

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh

Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

Here are the arguments provided allegedly in a study, "The Plain Truth", published in the February 1984 against the Holy Bible in support of newly converted to the false religion of Islam.

I present them as follows, and will refute each point individually. Here they are again:

1. The Bible Convicts Women as the original Sinners (ie. Eve picking from the forbidden tree){Genesis 2:4-3:24}. But the Koran Clarifies it was Adam Not Eve {Koran 7:19-25}
2. The Bible says "The Birth of a Daughter is a loss" {Ecclesiasticus 22:3}. While the Koran says both are an Equal Blessing {Koran 42:49}
3. The Bible forbids women from speaking in church {I Corinthians 14:34-35}. But the Koran says women can argue with the Prophet {58:1}
4. In the Bible, divorced Women are Labeled as an Adulteress, not men {Matthew 5:31-32} But the Koran does Not have Biblical double standards{Koran 30:21}
5. In According to the Bible, widows and sisters do not inherit Any property or wealth, only men do {Numbers 27:1-11}. While the Koran abolished this male greed {Koran 4:22} and God protects all.
6. The Bible Allows Multiple Wives {I Kings 11:3}. In The Koran, God limits the number to four only under certain situations (with the wife's permission) and prefers you marry only one wife {Koran 4:3} The Koran gives the woman the right to choose who to marry.

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh
Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

7. "If a man happens to meet a virgin who is not pledged to be married and rapes her and they are discovered, he shall pay the girl's father fifty shekels of silver. He must marry the girl, for he has violated her. He can never divorce her as long as he lives" {Deuteronomy 22:28-30}.

But, one must ask a simple question here, who is really punished, the man who raped the woman or the woman who was raped? According to the Bible, you have to spend the rest of your life with the man who raped you.

The Prophet Muhammad Says {Volume 9, Book 86, Number 101} Narrated by Aisha, "It is essential to have the consent of a virgin (for the marriage)" . Would the Non-Muslim men reading this prefer the Women they know to be Christian or Muslim?

8. The Bible also asks women to wear veils as in Islam {I Corinthians 11:3-10}

9. Women were given rights to Vote less than a 100 years ago in the US, while the Koran gave women voting rights almost 1,500 years ago, and so on.

Refutation of each argument:

1. The Bible undoubtedly mentions the sin of Eve in causing Adam to fall. However, just as equally, the Holy Scriptures make it abundantly clear that Adam or the first man, was equally to blame. In fact, Romans 5:12-21, repeatedly contrasts Adam's sin as the cause of death on humanity as opposed to Christ, the cause of life and redemption. The phrase used constantly was: "*by one man...sin...offence...judgment...disobedience*". All this clearly reveals that Adam was certainly not exempt from accountability. In addition, the contrast is interesting since Christ

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh
Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

is the reverse of Adam in being the Life-Bringer.

2. This is a gross misquote of Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 22:3. The proper quotation will bring out what was actually intended as opposed to what Lauren and other foolish Muslims propose:

“An evil nurtured man is the dishonour of his father that begat him: and a foolish daughter is born to his loss.” (KJV).

Clearly, the context of the verse and the verse itself has nothing to do with calling a woman being born as a loss but rather is highlighting the situation of an evil person. According to the whole chapter as well as the whole verse, it is clear that an evil person will be despised in every area of life, even in bearing children. In fact the verse is clear that the evil man is a dishonour to his father and as a result, such a man will receive a foolish daughter to his own peril. As much as critics may say: “The word ‘foolish’ is in italics, thus not in the original Hebrew or Greek!”, the Authorized Version translators knew better on this matter than today’s critics. After all, the whole chapter of Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 22 was about the evil man and what behaviours and consequences he is to expect. Muslims as usual, do not ever quote in context and only know how to twist out of context to “prove” a point.

3. “Speaking in the church” is clearly referring to a specific practice, not to general speech. The context that the Blessed Apostle St. Paul was giving is a reference to prophesy (forth-telling) of the Word of God as well as to actual teaching in the church public worship. (I Corinthians 14:29-33). In addition, the context is clearly only for public worship whereby women were not to engage in prophesy (forth-telling) of the Word of God and were not to be in a position of instruction over the whole church or the men of the church, as the words of the verses in question clearly state. As a result of this, women were not to be priests or bishops. However, this is not to say that women’s role in a church was in any way inferior to that of the man. Far from it, since the Blessed Apostle actually acknowledges women by name who were of great help to his ministry and to the Church as is found in Romans 16.

