

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

Modern Muslims try to sanitise Mohammed and Islam, and so many Christians are duped by their double-talk. But, they cannot escape what the contemporaries and early people thought of Mohammed and Islam! In this article I will show the reality behind the modern, erroneous attitude towards Islam.

In the early medieval period (when Mohammed devised his religion) his efforts were dubbed heresies of Christian teaching, and Mohammed a false prophet (of the true God). This view changed significantly by the late medieval period, when Islam was called heathenism, and Mohammed was called demonic and an anti-Christ. It is only relatively recently that Islam and Mohammed were viewed in a softer light, because Islam was supposedly no longer a military threat (!). Thus, the Ottomans may have been the last empire seen to be a threat, way into the early 20th century.

However, this softer view has again been changed back to one of horror and anxiety, given the multiple terrorisms worldwide. Though this movement is so obvious, many still wish to see Islam as benign, which is very odd. The jihad activities are definitely militaristic, so perhaps the views once given by contemporaries of Islam and Mohammed will again come to the fore. I believe they should. But, what was said at the time of Mohammed?

The Crusades

Islam always portrays itself as peaceful and loving, but this was not how the Middle Ages saw it. By his death in 632, Mohammed had already inflicted much war and death on the Middle East, and many people were subjugated by threat of the sword. Obviously, as generations arise after the first subjugation, the oppression of an invader is taken for granted, and this is what we see today in once-free people.

The Roman Catholic church instigated the Crusades (not by genuine Christians), who saw Islamists as a danger to life, limb, and Christian truth. They were also combatting the bloodthirsty nature of Islamic regimes. Then, in the later Middle Ages, protracted wars were fought against the Ottomans. The general Christian view of Islam was negative for over a thousand years. Only lately has Islam been portrayed as quiet and worthy, and even Christians have been persuaded to see it as co-equal with the Christian faith, which is a grave error.

Contemporaries Got It Right

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

In the early medieval days, Mohammed was said to be a deceiver: *"...a deceiving prophet has appeared amidst the Saracens"*.

This is a significant statement because it was made in Mohammed's lifetime. (*Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*. It was a letter between a Christian convert and some Jews. The comment about Mohammed was made after the brother of the convert told him about the new Islam).

One of the communicants in the letter said about Mohammed: *"He is deceiving. For do prophets come with sword and chariot?, ...[Y]ou will discover nothing true from the said prophet except human bloodshed"*.

(Walter Emil Kaegi, Jr., "Initial Byzantine Reactions to the Arab Conquest", *Church History*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (June, 1969), p. 139–149, p. 139–142, quoting from *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati* 86–87). As I said, this is interesting because it was a contemporary view of Mohammed and his militaristic 'religion'. Modern Muslims attempt to paint over this early violence.

For some reason few gave Mohammed's name, but everyone knew he existed, and what he was doing. Jews and Christians thought little of him and objected to his 'religion' (Kaegi p. 139–149, p. 139–142), mainly seeing it as a Christian heresy, until Islam developed into an irrational monster.

Another indirect view was given by the Orthodox Patriarch Sophronius, who thought that the murderous activities of Mohammed were a punishment from God upon errant Christians (Kaegi p. 139–149, p. 139–141). But, even at that time, the Saracens were not known to have had a faith of any kind* (which ties in with having 360 idols and false gods), which shows that Islam as a religion was not accepted as genuine for some time. Rather, it was Mohammed's violence and murders that came to the fore, and not his invented 'religion'. (Note: He was variously called Mahomet and Mahound (Anglicised forms), or the Arabic Muhammad – the version used today by Islamists. The more correct form is Mohammed). (*However, to be thought of as a Christian heresy, Arabs at that time must have been largely 'Christian' in thought and belief, otherwise the accusation would not have been made).

