# Western Hypocrisy and the Islamic Scourge

## by Stephen C. Perks

THE inability to recognise the chastening hand of God in the events of September 11, 2001 represents a major failure of leadership in the West, both in the political and the ecclesial spheres. Throughout the history of Israel God raised up evil and tyrannical foreign powers to punish the children of Israel for their apostasy. Those who like to argue that analogies of this nature are not valid, that God does not deal with nations today in the way that he dealt with the nation of Israel, must concede that the major part of the Bible, the Old Testament, is worthless and might as well be thrown away because it has nothing of much value to teach us that is actually relevant to life. Of course, this is precisely the position of much of the Church today, evangelicalism included, certainly in practice if not in theory. But if it is recognised that the whole of the Bible is God's word to both men and nations, as it claims to be (see for example Ps. 2), then we must be willing to apply the lessons it teaches. These lessons are often not easy or pleasant, but they are necessary.

It has become rather fashionable in the West to view all religions as equally valid or, perhaps more accurately, as equally repulsive. All that is, except one, namely secular humanism, which is deemed so obviously to be not "religion" but the truth that only the mad or the bad can be seriously opposed to the new secular humanist and politically correct world that is now in the making. But it is a religion, and it is a vicious and destructive religion that has dismantled Christendom and flung open the gates of the Western nations to the neo-pagan and Islamic hordes waiting to invade.

Islam is a violent religion that will not stop until all the infidels are either converted or killed. This is at the heart of Islam. Jihād is the second most important duty in Islam. Our political leaders choose to ignore this fact and insist that it is only certain extremists who have this militant interpretation of Islam. Undoubtedly, naïve scholars of comparative religion have often reinterpreted the notion of jihād while wearing their Christian spectacles, and many Muslims in the West make similar interpretations. But it should be remembered that this is a *re*-interpretation that seeks to accommodate itself to Western, i.e. *Christian*, sensibilities about justice and mercy, and would last no longer than it had to in order for Islam to get a strangle hold on the nations of the West. History bears out the truth about Islam. One has to shut one's eyes to miss it. Unfortunately, this is just what our politicians choose to do. We should be in no doubt, however, about Islamic objectives worldwide.[1]

Another important religious duty of the *imām* and the Muslim community is the holy war against unbelievers—the *jihād* (i.e. "to take trouble," "exert oneself," striving "on the way of Allāh" [ *fī sabîl Allāh*])—in order violently to convert the heathen to the true faith, or at least to subject them to the yoke of Islām. In the earliest period of Islām, Muslims were forbidden to take measures against the unbelieving inhabitants of Mecca who persecuted and ill-treated them, but after the *Hijrah* the position was altered. In Qur'ān XXII. 39–42, Allāh declared that in future Muslims should be permitted to defend themselves if they were attacked, and that in so doing they could count on God's support . . . This permission to offer defence against attacks was soon afterwards changed into a command actually to attack the unbelievers, and, since the various expeditions for robbery and pillage on both sides brought about a state of perpetual war between the inhabitants of Mecca and the Muslims at Medîna, the *jihād* gradually became one of the most important duties of Muhammad's adherents . . . Those who could not personally take part in the campaign must at least assist in the *jihād* by payment of money according to their means. Even after Mecca was taken, and the inhabitants had been converted to Islam, the *jihād* against unbelievers remained a religious duty . . . The doctrine that all heathen must be subjected to Islām "because of their unbelief " first arose in the time of the Great Conquests, after the death of the Prophet, when the Muslim armies succeeded in conquering an extensive territory outside Arabia, and in making tributarises of many unbelievers. At that time the Prophet is said to have declared: "I am commanded to fight against men until they bear witness that there is no God but Allāh, and that Mohammad is God's messenger; only by pronouncing these words can they make their property and blood secure from me."[2] The *jihād* is a duty of every male Muslim who is free, of full age, and not only in the full possession of his intellectual powers, but physically fit for service and able to obtain the necessary weapons.[3]

