

Principalities and Powers, Islam and Christendom, Parts 2 and 3

By Bob Vincent

Bible Text: Matthew 12:43-46; Daniel 10

Preached on: Sunday, October 24, 2004

Grace Presbyterian Church

4900 Jackson Street

Alexandria, LA 71303-2509

Website: <http://www.rbvincent.com>

Online Sermons: <http://rbvincent.sermonaudio.com>

By way of a quick review I mentioned that I saw several indications as we looked in the 10th chapter of Daniel at a particular type of demonic entity, a principality. We saw how the prince of Persia was at one time dominant over God's people, the people of Israel and Judah. But then in the sovereignty of God – and we must never lose sight of the fact. If we lose sight of the sovereignty of God then we find ourselves given over to a spirit of fear and that's not what God wants you to have. But we need to be aware of what we're up against. But in the providence of God, in the sovereignty of God the spirit of Persia began to wane and the spirit of Greece began to wax.

We need to understand that if we have a biblical view of history, history is not simply due to this fortuitous circumstance or this fortuitous circumstance or this great person or that great person, it is due to the fact that the world itself is a fallen world and under the judgment of God. And because it is such a world as that the world has come under the lordship and the dominion of Satan to some degree. And I want to underscore that – to some degree. That's why Satan is called the god of this world. He's the prince of the power of the air. And so the unfolding of human events is not due to bright people. But it's due to God, in his sovereignty, having sovereignly permitted the evil one to exercise a certain measure of control. Let me illustrate it with three revolutions for a moment before I shift into where we are. And I didn't cover this this morning, but it helps to kind of flesh out things before we move on.

There are three great revolutions when I think about modern times and contrast to things. Let's think, first of all, of the American Revolution. The American Revolution is unique in that there were huge numbers of Bible believing Christians involved in the American Revolution. And therefore, there was never an absolute contempt for authority. It wasn't simply individual radicals running out here with violence to destroy civilization. The American Revolution begins through lawfully elected representatives coming together and deciding – like the Continental Congress – that they are going to distant themselves from the authority of Great Britain. Whether the American Revolution, or War for Independence, is right or wrong, it was not a chaotic revolution as such. In many ways it's a mistake to call the War of Independence a revolution because it's one set of authorities, government authorities, lawful authorities, waging war against another group.

But I want to contrast that with the French Revolution. In the French Revolution, like the

Russian one, begins somewhat mildly but then gets in the hands of crazy people. And the French Revolution ends up being a blood bath. And out of that blood bath there comes a single man who eventually seizes power. And that's Napoleon Bonaparte. In other words, it's the bloodiness of the reign of terror with people like Robespierre that paves the way for an antichrist – not *the* antichrist – an antichrist by the name of Napoleon who rises out of this. And in the French Revolution – very different from the American Revolution – they are radically different things in history. And we must never forget that even though a lot of people would like to blur it. They are radically different.

The American Revolution did not overthrow any basic social structure, religious structure, cultural structure in America. But the French Revolution overthrew all of that and, for example, takes a prostitute, puts her on the throne and marches her in to Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris, France as the embodiment of reason. So, you see, in the French Revolution there's a truly radical thing that overthrows all that's decent and good and what not. And it paves the way that out of the chaos and the blood bath of the reign of terror comes a Napoleon who does such damage in Europe.

Then let's look at the Russian Revolution; another example of a revolution radically different than the American War for Independence. And in the Russian Revolution under the most profoundly autocratic rule in all of Europe – the Czars – you have a movement because of the weakness of Czar Nicholas II, the last of the Romanoffs. You have the beginning of a revolution through the Mensheviks. The leader of the Mensheviks who becomes head of the state for a brief period of time in 1917 Kerensky eventually emigrates to America.

But there was a very moderate revolution, not unlike the spirit of the American Revolution. But what happens is, because of the differences in the eastern and western calendar it's called the Octoberist Revolution, but it's really November 17th. What happens is a group of radical, God-hating, immoral chaos breathing men and women seize power. They seize the battleship *Aurora*. And they force the surrender of the Mensheviks and they seize power. And that's the Bolsheviks. And they're bloody people. They rule with a reign of terror. They are cruel. And they suppress the Russian people for decades.

And so what I want to say is that...how did these things happen? Why was the American Revolution different from the French and different from the Russian? I submit to you the American Revolution was different than the other two because the spirit in America was different than that that was ruling over France and ruling over Russia.

Now, I want to make this point that I made this morning. I want to reiterate it and make it much more clearly. Christianity and the Church should not be confused with Christendom. Christendom is simply what? It's the Roman Empire influenced by Christianity. It's not perfect. It's not always good, but in my view, of all of the forms of government or ways of life, that's better than forms of government because Christendom has had monarchies and republics and lots of other things. But of all of the ways of life that this world has known throughout its history, Christendom has produced the best.

And particularly Christendom in the wake of the Reformation because in the Reformation there's this great sense of the right of every man and woman to pick up the Bible and read it and understand for himself and herself. And out of that comes a sense of self-government and accountability that profoundly affected governments. Without the Reformation there would have been no United States.

And I want to say one last thing on that before I pick it up into the modern world. Democracy, as we know it – call it whatever you will. By democracy I'm not even referring to a form of government, I'm referring more to a sense of human rights and a way of approaching life that things like trial by jury, limited government, representative government – that didn't just happen in history. It's the result of historical processes that God was intimately involved in. And if you want to look at where America came from in terms of its basic way of life in terms of government and rights, we go back to the field at Runnymede in England when the Barons forced King John in 1215 to sign the Magna Charta.