Knowledge of Islam became known only after Mohammed made his murderous drives across the deserts to claim land, treasure trove, and slaves. Knowledge of his false religion took longer to surface. In other words, prominence arose not through Islam but through militaristic campaigns based on fear and death. As we find in Wikipedia (*Teaching of Jacob*), the massaged history of Islam by modern Muslims is very different from the actual history given by people at the time of the Arab conquests (Crone, 4). Just a few days ago I had occasion to write to the present Caliph of a branch of Islam in London. I was forced to call him a liar after he wrote a glowing 'history' of Mohammed as a kind, industrious, well-balanced fellow loved by all

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

in his day! How such people think they can hide the truth is amazing.

The Byzantines, who the Arabs conquered, even saw the rise of Islam as a working-out of Daniel's prophecy of the fourth beast, such was the horrific nature of Mohammed and Islam. (Kaegi, Jr., 142. Examples of this very negative contemporary view of Mohammed and Islam can also be found in *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem* [Pseudo-Athanasius literature], and the *Quaestiones et responsiones* attributed to Anastasius of Sinai).

The Messiah

Mohammed was said to have proclaimed a Jewish Messiah, and this was said at a time that Muslim historians say he was already dead!

"... they were saying that the prophet had appeared, coming with the Saracens, and that he was proclaiming the advent of the anointed one, the Christ who was to come. I, having arrived at Sykamina, stopped by a certain old man well-versed in scriptures, and I said to him: "What can you tell me about the prophet who has appeared with the Saracens?" He replied, groaning deeply: "He is false, for the prophets do not come armed with a sword. Truly they are works of anarchy being committed today and I fear that the first Christ to come, whom the Christians worship, was the one sent by God and we instead are preparing to receive the Antichrist."

And

"So I, Abraham, inquired and heard from those who had met him that there was no truth to be found in the so-called prophet, only the shedding of men's blood. He says also that he has the keys of paradise, which is incredible."

(Both quotes are from *Doctrina Jacobi* V.16, 209. [p. 57].)

Today, this 'Messiah' is the so-called Mahdi* and not the Jewish Messiah. He would free the world of evil... so how Muslims can equate that with jihadi violence and murder I cannot tell, unless all sense and reason are suspended. Evidently, contemporaries saw Mohammed as a false prophet and a bloodthirsty savage, his 'religion' as a sign of grave lies that surpassed even

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

heresy. (*BTM reported on the supposed appearance of the Madhi years ago! Perhaps it was a trial run!!).

"This document is plausibly one of the most archaic elements of the Islamic tradition, its agreement with the earliest external accounts of the origins of Islam is highly significant"

(Patricia Crone-Michael Cook 1977)

Other modern sources are more pro-Islam, so one cannot expect them to be accurate.

Sophronius, an Eastern Orthodox leader, Patriarch of Jerusalem, from 634 to his death, was a knowledgeable contemporary of Mohammed and his campaigns, and was geographically close to the 'action'. By birth he was a Syrian Arab and he warned his monks of the Muslim advance and murders (Averil Cameron and Lawrence Conrad). He died just before the fall of Jerusalem to the Muslim caliph Umar I in 637, a companion or sahaba of Mohammed. He allowed Jews to live.

An interesting incident occurred when the caliph Umar ibn al-Khattab overcame Jerusalem. He toured the city with Sophronius and came to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at the time when Muslims prayed. Sophronius asked him if he would like to pray in the church, and his reason for doing so is quite unusual in light of today's massacre-mentality of modern jihadists. Umar declined because he did not want future Muslims building a mosque on the site! Modern jihadists burn down churches or desecrate them, or use them as mosques. Quite a difference.

Given his gracious response, Sophronius handed him the keys to the church. The caliph then gave them to a family of Arabs in Medina, so they could open and close it daily. The keys are still in the hands of the same Arab family's descendants. From this and other historical facts, we can say that though the Saracens were murderous, their general Arab counterparts seemed to be mainly peaceful.

John of Damascus

His was the first Summa of theology in either East or West. He referred to Islam as 'the heresy

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

of the Ishmaelites’.

