

ISIS - ISLAMIST VIOLENCE AND THE ISLAMIC STATE

ISIS - Islamic State is guilty of creating its violent theocracy on earth and claiming in doing so that it follows Islam and Muhammad correctly. Allah, God, is ultimately responsible for he founded Islam.

The problem is that because of ISIS conducting terror attacks such as 9/11 the left in order to prevent attacks on Muslims has tried to make out this is not a Muslim problem for ISIS is just heresy or fake Islam. The real goal is just to keep winning votes for no politician can afford to be linked to anti-Muslim violence. Sadly they can be linked to persecuting people for so-called Islamophobia and there is no problem!

AMERICAN THINKER

Think on this: The American Thinker in 2014 worked out that through the centuries, Islam slaughtered 250 million people through wars and expanding the religion. "Islam has killed and tortured far more than any other creed, religious or secular."

Think on this: If I hate dictatorships and how they kill and endanger people why am I not suicide bombing in such a regime? Why are Muslims then hating our freedom and blowing themselves up to make this point?

Lesson: There is no evidence and cannot be any evidence that religion or any religion is by definition good because all kinds of devout people may do harm in every religion. Thus we can define religion as being "an arrogant set of beliefs around magic and the supernatural" and why not? Nobody has cause or the right to say we are wrong! A really good religion or faith cannot incubate terrorist ideology and/or terrorists. A golf club does not develop suicide bombers. Any religion that is man-made has no power to change evil hearts. Man is not that powerful!

ISIS IS A FLUID LOOSE RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION

ISIS is a rather loose organisation though it has its organised side. But for membership it simply decrees that any person who decides that Muhammad is the prophet of the only God Allah and the Koran is God's literal word and then commits to ISIS is a true ISIS member so ISIS can appear literally anywhere. ISIS then has a lot to do with Islam even if it is heretical. Islam is its framework. It does not regard an unbeliever who commits to it as a member. No religion can afford to be smug for a form of the IRA could appear in Ireland tomorrow that requires members to commit to the Church by going to Mass on Sundays and they take an official oath of allegiance to this IRA to be considered members and the oath can be taken by anyone anywhere. Even the fact that there is that potential is a warning sign of the danger of religion.

ISIS can appear anywhere for Islam is a faith religion. You become Muslim by believing there is only one God and Muhammad is his prophet and the Koran is the literal word of God. Then you make a vow to support ISIS. Islam makes that possible for it embraces ignorant believers who think they can kill unbelievers to their heart's content as true Muslims even if misguided. And when Islam depends on faith why can't ISIS see committing to ISIS without any formal ceremony or contract as making you an ISIS member? Muslims pretend to be against ISIS but they will not excommunicate them meaning they are considered to be fellow Muslims in okay if not good standing. The argument that they cannot be excommunicated for they are not Muslims is rubbish for groups that call themselves Muslim but which are at odds with Muhammad such as Sufis are excommunicated. Excommunication can deal with bad Muslim groups and also groups that are not Muslim any more but think they are part of the Islam family. Muslims have no right to expect people to believe that merely joining a cause in your heart as you might do with ISIS is in any way invalid or defective. Outward membership is not membership as much as being a member in your heart. Islam's method of becoming Muslim has something to do with how you become ISIS for ISIS merely imitates it and if Islam can do it so can ISIS. Islam in many ways feeds the narrative of ISIS.

It has been noticed that there is link between Muslims joining ISIS and Muslims failing to integrate into the wider society. People always sacrifice their faith commitments to get food and drink and shelter. The saints, monks and nuns vowed to peace will gladly slaughter if they lose those basic resources. A religion with a blood splattered warmongering past will behave itself and seem to integrate when it is a minority. Muslims fitting in in say the UK means nothing. When numbers get big enough in the area and the Muslims feel more self-sufficient they end the integration. The integration was never real in the first place.

Islam is a religion and it is also a legal and judicial system rolled into one. It is government by the Muslim God done through his representatives who apply his laws. Governments are always corrupt and there is never any such thing as judicial justice for nobody really knows how to be properly fair to criminals so Islam is bad at the root and cannot complain if monsters that would scare even it start to grow out of it and in it.

Pleas for Muslims to be peaceful and not to be sympathetic or emphathetic towards violent Islamist terrorism will fall on deaf ears when the victims are those who would terrorise or condone attacks on Muslims in a war. Such pleas are often insincere. War breeds war and unjust war breeds war fastest.

