Thessalonians*

1Thessalonians 1:5-10 (5) For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake.
(6) And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost:
(7) So that ye were ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia.
(8) For from you sounded out the word of the Lord not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to God-ward is spread abroad; so that we need not to speak any thing.
(9) For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God;
(10) And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.
Paul was the inspired apostle and writer of this epistle, though he makes no mention of his apostleship, which was not doubted by the Thessalonians, nor opposed by any false apostle among them. Thessalonica was on the road to Athens from Philippi, was the capital of ancient Macedonia and was a large and important port city. Paul had first entered Europe at Thessalonica. The church he started there was composed of both ethnic Jews and Gentile proselytes to Judaism, with a great multitude of the latter becoming Christians. This development stirred up the unbelieving Jews, who thenceforth sought to destroy Paul wherever he went. After forming a church there, Paul and Silas were suddenly required to leave the city, imagine that, let's turn to;
Acts 17:1-10 (1) Now when they had passed through

Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews:
(2) And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures,
(3) Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.
(4) And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.
(5) But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people.
(6) And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also;
(7) Whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus.
(8) And they troubled the people and the rulers of the city, when they heard these things.
(9) And when they had taken security of Jason, and of the other, they let them go.
(10) And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming thither went into the synagogue of the Jews.
Paul had warned the new converts in Thessalonica that they might face persecution, however, they did have a number of questions, especially in relation to life after death and the promised return of the Lord. These were key topics which Paul in his brief ministry there had evidently not been able to deal with adequately. Consequently, this epistle most likely contains the most important and definitive passage in the Bible on these topics. Turn your Bibles to;
I Thessalonians 4:13-5:4 (4:13) But I would not have you to be

ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope.
(14) For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.
(15) For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.
(16) For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:
(17) Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.
(18) Wherefore comfort one another with these words.
1 Thessalonians 5:1-4 But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you.
(2) For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night.
(3) For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape.
(4) But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.
Here is comfort for the relations and friends of those who die in the Lord. Grief for the death of friends is lawful; we may weep for our own loss, though it be their gain. Christianity does not forbid, and grace does not do away with our natural affections. Yet we must not be excessive in our sorrows; this is too much like those who have no hope of a better life. Death is an unknown thing, and we know little about the state after death; yet the doctrines of the resurrection and the second coming of Christ, are a remedy against the fear of death, and undue sorrow for the death of our Christian friends; and of these doctrines we have full assurance.
It will be eternal happiness that all the saints shall

meet, and remain together for ever; but the principal happiness of heaven is to be with the Lord, to see Him, live with Him, and enjoy Him for ever. We should support one another in times of sorrow; not deaden one another's spirits, or weaken one another's hands. And this may be done by the many lessons to be learned from the resurrection of the dead, and the second coming of Christ (Hebrews 10:28). *What happiness a man may have by telling friends they are going to appear before the judgment-seat of God! But who can feel comfort from those words? That man with whose spirit, the Spirit of God bears witness that his sins are blotted out. There seems to have been certain counterfeit letters, perhaps written to the church in Paul's name, confusing the church about the doctrine of Christ's second coming, and conflicting with what Paul had written earlier in his first letter. Consequently, II Thessalonians contains a very important exposition on the son of perdition, as well as the coming of the true Christ. Please turn to;*

2Thessalonians 2:1-12 (1) Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him,
(2) That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.
(3) Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the **son of perdition**;
(4) Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.
(5) Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?
(6) And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.
(7) For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who

now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.
(8) And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:
(9) Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,
(10) And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.
(11) And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:
(12) That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