“There is also the superstition of the Ishmaelites which to this day prevails and keeps people in error, being a forerunner of the Antichrist. They are descended from Ishmael, [who] was born to Abraham of Agar, and for this reason they are called both Agarenes and Ishmaelites. They are also called Saracens, which is derived from Sarras kenoi, or destitute of Sara, because of what Agar said to the angel: ‘Sara hath sent me away destitute.’” (Cf. Gen. 16.8. Sozomen also says that they were descended from Agar, but called themselves descendants of Sara to hide their servile origin (Ecclesiastical History 6.38, PG 67.1412AB).

“These used to be idolaters and worshiped the morning star and Aphrodite, whom in their own language they called Khabár, which means great. And so down to the time of Heraclius they were very great idolaters. From that time to the present a false prophet named Mohammed has appeared in their midst. This man, after having chanced upon the Old and New Testaments and likewise, it seems, having conversed with an Arian monk**, devised his own heresy. Then, having insinuated himself into the good graces of the people by a show of seeming piety, he gave out that a certain book had been sent down to him from heaven. He had set down some ridiculous compositions in this book of his and he gave it to them as an object of veneration.”*

(*The Arabic kabirun means ‘great,’ whether in size or in dignity. Herodotus mentions the Arabian cult of the ‘Heavenly Aphrodite’ but says that the Arabs called her Alilat (Herodotus 1.131) (**This could have been the Nestorian monk Bahira (George or Sergius) who met the boy Mohammed at Bostra in Syria and claimed to recognize in him the sign of a prophet).

Note that at the time Islam was formulated, onlookers, including Arabs, were shocked by Mohammed’s strangeness, and called his writings and claims ‘ridiculous’. As I have shown elsewhere, modern charismatics make similarly ridiculous claims and expect Christians to accept them as true.

“He (Ed Mohammed) says that there is one God, creator of all things, who has neither been begotten nor has begotten.+ He says that the Christ is the Word of God and His Spirit, but a creature and a servant, and that He was begotten, without seed, of Mary the sister of Moses and Aaron++. For, he says, the Word and God and the Spirit entered into Mary and she brought forth Jesus, who was a prophet and servant of God. And he says that the Jews wanted to crucify Him in violation of the law, and that they seized His shadow and crucified this. But the Christ Himself was not crucified, he says, nor did He die, for God out of His love for Him took

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

Him to Himself into heaven+.*

(+Koran, Sura 112. ++Sura 19; 4.169. Note the absolute absurdity of this claim! *+Sura 4.156).

John was contemporaneous with the new Islam, and spoke and read Arabic, so we see the actual reaction to Mohammed's new anti-God theology, rather than later assessments based only on literature and the loyal claims of early Islamists. How could these Islamists possibly denigrate their own beliefs, without showing their own stupidity? Many of their claims are so absurd as to be bizarre, but they are either intellectually impaired or just embarrassed by their own Koran!

Mohammed also made out that God (as he saw him – the singular god) did not know what Jesus had said on earth! See how only Jesus' shadow was crucified. Perhaps the centurion near the cross was stupid, too? Or, the soldiers who lanced his side? Or, those who buried His body? Did they all not realise it was only His shadow? What nonsense!

“And he says this, that when the Christ had ascended into heaven God asked Him: ‘O Jesus, didst thou say: “I am the Son of God and God”?’ And Jesus, he says, answered: ‘Be merciful to me, Lord. Thou knowest that I did not say this and that I did not scorn to be thy servant. But sinful men have written that I made this statement, and they have lied about me and have fallen into error.’ And God answered and said to Him: ‘I know that thou didst not say this word.” (Sura 5.116f)

In this way Mohammed misrepresented what Christians already knew to be true – Jesus was the Son of God, and said it to everyone. Mohammed's words are blatant heresies indeed, but it was necessary for him to say Allah was the ONLY God, so that he could enforce (literally) his new religion and displace the known religion of Christianity, thus removing Arabs from truth and genuine religion. John presses home his accusations against Mohammed:

“There are many other extraordinary and quite ridiculous things in this book which he boasts was sent down to him from God. But when we ask: ‘And who is there to testify that God gave him the book? And which of the prophets foretold that such a prophet would rise up?’—they are at a loss. And we remark that Moses received the Law on Mount Sinai, with God appearing in the sight of all the people in cloud, and fire, and darkness, and storm. And we say that all the

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

Prophets from Moses on down foretold the coming of Christ and how Christ God (and incarnate Son of God) was to come and to be crucified and die and rise again, and how He was to be the judge of the living and dead. Then, when we say: 'How is it that this prophet of yours did not come in the same way, with others bearing witness to him? And how is it that God did not in your presence present this man with the book to which you refer, even as He gave the Law to Moses, with the people looking on and the mountain smoking, so that you, too, might have certainty?'—they answer that God does as He pleases. 'This,' we say, 'We know, but we are asking how the book came down to your prophet.' Then they reply that the book came down to him while he was asleep. Then we jokingly say to them that, as long as he received the book in his sleep and did not actually sense the operation, then the popular adage applies to him (which runs: You're spinning me dreams.)

^

(^The manuscripts do not have the adage, but Lequien suggests this one from Plato).

The query is legitimate. In our own day I present a similar charge against charismatics who introduce many errors, saying 'Thus said the Lord', even though they cannot prove their source to be God. They make similar claims to 'tongues', though they are plainly deceptions. John is correct to question Mohammed's legitimacy, for Mohammed laid claim to his assertions even though no-one was a witness to his obtaining this knowledge.

Anyone can say God told them to write this or do that! Indeed, this is the claim made by many an insane man. John also points out that nowhere in scripture do we find any such prophet as Mohammed foretold, whether as a prophet at all, or as the 'last' prophet. It is very clear from the New Testament that the last prophet of the Old era was John the Baptist, because he spanned both old and new. Jesus then ushered in the New era, meaning that there could be no new revelations after Him. The prophets of the old era foretold of the Messiah, Jesus, and all the prophecies came true... but nothing is said about Mohammed. John then laughed – that Mohammed was spinning a yarn!

He goes farther – that in everyday life Mohammed used witnesses to marry and buy things, but when it came down to giving the supposedly final word of God to the world, there were no witnesses! Obviously, in his day, Mohammed was called a liar or one who told only of his private dreams. After all, there was no proof whatever that his 'revelation' was holy, or from a divine source. The same can be said today of charismatic 'prophecies'. This contemporary view of Mohammed and his new religion led Christians at that time to call the Islamists "Mutilators of God" (St John of Damascus' Critique of Islam", Orthodox Christian Information Centre).

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

John was, as we might say today, 'hot' in his accusations and understanding of Mohammed, because he was so close to the action! His critique continues, that the Islamists hated the Cross and said that veneration of it was an abomination. John returned: *"How is it, then, that you rub yourselves against a stone in your Ka'ba*

(Ed. Which contains a relic of pre-Islamic worship, the Black Stone, said by Islamists, without proof, to have belonged to Abraham. See later note on its real origins) *and kiss and embrace it?"*

Today, hundreds die as they try to march seven times around the Kaaba, itself a building used in pre-Islamic idolatrous days. This is just as much veneration as is kissing a cross. John then adds to his scorn of Islam by bringing out a solid fact concerning the Black Stone:

"This stone that they talk about is a head of that Aphrodite whom they used to worship and whom they called Khabár. Even to the present day, traces of the carving are visible on it to careful observers." (As above, and below)

I do not know if the carvings are still visible, but it is likely that ardent Islamists will by now have chipped them off! John must have read all of Mohammed's books and so was able to dismiss them as "ridiculous". In a book 'On Woman' (Koran, Sura 4), Mohammed said we may take wives and a thousand concubines. Wives could be discarded on whim and added on whim. Mohammed even took the wife of a very naïve and stupid follower named Zeid, saying that God commanded it! Thus, he did not call it 'lust' and 'adultery', but defamed God to get his own way. A similar thing happened when he took an under-age girl to his bed, rationalising paedophilia.

