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Caption Banality of Evil: hear no evil, speak no evil, see no evil (image via wikipedia)

This book is about an open secret that few Muslims speak about openly: that the Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam from the very first century of the advent of Islam has been used to build empires. Its system of Divine Guidance subverted from the very beginning and the meaning of the religion molded so as not to interfere with the primacy instincts and imperatives of the rulers. The Muslim body politic for over fourteen centuries has been carefully molded, cultivated and socialized with the help of venerated scribes and pious pulpits to get it to strive in personal morality seeking Heaven elsewhere.
The public mind is cunningly taught to leave the rulers alone, and the empire in turn does not care how loud and varied the daily call for prayer is so long as nothing interferes with the ruling class making their own heaven right here on earth. This politics is self-evident, except that it isn't to the indoctrinated Muslim mind.

This book disabuses this twisted control of the public mind by extricating it from both self-interest and socialization bias imposed upon oneself by one's own will, and from Machiavellian perception management imposed by others' will. The book is a case study of Islam and Muslims at the intersection of religion of Islam and political science. That intersection is called social engineering, study and control of the public mind.

This version of the book, titled *Case Study Why is the Holy Qur’an so easy to Hijack? Vol. I*, is a condensed compilation from the compendium titled: *Hijacking Holy Qur’an and Islam, 2nd Edition 2015*. The Case Study focusses on the multi faceted meta question: how is it, and why is it, that if all Muslims have a common Book among them, and they unanimously believe that this Book is of Divine origin, a Book of Divine Guidance to mankind, that they cannot agree on what it means; what role does the Holy Qur'an itself play in that empirical outcome; what role do human psychology and human sociology, human factors upon which the individual exercises little control, play in that outcome; how does that outcome lead to the hijacking of the meaning of the Holy Qur'an and its pristine religion named Islam for imperial mobilization?
Zahir Ebrahim, an electrical engineer and computer architect, temporarily gave up his high-tech career in Silicon Valley, California, in the late 1990s to spend time raising his kids. Zahir originally studied EECS at UET (Lahore, Pakistan), MIT, and Stanford University (via SITN). He was an ordinary engineer and worked in several corporations in the San Francisco Bay Area pursuing his own “American Dream” like most ordinary people (see engineering patents at http://tinyurl.com/Zahir-Patents). Zahir switched directions immediately after 9/11 and turned towards justice activism with the same zest with which he had previously endeared himself to his profession. Zahir's 2003 maiden book of protest against the criminal military invasion of Iraq, titled *Prisoners of the Cave*, was rejected by numerous publishers and can be read on the web at http://PrisonersoftheCave.org. Zahir writes exclusively for Project Humanbeingsfirst.org which he founded as *The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons*. Zahir may be reached at http://Humanbeingsfirst.org. Bio at http://ZahirEbrahim.org. Full Copyright Notice at http://humanbeingsfirst.org/#Copyright.
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What others say

“you are a completely stupid fool,
a disgrace to humanity”

The white man when caught in his lies,
Paul Craig Roberts,
United States Former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,
anointing Zahir Ebrahim,
Dec 06, 2008.
(The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity)
To confront

or

be co-opted?
Is it Divine Comedy
or
Just Irony?
The land of the free that
nurtured a most pernicious
Hectoring Hegemon
also nurtured its
Antidote!
The Plebeian Antidote to

Hectoring Hegemons
“It is difficult to generalize about Islam. To begin with, the word itself is commonly used with two related but distinct meanings, as the equivalents both of Christianity, and Christendom. In the one sense, it denotes a religion, as system of beliefs and worship; in the other, the civilization that grew up and flourished under the aegis of that religion. The word Islam thus denotes more than fourteen centuries of history, a billion and a third people, and a religious and cultural tradition of enormous diversity.” --- Bernard Lewis, *Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror*, 2003, pg. 1

“But Islam, like other religions, has also known periods when it inspired in some of its followers a mood of hatred and violence. It is our misfortune that we have to confront part of the Muslim world while it is going through such a period, and when most – though by no means all – of that hatred is directed against us.” --- Bernard Lewis, *Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror*, 2003, pg. 25
Samuel Huntington at Harvard University Asserts

“...The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power. The problem for Islam is not the CIA or the US Department of Defense. It is the West, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the universality of their culture and believe that their superior, if declining, power imposes on them the obligation to extend that culture throughout the world. These are the basic ingredient that fuel conflict between Islam and the West.” --- Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations And The Remaking Of World Order*, 1996, pgs. 217-218
The Holy Qur'an defines the word “Islam” as proper noun

(whereas Bernard Lewis cunningly redefined it as a common noun)

“This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion.”

(Arabic:
الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَنْتَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نَعْهَدًا وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمْ ِالإِسْلَآمَ دِينًا
)

Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Maeda 5:3
The Holy Qur'an also gives a different definition of Islam

“This is the Scripture whereof there is no doubt, a guidance unto those who ward off (evil).”

(Arabic: ذلک الکتاب لآ ریب فیه هدا لیلتقین )

“Who believe in the Unseen, and establish worship, and spend of that We have bestowed upon them”

(Arabic: ۖالذین یؤمنون بالغيب ویقيمون الصالوة ویمیموا الزیقهین یینفقون )

Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:2-2:3
What's Going On Here
With These Western Scholars?

Are these superior Jewish minds in America's top Ivy Leagues really so damn innocent of knowledge about Islam?

Or

Were they manufacturing “Doctrinal Motivation” years in advance and harvested it on 9/11 for “Imperial Mobilization”?
What's Going On Here
With Muslims?

Why is the Muslim mind always so EASILY misled?

On 9/11 “Good Muslims” so EASILY bought that “Bad Muslims” wielding “Militant Islam” did it!

Why is Islam always so EASY to Hijack for “Imperial Mobilization”? 
Even the FBI is being trained to equate terror with Qur'an

Caption: An FBI training presentation titled “Militancy Considerations” measures the relationship between piety and violence among the texts of the three Abrahamic faiths. As time goes on, the followers of the Torah and the Bible move from “violent” to “non-violent.” Not so for devotees of the Koran, whose “moderating process has not happened.” The line representing violent behavior from devout Muslims flatlines and continues outward, from 610 A.D. to 2010. In other words, religious Muslims have been and always will be agents of aggression. (via Wired.com)
The Holy Qur'an bears
Witness to this Zeitgeist

'Then the Messenger will say:
“O my Lord! Truly my people took
this Qur'an for just foolish
nonsense.”'

(Arabic: 
َوَقَالَ الَّذِي نَزَّلَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْقُرْآنُ يَا رَبِّ إِنَّ نَفْسِي أَتَخْذُوْا هَذَا الْقُرْآنَ مَهْجُورًا
)

Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30
The Predatory Mind and Behavior Control

“We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of.”

Edward Bernays, Propaganda, 1928, pg.1
The Predatory Mind and Scientific Techniques

“We are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude!”

Aldous Huxley,
The Ultimate Revolution,
Speech to students at UC Berkeley, 1962
The Predatory Mind in the Technetronic society

“In the technetronic society the trend seems to be toward aggregating the individual support of millions of unorganized citizens, who are easily within the reach of magnetic and attractive personalities, and effectively exploiting the latest communication techniques to manipulate emotions and control reason.”

Zbigniew Brzezinski,
Between Two Ages, 1970, pg. 11
The Public Mind
and its weaknesses

“What a man believes upon grossly insufficient evidence is an index to his desires – desires of which he himself is often unconscious. If a man is offered a fact which goes against his instincts, he will scrutinize it closely, and unless [and at times even when] the evidence is overwhelming, he will refuse to believe it. If, on the other hand, he is offered something which affords a reason for acting in accordance with his instincts, he will accept it even on the slenderest evidence.”

Bertrand Russell,
Proposed Roads to Freedom, 1919, pg. 147
A Gestalt Shift in PERSPECTIVE is Required to Understand the Instinct for Primacy

Caption Can the innocent child staring at the fishbowl in absolute wonderment ever imagine what the feline is thinking? What would it take for the child to view the world from the cat's perspective? Gestalt Shift in PERSPECTIVE!
How can the public counter this perspective deficiency?

“Yee shall know the truth 
and the truth shall make you free”

John 8:32, KJV, Holy Bible
Etched in stone wall in the Main Lobby of the CIA Headquarters in Langley, Virginia, USA
And what is that “truth”?  

“Who controls the past controls the future  
Who controls the present controls the past”  

George Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-four
What is that “truth” again?

“Deception is a state of mind and the mind of the State”

James Jesus Angleton,
Head of CIA Counter Intelligence, 1954-1974
Then how can the public ever know what is truth?

“In the age of universal deceit to discover
the truth is a revolutionary act”

_In this scribe_

“In the age of universal deceit to tell
the truth is a revolutionary act”

George Orwell

“In the age of universal deceit to live
the truth is a revolutionary act”

Semantics of verse 103:3
Surah Al-Asr, Holy Qur'an
From the Public Mind
to the Revolutionary Mind

“Aspire to be like Mt. Fuji, with such a
broad and solid foundation that the strongest
earthquake cannot move you, and so
tall that the greatest enterprises of common
men seem insignificant from your lofty
perspective. With your mind as high as Mt.
Fuji you can see all things clearly. And you
can see all the forces that shape events;
not just the things happening near to you.”

Miyamoto Musashi
(Quoted in Political Ponerology,
by Andrew M. Lobaczewski)
Precepts of Islam most neglected by pious Muslims

The Holy Qur'an reminds those who follow others

“(On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them.

And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166-167)
Precepts of Islam most neglected by pious Muslims

The Holy Qur'an reminds those who lead others

Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear! (Surah An-Nahl 16:25)
Precepts of Islam most neglected by pious Muslims

The Holy Qur'an reminds those who seek Allah

“O ye who believe! Do your duty to Allah, seek the means of approach unto Him,” (Surah Al-Maeda, 5:35)

The Holy Qur'an reminds those who dispute

“...If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” (Surah Al-Maeda, verse fragment 5:48)
Dedication

To All Who Care

And, for my children — to lend them
courage to reshape tomorrow's world
PART ONE

The Heart of the Matter
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Preface

2015 Revised Second Edition

Hijacking Holy Qur'an And Islam

This book which you now hold in your hands, Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam – Muslims and Imperial Mobilization, 2015 Revised Second Edition, abbreviated to Hijacking Holy Qur'an And Islam, is a mini compendium of topics at the intersection of religion of Islam and political science. It is a case study in social engineering, of why the Holy Qur'an is so easy to misinterpret for self-interests, and consequently, so easy to hijack for “imperial mobilization”.

It is important to state up front what this book is not about before delving into details of what it is about. (1) This book is not about faith. (2) This book is not about proselytizing Islam. (3) This book is not intended as an advocacy of Islam even indirectly, a task for which this scribe is least qualified. That function was performed by the noble Prophet of Islam by his penetrating the heart of the believers and is best left to those who claim his mantle. This scribe does not claim that station. He is merely a student of truth, and not its master. (4) Lastly,
this book is not about this scribe's faith.

What this book principally does is attempt to teach how to fish with an honest intellectual hook when one is emotionally too close to a subject. It does not however catch the reader her fish. Nor does it make any appeals of faith and non-falsifiable axioms to the heart. The reader still has to practice catching her own fish to feed herself. Using the intellectual hook however, as opposed to axioms of faith, is a tad harder than one might think. In fact, it may be the hardest way to fill one's intellectual hunger. It is much easier to pretend to be an intellectual and employ incestuous self-reinforcement through self-selecting data and confirmation bias to arrive at conclusions one is already predisposed towards. For some, like this scribe, actually fishing with an intellectual hook and not knowing what one might catch with it until one has actually caught it, makes for a most gratifying meal. It is the only way to nourish a parched mind. The food for a parched soul is to be found elsewhere. If one is inspired here, let it be the intellect that becomes curious. From that first curiosity to discover reality the way it is, all else will naturally follow.

The terminology “social engineering” refers to the cunning discipline of perception management for mass behavior control. That exercise is ancient and Plato addressed it most poignantly as the Simile of the Cave in his now 2500 year old book The Republic. In modernity, that exercise in mass behavior control in which the public voluntarily offers a measure of their consent for someone else’s agenda, whether being pursued overtly or covertly is immaterial, whether noble or ignoble is also immaterial, whether it's in the public interest or against public interest is again immaterial, has been formalized into two separate components: (1) “soft” social engineering and (2) “hard” social engineering. There is often a compartmentalized coordination between the two with several degrees of cellular separation such that all interconnections can be plausibly denied and causality turned on its head. Soft social engineering is rooted in soft “scholarship”, meaning, learned discourses, academic treatise, ideology, books, news media,
pulpits, education system, religion, self-deception, et. al., all better served by the catchall term “propaganda” which simply means to make the public mind according to someone else's wishes while letting the public pretend that they made their own mind. It is a manipulative exercise. It is the irresistible natural calling of shepherds and turns on the axis of authority figures. At the end of the day, this exercise is still of mere words however. It is like the shepherd without his faithful sheep dog, blowing his whistle to which the sheep respond only by force of habit. It works well for old sheep, but new untrained sheep can pose a problem. And after a long absence of the sheep dog, even old sheep become hard to motivate by merely blowing the whistle.

As Adolph Hitler had well understood, words alone are often not sufficient to mobilize a people. Words have to be backed by “events” or “acts”, real or imagined, that induce public horror in support of propaganda. Hard social engineering is rooted in hard mobilizing “events”, the sheep dog equivalent, meaning, covert-ops, false-flag, warfare, crisis situations, real or imagined threats and horrors whose impact the public can be made to feel, or anticipate with fear, and react to as predicted, often probabilistically by a new mathematical discipline called game theory which can statistically manipulate several variables simultaneously to predict behavior. The public mind is collectively maneuvered by the pied pipers to the point of a significant vocal number actually demanding the same solutions the controllers want to sell them in the first place as the panacea for solving the crisis situation. In advertising and marketing this is easily recognized by the business student as its bedrock discipline of “demand creation”. It is the foundation of a trillion dollar global advertising industry. The herd principle ensures its dispersion among the silent majority. The same ideas constitute the bedrock of social engineering for public governance but unfortunately most refuse to recognize it as such. In fact, as any shrewd observer expects, it is actively denied by the same pied pipers in order to not dilute its efficacy in making the public mind.
That fiction has to be maintained for political purposes especially in a democracy where the electorate supposedly choose their rulers by popular vote of their own free will. Hitler explained this at great length in Mein Kampf (inter alia, see Vol. 2, Chapter VI), and created an entire ministry in the Third Reich under the leadership of Joseph Goebbels, Reichminister of Propaganda and National Enlightenment, to make the German public's mind. Today that function is decentralized, and far more sophisticated than under Nazi socialism which ruled its public mostly at the point of the bayonet.

Engineering the public's consent for the narrow agendas of the elite, the controllers outside the cave in Plato's allegory, is of course a game as old as hegemony, as old as empire. But today's modernity has introduced many erudite twists and turns with sophisticated political theories (such as Machiavelli, Hegelian Dialectic, Big Brother Statism, Plausible Deniability, Manufacturing Consent, Manufacturing Dissent), and direct psychological manipulation of both the irrational mind (the subconscious mind, catering to fears, desires, anxieties, the harnessing of which is by demand creation) and the cognitive mind (the conscious mind, cognitive infiltration by authority figures who sell big lies, half-truths, three-quarter truths, often wrapped in long-held beliefs and prejudices which make these appear to be true in group-think and in shared ethos, especially in moments of crisis when the normal brain functioning is already in shock and people congregate around those with whom they have shared beliefs and trust, and these deceit are subsequently belabored by authority figures and group-think pied pipers to eventually become the presuppositional facts underlying all popular narratives). These exercises, run long enough, hard enough, with a continuous supply of “high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification” as Zbigniew Brzezinski put it in his American Mein Kampf, The Grand Chessboard, and a whole new generation grows up believing myths to be historical fact. This is the empirical foundation upon which Jews have been sold that they need Zionism and a milita-
rized Jewish state in Palestine even if it means soiling their Jewish hands in the blood of its native inhabitants. A need evidently as necessary as the fish need bicycles (as per a famous Russian Jew turned Christian who this scribe once heard make this observation known in his talk at Stanford University).

All of this is the early stage discipline of social engineering --- mass behavior control with at least some measure of voluntary consent from the masses. Time is not far away when bio-chemical tampering of the brain and genetic manipulation of DNA may obsolete this early stage of behavior control as was depicted in Aldous Huxley's fable *A brave new world*. While fables are eruditely read even in high schools, this discipline of social engineering is not taught in universities except in disjoint bits and pieces in disconnected faculties. But it is practiced as a unified whole almost universally, with military precision, for making the public mind. Its zenith has been reached in the United States psychological warfare programs, far surpassing Europe's former dominance of the field in previous centuries. The companion volume to this book “The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity” (see below) examines this subject of behavior control in some depth. A separate volume “Undoing the Theft of Palestine” has examined the Jewish dilemma of living on myths and earning the world's hatred in recompense. That book has taken on the impertinence of liberating both the Jews and the Palestinians from their respective prison states while simultaneously freeing the world from oligarchic control. All good words on paper that will remain still-born, for words alone can no more free the mind of its chains than propaganda alone can shackle the mind. It takes a good measure of voluntary consent for both. The forces of social engineering make the latter consent happen. There are no similar social engineering forces in play for the benefit of the former. That calling must be unleashed from within without help from social engineering.

This book now in your hands is situated in that whole context in its overarching impertinence of attempting to undo the hijacking of
the religion of Islam as the *force majeure* for subversive behavior control. To do so effectively one has to not just understand the disease by becoming somewhat detached from it as a good doctor is from her patient, but also get its causality and etiology mapped accurately in that whole context, being mindful of both deliberate misdirection as well as self-deception. Linkages and interconnections can carry more weight than individual elements they link and identifying them correctly when they prefer to hide, deceive, and misdirect, takes great forensic acuity. Poor diagnosis by imperceptive mind is sure guarantee of continued suffering, and fatality.

That is the formidable challenge taken up by this book in the aforesaid overarching context of social engineering. This 2015 Revised Second Edition cherry picks pertinent essays, detailed case studies, reports and letters from Project Humanbeingsfirst archive, all original work of this scribe who is not a scholar, just an ordinary plebe who dared to make the effort to think for himself, to analyze and deconstruct:

- (1) how the religion of Islam is often incestuously interpreted by self-interest and socialization bias;
- (2) how the religion of Islam is harnessed for “imperial mobilization” by empire;
- (3) how the religion of Islam itself contributes to this abuse by being open-ended, ambiguous, comprising algebra-style variables and value-loaded characteristics or puzzles that are open to interpretation instead of known and specific constants for identification, and employing metaphorical or imprecise allusions, in certain key verses in the Holy Qur'an (such as in verse 4:59 where who are the ulul-amr is left unspecified), all opening the door for self-serving and imperial interpretations, as well as unwitting incestuous self-reinforcement through confirmation and socialization.
bias, generation after generation, leading inevitably to divergent understandings of the same scriptural text.

The long first chapter in five parts (of which Part-V is still incomplete and under gestation) is a case study which attempts to disabuse this dismal state of affairs by opening the door to an unusual idea: to read and attempt to understand what Islam's singular scripture, the Holy Qur'an, itself says, and more importantly, does not say, instead of what the scribes, historians, scholars, pontiffs, pundits, turbans, and the pious pen of men say it says. Duh!

That's just how unusual this idea is for the Muslim mind, because, the Holy Qur'an does not carry context of its verses within its pages which contain a total of exactly 6236 verses as counted in the standard Medina Mushaf (مصحف المدينة النبوية). The Muslim public in virtually every Muslim society have been trained from generation to generation to seek that context outside the pages of the Holy Qur'an. Principally, in the plentiful exegesis known as “tafsirs”, and in other sanctified compilations of history and the sayings of the Prophet of Islam, known as “hadiths”, all composed/compiled by the hand of man. Whereas, the Author of the Holy Qur'an itself, as claimed by the Good Book, is God Himself. If one accepts that proposition on faith, as the Muslim mind does, then imagine using the mind of some other fallible man long dead and whom one never met, to understand the mind of God! That alone is a non sequitur --- but the Muslim mind, from clergy to laity, persists in that absurdity. This is an inherent epistemological problem of the Holy Qur'an. Unfortunately, it has been solved with utmost laziness through cultural osmosis handed down from generation to generation, including among the clergy who are well known for incestuous self-reinforcement of their own sectarian doctrines drawn mostly from pages outside the pages of the Holy Qur'an and used for interpreting the verses of the Holy Qur'an!

This book attempts to change all that by substituting the historical laziness and clerical comfort zones of antiquity stemming largely from the culture of religious socialization, with clear analytical thinking.
The logical analysis brings an epistemological perspective to bear on the matter which is further peppered with ample commonsense and reasonability tests in lieu of socialized faith-based axioms handed from generation to generation. By permitting the Holy Qur'an to Speak in its own explanation on the anvil of one's thinking capabilities rather than parroting capacity, the result is both interesting and revealing. The seemingly intractable problems created by the absence of context within the pages of the Holy Qur'an, suddenly eviscerate as no longer being pertinent to understanding the essential message being conveyed to mankind from age to age.

The first detailed case study in Chapter One introduces the nomenclature of “Determinate” and “Indeterminate” verses to categorize the statements of the Holy Qur'an more precisely to assist in comprehending how much of the various sectarian understanding of the religion of Islam is from the “Determinate” verses, and how much is from gratuitously filling in the variables and interpreting the “Indeterminate” verses. A sensible model for extracting the core message buried in the verses is proposed: to treat the verses as a cipher text which is to be decoded using only the verses of the Holy Qur'an into its plain text. The exercise is most revealing. In the examples considered, and those examples are chosen upon which Muslims have become embroiled in needless sectarian schisms, the method easily and straightforwardly extricates the religion of Islam from mythology, socialization bias, idiocy of sectarian world views, and the mind of man. The case study ends with a gestalt proposal to all Muslim pulpits to adopt this approach to evaluate their own sectarian epistemology and to just bring their discoveries to their respective flock. Just that one step can undo fourteen centuries of dysfunction. Subsequent chapters draw on current affairs and history to examine the other two aspects, disabusing the psyche of the intense propaganda warfare inflicted upon the Muslim and non Muslim public mind.

While Islam may be the faith of the nonconformist, and what might appear to some as unorthodox, author of this book, the activist
compulsion to pen it is not religious – the author could not care less what philosophy, religion, or sect you espouse so long as it does not interfere with others' rights to exercise the same. Rather, it is to unravel the vile deception games which underlie the latter day “imperial mobilization” of which he, his nation, his people, and mankind everywhere on earth, are victim, or will soon be. Self-defense against this full spectrum onslaught upon the public mind, in specific, upon the Muslim public mind, is the primary purpose of this humble endeavor. If Muslim scholars, intellectuals, ullemas, imams, ayatollahs, muftis, leaders, politicians, and the all and sundry opinion makers among the Muslim polity worldwide, had not remained silent, were not devoid of deep understanding of how the world really works, were neither being useful idiots for Western hegemons, nor infected with the Plague of Occidentosis, meaning, not mentally colonized as modern day House Niggers and Uncle Toms, this book would not have been necessary!

This book does not invite you to an insurrection. But to a revolution. A revolution of the mind – from which all else will naturally follow.

Unlike the fabricated “United We Stand” mantra of the Western hegemons which has today coercively united the Western public behind their respective governments in waging their manufactured “war on terror” upon Muslims and Islam while ostensibly being only against their own fabrication of “militant Islam”, this book and its Companion Reader on Modernity are dedicated to fostering both Muslim unity, and people unity, under accurate truth discovery. Western “imperial mobilization” primarily succeeds because of their vast intellectual capital invested in social engineering through universal deceit against which neither the Muslim public, nor the Western public, have any effective response. But as the Good Book says: “Yee shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free”.

The intellectual capital generated by Project Humanbeingsfirst is that missing response to hectoring hegemons, of every era, including the past dynastic Muslim empires built from hijacking the religion of
Islam and bequeathing to posterity, us, a crippled epistemology in the form of “Islamic literature” which legitimized their absolutist rule. The bread and butter of all empires, all primacy, and all predatory scholarship, is deception. But its Achilles’ Heel is the public able to do simple arithmetic correctly and using their commonsense when two plus two is proclaimed to make five. Had this straightforward rational path of truth discovery been followed in the past fourteen centuries by the Muslim body politic by suppressing its fear of empire, narrow self-interests, and overcoming its crippled epistemology, or is done today, the religion of Islam would surely be spared the lament of the Prophet of Islam recorded in the Holy Qur’an for the Day of Accountability, of how the Muslims will have constricted and adulterated his teachings of the religion of Islam and the Holy Qur’an:

> 'Then the Messenger will say: “O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur’an for just foolish nonsense.”’
> (Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30)

As George Orwell argued through the pen of Winston Smith in his famous fable *Nineteen eighty-four*, conveying through the mind of the beleaguered protagonist an important and timeless axiom:

> “Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows.”

Unfortunately, like any un-invested capital sitting idle and ignored, this straightforward antidote, the ability to do simple addition correctly, and be able to proclaim the result freely, also only gathers dust and continually loses in value for waging an effective and time-critical preemption to the worldwide *social engineering* before the public is handed a fait accompli. Afterward, it is only history and the new reality becomes irreversible due to time invariance which applies equally to physics and to societies.

Despite the creation of the aforementioned intellectual capital by
Project Humanbeingsfirst though intellectual rigor and basic arithmetica as evidenced in this book, its author neither is, nor claims to be among those who are “firmly grounded in knowledge” as “Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” (الرَّاسِخُونَ فِي الْعِلْمَ), see verse 3:7 of the Holy Qur'an. Nor is he particularly bursting with great piety and/or self-purification as “al-mutaharoon” (الْمُطْهِرُونَ), see verse 56:79, Ibid. Instead, he wears a battle-dress head to toe 24x7 (imagine Don Quixote of La Mancha if you must), marches to his own little drummer inside his head, fights hard to liberate his understanding from “truth's protective layers” (but is forever restrained by his own natural limits), uses cuss-words frequently (as any unpretentious ordinary plebeian), takes no prisoners, suffers no fools, bows before no turbans, holds those who claim for themselves the titles of “scholar”, “imam”, “Sheikh-ul-Islam”, etceteras, in considerable contempt, and really knows very little about any matter!

In fact, let's just gauge how much he actually knows and what presumption entitles him to proclaim the material in this book before the public. If he were to carefully read, just once, 10,000 books before his time was up, that averages to reading 4 books a week, 200 books a year, over say a 50 year period of productive life. Of those, if he were to diligently study a mere ten percent, say a 1000 books of his choice – where “study” entails more than a careful read, rather, an endeavor to master its contents – that amounts to studying 20 books a year over a 50 year period of productive lifetime. Given that there are in excess of 10 million books in existence in all human languages, he would still be 99.9 percent ignorant of the already known human knowledge of the world, let alone of what is yet to be discovered in the future. Even if he were to strive his hardest his entire life to escape the natural paradigm of “ilm” explosion as man endeavors to discover its place in the universe, and as the wisdom of civilizations and its sages continue to accumulate, he would at best be relegated to remain somewhere between a superficial generalist and narrow-gauged specialist who is largely ignorant of the breadth and depth of human knowledge.
How can a 99% ignorant fellow make any claims to being among the (الرَّأَسَحُونَ فِي الْعَلْمِ) as is required to fully comprehend the message of the Holy Qur'an which is not even the expression of human knowledge (تنزيل من رب العالمين)?

What is therefore deemed to be accurate in this humble endeavor that you now hold in your hands, is only by the quirk of accident that the neurons in both halves of his brain fired correctly while he was wide awake. The rest may be entirely gibberish – like the random noise inherent in all electrical activity. If you can't however tell the difference between signal and noise, then the fundamental question of epistemology that you must grapple with is: how do you know that those claiming to be “scholars”, “intellectuals”, “ullemas”, “imams”, “ayatollahs”, “muftis”, “learned leaders”, bearing lofty titles, princely accolades, and even knighthood, fare any better?

As this book trenchantly demonstrates, the world is full of both clever supermen and useful idiots proudly donning the mantle of scholarship, leadership, imammate. This is not just the vile invention of Machiavellian modernity; it is also the empirical fact of recorded history. The truth of these words is beyond doubt. It is in fact self-evident. From Plato's 2500 years old Simile of the Cave to modern perception management of the Mighty Wurlitzer, is a continuous endeavor for the control of the public mind by the superman. If you base your faith upon that pen of man, whether of notable scribes and wanna-be imams (leaders) of today, or of lauded scribes and glorified imams of history, you should at least know what to expect. Here is what the Good Book of the Muslims, the Holy Qur'an, has to say about it:

“One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams” (Surah al-Israa' 17:71)

If you voluntarily follow others in this world making them your “imam”, you should know that you will also be held to account in
their company involuntarily on the Day when all accounts are finally settled. The Arabic-English dictionary of the Holy Qur'an in the hands of this scribe defines the word “Imam” thusly: “Leader; President; Any object that is followed, whether a human being or a book or a highway”. If you followed any of them here voluntarily, you will have no choice but to also follow them to wherever is their ultimate destination post Accounting:

“(On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them. (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166 )

And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:167)

In the age of universal deceit, it is surely wise to follow one's own mind as one's imam first, as limited and as fallible as its vision might be, for one never really knows who is the marde-momin and who is the superman. Empiricism has shown that regardless of the merits of their claim, they both lead one to hell on earth while promising heaven elsewhere. And so does the feeble mind, the foolish mind, the dull mind that is unable to separate chaff from wheat, and who lives its socialization bias in absolute self righteousness. That is traditionally the Public Mind, encouraged to remain a perpetual follower so that it can be deftly shepherded wherever the shepherd fancies.

This book endeavors to sharpen that public mind on the grindstones of self-awareness, intellectual thought, and logical analysis. It
is not intended to create followers, nor induce faith, nor reinforce faith, but rather to challenge you to a duel. A duel with yourself. To induce cognitive dissonance by getting you to challenge your own preconceptions, your own presuppositions, your own bloated sense of self-importance, your own state of contentment at your hubris that if you wear a turban, an imama, a fancy Western gown, are anointed with “sir”, “alim”, or “ayatollah”, that you know it all, let alone understand anything of substance beyond superficial generalist to narrow-gauge specialist and 99 percent ignorant! It is to sow the first seeds of discontentment in your mind by inducing the realization that one is in fact often at the mercy of a crippled epistemology bequeathed to every domain by narratives of power and its holy pens. And that, unless one becomes cognitively aware of this fact, one remains bounded by incestuously self-reinforced scholarship both due to socialization bias, as well as adept perception management by controllers of Plato's cave. It is impossible to escape this subliminal mind-force without making deliberate effort in the escape-direction. Like the force of gravity, it remains unseen, but very much there, and in order to escape its earthly grip, one has to reach escape velocity in the correct direction – up!

Meaning, the counter-force to crippled epistemology is a vector, not a scalar. Mastery of a 1000 books is still meaningless, and doctoral degrees and Nobel prizes only caricatures of “ilm”, if the vector is zero. Or, if wherewithal, insight, understanding, conception of the whole, are missing:

“Modern physics has taught us that the nature of any system cannot be discovered by dividing it into its component parts and studying each part by itself, since such a method often implies the loss of important properties of the system. We must keep our attention fixed on the whole and on the interconnection between the parts. ... The same is true of our intellectual life. It is impossible to make a clear cut between sci-
ence, religion and art. The whole is never equal simply to the sum of its various parts.” (Max Planck, Partly cited in *Critique of Western Philosophy and Social Theory* By David Sprintzen, pg. 76)

This is why, what is important in the real world is not how much you know, or how many encyclopedias you can do instant recall from, or how much energy you can expend in blind perspiration, **but how much you perceptively understand, and what can you actually do with the little that you do understand!**

However, perceptive understanding principally relies on how effectively you can think and reason not simplistically, but with some wherewithal and commonsense. Human beings are not Mr. Spock. Our brain is not all logic-only brain overflowing with Intelligence Quotient. Human beings also possess subjectivity, intuition, love, hate, fear, needs, predilection, bent of mind, and let's just capture all that with the analogous term: Emotional Quotient, all of which remain beyond the pale of scientific empiricism and rational logic. While ordinary people are amply endowed with a physical brain, cognitive thinking is made subservient to, or is at least cradled in, the subconscious mind that is beholden to the latter human characteristics. Cognitive thinking is often colored by the undeniable artifacts of socialization, perception, prejudice, cultural assimilation, and other natural psychological tendencies specific to each individual and to her civilization, but of which she is often unconscious. This empirical statement of fact and its effect was ably captured by the British aristocrat philosopher-atheist well known for his antagonism towards all theistic religions, Lord Bertrand Russell:

“What a man believes upon grossly insufficient evidence is an index to his desires – desires of which he himself is often unconscious. If a man is offered a fact which goes against his instincts, he will scrutinize it closely, and unless [and at times even when] the evidence is overwhelming, he will refuse to believe it. If,
on the other hand, he is offered something which affords a reason for acting in accordance with his instincts, he will accept it even on the slenderest evidence.” (Bertrand Russell, Proposed Roads to Freedom, 1919, pg. 147)

The parentheses extending Bertrand Russell's observation are this scribe's. Re-read that passage by replacing “instincts” with “worldview” and it will shock you! While the ability to harbor instincts is arguably innate, worldview is decidedly socialized and becomes the primary instinctual filter for how we relate to the world. Meaning, both nature and nurture conspire to lend intense subjectivity to man of which he himself is often unconscious. The atheist philosopher's empirical insight into this human failing underscores the import of Qur'anic verses which harken to the “cleansing of the heart” as a precondition for understanding the message of Islam: “That this is indeed a Qur'an Most Honourable, In a Book well-guarded, Which none shall touch but those who are clean (purified), A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds.” (Surah Al-Waqia, 56:77-80); “In their hearts is a disease, and Allah increaseth their disease. A painful doom is theirs because they lie.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:10); “Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Nay, on the hearts there are locks.”(Surah Muhammad 47:24).

What these admonishments: “In a Book well-guarded”, “none shall touch but those who are clean”, and “on the hearts there are locks” mean in the complete context of the Holy Qur'an, is man endeavoring to overcome those very artifacts of biases and prejudices which have become instinctualized and ingrained through socialization, self-interest, and crippled epistemology, before man can fully understand the Book's contents. In other words, the Book carries a Message from its Author to mankind but full access to its comprehension is restricted to those who approach it without preconceptions, presuppositions, bias, and prejudice. A cipher text whose decoding key is self-cleansing!
In the limit however, this “self-cleansing” is clearly a self-referential problem in which a mind can no more be wiped clean of its socialization and perception vestiges than one can perform brain surgery upon oneself under full anesthesia. In recognition of this fundamental self-referential limit in human beings to be completely free of subjectivity, a paradox really, that we find categorical directives in verses like Surah Al-Maeda, 5:44-48, teaching the foundational principle of multi-culturalism in Islam which culminate in the rather incredible advocacy to man in verse 5:48 (reproduced in full below): to compete “as in a race in all virtues” instead of in brinkmanship on beliefs. This principle of multi-culturalism is further underscored categorically in the verse: “There is no compulsion in religion.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:256), teaching not to impose one's beliefs upon another regardless of how self-righteously held.

Why does such strange accommodating advice exist in the Holy Qur'an for a self-righteous religion which categorically claims to be: “A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds.”, if not for the practical understanding of its Author who also claims to be man's Creator: “Surely We have created man from a small life-germ uniting (itself): We mean to try him, so We have made him hearing, seeing.” (Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-insaan 76:2), that there is an inherent built-in subjectivity in how man is constructed in his basic composition. The appeal to the heart, and to reason, to BOTH (47:24), is to strive to overcome that inherent subjectivity as best as one can in order to objectively comprehend the Message of Islam! One will reach a common understanding among people on any matter only when one can objectively comprehend that matter. When subjectivity is the impediment, or self-interest, it must be removed. That endeavor, and to what extent, if at all, undertaken for the study of the Message of Islam in the Holy Qur'an, is left completely as a matter of personal choice. It is not the concern of any other: “Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or unthankful.” (Surah Al-insaan 76:3).

While the prescription of best effort, as best as one can, to over-
come subjectivity may work well for one man's solo spiritual journey, and the prescription of competing on good works “as in a race in all virtues” rather than on beliefs, underscores the efficacy of that prescription in a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, multi-religion society for harmonizing relationships, it is clearly not good enough when it comes to having two or more people come to a shared understanding on the journey of discovery of the physical world. And it is woefully inadequate for creating a community, a society, and least of all a nation, if none agree on the fundamentals. A veritable Pandora's box of dissonance and disharmony in any social setting of any appreciable size where different beliefs, worldviews, presuppositions, axioms, are self-righteously held! Which means, the ones with the biggest stick, the rulers, authority figures, get to impose their own axioms of faith upon everyone else. This is true of every discipline, every enterprise.

This is why science, in its drive to discover nature the way it actually is, winnows out from acceptable epistemology everything subjective, including insight and intuition, to reduce it to what is empirical, measurable, and confirmable by others, in order to lend some degree of objectivity to the discovery of what exists. What is not empirical or amenable to science is termed non-falsifiable. Science relies exclusively on falsifiability and falsifiable theories for its advancement. Without falsifiability, science stagnates. What falsifiability means is that a theory or notion or observation can be shown to be either true or false eventually. Non-falsifiable means the matter can never be proved either way. Therefore, for the well-known processes of science, which basically involve four recursive steps, or stages, any of which may be absent or combined in a given endeavor: (1) theorizing, hypothesizing, modeling; (2) testability (of the model), observability, reproducibility (by others); (3) measurability, quantifiability; and (4) predictability, anticipatability (based on the model); subjectivity borne of faith, belief and intuition as means or motivation, belong to the category of non-falsifiable theory whose reality can neither be proved nor disproved by the scientific method. But its immediate impact on all four
processes of science also cannot be denied. The labor of love and perseverance that results from faith or belief or special insight, often leads to advancement in understanding and to empiricism which is amenable to the scientific method. Science is only a set of methods, a means, by which to uncover what is, and not an end unto itself. Some things which are just as real as nature, and a creation in nature, are not always amenable to the reductionism of science, such as feelings, emotions, love, hate, spirituality, consciousness, awareness; domains that cannot always be reduced to material principles and natural laws (apart from biochemical reductionism) that wholly circumscribe the purview of science.

Often times it is the implicit trust factor in respectable authority figures that one chooses to accept their personal formulations based on their faith and their special insight, as the axiomatic presuppositions of truth, without seeking any empirical evidence or examination for oneself. The late physicist Richard Feynman's famous out of body experiment was easily accepted by others despite it being irreproducible (noted in this scribe's letter to biologist Richard Dawkins cited below). The abuse of such science, the science of authority figures, also called pseudo science, in making the public mind is of course among the best practices of Machiavelli. This is examined in “Disambiguating Religion, Science and Psychological Warfare Operations” (tinyurl.com/Religion-Science-Psyops) and “Reflections on Science in the Service of Empire” (tinyurl.com/Science-in-Service-of-Empire). But we stay for the moment with the innocent concept of initial non-falsifiability of personal axioms of faith driving reason and persistence, and eventually expressing themselves in a form that become amenable to the processes of science for others to reason and adjudicate as well.

This highly nuanced semantic difference is crucial to comprehend for the point at hand. That point being that we can reason about things despite having faith in them if we can understand how they each have a role to play in advancing our overall understanding of the matter.
such that the whole comes out greater than the sum of its parts. Max Planck's observation quoted above, “It is impossible to make a clear cut between science, religion and art. The whole is never equal simply to the sum of its various parts.” is not singular. Other stellar minds known for their scientific capacity and deep penetrating insights have ventured along the same path. Here is the late Pakistani physicist, Dr. Abdus Salam of Cambridge University, a Muslim, making the following perceptive observation in his speech at the Nobel Prize banquet for the 1979 Nobel prize in theoretical physics which he shared with two colleagues, a Christian: Sheldon Glashow, and a Jew: Steven Weinberg, the latter an atheist:

"On behalf of my colleagues, Professor Glashow and Weinberg, I thank the Nobel Foundation and the Royal Academy of Sciences for the great honour and the courtesies extended to us, including the courtesy to me of being addressed in my language Urdu.

Pakistan is deeply indebted to you for this.

The creation of Physics is the shared heritage of all mankind. East and West, North and South have equally participated in it. In the Holy Book of Islam, Allah says

"Thou seest not, in the creation of the All-merciful any imperfection, Return thy gaze, seest thou any fissure. Then Return thy gaze, again and again. Thy gaze, Comes back to thee dazzled, aweary.” (The Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Mulk, 67:3-4)
This in effect is, the faith of all physicists; the deeper we seek, the more is our wonder excited, the more is the dazzlement for our gaze.' (Dr. Abdu Salam, 1979 Nobel prize banquet speech, Stockholm, http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laurates/1979/salam-speech.html)

It should be obvious that it is principally the deeper understanding, penetrating insight, and uncanny intuition, and not the regurgitation, parroting, and mastery of immense encyclopedias and arcane data-sets, nor the momentous processes of science alone, limited as they are to the falsifiable, which are the cornerstone of wisdom. All wisdom! Including scientific wisdom which, at some deeper primordial level, is still driven by faith, insight, inspiration, and intuition. Forces which themselves remain beyond the pale of scientific measurement and quantification, but whose presence underwrites the endless perspiration of science.

The perceptive statement: “This in effect is, the faith of all physicists” by the Nobel prize winning physicist, speaks to the reality of a primemover natural force for doing great science: “faith”, non quantifiable, non measurable, but which impelled his own über scientific endeavors forward. Without faith, the belief that something is possible, or out there, or must be so, the super scientist pursuing Einstein's dream that has inspired generations of brilliant physicists in search of the grand unification of all natural forces, may well have given up. In other words, faith and reason co-habitat and co-construct human wisdom, and the two interplay with each other in non quantifiable ways most poorly understood today but also accepted as existential. This is also true of all great inventors, discoverers, explorers; indeed, faith is an essential motivating force for any striving that defies or transcends logic. The age-old banal response to the question: “why climb the mountain” (because it's there) is perhaps its most eloquent expression. Without this un measurable and un quantifiable prime mover force which inspires, dunce people perspiring all day in their
ardent labors cannot reach deeper understanding, be they scientists, or ordinary sons of the soil. The tragedy is that when a person of religious faith uses that unquantifiable factor for a spiritual journey as opposed to the scientific journey where it is evidently more acceptable, he is scoffed at by provincial minds bearing the lofty banner of *secular humanism*. They may even come with “scientist” prominently tattooed on their forehead (see this scribe's letter to biologist Richard Dawkins titled: “Error in The First Chapter of: The God Delusion(?)”, February 18, 2008, http://tinyurl.com/letter-dawkins-god-delusion).

This same unquantifiable factor is especially true of political wisdom. A wisdom which is essential not just for developing the instincts for survival in the Darwinian jungle infested with the plague of “will to power”, but also for safe extraction from its jaws of deceit. Political wisdom is the primemover force which also underwrites the first “revolutionary act”: **In the age of universal deceit to discover the truth is a revolutionary act.** It is the first precondition to what the prescient novelist George Orwell had incompletely proclaimed; **“In the age of universal deceit to tell the truth is a revolutionary act.”** In order to tell the truth one has to discover it first. In the age of universal deceit, by definition that is not so straightforward.

It is only the perceptive understanding and intuitive comprehension of unseen manipulative forces – forces that largely remain hidden beneath the surface like the iceberg, and often reach several degrees of separation between their first-cause and visible effects leaving no direct receipt of their existence – more than academic degrees, more than titles of “Sir”, “Scholar”, “Ayatollah” and “Sheikh-ul-Islam”, which enable liberating oneself from *Plato’s cave* of full spectrum mind control. The purpose of this mind control is mass behavior control. And the purpose of mass behavior control is to foster complete obedience of the public mind to authority. In that respect, the controllers outside of *Plato’s cave*, the *superman*, identify with a characteristic of God: the demand of complete submission to his will. And the key to their constant success in every era of human civilization, from
time immemorial, is in the superman's cunning ability to keep the understanding of the whole away from the public mind. Half-understanding wrapped in half-truths and outright lies enable the primacy of the superman. Its first hunting ground: the human mind.

Therefore, to be able to separate chaff from wheat in such an age of universal deception by forces unseen, requires immense sha-oor (wherewithal, deep insight), and not royally anointed pieces of parchment and medals which proclaim super-learnedness. It is for this very empirical reality that the Holy Qur'an, in Surah Aal-'Imran in verse 3:7, unequivocally commends only the men (and women) of understanding, أَوُلُو الْأَلْبَابِ: “and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding.”

This commendation in the Holy Qur'an which elevates the stature of “men of understanding” is as expected, for it is also based on clear commonsense that without understanding, the human mind is easy picking for the superman, in every domain. Religion being the first. In fact, this scribe is unaware of a similar commendation in the Holy Qur'an for its parroting, memorizing, and endless recitations without comprehension, a labor of love in which Muslims today, as yesterday, take great spiritual pride and spend a great deal of their free time. Whereas, time and again, the verses of the Holy Qur'an categorically enjoin deep understanding, deep comprehension, through deep reflection, and show the path to reach it through the journey of the “cleansed heart” as already explained. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that meaning of the Holy Qur'an was cleverly protected from public understanding by the rulers and their surrogate pulpits through this (mis)emphasis on spending time in its endless recitation instead of its diligent study. And the focus of the source of understanding of the religion of Islam cunningly shifted to what the anointed scribes have written instead of endeavoring to comprehend what the Good Book itself conveys.

Even today, in the most prestigious religious seminaries among all Muslim sects, the study of the Holy Qur'an is still rather tepid. The
emphasis still remains on regurgitating what the holy scribes have written, or on jurisprudence (the legislation of Islamic Sharia). The latter is where all the easy livelihood (without expending a day's worth of honest toil), power, prestige, social control (legislating the “do” and the “don't” on behalf of Allah), are to be found. It is evidently the easiest profession in the world, second only to the oldest. While it is seen to be a safe haven for the feeblest minds of society who cannot make a dignified living elsewhere, it is principally where the most pernicious superman is often found lurking. Under the turban.

Unfortunately, the obvious and rather self-evident perspective that understanding trumps vast quantities of regurgitated knowledge (historians), voluminous research (scientists), loquacious speech (pulpits), and that authorship of a hundred books remain infertile if devoid of insights of the whole, is often sorely absent even in highly credentialed intellectuals who are intimately invested in their “American Dream”. This is of such practical as well as existential significance that it bears at least some evidencing from this scribe's own life. As this scribe wrote in the Foreword of his maiden 2003 book Prisoners of the Cave, penned in a most tearful state during the barbaric American bombing, invasion, occupation, subjugation, and total decimation of Iraq and its advanced society under the false pretext of WMD which was Orwellianly labeled in the Newspeak of empire as Operation Iraqi Freedom:

Begin Quote

“How did I learn about these plans? I actually only uncovered PNAC, JV2020, and the Wolfowitz’s chauvinist doctrines of preemption that he had supposedly been pushing since 1990, after 911, when I started scratching my head at the inexplicability of it all the moment some 19 Muslim hijackers’ names were announced, and the public was informed that they had learnt flying on flight simulators and had told their instructors that they weren’t interested in learning how to land! If
Bin Laden was so smart at having planned such an outrageous attack and counted on such brilliant executioners who did it so flawlessly after only learning to fly on simulators, he was pretty stupid at having enlisted idiots who would deliberately leave such a trail of evidence behind, including statements that they weren’t interested in landing – so that either they would risk being uncovered before the attack, or their attack foiled while in progress, or after a successful attack, America would know exactly whom to go bomb in retaliation!

Only one of these aspects could be true, either they were brilliant military tacticians and strategists, or nincompoops from a three stooges movie who succeeded despite themselves, but the incongruence could not exist simultaneously on this large scale military style invasion project, except in a Hollywood spoof.

Having already read Brzezinski’s Grand Chessboard and Huntington’s Clash of Civilizations several years earlier, I immediately grasped the new pearl harbor concept the moment America deployed to bomb Afghanistan without adequately explaining or investigating any of the events of 911. ...

I started to reread Brzezinski and Huntington very carefully once again, then reread the entire voluminous Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, and the Mein Kampf of Hitler. The similarities between the rising crescendo of WMDs and the propaganda that William Shirer had recorded as having transpired in the Third Reich, and the similarities between ZB’s and Hitler’s descriptions of their respective imperatives and how to get them, were ominous, except that ZB’s were more polished and more sophisticatedly put. I got really paranoid as many more light bulbs went on in my head which had not gone on when I had originally read them. I had just taken Brzezinski’s book as theoretical, as being from the pen of a Cold War warrior now retired and indulging in some arm chair warrior fantasies. I didn’t understand that hectoring hegemons never retire until they are six feet under. I had also dismissed Huntington’s book as an ignoramus's work not to be taken seriously, as it was replete with obvious disinformation and tor-
tuous conclusions that were easy to spot by anyone who knew anything about the subject. Now both were being egregiously put into practice, and the latter book did not appear so silly anymore, but rather shrewd and calculated.