The goal of Islam is the same as that of biblical Christianity: conversion of the whole world to the faith. But the means appointed for this could not be more different. It is true of course that Christians have engaged in unjust wars and abused their power. But this is just the point. From a Christian perspective murder and robbery are always abuses of power, crimes, and they are not Christ's appointed means of winning the world to himself. The preaching of the gospel and the healing of the sick along with works of charity are Christ's appointed means of winning the world to himself. The sword and oppression, war and conquest are the means appointed by the founder of Islam for those who refuse to submit to Allah. And the popular notion that the so-called "people of the book" were treated better than other non-Muslims by their Islamic conquerors is a myth that has been exposed by Bat Ye'or in her book, *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam*.[4]

If the nations of the West permit Islam, or indeed any other false religion, to take root in their societies they will inevitably have to face some fearful consequences. We have

---

1. See F. W. Schnitzler, "Islamic Objectives Worldwide" in *Calvinism Today*, Vol. III, No. 2 ( July 1993), pp. 19–23, reprinted in this issue of *Christianity & Society*.

2. This is a saying of Muhammad's that is recorded in a number of different hadiths: see *Sahih Bukhari*, Vol. 1, Bk 2, §24; Bk 8, §387; Vol. 4, Bk 52, §196; Vol. 9, Bk 84, §59; *Sunan Abu-Dawud*, Bk 14, §2635; Bk 19, §3061.

3. Th. W. Juynboll, "Law (Muhammadan)" in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark), Vol. VII, p. 881a.

4. Bat Ye'or, *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam: From Jihad to Dhimmitude* (London: Associated University Presses, 1996). See the review by John Peck in *Christianity & Society*, Vol. X, No. 3 ( July 2000), p. 28ff.

already had in Britain a situation in which book shops have been firebombed by Muslims for selling books critical of Islam. This problem can only get worse while the present institutional indifference and even antipathy to Christianity and the *laissez-faire* attitude to other religions prevails. In a Christian society tolerance is a virtue. But when a society's understanding of tolerance is stripped of any Christian content this virtue becomes a vice. There must be limits to a society's willingness to tolerate influences that will ultimately overturn its religious foundations and, consequently, undermine its very existence. Islam understands this. The West, drunk on secular humanism, is no longer able to see the obvious. Islam, unlike Christianity, is not a religion that makes a virtue of tolerance. Opening the doors of our nations to the religion of Islam is folly, indeed madness. But as the proverb says, "Those whom the gods would destroy, they first drive mad."

Nevertheless, despite this fact, and despite the fact they we must resist Islam and bring to justice those who perpetrate murder in the name of their religion, the truth is that the Western nations ought to have nothing to fear from Islam or any other false religion. What they do have to fear, or should fear, is rather their own apostasy from the true religion, Christianity. Trusting in her chariots will not save America or Britain any more than such misplaced trust saved the nation of Israel. The real challenge for President Bush and Tony Blair on September 11 was not whether they would have the determination to bring down the Taliban. Rather, the real challenge they faced was whether they would recognise the real problem, namely the apostasy of the West and God's hand upon their nations, and whether they would show the courage to call their nations to repentance and faith in Christ.

This should have been the first item on their agenda. The second item on their agenda should have been *leading* that repentance by their own example. What we had instead was self-righteousness on stilts. The British government responded by attempting to create one of the most Draconian laws imaginable, a religious hate law that would effectively have banned free speech and evangelism for Christians. Parliament defeated this attempt to silence the gospel, but that it was even attempted was a sobering testimony to the state of apostasy into which the nation has fallen, as exhibited by her national political leaders in their rebellion against God.

Of course those who destroyed the World Trade Center on September 11 should be brought to justice, and it is the duty of the American State to make sure that they are brought to justice and punished for their crimes. But we if are to win the war against terrorism and stop such evil acts from being committed we must recognise evil for what it really is: disobedience to the God of the Christian Scriptures, the transgression of God's law. And this applies every but as much to the peoples and governments of Western nations as it does to the Taliban and the terrorists who planned and destroyed the World Trade Center. If we are really going to reform the world we must start with our own hearts and our own nations. Being self-righteous about the sins of other people and nations will not excuse our own sins and the sins of our nations. And it is here that the hypocrisy and self-righteousness of the American and British political leadership is shown up so vividly.

