

To debate about Islam rationally

Contribution of Christian Eyschen

Free thinking is firstly a rational method to examine things, facts and ideas. It has not for object to obey to fashion effects which are never uninterested. **Victor Hugo** said, « *What fashion brings, Fashion always takes it away* ». One is forced to state out that the offensive against « muslims » in the world is not without relations with the defence of economical, political, strategic interests of dominating powers who do not make war for ideas but for their own interests of domination.

This is how was proved true that all the words on mass destruction weapons "*held*" by Saddam Hussein's regime were totally false, were a lie of State and that they had only served to conquer oil fields of less expensive exploitation, for the US companies, first of all that of the **Bush** family. And all this in the name of the fight against the supposed « *Islamism* » of the Iraqi regime of the time.

One cannot extract himself of the social and political fact to utter judgments *ad vitam aeternam*, valid every time and everywhere. If, for the free thinker, all the religions are equal and must be fought, the conditions of their existence have to be the object of a deep and differentiated examination.

In this sense, the Free Thought always made a distinction between the polytheism and the monotheism, although it fights any form of religion. Analyzing the fact that the polytheism imposed no faith, did not oblige an obedience, but simply a respect for the gods, that all the gods of the losers were integrated into the Pantheon and that it was necessary to respect them also; it is clear, in the eyes of the free thinkers, that the polytheism ignored the holy wars, the crusades, the jihad, the Inquisition and the forced conversion.

That's in this sense that the free thinkers, far from considering the advent of the monotheism as a progress or an obligate way, always considered that it was a regression of the thought. All the approach of the paganism to try to explain things by the will of the gods was then replaced by the requirement of the obedience to the divine law of a single god: "*do believe and shut up*".

One has thus to establish distinctions which, if it withdraws nothing from the fight against all religions, involve nevertheless differentiated analyses to be true and valid.

1. Back to Islam's history

Islam reigned over the biggest empire having never existed, because, during two centuries, it shone on 3 continents. From the religious point of view, it is only a variant of Christianity: the Arianism. That is why it became established so easily within the lands of the Byzantine Empire and North Africa. He was expanding as a message of equality, through the pilgrimage in Mecca, because everyone could do it, masters as humble, all of them could be *Hadj*.

When it developed, the borders were closed since 1 000 years (since Alexander the Great). They will open with Islam, by the way of trade. Caravans are the vector of Islam's spread, the new ideas accompanying the goods. Islam brings some safety to Bedouins and traders.

Rather quickly, Baghdad, which is the center of the new religion, becomes the center of Knowledge and Culture. The Knowledge develops to solve the problems of this so vast and so powerful Empire. Islam becomes the athanor of knowledge. One digs up the ancient texts, which are translated, analyzed and which one discusses.

There is then no contradiction between Knowledge and Faith. The Muslims integrate **Platon** and **Aristote**. Arabic becomes the language of Knowledge. In the very Europe, where Christianity spreads its black veil on knowledge, the scholars learn the language which conveys the search. The Renaissance has unmistakably its origins in Baghdad. Islam revises everything and submits the Knowledge of the time to the hard school of criticism.

It is the beginning of scientific research, the medicine knows a new development and a new impetus. By discovering the paper in Asia, and using it massively instead of parchments, the Muslims contribute to the spread of ideas.

The Muslim world of the IXth and XIth centuries is nothing but monolithic, it is so diverse as it has to face tribes which refer or not to the Islam against the central power, the majority of the population of this caliphate not practising the Islam besides.

It is the bloody crusades of the Christian Empire that strike an important blow to this development of civilization in the East. In 1099, the capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, massacring indifferently Muslims and eastern Christians, will remain a deep trauma which will enlarge the gap between the Christian and Muslim worlds. It is the initial terrorist shock which the Muslims will never forget.

What unifies the Islamist Empire, is trade, in particular of textile which becomes fundamental in exchanges. By a system of checks before time, the money flows in stream on the basis of confidence. Financial centres will develop everywhere, the money does not travel, but is everywhere. Islam so radiates Christian Europe.

