is what the world is doing.

It is why we will ask ourselves the question: "IS ISLAM A RELIGION OR A POLITICAL SYSTEM?"; question that will

have, as only aim, a better understanding from our brothers as well as from our world ...

In our country (France) there are a lot of Muslims. They are often a priori judged, but without being able to understand them. One speaks of integration; one thinks that one knows the problems of Yugoslavia, a little bit less those of Chechnya, accepting merely and stupidly the thoughts that are given by television. One might as well say that one does not understand anything. And one cannot understand anything if one does not go to the source, if one has not read the Koran. Now let us ask this question, a priori very simple: « Who amongst us has read the Koran? » Let us bet that there is no one. How could we allow ourselves to discuss on all those topics? How are we able to understand? It is the same for the rest... When I come to speak of Hinduism, it is possible to see the same knowing smiles; but who will go and see, inquire, to tell the truth: learn? Nobody. We prefer to stay with our own views that are, so to say, ecclesiastic.

Now, let us come to our topic. What is aimed at with this exposé is to try to help to understand what is happening presently before our eyes. To draw attention, I will merely quote what, between disciples in India, we said: "Third World War has begun the very day when Khomeiny has left France."

The so-called Muslim fundamentalism is not in its first game. Already in the past, it has conquered numerous countries, and nowadays it conquers new ones. After the first Muslim wave that has gone as far as India and

Indonesia, has come the wave of fundamentalism fundamentalism. Christian called colonialism in which the white race has used religion to enslave its human brothers, and even put out of history complete civilisations, like Indian civilisation in America or Aborigine in Australia. British have been especially superior in this field; and when, during the modern times, they have left these countries, they have taken a great care to divide them within before making off; and it is possible to see what this has produced, for instance in India after the split that has given birth to Muslim Pakistan, a terrorist state, or in Middle-East, or again with the system of apartheid in South Africa, created by cousins of theirs.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between what Christians have done and what Muslims have done and continue to do. Christians, on one hand, have practised the complete opposite of Jesus' teachings, when Muslims, on the second hand, follow step by step the teachings of whom they call a prophet who would be named Muhammad. But where is the difference? Only there. Actually, Christians had, as grounds, not Jesus' teachings but those of a sect called Church, of which the involuntary creator is Saul of Tarsus who, however, like Muhammad, has merely claimed that Christ had appeared before him and had given him a revelation. The first, Saul, was however an initiate and has left proofs, while Muhammad was not an initiate and has left nothing to us. Church however was not really the creation of Saul but the creation of Constantine and, from him, it has been used to build a political system. The fact remains that,

afterwards, both these sects have carried on with exactly the same politics, even if, besides, both have given great saints, with however the following remark: Muslim saints are all Sufis, and Sufism is rejected by Muslim orthodoxy as being heretical.

If the white race is presently trying to rule again over the world and is practising a new colonialism in an economic form, Islam is presently playing a second game, everywhere in the world; and all the same one should understand the causes in order to understand the effects that one can see presently and also to understand why violence is present in almost all Muslim countries, why poverty reigns in most of them ... when there is no petrol, etc...

All these basics are in the Koran. But who, as the question was already asked, has read the Koran? Which political person has read the Koran? Without reading the Koran, it is absolutely impossible to understand anything of what is happening. Let us therefore try to look at the general outlines of these basics.

#### I.- ISLAM, A RELIGION?

What is, the Koran, this book that is sacred for Muslims?

#### A.- THE NON SENSE OF THE 'REVELATION'

Moreover, one tells us now that only those who speak Arabic - for it would be read only in Arabic - can understand the Koran. This has become like a weapon, meaning: « No, what you say is false. You don't speak Arabic and it is therefore impossible for you to understand the Koran". The translated Koran would therefore be false ... Of course this could be said to a child, to an animal, but not to a sensible being. As if the meaning of an idea would change with its translation. It is only through the 'Arabic telephone' that the meaning changes! Could any idea become different because carried in another language? Language is but the vehicle of thought and it is indissociable from it. A name is linked to a form and can be linked to one form only. Thus, believing that a different meaning could be given is even worse than blind belief. It is debility. Actually, what was meant at the beginning is this: The Koran is God's Word. As God has spoken in Arabic, to change this text,

even to translate it would be to touch it and would therefore be a blasphemy. That's all, of course, and then this is very honorable, as it is very honorable to preserve the Sanskrit text of the Vedas (with many more reasons for the latter).

Now, brothers and sisters, if you listen to the 'learned', you know now that God is a man; moreover, he speaks Arabic and does not seem to speak any other language. This is for his perfection and his omniscience, etc... Then, how it is that, in countries where Arabic is not spoken by Muslims, it is asked to read the Koran in a translation? But let us admit.

Let us admit - what cannot be admissible for any sensible being - that the Koran is revealed. Then, it has been revealed through the channel of a man, therefore it would be divine as well as human, whether one likes it or not. In this case, Muhammad is completely linked to the history of this so-called revelation. And here is God speaking through the channel of a man who sometimes preaches love and sometimes violence, on the same topics as we will see later. If this is God's word, how can God contradict himself from a sura to another one, since, until we have further information, he is perfect?

The initiate objects to revelation. True revelation is the final initiation (if it is possible to express it like this), when the being discover himself in his totality, and this is beyond mind. Revelation to one being to another one, moreover at the level of mind, the initiate objects to it as being not a revelation of the complete and total Truth.

God addresses someone. Oh!... Is there something that is more anthropomorphic? As Swami Vivekananda said, everyone looks at God in his own image. For a fish, God is certainly a big fish; for a man, he is a big a man in the sky, that is to say a huge individual, a huge ego! And this is what gives the images of the Hebraic or the Muslim God: a God of wrath, a frightful God, who chastises, etc... Of course, such is not the God of the initiate, of the twice-born, of the *dvija*.

So, it is enough that God addresses someone. Many sects were born like this. The so-called prophet writes in his book... Besides Islam, there were Mormons, now Scientology, etc... (and now even channelling Newagers!). Actually, one comes to all those false prophets one finds very often, false gurus, new messiahs. Muhammad seems to be one of them, and Islam, like Catholic Church, a sect that has met success.

Truth can reveal Itself only within ourselves, to our Self. Otherwise, it is nothing but blind belief.

If we are idiots and believe in revelation, then, Mister God speaks to Mister Muhammad. It is nevertheless the case that Mister Mohammed is but a channel and, for the revelation to be perfect, Mister Muhammad would have to be perfect. And, to be perfect, he should be God. Q.E.D. In India, the true Guru is a realised being. Enough is to say that there are very few in this world. He, he knows. Jesus the Christ has proven he was perfect as the Father is perfect. He did not speak of himself, but of the Father. He said that the Realm was within, and he said:

'Renounce thyself.' And the true Master let the others free to follow him or not, to listen to him or not. Never does he oblige them.

But really, who tells us that it is a revelation? Nobody, but the so-called Koran. And even! Is it telling really so? Is it God who reveals, or is it somebody else? This is what we will look at now. Let us try this in a more practical and historical way.

#### B.- THE HISTORY OF THE KORAN

### ABSENCE OF HISTORY, MERELY FRUIT OF IMAGINATION

The definitive version of the Koran would be due to a man named Othman, who would have been a man of the Soraïsch tribe, like Muhammad. This man became converted in order to marry one of Muhammad's daughters. In order to monopolize Allah's words for himself, he would have destroyed all the copies of the Koranic text and would have only kept his own copy on which he would have done the following operation: to arrange all the leaves so that the longest chapter was the first and the others arranged in a decreasing manner. From this, the genesis and the development of the Islamic preaching is unintelligible. It is nevertheless on this basis that the entire development of Islam lies, and Othman could rule in the name of Allah in the way he liked.

The oblivion of origins was replaced by imagination and, step by step, a lot of details have appeared about the life of a man named Muhammad, from his birth in 570 to his death on 632. One suddenly gets his slightest words, which will form the Hadith, until al-Tabari who will again add other so-called information in 923! However, the truth is that we know almost strictly nothing on the named Muhammad. However, everybody will take and continues to take legends that were born afterwards, with many dates, for Gospel truth, and what is but a legend has become a reality for most people! Moreover, a reality that is forbidden to discuss!

Here is where we are. One knows that some suras were written in Mecca, some others later in Medina. One must, therefore, in the first place, try to restore the chronological order of the suras in order to know the stages of the birth of Islam.

It is like this that, without any real historical support, exegetes proceeded with this study, taking as grounds the style, the concepts, etc... in order to try to re-establish some order. One comes, roughly, to class 90 suras in the time of Mecca and 24 in the time of Medina. Exegetes went further but we have not to go into details here.

Be that as it may, this supposed Koran narrates a quarter of a century. In the beginning, Mecca is an important commercial centre, though already falling into decay, and a big centre for traffickers. Caravans come and go. Khadidja, said to be the first Muhammad's wife, was an

expert in commercial business. Muhammad found once himself in this network.

In the religious field, the Ka'ba already existed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. It had been build around the well of Zemzem, resting place for nomads. Later, to give thanks to gods, a black stone was put there, object for worship, and the Ka'ba was not the only place to receive such an object. In the 6<sup>th</sup> century, it is not yet said that it has a celestial origin. The story of the trip of the Archangel Gabriel bringing the stone to the Ka'ba, of which the foundations would have been laid by Abraham and even by Adam (sic), is the invention of people from Medina. Actually, during the 6<sup>th</sup> century, the Ka'ba contained many idols, male and female divinities, like Allât, Manât or Al'Ouzza, divinities that were revered in Arabia and in the Middle East since centuries. In the sura nr 71, one finds the story of Muhammad's dealings with Meccan idolaters and, as to play the fish, one finds references to Noah at the beginning and at the end ... The god Allah already existed before Islam, and he was one of the most important gods, amongst many. It is essential to know that.