OBAMA AND CAMERON SAY ISIS IS NOT MUSLIM

Re - claims by Obama and Cameron that ISIS is not really Islamic though it claims it is

Even if ISIS is behaving contrary to the Muslim religion, it is behaving in accordance with its understanding of Islam and is still a religion. It is still proof that religion can be dangerous and often is dangerous. It is possible to misunderstand doctrine and still be acting in the name of the religion and its still the religions fault - say for example, it has violent scripture texts. It is its fault if you find authority in those texts to kill even if your interpretation is unpopular. It is still a valid interpretation. People are allowed liberty in interpreting.

Remember the Nice attacks? Do-gooders squealed that the terrorist was not very devout so it had nothing to do with the Muslim faith or religion. But no one person ever can represent all the values of Islam or any religion. A religious terrorist who prays ten times a day is still a religious terrorist even he prays only once a week.

A religion is to blame for terrorism either directly or indirectly. The indirect links are the worst for they are harder to do something about and people keeping trying to make out that the religion is blameless.

Some Christian and Muslim groups are fond of bloodletting and ISIS is one example. If they are behaving contrary to the Christian or Muslim religion, the fact remains that the God speaking in the Old Testament and the Koran and Muslim tradition authorises violence. That leads to the sects thinking, "Okay let us endorse and dish out this violence. If we are wrong, it is not that big of a deal for violence is endorsed by God in the scriptures anyway." And it does not matter if the sect is authentically Christian/Muslim or not. What matters is that it claims to be a religion and we should take it at its word. Is the religious attitude the problem? Is religion the problem? Is the sect merely a symptom of what religion does to people's heads? Does "good" religion pose a risk? Is it luck or forces external to the religion that we have to thank when nothing has happened?

And the Koran God does undeniably endorse barbaric terrorism:

Koran 5:33 "Those that make war against God and his Apostle and spread disorder in the land shall be slain or crucified or have their hands and feet cut off on alternate sides or be banished from the land."

We must not forget that believers in God hold that God has the right to murder and take life.

How can they expect to get through to somebody who thinks he is a prophet and who says God authorised him to take life? We must remember too, that it is not true that Christianity and Islam (to mention just two faiths) are opposed to killing the innocent. They know that war always results in much loss of innocent life but they do not consider that enough to forbid it. Also, even if those faiths say they condemn the killing of the innocent, they do not consider adulterers or practicing homosexuals or apostates as innocents. The New Testament God says that he has sentenced us all to death for sin. Their defence of the innocent is empty and superficial.

And the terrorists might reason, "Okay if we are wrong big deal! The scriptures command violence anyway."

What gives Obama and Cameron the right to state what Islam teaches and what is real Islam and what isn't as Muslim scholars struggle with deciding what teachings follow from the scriptures/hadith and what one's are inconsistent with it? Their assertions are just whitewashing and they want to pretend to be ambassadors of religious tolerance. And they want intolerance towards those who may know that their Islamic faith is pro-violence. They want to set the stage for that to happen with their manipulative talk.

In response to David Cameron telling the House of Commons that Islam does not justify terrorism. December 2013.

So, 'There is nothing in Islam that justifies acts of terror.'

What an utterly hypocritical statement from Cameron considering that even Christianity allows war in certain circumstances knowing fine well that war makes many people uncontrollable and soon there is child murder, rape, torture all because the chances of getting away with it are virtually certain. Both Christianity and Islam facilitate terror - it might

be sort of limited but that does not make it any better. And both the Bible and Koran Gods commanded violence.

Airbrushing violent religious teachings does not help at all and is refusing to deal with the problem properly and honestly and can lead to violence against those who broadcast the truth and oppose scriptures and holy books that glorify evil. Even if Rigby's killers are disobedient to Islam, the question is, how wrong (from a Koranic perspective) is that disobedience considering God supposedly endorsed violence anyway in the Koran? Perhaps it could be seen by believers as being wrong but not a serious sin considering violence is not intrinsically wrong? I am proud to follow no scripture and is it any wonder?

The notion that all religion is really good so that anything bad is not religion is ridiculous. It makes one religion as good as or as true as another. If a religion is not true, then it is opposed to what people should and need to believe. It is opposed - perhaps unintentionally - to what God wants people to believe. To suggest that all religions are equally good insults the victims of bad religion and enables bad religion to thrive. The notion that we all have our crutches and religion is a crutch enables the problem of religion too. We do not need a religious crutch and that is that - even if we are fond of crutches. If religious faith is a crutch that does not excuse it. The only right reason to belong to a religion is thinking it is true - and religion itself teaches that. The crutch is an abuse of religion.

CONCLUSIONS

ISIS can be Islam. It can be true Islam even if the chance is slim. ISIS is Islam for that is what the facts say. Muslims of peace either have no reason to hurt or they are not committed enough.

