

# Response To Mr. Aziz Junejo



The Rev. David R. Graham  
Adwaita Hermitage  
February 17, 2006

You ask why Christian leaders have not condemned the editorial cartoons published in Denmark four months (!) ago and subsequently.

The answer is: because Christian leaders, to include the political ones, publicly label and

even condemn their heretics and evil doers as not Christians and expect Muslim leaders to do the same with respect to theirs.

Muslim leaders do not do that. They remonstrate with heretical Muslims and evil doers about what is true Islam, but they do not publicly label or condemn them as not Muslims.

Why not? Afraid of them? Not sure of the theological grounds? Are their crypto-supporters (which you have to know is the general opinion outside the circle of Muslim "spokespersons")?

That is the challenge Muslim leaders face, and until they conquer it, in their own sphere, they will get no help from Christian leaders beyond what they have experienced already, which is to say, "compassionate

dialogue." Certainly no support because Muslim leaders are seen to be temporizing, if not secretly supporting, their own heretics, who now as always (no matter their religious base!) are violent hegemonists.

Make the point that Islam is peaceful. That is correct. But unless you make the correlative point that the violent ones are not Muslims you will never be accepted in the community of religious leadership. In fact, you will be opposed, and not just by the religious leadership but also by the political.

This reality goes quickly to national governmental policy: unless you can convince government policy makers -- regardless of party -- in the Americas, Europe, Japan, Korea, India, Australia and New Zealand -- basically, the industrialized English-speaking world -- what "terrorists" really are, those policy makers will take down "terrorists" as categorically Muslims -- meaning, Islam in general, as the cartoons imply -- rather than discriminating, as is proper, between Islam, which is peaceful, as you say, and "terrorists," who categorically are not Muslims, as President Bush says.

You have to say publicly and categorically that they are not Muslims. And you have to say what they are. Have you courage to say what they are? That question raises considerable doubt, especially after reading temporizing with evil such as you propose through the [Seattle Times](#).

Muslims lecturing their violent so-called co-religionists are, in the old phrase, "playing God with evil." God does not do that, but "religious leaders," and not only of Islam, do that!

The "terrorists" are demonic clergy and scholars, aka tribal, clan and racial hegemonists, of both the Middle East and Africa.

"Terrorism" is a misnomer, tragically missing the reality of those individuals and groups. They are fronting Islam as a cover for their own

demonic personalities and hegemonist intentions. They are driven by Muslim-sourced petrol, trading and construction dollars.

Muslims *qua* Muslims do not support them? It appears they do!

Besides the Chinese and other communists, who have tactical but not strategic reasons for supporting them, who besides Muslims support demonic clergy and scholars of Arabia, Africa, Iran and elsewhere calling themselves Muslims?

Unless you can convince the aforementioned governments that there is a valid distinction between Muslims and demonic clergy and scholars standing up from so-called Islam, those governments will slice Islam willy-nilly because, without your help, they will not be able to see the distinction between Muslims and not Muslims.

President Bush is right to go after those people, wherever they are, but he is wrong to call them "terrorists." That is temporizing. They are demonic clergy and scholars, hegemonists of tribe, clan and race.

I say this with the utmost urgency. The terrible destructive power of those governments cannot be opposed by any power available to any Muslims, genuine or heretical.

Ultimately, the question is, who is right and who is wrong? The demonic clergy and scholars, the hegemonists, are wrong. Period. And they will be taken down by external forces if Muslims do not take them down themselves.

The [Amman Message](#) is a good start, but do you support it? I have signed it.

[King urges Muslim unity to meet challenges](#)

Oil is an issue now but will not be if Muslims themselves do not stop the hegemonists. The governments whose sovereignty is being threatened by those hegemonists will not stop until they consider themselves safe. Think Hitler and Tojo. They will "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship" to defeat whatever they consider threatens them sovereignty. And they do not stop until success in their own eyes is achieved!

The hegemonists underestimate but genuine Muslims, such as yourself, must not the radical asceticism those governments can summon to ensure their safety. It is in the culture of their religion and their constitutions, as you should know if you have studied them more than superficially.

At this time, only Muslims can prevent the deployment of that terrible asceticism, which cannot but succeed in achieving its goal, but at far, far greater cost to Muslims than is warranted by the truth. You must do that by taking down demonic clergy and scholars, the hegemonists, aka "terrorists," yourselves (!), very, very, very quickly, Muslim against heretic and evil doer claiming to be Muslim. That is your challenge and I hope you can meet it.