On the day of the World Trade Center bombings Tony Blair, the British Prime Minister, stood up and said of terrorism: "This is the new evil in the world." What a truly fascist sentiment this is! What it means is that evil is *out there*. The problems in the world are *other* people. It is other groups who commit evil acts. Ridding the world of evil means dealing with *them*. There's no evil in Blair's administration you see. The evil is committed by other people. But evil is a human problem, and the West is not righteous. There is plenty of evil for Bush and Blair to deal with at home, but will they? It is much easier and more convenient for politicians to tell us that the evil in the world is the result of what other people are doing. Such propaganda is an old fascist strategy and very useful in deflecting attention away from the evils committed by our own politicians. Let us look at just a few examples:

First, how many World Trace Center bombings would have to take place each year before those who were killed by them would equal the number of those slaughtered in our abortion clinics each year? Well, in the UK we murder around 200,000 unborn infants each year in the abortion clinics. In the USA it is many times more than this. Our nations commit crimes against God's law every bit as heinous as those committed by the Muslim terrorists on September 11. And what do we do about it? Our political leaders use perverse arguments and crude sophistry to justify their unwillingness to stand against such evil.[5] What kind of justice do these unborn children get? None. This does not excuse what the terrorists did of course, nor does it mean those who did it should not be brought to justice. It means our nations should *repent* of their sins and stop the abortions. "God bless America"! How can America ask God to bless her war on terrorism when she is committing acts just as horrendous as those she claims to abominate? Will God look favourably on the USA while this is the case? Unfortunately, in the UK few of our politicians and rulers will even say "God bless Britain" any more. We cannot expect God to bless and protect our nations while we are committing such atrocities and excusing them with political duplicity. The Bible tells us that "Blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein except by the blood of him that shed it" (Num. 35:33).

Second, both the USA and Britain have been involved in acts of terror very similar to that committed by the Muslims on September 11. I refer of course to the deliberate bombing by NATO forces of a TV tower staffed by civilians in Serbia. Now, doubtless the argument will be that this TV tower was a strategic military target because it was controlled by the Serbian government and was used for propaganda. Very true no doubt. But to the Muslims who bombed the World Trade Center their target was every bit as much a strategic military target. If the Muslims can bring down the financial power houses of the Western economies this will enable them to win their war against the West. The arguments are precisely the same for both bombings. And the arguments are precisely the same *against* both bombings. So what are Bush and Blair going to do about this? Are they serious about bringing to justice those who commit such acts? Of course they are not. They are only serious about bringing to justice those who commit such acts against their own nations. They are only interested in "victor's justice."

---

5. See my editorial article "Political Duplicity" in *Christianity & Society* Vol. XI, No. 4 (October 2001) for more on this.

Do they really expect people to accept such shallow sophistry? How they have deluded themselves!

Third, on the same subject of the situation in the Balkans, we must remember that NATO gave support to the KLA. But the USA has now admitted that the KLA is a terrorist organisation. According to President Bush, the war on terrorism will pursue not only the terrorists themselves but those States that protect and shelter terrorists. Well now, does this include the USA and Britain? US foreign policy is continually shooting itself in the foot in this regard. The ghosts of previous foreign policy come back to haunt subsequent administrations constantly. NATO supported the KLA in the Balkans. What does Bush propose to do about this now?

