

## **THE SPENCER SPIN**

**“spin” v. Taking informational material, and twisting, slanting, misinterpreting, misquoting, or changing it in an effort to make it support your own personal agenda. See media, propaganda, political campaigns, racists, and Robert Spencer.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

**The first things I asked myself in reviewing the mountain of material for this article was what possible conclusions could be reached, and how to organize all this information. Using the standard journalist’s verbiage, the best overarching explanation of such is:**

**WHO: (The target of this article) Robert H. Spencer, aka Robert Bruce Spencer, aka Hugh Fitzgerald, aka Jihad Watch, aka Dhimmi Watch.**

**WHY: Spencer is one of the most prolific writers of anti-Islamic claims, publishing on blogs, online and print journals, writing 6 books, appearing on television on the subject, where he is erroneously proclaimed “a scholar of Islam”, “a scholar of law” and “a scholar of history.”**

**WHAT: What are Spencer’s his exact positions, on what does he support those positions, and what is his motivation for holding those positions?**

**WHEN: Spencer appears to have been engaged in his campaign against Islam since 2002. My research on Spencer covers a period of roughly hours over twelve months.**

**HOW: I utilized the Internet, religious texts, legal texts, theological dissertations, historical analyses; read many hundreds of Spencer’s writings, and engaged in an extended and intense email discussion with Spencer over a period of about 6 months. I maintained an enormous amount of notes and reference material, along with originals of all emails, online articles, references, etc. I then organized the material, found that I had enough to write a book, and went through (as of this writing, which may be before the edition that you are reading), 68 drafts to summarize my findings in a short enough article that you wouldn’t fall asleep reading it.**

**WHERE: The research was conducted from my church office, my home office, numerous libraries, religious institutions, through interviews, reference materials and online materials.**

Keep in mind throughout this report, I have no problem whatsoever with someone being creative and showing the entrepreneurial spirit that made our country great, and earning a decent income. However, I have a big problem with someone earning a decent income on the basis of lies, deception, spreading enemy propaganda, supporting the enemy, and playing on the fears of Americans. I ask the reader many questions in this article, at points where it is important to review the presented facts about Spencer, and consider

what the motivation could be. I encourage readers to read the facts within, verify them, and then draw your own conclusions.

**So let's get into it, shall we?**

**We'll begin with the Conclusion, and then show how that conclusion was reached:**

**CONCLUSION:** After a lengthy period of research on Spencer, and intensive email discussions with him, I have come to the conclusion that, although he *can* be properly identified as an Islamophobe, Spencer does not trash all of Islam and all Muslims out of hatred or his own fear. Instead, he does it for economic gain and seems to knowingly do it to assist our enemy, Usama bin Laden and similar terrorists and extremists. Yes, that is a very serious charge. Note that the latter part of this conclusion is based on Spencer's own writings and emails, I am not in possession of evidence that any money has flowed from terrorists to Spencer. However, as you continue to read you will see that Mr. Spencer is aware that his claims are assisting UBL, and yet he knowingly continues to make the very same claims, including the claim that Usama is correct in his twisted, perverted version of Islam. We will see Spencer use various techniques such as logical fallacies, deception, misdirection, outright lies, out of context verses, and temporal remoteness in his campaign of deceit.

**HOW AND WHY ROBERT SPENCER CONVINCED ME HE CONDEMNS ALL MUSLIMS, ALL OF ISLAM, SUPPORTS USAMA BIN LADEN, IS MOTIVATED BY GREED AND QUITE POSSIBLY BY TREASON...**

**I have been quietly researching Robert Spencer for close to a year, as I prepared for this Hatewatch site, and over the past six months, I have exchanged 240 emails with Mr. Spencer. The emails began with his threatening to sue me and proffering various insults about me. They progressed to his being mostly polite, with an occasional flame (insult) thrown in, while he tried to convince me of his views of Islam.**

**At first I thought Spencer was either misinformed or just ignorant on the subject of Islam, as is common of those who "self-teach" themselves on complicated topics, especially those involving theology, the evolution of culture, and how these affect the reality of contemporary society. So I patiently read the voluminous email sent by Spencer (A for Effort, F for Accuracy) approaching them with an open mind, carefully researched each topic he raised and responded to as many as I could.**

**When I realized how mistaken most of them were, I successfully refuted them using a vast number of authoritative sources, and that led Mr. Spencer to logical fallacies and then back to the insults. I imagine the lawsuit threats will soon follow. On occasion, the very sources that Spencer supplied refuted the claim he assigned to it.**

**It is quite important to be mindful of the fact that we are at war with extremists of all ideologies. While we (the USA) are at war with extremists and terrorists of a**

large variety of ideologies (Islamist, Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Buddhist, Socialist, Communist, Anarchist, Marxist, Nationalists, etc.) this article primarily concerns our efforts against Islamist extremists (see Appendix Definitions) and domestic extremists (see Appendix Definitions), also classified as foreign terrorists and domestic terrorists.

As for Islamist extremists/terrorists, the threat of this ideology of violence and hatred is at greatest risk of spreading among those who perceive there to be significant threats to Islam, those who believe the United States and the West pose such a threat are particularly likely to support terrorism. (“Correlates of Public Support for Terrorism in the Muslim World”, Ethan Bueno de Mesquita, Washington University in St. Louis, page 8.)

### **SPENCER’S BACKGROUND:**

Robert H. Spencer, (also known as Robert Bruce Spencer) owns and operates the websites of jihadwatch and dhimmiwatch, has written a half-dozen books on “the threat of Islam”, has written frequently for ultra-conservative publications such as the Washington Times, National Review, Little Green Footballs, Townhall.com, FrontPage Magazine, Human Events, WorldNet Daily, Faith Freedom, Noisy Room, LadyPredator, and other such publications and online sites. Spencer has written several fiction books that claim to understand and explain Islam. Spencer has given countless lectures on “the threat of Islam”, and has made many television appearances on conservative talk shows, and has participated in seminars on “the dangers of Islam.” He is sometimes mistakenly identified as “a scholar on Islam”, “a legal scholar” or “an expert on Islam”. This article will show that his knowledge of Islam – in reality – is very poor, stuck in the 7<sup>th</sup> Century, based on misinterpretations (deliberate or otherwise), mistranslations, out-of-context citations, deceit and endorsement of the claims of Osama bin Laden, all of which lead him to highly erroneous conclusions.

From: <http://jihadwatch.org/spencer/>

Robert Spencer holds a Master's degree in Religious Studies from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 1986. He began his career in 1979 at the University of North Carolina. His MA thesis is entitled [The Monophysite in the Mirror](#) and concerns the conversion of [John Henry Newman](#) to Catholicism in 1845 and Newman's denunciation of the [Church of England](#) as [monophysite](#) (holding the doctrine that Christ's nature remains altogether divine and not human even though he has taken on an earthly and human body with its cycle of birth, life, and death.) (*In other words, his only advanced education is on the subject of the Medieval Roman Catholic Church and one individual's conversion from Protestantism to Catholicism.*)

According to the biography at one of his websites, Spencer began studying Islam on his own initiative and outside of formal education in 1980 during his first year as an undergraduate at the University of North Carolina. He wrote freelance articles for various publications between 1980 and 2001 on Catholic religious issues. In 2002, he became an

adjunct fellow with the [Free Congress Foundation](#). He wrote seven monographs on Islam for the Free Congress Foundation in 2002 and 2003. He is a regular columnist for FrontPageMagazine.com, and Human Events. His writings on Islam and other topics have been published in various other publications. He owns jihadwatch and dhimmiwatch, blog sights well known as havens for hate speech.

Note here <http://www.q-and-a.org/Transcript/?ProgramID=1086>, in a CSPAN interview, Spencer states that he is a Melkite Greek Catholic, and that his family is from "*what is now Turkey and actually that is the beginning of my interest in the subject of Islam that my grandparents shortly after World War I were offered the choice of conversion to Islam or exile from the land where they had lived for many hundreds of years – that is my family had lived. And many Christians in that area had lived there.*"

*"They were – those chose exile and they came to the United States. They, despite their experiences which involved some violence and some of the – some killings of some of the family members, they were – they spoke in a uniformly positive fashion about life over there and made me become quite fascinated with it such that I took the first opportunity I could when I went to college to read the Koran and to begin studying Islamic theology and history."*

**Noting that WWI ended in November 1918, and the nation-state of Turkey was founded in October 1923, I went looking throughout historical sources for Muslim forced conversions of Melkite Greek Catholics in this area of the Ottoman Empire, the remains of which are now Turkey. The only record of "forced conversions" by Muslims anywhere in the world in this time period was in Yemen, and it was not "conversion or exile", it was through legislation for the state to raise Jewish orphans, a 1922 Zaydi statute known as the Orphans Decree. In point of fact, in the Melkite Church's official history, there is no mention at all of any Muslim efforts to force the Melkites to "conversion or exile" in this time period. See <http://www.melkite.org/Bearers%20of%20the%20Mysteries/ChapterTwo.htm>**

*At first the Melkites were made part of a generic Catholic millet with an Armenian priest as ethnarch, but they continued to agitate for recognition as a separate "nation". This was achieved at last in 1848 through the efforts of Patriarch Maximos III. Over 100 years after its ecclesiastical identity was determined, the Melkite community attained civil recognition.*

*Civic status was extremely important to the Melkites of that day. It provided them with a sense of identity, recognition that they were a Church, a distinct community, not a part of another identity. They continued to find their identity in this civil nationhood as long as the Turks governed the Middle East. The Church retains some civil functions to this day in some parts of the Middle East, where Church courts often have the power which belong to probate courts in the U.S.*

*The millet system continued until the downfall of the Ottoman Empire after World War One when power in the Middle East passed from the Turks to the British and French. When that happened, a new nationalist identity (eg. Syrian or Lebanese) began to emerge*

*and the Churches began losing their tribal functions. The Melkite community started to look elsewhere to find its purpose: back to the roots of its Eastern spiritual heritage.*

**This raises some questions as to the background claims of Mr. Spencer. Perhaps Spencer is referring to the 1914 - 1924, Pontian Greek war with the Turks (factual information here: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pontic\\_Greek\\_Genocide](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pontic_Greek_Genocide)) -- as he seems to wish to memorialize it here: <http://www.taooftoofiance.com/2007/05/18/may-19th-pontian-greek-genocide-remembrance-day/> Granted, this is still a controversial subject today, but most historians agree that this was a nationalist war, not a religious war, and that is began in the waning days of WWI when the Greeks who lived in the southern part of Turkey invaded Smyrna. (The Greeks and the Turks have been ethnic enemies for ages) Turkey not only defended their country, they over-aggressively moved to destroy any future threat from the Greeks and the Armenians. There were many horrors and war crimes, apparently on both sides. Some historians claim the Turks engaged in genocide, others claim they did not. The historical accounts show that if there was a genocide, it was against the Armenians.**

**The historical documents and accounts mention nothing about Melkite Greek Catholics, and not a word about any forced conversions, or a choice of "convert or die", "convert or leave", etc. This was a situation, as shown by historical records, where the Greeks living in Turkey (who were primarily Christian) and the Armenians who lived in Turkey were viciously fought, murdered and expelled by the secular Muslim government of Turkey, known as the "Young Turks." This was not a religious war, or a war based on religion. There was no attempt to eliminate other religions. This was a war – if one wishes to call it that – that was based on ethnic racism. The Turks and Greeks have hated each other for many centuries. The secular Turks wanted the lands occupied by the Greeks and the Armenians. There was no demand to "convert or leave", when a demand was given, it was "leave or die." The Turks had no interest in converting the Greeks or Armenians, they just wanted them to leave, or die, so that the Turks could have their lands. So Spencer's claim of his parents coming to the US because of Muslims giving them a choice of "convert or exile" is not historically accurate (is that a polite enough way to say "lie"?)**

**But since Spencer is Melkite Greek Catholic, then what do the Melkites endorse, what is their ethnic background, and what do they believe about the USA and Arab countries? Why is this important in our look at why Mr. Spencer so frequently indicts all of Islam, supports the perverted violent form of Islam pushed by UBL, and outright rejects any and all condemnations of terrorism by mainstream Muslims?**

**Patriarch Gregory III, the current worldwide leader of the Melkite Greek Catholic church, states that Melkite Greek Catholics are "Arabs but they are not Muslims, Eastern but not Orthodox and Catholic but not Latin." The Patriarch also states that "in most Middle Eastern countries, Christians have been free to worship, and churches have the same tax-free status as mosques." The Patriarch went on to warn that the unconditional support of some in the West for Israel, especially among**

**Christians who see Israel as part of God's plan, was "playing with fire" and giving Muslims a bad view of Christianity. And his most baffling statement: He said he had written to Arab leaders telling them they could impose peace on the West if they would act together. (Arab countries need to "impose peace" on the West? Since when?) See [http://www.catholic.org/international/international\\_story.php?id=22135](http://www.catholic.org/international/international_story.php?id=22135)**

**Now, I'm not going to be the one to suggest that the above could lead one to the conclusion that the leader of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church is pro-Muslim-extremist, anti-Israel, "It's all America's fault", and a supporter of the Arab world needing to conquer the Western world. I wouldn't even think of making such allegations. Just read the above comments from the leader of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church and come to your own conclusions. Then wonder what the most faithful followers think on these subjects.**

After a lengthy period of research on Spencer, and intensive email discussions with him, I have come to the conclusion that, although he can be properly identified as an Islamophobe, Spencer does not trash all of Islam and all Muslims out of hatred or his own fear. Instead, he does it for economic gain and knowingly does it to assist our enemy, Usama bin Laden. Yes, that is a very serious charge. However, as you continue to read you will see that Mr. Spencer is aware that his claims are assisting UBL, and yet he knowingly continues to make the very same claims. He states that UBL's claims are correct, and that Spencer makes a substantial income from spreading his deception. Spencer utilizes logical fallacies, deception, outright lies, mistranslations, out of context citations, 1,400 year old Islamic jurist rulings, and citations from the most extreme terrorists to base his claims that these are true and binding on modern Muslims. Until such time as a trial, there is no way to tell if Spencer assists the enemy of the USA for treasonous reasons, or if it is simply a matter of his not wanting us to win the war on terror, because then he would no longer have a career writing distortions of Islam in order to frighten the gullible.

Unfortunately, either for the above motivation, or because he suffers from the same narcissism that infects many other bigots – Spencer adamantly refuses to even consider the possibility that his statements and conclusions on Islam could be wrong – so stubbornly that he mimics the exact techniques, claims and sayings as neo-Nazis, anti-Semites, and other Islamophobes. Of course, Spencer may be afraid that if he publicly considered that he was wrong, the income from his books and columns would drop and diminish the profit he makes by playing on people's fears.

As we go through this, it is important to note that Spencer has no military experience, no law enforcement experience, has never lived in or visited the Middle East, and cannot speak or read Arabic. And as we shall see, Spencer has only the shallowest of understandings of Muslim culture, history and theology. Spencer has little or no knowledge of the legal system or the history of legal systems in the USA, in Muslim history or in Muslim countries. As we shall also see, these factors play an important role in the major mistakes Spencer makes in his thinking on terrorism and on Islam.

I wish to note that during the weeks of intensive email exchanges with Mr. Spencer, he generally remained polite to me, with only the occasional ad hominem (insult), usually given when his claims were authoritatively refuted by Muslim scholars that I provided, and he didn't have anything with which to defeat the refutation, and when I answered his claims with such basic common sense that the only thing he could think of doing in return was the equivalent of sticking his playground insults.