What's significant about the Magna Charta? The significance of the Magna Charta lies in one basic principle: limitation of government; the concept of limited government as over against the kind of thing with the Romanoffs in Russia of autocracy and absolute authority. So we have limited government as far back as 1215 when King John is forced to sign the Magna Charta. That really comes to a head in what's called the Second Reformation.

And in the Second Reformation – the first Reformation occurs in the 16th century with people like Luther and Calvin and Huss and Zwingli and Knox. But the Second Reformation is what occurs in Scotland and England in the following century – the 17th century. In that century there is a book that you need to know about. And it's called *Lex Rex*. And the author of that book was a Presbyterian preacher by the name of Samuel Rutherford. *Lex Rex* is Latin. It means “law is king.”

This is a fundamental defining document that paves the way for what we have in America. The law is king. And by that, again, we're saying that what? Going back to the principles of Magna Charta; limited government. There are checks and balances. There is a basic sense of realizing human beings are depraved. And because of human depravity, human selfishness and the tendency that we all have to go nuts eventually, no one is given absolute authority. There are checks and balances. And there are documents that are difficult to change and amend that hold government's power in check.

I'm submitting to you that a biblical understanding of these things is to say that they are not only the result of God's sovereignty, but they are also the result – if we really reflect on what's being set forth in that pulling back of the veil of Daniel 10 – they are conflicts; or rather we should say there are various ruling spirits or principalities that rise in dominance and fall in dominance.

And so what we have in America didn't just happen because people were creative. It's a result of historical process that involves principalities and powers in high places under the overarching sovereignty of God.

Now, in the West there has been a basic optimism even in times of pessimism. Now, let me say what I mean. A basic optimism even in times of pessimism; and by that is a sense of: Our way of thinking is right. The values that we hold to are right. The way that momma and daddy brought us up is right. The teachings of the Church are right. What we learn from our neighbors is right. Our way of life is right.

Now, what have seen happen in Europe in the 20th century? After World War I the ruling spirit in Europe, as I have been given to see this, and I'm not purporting to have any unique insight or special revelation. I'm simply looking at history in light of the teaching of Daniel 10. That's all I'm doing. I'm looking at history in the light of Daniel 10.

So in looking at history in the light of Daniel 10 what happens in Europe in the wake of World War I is a profound pessimism comes over Europe. Why?

Before World War I almost the entirety of Europe is ruled by fairly benevolent monarchies; many of them constitutionally limited. And there are beginnings of a basic enlightened sense of human rights and welfare, the protection of citizens and some limitations on the power of government; but still with a monarch at the top in one way or another. As in Great Britain it's roughly symbolic and not absolute at all after what happened in the Second Reformation. And in the Second Reformation you have civil war in Great Britain in the 1700s and the king is actually executed out of the principles of *Lex Rex*, the law is king. The king is actually executed and he's put on trial for treason and executed for treason in England in the 17th century.

And so, again, this limitation on government.

What happens is that Europe, after World War I buys into pessimism big time. And it essentially rejects Christianity as the defining motif of its approach to life. In other words, World War I, in Europe, is the beginning of the end of Christendom. World War I is the beginning of the end of Christendom in Europe. Christian values begin to diminish in their influence.

And what happens in the wake of that? Well, it's easy to see. Just as the French Revolution gave us Robespierre and other people and eventually Napoleon, so what happens in the wake of the collapse of Christian values in Europe; give us people like Mussolini and Adolf Hitler.

And just as the Russian Revolution that begins with maybe noble ideas, but stupid ideas failing to take into account human depravity, they give us Lenin and then his successor who is even more of a monster, Stalin.

So Europe then goes into a period of pessimism and a rejection of Christianity.

Now, I spoke this morning in terms of evidence of this pessimism is a declining birth rate. And there are wonderful exceptions to that even in America. There are lots of Christians that have lots of kids. So, I'm not saying that the pessimism is absolute and totally pervasive, but taken as a whole, Europe represents a dying civilization. I mean, it really does. Europe represents a dying civilization, a kind of jaded defeat dying civilization because it's lost its sense of Christian identity. And that's what gave such an impetus to it at the time.

What do we see happening in the United States? Well, as I look at the United States, I see the United States as always – ever since World War I – being influenced by Europe but always maybe a generation behind. So, instead of World War I producing pessimism in the United States, that doesn't come even after World War II. The pessimism begins to come in the decade of the sixties because in the decade of the sixties there's a throwing off of the basic standards of Christian civilization. And there's an embracing of relativism. And in the embracing of that relativism there is a rejection of a sovereign God who has given moral absolutes. And in the wake of that there is a kind of pessimism.

And if you think about it this way, think about each generation of Americans going back to Jamestown and Plymouth Rock, thinking again of the British influence on America as over against the Spanish influence on America or the French. Think of each succeeding generation of Americans going back to the 1600s. What do you find? What were the things that marked the people that came to this country, settled in New England, Virginia, South Carolina, Maryland? What was it? There was a basic optimism about life. There was a basic sense that I don't count, but my children do. My grandchildren really do. And my great-grandchildren really, really do.

In other words, there was a basic belief in the future in this world. And there was a basic sense of self-sacrifice for the welfare of a generation yet to come. And so those early Americans in the 17th and the 18th and the 19th and early 20th centuries and our ice box is suddenly beginning to heat up. We may need to turn it on for a minute. What happens is that a basic picture of a culture's confidence in itself and its way of life in the future can be measured statistically by its birthrate. When people despair of the future, when people have nihilistic values people tend not to reproduce themselves. Europe has ceased to replace itself. And so in order to have a population in Europe, Europe is relying on immigrants.

Do you want to know one reason why Europe has not backed us in this Second Gulf War? It isn't just because of the oil money out of the UN and Germany and France being involved in it. That's certainly a factor. But there's another factor and it's a huge factor. And that is that just as America relies on cheap labor coming out of Mexico, so Europe is relying on immigrants coming in and where those immigrants largely come from. There is a growing and very significant Muslim population in Europe, particularly in places like France because Algeria was a French colony and so on. There's an enormous change here.

