

An Essay from Michael Mannheimer
Germany, March 23, 2010

The Principle of Abrogation in the Quran

**The trick behind the apparent inconsistency of the Quran
and why the radical Muslims are always correct.**

Like no other holy book among the world religions, the Quran contains an abundance of contradictory expressions. What is forbidden in one place is expressly demanded in another, and vice versa. However, the contradictory quality of the Quran is only an apparent one. It falls apart abruptly when one recognizes the very carefully protected secret hidden within the architecture of the Quran. For the Quranic Suras (chapters) are not arranged chronologically, but rather according to their length – and the newer Suras (from Muhammad’s violent later phase when he was in Medina) override the older ones from his era in Mecca that were comparatively more peaceful. However, this secret is guarded by Islamic scholars very closely as if it were a holy grail – and is aired only on particular occasions.

Contents

Part 1:	
Introductory Thoughts	Page 1
Part 2:	
Notes Regarding the Inconsistencies of the Quran	Page 4
Part 3:	
The Solution to the Quran’s Inconsistencies.	Page 7
Part 4:	
Summation	Page 13

1. INTRODUCTORY THOUGHTS

The plainly crucial question: Is Islam peaceful or dangerous?

In spite of the fact that almost all international terror acts of the last decade have been carried out by Muslims, Islamic scholars insist that Islam is a “religion of peace.” As the underpinning

for their thesis, they cite Quran verses somewhat like Sura 5 verse 32, according to which the one who "kills a person," shall be "like one who has murdered the whole of mankind¹ . "Critics of Islam confront Muslims about this with Suras that demand the opposite: namely the murder of infidels. Thus in Sura 47 verse 4, it says somewhat like: "And if you meet the infidels, then off with their head until you have spread a massacre among them."

Almost every media report about Islam, nearly all talk shows with and about Muslims and their faith revolve around the central question of whether Islam is a religion of peace or of terror. And most of the reports and talk shows consistently finish the same way: the mostly uninformed viewer is exactly as knowledgeable as before. For the defenders of Islam cite ostensibly peaceful Quran verses while their critics point to the countless terrorist acts of violence that are carried out by Muslims in the name of Islam. Like with communism once upon a time, nowadays the Muslim advocates also answer with the remark that those violent acts have nothing to do with Islam. And like the communists back then, most Muslims today also regularly suppress the reports of the thousands of atrocities and human rights offenses – committed in the countries of Islam and the countries of "infidels" – in their debates and in contrast point to the alleged guilt of the West, to its colonization and capitalism as the real cause for that terror. As communists did in their time, Muslims and their Western apologists assert today that the worldwide terror acts have to do with the "understandable" and desperate condition of the the poorest in the face of the dominance and humiliation from the West, and in reality have nothing to do with Islam.

However, the facts speak a totally different language. In the Index of Christian Persecution by Open Doors that lists the 50 worst countries for persecution of Christians, 40 places are occupied by Islamic states – in the highest position. And in the Anticorruption Index of the UN, Islamic states consistently show as the most corrupt power structures on our planet. And the majority of applicants for asylum in Western lands originate from Islamic countries in which almost all human rights are systematically denied (*in Holland, some nine out of ten applicants are from Islamic countries*).

Since the first days of their religion, Muslims have shown themselves incapable of searching out possible causes for their disaster. Islam's complete incapability of exercising self-criticism and self-examination one side, and the pathological, broad encompassing, self-loathing of the West on the other, form fruitful ideological Humus, and on this fertile ground Islam is currently spreading with a historically unmatched speed in the countries of the West, and has become the historically greatest danger for cultural and ideological survival in Western culture as well.

Islam is neither anticapitalist nor anticolonialist, nor does it aim for the equality of all people.

For Islam deals neither with the abolition of capitalism nor with the abolition of colonialism, and especially not with the abolition of human and individual equality. Islam is, and has always been, capitalistically structured: from the very beginning it has supported itself less by production and more by trade. With its international trade practices, Muslim marketers have acquired much influence and affluence by the most inexpensive purchase possible of undesired products and then the subsequent sale of those products in other places for maximum

¹ Islamic clerics, however, hide from their faithful followers that in this verse, Muhammad cited commandments from the Jews' Talmud [Sanhedrin 4:1, 22a]

profit. According to Marxist terminology, such trade, that appropriates the surplus value of the poor but value-determining proletariat (for the earlier era of Islam, they were day workers and poor plantation workers) without letting them participate in the profit, is termed "capitalism" as defined by Marx and Lenin.

And from the very beginning, Muslims have fallen upon foreign people, colonized them, and where possible Islamized them, and and preyed upon their productivity in the form of taxes. Islamic imperialism already existed long before Western imperialism, whether in North African states (that were primarily Christian and Jewish), or in Spain (Cordoba Islam), or in the conquest and imperial assimilation of the early-Jewish-Christian Middle East, or by the attack and partial conquest of India costing millions of Hindus their lives and nearly wiping out the peacefully minded Buddhists who had no defence against the murderous attacks of the Arabs. Also the Ottoman kingdom was an Islamic empire, long before Spaniards, Portuguese and English colonized foreign peoples. However, in politically correct fashion, the imperialistic aspect of Islam has been and is to this day completely ignored by sociologists, political scientists, Islam scientists and historians.