The first time I had read Huntington with the lens of ‘here is an interestingly titled book from a prominent Harvard professor, let me see what he has to say’; the second time I read it with the lens ‘let me understand how deception is created and its seeds planted in a free society that is not too knowledgeable about the rest of the world’. The second reading showed that the obviousness of his distortions, coming from a top branded American University like Harvard, had some deeper strategic thinking behind it. Huntington is also involved in national security and other strategic studies as a prominent professor and intellectual at Harvard, and couldn’t be just a simple moron like Harvard's President, Lawrence Summers, who recently claimed women were inherently not as smart as men. I was wondering how people like that become president at prestigious American universities, until once again I uncovered during my research that the same Harvard President had also written how the industrialized nations should dump their waste in developing nations while he was at the World Bank in the 1990s. With Wolfowitz now as the head of the World Bank, it is only shortsightedness to underestimate the power of the dark side, or the people who wield it. Huntington’s theme from portions of his book relevant to the topic at hand is systematically dismantled in Chapter 9.

Based on this new found respect of the doctrinal scholars for their craft, and realizing that we were entering a phase with the hastily approved Patriot Act I that could only lead to the Fourth Reich in America, I started attending antiwar teachins and protest marches with my family, and began talking to prominent Vietnam war dissenters about governmental lies.

And that is when I first heard about the PNAC – from antiwar teachins. Ordinary people like me, engagingly concerned about what was happening, had uncovered more material from public sources and

Muslims and Imperial Mobilization

**End Quote**

The story of this scribe's journey since the very day of September 11, 2001, is the systematic standing up to such experts' godly craftsmanship by a most ordinary plebeian simply doing his own due diligence. It has often been sufficient to demolish many false gods. Experts tend to fall to even simple forensic scrutiny just as easily as they have been propped up, at times by quackery, at other times by Machiavelli, and most foolishly, often by the childish innocence and unsophistication of their audiences themselves who naturally gravitate to “experts” rather than use their own head. Modernity, like antiquity, has produced many such experts in virtually every domain who have been imposed upon the public mind as celebrities and heroes. They are the cornerstone of the trillion dollar global advertising industry that harnesses everything from human insecurities to celebrity appeal to make the public mind in virtually every sphere of human existence — from marketing political agendas, religion, ideology, wars, peace, global warming, global war on terror, to baby diapers and condoms.

However, despite all this cognizance, the scribe has faced the constant dilemma which falls out of being fallible and all too human — how does one know that what one has learnt, understood, comprehended, is fully correct? Truth in virtually every domain, including religion, and especially religion, comes wrapped in so many layers upon layers of deceit, half truth, quarter truth, and self-serving interpretations and confabulations in respectable books, that how does one know that one has reached the kernel of truth despite all the unlayerings?

While the author remains acutely mindful of epistemology, and of his own fallibility in the pursuit of greater understanding, he cannot
guarantee that he has any more license to arriving at the whole truth of any matter than any other mortal who endeavors to learn it, just because he has all the good and righteous intentions of learning it truthfully. One can also learn false things very truthfully. In fact, quite often, one dies holding on to many falsehoods most self-righteously as gospel truth. That is fallibility. A fallible mind cannot lead another and not be the recipient of the “burdens” forewarned in Surah An-Nahl:

Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear! (Surah An-Nahl 16:25)

Only the inerrant and infallible can be exempt from the “burdens” of verse 16:25 – for indeed, only the inerrant cannot ever mislead anyone, including those foolish unthinking people without knowledge who follow blindly! The straightforward logic of this Qur'anic semantics suggests that it is only ever safe to follow the inerrant, which is why, in verse 6:90 of Surah Al-An'am, the Author of the Holy Qur'an also avers: “These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance.”

This errant author therefore has always disclaimed followers. The Holy Qur'an has itself emphatically admonished followers (as already noted above in Surah Al-Baqara 2:166, 167). But fools of course only follow – which is why Machiavelli always has such a rich harvest of fools. Few Muslim scholars, from antiquity to modernity, appear to be cognizant, never mind fearful, of these considerations as they self-righteously proclaim to be the heralders of “truth”; often treated as such by the myths that are carefully cultivated around their supposed holiness and special privileges.

Perhaps all these realizations, of humbleness and insignificance of
an individual's endeavors on the one hand that can so easily mislead the public mind wont to blindly follow experts, and of self-empowerment by using one's own head and commonsense on the other, can induce an acute sense of discontentment. That, while most of us can actually know very little despite our presumptions to the contrary (and that includes experts), what we do know need not be insignificant for ourselves. We can still make important existential decisions, both for sensibly elevating and protecting ourselves in this life, and if we believe in some theology, for preparing ourselves for what comes afterward, without following *supermen* experts who often only lead us to hell on earth while promising heaven elsewhere. As the saying goes: “*If necessity is the mother of invention then discontent is the father of progress.*”

That discontentment, rationally induced among those so presumptuously wearing the multi-styled, multi-colored turbans preaching and sowing discords of self-righteousness, will surely bear some fruit. While they may be the presumed “experts” of religion, and they might well have memorized a 1000 books of antiquity often regurgitating them in dazzling oratory, they can also easily be trumped by the commonsense of ordinary people just thinking and studying for themselves. And their power to command followers straightforwardly taken away from them by the ordinary person simply refusing to follow them. As this incisive book is evidence, the scribe has acquired sufficient disdain of all “experts”, of both what they say, and what they carefully omit to say by way of silence, to hold them in strong contempt as propagandists. *Wherever one turns, one sees only scoundrels telling half-truths and quarter truths at best, by cunningly lying by omission, by cleverly omitting to disclose facts to their audience that are inconvenient to their narratives.* It makes for the most diabolical form of propaganda warfare, and Aldous Huxley captured its impact on the public mind most ably:

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining
from doing. **Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth.** By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.’ (Aldous Huxley, 1946 Preface to Brave New World, 1931, Harper, pg. 11)

If you don't like these statements of fact and empirical truths, good. It means you may already be experiencing some cognitive dissonance in relation to your existing world view and you haven't even opened chapter one yet! If you are lucky, you will go through several psychological state transitions that you might like to become aware of. The first one being your natural inclination to dismiss this work because it isn't written by an “expert” who comes suitably anointed with a turban and *sajdah* (mark of worship) stamped upon his forehead.

If you are fortunate enough to have some neurons that still function independently despite the tranquilizing sleep that the pursuit of *American Dream* often induces, and able to examine material without the customary appeal to “celebrity experts” that modern marketing and advertising has invented to not just sell consumer products, but also lifestyles, ideologies and mythologies, your next inclination to reject will be due to its substance going against your entrenched worldview. And if you are able to transcend even that aspect of the public mind, only then will you be in any position, from the enlightened heights of Mt. Fuji no less, to even reasonably adjudicate what is writ-
ten here.

The upsetness you may feel may also have nothing to do with cognitive dissonance – and that is a more likely response if your favorite hero, scholar, leader, imam, shaykh, myth, false belief, or the kaaba before which you bow has been unmasked in this book. The contents of this book are too unorthodox to benefit from for the mind groomed in herds (and that includes mankind's finest scholars') which, although quite capable of thinking for itself, but either through sheer mental laziness, or lack of basic reasoning skills that never got developed despite acquiring a college degree, a Ph.D., or a turban, always relies on some “authority” to do the principal thinking for it.

The rational call of the times is to espouse some humility rather than self-righteousness in order to come together with others who also sail in the same boat of humanity on the same turbulent seas ruled by the same common predators. As counseled by the same common Book whose scholarship some blithely claim to be divine custodians of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: <strong>so strive as in a race in all virtues.</strong> The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” (Surah Al-Maeda, 5:48)</th>
<th>وَلَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَجَعَلَكُمْ أُمَّةً واحِدَةً لَكُمْ فَلَبِئِسَوْا الْخُيُرَاتِ إِلَى اللَّهِ مَرْجَعَكُمْ جَمِيعًا فَبِئِسُواْ بِمَا كُنتُمْ فِيهِ تَخْتَلُفُونَ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Qur'an speaks to all people in the above verse: “**If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people,**”. Never mind the multitude of Muslim sects warring with each other to serve the interests of those who have perfected the art of divide and conquer, the Qur'anic prescription to all mankind to compete on doing good works as if “**in a race in all virtues**” instead of theological upmanship and triumphalism, is categorical in Surah Al-Maeda, 5:44-48. That pious platitude surpasses the Ten Commandments which are noble prescrip-
tions of refrains, whereas Surah Al-Maeda, 5:44-48 are positive acts of commission to create amity and harmony. Understandably, neither system is put into practice by its respective adherents --- to the great rejoicing of hectoring hegemons who exploit religions and human nature with the skill of a surgeon to implant maladies and divides. This book is its humble antidote: fashioning a perspective from a deeper and accurate understanding of how Islam is hijacked by both self-interests, and by way of self-deception. Muslims don't need external enemies to subvert us. We do a pretty good job ourselves!

This book has a Companion Reader, The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity – Oligarchic Primacy for World Government, 2015, 9th Edition, which is a much larger compendium of essays, letters, and case studies focussed on deconstructing the diabolical techniques being employed in the surreptitious construction of one-world government. The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity is the pièce de résistance of Project Humanbeingsfirst. It cherry picks penetrating analysis of current affairs from over a decade of written scholarship as the student of truth, and not its master. The Companion Reader systematically unpeels “truth's protective layers” in several different domains of human endeavor to demonstrate that virtually nothing the public mind is led to believe about any matter is wholly true. In fact, what the public believes and responds to is often outright bunk. As The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity demonstrates, in the age of Machiavelli and universal deceit, the ultimate revolutionary act is not just to discover truth in a sea of lies, nor just to tell it to the deaf and blind who can neither hear nor see, as morally courageous as both these endeavors are for the malcontent, but to act upon truth that one is so convinced of with the courage of one's convictions. In the age of universal deceit to live truth is a revolutionary act!

This is the principal teaching not just of the Holy Qur'an, not just of the Holy Bible, not just of the Vedas and the Gita, but of all noble human wisdom traditions from time immemorial. The quest for living in truth is as old as mankind, right alongside hegemony and primacy.
Please read the Project Humanbeingsfirst.org Legal Disclaimer Notice (http://humanbeingsfirst.org/#Legal) before you hasten to do so based on what you read here. The Legal Disclaimer Notice is hereby incorporated into this book by reference. In précis: (1) you are responsible to verify what is presented here; for all you know, it could also be all myth like the rest of what you believe to be true. And (2): Project Humanbeingsfirst and this author have no affiliation with anyone; reference citation to sources is for scholarship purpose only.

Remember, your own mind is your first imam, and that first natural guide built into each one of us is itself under manipulation from all sides not just by the external perception managers who manufacture a synthetic reality for us, but also by self-serving natural inclinations which often remain rooted deeply in the unconscious mind and manufacture our own subjective reality of which we remain unaware of. A self-referential problem every seeker of objective reality must vigorously confront if honesty of purpose is their driving intent. Know thy self to know the world, so to speak. While self-evident, few labor in that prescription. The target audience of this book, socialized Muslims, especially remain oblivious to this ingrained socialization bias in their self-righteous indignation to any invitation to introspection. Shia Muslims fervently remain Shia, Sunni Muslims fervently remain Sunni, and each remains violently attached to their respective ethos, each understands their history somewhat differently, and consequently fall easy prey to all “us vs. them” emotional and theological separation schemes conjured up by every conquering hectoring hegemon throughout the ages.

Today, that age-old divide and conquer modus operandi has been convoluted and amplified by political science contortions such as the Hegelian Dialectic of “militant Islam” vs. “moderate Islam” vs. “revolutionary Islam”. The former two are derived from Sunni distortions of Islam, and the latter is derived from Shia distortions of Islam, all of which are just more attempts at seeding separation among people to fabricate internecine warfare under sophisticated political theories of
statism to fashion a one-world global superstate. This book is intended to be the antidote shock therapy for Muslims. It can surely succeed but only if cognitively addressing the self-referential problem is made part of extending our understanding of the world. One has to diligently compensate for one’s own natural subjectivity and perception biases before one can be analytical about any external matter. Once again, for emphasis, know thy self to know the world!

Since you have reached this far in this long Preface, welcome to the journey of discovering how much we are deceived by the fact that we are only human. But because we are primarily human, and not animal, howsoever we may have come about, we can do better than animals who are stuck in their nature and their habit. The beaver has been building dams for 5000 years, but in exactly the same way. The honey bee has been making honey for a lot longer, but also in exactly the same way. While man still cannot mimic what the natural world does so easily, man has something the natural world does not. We build a better dam each time around!

Socrates had surely summed up his own challenge to his audience thusly*:

‘Agree with me if I seem to you to speak the truth; or, if not, withstand me might and main that I may not deceive you as well as myself in my desire, and like the bee leave my sting in you before I die. And now let us proceed.’

Stating the matter of fact in the same words, for the same purpose, let us proceed as well.

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons,

Zahir Ebrahim
Project Humanbeingsfirst.org
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To The Reader's Notice

The Arabic verses of the Holy Qur'an and its translations reproduced in this case study are also cited with a link to their authentic oral recitation in Arabic. The oral text in Arabic is the definitive text of the Holy Qur'an under all circumstances. The recitation of the oral text is by the well-known qaari Shaykh Mahmoud Khalil al-Husary. The written text is from the Open Source Qur'an Tanzil Project. The written text of the Holy Qur'an, in general, is authenticated against the oral recitation (drawn from the set of Seven Qira’at) by an authentic haafiz of the Holy Qur'an, who in turn is traceable to an authentic Qur'an institution that is universally accepted by the Muslim pulpit of both major sects of Islam. One such authentic compilation is the Medina Mushaf (مصحف المدينة النبوية) which the open source Tanzil Project states to have used. We have no reason to doubt their effort or their exercise in due diligence. However, there is a diabolical movement afoot in the United States and some Western nations to adulterate the written Arabic text with doctored versions of the Holy Qur'an. These proliferate in both printed as well as electronic editions. Some people have discovered such doctored Qur'an even in mosques in the United States, donated by anonymous donors. Please report any error found in this book to: humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com.
Motivation

[ Tuesday, August 02, 2011, 2nd day of Ramadan in the United States, Muslim year 1432 ]

Despite a slight throbbing headache due to abstinence from my usual cups of morning tea on my second day of fasting, I feel motivated to address an observation made by a fellow Muslim at an Iftar dinner in a Pakistani restaurant in Islamabad many years ago. In the past few years I have spent many a Ramadan in Pakistan and often visited the same restaurant for breaking the fast with a lavish buffet meal. Servicing a mere day's hunger from self-imposed deprivation
can be a sight to behold. Any sensible person watching privileged Muslims feast at *Iftar* with perfunctory courtesy to Islam would surely wonder about our religion. Thank goodness non-Muslims don't approach Islam by looking at the behavior of us gluttonous Muslims, but rather, by approaching the Holy Qur'an directly. And that's the topic of this column – understanding Islam directly from its singular source, the Holy Qur'an.

The good fellow who was one of the restaurant managers and was pursuing part-time studies in Arabic, sometimes would sit with me for a cup of tea. As I vividly recall, on one of these visits for a hearty meal, he had asked me a rhetorical question to which I had partly replied in some seriousness with reference to the Holy Qur'an. My interlocutor's immediate riposte to me was something like this:

“don't quote me the Qur'an; everyone quotes their favorite verses to justify their own narrow positions; the shias quote it, the sunnis quote it, the wahabis quote it, the barelvis quote it, the deobandis quote it, the qadianis quote it, and yet they all have slightly different understanding of the same Holy Qur'an and each would rather die for that difference than relent in their view.”

Indeed, as many Muslims who have read the Holy Qur'an are aware, anyone can pretty much find at least some justification for any agenda, any belief, and mainly the one into which one is socialized at birth, in that most unusual Book.

It is an empirical fact that that's how Muslims become divided into sectarianism. Not by rationalism, logic or investigation, but by the fact of being born into a Muslim home and adopting the dominant theology and practices of the sect to which the parents belong – whether or not they be practicing Muslims. Often times, the de facto socialization parameters are determined by the dominant sect of the culture, nation, or civilization where one is raised. This is why the ma-
ajority of Muslims in the world are classified in general terms as sunnis – the dominant sect among the Muslims. This is also why a Saudi Muslim is different from an Iranian Muslim, for example. Neither chooses their sectarian version of Islam – each is born into it. But each claims to be the sole custodian of Islam's true interpretation. As the dominant mainstream, the sunnis don't consider themselves to be a “sect” by the fact of being the majority. Only the other minority is a “sect”. Every minority of course think the majority is usually wrong pointing to how it killed Socrates. Some ask: is the religion of Islam a “democracy” – that fifty one percent of the people who are born into it define what Islam and its Book must mean for the rest of the forty nine percent? Isn't that also called mob rule – where majority ignorance rules? Should one follow the majority just because they are a majority irrespective of the merit of their position? And what objective merit is that when every group, big and small, sees maximum merit only in their own socialized interpretation of Islam?

The vast majority of the 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide are directly socialized into our sectarian beliefs from birth. As adults, our understanding of the religion of Islam is thence derived almost exclusively from our birth-sect's dominant worldviews. Our respective beliefs are further strengthened when we see our sect's ullema (Muslim religious scholars) most eloquently argue their respective theological raison d'être for differing with that other sect's mumbo jumbo directly from the Holy Qur'an, and from other secondary and tertiary books of their own sect. That fact of socialization applies recursively to all scholars and compilers of antiquity as well. The bulk of their writings constituting the secondary and tertiary sources of information for subsequent generations of Muslim scholarship. Each group or sect naturally selecting the narrow views of their respective socialization to promulgate forward to the next generation in a classic example of a crippled epistemology which incestuously feeds upon itself.

This is quite empirical. Pick up any book of antiquity, from tafseer to hadith compilation to history, and one will see the clear separation
of shia vs. sunni dichotomy run through them. Examine the background of the authors and they invariably exactly fall along that same boundary. A very peculiar state of affairs which is inexplicable, since all sects claim to have the same exact text of the Holy Qur'an, unless one begins to understand the power and influence of incestuous socialization in Muslim scholarship. Few escape it. And this fact is evidenced by the straightforward observation that socialized masses and scholars alike, don't account for their own socialization in their self-righteous proclamations entirely rooted in the superiority complex of their respective inheritance.

**Is the religion of the masses therefore, practically speaking, merely reduced to an inheritance?**

The Author of the Holy Qur'an vociferously decries that notion of following in the footsteps of one's forefathers, unequivocally warning not to follow the religion of one's ancestors just because one is born into that religion. Surah Al-Baqara is replete with that theme. E.g.,

“This is a people that have passed away; they shall have what they earned and you shall have what you earn, and you shall not be called upon to answer for what they did.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:141);

“(On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them. And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166-167)

The Holy Qur'an repeatedly invites individual reflection of every human being in the matters of beliefs instead of merely inheriting the beliefs from one's forefathers, as in Surah Al An'aam:

“So when the night over-shadowed him, he saw a star;
said he: Is this my Lord? So when it set, he said: I do not love the setting ones. Then when he saw the moon rising, he said: Is this my Lord? So when it set, he said: If my Lord had not guided me I should certainly be of the erring people. Then when he saw the sun rising, he said: Is this my Lord? Is this the greatest? So when it set, he said: O my people! surely I am clear of what you set up (with Allah). Surely I have turned myself, being upright, wholly to Him Who originated the heavens and the earth, and I am not of the polytheists.” (Surah Al An'aam, 6:76-77-78-79)

The Holy Qur'an enjoins such reflection even while also accepting socialization as an empirical fact among mankind. The Author of the Holy Qur'an Itself proclaims that It created mankind in tribes and nations:

“O mankind! Lo! We have created you from male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that ye may know one another. Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight of Allah, is the best in conduct. Lo! Allah is Knower, Aware.” (Surah Al-Hujraat, 49:13).

And sent His message to them all in their own languages:

“And We never sent a messenger save with the language of his folk, ( that he might make (the message) clear for them.” (Surah Ibrahim, 14:4)

And that:

“If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you:” (Surah Al-Maeda, 5:48)

So, as the verse continues its advocacy:

“so strive as in a race in all virtues ( ). The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show
you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” (Surah Al-Maeda, 5:48)

The Holy Qur'an therefore rationally countenances socialization for those pursuing their respective beliefs other than Islam, despite the Holy Qur'an oft stating that Islam supplants them all as the final Revelation in a tamper-proof package:

“In a Book well-guarded, Which none shall touch but those who are clean.” (Surah Al-Waqia, 56:78-79)

See the examination of Surah Al-Fatiha and Surah Al-Maeda in Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization (http://tinyurl.com/Islam-Socialization) for the consequent principles of pluralism for virtuous conduct regardless of beliefs inherent in the message of the Holy Qur'an which unequivocally avers:

“There is no compulsion in religion.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:256)

“Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or unthankful.” (Surah Al-insaan 76:3)

While accepting socialization as a fact, the Qur'anic recipe to circumvent socialization as a means for independent evaluation of beliefs, is to approach the Holy Qur'an with a cleansed heart. (Ibid.) But one still observes all the cleansed hearts throughout the ages still pretty much fall along the same sectarian demarcation among the Muslims. Why does the cleansed heart recipe evidently fail when it comes to sectarianism for the topics which divide the Muslims? Perhaps the hearts aren't cleansed enough? That platitudinous metaphor for bringing utmost earnestness when seeking a rational as well as spiritual understanding of the Holy Qur'an, not bringing preconceptions and prejudices to its study and reflection, doesn't really lend any additional insight into the subject of why even the most earnest seekers of truth come away understanding the Holy Book pretty much along the axis of their socialization. Focusing on the heart is a dead-end as far as further intellectual inquiry is concerned.
Therefore, the question naturally arises, that if it is empirically observed that everyone finds their own self-serving justifications to validate their respective socialization in the Holy Qur'an, how is one to study the Holy Qur'an objectively, independent of one's own socialization, in order to learn and comprehend what its own Author wanted to convey in that most revered Book of the Muslims?

How are we to prevent the hijacking of the Holy Qur'an from a self-serving understanding of it for our own selves?

Before one can even begin to perceptively answer that crucial question, commonsense suggests that one has to first diagnose and dissect the problem more precisely.

Therefore, we begin by formulating the problem in this way:

What are the inherent impediments for studying the message of the Holy Qur'an which make the Book so amenable to self-serving interpretation, socialization, and even bastardization by anyone?

Just to briefly footnote the usage of the latter villainous word, bastardization, it is no secret that today, its harbingers include the most notable Western propagandists. E.g., Bernard Lewis of Princeton University who skillfully crafted the mantra of 'Clash of Civilizations' and subsequently wrote the thesis “Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror”; and Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski who easily gave to the USSR its Vietnam War in Afghanistan in Muslim blood with nothing more profound than a simple retake on the German Third Reich's battle cry “Gott mit uns” (God is with us): “God is on your side”.

“In 1990 Bernard Lewis, a leading Western scholar of Islam, analyzed 'The Roots of Muslim Rage,' and concluded: 'It should now be clear that we are facing a mood and a movement far transcending the level of issues and policies and the governments that pursue
them. This is no less than a clash of civilizations – that perhaps irrational but surely historic reaction of an ancient rival against our Judeo-Christian heritage, our secular present, and the worldwide expansion of both. It is crucially important that we on our side should not be provoked into an equally historic but also equally irrational reaction against our rival.”

(Samuel Huntington in *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, page 213)

That supposed “Muslim Rage” of 1990 was turned into the egregiously titled full blown propaganda treatise *The Clash of Civilizations* by Bernard Lewis' Zionist-imperialist confriere at Harvard University, Samuel Huntington, in 1995:

“The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power. The problem for Islam is not the CIA or the US Department of Defense. It is the West, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the universality of their culture and believe that their superior, if declining, power imposes on them the obligation to extend that culture throughout the world. These are the basic ingredient that fuel conflict between Islam and the West.” (Ibid. pages 217-218)

And Huntington's myth crafting of 1995 was turned into the perpetual “War on Terrorism” on September 11, 2001 by the Zionist-imperialists' errand boy, George W. Bush Jr., the President of the United States, with “either you are with us, or with the terrorists”!

Moreover, today, both “militant Islam” and “moderate Islam”, the Hegelian Dialectic to continually advance and sustain the cause of empire's “War on Terror” as a “self-fulfilling prophecy”, draw justifi-
cations from the Holy Qur'an. One for Holy War, the other for Holy Peace. Each side has its partisans among the public because each side easily sees the correctness of their own position – it is, after all, (selectively) rooted in the Holy Qur'an they each claim. See Response to the Fatwa on Terrorism in the Service of Empire.

However, mechanisms for the bastardization of a religion is not the focus of this analysis. See Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization, Islam vs. Secular Humanism and World Government, and Case Study in Mantra Creation for these details. The political novel (or historical fiction – the only fair way to characterize it) “Memoirs Of Mr. Hempher, The British Spy To The Middle East” is further revealing of how the hijacking of the religion of Islam can be so diabolically engineered by planting and cultivating stooges for cognitive infiltration into the religion via a subversive sect creation in the 18th century. In PART SIX of the novel, key insightful observations are made about the religion of Islam and the Muslim psyche which, regardless of who authored them – whether as historical fiction or a real handbook of subverting Islam – are empirically visible even today. Empiricism lends direct credence to the description of the Machiavellian methods of subversion of the religion of Islam in that political treatise (read pertinent excerpt) irrespective of who is its author, or what literary device is employed to convey the malignant thesis.

Just as “Philip Dru Administrator: a Story of Tomorrow 1920 - 1935”, by Edward Mandell House, depicts in a fictional narrative, the first principles used for the author's own Trojan Horse role in controlling President Woodrow Wilson's presidency (1912-1920) as a puppet on behalf of oligarchic powers behind the scenes. First principles which one can observe being practiced for all American presidencies ever since, including today for President Obama's puppet presidency. Just as empiricism also lends incontrovertible weight to the Machiavellian methods in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion regardless of who wrote that malignant treatise whose effects in the world today are plainly visible as if blueprinted directly from that villainous recipe.
book of subversion. All these political treatises in varying forms are akin to the political novel *The Prince* by Machiavelli, written in the 16th century which still forms the guide-book for modern statecraft, and that is the heart of the matter – the principles of subversion espoused in them. Just as Machiavelli is read and followed in statecraft, so are any recipe books which permit subverting the enemy, including the 2500 years old Chinese treatise of Sun Tzu, *The Art of War* (read all these works).

And lastly, in that same vein of subversion of a lofty religion for seeding havoc among its followers, the two articles Egypt and Tunisia – The 'arc of crisis' being radicalized! and Unlayering the Middle East War Agenda: Making Sense of Absurdities, delve into the more recent cultivation of the shia Iranian Revolution of yesteryear to connect with the present “revolutions” suddenly erupting in the Middle East against the same tyrannical rulers who were previously aided and abetted to remain in power over their peoples just like Saddam Hussein of Iraq. Its juxtaposition to the cultivation of the sunni “Mujahideens” in Afghanistan at exactly the same time period, both of them to fertilize the “*arc of crisis*” with bipartisan Muslim blood, is frightening testimony of the persistence of vulnerable fracture points among the followers of Islam which are perennially ripe for harvesting.

The Muslim fratricide of Iran-Iraq war was only made possible by deftly employing the age old historical schisms of shia-vs-sunni, arming both sides and contriving the fratricide in untold millions. That contrivance is a textbook example of *game theory* being put into practice for a global agenda. The effects of fertilizing the “*arc of crisis*” in Muslim blood predictively percolated into enabling other premeditated global events, ultimately setting into motion the creation of a New World Order – of one world government. Read the aforementioned two articles to fathom the self-serving Cassandra-like predictions made by Zbigniew Brzezinski right after lighting that fuse to what he prophetically (sic!) called the “*arc of crisis*”. A fuller under-
standing of that epoch of the latter half of the twentieth century mini-
mally requires a book-length read which perceptively re-links the
seemingly disparate and often unlinked antecedent and subsequent
events, wars, collapses, revolutions of the past century, melding di-
rectly into the searing event of the New Pearl Harbor on September
11, 2001. See a précis in Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road
to World Order.

With the preceding bird's eye view of the age old villainous meth-
ods of subversion and harvesting of the religion of Islam from within,
the focus in this article is exclusively on the natural impediments to
the earnest study of the Holy Qur'an by a genuine seeker of its knowl-
edge who willingly comes to the Book with an intent to learn its con-
tents.

So now you open the Holy Qur'an to read, reflect, and study, with
a cleansed heart, Muslim or non-Muslim, native Arabic speaker or
reading many translations in your own language alongside. Common
impediments now make the study of the Holy Qur'an uncongenial to
the ordered mind. Let's dissect that uncongeniality with a surgeon's
scalpel. The result is not as obvious as it might first appear.
Thought Experiment Introducing Mr Spock

Let's begin with a thought experiment. Imagine Mr. Spock from Star Trek curiously picking up the Holy Qur'an to examine its fascinating contents. What will he find?

For those unfamiliar with Mr. Spock, he is a fictional character in a science fiction television series of the 1960s. Spock is a completely logical being. He exhibits no human characteristics of subjectivity and emotionalism. He has no intuition, no imagination, and no inspiration. He makes rational analysis of any matter based solely on available facts and data. He draws linkages, makes inferences and deduction, theorizes and opines, based solely on factual logic and not on intuition or other un-quantifiable human notions of tea-leaves reading, sixth sense, gut feel, love, hate, etc., all of which transcend rational logic.

Therefore, Mr. Spock can put no subjective spin on his analysis. His opinion is always supported by facts at hand. When he is forced to speculate, he refrains by saying one needs facts to even speculate. When he theorizes for the unknown, he only does so based on available factual evidence. He is entirely impervious to the following human tendency:

'What a man believes upon grossly insufficient evidence is an index to his desires – desires of which he himself is often unconscious. If a man is offered a fact which goes against his instincts [or worldview], he will scrutinize it closely, and unless [and at times even when] the evidence is overwhelming, he will refuse to believe it. If, on the other hand, he is offered something which affords a reason for acting in accordance with his instincts [or worldview], he will accept it even on the slenderest evidence.' — Bertrand Rus-
It is fair to say that Mr. Spock is completely un-socialized into any worldview other than of pure logic, facts, and empiricism. Therefore, unlike normal human beings, Spock brings no presuppositions and no prejudices to his testimony other than that which naturally falls out from pure logic applied to empirical data.

An example to illustrate his logic mind is from the episode titled “Court Martial” where Mr. Spock is being asked to testify in a court martial of his captain. When Mr. Spock asserted that it was not possible for his captain to be guilty as charged because it was not in his nature to make such an error, he was accused by the prosecutor of bias due to loyalty to his captain; that Spock hadn't actually watched the captain not do what he was charged with doing. Mr. Spock's response is elegantly logical: “I know the captain. Lieutenant, I am half Vulcanian. Vulcans do not speculate. I speak from pure logic. If I let go of a hammer on a planet that has a positive gravity, I need not see it fall to know that it has in fact fallen.”

As the science officer aboard the Starship Enterprise, Mr. Spock is the second in command and has the distinguished record of one hundred percent objective situational analysis of fast breaking crises one hundred percent of the time. Just the kind of mind we need to launch our forensic examination of the Holy Qur'an – the separation between the object under study and the observer. Mr. Spock's logical mind lends us that much needed cleavage.

Continued in Part-II
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Chapter I Part 2

Case Study: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to Hijack?

Part-II

Introduction

In Part-I of this study, Mr. Spock from Star Trek had just picked up the Holy Qur'an and with a cleansed heart as is natural to him on all matters (i.e., without prejudice and socialization bias – see Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization, http://tinyurl.com/Islam-Socialization), delved into the inquiry of what is in that Holy Book of 1.6 to 2 billion Muslims on planet earth. While it will surely take a good book-length report to cover all that he learnt, this Part-II and sequels to follow narrowly focus on the factual and analytical portions of his discovery as directly pertinent to the overarching inquiry question raised.
in Part-I:

What are the inherent impediments for studying the message of the Holy Qur'an which make the Book so amenable to self-serving interpretation, socialization, and even bastardization by anyone?

While this investigative study is intended primarily for the benefit of ordinary Muslims to foster a greater analytical understanding of our own religion, Islam, ordinary Non-Muslim peoples will, perhaps for the first time in the English language – the language of the Anglo-Saxon masters du jour of the affairs of the world – perceptively glimpse the scriptural reasons for the delicate fracture points of disunity among Muslims. These fracture points have been rife for exploitation by all *imperial mobilizations* of all empires, both past and present.

But “Islam”, the proper noun, a “deen” chosen by Allah, the Author designate of the Holy Qur'an, and by the Author's own proclamation, a “favor” unto mankind to show them an enlightened and divinely guided way of life, **has nothing to do with empires:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the Scripture whereof there is no doubt, <strong>a guidance unto those who ward off (evil)</strong>. (2:2)</td>
<td>لَذَٰلِكَ الْكِتَابُ لَا رَبِّ بِهٰٓيْنَ هَدّى لِلْمُتَّقِينَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who believe in the Unseen, and establish worship, <strong>and spend of that We have bestowed upon them</strong> (Su-rah Al-Baqara 2:3)</td>
<td>لَاتَّدِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ وَيَتْبَعُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَهُمْ يَنفَعُونَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadhan is the (month) in which was sent down the Qur'an, <strong>as a guide to mankind</strong>, also clear (Signs) for guidance and judgment (Between right and wrong). (Surah Al-Baqara verse fragment 2:185)</td>
<td>شَهِرُ رَمَضَانِ الَّذِىٰ أَنزَلَ فِيهِ الْفُرْقَانُ هَدّى لِلْنَّاسِ وَبَيِّنَتْ مِنَ الْهَدِىَّ وَالْفُرْقَانِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alif. Lam. Ra. (This is) a Scripture which We have revealed unto thee (Muhammad) that thereby thou mayst bring forth mankind from darkness unto light, by the permission of their Lord, unto the path of the Mighty, the Owner of Praise, (Surah Ibrahim 14:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute. (Surah Al-Maeda 5:48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Muslim men and women,- for believing men and women, for devout men and women, for true men and women, for men and women who are patient and constant, for men and women who humble themselves, for men and women who give in charity, for men and women who fast (and deny themselves), for men and women who guard their chastity, and for men and women who engage much in Allah's praise,- for them has Allah prepared forgiveness and great reward.” (Surah Al-Ahzaab, 33:35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By the declining day, (103:1)  
Lo! man is in a state of loss (103:2)  
Save those who believe,  
and do good works,  
and strive for “haq”,  
and are patient (Surah Al-Asr 103:3)  

| بَلْ ِالْعَصْرِ  
| الْإِنسَانُ لِفَا خَسَرَ  
| إِلَّا ِالْدِّينِ أَمَنُوا  
| وَأَعْمَلُوا ِالصِّلَّحَةِ  
| وَتَتَوَاصَأُوا بِالْحَقِّ  
| وَتَتَوَاصَأُوا ِبِالصَّبْرِ |

O soul that art at rest! (89:27)  
Return to your Lord, well-pleased (with him), well-pleasing (Him), (89:28)  
So enter among My servants, (89:29)  
And enter into My garden. (Surah Al-Fajr, 89:30)  

| يَا بَيْنَكُمْ نَفْسٌ مُّطْمِئْنَةٌ  
| أَرْجَعِى إِلَى رَبِّكَ رَاضِيّةٌ  
| مُرْضِيّةٍ  
| فَأَدْخَلْيُ فِي عَبْدِي  
| وَأَدْخَلْي جَنِّي |

This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion.” (Surah Al-Maeda verse fragment 5:3)  

| اِلْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ عَلِيُّكُمْ بِعَمْتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمْ  
| إِلَّا يِسَالَ دِينًا |

Caption Verses capturing the primary mission statement of the Religion of Islam in a nutshell. See any empire?

The above table captures the primary mission statement of the Religion of Islam in its own words in a nutshell. There is no mention or even conception of empire in it. Nor in the rest of the Holy Qur'an. There is not even a word for “empire” in the vocabulary-rich language of the Holy Qur'an, never mind an advocacy to strive for it as the purpose of life. The purpose of man's striving is specified entirely different from what it would be if “imperial mobilization” of Islam (under any flag, banner, label, or pretext) was among the purposes of its con-
stitution for a moral existence that its Author claims He already “perfected”. Meaning, there is no room for more specification in it. And there is exactly zero specification for empire in it.

Then, the obvious pertinent question must be asked. How did a “deen”:

- which Allah “perfected” (مُّقَدِّمَتُ لِّكُمْ دِينَكُمَّ) as moral guidance for the pious (هَذَا لِلمَّتَّقِينَ) to: “bring forth mankind from darkness unto light” (ذَٰلِكَ مِنَ الْخَلْقِ إِلَى الْثَّوْرِ) ;

- showing a path of perseverance (تَوَاصَّوْا بِالصَّبْرِ) for doing “good works” (عَمِلُوا الصِّلَاحَ) and establishing “haq” (قَدَّمُوا الْخَيْرَاتِ) as if “in a race in all virtues” (تَحْرُرَوا الْمَلَكَبَاتِ) ;

- whose main prize is proclaimed to be: “forgiveness and great reward” (مَغْفِرَةً وَأُجْزَاءَ عَظِيمًا) for a “soul that art at rest” (الْفَتُوحَةِ) upon its “Return to your Lord, well-pleased (with him), well-pleasing (Him)” (أَرْجِعِي إِلَيْ رَبِّي رَاضِيَةً مُّرْضَيَةً) ;

- and whose “great reward” being: “So enter among My servants, And enter into My garden” (فَاعْلُخبَى فِي عِبَادِي وَأَنْخَلَى جَنَّتِي) ;

become world-dominating empires soon after the death of its Prophet?

That's a pretty straightforward prescription above, a rather simple constitution to comprehend by even the laity requiring no industry of the clergy class, nor the pulpit, to expound it. So what went wrong?

These “Islamic” empires ruled unsurpassed vast territories in the name of Islam under various Muslim dynasties say from 700 A.D. to 1400 A.D., and for another 500 years afterwards in stiff competition with European empires, the last remnants of which were forcibly laid to rest by the Anglo-Saxon masters in the early twentieth century in full capitulation to the white man's burden. How that came about is a study of history of rise and fall of empires in all its broad dimensions that has been repeated many times by others. Such is not the direction of this far humbler work.
These Muslim empires unfortunately bequeathed to mankind what it has largely come to understand of Islam today. This is true of Muslims and non-Muslims alike. If you just bother to open Bernard Lewis' many books on Islam for instance, and the Princeton University's most famous Zionist propagandist is touted as a “leading Western scholar of Islam”, you will immediately see that he eruditely opines about Islam largely from sources penned by history's scribes rather than from the Holy Qur'an itself. Care to ponder why? Can't the incredibly well-read multi-lingual vulgar propagandist find sufficient ammunition in the Holy Qur'an to malign Islam pedantically like some of the lower-order propagandists such as the Qur'an burning pastor from Florida do? Why does Bernard Lewis so eagerly reach for the scribes of history for his propaganda manuals? His “Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror”, as does his “What Went Wrong? – The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East”, both draw sustenance from history's scribes to respectively demonstrate the “terrorism” and backwardness of Muslims being rooted in “Islam” (see Hijacking the word “Islam” for Mantra Creation).

Tragically, in almost exactly the same way, Muslims trying to escape their socialization biases by studying Islam for themselves, also always first reach for the same history's scribes to understand Islam, and invariably end up basing their understanding of their religion almost entirely on expositions of these history's scribes. And as expected, they also end up incestuously self-reinforcing their socialization biases by first, and often only, reaching for history's scribes favored by their own narrow socialization in a naturally self-selecting way. While Bernard Lewis does it self-servingly for his inimical self-serving agenda, Muslims end up following the same epistemological process unwittingly, without necessarily having any agenda other than to earnestly learn their religion to better themselves.

This crippled epistemological process is nearly universal. It transcends all sectarian divides among Muslims. Sunni Muslims get their understanding of Islam from their respective “wassael-e-sunni”
penned by their history's favored scribes, and Shia Muslims get their understanding of Islam from their respective “wassael-e-shia” penned by their history's favored scribes, just as Bernard Lewis gets his Islam from both their collective works. None of them principally get their understanding of Islam directly from the Holy Qur'an despite often having an intense familiarity with its words. The truth of these observations is beyond doubt. It is empirical. And therefore, also easily falsifiable if not rooted in factual observation. Muslims today would have been a single Muslim nation (أمة مسلمة) if these words are false. And Bernard Lewis not the very successful propagandist for “World War IV” – West's perpetual “War on Terror” as labeled by a former director of the CIA – that he has become, adorning Goebbels' shoes without fear of retribution. And the 1.6 to 2 billion Muslims worldwide would not be running helter-skelter foolishly asking their own predators to come save them like puppets on a string.

This study principally examines the narrow question which to this scribe's knowledge has not been addressed in Muslim and non-Muslim scholarship alike: Has the Holy Qur'an, the Book of divine guidance to the pious, itself contributed to its own “subversion”? Meaning, its own proclaimed goal of a single Muslim nation (أمة مسلمة):

“We Lord! make of us Muslims, bowing to Thy (Will), and of our progeny a Muslim nation, bowing to Thy (will); and show us our place for the celebration of (due) rites; and turn unto us (in Mercy); for Thou art the Oft-Returning, Most Merciful.”
(Surah Al-Baqara 2:128)

This is a frightening question to ask, let alone explore with unabated courage. But it is a legitimate question to inquire into because its seeds are directly planted in the Holy Qur'an itself, just waiting to
be ploughed by an alert mind seeking the fruits of its divine message rather than foolishly parrot its words without comprehension as a cultural inheritance in socially acceptable ritualistic ways:

''Then the Messenger will say: “O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.”''
(Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30)

Apart from the Prophet of Islam himself condemning his people for shackling the Qur'an into “foolish nonsense” – the Arabic word is perhaps better translated as the un-implemented, shackled, chained, ritualized, constitution that was studied, taught and repeated verbatim most fervently for spiritual salvation, used mainly as a prayer book for earning rewards in Heaven, as if the Holy Qur'an was not something to be understood and implemented for the living; to create equity and justice in society which it principally advocated as the Deen-ul-Haq (see exposition of Surah Al-Asr) – what are some other seeds planted in the Holy Qur'an which further beg the question posed in this study?

Witness:

“Mankind was but one nation, but differed (later). Had it not been for a Word that went forth before from thy Lord, their differences would have been settled between them.”
(Surah Yunus 10:19)
“If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” (Surah Al-Maeda verse fragment 5:48)

Caption Surah Yunus 10:19, *Verse of Separation*; and Surah Al-Maeda verse fragment 5:48, *Verse of Unification*

It says it right there – in the momentous words of the Holy Qur'an: “If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people,!” And “Had it not been for a Word that went forth before from thy Lord, their differences would have been settled between them.” Had God wanted to, matters of disunity would have been settled in the very beginning. But, the verse of the Holy Qur'an vouches, it was by the Lord's Word instead, that differences arose, and the settlement day deferred to be the Day of Reckoning:

“And for every nation there is a messenger. And when their messenger cometh (on the Day of Judgment) it will be judged between them fairly, and they will not be wronged.” (Surah Yunus 10:47)

But, until then, “(His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” And that divine plan is one of choice for man, whether man is thankful or unthankful for the guidance:
The topic of inter-civilizational and inter-religion striving: “as in a race in all virtues” (فَاستَنْبَقُوا الْخَيْرَاتَ), transliteration fuss-tabiq-ul-khairaat (5:48 quoted above), has already been examined in the study Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization where religion as socialization among different peoples of different religions, cultures, and civilizations, is explored in some depth.

The same considerations apply to Muslims as well who, as one empirically observes, also become divided into sects and nations by way of socialization and inheritance no differently than the rest of the people on earth.

An alert mind can therefore legitimately inquire into the same Qur'anic concepts noted above also being applicable among Muslims themselves! Had God wanted to, He could have surely clarified all matters in the Holy Qur'an unambiguously, but as we shall discover in this study done through the metaphor of Mr. Spock, the Author of the Holy Qur'an instead announced the following:
He it is Who has sent down to thee the Book: In it are verses basic or fundamental (of established meaning); they are the foundation of the Book: others are allegorical.

But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah.

And those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say: 'We believe in the Book; the whole of it is from our Lord:' and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding.’

(Surah Aal-'Imran 3:7, Tr. Abdullah Yusuf Ali)

Caption Parsing 1 Verse 3:7 Surah Aal-'Imran, defining the first source of confusion about the religion of Islam

As is examined in-depth later on, the afore-quoted verse 3:7 of Surah Aal-'Imran lends prima facie justification into this inquiry which is evidently long overdue (by fourteen centuries it would appear). The poorly understood nature of sectarianism among Muslims which is always examined as events of history and not as a prima facie consequence of the ambiguity in the Scripture itself, testifies to this bold observation.

Just as the “Word” (وَلَوْلا كَلِمَةَ) caused differences to appear among mankind to be settled on the Day of Reckoning: “And when their messenger cometh (on the Day of Judgment) it will be judged between them fairly, and they will not be wronged.”, did
the Qur'anic Word also deliberately induce differences to appear among the Muslims: “But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings,”, for the same considerations: “(His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.”; and to offer them the same choice: “Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or unthankful.”, in almost exactly the same parallel:

“One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams” (Surah al-Israa' 17:71)

Caption Verse 17:71 Surah al-Israa', the fundamental verse of the Holy Qur'an introducing the notion of Accountability with the imam one followed! The verse yields the logical deduction: better be aware of what, or who, one is following as one's imam, including from whence one derives one's path attributed to whom one presumes one is following. The Arabic-English dictionary of the Holy Qur'an defines the word “Imam” thusly: “Leader; President; Any object that is followed, whether a human being or a book or a highway”.

It is like opening the Pandora's box – but as the legend declares, if one has the patience and the determination to dig through to its very bottom, the understanding will be found.

A cautionary negative side effect falls out from the afore-quoted verse 17:71 which is perhaps pertinent to mention here just briefly before continuing. The Holy Qur'an emphatically avers that all human beings will be held to account on the Day of Judgment in the company of the leader, the Imam, they each followed. So if one correctly fol-
lowed any Prophet of God, since Messengers have been sent to all peoples, no problem for them, as expected. That is the pluralism of Islam – the only religion bequeathed by antiquity to the modern world to espouse such liberalism. See Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization for details. But what if one inadvertently made a fast-talking ignoramus one's “Imam”; or followed learned discourses written by kings and shrewd apprentices of Machiavelli who obfuscated and subverted the religions to control their peoples; or simply remained socialized under the iconic authority figures they grew up with? It would be hell to pay on the Day of Judgment – for both Muslims and non-Muslims alike, since verse 17:71 is addressed to all human beings. You are whom you follow and learn from – better choose your teachers and Imams wisely! That's the principal Qur'anic message here, to Jews, Christians, Muslims, Hindus, to all human beings whatever their persuasion and inheritance. (Also see verses 2:166-167 of Surah Al-Baqara).

Coming back to the main theme of opening a Pandora's box in this inquiry, the Holy Qur'an's focus upon the virtuous, هذى للمنففين (verse 2:2 above), those who are perpetually on the straight path of becoming the perfect man (or marde-momin)[1], also seems rather simplistic on the surface. Especially so in a modernity which is run entirely by soulless, psychopathic, Machiavellian, Nietzscheian, manipulative controllers who create prisoners of the cave with the ease of perception management described by Plato in The Republic. (See Simile of the Cave, http://tinyurl.com/Plato-Myth-of-the-Cave)

What can the virtuous possibly ever do to overcome that perception management for regimented social control if they only journey from cradle to grave as prisoners of the cave? (See The Mighty Wurlitzer, http://tinyurl.com/MightyWurlitzer)

Plato's book was written one thousand years before the Holy Qur'an was disseminated to mankind in Arabia. And it begs the pertinent question: has the Holy Qur'an provided any recipe for extracting oneself from the matrix of perception management for prisoners of
the cave? Can a prisoner of the cave ever escape the chains of the cave using purely his own cognitive reasoning abilities? Is logical examination of observed facts based on the five human senses, the empiricism of scientists, alone sufficient to extract oneself from such perception-management which is now akin to mind-control?