So, the first thing that we have to go back, as we think about in fleshing out this morning and which I didn't touch on – and as we think about the decline of the West, what I submit to you, how I see it in light of Daniel 10 is that there is, just as the Persian prince in Daniel 10 declines before the prince of Greece who rises up, so I see the spirit of Christendom which has produced so much freedom, capitalism, entrepreneurial spirit, adventure, going out, optimism. I see that spirit dying. I see that spirit waning. And I see it waning in Europe and I see it coming here and waning here. There's pessimism.

And, for me, the greatest indicator of that is how people are educating children today as we look at our heroes of the past. Instead of looking at Columbus as a hero, he's seen as a villain. Instead of seeing George Washington as a great man – and he certainly was a great man, but like all humans except for the Lord Jesus, he was a man with great flaws as you have great flaws and so do I. But instead of seeing him as a role model, someone to emulate, we have a tendency in the post-1960s America, we have a tendency to demonize people like George Washington or Thomas Jefferson.

Now, Thomas Jefferson was a Christian in the sense that liberal protestant denominations are Christians. But he wasn't a Christian in the sense of being a Bible believing man with an evangelical faith in Christ. But, nevertheless, Thomas Jefferson really did put into practice in his way of thinking or put into writing, basic biblical concepts of limited government.

But, you know, it's very popular to demonize him. For example, the DNA and all with Sally Henning; perhaps he had children by her. We don't know. The DNA is conclusive that there are some family ties here. But it may have been a brother of Jefferson. The point I want to make is this: Not that Jefferson sold his own kin into slavery. I don't know that and I'm not presenting that as having happened. All I'm saying is: It's become popular to debunk our heroes. And it's become popular to look at our own history and denigrate it and despise it.

So, as I say, Christendom is not identical to Christianity. It's not identical to the Church. It's imperfect. It has flaws. There are moral failures. There are great exceptions to being good. There are atrocities that have been done. We didn't always treat Native Americans the way they ought to have been treated. We didn't always treat blacks the way they should have been treated, obviously. Slavery was a great blight on our history and our way of life.

But, these flaws did not remove the fact – and this is what's fundamental for us – that the American way of life is absolutely, as I look at history, the best way of life that human beings have ever come up with. It is. I mean, look at anything else and throw it up against it and it dims in comparison.

So to denigrate George Washington and Thomas Jefferson as evil and wicked men because they did have slaves and to treat them as if they were on better than Attila the Hun or Genghis Kahn, that's wrong and that's evil. They were great men and God used them. Whether they were truly born again and are in Heaven or not, they were truly great

men used of God to establish a civilization that is superior. But, you see, that very statement is challenged today.

I made the statement just a moment ago that the American civilization is superior to other civilizations. That doesn't mean that I think that we ought to conquer the world and make it like us. It's just that when I compare it with other civilizations I see no other civilization, in spite of our flaws, that has given more opportunity for the gospel, for people to live Christianly, for people to have a good way of life, to have success in life, to create wealth and to share that wealth and to be kind to others. And I challenge anyone anywhere to give me a better civilization.

And, again, it's flawed. It's imperfect. But what I'm saying is that one indicator of the waning of the spirit of the West, of the dying of the principality over Christendom, if you will, is the fact that we no longer are comfortable saying that. There are a lot of places that if I said that the American way of life is superior to the way of life of the Native Americans who were here before we came to this country I've just cussed. I've just used foul language. I've just violated things and I've become a rube and a bumpkin and a racist or a culturalist.

But I'm telling you that the very fact that we are uncomfortable saying that is a prime indicator that our culture is dying.

Now, let's look at Islam by contrast. Islam is not dying. The spirit behind Islam is very much alive and very assertive and very aggressive.

Now, we need to understand something about Islam in its impetus. I said this morning that Islam – unlike Christianity, whose founder is the Prince of Peace and who taught us to turn to the other cheek and who submitted meekly to oppression and allowed himself to be beaten and even crucified wrongly – the founder of Islam is the mirror opposite of Jesus.

Mohammed is a warrior and Mohammed, after he begins to receive his revelations in the caves begins to try to change things in Mecca. But they won't have anything to do with him. And so he leaves Mecca in the year 622 and he goes to Medina. And his preaching is accepted by the people in Medina. And within about eight years of that he returns with an army of 10,000 people and he seizes Mecca and he enforces the Islamic way of life and thinking on the people of Mecca and he dies two years later.

What happens immediately after that? Mohammed is succeeded by the Khalifs. And under the Khalifs there is a tremendous expansion of Islam. How did they do it?

Christianity spread very slowly. Christianity spread by word of mouth. Christianity spread as people shared their faith in Jesus Christ and sometimes were willing to die for the faith. But the early Christians, for at least three centuries, were not willing to kill for the faith. They were only willing to die for the faith. And there is an enormous difference in that. Mohammed is willing – starting in 630 – to kill for the faith. And the followers

of Mohammed since 630 have been willing to kill for the faith. And so a remarkable thing occurs. Islam spreads throughout western Asia. And within 10 or 20 years much of western Asia is seized.

And here is what happens. Christians are offered terms of surrender. As long as they will observe the law of Islam – Sharia, this is very important concept – as long as they will observe the law of Islam, they are allowed to remain Christians. They cannot engage in what the Muslim would regard as idolatry. They have to keep their faith to themselves. They can share it with their children, but they cannot engage in evangelism beyond their own community. They can evangelize their own Christian community, their own children, grandchildren. They cannot evangelize the world beyond them.