Moreover, Islam is totally uninterested in the equality of individuals and people. Much less is there any equality of man and woman within Islam (Islam is without question the largest and longest lasting Sex-Apartheid in world history) – and Islam tolerates other religions as equal persuasions just as little. On the contrary, the main objective of Islam is the capture of world domination (*dar al-Islam*), and every means is justified and allowed on the way there: even to the point of destruction and annihilation of every "infidel," so titled by Muslims – being oriented by the declarations of the Quran and Muhammad – for all those of a different faith. Hence, Islam classifies individuals into two classes: the class of believers, and that of the "infidels." The former are Muslims and will go to Paradise. The latter are non-Muslims, and therefore individuals having no value², that will go to Hell, and they may be, indeed must be tortured, fought against and killed³ (*or so in Sura 2, Verse 216: "Battle is mandatory for you, though it may be disgusting to you!"*), since they are the ones standing in the way of the world domination by Islam.

This is class hostility and racism, pure and simple. The German political scientist Matthias Küntzel brings this fact to the point like this:

*"Islam has substituted the biological racism of the Nazis with a form of theocratic racism without dependence on racial superiority and a program of euthanasia, nevertheless it seeks to annihilate Jews as the presumed root of all the world's ills."*⁴

That the critics of that kind of religious racism, of all people, are yet defamed as racists on the part of the mainstream media (for example, the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*) is the height of wilful ignorance and lack of knowledge that prevails in broad parts of Western intellectualism.

² regarding this subject, the Imam of London, Sheikh Omar al-Bakri Muhammad, said recently: "We make no distinction between civilians and non-civilians, between innocent and guilty – only between Muslims and infidels. And the life of the infidel is rubbish!" Source: "Publica," Portugal. April 20, 2004

³ or so in Sura 2, Verse 216: "Battle is mandatory for you, though it may be disgusting to you!"

⁴ <http://www.matthiaskuentzel.de/contents/islamismus-faschismus-und-ns>

2. NOTES REGARDING THE INCONSISTENCIES OF THE QURAN

Most Muslims know only the positive passages in the Quran and Hadith. If a Muslim is asked what he can say about his religion, most of the time one will hear such standard expressions as: *"Whoever kills a person has killed the whole world!"* or *"Islam means peace!"* or *"There is no force in faith!"* However, the whole truth about his faith – at least from the beginning of his Muslim existence – has been deliberately suppressed. For the declarations of the Quran are inconsistent like none of the other world religions. For in nearly any subject of choice (women, Christians, Jews) positives **and** negatives, peaceful **and** destructive declarations can be found.

For such previously mentioned positive expressions *"Whoever kills a person has killed the whole world!"*, there are numerous completely opposing counterexpressions such as the following: *"And slay them (the infidels), wherever you bump into them."* (Sura 2, verse 191) or the declaration in Sura 47, verses 4-5: *"And if you meet the infidels, then off with the head, until you have wreaked a massacre among them; then bind the bonds!"*

Both expressions cancel each other out in their messages. It is namely impossible to assert that whoever kills a person has killed the world, and then in the same breath, demand that the infidels be killed wherever they can be pulled into grasp.

One cannot assert that Islam means peace, and then in the next breath quote Sura 8, verse 61, where it says: *"Therefore arm yourselves against them with as much power and horses as you can gather, so that Allah's enemies can be filled with terror"* or Sura 8 verse 65, where it says *"Prophet! Fire up your believers to battle! If there are twenty among you that demonstrate patience (and endurance), they will be more than two hundred, and if there are one hundred among you, then they will have the victory over a thousand infidels!"* Also Imams like to cite verse 256 of the second Sura to their Western interviewing partners (but also for the deception of their own believers), in which it says: *"There is no force in faith!"* This verse is often interpreted as a sign of tolerance and freedom of religion in Islam, makes things easier in the Western press, and is cited as presumed evidence for the peacefulness and tolerance of Islam (*Süddeutsche Zeitung*). This same press never cites so much as one of those verses where such peace is immediately excluded, as can be seen in the 89th verse of the fourth Sura:

"And if they turn away (and give no ear to your invitations to believe), then seize them and kill them wherever you find them."