May we ask our Muslim friend who quoted this and then went on to quote Sura 58:1: “If women could argue with Muhammad, then why is it that he went on to state that hell would be filled with women, that if a woman passed by a man who was praying, then his prayer would not be counted and other more denigrating conditions in the Hadiths? [See Sahih Bukhari Book 2, 28; Sahih Abu Dawud Book 2, 704]. May we ask, in a mosque, do women in general, have the right to call the faithful to prayer, let alone take the role of a sheik/imam?”

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh
Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

Based on this, who was more denigrating to women: The Blessed St. Paul or the so-called "Prophet" Muhammad?

4. Double standard? Why is it then that in Islam, the right to divorce is easily granted to the man, and not to the woman, to the point of saying 3 times, with or without witnesses: "Talaq, Talaq, Talaq" [I divorce thee, I divorce thee, I divorce thee]. Who then is guilty of double standard? Since Ms. Booth had the audacity to half-quote Matthew 5:32, let us quote it in full and then see what is really said:

"But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." (KJV)

From this we discover from the words of our Lord Jesus Christ the following:

- a) Unless there has been a sexual deviancy outside of marriage (fornication), divorcing the wife is not acceptable.
- b) To divorce without the above valid reason is forcing the wife to commit adultery.
- c) The one who marries the woman in the above situation is the guilty party to adultery.

Clearly, whoever provided the above arguments, has lost his/her ability of reading and any sense, by stating that only women are guilty of being accused of adultery in the above verse. As explained from the actual words of our Lord, the man is equally accused of being the adulterer as the woman of being the adulteress. Therefore this person has deliberately distorted the facts of the Gospel of Christ in order to promote her rebellion towards Christ our God.

5. Clearly, converts from Christianity and other Muslims do not know how to read. They are as illiterate as their so-called "Prophet". Let us quote the whole passage they made reference to and see what is really being said here:

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh

Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

[1] Then came the daughters of Zelophehad, the son of Hopher, the son of Gilead, the son of Machir, the son of Manasseh, of the families of Manasseh the son of Joseph: and these are the names of his daughters; Mahlah, Noah, and Hoglah, and Milcah, and Tirzah.

[2] And they stood before Moses, and before Eleazar the priest, and before the princes and all the congregation, by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying,

[3] Our father died in the wilderness, and he was not in the company of them that gathered themselves together against the LORD in the company of Korah; but died in his own sin, and had no sons.

[4] Why should the name of our father be done away from among his family, because he hath no son? Give unto us therefore a possession among the brethren of our father.

[5] And Moses brought their cause before the LORD.

[6] And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

[7] The daughters of Zelophehad speak right: thou shalt surely give them a possession of an inheritance among their father's brethren; and thou shalt cause the inheritance of their father to pass unto them.

[8] And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a man die, and have no son, then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter.

[9] And if he have no daughter, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his brethren.

[10] And if he have no brethren, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his father's brethren.

[11] And if his father have no brethren, then ye shall give his inheritance unto his kinsman that is next to him of his family, and he shall possess it: and it shall be unto the children of Israel a statute of judgment, as the LORD commanded Moses." (KJV)

What situation do we have here? Daughters of certain parties who were concerned about the family names being thrown to dust because there are no sons to inherit the fathers' property or wealth. The decision given by God to Moses is as follows:

a) Give the daughters what they have requested (v6, 7)

b) If a man has no son to inherit him, then he can pass it on to his daughter for inheritance. (v8)

c) If there are no daughters as well as sons, then he can pass the inheritance on to any of his brethren [includes sisters as well]. (v9)

d) If there are no brethren, then to any of the father's brethren. (v10)

e) If the father has no brethren, then to any other relative close the father. (v11)

Clearly, women are allowed to possess property and inherit the property of the father in the above passage. Contrast this to the Qu'ran, which not only makes a woman half that of a man in a court of law, but even makes it clear that a woman's share of inheritance will always be much less than a man by double! (Surah 2:282; 4:11, 176;) The Holy Bible makes no such unequal proportions. The Qu'ran does, and goes further to denigrate women.