The rational materialist scientists oft proclaim of their left-brain dominated scientific processes:

“The only means of knowledge is reasoning from observed facts; The senses provide our only direct contact with reality; Pure logical thinking cannot yield us any knowledge of the empirical world; all knowledge of reality starts from experience and ends in it;” (Albert Einstein, as noted by Dr. Abdus Salam in his Nobel speech, 1979)

A thoughtful reading of Plato's Myth of the Cave is essential to apprehend the depth and dimensions of this question. The reader is referred to Plato's The Republic if unfamiliar with the simile of the cave. (See excerpt titled Myth of the Cave in the Introduction of Prisoners of the Cave http://tinyurl.com/Plato-Myth-of-the-Cave ) This question, which addresses the mind that is itself under intense psychological manipulation by both, the forces of socialization from birth, and Machiavellian social engineering by the “controllers outside the cave” (using Plato's vernacular), and therefore, it being a self-referential problem, appears intractable using only empirical and experiential logic.

This question is therefore at the very heart of epistemology – the study of knowledge, how we know what we know. The totality of cognitive, subliminal, and primal forces diabolically manipulating the mind which remain entirely incognizant to the logical mind, known as psychological forces, compound the already self-referential problem. Twentieth century Austrian logician, mathematician and philosopher, Kurt Friedrich Gödel, demonstrated the intractability of such a prob-
lem if it is constrained to the dimension in which the problem is formulated, in his *Incompleteness Theorem*. One has to transcend to a higher dimension which contains the dimension of the problem being solved within it, in order to examine the lower dimension's axioms for self-consistency and completeness. This is as true in mathematics and in immanent philosophy, as perhaps in practically escaping the mental chains of *Plato's Cave*. Perhaps we shall also uncover that dimension, a higher evolutionary consciousness which transcends the five senses and simplistic notions of piety, and come up with some sensible understanding of Islam's role in addressing this question as well.

Before we can follow Mr. Spock's trail of discovery of the Holy Qur'an, some further elaboration on the *Mr. Spock* metaphor is necessary for those unfamiliar with Star Trek and don't immediately get the concept of the logic mind in contrast to the intuitive mind.

---

**Why Mr. Spock Abstraction**

Briefly introduced as an abstraction at the conclusion of Part-I as a lead into the analytical study of the Holy Qur'an, Mr. Spock is a fictional character from the 1960s television series fable called Star Trek. As fables usually are, this fable also carries within it many intriguing lessons. Mr. Spock is a useful literary device for purely logical and purely analytical exploration of any subject matter. That is so because this character possesses no intuitive understanding of, or sus-
ceptibility to, faith or to faith inducing artifacts including socialization, love, hate, emotional attachments, imagination, intuition, gut-feel, etc. Mr. Spock only goes by facts alone, and reasons by factual logic alone, in a very sterile methodical manner like a computer. He is strictly bound by causality which is empirical, and not fettered by imagination and intuition which perpetually remain beyond the bounds of causality.

Since Mr. Spock is entirely what might be classically called “left brained”, the spiritual aspects of the Holy Qur'an which often impact the human heart and imagination, the human soul, have no impact on him. This “left brained” metaphor for mathematically precise logical behavior requires some elaboration for readers unfamiliar with the anatomy of the human brain.

The human brain is principally in two distinguishable halves, the left and the right. For an undamaged brain which hasn't re-mapped its functions to its non-damaged parts in the self-healing process of an injured brain, the left-half typically deals in the more concrete matters of logic, analytical reasoning, engineering, math and science. And the right-half typically deals in the abstract, creative, artistic, verbal, linguistic, imaginative, poetic, spiritual, insight that is intuition based, and intuition and inspiration related matters that are not necessarily bound by causality and empiricism.

Narrowly specialized scientists generally tend to have left-half brain dominance which is what makes many of them such dorks on spiritual matters but brilliant in scientific endeavors. Whereas narrowly specialized artists and touch-feely people generally tend to have right-half brain dominance which is what often makes some so hopelessly romantic, and some others great sensitive, imaginative poets. The rest of humanity is somewhere in between that spectrum, more or less on a bell curve.

The best scientists however, those not narrowly and overly specialized, well understand the role both imagination and intuition, i.e.,
what appears to be faith to others, plays in one's scientific pursuits. As Charles Townes, 1964 Nobel physics laureate stated it: “Science wants to know the mechanism of the universe, religion the meaning. The two cannot be separated. Many scientists feel there is no place in research for discussion of anything that sounds mystical. But it is unreasonable to think we already know enough about the natural world to be confident about the totality of forces.” Abdus Salam, who shared the 1979 Nobel Prize in Physics with Wienberg and Glashow, noted the role of faith in physics by first reciting verses 67:3-4 of Surah Al-Mulk from the Holy Qur'an on the Nobel podium in Stockholm, and stated: “This in effect is, the faith of all physicists; the deeper we seek, the more is our wonder excited, the more is the dazzlement for our gaze.” Arthur L. Schawlow, 1981 Nobel Prize in Physics observed: “It seems to me that when confronted with the marvels of life and the universe, one must ask why and not just how. The only possible answers are religious. ... I find a need for God in the universe and in my own life.” And Max Planck the pioneer of modern physics, 1918 Nobel Prize in Physics, is famous for his insight (see full quote below): “It is impossible to make a clear cut between science, religion and art.”

All these Nobel laureates espoused something far greater than logic and reasoning aptitude of the left-brain. They also engaged their right-brain to fully employ their entire mind to perceive reality. Such broad-band scientists evidently style their life's pursuits in accordance with what they perceive by imagination and faith. Since the domain is physics, it naturally lends itself to empiricism and measurement to confirm to others what one discovers running on faith and imagination. And then it becomes science. But when the domain is metaphysics which is not amenable to empiricism and measurements, demonstrating the truths one uncovers can be a difficult problem. This was demonstrated by Richard P. Feynman, 1965 Nobel Prize in Physics, by his out of body experiments in a sensory deprivation tank in which he experienced a state of mind and consciousness which no one else can
reproduce, let alone measure. And this problem was also marvelously portrayed by Rudyard Kipling in his novel “Kim”. Once the lama discovers the *River of the Arrow* after a lifetime of quest, he is unable to explain its wondrousness to anyone, including to his ardent disciple!

That is the general problem of subjectivity inherent in imagination and intuition, gut-feel and insight, the purview of the right-brain abstraction. The two halves together constitute human consciousness — the raison d'être for the human mind which enabled the human Captain Kirk to trump the logic-only Mr. Spock every single time in every Star Trek episode. We see that both literature and science understand the meta logic of the mind — that it is not constrained by logic, causality, or being able to measure something quantifiably in order to assert its existence, in its most heightened state of awareness.

This is obviously a first order model because human beings are clearly multifaceted and rather complex. Scientists have barely scratched the surface of the human mind even though the human brain has already been under the modern microscope for well over a hundred years, and even though much understanding has been gained on behavioral and cognitive psychology fronts which form the core basis of modern behavior control via perception management and propaganda. See the report *Behavior Control: Architecture of Modern Propaganda* for comprehending the degree of perception management achieved in today's modernity where the difference between reality and the image of reality is akin to day and night.

All of Mr. Spock's brain is what would be only the left-half brain in humans, multiplied by two to occupy the entire cranial space which is the same physical size as in humans.

Thus, using Spock to perform this narrow study is equivalent to using an IR filter in a camera to block out unwanted infra red wavelengths from being captured in the image and leaving its indelible artifacts upon the image, when one is specifically only interested in seeing what the image looks like in the narrow visible light spectrum.
This is also called controlling the selectivity in engineering parlance. Mr. Spock's limitation of not having what we humans have in the right-half brain, lends a natural selectivity switch for intellectually understanding the Holy Qur'an without interference from the spiritual right-half brain which typically drives matters pertinent to human faith.

This is only a useful abstraction, an intellectual tool, and not to be taken too literally – for first and foremost, the Holy Qur'an is a spiritual message to mankind: to believe in an unseen Creator (بَيْنَ الْغَيْبِ وَالْحَيَّ) on faith alone! (verse 2:3)

The Holy Qur'an asks man to believe in several matters of Divine provenance which defy man's analytical and experiential logic, such as Revelation, Prophethood, Resurrection, Day of Judgment, Hereafter, Heaven, Hell, etc. But these do not defy the spirit of man whose essence is clearly spiritual, i.e., non material. Empiricism indicates that man, despite the overt formulation of his material body, is not just a collection of atoms and chemical reactions which can be analytically reasoned about in a laboratory or in philosophy (despite the insistence of scientists & philosophers). Love, moral-sense, self-sacrifice, the language of the heart and its tribulations, all defy pat formulations of the materialist. The intellect which enslaves the heart often turns it into stone. (See Morality derived from the Intellect leads to Enslavement!)

The twentieth century poet-philosopher of Muslims from the Indian subcontinent, “Sir”[2] Muhammad Iqbal, also known as Allama Iqbal (1877-1938), who surely only endeavored in his lovely poetry to free man from the shackles of all servitude to fellow man and to his enslaving intellectual ideologies, put it this way in a famous verse in Urdu:

صبح ازل یہ مجھے سے کوا جبرنیل نے
جو عقل کا غلام بو، وہ دل نہ کر قبول
'Subh-e-Azal yeh Mujh Se Kaha Jibraeel Ne
Jo Aqal Ka Ghulam Ho Woh Dil Na Ker Qabool'

“Gabriel on the Morning of Creation a piece of useful counsel gave:
Accept not the heart from a beloved whose mind enslaves it”
(Allama Iqbal, Zarbe-e-Kaleem, source)

And Rabindranath Tagore put the limitations of one sided use of the intellect thusly:

“A mind all logic is like a knife all blade. It makes the hand bleed that uses it.”

What gives a protective handle to this “knife all blade”, and breathes humanity into this collection of atoms and molecules called man, is a spiritual essence, and it is to that essence that the Holy Qur'an speaks for imparting spiritual guidance, to the who believe in the unseen (verses 2:2-3 and onwards), while also inviting reflection with logic and analytical reasoning (e.g. Verses 67:3-4; 6:76-79). Neither is sufficient by itself for human beings. We require both logic and reason (predominantly left-half brain) to understand and discern cognitively, and imagination and faith (predominantly right-half brain) to perceive spiritually. The left-brain parses the language of logic. The right-brain parses the language of the heart. In the Urdu language, the latter is called “sha-oor”, which in English is only loosely translated as “wisdom” or “insight”, and like “love”, another instinctual construct rooted in the language of the heart, it defies pat formulations.

To ignore either brain function is to deliberately be one-eyed when most are endowed with two for full depth perception. Such full spectrum apprehension with both eyes, the eye of logic and reason, and the eye of faith and intuition, enables thwarting cognitive as well as subliminal infiltration used for perception management and behav-
ior control by the vile among mankind. It helps man perceive and react to reality the way reality actually is, rather than the way it is made manifest on the screen of Plato's cave.

Abstractions like the one employed here therefore can help formulate and understand an otherwise intractable problem by breaking it down into logical components. This can be done recursively to each component until one gets down to a level at which one can completely (or at least satisfactorily) comprehend or manage it. However, as Max Planck sensibly wrote on the process of knowledge acquisition demonstrating that he well understood the role of both the left and right half brain abstractions in the service of the entire mind seeking knowledge:

“Modern physics has taught us that the nature of any system cannot be discovered by dividing it into its component parts and studying each part by itself, since such a method often implies the loss of important properties of the system. We must keep our attention fixed on the whole and on the interconnection between the parts. ... The same is true of our intellectual life. It is impossible to make a clear cut between science, religion and art. The whole is never equal simply to the sum of its various parts.” (Max Planck, Partly cited in Critique of Western Philosophy and Social Theory By David Sprintzen, pg. 76)

To engage such abstract analytical methods one requires a great deal of selectivity as a tool to enable focussing on matters pertinent to each level of abstraction. After the decomposition exercise is completed, reassembling the smaller well-understood pieces into an interconnected greater whole enables conquering the once insurmountable problem.

This additive reassembly is often termed superposition in engineering parlance. In the illustrative example, it is akin to removing the
IR filter from the camera to see what the composite image finally looks like in the presence of the unseen-to-the-naked-eye infrared wavelengths.

Since human beings are a combination of BOTH, left and right half brain which perform different functions, it would be foolish to take a one-half brained understanding of any matter as the complete understanding of the matter when we actually possess two distinct halves to yield to us a much greater and richer understanding when we maximally use both halves. But it can be quite insightful to use each half independently as an abstraction, employing tools pertinent to comprehending each, and superpositioning the understanding gleaned separately from the two different halves into a greater whole. Combined sagaciously with insight and perspective of empiricism, and the whole becomes greater than the sum of the parts. Combined idiotically and you end up with fanciful theory of the philosopher.

It is pertinent to recall from Star Trek that the captain, James T. Kirk, is a human being who draws upon Mr. Spock's analytical abilities as needed, but runs his ship as a human being, full of intuition, full of insights, gut feels, and other non-logical things which bedevil Mr. Spock. But doing so enables the ship's captain to do far more than the solely logical Mr. Spock ever can. The interesting characteristic of Spock is that he does not deny nor oppose the understanding acquired via the right-half brain by the captain. He merely accepts that it is not within his limited capabilities, being a solely left-half brained creature, to fully comprehend the captain's intuitions. Such logic of acceptance might shame the humility challenged who reduce human beings to the material lives of a cell!

So we use Mr. Spock just as Captain Kirk uses him for logical analysis, and no more.

Let's now follow Mr. Spock's trail of discovery on that aforementioned narrow question whose exploration is surprisingly very broad.
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Holy Qur'an Not a Book of Literature

The first thing Mr. Spock did before he began his study was to classify the genre of the Holy Qur'an as a law book, as a rule book, as a specification manual, as a specific message conveyed through a Messenger, rather than as a book of literature, fiction, poetry, philosophy, theosophy, mysticism, science, or history. Spock recognized the import of such a core classification. He understood that the Holy Qur'an was a message by its Author to its audience. It was like an important letter or cipher conveying a singular message. Therefore, accurate extraction and understanding of the message was essential in the exact context conveyed by the Author of the Message, and not in the context of the reader – or the reader can misunderstand and misinterpret the message or parts of the message, and believe and act in ways not intended by the Author. And Mr. Spock of course was embarking on his study of the Holy Qur'an in order to learn exactly what the Author of the Holy Qur'an had specifically intended to convey in that Message as opposed to how he might interpret it on his own fancy.

Being of logical and sensible scientific acumen, Mr. Spock well understood the difference between reading literature which is amenable to personal interpretation and localized understanding such as what does a poem or philosophy mean to a human being or to a culture (in their own particular circumstance), and reading a rules and regulations manual delivered in a particular cultural context, or a design specification manual in a particular technology, where there is no room for personal and localized interpretation otherwise one gets it wrong and fails the interoperability and system integration tests. One
has to comprehend exactly what the author has stated and meant, both in the letter and the spirit of the specification in the totality of the system specification.

Imagine trying to interpret the DMV driver's manual for the rules of the road, or the income tax code by one's own fancy. It is empirical that in the latter cases one endeavors to exactly understand what the relevant authority has meant to convey in its own, often convoluted, legalese language of expression and cultural context, or one does not pass the driver's license test and gets a tax audit, respectively! Foreigners coming to the United States for instance, have to learn English and the road rules and road signs which are in English, in order to pass the DMV driving test which is particular to each of its fifty states. No Pakistani can try to interpret these unfamiliar traffic rules in his or her own Pakistani cultural context – which would be absurd and rather hazardous in any case if one is driving in the streets of America.

Even though Mr. Spock is left brained and does not interpret based on personal inclination by definition, doing his due diligence to address the posed question, he classified the Holy Qur'an as not open to personal interpretation.

Instead, Mr. Spock deemed the Holy Qur'an akin to a cipher which must be deciphered into a singular plaintext. Correct deciphering entails exactly recovering the plaintext message which its Author has meant to convey through the cipher.

The result of this classification has far reaching consequences for the question posed at the top. And this is the first commonsense conclusion Mr. Spock reached – without even opening the Holy Qur'an.

Knowing that human beings are generally prone to the right-half brain interfering via personal subjectivity in even logical matters, he logically deduces that people would also try to interpret the Holy Qur'an according to their own proclivities and socialization contexts just as they might a fine book of literature or poetry.

That instead of first judiciously trying to comprehend the princi-
ples which the Author of the Holy Qur'an had laid down in its specification in both letter and in spirit (as when using the DMV manual for instance to pass the driver's license test) and then applying those principles to one's own epoch (just as one might apply the DMV traffic rule book to one's own specific road conditions), the believers of the religion of Islam would be naturally inclined to interpret the Holy Qur'an in their own respective socialization contexts.

And therefore, when they did that, they would each understand something different from reading or hearing the same text and that would explain the empiricism of Muslims being always divided on the meanings of the same verses of the Holy Qur'an ever since the demise of the Messenger of the Author of the Holy Qur'an who had acted as its Exemplar.

This condition is akin to different human beings reading the DMV driver's handbook interpretively and coming away with a different understanding of the traffic laws because no DMV inspector is sitting next to them in the car and being their exemplar for every emerging driving condition. Wouldn't that create chaos and mayhem on the road?

The same chaos is seen on the spiritual road of Islam in the mayhem of sectarian divides and mis-interpretations when people misclassify a spiritual specification book and sub-consciously or deliberately read it as fine subjective literature because they are taught: read and see what the Holy Qur'an means to you!

Imagine if the DMV inspector said that to the learner waiting patiently for his turn to pick up the DMV rule book to pass the driving test: here take this DMV driver's manual and see what it means to you! The burden is always upon the prospective driver to exactly learn what the DMV driver's manual intends to teach, and not what it might mean to him in his flights of fancy as a race car maniac.
**Holy Qur'an Primarily Not a Written Book**

The first thing Mr. Spock discovers upon checking out the Holy Qur'an from his space ship's library is that there is no name of author imprinted on the cover page of the Holy Qur'an. Since a name is always a proper noun, Spock decides to call its author, Author of the Holy Qur'an, or just Author (with a capitalized A).

The next thing Spock discovers is that the Holy Qur'an is really an aural tape, an oral recitation in Arabic, and its medium of ingestion is primarily through the ears. He is initially delighted because he has big pointed ears. So he quickly learned the Qur'anic Arabic from the computer library to the point of understanding the Arabic language (but not the lingua franca of the day, gerald, in which the Holy Qur'an was made manifest as a Book – Mr. Spock hasn't as yet discovered the pertinence of that lingua franca in this specialized study). After mastering Classical Arabic grammar, syntax, morphology, Qur'anic phonology (styles of recitation), and formal semantics of nuanced words and idioms quickly (remember his left-half brain is twice the physical size of humans and thus carries an exponential higher capacity to learn a language formally), he listened intently to the entire Holy Qur'an. It made no soulful impression on him (as expected, remember he has no right-half brain). So Mr. Spock delved directly into its contents.

But since Spock was used to reading specification manuals with his eyes-brain combination rather than ears-brain combination – despite large ears – he decided to focus on the written version of the Holy Qur'an so that he could easily sift back and forth as he would a
science encyclopedia, but much more complicated in the case of the Holy Qur'an.

The Holy Qur'an, he discovered to his consternation, did not read contiguously for a topic like every other specification manual he had ever read – and being a well-traveled man of space, he had read most works of science as well as literature of not just mankind but also of many other beings in the galaxy. His captain usually quoted from the Bible and Milton, and Mr. Spock was quite familiar with their contents, if not their appreciation. Reading the Holy Qur'an as a Book and digesting its information wasn't going to be as straightforward as Spock had imagined, having given himself only a few hours for the examination – which now stretched into days.

---

Holy Qur'an Complicated to Understand

While reading the Holy Qur'an sequentially, Mr. Spock discovers that the context of the verses, such as which verses are related to which verse, the antecedents and the precedents, unless the subject matter is explicit and obvious, is impossible to determine from the text of the Holy Qur'an. The Holy Qur'an does not carry the context for all the verses within it, nor the order in which the verses were revealed by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to His Messenger to convey to the people, and nor on what occasions and in which local contexts did they apply and to whom did they apply.
Therefore, to infer the general meaning of a topic without having the local context is not only subject to error, but can lead to multiple interpretations. As the causality among the various verses is impossible to ascertain with certainty in all cases from the Holy Qur'an except where it might be patently obvious, it also introduces error in understanding the full import by not always knowing all the verses and their full contexts pertinent to a topic. Mr. Spock also discovers that nor is it possible to determine the meaning of many of the allegorical verses, nor always categorically know which verse is metaphorical and which categorical.

Mr. Spock uncovers that verse 3:7 of Surah Aal-'Imran (quoted in the Introduction above and reproduced in the table below with several translations) even confirms that no one may know their full meaning apart from the Author of the Holy Qur'an. And that none will grasp that Message except men of understanding (أولو الالباب). The implication of that Qur'anic statement made Mr. Spock ponder: Why have verses in the Holy Qur'an when the Author asserts that the purpose of its “Scripture” is guidance to “bring forth mankind from darkness unto light .. unto the path of the Mighty, the Owner of Praise,” (see verse 14:1 quoted above), but which none but the Author Himself will understand: “but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah”?

Mr. Spock pushes that puzzle onto his puzzle evaluation stack which is steadily growing.

The puzzle obviously created a logical absurdity for Mr. Spock's rational mind. Perhaps, Mr. Spock reasoned, an alternate parsing of the verse with different emphasis and punctuation might make more rational sense for the benefit of a Left-brained scientist. The alternate parsing of the verse fragment of 3:7 leads to an entirely different semantics as captured in the table below.
“He it is Who has sent down to thee the Book: In it are verses basic or fundamental (of established meaning); they are the foundation of the Book: others are allegorical.

But those in whose hearts is perversion follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah[,] and those who are firmly grounded in knowledge[;]

[they] say: 'We believe in the Book; the whole of it is from our Lord:' and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding.” (Surah Aal-'Imran 3:7, Tr. Abdullah Yusuf Ali, alternate punctuation in [brackets], un capitalization in bold)
tuation. This is even true for any spoken language where the tone and emphasis of the spoken words determine the semantics of what is being said. In other words, *Qira't* for the Holy Qur'an determines the emphasis for the sentence boundary in verse fragments to make coherent sense for what is being stated. Arguably, punctuation that would create a semantic absurdity is naturally ruled out in any sensible context. Since there are at least Seven accepted standard *Qira'at* that have been handed down from antiquity, it leaves the door open to interpretation as to the implied punctuation that most accurately captures the Divine semantics. Since the oral recitation, *Qira't*, came before the written text, the Holy Qur'an being revealed as the Spoken Word and only later written down, which oral recitation, or reading style from the written Qur'anic words, defines the correct punctuation semantics and hence the correct deciphering of the verse? That conundrum creates an ambiguity ab initio. Ironically, the verse that is defining the category of مُتْشَابِهات، allegorical verses with hidden meanings, itself appears to be a مُتْشَابِهات when it comes to unambiguously describing who alone besides Allah will understand these hidden meanings! Thus the admonition: “But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings”, applies to its own parsing as well!

He it is Who hath revealed unto thee (Muhammad) the Scripture wherein are clear revelations - they are the substance of the Book - and others (which are) allegorical. But those in whose hearts is doubt pursue, forsooth, that which is allegorical seeking (to cause) dissension by seeking to explain it. None knoweth its explanation save Allah. And those who are of sound instruction say: We believe therein; the whole is from our Lord; but only men of understanding really heed. (Marmaduke Pickthall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He has sent down this Book which contains some verses that are categorical and basic to the Book, and others allegorical. But those who are twisted of mind look for verses metaphorical, seeking deviation and giving to them interpretations of their own; but none knows their meaning except God; and those who are steeped in knowledge affirm: &quot;We believe in them as all of them are from the Lord.&quot; But only those who have wisdom understand. (Ahmed Ali)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| It is He Who has revealed the Book to you. Some of its verses are absolutely clear and lucid, and these are the core of the Book. Others are ambiguous. Those in whose hearts there is perversity, always go about the part which is ambiguous, seeking mischief and seeking to arrive at its meaning arbitrarily, although none knows their true meaning except Allah. On the contrary, those firmly rooted in knowledge say: 'We believe in it; it is all from our Lord alone.' No one derives true admonition from anything except the men of understanding. (Abul Ala Maududi) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is He who sent down upon thee the Book, wherein are verses clear that are the Essence of the Book, and others ambiguous. As for those in whose hearts is swerving, they follow the ambiguous part, desiring dissension, and desiring its interpretation; and none knows its interpretation, save only God. And those firmly rooted in knowledge say, 'We believe in it; all is from our Lord'; yet none remembers, but men possessed of minds. (Arthur John Arberry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
He it is who has bestowed upon thee from on high this divine writ, containing messages that are clear in and by themselves - and these are the essence of the divine writ - as well as others that are allegorical. Now those whose hearts are given to swerving from the truth go after that part of the divine writ which has been expressed in allegory, seeking out [what is bound to create] confusion, and seeking [to arrive at] its final meaning [in an arbitrary manner]; but none save God knows its final meaning. Hence, those who are deeply rooted in knowledge say: "We believe in it; the whole [of the divine writ] is from our Sustainer - albeit none takes this to heart save those who are endowed with insight. (Muhammad Asad)

He it is who hath sent down unto thee the Book, wherein some verses are firmly constructed they are the mother of the Book: and others consimilar. But those in whose hearts is and deviation follow that which is consimilar therein, seeking discord and seeking to misinterpret the same whereas none knoweth the interpretation thereof a save Allah. And the firmly- grounded in knowledge Say: we believe therein, the whole is from our Lord. And none receiveth admonition save men of understand- ing. (Abdul Majid Daryabadi)

It is He who has sent down to you the Book. Parts of it are definitive verses, which are the mother of the Book, while others are metaphorical. As for those in whose hearts is deviance, they pursue what is metaphorical in it, courting temptation and courting its interpretation. But no one knows its interpretation except Allah and those firmly grounded in knowledge; they say, ‘We believe in it; all of it is from our Lord.’ And none takes admonition except those who possess intellect. (Ali Quli Qara'i)
He it is Who has revealed the Book to you; some of its verses are
decisive, they are the basis of the Book, and others are allegori-
cal; then as for those in whose hearts there is perversity they fol-
low the part of it which is allegorical, seeking to mislead and
seeking to give it (their own) interpretation. but none knows its
interpretation except Allah, and those who are firmly rooted
in knowledge say: We believe in it, it is all from our Lord; and
none do mind except those having understanding. (Muhammad
Ali Habib Shakir, House of Habib, Pakistan --- Derived from
Maulana Muhammad Ali, MMA 1917 PDF, verse is labeled 3:6 ;
Muhammad Hussain Tabatabai, uses MMA 1917 PDF in the Eng-
lish version of his tafsir)

وہی ہے جس نے ٹھہری اس میں بعض آیات محکم محکم بین (جن کے معنی
واضح بین وہ کتاب کی اصل بین اور دوسری مشابہ بین (جن کے معنی معلوم ہے
معین بین) سو جن لوگوں کے دل ذیزعہ بین وہ گمرابی پہلئے کی غرض سے
اور مطلب معلوم کرئے کی غرض سے مشابہات کی پیچھے لگے بین اور
حوالہاں ان کا مطلب سواں اللہ کے اور کوئی بین جانانہ اور مضمبوط علم والے
کہتے بین بمارا ان چیزون پر ایمان ہے یہ سب بمارے رب کی طرف سے بین اور
نصیحت وہی لوگ مانے بین جو عالم میں بین
(Ahmed Ali)

وہی خدا ہے جس نے بی کتاب تم پر نازل کی بہی اس کتاب میں دو طرح کی آیات
بین ایک محکمات جو کتاب کی اصل بین اور دوسری مشابہات جن لوگوں
کے دل ن مویہہ ہے وہ فتنہ کی تلائش میں بیتش مشابہات بی کے پیچھے
پہنچے بہت بہت بین اور ان کو معنی بینانے کی کوشش کیا کرتے بہی حالانہاں ان کا
حقیقی مقبوض اللہ کے سوا یناکی نہیں جانتا اور کوئی کے جو لوگ میں پچھہ
کرتے ہیں وہ بہت بین کہ "بمارا ان پر ایمان ہے یہ سب بمارے رب کی طرف
سے بین اور سے بین کسی دیکھ سے صحیح سب صرف دانشمند لوگ بی
حاس کرئے بہی
(Abul Ala Maududi)

اس کے کبھی بین اور کچھ مشابہ بین اب جن کے دل ن مویہہ ہے وہ ان نی
مشابہات کے پیچھے لگ جانے بین تاکہ فتنہ بہت بہت اور من میں تلاوی کرین
حوالہاں اس کا توانا حاکم صرف خدا کہ بہ اور ابھی منہ میں رسوخ
رکھئے وہ بہ بہ - جن کا کہنہ ہے بہ کہ میں اس کتاب پر ایمان رکھئے بہ اور بہ
سے کہ سب محکم و مشابہ بمارے پرودگار بہ کہ طرف سے بہ اور بہ
سوانے سمجھا کہ کوئی نیک سمجھ سکتا ہے
(Syed Zeeshan Haider Jawadi)
Caption Various translations of Surah Aal-'Imran 3:7. Is it merely a coincidence that all Sunni translators quoted in the table without exception employ the first parsing, that only Allah knows the hidden meanings of ; whereas the Shia translators (Jawadi, Najafi, Qara'i whose translations are their own work) employ the second parsing, that in addition to Allah, the also know the hidden meanings! (Tabatabai's and Shakir's English translation are not originally theirs but closely follow MMA 1917; Tabatabai's tafsir, while employing MMA 1917 translation in its online English version, argues for the second parsing consistent with his Shia orientation) But which of the two is the correct parsing outside of one's socialization bias, that leads to the correct singular deciphering of the verse? Both parsings cannot be simultaneously correct as they are conflicting and alter the meaning drastically – it is one or the other! The first parsing creates an absurdity. The second parsing asserts there exists a group of persons who also know the hidden meaning of the Holy Qur'an on par with Allah. Observe that a simple punctuation emphasis can change what is understood from the verse. It immediately opens the door to argumentative interpretation (in this case exactly along the sectarian divide) – precisely the warning issued in the same verse not to pursue! What's more, the last fragment of the verse...
asserts that none but those with any brains, أُولَٰئِكَ الْأَلْبَابُ , the men of understanding, the intelligent people who have any commonsense, صَاهِبَانِ عَقلٍ, will comprehend this matter!!! (Translations are from the electronic versions at tanzil.net/trans/; MMA 1917 PDF is courtesy of aaiil.org; Tabatabai is courtesy of shiasource.com/al-mizan/; Ali Quli Qara'i translation is courtesy of islamawakened.com/Quran/3/7/default.htm)

Using the alternate syntactical parsing in the above table with only a punctuating semicolon added, leads to an outright different, and conflicting semantics with respect to the first parsing, for the pertinent verse segment. The semantics now also include some unnamed persons who are “firmly grounded in knowledge” مُولَّدِي النَّاسِحُونَ فِي الْبَلْمَ, transliteration Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm, who also know the hidden meaning of the allegorical verses at the same level of understanding as the Author of the Holy Qur'an Himself!

Following the logical trail of that revised semantics opens up the obvious (largely academic) question: are these unnamed persons exclusively the Author's Messengers and “those vested in authority over you” (see 4:59 below) who are made “firmly grounded in knowledge” so that they may discharge their duties as guides of the people inerrantly, or can anyone become “Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” by their own striving of due diligence? That question remains unanswered in the verse itself for the second parsing which naturally creates that question ab initio.

Which parsing of the two correctly decodes the cipher text? An irrational but grammatically correct parsing in which the Author writes a specification for all mankind to follow but which only He alone shall understand? Or, the more logical also grammatically correct parsing that some other unnamed persons also understand its hidden meanings?

In the absence of explicit punctuation, the punctuation is deter-
mined entirely by the *Qira‘t*, or what makes logical sense. Since no reference decoding is available, obviously, as the Messenger who brought the Message is no longer present to adjudicate the parsing, how is one to know that one has decoded the verse correctly? A simple punctuation emphasis can drastically change what is understood from the verse!

Interestingly, the question itself only has academic merit long after the actual epoch of the Messenger. Its relevance for establishing the Messenger's supremacy over his followers, and thus the reason for command obedience authority delegated to him in verse 4:59 as the inerrant Messenger of Surah An-Najm 53:1-5 (see Part-III), also being لَرَاسِخَونَ فِي الْعَلَمِ who intimately knew the hidden meanings of the verses of the Holy Qur'an, would surely have been of immediate pertinence. By extension, it would also have been pertinent in establishing the authority of وَأوَلِيَ الْأَمْرِ مَنْ كُنْم over other Muslims.

Ironically, the verse that is defining the category of مُتَّبَعَات, allegorical verses with hidden meanings, itself appears to be a مُتَّبَعَات when it comes to describing who alone besides Allah will understand these hidden meanings! Thus remarkably, the explicit admonition in the same verse: “*But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings*”, applies to its own parsing as well!

The above table capturing several translations however empirically validates the primary thesis of this analysis. It is evident that even a mere semicolon emphasis is placed in accordance with one's socialization bias to always support one's own socialized interpretation! Otherwise, the translations of 3:7 above would not so cleanly fall on the Sunni-Shia dogmatic divide with such precision. Now would it?

Principally, verse 3:7 Surah Aal-'Imran is a defining verse in the Holy Qur'an. The Book is explaining its own contents. The verse identifies two main category of verses in the Holy Qur'an، آياتُ مَخْمَمَات، the
foundational verses whose meaning is plain and straightforward. The verse proclaims that these constitute the heart of the Holy Qur'an. And the allegorical verses whose meaning is not so straightforward. The verse proclaims that their layered meaning is in fact hidden, and known only to the Author. And, in its alternate logical parsing, their hidden meaning is known to as well. Mr. Spock has decided to carry both parsing in his head for a while until matters become clearer during the study and perhaps automatically resolve themselves as either knowable, or unknowable.

What Mr. Spock found particularly fascinating in this self-description of the Holy Qur'an, is the cold prediction made by the Author of the Holy Qur'an that those with perversity in their heart, or from sheer ignorance, will pursue the latter, (أيَّاتُ مَتَّاسِبَائِتِهَا ), deliberately sowing discord instead of harmony. But “those who are firmly grounded in knowledge” will not fall for this trick for they either understand the hidden meaning of the verses exactly and don't need to speculate (the second parsing), or accept whatever is in the Book and accept it whether or not they fully understand it (the first parsing), and yet, “none will grasp the Message except men of understanding.”

Thus a significant source of misunderstanding and misreading of the Holy Qur'an is made known by the Holy Qur'an itself! Even in the very verse that is itself describing that fact!

How many mortal minds in the public who read this Book, wondered Mr. Spock, would be “firmly grounded in knowledge” (والَرَاسَخُونَ فِي العلم), and “men of understanding” (أولِو الألَّتِيَاب) ?

Why put such tall prerequisites in a Book which its Author asserts is “a guide to mankind,” (هَذِى ۖ لِلْمَتنَاسِ), to “bring forth mankind from darkness unto light” (see verses 2:185 and 14:1 quoted above)?

Why posit such a high degree of mental acuity: “men of understanding” (أولِو الألَّتِيَاب), objective learning: “firmly grounded in knowledge” (والَرَاسَخُونَ فِي العلم), and spiritual enlightenment: “a guidance unto those who ward off (evil)” (هَذِى ۖ لِلِّمُتَّقِينِ) (see verses 3:7 and
2:2 above), as prerequisites in order to fathom the Guide Book which is even addressed as “an admonition to all creatures” (see verse 25:1 below), rather than being straightforward and easily accessible to all mankind so that those creatures who don't rise to such high standard of moral purity and intelligence can also be easily guided by the Criterion by which to judge and benefit themselves (see 2:185 quoted above)? While the popular understanding of the Holy Bible, the Book of Christians, is that it is salvation for sinners, the Holy Qur'an is asserting high levels of prequalifications before it can offer salvation! The Book of Muslims, after all, by its own assertion, is “a guide to mankind,” “an admonition to all creatures”, from the “Lord of the Worlds” (see verse 56:80 below and also 1:2) Who, by definition, understands all matters including all that which can confuse people.

Therefore, it naturally follows to ask that why not make its understanding straightforward, so that anyone with even an iota of brain can simply comprehend the Holy Qur'an, like say the ease of understanding the refrains of the Ten Commandments in the Book of Jews? Comprehension alone does not of course mean people will follow virtuous platitudes, as had amply been demonstrated by the pious Jews in the conquest of Palestine, lamented Mr. Spock, despite possessing a very easy to understand moral guidance given them, it even being carved in stone tablet to prevent its obliteration.

But making the Book difficult to comprehend for the ordinary peoples, and turning it into a cipher which only the qualified people as quoted above will comprehend, needlessly creates an order of magnitude new obstacles.

For one, it naturally seeds different (mis)understandings of the same text depending upon the intelligence level, bent of mind, and socialization biases of the people – none of whom are able to correctly decipher the cipher text anyway since none possess the reference plaintext to objectively adjudicate their deciphered text against. Thus everyone and anyone is free to proclaim their own version the most authentic. This cipher therefore becomes a great system for seeding
natural diversity of beliefs in which everyone can arguably stand their ground. Their natural inclination afterwards is to damn everyone else in great respectability. (See for instance The Amman Message, http://tinyurl.com/Amman-Message-Aga-Khan)

Second, statistics alone favor a misunderstanding of the Message of the Holy Qur'an. Mr. Spock recalled the favorite lament of interstellar-sociologists about the war-faring indoctrinated masses of human beings who had refused to evolve in several millennia, and remained under the unrestrained control of Machiavelli despite the never-ending stream of prophets that its literatures in many human languages proclaimed to have visited them:

'at best less than 2% of the people think, about 8% think they think, and 90% wouldn't be caught dead thinking!'

Mr. Spock further notes that the Author of the Holy Qur'an in verse 4:59 of Surah an-Nisaa' had delegated His command Authority to His Messenger and Exemplar at the same precedence level of obedience as He demanded for Himself:

“O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you. If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger, if ye do believe in Allah and the Last Day: That is best, and most suitable for final determination.” (Surah an-Nisaa' 4:59 )

Caption Verse 4:59 of Surah an-Nisaa', the Verse of Obedience, itself opening the door to sectarian schism, the source of fundamental bifurcation between Sunni and
Shia sects during the Muslim expansion into world dominating empires after the demise of the Messenger. The *Verse of Obedience* specifically underwrites the Principle of Inerrancy as a requirement for holding any Apostolic office that demands obedience from the flock.

But what the Messenger had conveyed to his people based on this divinely delegated authority and which was made binding upon the people by the Author of the Holy Qur'an, had not been recorded in the Holy Qur'an apart from the fact of this delegation of authority!

For example, in the above quoted verse, who are “*those charged with authority among you*” as the extension of the Exemplar, are not unambiguously identified by name in the Holy Qur'an.

However, Mr. Spock's keen mind does note that a great deal of subtext is implicit in that most succinct verse, the *Verse of Obedience*. It specifically underwrites the *Principle of Inerrancy* as a requirement for holding any Apostolic office that demands obedience from the flock. This is examined in more depth in Part-III.

Mr. Spock is perplexed by the fact that only the Author's own message is preserved in the Holy Qur'an, and not those articulated by the Messenger, even though the Messenger, by the accurate grammatical parsing of verse 4:59, has equal command obedience authority to the Author. Therefore, whatever the Messenger of the Author gives to his people as guidance, doctrine, or verdict, or explains to them as Exemplar of the Holy Qur'an, obeying it has the same obligation as if the Author Himself issued the directive in the Holy Qur'an.

While the Exemplar was living among his peoples, his followers were surely informed of all the contextual matters pertaining to adequate comprehension of all آیات مَتَّى, the foundational verses in the Holy Qur'an, such as who are the persons identified as “*those charged with authority among you*” to whom, evidently, by the logic of the verse, command obedience is as obligatory as to the Prophet of Islam himself.
Mr. Spock is baffled. The Muslim flock is ordered to Obey the Messenger in all that the Messenger conveys, but these articles of obedience, and exponentiation of the full context of the Qur'anic verses, are not recorded in the Holy Qur'an by the Author of the Holy Qur'an.

How are the succeeding generations to know? From the doubtful hands of fallible scribes and partisan narratives of imperial history? This seemed very illogical to Mr. Spock. It created a primary paradox for a Book which claimed to have “no doubt” and “perfected” (as per verses 2:2 and 5:3 quoted earlier).

Mr. Spock realized that a perpetual open-ended gaping hole is left in the Qur'anic guidance system to mankind. Spock wondered if that was calculated, to introduce deliberate ambiguousness in the specification, just as the presence of ًٍاٍِ ٌٍۡ، the allegorical verses described in verse 3:7 quoted earlier, was deliberate in order to mislead those with perversity in their heart: “But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah.”

Ambiguity Evidently By Design

What could be the Author's motive to offer such an ambiguous specification to mankind which could deliberately mislead them? Is it
perhaps part of the process of spiritual ascendance in Islam, pondered Mr. Spock at the illogic of an ambiguous specification which proclaimed itself to be universal guidance to mankind, by which man is supposed to elevate himself (and herself) with the help of divine guidance to those who are cleansed of heart, to the status of Ashraf-ul-Maklooqat, the best in creation? For the verse fragment 4:59 continues: “If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger, if ye do believe in Allah and the Last Day: That is best, and most suitable for final determination.”

This appears convoluted (at least on the surface). First, the specification is deliberately made ambiguous permitting differences to arise. Then it is noted that it is okay if you disagree – “There is no compulsion in religion.” (2:256 quoted above) – just refer the matter to the Author or His Messenger, or to those unnamed (و אולني الأمر منكم) who are charged with authority among you because you are commanded to obey them. While simultaneously reminding the flock the oft repeated admonishment of the Day of Accountability so that they would take heed not to fall victim to personal whims and fancies, and strictly accept, and follow, whatever is given to them by the Messenger. Since the Messenger is no longer living in subsequent epochs, that additional directive of verse 4:59 can logically only mean: refer all matters of disagreement, or confusion, to Allah, or, to “those charged with authority among you” (if they are still living) because they are a divine extension of the authority of the Messenger if obedience is commanded to them at the same command obedience level as the Messenger.

Look closely at the convolution. In the first part of 4:59, the Author lays out command obedience unequivocally to three items: to Himself, to His Messenger, and to the أولي الأمر. There are no options and caveats to that command directive. It is an absolute and complete command. The next part of 4:59 states that if people don't like or dispute any matter, implying, including any matter that the Prophet has decided, including the appointment of أولي الأمر, to refer the matter
back to the Messenger, or to the Author (meaning to the Holy Qur'an). But what if the Messenger has passed away and his designated أولي الأمر are still living? Then, the dispute must logically be referred back to the أولي الأمر as they are now standing in place of the Prophet as his designated Exemplars of the Holy Qur'an. They are empowered to resolve any dispute, including about themselves (if the Holy Qur'an does not resolve it) because obedience to the أولي الأمر is also made mandatory in the first part of 4:59. One cannot escape the powerful logic – the convolution not withstanding! The word of the أولي الأمر is binding, their dispute resolution is final, even if the dispute among others is about themselves! The word of أولي الأمر about any matter, including about themselves, is as veracious as the Messenger's word about any matter, including about himself. Only under that logic, as any sensible person with an iota of reasoning ability will immediately perceive, can the Author of the Holy Qur'an demand command obedience to both the Messenger and the أولي الأمر on par with Himself as he does in 4:59.

It cannot be any other way because the semantic logic of the verse can be no other way. When the Messenger is living, his word trumps the word of all others (including the أولي الأمر were the two to ever disagree – and that's impossible as they both obey the same Author). When the Messenger is no longer living, the word of أولي الأمر trumps the word of all others in exactly the same way as the Messenger's did when he was alive! Mr. Spock reflected on the density of the Author's logic in such a pithy statement – a remarkable characteristic of sophisticated law that always requires jurists and judges to parse down to their logic but which often befuddles the common mind.

This is perhaps why, realized Mr. Spock, the Author repeatedly admonishes in the Holy Qur'an a people who might have been constantly challenging the Messenger's decisions when these decisions went against their narrow acumen or narrow self-interests. For there is no other logical reason for such repeated admonishment to obey the Messenger and to not dispute his decisions, unless there is need of
such admonishments. Mr. Spock found yet another instance of the Author's admonishment, more plain than before, more shocking than before, addressing the “Believer” (لمؤمن ولا مُؤمنة) this time:

“It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.” (Surah Al-Ahzaab, 33:36)

Caption Verse 33:36 Surah Al-Ahzaab, the most shocking admonition to the companions, believing man and woman, of the Messenger! Why is this admonition even present in the Holy Qur'an – unless there was a need for it in some circumstance?

That warning of 33:36 is remarkable. The Author, directly addressing the Muslim contemporaries of the Messenger and not the unbelievers or the hypocrites, unequivocally calls those Believing man and Believing woman who dispute and disobey the decisions of the Messenger on any matter, as being “on a clearly wrong Path”! To Mr. Spock's sociologist's mind, the verse is prima facie evidence of undercurrents among these contemporary Muslim followers of the Messenger, including those who actually Believe in his Apostleship (implied by the words “momineen” and “mominaat” in the verse), as not always entirely happy with the Messenger's proclamations. They are being admonished emphatically in 33:36. Who exactly these people “on a clearly wrong Path” are remain unnamed in the Holy Qur'an, just as who exactly “those charged with authority among you” remain unnamed. One is deemed clearly on the wrong path to the point of condemnation by the Author, and one is deemed on the right path to the point of commanding absolute obedience akin to obe-
dience to the Author, and no identifications by name.

Furthermore, the Author, who introduced the Holy Qur'an as “A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds”, also asserts that it has made Its definitive reference handbook available to all peoples, for all times, “In a Book well-guarded”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“That this is indeed a Qur'an Most Honourable, (56:77) “</th>
<th>إِنَّهُ لْقُرآنٌ كَرِيمٍ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a Book well-guarded, (78)</td>
<td>فِي كُتْبٍ مَكْتُوبٍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which none shall touch but those who are clean (purified) (79)</td>
<td>لَا يَمْسَحَهَا إِلَّا الْمُطَهَّرُونَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds. (80)</td>
<td>تَنْزِيلٌ مِنْ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem?” (Surah Al-Waqia, 56:81)</td>
<td>أَفِي هَذَا الْحَدِيثِ أَنْتُمْ مُدْهَنُونَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Book well-guarded, Holy Qur'an Surah Al-Waqia, 56:77-81

Such a momentous conflict resolution protocol to boot; such power devolved upon “those charged with authority among you”; and yet, these أولي الأمر أَوْلِي الْأَمْرِ go un-named in the Holy Qur'an. What a cipher! Or more straightforwardly, perhaps these verses are not pertinent to any other time and place other than that epoch where their identities are naturally known to the people in question. Sensible, but is the latter what the Holy Qur'an intends to teach? How to know that one has deciphered its cipher correctly?

Mr. Spock's ever vigilant mind observes that the Holy Qur'an refers to itself as al-Furqaan، the criterion by which to judge and adjudicate the truth or falsity of all matters, and all propositions, pertaining to Islam; and that it also refers to itself as a Guide, a Mercy, that explains all things:
“Blessed is He who sent down the criterion to His servant, that it may be an admonition to all creatures;” (Surah al-Furqaan 25:1)

Ramadhan is the (month) in which was sent down the Qur'an, as a guide to mankind, also clear (Signs) for guidance and judgment (Between right and wrong). (Surah Al-Baqara verse fragment 2:185)

“and We have sent down to thee the Book explaining all things, a Guide, a Mercy, and Glad Tidings to Muslims.” (Surah An-Nahl verse fragment 16:89)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caption Verses proclaiming that the Holy Qur'an is a criterion, Al-Furqaan, standard, to judge matters by.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therefore, Mr. Spock reasons based on the unequivocal assertion of these verses, that the gaping holes which he had identified as an impediment to understanding the Holy Qur'an, indeed appeared deliberate, and by design. They were certainly not inadvertent. They just had to be deciphered correctly by reasoning correctly. Their resolution, if it is of pertinence as Guidance to man that he must become aware of, is also present in the Holy Qur'an in the foundational verses, آیات مَحْكَمَات, whose meaning is plain and straightforward as classified in verse 3:7 (quoted earlier). And by the self-classification of the Holy Qur'an itself in verse 25:1 and 16:89 above, the Holy Qur'an contains within itself, by its own assertion, the complete criterion and explanation by which to adjudicate all that appears unknown and ambiguous in the Holy Qur'an if it is to be knowable by man, because, after all, as is claimed by its Author, it is a Book in which there is “no doubt”, دَلَّ كِتَابٌ لَا رَيْبَّ، and which had been “perfected” as a “religion”, ﴿ۡاَلْبِيُوم﴾.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the Holy Qur'an even affirmed its own understand-ability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فَإِنَّمَا يَسَّرُّنَّهُ بَلَسَانَكَ لِتُبَشِّرْ بِهِ ٱلْمُتَقَينِ وَتَنَذِّرْ بِهِ ۚ قُوَّاً لَّدَأَ (see verses 2:2 and 5:3 quoted earlier).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And We never sent a messenger save with the language of his folk, that he might make (the message) clear for them. Then Allah sendeth whom He will astray, and guideth whom He will. He is the Mighty, the Wise.” (Surah Ibrahim, 14:4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Verses proclaiming that the Holy Qur'an is clear, and easy to understand, and that it is in the “language of his folk” (بَلَسَانَ قُوْمِهِ) so that the Messenger can explain the Message to them in their own tongue.

