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Sam Harris is the best voice out there, IMO, but this is not his best effort, by far. Majid Nawas should stay in the game...and raise his. Yet, I cant think of anyone to whom I would recommend this book. Nawas’ Quillian Foundation does useful work. I read dr. Usama Hasan’s “From Dhimmitude to Democracy” [...] which Nawas promotes. Yes there were voices for Islamic reform, but the prophet’s voice alas is not among them. What Nawas blasts as the “vacuous” or de-contextualized reading of the texts is what others would call the obvious, or prima facie or generally accepted reading. Examples like the Koranic prohibition of wine (does it prohibit beer?) should sensitize jihadis to the need for context. If Harris weren’t so deferential he would make short work of this. “kill them wherever you find them. Drive them out of the places from which they drove you. Idolatry is worse than carnage. (Koran 2 :193) Make war upon them until idolatry shall cease and God's religion shall reign supreme. (Koran 8:40)” After you contextualize this, what does “kill them” mean? does it mean “Don’t kill them?” Pity that eg 14th century Hanbali jurist Ibn Taymiya (whose Mardin declaration Hasan praises so highly) got the context wrong: “Therefore, since jihad is divinely instituted, and its goal is that religion reverts in its entirety to Allah and to make Allah's word triumph, whoever opposes the realization of this goal will be fought, according to the unanimous opinion of Muslims... The wives of infidels must also be reduced to slavery and the possessions of infidels must be confiscated.” (Cited in Bat Yeor Islam and Dhimmitude, pp 44-45)

How about context from the 1948 Geneva convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide: “In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national ethnic racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberate]y inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its
physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.” The Koran preaches and the prophet practiced genocide (like Moses). Muslim scholars at Al Azhar in 1994 found linguist Nasr Abu Zayd guilty of apostasy inter alia for his “denunciation... of the permissibility of the ownership of slave girls, a principle considered religiously proven without doubt " (p. 16 of the judicial opinion) [...]. They refuse to declare Al Baghda
di an apostate. Zayd has to flee for his life, Al Baghdadi gets a free pass. So Majid, I was wondering whether I should attack my neighbor, confiscate his possessions, kill him, rape his wife and sell his kids into slavery if he doesn’t accept Islam, what do you think? Majid says “lets contextualize verse 8:40”?! Let us first agree that Taymiya preached genocide. Later we can help god express himself more clearly.

Undecided says:

I don't see how this has any relevance to the book? Your screed has context but can you relate it to this book, the author, the content, or their arguments? It seems more like a hit-and-run because of your ideology and agenda than an objective review.

Roger M. Cooke says:

Thanks for your comment. I don't see these things as book reviews in the sens of The New York Review of Books, but rather as an explanation why one did or didn't like it. My point is that there is a serious conflict between islam - from the primary sources - and modern morality as set down in eg the Geneva
conventions. Given that very large moral issue, its a bit disingenuous to focus on hermeneutics, as if that moral issue didn't exist. That's what Nawas does. Harris is so deferential that he lets Nawas get away with this. "The prejudice of low expectations?" My review is things I think Harris should have said. Hope this explains.

Daniel G. Schaeffer says:

Thanks, Mr. Cooke. I saw the Harvard "debate" and here goes. I suspect that Harris has resigned himself to the obvious fact that supporting whatever sincere moderates he can find is a possible way of helping save lives, and I sensed an unnerving constant sense of patronization going on between both men.

Nawaz is fighting a losing battle, I suspect. I've seen a number of debates between him and other spokesmen on YouTube reprints of BBC programs, and they clearly secretly loathe him for being too forthright. Essentially, the Koran is totalitarian, and cannot be reformed.

To any astute third party readers: to find out why this is so, read Ibn Warraq's classic "Why I Am Not a Muslim." I review it, BTW. He wrote this in honor of Rushdie, and he's under a death sentence himself for doing so. That says something important about Islam.

