

## THE LIE THAT ALLAH PREACHED RELIGIOUS FREEDOM - THE FAMOUS "NO COMPULSION IN RELIGION" VERSE

Islam has being associated with opposition to religious conscience rights. It is believed it forces people when possible to join. It is believed it forces people who join to stay.

Do-gooder liberals like to point to a verse that seems to say Islam does not do that when it is properly understood. Liberals go on as if Muslims will not obey the nasty texts in the Qur'an as if they know nobody really takes religious texts seriously. Then they take a different stance when it is a text that they think agrees with liberalism!

We hear a lot about this verse but it does not change the fact that it is outnumbered hugely by verses where God tells Muslims to revel in violence. To concentrate on it is to insult that blood dripping context.

And that is the wider and bigger context. There is too much violence for anybody to say, "The Qur'an is not very good with context and lots of texts seem to be thrown together so maybe if we knew the circumstances of a text that preaches violence we would understand that it is on about self-defence or something." And if Allah put the texts in that way it is clear he wants them NOT TO BE EXPLAINED AWAY. So violent texts mean what they say.

2:257 says that nobody must be forced in religion. Let there be no compulsion in religion: Truth stands out clear from Error: whoever rejects evil and believes in Allah hath grasped the most trustworthy hand-hold, that never breaks. And Allah heareth and knoweth all things.

The historical context is that it is about letting Jewish, Christian or Magian people choose between conversion and paying the jizyah. Some choice!

But pretend it is about real religious freedom - it does not say that it is a command.

It is careful not to say it is a command directly from God. That gives Islam a loophole which it can use to force conversion on people.

If it merely says that man cannot force that may imply that only God can. So man can force and say the converts that result were God's work. It is like how Christians say that doctors do not heal but only God heals and he does it with doctors.

The verse speaks as it refers to how the ideal is for people to join Islam freely. Scholars hold that there is need for force for any person can see that Islam is true. It is using the word religion for religion as in faith. There is to be no compulsion in faith for all can see the faith is right.

What if they will not embrace the faith regardless of its obvious truth? Perhaps then they must be forced but is it really force when they must know anyway the faith is true. No. The verse does not really support religious tolerance at all.

The Qur'an forces people to obey God in many things. If you join Islam freely you are not allowed to leave. The command that there is to be no compulsion in religion only speaks of people entering Islam. There are other examples of forcing – for example, your hand is to be cut off if you are a thief so it attempts to compel you not to steal. It sees a choice between God and execution as a real choice. The no compulsion in religion verse does not prove that Muslims can believe in live and let live.

What the verse condemns is any deliberate forcing of a person to be a Muslim in such a way that the only result will be them pretending to be a Muslim and since their heart is not in Islam or its faith they are not Muslims. But if you force a Muslim to stay a Muslim and not to disobey the faith why not force a person to become one? The contradiction is plain. And the Islamic reply that it is different for the Muslim for he knows that Islam is true is a cop-out.

The traditions used to give more light on the Qur'an state that forcing Muslims to stay Muslims is a duty. The following Hadith is interesting. "The Prophet said, "The blood of a Muslim, who confesses that Lâ ilâha ill-Allâh (there is no god but Allâh), cannot be shed except in three cases: 1. Life for life (in cases of intentional murders without right i.e., in Al-Qiṣâṣ - Law of Equality in punishment); 2. A married person who commits illegal sexual intercourse; and 3. The one who turns renegade from Islâm (apostate) and leaves the group of Muslims. [9:17-O.B]" - Sahih al-Bukhari, 9:83:17.

Oddly enough the verse saying that to kill one person is to kill the human race is said to condemn murder. But in fact that can be read as an encouragement to murder at least within limits. And the context does just that. Here we are.

Qur'an 5:32 For that cause We decreed for the Children of Israel that whosoever killeth a human being **for other than manslaughter or corruption in the earth**, it shall be as if he had killed all mankind, and whoso saveth the life of one, it shall be as if he had saved the life of all mankind. Our messengers came unto them of old with clear proofs (of Allah's Sovereignty), but afterwards lo! many of them became prodigals in the earth.