#### C.- THE 'TRUE' CORAN WOULD BE NO OTHER THAT THE BIBLE

Let us not go into details. One thing is striking, it is that Allah, finally, essentially points out to the God of the Jews: One, Creator, Almighty, dispenser of all good

things. The word *Il* or *Ilah* can be found in diverse forms amongst old Semites; the old Aramaic and Phoenician inscriptions give mention of *Il*, *Ilal*, *Ha-ilha*. *Allah* is, therefore, not specifically Muslim and numerous Arabic generations had been converted, before, to Christianity or Judaism in the name of Allah, and this long before Muhammad's arrival.

a) In the suras of the first period of Mecca, it is difficult to find anything that is not typically Jewish, and particularly the fear of God. There is nothing original. Everything is purely Judaic. And it is there that a revelation comes by itself, as it were, that a veil begins to vanish. Everything that, in the Koran, is not found in the Bible, it is possible to find it in Talmudic fables. The knowledge of the person who writes this book is not limited to the Bible, but extends to commentaries of the masters who have come before him. It is possible to find that he knows *misdrachim*, which are works that comment and paraphrase biblical texts. Even the story of the djinns is there!

This almost automatic 'revelation' is that the so-called Koran could not be written, at least for what concerns the Mecca period, by the so-called Muhammad, but that he could be written only by a Jewish Rabbi. I will only quote a word of Salomon Goldstein in his book 'Jews and Arabs' to summarize a long part of the pages I have removed from this exposé and that proved all this by the so-called Koran itself: 'One even finds in the holy Book of Islam some exegetic apologues, misdrashim that are undeniably Jewish and which have not yet been traced in

the Hebraic literature, as well as evidences of a real knowledge of Jewish customs and ideas.' (If you want details, it is possible to get a lot at will (see some below).

So, the so-called Koran is not at all God's revelation to an Arab, but it is simply the teaching of a Jewish rabbi to an Arab disciple. As Bertuel says: 'Every historian is led to this conclusion: a Jewish rabbi moves about in Mecca... There is nothing that has obliged God to put Himself into trouble in order to reveal to an Arab, during the 7<sup>th</sup> century, what He had already revealed to Jews since thousands of years and which was continually preached to anyone who wanted to hear it, by Jews as well as by Christians.'

b) The second revelation that comes by itself when we study the Koran is the following: the Koran is not the Koran. The book that is commonly known as Koran speaks itself about the Koran. It is therefore because it is separated from it. And it is possible to prove that this Koran, of which it is spoken in the so-called Koran, is nothing else but the Bible. Look at what is said in the sura 85: 'Has it come to you, the moving narration concerning the armies of Pharaoh and Thamoud? It is the glorious Koran, written on a table that is kept with a great care.' The word 'Qoran' derives from Qarad, to read, and means: what one reads, the Law written to be read.

Thus, what is called Koran is not at all the Koran, which, actually, is nothing else but the Bible. The Koran we know does not contain divine revelations to an Arab, but the teachings of a rabbi to a disciple. And then, when one reads again the Koran from that angle, everything becomes perfectly clear and limpid! In the sura 73, this rabbi says: 'O thou, wrapped in a coat (in order not to be recognized during this time of initiation to Judaism) sit up a little time, half the night, and carefully intone the Koran (that is to say the Bible, the Koran cannot ask to read the Koran), for, during the day, you have many things to do.'

Besides, Let us emphasize that, during Mecca period, the word 'prophet' never appears, but the word 'apostle', which is now, of course, systematically wrongly translated by 'prophet'...



Bertuel, who has past the most of his life to study the foundations of Islam, and who has pursued the studies of G. Théry (who has past himself the most of his life on this too) affirms: 'Who has uttered these words of preaching? Neither Allah of course, nor Muhammad, but 'words so deeply rooted in Judaism could not be uttered by anybody else than an authentic Jew. 'Every historian is led to this conclusion: a Jewish rabbi moves about in Mecca... He introduces himself to Arabs as the Prophet of God... Moreover, who would be

this Allah who would reveal to this Meccan nothing else but the old doctrines of the Old Testament?' And this study, which bases its arguments on the only Koran, demonstrates this fact.

This exegete leads us very far, using Koran itself as the only proof. Example: in the sura XCV, the prophet, whose name has not yet been mentioned, swears on a tree, the fig tree, that exists abundantly in Palestine but that is almost unknown in Mecca! It is not possible to find any oath that could be more Hebraic.

In the sura 80, archangel Gabriel uses a Aramaic locution, 'sarafatum' – revered leaves. Why not to speak in Arabic? In the sura 37, it is said: 'We have been kind to Moses and Aaron, We have brought the Scripture filled with obviousness'. Thus, this prophet who speaks to Arabs clearly declares that the revered leaves are Moses' writings, that is to say the Torah. In the sura 32, it is said: "We have given the Scripture to Moses, and We have done with it a direction for the sons of Israel."

Let us come back to the story. So far, the Book of Islam is not anything else than the Old Testament, taught in a free style to Meccans. Few time later, in the sura XCI, the preacher tries to prove that it is a duty to welcome God's apostles and, since he is this apostle, he has to be listen to if one doesn't want suffer the punishment.

It is like this that one discovers that the Koran is, actually, the teaching of a Jewish rabbi to a young Arab. For instance, in the sura XCIII, he comes back to the life of this student: "Have we not put your fame high? Didn't you see how the Lord has treated the men of the Elephant, etc...". Thus, from the mouth of this rabbi who preaches his disciple, we learn that the Koran is not and cannot be the Arabic Koran – that, moreover, contained only few chapters – but well and truly what had

been written by Moses, already mentioned in the preceding sura: "Truly, this can be found in the First Leaves, the Leaves of Abraham and Moses". And this preacher teaches his listeners by narrating to them the story that are in the Koran, i.e. Moses' writings.

The custom to take off shoes is Jewish and comes from India. It has prevailed amongst Muslims who do not know that, by doing this, they stand by this Jewish custom. (Exode III,4: "Do not approach, take off your sandals. Truly, thou are in the Sacred Valley of Towa" (towa means 'twice' and it is said in Exodus that God called Moses twice to see better)". So, says Joseph Bertuel, "here we are when the preacher, not named, draws on a Book that he allows us to identify as being Moses' book that he calls Koran, revealed by Yahweh on Mount Sinai in order to regulate the behaviour of humanity, and the existence of a Jewish preacher writing the Arabic book of Islam that will be wrongly named Koran afterwards.

It is nevertheless the case that, presently, everybody remains with this wrong idea, based on inventions about the life of a Muhammad who, a priori, seems to be a mere invention. Everything has been said about him; he has even travelled in the Sky ... of course. The only explanation: this Muhammad seems, actually, to be the student of the Jewish rabbi. Dixit Joseph Bertuel:

"So far, everything that we have read, at leisure mixed up by the first Arab commentators and of course absorbed by the Western koranologists since centuries, boils down to this: the only religious Book that will ever exist for Jews is the Hebraic Koran, the Torah of Moses, guide of truth and justice. Yahweh is its author. Moses is neither a djinn, nor a diviner nor a poet. God has appeared to him. He has spoken to his servant. Glory to Yahweh!

But it is to be blind or very ignorant not to detect, in this Arabic Book, the truth that is obvious: a Jewish master preaches to the Arabs the religion of Israel, and he does not preach that only » ... "To explain the complete success of the Jewish master, we are therefore obliged to assume that he has found some complicities, even a powerful help, within the family of his future disciple. We know that the latter had married a wealth, cause of the regard he was enjoying. According to the Arab tradition, the absolute mistress of this wealth was named Khadidja, and she was Jewish."

Here is the preacher who teaches his disciple. Sura LXXIII: "O thou, wrapped in a coat (in order not to be recognized during this time of initiation to Judaism) sit up only a little time, half or less than half the night, or a little bit more, and carefully intone the Koran ... during the day, you have many things to do." This is the second time that the word Koran is used. How would it be possible to intone what is not yet written? 'Ooran' derives from 'Oarad', to read, and means: what is read, the Law written to be read. For a Jew, there is only one: the Law that has been revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai. The disciple makes progress: sura LXXV: "Don't move your tongue while saying it, with the view to hasten it. It is up to us to assemble it and to recite it. When we declaim it, follow well the declamation, and then it is up to us to explain the text." Sura CXII: "Say: He is God, Only; God, the only one. He has not been begot. Nobody is His equal." Thus, Muhammad has become a Jew, according to the formula of the Talmud: « Whosoever repudiates idolatry is said to be a Jew.' Sura CIX: "Tell them: Ô infidels! I will not worship what you worship and you will not worship what I worship. To you your religion. As for me, I have mine." etc.. etc... Thus, the disciple has become a convert, this will be reminded to him continuously, and he has to meditate on the story of the great patriarchs of the Bible. Muhammad (let us name the disciple

with this name, why not?) is a 'Warner' who has to learn and to repeat what is taught to him. Sura XXXII: "The revelation of the Scripture, without doubt, comes from the Lord of Centuries. Will they say: 'He has forged it?' Not at all! It is the truth coming from your Lord so that you may warn people to which, before you, no Warner had come." Sura XXVIII, 46: "You were not on the slope of Mount Sinai. However, by the grace of your Lord, you have received knowledge of it in order to warn a people to which no warner had come before you."

To conclude, Islam, as the specific religion of Arabs is a myth. Dixit Bertuel: « He has brought nothing new. He has received everything, with the order not to add anything to the preceding revelations of whom Bible names Yahweh and who was already named Allah in the Middle-East in the 6th century.