Roger M. Cooke says:

Daniel
Our posts are crossing. Thanks for your thoughts...I suspect you may be right about Harris. Ibn Warraq should get back in the ring - if he's still alive.
Daniel G. Schaeffer says:

I gather he is, and what he should do is get hold of Dawkins and write up essays for Salon. With Warraq's scholarship and Dawkins' vinegar wit, they'd make a great team. Of course Salon might not approve, but maybe they could do an online hangout on YouTube with Sargon of Akkad, ThunderFOOt, Gad Saad, the Unstoppable Kangaroo, etc. As a lot of people have pointed out, Maajid's sales pitch is no different from what we get from Aslan or Ramadan, even if his intentions are different. None of it is convincing.

Reply to this post

Earlerich667 says:

I would be interested to know whether you feel that this conflict between Islam - from the primary sources - and modern morality also exists between Christianity - from the old testament - and modern morality. While this may seem off topic, to me this is THE real question, because it seems to me many apologists for the "context" approach are seeking parallel treatment for moderate Moslems and moderate Christians. (Most Christians, despite claiming to follow the Bible, do not advocate the brutal practices advocated therein.) In your view, can we draw such parallels? Is the fact that there exists no Christian equivalent of ISIS a result of fundamental differences between Islam and Christianity, or is it instead a result of Christianity having been "domesticated" along with the industrial revolution and the modern age while Islam was not? I am interested to hear your thoughts.

You replied with a later post

Roger M. Cooke says:

Thanks for these thoughts. I agree that the father of Jesus, the god of the covenant, violates modern notions of morality, big time (Deuteronomy 8.5, 20.13, 20.16, 33/34, Numbers 31.2, 31.17/18, etc etc). Jesus pf the gospel is much better, at least there is no scriptural evidence that he committed war crimes, though verses like John 15.6, Luke 11.23 and Mathew 10.34 can be
read as legitimating violence. You ask a very interesting question whether there is a christian ISIS, an if not why? I could easily imagine an orthodox Jewish ISIS, their core beliefs have many similarities. However, the primary sources for christians - the gospel - simply does not provide the legitimization of war crimes as we find in the Koran and the Old Testament, IMO. That said, the catholic church rivaled the depravity of ISIS when it had the power to do so - except for rape of slaves. These tidbits are less accessible, so I quote some; The Decree of the Council of Toulouse in 1229 Art.3: "The lords temporal shall diligently hunt out heretics in such towns, houses, and forests as they use for their meetings, and shall cause these haunts of theirs to be destroyed". Art. 10 "Those who return to unity with the Catholic Church through fear of death or for some other motive rather than of their own free will, shall be cast into prison by the Bishop..." Art. 14 "Lay persons are forbidden to possess the Books of the Old and the New Testament, with the exception of the Psalter, the Breviary and the Book of Hours of the Blessed Virgin, and it is rigorously forbidden to possess even these in the vernacular tongue." The Bull Ad extirpanda of 1252: " The head of state or ruler must force all the heretics whom he has in custody, provided he does so without killing them or breaking their arms or legs, as actual robbers and murderers of souls and thieves of the sacraments of God and Christian faith, to confess their errors and accuse other heretics whom they know." The Bull Summis desiderantes affectibus of 1484: "...many persons of both sexes...have abandoned themselves to devils, incubi and succubi, and by their incantations, spells conjurations and other accursed charms and crafts...have slain infants yet in the mother’s womb, ...have blasted the produce of the earth...they hinder men from performing the sexual act and women from conceiving...over and above this, they blasphemously renounce the Faith...whereby they outrage the Divine Majesty ....We decree and enjoin that the aforesaid Inquisitors be empowered to proceed to the just correction, imprisonment, and punishment of any persons, without let or hindrance,...[the inquisitor] may by Our authority aggravate and renew these penalties as often as he list, calling in, if so please him, the help of the secular arm. ...[should any man oppose this] upon him will fall the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Aspostles Peter and Paul."

So I think the christian's margin for boasting is quite narrow. Worshiping war criminals doesn't help mankind domesticate itself, and I believe that public shaming all immoral gods may help avoid another inter-faith series of conflicts.
Daniel G. Schaeffer says:

Thanks, Mr. Cooke, and E667. If I may add a few thoughts of my own here, it has often struck me that one of the most important reasons why it was RELATIVELY easy to separate religion and politics in western Christianity is that Pauline Christianity was originally an attempt to form a sect of heretical "Septuagint" Greek Jews that would get along well enough with the Roman empire, and the Gospels portrayed a Jesus who would have approved.