The Islamic Empire knows then a major upheaval: the Mongols will annihilate the Islamic continent. But the losers, as often, permeate the winners with their culture. The Mongols become Muslim. By breaking the monopoly of Arabic on the Islam, they open it to the world and to the expansion. It is the time of turco-Muslims who will open a new page of the Muslim Empire.

It should be noted as well, and it in no way nothing in the development of the Islam, that it is not an adulator of slavery. If this one is practised on its lands, it is contradictory to the said "holly" texts. *"The devotion also consists in sharing his good, in the very resentment of the attachment which we wear to it, with the close friends, the orphans, the needy people and those on the road... and by slaves liberation "*. (II, 177) or *"God has favoured some among the others regarding richness and goods. Do those who were favoured go as far as sharing their goods with their slaves so that they become their equals? "* (XVI, 73). Or also *"We directed him to both outcomes, but he did not engage in the ascending way. What thus is this way of salvation? It is the liberation of a slave (fkkû raqbatîn) or the fact to feed, by a day of lean cows, a close orphan or a poor man without any means "* (XC, 10 - 16).

What is not the case with the Christianity. The so called **Paul** said: " that all those who are under the yoke of servitude consider their masters as deserving of any honour, so that God's name and doctrine are not blasphemed " (1 Tim - 6, 1) "saint" **Augustin** added: *" the slavery is foreign to nature, but it is nevertheless legitimate, because it is the punishment of the original sin "*. Closer to us, pope Pie IX, in 1866, indicated: *" the slavery, in itself, is in its essential nature not at all against the natural and divine law, and he can have several right reasons of slavery there "*.

In numerous places, it is the Muslims who free the slaves, what explains its development in certain layers of society.

In this frame, it can be inferred that Islam is neither a sub-religion with regard to the other monotheisms, nor a devalued religion. The Islam enters its steps in the religions which preceded him and with whom it lives more or less well.

2 °) The question of the violence in the texts of Islam

- a) Our magazine *La Raison* published in its issue of April, 2016, the following article: "*an American engineer-developer used his software of text analysis on the old and new testimony, and on the Koran. According to its results, the Bible is slightly more concerned by destruction and murder than the book of the Islam. The Koran speaks more often about enjoyment than the Bible, which speaks more of love.*"
- b) "*is the Koran really more violent than the Bible?*" Everything went from this question that Tom Anderson, an engineer-developer of New York settled. By analyzing the complete Bible and the Koran, by the way of his comparative software, the engineer in computing data realized that the Christian book contained more allusions to the "murder" and to the "destruction" than his Koranic counterpart.

Last January, **Tom Anderson** noticed that, in the debates, the recent terrorist episodes were often associated to a "*fundamentalist Islam*", which would be a home of violence exploited by the extremists. According to some, the Koran would encourage more the brutal acts, compared with the other religious texts. Meanwhile, "*to understand a religion, it is completely logical to begin to examine its literature*", put the engineer in his study.

And, the timing being good, **Tom Anderson** designed the software of analysis, *OdinText*, intended to help the researchers in their study of documents. The tool scans coolly the contents of a work and reveals trends in the used vocabulary, according to chosen keywords: the number of times when the word was used, its synonyms, the terms bound to the same lexical field, or still its closeness with the other sought words.

Thus passed under the mechanical eye of the software: The **Old Testimony** (among which the first five books are common to the **Torah**, the sacred book of the Judaism), the New Testimony (associated with the Old, it constitutes the Christian **Bible**) and finally the **Koran** (the sacred book of the Islam). To compare three books, Tom Anderson used marks around the feelings: the enjoyment, the expectation, the anger, the disgust, the sadness, the surprise, the fear /anxiety and the confidence / faith. *OdinText* analyzed 886 000 words all in all, quite there in two minutes.