Convince those governments that they are other than terrorists of Islam. They are demonic clergy and scholars, the hegemonists of anti-Islam.

If you cannot do that, then it will be concluded that you support their aim of "one world under Islam," something that will not happen and has never happened. Rather, this latest hegemonist threat arising from heretical Islam will be eliminated, and at great cost to genuine Muslims.

### **Comment by Azam to the above:**

Simple non-intellectual question:

If a person, who believes in all that is needed to be considered a Christian by his/her community, commits a grave sin, do you consider him/her not to be a Christian?

If yes is your answer, then I have to say that the number of Christians in the world would be greatly depleted. Do you call the members of the IRA non-Christians? Do you call Timothy Mcveigh, a non-Christian? These are extreme examples, but I hope you are getting my point. Committing a sin does not take away your faith if the base of your beliefs are not altered. You can make a statement about atrocities committed by a member of your faith by condemning it and making it heard that this is not an act representing your religion. In the end, how could myself or you or anyone of faith, judge if someone is or still is, a muslim, a christian, a buddhist, or a hindu? That, my friend, is God's job.

Azam

Posted by: [Azam Ali](#) at March 28, 2006 02:09 AM

### **Reply by David to Azam:**

Azam,

Your opening line is absurd. Communication occurs in the ground of intellection. What do you mean by using such a statement? Commonly it is an expression of feigned modesty and direct self-elevation.

Adwaitha Hermitage Weblog is an event of higher learning. Please prepare yourself to that standard before participating further in it.

Beyond that, your question is in the minds of people of all times and climes.

The answer is that the question begs itself unendingly. In other words, it cannot be answered with anything this side of absurdity -- that is, within the scope of that which is reasonable and intelligible. And since reality, both inside us and outside us, is logistical, not absurd, we are not required to deal with the phenomenon of absurdity more than to say that it is ephemeral and not therefore a driver of the multi-dimensional unity of life, which is the intended subject of your question.

Your question requires an answer that is analogous to the square root of minus 2.

Here are the bases for that statement, bases going to the heart of the "wars of religion" which are really wars of demagoguery, not religion, and also to the heart of the logical trap you feel you have laid for me – a low motive for a questioner, by the way, and not worthy of you:

Belief in something or other, whatever it is, does not make one a Christian, Muslim, Hindu, etc. Faith does. And faith is not self-made and not a subscribing to a set of articles of belief or way of living or anything that man has ability within himself to accomplish. Faith is a gift, or as all religions say, a Grace from God. Faith is the reunion by God with Himself of that which is estranged from Him, that is, of existence itself, and in our case of our personal, corporate and historical existence, regardless of the reason for the estrangement and regardless of its past, present or future conditions.

One is a Christian, Muslim, Hindu, etc. by act of God, not by anything we humans do. An implication of this is that none of us has the right to call ourselves a Christian, a Muslim, a Hindu, etc. Faith has no visible sign by which others or we can recognize its presence.

In matters of faith and religion, man is 100% contingent on God. Actually, in all matters man is 100% contingent on God. God is the substance of

man. Man is the form of God. Only God can affirm whether we are a Christian, Muslim, Hindu, etc., or not. Only He knows the heart and only He knows the past, the present and the future of each and every one of us. He knows those because He knows Himself -- and only He knows Himself.

Besides this, the answer to your question involves mentioning that there is an important difference between sin and sins. Sin is a condition. No one is ever not in the condition of sin, even and especially those who have been gifted faith.

Sin is the condition of estrangement from God, our self and our world. This condition exists unconditionally for any thing or any one having existence.

Sins are particular acts that are committed willy-nilly by all, including those to whom God has given faith. Murder, theft, lying, cheating, etc., these are sins, not sin. Sin is the condition of estrangement from God, our self and our world.

Those who have the gift of faith commit sins and live in the condition of sin, both. So do those who do not have the gift of faith.

Thus, neither on the basis of an analysis of sin nor on the basis of an analysis of sins can one declare that someone is or is not a Christian, Muslim, Hindu, etc. Who is to know, and how are they to know? Only God can know, notwithstanding the absurd claim of "scientists" to the effect that "we now know that [something or other]."

One cannot understand that under which nothing stands, namely, that which has no second. God has no second.

Following on all of that as necessary conceptual background, your post raises a significant question, whether one can identify something as not

what it claims to be, specifically a titular representative of a religion. This is a worthy question, despite your unworthy manner of developing it.