John had many really good arguments against the claims made by Mohammed, and the people of his day were well aware of it! He adds that Mohammed commanded many anti-God laws to be kept: *"And again, in the book of The Heifer, he says some other stupid and ridiculous things, which, because of their great number, I think must be passed over. He made it a law that they be circumcised and the women, too, and he ordered them not to keep the Sabbath and not to be baptized"*. John's words still apply: "stupid and ridiculous".

(Historical note: the original Muslims were known as 'Saracens'. Everyone knew them to be vicious, criminal Barbarians [themuslimissue.wordpress.com], who created and expanded their power and cruelty by deception. Today, Mohammed and his followers are whitewashed so that they are all made out to be saintly and peaceful! The religion was compiled from fragmented pieces acquired from booty from a myriad of sects, tribal customs, and local religions of the age (Old Testament, New Testament, tribal beliefs, Hindu paganism, and the testimony of the life of

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

a brutal warlord).

The Saracens worshipped the head of Aphrodite, acquired from booty on Muslim slave raids and thefts stolen from the Temple of Paphian Aphrodite, in Paphos, Cyprus. This took place sometime between 620-660 AD according to the history of Muslim invasions into Europe, when they had already managed to reach Cyprus, Greece, and Southern Italy.

“When the Saracens invaded Europe they damaged all idols and statues by removing the head or disfiguring the face to demean any forms of idols; thus European museums display many headless or desecrated statues of whatever is left from Muslim destruction of classical civilization.

black stone, al-ajar al-Aswad, was then transported to Arabia and installed in the Kaaba in Mecca (called Chabatha in those days). Being booty the barbarians fought over the stone-head and Muhammed had to make a final decision where it should be installed, which decidedly was in an old pagan temple confiscated by Muhammad and his warriors in Mecca.”

They even beheaded lifeless objects! A modern text says this of the above:

“Astarte, the early Aphrodite, was a goddess of war and licentious sex. They must have assumed it would give them powers over their kafir enemies to steal and worship Astarte. It may also indicate that Cyprus was a very powerful and wealthy place at the time of Muhammad for them to put such significance to the statue.

The head has been kissed, circulated, and worshipped like an idol by millions of Muslims ever since. Only the King and a few keepers are allowed to enter inside the kaaba where a few idols remained from Mohammed’s raids of locals sects and religions. When the head was cut and fell to the ground, it actually got split into pieces. Due to this, the al-ajar al-Aswad has to be kept in a silver frame (shaped like the Hindu Yoni symbol) to hold it together. The marks from the damage done to the statue can still be seen on the black stone. The face should certainly be visible if it is turned around.” (As above)

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

A statue of Aphrodite had a crescent moon in her hair on the top of her head. It is the same moon shown on Islamic flags, etc. proving the pagan source of Islam. As muslimissue adds: *"Of course, Muslims have erased these facts from their history and will never admit that they worship the head of a Greek warrior goddess belonging to the dreaded kuffars."*

Do you not think it odd that those who say they worship the one true 'god' should base their adulation on a created object, the moon? Worship of the moon god/dess was common in the Middle East at that time, and why a figure of the moon god was kept in the Kaaba.

This should not surprise us, for Middle Ages Arab worship was multi-god mixing polytheism, Christianity, Judaism and Iranian religions. This multi-worship was found in the Kaaba until Mohammed decided to have just one of the pagan gods as 'chief' – Allah (moon-god). To bring this about he warred against followers of the god Hubal (Battle of Badr, 624). Hubal was shaped like an human and made of red agate ('Book of Idols', Hisham Ibn Al-kalbi).