People who were Jews are in the same category as Christians. They are allowed to hold to their faith, but there are limitations on it just as there are for Christians. But both Christians and Jews have to pay a special penalty tax in order to exist under an Islamic state.

So, does Islam practice religious tolerance? If you want to define religious tolerance as not being able to engage in evangelism, but being allowed to believe as you want to and have a house of worship as long as it's kind of a private thing and you don't try to share it openly and publicly beyond your own little ghetto, yes they practice historically religious tolerance for Christians and Jews because they accept the Bible as God's Word, but as a corrupted Word.

What about people who are not Christians and Jews? They are forced to become Muslims. Polytheists are forced to become Muslims. If you look at the Sudan and the slaughters that are going on in the Sudan today, part of that is that they are doing what Mohammed did. They are dealing with animists, animists who worship spirits in the rocks and the trees and the water and what not. They have to give up their ways. They have to give up their religion and become Muslims. And if they refuse to do so they will be sold into slavery. They will be put to death.

So, within 100 years of the death of Mohammed – Mohammed dies in 632 – and within 100 year of the death of Mohammed Islam has conquered the entirety of Christendom except for Europe. It's conquered the entirety of Western Asia. It's conquered the entirety of Northern Africa. It's come in and taken Spain, the Iberian peninsula. And it's moved around with a pincer movement coming up but stopped by the Byzantine Empire.

What happens in 732 in terms of Europe is: there's a battle called the Battle of Tours. And at that battle the Muslim forces are stopped. And so from 732 onward Europe holds the Muslim hordes in check. But the Muslims still control Spain for 700 years till they're driven out by El Cid and then, of course, as the Spanish kingdoms unite in one kingdom under Isabel and Ferdinand. They are driven out of Spain in the 15th century.

In terms of the eastern part of Europe, what happens there with regard to Islam is that there is a continual assault by the armies of Islam against Christendom, particularly the

Byzantine Empire. The Byzantine Empire continues on – and I've talked about this on Wednesday night – until 1453. And in 1453, I think it's May 28th, the city of Constantinople falls before the Ottoman Turks.

What was the first thing they did when they seized the city of Constantinople? They went in to the greatest church in all of Christendom – the Hagia Sophia – and they immediately converted it into a mosque.

And so we need to understand something about Islam. Islam is spread by the sword. It would like not to have to spread by the sword, but it will spread itself by the sword. It practices a kind of religious tolerance. But remember that Islam is interested in external conformity to law. Islam is fundamentally about externalism, conformity to law. And so as long as you conform to the law you're ok. And what is the law in Islam? It is Sharia.

So, Islam takes over Constantinople. Part of what you have as you look...you know, we've had the trouble in Eastern Europe. Since the death of Tito you have all of this conflict. What was, by the way, what was the shot that was fired that started World War I? Anyone remember that? What started World War I?

[Off Mic Voice] Arch Duke Ferdinand was assassinated.

Where was he assassinated?

[Off Mic Voice] In eastern Europe, Sarajevo.

Sarajevo. He was...that's a name that's been in the news a decade ago with the Clinton wars. And so what you have there is what? What's the problem in that part of the world? The problem in that part of the world goes back to 1453 because once the Turks take Constantinople the Turks engage in a policy of raping women and leaving children who are of mixed parentage and developing what? Developing groups of Islamic people amongst the Christian communities of Europe. And the Christian communities in that part of the world, what we called Yugoslavia in the past, were both eastern and western Christians. That is, they were western. Some of them were Roman Catholic and others were Eastern Orthodox. But you have this Islamic influence there that's profound.

And it took – and we need to understand this – it took, with all of this fulment that went on for a couple of hundred years, it took a strong man, it took a dictator by the name of Marshall Tito to hold that thing in check because if you didn't have a dictator who was a tyrant – he was a Marxist, Marxist tyrant. Tito actually was, in a certain sense – this is going to sound funny – he was a blessing because he kept these people from killing each other off because there are these tremendous ethnic rivalries: Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Islamic people. These rivalries were all at each other's throats. And so Tito ruled with an iron boot.

And I jumped ahead in history with Tito who died a couple of decades ago and that's when all the chaos started over there again.

So Islam continually assaults Eastern Europe from the time of the fall of Constantinople in 1453. And it's finally defeated on September the 12th – interesting date, isn't it, September 11th, September 12th – September 12th, 1683 at the Battle of Vienna. That's when the forces of the Ottoman Turks are turned back and Eastern Europe is saved. So two significant dates – 732, the Battle of Tours saves Western Europe; and 1683 saves Eastern Europe.

The point I want to make is this and I'm going to read some quotations from the Koran. Islam is spread by the sword. It practices a form of religious toleration but it's always with a view to dominance. That's a very key word. Islam means what? Submission.

And what's the response of someone enforcing that submission? It's dominance. Dominance is a very key thing. This capricious, unknowable, arbitrary god called Allah rules with an iron hand. He dominates. He doesn't win the heart. He dominates. And he enforces his law this way.

Let me read you a couple of quotes from the Koran. And this is important because it's important to understand that Osama bin Laden represents a true expression of Islam, that Osama bin Laden represents the spirit of Mohammed. Now, there are other representations of that. But it's very important to understand that what Osama bin Laden represents is not something that's foreign to the basic original spirit of Islam. And let me demonstrate. And then I'll get into the clash between secularist Muslims like Abdul Nasser and Ataturk on the one hand and Saddam Hussein and on the other hand the more religious non-secularist Muslims like Osama bin Laden. There is that distinction.

But to give you the spirit of the founder and the spirit that gave the impetus to Islam to conquer the entirety of Western Asia, the entirety of northern Africa and to begin to conquer Europe you need to hear this from the Koran. This is Koran Sura eight and verse 40. "Know that whatever booty you take, the fifth of it is for God, and the Messengers, and the near kinsmen's, the orphan's, the needy and the traveler." So they give a kind of a double tithe on what's taken there.