Moreover, the media are silent about the fact that in all Islamic countries, Muslims who convert to another religion, or consider doing so, are threatened with death – in doing so, the Sharia judges refer explicitly to Muhammad's command *to kill anyone who changes*⁵. In contrast: not only has this practice, which has continued uninterrupted for 1400 years until the present, been ignored by most of the media, but even vehemently denied. For instance, Thomas Steinfeld, in his ignorantly bristling article in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, defended Islam with the citation:

*"There is no force in faith," or so it says in the Quran (Sura 2:256)*⁶

⁵ Source: Hadith

⁶ Thomas Steinfeldt: "Zur Kritik am Islam. Militante Propaganda," in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, February 1, 2010 (<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/595/501846/text/>)

– without losing a single word about the fact that this declaration applies only to Muslims (and in this fact, all serious Islam scientists are unified) – and without giving his readers even the slightest hint about the previously mentioned Sura 4:89, or Muhammad’s command to kill the apostates that the Suras cited by Steinfeld nullify. Whether Steinfeld is conscious of this or not plays only a secondary role. For just ten short years after September 11, one should expect from a journalist that deals with the fundamental question of the peacefulness of Islam that he would have come up with more than just “There is no force in faith” in his research – or one could comfortably expect that he would engage himself with all vehemence against the presently great threat against human rights. Sloppy research and ignorance regarding Islam are the usual marks of most of the media reporting in Germany and Europe. Like what occurred at the beginning of Hitler’s grasp for Europe during the times of the Weimar Republic, large segments of intellectual Germany and Europe are collapsing in the face of the much greater threat against the free world by way of Islam.

Notes regarding the logical and psychological consequences of self-contradicting ordinances and commands in the Quran

The advocates of both sides of Islam, of the “moderate” as well as of the “Islamistic,” can operate according to their whims when considering the numerous self-contradicting messages in the Quran,. Islam means peace; Islam also means war. There is no compulsion in belief, but whoever changes religions will get killed. Islam is therefore characterized by the coexistence of logically and contextually contradictory declarations. Islam treats each one that deals with it, whether “believer” or “infidel,” accordingly in a dual fashion: Islam means peace, and Islam means war. Islam wishes to sustain life, and Islam wants to kill. Islam is tolerant, and Islam is intolerant. In this we have a fundamental problem that is logically and semantically unsolvable. For if the following is true:

$A = +1$ and at the same time $A = -1$

then it is impossible to come to a logically or semantically *sensible* statement about A. Then both statements about A are correct and incorrect at the same time, even though A cannot indeed be +1 and -1 *simultaneously*. Therefore the statement: “Islam means peace” is simultaneously correct and incorrect as well as “Islam means war.”

The strategy behind the “paradoxical communication” of the Quran

Which expressional value can be given to a text, a basic law, or religious autograph, when the statements, laws or ethnical guidelines contained therein are both right and wrong at the same time? Or if we find pretty much the same in a fundamental law: whoever kills will be severely punished! as well as: whoever kills will be richly rewarded?

Double expressions of this kind have, by definition, no generally binding declarative value. They offer absolutely no standard and orientation for what is right and wrong, for whatever gets punished and rewarded, for that which one should do or better leave alone. On the grounds of necessary clarity and reproducibility in a linguistic message (*Wittgenstein*), such texts should really not exist. However they do exist. In the field of psychology, such double messages are recognized under the concept of double-bind. “Wash my fur, but don’t get me wet” is a well known example of a double-bind. One cannot do the one thing (“Wash my fur”)

and simultaneously avoid doing the other ("Don't get me wet.") - and yet both are sometimes required. Communications scientists describe such interpersonal communication under the concept of *paradoxical communication strategy*. It has been known for a long time about this form of communication that, under extreme circumstances, it can lead to schizophrenia among those affected by it. An example from criminal science psychopathology shows what devastating consequences paradoxical communications strategies can have on an individual:

Jürgen Bartsch was a four-time sadistical child murderer in the 60s - and schizophrenic as well as highly intelligent. Although he was already well into puberty, his mother insisted upon still bathing him personally. Whenever he would refuse this wish, she made him understand that he didn't love her very well and punished him with protracted periods of non-affection. When he would ask his mother if he could go to the disco, he would hear from her that it was certainly impossible for anyone to go to the disco that would let his mother still bathe him at his age. Communicatively speaking, this is a situation with no escape.

It is recognized from research about paradoxical communication strategies (compare *Gregory Bateson*) that in a persistent dependent relationship⁷ it is impossible in the view of the dependent to find a way out. An outstanding example of the impossibility of leaving such a dependent relationship based on paradoxical communication strategies is Islam.

For precisely in the previously described dilemma of this paradoxical communication strategy is where the simple Muslim finds himself, precisely in this dilemma is where the West finds itself in that it constantly hears: Islam means peace, while simultaneously perceiving that Islam means war. Which side is believable, which side must one believe, which side is correct?

Take the safe side - and this is the main strategy not only for Western do-gooders and upstanding individuals but also for most upstanding Muslims themselves - one plays it safe with this unsolvable duality in Quranic messages and believes that Islam in its heart is just as peaceful as other world religions. For the other option, that Islam is not good but rather evil, hardly anyone would dare to think through all the consequences. The results of such an option would be apocalyptic in nature for the 1.5 billion Muslims.