There is still confusion about the doctrine of Christ's second coming. The modern expression "Rapture", is not mentioned anywhere in the Bible or any Christian writings, until after the year 1830 AD. Of course, those who feel the origin of the teaching is in the Bible, would say that it ceased being taught for some unknown reason at the close of the apostolic age only to reappear in 1830. But if the doctrine were so clearly stated in Scripture, it seems incredible that no one should have referred to it before the 19th century. Take the example of baptism, there are many writings on this subject, both for and against it, outside scripture. So what is the deal with a rapture? It seems that on one particular evening, the power of the Holy Spirit was said to have rested on a Miss Margaret Macdonald while she was ill at home. She was dangerously sick and thought she was dying. In spite of this she is supposed to have come under the "power" of the spirit, for several successive hours she experienced manifestations of "mingled prophecy and vision." She found her mind in an altered state and began to experience considerable visionary activity. The message she received during this prophetic vision convinced her that Christ was going to appear in two stages at His Second Advent, and not a single occasion as was

believed from Apostolic times (2Peter 3:10). *This visionary experience of Miss Macdonald represented the prime source of the modern Rapture doctrine as the historical evidence compiled by a Mr. MacPherson reveals. The studies of Mr. MacPherson show that her sickness during which she received her visions and revelations occurred sometime between February 1 and April 14, 1830. By late spring and early summer of 1830, her belief in the two phases of Christ's coming was mentioned in praise and prayer meetings in several towns of western Scotland. In these meetings some people were speaking in "tongues" and other charismatic occurrences were in evidence. These extraordinary and strange events so attracted John Darby that he made a trip to the area to witness what was going on. Though he did not approve of the charismatic episodes that he witnessed, it is nonetheless significant that Darby, after returning from Scotland, began to teach that Christ's Advent would occur in two phases. MacPherson shows good evidence that Darby even visited Miss Macdonald in her home. There can hardly be any doubt that the visions and spiritual experiences of Miss Macdonald are the source of the modern doctrine. But belief in such paranormal experiences are dangerous, especially when they are contrary to scriptural teachings. The Pre-Tribulation Rapture Theory is a menacing doctrine that perverts the plain language of the text of the New Testament. Some preachers today look on the doctrine as the heart and core of present Christian expectations in regard to prophetic truth for the near future! Many believe in this false teaching as the principle hope of the Body of Christ for their redemption and safety during the Great Tribulation. Warnings from God's word are a reminder that we should exercise caution in accepting the truthfulness of visionary revelations, particularly those near the end of the age, and which are contradictory to one another and to the Bible. The Pre-Tribulation Rapture Theory is such a doctrine; a teaching with no scriptural warrant. Jesus is the author and*

finisher of our faith, that eliminates Miss Macdonald, John Darby and others. Does the Bible speak of a rapture? Proponents claim the Rapture will be secretive. We are told that families will be shocked by the strange disappearance of a mother, father, or child. Driverless cars will collide in the streets (thus the bumper sticker: "In case of rapture, this vehicle will be unmanned"). A man and wife will be in bed; she hears a noise, turns her head, and finds him gone. Planes will crash with no pilots found. These sensational and dramatic examples illustrate the view that the Rapture will be an invisible coming of the Lord for His saints, leaving visible results of chaos and confusion among the remaining unbelievers. The primary passage used to support the idea of a "rapture" is 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17.

But this passage was not actually given to deal with the return of Christ. Its purpose was twofold. First, it was designed to reassure Christians that their deceased loved ones would be able to share in the Lord's return. Second, it informed Christians that those who are still living when Christ returns will have no precedence or advantage over those who have already died. This dual function of the text constitutes a very different emphasis from the one imposed upon it by dispensationalists. Christ's coming will not be secretive, He will announce His arrival to the whole world in no uncertain terms. The only thing secretive about that day is the knowledge pertaining to its timing. Only the Father knows the arrival date of the last day and when He tells the Son to "GO", all will know! (1Thess 5:1-6).

It is needless or useless to ask about the particular date or time of Christ's coming. Christ did not reveal this to the apostles, even He does not know. However, the times and seasons for us to work are upon us now, and these are our duty and interest to know and observe. The coming of Christ will be a great surprise to men. Our Lord Himself said so. Christ's coming will be terrible to the ungodly. Their

