

An Open Letter to Nadir Ahmed

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Dear Nadir,

First of all, I want to thank you for the compliment you have given to me. Since there are hundreds of Christian apologists who have refuted Islam, that you would devote so much time and effort on me is a compliment to the power of my arguments. The fact that Muslim apologists attack me again and again gives me great satisfaction. This is certainly better than being totally ignored!

Second, it was a tactical error on your part to take a Christian argument that Jesus is either liar, lunatic or Lord and apply it to me. Islam does not stand or fall on you just as Christianity does not stand or fall on me. We are mere followers - not founders of a major religion. It was childish on your part and marks your entire site as one vast joke.

Third, al-Islam stands or falls on three great issues:

Is Allah a true or false god?

Was Muhammad a true or false prophet?

Is the Qur'an a true or false book?

Islam is like a three-legged stool. If one of the legs is broken, the stool cannot stand. If Allah, Muhammad or the Qur'an is discredited, Islam falls.

Fourth, I was disappointed that you did not deal with the essential issues that determine whether Islam stands or falls.

Fifth, in terms of logic, you committed several formal fallacies.

You have repeatedly committed the "red herring" fallacy of focusing on trivial issues that are irrelevant to the question of the validity of Islam. Let me illustrate what I mean.

Both Shabir and Badawi focused all their time and energy on trying to paint me as a "liar" because I said that Bukhari's Hadith stated that Muhammad had a white "thing." They made a big deal of this issue because their copy of Bukhari said "thigh" and not "thing." They put the issue on their websites and even printed it up in booklets and tracts.

Now, does Islam rise or fall on "thing" or "thigh"? No. As a matter of fact, my point was that Muhammad was a white man according to several Hadith references. Shabir and Badawi did not deny that the word "white" was used in reference to him. In the end, both Badawi and Shabir had to eat crow when they discovered that Muhammad Khan's translation of Bukhari did in fact have "thing" and not "thigh."

Did they apologize to me? No. Did the fact that I was vindicated disprove Islam? No. Did Islam stand or fall on whether Muhammad's "thing" or "thigh" was white? No.

My point is this: Badawi and Shabir dragged out the red herring of the "thing" or "thigh" issue in the false assumption that if they could show that I had made a mistake on some minor irrelevant point, then they could avoid having to answer my major arguments.

This is another fallacy you make. You, like them, assume that the attributes of a part can be applied to the whole. What you do not understand is that I could be mistaken on this or that irrelevant issue and this logically has no bearing on my main arguments against Allah, Muhammad, and the Qur'an.

Badawi and Shabir falsely assumed that if they could catch me in some minor point, this proved that I was a "liar." This in turn in their minds meant that *all* my other arguments were likewise false. This is, of course, logically absurd. Even if they could prove that I was mistaken on some minor point, this logically means nothing. Even a liar can tell you the truth!

Sixth, you searched through my written works desperately trying to find some way to refute me. But you did not debate me on any of the relevant arguments I raised in my books.

So, what did you do? You found a tape where you could quote me out of context and misapplied my statements to issues I was not dealing with at the time.

For example, in one lecture I raised the issue of the scientific error of Muhammad that one wing of a fly had the antidote to the poison found in the other wing. Scientists have examined all the wings of a fly and they are exactly the same. Muhammad concluded from this error that since one wing counteracted the poison found in the other wing, you could drink the water into which the fly had fallen. The issue I raised was the scientific error that the wings of a fly had both poison and antidote.

Now, does Islam or my main arguments against Islam stand or fall on whether a Muslim decides to drink the water with or without the fly? No. That issue is irrelevant.

Seventh, when I looked over the issues you raised (you call them "lies" [sic]), I said to myself,

"If this is the best Nadir can do, he is a total idiot!" The issues are trivial, irrelevant, and based on logical fallacies. For example, you fail to make the distinction between a "mistake" and a "lie."

In case you do not know the difference, let me instruct you. When someone states what he sincerely believes to be the truth and later finds out that he was in error, he simply made a "mistake." If someone states as true what he in fact knows not to be true, then he has committed a "lie."

I freely admit that I am not perfect and have made plenty of "mistakes" in my public speaking. I mispronounce words at times and give the wrong reference to a verse.

But, let me make this perfectly plain, I do not lie when I speak what I believe about Islam.

Thus when I sincerely say that Muhammad was a false prophet, I am not *lying* because I do not believe the contrary of what I am saying. I really do believe that he was a child-molester, a murderer, a rapist, a liar, and a thief; I sincerely believe that this is true.

Now you may state that I am *mistaken* in my sincerely held beliefs. But when you say that I am "lying" you only reveal the poverty of your religion.

Nadir, accord me the same benefit of the doubt that I accord you. I believe that you are mistaken in your beliefs. But to say that you are a "liar" would be wrong.

Eight, you also fail to make the logical distinction between questions of fact and questions of relevance. Let me explain.

You do not deny most of the facts I raise. What you disagree with is what I deduce from those facts. For example:

- Did Muhammad teach Islam to his followers by his words and by his example? Yes.
- Does the Hadith record both the words and the examples of Muhammad as a pattern to follow? Yes.
- Did he teach that Muslims should not face Mecca when going to the bathroom? Yes.
- Why was it wrong to face Mecca when going to the bathroom? All the scholars I have asked say that it was to show respect to the Kabah.
- Does the Hadith record that Muhammad faced Jerusalem when going to the bathroom? Yes.
- If you do not face Mecca to show respect for Islam, then what would a rational person conclude if you face Jerusalem instead?