- They would consequently have to give up their religion and throw Allah, Muhammad and the Quran in the historical trash can.
- Furthermore, they would have to admit to themselves and to the world that they, the umma and "best of all religions" have found themselves in a 1400-year error; and in addition that all the victims and murders of their religious wars, all the gruesome acts in the name of the sharia, and all the people sent to their deaths under ordinance from God have been killed in vain.
- Otherwise they must give themselves blindly over to the misanthropic commands of their Allah and simply trust that only when the infidels are annihilated (as imparted by the Quran and Muhammad), and the world government as envisioned by the Quran and Muhammad is instituted, as promised by their religion: only then will peace be achieved in the whole world. At the same time, they can neither inquire about nor analyze the centuries old conflicts within the various currents of Islam, somewhat like that between

⁷ for example, in custodial law as well as duties within the care giver relationship

the Shiites and the Sunnis (which by the way have cost more human lives than in all of the conflicts with the "infidels" altogether). For obviously something isn't right with the Islamic paradigm of the "dar al islam," the vision of a world-wide peace for the case throughout which Islam has had overall victory.

To decide collectively for the dismantling of their religion might well be classified as in the realm of an unrealizable societal utopia, and therefore it doesn't even get considered as a possible option. What remains, though, is the return to the option in Islam that - in spite of all doubts - ultimately deals with a peaceful religion. However, precisely in this option is where the fatal error resides on the side of uninformed and well-intentioned Muslims as well as on the side of Islam's reception by the West.

3. THE SOLUTION TO THE QURAN'S INCONSISTENCIES

Islam's Tricks

In light of the inconsistency and apparent whimsicalness of Islam's declarations, one has to ask the question from a logical view, why in the history of the "peaceful religion" the radical and fundamentalist powers always get the upper hand pretty much. For, theoretically speaking, it would have been completely thinkable that Islam in the course of 14 centuries would have evolved, not into a totalitarian, but rather a peaceful religion. But the facts show, however, that at no time, nor in any place has it been peaceful - not even in the so-called Cordoba Islam, that upon closer scrutiny, presents itself just as intolerant and bloodthirsty as all the other Islamic forms of government⁸.

The question concerning the peacefulness of Islam cannot be answered without knowledge of its vital secret. Normal Muslims (and "infidels" in any case) hear so little about this; however, this secret is so well recognized and understood by most of the attorneys and profit-takers of Islam - which altogether are a clique of power hungry lords. That carefully guarded knowledge of rulership is spoken about only on special occasions - more or less when their power becomes threatened - such as at the proclamation of a new Jihad, a new holy war as an example. For the Suras of the Quran have a hidden hierarchy that lends the one who knows it absolute interpretational sovereignty over the Quran and absolute power over the believers and reformers of Islam

⁸ Contrary to the persuasion of the most Europeans, hundreds of thousands of Christians and Jews were slaughtered, beheaded and even whole village communities were crucified alive - and from the skulls of the beheaded infidels, whole minarets were erected in Andalusia as a sign for the glorification of Allah in the light of his religion's victory over the "infidels" of Spain. The compulsory taxation of the Christian and Jewish natives of Spain by the Muslims reached such a high and intolerable level that Christians and Jews converted to Islam by the hundreds of thousands in order to escape the yoke of the existentially threatening tax tribute. However, the myth of the peaceful Cordoba Islam is still being taught in European history books and on countless Internet forums, and propagated by TV talk shows and media reports

Trick 1: The achronological arrangement of the Quranic Suras

The secret is hidden in the Quran itself. Or, more accurately, in the arrangement of the Suras. Hardly anybody is aware that the Suras are arranged - as one should reasonably expect - in a time-based/chronological form. They are - one can accept this knowledge with complete bewilderment - organized according to their length: the longest Sura at the beginning, the shortest at the end of the Quran.

A odd construction, one would think. Though certainly a construction that needs some consideration, for the sequence of a great text with 114 chapters (=114 Suras) normally follows the rules of chronology or of internally causal context. A history book regarding antiquities is by way of example either chronologically (which is the general rule) - or according to a causal model in which treatment of the historical contexts of wars, cultural developments or relationships between governments of that time are considered: Because A did action X, B reacted with action Y. Imagine the publisher of a novel or history book coming upon the idea of sorting a book's text by the length of its sentences or chapters: No reader would be able logically to follow the internal context or the structure of events (*however, this is precisely the case with the Quran. And with violent results by its effect on believers and "infidels," as can still be seen*). Such a book in its incomprehensibility would be worthless.

There truly are two cases, however, in which the arrangement of the chapters would truly be possible and still not disturb the sense and logical structure of a longer text.

1. The various chapters have principally nothing to do with each other as regarding context or logic and declare general information and wisdom (for example, in a collection of aphorisms, or a dictionary)
2. The various chapters constantly repeat one and the same context, sometimes from one viewpoint, sometimes from another. This is often the case with religious texts such as prayer books, song books, and the like, but also in a targeted brainwashing scheme, as can be discovered in totalitarian structures.

Both points apply in the Quran. For among the 114 Suras an inner and logical context is missing - and in principle they repeat nothing other than one and the same message that can be regurgitated accordingly.