And then here is from Sura 47, verses four and eight: "When you meet the unbelievers, smite their necks, then when you have made wide slaughter among them, tie fast the bonds, then set them free, either by grace or ransom, until the war lays down its loads... So shall it be and if God had willed he would have avenged himself upon them. But that he may try some of you by means of others. And those who are slain in the way of God he will not send their works astray." Now, listen to this very carefully. "He will guide them and dispose their minds aright and he will admit them to paradise that he has made known to them."

This is very important. When I had the local Muslim leader – Sheikh Yassir Mohammed come here in the sanctuary six or so weeks ago and talk to my high school Bible class – I had planted a question with one of the students from last year who was visiting from college to ask him: How can I know I'm going to go to Heaven?

And what was the response of Sheikh Yassir Mohammed? “Well, you can’t know that.”

Why?

“Well, you can’t know that you’ve really satisfied the will of Allah that you’ve been good enough in order for Allah to admit you to Heaven.”

In other words, it’s works righteousness, but you can never know that you’ve been good enough. But look here. You want to know the John 3:16 of the Koran?

Our John 3:16 tells us what? In spite of the fact that you and I are both moral failures and have deep character flaws and fall short of the glory of God we have John 3:16: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

What’s their John 3:16? Let me read it for you again. And here it is, their John 3:16. What’s the one way you can know you’re going to go to Heaven in Islam? Here it is: “And those who are slain in the way of God he will not send their works astray. He will guide them and dispose their minds aright and he will admit them to paradise that he has made known to them.”

Sura four, verse 75 of the Koran: “So let them fight in the way of God who sell the present life for the world to come and whoever fights in the way of God and is slain or conquers, we shall bring him a mighty wage.”

Sura nine, verse 110: “God has bought from the believers and themselves and their possessions against the gift of paradise. They fight in the way of God. They kill and are killed. That is a promise binding upon God in the Torah and the gospel and the Koran.”

So, you notice they recognize the holy books of Judaism and Christianity, but he goes on.

“And who fulfills his covenant truer than God?”

We read further. This is from Koran Sura 44, verse 52: “Surely the god-fearing shall be in a station secure among gardens and fountains, robed in silk and brocade set face to face. Even so, and we shall espouse them to wide eyed houris, therein calling for every fruit secure.”

Well, what is a houri? A houri is a virgin. She may not be a human virgin. And this is a very important thing we have to say about Islam in terms of the status of women. Can a woman go to Heaven? We don’t know. But what about the women who are in Heaven, the houris? We don’t know if they are really human or whether they were simply created by Allah for the sexual pleasure of men.

So, how can you know you're going to go to Heaven? Well, you can try to be good enough and Muslims do try to live a kind of self-righteous way. And there are very many fine Muslim people. And not all Muslims are terrorists. I want to make that plain. We should befriend the Muslims who have come to our community. We should try to establish a friendship so that we build a bridge so that we can share our faith in Christ which you have to do very slowly, very gradually.

But make no mistake about it: You can't know you're going to go to Heaven in Christianity except by one way – the John 3:16 way. And you can't know you're going to go to Heaven but one way – and that's the way of jihad.

Now, what happens when you retreat before an enemy unless it's a strategic move? You know, sometimes you retreat, pull back so you can gain an advantage on an enemy and move in for the attack. What happens there?

You want to know how to go to Hell, not pass go, not collect \$200? Here is Sura eight, verse 15: "Oh, believers, when you encounter the unbelievers marching to battle turn not your backs to them. Whoso turns his back that day to them, unless withdrawing to fight again or removing to join another host, he is laden with the burden of God's anger and his refuge is gehenna, an evil homecoming." Do you want to know how to go to Hell? You surrender, surrender in battle. That's a sure ticket to Hell.

Now, what happens with Islam? We talked about the Battle of Tours, 732; the Islamic forces are held in check in Western Europe by Charles Martel. We talk about the Battle of Vienna where Eastern Europe is saved from the Muslim hordes in 1683. Islam kind of goes into a period of decline, not absolutely, but decline in terms of trying to conquer the West. And it kind of sits on its laurels and holds its own. And it's ruled, by and large, by the Ottoman Empire.

Now, the Ottomans line up with the Austrians and the Germans in World War I and, of course, they are defeated. And then two things happen that create lots of the problems we have today. One of the things that happens is: with the defeat of the Ottoman Empire and its collapse, an English General by the name of General Allenby takes on the task of dividing up the Middle East. So he takes these lands that were controlled by the Khalif there in Baghdad, I guess, or Constantinople. I'm not sure where he ruled from, but the Ottoman Empire. I got that fuzzy, sorry. These lands that were controlled by the Ottoman Empire now are separate countries, they are Muslim countries and the British, having won the war, begin to divide the thing up.

Sometimes it was a very natural division. Iraq was a very unnatural division. Why was Iraq an unnatural division? Well, in terms of culture and people groups there is next to Iran – that part of Iraq that's next to Iran – is largely a Shiite community. Remember that the vast majority, about 90% of Muslims, are Sunnis. But about 10% are Shiites. The Shiites are the dominant group in Iran. But they're also the dominant people group in Iraq except around Baghdad. And around Baghdad there is a sizable minority of Sunnis. And then up to the north there are the Kurds.

And so what happens is, as General Allenby takes his cookie cutter out and he's got this rolled out dough – the old Ottoman Empire – and he says, “Well, let's see. We'll call this Jordan. Now, we do know historically about Syria. But we'll create Jordan and we'll call this something else and this something else.”

And I'm being a little bit hyperbolic here, but sometimes it was really an arbitrary thing.