## **MOVING ON TO SPECIFICS:**

**Spencer claims, over and over, that he never, ever, condemns all Muslims or all of Islam. This is just one of his many claims that is completely wrong. Note the following (each with a link to verify Spencer's words.)**

<http://www.q-and-a.org/Transcript/?ProgramID=1086>

*ROBERT SPENCER, DIRECTOR, JIHAD WATCH: Well the problem that we face with international Jihad terrorism is deeply rooted within Islam. Although there are many officials who are hastening to assure us that the problem with terrorism has nothing to do with Islam at all, the only people that they don't seem to be able to convince of that are the Muslims themselves, particularly the terrorists who claim to be representing and acting upon the teachings of pure Islam and true Islam.*

*UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: The true faith of Islam we believe is a religion of peace and we intend to work with them in that regard.*

*LAMB: So what are you hearing that you want to comment on?*

*SPENCER: I think that's all hogwash, I'm sorry to say. Islam is the only religion in the world that has a developed doctrine, theology and legal system that mandates violence against unbelievers and mandates that Muslims must wage war in order to establish the hegemony of the Islamic social order all over the world.*

*...And so while there are moderate Muslims, the fact that Islam is not moderate makes it very difficult for those moderates to establish any kind of large scale anti-terror effort.*

*..This is Walid Shoebat who is, of course, the very prominent ex-Palestinian terrorist who converted to Christianity, gave up his terrorism. He tells some quite hair-raising stories about life growing up in that environment. (see here <http://hatewatchhallofshame.blogspot.com/2007/03/judge-for-yourself-fake.html> for evidence that Shoebat is a fake, a shill being paid to claim he's a former terrorist, when in fact he is and always has been a fundamentalist Christian.)*

## ATTEMPTS TO INFLAME THE MUSLIM WORLD

As a "scholar on Islam" Spencer must certainly be aware of the extreme offense Muslims take at insulting images of Muhammad, and of the worldwide flap when a Danish newspaper published some cartoons that were very insulting to Muhammad. (My personal opinion: Get over it, folks, they're only cartoons, but we don't need to deliberately insult an entire religion.) Yet, in an apparent effort to continue to inflame Muslim passions (perhaps in the hope of triggering more riots?) Spencer also published the offensive cartoons here

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/010009.php> and has a permanent link to them on the main page of his jihadwatch website. Perhaps Spencer's hopes for the impact of his repeatedly publishing the offensive cartoons are best expressed by Spencer himself:

*"Muslim cartoon rage, having spread now all across the Muslim world, from Egypt and Sudan to Pakistan and beyond, also threatens to become the tinderbox that sets off a much larger conflagration between the West and the Islamic world than the present conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Muslim world was enraged over the Abu Ghraib prison scandal, and over reports last May that a Qur'an had been flushed down at toilet at Guantanamo Bay. But although there have been no killings in connection with the cartoons yet, as opposed to the Qur'an desecration scandal, the international scope of the cartoon rage makes those other sources of anger trivial compared to it."*

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/010009.php>

**A side note: At the time of this statement by Spencer, February 2006, it was well known that the "Qur'an desecration scandal" was a hoax, so why does Spencer also include that in his statement of hoping for the Muslim world to explode with anger?**

## **SPENCER SAYS HE NEVER CONDEMNS ISLAM OR ALL MUSLIMS, BUT IN REALITY...**

['Anti-Muslim'? – not me guv, says Robert Spencer](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on October 20, 2005

Robert Spencer ponders the question: "am I indeed, and is the entire Jihad Watch enterprise, 'anti-Muslim'?" The answer, you'll be surprised to hear, is no – though "the jihadists and their allies would say yes". Spencer observes: "If jihadists use ...

[Robert Spencer, on Q & A, a television show on C-SPAN.](#)

<http://www.q-and-a.org/Transcript/?ProgramID=1086>

**The problem that we face with international Jihad terrorism is deeply rooted within Islam. Although there are many officials who are hastening to assure us that the problem with terrorism has nothing to do with Islam at all, the only people that they don't seem to be able to convince of that are the Muslims themselves, particularly the terrorists who claim to be representing and acting upon the teachings of pure Islam and true Islam**

### [EU opens talks on membership for Turkey – Robert Spencer not happy](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on October 4, 2005

Robert Spencer is less than enthusiastic about the possibility of Turkey's entry into the EU: "there is still some hope that Turkey will be rejected, and Europe saved. But that hope is slim". He adds: "In a speech last month, British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw said Turkish membership...

### [Robert Spencer's mission – to 'dispel myths and stereotypes' about Islam](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on August 3, 2005

Spencer, director of Jihad Watch, blamed political correctness, which "stifles public discourse", combined with a general unwillingness among public officials to recognize the fundamental teachings of Islam as a source for acts of terror throughout the Western world for distorting the public's perception...

### [Spencer spells it out](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on May 30, 2005

"I have written on numerous occasions that there is no distinction in the American Muslim community between peaceful Muslims and jihadists." Robert Spencer spells it out. Jihad Watch, 30 May 2005 This is the man who has also written: "Islam is not a monolith, and never have I said or written anything ...

### [The Million-Dollar Qur'an Challenge](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on February 18, 2005

Robert Spencer of Jihad Watch explains how terrorism is rooted in the Qur'an. Front Page Magazine, 17 February 2005

### [Islam growing in central Iowa](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on May 9, 2005

Robert Spencer is appalled. Dhimmi Watch, 9 May 2005 I mean, in central Iowa – is no-one safe?

### [The Myth of Islamic Tolerance](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on April 11, 2005

"Islam is a totalitarian ideology that aims to control the religious, social and political life of mankind in all its aspects; the life of its followers without qualification; and the life of those who follow the so-called tolerated religions to a degree that prevents their activities from getting in th...

### [Muslim school to become state school?](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on May 13, 2005

Robert Spencer of Jihad Watch is outraged to find that an independent Muslim school in Nottingham may be accepted into the state sector. See Nottingham Evening Post, 10 May

2005 This would make fully four – yes, that's four – state-funded Muslim primary schools in the whole of Britain, compared with...

### [George Bush – 'archdhimmi'](#)

Journal Entry by Martin Sullivan on August 16, 2006

A report that Bush avoided a reference to "Islamic fascists" and instead spoke of "individuals that would like to kill innocent Americans to achieve political objectives" has angered Robert Spencer, who accuses the president of "archdhimmitude" and of bowing to "hi...

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/dhimmiwatch/archives/016413.php>

### **Tufts paper guilty of “harassment” for publishing unpleasant facts about Islam**

#### [The truth hurts, don't she?](#)

Tufts' conservative student newspaper, The Primary Source, published some factual statements about Islam -- quotes from the Qur'an and other sources, during Islam Awareness Week. Now Tufts has found the paper guilty of "harassment" -- apparently for publishing facts about Islam that we aren't supposed to know.

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/dhimmiwatch/archives/016412.php>

The subjection of women in Muslim societies--especially in Arab nations and in Iran--is today very much in the public eye. Accounts of lashings, stonings, and honor killings are regularly in the news, and searing memoirs by Ayaan Hirsi Ali and Azar Nafisi have become major best-sellers. One might expect that by now American feminist groups would be organizing protests against such glaring injustices, joining forces with the valiant Muslim women who are working to change their societies. This is not happening.

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/dhimmiwatch/archives/016410.php>

Every single "Mosque Outreach" evening friends of mine have attended, and taken notes on, around the country, always ends with some pita and chicken and then something baklavish. All very good. The whole thing is down to a science. Muslim websites, carefully instructing Muslims in how to woo and win over teachers and administrators at their children's schools (to obtain even in public schools quite exaggerated "accommodation" for the exercise, on sight, of Islam) talk about being sure to invite them for meals, and even what kinds of things to serve. It's like the emphasis on Ramadan -- the kind of thing that always forms the deceptive center of any "presentation" of Islam. The rituals of Shehada, zakat, salat, Ramadan, and hajj -- but never a word about Asma bint

Marwan, Aisha, or the more than one-hundred blood-curdling Jihad verses in the Qur'an, or the even more menacing hadith.

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/dhimmiwatch/archives/016448.php>

May 15, 2007

Fitzgerald: The terminal naivete of Westerners

U.S. forces are building madrassas in Afghanistan.

"We are saying that we respect their culture and religion," said naval commander Eduardo Fernandez, the man in charge of American aid efforts in the Sharana district of Paktika.

"We have to give the religious leaders the respect they feel they deserve." -- from [this article](#)

Get that naval commander out of the Sharana district, out of Afghanistan, and possibly out of the navy, fast. Start educating the members of the armed forces on the tenets of Islam. Make them read, and reread, and reread, Qur'an, Hadith, and sira. Teach them about naskh, or abrogation. Teach them to distinguish the "authoritative" muhaddithin from the less authoritative ones, and the "authentic" Hadith from the kind that Karen Armstrong likes to quote. Expose every single one of the tricks of Muslim apologists and undercut them...

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/016473.php>

"These days it sometimes feels really hard to be a Muslim in America"

Here, in the wake of the Fort Dix jihad arrests and ongoing jihad violence around the world, is another Muslim in America claiming victim status.

....Meanwhile, you don't have to face all the deprivations and human rights abuses of Muslim-majority countries. In fact, Muslims in the U.S. are as free to practice their religion in peace as they are anywhere in the world, and freer than they would be anywhere else from violence, instability, repression.

But they might have to explain their Religion of Peace to skeptical infidels. It's too bad that Ayesha Malik Nasson doesn't direct her efforts to eradicating jihadist sympathies from the American Muslim community. But of course that would make her even more tired and irritated than she is now.

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/016518.php>

The Qur'an also declares that a woman's testimony is worth half that of a man: "Get two witnesses, out of your own men, and if there are not two men, then a man and two women, such as ye choose, for witnesses, so that if one of them errs, the other can remind her" ([2:282](#)).

It allows men to marry up to four wives, and have sex with slave girls also: "If ye fear that ye shall not be able to deal justly with the orphans, marry women of your choice, two or three or four; but if ye fear that ye shall not be able to deal justly (with them), then only one, or (a captive) that your right hands possess, that will be more suitable, to prevent you from doing injustice" ([4:3](#)).

It rules that a son's inheritance should be twice the size of that of a daughter: "Allah (thus) directs you as regards your children's (inheritance): to the male, a portion equal to that of two females" ([4:11](#)).

The Qur'an tells husbands to beat their disobedient wives: "Men are in charge of women, because Allah hath made the one of them to excel the other, and because they spend of their property (for the support of women). So good women are the obedient, guarding in secret that which Allah hath guarded. As for those from whom ye fear rebellion, admonish them and banish them to beds apart, and scourge them" ([4:34](#)).

It allows for marriage to pre-pubescent girls, stipulating that Islamic divorce procedures "shall apply to those who have not yet menstruated" ([65:4](#)).

And of course it counsels Muslims to make war against Jews and Christians until they submit to Islamic authority and pay a special tax: "Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the religion of Truth, (even if they are) of the People of the Book, until they pay the Jizya with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued" ([9:29](#)).

And it says that those who "make war upon Allah and His messenger and strive after corruption in the land" -- an elastic term that could mean almost anything -- should be punished by crucifixion, double amputation, or exile: "The only reward of those who make war upon Allah and His messenger and strive after corruption in the land will be that they will be killed or crucified, or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off, or will be expelled out of the land" ([5:33](#)).

Now, in light of all that and more, please don't tell us that "there is nothing in the Qur'an that violates human rights." We can read, and at face value passages like these are clearly in violation of numerous human rights norms.

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/017000.php>

## **Muslim world inflamed by Rushdie knighthood**

Note once again that we have never seen this kind of rage against Osama bin Laden or any of the others whom we are endlessly told have "hijacked" Islam. (click on the link for the full article)

---

**(I included this enemy propaganda from Spencer (he posted this on 6/19/2007) as it is clearly a deliberate lie. In my very extensive email correspondence with him, I used several occasions to show him a massive collection of the leaders of the Muslim world clearly condemning terrorism, militant jihad, suicide bombings, violence; also fatwas against all of the aforementioned, at <http://facts-not-fear.blogspot.com> Spencer and I also discussed the numerous and massive Muslim protests against terrorism in Turkey, Spain, Malaysia, etc. Yet he continues with his policy of never letting facts get in the way of a rant.)**

=====  
**SO IN REALITY, SPENCER IS VERY CLEARLY AND VERY FREQUENTLY CONDEMNING ALL OF ISLAM AND ALL MUSLIMS, DESPITE HIS DENIALS.** Of course, he does on the rare occasion issue a weak statement to the effect of (paraphrasing here): "Not all Muslims are jihadists... but they aren't real Muslims, they're apostates, so real Muslims must kill them." This is what's known as a "No True Scotsman" logical fallacy – (See Appendix: Logical Fallacies.)

The easiest way to understand logical fallacies is that they are major faults in logic. They are often used in propaganda, "push polls", deceptive advertising, hate speech, during election campaigns by some (not all) politicians, frequently used by tyrants, and most often used by writers and debaters as a method of deception. Logical fallacies, as major faults in logic, are said to "fail on their face" or be found false immediately on presentation. If someone uses a logical fallacy in a debate, he would instantly lose points, if someone wrote something using logical fallacies, whatever was written would instantly be discounted as false. As we move through this article, we will see Spencer using a wide variety of logical fallacies. Now, admittedly, not everyone is aware of logical fallacies, and some people use them accidentally. However, they are taught in almost all basic college courses, and Spencer is the self-proclaimed "scholar." Scholars certainly are well aware of logical fallacies and legitimate scholars stay far away from these, because they know that if logical fallacies are recognized in their works, that no "scholarship" or credibility would be attached to their works – in other words, they would be recognized for a fake, a phony, a fraud.

What is being accomplished with Spencer's condemnation of Islam and of all Muslims? He is confirming the propaganda efforts of Usama bin Laden, who is trying to convince mainstream Muslims that the West (America, the UK, etc.) are trying to eliminate Islam, so the mainstream Muslims must join in UBL's jihad to defend their faith and themselves.

See

[http://uscavonpoint.com/blogs/reconstructing\\_iraq/archive/2007/05/25/3734.aspx?utm\\_source=onpoint+may2007Ce&utm\\_medium=bulkemail&utm\\_term=media+doctrine&utm\\_campaign=onpoint+may2007Ce&urlid=onpoint\\_mediadoctrine](http://uscavonpoint.com/blogs/reconstructing_iraq/archive/2007/05/25/3734.aspx?utm_source=onpoint+may2007Ce&utm_medium=bulkemail&utm_term=media+doctrine&utm_campaign=onpoint+may2007Ce&urlid=onpoint_mediadoctrine) for more details on this.

Why would Spencer want to confirm UBL's propaganda, knowing this will ultimately cause more marginalized Muslims to join al Qaeda and murder Americans?

Spencer claims that it means nothing when his detractors accurately state that he has no formal education in Islam, in Middle Eastern cultures, that he has never traveled to the Middle East or spent any time there, that he does not speak or read Arabic, and that he is entirely self-taught. Spencer maintains his self-granted title of "expert on Islam", and "scholar on Islam".

I do not claim to be any sort of expert on Islam. However, I have spent considerable time in the Middle East during my time in the service; I speak, read and write Arabic, I have closely interacted with many very friendly and supportive Muslims, I have engaged in theological discussions with Muslim scholars, including those who are Americans and some who were from other countries, I studied comparative religions in seminary, I have studied the Qur'an and Hadiths with the help of imams, and I have learned about Islam from these experiences and interactions. I have fought, side by side, with Muslim members of the US military, and trained with Muslim members of the Israeli Defense Force, and I saw nothing other than the courage, loyalty to country, and dedication to their missions that is exhibited by any other member of the military. I have also engaged in anti-terrorist activities that targeted extremist Muslim terrorists, and successfully put an end to their activities, as I also have with American terrorists.

A common problem with someone like Spencer involves the pitfalls of "self-teaching" and is often seen by pastors. Pastors call those who self-teach on the subjects of theology, philosophy, religious history and application "the unchurched" and we know that this is where many extremists originate. Without formal guidance in their education by someone who actually knows the subject, the self-taught (especially in topics such as religion, philosophy and law) misunderstand that which they are reading, form incorrect and often illogical conclusions, then build on those until they have formed an extensive, yet completely illogical, inaccurate, unfounded and incorrect picture of the theology and realities involved. As a matter of basic human psychology, everyone filters what they read through their own perceptions, based on their own life experiences, biases, etc., so the outcome – having been perceptively filtered – is oftentimes far different than the input. Whatever they are trying to learn usually ends up more what they want it to be than what it really is meant to be.

## **A SHORT WORD ABOUT DHIMMI WATCH**

Spencer's other blog-o-hate is named Dhimmi Watch. On its front page, it states why he felt it was necessary to write a very large number of articles on dhimmitude. From the site:

## WHY DHIMMI WATCH?

*Dhimmitude is the status that Islamic law, the Sharia, mandates for non-Muslims, primarily Jews and Christians. Dhimmis, "protected people," are free to practice their religion in a Sharia regime, but are made subject to a number of humiliating regulations designed to enforce the Qur'an's command that they "feel themselves subdued" (Sura 9:29). This denial of equality of rights and dignity remains part of the Sharia, and, as such, is part of the law that global jihadists are laboring to impose everywhere, ultimately on the entire human race.*

The problem here is that Spencer bases his entire collection of condemnations of all things Muslim on a false premise. As he states (above) dhimmitude “is the status that Islamic law, the Sharia, mandates for non-Muslims, primarily Jews and Christians. Dhimmis, "protected people," are free to practice their religion in a Sharia regime, but are made subject to a number of humiliating regulations”. What he “forgets” to tell his readers is that the only country under Islamic (Sharia) Law is Iran. So dhimmitude is not required practiced anywhere except Iran. But Spencer posts articles about every little thing he imagines to be wrong with Islam everywhere in the world. Thus every article in the Dhimmi Watch blog is based on a faulty premise. And, while things certainly aren’t the greatest for Christians and Jews in Iran, the “dhimmitude” must not be too terrible, considering there are Jewish members of the Iranian parliament. See:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morris\\_Motamed](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morris_Motamed)

### **SPENCER’S CRITICS STATE:**

*(noting that for all the critics posted here, there are an additional 4,093 easily found online.)*

[Robert Spencer, WTF? « St. Louis CofCC Blog](#)

A more likely explanation is that Spencer makes something of a living from being America’s top professional opponent to radical Islam.

