

verse is that Allah justifies the war upon the Meccans by telling Mohammed that only Allah knows what is right. In other words, Mohammed is just following Allah's command. Though Mohammed personally led sixty-eight military missions, he suggests that he hates war ("though it is hateful to you") but that the violence was *necessary* since Allah forced him to commit war and engage in killing. Much like Hitler's ravings that destroying Jews was necessary since Fate demanded it, Mohammed the politician justifies killing and war by blaming Allah. How convenient.

They question you (O Mohammed) with regard to warfare in the sacred month. Say: Warfare therein is a great transgression but to turn men from the way of Allah and to disbelieve in Him and the inviolable place of worship and to expel its people thence is a greater transgression, for persecution is worse than killing. (Koran 2:217)

In pagan Arabia it was a grave offence to kill during the sacred month of Rejeb. In fact, all pagan Arabs declared truces during their holy periods to allow free travel, worship, trade, and general peace. Mohammed broke this taboo by raiding Meccan trade caravans and butchering innocents. To justify this crime, Mohammed came up with the excuse that since the people killed were unbelievers, it was perfectly fine and was not a transgression of Allah's wishes. Since the innocent Meccans did not believe in Mohammed's version of god, they were free to be killed during the holy period. This sounds like a tolerant and peaceful prophet, does it not?

Much like the writings of Hitler, Lenin, or Stalin, the Koran and Suras are suffused with Mohammed's justifications for war, incest, rape, murder, theft, terror, and destruction. Divine revelations conveniently remove the blame from Mohammed's twitching bloody hands and those of his followers and places guilt upon the mysterious Allah. What criminal would not want to say in court, "Sorry, your honor, I was forced to commit the crime—Allah made me do it"? Thus the "robber" culture had a great appeal to seventeenth-century pagan Arabs—poor, illiterate, brutal, confused, and resentful of Jewish trade and civil success. No wonder the uncivilized culture of Arabia so enthusiastically embraced Mohammed.

In this regard, without going into an extended discussion of Jesus Christ (Was he a man? Did he exist? Where is the proof? etc.), it is clear that the example given by Mohammed was the exact polar opposite of the example set by the figure of Christ. While silly books and listings of history's greatest men usually rank Mohammed and Christ side by side, the comparison is immoral and wrong. Christ was a completely different phenomenon and set of living ideas than Mohammed. Christ was not violent, bloodthirsty, lustful, and deceitful; nor did he engage in

plunder, rape, destruction, war, or paganism. Christ taught the Golden Rule (Do unto others as you would have done unto you), charity, love, and aiding the poor and powerless. As one commentator eulogized:

Christ ministered to the downtrodden, the outcast, and the poor. He himself was the poorest of the poor, as he reminded us: "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head." (Luke 9:58) He was a homeless man. Again, the life of Mohammed stands in marked contrast to the man from Nazareth, for at the age of 25 (some say 28) he married Khadija, a 40-year-old, well to do Arabic widow. Later, when he began leading armed expeditions against various tribal groups, he amassed considerable wealth, much of it in the form of booty, of which he commonly took one-fifth.⁸⁷

It is clear that from what Mohammed taught and, more importantly, from what he did that he was the exact converse of Christ. Christ was a missionary—aiding the poor, the sick, the female, and the enslaved. He never engaged in conflict, war, or violence; nor did he create polygamous marriages, raid caravans, torture nonbelievers, take slaves, or butcher those who opposed his authority. All of these things and more, Mohammed did.

Mohammed was not a man of God but a political leader who used theology to conquer Arabia and bring various tribes under his control. His rule was spread not by love or compassion but purely by killing and war. As one eighteenth-century Muslim scholar commented:

No two personages ever appeared in the world more perfect and absolute contrasts to each other than the founder of the Turkish (Islam) and Christian religion. Christ was pure and Unspotted in the whole of his deportment . . . but Mohammed was a sink of iniquity, lust, and ambition, if we listen to his friends. Jesus employed no weapons in defense of his mission but the artillery of reason and argument, joined to the impetuous influence of stupendous miracles, while Mohammed could do nothing without the energy of the sword.⁸⁸

The energy of the sword was premised on the jihadic spirit found in the Koran and maintained by the fascist priestly class that has mandated, since Mohammed's death, the spread of Islam through war and violence.

⁸⁷ Schmidt, p. 15.

⁸⁸ George Sale, eighteenth-century British scholar of Mohammed first translated the Koran into English in 1734.