There was a second thing that created some of our tensions and that was the Balfour Declaration that takes place in the wake of World War I. And the Balfour Declaration is the espousal of what we call Zionism.

Now, remember, not all Jewish people are Zionist, but a majority of Jewish people are Zionists. And with Zionism is the idea that the Jewish people should find a home away from the Diaspora that they've been part of for almost 2000 years having been set out into the world to return to a home of their own. And so with that is the idea of a Jewish homeland.

Now, these two forces together, the cookie cutter that General Allenby did, dividing up the former Ottoman Empire – sometimes arbitrarily – finding British family and saying, “Oh, you're the king of this country,” 'cause they were friendly to the British. And then the Balfour Declaration with the beginning of Zionism and the immigration of lots of Jewish people begins to set things into trouble because then you begin to have clashes with various ethnic groups.

And remember that these people have been held in check by what? By an iron will. Just as Marshall Tito after World War II seizes power in Yugoslavia and rules these various ethnic areas with an iron boot, so the Ottomans had ruled these people and held a lot of forces in check. But now the cookie cutter comes in from the British. Now there's the beginning of the immigration of Jews and with World War II and the Holocaust that Adolf Hitler committed against the Jews, there's an enormous sympathy and enormous impetus to give the Jewish people a state of their own.

And so what happens on May 18th, 1948 is: there is a War for Independence and the Jewish state is established. But immediately what happens? The entirety of the Middle East comes against that. And so the entirety of the Arab world is against the state of Israel for a lot of reasons.

The enormous antipathy of the Muslim world against Jews really begins at this point. I'm not saying there wasn't resentment against Jews before that, but I'm talking about the enormous antipathy against Jews begins at this point because they see the Jews as having taken the third holiest place in Islam.

You say: What's the holiest place in Islam? Mecca.

What's the second holiest place? Medina.

What's the third holiest place? Jerusalem, in Islamic teaching.

And so you have two great mosques there on the site of the Jewish temple. And so now there's this great conflict. And so there is a native Arab, largely Muslim, population that is driven from their homes being replaced by a Jewish population that's not Middle Eastern in its basic thinking, but European.

So these Jewish people come from particularly Russia and Eastern Europe and other parts of the world. And they begin to immigrate into Israel. And what's the result? Arab Muslims are driven from their own homes and put into detention centers or forced to live in other communities.

So there you are. You're a Muslim Arab. Your father farmed this land. He worked the olive trees. Those same olive trees were around when your granddaddy was there, your great-granddaddy. And there's a tradition that goes back 10 generations that the Khalid family has owned this farm and worked it for at least 10 generations. And now a bunch of Europeans who dress like prostitutes, because Islam is extremely modest. In Islam a woman can only uncover her hands and her face. She can't uncover her arms. She can't uncover her legs. So a woman in shorts looks like a harlot. So now a group of loose living, virtual atheists, immoral people has come in and they've taken your homeland and they are now farming your land which was your daddy's and your granddaddy's for 10 generations. And how do you think they feel?

So one of the things that happens is: you have these Palestinians wanting to go to other countries and they're not wanted. You think they're wanted in Jordan? You think they're wanted in Syria? You think they're wanted in Kuwait? They work in Kuwait, but they have no rights. They are an oppressed minority even in Kuwait.

So you've got these two factors. You've got the cookie cutter approach of General Allenby and you've got the rise of the state of Israel.

Now, there are two developments that you need to get a hold of if you want to understand Islam in the modern world. And these are phenomena that occur in the 20th century. There has never been an Islam what happened in the West with the Enlightenment. In the Enlightenment we had the concept of what? Religious freedom. You can be a Catholic. You can be a Baptist. You can be a Jew. You can be a Lutheran. You can be an Episcopalian. You can be a Pentecostal. It's ok. Just don't go destroy anything. Don't violate the laws. Don't force your religion in some kind of physical way on somebody else and you're free to practice it. You can be a Mormon and you can practice spiritual polygamy, but you can't practice literal polygamy.

In other words, there's not absolute freedom of religion in America, but its freedom of religion up to the point of not breaking the law. So you're free to be a Mormon. You're free to be a Jehovah's Witness. You're free, if you feel like your conscience won't allow

you to stand and salute the flag, you're free not to do that out of religious reasons as Jehovah's Witnesses have done.

So, in other words, there's a basic religious freedom that grows out of the enlightenment. But the Muslim world has never experienced that. And in the Muslim world there's no difference between a pronouncement of a recognized religious leader, like a preacher, and the president of a country or congress of a country passing a law and saying this is the case. And this you've got to understand.

In Islam if I happen to be an imam, a religious leader, a recognized religious leader... So, you know, if I were a Muslim that's what I would be; and I determined that Don Sproul has written something that blasphemes the prophet Mohammed I can issue what's called a fatwa on Don Sproul. You need to understand this. Don Sproul can live in Paris, France and I can live in Istanbul, ok? But I have that authority to issue a fatwa on the head of Don Sproul because I've read a book that Don Sproul has written and it offends...it blasphemes the prophet.

Now, what you need to understand is that in the Islamic way of thinking for me as a religious leader to issue that fatwa for his death, calling for his death, is absolutely the same legal force as if the 9th Judicial District Court here in Louisiana met, or judge of the 9th Judicial District Court held court and a jury of a man's peers tried and found a man guilty of first degree murder, did the second trial to determine the penalty – which would be death – and that 9th Judicial District judge has that convicted murderer stand before him and says, "I sentence you to death by lethal injection."

And what you need to understand is that for me as a religious leader to say that there's a fatwa on the head of Don Sproul, living 10 countries away because he blasphemed the prophet, is of the same force legally as a jury of your peers finding you guilty of murder, tried before the judge and the judge pronouncing the death penalty on you. That's really serious and a basic difference.