Therefore, there couldn't be any holes in the specification which could not be unequivocally resolved if these proclamations of the Holy Qur'an are taken to be truthful and on face value, including the affirmation: “We made the (Qur'an) easy in thine own tongue,” and “We never sent a messenger save with the language of his folk, that he might make (the message) clear for them.” Mr. Spock decided to entertain these assertions of the Author because that's what the specification itself stated, that the Book will eventually reveal itself despite it being in the tongue of the people among whom it was revealed (بَلَسَانَ قُوْمِهِ), rather than hastily conclude based on what he had studied thus far that the Holy Qur'an was fallacious. It just meant that Mr. Spock will have to acquire their lingua franca (see below).
But that comforting realization based on the logic of the statements of the Holy Qur'an, does not by itself solve the problem for the ever logical Mr. Spock because of the inherent incompleteness of context specification, causality specification, and verse 3:7 statement which bizarrely asserted “but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah”? (See earlier discussion of 3:7 on its alternate parsing). Which sensible author ever composes a major specification like that, wherein, he first claims it is for everyone to follow as essential specification, but then includes clauses, ambiguities, allegories, and metaphors which no one other than the author himself can understand? Mr. Spock had not encountered a specification Book or an Author like this one in the entire cosmos.

Furthermore, because the specification is now incomprehensible at first glance with many unknowns rather than straightforward, not only is it enormously time consuming to figure it all out (assuming it is possible to do so), perhaps even requiring “experts” like jurist-doctors and other narrow-gauge specialists to expound it, but it is also replete with the subjectivity inherent in such exercise. Different human beings having different levels of brain-power, psychological bent of mind, socialization, and perception biases naturally tend to understand things differently when they try to figure it all out based on their own study and due diligence. This is why even rational and most logical scientific people will still disagree on many matters when these extend into the purview of human subjectivity and opinion mongering from cold empiricism that is amenable to experimentation and scientific measurement.

And here Mr. Spock realizes is the next core-reason for human beings to understand the same text of the Holy Qur'an differently from each other.

The moment Muslims and non-Muslims alike, step outside the pages of the Holy Qur'an to gather what was incomplete in the Holy Qur'an as a specification which can be fully comprehended – namely, the temporal and social context of the Qur'anic verses for which they
were revealed, their causality, the identification of the unknown persons and events, and what the Exemplar had explained to the people for twenty three years by the authority explicitly delegated to him as in verse 4:59, called the Sunnah of the Prophet – by perusing the pages of history, or vicariously from their cultural contexts as most are wont, they fall unwitting victim to socialization and history writing artifacts. Including, books upon books, and treatise upon treatise of scholarly opinions compiled by people other than the Author of the Holy Qur'an, under the suzerainty of the most oppressive dynastic kingdoms and rulers among the Muslims. (See Part-I, Part-IV, Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization, and Islam vs. Secular Humanism and World Government for what socialization and history-writing artifacts mean.)

Mr. Spock is struck by the remarkable disparity of preservation between the Sunnah of the Prophet by doubtful hands in history and the Author's own pristine words for which He claimed there was “no doubt”, despite the assurances from the Holy Qur'an that it contains the criterion for deciding all pertinent matters.

Why is the full and complete message of Islam not straightforwardly recorded within the Holy Qur'an itself?

Why is it left to the native human scribes who are never immune to socialization and prejudicial artifacts themselves in the best case, and self-interest in the worst?

Was the Sunnah of the Prophet of Islam merely intended to be ephemeral, temporal, only binding upon the then existing people for the limited lifetime of the Exemplar, and not of any pertinence to subsequent generations of Muslims? If the Sunnah was of pertinence in perpetuity, then why was it not recorded in the same Holy Qur'an for the same degree of its preservation as the verses of the Holy Qur'an themselves, especially when the command obedience to both is on par?

Did the Author of the Holy Qur'an who claims to be the Creator of
mankind, not know that its recording will be at the capricious whim and fancy of the rulers, the obliging narrators, and subject to the artifacts of historicity, hagiography, and other narrative vestigials under the forces of socialization, coercion, perception management, hidden motivations, human weaknesses, and the cumulative hystereses of cultural memories of every group and sect who'd be passing it on as legacy to the next generation? That, noisy cultural texts susceptible to myth amplification and all inconvenient truth attenuation, would become the key source of interpretation of the pristine guidance to mankind, a perfection, as claimed by the Holy Qur'an?

Or, as Mr. Spock reasoned, is the Holy Qur'an itself to be used to separate the chaff from the wheat? How is that possible to the same level of reliability for socialized texts written by fallible human scribes with hidden motivations and vested interests over a period of centuries, as the pristine text of the Holy Qur'an which all Muslims accept remains un-tampered by the hand of human scribes? Mr. Spock wondered how could a specification which claimed to be divine guidance for which there was “no doubt”, require Muslims in subsequent generations to put their faith in the hands of these scribes of history whose mother's name they even did not know? It was illogical.

Mr. Spock pondered at the stark contrast between this, and the Holy Qur'an asking the people to put their faith in the Prophet of Islam who, as was observed in the Holy Qur'an, not only belonged to a well known prophetic pedigree, but as the historical narratives unanimously affirmed, within his own lifetime among his own peoples had been anointed “Sadiq” and “Ameen”, the most truthful, and the most trustworthy, by the peoples themselves even before he brought the Message of the Holy Qur'an to them.

No such guarantees are vouchsafed for these largely unknown scribes of history who claim to have gathered the Sunnah of the Prophet of Islam some two centuries later amidst the cloud of internecine violence and tyrannical rulers – and as Mr. Spock reasonably
asked, what value is anyone's piousness to another, except to oneself? In any case, how can anyone judge another's piety, intentions, hidden motivations, proclivities, bent of mind? By how many times they are reputed to have bowed in prostration? Besides, they could be blithering idiots, *house niggers*, or Machiavellis and still live on their forehead. There are plenty of Muslim Stooges in the Service of Empire in every epoch. Society today lends substantial empiricism to hold that conclusion. See for instance, Response to the Fatwa on Terrorism in the Service of Empire as an example of a Muslim cleric's selective story-telling to service empire. He was rewarded with a place-seating next to the massa at the 2011 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. His 600-page Fatwa on Terrorism was published with much fanfare in the UK and will survive as long as the empire needs the 'war on terror'. Anyone examining that document a hundred years from now will firmly believe in that narrative, penned by a Muslim scholar no less, for there won't be any dissenting voices on the bookshelves deconstructing its egregious omissions of vile servility to empire. Arguably, the survival of the names of Muslim scribes and their prodigious works through the vicissitudes of history had a lot more to do with ruling interests, than necessarily their own merit.

It is visible even today for works of scholarship which tend to never make it to the bookshelves, or simply disappear even from prestigious libraries, if they oppose the paradigms of ruling interests. The books listed in Recommended Reading (in “The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity”) is evidence of that tortuous fact. Except for one, I believe all are out of print, and rarely available even in public libraries. They might even disappear from the Internet someday and possessing them may even be deemed a *thought crime*, just as is depicted in the fable by George Orwell, *1984*.

And behold, Mr. Spock, while diligently perusing the Holy Qur'an, encounters this remarkable warning by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to precisely clarify just this matter, almost as if it was waiting there patiently all this time for someone like Mr. Spock to precisely
ponder that dilemma:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“(On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166-2:167)</th>
<th>إِذَا نَبَغَوا وَأُعِدُّوا ٱلْعَذَابَ وَتَقَضَّعَتْ بِهِمُ ٱلسَّبَابُ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166)</td>
<td>وَقَالُ ٱلذِينَ أُتَبَغُوا لَوْ أَنَّ لَنَا كَرَةً فَتَبَيَّنَأَ مِنْهُمْ كَمَا تَبِرَّوا مَنْ تَبَيَّنَّا كَذٰلِكَ يُرِيدُهُمُ ٱللَّهُ أَعَمَّلَهُمْ حَسَنَاتٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَمَا هُم بِخَارِجٍ مِّنَ ٱلنَّارِ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Verse 2:166 and 2:167 Surah Al-Baqara, a most unexpected blanket warning in the Holy Qur'an. When read in conjunction with: verses 1:6-7 of Surah Al-Fatiha teaching man the path to choose and the paths to avoid in order to acquire divine guidance for the straight path; verse 5:35 of Surah Al-Maeda clarifying to seek divine guidance only through “wasilah” as “your duty to Allah”; and verse 17:71 of Surah al-Israa' promising every human being will be raised in the company of the “imam” they each followed, for Accountability; the fundamental basis of the divine guidance system of the Holy Qur'an becomes apparent. Namely, beware of false imams, false caliphs, false leaders, false guides, false paths penned in books and announced from pulpits; seek the path shown by legitimate guides whom Allah has guided: “These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance”! (Surah Al An'aam 6:90) The question is: How does one discover that path? How does one know whom has Allah guided? An open-ended Indeterminate speci-
ification? Or a **Determinate** puzzle specification, a soluble cipher? See the definitions of these terms below. In practice, the question is almost always solved by socialization bias by the pope shepherding the laity instead of analysis of the **Determinate** verses of the Holy Qur'an – like everything else about understanding Islam. See in Part-III, the critical examination of Principle of Inerrancy, and “taqlid” (blind following of a jurist in both Shiadom and Sunnidom), reasoned solely from the **Determinate** verses of the Holy Qur'an to reveal more logical surprises. If only Muslims undertook to read and understand the Good Book with more due diligence taking it as a Message of Guidance in a cipher form for living a life that is “not at a loss” in the here (see Surah Al-Asr) rather than in the Hereafter! This profound concept, of actively taking care of the here so that the Hereafter takes care of itself, became the very first victim of subversion of the lofty precepts of Islam by noble caliphs and pious pontiffs. Ordinary mortals anointed themselves the **Interpreter of faith** and employed Islam as a force for social control to **engineer** the behavior of those who accepted and followed them, inducing the public mind to focus upon the Hereafter instead of the here! Verse 2:166-2:167 clearly attest to this dismal fact of servitude extracted from the Muslim masses by introducing false paths. These false paths have been repeatedly warned against, most shockingly in verse 33:36 as “**clearly the wrong path**” (quoted above). This vile legacy of **Interpreter of faith** still endures in controlling the public mind, well into this twenty-first century!

So here we have a self-proclaimed Divine Guidance System which is not fully specified, requiring going to a multitude of human scribes of antiquity outside the Holy Qur'an to learn the **Sunnah** of the
Prophet of Islam, while its Author simultaneously issues the warning not to follow others (blindly). Also see the earlier cautionary discussion on verse 17:71 above. Mr. Spock realized that the Author goes even further, categorically stating:

“That was a people that hath passed away. They shall reap the fruit of what they did, and ye of what ye do! Of their merits there is no question in your case!” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:134)

Caption Verse 2:134 of Surah Al-Baqara, categorically asserting about those who went before: “Of their merits there is no question in your case”; that straightforward counsel is repeated again for emphasis in verse 2:141

When the Holy Qur'an so clearly vouches for that separation of deeds of the people who went before from those who come afterwards without equivocation: “Of their merits there is no question in your case”, then how can the Author condone the acceptance of their voluntary workmanship in the documentation of what is not explained in the Holy Qur'an, for those coming afterwards to follow for their own merit? That would create a contradiction, especially if it is mandated that one must refer to the craftsmanship of those fallible scribes of antiquity who went before to acquire the authentic decoding of the pristine text of the Holy Qur'an.

Furthermore, it is not an easy burden being a scholar, scribe, and imam in the religion of Islam lest one mislead and misguide those fools without knowledge who are wont to follow experts blindly. (What is meant by following experts “not blindly” in this context remains to be defined more precisely. Generally speaking, following an authority figure, “taqlid”, by definition, is always blind; since one does not possess the domain expertise because of which one follows
the experts, so how can one know when the experts are wrong, themselves misled, or deliberately misleading the followers for an agenda? One would think it absurd if the Holy Qur'an did not impose that sanction against following, and against misleading followers, as a blanket prohibition without splitting hairs when is following blind and when it is not blind. Only those who do not know follow others, in which case following is always blind. Usually by faith in the expert, or imam! More are led astray by misplaced faith than the public mind is aware, and that is why the Holy Qur'an repeatedly cautions against misplaced trust in false leaders and false imams. See Surah Al-Furqaan verses 25:27-30, examined in Part-III for the question of “taqlid”). The Holy Qur'an categorically apportions each imam their culpability in Surah An-Nahl (and Surah al-Israa' 17:71 quoted above):

Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear! (Surah An-Nahl 16:25)

Verse 16:25 categorically informs those able to understand, أولو, that a fallible mind cannot lead another and not be the recipient of the “the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled” in some distinct measure! Mr. Spock, capable of drawing logical inferences with unsurpassed alacrity, immediately grasps that only an infallible mind that never errs, never makes a mistake, and therefore can never misguide anyone who follows them even blindly, can ever be exempt from that categorical statement! One such mind was the Messenger himself as is categorically proclaimed by the Author of the Holy Qur'an in Surah An-Najm verses 53:1-5 “Your companion does not err, nor does he go astray; Nor does he speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed,” (see
Ergo, follow the Prophet of Islam, even blindly, in full faith, blind faith, and in absolute obedience, 'cause he can never make an error and consequently can never misguide his flock.

So what did the Prophet of Islam teach by way of the command authority delegated to him in verse 4:59? Where to get that Sunnah from? Whom to follow, whose books to read, whose word of mouth passed from generation to generation to accept, if one cannot even count on the imagined absolute honesty and hypothetical unsurpassed integrity of the scribes of history which the Holy Qur'an categorically proclaims is of no merit for those who come afterwards: “They shall reap the fruit of what they did, and ye of what ye do! Of their merits there is no question in your case!”?

Furthermore, how does one differentiate between following blindly and following due to socialization? Aren't they exactly the same thing? How does one tell fact from fiction, mis-interpretation from dis-information, plausible sounding from actuality, in the presence of Machiavelli who can enact prisoners of the cave generations downstream by the fiat of writing the historical narratives of its liking? Besides, the natural process of myth amplification, inconvenient truth attenuation, even when empires are not built upon it, makes parsing of any history always tentative, and seldom definitive. Even incontrovertible facts can be cradled in differing contexts to give them different meanings and justifications out of vested interests.

Furthermore, not everyone in mankind has the natural skills to be a doctor, scientist, or engineer, anymore than the ordinary peoples among the masses have the time or the talent to become scholars of the Holy Qur'an and study all matters for themselves first hand. Therefore, most are naturally inclined to follow “experts” whom they revere. These “experts” themselves, as human beings, are always constrained by the socialization and historical narratives passed onto them from previous scribes. The Qur'anic admonishments quoted
above apply to both the “expert” and the laity following them, as the most honest “experts” too, sensibly, have presumably followed someone else to get their data and not just invented their own (i.e., speculated, which the subsequent generation of scribes then take as gospel truth leading to more myth and noise amplification).

Even when one finds the “honest” “expert” to follow after all the due diligence one can muster, how does one still tell whether the “honest” “expert” is the “momin” of the Holy Qur'an or the “superman” of Nietzsche? See: *Allama Iqbal - marde-momin or superman?* (http://tinyurl.com/Allama-Iqbal-ubermensch).

These are the very real pitfalls due to the pious layers of masks put on the endless abyss of the human soul that none outside may peer through, and therefore be easily deceived into taking actions that are inimical to their own interests, for here or in the Hereafter.

That is the primary reason for the categorical admonishment in verses 2:166-167 of following others (blindly), and verse 16:25 categorically warning those who might be presumptuous enough to imagine they ought to lead or guide others and end up misguiding those without knowledge who follow them. And the warning to the followers in verse 17:71 that they will be raised for Accountability in the company of those whom they each followed.
Al-Wasilah – “seek the means of approach unto Him”

But the means is not straightforwardly named

In contrast to these emphatic and categorical warnings of (blind) following, and trying to lead others when one is oneself fallible, Mr. Spock discovers that the Author of the Holy Qur'an simultaneously asserts: “seek the means of approach unto Him,” the “Wasilah” (الوسائلة), in Surah Al-Maeda 5:35. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition of previously tread ground, it is necessary to reproduce the following conclusion already reached in an earlier report: Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization (http://tinyurl.com/Islam-Socialization).

Begin Quote from Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization

Evidently, according to the prima facie prescription of Islam itself, the cleansed hearted journey to understand the Holy Qur'an for Muslims (like all other peoples seeking divine guidance) can only be undertaken by seeking out the path of some unnamed people whom God has favored. This is further underscored:

O ye who believe! Do your duty to Allah, seek the means of approach unto Him, Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Maeda 5:35

Caption Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Maeda 5:35, Verse of Wasilah, unequivocally putting to bed for all times the argument on how to approach Allah: “O ye who believe! Do your duty to Allah, seek the means of approach unto Him,” Who are these “means of approach unto Him”? See below Surah Al-Baqara verse 2:166-2:167, and Surah An-Nahl 16:25, for Qur'anic
constraints on "Wasilah", whereby both followers and leaders are respectively condemned! Who specifically then meets the highly constrained requirements of "Wasilah" of this pivotal verse 5:35 wherein "believers" are commanded to "seek the means of approach unto Him," as an obligatory "Duty to Allah"?

It follows therefore, rather straightforwardly in fact from the logic of the Qur'anic Message, that ONLY "the path of those whom Thou hast favoured" as proclaimed in Surah Al-Fatiha 1:7, and subsequently clarified as "seek the means of approach unto Him," the "Wasilah" (wasilah) in Surah Al-Maeda 5:35, can exemplify, interpret, and explain the journey of the straight path (ṣawātir al-mustaffiq)!

Verse 1:7 teaches the supplicant to beseech the Creator to show the path of His Favored Ones. And verse 5:35 commands the supplicant to first seek the means of approach unto Him as his duty to the Creator, in order to even approach the straight path! The Author of the Holy Qur'an specifies how to seek Guidance from His Scripture in order to approach Him --- to seek His designated "Wasilah"!

In simpler words for the language and logic challenged, let's break that down step by step. This is what is meant by reflection when the Author repeatedly invites reflection on the verses of the Holy Qur'an with a cleansed heart: "Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Nay, on the hearts there are locks." – for its greater meaning is only understood when one thinks and reasons through the whole because the whole is much larger than the sum of its individual parts. There is a great deal of advanced understanding contained even in very simple verses when their obvious interconnections are grasped. These are the low hanging fruits of the tree so to speak, within reach of anyone who is willing to reach up to pluck them, but is not available when one makes no effort at reflection or stays mired in its Cliff notes:

- By the proclamation of the Holy Qur'an itself, the suppli-
cant, the seeker of the straight path, cannot approach the Creator directly, but only through the specified means, of seeking the “Wasilah”, the means of approach unto Him.

● For emphasis, it is even presented as a “duty” of the “believers” to first seek the “Wasilah”!

● And it is further emphasized that only the Author's own favored ones can delineate the straight path unto Him.

● The Author's own favored ones, and not the believers' favorite ones, are veritably the Wasilah, “the means of approach unto Him.”

● The Holy Qur'an categorically affirms that the straight path is indeed a guided journey under the leadership of the Divinely Favored Imams, Al-Wasilah, and not a solo journey by one's own interpretation, imagination, due diligence! Al-Wasilah must specifically be sought and followed for the journey on the straight path in order to benefit from Divine Guidance. The rest are led astray because they end up on the paths of the wrong types of people!

● Since the straight path is singular, it follows that all the favored ones who are Al-Wasilah, the show-ers of the straight path upon whom God has bestowed favors, the Guides to follow, the Imams who lead on that path, are directing believers to the same one path without making an error and without disagreeing with each other one iota. Like the airline flight path, once divined by the ATC, is singular and has no margin of error --- it has to be exactly followed without deviation.

● It follows that Al-Wasilah are inerrant by the very definition of their job function!

Mind blowing... putting to bed all facile views pertaining to the
path of spiritual guidance and spiritual ascendance in the pristine Religion of Islam. This is not the man-made Islam penned by the hand of man. But the untampered and unadulterated Islam that eagerly beckons when one approaches the study of its singular Scripture with even a moderately cleansed heart! Imagine the depth of understanding one may be able to reach with greater self-control of the mind to remove all vestiges of socialization bias, confirmation bias, self-interest and perception management.

Putting it together with verse 39:9 of Surah Az-Zumar then makes that rhetorical question obviously prescriptive, rather than being merely tautological: “Are those equal, those who know and those who do not know?”

Meaning, it further follows that these “Wasilah”, the show-ers of the straight path upon whom God has bestowed favors, the Guides to follow, the Imams who lead on that straight path, must also be the ones highest in knowledge and understanding of that straight path among those whom they guide. Otherwise, how can they guide others more knowledgeable than themselves? Or, if their own understanding concerning this straight path was error prone? Especially of an obscure path which Allah ordained that no man may otherwise know of his and her own accord, except through those who were divinely favored. Which, of course, also automatically implies that their teacher can be none among those whom they have been divinely chosen and ordained to guide! And the Holy Qur'an precisely confirms this, that their teacher is only Allah, in verse 6:90 of Surah Al An'aam: “These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance”!

These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance. Say: I do not ask you for any reward for it; it is nothing but a reminder to the nations. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al An'aam 6:90

أوَلَئِكَ الَّذِينَ هَدَى ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ \(\text{فَهِيدُهُمْ} \) ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ \(\text{فَهِيدُهُمْ} \) إِنَّ هَوَّ إِلَّا ذُكْرَىٰ لِلْعَلَّمِينَ
Mr. Spock, having perused the aforementioned study to further reinforce his own rapidly evolving understanding of the Author's principal modus operandi of administering Divine guidance to mankind:

- only by way of seeking the “Wasilah”;
- and only by following the path tread by the Divinely favored ones;
- and by avoiding the path tread by all others;

realized the gravity of the conundrum posed by the Holy Qur'an.

The Believer is cautioned on the one hand from being a (blind) follower, the learned is cautioned from misleading the uninformed by virtue of their own fallibility and the foolish peoples' universal inability to tell the difference, and on the other hand simultaneously commanded to seek the “the means of approach unto Him” as even a “duty to Allah” no less! The prima facie text of the verse – since it is addressing the Believer, “O ye who believe!”, namely, addressing the person who already believes in the Messengership of Prophet Muhammad as the Divine representative of the one God bringing Divine Guidance to mankind, is now commanding him to seek the “Wasilah” as his or her “duty to Allah” – is clearly speaking of some resource other than the Messenger. Who or What is that “Wasilah” is not specified --- thus naturally leading to a great diversity of paths, and people automatically choosing their own “Wasilahs” as per their socialization bias and sectarian teaching.[6]

The Author was being clearly adamant at not being straightforward in His Divine Guidance cipher despite His Own Proclamations: “We made the (Qur'an) easy in thine own tongue,” and “We never sent a messenger save with the language of his folk, that he might make (the message) clear for them.”!

It was more and more evident to Mr. Spock that the Holy Qur'an is
deliberately contributing to the diversity of perspectives among its Believers, the natural outcome of any open-ended specification. If that wasn’t the intent, there’d be no reason to speak in variables like the unnamed “al Wasilah”, when the verse could just as straightforwardly have provided a constant instead of a variable if it deterministically wanted to force a single understanding. Mr. Spock began to appreciate the emphasis in verse 3:7 on “men of understanding” (أولو الآثاب) even more! And that only increased the scale of the conundrum because as previously discussed, the public mind can hardly be characterized as أولو الآثاب!

Returning back to the conundrum posed by the open-ended specification in verse 4:59, Mr. Spock consciously refrained from leaping to the most obvious logical deduction as a way out of this conundrum.

That, verse 4:59 is principally temporal, and only for the time and age of the Prophet of Islam. For then, those people had the Messenger living among them to explain what is not explained or elaborated further in the Holy Qur’an. Verse 4:59, along with the profound attestation of infallibility made in Surah An-Najm: “Your companion does not err, nor does he go astray; Nor does he speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed,” (Surah An-Najm 53:2-4, see Part-III), established for those people the unchallenged supremacy of the Messenger over them in order to command unfaltering obedience to him so that the process of enacting the religion of Islam could be bootstrapped into a political reality – which empirically did transpire in Medina when the Prophet of Islam ruled that city according to the Divine Mandate as both its Messenger and its Exemplar.

It is like a national constitution that demands obedience to state laws in order to execute governance. The fact that such directives were necessary is underscored by the fact of existence of the shocking disclosure by verse 33:36 (quoted above) that there were Believers in the Messenger's congregation, those who had professed belief in his Messengership, who disputed the authority of the Messenger when his diktats did not suit them. Mr. Spock realized that he lacked the posi-
tive evidence and fuller comprehension of the Holy Qur'an to reach such a logical deduction of temporal restriction. Verse 5:35 of Surah Al-Maeda (quoted above) also dissuaded from that hasty deduction. The requirement for seeking (لا وسيلة) is categorical, unbounded by time and space, even if the “Wasilah” itself is unspecified in the verse, just like “those vested in authority over you” (أولئك الذين في أيمنكم) is unspecified in verse 4:59.

Nevertheless, the mathematical incompleteness of this system is inherent, and Mr. Spock could not escape that obviously compelling logical deduction. That observation was obvious to him because he understood mathematical closure. It is like having a closely guarded pristine cipher (the Holy Qur'an) protected by an un-challengeable superpower (Allah), while leaving its cryptographic keys (the Sunnah) in the protection of the noisy press (the scribes of history) which can publish whatever it wants under the supreme orchestration of the Mighty Wurlitzer.

Unless of course, these apparent cipher keys to the elusive door past which one can't see, are irrelevant to deciphering the cipher by succeeding generations. Perhaps some other keys within each human being is to be utilized – such as engaging the right-half brain for spiritual reflection and intuition (which Mr. Spock of course is not capable of, but he did not deny its existence and the superior abilities it conferred upon Captain Kirk, and nor its utility in commanding a Starship, and nor it being the official requirement for holding the position of command as the captain of a Starship, which Mr. Spock consequently did not hold and remained just the indispensable logical science officer).

Given the assurance of the Holy Qur'an that it contains all the necessary and sufficient criterion for evaluation and adjudication of all pertinent matters, Mr. Spock decides to dig deeper more systematically.
Adopting a Systematic Systems Approach

Mr. Spock decides to identify all that is precisely knowable, and all that which is not precisely knowable, from the text of the Holy Qur'an alone. A study such as this would exactly delineate all the vicarious notions Muslims have about Islam which are not explicitly contained in the Holy Qur'an, or only ambiguously specified by its Author and open to interpretation and socialization, creating the unnecessary and illogical fracture lines among the ummah even when they are supposedly following the same textual Holy Qur'an!

This is empirical and not speculation since no such divisions evidently existed on the surface while its Exemplar was still living among the Muslims and able to forcefully arbitrate on all matters in which the early Muslims might have disputed based on the authority vested in him by verse such as 4:59.

But the moment the Messenger is gone and the burden is put upon the Muslims to arbitrate themselves based on the al-Furqaan, the criterion, left behind by the Messenger, disputes, interpretations, misinterpretations, some deliberate borne of vested interests, others natural borne of ignorance, arose directly due to the fact of these gaping holes present in the Holy Qur'an.

Evidently, as was gleaned by Mr. Spock by examining the sociological context, some concerted efforts were made by the rulers to not document and write down the Prophet's rulings and explanations on all Qur'anic matters after his death. The argument speciously put forth by many an apologetic scholar of antiquity being, to seemingly protect
the statements of the Holy Qur'an from being confused with those of
the Messenger's by the uneducated public, for had the Author of the
Holy Qur'an wanted, they argued, It would have made the Messenger's
statements part of the Holy Qur'an ab initio.

The sophistry of these apologetics for not immediately preserving
and writing down the binding rulings of the Exemplar after his death
in a separate compilation from the Holy Qur'an in order to prevent
them from being lost to the vicissitudes of time, was not lost on the
sophisticated Mr. Spock. But something else also puzzled him.

To Mr. Spock's logical and scientific mind attuned to studying
complex specifications from which even the most sophisticated and
enduring material systems could be fabricated by very large teams of
different beings on different planets and still have the designs pass the
interoperability tests to function as specified in a working system,
there appeared to be too many unknowns in this 

ت م ؤ ر

، divine

specification for the guidance of mankind, for any reasonable in-
teroperability as a single

أمة مسلمية

， its own stated goal.

To Spock, ambiguity appeared to be a specification objective by
design. It could have been trivially addressed ab initio, had the Author
of the Holy Qur'an wanted to address it unambiguously. Namely, have
the Holy Qur'an contain all which Mr. Spock identified as missing but
logically necessary for its completeness and self-sufficiency by its
own Qur'anic metric, for comprehensibility by all without leaving its
pristine pages. Then, there'd there would have been no fracture lines
among the Muslims.

Indeed, why have divine guidance in the first place if it is to re-
main ambiguous, is a dogged question which arises in any logical
mind.

As Mr. Spock began to comprehend the sociological contexts and
the turbulent times which cradled the first 200 years of the death of
the Messenger, he put the following hypothesis on the puzzle stack for
further examination: Was it this deliberate ambiguity in the specifica-
tion which enabled the Holy Qur'an itself to survive the early power struggles, the vicissitudes of empires and kingdoms, after the death of the prophet of Islam, such that today, fourteen centuries into the advent of Islam, all Muslims of every race, ethnicity, culture, language, and geographic origin, emphatically assert that there is no “tahrif” (changes) in the text of the Holy Qur'an like the scriptures of the past? That, unlike other holy books of antiquity, Muslims' remains un-tampered by the hand of man such that even today, one can glean the same pristine text with certainty![5]

And Mr. Spock confirmed this most unusual fact by examining the many different editions of the Arabic text (in differing scripts) and the Arabic aural recitations of the Holy Qur'an in the ship's library. They were identical. There did not appear to be any equivalent of the King James Version, the Gideons International Version, the New International Version, the Babylonian Talmud, the Sanhedrin Talmud, Mishneh Torah of Maimonides, the Five Books of Moses in the Old Testament with the Christians, the Five Books of Moses in the Torah scriptures with the Jews, etceteras. The Arabic text of the Holy Qur'an was identical no matter which Muslim culture, sect, and epoch had published it in the written and aural mediums. Mr. Spock could only exclaim: fascinating.

And Spock further confirmed his analysis that in the vast majority of instances, the expositions on the Holy Qur'an and the Prophet of Islam written by scribes throughout the ages more or less differed exactly along the holes and ambiguities in the Holy Qur'an itself that he had identified.

Mr. Spock noted that there are 114 Chapters called Surahs, comprising 6236 total verses, uttered by the Prophet of Islam often in fragments over a 23 year period. Except for the visible contiguity in long narratives of what appears to be tales of ancient peoples as allegorical guidance, topics are not necessarily contiguous in the Holy Qur'an, even in the adjacent verses, or even within a Surah. Topics appear to be randomly spread out across many surahs, and even in-between
verses, often with much repetition, and often employing different parables and similes to explain the same concepts as if the Holy Qur'an is addressing the most feeble public mind.

There is also no explicit indication that a verse is co-related to another verse within the Holy Qur'an. It is impossible to establish causality between verses from the text of the Holy Qur'an. There is not even the indication which verse was revealed first, nor which verse was revealed last, nor which was revealed second last, and so on, as the surahs and verses are not arranged chronologically.

Mr. Spock also noted that within a verse, a verse fragment could be speaking of some entirely different topic from the rest of the verse (as for instance in 5:3, 8:41, and 33:33). Mr. Spock further discovers that the subtleties of Arabic grammar and its gender specificity of nouns and pronouns, verbs and adjectives, enabled changing the point of reference suddenly within a verse just by changing the gender, or the pronoun. It wasn't always obvious who or what those new points of reference were without knowing the exact localized context in which the verse was revealed (as for instance in Surah Al-Ahzaab 33:33 for the sudden change in the gender of the 2nd person pronoun when referring to the Ahlul Bayt, explained in Part-III; and in Surah Abasa 80:1-12 for rapidly switching pronouns to indicate that the verse is speaking of different persons, but who, remain unspecified, and thus open to interpretation and pronoun fixing by the scribes of history).

Mr. Spock also noted that the refined diction and subtleties of the Arabic language permitted poetic allusions and implicit similes which the people of that epoch in whose lingua franca the Holy Qur'an spoke to them, would have certainly understood. But those living in the future time and space would not necessarily know the intended meaning and easily get it entirely wrong. Such comprehension was only attainable by acquiring the lingua franca of the epoch. Mr. Spock had already recognized that he would also have to study the epoch itself when the Holy Qur'an was revealed in order to acquire its sociological
context. Without acquiring that sociological backdrop, an acute sense of the public mind of that epoch, and the lingua franca of its peoples, just proficiency in the Arabic language and its grammar appeared insufficient to Mr. Spock to comprehend the finer subtleties expressed in the language of the Holy Qur'an which outright asserted that: “And We never sent a messenger save with the language of his folk, (ٰہمودانِلیبِ) that he might make (the message) clear for them.” (SuraH Ibrahim 14:4 quoted above). That made the task of apprehending the finer subtleties of the Holy Qur'an non-trivial for people not of the revelation period and its lingua franca, including for native speakers of the Arabic language, unless they acquired that specific lingua franca of the ancient Arabs (ٰہمودانِلیبِ) which the Holy Qur'an itself declared was its language of revelation!

The fact that context and causality of the verses is not carried within the Holy Qur'an also made it impossible to extract information which is not there to begin with, thus significantly hampering understandability.

The task of studying the message of the Holy Qur'an had suddenly become monumental, and not at all akin to the straightforward reading of Milton, Plato, Shakespeare, or the DMV driver's manual – even when one spoke that language.

Nevertheless, intrigued by the total lack of traditional structure and visible cohesiveness to the Holy Qur'an normal to any typical system specification where everything pertaining to that specification is clearly and unambiguously specified within the specification itself, without requiring reference to vicarious outside sources to ascertain their meaning, Mr. Spock decided to treat his study akin to solving a most complex puzzle. A cryptographic cipher, as he had classified the genre, but also under time pressure – as Spock also had other science duties to perform and could not spend his entire life decoding a most interesting cipher.
Definitions

Mr. Spock began his systematic analysis by classifying and identifying the entire text of the Holy Qur'an according to the following nomenclature:

- **Determinate**: A topic, or the full meaning of a verse or verse fragment, in context, is fully determinable from the full context of the 114 Surahs of Holy Qur'an. For instance, verse 5:48 is evidently in this category, it is categorical, as are all the foundational verses (آیات مُحتکمَات) by definition as per verse 3:7.

- **Indeterminate**: A topic, or the full meaning of a verse or verse fragment, in context, cannot be fully established from even the full context of the Holy Qur'an including the Determinate verses due to insufficient information in the Holy Qur'an. For instance, verse 4:59 is evidently in this category, as are all the allegorical and metaphorical verses (آیات مُشَابهَات) by definition as per verse 3:7.

- **Layered**: A topic, or word, or verse, or verse fragment, or context has obvious or un-obvious multiple bindings or points of reference, and which meaning or point of reference is implied in a given context is Indeterminate.

- **Nuanced**: A topic, or word, or verse, or verse fragment, or context is highly nuanced, even when not Layered (i.e., it has exactly one applicable meaning from a plurality of nuanced meanings in the language of exposition), and the context for the nuance is Indeterminate.

Mr. Spock could already perceive just by the construction of these definitions that even to enumerate every verse and verse fragment of the Holy Qur'an as Determinate or Indeterminate was going to require a great deal of study. But without this classification work as prerequisite, making headway into deciphering the message of the Holy
Qur'an appeared intractable. One could spend an infinite time on the **Indeterminate** verses for instance and never decipher them accurately as they were by definition not fully decipherable. Which is why it was essential to identify verses accordingly, so that the main focus of deciphering could be brought to bear on what was indeed straightforward and soluble.

It is part of the cipher, lamented Mr. Spock, that the Holy Qur'an itself did not straightforwardly identify which verses are in which category as defined in verse 3:7 – just like other matters of missing information – leaving it to the intelligence of **“men of understanding”** who are **“firmly grounded in knowledge”** to decipher the text with deep reflection. However, as the ubiquitous understanding of the Muslims of verse 4:59 demonstrated, Mr. Spock could already see the result of the requirement for public intelligence and reflection. Muslims, invariably socialized into its dogmatic sectarian interpretations from birth, irrespective of the fact that verse 4:59 itself appeared to be an **Indeterminate**, remained at loggerheads throughout history over its meaning to the point of extreme internecine warfare and sectarian hatred. Virtually all sectarianism among Muslims is directly rooted in different interpretation of 4:59. On the other hand, Muslims also largely ignored the straightforward meaning of verse 5:48 which ab initio provided the bedrock for peaceable co-existence among all socialized interpretations of 4:59.

The Muslim public intelligence over the past millennia, were it on par with that required to understand the Holy Qur'an as stipulated by verse 3:7, would not have shackled the Holy Qur'an into ﺵَوْرَاءُ مَهْجُورًا as vouchsafed would be lamented by the Prophet of Islam in verse 25:30. With even a modicum of understanding of the Holy Qur'an, the Muslims could have easily formed one unbreachable أمَّةُ مُسلِمِةٍ, a single Muslim nation, which now entirely eluded them despite the repeated entreaties by the Holy Qur'an: **“Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem?”** Surely, the **“people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense”**!
Mr. Spock's evaluation stack is growing rapidly with accumulating conundrums, not to mention the monumental task before him for the primary classification of all verses and verse fragments according to the aforementioned nomenclature. Being an expert science officer, Mr. Spock set out to develop the framework on his advanced computing system to manage this classification, down to morphology and syntax on word boundary. He deemed this resolution necessary because he had discovered that much semantic knowledge is embedded in the gender-sensitive Qur'anic Arabic syntax and its parts of speech, especially in its usage of gender-specific second person pronouns which few human languages apart from Classical Arabic even supported (as seen in verse 33:33).

He had discovered phonology, recitation style, also important because it determined implicit punctuation (as seen in the alternate parsing of verse 3:7). Such linguistic features, and the unsurpassed unique style employed by the Holy Qur'an, made both translating as well as understanding the Good Book difficult for the socialized adult mind not socialized into thinking in such explicit and subtle language features which was the natural oral lingua franca (بُلْسَانْ قُوْمَهُ) of the Arabs of antiquity to whom it was originally revealed.

Unless one explicitly focussed on it, sort of like thinking about how one is walking with every step one takes rather than just walking naturally without thinking, it is easy to overlook these linguistic characteristics leading to misunderstanding and misinterpretation of what is otherwise patently obvious in some cases.

Continued in Part-III
Footnotes


[3] An evaluation stack is an abstraction, an idea from computer science. It can be used to solve almost any computational problem. An entire computer can be built using just this form of underlying computation. Not very efficient, but simple to implement. My very first course in computer science as an undergraduate at MIT taught this basic abstraction of a stack machine. As the terminology prima facie suggests, an evaluation stack is a stack, just like a stack of dirty dishes. You *push* a dirty dish onto the top of stack for cleaning, and you take the top most dish from the top of the stack to clean it first (called *pop*). Using this metaphor here is just for the convenience of thinking that the puzzles are soluble and not intractable – they just need solving.

[4] This analysis is to understand the system design of Islam as disclosed in the Holy Qur'an. It is not to lay out an alternate system design that betters the “Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds.” (56:80) Asking the questions “why” and “why not” to forensically comprehend the Holy Qur'an's system design is not the same thing as proposing why the Holy Qur'an itself is not a different system design. The intent of this report is to field a serious inquiry into the former purpose and not for indulging the facile mind into specious endeavors.

and holistically approach its study from a real Muslim scholar's point of view as opposed to the logic-only Mr. Spock's who prefers his own left-brain dominated forensic-approach for the empirical examination of any matter, be it pertaining to hard science, social science, engineering, art, religion, history, or warfare, see Murtada Mutahhari, *Understanding the Uniqueness of the Qur'an*, http://www.al-islam.org/al-tawhid/unique-quran.htm.

[6] An inquisitive mind may perhaps stop to ponder that why did the Author of the Holy Qur'an not directly impart its self-proclaimed divine guidance directly to every human being instead of employing the convoluted Indeterminates, Messengers, Imams, and Wasilah, mandating “the means of approach unto Him”? In an alternate and rather straightforward system, an energetic mind may perhaps theorize, every human being could have just as easily been his or her own Messenger, Imam, Wasilah, employing direct Divine Inspiration – the perfect egalitarian system with direct connection to the Creator – thus obviating the need for chosen Messengers, divine Books, etc. This could have also avoided the corruption of the pulpit and the concomitant bloodshed of several millennia altogether! Why such an obviously egalitarian approach was not adopted by the Self-Proclaimed All Knowing and All Seeing Author of the Holy Qur'an, may at best only be baselessly speculated upon by the brilliant mind. For that's clearly not the method adopted by the Author of the Holy Qur'an! The Author proclaims the Holy Qur'an to be not just Guidance for the individual, but also for the collective; beginning with the self, reaching to the immediate family unit, and extending to a Muslim nation: “Our Lord! make of us Muslims, bowing to Thy (Will), and of our progeny a Muslim nation, bowing to Thy (will);” (2:128) Perhaps the Holy Qur'an has itself answered that question!
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Continuing seamlessly from where Part-II left off, Mr. Spock probes deeper into the question guiding this inquiry using his new nomenclature: Determinate and Indeterminate. The key question guiding this inquiry is restated:

What are the inherent impediments for studying the message of the Holy Qur'an which make the Book so amenable to self-serving interpretation, socialization, and even bastardization by anyone?
The purpose in Part-III is to illustrate the inherent difficulties in comprehending the Speech of the Author of the Holy Qur'an due to its Indeterminates, and how to even begin to decipher the Message by logical reasoning from the Holy Qur'an itself without resorting to any outside sources, and without resorting to speculation and baseless interpretation that fly in the face of the prima facie meaning of the verses. Technically, this process of reasoning from the Holy Qur'an is sometimes referred to as “tawil” (تَأْوِيله).

And just like there is poor scholarship and outstanding scholarship, there is also poor “tawil” which indulges in baseless speculation and self-serving interpretation of the metaphorical verses (آيات المتشابهات) and even the categorical verses (آيات المحكمات), and outstanding non speculative “tawil” which confines itself to the logical reasoning based on the prima facie meaning of the verses as demonstrated by Mr. Spock. This is mandated by the Holy Qur'an itself to the “men of understanding” (أولو الألباب) in Surah Aal-'Imran 3:7 for correctly deciphering the Determinates of its Divine Guidance System.

Mr. Spock will soon discover to what extent can that logical reasoning process of deciphering the Holy Qur'an take the inquiry after which matters become patently Indeterminate, and what sensible lessons may be drawn from this conspicuous limitation of the Divine Book that continually plagues all those among mankind who are not the “Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” (الرَّاسَخُونِ فِي الْعِلْمِ) referenced in the Holy Qur'an (3:7, 4:162).

The focus of exposition continues to remain the exploration of verses that have fueled sectarianism. The text draws on Part-II when making reference to verses already quoted, with the phrase “quoted above”.

128 Muslims and Imperial Mobilization
Sociological Factors & Contextless Verses

Being a well-traveled science officer aboard the Starship Enterprise and having visited many different worlds and civilizations in their differing stages of sociological development throughout the traversable universe, Mr. Spock is well aware that the general knowledge of history and other sociological material can always lend some context to any matter when it pertains to living creatures.

But Spock is also well aware from the blood-drenched history of early civilizations that history is typically written by the victors of history. Only the works of those scribes typically survive in the libraries or in the cultural memory of the majority of the people, who either echo, or don't challenge, the core-axioms of the victors. All narratives consequently harbor a germ of untruth and falsehood in them even when they appear to narrate honestly, due to ingrained biases, vested interests, loyalties, infidelities, and other psychologically and sociologically induced tendencies of the living authors. (This is explored in more depth in Part-IV.) Mr. Spock also well understood that this characteristic was common to most if not all species in the universe he had visited. Even the history of his own planet, despite being all logic and event based, was not devoid of falsehoods and power-plays of hidden motivations of his peoples – for good and evil are merely tools for the superior intellect to achieve its end. Whether an end is noble or not is merely the moralizing semantics put on it by those who wish to see matters in that light. Whereas, in reality, these have no a priori moral and spiritual bounds put on them by creatures who lack the right-half brain function to feel, to empathize, and to moralize. (See Morality Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam 2015 129
derived from the Intellect leads to Enslavement!)

In addition, human beings especially, are among the most subjective and highly malleable of cognitive creatures. Mr. Spock well knows after his lifelong sojourn among them that it is the race of mankind, more than any other cognitive race in the vast expanse of the universe, that most naturally espouses irrational feelings, uncalled for emotions, loves, hates, anxieties, fears, wants, sense of belonging, and are often driven by hidden subconscious motivations of which they themselves remain cognitively unaware of. These psychological forces and innate proclivity towards partisanship, tribalism, ethnocentrism, and ideological alliance shared with relevant political community, etc., naturally color their perception of events, epochs, and history which they record as its scholars, no differently than those who sanction or orchestrate those events, epochs, and history as the “history's actors”. No scientist, historian, sociological commentator and scholar is immune from these psychological forces.

Its undesirable consequence to accurate scholarship is that myths and falsehoods get easily amplified with successive generation of historians just as much as unpopular truths get easily attenuated. The truth of these words is beyond doubt. It is in fact self-evident. It can be witnessed in the scholarship of any people and any civilization among mankind. Just the straightforward observation that heroes of one civilization often turn out to be the villains of another, and vice versa, is sufficient to create caution in the mind of the non dogmatic student of both history and current affairs that even the most scholarly narratives minimally have to be studied with the forensic eye of scrutiny. Without awareness of psychological and sociological forces, the human student seeking understanding of history is as compelled to 'United We Stand' with the narratives due to “group-think” as the narrators themselves. Mr. Spock fortunately is not human.

For the case at hand, Mr. Spock discovers that no written records exist of the early period of the advent of Islam until after more than a century of the death of its Prophet. Several generations until then, as
was noted by the first historians writing of that period some two centuries later, had carried the Sunnah of the Prophet of Islam, the Qur'anic directive “Obey the Messenger”, in their cultural memories, or word of mouth, and passed them from father to son, mother to daughter, generation after generation, due to the tyranny of the Muslim rulers who were crafting dynastic empires on Islam. These rulers, it was evident, had themselves sanctioned historical narratives and compilations of Sunnah which were not inimical to their own ruling interests.

Nevertheless, Mr. Spock also realized that facts are facts. And so he began searching the vast computer libraries of millions of books on Islam beginning from its earliest primary written works in search of what might be unarguable, reliable, and authenticated facts and events pertaining to the epoch of the Messenger of the Holy Qur'an and those that immediately followed, to lend some sociological context to his study. To further identify what is a real fact vs. merely a narrative which might or might not be true, Spock clarified his thinking thusly. He took the most shocking example of a fact to delineate what he considered incontrovertible fact vs. merely a historical narrative.

The following is an exemplar case study to illustrate the issues, the difficulties, and the forensic approach to resolving indirections using guidance from the Determinate verses of the Holy Qur'an which has called itself: Al-Furqan, ان الفَرْقَانِ (verse 25:1). Many other Qur'anic indirections and conundrums can similarly be examined using this exemplary approach.

An incontrovertible fact is of the following type: The historical narrative indicated that a Muslim ruler in the Ummayad Dynasty, in 680 AD, slaughtered Hussein ibn Ali ibn Abi Ṭālib, the revered grandson of the Prophet of Islam, along with many other male members of his family including children. And this act transpired despite the Author of the Holy Qur'an's remarkable and explicit commandment to Muslims to both honor the Author's Messenger, and to honor and love the Messenger's “near of kin”, which obviously includes his progeny:
Evidently, even to the untrained prima facie eye, never mind to the super-trained mind of a forensic detective of history like Mr. Spock, something major appeared to have gone systemically wrong after the death of the Prophet of Islam. Only within the passage of a mere sixty years, matters came to this criminal abhorrence of internecine Muslim upon Muslim state violence inflicted upon the family of the Messenger. And this despite the most lucid and clear-text commandment of the Holy Qur'an to the Muslim polity: 'Say: “No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin.”''