Which leads to a more uncomfortable conclusion — Spencer doesn’t want the problem of radical Islam solved, because solving it would end his profession.

[The Busybody: The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam and the Crusades](#)

Robert Spencer, author of the controversial blog [Jihad Watch](#), shakes things up in an equally controversial book, [The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam and the Crusades](#), a brutal attack on Islam and apologetic defense of the Christian crusades.

On the not-so-bright side, Spencer offers some counter-myths that need correction. I'll focus on three in particular: (1) the crusades were defensive conflicts; (2) Christianity is inherently benign, and Islam nasty; and (3) we should be thankful for the crusades.

<http://cathyyoung.blogspot.com/2006/07/jihadwatchcom-and-anti-muslim-bigotry.html>

Do you really think a demagogue such as Robert Spencer will agree with anything that you have to say?

Spencer has a vested financial interest in writing his books and blogs. Given his family's apparent poor experience with Muslims in the past and Free Congress Foundation (see Paul Weyrich of "Christ was crucified by the Jews" fame) association, this hardly makes him an impartial observer.

To agree with you would be to peel away slightly the veneer of Defender of The West Against (Evil) Islam for Robert Spencer.

Indeed, with no verifiable credentials, Spencer relies on 'exposing' and smearing real academics and scholars who have spent their whole lives studying Islam but do not agree with his theses (and thus must be in the pockets of the Saudis) in order to prop up his own credibility.

[http://www.nypost.com/seven/09072006/postopinion/opedcolumnists/islam\\_haters\\_a\\_n\\_enemy\\_within\\_opedcolumnists\\_ralph\\_peters.htm?page=1](http://www.nypost.com/seven/09072006/postopinion/opedcolumnists/islam_haters_a_n_enemy_within_opedcolumnists_ralph_peters.htm?page=1)

And the world's only hope for long-term peace is for moderate Muslims - by far the majority around the globe - to recapture their own faith.

But a rotten core of American extremists is out to make it harder for them.

The most repugnant trend in the American shouting match that passes for a debate on the struggle with Islamist terrorism isn't the irresponsible nonsense on the left - destructive though that is. The really ugly "domestic insurgency" is among right-wing extremists bent on discrediting honorable conservatism.

<http://209.85.165.104/search?q=cache:t8FeIIL-Hh0J:eteraz.org/story/2007/3/4/65215/02266+Robert+Spencer+is+no+scholar&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=5&gl=us&ie=UTF-8>

**Robert Spencer's** Inconsistency, Response To Substantive Argument and General Eteraz Thoughts

## [Problems With Jihadwatch's Op-Ed In Emory Univ. Student Paper | TPMCafe](#)

Recently, Jihadwatch writer Robert Spencer, who has a penchant for inserting pictures of Muslim criminal from other parts of the world into his posts when he is supposed to be engaged in a civil debate with American Muslims as if the two are interchangeable, [submitted an op-ed](#) full of glaring errors to the *Emory Wheel*, Emory University's Student Paper. His op-ed came in the aftermath of an advertisement purchased by David Horowitz in the Emory Wheel in which Islam and Nazism were conflated with one another. The central premise of this op-ed was this:

## [Eloquent Incoherence » Blog Archive » Robert Spencer's Jihad](#)

In a post on his website [responding](#) to the op-ed, Eteraz correctly identifies the fatal flaw in Spencer's arguments. He points out Spencer's failure to distinguish between theology and jurisprudence and notes that none of the scholars Spencer quotes lived past 1406. These are more than just inconsequential oversights; unlike philosophers and theologians, jurists are bound by the context in which they live. While the former are concerned with philosophical matters relating to the attributes of God and the nature of human existence, the latter deal with actual legal and political problems. Opinions of jurists, even when framed in the most general of terms, are always informed by the factual realities of the problems they address.

## [Notes on the Ideological Patrons of an Islamophobe, Robert Spencer](#)

The publications of Spencer belong to the class of Islamophobic extremism that is promoted and supported by right-wing organizations, who are perpetuating a type of bigotry similar to anti-Semitism and racial prejudice. They are to be viewed with great suspicion by anyone who wishes to find reliable and scholarly information on the subject of Islam. I make these remarks because Spencer was invited to speak at UNC-Chapel Hill in the spring of 2004; I shared these observations with UNC students at the time to indicate that his views have no basis in scholarship (he has no academic training in Islamic studies whatever; his M.A. degree was in the field of early Christianity).

## [JihadWatch prepares the ground for ethnic cleansing « Hating Hate](#)

JihadWatch is not worth the electrons it is published with. It is an un-American hate site, no more, no less, preparing the ground for the ethnic cleansing of Muslims.

[Robert Spencer's ongoing, unshakeable quest for self-publicity](#)

Journal Entry by Bob Pitt on June 30, 2005

Yet another plug from Robert Spencer of Jihad Watch for his forthcoming book 'The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (and the Crusades)'. Jihad Watch, 29 June 2005 The book description on Amazon reads: "Islam expert Robert Spencer reveals Islam's ongoing, unshakeable quest for global conquest and..."

[http://www.publiceye.org/magazine/v20n2/carroll\\_crusader.html](http://www.publiceye.org/magazine/v20n2/carroll_crusader.html)

As director of the provocative Jihad Watch website, as well as author of Islam Unveiled and Onward Muslim Soldiers, Robert Spencer seems to see himself as a commander in a struggle. His enemy is not a specific group of Muslims with particular aims and aspirations but instead a monolithic and unchanging Islam. On scores of radio and TV shows, he fulminates against the religion as a self-appointed expert, despite a lack of serious credentials or even, apparently, interest in the richness of his subject matter. In his intolerance and literalism, Spencer is remarkably like those extremists he condemns.

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/4a05a4a4-f134-11db-838b-000b5df10621.html> (note: Karen Armstrong is one of America's foremost experts on Islam and its history.)

Balancing the Prophet

By Karen Armstrong

Published: April 27 2007 15:43

Spencer has studied Islam for 20 years, largely, it seems, to prove that it is an evil, inherently violent religion. He is a hero of the American right and author of the US bestseller The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam. Like any book written in hatred, his new work is a depressing read. Spencer makes no attempt to explain the historical, political, economic and spiritual circumstances of 7th-century Arabia, without which it is impossible to understand the complexities of Muhammad's life. Consequently he makes basic and bad mistakes of fact. Even more damaging, he deliberately manipulates the evidence.

The traditions of any religion are multifarious. It is easy, therefore, to quote so selectively that the main thrust of the faith is distorted. But Spencer is not interested in balance. He picks out only those aspects of Islamic tradition that support his thesis. For example, he cites only passages from the Koran that are hostile to Jews and Christians and does not mention the numerous verses that insist on the continuity of Islam with the People of the Book: "Say to them: We believe what you believe; your God and our God is one."

...People would be offended by an account of Judaism that dwelled exclusively on Joshua's massacres and never mentioned Rabbi Hillel's Golden Rule, or a description of

Christianity based on the bellicose Book of Revelation that failed to cite the Sermon on the Mount. But the widespread ignorance about Islam in the west makes many vulnerable to Spencer's polemic; he is telling them what they are predisposed to hear. His book is a gift to extremists who can use it to "prove" to those Muslims who have been alienated by events in Palestine, Lebanon and Iraq that the west is incurably hostile to their faith.

<http://newsbloggers.aol.com/2007/05/17/memo-to-christians-convert-or-die/>

Memo to Christians: Convert or Die

Posted May 17th 2007 11:19AM by [Dinesh D'Souza](#)

Filed under: [Breaking News](#), [Islam](#), [Christianity](#), [Islamic Radicals](#)

Pakistani Christians are receiving threats from the Taliban to convert to Islam or die. Here we see the difference between radical and traditional Islam. In traditional Islam it is never acceptable to force anyone to convert. The Koran says "there shall be no compulsion in religion" and this has been understood, by all the mainstream schools, to mean that one should freely choose to become a Muslim. No Muslim empire has historically enforced mass conversion.

Typically Muslim empires have distinguished between conquering a country and bringing it under Islamic rule and law--this is allowed--and forcing people to become Muslims--this is not allowed. The Islamic radicals, in trying to compel conversions on pain of death, are breaking with the Koran and the Islamic tradition. Only two schools of Koranic interpretation--the Bin Laden school and the Robert Spencer school--consider Taliban-style "convert or die" jurisprudence to be consistent with what the Prophet Muhammad taught and what the Koran says.

[Khaleel Mohammed](#),<sup>[1]</sup> [Dinesh D'Souza](#),<sup>[1]</sup> [Karen Armstrong](#),<sup>[3]</sup> and organizations such as [CAIR](#),<sup>[4]</sup> and [ADC](#)<sup>[5]</sup> hold critical views.

[Khaleel Mohammed](#), [Louay M. Safi](#), and [Carl Ernst](#) assert that Spencer's scholarship and interpretations of Islam are fundamentally flawed - that he supports preconceived notions through selection bias - that he lacks genuine understanding and; that 'he has no academic training in Islamic studies whatsoever; his M.A. degree was in the field of early Christianity'.<sup>[6][7][8]</sup> For example, critics have objected to what they see as Spencer's method of taking some Muslim interpretations and then using them to characterize all Muslims or what he implies is the real Islam; cf. for example [Mark LeVine](#).<sup>[9]</sup> They object to what they describe as Spencer's method of taking a position they deem to be radical (on apostasy, women, *etc.*) and then attribute that position to all of Islam, rather than situating it within ongoing discussions.<sup>[1]</sup>

Khaleel Mohammed and Spencer have had detailed discussions on [FrontPage Magazine](#).<sup>[10][11][12][13]</sup> [Carl Ernst](#) and William Kenan have called him an [Islamophobe](#).<sup>[14]</sup>

They also allege that Spencer's publications are not scholarly because they are not blind peer reviewed and not published by any university press.

1. <sup>a b</sup> [Home page of Muhammad Khaleel](#).
2. <sup>a</sup> Dinesh D'Souza (2007-03-02). [Letting Bin Laden Define Islam](#).
3. <sup>a</sup> [4a05a4a4-f134-11db-838b-000b5df10621.html](#).
4. <sup>a</sup> [CAIR press release](#) (November 11, 2005).
5. <sup>a</sup> [ADC Op-ed: "Violence is a human, not an Islamic trait"](#). American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (February 3, 2004).
6. <sup>a</sup> Louay M. Safi (Dec 29 2005). [Will the Extreme Right Succeed? Turning the War on Terror into a War on Islam](#).
7. <sup>a b</sup> [Response to Spencer's "Muslim Feminism?"](#). FrontPage Magazine.
8. <sup>a</sup> [Home page of Muhammad Khaleel](#). - Comments on his discussions with Spencer accessible at 8/28/2006 - The comments are [archived in a prior version of this article](#).
9. <sup>a</sup> [See paragraph 6](#).
10. [Muslim Feminism? by Spencer](#)
11. [Response to Spencer's "Muslim Feminism?"](#)
12. [Response to Khaleel Mohammed](#)
13. [Spencer vs. Mohammed, Round II](#)
14. [Notes on the Ideological Patrons of an Islamophobe, Robert Spencer](#)

See full report on #14 at

□ ["Notes on the Ideological Patrons of an Islamophobe, Robert Spencer"](#) by Professor Carl W. Ernst of [University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#)

<http://newsbloggers.aol.com/2007/05/30/more-religious-wars-mr-spencer/>

More Religious Wars, Mr. Spencer?

Posted May 30th 2007 12:44PM by [Dinesh D'Souza](#)

Filed under: [Iraq](#), [Islam](#)

Today's [New York Times](#) reports on escalating sectarian conflict in northern Iraq between Sunnis and Kurds. I'm sure Robert Spencer would be on the case, spouting his nonsense about religious wars, except that the Kurds happen to be Sunni as well!

Ah, yes, but Robert the history major can find examples in history of clashes between the Kurds and other Sunnis. Indeed there have been clashes, but that's because most of the Sunnis in the Middle East are Arab, while the Kurds are not. Ethnic and tribal identity--not religion--is the source of the conflict.

Saladin was a Sunni Muslim of Kurdish descent, and I'm sure Spencer can find some ancient conflict over territory to convince his gullible followers that the Sunni-Kurd clash has been going on for centuries. Actually this is nonsense, but fortunately for Spencer none of his readers actually knows what any of the internecine Islamic conflicts were

about. So Spencer relies on the argumentum ad ignorantium: the argument that relies on the ignorance of the reader.

In reality, the clash in northern Iraq between the Kurdish Sunnis and the Sunni Arabs is no more about religion than the clash in Baghdad between the Shia and the Sunni. No theological issues are involved whatsoever. In the latter fight, one group used to be in and is out, and the other group which was out is now in. Both groups want to be in charge, and that's why they are fighting.

[ISLAM-HATERS: AN ENEMY WITHIN By RALPH PETERS - Opinion | Editorials | Op-Ed Articles](#)

The most repugnant trend in the American shouting match that passes for a debate on the struggle with Islamist terrorism isn't the irresponsible nonsense on the left - destructive though that is. The really ugly "domestic insurgency" is among right-wing extremists bent on discrediting honorable conservatism.

How? By insisting that Islam can never reform, that the violent conquest and subjugation of unbelievers is the faith's primary agenda - and, when you read between the lines, that all Muslims are evil and subhuman.

<http://mparent7777-2.blogspot.com/2006/12/dehumanization-of-american-muslims.html>

The Dehumanization of American Muslims

Dec 12, 2006

By Tariq Nelson

Dehumanization is defined as a process by which members of a group of people assert the "inferiority" of another group through subtle or overt acts or statements. Dehumanization may be directed by an organization or may be the composite of individual sentiments and actions.

A coalition of anti-Muslim bigots have formed that sit at their computers full time seeking out news – no matter how vague – of bad Muslim behavior to demonstrate to their growing numbers of readers that all Muslims are irreparably evil and ultimately must be put into internment camps and/or systematically eliminated whether by getting them to leave Islam or by killing them.

Their assault on Islam and the Muslims is unrelenting and uncompromising. There are no good Muslims. If you meet a good Muslim, then he/she is making 'tuqiyyah' and/or part of a "sleeper cell". Muslims can do no good. NONE!

## **SPENCER HAS BEEN CRITICIZED FOR HIS POOR UNDERSTANDING OF MUSLIM HISTORY:**

[Robert Spencer's History for Dummies - News Bloggers](#)

Posted May 27th 2007 11:25PM by [Dinesh D'Souza](#)

Filed under: [Iraq](#), [Islam](#)

Taking up the gauntlet, Robert Spencer [purports to answer](#) my challenge to name two wars fought between the Shia and the Sunni. The context for my question was this. I argue that the Shia-Sunni conflict in Iraq is not a religious war. Nor have the Shia and the Sunni fought religious wars in the manner of the Catholic Protestant conflicts in Europe. Rather, I contended that this is a gang fight between two groups over who gets to rule the country.

Spencer proceeds to give a list of Shia Sunni conflicts of the past. Interestingly, all but one occurs before the middle of the seventeenth century. That's right! Spencer can name only a single Shia-Sunni clash in the past three hundred and fifty years. So my argument isn't holding up badly at all so far.