At that time Hubal was the chief idol or god (Hafiz Ghulam Sarwar, Muhammad The Holy Prophet (1969). Though Mohammed replaced all idols with just one, Allah, Hubal was a lunar deity (Hugo Winckler, Arabisch, Semitisch, Orientalisch: Kulturgeschichtlich-Mythologische Untersuchung, 1901, W. Peiser: Berlin, p. 83). This makes a denial of Allah as the moon-god very strange, unless the aim of modern Muslims is to make their created being (the inanimate moon) into a Creator and thus divine.

Some say that Mohammed merely manipulated Hubal into Allah, making him a newer incarnation of the moon-god (The moon-god Allah in the archaeology of the Middle East. Newport, PA : Research and Education Foundation, 1994). One Christian source, Janet Parshall said that Muslims "worship a moon-god in syndicated radio broadcasts (Jack G. Shaheen, Arab and Muslim Stereotyping in American Popular Culture, Centre For Muslim-Christian Understanding, Georgetown University Occasional Papers, p. 8, 1996). Pat Robertson said "The struggle is whether Hubal, the Moon God of Mecca, known as Allah, is supreme, or whether the Judeo-Christian Jehovah God of the Bible is Supreme." (Donald E. Schmidt, The folly of war: American foreign policy, 1898-2005, Algora, 2005, p.347).

Such claims have been dismissed by Islamic scholars. Of course, they are bound to do so, even though the evidences for Allah as moon-god seem to be solid. It must be remembered, as we have noted, that no proofs for the meanings of the Koran or of Mohammed's statements, were known at the time of his life. This means that all Islamic statements come from Muslims who lived after the time of Mohammed.

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

"In the 1950's a major temple to the Moon-god was excavated at Hazor in Palestine. Two idols of the moon god were found. Each was a stature of a man sitting upon a throne with a crescent moon carved on his chest (see Diagram 1). The accompanying inscriptions make it clear that these were idols of the Moon-god... Several smaller statues were also found which were identified by their inscriptions as the "daughters" of the Moon-god."

(R. Morey, *The Islamic Invasion: Confronting The World's Fastest-Growing Religion*, 1992, op. cit., p. 213; idem., *The Moon-God Allah In The Archeology Of The Middle East*, 1994, op. cit., p. 5 and p. 7. Using the services of Morey similar claims concerning the statues discovered at Hazor were made by B. M. Stortroen (Ed. G. J. Buitrago), *Mecca And Muhammad: A Judaic Christian Documentation Of The Islamic Faith*, 2000, Church Of Philadelphia Of The Majority Text (Magna), Inc.: Queen Creek (AZ), p. 91).

Needless to say, Islamists say that the connection between Allah and moon-gods is "merely speculative". But, they still have to explain away why Allah is connected to the crescent moon and why this description began with Mohammed. Too many 'coincidences' must be dismissed before we can even consider the legitimacy of Islamic 'scholars'.

More Contemporaneous Views

"It is not uncommon to hear many a Muslim dawagandist asserting that long before Muhammad's prophetic career began he was known among his people as a man of utmost integrity and as having an impeccable character. One will often find these Muslim propagandists claiming that Muhammad's contemporaries knew that he was an honest man, one in whom there was no falsehood. In fact, they even gave him the moniker Al-Amin, or "The Trustworthy" (or so the story goes).

The problem with all of these assertions is that they are not based on contemporary eyewitness accounts but on sources which were written centuries after Muhammad's death. And they were also written at a time when Muslims had the upperhand and could basically rewrite history to their liking. The Muslims were pretty much free to read back into the life of Muhammad their specific theological views and beliefs concerning their prophet.

More importantly, the Muslim scripture itself is a witness against the assertions made by these Muslim apologists. When we analyze the Quran we find that the people around Muhammad did not believe that he was the beacon of truth or that he was a completely honest man. Their testimony is rather unflattering, to say the least, and demonstrates that the later stories of

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

Muhammad's enemies praising his character are nothing more than legend, clear examples of myth-making at its best."