destruction will overtake them while they dream of happiness, and please themselves with vain amusements. There will be no means to escape the terror or the punishment of that day. That day will be a happy day to the righteous. Let us therefore endeavour to awaken ourselves and each other, and guard against spiritual enemies. The only other thing I might add is, the rapture has been predicted to occur on several occasions, but has never materialized. This in itself is proof that it is a false doctrine. There also seems to be misconception concerning antichrist in all this. Somehow 'I Thessalonians 2:3' *is in the mix;* Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the **son of perdition.** *The son of perdition and antichrist are two separate states of being. As a matter of fact, the term "antichrist" occurs only five times in Scripture, and only in the writing of John, and only in two of his five books. The implications are significant. Dispensationalists do not go to 1 and 2 John when they discuss the Antichrist. They go to Revelation, or Thessalonians, or Daniel. They go to passages that do not even use or hinge on the word Antichrist! But what or who is the son of perdition? The definition of "perdition"* is a state of final and irrevocable spiritual ruin, loss of the soul, damnation and the future state of the wicked. *Surly this describes anyone who sells their soul for the wages of sin. Another thing to consider is the fact that perdition is not exclusive to Thessalonians, turn to;*
Revelation 17:7-8 (7) And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns.
(8) The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into **perdition**: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and

yet is.
The Concise Encyclopedia gives an interesting account of Antichrist, {Chief enemy of Christ who would reign at the end of time, first mentioned in the epistles of St. John. The idea of a mighty ruler who will appear at the end of time to fight against the forces of good was adapted from Judaism; the Jewish concept in turn had been influenced by Iranian and Babylonian myths of the battle of God and the devil at the end of time.} *Now turn with me to;*
2Thessalonians 2:5-17 (5) Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?
(6) And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.
(7) For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.
(8) And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:
(9) Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,
(10) And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.
(11) And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:
(12) That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.
(13) But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth:
(14) Whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.
(15) Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.

(16) Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace,
(17) Comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.

Faith in Christ is worth every thing. But those who have no faith in Christ, then His appearance will be terrible, especially to those who rebel and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is the great crime of multitudes, the gospel is revealed and they will not believe it; or if they pretend to believe they will not obey it. Believing the truths of the gospel, is paramount to obeying the precepts of the gospel. Though sinners may be long spared, they will be punished at last. They did sin's work, and must receive sin's wages. It will be destruction from the Almighty; and who knows the power of His anger? It will be a joyful day for some, to the saints, to those who believe and obey the gospel. The least in the Kingdom of Heaven shall enjoy more than the most enlarged heart can imagine while on earth. Jesus said; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. *What does this entail? A belief that results in faith in Christ, Godly sorrow that results in repentance, confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and then be baptized for remission of sins. If there is need of prayer for other reasons, in either case come while we sing.*

This message approved by
Jack Warford
a Minister for Christ

"Islamophobia"?

by Dave Miller, Ph.D.



Political correctness is running amok in American civilization. This irrational, self-contradictory ideology is virtually ensconced in culture. Millions have been victimized by this propaganda and intimidated into silence when confronted by ideas and behaviors that are immoral or destructive. This sinister ideology began to assert itself with a vengeance during the turbulent 1960s. In seemingly conspiratorial fashion, socialistic forces strategized means by which to bully mainstream Americans into silent passivity. As Cuban producer, director, and author Agustin Blazquez explains: “Change their speech and thought patterns by spreading the idea that vocalizing your beliefs is disrespectful to others and must be avoided to make up for past inequities and injustices” (2002). While accusing the status quo of censorship, attempting to stifle free speech, and oppress the left, ironically, the left now uses the very tactics they mistakenly imagined in their opponents. Hence, the social liberals in politics, education, and beyond launched “a sophisticated and dangerous form of censorship and oppression, imposed upon the citizenry with the ultimate goal of manipulating, brainwashing and destroying our society” (Blazquez). They have worked their agenda with a shrewd precision that would be the envy of the most sinister dictators of human history—from Nero to Hitler to Stalin.

Strangely, the effort to silence the traditional Christian values that have characterized America from the beginning has been accompanied by inconsistent and self-contradictory accommodation of Islam. Immediately after 9-11, the forces of political correctness sought to minimize the obvious connection between Islam and the attack by insisting that Islam is a peaceful religion, and by promoting Islam in public schools and encouraging the construction of Mosques throughout the country. Even as Christmas cards, Christian prayer, and allusions to Christianity in American history were being challenged across the country, an elementary school in Texas permitted a girl to present an overview and show a video about her Muslim religion to her classmates; a public middle school in San Luis Obispo, California had its students pretend to be warriors fighting for Islam; and a school near Oakland, California encouraged 125 seventh-grade students to dress up in Muslim robes for a three-week course on Islam. Consider the attack by Islamic gunmen that killed 12 people at the offices of a French satirical newspaper in Paris. The event evoked reactions that sought to lay blame on “disrespect for religion on the part of irresponsible cartoonists” and “violent extremists unrelated to Islam,” rather than placing blame on Sharia law, Islam, and the Quran (McCarthy, 2015; Packer, 2015; Kristof, 2015; “All in With…,” 2015; Tuttle, 2015).