The named Muhammad was merely a student of a Jewish rabbi, come to convert the Arabs. Muhammad will be formed: "We will teach you how to recite and you will not forget» (sour. LXXXVII,6). In the sura LI, the quotations from the Pentateuch begin. It is noteworthy, as Bertuel notes, that the knowledge of this rabbi is not strictly limited to the text of the Bible, but he equally knows the commentaries of the masters who have come before him and whose teachings have been collected in the Talmuds of Jerusalem and Babylon. He speaks like a rabbi, and not like a mere narrator of the Bible. He knows misdrashim. Actually, Islamism is "the conversion of the Meccan polytheists to a sole God or, more concretely, to the Jewish religion".

Allah has never revealed any Talmudic fables to an Arab! Like this, there are plenty of details that are not found in the Bible but that are in other Jewish texts. « A singular familiarity is needed to remember the person of Choaib in the Old Testament, person quickly forgotten by all the exegetes.

Therefore, how an Arab, who frequented the Ka'aba and worshipped idols during most of his life, could have learnt such details? This is totally contradictory." Bertuel summarizes: "If this author wanted just to establish his religion on Biblical revelations, he would have abided by the text of the Old Testament... But we are before an author that is totally unable to compose his narrations without peppering it with developments that are specifically rabbinic and of which, still to day, very few people have the curiosity to look at the sources. Unfortunately, almost no commentator of the socalled Koran has done it. Only Siderski did, but it has not been possible for him to free himself from the Arabic legends about Muhammad. He has not drawn the conclusion that came by force: to erase Muhammad from the list of the great founders of religions; to take away from him the paternity of this book." "The great novelty of the Arabic Book; Bertuel adds, is that, precisely, it contains nothing new. It is a book of the past... Not only every assertion and even the details of its descriptions can easily be linked to a biblical text, but there is more: our preacher, far from using the Biblical Scriptures in a book manner, thinks really like a Jew. His "infernal threats' are part of a complete scheme of judaization. In order to restore its historical truth to this text, it is enough to replace Muhammad by his Jewish master. With this essential correction, everything comes back to the normal. It is a complete schema of conversion " Bertuel continues: "The Arabs to whom the preacher speaks like to play with small boys and virgins? No problem! Convert and you will get ... Your pleasure is to deflower virgins, you take pride of it? Good, in Heaven, your glory will be endless and limitless. All the women you will find there are virgins, etc..." This master does everything to convince, in the same way our Catholic missionaries continue to do. He describes Heaven with details that embarrass our Koranologists, so much that they absolutely

want to find some symbolic meaning. But tell today's Muslims that they will not get women in Heaven...

Such is the conclusion: Islam is not a new religion. The Koran is nothing else than the Old Testament. Muhammad was never a prophet, and the so-called Koran has to be called, more exactly: 'Arabic book of Islam'. Islam is a deformation of Hebraism, itself a deformation of Hinduism. Let us add that 'Muslim' means 'submitted': mouslimina (S. XVI,83).

Conclusion: "The man who preaches speaks on his own initiative and he is the intermediary of no one. He shows a vast knowledge of the Bible and rabbinic literature that he uses with ease. He adapts his teaching to his audience. He does not give a technical teaching, but he is a fearless apostle who knows what he wants. It is in this way that it is possible for us to see the working out of a scheme of iudaization of Arabia through themes that are borrowed from the history of the Hebrews and Jews. It is hard to convince the Meccan idolaters. The rabbi's disciple becomes the husband of a rich Jew. Up to there, we do not know the name of this Arab, and we do not hear him pronouncing the least word. He receives his mission to preach in his turn and to become a 'warner'. During this period, we know that there is no Koran; the only Koran to which the rabbi refers is the Hebraic Koran the Torah.

-----

Thus, the Koran does not teach any new religion but the Jewish religion. This conclusion comes from the first Meccan period. With Medina, everything continues in a logical way in this viewpoint. More, as conflicts are

coming in Mecca, the suras of Medina often say the complete opposite of those of Mecca, so much so that, in the Koran, we find everything and the opposite of everything. In Mecca, the teachings of the rabbi forbid violence, injustice and the neglect of the poor. In Medina, as the disciple (who now can be called Muhammad if we want) begins to have some followers, he begins to become warlike. Now, is it the rabbi or the disciple, Muhammad, who speaks? Here are some examples:

Sura 73:10 – Mecca: "Be patient with what they say, and go far from them in a courteous manner." And in Medina: "Kill them, wherever you can find them, and drive them away from all the places from where they have driven you away."

Sura 2:256 - Mecca: "There is no compulsion in religion". Medina: "Fight them until there is no more persecution and until religion is God's religion."

Sura 29:45: "Don't speak with the people of the book who are not harmful otherwise than with good means, and tell them: 'we believe in what has been sent to us and in what has been sent to you. Our God is the same as yours, and we are His subjects." Sura 9:20 "Fight those who don't believe in God and in the Last day ... and fight the People of the Book, who don't accept the religion of truth, until they pay tribute, being inferior."

Actually, the preacher feels much stronger now to come to the stage of the Jihad. There is also a particular thing, that is that, when, before, he just quoted the Bible, the

Talmud, etc., now he will go as far as to speak against the Jews, since he meets with the hostility of the Arabs towards them. If you take those works as God's words, then God contradicts Himself; but if you take them as the words of a mere preacher, then there is no more contradiction: he asks his disciple to behave in another way than before, because the circumstances have changed.

We will not go further. This simple résumé is enough. Islam, a religion? Absolutely not.

And this will be transformed. In following the story of this book, wrongly called Koran, it is easy to find that everything continues in a very logical way. We are now where the (not yet called) Muhammad and his master are obliged to flee from Mecca, which has become very dangerous for them. And they arrive to Medina.

The Jewish religious education, with the arrival to Medina, will be transformed in a real political system.



#### II

## FROM MECCA TO MEDINA or FROM RELIGION TO POLITICS

With Medina, we go beyond revelation, we come to the stage of intercession, as it is written in the wrongly caller Koran! End, for the first time, le word 'prophet' will be used (sura 33, from Medina). While he was laughed at in Mecca, in Medina he will assert himself. It was said so far: "You who believe, obey the apostle" (what, between us, proves once more that he did not get any Revelation). He was not a prophet at this time, he was only an apostle, a rabbi who was teaching, and at that time, there was no Koran, no revelation, Q.E.D. Now in Medina, some people begin to follow him, and one can see him becoming a 'prophet'.

Anwar Shaikh – who is or has been a Muslim, has participated in the partition of India and in the creation of Pakistan. He has killed Hindus, following the Koranic instruction by doing so. Then, leaving blind belief, he has gone in his own search. Presently, he is under a fatwa that is even harder than for Talisma Nasreen or Salman Rushdie who, compared to him, have done nothing, for

he praises the Vedas and he has deeply proved that Islam is nothing but a political movement, and this since the beginning. I let him speak, making his words shorter:

"Prophecy is a stratagem to project oneself as a God, to give oneself a certificate of excellence without any relation to reality. The God that depends on man is of an inferior nature compared to him. A prophet commands people from his grave what they must or what they must not do, and this through laws that he said himself to be divine, with a system of rewards and punishments. The prophet says that God communicates directly only with him, and with nobody else!!! If God cannot prevent people to do whatever they like, how could He prevent the wrong deeds of a prophet? It would have been better for the Lord to create a mechanism for receiving His message directly! The only concept of 'prophet' is a ridiculisation of God."

Allah was originally an idol in the Kaaba, where it was worshipped by the Quresh, the tribe of the prophet! Afterwards, Muhammad has made an idol of himself. He has destroyed all the statues of the Kaaba with the statue of Allah; he has given Allah the status of God. This is the résumé made by Anwar Shaikh, and it totally corresponds to the continuation of what we have said above on the fact that the true Koran is no other than the Bible:

1.- Following Moses' model, he first claims that Allah, the Islamic God, has forced him to accept to be a prophet (Sahih Muslim: 301)

- 2.- In the beginning, to impress people, he says: «"There is no other God than Allah and Muhammad is his messenger". This is what is called the Shahadah, the foundation of the Islamic creed. Until he reaches an important number of followers, he says that he is a mortal who has received the duty to spread Allah's message. The so-called Koran says that he is only a servant (The Cow: 20) (and I make you remember that, when we know that it is the rabbi who speaks to his disciple, everything is limpid), that he does not know the Not-Seen (The Cow: 50). He has not the power to perform miracles (The Storm: 5). "I only received the order to serve God" (Storm: 35). Being mortal, he is also subject to reward and punishment: "If He wants, he will have mercy toward you, or, if it is His will, He will chastise you" (The Night trip: 55). "Don't place any other God besides Allah, or you will be driven to the Gehenna." (d°: 40)
- 3) Then, when he becomes strong enough, he throws the preceding style away and expresses himself as being a part of Allah:

"Obey God and his messenger" (Imra's house: 25). "Who obey God and his messenger will be admitted in the gardens" (Women: 15). He even becomes a co-sovereign with God: "For any believer, man or woman, what God and his messenger have enacted, they have no choice in the matter. Who disobey God and His messenger are in complete mistake." (Confederates: 35).

Gradually, he makes himself equal to God. More, God becomes his disciple: "God and His angels ask the

prophet for peace. O believers, bless him too and ask him for peace » (Confederates: 55). Praying for peace is the highest form of worship. Both angels and God worship Muhammad by asking him peace!

One finds a stratagem that is parallel to the Church's stratagem with the Pope's infallibility: according to Gratien, the Pope « is superior to all laws and the source of all lows. His position is therefore equal to the position of the Son of God"...