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh

Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

6. What a lying hypocrite would say such things! Muslims as usual, never cite references in context or properly. The verse quoted in I Kings 11:3 have a very interesting statement at the end: *"and his wives turned away his heart"*. This verse clearly reveals that King Solomon, who despite his wisdom in his earlier years, had departed from the correct teaching of God (Jehovah) and had been led astray by his wives who were idolaters. Unfortunately, Solomon had no wisdom to pick the wives carefully and chose the idolaters, and instead of correcting their evil practices, condoned it and thus caused his own downfall. To cite this as a point against the Holy Scripture is clearly foolish, since the point was that Solomon's behaviour was at a time when he was in apostasy.

Before these foolish Muslims use this as a point to support their version of marriage, let us point out that even in the Holy Bible polygamy whilst acknowledged, had a lot of restrictions placed upon it on what is to be done and not done. For one, unlike their so-called "Prophet" Muhammad, you could not force yourself onto a married woman to join your harem and expect God to approve. This is clear from the case of King David and Bathsheba, whereby David forced himself on Bathsheba, who was already married to Uriah the Hittite and even sent him to the front-line to be killed so that he could copulate the relationship. However, this was not to go unnoticed with God and he sent the prophet Nathan to not only rebuke David for his sin of both adultery and murder but also pronounced the punishment (II Samuel Chapters 11-12). Interesting to note is that God's rebuke via the prophet Nathan was that if David really needed another wife on top of his harem, then he only needed to ask God and God would have provided her, without David resorting to sin. However, since David committed sin of both murder and adultery, he has shown contempt to God's commandments and is to be punished accordingly. (II Samuel 12:8-10).

Contrast this to Muhammad, who stole Safiya Bint Huyay from her husband after torturing him and stealing his wealth, and then had the audacity to marry his widow on the same day. All with Allah's approval! If you want to examine the evidence, then see the following Hadiths: Volume 1, Book 8, 367; Volume 3, Book 34, 437. The God the Bible will never approve cold-blooded murder and adultery, even from any of his prophets! This clearly shows a contrast between the God of the Bible and the Qu'ran. What have Muslims to say for themselves now?

Even in polygamy, which God displayed standards and morality, Jehovah or Allah?

This topic of "Biblical Polygamy vs Islamic Polygamy" deserves another discussion, which time does not allow now but will be addressed at a later date.

Refutation Of Al-Taqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh

Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

Suffice to say, Ms. Booth clearly does not read properly, and neither do the Muslims either, since the verse in question is not a glorification but a condemnation of Solomon's sin.

7. It is obvious from the quoted passage in Deuteronomy 22: 28, 29 that God was clearly commanding responsibility on the part of the man to not treat sexual relations with a woman lightly. In fact, this is actually the antidote to the world's system of "sowing [one's] wild oats" on the part of the man. When read carefully, we discover that this is a clear case of 2 consenting parties, both a man and a woman, who have been caught in the act. In fact, it is assumed in v28, that the woman in question is not married hence the word: "a virgin" and "damsel". Since they have both been caught in the act, the man now has a big responsibility of the dowry price to the father in v29. The wording in v29 is most interesting as a command on the part of the man towards the woman in question: "because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days." Ms Booth wrongly assumes that it is the lady being punished, when in reality, it is the man who is bearing the brunt of the guilt and has to live with it. If anything, a woman should feel honoured, since the man cannot just use her body sexually and then dump her, as the dishonourable man of today's society tends to do. It is the man who is suffering the consequences more than the woman.

If she is so concerned about her honour as a woman, then why does she not take issue with the fact that Muhammad allowed for something called mu'tah or temporary marriage, which is avidly practiced by the Shi'ite school of Islam? Allah clearly does not value a woman's honour and dignity that he would allow for both easy divorce on the part of the man as well as mu'tah marriage as evidenced in the following Hadiths: Mishkat al-Masabih Book 2, Section 18, No's 115 and 116. She should seriously ask those questions to her imams if she has any courage. Contrast this with the God of the Bible as evidenced in Deuteronomy 22;28, 29 already discussed as well as Deuteronomy 21:10-14, whereby God even mentions in the finest detail how in war, a man soldier should behave towards a woman he has found attraction to on the enemy side. In this passage, we also see the justice and high morality of the God of the Bible displayed here. In it we discover, that the man is to let her perform her acts of mourning on the part of dead relatives for a full month (21:12, 13). After all her mourning, she is then to be the wife of that soldier. (21:13). If he finds later on that he has "no delight in her" then he is to let her go and "thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her." (21:14). In other words, a woman is not property that you can buy and sell to the highest bidder. Even in this arrangement, the relationship is understood to be a permanent relationship not a temporal one. Hence, an Israelite soldier had to think twice before even considering a wife from the other side, since he was stuck with it and he had to let her go rather than sell her, if he found that he was not happy with her anymore. The God of the Bible clearly regards the feelings of the woman as opposed to the god of the Qu'ran. Allah treats women as property and not as persons, hence they can be temporarily be married and sold off to the highest bidder, as is shown in Islamic sources and Islamic countries even today. The God of the Bible clearly sees a woman as a person of compatible grace to the man, and is therefore not to be taken lightly to either neglect or abuse.