The open promotion of Islam across the country has become widespread as footbaths are being installed in universities and other public facilities, traffic in New York City is disrupted by Muslims performing prayer rituals in the streets, public school classrooms and extracurricular activities are altered to accommodate Ramadan and daily prayer rituals, and the capitol lawn is given over to a Muslim prayer service involving hundreds. Any who dare even to question these proceedings are instantly pummeled and castigated as intolerant and "Islamophobic."

As an example, consider the nationwide brouhaha that surrounded the construction of a mosque near ground zero. Despite what the left alleged, participating in a public rally to voice opposition to the construction of a mosque was not "bashing Islam" or being intolerant and "Islamophobic." In 1941, the World War 2 generation was not being "Japophobic" when they went to war with Japan because Japanese aircraft bombed Pearl Harbor, killing some 2,400 of our young men, and wounding a 1,000 more. Nor were they "Naziphobic" when they sought to deter Germany from its attempted conquest of Europe and eventually America. **Even to suggest such is ludicrous**. They were merely facing reality—an ability today's social liberals seem to lack, coupled with their complete naiveté regarding the sinister threat posed by Islam. What if Japanese living in America had sought to erect a Buddhist temple or Shinto shrine over the wreckage of the USS Arizona?

Make no mistake, **true Christians do not hate Muslims**, nor harbor prejudice or ill will against them. Rather, informed Christians and Americans simply recognize the fundamental threat that Islam poses to the freedom to practice one's Christian beliefs without fear of reprisal. Indeed, taking steps to minimize the spread of Islam is itself the exercise of First Amendment rights. It is a sincere attempt to discourage the spread of religious views that are antithetical to liberty and the Christian principles on which America was founded—and on which her perpetuation depends. **The American Founders recognized this fact**.

the founders on islam

Father of American Jurisprudence and New York State Supreme Court Chief Justice James Kent noted that "we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted [*sic*] upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those **imposters**"—referring to "Mahomet and the Grand Lama" (*The People*…, 1811, emp. added). Did you catch that? The moral fabric of America is "deeply engrafted" on Christianity—not the false religion of Islam. Labeling founders of false religions "imposters" is not "hate speech;" it is simply describing reality.

James Iredell, appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court by George Washington, felt sure that Americans would never elect Muslims, pagans, or atheists to political office when he demurred, "But it is never to be supposed that the people of America will trust their dearest rights to persons who have no religion at all, or **a religion materially different from their own**" (1836, 4:194, emp. added). Father of American Geography, Jedediah Morse, explained the intimate connection between America's freedom and the Christian religion:

The foundations which support the interests of Christianity, are also necessary to support a free and equal government like our own. In all those countries where there is little or no religion, or **a very gross and corrupt one, as in Mahometan** and Pagan countries, there you will find, with scarcely a single exception, arbitrary and tyrannical governments, gross ignorance and wickedness, and deplorable wretchedness among the people. **To the kindly influence of Christianity we owe that degree of civil freedom, and political and social happiness which mankind now enjoy** (1799, p. 14, emp. added).

Here is an extremely wise, insightful, and sobering admonition—if we will listen and learn. The portrait that Morse painted has not changed in the intervening 200^{+} years. Muslim nations across the world are **still** "very gross and corrupt," with "tyrannical governments" and "deplorable wretchedness among the people." Is that what Americans desire for their own lifestyle? Does even the politically correct crowd wish to live in such a country? They do not. Yet, they foolishly hasten the deleterious transformation of our country.