Allah is the only god. And Muhammad is his prophet. After Muhammad, no more prophets will exist. The most holy duty of the believer is to submit himself without contest to Allah, Muhammad and the Quran. (for Islam etymologically also means "submission" and not "peace", as the advocates of Islam assert in prayer-mill fashion)

This message is received by the average Muslim a hundred thousand times in the course of his life. It is the Islamic supreme mantra that is almost indelibly burned like a brand into his brain. This mantra, as a rule, guarantees an uncompromising life-long fidelity of most Muslims to Allah and their prophets - a fidelity for which they are prepared to die, if Islam would command them to do so. In totalitarian systems, brainwashing has for all time had the desired effect - and not only in Islam. In National Socialism and in communist countries as well, brainwashing was a dependable guarantor of results and led in most cases to the desired goal among successful teams: the unconditional obedience to a person (Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, Mao)

or accordingly an idea with universal claim to truth (racist mania, Marxism). National Socialism lasted a full 13 years - and communism eliminated itself after seven decades. Meanwhile, however, Islam can look back on a 1400-year successful track record of massive brainwashing. And its success to this day is also the justification for its unchanging practice in the future.

Trick 2: The abrogation of the Meccan Suras by the Medinan Suras

So far, we have mentioned still only one part of the secret that is hidden in the architecture of the Quran. The other part that the advocates of the peaceful religion carefully hide, not from only their enemies but also the bulk of their own followers, will explain why, historically speaking, the radical and fundamental currents of Islam are ever able to carry on, and why the peaceful and tolerant powers to this day have appeared to be mostly marginal. And for this, we must occupy ourselves for a little with the beginning phase of Islam - paying special attention to both of the most important places of Muhammad's activity: Mecca and Medina.

The Meccan phase of the Quran

Muhammad was born in the year 570 in Mecca. Only at the relatively high age of 40 (a traditionally symbolic number) did he receive his first visions, which he made known right away only in his nearest circles. These inspirations that, by his report, were whispered to him by the archangel Gabriel later formed the Suras, and the aggregate of these Suras eventually made up the Quran. At the beginning of his doctrine of Islam, that he preached in private as well as in the public, the influential representatives of the Koreishites (the tribe from which Muhammad himself originated) had no objections to Muhammad's teaching of a single god whom he named after one of the 300 wilderness gods of the Koreishites and (one hears this and is astounded) himself: Allah. For Muhammad's name is in its entirety "*Abu El Kasim Ibn Abd Allah.*"

At the beginning of his mission activity, Muhammad attempted to win over the inhabitants of Mecca peacefully to his new monotheistic religion. He especially expected that the Jews and the Christians would join in with his new religion. For in his own way of thinking, he wasn't just the prophet of a new religion, but the reformer and last prophet of Abrahamic monotheism. However, he was disappointed. For neither Jew nor Christian thought of following this outsider's doctrine. From this time - also called the Meccan phase - is where most of the more peaceful and tolerant Suras of the Quran originate. With time, however, Muhammad began to act more aggressively against the polytheism (idol cult) of his hometown Mecca. When his followers began to battle against the old gods and their followers, it came to a split between Muhammad and his Meccan tribe of Koreishites.

The Medinan phase of the Quran

In the face of a hopeless situation turning hostile, Muhammad decided in the year 622 to leave Mecca and to go with his followers to the care of Yathrib (Medina). This entry in Islamic history about Muhammad's move to Medina, known as the Hejira, is of central importance in the doctrine of Islam, in that the Quran scholars separate the Suras of the Quran into "Meccan" and "Medinan" Suras. Medinan Suras distinguish themselves from Meccan Suras among other things by their length (most of the long Suras originate from Medina) as well as by their

quality (more practical rules of faith were revealed in Medina), and partly in their center of reference (the political situation in Medina or Mecca). But they distinguish themselves from the Meccan Suras in one more considerably important point: In Medina, Jews and Christians (and consequentially all "infidels") were increasingly vilified and presented as the worst enemies of Islam that must be killed off so that Islam can propagate itself. This change in Muhammad's attitude also finds itself deposited in the Suras that he "received" in Medina.

In spite of the "Agreement of Medina," in which Muhammad accorded all the named advocates of Islam AND Judaism (an interesting side note in history) the same rights and duties ("*The Jews have their religion, and the Muslims their religion*"), increasing limitations against Jews, Christians and all other "infidels" can be found in the so-called 'Medinan' Suras," that among other things lead to the well-known murder and annihilation proclamations of the Quran making up the real ideological basis for worldwide Islamic terror to this day. As direct emissary of God, Muhammad ruled by authority of godly decree over all Muslims, and by authority of the three parties⁹ that agreed upon and signed treaties, he ruled also over the non-Muslims. Therefore, from that time - also called the Medinan phase - originate most of the intolerant Suras of the Quran, and those that call for murder, war and annihilation of all "infidels."

Muhammad led many campaigns (*majazi*) against Mecca¹⁰ after 623, until in March of 628 a cease-fire was called. After his departure from Medina, Muhammad was not only the prophet of his own created religion, but a warlord who had thousands of people killed in dozens of wars and attacks on caravans - and whose murders and vengefulness even the inhabitants of Medina didn't condone - those who had welcomed him with open arms in his time of need. In his endeavor to make Medina "Jew-free," he staged an unbelievable massacre among the Jewish tribe of Banu Kureiza: When this tribe refused to follow the command of Muhammad to perform a complete conversion to Islam, in the year 527 AD, 700 Jewish men (other sources speak of over 1,000 men) were beheaded in an unprecedented massacre, and their wives and children were taken into slavery. This massacre is not mentioned in the schoolbooks of the West, nor in the media, and not in the numerous books about Islam - and if it is, then it is the utmost exception. With these facts, one can comfortably classify Muhammad as a mass-murderer of his time, in which it is clear that he doesn't have the least thing in common with the other Biblical prophets in whose ranks he tries to put himself.