Now, there are forces that began to arise in the 20th century within Islam to secularize Islam a little bit. Now, this is what many Americans fail to come to grips with. The first and greatest of those leaders is a man by the name of Kamel Ataturk. Ataturk helped to take the Turkey – the core piece in the old Ottoman Empire – and begin to westernize some of it, begin to make it a little more secular, a little looser, a little more tolerant. But what you need to understand is that the big leader of this thing in the post World War II world is a man by the name of Abdel Nasser. He's an Egyptian.

And he led a movement called pan-Arabism. And his goal was to unite the entire Muslim world into one big nation and would have been, relatively speaking, secularistic. Now, when I say secularistic it's kind of like Jimmy Carter and Christianity. Is Jimmy Carter a Christian? Sure. Many people said he's the best ex-president we ever had. But Jimmy Carter represented a kind of secular approach to Christianity.

Take abortion, for example. Jimmy Carter would be personally opposed to abortion. He would never have an abortion; of course, he'd never need one. But he would not do anything to restrict a woman's access to abortion. So what I'm talking about secularism, that's an analogy there. In other words, it's distancing a little bit of the religious conviction from every day life.

Well Nasser represents, in a mild way, that. Now here's the deal with Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein was a member – is a member, I guess – of the Bathist party. The Bathist party was, relatively speaking, a secularist movement. That's why, interestingly enough, you remember the guy that we learned to hate for the last 10 years who would get on TV? Tarik Aziz. Tarik Aziz is a Christian.

He isn't a real Christian.

Hey, I don't know who a real Christian is or not. I know I'm a Christian. I know I've been to Jesus and I'm born again and I'm going to Heaven. I'm not going to evaluate whether a person is a real Christian or not. There are contradictions in his life, obviously. The only man I have to worry about is: Am I a Christian?

He was a professing Christian, a member of a Christian church. Well, you wouldn't have that in what? Saudi Arabia. You wouldn't have that in Saudi Arabia. You wouldn't have that in most Muslim countries. But you would have that in Saddam Hussein's Iraq because Saddam Hussein was not an Islamicist. He espoused Islam, but he was not an Islamicist. What do I mean by an Islamicist? Well, I want to introduce you to the philosopher behind Osama bin Laden.

In the year 1966 Abdel Nasser hung a man and that man's name is Saib Kudeb. Saib Kudeb is an Egyptian who wanted to take us back to the original teachings of Mohammed: Islam in its pure form, Islam as a militant religion, Islam as a religion of conquest, Islam where women didn't run around half naked like every woman here tonight is half naked in a Muslim view of things because I can see, at least, your forearms in most cases. Now, Nelda, you'd probably pass except for your hair Nelda. That's pretty loose living there.

That's right. If you wore the star if you'd pass.

So Saib Kudeb was a professor of philosophy and he began to gather disciples around him. This is the rise of the modern Islamicist movement.

What do you have here? This is very important as we look at the war in the Gulf. Got to remember that, once again, I can declare a fatwa on Don Sproul. He lives in Paris, France and I live in Istanbul and it's absolutely recognized just as much as if a jury in the 9th Judicial District with a judge of that district court issues the death penalty after a proper trial for murder.

You have to understand that Islamicism is a religious, political movement within Islam that is extremely strong. Why is it strong? Does that mean that all Islamicists are terrorists? No. But it does mean that all Islamicists believe strongly in Islamic militancy; believe in eventually forcing the West to prostrate itself.

What's their great beef with the West? Here's their beef with the West. Why do they bomb us? You want to know why they hate us. Here they are. How do I know this? 'Cause they make no secret about it. You want to read about it? Go to my website and I have Osama bin Laden's epistle of war. He spells out why he's waging war against us.

Number one reason: Our presence in their holy land. 1943, middle of World War II, in order to secure the newly discovered oil fields of Arabia, Franklin Roosevelt places American troops there. We've maintained a military presence in Saudi Arabia and the rest of the Muslim world in one way or another since 1943. The big boot in this was in the first Gulf War. The Saudi Arabians, their oil fields are threatened because Saddam Hussein comes down and takes Kuwait. They turn to us for help. We provide the help.

Who offered to defend that country? Osama bin Laden. Who was Osama bin Laden? He was our creation, just as Saddam Hussein was our creation. Ronald Reagan created Saddam Hussein in a certain sense because to get back at Iran after Iran had humiliated us under Jimmy Carter in seizing our embassy, we wanted to build up militarily the biggest threat to Iran which was Iraq. And those people were fighting each other. And we trained Saddam and his army and his secret police and gave him lots of military material in order for him to wage war. He's Ronald Reagan's man.

What about Osama bin Laden? Well, we saw a great opportunity in fighting the Cold War as the Russians were trying to back the puppet regime in a place called Afghanistan. And as the Russians are trying to maintain their stronghold there with a puppet regime in Afghanistan, the United States backed the forces that we call the Mujahideen. Who are the Mujahideen? That's simply holy warriors in Muslim thing. They were holy warriors, the Mujahideen.

Where do the Mujahideen come from? The Mujahideen came from Egypt. The Mujahideen came from Kuwait. The Mujahideen came from Saudi Arabia. They came from Yemen. And one of those people was the son of a very wealthy construction man named Osama bin Laden. And he was trained by our people.

And so, in a sense, these two forces trained by us; the one a secularist – Saddam Hussein – the other an Islamicist – Osama bin Laden. So there's great offense when we begin to put military people in the Saudi Arabian people en masse in the First Gulf War; deeply offended many Muslims even though the leadership understood that they needed the American military in order to push Saddam Hussein back out of Kuwait.