In his masterful refutation of Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason*, Elias Boudinot, who served as one of the Presidents of the Continental Congress, offered a blistering assessment of Islam in its contradistinction to Christianity:

Did not Moses and Christ show their divine mission, not only by the nature and effects of their doctrines and precepts,...but also by doing good, in the presence of all the people, works, that no other men ever did…? But Mahomet aimed to establish **his pretensions to divine authority**, **by the power of the sword and the terrors of his government**; while he carefully avoided any attempts at miracles in the presence of his followers, and all pretences [sic] to foretell things to come…. [The laws] of **Mahomet and other impostors** have generally been compiled by degrees, according to the exigencies of the states, the prevalence of particular factions, or the authority who governed the people at his own will. Mahomet made his laws, not to curb, but humor the genius of the people; they were therefore altered and repealed from the same causes…. [W]here is the comparison between the supposed prophet of Mecca, and the Son of God; or **with what propriety ought they to be named together**? The difference between these characters is so great, that the facts need not be further applied (1801, pp. 36-39, emp. added).

Ethan Allen exposed a fallacy of Islam in his discussion of the fact that the providence of the God of the Bible "does not interfere with the agency of man," whereas

Mahomet taught his army that the "term of every man's life was fixed by God, and that none could shorten it, by any hazard that he might seem to be exposed to in battle or otherwise," but that it should be introduced into peaceable and civil life, and be patronized by any teachers of religion, **is quite strange, as it subverts religion in general**, and renders the teaching of it unnecessary… (1854, p. 21, emp. added).

He also warned against being "imposed upon by **imposters**, or by **ignorant and insidious teachers**, whose interest it may be to obtrude their own systems on the world for infallible truth, **as in the instance of Mahomet**" (p. 55, emp. added).

When Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were appointed and authorized by Congress to negotiate a treaty with the Muslim terrorists who continually raided American ships off the coast of North Africa, they met in London in 1786 with the Ambassador from Tripoli. On March 28, they penned the following words to John Jay, then serving as Secretary for Foreign Affairs, reporting their conversation with the ambassador:

We took the liberty to make some inquiries concerning the grounds of their pretentions to make war upon nations who had done them no injury, and observed that we considered all mankind as our Friends who had done us no wrong, nor had given us any provocation. **The Ambassador answered us that it was founded on the laws of their Prophet, that it was written in their Koran that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found, and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners; and that every Musselman who should be slain in battle was sure to go to Paradise**. That it was a law that the first who boards an enemy's vessel should have one slave more than his share with the rest, which operated as an incentive to the most desperate valour and enterprize [sic], that it was the practice of their corsairs to bear down upon a ship, for each sailor to take a dagger, in each hand, and another in his mouth, and leap on board, which so terrified their enemies that very few ever stood against them, that he verily believed that the Devil assisted his countrymen, for they were almost always successful ("Letter from the…," emp. added).

While the Founders were supportive of "freedom of religion," they were not for encouraging false religions (i.e., all non-Christian religions) to spread in America, or to be given "equal time" with Christianity, or allowed to infiltrate civil institutions (see Miller, 2013). Consider U.S. Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story who was appointed to the Court by President James Madison in 1811, and is considered the founder of Harvard Law School and one of two men who have been considered the Fathers of American Jurisprudence. In his *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States*, Story

clarified the meaning of the First Amendment as it relates to religious toleration and Islam:

The real object of the [First—DM] [A]mendment was not to countenance, **much less to advance Mahometanism**, or Judaism, or infidelity **by prostrating Christianity**; but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to a hierarchy [of one denomination—DM] the exclusive patronage of the national government (1833, 3:728.1871, emp. added).

Samuel Johnston, Governor of North Carolina and Member of the *Constitution* ratifying convention in 1788, attempted to allay fears that anti-Christian ideologies may infiltrate our elected officials:

It is apprehended that Jews, **Mahometans**, pagans, &c., may be elected to high offices under the government of the United States. Those who are **Mahometans**, or any others who are not professors of the Christian religion, can never be elected to the office of President or other high office, but in one of two cases. First, if the people of America lay aside the Christian religion altogether, it may happen. **Should this unfortunately take place**, the people will choose such men as think as they do themselves (as quoted in Elliot, 1836, 4:198, emp. added).