## **GOVERNMENT CRITICISM AGAINST HATE MONGERS SUCH AS SPENCER:**

[Johnson \(TX30\) :: Floor Statement :: Condemning Bigotry And Violence Against Arab-Americans, Muslim-Americans, South Asian-Am..](#)

Resolved, That the House of Representatives--

(1) is concerned by the number of bias-motivated crimes against Arab-Americans, Muslim-Americans, South Asian-Americans, and Sikh-Americans, and other Americans in recent months;

(2) declares that the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans, including Arab-Americans, Muslim-Americans, South Asian-Americans, and Sikh-Americans, should be protected;

(3) condemns bigotry and acts of violence against any American, including Arab-Americans, Muslim-Americans, South Asian-Americans, and Sikh-Americans

In addition, the Civil Rights Division continues to spearhead the criminal investigations and prosecutions of hundreds of backlash crimes. In April 2003, Attorney General John Ashcroft announced that approximately 400 incidents of backlash discrimination have been investigated since September 2001 by the Civil Rights Division, the FBI and the

U.S. Attorneys' Offices. Of these investigations, approximately 70 State and local criminal prosecutions were initiated and Federal charges were brought in ten cases.

President Bush recently called for the Department of Justice to investigate the hate filled propaganda and lies of Islamophobes, as these are damaging to the war effort and aiding the enemies of the USA. It is my hope that the Civil Rights Division continues to vigilantly investigate and prosecute those crimes.

## **WHAT DO CONTEMPORARY ISLAMIC LEGAL SCHOLARS SAY ABOUT TERRORISM, SUICIDE, AND MILITANT JIHAD?**

<http://muslim-canada.org/binladensfatwa.html>

Terrorism (i.e. vicarious punishment and inflicting reprisals on one person for the crime of another) is expressly and formally forbidden under Islamic law [Qur'an [6:164](#), [35:18](#), and [55:39](#)] The civilian population, (including and especially the elderly and infirm, women and children) cannot be harmed even on the battlefield. Even if these people participated in war by way of providing ancillary services (i.e. first-aid, etc. to wounded soldiers), they cannot be harmed. Collective punishment (i.e. punishment of a group of innocent people for the crimes of certain criminal individuals) being vicarious in nature, is also forbidden under Islamic law. It is for this reason that The Canadian Society of Muslims, in its press release of Sept. 12, 2001 had condemned in the strongest terms possible, the acts of terrorism against the innocent civilians in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania. Islamic Law does not suggest that any political cause could ever be advanced or assisted by such immoral acts which are explicitly forbidden by Islamic Law (*Shari'ah*).

To commit **suicide** is a heinous crime and sin under Islamic law. It is the legal obligation of every Muslim to protect and preserve his or her own life by all available means and to NEVER destroy one's own life, since one's life does not belong to the individual but only to God.

**Murder** is also a monstrous capital crime and sin which carries with it an appropriate punishment. When suicide and murder are combined and committed, as was done in the terrorist attack on the U.S., it is a double crime. In my opinion, the perpetrators have definitely reserved for themselves the punishment of eternal life in Hell.

They are deluding themselves if they think that they will receive the reward of Paradise. That is the reward for *true* martyrs (*shahid[s]*) and it is not a reward for the self-proclaimed false ones.

## **WHEN MUSLIM LEADERS SAY THIS:**

### [Islam Online- News Section](#)

Sheikh Yusuf Al-Qaradawi Condemns Attacks Against Civilians: Forbidden in Islam DOHA, Qatar, Sept 13 (Islam Online & News Agencies) - Renowned Muslim scholar Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi denounced the attacks against civilians in the U.S. Tuesday and encouraged Muslims to donate blood to the victims of the attack.

### [Bin Laden's idea of 'jihad' is out of bounds, scholars say](#)

The concept of jihad has many shades of meaning, but the way Osama bin Laden has applied it to political violence has moved beyond the bounds of Islamic teaching on warfare, scholars say.

### Muslims Condemn Terrorist Attacks

Scholars' Statements Regarding The Attacks In The United States, by Shaykh Abdul-Aziz Aali-Shaykh, Grand Mufti of Saudi Arabia and President of the ...

<http://www.muhababah.com/otherscondemn.php>

### PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY SENIOR SAUDI OFFICIALS CONDEMNING

EXTREMISM ...File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat –

ON THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN RIYADH. His Royal Highness Prince Bandar bin Sultan, Saudi Ambassador to the United States, issued the following statement on ...

[http:// www.saudiembassy.net/ReportLink/Report\\_Extremism\\_Oct03.pdf](http://www.saudiembassy.net/ReportLink/Report_Extremism_Oct03.pdf)

### Scholars of Islam & the Tragedy of Sept. 11th

Statements from leading Muslim leaders, condemning the terrorist attacks of ..... We, the undersigned, citizens and residents of the United States of ...

<http://www.groups.colgate.edu/aarislam/response.htm> - 103k

[Scholars' Statements Regarding The Attacks In The United States](#), by Shaykh Abdul-Aziz Aali-Shaykh, Grand Mufti of Saudi Arabia and President of the Committee of Senior Scholars, and Shaykh Saleh Al-Lehaydaan, Chief Justice Of The Saudi Arabian Judiciary, and Shaykh Dr. Saaleh Ibn Ghaanem As-Sadlaan, Pres. Higher Studies Dept. Al-Imaam Muhammd Ibn Saud Islamic University

<http://www.muhababah.com/islamicblog/archives/veiled4allah/010050.php>

Saudi Arabia's highest religious authority on Wednesday condemned as a sin the deadly shootings at a U.S. Consulate, and local newspapers reported that one of the slain assailants was a former employee of the nation's religious police. The U.S. Embassy in Riyadh reopened Wednesday, two days after militants stormed into the inner courtyard of the U.S. Consulate in this port city, firing guns, grabbing human shields and killing five people. Four of the attackers also were killed.

Grand Mufti Abdul Aziz bin Abdullah al Sheik said in a statement that anyone who entered the kingdom with the permission of its leaders had a promise of security and should not be attacked.

"What happened on Monday regarding the storming of the U.S. Consulate in Jidda, using weapons and explosives, killing innocent souls, petrifying secure ones, and undermining security in the kingdom are all forbidden acts and grand sins," the mufti said. [emphasis added]

### [The True Islamic Morals](#)

Some people who say they are acting in the name of religion may misunderstand their religion or practice it wrongly. For this reason, it is a mistake to form any idea of that religion from the activities of these people. The best way to understand Islam is through its holy source.

The holy source of Islam is the Qur'an; and the model of morality in the Qur'an is completely different from the image of it formed in the minds of some westerners. The Qur'an is based on the concepts of morality, love, compassion, mercy, modesty, self-sacrifice, tolerance and peace, and a Muslim who truly lives according to these moral precepts is highly refined, thoughtful, tolerant, trustworthy and accommodating. To those around him he gives love, respect, peace of mind and a sense of the joy of life.

<http://muslim-canada.org/binladensfatwa.html>

On bin Laden's Fatwa calling the world's Muslims to jihad:

The Muslim community at large, particularly in Canada and the United States, is once again experiencing a nervous agitation in relation to the so-called **FATWA** (legal opinion) issued two days ago [Oct 7, 2001] by Mr. Osama bin Laden. As a consequence, we have received quite a few enquiries from people (both Muslims and non-Muslims) and organisations, (e.g.. CFRB, etc.) asking us as to what the Islamic legal position is. As a student of Islamic Law and a lawyer in Muslim Law (*Shari'ah/Fiqh*) and Muslim International Law, I would like to express my views and personal opinion very briefly as follows:

In view of the chaotic situation that prevails in Muslim countries, it would be prudent to say that only sovereign Muslim states/governments have the legal authority to declare *jihad* in any given circumstance. Mr. Osama bin Laden is **NOT** the head of any sovereign Muslim state and as such he has no legal authority or power to declare *jihad*. Surely, the law of Islam does not say that every Muslim is obliged to accept the declaration of war and respond to the call to take up arms without hesitation and start a world-wide war at the behest of every Tom, Dick or Harry (or Zaid, Omer and Bakr in the Muslim vernacular). It matters not how efficient and popular that individual may be as a brave warrior or a meticulous planner of unlawful and immoral schemes of hatred, terror and destruction.

Surely every Muslim in the world is not obliged to accept and immediately act upon the command of any Tom, Dick or Harry, no matter how highly regarded he may be, to take up arms and start a world-wide war! Only people who are properly qualified and trained, and hold a license from Muslim governmental authorities, have the authority to issue *fatwas*. Mr. bin Laden, to the best of my knowledge, does not qualify as a *Mufti* (a juris-consult or scholar of law who has been given a license to issue *fatwas*.) The most that can be said about the so-called "*fatwa*" of Mr. bin Laden is that it is not worth the paper it is written on - if he ever rendered his ruling on paper at all. For this reason, it goes without saying that his so-called "*fatwa*" is no more than a personal opinion expressed by an ordinary, yet rich and biased person.

#### [Islam not religion of anarchy: Imam-e-Kaaba](#)

Daily Times - Lahore, Pakistan

By following golden teachings of Islam, he said, the Muslims could obtain prosperity, peace and progress in the world. He observed that strength of Muslims ...

#### [Islam Advocates Peace And Goodwill For Every One: Sheikh Sudais](#)

Bernama - Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

"The remedy with Muslims is to strictly follow the teachings of Islam and get united," he added. Sheikh Al-Sudais said that Islam teaches moderation at all ...

#### [Imam of Holiest Place in Islam Condemns Violence](#)

- South Korea

Muslims all over the world face Holy Kaaba (Mecca) for their prayers five times a day. In Pakistan the Imam of Holy Kaaba is kept in high esteem and people ...

#### [Memo to Binladen: Go to Hell!](#)

Muqtedar Khan, Ph.D.

This article has so far been published in [Washington Post](#) (02.16.03), [TheGlobalist](#) (02.14.03), [Outlook India](#) (02.15.03) [The Arab News](#) (Saudi Arabia 02.18.03), [The Age](#) (Melbourne, Australia 02.22.03), [Afghan Times](#) (02.23.02) [Times of Central Asia](#) (02.22.03) [Iran and World](#) (02.22.03) [Tampa Tribune](#) (02.21.03), [Euthanesia News](#) (02.22.03) [DestinyWalking](#) (02.22.03), [St. Petersburg Times](#) (02.21.03). This Memo was also read by the author on the Roy Green Show (Ontario, Canada 02.20.03).

*This is an American Muslim's response to the Tape recorded message dated February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2003 by fugitive-terrorist Osama Bin Laden. (read the full article at the link)*

**Also consider these condemnations from some of the world's leading Muslims:**

[A Message from the Council on American-Islamic Relations](#)

[American Muslim Leaders Condemn Attacks](#)

[American Muslims and Scholars Denounce Terrorism on Anniversary of 9/11](#)

[Australian Muslims Condemn Terrorist Attack](#)

[Bin Laden Distorts Islam, Islamic Scholars Say](#)

[Bin Laden's Idea of 'Jihad' is Out of Bounds, Islamic Scholars Say](#)

[British Muslim leaders condemn terrorism](#)

[British Muslims Condemn Terrorist Attacks](#)

[Canadian Muslims Condemn Terrorist Attacks](#)

[Islamic Statements Against Terrorism in the Wake of the September 11 Mass Murders](#)

[Islamic World Deplores U.S. Losses](#)

[Looking for Answers in Islam's Holy Book: What Islamic Scholars Have to Say](#)

[Muslim Reactions to Sept 11](#)

[Muslim Voices Against Extremism & Terrorism - Part II - Statements by Organizations](#)

[Muslim World Condemns Attacks on U.S.](#)

[Muslim rulers condemn WTC attacks](#)

[New Zealand Muslims Condemn Terrorism](#)

[Organization of the Islamic Conference Foreign Ministers Condemn International Terrorism](#)

[Quran a Book of Peace Not War, Islamic Scholars Say](#)

[Scholars of Islam Condemn Terrorism](#)

[Some American Muslims Take a Look at Their Communities' Shortcomings](#)

[U.S. Muslim Scholars Condemn Attacks](#)

[UK Muslim Leaders Condemn 'Lunatic Fringe'](#)

[When is jihad OK? Muslim Perspectives](#)

### **Specific Muslim Scholars**

[Attacks on Civilians: Forbidden by Islam](#), by Shaykh Yusuf Qaradawi

[Ayatollah Muhammad Husain Fadlallah of Lebanon condemns Osama Bin Laden](#),  
by Ayatollah Muhammad Husain Fadlallah

[Bin Laden's Violence is a Heresy Against Islam](#), by AbdulHakim Murad (Tim  
Winter)

[Defending the Civilians \(a fatwa against terrorism\)](#), by Shaykh Muhammad Afifi al-  
Akiti

[Expert Says Islam Prohibits Violence Against Innocents](#), by Shaykh Hamza Yusuf

[Grand Sheikh of al-Azhar Condemns Suicide Bombings](#), by Shaykh Muhammad  
Sayyed Tantawi

[High Mufti of Russian Muslims calls for Extradition of Bin Laden](#), by Russian  
Muslim leaders

[Iran's Supreme Leader Condemns Attacks on U.S.](#), by Ayatollah Ali Khamanei

[Islam and the Question of Violence](#), by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Iranian scholar

[Jihad and the Modern World](#), by Dr. Sherman Jackson

[Jihad: Its True Meaning and Purpose](#), by Muzammil H. Siddiqui

[Most Prominent Sunni Muslim Scholar Condemns Killing of Civilians](#), by Shaykh  
Muhammad Sayyed Tantawi, Grand Imam of Al-Azhar University

[Muslim Attitudes about Violence](#), by Shaykh Muhammad al-Munajjid

[Muslim Voices Against Extremism and Terrorism - Part I - Fatwas](#), by various  
scholars

[Muslim Voices Against Extremism and Terrorism - Part IV A few Quotes](#), by various scholars

[On the Terrorist Attacks](#), by Imam Zaid Shakir

[Prominent Pakistani Cleric Tahir ul Qadri condemns Bin Laden](#), by Tahir ul Qadri

[Reclaiming Islam from the Terrorists](#), by AbdulHakim Murad, British scholar

[Reflections on the National Horror of September 11, 2001](#), by Muzammil H. Siddiqui

[Refutation of Bin Laden's Defense of Terrorism](#), by Moiz Amjad, Pakistani scholar

[Response to a Question about Islam and Terrorism](#), by Moiz Amjad, Pakistani scholar

[Saudi Clerics Condemn Terrorism](#), by Sheikh Abderrahman al-Sudayes

[Saudi Grand Mufti Condemns Terrorist Attacks in U.S.](#), by Shaikh Abdulaziz Al-Ashaikh

[Spanish Muslim Clerical authorities Issue Fatwa against Osamah Bin Laden](#), by Spanish Muslim leaders

[Terrorism Is at Odds With Islamic Tradition](#), by Khaled Abou El Fadl

[Terrorism: Not a doorway to heaven](#), by Jamil Abdul Razzak Hajoo, of Idriss Mosque, Seattle

[The Myth of Islamic Terrorism Exploded](#), by Shaykh Abdul Azeez bin Abdullah bin Baaz and Shaykh Muhammad Bin Saalih al Uthaymeen

[The worst enemies of Islam are from within](#), by Hamza Yusuf

[Top Saudi Cleric Says Attacks on U.S. a Terrible Crime in Islam](#), by Shaykh Salah al-Lahidan, head of the Islamic Judiciary of Saudi Arabia

[Violence Against Innocents Violates Islamic Law](#), by Imam Siraj Wahhaj

[What is jihad? What is terrorism?](#), by Statement by Muslim scholars

## **SPENCER RESPONDS WITH THIS:**

In a message dated 6/3/2007 5:31:06 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*You are assuming that all the people you mentioned after the 4,200 scholars are acting in all cases and in all ways on Islamic grounds. There is no reason for this to be the case, any more than all Christians always and in all cases act on Christian grounds.*

*As for the scholars, and AQ, you have never produced even one scrap of evidence of any school of Islamic law or any orthodox Islamic sect that rejects violent jihad. This has nothing to do with AQ, actually. It is a much larger issue. And you, when you ignore, deny, and excuse every bit of evidence that doesn't fit your theory, are the one in serious denial.*

*Of course I'm giving you the arguments extremists give you. That's exactly what I'm trying to do -- show what the extremists are doing to make recruits, and ask peaceful Muslims not just to write whitewashes and denials, but to refute those extremist arguments directly.*

In a message dated 6/2/2007 11:36:48 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*They aren't clear and verifiable facts. They are distortions, and whitewashes. I explained how and why in some detail, but you can't bear to face the truth*

Spencer frequently cites Sayyid Qutb, of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, a prolific writer who is well respected by Islamist terrorists. Qutb was imprisoned several times and finally hung in 1966 for his extremism. Many Muslim scholars condemn Qutb for taking Qur'anic verses out of context in order to justify his point. Some examples are:

"You shall destroy all the peoples ... showing them no pity." (7: 16)

"... All the people present there shall serve you as forced labour." (20:12)

"... You shall put all its males to the sword. You may, however, take as your booty the women, the children, the livestock, and everything in the town -- all its spoil -- and enjoy the use of the spoil of your enemy which the LORD your God gives you." (20:14-15)

"... You shall not let a soul remain alive." (20:17)

OOPS, my mistake, those are from the Old Testament in the Bible. I guess anything can be made to look bad when it's taken out of context. Qutb used the same technique with the Qur'an.