Fourth, there is another situation that must be dealt with while we are considering this issue. The IRA received much support from communities with strong Irish connections in the USA for many years. I found Tony Blair's rushing to the side of the American President to offer his unqualified support for the "war on terrorism" quite nauseating because of this. Bush said that "America has no better friend than Britain" or words to that effect when Tony showed up in the USA soon after the bombings. Unfortunately this sentiment cannot be reciprocated very well. America did not stand shoulder to shoulder with Britain while it fought terrorism in Northern Ireland. Where was the USA when Britain was having to deal with the situation in Northern Ireland? No war on terrorism was deemed necessary then. Members of the IRA are seen as "freedom fighters" and convicted IRA terrorist are classed as "Republican political prisoners" by many Americans and America harboured these supporters of terrorism without any problems. What was needed in Northern Ireland was a "peace process," not a war on terrorism. How convenient for American politicians whose constituencies included large Irish communities that supported the IRA!

Well, perhaps all the USA needs now is a "peace process" with the Muslim terrorists who are targeting their land. Perhaps we can offer to send them an envoy to broker it for them. Perhaps Bush should get round the negotiating table with the Islamic men of blood just as our government was expected to get round the table with the IRA. What's sauce for the goose is certainly not sauce for the gander in the USA. Before we signed up unconditionally to Bush's war on terrorism I think our political leaders should have asked a few searching questions about these issues. What did the US government do about NORAID?

But of course the problem is not only that America has these double standards regarding terrorism. British politicians have also been hypocritical in this matter. Blair's self-righteous posturing over the war on terrorism issue following the September bombings took place against the backdrop of almost total compromise with the IRA terrorists in North Ireland. The so-called "peace process" is nothing but a surrender-process instigated by a British Conservative government and thoroughly endorsed by Blair's New Labour government when it came to power.

If the governments of the USA and Britain are going to condemn terrorism they should condemn all acts of terrorism and they should be just as ready to deal with the atrocities committed in the USA and Britain by terrorists and atrocities committed by the USA and British governments. Of course Tony will say that he does condemn all acts of terrorism. But then we must ask why IRA terrorists have been released from prison in Northern Ireland. In one respect, though, the absurd logic that seems to fill Tony's head did get an interesting outing following the fall of the Taliban, and I wonder what Americans made of it, namely the concern that was exhibited over whether British citizens ultimately convicted of complicity in the September 11 bombings would receive the death sentence.

Our political leaders are blind guides. They say that the war on terrorism is not a religious war. But this is ridiculous. Of course it is a religious war. It is a war motivated by two conflicting religious world-views. The leaders of the Western world are committed to the idea that governments should be completely neutral when it comes to matters of religion. But religious neutrality is impossible. What they are really committed to is the notion that government should not take sides with one of the recognised or dominant monotheistic religions, i.e. Christianity, Judaism or Islam. They think if they avoid declaring themselves for any of these they have maintained their religious neutrality. But they have not. They have simply nailed their colours to another religious mast, namely secular humanism, and they are just as dogmatic, just as "extremist," about the necessity of this religion being the religion of State as any Christian, Jew or Muslim "extremist" might be. The only difference is that they are so thoroughly indoctrinated by this religion that they do not realise it is a religion. They deem it the indubitable truth. This is the very worst form of religious extremism, because when one fails to recognise the religious nature of one's world-view it will function all the more effectively as religious dogma that cannot be challenged, except of course by those who are mad or bad. The establishment of secular humanism as the religion of State, despite the fact that it is not recognised as a religion, is one of the most repressive and extremist forms of religious establishment. The Gulag is testimony enough to that. But in the West now we have our own form of Gulag, or perhaps I should say a new form of Inquisition, the secular humanist Inquisition, namely political correctness, which is far more effective than the Russian Gulag ever was because it is, for the most part, self-policed, i.e. the result of effective indoctrination. Nevertheless, our government is willing and eager to put the whole weight of the coercive machinery of State behind this new Inquisition when the religious dogma of secular humanism demands it. This is precisely what the proposed religious hate law demonstrated. Religious neutrality is a naïve dream.