That's area number one of offence is our being involved here.

Let me say something. We have a clear example, in the case of Iran, of how westernization forced does not work on an Islamic population. What happens? We back, once again, we back a puppet leader, the Shah of Iran. And what happens? He rules and he tries to westernize. Iran, at the height of the power of the Shah, was one of the most “democratic” countries in the Middle East; a lot of religious toleration, a lot of freedom for women, all of that. But what happens? It’s ruled from the top down. And here’s the point. We haven’t dealt with the underlying spirit of Islam.

What we have is the Shah of Iran with his secret police and his reign of terror against anyone who opposes him. So people like the Ayatollah Khomeini have to leave. And he goes to France. Then the Shah develops cancer, the Rockefeller family – who backed him very much – brings him to America and what happens? In the wake of that the Ayatollah Khomeini returns home and the Iranian Revolution occurs.

You see, you haven’t dealt with the spirit of Islam. Until you deal with the spirit of Islam all you can do is temporarily suppress it. But the moment that suppression is removed, like a Marshall Tito, the moment that suppression is removed, like a Saddam Hussein being removed, then these factions rise to power who are Hell bent on domination of the non-Muslim.

So you have the military factor, the West involvement.

What’s the second big factor? It’s huge. The United States supports the state of Israel. That is the second and a huge, huge factor in the hatred of the Muslim world for the United States. Does the Muslim world hate the United States? Kind of like a kid views an abusive dad. It’s a love-hate relationship. They love many things about America. They love a lot of things about American culture. They love the economic opportunities of America. But they hate our unconditional support of Israel.

No other nation in the world unconditionally supports the modern state of Israel. And the modern state of Israel under the Likud party has practiced, in a kind and gentle way, a kind of genocide on the Palestinians. I say a kind and gentle way. What I mean by that is: they are forced with suicide bombers to push restrictions back more and more. And as they put those restrictions in place people find less and opportunity to make a living.

If I were the head of Israel would I do differently? I’m not saying I would do differently. I’m not saying that they are out to do evil. I’m simply saying: If you were faced with going to the market and you’ve got a woman who looks like she’s pregnant, but instead of being pregnant under her robe is a bomb and she is willing to blow herself up in order to kill you and 25 other people, what do you do?

So, I want us to put it in perspective. But you’ve got to understand how it’s viewed by the Muslim population.

Third thing: Why do they hate us? They hate us because America is involved in a secular crusade against Islam. What do I mean by a secular crusade? I’m not talking

about something militarily now. I'm talking about our modern hedonistic culture. I'm talking about rock music and the sexual revolution. I'm talking about working through the agencies of the United Nations.

Make no mistake about this. If you don't like the U.N, know that your friends in Saudi Arabia and other Muslim countries hate them even worse. No group of people hates the United Nations as much as the Muslim world. But just as they see Israel as a surrogate of the United States carrying out our will, they see the United Nations as our surrogate indoctrinating their people in: There's nothing wrong with fornication, dress immodestly, it's ok to be a homosexual and all these other things that unpopular American culture is coming down.

Now, there are other factors there. Another factor, a fourth factor in why they hate us is that America has practiced – going back to the Monroe Doctrine to protect the western hemisphere – we support bad people as long as they are our friends. In other words, American foreign policy, if we find a dictator over here who is just mean and ornery and oppresses his own people, but he will align himself with us and be an ally with us against our particular enemy – like, during the Cold War, the Soviet Union – then we're going to help him out. We're going to train his police forces. We're going to train his military. We're going to send his soldiers to Fort Polk and that kind of thing.

So those are four reasons why the Muslim world hates us. The bottom line of what I'm trying to say and I wrap this up with this and open it up for questions is this: I submit to you that Christendom is dying. And Christendom is dying because the Church has lost its confidence in the Bible and in biblical Christianity and the biblical way of life to the point where we're not assertive about that in any really effective way either in Europe, Canada or the United States. And the United States is...Christianity is still much more vibrant and effective in the United States than it is in Canada and in Canada than it is in Europe.

Islam, on the other hand, is experiencing an enormous revival. And it's been fueled by several forces at once. And I submit that that fueling is because of the demonic power behind Islam. And it's being fueled by several forces. One is economic. Where did Allah put so much of the oil? Right in the middle of them.

What's the Muslim world? Is it just western Asia? What's the biggest Muslim country in the world? Indonesia. The biggest Muslim country in the world is Indonesia. Where is Indonesia? Lot's of oil in Indonesia. And it's not in Western Asia. It's in Eastern Asia. They're not Arabs, they're Muslims.

So you've got this enormous economic thing. What are Muslims doing today with that money? They are going to poor countries like Egypt and getting poor boys and training them to become sheiks and imams and they're sending them to Detroit, Michigan where they are assimilated and sent out to establish mosques in American cities.

What kind of Muslims do you think are being recruited and trained in Islam? And what version of Islam do you think they're being trained in? Generally speaking, not the Shiite 10% minority; it's the 90% Sunni. But it's not just the 90% Sunni. There is a particular sect, just as you can speak of Catholics and Protestants. And within Protestantism there are various sects. So you can say within Sunni Islam there are various sects. There is a very strict sect and it is very much associated with our friend Saib Kudeb how was hung by Abdel Nasser and it's called Wahabi Islam.

Osama bin Laden believes in Wahabiism. He's a Wahabiist. What do you think is the religion of the ruling class of Saudi Arabia? Wahabiism. What kind of Muslims do you think are being recruited and what version of Islam do you think they are being trained in as they are sent to America? Wahabiism.

The spirit of Islam is on the ascendancy. It's on the rise. It's a demonic thing. It's powerful. And we is in deep, deep trouble.

Transcription by Audioposting: (www.audioposting.com/transcription.php)