Result of this *battle*: the notion of "*anger*" is more used in the Bible (both Testimonies) than in the Koran, which obtains a higher score on the side "*enjoyment*" and "*confidence / faith*", but also as for the "*fear / anxiousness*". The surprise, the sadness and the disgust find themselves in equal shares in both texts, specifies the analyst. The Bible defends itself however thanks to "*love*" present in 3 % in the New Testimony, in 1,9 % in the Old, against 1,26 % in the Koran.

But the question remains: is the Koran more violent? "*Murder*" and "*destruction*" constitute 2,1 % of the book of the Muslims, against 2,8 % of the New Testament and not less than 5,3 % of Old-Testament, that is more than double compared with the Koran. By looking at the concept of "*enemies*", it is again the oldest Christian text which beats the record: 1,8 % of its contents mentions it, followed by the Koran (0,7 %) and of the New Testimony (0,5 %). In the Koran however, the enemy is slightly more often a concept, as the "*Devil*" or the "*evil*" (0,2 %), than in the New Testimony (0,1 %).

The Koran evokes besides more often " *the forgiveness/the grace* " (6,3 %) than the New (2,9 %) and the Old (0,7 %) Testimonies. Tom Anderson notes however that this ratio is partially due to the attribute "*merciful*" frequently matched in the name of Allah. " Some people could exclude this word, grounds that it is only a label or a title, but we think that it is significant, because the mercy was preferred to the other attributes as "*almighty*", he qualifies. "

The Free Thought dedicated this article to all those who claim a rewriting of the Koran to expurgate it of violent texts to fight against the "*terrorism*". Did not the biblical parable speak about the straw and the beam? It will be necessary to explain to us how we can require, on one side, that the Koran be censored of its violent passages to allow the Islam to accept democracy and secularism and how, on the other one, the Bible was not censored of the same passages, what did not prevent the religions of the Book, according to the detractors of the Islam, from having been converted to the values of the secularism. It is the very most beautiful demonstration that the contents of the said "*holly*" books have nothing to do in all this.

For the Free Thought, all monotheisms are equal, all the "*holly*" books are only piles of dogmatic intolerance. There is no one religion to save the other one. It seems that there is no thorough difference between the Islam, the Judaism and the Christianity regarding the apology of violence. Their respective history is there to testify of it. There is thus no specific, intrinsic reason, which would make that such or such religion would be soluble in democracy, secularism and Republic, and not the other one.

3 °) The question of Separation

We hear curious things in the debate on the Islam. For example that, by definition, the Judaism and the Christianity would be intrinsically compatible with democracy and secularism. All the politicking operation of the historic Holocaust deniers rests on a sentence pulled from Gospels: "*return to God what belongs to God and to Caesar what belongs to Caesar*" and this is very thin and weak. To perfect their culture, if it is possible, we deliver them gladly what is written in the Koran, and is of the same nature. Mohammed Said: "*I am only a man, if I order you something of your religion, follow him. If I order you something being of my personal opinion, you should know, I am only a man*" [Sahih of imam Muslim, hadith on 2361 according to Râfi ' b. Khudayj. Or also: "*as for the affairs of your religion, it concerns me; as for the affairs of your world down here, you are better able to know what.*" (Hadiths)

The distinction between the spiritual and the temporal is present in the Koranic text. From the point of view of the vocabulary, the used words assert it clearly: *din* (religion) and *dawla* (state), *aqida* (faith) and *charî'a* (law), *oumour eddin* (affairs of the religion) and *oumour el-douyna* (secular affairs). (According to Béchir Chebbah, in PDVI N 182 - seen again by the Grand Lodge of France)

This justifies completely the position of the Free Thought: there is no reason to establish a distinction between the various religions about the secularism and about the Separation of Churches and State. All the monotheist religions are theocratic in essence. It is the fight of the peoples that, only, can impose them to move back and to accept the democracy. It is valid for the Catholicism; it is valid also for the Islam.