Your post also implies the corollary significant question of whether identifying something as not what it claims to be – assuming one is justified in so identifying it – is a judgment, implying a disallowed activity, namely, judging.

The answer to your main question is that one can identify something as not what it claims to be, and specifically, one can identify a titular representative of a religion as not a representative of that – or any – religion when their words and deeds, and as implied from these their thoughts, do not value life in general and human life especially.

Blowing up men, women and children, sodomizing animals and boys, abusing animals and the land, all of whom are going about their daily business, is not a religious – meaning Godly – activity. Neither is justifying lying, cheating and stealing from people one deems “infidels.” People who do that are Assassins, not Muslims, Murderers, not Christians, etc.

The valuation of human life in particular, but also of life universally, including plant and animal life, is the concrete standard of religious commitment and activity. Absent evidence of human values – which may be summarized as Truth, Righteousness, Peace, Love and Non-Violence – one is entitled, nay, compelled to deny any assertion of religious affiliation or representation by anyone whomsoever.

Infidel, by the way, is a technical word and not to be used lightly. It means a person who is brought providentially by God into the structure of a valid, universal faith – Hinduism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, Islam and Christianity are valid, universal faiths – then perfidiously renounces the validity and universality of that faith in favor of another.



Infidel means "unfaithful." A cheating spouse is an infidel. One who trifles with the heart of another is an infidel.

Now, this can happen sincerely, in the case where one who was raised, say, a Muslim was never really one by God and in later life God rebirths them spiritually as, say, a Christian (or the other way around, of course). Man – including titular clergy – is not justified, in this case, in saying that because the person was raised a Muslim they are a Muslim. Who is to know? Only God can know in which faith structure, if any, a person lives. God alone makes those decisions and has knowledge of them. Such a person is not an infidel.

On the other hand, in the case where a person from fear or propaganda or expediency "converts" from one religion to another, and not from God's act of reuniting that person with himself in faith but from their own perfidy, then that person is an infidel.

But again, how would a mere human know the inner workings of the situation? He or she could not know. Only God can know.

So in every case it is indicated to hold one's tongue on such matters and not use the word "infidel" in any situation whatsoever.

However, this principle also implies that when someone is applying the word "infidel" to someone else, the one applying it is not a representative of any religion because they are claiming to know something they cannot know.

So there is another way of recognizing when a titular representative of a religion is no such thing, is retailing falsehood.

Now, to the important implication of your question: is identifying something as not being what it claims to be a judgment, meaning,

something unworthy and odious, or is it something else, something worthy and even necessary?

Well, clearly, it can be a judgment. However, it can be something else, and one should inquire in every case whether something, which might appear as a judgment, is in fact something else entirely, such as an assessment, which is required for living at all.

Judgment means assigning something to a place or condition. In matters of religion and salvation, no human has authority to do that, assertions by the Vatican and many titular Muslim "clergy," "sheiks" and "ayatollahs" notwithstanding. This is abjured by every religion for matters of religion and salvation, and rightly so.

Assessment means observing the structures that comprise the inner meaning of what is going on and correlating them with the norm of human values. All are required to engage in this activity or cease living as human, and ultimately, living at all.

So, I say forthrightly that Arabs who, since the Saudi usurpation of the Hashemite Throne of Arabia, have revived the old Assassin Cults and Iranians who, since the Qom-ist usurpation of the Solar Throne of Persia, have done likewise, are Assassins, not Muslims, who require to be uprooted and decimated for their crimes against humanity. And they will be.

The world can live in peace with Muslims, but not with Assassins, regardless of their race or nationality. Humanity is destroying Assassins even now and will finish the job. Arabs, Iranians and Africans have joined the operation. Arabs, Iranians and Africans who do not join it will be ground under and dispersed like chaff to the wind. Do not doubt.

Now an observation on process: try to make your questions worthy, meaning sincere questions. Resist the impulse to demonstrate your

proress or the deficiencies of the person you are "questioning" by seeking to trip up or trap or embarrass that person or by displaying your own brilliance.

Even if you are right, and have spotted a definite weakness or error in the other person's points, state your point straightforwardly rather than seeking to trap them or aggrandize yourself. If the person is worthy himself or herself, they will admit the relevancy and power of your point. If they are not worthy, they will seek to belittle you and aggrandize themselves, in which case, they are not worthy of your company.

David

Posted by: David Graham at March 28, 2006 06:52 PM

A.M.D.G.