Regarding the principle of abrogation (nullification) of older Suras (Meccan) by newer (Medinan) ones

Islam has found itself confronted for a long time with the contextual inconsistencies between the (relatively friendly) Suras from the earlier Meccan phase and those of the later Medinan phase. As demonstrated and described in the previous chapter, it is impossible to follow simultaneously such a declaration as: "Each has the free choice of religion" and "Kill each one that departs from his religion." This dilemma is unsolvable if there is not a clearly defined solution algorithm available. Precisely this is the case in Islam. It is through the principle of abrogation (annulment) that the Islamic scholars have rescued their religion from this logical quandary.¹¹

⁹ the Muslim immigrants from Mecca, the Muhajirum, the native Muslims from the tribe of al-Ansar, and the Jews residing in Medina - the Yahud

¹⁰ Victory of the Muslims in the slaughter of Badr [624], the slaughter on Mount Ubad [625] and the grave slaughter [627]

¹¹ For according to Quranic statements about itself, the Quran is a book without errors and contradictions.

This proves that everything Muhammad said later on either relativizes or nullifies the earlier sayings. That can be reproduced throughout, for ultimately the old Muhammad was more mature and wiser than the young one was for his followers. Therefore, the Suras that Muhammad "received" in Medina are more important than the Suras from the Meccan time. And therefore, the hitherto unsolvable problem of inconsistency in the Suras can finally be answered logically. Since the warlike Suras from the time in Medina came later in time than the earlier peaceful Suras from Muhammad's Meccan phase, their contents are considerably more important and determinant for the course of Islam than the peaceful Meccan Suras. That answers the question, why the radical advocates of Islam have always had the upper hand historically: they successfully invoked the principle of abrogation (nullification) that is accepted by most of the Muslim currents of faith.¹²

Whoever is not cognizant of this principle (and that accounts for most Muslims as well as most Western intellectuals especially) is as good as helpless against the self-conflicting elements of the Quran - and in naïveté and desperation would prefer to invoke the peaceful passages of Islam. It is another issue, however, that he hasn't really recognized the true character of Islam in all of this, and that he confesses a religion that isn't really what he thinks it is. Another issue as well is that the educated Muslims guard this principle of abrogation like the Holy Grail. For up until now, general ignorance about this subject has been their best help with respect to the confusion and ultimate conquest of their enemy, as all "infidels" in the world are considered.

Taqiyya - the Islamic mastery in the deception of its enemies

"*You shall not bear false witness,*" it says in the Ten Commandments of the Christians. Buddhists teach in their "*Noble Eight-Fold Path*" the practice of "*right attitude, right viewpoint, right thinking and right decisions*" - in which it means that one can go to Nirvana only through uprightness, honesty, and social consciousness and action.

The Taqiyya of Islam stands in direct opposition to this. Under Taqiyya, it is permitted to lie until the ceiling beams bend. Al Ghazzali (1059-1111), one of the most eminent theologians of Islam, compiled the command of the Taqiyya as follows:

"Know this, that lying in itself is not wrong. If a lie is the only way to a good result, then it is permitted. Therefore, we must lie if the truth leads to an unacceptable result.

The good result is Islamic world domination. The unacceptable result would be that the enemies of Islam would be informed about it. For on their way to world domination, everything is permitted for Muslims in order to have victory over their opponents: they are allowed to deceive, lie, enter into fake contracts, break their word - and kill without compunction, when necessary. An essential means in Islamic perpetual Jihad has always been to deceive the enemies of Islam (according to the Quran and Muhammad: Jews, Christians and other "infidels")

¹² Not all Islamic groups recognize this principle. According to Hazrat Mirza, Ghulam Ahmad, the founder of Ahmadiyya, apparently contradictory statements, which are not allowed to be resolved without declaring parts of the Quran invalid, are the result of an incomplete understanding of the Quran. That would speak contrary to the self-declaration of the Quran that it is an error-free, perfect book. The Mu'tazila also regard the Quran as not being eternal or uninterpretable. However, in the aggregate structure of Islam, the Ahmadiyya and Mu'tazila play an important role and are regarded as and fought against by Sunnis and Shiites as though they were infidels)

about the intentions of Islam and to present themselves as a peace-loving and tolerant religion that wishes to harm nobody. The principle of deception is as old as Islam – and understanding of it apparently has not made its way into the government rooms and editorial offices of politicians and journalist just yet. Nobody there wants to believe that which cannot be true. In their sermons among their peers, Islamic clerics take no notesheets with them. Such was the announcement of the Ayatollah Khomeini in an address from the year 2004 to his brethren in the faith:

"Deception, subterfuge, conspiracy, fraud, thievery and murder are nothing but means for Allah's business!"