Getting back to Qutb, in claiming that Qutb is considered close to infallible by Muslims in general, Spencer completely overlooks the glut of criticism of Qutb's works. Here's an article citing the many Islamic jurists and scholars, including Ibn Taymia, Imam Malik, Ahmed, and Abu Hanifah, who have in fact completely condemned Qutb's call for jihad, with the most important fact being explained in some detail, that the Islamic highest

authority, the Qur'an, completely forbids anything other than self-defense against an invading army. <http://muslim-canada.org/elmasry.html>

Here's another article completely refuting Qutb and exposing how he perverted Islam to make his claims. [http://www.allaahuakbar.net/jamaat-e-islami/qutb/mistakes\\_and\\_innovations\\_of\\_sayyid\\_qutb.htm](http://www.allaahuakbar.net/jamaat-e-islami/qutb/mistakes_and_innovations_of_sayyid_qutb.htm)

WHEN I CITED our President and Congressional leadership, who are united in their statements that we are not at war with Islam, that we are only at war with the extremists who embrace an ideology of terror and violence, Spencer responds thusly:

In a message dated 6/2/2007 10:37:02 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*You are no longer succeeding in masking your arrogance and prejudice.*

*The President and Congressional leadership have political reasons (chiefly Saudi ones) for saying what they're saying. What experts on Islam have they cited? Esposito, who is in Saudi pay.*

*There are war profiteers. You are missing the real ones.*

NO, ROBERT, I haven't missed the real ones, this article is about one of the worst.

Anyone who thinks that the condemnations listed above, let alone the 4,200 some Muslim leaders refuting terrorism at <http://facts-not-fear.blogspot.com> are "not acting on Islamic grounds" or "have not rejected violent jihad", or that these are "whitewashes" that do not specifically refute Islamist extremists, then I strongly suggest you read each and every one again, because you missed about 99% of what is written. Spencer, in claiming that these scholars do not present clear and verifiable facts, that they are distortions and whitewashes, claims his evidence of such are the writings of Islamic jurists from 1,200 years ago and the rantings of bin Laden.

### **THE FAULTS WITH SPENCER'S LOGIC:**

The primary fault with Spencer's logic is that he does not seem to understand the difference between Theology and Law, and he has astonishingly little knowledge of either subject. The former deals with spiritual and philosophical matters generally concerning God, the latter with temporal matters concerning society's rules.

Another major fault with Spencer's logic is that he completely misses the fact that there are religious Muslims and there are secular Muslims, the same as in other religions. Religious Muslims are supposed to live their lives according to the following level of authorities – listed from most important and authoritative to the least:

- 1) Allah
- 2) The Qur'an
- 3) The Hadiths
- 4) The Schools of Jurisprudence (Sharia)

Since Allah ('God' in Arabic) spoke through the Qur'an, that pretty well combines #1 and #2 into the strongest level of authority. When a subject is addressed, for example, by any of the four Schools of Jurisprudence, and the schools say one thing, and the same subject is addressed by the Qur'an which says something different, then a Muslim is to follow the highest authority, which is the Qur'an.

Yet another major fault with Spencer's logic is that he bases the vast majority of his arguments on legal rulings from Muslim jurists from the 7<sup>th</sup> Century! Most people understand that this is the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, and that as time goes by, man evolves, the rules of society evolve, and even man's understanding of his religions evolve. Unfortunately, Spencer shows his lack of knowledge of legal customs and systems, of statutes and case law, and of the supremacy of current case law over ancient case law. If you're in a courtroom, the judge is not going to look at legal rulings from the 7<sup>th</sup> Century, he's going to look at the latest and most current legal rulings, because on almost all subjects, a new ruling supersedes (replaces and updates) old rulings. In some cases, the judge may look at the law that was in effect at the time of the alleged offense, however, as best I am aware, there is no one alive who is 1,400 years old.

Spencer is absolutely adamant that these 1,400 year old rulings apply just as much today as they did in the 7<sup>th</sup> Century.

In a message dated 6/2/2007 7:05:00 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

1. *The 7th century irrelevant jurists are not irrelevant. The gates of ijihad are closed, and there is ijma on jihad. That means the 7th century jurists (and Ibn Khaldun et al ain't 7th century) are quite relevant. Also, the jihadists cite them, and gain recruits thereby. Why, if they're irrelevant?*

One of the many problems with this claim by Spencer is that since current, living Muslim legal scholars still debate the conditions of and types of jihad, there is no ijma (agreement of the entire community) on jihad. Therefore, the "gates of jihad are" **not** "closed" (if they were closed, there would be no disagreement, all the rules, etc., would be "set in stone for all time."

YET ANOTHER FAULT in Spencer's logic relates to this lack of legal understandings along with a lack of understanding of Muslim customs. Muslim legal jurisprudence (Shar'ia law) is only applicable for Muslim residents of a Muslim country governed completely under pure Shar'ia law.

The only country in today's world that operates under pure Shar'ia law is Iran. Saudi Arabia operates under a mix of Constitutional law, English common law, and Shar'ia law; Pakistan is the same, a mixture of constitutional law, Shar'ia law (mostly in the tribal areas, but it is dying off there), and English common law. A few other countries are

considering allowing modern (note the use of the word “modern”) Shar’ia courts to be established to handle only matters of divorce or contract disputes among Muslims. People of any other faith would not be at all affected by these small community-based religious courts, and even Muslims would only submit to these courts on a voluntary basis for the very specific matters on which they would be consulted. This is quite comparable to the small Jewish courts found around the world today, even in the USA, that decide on religious matters including divorce, or the Christian “common law” courts that decide on civil disputes.

The only extremists who are making the claim that these ancient rulings are in effect today are Usama bin Laden, Robert Spencer, and an imprisoned Jordanian terrorist who is said to be bin Laden’s philosophical successor, Isam Mohammad Tahir al-Barqawi (also known as Abu Muhammad Asem al-Maqdisi). I cited multiple Muslim scholars on this subject who thoroughly refuted these claims (see above), Spencer’s response was that they were lying. When I raised a question about lawsuits in general, Spencer responded in a way that shows he has zero knowledge of even the American legal system. Yet he is also a self-annointed “legal scholar.”

Granted, some few mainstream Muslims may, of their own volition, believe in some of the writings of ancient jurists. People are free to believe what they want, as long as it doesn’t interfere with the rights of others. However, the only place that these ancient jurists are strongly believed, or followed, is in Iran, and in Spencer’s, Barqawi’s and UBL’s preachings, and of course by the tiny minority who are foolish enough, gullible enough, to follow the preachings of these extremists.

### **MORE FAULTS IN SPENCER’S LOGIC:**

Spencer argues that the Qur’an is immutable, that it is accepted by all Muslims as, word-for-word, completely accurate and as binding today as the time it was written, that changes in society, culture, laws and governments do not change one single thing in the Qur’an, and that all Muslims must interpret it as such or else they’re not real Muslims.

Spencer claims that Islam is uniquely impervious to reformation because its adherents regard all of its dictates as the absolute word of God, beyond human interpretation or reinterpretation, that these words can never be changed.

Yet at the same time Spencer (and Usama bin Laden) claim that the verses about making peace, about honoring Jews and Christians, about never being the aggressor in war, about no compulsion in religion are abrogated (repealed) by the verses about subjugating anyone who isn’t Muslim. If the Qur’an is uniquely impervious to reformation, and is indeed beyond interpretation or reinterpretation, then the peaceful verses cannot be abrogated by the violent verses. Spencer is contradicting his own argument with these competing claims.

Spencer cites proponents (supporters) of his position – Islamic legal scholars who have been dead for over a thousand years, a very few current and past Islamist extremists (most of whom are dead or imprisoned such as Qutb), and Usama bin Laden. (Why would

someone who claims to condemn Islamist extremism cite the most violent of Islamist extremists as supporters of his position, and also claim to support their positions?)

We see Spencer, in using these arguments, utilizing several of the Logical Fallacies, (faults of logic that are often used for deception, distraction, or lies) such as the Appeal to Fear, Biased Sample, Misleading Vividness, Questionable Cause, False Dilemma, Guilt by Association, Red Herring, Strawman, No True Scotsman, Ad Hominem, and Non-Sequiturs. If you click on each blue link here you will find an explanation of each of these logical fallacies. The problem with logical fallacies is that, as fallacies, they “fail on their face”, in other words, in a discussion or debate, they fail as soon as they are used. The other party doesn’t need to refute them, logical fallacies are so outlandish, so poorly constructed, that they act like a house of cards in a hurricane. You can find definitions and examples, including examples of Spencer’s use of Logical Fallacies at the end of the article, in the Appendix.

## **SPENCER’S HYPOCRICY**

Spencer complains, as do others, that Muslim leaders fail to speak out, to condemn terrorism, violence, suicide bombings or militant jihad. In response, I showed Spencer approximately 4,200 Muslim political leaders, religious leaders, scholars, theologians, philosophers, writers, Muslim experts on Islamic jurisprudence, Muslim journalists, and Muslim leaders of major associations for advocacy, education, religious rights; all of whom without reservation clearly condemned the extremists who pervert Islam to justify their terrorism, violence, suicide bombings and militant jihad. These leaders have issued fatwas (religious/legal rulings) against UBL, they have issued fatwas against any Muslim engaging in terrorism, they have reminded Muslims that anyone engaged in terrorism will never see Paradise (Heaven), they have gone into great detail to refute the perversions of the Qur’an, the myths, the lies, the out of context verses, the 1,400 year old legal rulings that don’t apply to anyone outside of Iran, and to carefully and completely refute what Osama and Spencer are preaching.

*Anyone would think that Spencer would be ecstatic that so many Muslim leaders, from around the world, are issuing these condemnations. However, Spencer dismisses them, claiming:*

- 1) These Muslim leaders are lying
- 2) These Muslim leaders are using deception in time of war
- 3) These Muslim leaders don’t understand Islam
- 4) These Muslim leaders don’t matter
- 5) These Muslim condemnations weren’t specific enough

Spencer also completely dismisses the 80,000 American-Muslims who are in the US Army and US Marine Corps, putting their lives at risk every day in defense of our country and in their hunt for terrorists. Likewise, Spencer dismisses the anti-terrorist military and law enforcement efforts of our Muslim allies, such as Pakistan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia,

Oman, the UAE, Azerbaijan, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Afghanistan. He is absolutely adamant that every Muslim in the world must obey the 1,400 jurist rulings about making war on the enemy. Of course, he “forgets” to include the primary conditions of militant jihad (aka the “lesser jihad”) that are required before any Muslim can even consider this: The jihad cannot be started with Muslim aggression, ever. The jihad must be to repel invaders from the Muslim land. And the jihad must be declared by the Caliph of all Islam. So even if someone is so incredibly naïve as to believe 1,400 year old legal rulings would still apply today, there is the huge obstacle to overcome in that there has been no Caliph since 1914, so there is no one authorized to declare jihad.

Here : <http://frontpagemagazine.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=28417> Spencer claims that Muslim leaders are wrong about their own religion, and that the extremist interpretation by Usama and Spencer is the only correct interpretation. Of course, the fact that it is based on out-of-context verses from the Qur’an, deliberately misquoted verses from the Qur’an, and those infamous 7<sup>th</sup> Century Islamic jurists is absolutely ridiculous to the vast majority of Muslims and to anyone with a working brain cell, but Spencer insists otherwise.

Spencer keeps citing the Qur’an verse 2:193, which states: PICKTHAL: *And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is for Allah. But if they desist, then let there be no hostility except against wrong-doers.*

However, he cites this completely out of context, which should include 2:190, PICKTHAL: *Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you, but begin not hostilities. Lo! Allah loveth not aggressors.*

This section of the Qur’an lists some of the rules above, that Muslims are never to be the aggressors in war, they are only allowed to defend themselves if invaded, and even then (this is where 2:193 contextually belongs) as soon as the invaders stop fighting, the Muslims must also stop fighting.

Another trick of Spencer’s, seen at the same site as the above link, is to cite 9:29 of the Qur’an, which says: YUSUFALI: *Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the religion of Truth, (even if they are) of the People of the Book, until they pay the Jizya with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.*

Spencer claims this means to fight Christians and Jews. However, as usual, he picks and chooses his verses out of context. The verse immediately preceding 9:29 explains who is being “fought” here: YUSUFALI: *“O ye who believe! Truly the Pagans are unclean; so let them not, after this year of theirs, approach the Sacred Mosque. And if ye fear poverty, soon will Allah enrich you, if He wills, out of His bounty, for Allah is All-knowing, All-wise.”*

This verse discusses the Pagans, (at that time consisting of animists, polytheists, and Jews and Christians who had forsaken their religion to join the Pagan armies, who were savagely making war on Muslim tribes, ravaging Muslim villages and destroying the land.

At that point in time, almost all of the Arabian Peninsula was at war, with the various tribes fighting each other. This verse – in context – clearly states to give the Pagans a year’s notice, then to not let them near the Sacred Mosque. This is Spencer’s claim that the Qur’an justifies Muslims making offensive warfare, where Muslims can – without being attacked first – attack and kill innocents. I know, we need waders and shovels, Spencer’s writings are starting to really stack up like a pile of bovine excrement. Reading these is how I originally came to the opinion that perhaps Spencer was just incredibly ignorant. But now I know he has an economic motive and perhaps an additional motive, far worse than economics – perhaps that of treason, as we will see here.

ANOTHER MAJOR POINT OF SPENCER’S HYPOCRISY is that he denies that any other form of terrorism exists in today’s world other than Islamist. I presented him with statements and statistics from the Southern Poverty Law Center, the ADL, the FBI, the BATF, and the Terrorism Information Center in Oklahoma City, proving that Christian terrorists are quite active and dangerous in the USA. These include groups such as neo-Nazis, the Army of God, the World Church of the Creator, White Supremacists, the Armagedonite Movement, the Christian Identity Movement and many others. The FBI estimates that there are at least 10,000,000 of these domestic terrorists and extremists in the USA today, and that they are well funded. In his testimony to Congress in 2005, Director Mueller of the FBI stated that THESE terrorist groups were the most imminent domestic danger to the United States today. The FBI takes this threat so seriously that they have assigned 5,000 of their 15,000 agents to work fulltime on domestic terrorists. Yet Spencer routinely denies that there is any danger from Christian terrorist groups, he’s even writing a book “proving this danger doesn’t exist.” See <http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/016966.php> .

Domestic terrorist groups, including Christian terrorist groups, are such as: (clicking on blue links will lead you to details about each organization):

[1st Mechanical Kansas Militia](#)  
[3rd Continental Congress](#)  
[American Front](#)  
[Animal Liberation Front \(ALF\)](#)  
[Arizona Patriots \(AP\)](#)  
[Armed Forces of National Liberation](#)  
[Armenian Revolutionary Army](#)  
[Army of God](#)  
[Arvan Nations \(AN\)](#)  
[Arvan Republican Army \(ARA\)](#)  
[Aum Shinrikyo / Aleph](#)  
[Black Liberation Army](#)  
[Black Panthers](#)  
[Black Revolutionary Assault Team](#)  
[Cambodian Freedom Fighters \(CFF\)](#)  
[Coalition to Save the Preserves \(CSP\)](#)  
[Colorado 1st Light Infantry](#)  
[Covenant Sword and Arm of the Lord \(CSA\)](#)

[Croatian Freedom Fighters \(CFF\)](#)  
[Earth Liberation Front \(ELF\)](#)  
[El Rukn](#)  
[Evan Mecham Eco-Terrorist International Conspiracy \(EMETIC\)](#)  
[Fourth Reich Skinheads](#)  
[Free Vietnam Revolutionary Group](#)  
[Freemen \(based in WA\)](#)  
[Hammerskin Nation](#)  
[Hector Riobe Brigade](#)  
[Independent Armed Revolutionary Movement \(MIRA\)](#)  
[Islamic Salvation Front](#)  
[Jewish Defense League \(JDL\)](#)  
[Justice Commandos for the Armenian Genocide](#)  
[Ku Klux Klan \(KKK\)](#)  
[Mara Salvatruchas](#)  
[May 19 Communist Order](#)  
[Montana Freemen](#)  
[Mountaineer Militia](#)  
[Nation of Yahweh](#)  
[New Order](#)  
[Oklahoma Constitutional Militia](#)  
[Omega-7](#)  
[Order II](#)  
[Order, The](#)  
[Patriots Council](#)  
[Phineas Priests](#)  
[Puerto Rican Resistance Movement](#)  
[Republic of New Africa](#)  
[Republic of Texas \(RoT\)](#)  
[Revolutionary Action Party](#)  
[Revolutionary Cells Animal Liberation Brigade](#)  
[Revolutionary Force Seven](#)  
[San Joaquin Militia](#)  
[Secret Army Organization](#)  
[Secret Organization Zero](#)  
[Sheriff's Posse Comitatus](#)  
[Southeast States Alliance](#)  
[Southern California IRA](#)  
[United Freedom Front \(UFF\)](#)  
[Up the IRS, INC.](#)  
[Washington State Militia](#)  
[Weather Underground Organization \(WUO\) / Weathermen](#)  
[White Order of Thule](#)  
[White Patriot Party \(WPP\)](#)  
[World United Formosans for Independence](#)

**These groups have been responsible for:**

546 terrorist incidents  
4,170 injuries  
3,228 fatalities

(note these figures do NOT include casualties from the 9/11 attacks.)