---

**Case Study: What does the Holy Qur'an say about the Ahlul Bayt?**

**Does the Scripture identify their composition?**

The reasonable question arose in Mr. Spock's mind: why this commandment to honor and love the Exemplar's progeny, his “zurriyat”, those near of kin, في آلّ الرَّبِّي؟ What is so special about the Prophet of Islam's kin? And again, what is the purpose for loving them? Note that in this verse there is no command to obey them. It is to actually love
them, with emotional content. Rather unusual to ask people to love someone else's progeny. What is the context for showing such love and faithfulness to them?

Indeed, much preference and affinity is shown for the family of the Prophet of Islam by the Author of the Holy Qur'an, by referring to them as أهل البيت, Ahlul Bayt, and sanctifying them with a تَطْهِيرًا, a thorough purification:

“And stay quietly in your houses, and make not a dazzling display, like that of the former Times of Ignorance; and establish regular Prayer, and give regular Charity; and obey Allah and His Messenger.

And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the Family, and to make you pure and spotless.” (Surah Al-Ahzaab, 33:33)

Caption Verse 33:33 Surah Al-Ahzaab – the Verse of Purification, the Verse of Perfect Cleansing. Incredible verse that hides a wellspring of semantics by employing the gender sensitivity of Arabic grammar in its second person pronoun to describe the composition of Ahlul Bayt. Another reason for misunderstanding the Holy Qur'an – its sophistication of using the Classical Arabic language constructs to hide a wellspring of secrets that none among the ordinary people seeking guidance from it shall fathom except those who are capable of understanding أُولُو الْأَلْبَاب (see verse 3:7) and having command of its unsurpassed natural language of exposition بِبَعْضِ قُوَّمِهِ (see verse 14:4)! Verse 33:33 is a categorical example of
why the Holy Qur'an is simply untranslatable, even syntactically, let alone semantically! Even the “Orientalism” jaundiced West is reluctantly forced to admit this characteristic of the Holy Qur'an: “The miraculous rhetorical quality that the Qur'an has for the reader is lost in translation, ... mistranslation usually occurs when translators retain Arabic terms or force a single meaning upon Arabic words.” (http://tinyurl.com/Quran-Untranslatable-Harvard).

Why is the Prophet's family so important to the Author of the Holy Qur'an, persisted Mr. Spock? Why is the Prophet's Ahlul Bayt given such preeminence based merely on their DNA, as it would appear?

Before we proceed further in hot pursuit of that question, this remarkable verse fragment of 33:33 (يَا بِنْيَاءَ الْقُرْآنِ أَيُّهَا الْبَنَيُّ إِنَّمَا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ لِتُنْهِيَ عَنكُمْ الرَّجُلَيْنِ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطْهِرُكُمْ تَطْهِيرًا) bears closer examination as it is exemplary of the most commonly misperceived verses of the Holy Qur'an, especially when read in translation.

As was only briefly alluded to earlier, Mr. Spock had already noted of the difficulty of understanding the Holy Qur'an, that within a verse, a verse fragment could be speaking of some entirely different topic from the rest of the verse, as for instance in 5:3, 8:41, and 33:33. And that the profound subtleties of Arabic grammar and its gender specificity, enabled changing the point of reference suddenly within a verse by simply changing the gender of the verb, noun, pronoun, etc., as for instance in the verse fragment of 33:33 which refers to the purification of the Ahlul Bayt. Let's look at the complete verses preceding 33:33 which ostensibly establish the overarching context for that Verse of Purification of the Ahlul Bayt. But do they? Not if you read it in Arabic and know Arabic grammar. Whereas, when you read it in translation, you are easily misled unless the translator took the pains to accurately capture the gender change of the pronoun in a footnote or in parenthesis to clarify matters which could not be translated in a
non-gender sensitive language. And, the publisher also continued to reprint the translation with footnotes un-modified until the time you got hold of that translation. [7]

The savvy Mr. Spock trenchantly noted the games played in translations, and also by publishers, for deliberate sectarian obfuscation of what was plainly manifest in the Qur'anic Arabic. From his ship's vast library collection, Mr. Spock compared editions of the same translations from different publishers and warily noted the remarkable dropping or subtle modification of the clarification footnotes posthuminously in some subsequent editions even when the translator had taken pains to footnote the gender change and its implication in understanding the verse accurately in his original work.

The following table captures the complete context of the topic under discussion in Surah Al-Ahzaab, verses 33:28-34, using Yusuf Ali's translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| يَأْتِيَهَا أَنْبِيَّي قَلْ أَزْوَّجِكَ إِنْ كُنْتَ تُرَّذِنَّ الْيَوْمَ الْهَيَوْةَ لَدُنيَا وَزِينَتَهَا فَتَعَالَبْنَ أَمْتَعَكْنَ وَأَسْرَحَكْنَ سَرَاحًا جَميِلاً | "O Prophet! Say to thy Consorts: "If it be that ye desire the life of this World, and its glitter,- then come! I will provide for your enjoyment and set you free in a handsome manner. (28)"
| وَإِنْ كُنْتَ تُرَذِنَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَالْيَوْمَ الْآخِرَةَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ أَعَدَّ لِلْمُخَسَّنِينَ مِنَكَ أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا | "But if ye seek Allah and His Messenger, and the Home of the Hereafter, verily Allah has prepared for the well-doers amongst you a great reward, (29)"
| يُسْأَل أَنْبِيَّي مِنْ يَأْتِيَ مِنْكَ بِقَحْشَةٍ مُّبِينَةٍ يُصَعِّفُ لَهَا عَذَابَ ضَعِيفَينَ وَكَانَ ذَلِكَ عَلَى اللَّهِ يُسْرًا | "O Consorts of the Prophet! If any of you were guilty of evident unseemly conduct, the Punishment would be doubled to her, and that is easy for Allah. (30)"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>هَوَاءً وَمَلْعَةً مِّنْ أَلْلَهِ يَأْتِيَ }</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ومن يكثت منكم له ورسوله وعمل صلحا نوتها أجرها مرتين وأغذها لها رزقا كريما</td>
<td>But any of you that is devout in the service of Allah and His Messenger, and works righteousness,- to her shall We grant her reward twice: and We have prepared for her a generous Sustenance. (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يثب أنثى للثاني كحده من النساء وإن الفتيت فلا تخصعن بالقزل في يدمي الده في قلبه مرص وقلة وطهرا معرهفا</td>
<td>O Consorts of the Prophet! Ye are not like any of the (other) women: if ye do fear (Allah), be not too complacent of speech, lest one in whose heart is a disease should be moved with desire: but speak ye a speech (that is) just. (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وقرون في بيوتكم ولا تبرج تبرج الجهلية الأولى وأفن الصلوة وعاصتين الزكوة وأطفن الله ورسوله إنما يريد الله ليذهب عنكم الرجس أجل البيت ويطهركم تطهيرا</td>
<td>And stay quietly in your houses, and make not a dazzling display, like that of the former Times of Ignorance; and establish regular Prayer, and give regular Charity; and obey Allah and His Messenger. And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the Family, and to make you pure and spotless. (33:33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وانتكن من عالي الله والحكمة إنه الله كان لطيب خبيرا</td>
<td>And recite what is rehearsed to you in your homes, of the Signs of Allah and His Wisdom: for Allah understands the finest mysteries and is well-acquainted (with them). (Surah Al-Ahzaab, 33:34) (Tr. Abdullah Yusuf Ali)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Surah Al-Ahzaab, verses 33:28-34 – An illustrative case of how a translation fails to capture the seman-
tics of the Qur'anic Arabic grammar accurately due to
language limitations of English which does not have gen-
der-specific second person pronouns and possessive pro-
nouns. In this instance, it leads to the misperception that
the interspersed verse fragment purifying the Ahlul Bayt
in 33:33 is referring to the Messenger's wives just be-
cause the wives are being addressed by the Author earlier
in that verse, and also in the preceding verses, and in the
succeeding verse! This switch in topic for the verse of
purification cannot be captured in a translated language
which does not have gender-specific 2nd person pronoun
with the same semantics as the Classical Qur'anic Arabic
does, without explicit elaboration.

The following table completely decomposes verses 33:33
and 33:34 word by word. Please take a few minutes to study the switch in
pronoun from 2nd person feminine plural possessive pronoun when
referring to the houses of the wives, to 2nd person masculine plural
object pronoun when referring to the Ahlul Bayt, and back to 2nd per-
son feminine plural possessive pronoun when referring again to the
houses of the wives in 33:34:

- **2nd person feminine plural possessive pronoun**
  - (33:33:3) نَتُوْيُتَكُنَّ your houses

- **2nd person masculine plural object pronoun**
  - (33:33:20) عَنْكُمَ ankumu from you,
  - (33:33:24) وَيُطَهِّرُكُمْ wayuṭāḥhirakum And to purify
    you

- **2nd person feminine plural possessive pronoun**
  - (33:34:5) نَتُوْيُتَكُنَّ your houses

The significance of this switch in pronouns is not lost on the super
analytical Mr. Spock.
Having become an instant grammarian of the classical Arabic language, Mr. Spock knows that the 2nd person masculine pronoun ﺖﻤْرأٰي “kum”, and 2nd person feminine pronoun ﺖﻤْرأٰي “kunna”, unambiguously represent the following semantics in order to be grammatically correct in their usage:

- “kum” when used with a plural object or possessive case represents a composition that must contain at least one or more males, and may contain zero or more females (it is equivalent of 2nd person pronoun “you”, “تم” and “vous” in gender neutral English, Urdu, and French respectively);

- “kunna” represents an all female composition (it has no equivalent in English, Urdu, French, et. al.; consequently, the same 2nd person pronoun “you”, “تم” and “vous” are respectively re-used causing a loss in semantics in translation).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Arabic word</th>
<th>Syntax and morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:1)</td>
<td>waqarna</td>
<td>CONJ – prefixed conjunc-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And stay</td>
<td>tion wa (and)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V – 2nd person femin-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ine plural imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRON – subject pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:2)</td>
<td>fi</td>
<td>P – preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:3)</td>
<td>buyūtikunna</td>
<td>N – genitive masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your houses</td>
<td>plural noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRON – 2nd person femi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nine plural possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>اسم مجرور والكاف ضمير متصل في</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>محل جر بالإضافة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:4)</td>
<td>wala</td>
<td>CONJ – prefixed conjunc-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and (do) not</td>
<td>tion wa (and)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRO – prohibition particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Arabic word</td>
<td>Syntax and morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:5) tabarrajna</td>
<td>نُذَرْجُناَ</td>
<td>V – 2nd person feminine plural (form V) imperfect verb, jussive mood PRON – subject pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>display yourselves</td>
<td>V – 2nd person feminine plural (form V) imperfect verb, jussive mood PRON – subject pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:6) tabarruja</td>
<td>تَمْرُجْ</td>
<td>N – accusative masculine (form V) verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as was the) display</td>
<td>اسم منصوب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:7) l-jähiliyati</td>
<td>الْجَهْلِيَّةَ</td>
<td>PN – genitive feminine proper noun → Al-Jahiliyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of the times of) ignorance</td>
<td>اسم علم مجرور</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:8) l-ūlā</td>
<td>الْأوْلِيَّةِ</td>
<td>N – nominative feminine noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the former.</td>
<td>اسم مرفوع</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:9) wa-aqim'na</td>
<td>وَأَفِمَّنَا</td>
<td>CONJ – prefixed conjunction wa (and) V – 2nd person feminine plural (form IV) imperative verb PRON – subject pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And establish</td>
<td>الواو عاطفة فعل أمر والتاء ضمير متصل في محل رفع فاعل</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:10) l-šalata</td>
<td>الْشَّلَاتَ</td>
<td>N – accusative feminine noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the prayer</td>
<td>اسم منصوب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Arabic word</td>
<td>Syntax and morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (33:33:11)  | waátína and give | **CONJ** – prefixed conjunction *wa* (and)  
**V** – 2nd person feminine plural (form IV) imperative verb  
**PRON** – subject pronoun |
|             |             | الواو عاطفة  
فعل أمر والتاء ضمير متصل في محل  
رفع فاعل |
| (33:33:12)  | l-zakata zakah | **N** – accusative feminine noun |
|             |             | اسم منصوب |
| (33:33:13)  | wa-áti'ná and obey | **CONJ** – prefixed conjunction *wa* (and)  
**V** – 2nd person feminine plural (form IV) imperative verb  
**PRON** – subject pronoun |
|             |             | الواو عاطفة  
فعل أمر والتاء ضمير متصل في محل  
رفع فاعل |
| (33:33:14)  | l-laha Allah | **PN** – accusative proper noun  
→ Allah |
<p>|             |             | نظ الجلاله منصوب |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Arabic word</th>
<th>Syntax and morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>warasūlahu and His Messenger.</td>
<td>CONJ – prefixed conjunction <em>wa</em> (and) N – accusative masculine noun PRON – 3rd person masculine singular possessive pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:16)</td>
<td>ACC – accusative particle PREV – preventive particle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innamā Only</td>
<td><em>mā</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:17)</td>
<td>V – 3rd person masculine singular (form IV) imperfect verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yurīdu Allah wishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:18)</td>
<td>PN – nominative proper noun → Allah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-lahu Allah wishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:19)</td>
<td>PRP – prefixed particle of purpose <em>lām</em> V – 3rd person masculine singular (form IV) imperfect verb, subjunctive mood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liyudh'hiba to remove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Arabic word</td>
<td>Syntax and morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:20) ʿankumu from you</td>
<td>عَنْكُمْ</td>
<td><strong>P</strong> – preposition <strong>PRON</strong> – 2nd person masculine line plural object pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>جار ومجريز</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:21) l-rij'sa the impurity,</td>
<td>أَلْرَيْسَةَ</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> – accusative masculine noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>اسم منصوب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:22) ahla (O) People</td>
<td>أَهْلَ</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> – accusative masculine noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>اسم منصوب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:23) l-bayti (of) the House!</td>
<td>أَلْبَيْتِ</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> – genitive masculine noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>اسم مجرور</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:24) wayuṭahhirakum And to purify you</td>
<td>وَيَطْهِرُكُمْ</td>
<td><strong>CONJ</strong> – prefixed conjunction <strong>wa</strong> (and) <strong>V</strong> – 3rd person masculine singular (form II) imperfect verb, subjunctive mood <strong>PRON</strong> – 2nd person masculine line plural object pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>الواو عاطفة فعال مضارع منصوب والكاف ضمير متصل في محل نصب مفعول به</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:33:25) taṭhīran (with thorough) purification.</td>
<td>تَطَهِّرًا</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> – accusative masculine indefinite (form II) verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>اسم منصوب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Arabic word</td>
<td>Syntax and morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (33:34:1)   | wa-udh'kur'na | CONJ – prefixed conjunc-
              |              | tion *wa* (and)  
              |              | V – 2nd person feminine plu-
              |              | ral imperative verb  
              |              | PRON – subject pronoun |
| (33:34:2)   | mā | REL – relative pronoun  
              |              | اسم موصول |
| (33:34:3)   | yut'lā | V – 3rd person masculine  
              |              | singular passive imperfect  
              |              | verb, subjunctive mood |
| (33:34:4)   | fī | P – preposition  
              |              | حرف جر |
| (33:34:5)   | buyūtikunna | N – genitive masculine plu-
              |              | ral noun  
              |              | PRON – 2nd person femi-
              |              | nine plural possessive pro-
              |              | noun |
| (33:34:6)   | min | P – preposition  
<pre><code>          |              | حرف جر |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Arabic word</th>
<th>Syntax and morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:7)</td>
<td>N – genitive feminine plural noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āyāti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the) Verses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:8)</td>
<td>PN – genitive proper noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-lahi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of) Allah</td>
<td>→ Allah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:9)</td>
<td>N – genitive feminine noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wal-ḥik‘mati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the wisdom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:10)</td>
<td>ACC – accusative particle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeed,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:11)</td>
<td>PN – accusative proper noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-laha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allah</td>
<td>→ Allah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:12)</td>
<td>V – 3rd person masculine singular perfect verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:13)</td>
<td>N – accusative masculine singular indefinite noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>latīfan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Subtle,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Arabic word</th>
<th>Syntax and morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33:34:14)</td>
<td>حَبِيرًا</td>
<td>ADJ – accusative masculine singular indefinite adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khabīran</td>
<td>صفة منصوبة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Aware.</td>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Surah Al-Ahzaab 33:33-34 Word by Word syntactical decomposition. (Arabic syntax and grammar courtesy of corpus.quran.com/documentation/grammar.jsp ; corpus.quran.com/wordbyword.jsp?chapter=33&verse=33 )
The following table captures some prominent English and Urdu translations of verse 33:33, all of them spectacularly failing to capture the gender switch of the 2nd person pronoun from feminine to masculine form of the original verse in Arabic when referring to the Ahlul Bayt. Whether or not this translated language limitation is footnoted in the original printed editions by their respective translators to draw attention to the significance of this switch in pronouns, is not known.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And stay in your houses and do not display your finery like the displaying of the ignorance of yore; and keep up prayer, and pay the poor-rate, and obey Allah and His Apostle. Allah only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! and to purify you a (thorough) purifying. (Muhammad Ali Habib Shakir, House of Habib, Pakistan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And stay in your houses and do not display your finery like the displaying of the ignorance of yore; and keep up prayer, and pay the poor-rate, and obey Allah and His Apostle; Allah only desires to take away the uncleanness from you, O people of the household! and to purify you a (thorough) purifying. (Maulana Muhammad Ali MMA 1917 PDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And stay in your houses. Bedizen not yourselves with the bedizenment of the Time of Ignorance. Be regular in prayer, and pay the poor-due, and obey Allah and His messenger. Allah's wish is but to remove uncleanness far from you, O Folk of the Household, and cleanse you with a thorough cleansing. (Marmaduke Pickthall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain in your houses; and display not your finery, as did the pagans of old. And perform the prayer, and pay the alms, and obey God and His Messenger. People of the House, God only desires to put away from you abomination and to cleanse you. (Arthur John Arberry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay at home, and do not deck yourselves with ostentation as in the days of paganism; fulfil your devotional obligations, pay the zakat, and obey God and His Apostle. God desires to remove impurities from you, O inmates of this house, and to cleanse and bring out the best in you. (Ahmed Ali)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And stay in Your houses. and display not yourselves! with the display of the times of former Paganism; and establish the prayer and give the poor-rate and obey Allah and His apostle. Allah only desireth to take away uncleanness from you, people of the household, and to purify you with a thorough purification. (Abdul Majid Daryabadi)

And abide quietly in your homes, and do not flaunt your charms as they used to flaunt them in the old days of pagan ignorance; and be constant in prayer, and render the purifying dues, and pay heed unto God and His Apostle: for God only wants to remove from you all that might be loathsome, O you members of the [Prophet’s] household, and to purify you to utmost purity. (Muhammad Asad)

And stay in your homes and do not go about displaying your allurements as in the former Time of Ignorance. Establish Prayer, give Zakah, and obey Allah and His Messenger. Allah only wishes to remove uncleanness from you, O members of the (Prophet's) household, and to purify you completely. (Abul Ala Maududi)

Stay in your houses and do not display your finery with the display of the former [days of ] ignorance. Maintain the prayer and pay the zakat and obey Allah and His Apostle. Indeed Allah desires to repel all impurity from you, O People of the Household, and purify you with a thorough purification. (Ali Quli Qara'i)

(From Islamic sources:)

And stay in Your houses. and display not yourselves! with the display of the times of former Paganism; and establish the prayer and give the poor-rate and obey Allah and His apostle. Allah only desireth to take away uncleanness from you, people of the household, and to purify you with a thorough purification. (Abdul Majid Daryabadi)

And abide quietly in your homes, and do not flaunt your charms as they used to flaunt them in the old days of pagan ignorance; and be constant in prayer, and render the purifying dues, and pay heed unto God and His Apostle: for God only wants to remove from you all that might be loathsome, O you members of the [Prophet’s] household, and to purify you to utmost purity. (Muhammad Asad)

And stay in your homes and do not go about displaying your allurements as in the former Time of Ignorance. Establish Prayer, give Zakah, and obey Allah and His Messenger. Allah only wishes to remove uncleanness from you, O members of the (Prophet's) household, and to purify you completely. (Abul Ala Maududi)

Stay in your houses and do not display your finery with the display of the former [days of ] ignorance. Maintain the prayer and pay the zakat and obey Allah and His Apostle. Indeed Allah desires to repel all impurity from you, O People of the Household, and purify you with a thorough purification. (Ali Quli Qara'i)

(From Arabic sources:)

Stay in your houses and do not display your finery with the display of the former [days of ] ignorance. Maintain the prayer and pay the zakat and obey Allah and His Apostle. Indeed Allah desires to repel all impurity from you, O People of the Household, and purify you with a thorough purification. (Ali Quli Qara'i)
Caption various translations of Surah Al-Ahzaab verse 33:33 into English and Urdu, the non-gender sensitive languages, all spectacularly failing to capture the semantics created due to the gender change from feminine to masculine form of the 2nd person pronoun when referring to the Ahlul Bayt. (Translations are from the electronic versions at tanzil.net/trans/ ; MMA 1917 PDF courtesy of aail.org ; Ali Quli Qara'i courtesy of islamawakened.com/Quran/33/33/default.htm)

In French, which is more gender sensitive than either English or Urdu but less so than Classical Arabic, the translation of verse 33:33 is given below. The 2nd person pronoun “vous” in French, like its Urdu and English 2nd person pronoun counterpart “تم” and “you” respectively, including the possessive case variations thereof, are unfortunately gender neutral and unable to distinguish between singular and plural object, leading to the same loss in semantics.

Restez dans vos foyers; et ne vous exhibez pas à la manière des femmes d'avant l'Islam (Jâhiliyah). Accomplissez la Salât, acquittez la Zakât et obéissez à Allah et à Son messager. Allah ne veut que vous débarrasser de toute souillure, ô gens de la maison [du prophète], et veut vous purifier pleinement. (verse 33:33 Tr. Muhammad Hamidullah)
Caption Translation of verse 33:33 into French. The second person pronoun vous is gender neutral just like in Urdu and English, despite French being more gender sensitive than either English or Urdu, therefore leading to the same loss in semantics.

In Spanish however, the matter is salvaged. Spanish enables expressing gender sensitivity of the object by addition of either “os” or “as” to the verb. Therefore, a correct semantic translation of verse 33:33 from Arabic into Spanish is possible by reflecting the 2nd person plural gender sensitivity of the pronoun in Arabic, to the correct conjugated form of the verb expressing the gender and plurality of the object. So, if “gente de la casa” (Ahlul Bayt) was referring to only the wives of the Messenger, the grammatically correct verb conjugation of the root verbs 'librar' and 'purificar' in Spanish would have been “libraras” and “purificaras” instead of “libraros” and “purificaros”.

¡Quedaos en vuestras casas! ¡No os acicaléis como se acicalaban las natiguas paganas! ¡Haced la azalá! ¡Dad el azaque! ¡Obedeced a Alá y a Su Enviado! Alá sólo quiere libraros de la mancha, gente de la casa, y purificaros por completo. (verse 33:33 Tr. Julio Cortes)

Caption Translation of verse 33:33 into Spanish. The loss of semantics in translation is prevented by reflecting the 2nd person plural masculine pronoun of Arabic on the correct selection of masculine or feminine verb conjugation, since both choices are available in Spanish to indicate object composition and its plurality.

That language limitation conundrum disclosed above, noted Mr. Spock, is yet another source of misunderstanding the Holy Qur'an – studying it in translation! The Holy Qur'an is simply untranslatable, in any language. Which is why the famous translator Arthur J. Arberry, in deep humility, called his excellent rendition into English: “The Koran Interpreted”. Even the “Orientalism” jaundiced West is reluctantly
forced to admit this characteristic of the Holy Qur'an: “The miraculous rhetorical quality that the Qur’an has for the reader is lost in translation, ... mistranslation usually occurs when translators retain Arabic terms or force a single meaning upon Arabic words.” (see http://tinyurl.com/Quran-Untranslatable-Harvard).

Furthermore, a translation also lends itself easily to both Machiavellian as well as inadvertent perception management of the public mind. We can see this pernicious cognitive infiltration in the contemporary English translation of the Holy Qur'an titled: The Sublime Qur'an (see http://tinyurl.com/Critique-Laleh-Bakhtiar-Zahir).

To this day, countless generations of Muslims growing up in non-Arabic speaking Muslim countries do not perceive what has so straightforwardly been demonstrated above, as the sophistication of the classical Arabic language to mask its secrets from the unwary by something so elegant as simply a gender change in its 2nd person pronoun. The syntactic as well as semantic limitations of any translation language in comparison to the intrinsic richness and succinctness of Qur'anic Arabic requires much reframing for the target language in order to preserve both literal as well as semantic accuracy, which, as in the case of verse 33:33, simply cannot be maintained without additional footnotes and parenthetical annotations.

These language limitations naturally create additional motivation to seek sources of explanation and exegeses outside of the pages of the Holy Qur'an, called “tafsir”, especially for those who do not speak Arabic, which is approximately 90 percent of the 1.6 to 2 billion Muslim public spread throughout the world in many different cultures and civilizations. That fact automatically leads to the very paradox being explored in this analysis: fallible hands, fallible minds, and fallible hearts, some clean and some unclean, some competent and some incompetent, none of them categorically known to be among the “Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” (الرَّاسِخُونَ فِي الْعَلَمِ) of verse 3:7 of the Holy Qur'an, expositing the pristine text of the Holy Qur'an according to their own perception and socialization bias – rather than the Word of its own

At least with respect to this verse fragment 33:33, the native Arabic speaker has a leg-up on the non Arabic speaker. The former knows that *Ahlul Bayt* is being referred to with a masculine pronoun and therefore its composition, by definition, comprises one or more males, and cannot comprise only females, and therefore the verse fragment 33:33 is not necessarily referring to the wives, or even just the wives alone. If that verse fragment was indeed referring to only the wives, an all female group, then the feminine form of the pronoun would have been used to refer to the *Ahlul Bayt* as is done when referring to the houses of the wives before and after that verse of purification.

But that's also where the native Arabic speaker's advantage over the non-speaker ends. Neither knows the actual composition of the *Ahlul Bayt* beyond that prima facie information contained in that sequence of verses 33:28-34 reproduced above, that it is a Household of the Prophet, and comprises one or more males, and zero or more females, and it may or may not contain the wives of the Prophet, irrespective of the fact that the verse fragment is interspersed in between where the Author of the Holy Qur'an is commanding the wives of the Prophet of Islam what they are supposed to do. Whereas, in the purification fragment of verse 33:33, the Author declares what He Himself intends to do to the *Ahlul Bayt*. That change of “actor” from the wives to the Author and back to the wives is most conspicuous in the verse. In that interspersed switch, the Author pledged some abstract “perfect purification” to the *Ahlul Bayt*. What that “perfect purification” means remains as foreign to the native speaker of Arabic as to the non-speaker. It requires for both to indulge in much due diligence to uncover. Mr. Spock was finding that the Holy Qur'an is hardly the Book that is so easy to understand or so clear as claimed by its Author.
Returning to the thread of analysis before that closer look at verse 33:33, the same verse fragment of “perfect purification” begs the obvious question: Why are only the Ahlul Bayt chosen by the Author of the Holy Qur'an and sanctified so specially with such a profound divine benefaction: “Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the Family, and to make you pure and spotless” (إِنَّا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنكُمْ الرَّجْṣَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيَطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطَهِّرًا ), and no one else is chosen for this benefaction from among the vast number of respected companions and close familial ties of the Prophet of Islam?

What did this unusual “purification” actually mean in the language of the Holy Qur'an such that it exclusively only applied to the Ahlul Bayt?

How should (وُبِطَّهَرَكُمْ تَطَهِّرًا) be accurately understood from its cipher-text form? Having witnessed the ease of straightforward obfuscation possible due to the gender-specific Arabic grammar cleverly employed in this verse to suddenly change the context, Mr. Spock is exceptionally vigilant for correct and un-careless decoding of the cipher text of the Holy Qur'an, and especially for this verse fragment which evidently is hiding some secret. It appeared to be another one of those bedeviling verses (مَثَّبَهَات) defined in verse 3:7 on the face of it. Perhaps it was an Indeterminate, and perhaps it wasn't. To further his understanding of what was meant by “purification”, Mr. Spock therefore pushes onto the ever growing evaluation stack the words “Tahira kum Tathira” (وُبِطَّهَرَكُمْ تَطَهِّرًا) of verse 33:33, and the related “Mutaharoon” (الْمُطَهِّرُون) of verse 56:79 (see Surah Al-Waqia quoted above).

Perhaps that held an important clue to the identity of who were
being purified if what “purification” actually meant in the language of the Holy Qur'an could be correctly deciphered. Then its purpose, the why, would become known, which would in turn perhaps lead to the who, as in who could achieve that purpose. Even in the prima facie meaning, it obviously was not an exoteric physical purification, such as cleansing of the physical body. Rather, it implied some esoteric “religious” purification just from examining the verses 56:78 and 56:79 which a priori defined who could even access the Holy Qur'an: “In a Book well-guarded, Which none shall touch but those who are clean (purified).” (الْمُطَهَّرُون
described in verse 3:7 (already quoted above). Thus, the Author of the Holy Qur'an choosing the Ahlul Bayt for “perfect purification” appeared to harbor a far deeper context beyond what was superficially apparent from a careless reading of verse 33:33 which was in outright error. The matter demanded careful analysis and deeper study. The Holy Qur'an itself demanded such due diligence by straightforwardly asserting: “Do they not then reflect on the Qur'an? Nay, on the hearts there are locks.” (see 47:24 quoted below).

To Mr. Spock's perceptive mind already attuned to different methods of access control for managing hierarchical access to privileged information, the concept of “purification” in the light of verses 56:78-79 appeared akin to the Author of the Holy Qur'an requiring a “security clearance” for access to His Message in the “Book well-guarded”. And the Book progressively revealing more and more of its inner secrets higher the “security clearance” of the seeker of its Guidance. Therefore, “perfect purification” would logically mean the highest level of “security clearance” and the complete revealing of all its deep secrets to those who possessed that rank – the “Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” (الرَّاسِخُونِ فِي الْعَلْمِ) described in verse 3:7 (already quoted above). Therefore, “perfect purification” would logically mean the highest level of “security clearance” and the complete revealing of all its deep secrets to those who possessed that rank – the “Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” (الرَّاسِخُونِ فِي الْعَلْمِ) described in verse 3:7 (already quoted above). Thus, the Author of the Holy Qur'an choosing the Ahlul Bayt for “perfect purification” appeared to harbor a far deeper context beyond what was superficially apparent from a careless reading of verse 33:33 which was in outright error. The matter demanded careful analysis and deeper study. The Holy Qur'an itself demanded such due diligence by straightforwardly asserting: “Do they not then reflect on the Qur'an? Nay, on the hearts there are locks.” (see 47:24 quoted below).

To Mr. Spock's observant mind, preference for a choosing a particular family and lineage, a particular strand of human DNA above all the nations, and continuing to choose from that strand generation after generation for the divinely appointed stewardship of man, لِلْدَّنَّاسِ إِمَامًا.
appeared to play a principal role in the overall provenance and sequence of divine guidance by the Author of the Holy Qur'an:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Surely Allah chose Adam and Nuh and the descendants of Ibrahim and the descendants of Imran above the nations. <strong>Offspring one of the other;</strong> and Allah is Hearing, Knowing.” (Surah Aal-e-Imran 3:33-34)</th>
<th>إنَّ اللَّهُ أَصَطْفَى ٱلْأَدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَءَلَّاهُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَءَلَّاتِ عُمْرَانٍ عَلَى ٱلْأَلْبَمِينَ دَرِيَّةً بَعْضُهَا مِنْ بَعْضٍ وَلَنَّالَهُ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“And when his Lord tried Ibrahim with certain words, he fulfilled them. <strong>He said:</strong> Surely I will make you an Imam of men. Ibrahim said: And of my offspring? My covenant does not include the unjust, said He” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:124)</td>
<td>وَإِذَا أَبْنَى إِبْرَاهِيمَ رَبَّهُ بِكَلِمَةٍ قَانِمٍ قَالَ إِلَى جَاعِلِكَ لِلنَّاسِ إِمَامًا قَالَ وَمَنْ دَرِيَّةٍ قَالَ لَا يَنَالُ عَهْدِى أَلْطَمِينَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Verses of the Holy Qur'an laying out the Principle of Divine Appointment of leadership bestowed upon Apostles, Messengers, and Imams. The verses of Surah Aal-e-Imran 3:33-34, and Surah Al-Baqara 2:124, clearly and succinctly state that **Allah chooses His Imams above the nations as Divinely Appointed guides for the people whom people can follow** (the word “Imam” للناس إماماً), that these chosen people are offspring one of the other, **and that it is not a democratic selection by the people!** (See Principle of Inerrancy below as the co-requisite for Divine Appointment of leadership)

So, once again encountering a preference for a specific family, the Ahlul Bayt, which Allah chose in 33:33 for a thorough purification,
and in 42:23 commanded the Prophet to tell the people to love his “those near of kin”, was not unusual to Mr. Spock's perceptive mind. It followed a consistent pattern, that the Author of the Holy Qur'an chose whomsoever as His Messengers, Exemplars, and Imams above all the other peoples. And verses 3:33-34 and 2:124 unambiguously and unequivocally indicated the Author's particular preference for a very specific lineage starting from Prophet Adam, “Offspring one of the other”, to choose Prophets and Imams from among that lineage only, to bring His Divine Message to all peoples among mankind (see verse 10:47 quoted above, and many others like 16:36 “And verily We have raised in every nation a messenger, (proclaiming): Serve Allah and shun false gods”). The Author's preference for the Prophet of Islam's Ahlul Bayt in verse 33:33 was from the same DNA strand of Prophet Ibrahim. Which, according to verse 2:124, was also going to spawn Imams of the people throughout the ages in Prophet Ibrahim's progeny.

Mr. Spock noted that verse 2:124 proffered an unambiguous criterion for such appointment. That, if there were to be any divinely appointed Imams among the people of Arabia, they had to emerge from the genetic seed of Prophet Ibrahim only, as per the Author's Promise to Prophet Ibrahim. That criterion was just as applicable to Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam, as to his Ahlul Bayt. Mr. Spock ascertained from the historical record that Prophet Muhammad was considered a descendent of Prophet Ibrahim by the people of Arabia, coming from the distinguished prophetic lineage of Bani Hashim who had been the keepers of the pilgrims' structure called the Holy Kaaba for generations. The Author of the Holy Qur'an too attested to the fact that Prophet Muhammad was indeed a descendent of Prophet Ibrahim, by the act of choosing him over all others in Arabia as His Messenger – since the Author by His own admission only chose successive Prophets, Messengers, and Imams, from a single lineage as per His proclamation noted in verse 3:33-34.
Therefore, if there were to be any additional Imams as per the promise in verse 2:124 to Ibrahim, reasoned Mr. Spock, these Imams had to carry the seeds of Prophet Ibrahim or Prophet Muhammad in order to continue the Author's self-proclaimed modus operandi for conveying His Guidance to the people: “Offspring one of the other”.

Furthermore, the Holy Qur'an attested to the fact that Muhammad was not a father of any men among the people:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{“Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Apostle of Allah and the Last of the prophets; and Allah is cognizant of all things.”} & \quad \text{ما كان مَّحَمَّد أَبا أَحْدِ مَن} \\
& \text{رَجَالِكُمُ وَلْكَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتِمَ} \\
& \text{آَلِ الْبَيْتِ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ يَكْلِلُ شَنْئُهُ} \\
& \text{عِلْيَمًا.}
\end{align*}
\]

This automatically meant, reasoned Mr. Spock, that if such leadership as promised in verse 2:124 was to continue after the Prophet of Islam – Muhammad being the last of the Messengers according to the bold proclamation of the afore-quoted 33:40 – as it evidently did by virtue of the Qur'anic commandment of 4:59: “obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you”, the latter “those charged with authority among you” could only emanate from either Prophet Ibrahim's seed of which Muhammad was himself a progeny, or Prophet Muhammad's own progeny.

The fact that Muhammad had a progeny is testified by the Holy Qur'an in the verse where its Author is evidently consoling His Messenger that it is the Messenger's enemies who will be without progeny (and not him):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{“Surely your enemy is the one who shall be without posterity.”} & \quad \text{إِنَّ شَايْبَكَ هُوَ الأَلْبَرٌ} \\
& \text{(Surah Al-Kauthar, 108:3)}
\end{align*}
\]
Therefore, in order for the Holy Qur'an to not be falsified, verses 33:40 and 108:3 straightforwardly imply that Prophet Muhammad's progeny must be through his female offspring only as “Muhammad is not the father of any of your men”.

This criterion, adduced directly from the Holy Qur'an, automatically implied the composition of the Ahlul Bayt from which to search for Imams, leaving the straightforward identification of “Offspring one of the other” from the factual historical records by seeking out the Prophet of Islam's female progeny. Provided of course that such factual historical records are incontrovertible, reliably documented. Fortunately, history documents to the same degree of empirical veracity as it documents that Prophet Muhammad is a real figure of history, that lady Fatima Zahra is Prophet Muhammad's only seed to procreate, and her two sons, Hassan ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib, and Hussein ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib, are her only two male offspring, the latter being killed by the Muslim Ummayad ruler's army as noted at the beginning of this section. All recorded historical facts that remain incontrovertible.

However, the precise identity of the progeny is still held as an unknown variable in Mr. Spock's logical mind in this specific thread despite being fully aware of the sociological context and documentation of Muslim history. Because, as already noted, in this study Mr. Spock is keenly interested in separating what the Holy Qur'an has itself conveyed in the “criterion” of “no doubt”, without confusing it with the historical records or the narratives of doubtful scribes of history. The criterion, once adduced from the Holy Qur'an and correctly understood, can always be applied for extracting any valid signals from the partisan noise of history to understand that history itself.

The general problem Mr. Spock is wrestling with, in case the reader has lost track, is the enigma that instead of applying the criterion learnt from the Holy Qur'an to parse history recorded by fallible scribes in order to improve its signal to noise ratio, history is evidently necessary to understand the meaning of the text of the Holy Qur'an due to its Indeterminates. That's like putting the cart before
the horse! Mr. Spock in this forensic study is sensibly trying to adduce the criterion first from the self-described “criterion” of “no doubt” revealed by the “Lord of the Worlds” on how to even go about selecting valid signals from the doubtful penmanship of history which could, in turn, perhaps enable deciphering the message of the Holy Qur'an to some degree of objectivity when at all necessary. In order to not lose sight of that primary motivation, Mr. Spock is explicitly holding what is an Indeterminate as an explicit variable (that is fixed from history by Muslims, often subjectively, based entirely on their socialization biases and/or vested interests), and what is Determinate as a known constant (which is lamentably often ignored by Muslims).

That is the main objective in Mr. Spock's search for identifying the Ahlul Bayt from the Holy Qur'an, by understanding the criterion established in the Holy Qur'an itself, the book that called itself the “Criterion”, for their identification. Otherwise, if Mr. Spock is to ask even a laity Muslim during any epoch at any place, who the daughter of the Prophet of Islam and her children are, the laity will unanimously rush to inform him with a single answer – another incontrovertible fact of recorded history which unites all Muslims in all civilizations across time and space. It is this universal unity among Muslims on the fact of the identify of the Messenger's progeny, just as their unity on the fact of the text of the Holy Qur'an being un-tampered by the hand of man, which lends more than just academic and existential veracity to the historical record documenting both. It is a component of the unshakable belief of a Muslim that has continued to be so throughout history right from the time of the Prophet of Islam.

Because of this unusual empiricism, the enigma posed in this section of the Prophet's grandson being killed so mercilessly by the Muslim Ummayad army despite the clear-text Qur'anic commandment of verse 42:23 to love them, and the Muslims of the epoch clearly recognizing the Messenger's progeny who weren't an unknown to the people, is being examined in such great depth.

To Mr. Spock's objective mind unsocialized into the Muslim
ethos, just the fact that this violence upon the Messenger's immediate grandchildren could even transpire at the hands of a Muslim ruler, and the Muslims of the time even permitted it to transpire, is indicative that both, historiography by partisans of power, and hagiography by partisans of victims of that power, is the defining epistemology of Muslim scholarship. And therefore, the latter had to be examined with an acute forensic eye to improve its reality to myth ratio. It lent further substance to the paradox Mr. Spock is grappling with that how could the “perfected” ciphertext of the Holy Qur'an require itself to be decoded by such an epistemology of imperfect pens of history? This is taken up in more depth in Part-IV.

Mr. Spock, persistent in his study, continues to qualitatively observe that the remarkable show of preference for the Messenger's Ahlul Bayt was entirely self-consistent with the Author's overarching narrative in the Holy Qur'an for choosing some over all others for His special favors. This idea of granting special favors to some people over all others during the period of providing guidance to the people, Mr. Spock discovered, is almost over-emphasized by the Author of the Holy Qur'an, as for instance in:

| “And this was Our argument which we gave to Ibrahim against his people; We exalt in dignity whom We please; surely your Lord is Wise, Knowing.” (Surah Al An'aam, 6:83) | وَتَلَّكَ حُكْمَتُنَا عَاتِيَّتَهَا إِلَى هِمَّ | عَلَى قُوْمِهِ رَفَعُ دِرَجَتِ مِنْ نَبْتَن َّةٍ إِنْ رَبُّكَ حَكِيمٌ عَلِيْمٌ |

Caption: The Holy Qur'an elaborating upon the Principle of Divine Appointment of leadership and disclosing the fact that the people are often unhappy or jealous with such appointment! Verse 33:36 of Surah Al-Ahzaab (quoted above) testifies to the pathetic existence of this fact even among the Muslim believing companions of the Prophet of Islam! Surah Al An'aam verse 6:83 further
sets the principle that the Divine Appointment by fiat by the Lord of the Worlds is even accompanied by the Lord's Argument on behalf of His Appointee and against his people that is given to the Appointee. This verse lays out a hint to search in the Holy Qur'an for Divine Arguments when it comes to any question of Divine Appointment – since the Holy Qur'an speaks in its own explanation!

Mr. Spock recognizes that the continuation of verse 6:83 of Surah Al An'aam was further revealing of the Author's principal modus operandi of choosing some over others for special favors, especially verse 6:87 “And from among their fathers and their descendants and their brethren, and We chose them and guided them into the right way.”

And verse fragments 6:89-90 asserted a pertinent purpose which further explained why “those charged with authority among you” existed in addition to the Prophet of Islam: “We have already entrusted with it a people who are not disbelievers in it. These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance.”

And We gave to him Ishaq and Yaqoub; each did We guide, and Nuh did We guide before, and of his descendants, Dawood and Sulaiman and Ayub and Yusuf and Musa and Haroun; and thus do We reward those who do good (to others). (6:84)

And Zakariya and Yahya and Isa and Ilyas; every one was of the good; (6:85)
And Ismail and Al-Yasha and Yunus and Lut; and every one We made to excel (in) the worlds: (6:86)

And from among their fathers and their descendants and their brethren, and We chose them and guided them into the right way. (6:87)

This is Allah's guidance, He guides thereby whom He pleases of His servants; and if they had set up others (with Him), certainly what they did would have become ineffectual for them. (6:88)

These are they to whom We gave the book and the wisdom and the proph-ecy; therefore if these disbelieve in it We have already entrusted with it a people who are not disbelievers in it. (6:89)

These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance. Say: I do not ask you for any reward for it; it is nothing but a reminder to the nations. (6:90)

Caption Surah Al An'aam verses 6:84-90 elaborating upon the Principle of Divine Appointment of leadership for the continued guidance of nations among mankind from time immemorial.

Unless Mr. Spock was erroneous in his analysis despite applying his best reasoning and logic capabilities which had earned him the
most difficult position as the solo science officer aboard the Starship Enterprise, application of straightforward logic to the study of the Holy Qur'an had been incredibly revealing thus far. It was heartening to Mr. Spock that the Holy Qur'an emphatically admonished the people who did not reflect on its Message, or treated it as “just foolish nonsense” (مْهْجُورًا see verse 25:30 quoted above):

| “Do they not then reflect on the Qur'an? Nay, on the hearts there are locks.” (Surah Muhammad 47:24) |
|:Aعَفَلاَ يَتَذَرُّونَ الْقُرْآنَ أَمْ عَلَى قُلُوبٍ أَفْقَاهَا |

Whereas, even rudimentary logical reflection on the texts of the Holy Qur'an, the categorical foundational verses which formed the heart of the Holy Qur'an as per its Author's own declaration of آيات مَحْكَمَات, automatically led the earnest detective to such inescapable logical deductions as demonstrated in the aforementioned reasoning process by Mr. Spock. But such reasoned deductions also begged the layman's foolish question, for what purpose? – As if it isn't already patently obvious by now.

Because, after all, it could also be argued that verse 5:3 had already categorically asserted that the Qur'an was completed in the Prophet's own lifetime: “This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion.”

Therefore, wasn't Qur'an alone sufficient? Mr. Spock recalled the rebuke to Believers in Surah Al-Ahzaab verse 33:36, “It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.” (quoted above). It takes no speculation to infer from this shocking verse the presence of undercurrents of dissent and disputation with the Messenger among some Believers. Such disputing could easily lead to the suggestion that Qur'an alone is sufficient
in order to suppress the decisions of the Messenger not contained in the Holy Qur'an which the Believers in his congregation did not like. Which, at least to Mr. Spock's intelligent mind gave an explanation for why the first Caliphs after the Prophet's demise forbid the documenting of the Messenger's verdicts and statements, called Hadiths.

It now becomes self-evident to Mr. Spock that:

1. by the categorical statement of 4:59, that there existed some unnamed persons besides the Messenger, “those charged with authority among you” to whom obedience was made obligatory;

2. by the assertion of verse fragments 6:89-90 in full context that “We have already entrusted with it a people who are not disbelievers in it. These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance.”

3. by the categorical directive of 5:35 to the Muslims: “O ye who believe! Do your duty to Allah, seek the means of approach unto Him,”

4. and in the light of 5:3 that the religion of Islam had been “perfected”;

there was a pretty clear logical reason for the presence of “those charged with authority among you” apart from the Messenger, and to whom obedience was made as obligatory by the Holy Qur'an as to the Messenger for all Muslims.

That, by the commandment “those charged with authority among you”, the Author of the Holy Qur'an had very clearly provided to the early Muslims, additional temporal Exemplars, Imams, besides the Prophet of Islam, “Offspring one of the other”, who were meant to continue teaching to the people the “perfected” religion which Prophet Muhammad had brought to them as the Messenger, even after the Messenger was no longer among them. This is a straightforward
logical conclusion based upon its Author's own statements. Otherwise, the Holy Qur'an is falsified by verse 4:59 if there were no Imams after the Prophet of Islam!

That, dereferencing the indirect pointers given in the **Determinate** verses of the Holy Qur'an for the identity of these additional Imams:

5. by the criterion of 2:124, that the Author promised to choose leaders and Imams only from the seed of Ibrahim after Ibrahim passed his “test”;

6. by the fact that there is no verse in the Holy Qur'an to suggest that 2:124 is not an exclusive promise to the family of Ibrahim, quite the contrary, the assertion of 3:33-34 indicates the Author's sole criterion for choosing the Imams of mankind, from the limited subset of a single family: **“Offspring one of the other”**;

7. by the benefaction of 33:33, that the **Ahlul Bayt** were elevated above all others with a thorough spiritual purification;

8. and by the commandment of 42:23, that the people were asked to love (in its most superlative form) and honor the Messenger's near of kin;

naturally lead to identifying them as being only from the **Ahlul Bayt**.

The above sensible reasoning applied to the verses of the Holy Qur'an to accurately infer their meaning as a system of guidance bequeathed by the Author to mankind, leads to the following straightforward logical deductions:

1. That, there appeared to be no other competing, or even plausible solution based on the **Determinate** verses of the Holy Qur'an, to decipher this inquiry in any other direction for the straightforward logic of the matter that these Imams **“whom Allah guided, there-**
fore follow their guidance” had to be “Offspring one of the other”, and also possess the same degree of knowledge and understanding of the Holy Qur'an as the Messenger in order to continue the Messenger's mission of divinely guiding the Muslims as his successor exemplars of the Holy Qur'an without any disagreement or conflict of opinion among each other or with the Messenger. The logic of 4:59 asserted that the three entities can never disagree with each other and in order for that to be true, the successors had to have the same degree of knowledge and understanding of the Holy Qur'an and compliance with it as the Messenger.