It is enough to examine what takes place in the theocratic State of Israel, in the Christian corporatist diets, in Hungary, Croatia and Poland to notice that all the monotheisms have the same practices and that no religion became accustomed to secularism. In France, country of the Separation of Churches and the State, we attend a catholic real one Reconquista on the question of the signs and the religious emblems in the public place.

A principle can be established: it is the strength of the peoples that pushes back the religions in their dogmatic claims and, as soon as they can, the religions try, by nature, to recover their power and their dominant position.

There is no more and not less possibilities of seeing a secularized, democratic or republican Islam that to see a democratic Catholicism or a proselyte Judaism. We are in the oxymoron and not in the pleonasm. To claim to impose a model on the religions is illusive and also constitutes an infringement on the freedom of conscience of each one.

There are not within the competence of the Free Thought of "*counselling*" the religions on what they have to do or not to do. The Free Thought is not a rating agency of the religiosity. The freedom of conscience is not listed in the stock exchange. For the Free Thought, there is no good religion. They are an explanation of the world which goes against the rationalism and against the role of the human being on the way of his emancipation.

4 °)-The question of the return of religiosity in societies

In reaction to the development of the secularization in countries, a certain fundamentalism developed in all religions. It is the old fight between the human progress and the religions. The first appearance of this phenomenon was the Protestant fundamentalism in the USA, after 1912. The United States have a laic legislation and the country knew an increasing secularization during the XIXth century. For political reasons, the various North American governments accompanied this offensive of religious refoundation with the successes which we know. This support to religion by the political power is moreover, neither peculiar to the North American continent, nor to the Protestantism.

If the USA favored the development of the fundamentalism, which is a return of religion in the affairs of societies, it is because the religion spreads a message of submission which suits very well to the powerful men of this world: "*there is no authority which does not come from God or which is freely granted by him. As a consequence, the slave has to obey to theirmasters as woman to her husband*" said "*saint Paul*". The religion always legitimized the power, the oppression and the exploitation.

The Christian fundamentalism is the armed wing of the interests of the USA. It is not for nothing that it develops in Latin America, in Africa and in Europe. In the very France, it led to a real upheaval in the Protestant sphere, formerly attached to the democracy, to the Republic and to the secularism. Because Lutheran and Calvinists became minority in front of evangelists of North American origin, the French Protestantism joins the Catholicism against the secularism and the Secular school.

This religious offensive is made in the name of the values of the Christian West, it needs a declared enemy: the Muslims. It is in the name of the "*values of Christian West*" that one bombs the peoples and the countries and that one plunders them their wealth. The Free Thought does not have to participate in this barbaric deceit which makes so many victims.

It is also advisable to analyze these phenomena. Is it about a development of religiosity or about a toughening of a fringe of religiosity? The number of unbelievers and declared atheists does not stop increasing on the planet, the number of the "*believers*" living their faith in violation of the rules of their religion, also.

It is not thus about a religious reconquest, but about a toughening of a fringe of religiosity. It is actually because the religion is in deep crisis that sign within it two opposite currents: the modernists who want to change things

so that nothing changes on the background and the fundamentalists who aspire to a step backward. Both can coexist only on the basis of a decrease and not of a development of religion.

This "*toughening*" of a part of religiosity has a political source: that of the imperialist intrigues against the peoples, nations and States in situation of submissions and economic, political and military subjections. The fact as well as the "*usual*" channel of the "*socialist*" block of the ex-USSR - which constituted, doubtless, a false answer to the aspiration of the oppressed peoples, but an answer anyway – disappeared, is not for nothing in this situation. It also exists, in the Muslim countries, the will of certain political forces to win the power for themselves.

Present the "*terrorism*" as being of religious origin leads to the most absolute nonsense. We know that the question of the right of the Palestinian people to possess its ground is not for nothing in the discouraged way of some people towards the violent action; namely, the perception felt by the treatments which undergo everywhere the immigrants and the migrants. If the State of Israel can with impunity, not only to violate the rights of the Palestinians, but also to kill who he wants, then why not to do the same somewhere else? Such is, it seems the reasoning of many terrorist apprentices.

