

Analysis of President Bush's Speech

Dr. Robert A. Morey | September 21, 2001

<https://njjat.com/apologetics.html>

President Bush throws out the 1st Amendment and establishes a new state religion and now threatens to punish any religion that disagrees with his personal religious beliefs.

1. In his address to congress, President Bush first stated his religious belief that Islam is a good and peaceful religion and that it does not teach or practice violence. He also stated that in his religious opinion, terrorists such as Bin Laden are not true Muslims.

2. Bush went on to establish his religious beliefs as the official religious beliefs of the United States. In short, he violated the 1st Amendment by establishing a state sanctioned religion.

3. He further violated the 1st Amendment by stating that he would fight anyone who disagreed with his newly established state religion. Does this mean that those religious scholars and clerics who disagree with his religious opinions on what the religion of Islam does or does not teach will be denied freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly? Will he now fill the jails with all Muslim, Jewish, and Christian scholars and clerics who believe that Muhammad did in fact teach and practice violence and that this has always been a part of the history of the religion of Islam? Does the federal government have the constitutional right to judge which religion is "true," "good," and "peaceful" and to prosecute any religion that disagrees with its religious dogma? NO!

4. The President acknowledged that although Muslim scholars and clerics disagreed among themselves on this religious issue, the US Government has now ruled by fiat that one theological school within Islam is right and all the others false! This is the same as if the President announced the Baptists are right on the issue of baptism and anyone who disagrees with Baptist clerics and scholars on this issue will be prosecuted by the state! Are the Presbyterians to be rounded up and put in concentration camps?

5. What qualifications does Bush have to rule on such religious issues as "What does Jihad mean according to the Qur'an and the Hadith?" Does he have a doctorate in Islamic Studies? He has no qualifications whatsoever.

6. When President Bush said, "The terrorists were not true Muslims," does this not mean in principle that he is claiming that the federal government has the right to decree who is or is not a true follower of any and all religions? Can he really determine who is a "true" Christian, Hindu, or Jew as well as who is a "true" Muslim?

7. Liberal and Fundamentalist Christian scholars and clerics have argued about such religious issues as the inspiration of the Bible, etc. What if President Bush went on national TV before Congress and declared that Liberals are not "true" Christians and that the federal government sided with the Fundamentalists in their doctrines? Since he has done this with Islam, then he could do this with any religion.

8. Who is or is not a "true" follower of any religion is not within the constitutional rights of the government.

Conclusion

We do not have to commit terrorism to fight terrorism. We must not give our civil rights to fight Islam.