You can find more information on these terrorist groups at [www.splcenter.org](http://www.splcenter.org), [www.adl.org](http://www.adl.org), [www.rickross.com](http://www.rickross.com), [www.fbi.gov](http://www.fbi.gov), and of course by checking the index on the Hatewatch Hall of Shame blog, along the left hand margin.

I asked Spencer is he understood that his ignoring or denying the wealth of information about Christian and other terrorist groups and sole focus on Islamist terrorists, was minimizing the other dangers in our world? In response, he wrote:

In a message dated 6/2/2007 7:05:00 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*Minimizing other forms of terrorism because they are minimum. A couple of Christian nuts is not equivalent to the worldwide jihad.*

In a message dated 5/31/2007 1:51:35 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*I've written a book refuting the Christian theocracy threat. It will be out in August.*

I BELIEVE that the widows, widowers and orphans of the Oklahoma City bombing, of the assassinated abortion doctors, of the murdered abortion clinic workers, of the 1996 Atlanta Olympics bombing, and of the many hundreds of domestic terrorist events carried out by Christian terrorist groups would strongly disagree with Mr. Spencer. For some reason, Spencer insists on being blind to American history and domestic problems, and even to the terrorist groups of other ideologies around the world, be they Marxist, Communist, Catholic, Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Buddhist, Socialist, Atheist or any other ideology.

***Islamist extremist terrorism must be dealt with and eliminated. But so must every other form of terrorism, every other group of terrorists. It would be monstrously foolish and extremely dangerous to ignore (for example) 99 threats to concentrate on one, when they are – for the most part – all just as dangerous to the freedom of peace-loving people in the world.***

**WHY DOES SPENCER IGNORE AND EVEN DENY OTHER TERRORIST THREATS?** Why does he work to draw attention away from other forms of terrorism, all of which the USA is fighting? The FBI, BATF and DHS estimate there are approximately 10,000,000 such in the USA alone. That is far more than "a couple of Christian nuts". FBI Director Mueller testified to Congress that these domestic terrorist groups present the most dangerous and imminent domestic threat to the homeland. 5,000 FBI agents assigned to nothing other than these groups. The Southern Poverty Law Center has a massive listing of violent incidents from these groups. Bombings, arson, kidnappings, assassinations, assault, hijacking, and plans to take over the government of the USA. The Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism in Oklahoma City has a very lengthy list of the terrorist incidents by these groups. Every major terrorism research center and law enforcement agency in the US is working on this very serious threat. WHEN SPENCER MINIMIZES ALL OTHER FORMS OF TERRORISM, then he can make Islamist terrorism look like the *only* threat. (Note: Christian terrorists are far from the only other form of terrorism. See [Worldwide Terrorism](#).)

**SPENCER WANTS US LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO USE ILLEGAL PROFILING AGAINST ARABS:**

<http://www.frontpagemagazine.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=23910>

**WHY We MUST Profile**

By [Robert Spencer](#)

FrontPageMagazine.com | August 17, 2006

*To profile or not to profile? Some recent suspicious incidents involving mass purchase of cell phones by Middle Eastern men have given this debate a new urgency.*

The problem with profiling, aside from its being illegal, is that we would miss a great number of terrorists. It didn't take bin Laden long after 9/11 to realize that he had to recruit people who were not Arabic, and he has. Look at the Europeans, Americans, Canadians and South Americans he has recruited. The problems with profiling are explained in more detail (including who we would have missed) at [The Controversy Over Profiling](#) (<http://hatewatchhallofshame.blogspot.com/2007/01/by-rev.html>) *Why would Spencer push for a program that would cause law enforcement to miss terrorists? Also, why would Spencer push to use a tactic that would, in the event of catching a terrorist, quite likely cause the case to be thrown out and the terrorist set free?*

I tried explaining to Spencer his tunnel vision is similar to knowing that a group of assassins are at your front door, a different group at your back door, another different group at your side door, and yet another group is climbing in your basement windows. You grab your gun and defend yourself and your family by only watching the front door. The result? You and your family will die by ignoring the other threats.

This is one area where Spencer's lack of any military and/or law enforcement training is glaringly obvious. All military and law enforcement personnel are thoroughly trained to keep 360 degree awareness, to always be fully aware of one's environment, to watch for

*all threats*, not just one. Focusing on just one is known as “tunnel vision”, and Spencer has a very serious case of tunnel vision. Focusing on just one threat gets you a free trip home in a body bag.

## **SPENCER’S SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO MUSLIMS WHO CONDEMN TERRORISM:**

[Jihad Watch: Florida doctor admits support for armed jihad](#)

**May 12, 2007**

### **Florida doctor admits support for armed jihad**

Rafiq Abdus Sabir believes that it is his religious responsibility to wage armed jihad. In response, no shortage of Muslim spokesmen can be found who will say, no, he has gotten it all wrong, jihad is an interior spiritual struggle. That's great, but it's time that mainstream media types started asking a couple of follow-up questions: if Islam really teaches peace, how did Rafiq Abdus Sabir and so many others get it all so terribly wrong? [Jim’s comment: Maybe they’ve been reading too many of Spencer’s columns?]

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/dhimmiwatch/archives/016448.php> "Expose every single one of the tricks of Muslim apologists and undercut them, including these:"

**Immediately below is a world leader rejecting Islamist extremism and terrorism!  
This should be a cause for joy, a cause to praise the Pakistani PM.**

[Attempts to Equate Islam with Terrorism must be Rejected: Pakistan PM](#)

Pakistan Times - Islamabad, Pakistan

"The actions of a few should not influence perceptions about Islam and Muslims, the majority of whom are peace loving, responsible citizens across the ...

**What is Spencer's reaction to this? He condemns the PM's speech as "platitudes" and says Islamophobes are only that way because Islamic extremists engage in terrorism - basically, the "blame someone else" argument for bigotry, very similar to the argument of Joseph Goebbels - (not that terrorist are comparable to the innocent Jews in WWII, just that it's the same argument.)**

[Click here: Jihad Watch: Pakistani PM: Attempts to equate Islam with terrorism must be rejected](#)

*"Here Shaukat Aziz repeats platitudes we have heard many times before, and yet again pretends that the problem of Islamic terrorism stems from "Islamophobia," while never acknowledging or confronting the fact that the "few" who are committing terrorist acts are the ones who are making the equation between Islam and terrorism. If they would stop equating Islam and terrorism, non-Muslims would stop making the association also."*

**And here, another leading Pakistani Muslim leader, rejecting terrorism, also rejecting the false image where some try to portray all of Islam as violent.**

**[Islam categorically negates extremism, intolerance: Khalid Maqbool](#)**

**Associated Press of Pakistan - Pakistan**

... dire need of the hour for the Muslims to reconcile their acts and deeds following the real teachings of Prophet Hazrat Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him). ...

**Again, what is Spencer's reaction? He condemns the statement and once again, blames bigotry and Islamophobia on Muslims.**

**[Click here: Jihad Watch: "Islam is the religion of peace, promotes respect and categorically negates tendency of extremism and](#)**

*"Whew! Glad he cleared that up. Gotta be ever vigilant against those "conspiracies against the Muslims in the world to dub as terrorists with bad intentions to dent the integrity of Islam and its followers." Here again, as ever, the blame is all on non-Muslims. No Muslims appear to be responsible for making people think that Islam has anything to do with "terrorists with bad intentions to dent the integrity of Islam and its followers."*

**WHEN I REFUTED SPENCER'S CLAIMS, his final responses were ad hominem, which are known as the tool of those who are desperate because they cannot refute facts. Not that it's unusual for someone to respond to my factual refutations with ad hominem, I am quite used to seeing these from my work against neo-Nazis, white separatists, anti-Semites, and plain old racists. It is clear that Spencer's focus is on antilocution and inflammatory speech to whip up any sympathy he can find from other hate mongers.**

In a message dated 6/3/2007 5:33:39 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*Yes. I see now fully what you are, and the immense evil you are doing.*

In a message dated 6/3/2007 6:01:28 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*You are so inflated with your own conceit and admiration for your own powers of discernment that you are jumping to conclusions without doing even BASIC research.*

In a message dated 6/3/2007 5:31:06 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, director@jihadwatch.org writes:

*I hope some day you will awaken to the damage you are doing to the cause of human dignity and freedom, to how thoroughly you have been gulled, and to your puffed-up arrogance and narcissism. In the meantime, you are not going to waste any more of my time.*

### **SPENCER'S "MISTAKES" ABOUT ISLAM**

Below are some of Spencer's typical mistakes about Islamic culture, jurisprudence, the Qur'an and the ahadiths. Where possible, I will try to show Spencer's specific claim, the authoritative refutation, and Spencer's response to the authoritative refutation. Note that throughout 240 emails, even when presented with authoritative, absolutely irrefutable evidence that his interpretation of Islam was incorrect, he adamantly insisted that he was right and all the evidence, including that of 4,200 Islamic leaders and scholars, was wrong.

Spencer's most constant theme, and most frequent mistake, is that he constantly quotes Islamic jurists' rulings from the 7<sup>th</sup> Century. We already know that Islamic extremists are stuck in 7<sup>th</sup> Century interpretations and use these to fool gullible followers, you'll have to read further into this article to find Spencer's motives. What Islamist extremists and Spencer have most in common is that they both lie when they cite 7<sup>th</sup> Century jurists as if they were relevant to and binding on the contemporary world – all Muslims everywhere, in today's society.

The other major faulty premise on which Spencer bases many of his arguments is the call for jihad, by these 7<sup>th</sup> Century scholars. In Islam, there are two basic types of jihad, the lesser jihad – which is (defensive only) fighting off an invader of a Muslim country, and the greater jihad, which is the struggle within yourself to be humble, to not be greedy, to live a good, charitable, and gentle life. The greater jihad is taken originally from a hadith which quotes Muhammad talking about how it is more important than the lesser jihad.

Spencer says: THE "GREATER JIHAD" HADITH IS WEAK. IT DOESN'T APPEAR IN ANY OF THE SIX MOST ACCEPTED HADITH COLLECTIONS.]>

However, while Spencer is correct in pointing out that this Hadiths authenticity is somewhat controversial, he completely fails to mention that while considered "weak, it is not ignored, it is widely accepted because it was confirmed by the renowned thirteenth century Sufi scholar, Jalal al-Din Rumi articulated such an understanding of jihad when he wrote:

*"The prophets and saints do not avoid spiritual struggle. The first spiritual struggle they undertake is the killing of the ego and the abandonment of personal wishes and sensual desires. This is the greater jihad" (Chittick 1983: 151).*

Spencer also frequently claims that "Islam has never been a pacifist creed", as if that is some sort of indictment. Since the definition of "pacifist" means to not engage in any fighting, even in self defense, even in the most extreme circumstances, then it can equally and accurately be said that only one or two religions are pacifist (Quakers, Amish, Mennonites and Jainism are the only religions that are complete pacifists). Christianity, Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, none of these are pacifist religions, so to claim that Islam is not pacifist in an attempt to indict, is not only false, it is deceptive and insulting to Spencer's readers that he would think they are so ignorant as to accept that statement at face value.

The rest of the world, including the vast majority of Muslims, reject claims from Usama bin Laden, Spencer, and other extremists, and have evolved in the intervening 1,400 years since Islamic jurist made these claims, but Usama and Spencer are stuck in time. Can Spencer possibly be this ignorant?

*"Ignorance is not innocence, but sin."* - [Robert Browning](#)

*"The sage awakes to light in the night of all creatures. That which the world calls day is the night of ignorance to the wise."* - Bhagavad-Gita

*"If you think education is expensive, try ignorance."* - [Derek Bok](#)

*"I do not believe in the collective wisdom of individual ignorance."* - [Thomas Carlyle](#)

*"Unintelligent people always look for a scapegoat."* - [Ernest Bevin](#)

*"To be ignorant of one's ignorance is the malady of the ignorant."* - [Amos Bronson Alcott](#)

## **DECEIPT ON SPENCER'S PART**

This is a typical example of how Spencer takes good news and uses deceit, creative interpretation and outright lies, to turn it into a "sky is falling" story falsely indicting Muslims. First the facts:

Recently, Pew Forum conducted a poll of 1,054 American Muslims. <http://pewresearch.org/assets/pdf/muslim-americans.pdf#> They found that the majority, 78% have assimilated very well into American society, are middle class and loyal to America first, Islam second. They condemn terrorism and violence. But the poll did find that out of 317 Muslims between the ages of 18 and 29, primarily consisting of Nation of Islam members, 1% agreed that suicide bombings were often justified in fighting off an invader, 7% felt that suicide bombings were sometimes justified, and 5% felt suicide bombings could rarely be justified, totaling 13% of these 317 youths. Now, there was no country mentioned, and not a single one of these young Muslims mentioned America. It is felt by the people at Pew Forum that they were probably thinking of the Palestinians.

So in particular detail, only 1% agreed that suicide bombings were justified, that equals 3 young members of the Nation of Islam. It should also be considered here that this particular demographic usually consists of disaffected, unemployed (50% unemployment rate), marginalized, angry-at-society young men who grow up in a very violent culture of gangs and drugs. Even so, keep in mind the poll yielded only 3 young men who would agree with suicide bombing, and they said not a word about America! Even if we extrapolate this out to the entire US Muslim population, using the same formula as the poll of taking 30% of American Muslims as being in the proper age group (1,200,000 American Muslims x 30% = 360,000) and then taking 1% of those are agreeing that suicide bombings were justifiable, we would get 3,600 who would so agree. Note, though, that Pew did not extrapolate this out to the general Muslim population.

How did Mr. Spencer report this poll? Did he report that only 3 young men endorsed suicide bombing (most likely in the Palestinian Territories) to repel invaders, or that at worst – extrapolated out to the entire US Muslim population, this 1% of disaffected youths would equal 3,600? His article is below. The 3 young men all of a sudden became 300,000 in Spencer's mind (and apparently poor math skills)! He multiplied Pew's results by 100,000 in order to twist and pervert this very positive finding into another of his multitude of "we all must panic!" stories. How did he report on the overall 13% who thought that perhaps suicide bombings could be used in rare circumstances? He doubled it - to 26%, although he contradicts himself in the very next sentence (one problem with lies, it's difficult to keep them straight or consistent.)

A STATEMENT FROM THE POLLING ORGANIZATION:

**Among the conclusions of this poll, according to Pew Forum:**

<http://pewforum.org/events/?EventID=146>

This is mostly a middle class and mostly mainstream public. We draw that conclusion from half-hour interviews. We find the Muslim Americans we interviewed largely assimilated. They're happy with their lives. They're moderate on many of the issues that sharply divide Muslims and Westerners around the world.

We have quite a perspective, using questions in this survey comparable to questions we've used in these international polls in the [Global Attitudes project](#); clearly this public comes across as much more moderate than Muslim publics in much of the world.

This is a highly diverse public. Two-thirds of the people we interviewed were foreign-born. Arabs, Pakistanis and other South Asians make up the largest percentage of the foreign-born population. Native-born Muslims are 35 percent of the public, and they are mostly converts. They weren't born as Muslims. African Americans make up 20 percent of the Muslim American public, and two-thirds of the native-born public. So the native-born public is dominated by African Americans.