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh
Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

8. Any serious Bible student knows this is a deliberate attempt on the part of Muslims to promote their oppression to others by distorting passages of Scripture. The passage in question was a reference to public congregational worship. I Corinthians 11:4-15 is clearly referring to congregational worship rather than ordinary, private everyday situations. First of all, it is clear that the veil in question was not just a head covering, but also referring to the long hair on the woman's head as a contrast to the hair of a man as is evidenced in v6, v12, v13-15. In fact, since this was a situation of public worship, the man is said to dishonour himself if he covers his head to pray or worship. (v4). In v6, it states clearly that if a woman is shaven or shorn, it is not only shameful, but also needs to be covered with a veil then. This evidence is taken further when it is pointed out that nature reveals that a woman naturally has a cover for herself in the form of her hair and for a man to even have long hair would disgrace him. (v14, v15). Therefore, even in this public situation, if a veil is not used, then if a woman has long hair, then that is good enough. There is a very interesting statement in v11 and v12 regarding the fact that in reality, men and women need each other in the Lord, thus any notion of inferiority on the part of a woman is unwarranted:

“Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God.” (KJV)

Furthermore, we should point out, that Christians who do practice veiling of the women, only do it in the congregational situation, but not in everyday life and in private, simply because this passage is understood clearly to be purely for a situation of public worship.

Muslims who wish to argue as foolishly as they have argued have shown their foolishness once again by not reading the passage properly or in context.

9. This is clearly a case of al-Taqqiyah [lying for the cause of Islam] at work here. Can they honestly name one instance in the history of Islam at its foundation through to present day where women were genuinely given the vote in Islamic society, except in more recent times? Ironically, the first time Arab Islamic women actually voted was in none other than in the Jewish state of Israel in 1948! Prior to this, can any Muslim highlight in history outside of modern times, where there was an honest vote on the part of women, let alone any sort of voting system? This is clearly an utter deception on the part of Muslim propagandists. Since a woman is considered inferior in Islamic society, any vote that occurred in modern times was purely a result of secularizing influences from the past rather than any Islamic influence.

Refutation Of Al-Taqqiya or so called "reasons" for converting to Islam

Written by Timothy Kwoh

Friday, 19 November 2010 19:59

I urge Muslims to stop slinging mud at the Holy Bible, and actually pick it up and read it for yourself. If you were honest, you would discover that the God of the Bible is nothing like Allah and is far better morally and in every other way. The God of the Bible (Jehovah) is True Love and Justice whilst Allah is an arbitrary tyrant with no regard for creation. The God of the Bible is intent on saving humanity, and has even taken the step into human history as the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord Jesus Christ healed the sick, restored sight to the blind, fed thousands but most of all, He died for the sins of the world as the Sinless Lamb of God (John 1:29) so that humanity can be forgiven and cleansed of not only their sins, but also saved from a hell that was meant for Satan and his demons (Matthew 25:41). He is the Risen Saviour who rose from the dead and returned to heaven, from hence shall He return to be the Judge of the quick and the dead. (Acts 1:11; 17:30, 31). The Holy Spirit pleads with you Muslims to repent and truly look at the Son and live (John 3:12-16). The Lord Jesus Christ can truly save since He is the I Am Who I Am (Exodus 3:14; John 8:24, 36, 58) that is Jehovah in the flesh. (I Timothy 3:16). Muslims, I plead with you too not to harden your hearts against the Holy Spirit, since it can only lead to damnation in hell. When you find Christ truly, He will grant you a new birth and make you a new creature (II Corinthians 5:17).

I wish to leave Ms. Booth and other Muslims with these concluding verses:

“For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one....He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record God gave of his Son. He that hath the Son hath life: and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God....And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.” (KJV)

(I John 5:7, 10-13, 20)