John Quincy Adams, son of John Adams and distinguished for his significant contributions to the Founding era and thereafter, summarized the attitude of most Americans and Founders toward Islam in his brilliant "Essays on the Russo-Turkish War" written in 1827. In these essays, we see a cogent, informed portrait of the threat that Islam has posed throughout world history:

In the seventh century of the Christian era, a wandering Arab of the lineage of Hagar, the Egyptian, combining the powers of transcendent genius, with the preternatural energy of a fanatic, and **the fraudulent spirit of an impostor**, proclaimed himself as a messenger from Heaven, and spread desolation and delusion over an extensive portion of the earth. Adopting from the sublime conception of the Mosaic law, the doctrine of one omnipotent God; he connected indissolubly with it, the **audacious falsehood**, that he was himself his prophet and apostle. Adopting from the new Revelation of Jesus, the faith and hope of immortal life, and of future retribution, he humbled it to the dust, by adapting all the rewards and sanctions of his religion to the gratification of the sexual passion. He poisoned the sources of human felicity at the fountain by degrading the condition of the female sex, and the allowance of polygamy; and he declared undistinguishing and exterminating war, as a part of his religion, against all the rest of mankind. THE ESSENCE OF HIS DOCTRINE WAS VIOLENCE AND LUST: TO EXALT THE BRUTAL OVER THE SPIRITUAL PART OF HUMAN NATURE. Between these two religions, thus contrasted in their characters, a war of twelve hundred years has already raged. That war is yet flagrant; nor can it cease but by the extinction of that **imposture**, which has been permitted by Providence to prolong the degeneracy of man. While the

merciless and dissolute dogmas of the **false prophet** shall furnish motives to human action, there can never be peace upon earth, and good will towards men. The hand of Ishmael will be against every man, and every man's hand against him [Genesis 16:12—DM]. It is, indeed, amongst the mysterious dealings of God, that this **delusion** should have been suffered for so many ages, and during so many generations of human kind, to prevail over the doctrines of the meek and peaceful and benevolent Jesus (1830, 29:269, capitals in orig., emp. added).

Observe that Adams not only documents the violent nature of Islam, in contrast with the peaceful and benevolent thrust of Christianity, he further exposes the mistreatment of women inherent in Islamic doctrine, including the degrading practice of polygamy. A few pages later, Adams again spotlights the coercive, violent nature of Islam, as well as the Muslim's right to lie and deceive to advance Islam:

The precept of the koran is, perpetual war against all who deny, that Mahomet is the prophet of God. The vanquished may purchase their lives, by the payment of tribute; the victorious may be appeased by a false and delusive promise of peace; and the faithful follower of the prophet, may submit to the imperious necessities of defeat: but the command to propagate the Moslem creed by the sword is always obligatory, when it can be made effective. The commands of the prophet may be performed alike, by fraud, or by force (29:274).

No Christian would deny that many Christians in history have violated the precepts of Christ by mistreating others and even committing atrocities in the name of Christ. However, Adams rightly observes that one must go **against** Christian doctrine to do so. Not so with Islam—since violence is sanctioned:

The fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion, is the extirpation of hatred from the human heart. It forbids the exercise of it, even towards enemies. There is no denomination of Christians, which denies or misunderstands this doctrine. All understand it alike—all acknowledge its obligations; and however imperfectly, in the purposes of Divine Providence, its efficacy has been shown in the practice of Christians, it has not been wholly inoperative upon them. Its effect has been upon the manners of nations. It has mitigated the horrors of war—it has softened the features of slavery—it has humanized the intercourse of social life. The unqualified acknowledgement of a duty does not, indeed, suffice to insure its performance. Hatred is yet a passion, but too powerful upon the hearts of Christians. Yet they cannot indulge it, except by the sacrifice of their principles, and the conscious violation of their duties. No state paper from a Christian hand, could, without trampling the precepts of its Lord and Master, have commenced by an open proclamation of hatred to any portion of the human race. **The Ottoman lays it down as the foundation of his discourse** (29:300, emp. added; see Miller, 2005).

These observations by a cross-section of the Founders of the American Republic

represent the prevailing viewpoint in America for nearly 200 years. Only with the onslaught of "political correctness" have so many Americans blinded themselves to the sinister threat posed to their freedom and way of life.