APPENDIX - PARIS ATTACKS

Posted on the Freethinker following Paris attacks November 2015

If in a hypothetical better world, had Islam not had violent commands in its scripture, the Quran, which God supposedly dictated would the Islamist violence have been as bad? Christians in some parts of the world are no better and the Christian reconstructionist movement believes that stoning gays and adulterers to death is God's will today. I would suggest that the state forces Islam and Christianity to remove violent commands from their holy books. It will take decades for that to be workable though.

The reality is that Islamist terrorists come from Islam. If a religion is a breeding ground for even a few terrorists it is to blame as a religion especially if it teaches that violent scriptures were revealed by God. I am not accusing all Muslims of being terrorists but of creating a religion in which terrorists appear.

To those who say Islamic State is not really Muslim or Islamic -

Are you really in a position to judge what is really Muslim when you are not a Muslim scholar?

The Prophet said, "A single endeavor (of fighting) in Allah's Cause in the forenoon or in the afternoon is better than the world and whatever is in it."

Sura 8:17 - "It was not you who slew them; it was Allah who slew them".

These texts go beyond seeing violence as a necessary evil but as something sacred.

Are you in a position to say that Islamic State is a distortion of Islam? - that does not mean it is not Islam and they could be uncompromising and overly strict rather than a distortion.

Why do many ordinary Muslims anywhere in the world become ISIS - many of them simply cannot have been brainwashed?

Why does it claim to be Islamic?

Why does it want to create a world that will enslave it as well as everybody else to oppressive religious law?

Why does it tell the truth that the prophets it looks up to such as Muhammad and Moses were murderers say of idolaters? Its prophet Jesus said that anybody who did away with any command in the evil Old Testament - eg the command to kill gay men by stoning - would be called dung in the kingdom of Heaven.

Why does it specialise in suicide bombings as if expecting a heavenly reward?

Why does it teach that God has the right to take life and therefore the right to delegate or bestow that right on them?

Why does it teach the fact that there is nothing in the Koran like "love your neighbour as yourself?" Many would say that failure to do that shows you are making violence possible for your attitude to others falls short of what it should be.

Why say IS is not Muslim when in fact the Koran's nasty vicious verses vastly outnumber the ones calling for peace?

Why say Islam is great for its holy book says that killing one innocent person is like killing the whole world - to exaggerate how bad evil is in order to deter people is a form of bullying and hate? (It will do nothing to put criminally minded people off and the Koran has its own idea of what an innocent person is that differs from secular understanding.)

Why does it argue that its violent interpretation of the word of God in the holy book is possibly valid? It cannot say that unless there are violent texts in that book. And it could be right or if wrong then it is still a reasonable or understandable interpretation. If God likes violence and you engage in it in a way he does not approve of then it is hardly a huge mistake considering he is usually okay with violence anyway. Violent scriptures give an excuse for violence. A religion with violent messages from God be it Islam or Christianity is giving evil people an excuse for violence - giving the means to make an excuse. The less chance there is for making an excuse the better. Excuses should not be enabled by religion. The better the excuse, the more the religion is to blame.

Sura 17:96 is about the doctrine of abrogation where God cancelled verses he revealed in the Koran. It is assumed by some silly scholars and politicians that God is limiting his authority and giving us freedom to question. But is he? Questioning in their book really means, "Maybe I should not obey his bad commands or his commands I don't like?" Questioning in the honest sense means, "Maybe if I think this book preaches peace and its nasty commands can be passed over then I am wrong?!" God abrogating verses he authorised is yet another demonstration of authority so he is not. Abrogation is as much authority as non-abrogation - sorry it is more for you are asking people to believe that God who makes no mistakes or changes his mind does change his mind! The fact remains that the doctrine gives nobody the right to assume any bloody text in the Koran is abrogated. The ones that are scrapped are clearly indicated.

If man is violent and makes errors that sometimes do harm, it is to be expect that any religion coming from man is not intrinsically peaceful or good. A man-made faith will do harm at least at times. Those who say bad people acting in the name of religion are not really part of religion are just stupid or politically correct or they confuse morality and religion (the two are not exactly the same). They go to the extreme of not mentioning the violence and lunacy commanded in the Koran or Bible by God.

Even if ISIS were not really Muslim, the fact remains that it is still a religion. It could be seen as a Muslim heresy. It is still a demonstration of how faith in a supernatural force or god can lead to bloodshed. Faith after all is violence in the sense that you act as if you know what you do not know and that is always risky and harm often follows. It is doing violence against your knowledge that you do not know.

I think a devout Christian who has converted to Islam and who knows of the violence in the Bible that was commanded by God and for which Jesus never apologised and was okay with could easily turn into an ISIS convert. The openness to violence is already there.