(Introduction to 'How Mohammed's Contemporaries Really Viewed Him', answering-islam.org)

According to contemporaries, the site says, Mohammed was a liar, forger, plagiarist, sorcerer... and a *majnun* – a madman, possibly possessed by a jinn (e.g. demon). Further:

"Now since Muslims believe that the Quran is a contemporary account that was composed during Muhammad's lifetime they must contend with the fact that the so-called earliest Islamic source which they possess does not support the claim that the pagans of Mecca viewed Muhammad as a trustworthy person. If anything, the statements of the Muslim scripture imply the very opposite, that Muhammad's contemporaries considered him to be a liar and deceiver, one who was prone to make stories up, passing off tales of the ancients as revelations from God. This explains why they didn't believe him when he said that God was speaking to him. They saw this as just another one of his far-fetched stories, more of his fantasies and allusions, and viewed this as one of his attempts of trying to make himself someone important with the hopes that his people would take him seriously this time and submit to his wishes and desires.

Moreover, it will not help the Muslim dawagandist to simply dismiss the statements of the disbelievers on the grounds that they are nothing more than false assertions and allegations since this only exposes the blatant inconsistency of Muslim polemicists. Keep in mind that it is the Muslim propagandist who is appealing to the assertions of the disbelievers to prove that Muhammad was a trustworthy person. S/he cannot therefore simply discredit the claims of the unbelievers when they are unflattering to the character of Muhammad. After all, if their testimony is reliable enough to support of Muhammad's integrity then by the same token the unbelievers' claims are also good enough to call his character into question. The Muslims cannot have their cake and eat it too."

(As above).

The site offers the following:

http://www.answering-islam.org/Responses/Abualrub/sinful_mo.htm

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

<http://www.answering-islam.org/Shamoun/possessed.htm>

http://www.answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_possessed.htm

http://www.answering-islam.org/Responses/Osama/zawadi_possessed.htm

Readers should note that the historicity of both Mohammed and the Koran are questioned (Wikipedia). Accounts of both are only evidenced in the Koran itself and from later accounts devised by Islamists who did not know either at their inception. This is why the hadith was thought to be necessary.... myth, legend or hearsay, used to bolster a failed, violent theology.

Advice

Do not take Islamic claims at face value. There are more direct references to Mohammed and the Koran from contemporary non-Muslim sources than from Islam. But, perhaps we can expect this when we see that Islam began as a way to give credibility to the violent excesses of the Saracens. Thus, the violence, theft and warring, took precedence over making the new 'religion' stick!

Mohammed picked and chose from many sources to write his Koran – Old Testament, New Testament, local and wider pagan religions. And he could not verify the divinity of what he wrote with eye-witness accounts. This is very much like the secret angelic visits supposedly made to Joseph Smith! In other words, Islam is true because Mohammed said so! No proof, just self-certification.

Contemporaries of him and the Koran call them 'stupid' and 'ridiculous'. They are certainly contradictory, and this is today exemplified by the way Muslim clerics argue very different explanations for the same texts.

The earliest thoughts were that Mohammed was a false prophet and what he claimed to be a new religion from God was just a mish-mash of occult, pagan and legitimate Jewish/Christian

What Contemporaries Thought of Islam and Mohammed

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 09 March 2016 21:09

scripture. Do not, then, even consider the Koran to be similar to or better than, God's word. A VERY careful study will show that the God of the Koran (Allah) is NOT the same as the biblical God, but is a false idol.

Bear in mind that God says He hates idols and their worship. This is why no Christian can have 'dialogue' with Islamists: to do so is to condone what God hates, and to give credibility to what is intellectually and biblically inferior. Remember that the contemporaries of Mohammed knew the truth – later 'experts' were never there, so they must speculate! There are many more contemporaneous accounts that easily tell us the real truth about Mohammed and Islam.

© February 2016

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}