When General George S. Patton was waging war against the Nazis in North Africa during World War 2, he had the opportunity to observe what Islam does for a nation, particularly the female population. In his monumental volume *War As I Knew It*, writing from Casablanca on June 9, 1943, Patton mused:

> One cannot but ponder the question: What if the Arabs had been Christians? To me it seems certain that the **fatalistic teachings of Mohammed and the utter degradation of women** is the outstanding cause for the arrested development of the Arab. He is exactly as he was around the year 700, while we have kept on developing. Here, I think, is a text for some eloquent sermon on **the virtues of Christianity** (1947, p. 49, emp. added).

The Founders of the American republic were hardly "Islamophobic." Rather, they wisely recognized the fundamental threat posed by the teachings of the Quran to the American way of life. As pursuers of truth, they believed Islam to be a false religion that should no more be encouraged to thrive in society than belief in Peter Pan's Neverland. They viewed Christianity as the one true religion (see Miller, 2010). Indeed, mark it down, if Islam is given free course to alter the laws and public institutions of America, it logically follows that America will become **just like the Islamic nations of the world**. It is naïve and foolish to think that Islam can eventually become widespread in America and America remain the same country she has been. It is only logical and obvious to conclude that when America's institutions are altered to accommodate Muslims, Islamic influence will, in time, dominate the nation. Then how will Christians be treated? The answer is self-evident. Look at how Christians are treated even now in Muslim countries around the world. Ask yourself this question: "Is there any Muslim country on Earth where I would choose to live?"

When clear thinking Americans examine Islam's doctrines, and assess the behavior of its adherents over the centuries, they are merely doing what any rational person does every day with respect to a host of ideas. The honest heart naturally desires truth. Truth has nothing to fear. The God of the Bible wants truth contrasted with error so that all sincere persons can discern the truth and distinguish truth from falsehood (1 Kings 18:21; Acts 17:11; 1 Thessalonians 5:21). Christianity is inherently a religion of truth, reason, and logic (John 8:32; cf. Miller, 2011).

conclusion

"Islamophobia" is an irrelevant, concocted notion. It is a prejudicial, "red flag" word created by the left to stifle any hint of an inherent threat posed by Islam to the American way of life. In the words, again, of Agustin Blasquez: "It's one thing to be educated, considerate, polite and have good manners, and another to be forced to self-censor and say things that are totally incorrect in order to comply with the arbitrary dictums of a deceiving and fanatical far-left agenda" (2002). As the deterioration and complete breakdown of traditional American (Christian) values climax, the destructive perpetrator—the left—is strangely eager to enable Islam to trample underfoot any Christian vestiges that remain. [NOTE: Ironically, if Islam were to take over America, many of the pluralistic ideologies championed by the left would be the first to be eliminated—from feminism to homosexuality.] To borrow the title of James Burnham's book (1964), the suicide of the west is nearly complete. Or as D.T. Devareaux's disturbing political cartoon depicts, Islam is happy to serve as the hammer finger on the weapon of Liberalism used by Uncle Sam (who upholds Western Civilization) to terminate his own existence ("The Art of…," n.d.).

REFERENCES

Adams, John Quincy (1830), "Essays on Russo-Turkish War," in *The American Annual Register*, ed. Joseph Blunt (New York: E. & G.W. Blunt), 29:267-402, http://www.archive.org/stream/p1americanannual29blunuoft.

Allen, Ethan (1854), *Reason, the Only Oracle of Man* (Boston, MA: J.P. Mendum).

"All In With Chris Hayes" (2015), "Terror Attack in Paris," *MSNBC*, January 7, http://www.msnbc.com/all-in/watch/terror-attack-in-paris-381379651841.

"The Art of D.T. Devareaux" (no date), http://plancksconstant.org/es/blog1/2009/06/the_art_of_dt_devareaux.html. See "The Study of Revenge: The Polemical Artwork of D. T. Devareaux," http://plancksconstant.org/es/blog1/2008/02/devareax.html.

Blazquez, Agustin (2002), "Political Correctness: The Scourge of Our Times," NewsMax.com, April 8, http://archive.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2002/4/4/121115.shtml/.