Most of the "*terrorists*" who made attempts in France these last years are not toughened Muslims, but on the contrary, young people in break, who used the religion to give themselves a cause to defend. It is the fact that the French Government bombs Arab and Muslim countries which brings them to this choice. We cannot leave untold the intensive bombardments in the Middle East by armed forces united around the USA and their consequences: the flight of the inhabitants (Syrian for example), partially towards "*bombing*" countries, where they are differently welcomed according to the employment situation (Germany, France).

This feeling of aggravated racism is strengthened when **Donald Trump** signs a decree forbidding the American territory to the nationals of exclusively Muslim countries. Decree invalidated repeatedly by important jurisdictions, of which the Court of Appeal of Virginia, for example, by calling upon the 1st Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Furthermore is added the post-colonial condescension towards the Muslims which denies them the right to create their religious structures by themselves. The State would have to make it, because they are presumed unable to get organized by themselves. The neo-colonial conception which underlies this will is the one which prevailed in the purest colonialism: who holds the imams and controls them, holds the people. It is what was called in the past French Empire the *indigenous statute*.

Studies of sociologists showed that it is not the reading of "*violent*" religious texts that brings to terrorism, but diverse reasons, in particular social, psychological and also political which make follow this path. Most of the "*terrorists*" show the weakest religious culture; their impetus is somewhere else. Moreover, their "*culture*" does not base on a nostalgia for the old time, but soaks in an urban lifestyle which marries their religious ignorance to the modern means of the western culture

To present all the "*terrorists*" as unintelligent, backward, uncultivated people is obviously against the reality. It allows neither to understand nor to act against. A short-lived French Prime Minister, Manuel Valls, of whom very fortunately the political life cleared us, had this stunning formula with regard to the intelligence of things: "*to explain, is yet to excuse*". We are then not any more in the rational world, but in that of the "*passions*" which is totally stranger to the method of Free Thought and rationalism. The "*terrorism*" is a political question, much less a religious question.

An element is always darkened by the anti-Muslim xenophobes: the famous "*terrorists*" are pure creations of the western powers in the fight for their interests, as well in the case of Al-Qaeda or as that of Daesh. Who buys the oil of Daesh? The same who denounce the Islamism. Who created, armed, trained Al-Qaeda if not the CIA and the USA? Who instrumented the Hamas against the PLO, otherwise the State of Israel? That the creature escapes its creator is one of the big laws of History. But it could not lead to forget the facts and the responsibilities.

Of the peculiarity to represent an enemy, would he be internal or outsider, everywhere and anybody at the same time, is also the construction of a warlike opinion deprived of Reason. Since about 40 years (with the Lebanon) the Middle East is the prey of conflicts, destabilization where the United States as Europe give lessons of democracy. Nevertheless the facts are blatant: in Afghanistan the women did not remove the burqa because a Mafioso government cooperate with our countries. The waves of the Iraqi conflict entailed a "*lebanonisation*" of this country, but also of Syria, the number of deaths is at least 500 000, without taking into account the refugees and the wounded persons. On the contrary the populations of Muslim countries as Egypt refuse the theocratic dictatorship of the Muslim Brothers and aspire to more liberties. Certainly, voices rise but this aspiration is the one of peoples who, by the way of Reason, that of doubt and understanding, settle their organs of emancipation. The AILP is for that, an opportunity to discuss possibilities of getting rid from dogmas: our Manifesto of Oslo, the colloquiums of Lebanon and Cyprus, as the world Congresses, were cornerstones for it.

5 °) The question of women

In the same way, the debate on the place of the women in the Islamic societies is by no means rational. One sets up in itself a western model with which all the peoples have to comply in the name of the "*unique thought*". One distinguishes nothing, one does not analyze anymore, one curse to whom would not be bare-breasted and which would not carry the G-string and the miniskirt. Any veil is sign of oppression, even when women carry him voluntarily as a sign of protest against the dominant society and the oppression against the immigrants and oppressed. Many of us made the same thing in their youth, by carrying long hair. The reactionaries of yesterday had only the insult and the contempt for the mouth, just like the reactionaries of today in front of veiled women.