The context is that a bird showed Cain how to go about burying Abel. The raven is linked with that decree. How would a raven assisting a man with advice on burying his brother be relevant here? Given that the book says Allah can decree what he wants then it makes perfect sense for Allah to give this decree for an arbitrary reason. It is not saying it is wrong to kill. It is saying all that matters is what Allah wants.

Qur'an 5:33 The only reward of those who make war upon Allah and His messenger and strive after corruption in the land will be that they will be killed or crucified, or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off, or will be expelled out of the land. Such will be their degradation in the world, and in the Hereafter theirs will be an awful doom.

Disgracefully dishonest Muslims and their leftist political enablers quote 5:32 and do not mention the context. Anyway it is a kind of murder and hate to make out that the killer of one should be treated as a genocidal person. The Qur'an by the way says Issa taught Israel so by implication he may have taught the doctrine and we may as well assume he did. The Bible God clearly says that it is a life for a life which means he rejects the unbalanced ravings of that text.

Qur'an MAKES IT A FUNDAMENTAL TEACHING THAT SINNERS SHOULD BE HARMED AND HATED

“God loves not the unbelievers” (III.25)

“God loves not evildoers” (III. 30)

“God loves not the proud” (IV. 40)

“God loves not transgressors” (V. 85)

“God loves not the prodigal” (VI. 140)

“God loves not the treacherous” (VIII.60)

“God is an enemy to unbelievers” (II. 90)

The no compulsion text is nothing compared to these. They show that it refers to the impossibility of getting some to convert not to the wrongness of forcing them. It would not see that as wrong if it could be done.

The argument that the violent verses of the Qur'an are abrogated by the peaceful ones ignores the fact that it is the other way around. The violent verses came after the peaceful ones. And the peaceful ones came about when Muhammad didn't have the military strength.

Nothing changes the fact that 2:217 -218 states once and for all that it is the principle that killing unbelievers cannot be much of a sin compared to blocking the spread of Islam by conversion.

They ask you about the sacred month - about fighting therein. Say, "Fighting therein is great [sin], but averting [people] from the way of Allah and disbelief in Him and [preventing access to] al-Masjid al-Haram and the expulsion of its people therefrom are greater [evil] in the sight of Allah . And fitnah is greater than killing." And they will continue to fight you until they turn you back from your religion if they are able. And whoever of you reverts from his religion [to disbelief] and dies while he is a disbeliever - for those, their deeds have become worthless in this world and the Hereafter, and those are the companions of the Fire, they will abide therein eternally. Indeed, those who have believed and those who have emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah - those expect the mercy of Allah . And Allah is Forgiving and Merciful.

That is clearly context free. It means what it says.

WE ARE NOT SONS OF GOD BUT SERVANTS SO HE CAN FORCE

The Qur'an says it is wrong to say Allah has a son. People say this is only opposing the pagan notion of Gods who have sex to beget children. But the book does not describe Allah as anything like those man-gods. It does not really understand how anybody fathers. It is opposing the idea of God adopting or getting sons in any fashion. The Christian claim that we are all sons of God and Jesus is the son in a unique sense is eliminated.

Religionists read specific historical contexts into scriptures that the scriptures may not even be thinking of. The historical stuff aside the verse actually says Allah only has servants and that is why he has no children in any sense.

And they say, "The Most Merciful has taken [for Himself] a son." You have done an atrocious thing. The heavens almost rupture therefrom and the earth splits open and the mountains collapse in devastation that they attribute to the Most Merciful a son. And it is not appropriate for the Most Merciful that He should take a son. There is no one in the heavens and earth but that he comes to the Most Merciful as a servant.

— Quran, surah 19 (Maryam (sura)), ayat 88-93.

FINALLY

No compulsion in religion does not tell us much when the book does not define the word religion. As Islam is also a social structure and a political and legal entity then no compulsion in religion does not rule out forcing people into Islam as a society.

Religious freedom does not imply you have a right once you join a religion to disbelieve what it says or defy its morals. Religious freedom is about facilitating religious commitment. It is about stopping forced conversion and giving the person the right to leave should it happen that proof or evidence shows the religion is false and not bringing you to God. The Qur'an says nothing about religion being a free choice. You are Allah's property so you cannot think about what you want.