What a crass contrast to the ethical foundations of the rest of the world religions. But the Western defenders of Islam, however, do not want to recognize all of that and they appear, just like their Muslim charges, to be immune to new forms of insight. Such quotes are rather dismissed as "unique cases," and even more likely as "taken out of context" – therefore it is also useless to refer back to the Quranic origin of the Muslims' Taqiyya tactics. For faithful Muslims ever draw their action and speech from appropriate statements in the Quran and the Haddith – and therefore, if one takes this fact to heart, they are by far not so unpredictable in their activities as one might commonly believe. In Sura 3:54, Muslims find the godly permission for their art of deception. In there, it says:

"And they forged a great deception, and Allah forged a great deception; and Allah is the best forger of deception."

And this is where Islam is unmatched among the other world religions: its god is the only one acclaimed as a deceiver, liar and crook – nothing else can be meant by the term "forger of deceptions." And non-Muslims are especially counted into this ruse in order to create a deception as to the true intentions of Islam. That is, to portray a world-conquering Islam as what it really isn't (but the infidels so gladly listen to): a religion of peace. Since the very beginning of their expansion, Muslims quote – by their campfires or in the marketplaces of their trade routes – the originally cited peaceful-appearing Suras from the Quran. Since most people they met were unable to write or read, they met with a receptive public that they could quickly win over to their faith. However, where they met with a literate public, they also saw themselves confronted from the very beginning with the criticism that there are numerous passages in the Quran that really aren't peaceful in any way, but call for the persecution and murder of those who believe otherwise. Back then, as now, the Muslim scholars were able to navigate around any apparent inconsistencies with great cleverness, and by means of their 1400-year-old well-tested confusion tactics, have turned this into a mastery that still entraps most Western intellectuals, today.

And so presently, most Westerners still don't know any correct answer for the apparent and inconsistent statements in the Quran, whether journalist, or writer, cleric or politician – except for the one that either ignores the inconsistencies of Islamic doctrine because of helplessness, or that arbitrarily bends it to their liking, or the one that perhaps divides Islam into a moderate and a violence-loving branch and repeats this construct often enough in their articles that they themselves end up believing it. However, in their zeal, they themselves fail to recognize that they had already long ago fallen victim to the ancient Islamic tactic of confusion by the Muslims. Moreover, they ignore the great disservice they are performing against their free society in that they have become compliant pioneers for Islam's way to absolute world power. For Muslims smile upon this artificial division of their religion into a good and an evil branch,

moreover they are only too glad to play along with this game in public opinion. For they know only too well what serves Islam. However, only very seldom, perhaps because of the feeling of Islam's invincibility at the time, or perhaps because of the mood at the time is just right, do they ever give away the secret that there are not two different Islams, but rather one sole Islam.

*"The term 'moderate Islam' is very repulsive; that is objectionable and an offense to our religion. There is no moderate or non-moderate Islam. Islam is Islam, and for this reason it is self-contained."*¹³

The segregation of Islamism from Islam is an arbitrary construction for the purpose of releasing Islam from the charge of violence, and by which the Western media have been entrapped into denouncing or berating every critic of Islam as racists, neo-Nazi or rightwing. Among this group can be found such formerly significant intellectual flagships as the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, *die Welt*, yes and even the traditionally liberal *ZEIT* – just to name a few of the most important ones. They – and most all of the German and European local and provincial papers in their channels – have allowed themselves to be deceived, and now they are themselves the ones who, together with their alleged moderate Islam, deceive their readership – by the millions – and thereby have themselves become the pioneers of a religion that is multiplying explosively in its triumphal procession in Old Europe. They will one day recognize that the gratitude they might hope to receive on the part of their Islamic clientele, as soon as the Muslims have established the Islamic State and the Sharia along with it; the "useful idiots," as they have ever called those supporters from the ranks of their enemies, will be the first ones to become one head shorter.

4. SUMMATION

The Quran, in its confusing inconsistency, is an outright parading example of the effectiveness of the Taqiyya Principle. In Islam, what is dealt with here is unquestionably the most gigantic and successful maneuver of deception in the history of mankind. As the only one of its kind in the world religions, Islam not only has an all-encompassing license to murder, but also a far reaching license to lie¹⁴ – thereby placing itself outside the group of those remaining great religions that ever strive for peacefulness, uprightness and respectability.

Islam is, historically speaking, an almost perfectly staged Machiavellian structure of authority that guarantees it maximum efficiency in its pursuit of unlimited power. All means possible are put under this claim of power. In its political actions, Islam sees itself hemmed in by no moral or ethical criteria. Islamic ethics are purely utilitarian: moral categories like truth, righteousness, good and evil therefore play a role only in the view of their respective usefulness by Islam, and are therefore relative. What may be good for Islam today, could very well be be injurious tomorrow. True, good, and right is only that which is useful for Islam. The murder of "infidels" serves Islam: therefore murder is good. The silence about the true intentions of Islam concerning "infidels" is just as useful to Islam: therefore lying to "infidels" is good. The

¹³ (Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Reconquista-Leader, Source: *Milliyet*, Turkey, 21 August 2007)

¹⁴ only, a Muslim is not to lie to other Muslims [Source: Hadith 7, the 40A-Hadithe]

Jihad against countries of unbelief serves for the worldwide spread and ultimate victory of Islam; therefore every Jihad is justified¹⁵.