More generally, the poll finds that Muslim Americans, even though they are largely foreign-born – and if you take into account first and second generation, overwhelmingly newcomers to the United States – nonetheless they're decidedly American in outlook. Seventy-two percent of them take the very American point of view that with hard work

you can get ahead and succeed in this society. That's an even larger percentage than the general public. Consequently, the income levels and education levels of Muslim Americans are at the national mean. Unlike Western Europe, they are not a small minority who are less well off and frustrated with economic opportunities and, to some extent, socially isolated.

This is a group that is living as most Americans are – we find Muslim Americans to be highly assimilated. Most report that the largest proportion of their friends is non Muslim. On balance they believe Muslims who come to the United States should try to assimilate and adopt American customs rather than trying to remain distinct, or they feel they should do a little bit of both. Most do not see a conflict between being a devout Muslim and living in a modern society. So another one of the major findings is this is an assimilated group or a group that at least aspires to assimilation.

Muslims in the United States reject Islamic extremism to an even greater extent than do Muslims in Western Europe, and to a much greater extent than Muslims living in the Middle East and Asia. Compared to Muslims elsewhere, very few believe that suicide bombings that target civilians in defense of Islam can be justified.

**Now the anti-Islamic Spencer spin:**

<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=20882>

300,000 U.S. Muslims Back Suicide Bombing  
by Robert Spencer  
Posted: 05/29/2007

Some of the results of the Pew Research Center poll of Muslims in America were startling: 26% of Muslims between the ages of 18 and 29 affirmed that there could be justification in some (unspecified) circumstances for suicide bombing, and five percent of all the Muslims surveyed said that they had a favorable view of Al-Qaeda. Given the Pew Center's estimate of 2.35 million Muslims in America, and the total of thirteen percent that avowed a belief that suicide bombings could ever be justified, that's over 300,000 supporters of suicide attacks. And 117,500 supporters of Al-Qaeda.

## MORE DECEIPT

### ROBERT SPENCER AS HUGH FITZGERALD?

Spencer's blog contains articles written by a Hugh Fitzgerald, who does give any information about himself and who gives no email or contact information. Fitzgerald uses an address of 405 Waltham St. #196, Lexington MA 02421, which is actually a UPS Store which offers anonymous remailing service. A clerk at that particular UPS store informed me that the mailbox was rented by Robert Spencer. I searched the telephone directories, the voter registration records, the local courts, property records, and business records to no avail – there is no listing for any Hugh Fitzgerald living in or around Lexington, MA. There is speculation by some that Fitzgerald is just a fake name being used by Spencer. Why? Perhaps because Fitzgerald advocates ethnic cleansing, and incarceration of American Muslims in concentration camps (both of which are war crimes and crimes against humanity). Spencer, as Spencer, offers very weak denials of supporting these actions, and sometimes outright supports them. But Spencer, as Fitzgerald, is gung ho to gather up every American citizen who is a Muslim and lock them up or ship them off to some other country, seize the oilfields of our Muslim allies, stop all further Muslim immigration to the USA, and somehow magically read the minds of all Muslim immigrants who are already here, to see if they are loyal to the USA. Spencer and Fitzgerald both write to indicate that there is no such thing as a “moderate Muslim”, that all Muslims, everywhere, are terrorists and want to kill Americans. Both are lying, if indeed there is a “both”

### Some of “Fitzgerald’s ideas:

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/007241.php>

Deterrent measures that could be undertaken in the event of a chemical or nuclear attack, *but without waiting in some cases for any further attacks* (although further attacks will help to justify the more far-reaching among them) might include, but not be limited to:

A complete ban on Muslim migration to the Western world (which needs to be undertaken in any case), and limits put on any contact between Muslims living in the West, who may already have obtained citizenship and -- unless they are native-born converts -- their countries of origin.

.... No, there is another way, or many other ways. And the first way is to put a complete stop to Muslim immigration, and to find creative ways to deport all Muslim non-citizens. These two measures would be accompanied by the creation of an environment where the practice of Islam is made not easy but difficult. (Jim: See “ethnic cleansing” in the Appendix definitions) (See Ethnic Cleansing in the Appendix definitions at the end of this article.)

.... An end to all outward and visible signs of rhetorical "respect" for Islam, including the studied refusal to mention "Islamic terrorism" or "Muslim terrorism" which has gone on

for too long. Use these adjectives; never let them go. Use the word "jihad." Stop all attempts at verbal escamotage, where the listener is left, puzzled, dissatisfied with the deliberate vagueness.

.... End the jizyah of Infidel aid to Muslim states, such as Egypt, Pakistan, Jordan, and whatever the latest political instrument of the shock troops of the Jihad against Israel, the "Palestinians," may be called. Call attention to the \$10 trillion that has already been recdeived by the Muslim members of OPEC in the last 1/3 century, and continue to advise those Pakistanis, Egyptians, Jordanians and "Palestinians" to ask for that aid no longer from the Infidels, who suddenly have to pay higher prices for oil and hundreds of billions more for security all over the Western world, but to those Arab and Muslim states that, not coincidentally, are receiving those hundreds of billions more in oil revenues each year.

.... Careful review of how citizenship is obtained, and what oaths of loyalty are administered, and if those oaths can possibly have been meant by those whose sole loyalty, by the very tenets of their belief-system, can only be to Islam and the Community of Believers, the umma al-islamiyya. (shh! No one tell "Fitzgerald" that we cannot read minds, he might get even more upset.)

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/016467.php>

*"...the rush to the gates of the embassies and consulates of the Western nations with requests for visas in order to reside permanently in those countries..." -- from [this article](#)*

*"They must not be allowed in. For the safety of our own citizens in the West, we can't take any more Muslims, and certainly not the most dangerous of all, the Shock Troops of the Lesser Jihad, the local Arabs who were carefully renamed the "Palestinians." They have proven to be at the center of many terrorist plots and schemes. And then they are suddenly identified demurely, so often, as having been "born in Jordan" or "born in Israel" -- and the word "Palestinian" that they always emphasize so often, suddenly disappears."*

**Let's seize all of our allies' oil fields – another Spencer/Fitzgerald idea!**

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/016833.php>

The Americans can always seize, and without much difficulty, in case of absolute necessity, the natural gas fields of Qatar, the oilfields of tiny Kuwait and the Emirates, and of course the fields in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia -- could do it, and in case of need, not American need (remember that oil is fungible) but the need of all oil-consuming nations, would certainly do so, and a great many countries would be relieved, and applaud the act.

And last but not least, “Fitzgerald’s” well known rant about there being no Muslim moderates, and if there are moderates, they are all lying, found at [http://www.newenglishreview.org/custpage.cfm?frm=6566&sec\\_id=6566](http://www.newenglishreview.org/custpage.cfm?frm=6566&sec_id=6566)

## **A “SCHOLAR”?**

Remember, a scholar is supposed to be an expert in his specific field, and exhibit a fair knowledge in all basic fields. Read the following, and decide for yourself if this “scholar” is deceitful, exaggerating, or just plain stupid? In the article <http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/016983.php> , Spencer publishes the claim that *“Now that Hamas has complete control of Gaza, Israel finds itself surrounded by three Iranian proxies: Syria, Hizballah and Hamas. Syrian President Assad finds himself in the strongest position he has ever been in. But does he know how to play his hand now in his ongoing quest for the Golan Heights?”*

**If we look at a map of Israel, we can see that in the real world, Israel borders on Egypt (with whom they have a peace treaty), Jordan (with whom they have a peace treaty), the West Bank (under control of the moderate Abbas and his Fatah party), Syria and Lebanon. Either Mr. Spencer needs a dictionary to understand the word “surround” (See Appendix Definitions) or he needs to learn to read a map. Or he is deliberately lying or exaggerating to pretend there is a much larger threat than there already is in Israel.**

## **MOTIVATIONS**

Obviously, without continuing to play on people’s fears and echoing the propaganda of UBL, Spencer wouldn’t have the opportunity to spread lies in his blog while holding out his hand for donations, or to give public speeches for a considerable fee, or to make money from his books (which should all be moved to the Fiction section of the few libraries that haven’t banned them). How much money is Spencer’s hate mongering and fear mongering generating? According to the IRS Form 990 for his “non-profit” corporation Jihad Watch (just one of his sources of income from hate mongering) found here <http://www.guidestar.org/FinDocuments/2005/200/699/2005-200699967-024da7f8-9.pdf> he is paid \$80,000 dollars a year by his own non-profit corporation, where he is listed as the only employee. The form lists no other employees of the corporation, none at all. (It does, on the very last page, list five unpaid members of its “Board of Directors”, one of whom may not exist, another – Rebecca Bynum – is a partner of well known hate monger Joe Kaufman. See info on Kaufman here <http://hatewatchhallofshame.blogspot.com/search/label/Kaufman>.)

Add to the \$80,000 per year the income from his numerous books and his frequent speaking engagements, usually at right-wing gatherings, his frequent articles on well-known hate sites such as World Net Daily, Little Green Footballs, Townhall.com, and other right-wing extremist rags, and Spencer is making quite an income off of hatred, most likely well into six figures. Spencer also directly solicits on Amazon.com. While he

also sells his books (which have been banned in Muslim countries and even some US libraries), this is an outright appeal for donations. See <http://zme.amazon.com/exec/varzea/pay/T1XGJSUCZ0FRA8/058-9819273-6638005>

During WWII, actions like these were called “war profiteering” and were punishable as a federal crime.

I want to be clear, I have no problem whatsoever with someone being creative and showing the entrepreneurial spirit that made our country great, and earning a decent income. However, I have a big problem with someone earning a decent income on the basis of lies, deception, spreading enemy propaganda, supporting the enemy, and playing on the fears of Americans.

Another, or perhaps an additional motivation, is far darker, far more sinister.

The average American understands that after the 9/11 attacks, the United States is at war with terrorists, including extremist Islamist terrorists such as Usama bin Laden, who, despite being weakened, is still leading the main efforts against the United States. So far, UBL’s army of extremist Muslims only consists of about 4 to 5 percent of the world’s Muslims. However, UBL is waging a very well funded propaganda campaign to convince the world’s mainstream Muslims that the Western world is out to eliminate Islam, and that they are required, under 1,400 year old legal decisions in Islamic jurisprudence, to defend Islam and join his militant jihad on the “unbelievers” (Americans, British, etc.) Mainstream Muslim leaders are issuing thousands of condemnations to show the mainstream Muslims that UBL is very wrong in the perverted version of Islam that he teaches.

However, Robert Spencer states, time and again, that UBL’s preachings are the correct ones, and mainstream Muslims worldwide are required to follow these and make war on the Western world. Aside from the issue of greed and war profiteering, which we have already discussed, why would any American be very publicly claiming that these perverted teachings, calling for Muslim war on America, are the correct teachings of Islam? There seem to be only three possibilities:

- 1) Extraordinary ignorance, perhaps even willful ignorance.
- 2) Some sort of mental health issue, to the point of psychosis
- 3) A desire to aid and abet the enemy of the United States and see more Americans murdered

After reviewing all the facts presented in this article, carefully consider these three choices, and make your own decision. Then ask yourself an important question: Should Americans continue to fund Spencer’s efforts by buying his books, attending **his** speeches, and contributing to his website? Isn’t there something better for you to do with your money than indirectly fund those who want to murder Americans?

For those who will read this article, stay in denial, and label me a “terrorist lover”, “an Islamist supporter”, “anti-American” or whatever, keep in mind that if you make it all the

way to the end of this article, and consider the evidence presented with an open mind, you will see that Robert Spencer deserves to be exposed and condemned, as do all who engage in racism, bigotry, hate speech and working against the interests of the United States. Unlike Spencer, I already have done my years in the military, and I have no problems whatsoever with offering a little “9x19” therapy to anyone who is a terrorist. But unlike Spencer, I have no desire to spread enemy propaganda.

### **SOME GOVERNMENT PLANS THAT COULD INTERFERE WITH SPENCER:**

From : <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nsct/2006/sectionV.html>

*Cyber safehavens.* The Internet provides an inexpensive, anonymous, geographically unbounded, and largely unregulated virtual haven for terrorists. Our enemies use the Internet to develop and disseminate propaganda, recruit new members, raise and transfer funds, train members on weapons use and tactics, and plan operations. Terrorist organizations can use virtual safehavens based anywhere in the world, regardless of where their members or operatives are located. Use of the Internet, however, creates opportunities for us to exploit. To counter terrorist use of the Internet as a virtual sanctuary, we will discredit terrorist propaganda by promoting truthful and peaceful messages. We will seek ultimately to deny the Internet to the terrorists as an effective safehaven for their propaganda, proselytizing, recruitment, fund-raising, training, and operational planning.

<http://www.wired.com/techbiz/media/news/2002/11/56294>

The Council of Europe has adopted a measure that would criminalize Internet hate speech, including hyperlinks to pages that contain offensive content.

The [provision](#), which was passed by the council's decision-making body (the Committee of Ministers), updates the European [Convention on Cybercrime](#).

Specifically, the amendment bans "any written material, any image or any other representation of ideas or theories, which advocates, promotes or incites hatred, discrimination or violence, against any individual or group of individuals, based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, as well as religion if used as pretext for any of these factors." (also: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=201401>)

Landmark cases include -

**Zundel** - the 2002 [ruling](#) by the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal under the Canadian Human Rights Act that the Holocaust denial site hosted in the US but maintained in Canada by Ernst Zundel is unlawful

**Toben** - the 2000 ruling by the Australian Human Rights & Equal Opportunity Commission that Frederick Toben breached the Racial Discrimination Act and should [remove](#) Holocaust denial content from his site

**Yahoo France** - action by anti-racist groups under French vilification law against Yahoo and French ISPs for alleged "complicity in making available" Nazi propaganda from US sites such as [Front14](#) and enabling online auctions of Nazi memorabilia.

In addition to the Penfold paper noted above Yaman Akdeniz's *Case Analysis of the League Against Racism & Antisemitism (LICRA), French Union of Jewish Students, v Yahoo! Inc. (USA), Yahoo France (PDF)*, Joel Reidenberg's 2001 *The Yahoo Case & the International Democratization of the Internet (here)*, Benoît Frydman & Isabelle Rorive's 2002 [keynote](#) *Fighting Nazi and Anti-Semitic Material on the Internet: the Yahoo! Case & its Global Implications* and the snappy '[iBrief](#)' on the *Duke University Law Journal* site offer an introduction.

**Nuremberg Files** - litigation over a stridently anti-abortion [site](#) that has been seen by some as inciting violence against doctors, health workers and others offering services not the liking of the site's owners. The site operator is appealing against a damages ruling of around US\$107 million.

Internet Service Providers and Search engines who are becoming aggressive at enforcing their Terms of Service / Authorized Use Policy to block hate speech sites:

AOL, Earthlink, Google, Google News, Yahoo, SBC Global, AT&T, Prodigy, American Airlines, The US Navy, The US Marines, Navy Cyber Defense Operations Command, Navy Marine Corps Internet, MySpace.

**I'll leave you with a legal definition to ponder, and then the Appendix:**

**From the US Constitution, <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/data/constitution/article03/>**

**U.S. Constitution: Article III**

Article. III. [ [Annotations](#) ]

**Section 3.**

Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The Congress shall have Power to declare the Punishment of Treason, but no Attainder of Treason shall work Corruption of Blood, or Forfeiture except during the Life of the Person attainted.

## **APPENDIX (definitions & statutes):**

- First, Logical Fallacy definitions, then general definitions -

### **LOGICAL FALLACIES INFORMATION:**

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/appeal-to-fear.html>

Fallacy: Appeal to Fear

Also Known as: Scare Tactics, Appeal to Force, Ad Baculum

#### **Description of Appeal to Fear**

The Appeal to Fear is a fallacy with the following pattern:

- 1. Y is presented (a claim that is intended to produce fear).**
- 2. Therefore claim X is true (a claim that is generally, but need not be, related to Y in some manner).**

This line of "reasoning" is fallacious because creating fear in people does not constitute evidence for a claim.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/biased-sample.html>

#### **Description of Biased Sample**

This fallacy is committed when a person draws a conclusion about a population based on a sample that is biased or prejudiced in some manner. It has the following form:

- 1. Sample S, which is biased, is taken from population P.**
- 2. Conclusion C is drawn about Population P based on S.**

The person committing the fallacy is misusing the following type of reasoning, which is known variously as Inductive Generalization, Generalization, and Statistical Generalization:

- 1. X% of all observed A's are B's.**
- 2. Therefore X% of all A's are Bs.**

The fallacy is committed when the sample of A's is likely to be biased in some manner. A sample is biased or loaded when the method used to take the sample is likely to result in a sample that does not adequately represent the population from which it is drawn.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/false-dilemma.html>

### **Description of False Dilemma**

A False Dilemma is a fallacy in which a person uses the following pattern of "reasoning":

- 1. Either claim X is true or claim Y is true (when X and Y could both be false).**
- 2. Claim Y is false.**
- 3. Therefore claim X is true.**

This line of "reasoning" is fallacious because if both claims could be false, then it cannot be inferred that one is true because the other is false.