How this Muhammad has done to get so many followers? He has destroyed Allah's statue that was the most sacred idol for the Arabs. It is only by doing so, that he has been able to take the place of this idol, projecting himself as the only Allah's representative on earth. He made the choice of Allah because the latter represented his tribe and was regarded as the most sacred and powerful. Then, he claimed that he had come for the sake of humanity. ("We have sent you through our mercy toward all beings" (The prophets: 180). We find this too in the Hadiths, for instance: "No one reaches faith, until I become to him dearer than the other persons of the house, dearer than his wealth, dearer than the entire humanity." (Muslim: Vol. I:70). To be obeyed, he says: "You have a good example in the messenger of God for anybody who hopes for God and the last day." (Confederates: 20).

Muhammad will go as far as to imagine that he is equal with God; and more, that God intervenes for him. He says (Shahih Muslim, vol. 4.5655): "I shall be the first mediator and the first person whose mediation will be

accepted by Allah". As Anwar Shaikh says: "Obviously, it is Muhammad who decides and Allah is his mere puppet... The belief in revelation is the stronger means of brainwashing, for it is the agent of the creed that shuts all the doors of the reason." Muhammad has the power to force Allah to do what he wants. He will even send Him his followers, even if they are murderers, rapists, thieves and liars. But the saint, if not Muslim, goes straight to Hell.

There is there too a contradiction with Mecca. In the beginning, the Koran clearly states that any mediation is impossible, and it says it emphatically. Suddenly, however, oops, it says the complete opposite and preaches it. On one side (Shahih Muslim vol. 11:2129) Muhammad says that it is impossible for him to save his own mother, neither (Shahih Muslim 1:408) his uncle who fought by his side, but on the other side he affirms that he will be the first mediator whose mediation will be accepted. « If he cannot intercede for his mother, how could he, Anwar Shaik asks, born himself in Islam, save countless murderers, thieves, cheats and liars? »

The résumé is the following: to simply believe in Allah does not make you a Muslim. You have to believe at the same time in Allah and in Muhammad. Afterwards, Allah and Muhammad command together, and a Muslim must obey them conjointly. God's law is what Muhammad says it is. And Allah is Muhammad's puppet. (ex. 4 wives for a Muslim, but he takes 9. If the Muslim has more than one wife, he must treat them equally; Allah however exempts Muhammad to do the same). It is like

this that all Muslims, even the thieves and the rapists, go to Paradise, and that all non-Muslims, even pious, go to Hell.

Then, when he speaks against the idolaters, « he allows the creation of a true pantheon under his divine shadow », but, of course, only formed with his parents and associates.

Muslims, very early, have done everything to camouflage the origin of their religion, by substituting some Muhammad to Moses. As for the countries where they have put their feet, they have done everything to destroy the entire period before them. Muhammad knew that Moses, before him, had created a wonderful nation of Jews that have been able to perpetuate his name. He wanted to do the same and has therefore imitated Moses. In everything. Mount Sinai is replaced by Mount Hira where he would have got revelation. Later Mecca will become Jerusalem. He narrates his revelations in a book. The big dream of Muhammad is to deify himself through the efforts of a great Arab nation that will fight for his glory.

The truth is that the Arabs were worshippers of statues. Muhammad came and worshipped the black stone before becoming the founder of Islam ("I had the habit to come and to pay my homage to it."). The stone is an object of

worship; it is therefore an idol. Moses condemns any image, but Muhammad continues to worship the black stone in the Kaaba to make of it the most sacred temple of Islam for national reasons. Anwar Shaikh says: "God is everywhere in the world, but Muhammad's genius seems to have made him reside permanently in Mecca for the profit of his own people: the Arabs."

What has to be known is that annual pilgrimages were a principle amongst the Arabs before Islam. All the tribes that had the same god came together there and were circulating in procession around the idol.

Actually, Muhammad was the founder of the Arab empire. And it is thus that the concept of Jihad will appear.

#### JIHAD

To get a permanent excuse allowing him to fight the non-believers, he comes to declare that all other religions are false (Sahih Muslim, cp. LXXI) and announces a state of war against them until they are eradicated, the complete goal being to acquire domination through bloodshed. In both the religions of the book, it is noteworthy to note that their God is a maniac of power. Both create theocratic countries with priests or mullahs. Both speak of infallibility.

"Let no believers take non-believers as friends (Imra's house, 60)

"Allah is an enemy for the non-believers." (The Cow, 98)

"God has cursed the non-believers and has prepared for them a frightful Hell." (Confederates, 55)

To obey to the Koranic injunction (Repentance, 29), non-Muslims living in a Muslim country are subjected to a tax, the Jazya. You pay a tax because you are not Muslim.

Allah does not allow the believer to exert his free will. He has to obey. It is like this that there is no science in Muslim countries and that everything that is scientific, medical, communications, etc., comes from West. Muslims have the cheek to say that physics, medicine, law, history, literature, etc... everything is contained in the Koran. But: read it and you will find that, even in a symbolic sense, it contains nothing of any of these.

Islamic law demands 4 eyewitnesses for a rape. Now you understand the story of that little girl who has been condemned to death, don't you? However, you were indignant when you have learnt of this! Now, having read the Koran, you are no more indignant, you understand, this becomes normal. When our brains were brainwashed by Catholicism, were not we doing the same? We were stupidly following. We were condemning.

"Don't allow non-Muslims to enter mosques. They will go to Hell" (Repentance: 17)

"O thou who believe! the non-Muslim is impure. Then, don't let them approach the inviolable places of worship" (Repentance: 28)

"O you who believe! Kill those amongst non-believers ... and let them find harshness in you." (Repentance : 123)

"Humiliate non-Muslims so much that they surrender and pay tribute" (Repentance 29)

"O believers, do not treat you fathers and your brothers as friends if they prefer non-belief to belief. Those who take such friends are harmful" (Repentance: 20)

God is certainly an enemy for the non-believers (The Cow: 90)

"Muslims are harsh towards the non-believers, but merciful between themselves" (Victory: 25)

But when forbidden months have passed, then seize and kill the non-believers wherever you can find them ... and lie to them and wait for them...; however, if they repent and do regular prayers and practise a regular charity, open the path for them." (9:5)

"Those who deny Allah and His messages and try to separate Allah from His messenger (viz. Muhammad) ... are true non-believers, and we have prepared a humiliating punishment for non-believers". (4.21.150-151)

Thus, there are those who side God on one hand, and on the other, all others who side Satan and who must be killed.

The Hadith, the so-called words of the Prophet, says (Shahih Muslim, Chp LXXI) that, as Islam is the religion for the entire humanity, it abrogates all the other beliefs. Hadith nr 285 says that the Jew or the Christian who has heard of Muhammad and who does not come to him becomes a « citizen of hell ». Thus, says Anwar Shaikh,

"this means that Muslims are superior to non-Muslim and that they have a birth-right to dominate them."

People have not to think by themselves, but to obey blindly. As Muslims in most countries are relatively poor and without resources, as, as a matter of fact, nearly all Muslim countries (without petrol) are part of the Third World where reign poverty, sickness, injustice and ignorance ("everything is based on strength, on lie, on robbery, etc..." (Anwar Shaikh)), and as, on another hand, the prophet is the only saviour, the only medium, as he will make their frustrated desires become true in the world to come, they will do anything in his name, without any reference do any morality. "If they obey blindly, says Anwar Shaikh, then they are allowed to beg, to rape, to murder, to rob and to betray without losing only one chance to enter the paradise that their prophet has guaranteed them in an absolute manner."

Corollary to this belief is the oppression of non-Muslims by Muslims: the denial of human rights for non-Muslims. The Prophet has set an example by throwing all Jews and Arabs out of Arabia.

#### Which are Allah's direct orders?

Jihad is a clear command for murder, plunder, rape, for creating widows and orphans, this to impose Allah's will. However, Allah is the Compassionate! Jihad and violence are regarded as holy by Allah. Repentance 110: "They fight on the path of Allah, they kill and are killed,

for this Allah grant them the gift of Paradise." One gets paradise in return for the murder of an Infidel. Paradise has in it Houris and Ghilman. Houris are the most beautiful young virgins it is possible to imagine, with superb breasts. Ghilman are young immortal boys, handsome like pearls, dressed in green silk and brocade and wearing silver bangles. To be sure that the guy, very lucky, is able to copulate, Allah will increase his virility by 100 times. It is therefore normal that Muslims often practise a practical morality based on violence.

PS.: Now you can understand why even boys transform themselves in living bombs! Their life is so hard where they live, with violence all around, and look, within 5 seconds, they can get incredible Houris!

#### ISLAM, THE ARAB NATIONAL MOVEMENT

The hatred of the non-Islamic is the pivot of the existence of Islam. Islam is an offspring of the Semitic culture that is an expression of the aggressive behaviour of man.

Muhammad, after being taught, is obliged to go to Medina, so much the things are bad in Mecca. He has an intense personal ambition, as we have seen. He wants to be loved and worshipped like God. At the collective level, also, he addresses to the nation. He knows that the people needs a chief, a head, and it is why he becomes a national leader when, in the beginning, he was just a mere nobody. The status of prophet makes you immortal, and it will even be possible for him to dominate from his grave! He wants to be worshipped, alone, and it is why he says that he is le last prophet, the only mediator, etc. etc. Islam is less a religion than an Arab National Movement, as he has proved it immediately.

While Christendom has waited the time to be structured, to have a power, a head, a church, and then, and only then has slaughtered and dominated; as Islam had already a head, it has begun to slaughter right away without waiting.

As we have seen, Allah speaks only in Arabic. Muhammad is from the tribe of the Quresh, which worshipped Allah long before his birth. Once he makes of himself the prophet of Allah and declares that he is the last and the only one and that all other religions are invalid, then he becomes an absolute power, a tyrant; and we have seen how he has brainwashed his followers. It remains that some do not agree completely and, among them, some tribes do not recognize him.