The war on terrorism is thus a religious war in every sense. And necessarily so. However, the nature of this religious war is not apparent to most people, least of all politicians. Let us spell it out clearly then. The war on terrorism is a war between two false religions, secular humanism and Islam, over the right for a third false religion, Judaism, to set up a State in Palestine and in the process deny the former Palestinian inhabitants of that land any right to their own State. Now, this statement needs some qualification because in one sense modern Israel is a secular State, not a Judaistic State, though of course it is Jewish State. And its continued existence is only made possible by the support of the secular humanist American State. Yet in another sense Israel is a Judaistic State because it exists as a result of the claim by large numbers of Western Jews that it is their rightful homeland, and underpinning this claim is the fact that what identifies someone as a Jew is in large part their

religious heritage. This is all rather complicated and confused however. Some religious Jews will not even recognise the State of Israel because it is a secular State.

This is further complicated by the fact that the secular humanist religion of the Western world, of which Israel is in one sense an outpost, is a parasite living off the rotting flesh of the host it has destroyed, namely Christendom, the cultural benefits of which it lays claim to as if these were the product of secular humanism's own genius. But this is not so, and the West will eventually discover the hard way that virtually all of what made the West both a civilised culture and a civilising influence on other cultures, the secular humanist State has illegitimately inherited from the host it has so cynically destroyed: Christianity. The modern secular State abominates the fanatical extremism of Islam and other ideologies that seek to propagate their message and lifestyle by acts violence and terror, yet it has abandoned and now persecutes in its own insidious and subtle way the only true religion, Christianity, which bequeathed to it all the virtues it claims to cherish, and which alone has the answer for the malaise that the modern world finds itself in, a malaise that the secular humanist States of the West are increasingly seeking to remedy by means the very same acts of terror that they supposedly abominate: *bombing.*

But the politicians are not the only problem. The situation is further complicated by the fact that large segments of the Church, particularly evangelicals, believe that the modern State of Israel is somehow connected with the biblical nation of Israel. What does the setting up of the modern State of Israel have to do with the Israel of prophecy? Now, I know that many Christians believe that "Israel is the apple of God's eye." But surely this is a misunderstanding of the Bible. Modern Judaism is not the Judaism of biblical times. It has travelled a long way from its roots in the first century. Did Western Jews really have any greater moral and legal right to the land of Palestine in 1947 than that of the Palestinians? Did not the God of Abraham himself spew the Jews out of the land in the first century for their rebellion just as he had turned the Canaanites out of the land? On what basis then do Christians claim that the modern State of Israel is the fulfilment of prophecy? On the basis of bad exegesis only.

This hardly constitutes a moral or legal basis for Israel's claims to the land of Palestine.

Furthermore, the establishment of the modern State of Israel took place amidst a conflict in which Israel committed acts of terrorism against Palestinians and also against the British occupying forces. This is another aspect of Western hypocrisy regarding the terrorism issue that dominates modern international politics in the middle east. How far does Bush intend to go with his commitment to deal with those States that harbour and commit acts of terrorism? We can be assured that he will not do anything that might threaten the Jewish vote come the next Presidential election.

Well, where does all this leave us? Osama Ben Laden is a terrorist who should be brought to justice. But the West has a greater enemy to fear: her own apostasy from the Christian faith. We have nothing to fear from enemies without if we are faithful as a nation to the God of the Bible. But when sin and corruption become institutionalised in the way that they have in the West today, and when the nation casts off God's law as Britain and the USA have done, we must be prepared to face the chastening hand of God on our nations. God raises up evil men and nations to scourge those nations that apostatise from the faith. War is certainly the correct response to what happened on September 11, war, that is, against the moral corruption and sinfulness of our own nations. Trusting in our chariots will not save us ultimately. We must turn to God in repentance.

Jesus gave us a very pertinent lesson that our politicians and Church leaders need to heed: "Those eighteen upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye they were sinners above all men that dwell in Jerusalem?" (Lk. 13:4). Of course not. Such calamities are not to be construed as personal judgement in this way. But this does not mean that there is no lesson to be drawn from such events. Jesus went on the say "Unless ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (v. 5). The people who were killed in the World Trade Center bombings were not sinners above all others in the West. But the West has now turned its back on God. Unless the nations of the West repent, they shall all likewise perish. And Islam may well yet prove to be the scourge that God uses to punish our apostate nations. *C&S*