Example: Spencer claims that Muslims must obey the 1,200 year old jurists and make war to take over the world, or else they are not true Muslims and will be killed for their apostasy.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/guilt-by-association.html>

### **Description of Guilt By Association**

Guilt by Association is a fallacy in which a person rejects a claim simply because it is pointed out that people she dislikes accept the claim. This sort of "reasoning" has the following form:

- 1. It is pointed out that people person A does not like accept claim P.**
- 2. Therefore P is false**

It is clear that sort of "reasoning" is fallacious. For example the following is obviously a case of poor "reasoning": "You think that  $1+1=2$ . But, Adolf Hitler, Charles Manson, Joseph Stalin, and Ted Bundy all believed that  $1+1=2$ . So, you shouldn't believe it."

Example: Spencer rejects an overwhelming number of Muslim leaders who condemn terrorism simply because Muslims (at least the vast majority) whom he condemns (as a class of people and as a religious people) accept the claim.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/questionable-cause.html>

### **Description of Questionable Cause**

This fallacy has the following general form:

1. A and B are associated on a regular basis.
2. Therefore A is the cause of B.

**The general idea behind this fallacy is that it is an error in reasoning to conclude that one thing causes another simply because the two are associated on a regular basis. More formally, this fallacy is committed when it is concluded that A is the cause of B simply because they are associated on a regular basis. The error being made is that a causal conclusion is being drawn from inadequate evidence.**

Example: The media frequently mentions “Islamic” or “Islamist” or “Muslim” with news about terrorism, so Spencer assumes (incorrectly) that Islam is the cause of all terrorism.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/misleading-vividness.html>

#### Description of Misleading Vividness

Misleading Vividness is a fallacy in which a very small number of particularly dramatic events are taken to outweigh a significant amount of statistical evidence. This sort of "reasoning" has the following form:

- 1. Dramatic or vivid event X occurs (and is not in accord with the majority of the statistical evidence) .**
- 2. Therefore events of type X are likely to occur.**

This sort of "reasoning" is fallacious because the mere fact that an event is particularly vivid or dramatic does not make the event more likely to occur, especially in the face of significant statistical evidence.

Example: Spencer claims that all Muslims are out to attack anyone who is not Islamic, despite the fact that a very, very small percentage of worldwide Muslims are extremist terrorists, and the fact that the vast, overwhelming majority of Muslims condemn terrorism.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/straw-man.html>

#### Description of Straw Man

The Straw Man fallacy is committed when a person simply ignores a person's actual position and substitutes a distorted, exaggerated or misrepresented version of that position. This sort of "reasoning" has the following pattern:

- 1. Person A has position X.**
- 2. Person B presents position Y (which is a distorted version of X).**
- 3. Person B attacks position Y.**

#### **4. Therefore X is false/incorrect/flawed.**

This sort of "reasoning" is fallacious because attacking a distorted version of a position simply does not constitute an attack on the position itself.

Example: Spencer is presented with an overwhelming number of condemnations of terrorism from current Muslim leaders, worldwide. In response, he uses a Strawman argument that Muslim jurists from 1,200 years ago said something else.

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/ad-hominem.html>

#### **Description of Ad Hominem**

Translated from Latin to English, "Ad Hominem" means "against the man" or "against the person."

An Ad Hominem is a general category of fallacies in which a claim or argument is rejected on the basis of some irrelevant fact about the author of or the person presenting the claim or argument. Typically, this fallacy involves two steps. First, an attack against the character of person making the claim, her circumstances, or her actions is made (or the character, circumstances, or actions of the person reporting the claim). Second, this attack is taken to be evidence against the claim or argument the person in question is making (or presenting). This type of "argument" has the following form:

- 1. Person A makes claim X.**
- 2. Person B makes an attack on person A.**
- 3. Therefore A's claim is false.**

Example: Spencer is presented with an overwhelming amount of evidence that a large number of mainstream Muslim leaders condemn terrorism. In response, he uses ad hominem (insults) to try to focus attention on the messenger and distract from the evidence.

<http://www.logicalfallacies.info/redherring.html>

#### **Red Herring**

##### **Explanation**

The red herring is as much a debate tactic as it is a logical fallacy. It is a fallacy of distraction, and is committed when a listener attempts to divert an arguer from his argument by introducing another topic. This can be one of the most frustrating, and effective, fallacies to observe.

Example: When presented with current Muslim leaders who condemn terrorism, Spencer responds "This 1,200 year old Islamic legal ruling says all non-Muslims must die!"

<http://www.logicalfallacies.info/notruescotsman.html>

## 'No True Scotsman'

### Explanation

The no true Scotsman fallacy is a way of reinterpreting evidence in order to prevent the refutation of one's position. Proposed counter-examples to a theory are dismissed as irrelevant solely because they are counter-examples, but purportedly because they are not what the theory is about.

### Example

If Angus, a Glaswegian, who puts sugar on his porridge, is proposed as a counter-example to the claim No Scotsman puts sugar on his porridge, the 'No true Scotsman' fallacy would run as follows:

- (1) Angus puts sugar on his porridge.
- (2) No (true) Scotsman puts sugar on his porridge.

Therefore:

- (3) Angus is not a (true) Scotsman.

Therefore:

- (4) Angus is not a counter-example to the claim that no Scotsman puts sugar on his porridge.

Example: The vast majority of the world's Muslims reject terrorism and militant jihad.

Spencer: Usama bin Laden and 1,200 year old Muslim jurists say that terrorism and militant jihad must be used.

Spencer: Therefore, Muslims who reject terrorism and militant jihad are not (true) Muslims.

<http://m-w.com/dictionary/non%20sequitur>

### non sequitur

One entry found for **non sequitur**.

Main Entry: **non se·qui·tur** 

Pronunciation: 'nän-'se-kw&-t&r *also* -"tur

Function: *noun*

Etymology: Latin, it does not follow

**1** : an inference that does not follow from the premises; *specifically* : a fallacy resulting from a simple conversion of a universal affirmative proposition or from the transposition

of a condition and its consequent **2** : a statement (as a response) that does not follow logically from or is not clearly related to anything previously said

Example: I explained to Spencer that all forms of terrorism must be identified and dealt with, no matter what the underlying ideology, religion or cause, that terrorism is terrorism, and all of it is wrong, all of it is dangerous, no matter who is involved in it.

Spencer: All doctors should be general practitioners. (Honest to God, he wrote that in an email response to the above.)

## **GENERAL DEFINITIONS:**

### **AIDING AND ABETTING:** [Aiding and Abetting/Accessory - Findlaw for the Public -](#)

A criminal charge of aiding and abetting or accessory can usually be brought against anyone who helps in the commission of a crime, though legal distinctions vary by state. A person charged with aiding and abetting or accessory is usually not present when the crime itself is committed, but he or she has knowledge of the crime before or after the fact, and may assist in its commission through advice, actions, or financial support. Depending on the degree of involvement, the offender's participation in the crime may rise to the level of [conspiracy](#). [criminal.findlaw.com](#)

## **ALLPORT'S SCALE**

**Allport's Scale** is a measure of the manifestation of prejudice in a society. It is also referred to as **Allport's Scale of Prejudice and Discrimination** or **Allport's Scale of Prejudice**. It was devised by psychologist Gordon Allport in *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954).

## **ANTILOCUTION**

**Antilocution** is a term defined by psychologist Gordon Allport in his book *The Nature of Prejudice*, 1954. Antilocution defines verbal remarks against a person, group or community, which are not addressed directly to the target. Generally referred to as "talking behind someone's back," the impact of this is often overlooked. However because antilocution creates an environment where discrimination is acceptable, it frequently progresses to other more damaging forms of prejudiced behavior. Its use is overshadowed by the more modern term "hate speech" which has almost the same meaning.

**DOMESTIC EXTREMISTS:** Also known as Islamophobes, homophobes, racists, bigots, eco-terrorists, anarchists, neo-Nazis, white separatists, Christian Identity, Armagedonites, domestic terrorists, (also by the individual group names such as listed in the article above.) Persons or groups who claim various ideologies, causes and purposes, all of which target a specific group of people, or a specific government, with hate speech, hate crimes, and violence, sometimes to the point of terrorism. They frequently used twisted, perverted, out of context religious texts as justification for their own agenda, often being afraid that revealing their real agenda would expose them to ridicule. These individuals and groups often violate United States Code Title 18, Section 2331 (5), as follows:

[http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cascode/uscodes/18/parts/i/chapters/113b/sections/section\\_2331.html](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cascode/uscodes/18/parts/i/chapters/113b/sections/section_2331.html)

- (5) the term "domestic terrorism" means activities that -
- (A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State;
  - (B) appear to be intended -
    - (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;
    - (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or
    - (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and
  - (C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

**ENEMY PROPAGANDA** is propaganda (as defined under Propaganda below) on behalf of the enemy or spread by the enemy, such as what bin Laden or Spencer spread. Of course, some would define what Spencer spreads as something else. See: Propaganda (below)

Propaganda minister of the Third Reich, Joseph Goebbels, said it in a famous quote that should be recited here in full lest we forget how the enemy thinks:

*'If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it.'*

**From the White House:** <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nsct/2006/sectionV.html>  
*Propaganda operations*, which are used by terrorists to justify violent action as well as inspire individuals to support or join the movement. The ability of terrorists to exploit the Internet and 24/7 worldwide media coverage allows them to bolster their prominence as well as feed a steady diet of radical ideology, twisted images, and conspiracy theories to potential recruits in all corners of the globe. Besides a global reach, these technologies allow terrorists to propagate their message quickly, often before an effective counter to terrorist messages can be coordinated and distributed. These are force multipliers for our enemy.

**ETHNIC CLEANSING:** Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)

ethnic cleansing

–noun the elimination of an unwanted ethnic group or groups from a society, as by genocide or forced emigration.

[Origin: 1985–90]

Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1) Based on the Random House Unabridged Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2006. Also see: (most recent examples) WWII Holocaust, Rwanda, Purge of Armenians by the Turks 1915, Jewish Genocide by Ukrainians 1910, Cambodians under Khmer Rouge 1970's, Bosnian Muslims in former Yugoslavia 1990's, Slaughter of Tutsis by Hutus in Rwanda 1994 and the current situation in Darfur.

**HATE SPEECH**

Hate speech is a term for speech intended to degrade, intimidate, or incite violence or prejudicial action against a person or group of people based on their race, gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, language ability, moral or political views, socioeconomic class, occupation or appearance (such as height, weight, and hair color). The term covers written as well as oral communication and some forms of behaviors in a public setting. It is also sometimes called antilocution and is the first point on Allport's scale which measures prejudice in a society.

**ISLAMIST EXTREMISTS:** Also known as Islamists, Islamic terrorists, Muslim terrorists, (also by the individual group names such as Al Qaeda, HAMAS, Hezbollah, etc.) Persons or groups who claim to be Muslims, and teach, proclaim and believe a version of the Islamic faith that is not consistent with the Qur'an and ahadiths. The version taught, proclaimed and believed by Islamist extremists takes Qur'anic verses out of context, fails to recognize that history has voided certain medieval beliefs held by several religions; they also cite antiquated and sometimes obscure legal rulings from the 7<sup>th</sup> Century as part of their justification for using violence against anyone they target. They frequently used twisted, perverted, out of context religious texts as justification for their own agenda, often being afraid that revealing their real agenda would expose them to ridicule. These individuals and groups often violate United States Code, Section 2331(1), as follows:

- (1) the term "international terrorism" means activities that -
  - (A) involve violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed

within the jurisdiction of the United States or of any State;

(B) appear to be intended -

(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and

(C) occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or transcend national boundaries in terms of the means by which they are accomplished, the persons they appear intended to intimidate or coerce, or the locale in which their perpetrators operate or seek asylum;

**NARCISSISM**: Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1) - Cite This Source

nar·cis·sism / [nahr-suh-siz-em] Pronunciation

–noun 1. inordinate fascination with oneself; excessive self-love; vanity.

2. Psychoanalysis. erotic gratification derived from admiration of one's own physical or mental attributes, being a normal condition at the infantile level of personality development.

Also, nar·cism / [nahr-siz-uhm] [Origin: 1815–25; < G Narzissismus. See narcissus, -ism]

*Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1) Based on the Random House Unabridged Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2006.*

**PROPAGANDA** Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1) -

prop·a·gan·da [prop-uh-gan-duh] Pronunciation

–noun 1. information, ideas, or rumors deliberately spread widely to help or harm a person, group, movement, institution, nation, etc.

2. the deliberate spreading of such information, rumors, etc.

3. the particular doctrines or principles propagated by an organization or movement.

4. Roman Catholic Church. a. a committee of cardinals, established in 1622 by Pope Gregory XV, having supervision over foreign missions and the training of priests for these missions.

b. a school (College of Propaganda) established by Pope Urban VIII for the education of priests for foreign missions.

5. Archaic. an organization or movement for the spreading of propaganda.

[Origin: 1710–20; < NL, short for congregātiō dé propāgandā fidé congregation for propagating the faith; propāgandā, abl. sing. fem. gerundive of propāgāre; see propagate] Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)

Based on the Random House Unabridged Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2006.

**RACIST**: Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1) - Cite This Source

rac·ism / [rey-siz-uhm] –noun 1. a belief or doctrine that inherent differences among the various human races determine cultural or individual achievement, usually involving the idea that one's own race is superior and has the right to rule others.

2. a policy, system of government, etc., based upon or fostering such a doctrine; discrimination.

3. hatred or intolerance of another race or other races.

Based on the Random House Unabridged Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2006.

**SURROUND**: American Heritage Dictionary - Cite This Source sur·round (sə·round') Pronunciation Key tr.v. sur·round·ed, sur·round·ing, sur·rounds

To extend on all sides of simultaneously; encircle.

To enclose or confine on all sides so as to bar escape or outside communication.

*The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*

**TEMPORAL REMOTENESS**: A point in time far away from the present. The opposite of Temporal Proximity. Judges look for temporal proximity in considering case law, that is, they look for the rulings (case law) that are closest in time to the current time. Temporal remoteness would involve looking for rulings that are farthest in time away from current times. News editors use temporal proximity to look for the most current news stories, they do not use temporal remoteness to report on something that happened thousands of years ago in their effort to report on current news.

EXAMPLE: Spencer continually claims that Islamic legal rulings from 1,400 years ago are binding on Muslims today.

**WILLFUL IGNORANCE**: *Willful* ignorance is a bad faith decision to avoid becoming informed about something so as to avoid having to make undesirable decisions that such information might prompt. Rather than being based on low intelligence or missing knowledge, this is the stupidity of closed-mindedness and willful ignorance.

### **SECTION THREE – STATUTES:**

(Statutes are laws that have been codified – defined and placed into the law books as part of the legal “code”)

<http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/crim/241fin.htm>

Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 - Conspiracy Against Rights

This statute makes it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person of any state, territory or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him/her by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, (or because of his/her having exercised the same).

It further makes it unlawful for two or more persons to go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another with the intent to prevent or hinder his/her free exercise or enjoyment of any rights so secured.

Punishment varies from a fine or imprisonment of up to ten years, or both; and if death results, or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years, or for life, or may be sentenced to death.

[http://www.firstfreedom.gov/ff\\_biascrimes.html](http://www.firstfreedom.gov/ff_biascrimes.html)

There is perhaps no religious right as basic as the right to gather for worship or simply walk down the street without fear of being attacked because of one's faith. The Civil Rights Division's Criminal Section, in conjunction with U.S. Attorney's Offices around the country, prosecutes violations of criminal civil rights statutes. In the area of religion-based bias crimes against individuals, these include 18 U.S.C. § 241 (conspiracy to deprive a person of his or her civil rights), 18 U.S.C. § 245 (criminal interference with federally protected activities), and 42 U.S.C. § 3631 (criminal interference with housing rights).

[US CODE: Title 18,2388. Activities affecting armed forces during war](#)

TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 115 > § 2388

§ 2388. Activities affecting armed forces during war

(a) Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies; or  
Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or willfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so—  
Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

[US CODE: Title 18,2384. Seditious conspiracy](#)

TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 115 > § 2384

§ 2384. Seditious conspiracy

If two or more persons in any State or Territory, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by force to seize, take, or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.