The fact remains that God is Arabic and sends a revelation in Arabic for the Arabs who, therefore, are the only ones to be in possession of truth, and we go until a point where it is no more the man who worship God, but God who worships man. The so-called prophet has succeeded in becoming superior to God who, with His angels, prays to him. He does not want that his followers dress like the non-believers: "When the prophet saw that Abdullah b. amr b. Al was wearing ochre clothes (Hindu color, the color of renouncement), he forbad them to wear them as these clothes were worn by the non-believers." (Sahih Muslim Vol. 3).

Thanks to the revelation, the prophet has worked out the doctrine of the Jihad, like this: to the Jews, he says that, if they become Muslims, they will be protected, otherwise they will see that earth belongs to Allah and to His messenger (Sahih Al Bukhari, vol. 4). Then he says: "Heaven lies under the shadows of the sabers." (d°). "Anyone wanting another religion than Islam will never be accepted." (Imran's House: 85), he abrogates the other religions: "Every Jew or Christian who hears of me but

does not believe in me will go to Hell." (Sahih Muslim Ch. LXX.1). Anwar Shaikh quotes some examples from Al Bukhari Vol. 8:

- 1.- The prophet cut off the hands and the feet of the men of the tribe of Uraina and let they die like this.
- 2.- When Ukl's men committed crimes, the prophet stopped them. Their hands and legs were cut off, their eyes were burnt with hot irons, and they were thrown at Al-Harra. They died of thirst.
- 3.- Those who fought against him, he amputated them and let them die

"Kill the non-believers wherever you find them." (Women: 90)

Muhammad loved Arabia and its traditions. So, the Muslims of the other countries began to do the same and to hate the traditions of their ancestors in the countries where they were converted (see the cricket matches in India).

#### III.- ISLAM AND THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD

As we have found, Muhammad has clearly said that there were: the nation of the believers and the nation of the non-believers, the **Dar-ul-Islam** and the **Dar-Ul-Harb**. This has huge consequences that one does not suspect presently.

Actually, first: the entire world that is non Muslim the Dar-ul-Harb, i.e. the ground of the war. It is stated that they must convert, so that the world becomes Muslim. Secondly: the Muslim does not recognize any other motherland than Islam, and he does not recognize the motherland as a country. In this way, Islam destroys the national spirit of non-Arab Muslims and has destroyed all the centres of civilisation as Egypt, Iran and India.

Muslims recognize the Muslim law before the law of the country. In France we have only seen a small example with the story of the scarf.

One could ask, logically, when we are said that the Koran has to be read in Arabic only, they convert people who do not speak Arabic! They cannot be true converts! End the converts by force are obviously not converts. But let us see this with more details:

More and more, the world is brought face to face with this fundamentalism. It is not possible to speak of a Muslim fundamentalism, as Islam is fundamentalist by nature. It is getting hold of the world, more and more, and it is inevitable that, one day, the world will be obliged to declare an open war on it. The war against Islam is inevitable.

"Allah has granted a great favor to the believers when He has sent them a messenger from amongst them who reveals them the signs of Allah, sanctifies them and teaches them in the scripture and wisdom..." (3.17.164)

"Soon, we will spread terror in the hearts of the nonbelievers, their abode will be in fire..." (3.14.151)

That is what both the religions of the Book have done: «The Koran or the saber, the Christianity of the Inquisition."



## Summary of the second part, and answer to two remarks

The Second Part deals, more in details, with Islam and the future of the world. It deals with the impossibility of democracy in Muslim countries, taking diverse countries as examples, and making a small analysis of the problem of Yugoslavia, this just in quoting Izebegovich's declaration. Then it deals with the other means of the strategy of the modern Jihad, then with the dichotomy between Islam and the scientific spirit (Islam and rational spirit, Islam and science), and this leads to blind creed and poverty. Then it comes to the Muslim fundamentalism, then to the casts and untouchability in Islam, then to the problem of women. It speaks also of the obvious impossibility of integration of Muslims in the countries that are not (Muslim), and of the illusion of politicians regarding this. Then it gives examples and quotations concerning Islam.

The conclusion is that Islam leads to world war, since such is the Jihad, the division between the two "Dar"; that Islam is the last of religions, which corresponds to the state of evolution that is just above the animal stage of the primary instincts that man has to learn to control; that Islam answers to that 'spiritual' level.

As for the future of the world, Islam is one the typical incarnations of Kali Yuga, of the complete blindness. Explanations are given about this. At the same time, maybe, it will be a means for the destruction of the present age, of the selfish and materialistic civilisation; it will, however, act as a

springboard for an opposite reactions from the enlightened minds.

We can only count on a second generation for the Muslims who are living somewhere else, for instance for the 'beurs' in France. Islam is such that every sensitive being who stands at a middle level of evolution is obliged to refute most of its terms. Now when it refutes a part, he is obliged to refute all of it. This means that every enlightened Muslim would have to leave the Muslim religion. His problem, of course, is that this religion forbids him to do so and that, if he does so, he can die!

Most of Muslims are peaceful people. My Muslims friends from India are a living example, and my French Muslim friends too. They practise less and less, as it has been for Catholicism. They just have respect for Ramadan. It is the only hope it is possible to have: youth that are brought face to face with another civilisation. It is why it is wrong to judge Muslims and to be, in this way, led to some cultural or religious racism, but Islam must be exposed. Not the man, but the system, whether political, religious or cultural. In this way, if some men have to be fought in Islam, they are the imams who, as Catholic priests of old, extol their religion with the only aim to get the power.

Therefore, the topic of this second part is: « Islam and the future of the world », of which the outline has been given at the end of the first part...

Before, I would wish to make a remark. Somebody, at the end of this first part, smilingly told me that my exposé was like a settling of accounts and that it spoke of 'present Islam'.

It is very important to say that it is a settling of account in no way, that I have merely quoted Koran and Hadiths, the goal being just to understand what is happening and what will happen around us. It is not at all question of judging people, but to understand why they behave like this, in the same way Catholics thought they were acting in a good way and following God's will by slaughtering civilisations. There is therefore absolutely no "settling of accounts". About the remark on present Islam, I must say that it was not the case. Of course, in West, Charles Martel and Poitiers apart, we have not been too much touched afterwards. However, such is not the case elsewhere. Hitlerian massacres are timid things compared to what Islam did in India where, in the world, never such butchery has been seen. This is not dated this day, obviously not, but this has begun with Muhammad of Ghazni!

Another remark was on the translation. As an example, one has quoted the word 'Dhar' that I have given as 'land', when the word means 'house', telling me that, in doing so, one could be led to make mistakes of interpretation. Everybody knows, however, that a translation, first, is made 'word for word' and is afterwards put in current language. In 'Dar Ul Islam' and 'Dar Ul Harb', the word Dar means house. Now, if one translates word for word, the meaning is even more restricted: that means 'the house of Islam' and 'the house of war'. This is not right for the second meaning, does it? It is why the term 'house' is not proper for a translation in current language and the term 'domain' must be used. If it is said that there is the 'domain of Islam' on one hand and the 'domain of the war' on the other, then to change the word 'domain' by the word 'land' does not change, in any way, the sense of the sentence.

Thus, for Islam, there is on one hand the 'domain of Islam' and, on the other, the 'domain of war', the goad being to have only the 'Dar ul Islam' everywhere on earth.

# **Impossibility of Democracy in Muslim countries**

Muslims are anti-secularist; they cannot stand for the state. For Christians: "Give back to Cesar what belongs to Cesar'. For Muslims, the state is Islam and nothing else. (Thus, it is possible to see, in India, cricket matches during which, when Pakistanis win, Indian Muslims applaud and boo their own country). (later note: in Mauritius, it has been the same when this country has received an Egyptian team of football. In France, in 2001, during the first football encounter France-Algeria, Muslim French were openly for the Algerian team and Muslim French have booed the French hymn!).

More than this, as it has been stated above, the Muslim acknowledges only the Muslim law, the sharia, and not the law of the country. For him, sharia is above the law of the country, since he believes, and this sincerely, that it has been given by God.

In the Dar-ul-Harb, Koran enjoins Muslims to wage an incessant war against the law and the order of the country, until this country is caught by Muslims. And this is what they do everywhere: a special law for them, no regard for the law of the country, etc...

In Muslim countries, religion is politics and politics is religion; and the strategy of Islam is inscribed in itself.

It has been so since the very creation of Islam. Coexistence between Muslims and non-Muslims is an impossible thing. Strictly impossible, only with Muslims who do not practise and are Muslims just because they were born as such.

Look: are the Muslims becoming integrated? No, they gather together. Go inside the very heart of Paris, at the foot of Montmartre.

Only two countries are outside of this: Indonesia and Turky ... so far ...

Wherever Muslims know a substantial minority, they insist for a separated identity. Integration in France is a dream, an illusion. Let politicians read the Koran first, then they will understand many things, inside as well as outside.

"Tell those who reject the Faith: soon you will be vanquished and all gathered together in Hell." (Koran: 3.2.12).

Dr Ali Issa Othman: "The rise of Islam was military. There is a tendency to ask us to apologize for this, but we have not to do so. It is one of the injunctions of the Koran that we must fight in order to spread Islam." (The Muslim Mind, 1976)

# Let us take some examples:

In India, during the Moghol period, Muslims killed several millions Hindus, converted by force several millions and destroyed more than 60.000 temples in Northern India, using their materials for building mosques instead (see Ayodhya, etc.)

Later, when India was going out of slavery thanks to giants like Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Gandhi, Muslims have insisted on partition. Some Muslims, however, remained in India, more than 100.000.000 presently, and they ask for special rights while they slaughter Hindus in Pakistan! Thus, in the regions where they are not in the majority, they do everything to exhaust, to humiliate the countries that offer them hospitality. "Terro on non-Muslims is the pillar of Islamic morality », Anwar Shaikh says. What is happening in France happens in India since times immemorial. But here, one does not understand, one thinks that it is possible to negotiate. No, no negotiation is possible. One must fight, have the courage to fight. But all of us have become assisted and calves.