Without the principle of abrogation, Islam would be a religion in which all values as well as their opposites would be valid: and therefore a religion of whim and vanity.

With the principle of abrogation, Islam is exactly what it is: a religion of terror against those of different faith as well as the sole world religion with a god-granted licence to lie, deceive, and kill.

CONCLUSION

1. For all devout Muslims in the world, the Quran, with its 114 Suras, is considered the only valid guide for proper thought and action.
2. These 114 Suras therefore make up the fundamental law of Islam that is to apply for all time.
3. Since the Suras are, by Islamic viewpoint, not the work of men but originate from God all by himself, then any criticism (even the slightest) is blasphemy and will be punished by death.
4. Likewise, all reforms in Islam that are not covered by the content of the Quran are attacks on the divine structure of the Quran, and therefore on Allah himself.
5. Therefore Islam – unlike that of Christianity or Buddhism – is essentially immune to reforms and adaptations to societal advances.
6. The Meccan as well as the Medinan phase represents the “overall system of Islam” in an interaction that is difficult to see through in the beginning.
7. Islam uses the relatively peaceful and tolerant Quran verses from the Meccan phase to attract newcomers. Most peaceful Muslims know only this Islam.
8. They hardly ever come in contact with the intolerant and hate-filled Islam from the Medinan phase.
9. And if so, then their way as an Islamic terrorist is set out before them.
10. The arrangement of the Suras according to their length and not according to the point in time that they were given to Muhammad makes the Quran, and Islam with it, inscrutable for the greater part of Islamic followers.

¹⁵ compare, in addition, communist totalitarianism, also among the RAF: “Ethical is that which serves the Revolution.”

11. Only informed Muslims recognize the qualitative division in the Suras after Muhammad's entry into Medina.
12. Since the principle of abrogation applies in Islam (the later sayings hold more importance than the earlier ones), the Suras from the later phase of Islam that are hostile to tolerance and peace (Medina) quasi annihilate the more moderate Suras from the earlier Meccan phase of Islam.
13. This principle is unknown to most Muslims, however they are very well known by the Islamic theologians as well as most of the fundamentalist Muslims who are falsely labeled "Islamists," that have an elite and powerful knowledge of rulership at their disposal that they can access whenever they need to.
14. By means of this knowledge of rulership, these Islam scholars possess a virtually unassailable power of definition within Islam that is described by German Sociologist Hohannes Feest as "socially prestructured possibility of defining a situation for others that is authoritatively binding."
15. It is precisely these Suras that are intolerant and totally disdainful of human rights (Medinan) – Islamically completely correct and ultimately invincible – that all "Islamists" and "Jihadists" relate to.
16. Islamic "warriors of god" are therefore the sons of Allah and his prophet Muhammad according to the doctrine of Islam, for they take his prime directive of world conquest and establishment of an Islamic political system and system of faith at its word.
17. Islam designated as "moderate" differs from that designated as "fundamentalist" (erroneously called "Islamism") only by the speed in which its goals are to be realized. While the "moderate Islam" relies on time, the "Islamists" want the foundation of Islamic world power to be achieved as soon as possible and by whatever means necessary. These means are explicitly outlined in the Quran: murder of Islam critics – deception of the "infidels" regarding the true goals of Islam (Taqiyya) – battle against and annihilation of all "infidels."
18. Moderate Islam therefore exists only in the minds of ignorant Muslims and clueless Westerners. In reality, though, "moderate" Islam is a historical chimera. For the Moderate acts according to the Quran just as much as the radical Imams and Muslims. There is therefore the pressing conclusion arises from the previously mentioned statements that – the better a Muslim knows the Quran, including the principle of abrogation, and the more he believes – the sooner he will bow to terror against "infidels."
19. For this reason, "Hatepreachers" exist only in the minds of uninformed and uneducatable non-Muslims. For, like "moderate" Imams, hate preachers refer 100 percent to the texts of Islam (Quran and Hadith); they differ, however, only from the former in their more consistent and therefore religiously purer implementation of the central message of Islam: the establishment of dar al-Islam (Islamic world domination) under the prerequisite of annihilation of their enemies ("infidels").

20. On these grounds, "moderate" Imams, therefore, never base the central theme of their sermons on that mandate known as world conquest. Because of this, however, they contribute considerably – whether consciously or unknowingly – to confusion and appeasement among the "infidels" as to the question of Islam's peacefulness, and therefore carry out in special measure their religion's Taqiyya mandate.

Michael Mannheimer

Germany, March 23, 2001
Contact: M.Mannheimer@gmx.net

Translated from German by anders denken

Translation Notes

Representation of Arabic names in English vary. The following names are listed so that the reader will recognize these "familiar" terms according to how they have learned them.

Quran = Koran

Muhammad = Mohammed