Once more, and it is not incidental, it is precisely the women who are in the line of sight. The anti-Muslim xenophobes believe, as a starting point, that they cannot be major and freely determined. Then, it is necessary to impose clothing fashions to them, as yesterday, in the name of the same arguments they were denied the voting right, because they were not politically major. It is always the same reaction which acts.

For a bit, one took out again the *Hammer of Witches* of the Inquisition, the sadly famous *Malleus Maleficarum* which saw so many women hunted, convicted, tortured, murdered by the Inquisition and the henchmen of the royal power, because they embodied alone the "*absolute evil*".

In France, the Republic is separated from religions and Churches by the law of 1905. The religion becomes a private matter. The law of Separation establishes legal spheres: a public sphere where the religious presence is forbidden for the holders of the public service (there is no reason to confuse liable state employees and users non-labile to the neutrality), a private sphere where prevails the democratic freedoms. Then, things are simple: in the private sphere, total freedoms in the name of the respect for freedom of conscience. Each is free, in the name of the article 10 of the **Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen** of 1789 to express his opinions, even religious.

Accordingly, in the private sphere, each gets dressed as he wants, it is freedom. The veil cannot be prohibited otherwise it is an infringement on the democratic liberties, as was the ban on the long hair and on miniskirts in the Greece of the Colonels in 1967 or in the Franco's regime in Spain. Asking for a repression against those who do not think as you is always the mark of totalitarian and of totalitarianisms.

How not to see also that this offensive on the question of the women in the Islam brings for those who lead it, to hide completely the fact that all religions have the same reactionary and misogynous character against the women. The wearing of the veil, comes from Saint-Paul. The minor place of the woman is in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: equally. As it is necessary to put a minus sign on Islam, the xenophobes cover with *the coat of Noah* the other monotheist religions.

6 °) What is the real danger today?

It is rather surprising that these strange "*secularists*" in Europe intone the danger of the increasing Islamisation which is going to dominate everything in Europe, become so in agreement with the most obnoxious extreme-right. If there is some fascism, it is actually there. Who manages in Europe? The institutions of the European Union. They are marked with the seal of Vatican, the only religion centralized at the international level. There is no "*Vatican*" in the Judaism, in the Protestantism, in the Islam, nor even in the Buddhism.

It is directly the social Doctrine of the Church that is implemented in all the social, economic, political aspects in all the countries, in all the European institutions. It is the Church which manages all the politicians. When they have a problem about what to do and how to do it, where do they go? **In Mecca? No, in Vatican** to report and take their orders. This is how in France we saw 260 Elected representatives of the Republic (right and left mixed up) going to Vatican, all expenses paid, to ask to **Pope François** to help them in their mission of Elected representatives. We even saw all the leaders of the European Union going to visit *ad limina* to ask the Supreme Pontiff advices to solve the problems in a full crisis in Europe.

Is there a single country, a single region, managed by Muslims in the European Union? **No**. On the other hand, the Men of Vatican are everywhere. It is them who manage everything and whatever is their political colour.

It becomes thus obvious that the big campaign of denunciation of the danger of Islam is an operation of mix-up to disturb the minds and conceal the fact that the political institutions are driven by the Men and women of Vatican, on behalf of the Roman Curia. We advise to all to read the book published by the French Federation of the Free Thought "*The Men of Vatican*" To see that they infiltrated all the cogs of the political, governmental, economic and social life in Europe and in every country. Vatican has even an organization (the COMECE) which allows influencing, discussing with the authorities and the leaders of the European Union.

That we stand by victims of Islam, we always were. The Free French Thought led big campaigns for the defence of the victims of the trials for blasphemy all over the world. It is our role.

We fight against all the religions. We fight all the dogmas. But nobody shall make us release the prey for the shadow: run behind the cutters of the Islamists head to better protect the men of Vatican.

No, thank you, we don't smoke.