APPENDIX: UKIP AND ISLAM

UKIP wants Muslims to repudiate the violent parts of their scriptures for they regard them as the writings of God

Response: The reality is that the scriptures of Islam and Christianity claim to be authored by God and they command violence. If Christianity hadn't ignored the Jewish Law, it would still be stoning people to death for adultery.

Violent scriptures will lead to some believers endorsing violence or enabling it if not actively engaging in it. Why wait until something happens before making it compulsory for believers to repudiate the violence commanded?

For educational purposes alone, it makes sense. Too many people are involved in religion without having made an informed decision to be part of it. Those who endorse a religion of violence without understanding that it is violent and venerates evil books are being exploited.

The purpose of scripture is to reveal God's will and it is to be obeyed if it is God's will even if it is violent. Jesus stood for that principle and argued that God wanted him to embrace crucifixion instead of trying to avoid it. Thus he illustrated the point. God knows what he is doing even if we think he does not.

I am atheist - believing in God has its dangers as I have shown. I don't want Islam to be singled out as having to denounce

the bad bits in its scripture. But any decent person will not want blood on their hands by endorsing evil scriptures as infallible and correct. Those scriptures killed people.

APPENDIX - PLANS FOR TERROR ATTACK

Muslim Couple Planning Terror Attack

People who say Islamic terrorism has nothing to do with real Islam have a lot of confidence in man-made religion. If man has violent tendencies they will be in at least some of the religions he invents.

And how many people claiming to be Muslims will bomb and maim before anybody admits that their being Muslim or their faith in Islam is the main problem or the problem? Faith in a religion is distinguished from the people who make up the religion even though you cannot really belong to the religion without it. Faith and the people in a religion cause problems in their own way. If they are not real Muslims that does not get the Muslim faith off the hook. The Bible of Jesus, the Torah, is full of God sanctioned violence and has very little love. Surprise surprise! And what does it say about him that he had to honour a book like that as sacred and his foundation. Those who say that religion is always good are talking a pile of shite. If one religion says Jesus is God and other says he is not one of them is not in tune with the truth and corruption always starts with failing to give priority to truth and to follow where it leads. And corruption leads to violence in one form or another.

A secular force causing war and terrorism is one thing. A religious one doing it is another. The two may do similar things but that does not make them the same. To say they are the same is dangerous. Accuracy in discernment is crucial. Those who deny they are the same are often motivated by a wish to pretend that religion never harms. That motivation is bad and religion is not a good thing if it inspires people to put their heads in the sand like that.

A religion does not always show its true face. What does? A religion that, in some subtle or indirect way, makes a few people turn terrorist is a bad religion regardless of how many good people seem to be in it.

If you take the word religion to refer to a community and a community only, then you cannot say, "Okay if they do harm in the name of the religion that does not mean the religion bad or untrue".

Some politicians extol religion because they think its crap but useful for manipulating the people to keep public order. Even that approach leads to intolerance and persecution of dissenters eventually.

Read the works of the philosopher of religion Brian Davies. He believes in God but says that the notion that free will means we can go against God is wrong. We supposedly have this freedom BECAUSE of God and not in spite of him. So God is somehow responsible for everything you do. That Muslim couple certainly seem to think that what they are doing is not a sin for God is enabling them. Their faith in God was to blame even if their Muslim faith can be exonerated. And it can't. It still commands death to apostates from Islam and do not forget the religion says everybody is born Muslim until led astray. The innocent people who would have died at the hands of those terrorists were not innocent in the eyes of Islam.

APPENDIX:

RELIGION AND VIOLENCE FROM PSYCHOLOGY TODAY

"ISIS ... expressed goal is ethnic and religious cleansing of territory they control."

ISIS, whether truly Islamic or not, is still a religion.

Why and how can a religion be that malignant?

One's religion is a reflection of oneself. Human nature is prone to selfishness. No matter how much sympathy we bestow on others, we would prefer them to face cancer and torture than ourselves or our loved ones. Religion acts as a placebo for the travesty of virtue that we engage in. If God exists and God is all-love then God deserves all our devotion not a portion of it. Yet people feel they connect with God though they certainly do not love him as much as they may say. They adore a God who in many ways only suits themselves and exists in their heads. Religion tends to condemn much evil while sanctioning hypocrisy and false virtue as long as the religious community is not impaired. The person who is totally honest is never popular and will be an outcast and labelled disruptive. She or he will not fit in a community that asks her to put up an appearance for the sake of peace or making the religious grouping feel like it is a community.

A religion becomes dangerous when it sanctifies and sanctions unrepentant but socially useful evil.