If Islam teaches that it cannot believe in democracy neither in secularism, then the Muslim minority in a non-Muslim majority has to leave the democratic countries they are living in, to go to a Muslim country where it will be possible for them to live and to practise their sharia (Jagtiani).

Muslims in India are against a common civil code because no Court has to interfere with their sharia!

They want to have their own laws, even if they are in the minority and they do not want to be rules by the laws of the country where they are living. The lesson is simple: when they are in the majority, they kill the non-Muslim minority; when they are not in the majority, they shout against discrimination. In no country where Muslims are in the majority, it is possible to have a secular constitution. Muslims want non-Muslims to be secular while they remain non-secular. Why, is Islam is sure of its faith, would it have to fear critic?

"When Hindus are accused, when Christians are accused, Christians say: « Let the dogs bark, who take care of them?". Muslims shout: « Why are the dogs barking? Kill them." (Jagtiani).

However, India is not the only example:

In **Cyprus**, it was possible to see incessant quarrels between the 120.000 Turkish Muslims and the 500.000 Greek Christians. Muslims have formed their own Turkish Republic. United Nations have been sent to try to keep peace between the two communities. It is everywhere the same.

In 1943 in **Lebanon**, Christians were in the majority. When Muslims have represented 60%, they have come back on their word and have asked for the cancellation and the partition of Lebanon.

In **Chad**, there is a civil war between the Muslim majority in the north and the Christian majority in the south. The solution? Probably a partition.

In **Malaysia**, in which population is 51% Muslim, there is discrimination. If a non-Muslim marries a Muslim girl, he must become converted before his marriage.

Islam in **Nigeria**: Society of Hindu Miss. 01-04/92. Since 1980 with Muhammadu Marwa, when 5,000 persons were killed. Marwa was killed, but his lieutenants came back in 1982 and killed again 3,000 persons, most of them Christians. The same in 1984 with more than 1.000 dead. Again in 1986 and 1987 and 1991 with more than 2,000 dead, mostly Christians. "I have seen hundreds of fanatical Muslims with bows, arrows, etc... walk towards Christian quarters. I have seen them kill more than 2,000 Christian brothers and sisters. I have seen them burn a 3 months baby." (Suleiman El-Ilodigwe, nov. 1991)

In **England**, Muslims are on the path of war. They have formed a Muslim Parliament with 155 members. Most of them are Pakistanis. Their goal is the creation of an Islamic state in Great Britain. Its director, Kalim Siddiqui, is the man who has pronounced the death sentence against Salman Rushdie.

In 1995, two members of the Koweiti parliament has asked their government to deport all Hindus.

**Present example of ex-Yugoslavia.**- (note: this lecture dates 1996)

Presently, it is the same with ex-Yugoslavia, but it seems that nobody understands. Of course Serbians are accused. But Iszebegovich, the boss of Muslim Bosnians, created the politico-religious organisation « Young Muslims » when he was 16. It is he who, with his Muslim Nazis, exterminated 320,000 Serbs and 30,000 Jews in Sarajevo just before the advance of the German army. It is he and his movement "Young Muslims" that applied ethnic cleansing and genocide during 50 years in order to obtain his territory, Bosnia. In 1983, for the violent activities of his movement, he was condemned to 16 years of jail for crimes against Serbs. He did only 6. Here are excerpts of his 'Islamic Declaration':

Do we want the Muslim nations to cease moving in circles, to stop being dependent, backward and poverty-stricken; do we want them to once again with a sure step climb the road of dignity and enlightment and to become masters of their own fate; do we want the springs of courage, genius and virtue to come forth strongly once again; (1)?

then we must show the way which leads to that objective: The implementation of Islam in all fields of individuals' personal lives, in family and in society, by renewal of the Islamic religious thought and creating a uniform Muslim community from Morocco to Indonesia. ... (2)

"... The first and foremost of such conclusions is surely the one on the incompatibility of Islam and non-Islamic systems. There can be no peace or coexistence between the "Islamic faith" and non-Islamic societies and political institutions. ... Islam clearly excludes the right and possibility of activity of any strange ideology on its own turf. Therefore, there is no question of any laicistic principles, and the state should be an expression and should support the moral concepts of the religion. ..."

... Islamic order may be implemented only in countries where Muslims represent the majority of the population. Without this majority, the Islamic order is reduced to authority only (because the other element is lacking - the Islamic society), and may turn into violence. Muslim minorities inside a non-Muslim majority, provided that one guarantee them the freedom to practise their religion, to live and to grow normally, must be loyal and have to accomplish all their engagements toward this community, except those that harm Islam and Muslims. The position of Muslim minorities in non-Islamic communities depends on the strength of the international Islamic community and on the esteem in which it is held....

... We find as absolutely unacceptable and unreal that, in this time of concentration and association, a people – Arabs – has to be divided into 13 units or states; that Muslims states stand on opposite sides on several international

significant questions; that Muslim Egypt is not concerned by the sufferings of Muslims in Ethiopia and Kashmir ...

... the Islamic movement should and must start taking over the power as soon as it is morally and numerically strong enough to not only overthrow the existing non-Islamic, but also to build up a new Islamic authority.... ...there cannot be any peace neither coexistence between Islamic religion and the social and political non-Islamic institutions...

The tendency to put together all the Muslim communities in the world was a natural function of the Islamic order ... This means a struggle for creating a big Islamic federation from Morocco to Indonesia, from tropical Africa to Central Asia...

The example of Pakistan, the only Islamic Republic that is declared today, must not be forgotten. We applaud Pakistan ... because it is the expression of this desire to establish an Islamic order and because those who have conceived and created it ware clearly led by an Islamic idea ... Pakistan was a general rehearsal of introducing Islamic order under modern conditions and on the present stage of development.... The Islamic protagonists should learn what must and what must not be done from the example of Pakistan ... No Muslim heart does not palpitate at the mention of something that is dear to us like Pakistan ... Pakistan is our great hope...

... Muhammad (peace be upon him) died in 632 B.C. Les than 100 years later, the spiritual and political power of Islam stretched on a large surface, from the Atlantic ocean to the Indus, from lake Aral to the Nile. Syria was conquered in 634, Damascus fell in 635, Ctesiphon in 637, India and Egypt were reached in 641, Carthage in 647, Samarkand in 676, Spain in 717. Muslims were at the gates of Constantinople in 717 and in southern France in 720. This unique expansion, to which no other else before can be compared, has given space for the development of the Islamic civilisation ..." etc...

(Excerpts from 'The Islamic Declaration', reprinted by 'Bosna', Sarajevo).

# Other strategic means of modern Jihad

One of the means of the Jihad inscribed in Islam is much less showy. An example, unknown here because one speaks never of those faraway countries, is the example of India with Bangladesh. Bangladesh is Muslim and more and more fundamentalist, as all Muslim nations. They infiltrate more and more into India since they cannot stand anymore in their country. A Muslim is allowed to have four wives. In old times an Arab was

able to produce several hundreds of children, and the same for those children, and it was like this that they have seized countries that have become 'Arab countries'. To them have been promised beautiful virgins and handsome boys in the future world as a reward for the destruction of 'kafirs'.

Thus, through polygamy, Muslims slowly seize the world. The percentage of Muslim in India does not stop to grow, as everywhere else.

Hadith nr 137, vol. 7 of Bukhari says that some of the Mujahids who have seized kafir women have practised the coitus-interruptus with them in order to avoid seeing them getting pregnant. The so-called prophet, consulted and surprised, asks them: « Have you really done this?". He repeats the question thrice and says: "There is no soul destined to exist that will not come into existence, until the day of Resurrection". In simple language, this means that everything that is destined to be born will be born and that, therefore, one must not practise birth control. We find underneath the desire of the so-called prophet to get a large number of disciples: "I hope that I will have the biggest offspring the day of the Resurrection." (Sahih Muslim: 283).

Bosnian Muslims have one of the highest birth rate in the world, and they hope to have a Muslim majority in 2000 in Bosnia... Just because of this, how would it be possible to get peace there?

Among other means, there are the following:

To build mosques in rural areas, then allow poor people to build their huts or their tents around them. Then to give money and work to convince them to join Islam. Afterwards, after the conversion, a publicly 'superiority' is given to them, this in order to tempt others to come and join hem. To avoid conflicts between casts, they are sent to villages, and there, they are brainwashed by destroying the entire ancestral culture that they still have in them by: circumcision, remarriage, change of name, etc.

As a supplementary strategy, we can find the following: early morning, when they get ready for the Ramadan, instead of going to their work normally while meditating, they shout, play the drum, try to make the entire neighboring knows that they are virtuous through their shouts; and they try to put on the path of others the maximum of embarrassment, as if they wanted that others get up at the same hour! Then, they tell their prayers while blocking all the streets, even in big towns, blocking entirely the traffic. Are they more preoccupied with the sanctity of their prayers or with the success they find by embarrassing everybody and drawing the attention on them?

I don't speak of the mosques... And thrice a day, the terrible music of their prayers, shouted in loudspeakers from the minarets... God, I'm a free man, I never asked for hearing their prayers! What if every religious sect was doing the same? Can I shout my prayers in the streets like this? If it is a prayer, is it not possible to tell them within

their hearts in silence, instead of shouting like this and obliging everybody to hear them and to be disturbed? Is it not a violation of people? The bells of Christian churches were disturbing too in the early morning, but much more melodious!

In France, the veil is a manner to conquer too.

At last, there is terrorism.

The motorist finances the bombs in the metro. Mosques that grow like mushrooms everywhere are financed by Saudi Arabia with the money from petrol. We are ourselves financing the Muslim fundamentalism!