2. That, it appeared to be a sophisticated bootstrap process of Islam whose legal texts had been perfected and completely revealed, to guide a stubborn pagan civilization that had inflicted so much physical warfare upon the Prophet of Islam during his entire tenure of Prophethood, onto the straight path for at least some additional time period after the Messenger had passed away.

3. That, just as Surah Al-Fatiha verses 1:6 and 1:7 informed the Believers how to beseech the Author to show them how to seek the path of divine guidance, the very narrow separation pointed out in 1:7 between the straight path and wrong path of those who go astray – both paths being tread by Believers themselves and not the obvious unbelievers who were easily identified – was very clearly delineated for the early Muslims by bequeathing to them the Ahlul Bayt who alone were elevated above all others with a most unusual divine favor of...
perfect purification in verse 33:33 (وَنَتَبْرِكُمْ تَطَهِّرًا).

4. That, the Ahlul Bayt was therefore the crucial differentiator as “The path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favors” of verse 1:7 given to the early Muslims to protect them from unwittingly following the other Believers who were reprimanded as “on a clearly wrong Path” (Surah Al-Ahzaab, 33:36).

5. That, it was indeed the same protocol for Prophet Muhammad's succession as it had been the Prophetic tradition of all previous Messengers of the Author, to leave designated successors behind to protect and carry-on their mission. Which, in that early bootstrap phase of Islam, was to protect and safeguard the journey of reaching the common goal of forming a single Muslim nation: “Our Lord! make of us Muslims, bowing to Thy (Will), and of our progeny a Muslim nation, bowing to Thy (will);” (Surah Al-Baqara 2:128)

6. That, the Ahlul Bayt construct was an additional divine favor given by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to the early Muslims as fulfillment of the prayer that the Author had Himself taught the Believers in Surah Al-Fatiha, and for which the Author also emphatically declared in verse 76:3 “Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or unthankful.”

7. That, these self-consistent conclusions when applied to empiricism explained reality as it had principally unfolded, most accurately. The goal of verse 2:128 obviously never transpired. The Muslims instead killed the grandson of the Messenger after a tumultuous ad hoc political succession process which tied a Gordian knot on the process of transformation itself. Unless
verse 33:36 is wiped off the pages of the Holy Qur'an by some fiendish technology, it is in perpetual Testimony by the Author Himself that some Believers who challenged the Prophet's decisions existed during his own time. The path of these same people so emphatically condemned by the Author in 33:36 as “clearly wrong Path” must have indeed taken over after the demise of the Messenger instead of the path of the rightful heirs from among the Ahlul Bayt, in order for the empirical reality to become manifested as it did. Otherwise, the Holy Qur'an is falsified if it is asserted that the right path was followed in the succession. The empiricism of the slaughtered grandson of the Prophet of Islam is prima facie testimony that this abhorrent destination was reached by only following the “clearly wrong Path”! Because, if this abhorrent destination was reached by following the right path, than the Holy Qur'an lied that such was a good path of “whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance” in Surah Al An'aam 6:90, as it still ended in that same abhorrence. In order for the Holy Qur'an to not be falsified by empiricism, abhorrence can only be reached by following “clearly wrong Path”!

As Mr. Spock well understands, empiricism is the only reality for a left-brained scientist. Any analysis, any model, any theory that goes against explaining reality is just imaginary and useless. Unless the analysis presented here is shown to be seriously flawed, the conclusions reached by the line of reasoning employed by Mr. Spock from the Determinate verses of the Holy Qur'an is remarkable discovery.

It sure explains empirical reality coherently, but most importantly, in self-sufficiency and self-consistency drawn solely from the Holy Qur'an and no other source!

For, as Mr. Spock ascertained perusing the historical record of
early Muslim rulers and empires, few Muslims among the masses living under their dominions seemed to have been aware of this rather straightforward logical deduction regarding the *Ahlul Bayt*, despite knowing, respecting, and also loving the progeny of the Prophet of Islam as some sort of revered objects thought to bring them divine blessings if salutations were continually showered upon them in daily prayers. And despite the fact of this discovery being made only from the **Determinate** verses of the Holy Qur'an in its آیات مُحکّمات texts requiring only a bare modicum of reflection to uncover the matter. And despite their daily recitation of the same **Determinate** verses of the Holy Qur'an with the most ardent religious fervor!

It was almost as if, observed Mr. Spock, this logically derived conclusion had been calculatingly masked off from the Muslim mind under the ruling paradigms of caliphs and dynastic empires.

Even today, lamentably, few Muslims are aware that this is a conclusion adduced directly from the straightforward statements and simple logic of the Holy Qur'an without making any recourse to vicarious outside sources and doubtful human scribes.

And that mass ignorance of the Muslim public, mused Mr. Spock, perhaps also explained the context for the Messenger's prescient but strange lament recorded in verse 25:30 of Surah Al-Furqaan (quoted above) after the ascent of Islam as the dominant religion of Arabia: "Then the Messenger will say: **“O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.”**"

What more can be gleaned from other eligibility criterion established in the Holy Qur'an to better comprehend the attributes and characteristics of **“those charged with authority among you”** that might enable identifying them more precisely?
Method of Reasoning it out from the Holy Qur'an itself – Taking analysis one step deeper and further

Principle of Inerrancy

The Qur'anic eligibility criterion of 2:124 and 3:33-34 have come only one step closer in the direction of identifying “those charged with authority among you”. That eligibility criterion had indicated to Mr. Spock that the only persons even eligible for this divine appointment of leadership, “those charged with authority among you” to whom obedience is made as obligatory as to the Prophet of Islam, must come from the Ahlul Bayt and no where else. Because, only that singular family automatically includes both the seed of Prophet Ibrahim and the seed of Prophet Muhammad, “Offspring one of the other” as already reasoned by Mr. Spock. That reasoning also lends sensible context to why the people are commanded to love the Prophet's near of kin. Even the way it is propositioned to the people by the Author of the Holy Qur'an, and the choice of Arabic word employed which only loosely translates to “love” in English but is the superlative form of love in Arabic, أَلْمَوْدُةُ, is revealing of its motivation: 'Say: “No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin.”'

The Prophet is asked by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to demand the love of his near of kin as a gratitude from the people – not as a favor the people are asked to do the Prophet, but in return for the favor done to the people by the Prophet of Islam of being God's Messenger among them!

In other words, it is an obligation put on the people to “love” the Prophet's near of kin in the most superlative degree that the semantic-rich Arabic language can convey for terms of endearment and affec-
tion to other human beings!

The logical connection among the many verses outlined above, and making the love and affection of Prophet's near of kin an obligation upon the people, thus making it psychologically easier for the people to accept Exemplars from among the Ahlul Bayt, conclusively indicated to Mr. Spock that "those charged with authority among you" could only emanate from among the Ahlul Bayt. But who among the Ahlul Bayt meets that criterion and are also "Offspring one of the other"?

Mr. Spock, solely on the anvil of pure reasoned logic applied to al-Furqaan (see discussion of verse 25:1, Surah al-Furqaan quoted above), could straightforwardly deduce still additional eligibility and rejection criterion to further narrow down the field for who could possibly meet the Qur'anic criterion to comprise the set of "those charged with authority among you".

That, as per verse 4:59, any such persons to whom command obedience is extended from the Prophet of Islam as an Exemplar of the Holy Qur'an, must also be Exemplars of the Holy Qur'an themselves! That conclusion is simply inescapable. Because, as Mr. Spock reasoned, they couldn't be just any prominent persons occupying the throne or the pulpit, no matter how learned or respectable, for in order to have command obedience to them as per verse 4:59, they'd have to possess knowledge and understanding of the divine message of the Holy Qur'an to the same level of unerring comprehension as the Prophet of Islam! Otherwise, they could possibly misinform and misguide the people using their own interpretation (despite their best intentions to be accurate). Which, of course, also automatically implied that their teacher could be none among those whom they have been divinely chosen to guide! The logic of that sequence of impeccable deductions is also undeniable. Not surprisingly, the deduction is directly underscored by the Holy Qur'an itself, as in verse fragments 6:89-90 (quoted above): "We have already entrusted with it a people who are not disbelievers in it. These are they whom Allah guided,
therefore follow their guidance.” Allah is their teacher!

Therefore, Mr. Spock continued to reason, these could only be persons who were specially favored by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to also be unerring like the Messenger. Unerringness being the primary logical criterion to being an Exemplar of the Holy Qur'an in order to faithfully convey the message of the Author who claims to be the Creator of Mankind and the “Lord of the Worlds”, to the people without any alterations, additions and subtractions, in full and accurate context, in both letter and spirit. This deduction is also simply logical and straightforward. The verse of purification already analyzed in 33:33 arguably conveys at least some sense of bestowing unerringness, الوَصِيُّينَ, from the Ahlul Bayt.

Once again, the Arabic words employed by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to convey to the people what is being kept away from the Ahlul Bayt (all abominations) and for what purpose (purification) are far richer in semantics than can be captured straightforwardly in semantic-starved translated English. As already discussed earlier, and pending further discovery by Mr. Spock of the most accurate meaning of the concept of “Mutaharoon”, المَطَهِّرُونَ, of verse 56:79 as the bearers of the secrets of the Holy Qur'an, the reasonable metaphor of privileged access control to those with “security clearance” implied by that verse of Surah Al-Waqia (quoted above), also led to the comprehension that perfect purification from “rijis” of verse 33:33 would necessarily mean perfect unerring knowledge of the Holy Qur'an – knowledge that is necessary and sufficient to guide others only if the guides themselves are without error.

After all, not given to error is a declared gift bestowed by the Author and not an endeavor of man himself to acquire that state of perfect knowledge. Only the Author can confer perfect unerring knowledge of His Divine Message such that He can blithely command Muslims to: “Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you” on par with His own Word be-
cause He has also declared in Surah An-Najm: “Your companion does not err, nor does he go astray; Nor does he speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed”!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وأَلْدَجُمَّ إِذَا هُوَى</td>
<td>I swear by the star when it goes down. (53:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَيْنِ</td>
<td>Your companion does not err, nor does he go astray; (53:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىَ</td>
<td>Nor does he speak out of desire. (53:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إِنَّ هُوَ إِلاَّ وَحُيٌّ يُوحَى</td>
<td>It is naught but revelation that is revealed, (53:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عُلْمَهُ شَدِيدُ الْقُوَى</td>
<td>The Lord of Mighty Power has taught him, (Holy Qur'an, Surah An-Najm 53:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إِنَّهُ لْقَوْلُ رَسُولِ كَرِيمٍ</td>
<td>Verily this is the word of a most honourable Messenger, (81:19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذُهُ قُوَةَ عِندَ ذِي الْعُرْشِ مَكِينٍ</td>
<td>Endued with Power, with rank before the Lord of the Throne, (81:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مُطَاعٌ ثَمَّ أَمِينٍ</td>
<td>With authority there, (and) faithful to his trust. (81:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَمَا صَانِبُكُمْ بِمَجْنُونٍ</td>
<td>And (O people!) your companion is not one possessed; (81:22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَلَقَدْ رَءَاهَا بِالَّذِينَ أُمِيِّنَ</td>
<td>And without doubt he saw him in the clear horizon. (81:23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَمَا هُوَ عَلَى الْغَيْبِ بِضَنْبٍ</td>
<td>Neither doth he withhold grudgingly a knowledge of the Unseen. (81:24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَمَا هُوَ بِقَوْلِ شَيْطَانٍ رَجِيمٍ</td>
<td>Nor is it the word of an evil spirit accursed. (81:25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When whither go ye? (81:26)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>فَايَنَّ تَدْهَبُونَ</td>
<td>When whither go ye?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verily this is no less than a Message to (all) the Worlds: (81:27)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>إِنَّ هَوَّ إِلَّا ذَكُرٌ لِلْعَلَمِينَ</td>
<td>Verily this is no less than a Message to (all) the Worlds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(With profit) to whoever among you wills to go straight: (81:28)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لِمَن شَآءَ مَنْكُمْ أَنْ يُسَتَقِّيمَ</td>
<td>(With profit) to whoever among you wills to go straight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But ye shall not will except as Allah wills,- the Cherisher of the Worlds. (Holy Qur'an Surah At-Tawir (81:29)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَمَا تَشَآءُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ يُشَآءَ رَبُّ الْعَلَمِينَ</td>
<td>But ye shall not will except as Allah wills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption The Holy Qur'an establishes the Principle of Inerrancy very clearly and most categorically for the Prophet of Islam in at least two notable places in two Surahs. Surah An-Najm verses 53:1-5 unequivocally declaring the Prophet of Islam inerrant, infallible, and whose speech is naught but revelation that is revealed! And Surah At-Tawir verses 81:19-29 which similarly corrects the misconception among the companions of the Prophet about the utterances of the Messenger of Islam, unequivocally declaring that the Prophet is invested with special power and rank by Allah, that his speech are the words of a most honorable Messenger, and that his words are a Message to (all) the Worlds, to benefit from if they so choose to do so. Only on such categorical basis of inerrancy, is obedience commanded to the Messenger on par with the Author of the Holy Qur'an in verse 4:59 of Surah an-Nisa'a', the Verse of Obedience. This same categorical inerrancy is extended to “those vested in authority over you” (أُولِي الْأَمْرِ مَنْكُمْ) by the syntactical construction of verse 4:59. No Arabic language linguist with any command of Qur'anic grammar can deny this most profound construction of verse 4:59 which so succinctly extends the semantics of inerrancy from God, to Prophet, both of whom are commanded to be obeyed.
unequivocally, to some unnamed أولئك الامام منكم. The extension of command obedience to the latter is made via the Prophet of Islam in verse 4:59, thus making the same characteristic of inerrancy bestowed upon the Messenger, also available to the “ulul-amar”. If not for the logic of this fact, the أولئك الامام منكم would be subject to verse 16:25 of Surah An-Nahl (quoted below), thus making a mockery of verse 4:59. Only “These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance” of verse 6:90 of Surah Al An'aam can ever be exempt from the damnation of verse 16:25! And only these inerrant people whom Allah is asking Muslims to follow, for indeed these have to be inerrant if Allah has directly guided them, can be the “ulul-amar” of verse 4:59! For if these people are not inerrant, then it creates a double jeopardy: Allah is asking Muslims to follow them but since they can make mistakes, foolish people without knowledge will also follow them, and as per 16:25, these people whom Allah is commanding to be followed will be damned! Since that is an absurdity, ergo, Allah can only command inerrant people to be followed! This first subversive hijacking of the religion of Islam, to deny this inerrancy requirement so that anyone could acquire power to caliphate and demand obedience from the Muslim public in the name of verse 4:59, was not orchestrated by the “vulgar propagandist” Bernard Lewis; it was fabricated by the first Muslims themselves, aided and abetted by the Muslim pulpit, and quietly accepted by the public. This first subversion continues to this very day – and it quite pales everything else in comparison that the hectoring hegemons and vulgar propagandists have been able to wreck upon the Muslims!

Qualitatively, observes Mr. Spock, the concept of inerrancy is
most clearly, most emphatically, and most unambiguously, asserted in Surah An-Najm verses 53:1-5, and Surah At-Takwir verses 81:19-29 (both quoted above). These are clearly **Determinate** verses, notes Mr. Spock, self-sufficient, clear, and without any indirections, allegories, and metaphors. To Mr. Spock's mind, it is the most obvious and applicable meaning behind “purification”, “Mutaharoon”, وَنِعْطُهْزُونَ، of verse 56:79, and is the underpinning of the blanket command obedience to the Prophet of Islam on par with the Author of the Holy Qur'an in Surah an-Nisaa' 4:59.

Surah An-Najm 53:1-5 further preempts the questions: How is the Messenger communicating the Author's Word unerringly to the people; How is the Messenger being an unerring Exemplar of the Holy Qur'an; How can the Messenger's companions know when to believe and obey the Messenger and when to follow their own opinion on any matter?

Firstly, verse 33:36 has already made it clear that the Messenger's decisions have to be abided by at all times: **“It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.”**

Secondly, verses 53:1-5 categorically put to bed the capricious speculation that the Messenger is only inerrant in some speech and not in others and therefore people can follow their own opinions in the latter: **“Your companion does not err, nor does he go astray; Nor does he speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed,”.**

If that absurd proposition were true, perceptively observed Mr. Spock, it would create a logical conundrum: How could the Messenger's companions ever know when is the Messenger errant and when is he inerrant? They'd obviously have to rely on the Messenger's own word to even know that in the first place. But if the Messenger is ca-
pable of making an error, he is also capable of making an error in that
determination as well.

If the Messenger is not inerrant in every single matter, every sin-
gle act, every single speech, every single thought, then even one er-
rance is sufficient to put his entire Messengership in doubt – due to
transmission error for instance. If not infallible, the Messenger could
have made an error in a hundred thousand different ways that would
remain undetectable by the people and they would be misled by the
Messenger masquerading his own fallible opinion for the Author's in-
fallible Word. The Messenger's own word for instance, differentiating
what is the Author's Words vs. his own word, could itself be in error if
the Messenger is ever capable of even a single error – and that opens
the Pandora's box: Is the Holy Qur'an error-free from transmission er-
rors of the Author's Message?

One must not forget that it is the Messenger who is ab initio intro-
ducing the Holy Qur'an, and not vice versa. It is the belief of the peo-
oples in the Messenger's truthfulness upon which the Holy Qur'an itself
is predicated. Unless the Messenger of the Holy Qur'an is infallible, it
puts the words uttered by the Prophet, who alone designated that the
specified words belonged to the Author of the Holy Qur'an and not to
himself, into jeopardy.

The logic implicit in the Verse of Obedience, verse 4:59, is ele-
gantly simple. Its “AND” conjunction, ﷲ, to join the three entities to
whom obedience is demanded, is at best a sixth grade grammar com-
position question. The verse is that straightforward in its syntactical
parsing. Let's observe the elegance of immutable logic implicitly em-
bedded in its pithy construction.

All three entities in that Verse of Obedience must always agree in
order for the verse to not be falsified! The logic itself is straightforward.
If the Prophet can make an error, then his will can differ from the
Will of the Author of the Holy Qur'an. The Verse of Obedience as-
serts that that outcome is impossible, by making obedience to the
Prophet of Islam akin, at the same precedence level, to obedience to the Author of the Holy Qur'an. The two cannot disagree or there will be a conflict as both must be obeyed; and if they ever disagree then there is no divine religion as God and His Messenger can't even agree on the Message! The same logical reasoning extends to the third entity in verse 4:59, the “ulul-amar”, who derive its authority from the authority of the Messenger due to the way the verse is grammatically structured. The command “obey” is not repeated again for the “ulul-amar”, but the clause is concatenated with the previous “obey” of the Messenger with the “AND” conjunction. If the will of “ulul-amar” ever differs from that of the Messenger, there is again a conflict as both are commanded to be obeyed. As per the semantics of the verse 4:59 implied from its straightforward syntax, the latter two cannot disagree with the Will of the Author of the Holy Qur'an and therefore the Messenger and the “ulul-amar” must also always agree.

Thus it follows that if the Author of the Holy Qur'an is Error-Free, there is no “Oops!” for Him, then so must His Messenger and “ulul-amar” be just as free from their own “oops”; they must not be touched by any “rijis” and always reflect the Will of the Author of the Holy Qur'an in both letter and spirit throughout their respective mission!

That semantic property of the Messenger having his own will exactly reflect the Will of the Author of the Holy Qur'an implicit in the syntactical composition of verse 4:59, is explicitly confirmed in Surah An-Najm verses 53:1-5, and Surah At-Takwir verses 81:19-29, by the Author of the Holy Qur'an! This is complete closure. If the reader is still unable to grammatically parse an “AND” conjunctive clause in a sentence in any language correctly, he or she better return to sixth grade – for that is the level of reading skills necessary to parse the syntax of the Verse of Obedience.

It is only after the trust in the Messenger's veracity and truthfulness is established among his contemporaries, that the people are invited to come to the Holy Qur'an. It is only at that point, after the Messenger has already established his veracity among the peoples,
that the Holy Qur'an subsequently confirms, through the speech of the Messenger itself and not via some other independent source, that the Messenger does not even err, always exactly reflecting the Will of the Author of the Holy Qur'an. To not err in his role as the Messenger to mankind means that the Messenger is infallible! The Author of the Holy Qur'an, speaking through the mouth of the Messenger, explicitly confirms and extends the people's earlier adjudication of Muhammad's integrity, by first swearing some unexplainable oath: “I swear by the star when it goes down.” (وَأَلْتَجِمْ إِذَا هَوَى ), and then categorically confirming to the Messenger's contemporaries: “Your companion does not err, nor does he go astray; Nor does he speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed”!

“Fascinating”, murmurs Mr. Spock to himself at the finesse of this bootstrapping process for launching the Divine Guidance System to mankind with an infallible human Messenger. Once the delivery of the Guidance System is completed to perfection, the Messenger is simply recalled! And man is left to his own devices whether or not he is thankful (Surah Al-insaan 76:3, quoted above) for all that is left behind for him (Surah Hud, 11:86, quoted below).

Mr. Spock ponders on the obvious genius of this bootstrap process. If there is no belief in the Prophet, there is no belief in the Holy Qur'an! Once that belief is established, only then the Holy Qur'an has any meaning. And only at that point does the Author of the Holy Qur'an avers, putting no caveat to His Declaration of the Prophet's infallibility, making His Proclamation unequivocal, categorical, universal, not subject to any doubt or debate, affirming both the success of Muhammad's Messengership of having accurately delivered the Author's Message (Surah Al-Maeda 5:3, quoted above). And also Muhammad's Exemplarship of having accurately explained the Divine Guidance System to his companions and contemporaries for which complete obedience to him was mandated for the believers so that the Author's Message in its entirety would not get distorted or questioned (verse 33:36, quoted above). The lamentable fact, now preserved for
all times in verse 33:36 in the Holy Qur'an, that not all believers among his companions were happy with some of the decisions the Prophet of Islam made, and for which they are categorically chastised as being “on a clearly wrong Path.”, makes the import of verse 5:3 increase in magnitude even further. That the Messenger completed his mission to perfection despite not just the opposition from the overt and hidden enemies of Islam respectively referred to as disbelievers and hypocrites in the Holy Qur'an, but also the undercurrent of opposition from among the believers themselves!

Therefore, returning back to the Verse of Obedience, by extending that command delegation authority of 4:59 from the Messenger to also obey “those charged with authority among you”, and for the foolish unthinking masses not ever to be misled by obeying them and the “ulul-amar” be held liable for misleading them as per verse 16:25 of Surah An-Nahl (quoted below), the أولئك الأمر منكم and must logically share the same attributes, the same “security clearance” so to speak, as the Messenger! There is simply no escaping that equivalence logic.

Ergo, it follows that the أولئك الأمر منكم of the Verse of Obedience must also be inerrant like the Apostle. The Verse of Purification cleansing the Ahlul Bayt to “perfect purification” now delivers some meaningful context for its full understanding. Only the Ahlul Bayt are explicitly being favored with this most potent Divine Favor, of some blanket “perfect purification” no less، and طهيرًا，from all “rijis” as their spiritual conditioning for being obeyed without equivocation!

According to the Qur'anic criterion, only such specially favored “purified” persons, who also are the offspring of Ibrahim or Muhammad, can even be eligible to be the subsequent Exemplars, Imams, of the people، after the Prophet of Islam. Only these favored persons can guide the Muslims immediately after the death of their Prophet on the Straight path of Surah Al-Fatiha. The logical analysis from the criterion established by the Holy Qur'an now confirms that the أولئك الأمر are indeed from the Messenger's own Ahlul Bayt! For how long should they continue guiding the people in the way of the
Messenger? The Holy Qur'an is silent on that question, making it an **Indeterminate**!

The successive application of Qur'anic eligibility criterions had narrowed down the search considerably for Mr. Spock to get him closer to identifying **“those charged with authority among you”** solely from their Divine characteristics deduced from the Holy Qur'an.

Remarkable what could be learnt from even a convoluted law book when one begins to decipher it accurately rather than rehearse it like a parrot or as the unwitting victim of socialization and perception management! All it had taken was a bit of reflection to tease it all out.

In equivalent terms, Mr. Spock now had the legal definitions, and the beginning of the understanding of what the letter and spirit of the Qur'anic law actually is. That law now needed to be applied to the empirical historical evidence in order to adjudicate, to separate the chaff from the wheat, the usurpers from the legitimate owners – which is the purpose of all law, both divine and man-made.

As Mr. Spock knew, meeting a criterion only determines eligibility. It does not necessarily indicate specific appointment – the specific “choosing”, or “charged”, or “entrusting”, as expressed in verses like: “We have already entrusted with it a people who are not disbelievers in it. These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance. Say: I do not ask you for any reward for it; it is nothing but a reminder to the nations.” (6:89-90 quoted above). The specific “entrusting” requires explicit evidence of appointment – some empirical evidence – not merely the general statements of law unless it specifically names the entrusted. Even the most logical deductions from law is merely theory in the absence of empiricism. Albeit, such reasoning of law and logic is surely necessary as a qualitative criterion; it helps one legally, i.e., objectively, without equivocation, exclude usurpers presumptuous enough to claim false entitlements.

While it may be argued by the learned doctrinaire that after everyone else is excluded by the accurate application of *the criterion*, those
who remain standing are automatically selected as the bearers of that “entrusting”, empirical affirmation as well as commonsense of the laity both demand explicit evidence of specific appointment and clear identification. Especially, when the matter is made contentious and kept locked for centuries within the suffocating ambit of empires which ruled in the name of “God”, and which controlled all the dominant narratives and expositions on Islam. To this very day when Mr. Spock took up the study of the Holy Qur'an millennia later, their legacy evidently endured in the socialization of the Muslim public across cultures and civilizations.

Thus Mr. Spock pondered, if this matter is important to the Author, why aren't the names of “those charged with authority among you” explicitly mentioned in the Holy Qur'an? Why just give the criterion to establish their identity – why not also their names? How are people in subsequent generations to know their identity without relying on the doubtful and partisan pens of the scribes of history? Because, that is the only place to go seeking empirical evidence of such “entrusting” in all subsequent time and space!

Mr. Spock reasoned that unless the Messenger had shirked his duty to the Author of the Holy Qur'an, in which case verse 5:3 would not exist affirming the completion and perfection of the delivery of the message of Islam as a “deen” for mankind, the Messenger must have categorically informed the people of Arabia, the first Muslim generation, of all the unknowns noted above based on the explicit authority delegated to him in 4:59: “Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger.”. Specifically, the Messenger would have informed the people who had the entitlement to be included in that characterization of Ahlul Bayt, for whom “Allah only wishes to remove all abomination”, and the exact identity of “those charged with authority among you” whom the Muslims had to obey on par with himself.

The people of the time would have also naturally known who the Messenger's near of kin were whom they were asked to love as a mark
of gratitude to the Prophet by divine commandment, by the simple virtue of the fact that the Prophet of Islam and his family lived among them his entire life. It is logical to presume, reasoned Mr. Spock, that the Messenger would have been asked by new Muslims coming from elsewhere, on hearing this verse, about the identity of who his near of kin were, and who “those charged with authority among you” were, and the Messenger of course would have hastened to inform them personally in order to discharge his duty faithfully as the Messenger.

How are we to know all that today when new Muslims, un-socialized into their new religion as an inheritance, similarly wish to inquire?

By leaving all this knowledge out of the pristine un-tampered pages of the Holy Qur'an, reflected Mr. Spock, why deny to subsequent generations of Muslims that certainty of knowing about this possibly momentous matter? What was the Author's wisdom in leaving them pitifully at the mercy of the doubtful scribes of history, their partisan pens, and cultural inheritance?

If in fact this was not important for subsequent generations to know, then why not just state so directly in the Holy Qur'an that this matter was only of temporal significance during that early epoch and not worth bickering about in subsequent times? And if it was important, why not just give the names of “those charged with authority among you” directly in the Holy Qur'an and be done with it?

These glaring omissions of the Author in the Holy Qur'an were evidently responsible for the flourishing sectarianism millennia later. And all indications still continued to lead to the same inescapable conclusion already noted earlier, that these ambiguities were deliberate and evidently well thought out by the Author as a system design of Islam for divine guidance to all mankind.

Mr. Spock muses how he could learn the precise identity of “those charged with authority among you” without the ease of reli-
ance on the partisan narratives of history to which Muslims had fallen victim. Having browsed sufficient sociological context, Mr. Spock wanted to focus solely on what, and how much, did the Holy Qur'an itself communicate on the question which appeared to be an Indeterminate from the outset.

Were there other straightforward verses in the Holy Qur'an which enabled and assisted in their further identification? Without the correct context for the verses which spoke in indirections and in unknowns, as verse 4:59 did, how was one to even identify such verses that spoke to their identity? Perhaps there were some other incontrovertible facts in recorded history, despite the partisanship of scribes and imperial craftsmanship – like the incontrovertible fact of the slaughter of the Prophet's progeny by the Ummayad army already cited above to which there can be no doubt that it transpired in history – which assisted in unequivocally affirming their identity? It persistently begged the question that why had the Author of the Holy Qur'an relied on the doubtful scribes of history to complete their identification – if that identification was of any significance to subsequent generations after the first crop of Muslim?

Mr. Spock began to realize that this puzzle was almost akin to solving a system of linear equations with several unknown variables, but which could only be solved if the number of equations were at least equal to the number of unknown variables. However, as already explored in depth in Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization, and alluded above by verses like:

- “One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams”, (17:71) ;
- “If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” (5:48) ;
“And for every nation there is a messenger. And when their messenger cometh (on the Day of Judgment) it will be judged between them fairly, and they will not be wronged.” (10:47);

the operative principle “so strive as in a race in all virtues” arguably indicated many solutions, not just one, which could satisfy these equations!

It appeared to Mr. Spock that the Author had very astutely, and quite sensibly, accounted for socialization biases by offering mankind the core guidance: “so strive as in a race in all virtues”, and the conflict resolution principle when they differed: “The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.”

Mr. Spock realized that he had made substantial progress already, and thus makes the assumption that it must be true that this puzzle of pertinent guidance is completely soluble by man in its cipher form, taking the Holy Qur'an at its word. Otherwise, he reasoned, the entire edifice of the guidance system to mankind proclaimed by the Holy Qur'an falls flat on its face. It becomes relegated to mean whatever anyone in power wants it to mean, or can write the dominant narrative for it which survives through history.

As per the first classification of the Holy Qur'an by Mr. Spock, as a cipher message of the Author to mankind that had to be decoded correctly, and therefore, was not open to individual interpretation or the recovery of the singular plaintext could be in error, Mr. Spock saw it being self-evident, that the correct meaning, interpretation, and understanding of the verses of the Holy Qur'an, in addition from the Prophet of Islam, and from the Holy Qur'an itself, could only be taken from these designated but unnamed persons as per the Author's declaration of obedience to them in 4:59. And not from just any pretentious scholar gurgling Arabic, or legitimately or illegitimately occupying the throne or pulpit of Islam.
This logical conclusion, argued Mr. Spock, is most significant and the key to the entire matter.

However, if, "those charged with authority among you" had been thrust aside or ignored after the death of the Messenger, their guidance not sought, not recorded, and not followed, then all the evil which followed from that first transgression of the first few generation of Muslims fourteen centuries ago accumulated into the greater whole of sectarianism and dynastic empires that have existed ever since. In other words, their crime was not mere disobedience, but a supreme crime as it contained within it the seeds of all the evil that followed, leaving Muslims today, as yesterday, a pathetic people mired in rituals, schisms, sectarian blood-shed, kingdoms, and servility to empire.

The fact that hardly anyone among the Muslim public outside of their myopic socialization biases is even aware of there being some specially designated (but unnamed) persons in the Holy Qur'an in addition to the Messenger who are meant to be its Exemplars after the Prophet of Islam, and obedience to them is made as obligatory as to the Prophet of Islam, lends credence to the logical surmising that "those charged with authority among you" must have been shunted aside by those coveting the highest pulpit of Islam.

It explains the empirical observation that today each Muslim understands the same verses slightly differently. There are, and were, too many "imams" interpreting and explaining the Holy Qur'an by their own fancy and judgment, even vested interest, having lost or ignored the explanation and interpretation by its authentic stewards! Despite the plaintext warning to the people to be wary of such "imams": "One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams" (see verse 17:71 quoted above). Mr. Spock recalled with marvel the foresight of the Author of the Holy Qur'an: "Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or unthankful." (see verse 76:3 quoted above)

Given the documented reality of the ensuing power-struggle im-
mediately after the death of the Prophet of Islam which pitted the family of the Prophet of Islam against the first Muslim caliphs, and the sociological context surrounding the events of power and its vile inflection in the name of God which culminated in the slaughter of the progeny of the Prophet of Islam and the emergence of the most abhorrent dynastic empires that led the Muslim world to its seven hundred years of unsurpassed global ascendency among much internecine state violence, Mr. Spock realizes that objectively extracting incontrovertible evidence of the appointment of “those charged with authority among you” in order to establish their clear identity from the historical records of imperial craftsmanship and outright suppression for two hundred years, would be akin to extracting a weak signal from a vast sea of background noise in communication theory in electrical engineering!

Mr. Spock recognizes that he would have to be a forensic detective in order to recreate the fuller contexts for the understanding of the largely contextless verses of the Holy Qur'an. He also recognizes however that such a detective work would surely identify the principal first cause of dissension among the Muslims which had led to all the subsequent multiplication into sectarianism. Identification and extraction of that principal first cause could be key to uniting the Muslims once again as they once were during the lifetime of the Prophet of Islam. Mr. Spock quickly pushes this overarching puzzle on his evaluation stack.

Mr. Spock's puzzle evaluation stack is growing rapidly with his increasing understanding of the complexity of the issues... For, indeed, the narratives which survived past those early period are clearly partisan, with scribes and rulers taking sides as already noted. Thus the richer context for the verses of the Holy Qur'an is now deeply mired in this blood-drenched early history of the Muslims and cannot be straightforwardly extracted merely by perusing the early literature.

As is the case for all such histories, even including the contemporary history examined in this volume under the orchestration of the
Mighty Wurlitzer, myths get naturally amplified by successive generation of scribes, and facts and factors inconvenient to their narratives, or to their rulers, are naturally attenuated as already explained above leading to a crippled epistemology for those who study things on faith or without any forensic talent.

Impact Analysis

In summation of the aforementioned discussion before embarking on its impact analysis, so far, Mr. Spock, well-read in both the sociological histories of empires and their social engineering of the public, has recognized that all works outside of the Holy Qur'an (including the Holy Qur'an itself) have been composed in sociological contexts and not in an abstract or sterile vacuum free from the influence of the ruling paradigms. And that these sociological contexts are most essential to fully identify and perceptively comprehend, especially when the early history of the advent of religion of Islam after its Messenger's demise is soaked in so much internecine state violence and obfuscation. To understand those outside written works therefore, Mr. Spock ascertains that the full sociological context under which all these books on Islam were originally compiled, must first be understood – as facts in a void can convey any meaning its compiler wants.

Therefore, Mr. Spock decides that facts alone without the context that created them will not be sufficient to establish clues to resolving
the **Indeterminates** of the Holy Qur'an. That it would also be necessary to cradle facts in the rich sociological context and the narratives of history which caused the strange paradoxical artifact: that the Author of the Holy Qur'an chose not to protect its Exemplar's *Sunnah* within the Holy Qur'an itself but to which it issued command obedience as per 4:59.

Furthermore, that such historical facts would have to be not just cradled, but forensically cradled in the sociological realities of realpolitik forces and often unrecorded motivations which gave birth to those facts, and to their narratives, in order to fully comprehend them.

And Mr. Spock immediately surmises that as the evidence of history in every civilization indicates, these narratives too are invariably the sectarian narratives of partisans taking sides. Historians, compilers, exegeses writers, essayists and poets, all taking sides, omitting and attenuating facts and contexts inconvenient either to their narrative, or to their socialization bias, or to the sanction of the rulers under whom they scribed, while amplifying myths and opinions conducive to their narrative and socialization outlook whereby the victors ruled creating the facts on the ground, and the victims mourned exaggerating and perhaps mythologizing the victimizing circumstances in cultural memory for centuries that might pale the Homer's Iliad by comparison. This natural cause and effect relationship of history, narrated by those most affected by it, on either side of it, becoming the de facto source of exposition and explanation of the **Indeterminates** of the Holy Qur'an as soon as one stepped out of its boundaries to figure out the unknowns.

The divine irony (or perhaps the divine comedy) poignantly strikes Mr. Spock's analytical mind: Mortal fallible pens seemingly completing a Book whose Author claims it is “**Perfection**” (5:3) and “**A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds.**” (56:80).

To Mr. Spock's mind, prima facie logic alone would dictate not to use the fallible pens to parse the Infallible pen of the Author Who
claims Itself to be Perfection Incarnate and the “Lord of the Worlds”. The Author of the Holy Qur'an is so assertive of the perfection of His Word that He asserts repeatedly, as in verse 2:2, that it is a Book in which there is no doubt, and a guidance to only those pious of heart who earnestly seek it. So why then use the fallible pen of scribes which is always full of doubt, to gain comprehension of the Infallible Words of the Author for which the Author asserts there is no doubt?

But the same Author has also, evidently by design, practically necessitated the very use of fallible pens by virtue of verses like 4:59 which create importance for the Sunnah of the Prophet of Islam on par with the Qur'an and to the obedience to it, but not recording those Sunnah within the pages of the Holy Qur'an and leaving the verses of the Qur'an as Indeterminates. This is a paradox in the Holy Qur'an.

This is why, Mr. Spock logically concludes, the Muslims from the very beginning had become preoccupied with the temporal, and often reactionary sociological contexts, deliberately drowning the holistic and timeless text of the Holy Qur'an by insisting on partisan hadiths, tafseers, and narratives of history penned in the fallible ink and cultural memories largely due to commandments like 4:59 which made the Holy Qur'an subject to easy abuse.

The Muslims, it became evident to Mr. Spock, through the subsequent generations after the first, had paradoxically become its unwitting victims because they had insisted on following the commandment 4:59 of the Holy Qur'an to the letter, without understanding its accurate import in the larger context of the entire message of the Holy Qur'an. And they used the scribes of history literally, along their own socialization axis, becoming putty in the hands of rulers who could trivially inflict internecine violence for political expediency upon those who fell out of favor.

The Muslims had not bothered to elevate themselves beyond the baggage of their respective narrow socialization which often leads to close-mindedness, and partisanship.
Their collective understanding of Islam in the successive Muslim empires and subsequent servile civilizations had therefore become ossified in the imperial narratives of history expounded from the “Roman pulpit”, and in reaction to it in its many “Protestant movements”, rather than become progressive and egalitarian based on the sublimity of its timeless doctrines principled in the Holy Qur'an. What had been intended as a sublime force of transformation for the evolution of societies from its barbarisms and exploitations to an enlightened state of mankind's existence over time, had become the force majeure for building absolutist enduring empires instead.

The Muslims had inexorably fallen victim to the same sort of corruption which was emphatically admonished by the Holy Qur'an about their cousins, the Jews and the Christians – the persistent distortion of the Author's message delivered to the Abrahamic seed!

Except, in the case of the Muslims, they continued to claim, in every epoch, to possess the Author's Message in its unadulterated most pristine cipher form. And demonstrably so. But Muslims could neither decipher nor implement it effectively because of the hijacking that the Holy Qur'an itself permitted by virtue of it being a cipher-text rather than a straightforward plaintext!

Of course, the aliasing of proper nouns in the Holy Qur'an into common nouns had been, and continues to be, the most common and obvious subversion of the Holy Qur'an by Muslims and Non-Muslims alike. For example, as already discussed in Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization, Muslims using the proper noun “Imam” as a common noun for anointing anyone with it, whereas the Holy Qur'an explicitly used لَتَأَمَّلُ لِلنَّاسِ إِنَّمَا to anoint only the Author's own favored ones with that station of leadership among mankind. Similarly, as also already deconstructed in considerable depth in “Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation”, Western demagogues inimical to Islam, like Bernard Lewis and Samuel Huntington, overloading the proper noun “Islam” to designate a kitchen sink of semantics, whereas the Holy Qur'an used الإسلام دينًا to explicitly designate a “deen” which Allah
“perfected”.

The use of **Indeterminates** in the Holy Qur'an had only facilitated such calculated hijacking, permitting the easy fixing of these values by anyone. The brilliant could subvert it easily for their power-interests to build empires. And the foolish remained socialized in it to find justification for whatever sect they grew up in!

Even its very first chapter, Surah Al-Fatiha, which Mr. Spock observed was parroted daily by all Muslims who reverently bowed in prayer, was a mini cipher (see its examination in Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization).

The Holy Qur'an was certainly turning out to be nothing like the plaintext Bible, the holy book of Captain Kirk of the Starship Enterprise, lamented Mr. Spock. He recalled the fluency and the ease with which his human captain sometimes quoted from it to teach him interesting lessons in selflessness of the most sublime in human endeavors. Mr. Spock had always found these lessons perplexing due to his logic-only rational mind. It is interesting to footnote in passing however, that in this 1960s' fable that was turned into movies in the 1980s and 1990s, Mr. Spock gave his own life selflessly in one of these episodes to save his spaceship in the **Genesis project**, making the rational irrefutable argument to his captain's chagrin and intense grief that in order for the Starship to continue its endless mission of discovery of the cosmos, **the life of one over the life of many is a purely logical decision**.

In any case, Mr. Spock pondered that how could this blatant self-contradiction, a macro puzzle, a paradox of the Holy Qur'an, of the Holy Qur'an ostensibly facilitating its own subversion, have escaped the acumen of Muslim sages throughout the ages?

More pertinently, why had it not been resolved all this time?
How Religion of Islam was Transformed into Empire

To Mr. Spock's logical mind, if conundrums and paradoxes borne of pure logic of the matter cannot be resolved with logic alone, they remain perpetual conundrums, and therefore, always ripe for subjective interpretation and harvesting for narrow interests. Here was the principal reason, within the text of the Holy Qur'an itself, which continually leads to seeking and following material outside the confines of the Authorship of the Holy Qur'an. And no Muslim sage is inclined to address it!

Perceptive as he is, the motivation to not solve this paradox, especially during the heyday of Muslim civilizations, is now readily apparent to Mr. Spock. This persistent puzzle of the Holy Qur'an to Mr. Spock is indicative of both, the deep sociological contexts which cradled the message of Islam from its earliest inception to the present day, and its pathological transformation into enduring empires. As Mr. Spock dispassionately observed, the religion of Islam had been morphed into an unsurpassed absolutist system for the exercise of imperial power by Muslim rulers. Anyone on the throne and the pulpit could interpret the verses of the Holy Qur'an any which way they liked simply by making recourse to any outside text written by themselves, or by their own favored scribes, or to their own favored narrative of history. By thus fixing values of its Indeterminates to suit their narrow self-interests, it was easy to hijack Islam to one's primacy advantage.

The intoxicating, almost mesmerizing, effect the Holy Qur'an has upon the Muslim masses makes it especially easy to manipulate and
control them by distorting the largely contextless verses of the Holy Qur'an and giving these any meaning that is expedient. Promising the masses Heaven in *After-life* for their sufferance of hell right here in this life. A messiah in the future who would free them of their misery and establish justice and equity if only they were patient in their afflictions and injustices here, and relegated themselves to dutifully mind their religious rituals instead. And, instead of challenging, either participated in, or suffered in silence, the kingly opulence and tyrannical adventures of their rulers as it was indeed God who had appointment them the absolute sovereign of the lands. After all, didn't the Holy Qur'an unequivocally command Muslims to obey: “those charged with authority among you”, and “to be patient” in their suffering!!

While musing this pathocracy of social control, Mr. Spock recalled a global primacy strategist's rational observations of absolutist empires which most aptly captured the global ascendence of these despotic Muslim empires:

“The earlier empires were built by aristocratic political elites and were in most cases ruled by essentially authoritarian or absolutist regimes. The bulk of the populations of the imperial states were either politically indifferent or, in more recent times, infected by imperialist emotions and symbols. The quest for national glory, "the white man's burden," "la mission civilisatrice," not to speak of the opportunities for personal profit—all served to mobilize support for imperial adventures and to sustain essentially hierarchical imperial power pyramids.”[8]

The Muslim empires, with their absolute sovereignty ruthlessly secured in the name of Islam's “God” from all domestic challenge, became great patrons of the arts, the sciences, and the humanities. They become the first to bring the translations of the works of the Classical civilizations into Arabic, from where it reached the Western shores
centuries later. The enterprising and talented ones among the Muslim populations labored under the parallel personal motivations to impel empire forward as already explored in the *Fable of the Bees* for the modern contemporary times under Western empires. The pertinent verses from the Holy Qur'an that encouraged astronomy, the study of the cosmos, in fact the study of all creation (as in verses 67:3-4 of Surah Al-Mulk which were also quoted by Dr. Abdus Salam when receiving his shared 1979 Nobel Prize in Physics and which precisely underscores this very point), and indeed the boundless pursuit of all forms of knowledge ("and say: My Lord! Increase me in knowledge." Surah Ta-Ha, 20:114, Arabic: وَقُلْ رَبِّ زِدْنِي عُلْماً), helped propel Muslim civilizations to the forefront of global supremacy on all fronts in their heyday just as it has done for American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives in this day and age. Except, in the development of political thought.

That necessary re-discovery had to await the *Renaissance* during the Middle Ages in the West, to finally end the reign of their own pulpit-led supreme Dark Ages that had principally been seeded in the hijacking of Christianity as the official state religion of the Roman Empire centuries earlier (in approx. 300 AD under Emperor Constantine).

Why had such *Renaissance* against the Muslim pulpit's hijacking of Islam likewise centuries earlier, right after the death of its Prophet, similarly not transpired in the Muslim civilizations despite their own un-challenged global supremacy of vast territories on Earth for a period far exceeding the Roman Empire? Considering that the Muslims were the first to be exposed to Greek classics and to their Classical Hellenic culture of political self-empowerment (such as republic, democracy), egalitarian ideas of social justice (such as Solon's, considered among the ten greatest law givers of Athenian antiquity according to Plutarch's Lives), etc., for these socio-political ideas to have never taken root in absolutist Muslim civilizations which likewise ruled dynastically with an iron-fist in the name of Islam's “God”, while they borrowed liberally from Hellenic math, sciences, and mili-
tary warfare methods to become the supreme empires of their time, is revealing in and of itself. If one simply compares that state of affairs to the political indifference of the learned in society today, all matters become patently obvious.

Of the hundreds of living Nobel laureates in the sciences and humanities in America and the Western world, how many learned minds rose to challenge the empire's narratives of 9/11, or called it for its prima facie enactment, an inside job, or showed any skepticism when BBC reported the destruction of WTC-7 the very same evening a full twenty-five minutes before it nearly free-fall collapsed into its own footprints with no airliner ever hitting it, or forensically deconstructed the so called Catastrophic Terrorism of 9/11 to uncover and publicly protest that it was to launch imperial mobilization for one-world government?

These most brilliant high achieving minds of America, like the rest of the American masses caught between their daily bread and circuses, watched their beloved Western world descend into police-states, lose their vaunted civil liberties, stood meekly at airports first with their own shoes in hands, and subsequently with their private parts in TSA's hands, all in the name of outright idiotic and villainous absurdities. To this scribe's last count as of the year 2012 AD, exactly zero have arisen to call America's War on Terror for what it is, or handed in their vaunted Nobel prize in protest to its open barbarianism upon the 'lesser peoples'. This silence and show of political indifference of the supposed “learned” of Western society during the exercise and expansion of Western hegemony is not a singularity. It is the norm under every empire from time immemorial. One cannot stand tall against the tyranny of ruling interests and thrive at the same time.

Mr. Spock perceptively observed with the precision of a sociologist and science officer, that a revolutionary religion, intended primarily for the transformation of man – both men and women – into the perfectman submitting wholly to its Creator “bowing to Thy (Will)”, and society into the perfect egalitarian system of social justice and
sublime morality (as for instance had been noted by Solon in Athens a thousand years before Islam (Ibid.), and most succinctly outlined in Surah al-Asr, chapter 103 of the Holy Qur'an), had been trivially transformed on the one hand into the opiate of the people waiting for Allah, and on the other into a natural force for *imperial mobilization* throughout the ages!