Here we have the difference between issues of facts and issues of deduction. I logically deduce that if to point in one direction shows respect, then to point in another direction is to show disrespect.

With these brief introductory remarks, I now deal with the minor points you raise.

Issue #1 Is Dr. Morey “indorsing Christians to bomb the Muslim city of Mecca in Saudi Arabia (so much for Christianity being peaceful and loving)?”

Nadir, you are mistaken on this point.

1. Where and when have I ever “indorsed” (sic) *Christians* to bomb Mecca? Could it be that you did not document your charge because you cannot do so? Yes.
2. I wrote a book called, *When Is It Right To Fight?*, where I defended the just war theory in which *governments* can go to war for just causes. While I do call upon the *governments* of the United States , France , England , etc. to warn the terrorists that if they continue to attack their countries, their military will destroy the Kabah in Mecca , I have never called upon private Christians to bomb the Kabah in Mecca.
3. Since I am speaking of military action done by governments and have never “indorsed” private Christians throwing bombs at Mecca, you owe me \$500.

Issue #2 Does the Qur'an teach that Allah has the same unconditional love for sinners as found in John 3:16?

Nadir claims that the Qur'an does speak of Allah having the same kind of love found in John 3:16. Is this true in terms of the facts?

1. The God of the Bible unconditionally loves lost, ungodly, wicked sinners so much that He sent His Son to save them. In Rom. 5 we are told that God loved us while we were yet ungodly, sinners, and His enemies.

2. What about Ahmed's "proof" that the Qur'an teaches the same kind of love exists in Allah? His first verse is:

Verily, Allâh **loves** AlMuhsinûn (*gooddoers* - see V.2:112).
(Al-Ma'idah 5:13)

This verse from the Qur'an actually proves my point! Allah does not have unconditional love for evil doers, i.e. sinners, but only a conditional love for those who are "good doers" according to the teachings of Islam. This conditional love is not the kind of love found in John 3:16.

3. The second verse he sets forth is,

Say (O Muhammad SAW to mankind): "If you... accept Islâmic Monotheism, follow the Qur'ân and the Sunnah), Allâh will **love** you and forgive you of your sins." (Aali Imran 3:31)

This verse also proves my point . Allah WILL love you IF you accept Muhammad and Islam. This love is conditional.

4. The issue I addressed was not whether there is a false conditional "love" offered to Muslims in the Qur'an. The point I was raising in my speech is that God's unconditional love for lost sinners is not found in the Qur'an.

5. The word "love" has different meanings and you failed to observe the kind of love I was talking about. You have committed the fallacy of equivocation.

Issue#3 Did Muhammad teach Muslims to face Jerusalem when going to the bathroom?

Let us set the record straight.

1. In Bukhari 1:IV:146 we find that Muhammad instructing Muslims that when following “the call of nature,”

“he should neither face nor turn his back towards the Qibla (Mecca), he should face either the East or the West.”

Why was it wrong to face Mecca and why could one face the East or the West?

2. In Bukhari 1:IV: 147 & 150, we are told twice that Muhammad was seen “facing Jerusalem” when following the call of nature.

3. Muhammad taught Muslims by his *example* as well as by his words. His example was to face Jerusalem . I believe that this was a way to show disrespect to the holy city of Jews and Christians.

Issue #4 Does a fly have poison in one wing and the antidote to that poison in the other wing? If it falls into your drinking cup, do you have to throw the water away or can you drink it?

1. Let us establish the facts of the issue. In Bukhari 4:54:537 and 7:71:673, we read that Muhammad dealt with the issue of what to do with your “drink” (that word is in the text) when a fly falls into it.

2. Muhammad taught that the wings of the fly give both the poison and the antidote to that poison.

3. Ahmed, you did not object to the above facts as I gave them in my lecture.

4. What you objected to is my making fun of Muhammad and saying to drink the water with the fly. In the context I was clearly poking fun at Muhammad. I do not apologize for making fun of him.

5. While in one Hadith Muhammad said to throw the fly away after you dunked it into the water, in the other Hadith he did not say what to do with the fly.

Issue #5 Does the issuing of a “Fatwah” ever mean a death sentence?

Ahmed, you are attacking the wrong person. Some Muslims in the audience chanted “Fatwah! Fatwah!” at me. When I asked them what they meant by that word, one man shouted, “You should die the death of a dog!” When Iran issued a Fatwah against Rushdie, he had a death sentence placed on his head and he had to go into hiding! I document this in my book, *Winning the War Against Radical Islam* . If you want to pretend that Rushdie was not given a death sentence through a Fatwah, that is your problem.

Dear friends, learn this lesson well. Are the issues raised by Ahmed, such as fly wings and in which direction you face when peeing, relevant and important to the validity of Islam? No.

Why didn't Ahmed debate me on whether Allah was the moon-god in pre-Islamic times? Or if Muhammad was guilty of false prophecies? Or if the Qur'an has scientific and historical errors? I am ready to debate him on those issues because Islam stands or falls on them.

I will not waste my time debating in which direction we are to face when peeing. I will not lower the ministry to debate those who only want the opportunity to verbally abuse the servants of Christ. I have unveiled the logical fallacies and absurdities on his site. Pro. 25:5 should be our guide in such situations.