The resulting Greek church became the official religion of the Roman empire -- something that Paul could never have foreseen -- and the later Russian church was comfortably in bed with the Tzars. As the Latin church gradually took over northwest Europe, it happened to convert a lot of different ethnic groups and traditions, primarily Teutonic, Norse and Celtic, who were psychologically and politically very different from the people of the more settled east. Consequently, the Church had to make a devil's bargain with the local kings, chieftains and emperors as to what constituted the sacred and secular realms of law. The resulting political and cultural stresses are among the factors that enabled the Renaissance and later the Reformation to happen. None of this happened in the east, which is why the intellectual history of these places is something of a snoozefest.

There was a third stream of Christianities in the far east that claimed descent from James, the Brother of Jesus, the theology of which was essentially derived from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and which later made such heavy contributions to the Koran. Check out Robert Eisenman's stuff on all this, if you have the time and energy. In fact the earliest Koran discovered was written in Aramaic. And as the Arab empire and Islam invented themselves, the whole thing became what is still called "a total way of life," i.e. a primitive and COMPARATIVELY benign form of totalitarianism.

Which is why Maajid Nawaz is such an anomaly. His cerebral cortex may be Muslim, but from the neck down he's a Brit. And the heir to the John Stuart Mill who inspired Ayaan. Which in turn is why he gets along better with atheists than Muslims, and why this book will probably have little if any effect in Dar al Islam.

You replied with a later post
Roger M. Cooke says:

Thanks for these thoughts. When I think separation of church and state, I think enlightenment, Spinoza, Port Royal, then JS Mill and the Brits, then Kant, and then I think that none of that would have emerged but for Luther, the thirty years war, and finally the Industrial revolution. Who was Paul? I found Hermann Detering's The Fabricated Paul quite interesting. Although the separation of church and state became law with the American and French revolutions, the Church didn't accept it until the Vatican II in 1965. Even then they didn't REALLY accept it, read carefully what they said "the C C recognizes the truths of other religions". That says, to the extent they say what we say, we agree. Anyway I think the key point is that the gross immoralities of the catholic church were very poorly grounded in the fundamental texts of the gospel. In contrast, the Koran is just blatantly immoral, cover to cover. I think a 'reform islam' isn't islam. Ayan Hirsi Ali is deluding herself. What is the title of Eisenmann's book?

Daniel G. Schaeffer says:

Eisenman"s book? He's got several! The DSS and the First Christians contains his most crucial stuff. I give it a lengthy review. This is a series of rather technical papers on the Scrolls which show that it's likely that The Righteous Teacher was James, while The Spouter of Lies was Paul, which makes the Scrolls the first Christian documents (and Jesus himself a comparatively unimportant figure in Jewish politics at the time, which may well have something to do with the fact that the Jews never cared whether he existed or not. They have no reason to). The follow-up, James the Brother of Jesus, is really heavy stuff, very picky and repetitious, but you can get the general drift just by reading the intro.

The material in the Scrolls themselves, if you should ever read them -- I used the Vermez translation -- are much like the Koran. Propaganda for the upcoming "mother of all battles," picky regulations, and lurid descriptions of Hell; as Eisenman says "xenophbic in the extreme."

He came out with a third a few years ago, which reputedly has a lot to do with "gnostic" symbolism and eventually Islam, but I haven't gotten around to it.
yet. Tom Holland's recent "In the Shadow of the Sword" (for which he's gotten the usual death threats, of course) I found sufficient.

And re:the RCC, I was raised Catholic at the time, and wow -- we all thought a new day was dawning. Fat chance. I now think it was all rather like Kruschev's Big Thaw or Mao's "Hundred Flowers" speech: "Let's just let these liberals show their heads above water, then we'll REALLY get 'em." And I think they picked Francis just to wash the taste of Ratzinger out of the world's mouth. A genuine, great fellah, but I think he's being used. I suspect there are a lot of cardinals who are praying he'll die soon.