## Islam and rational mind, Islam and science

A rational Muslim is a contradiction in terms.

Islam and science: During an Islamic conference, held in 1983 in Koweit, it has been said this: pure science is profane because it is secular and it is therefore against Islamic beliefs! In Muslim countries, the scientific research is almost inexistent .... but for the bombs ... (see » particularly Pakistan and Iraq).

Example: the new moon of the month of Ramadan is a matter of controversy between those who have a scientific mind and the ulemas, and among ulemas themselves. According to them, nothing is able to replace the eyesight. Pakistani government has created a Rueti-Hilal (sight of the Moon) from which a board is taken in a plane at the right moment to see the condition of the moon ...

Modernists say that the weather could be known through physical laws. Ulemas say: no, since such a prediction is out of what can be legally known by man and infringes therefore the spiritual field. Therefore, between 1983 and 1984, it has not been possible to see any weather forecast on Pakistani TV ... In 1990, an eminent biologist, Farouk Mahammed Ibrahim, was put in jail because he was teaching Darwinian Theory ... Of course he was beaten ...

# Muslim fundamentalism = Islam squared

Here are some of the « Words of the Ayatollah Khomeini » (Bantam Books inc.):

- Muslims have no other alternative, if they want to correct the balance of the society and force those who are in power to conform to the principles of Islam, than to give a holy armed war against secular governments.

- Holy war means the conquest of all territories that are no Muslim. Such a war can, very well, be declared after the formation of an Islamic government worthy of this name, under the direction and the orders of an Imam. Then, it will be the duty of every male adult to be voluntary for this war of conquest, of which the final goad is the put the Koranic law in power everywhere on earth.
- We have no other resource than to reject all the governments that are not bases on the pure Islamic laws and are therefore corrupt and corrupting, to pull off the treacherous, corrupted and tyrannical administrative systems that serve them. This is not our duty only in Iran, but it is also the duty of all the Muslims on earth, in all Muslim countries, de bring this Islamic revolution until its final victory.
- We affirm that music gives rise to immorality, to envy and to licence, and it stifles courage, valor and chivalrous spirit; it is forbidden by the Koranic laws and it must not be taught in schools.
- The Islamic government is the government by divine right, and its laws cannot be changed, modified or challenged.
- The Islamic government is subject to the law of Islam, which does not come from the people neither from its representatives, but directly from God and from His divine will.

- It is often claimed that religion has to be separated from politics. Such a propaganda comes only from atheists, it is dictated and spread by imperialists.
- In some cases, deceit is necessary for maintaining Islam and religion in general. Without it, faith could not survive.
- Muslims are not allowed to search for amending for their misdeeds with judicial or executive powers of improperly constituted governments.
- You, youth of the new generation, try to think in a clearer way. Stop to turn to science and its laws that have led humanity in making you neglect so much your responsibilities. Come and help Islam. Saye the Muslims.
- There are eleven impure things: urine, excrement, sperm, bones, blood, pigs, non-Muslim men and women, wine, beer and the sweat of a camel that eats excrement.
- Every part of the body of a non-Muslim is impure, even the hairs of his hand and of his body, his nails, and all the secretions of his body.
- A child that has not yet reached puberty is impure if his parents and grand-parents are non-Muslims, but if he has a Muslim among his ancestors, he is pure.

- Wine and all beverages that are toxic are impure, but opium and hashish are not.
- One must avoid to give the Koran to an infidel; it is even adviced to take it back from him by force if he already has it in his hands.
- It is absolutely forbidden to dissect the body of a Muslim, but the dissection of non-Muslim bodies is allowed."

This is what is called, in current language, we are obliged to say, the acme of the bloody stupidity. However, a large part of Muslims believe in this, as hard as iron! Why? Because, if you read the Koran, you will find that it is so. Why are they believing, as hard as iron? But, because this is the revelation of God, the very words of God. But which is their level of education? None. They are asked to listen to the Koran and to obey its laws and the Imam.

Here are some examples, among thousands:

Radiance, a newspaper written by fundamentalists: 3 May 1970: «if the Arabs kill a Jew for 10 of their own race, a day will come when there will be no more Jews to conquer but Arabs will still survive."

In Pakistan, a young Christian of 12 has been accused of blasphemy against Islam and his killing has been demanded. He was totally illiterate, unable to read or to write. Muslims just wanted the Christians to leave the

village, they have therefore created this story. In 1993, a Catholic, Gul Masih, was hung for blasphemy after his neighbour accused him to criticise Islam while he was angry at them. Even if this child would have been conscious, there is no order, in the Koran, that legitimates the murder of whom has insulted the prophet. The only thing that is written is Repentance: 61: "For those who persecutes Allah's messenger, there is a painful sentence."

Another example: the sharia, the Islamic law, allows abusing children... Sexual abuse, in the garb of marriage, is legal. Old people of 70 marry young Indian girls after abducting them.

In Saudi Arabia, within the 3 last years, 329 Christians have been arrested .... for attending Christian services. In 1983, 10 women have been hung in Iran because they were Bahai.

If you want, thousands of such stories exist. The last one, all of us know it, concerns the young Muslim girl who has been condemned to death because she was raped!

# Castes and untouchability in Islam

Here in Europe, one considers the caste system as a shame. Yes, it is a shame. And this shame exists since British invasion, for there was no question of castes

before, but of varnas. I would want to say that here, in West, and even in France, one does not give names but one does the same: there are the losers, the hobos, the bourgeois, the snobs, the homos, the young maids, etc.... that one does not consider in the same way. While the acknowledgement of the varnas is, simply, to say that, by nature, we can find scholars, warriors, traders and workers...

In Islam, Muslims are said to be equal; however, there is absolutely nothing like this. As already seen, differences exist, but also hundreds of castes, based on theology, interpretation, etc... Only in the state of Bihar, it possible to find the following Muslim castes: bhathiara, chik, dafalange, dafale, faqir, gadihar, hima, karanja, qassar, darzi, kasai, bhangi, madari, miriasin, mirshikar, momin, mukro, nat, pamania, rangrez, sayi et thakurai. And besides these divisions, there are others, as already seen: sunni, kariji, shia, zaida, imamia, Ismayliyya, Kojha, Bohra, Nizari, Isna, Ashari, Kachi-menon, Mutazila, Murji, Wahabi, Bahai, Ahmaddhi, Shanusi, Sufin, etc...

There is no equality among Muslims. In Pakistan, only the Sunnis are regarded as 'true' Muslims, but not the Ahmediyya who have been declared 'non-Muslims' ... the same for the Ahmadis...

Therefore is it hypocritical to say that Muslims regard themselves as equal. It is very interesting to find, like this, that Muslims do not agree between themselves, and it is why they slaughter each other, amongst brothers.

Already on the prophet, they do not agree... hence a division into sects:

- Most of the *Shiites* believe that Gabriel was sent to Ali but that he made a mistake by coming to Muhammad with Allah's message (sic). This means that Muhammad is not the true prophet.
- *Ahabis* think that one shoud not show more respect towards the prophet than the respect one has for one's own elder brother. Most Muslims find a blasphemy that both Allah and His angels ask Muhammad for peace.
- As for *Qadiyanies*, they frankly say that Muhammad was not the last prophet.
- *Sunnis* believe in all the superstition touching the prophet...

So, the world has still a chance .... But there is still a sect: Sufis. :

Though historians have tried to hide it, especially by wanting to locate its birth in Iraq, Sufism comes from India. It is Islam that has rubbed with India! Paintings showing Muhammad and Archangel Gabriel and other Sufi themes often show a Hindu influence, especially the women who have the 'bindi' between their eyebrows. In shots, it is also known, through Muslim writings that have been discovered, especially Shah Kalimu'llah

Jahanabadi who explains al the methodology of the manipulation, that Islamists have played Hindus to draw people and convert them afterwards. Thus, they followed all the practises of the Hindus; until the conversion ceremonies that were particularly accompanied with Hindu practises and symbols. Often, they wore the ochre robe of the swamis. They knew well yoga, meditation, japa, bhajan, all typically Hindu. They have taken again all the Hindu methods and have adjusted them by giving them Arabic names (like, for instance, the namasmaran that has become dikhr, and which is a technique of repetition, also called japa in India). The history of Islamic invasion shows however that Sufis were not better than the others and that, in the beginning, it was a mere technique of conversion. Movements that are more serious were born afterwards, like Bahism, recognized by 'pure and hard' Islam, movement... Only 20% of Sufis follow with faith the principles of Hinduism, but 80% were no others than fundamentalists and extremists in disguise. Thanks God, there is there some detachment from the teachings belonging to Medina. It is noteworthy that Sufism is violently rejected by 'pure' Islam. It is also significant that Sufism can still be practised only in democratic countries like India, or almost democratic like Turkey (dervishes)

That was for the castes and the sects. As for the concept of untouchability, it is simple and well defined: kafirs have always been considered as untouchable according to

Koran itself. Kafir means 'impure'. In the Koran they have not the right to approach Mecca or Medina and they have not the right to read the Koran. Muhammad institutes slavery for the kafirs through the Jihad, denying them any human right. The whole world is divided between Dar-al-Islam (the fiel of Islam) and Dar-al-Harab (the field of war) and humanity is divided into two parts: the kafirs (non-believers) and the momins (believers).

Let us have a look at the countries that know Islamic law. Are they happy, are they leading a happy life, prosperous and peaceful? Why are they even fighting each other? And what about women? 14 years ago, when I went to India for the first time, one recognized the Muslim women because they did not wear any 'bindi' between their eyebrows and because they were wearing the choridhar and not the sari. Presently however, more and more are black covered and wear the veil. Now then, just some quotations from the Koran about women:

#### Women

"And women must have equal rights to those that are opposite to them, according to what is right; but men have a degree more than them." (2:228)

"And take two witnesses among your men, and if they are not 2 men, then 1 man and two women." (2:282)

"And those women whose disloyalty you dread, admonish them, refuse to share their beds, beat them." (4:34)

"A man is allowed to marry until 4 wives at the same time." However, Muhammad has married much more.