No system of absolute rule, marveled Mr. Spock, has been able to surpass this tortuous mass control of the public mind that could so trivially persuade people to accept and enjoy their own servitude with just the mere promise of the *Hereafter* which not even the rulers, but their almighty God had undertaken to fulfill. The rulers got a free ride with no promises of their own to keep! Whereas today, a lot more sophistication and technical expertise, not to mention considerable expense and talent, is brought to bear to achieve the same effect under “democracy” (see *The Mighty Wurlitzer*), and a hell of a lot of bayonets under Stalinist like dictatorship.

This has been the real prime-mover behind the villainous history of the oft glorified Muslim empires of the past, where the first caliphate came into existence after the death of the Prophet of Islam under a cloud of dissent from the progeny of the Prophet of Islam, where the first Ummayad Empire came into existence by killing the progeny of the Prophet of Islam, where the follow-on Abbasside empire came into existence on the pretext of rectifying the wrong done by the Ummayads but then took over the *imperial mobilization* from where the previous tyrannical empire had left off. The Mongols conquered Eurasia, assimilated with the local population, and spawned the two new Muslim Empires of the Ottomans in Central Asia, and the Mughals in Persia and India. This is what Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote in *The Grand Chessboard* of their precursors, the Mongols' phenomenal conquest of Eurasia which gave birth to these Muslim empires:

“To find a somewhat closer analogy to today's definition of a global power, we must turn to the remarkable phenomenon of the Mongol Empire. Its emergence
was achieved through an intense struggle with major and well-organized opponents. Among those defeated were the kingdoms of Poland and Hungary, the forces of the Holy Roman Empire, several Russian and Rus' principalities, the Caliphate of Baghdad, and later, even the Sung dynasty of China.

Genghis Khan and his successors, by defeating their regional rivals, established centralized control over the territory that latterday scholars of geopolitics have identified as the global heartland, or the pivot for world power. Their Eurasian continental empire ranged from the shores of the China Sea to Anatolia in Asia Minor and to Central Europe (see map). It was not until the heyday of the Stalinist Sino-Soviet bloc that the Mongol Empire on the Eurasian continent was finally matched, insofar as the scope of centralized control over contiguous territory is concerned.

The Roman, Chinese, and Mongol empires were regional precursors of subsequent aspirants to global power. In the case of Rome and China, as already noted, their imperial structures were highly developed, both politically and economically, while the widespread acceptance of the cultural superiority of the center exercised an important cementing role. In contrast, the Mongol Empire sustained political control by relying more directly on military conquest followed by adaptation (and even assimilation) to local conditions.

Mongol imperial power was largely based on military domination. Achieved through the brilliant and ruthless application of superior military tactics that combined a remarkable capacity for rapid movement of forces with their timely concentration, Mongol rule
entailed no organized economic or financial system, nor was Mongol authority derived from any assertive sense of cultural superiority. The Mongol rulers were too thin numerically to represent a self-regenerating ruling class, and in any case, the absence of a defined and self-conscious sense of cultural or even ethnic superiority deprived the imperial elite of the needed subjective confidence.

In fact, the Mongol rulers proved quite susceptible to gradual assimilation by the often culturally more advanced peoples they had conquered. Thus, one of the grandsons of Genghis Khan, who had become the emperor of the Chinese part of the great Khan's realm, became a fervent propagator of Confucianism; another became a devout Muslim in his capacity as the sultan of Persia; and a third became the culturally Persian ruler of Central Asia.

It was that factor—assimilation of the rulers by the ruled because of the absence of a dominant political culture—as well as unresolved problems of succession to the great Khan who had founded the empire, that caused the empire's eventual demise. The Mongol realm had become too big to be governed from a single center, but the solution attempted—dividing the empire into several self-contained parts—prompted still more rapid local assimilation and accelerated the imperial disintegration. After lasting two centuries, from 1206 to 1405, the world's largest land-based empire disappeared without a trace.” --- Zbigniew Brzezinski, The Grand Chessboard, pgs. 15-17

Leaving behind their Muslim legatees, the Ottoman and the Mughal Empires. Little changed with their assimilation by the conquered peoples, as now these new absolutist regimes of the assimi-
lated ruling class exercised ruthless power in the name of the same “God” of Islam, rather than formerly as the Central Asian Mongol barbarians.

The Ottomans and the Mughals took imperial suzerainty from where the Ummayads, the Abbassides, and the Fatimides had left off, abusing Islam exactly as their predecessors, to inflict social control upon the masses in the name of “God”, and to infect the public with their own 'la mission civilisatrice' which supported imperial objectives, now largely held in check by the burgeoning European empire. And it is now, the contemporary history in the making of the Anglo Saxon's drive for a world government empire.

All principally enabled by the fracture lines among the Muslims themselves because of their slightly different theological understanding of the Holy Qur'an due to the open-ended interpretation of the verses of the Holy Qur'an that is possible, leading to losing the original message intended by the Author for the guidance to man. Once the Author's message is lost to individual interpretation, all the evil follows when the fault lines thus created fall into the grubby hands of *Supermen* and *Machiavelli* who know how to diabolically harness them in the name of “God” and “imperial mobilization”.

One can see perfect contemporary examples of the West's harvesting of Islam in Zbigniew Brzezinski crafting the Afghan Mujahideens in yesteryear as already examined in Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization. And today, in the crafting of 'militant Islam' vs. 'moderate Islam' Hegelian Dialectic, to create the “revolutionary times” necessary to seed the transformation into one-world government empire as already examined in The Mighty Wurlitzer.

It is only that, the abuse of the religion of Islam as an unmatched force for absolute social control in the name of “God”, and not its lofty purpose, concluded Mr. Spock, which led the Muslims to dizzying heights of unsurpassed empires for over seven hundred years, from 700 AD to 1400 AD. Muslim empires limped along, often in the
throes of mediocrity, in competition with the rapidly burgeoning Western hegemony in Europe for another five hundred years, until they were finally put out of their misery by an even more diabolical foe that had now surpassed the dynastic Muslim rulers in the arts and sciences of societal control and behavior manipulation.

The authority of “God” was replaced with that of “Democracy” (“We, the People”), and the pulpit by the Mighty Wurlitzer (wily mechanisms for the perception-management of “We, the People”).
Failure to Transform Society Towards Islam's Highest Ideals

Like spiritual Christianity, spiritual Islam has indubitably played a transformative role in the life of countless individuals. As captured most ably by the nineteenth century French novelist, Victor Hugo, for the metanoia inducing power of the Christian faith in his novel Les Miserable, the same narrative qualitatively captures the impact of Islam on the spirituality of Muslim individuals as well. Overcoming one's own inner demons, base desires, external tragedies and horrors that can easily transform man into a remorseless soul, “zulamat” in the Qur'anic language, is not only the purposeful guidance of the religion of Islam, but also its lofty attainment in every epoch Muslims have lived on earth. Despite living in the most enslaving societies under the most tyrannical governments made of despotic rulers and absolutist kings in the short fourteen and half century history of Islam, the faith undeniably created the bond of religious fraternity and socialization wherever it spread, fostering a common ethos borne of common religious rituals, giving different Muslim societies their distinctive common tenor often called “Islamic” civilization.

But that's not all there is to the religion of Islam. Why has the “deen” as “perfected” and “completed” in verse 5:3 of the Holy Qur'an, pondered Mr. Spock, failed to transform any Muslim society, without exception, into a just and egalitarian society as is advocated in the Scripture, rather than be continually hijacked by pious sounding despots for empire building and “imperial mobilization”? Ad hoc caliphaties to dynastic kingdoms lasting centuries is also the undeniable official record of Muslim history. An absolute ruler always ruled the dominions where Islam was preached, with an iron-fist no less, and so long as his rule was not interfered with, and people paid their taxes and obeyed the throne in everything and anything it wanted, including making wars and peace, it was fine to pursue social, cultural, technical and scientific attainments by individuals. The throne even patronized
such activities. And Muslims excelled in these in their seven hundred year dominance of earth, under full servitude to the ruling “gods” in power!

Mr. Spock recalled the statement of yet another twentieth century sociologist and political scientist, a “leading Western scholar of Islam”, professor Bernard Lewis of Princeton University, capturing the meteoric rise and dominance of “Islam” (see Hijacking the word “Islam” for Mantra Creation) in the following words, and it puzzled Mr. Spock why all that was even true despite there being no “empire” and no servitude to “gods” in the Religion of Islam:

“It is difficult to generalize about Islam. To begin with, the word itself is commonly used with two related but distinct meanings, as the equivalents both of Christianity, and Christendom. In the one sense, it denotes a religion, as system of beliefs and worship; in the other, the civilization that grew up and flourished under the aegis of that religion. The word Islam thus denotes more than fourteen centuries of history, a billion and a third people, and a religious and cultural tradition of enormous diversity. ... For more than a thousand years, Islam provided the only universally acceptable set of rules and principles for the regulation of public and social life. Even during the period of maximum European influence, in the countries ruled or dominated by European imperial powers as well as in those that remained independent, Islamic political notions and attitudes remained a profound and pervasive influence.” --- Bernard Lewis, Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror, pgs. 1 and 13

The key to that puzzle is in the text of the Holy Qur'an itself.

The very concept of spiritual guidance in the Holy Qur'an is addressed to a very narrow audience, those who approach it with a
“cleansed heart” (see detailed exposition in Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization). The rest are destined to be misled, as per the many admonishing proclamations in the Holy Qur'an.

But, as Mr. Spock already understood by way of considerable empiricism, no society, from time immemorial, possesses such wonderfully pious public with a “cleansed heart” in the majority! “Hegemony is as old as mankind”[9]; and so is its power to corrupt and to co-opt: “Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men.”[10] And their core instrument of extracting obedience from the public mind is Machiavellian political science. That succeeds primarily because, as is also an observed empirical fact, the general mass intelligence among human beings is rather low, irrespective of the civilization and epoch they belong to. A human philosopher had once captured this empiricism with wit: “Most people would rather die than think; in fact, they do so”.[11]

Therefore, questioned Mr. Spock, how is this guidance of the Holy Qur'an which is initially meant for only a small minority among the public who are required to both reason and think, and also bring a “cleansed heart” to bear upon the divine message, supposed to transform the majority of the people in any society?

One brimming with unbridled optimism may perhaps blindly speculate that the first seeds of moral enlightenment among the minority will eventually germinate and percolate to the rest of society – the evolution of societies under Islam to their more egalitarian and sublime state of equity, social justice, and spiritual ascendency – just like it arguably was on such a transforming path in the most backward piece of geography on earth at the time. In the desert of Arabia, when the Prophet of Islam established his ruling state in the small oasis called Medina during his own lifetime.

But not Mr. Spock, who had in fact been quite bored reading Pollyanna from the ship's library. He could already perceive that these are wonderfully lofty ideals of Islam no doubt, just like its predecessors'
the Ten Commandments brought by Prophet Moses to the 'chosen peoples', and the 'love thy neighbor' Gospel brought by Prophet Jesus to their legatees subsequently known as Christians. None has transpired yet! But all have succeeded in leaving high-minded platitudes on elevated bookshelves of over 5 billion peoples who today claim to follow the Abrahamic creeds!

Practically speaking, reasoned Spock, if the masses are mainly unthinking creatures of habit, socialization, and driven largely by their own narrow self-interests, what does transformation really mean, apart from merely implanting new habits and rituals among the masses by social engineering – no cleansed hearts needed for that. Indeed, Islam had succeeded in mainly accomplishing the transformation of rituals. The fact that dynastic kingdoms had cropped up among Muslims within sixty years of the death of the Messenger of Islam, and the Muslims had become embroiled in internecine warfare within twenty years of his death, and even the immediate aftermath of his death saw ad hoc political successions in the rapidly developing new ruling state with the Muslim public accepting any and all travesty in silence, including the heinous killing of the family of the Prophet of Islam despite explicit commandment in the Holy Qur'an to love them (Say: “No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin.”, Surah Ash-Shura 42:23), speaks of the Herculean task of reform from darkness to light taken up by the Holy Qur'an and its religion Islam. The empirical record thus far appeared rather poor. And fourteen hundred years after the advent of Islam, the Muslims appeared to have become the most backward, the most easily manipulated, and the most easily colonized people. Just the fact that the ubiquitous “war on terror” in the twenty-first century is being waged at the expense of Muslims and Islam to create world police-state with much of the Muslim world bewildered at what's happening to them, brings veracity to these words.

Mr. Spock is well aware that according to sociologists' empirical study of human societies still existing in the twenty-first century, at
best less than 2% of the people think, about 8% think they think, and 90% wouldn't be caught dead thinking! In fact, stupider the masses, more gullibly they are led to any destination by the Machiavelli with social engineering, and easily occupied with bread and circuses – and that has been a fact from time immemorial. Islam failed to alter that reality. That's just a fact, as unpleasant as it may be to swallow for Muslims.

Moreover, how can the Holy Qur'an even begin to counter that empirical reality among the wider populations of human beings with its platitudinous cleansed heart recipe? The way the Holy Qur'an is structured, that recipe principally requires the ability to think and to reason, like Mr. Spock's mind, while overcoming the chains of socialization and indoctrination inflicted upon the public from birth, in order to fully decipher the message of the Holy Qur'an.

But if not more than 2% of any human society realistically has such rational capacity at this stage of their human development on earth, as is empirically visible, genuine heart cleansing can only remain un-implementable. This automatically implies that holding diversity of views and remaining fragmented is the only practical outcome for such primitive societies, leaving the incredible statements of the Holy Qur'an to ultimately prevail to explain that empiricism:

● “If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people,” ;
● “(His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” ;
● “If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger, if ye do believe in Allah and the Last Day: That is best, and most suitable for final determination.” ;
● “Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful
or unthankful.”;

- “One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams”;

- 'Then the Messenger will say: “O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.”' ;

- “This is a people that have passed away; they shall have what they earned and you shall have what you earn, and you shall not be called upon to answer for what they did.” (all cited above)

As evidenced in the verses above, the Author of the Holy Qur'an asserts to have fully empowered individuals, societies, and civilizations from time immemorial with His Divine Guidance System whether they be thankful or unthankful. And will hold all human beings to account for its implementation in their own lives and their own times in the company of their respective Imams. Be that as it may, the implementation of the Author's Divine Guidance System is nevertheless made even more impractical by the meta paradox of the Holy Qur'an, that the hijacking of its understanding has been enabled by the Holy Qur'an itself. Even the smartest minds in sophisticated societies have to deal with the challenge of accurately deciphering the Holy Qur'an due to its Indeterminates!

But the twin of that paradox is still another paradox – that perhaps it was this first paradox which enabled the Holy Qur'an to even survive in its cipher form as a pristine un-tampered text through the vicissitudes of empires built upon the abuse of the religion of Islam as a force for social engineering, in the first place. When Muslim power-mongers at the very inception of Islam's ascendance did not hesitate from slaughtering the progeny of the Prophet of Islam to occupy its highest pulpits despite the clear Qur'anic commandment to Muslims that loving the Messenger's near of kin in gratitude is a moral obligation put upon them, 'Say: “No reward do I ask of you for this except the love of those near of kin.”', the verses of the Holy Qur'an
themselves would surely not have survived un-tampered had they effectively got in the way of imperial mobilization.

By using open-ended statements and indirections in its verses, i.e., by becoming a cipher, and by encouraging its verbatim memorization and recitation on every occasion imaginable primarily as an oral message, the Author has certainly been able to safeguard the text of the Holy Qur'an from the villainy of human scribes and the vicissitudes of time. And here is the twin paradox – but who can decipher that pristine un-tampered cipher message of “no doubt” into its singular plaintext today without any doubt? Albeit, the Holy Qur'an has provided a cipher key for breaking this deadlock condition, to approach its cipher with a “cleansed heart” and all would be revealed: “In a Book well-guarded, Which none shall touch but those who are clean (purified)”, Surah Al-Waqia, 56:78-79, already quoted above.

Many millenniums later, despite the indirections and the unknowns, the pristine text of the Holy Qur'an has still enabled the solely left-brained Mr. Spock to reason through the cipher using only the Holy Qur'an itself as the criterion to adjudicate his reasoning. As should be readily apparent to the reader, validating the broad claims of the Holy Qur'an, Mr. Spock has certainly comprehended quite a bit already.

But the paradox of trying to comprehend in totality, the Infallible Words of the Author from the fallible words of the scribes of history persists. This paradox is deeply inherent in the Holy Qur'an and no amount of rationalization of how pristine and un-tampered the Qur'anic text really is, can wipe it way. While its words and verses may be intact and pristine, the meaning of those words and verses on the precise fault-lines of sectarianism is far from Determinate.

Mr. Spock pushes this macro meta puzzle on the top of his evaluation stack, realizing fully well that albeit a totality of understanding may be difficult to acquire, a reasonable, even if ultimately partial, understanding may still be achieved to finally resolve all paradoxes with
logical self-consistency once he has dug his way to the very bottom of the Pandora's box.

Mr. Spock has also insightfully realized that unlike peoples of other religions, Islam and the Holy Qur'an evidently continue to play a much greater role in the daily lives of Muslim nations on earth in nearly all cultures and civilizations of the East. The West is also not immune to its intoxicating grip upon the Muslim peoples living there. The public's oral recitation of the Holy Qur'an, if not its penetrating study, is ubiquitous among the Muslim masses and comprises their essential Islamic ethos. It is a pathetic shame therefore, muses Mr. Spock, that they each understand the same text of their Good Book differently leading to needless fracture lines among them that are always ripe for harvesting by the vile and the villainous. Something really should be done about this – despite the potential of the Prime Directive adversely interfering with that lofty objective (Prime Directive: a social Darwinian concept to not have the highly evolved Star Trek folks in the fable meddle with primitive war-mongering civilizations in the galaxy, to instead afford them the opportunity to either evolve, or naturally die away and be replaced by a better civilization more eager and able to evolve).

Accurately unraveling the principal first cause of disunity among Muslims from which every schism, every empire, and every evil has followed, logically surmised Mr. Spock, would minimally lead to eliminating all sectarianism from among them; the Muslims already possess the common text of the Holy Qur'an which they are all already united upon, and mainly only differ in what it means. A rational elimination of these now very powerful fracture lines, a happenstance of history, would also eliminate the ease of abuse of Islam by rulers and empires who thrive on historical obfuscation, on aiding and abetting internecine violence, on fanning sectarian divides, pitting one narrative against the other among the ignorant partisans to assert their own primacy and its geostrategic imperatives. Eliminating just that singular source of global threat to other worlds and other civilizations,
would be worth violating the *Prime Directive* for, reasons Mr. Spock.

Because of his long exposure to the exercise of hegemony and evolution of primitive societies, Mr. Spock well understands that a society often only evolves due to being conquered, or sometimes due to resistance to being conquered, and rarely voluntarily without a motivating force. Industrial and technological advancement had been a primal force of social evolution – but rather than evolve the mental styles of man, it had only principally evolved the living styles of mankind.

No spiritual advancement had taken place over at least 5000 years of mankind's existence despite copious visitations by prophets. Therefore, Mr. Spock recognizes that if Muslim societies now under dire existential threat, are permitted or coached into evolving their comprehension of the real meaning of Islam and the sublime guidance to mankind offered in the Holy Qur'an, and if knowledge of this new egalitarian understanding of the religion of Islam is encouraged to percolate downwards to the Muslim masses and upwards to the Muslim pontiffs, that:

- firstly, all such subversions for “*imperial mobilizations*” would automatically be thwarted (See exposition of Surah Al-Asr, Chapter 103 of the Holy Qur'an, to understand how the *banality of evil* is easily overcome once the implementation of *Deen-ul-Haq* is liberated from the clutches of pious rituals and pious mullahs);

- and secondly, the concomitant societal journey towards a progressive more egalitarian state of spiritual as well as equitable material existence would become naturally organic and automatic.

But, Mr. Spock also lamentably ponders, which ruling class and threatened interests among them would ever permit such a positive transformation to occur on its own, without substantial use of a counter force, when it would kill the golden goose which lays the imperial egg? Especially, if such revolutionizing transformation could finally
even unite the Muslims into one enlightened people who would be next to impossible to conquer for inimical interests.

However, a bent tree can hardly ever be straightened without breaking it, as Mr. Spock well knows. And that unfortunate empiricism may necessitate that the religion of Islam, as preserved in its untampered scripture, continually resuscitate itself in new cultures and new civilizations, among new peoples, each time for a better implementation of divine guidance, while leaving the corrupted and hijacked nations to naturally decay away into oblivion. There is no arresting, never mind curing, cancer in an already decaying society.

With that as the overarching backdrop of the import of his study, Mr. Spock decides to dig his electrified mind into a deeper more penetrating examination of the Holy Qur'an. His mathematical genius simply had to solve these puzzles and paradoxes of the enigmatic text which appeared to offer some sensible guidance for mutual co-existence in the stochastic process of mankind's existence – a random process which seeds natural diversity among mankind via socialization bias that only depends upon which side of the railroad tracks people are born, but offering them a breathtaking unity of purpose as expressed in Surah Al-Maeda 5:48.
Path Forward: Impacting Muslim Existence with Qur'anic Political Science

The Question of Rulership in Islam – What does the Holy Qur'an have to say about it?

As far as Mr. Spock has been able to ascertain from his study of the Holy Qur'an, there are no Imams (Guides, Leaders, Rulers to rule over the Muslim nation after the Prophet of Islam) mentioned in the Holy Qur'an by name, nor the fact of their number, as in how many, except for the sole fact of the veritable existence of some unnamed وَأَوَلِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ to whom allegiance, obedience, is made as much compulsory for Muslims as is allegiance and obedience to the Prophet of Islam. That latter fact is categorical. The verse of obedience, 4:59, is categorical, blanket, general, and most clear. It cannot be denied (which is why, instead of denying it, the verse of obedience is resemantified, distorted and misinterpreted by the anointed experts from the clergy class to legitimize just about anyone's rule, including their own). Nor can it be denied that logical deductions from the verses of the Holy Qur'an have led Mr. Spock to the conclusion that these could only be from the Ahlul Bayt because of the requirement for being inerrant, infallible, if such absolute obedience commanded to any mortal man is made equivalent to obedience to God. And such perfect cleansing, from mistakes and errors, has only been afforded to the Ahlul Bayt in the entire Holy Qur'an, in the verse of perfect cleansing, 33:33 – and to no one else! The identity of who exactly comprise the Ahlul Bayt is not specified in the Holy Qur'an. Nor is it specified who these unnamed والأَوَلِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ are. Their precise identity therefore, if pertinence demands knowing who these are in future history, meaning outside of their own respective lifetime, requires adjudi-
cation from empirical data. Meaning, from the recorded pages of history, meaning going to sources outside of the pages of the Holy Qur'an – the first-cause source of pluralistic interpretations of Islam as already discussed in the preceding sections.

Beyond that, everything else on the subject of rulership of Muslims is shrouded in metaphorical verses of the **Indeterminates**. These are open to interpretation and historical fixing, and usually almost entirely by socialization bias. Neither the names of the members of the *Ahlul Bayt*, nor the names of the four Caliphs who took power in temporal succession after the Messenger's demise, nor the names of the Ummayad and Abbaside imperial rulers who came thereafter to create the Muslim dynastic empires, nor the names of the famous *Hadith* compilers and exegesis writers, nor the prominent jurists who formed their schools of jurisprudence by which Muslims identify themselves in sectarian affiliations, nor the names of any of the companions of the Messenger, nor the names of his wives, are mentioned in the Holy Qur'an. This silence is also a fact.

It begs the obvious question: Why is the Holy Qur'an not explicit in its own categorical verses on the question of Rulership of Islam after the Messenger of Islam? **Why is there not a single verse in the Holy Qur'an which unequivocally identifies who precisely is to succeed the Prophet of Islam in the rulership and imamate of the nascent Islamic state after his demise?** There is so much repetition of the mundane matters, including bedroom etiquette, and not one verse on guidance of how the Muslims are to be politically governed after the Prophet, let alone who is to take up his political and spiritual mantle? The Prophet of Islam, after all, had established the first Islamic state. What were the rules of successorship to be after him? And how were these to apply after that epoch, in future times? Instead, there are verses after verses on the concept of Imam, wilayat, valih, wasilah, etc., all forming a multiplicity of riddles couched in indirects and **Indeterminates** which must be solved, objectively and logically to say the least, in order to extract the Message contained in the
Holy Qur'an accurately.

What bothers Mr. Spock is not that silence in preciseness itself, because his logical mind straightforwardly discerns that fact of omission itself to be part of the Message of the Holy Qur'an, and therefore only to be deciphered correctly by its proclaimed adherents, but the more fundamental question: **Why is that question not asked by Muslims themselves?** Mr. Spock is more perturbed by their illogical rush to the scribes and pages of history to assert their own myopic inheritance as the principal message of Islam, often exclusively by socialization bias, and of the sect and home each is born into. Hardly the most sensible way to understand a Book as momentous as the Holy Qur'an!

What the Holy Qur'an has instead specified is exclusively the criterion by which to judge, adjudicate, ascertain and affirm, all matters pertaining to the religion of Islam in its categorical verses. Some of these criterion have been used by Mr. Spock to figure out many things, some shocking, like the admonishment that some Muslims in the time of the Messenger were **“on a clearly wrong Path”** (Surah Al-Ahzaab, 33:36). Similarly, on the topic which principally divides Sunnis and Shias and from which all their other sectarian differences follow – was there, or was there not, appointment of an Apostolic Successor by Divine Decree and proclaimed by the Messenger? So judge by the **Determinate** criterion of the Holy Qur'an alone, to your own good heart's content, who is entitled to be وَأَوَلِي الْأَمْرِ مَنْ تَكْمَلُهُ from among the distinguished players of history. Mr. Spock's path to understand the Qur'anic criterion is summarized in the Self Study section at the end.

But also observe that its relevance today is principally only of theoretical and academic interest from the point of view of the **Determinate** verses of the Holy Qur'an. Because, if it wasn't, these historically entitled وَأَوَلِي الْأَمْرِ مَنْ تَكْمَلُهُ would have been identified in the Holy Qur'an by name and details about them would be contained in the **Determinates** of the Holy Qur'an for subsequent generations to follow.
categorically, until the end of time. The reason they are not identified by name, is arguably because they were clearly known to the peoples in the era they each lived in, and were principally meant for. Whereas, the theologies surrounding them which have reached Muslims some millennia later, are not to be found in the Holy Qur'an except by way of interpretation of the Indeterminates, largely drawn from the preferred penmanship of history. What would have happened if none of these scribes existed, or had written anything – just as nothing was written down for more than a century after the demise of the Prophet of Islam? On what logical basis, deduced from the criterion of the Holy Qur'an, are these fallible scribes predicates to the understanding of the infallible Holy Qur'an? Mr. Spock found no reference in the Holy Qur'an mandating the existence of these scribes. There is no mention in the Holy Qur'an of scribes who have been “perfected” for this task of faultless preservation of historical narratives that exist today as the primary written sources of Islam outside of the Holy Qur'an.

Every generation has the new opportunity to start afresh – for the natural cyclical process of birth and death can also have a beneficial cleansing effect upon the baggage of legacy. Why should a new generation born into their own times be shackled by what went before? Which is why the Holy Qur'an itself advocates starting afresh for every man and woman rather than remain shackled by the holiness of others who came before them:

“That was a people that hath passed away. They shall reap the fruit of what they did, and ye of what ye do! Of their merits there is no question in your case!”
(Surah Al-Baqara, 2:134, repeated again for emphasis in 2:141)

When the Holy Qur'an so clearly vouches for that separation from the people who went before without equivocation: “Of their merits there is no question in your case”, then how can it endorse the acceptance of their workmanship for you to follow for your merit? That
would create a contradiction!

Indeed, the Holy Qur'an unequivocally confirms that conclusion with the following explicit warning:

“(On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them. And those who were but followers will say: **If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us.** Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166-167)

The **Indeterminates** of the Holy Qur'an weren't meant to be filled in by the imaginative scribes in pious robes, nor spawn Muslim empires by subverting their meanings from the pulpit, nor the latter day lucrative industry of madrassas, howzas, and seminaries which run into unaccountable billions of dollars of annual zakat, khums, and endowment funds. Like the financial secrecy enjoyed by the Papacy, no one has any accounting for these funds. No nation demands it. No accounting firm produces the balance sheet for the public for the funds harvest from the public in the name of religion. This holy industry feeds for lifetime, generations of savants who often cannot be gainfully employed in any competitive sector of society. In modernity, if you are a mental midget who cannot get into college, or are too poor to feed yourself, you become an “alim”. If you are more fortunate, you become a “revolutionary”, or acquire a Ph.D. to “bring reform to Islam”. The religion of Islam remaining in the clutches of the pulpit that feeds off of it, for profit, power, or glory, can never stand up to the hectoring hegemons. It becomes the stage for house niggers, useful idiots, and mercenaries of empire to rally the public mind to its agendas. We even empirically witness this in our own times. Caught between the Hegelian Dialectic of “militant Islam” and “moderate Islam”, with “revolutionary Islam” soon to be added to its mix to fo-
ment more “revolutionary times” of internecine violence, the sectarian pulpit spells worldwide national suicide for Muslims today.

Just as the ancient scribes fixed the Indeterminates of the Holy Qur'an to suit their narrow self-interests, we have the opportunity to rationally unfix the Indeterminates of their subversive bindings to suit our broader existential self-interests. We have the same ability to de-emphasize the Indeterminates in our religious ethos, or to treat them as options not to be fought or disunited over, just as the earlier times went in the opposite direction. We have the opportunity to actively build on what is common ground so easily forged by the Determinates of the Holy Qur'an, just as those who went before us differentiated on the basis of the Indeterminates.

Only that sensible path offers any coherent possibilities for Muslims to finally stop being puppets on a string. Only that approach permits the sectarianly divided Muslims to come together against common global predators whose only real leverage upon Muslims is their superior Machiavellian ability to divide and conquer the simpleton public mind.

Muslins in every new generation get the opportunity afresh to stop being simpletons. That is why man is given his own little “zulfiqar”, his intellect! But it is born dull just as man is born naked at birth. And just as we don't go prancing about in our birth-day clothes au naturel for the rest of our lives just because we are born naked, and if someone did they'd be simply locked away in an asylum, those still prancing about in their birth-day mind au naturel, are just as simply harvested for fodder by the Nietzschean superman.

Focussing on the Determinates effectively checkmates the hijacking of the religion of Islam from all pulpits. It helps overcome the sectarian divide among Muslims without either requiring anyone to give up their own socialization biases, nor requiring anyone to accept any particular sect's supremacy as the sole custodian of the religion of Islam some fourteen-fifteen centuries later.
Just acquiring that first crucial understanding, that Indeterminates by definition seed diversity of viewpoints, and those viewpoints that are inimical to the spirit of Islam expressed in its Determinates will always sow discord, is sufficient for this coming together of the Muslim public mind. Such common ground does not require a common pulpit. It only requires reaching a common understanding of the above principle so lucidly visible in the Holy Qur'an with even a modicum of reflection. All else will naturally follow with the realization that Muslims should abstain from building the core religious values of their faith upon the narratives of the scribes of history who fixed these Indeterminates according to their own logic and motivations pertinent to their own epoch, when today Muslims have the same pristine text of the same Holy Qur'an untampered by human hand also available to them to guide them in their own epoch!

Muslims today have that momentous benefit denied all other peoples none of whose sacred scriptures can stand that test of time. To then journey voluntarily on the path that peoples of other religions are involuntarily forced to adopt because they do not have such un-tampered sacred scriptures, and that path lead to disunity and infighting, is outright stupidity. Nay, asininity. When such foolishness leads to internecine warfare, it is outright criminal. And not to fight back that criminalist path when it perches a people on the very brink of existentialism, a national suicide!

Who can liberate the Muslim public mind so steeped in rituals, so manipulated from the pulpit in every sect, and so incestuously socialized into their respective sectarian ethos generation after generation? How to bootstrap that transformation of the Muslim public mind without wiping out that cultural history? How to fight back that national suicide?

If Mustafa Kemal Atatürk can ruthlessly separate a domineering people from their 300 year old Muslim heritage of Ottoman empire within a single generation to create Westernized Turkey, if Ayatollah Khomeini can wipe out 2500 year old heritage of monarchy in Persia
in far less time than that to create a Revolutionary theological Iran, it surely can be done. But can it be done without bloodshed, internecine violence, and a forced separation from who we are? Both those cited transformations of the twentieth century came at the expense of that forced separation of a people from their heritage; and much spilled Muslim blood – mostly by Muslims themselves! Neither is necessary nor desirable in order to end the divisiveness of sectarianism.

All it takes is pulpits in all sects to perceptively understand, and judiciously promulgate, the concepts of Determinates and Indeterminates to their respective flock. The rest will naturally follow. That initial first step will surely take state power to affect at national and international levels – for, if the pulpit was ever so rational, it had the choice of addressing the problem in the previous centuries on their own. Just as it took state power to first preserve the Holy Qur'an, it will also take state power to first push its common Determinate meaning through. The rest will surely be organic once a new generation grows up learning the new understanding. Other principled measures can also be adopted by any state, such as mandating Determinate verse 5:48 of Surah Al-Maeda as the overarching mission statement of every Muslim sect under its suzerainty in order for the sect to be accorded state recognition and constitutional protection of rights as a legitimate Islamic sect.

There is no fundamental political problem in sowing beneficial ideas by a state irrespective of its national or ideological predicates – popular atheist philosopher and novelist Ayn Rand's twentieth-century theology of Objectivism and individual selfishness notwithstanding. Holy Qur'an is inimical to such ideas and therefore, to not accord ideas inimical to the religion of Islam any protection in a Muslim dominated state is rational and self-consistent with the theology that is espoused by the people of that state. It is no different than the United States not according space to Communist ideology in its state and global sphere of influence. In the same vein, fraternal ideas the Holy Qur'an engenders in its Determinate verses are both a spiritual as
well as political constitution to live by for Muslims and therefore, there is no principal reason why certain key political principles extracted from the Good Book not be adopted as governing principles of a state even if it is a secular state. Just that one simple fundamental measure, like its Biblical counterpart known as The Golden Rule, will ensure that vitriolic sects whose entire *raison d'être* is ominously self-righteousness and exclusionary, declaring others “non-Muslim” their axiomatic enactment of their philosophy (takfirism), get naturally wiped out by making the soil infertile for their growth. That soil conditioning ingredient is categorically provided in the Holy Qur'an.

The power of political sagaciousness and beneficial mutual co-existence inherent in the **Determinate** verse 5:48 of Surah Al-Maeda both checkmates, and preempts, all internecine warfare among Muslims. No outside or inside Machiavelli can harvest Muslim cracks and lacunas with the universal adoption of verse 5:48 as part of the state constitution where diverse Muslim sects live in any substantial numbers and permitted to practice their religion with state protection of their rights. Those religious rights can be made contingent on the directives of the very religion that is being accorded state political rights. It is akin to making the Biblical Golden Rule “**Do unto others as you have others do unto you**” the cornerstone of all nations' constitutions by international law.

This line of reasoning is neither platitudinous nor theoretical. But straightforward Qur'anic political science to defeat Machiavellian political science. Take political science out of religion, out of the moral calculus of governance, and all a people are left with is the empty shell of banal rituals ripe for harvesting by Machiavelli to create hell on earth. **That's how the Religion of Islam was principally hijacked, and that's also how it will ever be un-hijacked!** And as in all battles between good and evil, between masters and slaves, between hegemony and servitude, between supremacy and equitable co-existence, between international law and aggression, this battle too needs to be fought. It needs its champions and its powerbase no differ-
ently than primacy needs its champions and its powerbase. Without their respective champions, neither side can dominate. The reason primacy continually succeeds to dominate is because it is not shackled by moral calculus and has instead made itself adept at shackling all others. Qur'anic political science is its antidote.

The world might pay attention to this if they care to rid themselves of the curse of the repeated diabolical harvesting of the religion of Islam for “imperial mobilization”. The world might also pay attention to the political evils spread in the name of “freedom” that is nipped in the bud with such cautious political adoption – even if it may sound exclusionary to the nihilistic advocates of unlimited freedom. This includes the so called avant-garde in political thought who want freedom to spread political evil in the name of political freedom, freedom to destroy with vile speech in the name of freedom of speech, freedom to belittle others' religion in the name of freedom of religion, and freedom to spread anarchy in the name of freedom of individualism. No civilization can exist for long with predators flourishing among them in the name of freedom and devouring its every moral civilizational construct in the lofty guise of liberté, égalité, fraternité.

The aforementioned solution-space is applicable even when the political governance system that Muslims live in is a theological state of any sectarian flavor. Today, these span the full gamut of defining governance characteristics that are not to be found in the Holy Qur'an but is presented as being part of the religion of Islam. Drawn entirely from the Indeterminates, it spans the gamut of extremes: from the strict orthodox Wahabi-Salafi Sunni sect that rules Islam's holiest places as a private kingdom named after their own ruling family which interprets (مَثْلُ الْأَمْرِ) of verse 4:59 as anyone vested in temporal power by any means (amply supported by their own preferred history's scribes and precedents); to the “virtuous philosopher-king” model of the Iranian Shia sect asserting a mandate for “Imamate by proxy” also based on the same verse 4:59 (and also amply supported by their own preferred history's scribes and precedents)!
The Iranian Revolution of Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini (imam in the ordinary sense of political and spiritual leader whom people followed, hence lower case usage) however was somewhat more creative and principled than the Wahabis pernicious takeover of Islam's sacred soil under the banner of the House of Saud.

The latter were largely an ignorant but locally powerful tribe, cognitively infiltrated by the Wahabi sect invented by the British empire as part of its ongoing subversive warfare upon the Muslim Ottoman empire, and brought to state power in the Hijaz by the interplay of victorious superpowers on the grand chessboard of the early twentieth century.

Whereas, the Iranian Revolution in the second half of the twentieth century was led largely by well-read scholars and theologians. Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini easily adapted Plato's “philosopher-king” for his “governance of the faqih” (vilayat-i faqih) model, seamlessly tying it to the Shia jurisprudence principle of “taqlid” to shepherd the flock. The philosopher-faqih and stoic antagonist of the despotic American imposed monarchy in Iran, equally easily sold the new franchise of “revolutionary Islam” to the Iranian public mind which had been readily primed for the revolution through the good graces of the ignoble Shah's CIA trained SAVAK. That, it was far nobler in the mind to be ruled by an enlightened clergy in the name of God under Divine Rule as the perpetual enemy of America (the Great Satan), rather than by America's own Shahanshah in his own royal name – without the conception of Hegelian Dialectic ever becoming part of the discourse space. The arc of crisis was lighted simultaneously on the Grand Chessboard by American President Jimmy Carter and his National Security Advisor with diabolical opposites: revolutionary Sunnis in Afghanistan as the sacred Mujahideens with “God is on your side”, and revolutionary Shias in Iran as the infernal enemy.

affairs where beliefs based on half-truths and outright lies are diabolically implanted in the public mind – virtually everything the public is made to believe in international relations is myth. See “Unlayering the Middle East War Agenda: Making Sense of Absurdities” (tinyurl.com/making-sense-of-absurdities). The same is true of the theological construct of *valih-e-faqih* that draws upon Divine Mandate to make the public mind. It bears closer scrutiny.

What does the Holy Qur'an say about Divine Rule of Valih-e-Faqih?

**Is it Determinate in the Holy Qur'an?**

A non hagiographic examination of the conception of *vilayat-i faqih* in both Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini's book: “Islam and Revolution” (translated by Hamid Algar, 1981), and how it has been enacted in post Revolutionary Iran, reveals that it is little different in terms of absolutist governance than what it replaced: both autocratic rules by those who ascribe to themselves the divine right of kings to rule and consequently, absolutely intolerant of dissenting ideology and dissenting politics. Both demonized their respective antagonists at home (never mind abroad) with the absolute righteousness of divine authority. Both asserting with unsurpassed oratory, and with the power of the state backing their oration, that the chosen elite, respectively them-
selves, is more entitled to govern the public than the public itself. And that, like the king's rule, the valih-e-faqih's rule too is absolute, with no limits, and no checks and balances, so long as he rules “justly”. The valih-e-faqih defines what is just and what isn't in all matters, including political matters of the state, as the imam (leader), and in theory can only be replaced if he leaves the bounds of Islamic Sharia. The absolute rule by the valih-e-faqih as the representative of the “hidden Imam”, is deemed by the jurist to be an obligatory religious duty as an integral part of the concept of “wilayah”, Divine Rule, prescribed by the religion of Islam for ruling the Islamic state.

Meaning, the Islamic state must be ruled by the jurist, and it is incumbent upon the jurist to create the Islamic state for Muslims and to rule it with absolute authority demanding absolute obedience just as the Prophet of Islam and his designated successor ruled with absolute authority.

In a 6 January 1988 letter to Iran's president and Friday prayer leader Sayyed Ali Khamenei on Determining the limitations of the authority of the Islamic government under the valih-e-faqih's rule, Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini addressing the president of Iran as “Hojjat al-Islam Mr. Khamenei” (and not as “Ayatollah Khamenei” as he is presently saluted and unquestioningly followed as the “marja taqlid”), and while paying elegant lip-service to accepting criticism as a “divine gift” in these pious words: “And of course we should not assume that whatever we say and do, no one has the right to criticize. Criticism, even condemnation, is a divine gift for the growth of humans.”, unequivocally asserted the principle of boundarylessness of “Absolute Divine Rule” vested in the ruler of the Islamic state:

“I must state that governance, which is a branch of the Absolute Rule of the Prophet (PBUH), is one of the primary laws of Islam; and it takes precedence over all secondary Laws, even prayer and fasting and the hajj pilgrimage. The ruler can destroy a mosque or a house that sits in the route for a road, and avoid the
money to the owner. The ruler can shut down mosques in times of necessity; and destroy a mosque belonging to pretenders [zerar], if a resolution is not possible without destruction. The government may unilaterally void Sharia-based contracts that it itself has made with the people in situations where that contract is contrary to the good of the nation and Islam. And it can prevent any action – be it devotional or not – that is contrary to the interests of Islam - as long as it continues to be so. The government can temporarily prevent the hajj pilgrimage – which is one of the most important divine practices – in situations where it deems it to be contrary to the interests of the Islamic country.” --- Translation via the Iran Data Portal at Princeton University, http://tinyurl.com/khomeini-letter-govlimits-1988 (link to Original Persian Text)

While one cannot vouch for the accuracy of this translation as it is the habit of orientalists to deliberately mistranslate and misrepresent the Iranian leadership, it is presumed to be accurate enough for the purpose of this analysis as it is consistent with the ideas put forth in “Islam and Revolution”.

All the aforesaid determinations by Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini underline the principle of Absolute Rule being the purview of the valih-e-faqih. And evidently, it is made noble and legitimate because these absolute determinations are in the name of Islam as “divine guidance”. It begs the obvious question to the discerning mind of Mr. Spock, that how is that absoluteness qualitatively any different from the divine king's self-ascribed right to absolute rule, absolute powers, absolute opinions, absolute directives, and absolute wisdom as the vicegerent of his gods on earth? The king does it to preserve his monarchy and makes recourse to his god as having received a mandate. The valih-e-faqih does the same thing to preserve his rule by making arguable reference to mandate given to him by his God. Both employ
the same means: absolute control of the public mind, and absolute control of the state, both demanding absolute obedience from the people. Absolute Rule is evidently more endearing to the philosopher jurist of Islam if it is in his God's name. Why is it philosophically so, even if one ignores self-interest and conflict of interest – meaning, even if the valih-e-faqih is obviously making a case for acquiring state power and authority over the people of which he and his jurist class are the prima facie beneficiary?

Harken back to Plato and the “philosopher-king”. It is the primary axiom upon which valih-e-faqih is principally based – that the religious philosopher is closer to God than all the rest of mankind, and hence closest to truth and justice than all the rest of mankind, and consequently better able to (or more entitled to) govern the republic and its masses with truth and justice than anyone else among mankind!

Upon that priceless axiom which remains conveniently hidden in the prolific arguments made to dignify vilayat-i faqih, the verses of “wilayah” in the Holy Qur'an, namely those verses speaking of “wasiyah”, “Imam”, and “obedience”, are interpreted by the jurist as being Exemplary of Divine Rule set forth in the leadership of the Prophet of Islam as the first head of the Islamic state in Medina, and in the short tenure of Imam Ali, the fourth Caliph, as the only legitimate Divinely appointed successor head of the Islamic state after the Prophet's death. Because they are both Exemplars of the Holy Qur'an and the system of governance espoused in the religion of Islam for all times, and not just for their own time, so argues the valih-e-faqih, how is the Divine Rule to continue in other times?

Specifically, under the Shia theology, during the absence (ghaibat) of the “hidden Imam”? The earth cannot be deprived of Divine Rule argues the brilliant faqih, otherwise tyrants will rule by enslaving the masses, and God's Guidance to mankind will remain unimplemented, constricted, “mahjoor” (see Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30 quoted above). The core argument is principally laid out by Plato in The Republic to dignify state rulership by the virtuous “philosopher-king”. Plato ar-
gued 2500 years ago, a thousand years before the advent of the Holy 
Qur'an, that if the most virtuous philosopher is not king, the masses 
will be ruled by diabolical controllers who will enslave the public 
mind in far constricting invisible chains of perception management 
than mere physical chains can ever hold any man captive. These pris-
oners of the mind will actually come to love their own enslavement, 
and resist all attempts to be freed.

Plato illustrated that idea most poignantly in his famous allegory 
titled *The Simile of the Cave*. (See http://tinyurl.com/Plato-Myth-of-
the-Cave-Excerpt ) The philosophical etiology of virtually all dis-
courses on voluntary servitude, behavior control, mind control, virtu-
ous leadership, virtuous statism, shepherding the public mind, and 
even Nietzsche's *Übermensch* (see Morality derived from the Intellect 
leads to Enslavement!), ultimately anchor in Plato. As far as Mr. 
Spock can ascertain, none have surpassed Plato in their own deriva-
tives. Some scholars are honest enough to acknowledge their ancient 
benefactor, while others merely plagiarize from him. But the audience 
of these latter demagogues does not know when Plato is being plagi-
ized in the garb of new theory because the public mind is at best only 
familiar with the name Plato, often in their own native language. 
Hardly anyone among *hoi polloi*, even among the college educated 
professional class, has actually read *The Republic*, let alone studied it 
for the due diligence it deserves to comprehend that foundational 
scholar of the Hellenic Civilization that became not just the cradle of 
Western civilization, but Muslim scholarship as well. Muslim scholars 
in Spain were the first to translate the Greek scholarship into Arabic, 
from where the Western Crusaders got their source material to trans-
late into Latin and subsequently into English. Today, the neo-cons for 
instance, are all Plato scholars. All significant liars and aggressors to-
day advocating military invasion of Muslim nations under the pretext 
of defending themselves from the tyranny of Islam also turn out to be 
Plato scholars in their background. (See http://tinyurl.com/Leo-
Strauss-Noble-Lies-Excerpt )
Plato’s characterization of mental chains through perception management from birth to death is so powerful that the diabolical superman, the state intelligence apparatuses, the military covert-ops, the Mighty Wurlitzer, Machiavelli, all harnesses it for themselves (see http://tinyurl.com/MightyWurlitzer). Virtually every Western philosopher of the age of enlightenment and onwards penning ideas on good and evil has borrowed at least something from Plato. The famous quotable statement of Goethe, the German philosopher, “None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free. The truth has been kept from the depth of their minds by masters who rule them with lies. They feed them on falsehoods till wrong looks like right in their eyes.”, owes a great deal of inspiration to Plato just on the very face of it. It is a paraphrase from the Simile of the Cave.

Anything to do with deception and the control of the public mind, and conversely, shepherding the public mind to higher enlightenment in a virtuous state led by its most enlightened stewards, Plato expressed its philosophy so comprehensively 2500 years ago that it is hard to add anything new to its principles, or to the perceptive understanding he displayed of the frailty of the human mind and how it is harvested by unseen controllers in society. Edward Bernays, known as the father of modern perception management, also called advertising when selling soap, public relations when selling agendas, and propaganda when selling lies, opened his 1928 Book titled Propaganda, with these famous words which are again mere corollaries of Platonic description: “The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of.”

Muslim scholarship borrowing fundamental notions and key ideas of intellectualism for their own intellectual tradition when they were
the dominant superpower in the world for 700 years, not just from Plato, but from the Hellenic culture of learning, is only to be expected, and is indeed what happened.

