## Imams Are Demonic Clergy: Quiet Them



The Rev. David R. Graham

Adwaitha Hermitage

June 1, 2007

The support of genuine clergy and religion is symbolistic reading and interpretation of scripture. The support of demonic clergy and religion is literalistic reading and interpretation of scripture.

Demonic clergy and religion base themselves on literalistic reading and interpretation of scripture. Every literalistic reading and interpretation of scripture produces demonic clergy and religion.

Religion proclaims a revelatory self-manifestation of God. Religion makes no claims regarding itself, its legitimacy, its validity, its perpetuity or its aseity.

Demonic religion makes claims for itself, its legitimacy, its validity, its perpetuity and its aseity.

Freedom, whether as an idea, a desire or a practice, lacks power to defeat the hegemonistic, inquisitorial fanatics trying to rule the world in the name of Islam. This is because freedom is not a principle, not a point of origin of the structure of being. Freedom is an element of the structure of being and then only half of that element, which is a polarity of inseparable activity, freedom and destiny.

Justice, however, is a principle, a source of reality and therefore also a judge of it, and so justice does have power to defeat and even to educate hegemonistic tyrants abusing the world in the name of Islam.

Neither religion, culture nor morality can define a belligerent. Only the grosser orders can do that, such as races, governments, tribes, voluntary organizations, religious organizations, academic institutions, etc.

Until the 18th Century, Moslems did not have clergy. They had (1) Caliphates, seats of supreme authority in the name of Islam, <sup>1</sup> (2) Sultanates, seats of secular authority in the name of Islam (and competing ones) and (3) Schools of Jurists, seats of scriptural authority in the name of Islam (again, competing ones). Neither Califs, Sultans nor Jurists considered themselves preservers and mediators of sacred rituals and traditions, which are the roles and duties of clergy.

However, during the 18th Century, in consequence of the decisive defeat of the Ottoman Caliphate at Vienna in 1683, Moslems searched themselves to explain how that defeat could occur. <sup>2</sup> The defeat at Vienna was not merely military. It was seen as a religious defeat, something that was thought impossible.

That defeat, therefore, drove a desperate existential question: "How could this happen?" Answers adduced included:

<sup>1</sup> Competing ones, by the way, notwithstanding their perpetual claim that there is one only Caliphate.

<sup>2</sup> Moslem doctrine declares that defeat can never come to Moslem arms nor shrinkage to Moslem dominion.

- 1- Islam has become polluted with alien technologies and values
- 2- without an industrial base we have inferior weapons and military formations
- 3- God is testing our resolve to remain faithful to Islam
- 4- the enemy, though not forever, had superior skill and equipment
- 5- somebody did this too us

6- and late in the 19th Century, by a writer in Istanbul: Moslems suppress women, treating them as jewels and musical instruments, thus making Islam a body half paralyzed. <sup>3</sup>

Late in the 18th Century, the greatest possible defeat occurred in the core of the Ottoman Empire, which for centuries had been acknowledged as the sole Caliphate and Sultanate. Napoleon Bonaparte easily conquered Egypt then moved north into Syria until his progress was checked at Acre by the British Naval Officer Sir Sidney Smith. A European power could roam at will in the orbit of Islam, which was thought to be impervious and invincible.

A month after Napoleon came ashore at Alexandria, Horatio Nelson took apart his fleet at Aboukir Bay near Alexandria. British power then supplanted French in Egypt and much of the Levant. Not only did a European power overwhelm a Moslem one, it took another European power to throw out the first one.

<sup>3</sup> That such a view could be published in the Moslem orbit shows how Euro-influenced the Ottoman Caliphate was at that time.

These developments late in the 18th Century drove even deeper soulsearching among Moslems.

Among the strong answers to the questions "Why?" and "How?" was this one: Moslems and their traditional structures of governance -- Caliphate, Sultanate and Juridical Schools -- became impure and even apostate through seduction by European styles and customs.

Importantly, Satan in Islamic usage is not a conqueror and not a ruler but a seducer. The difference in practical affairs is profound.

The assumption supporting this understanding of the symbol of Satan is that each on their own wants to espouse Islam because it is light and peace and therefore overwhelmingly attractive -- unless one is seduced away from Islam by Satan in the form of a non-Islamic government or religion/ideology. Islamic thought does not contemplate conquest to spread Islam but rather war (*Jihad* in one of its uses) to remove obstacles (governments or religions/ideologies) that frustrate by seduction (Satan) the innate eagerness driving all to embrace Islam. <sup>4</sup>

In the eyes of the Juridical Schools, this answer, involving the phenomenon of seduction specifically by European styles and customs, was puritanical, fanatical, alien to Islam and illegitimate because those advancing it were agitated loners, not members of a Juridical School qualified to exposit the Koran.

Among those making this answer, however, was one <u>Muhammad ibn</u> <u>Abd-al-Wahhab</u>, 1703 - 1792, founder of the Wahhabi movement and its combinations and permutations such as Salafism, Al Qaeda and preeminently, Muslim Brotherhood.

<sup>4</sup> They really are that stuck on themselves!

In the eyes of the Juridical Schools, and accurately, these unlicensed, fanatical, inquisitorial tyrants of ibn Wahhab read and interpreted scripture (Koran and Hadith) literally, pretended sanctimony, took the manner of clergy, collecting, organizing and commissioning followers, all actions foreign to Islam. Their modern successors, calling themselves Imams (aka demagogues), prolong this perverse stupidity.

Clericalism and its social and personal consequences are foreign to Islam. Modernly, this point has been made, interestingly, by <u>Colonel Muammar Abu Minyar al-Gaddafi</u>, and most significantly by the <u>Amman Message</u> of November 2004.

The formations these self-styled clergy have been organizing since the 18th Century, driven by literalistic, puritanical -- or as some would say, inquisitorial -- ideologies, were intended from the start as personal armed militias, and their being since the 18th Century retains that character.

Today, these self-appointed fanatics or demonic clergy style themselves as Imams. Imams and clergy as a class are foreign to Islam, which practices what in the Christian orbit is called the Protestant Principle that there is no intermediary between God and the believer. The Baha'i Faith, which may be viewed as a necessary and thorough reformation of both Islam and Zoroastrianism, champions the same principle -- and rightly, be it said -- of direct participation of God and believers, without a mediation of clergy.

Notwithstanding, the demonic clergy bestriding Persia and styling themselves Ayatollahs have so clericalized themselves by Vatican usage as to create a Pope, a College of Cardinals, a Bench of Bishops and, above all, an Inquisition. As Bernard Lewis wryly notes, perhaps soon they will create a Reformation.

Imams breathe threat and violence. They live intimidation and self-aggrandizement. They are demonic clergy. They are the chief source of

evil in the Moslem orbit since the 18th Century. It is they, Imams, self-styled, demonic clergy, who essay to rule the world and vex her. They must be quieted, each and all, wherever they reside.

A.M.D.G.