"Your spouses are for you an arable soil; therefore, approach them when and in the manner you like."

Muslim women have not voted in 1992 for the legislative elections in Koweit...

## **CONCLUSION**

'Islam' means 'peace', which is a height. For, if one follows the Koran to the letter, if the Muslim is really Muslim, then what happens presently is logical, for it is demanded in the Koran. And we come to words like those of Maulana Muhammad Ali in 1919, words that are very objective when one knows the Koran: "Yes, according to my religion, I hold an adulterous and treacherous Muslim as better than Gandhi." Yes, he is right, according to his religion, he is obliged to say so, he cannot say otherwise. According to his religion, bomblayers, rapists, etc..., if Muslim, are better than Jesus Christ

Jesus has never said that he was a prophet. He was a realised sage, moreover an avatar, as others have been before Him. Never has he called himself a prophet. A man, however, named Saul from Tarsus, called himself a prophet and was at the base of the foundation of the Church. However, the real creator of this Church was Constantine and this Church, later, after creating the

Inquisition, has begun to slaughter in the entire world, destroying civilisations. It is the same for Islam that, too, is nothing else but a sect, and a harmful sect. Judeo-Christians continue to starve others, no more under the cover of religion, but in economic form, presently with the globalisation of the economy, the GATT, etc... that is a true horror and a new havoc of others' wealth. Muslims are still at the stage of physical violence, but it is Judeo-Christians who finance it by acquiring petrol that allows them to make their new system of slavery of the Third-World work. This jihad, secret or open, is also financed by poor Muslims themselves, full of faith as Christians were before, who are exploited. Presently, the Hadi, the pilgrimage to Mecca (they reject idolatry, kill idolaters, but all of them want to go to Mecca to worship a stone!), draws more than 2,000,000 people that come from everywhere in the world. 3,000 sterling pounds are needed for a pilgrim. Thus, Saudi Arabia, only for the Hadi, attracts 6,000,000,000 pounds a year, that is to say an average of 5,000 for a Saudi Arabian family. Several millions people turn towards Mecca five times a day! The result reached by a nobody of old is wonderful, and alarming...

One pursues Nazi murderers; maybe on day one will pursue Bolshevik murderers; Serbian murderers will be pursued. But what is done of Muslim murderers who, along the history, have been much worse than Nazis; the most murderous men that the world has never known. Nothing! While he was in West, Swami Vivekananda said: "Hashshashin has become our word 'assassin'

because an old sect of Mohammedanism killed non-believers as a part of its creed."

Saudi Arabia is financing international terrorism and the hidden Jihad (construction of mosque everywhere in the world, etc...) but this country is respected because it gives the petrol, and one does not hesitate to help it, not at all for a new international moral order, let us laugh, but for petrol. Yes, the motorist finances the bombs in the metro.

God asks the mussalaman to go and kill the kafir. After this, if he dies, he will be able, above, to caress and make love with houris who have breasts big like pumpkins, and also little boys.

"If there are kafirs in the world of Islam, Anwar Shaik says, they are the mullahs and others who have brainwashed their people." However, Anwar forgets to add, as he says somewhere else however, that these mullahs are just forcing people to follow the precepts of the named Muhammad as they are inscribed in the so-called Koran.

Of course, there is no question of racism here. Truly, the man is not involved. The matter is Islam. For these people, if they have not a bright intellect, like all those, whatever their religion, who believe blindly, are sincere.

As Vivekananda said: "fanatics are indeed the sincerest of mankind." ... and: " They are very sincere, these fanatics, the most sincere of human beings."

For only a bad Muslim, because he does not follow the Koran to the letter, can be positive. Only a Muslim who follows only the teachings of Mecca and not those of Medina is able to search for peace and universal love. Much at least in France, lays on the generation of beurs who have lived something else than that. Much also on the young Muslim girls who, being in France, most of the time reject totally the slavery that would be theirs if they came back to their country.

Integration, peace, are impossible, even within towns. Peace is only possible with Muslims who do not practise, or who do not practise Medina, or with countries like Morocco, Senegal, Tunisia, and Egypt. However, we can see that, in these countries, the return to Koran, to fundamentalism, is on the rise.

Vivekanda said: "Every religion is only evolving a God out of the material man, and the same God is the inspirer of all of them." But Islam answer a need of this world that has fallen into Kali Yuga. When we look into the history of religions, this history follows the degenerations of the human soul: first Huiduism, then Buddhism, then Christianity, then Islam. To quote again Swami

Vivekananda: "The more selfish a man, the more immoral he is. And so also with the race. That race which is bound down to itself has been the most cruel and the most wicked in the whole world. There has not been a religion that has clung to this dualism more than that founded by the Prophet of Arabia, and there has not been a religion which has shed so much blood and been so cruel to other men. In the Koran there is the doctrine that a man who does not believe these teachings should be killed; it is a mercy to kill him! And the surest way to get to heaven, where there are beautiful houris and all sorts of sense - enjoyments, is by killing these unbelievers. Think of the bloodshed there has been in consequence of such beliefs!"

In the opposite direction, religions follow the direction of evolution: Islam must be the first religious step after the brute, each religion corresponding with an inner stage of evolution. To use other terms, a garment is needed for each one... until the moment when one can go naked.

#### **SWAMI VIVEKANANDA:**

" The Mohammedan religion allows Mohammedans to kill all who are not of their religion. It is clearly stated in the Koran, "Kill the infidels if they do not become Mohammedans."." (II.335)

- " It is here in India that Hindus have built and are still building churches for Christians and mosques for Mohammedans."
- " The Mohammedans brought murder and slaughter in their train, but until their arrival peace prevailed."
- "What real music we have lies in Kirtana and Dhrupada; the rest has been spoiled by being modulated according to the Islamic methods... The Mohammedans took up the different Ragas and Raginis after coming into India. But they put such a stamp of their own colouring on the art of Tappa songs that all the science in music was destroyed."
- ".. what they have done in India. This, among all the histories of the world, is the one that has brought the deepest sufferings and humiliation".
- "Now, some Mohammedans are the crudest in this respect, and the most sectarian. Their watchword is: "There is one God, and Mohammed is His Prophet." Everything beyond that not only is bad, but must be destroyed forthwith; at a moment's notice, every man or woman who does not exactly believe in that must be killed; everything that does not belong to this worship must be immediately broken; every book that teaches anything else must be burnt. From the Pacific to the Atlantic for five hundred years blood ran all over the world. That is Mohammedanism!"

**Swami Rama Tirtha**: "millions of non-Muslims have been slaughtered in massive massacres in the name of Islam"

#### Diverse:

"But if they break their oath or if they laugh at you because of your faith, fight them..." (9:12)

In England, there are as many Hindus as Muslims in France. Did you hear of problems with Hindus in England?

"If you are afraid not to be able to deal rightly with orphans, marry women of your choice, two or three or four, but is you are afraid not to deal rightly with them (the women), then only one." (4.1.3.)

In France, it was spoken by ignoramuses of Hindu fundamentalists about Ayodhya; but right after Ayodhya, 240 Hindu temples have been attacked by Muslims and nobody has given a word about it...

It is said that a Hindu thinks without doing anything, and that a Muslim acts without thinking of anything.

Never has any religious persecution happened in the history of Hindus.

(all this has been written 16 years ago)

# **Bibliography**:

## We recommend:

- Reading 'Koran' and Hadiths
- L'Islam, ses véritables origines, par Joseph BERTUEL, Nouvelles Editions Latines, France
- Anwar Shaikh
- Ibn Warrak: Why I'm not a Muslim
- Ali Sinna: Why I left Islam

And a website created by Ali Sina and Muslims who have left their religion: <a href="http://www.faithfreedom.org">http://www.faithfreedom.org</a>

## Final remark:

Since the time this text was put on the Internet, we got some reactions:

- The first was a threat;
- The second was from some "teacher" saying that all this was old stuff and that, nowadays, they know much better, that Bertuel and others were a kind of nuts, etc...
- The third was to tell us that you have seven levels in the Koran. That, yes, for sure, reading at the first level, all that is written is true, BUT ... there are seven levels. However, he never tried to explain us even a little bit of the second level... and posed himself as being somebody who, for sure, was very high and received the permission to teach others.

## **ADDENDA**

## August 2020

This lecture was given in 1996, 24 years ago today!

It is therefore possible to see that what was foreseen and predicted in this conference is happening before our eyes.

Now, with regard to the question itself: "Religion or political system", much research has been done since time, and we have just recently discovered a formidable synthesis of this research which, exposing the history of the genesis of Islam, answers all the questions that may have been asked in this conference. We expressly recommend it as it seems essential to us. This is the book: "The Great Secret of Islam" which can be found on the Internet and even downloaded (inn French) from the site <a href="https://legrandsecretdelislam.com/">https://legrandsecretdelislam.com/</a>

As for the Islamic scriptures itself, we recommend the following sites:

- http://www.faithfreedom.org/
- <a href="https://www.youtube.com/user/AmbiguitYl">https://www.youtube.com/user/AmbiguitYl</a> (David Wood)
- <a href="https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCiU8hlLb">https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCiU8hlLb</a> <a href="qdubrjQ7qqXYxEg">qdubrjQ7qqXYxEg</a>
- (Majid Oukacha)

As well as, among others, the following works:

- Craig Win : Prophet of Doom Islam's Terrorist Dogma in Muhammad's Own Words
- Ali Sina : Understanding Muhammad (6th edition)
- J.K.Sheindlin: The People vs Muhammad