Boudinot, Elias (1801), *The Age of Revelation* (Philadelphia, PA: Asbury Dickens).

Burnham, James (1964), *Suicide of the West* (New York: John Day Company).

Elliot, Jonathan, ed. (1836), *Debates in the Convention of the State of North Carolina, On the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* (Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Maury), second edition, http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lwed.html.

Iredell, James (1836), *The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution*, ed. Jonathan Elliot (Washington, D.C.: Jonathan Elliot).

Kristof, Nicholas (2015), "Is Islam to Blame for the Shooting at Charlie Hebdo in Paris?" *The New York Times*, January 7, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/08/opinion/nicholas-kristof-lessons-from-the-charlie-hebdo-shooting-in-paris.html?_r=0.

"Letter from the American Peace Commissioners (Thomas Jefferson & John Adams) to John Jay March 28, 1786" (1786), The Thomas Jefferson Papers Series 1. General Correspondence. 1651-1827, http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.mss/mtj.mtjbib001849.

McCarthy, Andrew (2015), "Don't Blame the Charlie Hebdo Mass Murder on 'Extremism,'" *National Review*, January 7, http://www.nationalreview.com/article/395876/dont-blame-charlie-hebdo-mass-murder-extremism-andrew-c-mccarthy.

Miller, Dave (2005), "Violence and the Quran," Apologetics Press, http://www.apologeticspress.org/APContent.aspx?category=8&article=1491&topic=44.

Miller, Dave (2010), *Christ and the Continental Congress* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press).

Miller, Dave (2011), "Is Christianity Logical?" *Reason & Revelation*, 31[6]:50-59, June, http://www.apologeticspress.org/apPubPage.aspx?pub=1&issue=977.

Miller, Dave (2013), "Were the Founding Fathers 'Tolerant' of Islam?" *Reason & Revelation*, 33[3]:26-28,32-35, http://apologeticspress.org/apPubPage.aspx?pub=1&issue=1116&article=2128.

Morse, Jedidiah (1799), *A Sermon, Exhibiting the Present Dangers and Consequent Duties of the Citizens of the United States of America* (Hartford, CT: Hudson and Goodwin), http://www.archive.org/details/sermonexhibiting00morsrich.

Packer, George (2015), "The Blame for the Charlie Hebdo Murders," *The New Yorker*, January 7, http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/blame-for-charlie-hebdo-murders.

Patton, George (1947), *War As I Knew It* (New York: Houghton Mifflin).

The People v. Ruggles (1811), 8 Johns 290 (Sup. Ct. NY.), N.Y. Lexis 124.

Story, Joseph (1833), *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* (Boston, MA: Hilliard, Gray, & Co.).

Tuttle, Ian (2015), "The Rush to Blame the Victims in the Charlie Hebdo Massacre," *National Review Online*, January 7, http://www.nationalreview.com/article/395912/rush-blame-victims-charlie-hebdo-massacre-ian-tuttle.

Copyright © 2015 Apologetics Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

We are happy to grant permission for items in the "Islam and Other World Religions" section to be reproduced in part or in their entirety, as long as the following stipulations are observed: (1) Apologetics Press must be designated as the original publisher; (2) the specific Apologetics Press Web site URL must be noted; (3) the author's name must remain attached to the materials; (4) textual alterations of any kind are strictly forbidden; (5) Some illustrations (e.g., photographs, charts, graphics, etc.) are not the intellectual property of Apologetics Press and as such cannot be reproduced from our site without consent from the person or organization that maintains those intellectual rights; (6) serialization of written material (e.g., running an article in several parts) is permitted, as long as the whole of the material is made available, without editing, in a reasonable length of time; (7) articles, excepting brief quotations, may not be offered for sale or included in items offered for sale; and (8) articles may be reproduced in electronic form for posting on Web sites pending they are not edited or altered from their original content and that credit is given to Apologetics Press, including the web location from which the articles were taken.

Revised; 10172019
Ref; The Rapture Theory - Its Surprising Origin **A.S.K.**
Will There be an "Antichrist"? Apologetics Press

The message 'Thessalonians' presented to BaronOk-Nov2013/