The entire realm of *ilm al-Kalam*, the wholly speculative intellectual discourse on topics of the Holy Qur'an, is fundamentally Platonic for instance, and is little different from Plato's *Shapes* --- entirely immanent, non-falsifiable, without any empirical reality-check possible. It is as rich as the human mind is fertile, and is freed from any bounds of reality and verification – an occupation of idle minds who do not have to strive to earn a living and can sit around all day in their seminaries (or ivory towers) eruditely discoursing *important matters* like how many angels can dance on a pin-head and whether the Holy Qur'an, as the Word of God, is created or uncreated! It is the contemporary Muslim scholarship today which plagiarizes more than just borrow with acknowledgment. The feeble intellectual mind unfamiliar with the genesis and etiological significance of ideas presented to him by the *superman*, never knows the difference. So forget about the public mind being any more the wiser just because collectively they are far greater in number. Plagiarized ideas can easily be ascribed to anyone, including to oneself as its inventor which is typically the case, but also to God to achieve some purpose. The latter takes an exceptionally clever mind to pull it off. In this exclusive club of the Übermensch, Nietzschean *superman*, one is arguably dealing with a most superior mind. To dismiss it as ignorant, short-sighted, or a stooge, is to not just not give the devil its due, but to also not recognize the formidable enemy for what it is. As Mr. Spock well knows, the sword of intellect can cut both ways. He is undeterred as he systematically unpeels the many layers of the question down to the very bottom of the Pandora's box. As that legend goes, opening the Pandora's box initially opens a can of worms but when you get to its very bottom, the entire mystery is solved.

With that overview of philosopher-king and the overarching impact of Plato on the world of intellectual thought, the responsibility
for implementing Islam's Divine Rule too, it is argued, must consequently fall to those philosophers and virtuous scholars of Islam who know and understand Islam the best. Otherwise, the Muslim polity, as history bears witness, will always be ruled by tyrants and usurpers. Well, who is best fit for that leadership role of shepherdng the plebeian mind away from the wolves, but the pious jurist!

Thus, Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini deemed his own clergy class the latter day “philosopher-king” ruling class since they presume to know Islam the best. They are closest to the mind of God, closest to truth and justice, and consequently make the best executors of His Divine Rule. The most capable jurist among this tiny coterie able to stand up to tyrants and falsehoods, able to exercise political and temporal leadership, is the “philosopher-king”. Ahem, the “wasilah” (already covered in Part-II, see Al-Wasilah): “O ye who believe! Do your duty to Allah, seek the means of approach unto Him,” (Surah Al-Maeda 5:35), “These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance” (Surah Al An'aam 6:90), the valih-e-faqih!

Since the Prophet of Islam and his designated successor implemented that Divine Rule with Absolute Authority, and since they demanded absolute obedience from the public as per the verse of obedience, 4:59, so must the valih-e-faqih who is only the heir to the third entity in the verse of obedience, ( وَأَوَلِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ ), the “ulul-amr”, also referred to as “valih-e-amr”, an unnamed third party to whom absolute obedience is also commanded by the Author of the Holy Qur'an! The valih-e-faqih therefore is only implementing God's prescription on his side of the elite fence as his religious duty as the heir to the noble Prophet's mantle, and the governed must implement its part and obey the noble valih-e-faqih in absolute terms on its commoner's side of the elite fence as its religious duty.

Here is that most dreadfully interpreted Verse of Obedience once again, from Part-II:
“O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you. If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger, if ye do believe in Allah and the Last Day: That is best, and most suitable for final determination.” (Surah an-Nisaa' 4:59)

Caption Verse 4:59 of Surah an-Nisaa', the Verse of Obedience, itself opening the door to sectarian schism, the source of fundamental bifurcation between Sunni and Shia sects during the Muslim expansion into world dominating empires after the demise of the Messenger. The Verse of Obedience specifically underwrites the Principle of Inerrancy as a requirement for holding any Apostolic office that demands obedience from the flock.

Once the mantle of Absolute Rule is claimed by axiomatic assertion, it inevitably leads to demanding absolute obedience as a self-evident matter, which further leads to the inevitable corollary that no one may even disagree with the valih-e-faqih once he has made up his mind just as no one may disagree with, or disobey, the Prophet of Islam once he has made up his mind as per verse 33:36 of Surah Al-Ahzaab “It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.” By extrapolating the proper noun Exemplar which singularly refers to someone specific, to the common noun exemplar, the same semantic construct in any language opens itself up to a group membership of ordinary peoples such that to disagree or to disobey this new plurality of exemplars of Divine Rule is also to be “on a clearly wrong Path”. To disobey the valih-e-faqih is to become a sinner! As a reminder to the forgetful mind, the hector-
ing hegemons who hijack the religion of Islam for waging world wars under the pretext of defending themselves against the corrupted Islam and its barbarian followers, routinely do the same resemanticization: alias proper nouns into common nouns. Professor Bernard Lewis extrapolated the word “Islam”, a proper noun of the Holy Qur'an, into a common noun when he cunningly resemanticized it to mean a kitchen-sink of semantics in his book: Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror (see Hijacking the word “Islam” for Mantra Creation). Here, a concept instead of a word is being aliased.

Indeed, to not follow and obey some marja-e taqlid from that elite set who deem themselves “worthy of emulation” – never mind the pompous title incestuously awarded among the clan by themselves under some unspecified and entirely subjective secret calculus of who is more learned in esoterica – is to be a sinner. To avoid that sin, an absurd set of restrictions is put upon the believer such that in practice she has little choice but to accept taqlid of someone from among that new divine set of exemplars. It does not matter whom she chooses from that elite set --- for she is now roped in for life into that church of taqlid and will pay her religiously mandated donations into those unaccountable coffers that run into sums higher than the GDP of many nations combined. But more importantly, the voluntary obedience is the foundational cornerstone of the fatwas issued by the marja-e-taqlid which define the halal and haram status not just in spiritual matters, but also in national, political, and temporal matters that the follower is now obliged to accept from her marja-e-taqlid.

The valih-e-faqih who is a grade above that station is like the Pope central, and his fatwa is binding upon all over whom he is a guardian, vali. The valih-e-faqih's canvas is far greater. He imposes upon the public mind of the far larger audience space what is permissible and what isn't by way of his own ijtihad at the threat of eternal damnation on the follower for disobedience and salvation for strict obedience. He defines and enacts national laws based on predicates of his personal divine ijtihad and imposes legal entitlements for breaking
the law even in this life! Whereas the lower ranking marja-e-taqlid only govern the reward and punishment in the Afterlife by exercising behavior control of their flock in this life, the valih-e-faqih also controls reward and punishment in this life. While all governments do that too, define and legislate laws, and police them, none of them have the chutzpah to draw their mandate from God, unless it is the Jews in the Jewish state, and the Muslims in the Muslim states. Christians seem to have overcome that phase of their spirituality after their dark ages, with the Vatican today more an appendage of a narrow elite mired in antiquated rituals than for exercising spiritual or temporal control over its flock in comparison to its other monotheist brethren.

“God”, from time immemorial, has always entered the political realm of mass behavior control through his proxy service providers. It is irrelevant that these service providers can produce no “certificate” from God in their own name. The topic of inquiry, as a reminder to the reader, is not whether God exists, Prophets exist, Divine Guidance exists, Divine Books exist (or not exist). That may be a topic of examination for another day and is beyond the scope of the present work. The topic of inquiry at hand is how is the religion of Islam hijacked so easily for self-interests by Muslims themselves who do believe in all the preceding presuppositions as an axiom of faith. It is demanded in the Holy Qur'an which defines both itself and its audience: “This is the Scripture whereof there is no doubt, a guidance unto those who ward off (evil). Who believe in the Unseen, ...” (Surah Al-Baqara 2:2-2:3). So how do Muslims fall prey to evil if their Holy Book is only for those who ward off evil? In this instance, the inquiry has reached the threshold of logic which begs the question of where is the jurist's certificate from God as his holy emissary that he can define halal and haram by his own ijtihad and impose it upon the public mind not just as a spiritual matter, but also a legal matter as the state ruler?

Just making the claim however is evidently sufficient because there are always followers. Orators and demagogues both attract fol-
lowers faster than trash bins attract flies. Human beings evidently find a compelling need for emotional and psychological security blankets. That natural need leaves the public mind wide open for any cognitive infiltration that comes suitably wrapped in relevant security guarantees by authority figures. The ancient man offered blood sacrifices to appease his god's anger under dispensation from their witch doctors. That was improved upon by the abstraction of an Afterlife in monotheism. Belief in the Day of Judgment is an axiom of faith required by the Holy Qur'an. Thus a successful jurist marja-e-taqlid now dispenses the certificates of do's and don'ts of daily life for essentially the same purpose as ancient priests but for the Afterlife.

The modern jurist no longer needs to sell God and its common axioms to his masses as they already believe in these axioms fervently by way of socialization and cultural acceptance. All the jurist has to do is carefully interpose himself in the public's path to Afterlife by drawing justification for his indispensability from the Indeterminates of the Holy Qur'an. With his learned confabulations in arcane subjects, he gets away with it in front of the modern busy man unfamiliar with ancient books that the jurist draws upon to impress the public mind. The truth of this timeless observation of the frailty of human psyche and how it is abused from time immemorial is without doubt. It is self-evident. That human frailty to be a follower is open game for anyone able to harness it. And especially because of the doctrine of “taqlid” already in place for centuries, the valih-e-faqih's mandate for Absolute Rule is made a practical political reality under the banner of “revolutionary Islam”.

Just as antisemitism has been the Zionist Jews best friend in founding the Jewish state, and oppression upon the Muslims of India through the Hindu-Muslim riots was the best friend of the Muslim League for founding the divine state of Pakistan, oppression upon the Shia Muslims is its latter day equivalent. Absolutely essential for the founding of revolutionary Islamic state. These ideologies only thrive under oppression of their own people and only come to fruition when

234 Muslims and Imperial Mobilization
the oppression is perceived as reaching cataclysmic proportions – whence divine help comes galloping on a white horse to end the tribulation period and all the bloodshed of innocent masses is justified and dignified as the reason for the new state. The people rejoice – momentarily, while the diabolical Hegelian Dialectic is birth-panged in Eurasia as the absolute sworn enemy of Oceania to carry on a perpetual war. One can't make this up except in a fable, but one sees it being enacted on the Grand Chessboard over and over again! All the revolutions of the twentieth century started in blood, and ended in blood, of innocent people. And they all exhibit the same common template – the creation of an enemy to wage world wars. The bibliography on this subject is vast indeed and it is not the intent to rehearse what is already been written elsewhere except to lend the aforesaid brief context. Here, Mr. Spock is keenly desirous of treading new ground in logical pursuit of the question at hand, suitably armed by the accumulated wisdom of what he has seen of man's history of waging wars by way of deception for the control of the public mind. From this first control, all evil naturally follows. Conversely, from its liberation, all else naturally follows too: “Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows.”

The brilliance of the argument for Absolute Rule by the valih-e-faqih is without question. The political circumstances leading to it no more unprecedented and no less conspiratorial than what led to the creation of the Jewish state from partitioned Palestine and the Muslim state from partitioned India. The natural arguments posited by Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini for the raison d'être of an Islamic state that implements the real religion of Islam, asserted as being self-evident.

To Mr. Spock's logical mind always searching for unstated axioms and implicit presuppositions in supposedly “self-evident” arguments presented as concentric proofs, the problem is glaring. Apart from the despotism that absolute rule demanding absolute obedience can take even the best of ordinary mortals to, the core problem is also just as straightforward as it is glaring.
While the Author of the Holy Qur'an both explicitly and unequivocally vouched for the Prophet of Islam in that categorical verse of obedience as an obligatory religious command on Muslims, and the Prophet as the first head of the Islamic state which he founded in Medina may have veritably vouched for the sole father of the source of his prolific progeny, Imam Ali, as history books have recorded thus establishing a chain of explicit vouching that directly connects to the Author of the Holy Qur'an (even though that fact is not explicitly recorded in the Holy Qur'an and has thus become a source of partisan interpretation throughout the short history of Muslim dominance of the world by its despotic rulers vying to establish their Islamic legitimacy by employing the same clergy class to serve their own imperial interests), who vouched for Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini as the Divinely designated Imam sanctioned for Divine Rule?

On what Qur'anic Determinates specifically did Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini apply the verse of obedience to himself to legitimize his own Absolute Rule as the “valih-e-amr”?

As a most learned jurist and scholar of Islam, was the revolutionary imam who so boldly altered the destiny of an entire nation, watered its cemeteries with the blood of a generation of its finest youth in the name of God without showing much compunction, unaware of the logic of verse 4:59 which imparts certain implicit characteristics of unerringness as already analyzed in Part-II? No jurist worth his salt can be unaware of it if Mr. Spock can so trivially deduce it.

How can Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini claim to be the “valih-e-amr” of verse 4:59 with any more intellectual integrity and moral gravitas than the autocratic House of Saud, or any of the other past claimants to absolute rule demanding absolute obedience throughout the imperial history of despotic Muslim rulers, all of whom having occupied the seat of the Prophet of Islam with theological sanctions from the self-serving pulpits drawing upon the same verse?

In fact, the pulpit did not even shy from applying that verse of
obedience to the British colonial masters of India as the Qadiani-Ahmadi pontiffs did at the turn of the twentieth-century; Maulana Muhammad Ali, laying its diabolical foundations in his seminal English translation of the Holy Qur'an, first in the Preface under the heading: Reverence for authority, pg. xv wrote: “But while teaching equality of rights, Islam teaches the highest reverence for authority. ... By those in authority are meant not only the actual rulers of a country, but all those who are in any way entrusted with authority”, then elaborated it further in his footnote number 593 for his English translation of verse 4:59 “The words ulul-amr, or those in authority, have a wide significance, ... among those in authority are included the rulers of a land, though they may belong to an alien religion.”! (see MMA 1917 PDF).

Just because someone else does the same gratuitous extrapolation, but applies it a tad more narrowly to the more holier than thou philosopher-king-jurist, and nominates himself as the vali-amr, the valihe-faqih-e-muslimeen, and does it in the name of the Ahlul-Bayt because of his own convictions on the matter, and the people of Iran show their approval with an applause, hardly makes the assertion any more relevant, let alone applicable.

Is the concept of Absolute Rule by Valihe-Faqih demanding absolute obedience even arguably sanctioned in the Determinates of the Holy Qur'an? See the examination of taqlid below which is the cornerstone of the theology of valihe-faqih.

In the case of Revolutionary Iran in 1979, the Iranian public evidently did not think it necessary to ask for such a “certificate” of divine sanction from Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini as the “ulul-amr” of 4:59, never mind think of how they might have actually verified it had he presented one. Just being against the Shah of Iran, against the absolute tyrant working for the imperialist United States of America, was sufficient certificate for ushering in everlasting absolute rule by the valihe-faqih in God's name; a divine provenance even gloriously fulfilled with the triumphant return of Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini to Iran on February 1, 1979, warming the hearts of the Persian masses to
the miraculous divine intervention.

The Iranian people agreed to accept their new rebel imam's absolute rule as the “valih-e-amr” designate of verse 4:59 in an unprecedented public referendum which remains unsurpassed as a willing choice exercised by a fed-up people to be eagerly ruled by their clergy class brought to political power on a (Air France?) jet airliner flying safely through America's NATO controlled French skies to land in Tehran, instead of continuing to live under the suzerainty of the most tyrannical and narcissistic King of kings who had previously been brought to political power in Tehran by America's CIA.

It begs the patently obvious question: Why was the airliner carrying the renegade Grand Ayatollah to power in Iran not shot down by NATO military forces (and easily blamed on the Shah's military) if revolutionary Islam was such a great threat to the Western hegemons? Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini had been most vocal about his revolutionary ideology and the rule of the faqih throughout his exile years. His Shia ethos of Karbala was well-known. He had made no secret of the fact that he hated the Great Satan and all those who sided with her. It would have certainly nipped the problem in the bud for the West. The Americans have shown no qualms about shooting down passenger airliners, as they demonstrated a decade later by shooting down Iranian passenger Airbus plane, Iran Air Flight 655, over the Persian Gulf killing all 290 Muslim pilgrims aboard, “by mistake” of course. They could have made the same “by mistake” a whole decade sooner and spared the world a great deal of Muslim on Muslim violence witnessed in the Iran-Iraq war. Not only did the Western Alliance not do that, but the BBC gave away free air time to the speeches of Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini broadcast to Iran, the French government extended great hospitality to the imam, even hosted the media circus which surrounded the revolutionary imam for months until the very day he departed for his homeland after the Shah's ignominious exit, and on and on and on. The list is long and undeniable of how the West supported the revolutionary imam to power against the interest of the Shah who
had formerly been brought to power as their own “policeman” of the Gulf.

The Iranian public was shown their revolutionary savior repeatedly calling for the overthrow of the despotic monarchy by revolutionary means by the Western press. Why?

Why did the West not support their own dictator as part of their collective antagonism against the revolutionary Islam in their former police-man's oil rich territory? Why was the Shah not setup in exile and immediately recognized as the de facto government of Iran to challenge and contain the threat of revolutionary Islam?

This fact of reality which anyone can observe by simply back reading and back watching the news coverage of the era, has put the entire antagonism of the West against Iran in question as deliberately manufactured, and Ayatollah (imam) Khomeini's own principled antagonism to the Shah given great press coverage only for the Iranian public's consumption to bring their new “enemy” into power as part of lighting the “arc of crisis” referenced above.

For the public mind, enemy of my enemy is my friend indeed, and more so when he claims an almost believable divine mandate for extracting absolute obedience from the masses consistent with the shared religious ethos of the people. The Catholic Pope and clergy draw on the same quality of shared ethos among the Catholic Christian flock to be accepted as their anointed spiritual leadership, and in not too distant a past, before the Reformation period tore their state powers asunder, also as their anointed political leadership. Shared ethos is a common denominator and without it, such a voluntary servitude of absolute obedience to the Popes of any religion cannot be implemented without brute force. This also means forcing valih-e-faqih upon non Shia Muslims who do not share that common ethos will only lead to more “revolutionary times”.

This is so obvious a political science truth that those who deliberately wish to create “revolutionary times” going forward in Sunni ma-
jority nations like Pakistan with a substantial Shia minority, can find great utility in creating the tortuous conditions of tyranny upon the Shia in which such a construct of “revolutionary Islam” can find its natural raison d'être for existence --- just as it transpired in Iran under the Shah with the help of his American trained secret police SAVAK!

Revealingly, the public in post Revolutionary Iran, just like in America, comes out to vote periodically to elect from among its respective ruling class who will govern them under their pre-established structures of administrative power. These structures implement the sacred ideologies and pre-determined state polices crafted by the real power behind the scenes, the valih-e-faqih, making it quite irrelevant whom the public elects as president in the much touted elections no differently than it is in the United States of America where its oligarchy holds all the key controlling cards.

The categorical fact remains that irrespective of whether a public makes their political choice with their ballot, or a “choice” is foisted upon a public with the bullet, theology, “democracy”, whatever, neither is “rule by kingdom” specified in the Holy Qur'an, nor is “rule by clergy” specified in the Holy Qur'an, and nor is “rule by parliament”, or “rule by Western power puppets and fabricated enemies of any flavor specified in the Holy Qur'an. A people are entitled to their choice of governance, or whether they wish to resist an evil one foisted upon them inspired by the moral platitudes, but they are not entitled to call whatever government they choose as exclusively sanctioned in the Determinates of the Holy Qur'an. Because it isn't.

There is no method of governance commanded, specified, or even outlined in the Holy Qur'an, at least not any that Mr. Spock has been able to discover in its Determinate verses, except the platitudinous guidance to build a righteous and just society in which no one takes unfair advantage of another, and where people do not suffer tyrants, false gods, exploitation, and pay their taxes on time. Mr. Spock notes that the key characteristics of a noble governance system for a just Islamic society are outlined as basic principles only, such as in waging
wars of self-defence to not transgress limits, to protect the weak and the infirm, to manage state treasury for public good instead of private gain, to abstain from usury, etc., whereas other matters like its inheritance laws, moral code of conduct, rights and responsibilities of parents, individuals, social and business interactions, marriage rules, are spelled out in minute detail. Corollaries and theorems are easily derived from these basic principles which form the basis of what's come to be known as Islamic Sharia. However, the implementation structures of governance, the form and shape of government, the method of government, who rules, is left unspecified.

It is of course self-evident that intellectuals and scholars of Islam ought to have a leading role in crafting any just society that is based on the singular scripture of Islam, the Holy Qur'an, just as it is for any system whose intellectuals and scholars play important roles in defining their system. Scholars and intellectuals are the bedrock of any enlightened society that draws its foundation from intellectual and spiritual capital. Plato would of course have the philosopher be the rulers. But the Holy Qur'an has left it unspecified. Unarguably, the matter is left Indeterminate like many other matters. Ostensibly, one may reasonably surmise, so that the core principles of Divine Guidance remain timeless and people of all levels of talent and expertise in every epoch are able to implement these principles according to their own requirements and social genius.

To therefore speciously assert that the religion of Islam has given a specific Divine mandate to rule solely to a particular class of people, namely to the faqih, is to mislead the public mind. Yes the capable faqih is just as much entitled to govern, and to provide intellectual and spiritual capital, as any other capable person of his time as a citizen of a state. What he is not entitled to is to rule, claim to be the beneficiary of the verse of obedience, claim to have special authority from God, and demand absolute obedience.

The example of King David, Prophet Daud, an ordinary sheep herder who came to lead his people as their Imam because of his un-
matched bravery in taking down “Jalut”, illustrates the point. Daud became the ruler of his nation as vouched in the Holy Qur'an, as a king no less, but he was hardly a theologian, or even an intellectual by his profession. He was surely very intelligent to have hit his enemy at his weakest point, and he ruled justly and with courage. Those qualities evidently were his qualifications to be anointed King of the Jews. This is quite contrary to Plato's philosopher-king and it is the Holy Qur'an that is making that assertion by retelling the story of Prophet Daud. As in all Qur'anic stories and parables, there is wisdom that is being conveyed.

The form of government is immaterial in the religion of Islam which lays a great deal of emphasis in its many verses on veritable moral principles as Divine Guidance to mankind. It is silent on what form the government should take, or who should become the rulers in future times.
Fixing Qur'anic Beatitudes

The Holy Qur'an instead affirms the lovely beatitudinous (from beatitude: supreme blessedness; exalted happiness) promise:

“And We desired to bestow a favor upon those who were deemed weak in the land, and to make them the Imams, and to make them the heirs,” (Surah Al-Qasas 28:5)

“Allah has decreed: "It is I and My messengers who must prevail": For Allah is One full of strength, able to enforce His Will.” (Surah Al-Mujaadila 58:21)

Before this We wrote in the Psalms, after the Message (given to Moses): "My servants, the righteous, shall inherit the earth." (Surah Al-Anbiyaa 21:105)

Caption The Holy Qur'an's equivalent of the Biblical Beatitude: “the meek shall inherit the earth” (Matthew 5:5 Holy Bible KJV). Is the Holy Qur'an proclaiming Divine Rule as the natural culmination of Islam? Or, are these verses proclaiming that the ordinary human beings among mankind will eventually prevail; they shall eventually establish justice among mankind and reach the highest station of creation in accordance with Divine Teachings that have been revealed to mankind by messengers and prophets throughout the ages? The twain are not the same propositions semantically – obviously – de-
spite the pious pulpits insistence upon the former interpretation of these verses! If Divine Rule is to be implemented by God's own appointed Imams, it is a tacit admission of failure of Islam to transform man upon his own volition! Only a foolish human author would set his own guidance system up for such an abject failure by predicating that no matter what man will do, mankind will still need divine intervention to reach Islam's culmination! Then what was the point of Islam? God could just as well have created the perfect man with Adam and Eve rather than the imperfect man who is destined to reach perfection by seeking Divine Guidance revealed in Islam's sacred scripture.

Straightforward inspection once again reveals that all these verses often brought up by the pulpits are prima facie Indeterminates. Like verse 4:59, verse 28:5 “who were deemed weak in the land,” is unknown. Perhaps it can be similarly qualitatively reasoned from other verses of the Holy Qur'an, but without specific context which is not in the Holy Qur'an, it would either remain temporal, meaning applicable only to the time of the Prophet when he was constantly under attack, or metaphorical and strictly Indeterminate. It can just as easily be argued by all oppressed to apply to themselves to encourage themselves with hope to continue in their perseverance! And it can also be argued by Machiavelli to apply to the oppressed to foment manufactured revolutions. However, a closer analytical examination also reveals that for the promise: “**to make them the Imams, and to make them the heirs,**” these heirs must logically also share common characteristics with the Imams the Holy Qur'an has referenced elsewhere. For instance, in Surah Al-Baqara verse 2:124 (already quoted above) where the Author proclaims that He alone makes Imams by Divine appointment: **“He said: Surely I will make you an Imam of men. Ibrahim said: And of my offspring? My covenant does not include the unjust, said He.”**
When the Author of the Holy Qur'an appoints Imams as per his covenant with Prophet Ibrahim, the word “Imam” is used in a specific sense from its common meaning as the proper noun expressing Divine Appointment. The Arabic-English dictionary of the Holy Qur'an defines the common meaning of the word “Imam” thusly: “Leader; President; Any object that is followed, whether a human being or a book or a highway”. That common meaning of the word “Imam” for instance is prima facie evident in verse 17:71 of Surah al-Israa' (examined in Part-II): “One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams”. One word, two distinct meanings, by the very definitions present in the Holy Qur'an in the semantics of the verse. The problem arises when attempt is cunningly or perhaps unwittingly made to alias the proper noun version as the common noun version.

As Machiavellian as that aliasing is for successfully marginalizing Islam, far greater damage is done when the Muslim pulpit and the plentiful exegesis writers who become sanctified in history as the source to go to for understanding the meaning of the Holy Qur'an, do the same aliasing to serve their own narrow interests. And whether they do it wittingly at the behest of their masters, or unwittingly due to incompetence or bias becomes irrelevant, for the impact in either case is resemantification of the verse and distortion of its meaning. It is the easiest subterfuge – you can't change the syntax and wording of the Holy Qur'an because that is protected by systematic oral memorization of the entire Holy Qur'an by plain ordinary Muslims from generation to generation beginning from the very time of the Prophet of Islam, so change its meaning! Only the very learned turbans can accomplish that most successfully. Especially when the verses are even partly or fully Indeterminate. But this travesty of the holy pen is plenty observable even for what is Determinate and what is categorical in verses which does not suit the ruling genius. The best example of this travesty is the watering down of the Principle of Inerrancy as applied to the Prophet of Islam by the holy scribes. Its idiotic rese-
mantification is visible in countless respected books of exegesis from antiquity to modernity. These exegeses have misinformed generation upon generation of Muslims who have reached for the *Cliff notes* on the Holy Qur'an.

This subversion of the Holy Qur'an is exactly identical to how the learned Jewish rabbis caveated their Ten Commandments from their universal form to exceptional form in order to claim moral exemptions for themselves so that actually doing the universal refrains to the *goy* was no longer forbidden to them. Thus, *Thou Shall Not Kill*, the First Commandment for instance, was changed to *Thou Shall Not Kill (a Jew)* in meaning. See Morality derived from the Intellect leads to Enslavement! for even more shocking contortions by the rabbis who superseded the spirit of the Torah with the spirit of the Talmud. The scribes of the Torah had already visited the same travesty upon the teachings of Prophet Moses. The Talmuds just took it ten steps further in perversity which today underwrites the Jewish ethos more than anything Prophet Moses ever taught. And the world amply sees this in Zionism which is but an expression of Jewish exceptionalism taught in the Talmud. The unequivocal condemnation in the Holy Qur'an of the Jews distorting their Good Book of Divine Guidance to suit their whim and fancy, is but a clear warning to the believers of the Holy Qur'an to refrain from doing the same. And yet, the Muslim turbans have visited the same travesty upon the Holy Qur'an and its religion Islam such that no two Muslims will necessarily agree on what something means. Each will bring their respective socialized understanding from the pens of these holy scribes to assert its meaning. The truth of these words is empirical, and without doubt. It is self-evident, except to those who are caught in its trap.

Therefore, keeping all that preceding clarity at the forefront of cognitive thinking, in the specific sense of Imam appointed by the Author in the context of 2:124, as opposed to just any ordinary leader that has a following in the context of 17:71, obedience is made obligatory for those for whom they are Imams, and the entire discussion of
of verse 4:59 in Part-II also carries over wherever and whenever obedience is made obligatory to any man by the Author. As already reasoned out in preceding sections, the Author of the Holy Qur'an cannot make obedience obligatory towards anyone who can make an error and not make a mockery of His Own divine Guidance System as the right path. Imam, obedience to the Imam, and the Principle of Inerrancy sort of go together as a package – in order for it to make any logical and rational sense to demand obedience to a man and still remain on the path of Divine Guidance which is proclaimed to be error free, infallible. Which is why, in its resemantification to serve self-interest, “ulul amar” is aliased as a common noun – and voilà, just about anyone can be it who can get away with it! That is the history of its corruption from the very day of the death of the Prophet of Islam until today where anyone has been able to become emperor, caliph, king, amir-ul-momineen, and today valih-e faqih, by including himself in that set and insisting on his entitlement by mere assertion and recourse to texts outside the pages of the Holy Qur'an. Why do they have to go outside for proof of their divine sanction? Precisely, because there isn't any in the Determinate verses of the Holy Qur'an. All one finds in its pristine pages is the categorical prohibition to being a follower, without caveat, as one can witness in the deconstruction of Taqlid below.

So, if the word “Imam” is used in verse 28:5 in that specific sense of 2:124, the verse is still only a Beatitude, an uplifting promise of some future time. The brilliant ability to harvest that theological concept for self-interest by the superman among both: the Shia pulpit to orchestrate “Imammate by proxy” to seed IRAN: The Crescent of Crisis as the birth of the uncompromising “Revolutionary Islam”, and among the hectoring hegemons to orchestrate the fiction of “Armaggeddon”, not withstanding. A contorted “doctrinal motivation” on two opposing sides for synthesizing the fear of “Clash of Civilizations” in order to continually lend credence to the threat of “End Times”. It enables manufacturing a brilliant Hegelian Dialectic which cannot be
disputed by those caught in its web – as it is already written in the sacred books that more than half the world's population believes in. It promotes the fiction of the existence of a global existential threat, putting the entire world on perpetual crisis footing.\[12\]

And if the word "Imam" represents the common meaning of 17:71 as an ordinary leader, it is exactly akin to the Biblical Beatitude: "the meek shall inherit the earth" (Matthew 5:5 Holy Bible KJV). Once again no reason to obey the meek when they inherit the earth – for they could become the next tyrants as was amply witnessed in the French Revolution and in the military dictatorship and conquests of Napoleon that followed.

Even whether verse 28:5 is speaking of the Messenger's own contemporary epoch when Prophet Muhammad finally prevailed over his own oppressors of twenty three long years and conquered Mecca just before he died, or of some future time, is Indeterminate. As is verse 58:21 affirming: "It is I and My messengers who must prevail"; and verse 21:105 similarly affirming: "My servants, the righteous, shall inherit the earth". All remarkably akin to the aforementioned uplifting promise in the Biblical Beatitude, and all recipient of the preceding analysis in toto.

When will such bliss transpire on earth is of course an ageless open question. It has been the source of speculation and anticipation from time immemorial, and the principal argument for Divine Rule since the adoption of Christianity by the Roman Empire. As far as the Holy Qur'an is concerned, it is Indeterminate.

It is of course also extraordinarily utilitarian for any believer or their chief to claim that inheritance for oneself in any era – mostly to survive with hope and dignity through dark periods of tyranny – for who can challenge that presumption? No certificates are required!

Especially if one succeeds in acquiring state powers and engages a thousand scribes and orators to extol one's divine rights to that inheritance as the vilayat-i faqih. Since it is an Indeterminate, it can be
posited any which way one wishes to dignify it, limited only by the fertility of one's imagination and foundation of one's eruditeness. The beatitude cannot be disproved from the Holy Qur'an because it is anchored as an Indeterminate! And it can certainly be proved to one's own audience by drawing upon one's own historical narratives that are collectively subscribed by the group. It is the empirical principle which seeds both group-think, conformity within a group, as well as diversity of thoughts and beliefs among different groups in mankind each exercising its own group-think.

"That which is left you by Allah is best for you, if ye (but) believed! but I am not set over you to keep watch!" (Surah Hud, 11:86)

Say: "Each one (of us) is waiting: wait ye, therefore, and soon shall ye know who it is that is on the straight and even way, and who it is that has received Guidance." (Surah Ta-Ha, 20:135)

Caption Is the Holy Qur'an proclaiming a Savior?

Verses 11:86 and 20:135 of the Holy Qur'an are intriguing examples of Indeterminates along the same lines of allegorical Beatitudes, but which directly fall on the Shia-Sunni sectarian divide on how these are understood by the Muslim mind. One must in fact go to sources outside the Holy Qur'an to even get an inkling of who or what (the people in the past believed) is being spoken of by the Author: ﷽ . These exemplary verses, and a few more like these, are esoterically proclaimed by some of these outside sources to be about Imam Mahdi – the Awaited Savior of humanity who will rule in End Times --- that entire eschatology itself being only in pages outside of the Holy Qur'an. Why are these verses not categorical rather than
metaphorical if the knowledge of eschatology is of pertinence to every people in every epoch? Speculation upon these verses is rife with absurdities.

Whereas, the prima facie meaning of verse 11:86 refers to some object (ٍبَيِّنَتُ), a nominative feminine noun, which can mean anything including persons or thing or guidance, that Allah leaves for “you” (لَكُمْ, both male and female) as a gift or benefit or mercy that you need for your divine guidance (ٍفِرْخٍ).

Straightforwardly, to the ordinary non doctrinaire mind, بَيِّنَتُ can represent the Holy Qur'an itself, which Allah has left those who believe (ٍفِيْوَمِينَ), as being best for them. Or it could mean the أولي الأمر of verse 4:59. Which one, if either, is not further disambiguated. The remaining part of the verse indicates Allah is not going to shepherd the believers beyond what He has already left them – it is entirely up to the believers to run with the remnant of Allah، بَيِّنَتُ الله، and: “Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or unthankful.” (see verse 76:3 quoted above)

The remnant of Allah، بَيِّنَتُ الله، in this verse is just a common noun, a symbol, a placeholder variable waiting to take on the instance of the object, or objects it represents, and not the object itself. Surely the Messenger of Allah must have explained what it means – but that explanation is not contained in the Holy Qur'an itself.

Therefore, verse 11:86 is prima facie allegorical, metaphorical, and not categorical; it is آياتُ مُتشابهات and therefore Indeterminate. This verse, like all the other آيات متشابهات، as a cynic would surely surmise, evidently exist only to sow confusion and discord among the Believers, perhaps to separate those who think (ٍأولو الأَلْبَاب) from those who do not: “and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding.” In addition, to stochastically seed diversity of beliefs based on natural socialization, tribe and nation that one is born into – which it has also always succeeded in doing, in every era. That observation is empirical. The veracity of these words is beyond doubt.
It is self-evident.

Notice that the Sunnis and the Shias each fill in the variable according to their respective sacred books. Being entitled to one's belief system whatever it may be as the most basic human right, the Sunni Muslims are not remiss if they think "بقيتُ آللَّه" might mean the Holy Qur'an, or the Caliphate; and the Shia Muslims are not remiss if they think it is the أُولى الأمر of verse 4:59. Since the latter today is the twelfth Imam, Imam Mahdi, according to the dogma found in Shia Ithna Ashari books of history, that's how that variable is fixed by them accordingly. Whereas the Shia Ismaili Muslim aren't remiss if some among them might believe "بقيتُ آللَّه" represents their Hazir Imam, the Aga Khan.

Believe whatever you want. However, unless it can be logically adduced from the Determinates alone who or what is being referenced by the Author in Surah Hud 11:86, it is categorically an Indeterminate. The Determinate verses at times provide an unequivocal rejection criterion for exclusion of what is willy-nilly fixed in the Indeterminates even when these Determinates may be silent on the acceptance criterion for the Indeterminates. The rejection criterion though powerful when applied logically and rationally, still leaves the door wide open for the acceptance of whatever that can be plausibly passed off by the boundless imagination of man in the Indeterminates! This is an undeniable problem that the Holy Qur'an has faced at the hands of the holy man. But it is a problem which it has itself enabled ab initio by the very presence of the Indeterminates. It is almost as if the Author of the Holy Qur'an wanted this to happen – why else would He leave that door wide open for it – thus laying the foundation of diversity of interpretations right there in the religion of Islam's singular scripture that the Author asserts he perfected: "This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion." (Surah Al-Maeda verse fragment 5:3) Well, if the Author perfected and completed the guidance system and the system itself plays out among its
own audience in multiple themes using its own Indeterminates, what else to make of it? Tell a child not to do something, and what's the first thing he will do?

Similarly, in the case of Surah Ta-Ha 20:135 where the Author commands, Say: "Each one (of us) is waiting: wait ye," the object noun for “wait ye” is noticeably absent, making the verse also an Indeterminate even on first reading. However, whatever that “wait ye,” might be for, the verse avers that it will unequivocally permit clear adjudication when that wait eventually does expire: “soon shall ye know who it is that is on the straight and even way, and who it is that has received Guidance." Once again we are immediately besieged by more imponderables. What does “soon” mean? How soon is soon? Is that the final Day of judgment? Or is that the arrival of the day of fulfillment of the promise made in the Qur’anic Beatitudes quoted above? Is that perhaps also what refers to, the fulfillment of the divine promise which is the remnant of Allah: “That which is left you by Allah is best for you”?

Thus, whichever way one examines it, is at best a metaphor whose semantics, never mind hidden meaning, is known only to Allah, (and as per the alternate parsing of verse 3:7 of Surah Aal-'Imran already discussed in Part-II) and to “Ar-Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” (ransxoon fi ilm).

All these inquiry questions are clearly Indeterminate, each one leading to more questions than answers, and thus entirely speculative to ponder upon. It is for this reason that these verses have been speciously speculated upon throughout the ages – an occupation of idle minds who perhaps never had to pursue a day's honest labor to earn their keep in their lifetime of paid employment from public funds as glorified theologians and scribes. The only function they ended up serving is causing needless differentiation to arise among Muslims based purely on speculative hearsay and verbal reportage centuries downstream – the “he said she said” which became known as the hadith literature – leading the foolish public mind deeper and deeper
into the sectarian quagmire. Integrated over time and space, this socialized ethos has become a permanent and virtually unshakable part of religious beliefs of virtually all Muslims, in all sects.

Today, the same public mind will comply in voluntary servitude under the demand of absolute obedience to authority on matters entirely **Indeterminate** and drawn from pages outside of the Holy Qur'an. If its Author wanted the people in future times to know any matter of religion of Islam not already covered in the Holy Qur'an, He would have clearly stated it categorically in the foundational verses and made it clearly **Determinate**, Mr. Spock sensibly surmises, so that all peoples in all times would understand it straightforwardly without juristic misinterpretation and chance of being misled by what is erringly human, the pen of fallible man. The Holy Qur'an unequivocally prescribes the accumulating fortunes of such imams in Surah An-Nahl:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear! (Surah An-Nahl 16:25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لِيَحْمِلُوا أُوْزَارَهُمْ كَامَلَةً يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وَمِنْ أُوْزَارِ الْأَلْبَاءِ يُضَلُّوْنَهُمْ بِغَيْبِ عَلَىٰ أَلْسَāءِ ما يَزَّرُونَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does the Holy Qur'an say about Taqlid?

Examining the Question of Following the Jurist

Verse of 16:25 of Surah An-Nahl quoted above is also stupendous in its overarching import. It straightforwardly exposes core lies which have become sanctified as “religion” in specious dogmas among Muslims. For one, it exposes “taqlid”, the practice of blind emulation and prescribed following of a jurist by the laity – a practice equally prevalent in both Shiadom and Sunnidom – as a master fraud for social control. Upon that master fraud is the edifice of the entire conception of sectarian Sharia laws, i.e., jurisprudence (religious legalisms that vary for each Muslim sect based on the opinions of its dominant jurists who have appointed themselves Interpreter of faith), constructed.

Expose its very foundation as being based on a core lie – and the entire sacred totem pole comes crashing down under its own weight!

The Holy Qur'an which daringly calls itself “Al-Furqaan” – the Author’s Criterion by which to judge the truth or falsity of any proposition (or understanding) pertaining to His Own Revealed Guidance System for mankind (مَثَّلَ الْقُرْآنَ وَأَنْقَلَبَ عَلَىَّ مَنْ أَغْلَبَ إِلَيْهِ), which He even asserts He “perfected” and “completed” and named it “Islam” (الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَنْقَلْبَ عَلَيْكُمْ بَعْضَكُم بَعْضٍ لِيُصَابَ عَلَيْكُمْ نَارٌ وَأَنْتُمْ تَذْمَرُونَ), and therefore there is no further room in its specification for additions and subtractions – does precisely that. (Verse fragments from Surah Al-Baqara 2:185 and Surah Al-Maeda 5:3 respectively.)

Even a tiny bit of logical reflection on the concatenation of verses pertinent to the Qur'anic Principle of Inerrancy already examined previously with verse of 16:25 of Surah An-Nahl exposes “taqlid” as a fabrication of the pulpit!

Perhaps it is necessary to restate for the sake of completeness, that only “These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance” (Surah Al An'aam verse 6:90 quoted earlier), can ever be
exempt from the damnation of this most electrifying verse 16:25 of Surah An-Nahl! Only the specific inerrant persons whom Allah is commanding the believers to follow – for indeed these have to be inerrant if Allah has directly guided them – can also be the “ulul-amar” of verse 4:59 already discussed earlier. No one else is permitted to be followed, and obeyed, in the religion of Islam! With that singular exception of obedience to the inerrant “imam” who is solely appointed by Allah (by His Own Declarations in the Holy Qur'an already examined above) and is not selected, elected, or anointed by the fiat of man, the entire concept of “following” and “followers” is unequivocally condemned in the Holy Qur'an. Most emphatically, in Surah Al-Baqara verses 2:166-2:167 (already quoted above). Due to its categorical significance, it is reproduced yet one more time to remind the reader of what the Good Book itself says categorically, in the clearest of terms, without caveats or exemptions:

“On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them.

And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166-2:167)

So how can “taqlid” of the fallible jurist be part of the religion of Islam when the very concept of following itself, ab initio, is not only most clearly deprecated, but Surah An-Nahl verse 16:25 also most clearly apportions culpability to those who are followed?
If “taqlid” of a fallible jurist was a part of the religion of Islam, then the Author of the Holy Qur'an created an absurdity, a foolishness; the Author commanded Muslims to follow an ordinary mortal who is not infallible, but since the jurist is not inerrant, and neither does any respectable jurist ever claim to be inerrant, foolish and sheepish people among the masses, those without knowledge and understanding, will also follow him. In point of fact and reality-check, in actual sectarian practice of Muslims, obedience is extorted from the public mind at the threat of eternal damnation – otherwise why would the sheepish laity follow the anointed popes except for that irrational fear which is continually cultivated and harvested by the church of man?

If “taqlid” of a fallible jurist was sanctioned by the religion of Islam, then, as per verse 16:25, these persons whom Allah is commanding to be followed will be apportioned their measure of blame if they are followed in their errors and the people are misled! That is a patent absurdity; a Kafkaesque double jeopardy: follow and be damned (verses 2:166-2:167), don't follow and be damned (“taqlid”), and the imam is damned because he is not inerrant and is followed and obeyed as ordered even in his mistakes, confabulations, distortions, half-truths, innovations, **Indeterminate** fixing, etceteras, which of course no one can adjudicate or catch or challenge because only the ignorant laity follows him (verse 16:25)! This is the base reality of Muslim jurists and their blind followers since the inception of the church of jurisprudence!

The Author of the Holy Qur'an Who claims to be the most Just and the most Wise Creator of all creation, cannot command “imams” to be followed and obeyed, and when they are followed and obeyed as per ordered, the “imams” are apportioned blame for their blind following when they venture their fallible opinions dependent solely on their particular bent of mind, proclivity, psychological tendencies, socialization bias, natural talent (and un-talent), ability to think and reason, knowledge, understanding, etceteras, in their verdict! No two people think the same, never mind agree on any matter --- and yet they
are commanded to be followed!

Indeed, if this absurd proposition of “taqlid” is true, then the Author has made a mockery of His own Guidance System! Whereas the Author is most sensitive about taking His Message lightly. He has repeatedly Admonished mankind to not mock the Holy Qur'an: “Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem?” (Surah Al-Waqia 56:81 quoted in Part-II); that: “Verily this is no less than a Message to (all) the Worlds” (Surah At-Takwir 81:27 quoted above); and: 'Then the Messenger will say: “O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.’” (Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30).

After all these straightforward admonitions to Muslims in the clearest of terms to take the Scripture seriously, the Author then ventures to mock His Own Message by mandating to the Muslim masses the “taqlid” of fallible jurists, and subsequently hanging these jurists for misleading the people because they are not inerrant and foolish people have inevitably followed them as commanded?

What a fickle-minded creator who damns if you do and damns if you don't --- only in the mind of man!

By *reductio ad absurdum*, when a proposition reduces to an absurdity, the premise it is predicated upon is false.

Since verses 2:166-2:167 and verse 16:25 are categorical, and presumed to be true ab initio as an axiom of faith that the Holy Qur'an has not been tampered with by the hand of man (no “tahreef”), therefore, Taqlid must be false as presuming it to be true in the presence of these verses leads to absurdity. If one still insists Taqlid to be true, then one also has to accept the consequent fact that the Holy Qur'an contains absurdities. No Muslim mind on planet earth will accept that outcome. It's easier for it to accept Taqlid as falsehood.

**Checkmate!**

Directly from the Holy Qur'an.
Q.E.D.

Marja-e-taqlid: right!

Blind emulation, “taqlid”, of a fallible imam jurist who is incestuously proclaimed Marja-e-taqlid by his coterie of equally fallible peers in Shiadom, is an absurdity in the religion of Islam in no less a measure than blanket obedience demanded to a fallible imam caliph who is speciously anointed “ulul-amar” by the shenanigans of political power around him, is in Sunnidom! Both are weighty fabrications of the respective pious Muslim pulpits; vile slanders upon the religion of Islam. It is categorically proscribed in the Holy Qur'an. There is no room for any doubt or interpretation. The veritable logic of Al-Furqaan, so clear and simple in adjudication with its Determine verses that even a sixth grader can straightforwardly follow its steps, coldly attests to that statement of fact. The previous examination of the Principle of Inerrancy which unequivocally established the singular prerequisite for complete obedience to “al-Wasilah” from the Determine verses, also attests to that fact. “Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear!”

Which is why, failing to find support in the Holy Qur'an, recourse is often made to pages outside the Holy Qur'an to legitimize this absurdity. Applying the same logic method of reductio ad absurdum recursively to every argument and every evidence presented from outside the Holy Qur'an, trivially demolishes them all. Sometimes evidence is presented from a recorded act of history, such as the Prophet or Imams of the Ahlul Bayt having appointed their own representatives and mandating the people over whom they exercised authority to obey their representatives on their behalf. Well, even philosophically, the burden of the acts and decisions of a representative ultimately still rests upon the one whom he represents, and who is still ultimately in authority to rectify matters if the need ever arose, to hear dissatisfaction, and to adjudicate. This is self-evident by definition of “representative” in this semantic context. Which is why it is a false argument of the self-appointed valih-e-faqih (or appointed by a consultative com-
mittee of self-styled holy jurists) for speciously conferring legitimacy upon himself because one, he can produce no certificate of such divine appointment, and two, he is now the highest authority next to God. No one can challenge his authority even legally. A throwback to the stone age to say the least, and no different than any vanilla don or king, including the King of kings the valih-e-faqih replaced with such fanfare in so much Persian blood tribute. Absolute rule which went away in the Age of Enlightenment in the West has been brought back with a new vengeance to the backward Muslims to help shape world order as proxy service providers of the West.

To be vigilant of false friends, false guides, false imams making false claims, is veritably underscored in Surah Al-Furqaan itself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Day that the wrong-doer will bite at his hands, he will say, 'Oh! Would that I had taken a (straight) path with the Messenger!' 25:27</th>
<th>وَيَوْمَ يَغُشُّ الظَّالِمُ عَلَى يَدِهِ يُقُولُ لَا أَيْتَنِي أَتَخَذَتْ مَعَ الرَّسُولِ سَبِيلًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Ah! Woe is me! Would that I had never taken such a one for a friend!' 25:28</td>
<td>يَا وَلَتَنِي لَمْ أَتَخَذَ فَلَاتَا خَليلا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'He did lead me astray from the Message (of Allah) after it had come to me! Ah! the Evil One is but a traitor to man!' 25:29</td>
<td>لَقَدْ أُصَلِّبْتُ عَنَّ الْذِّكَرِ بَعْدَ إِذْ جَاءَنِي ﷺ وَكَانَ الشِّيْطَانَ لِلإِنْسَانِ خَذَّولًا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then the Messenger will say: 'O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.' Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30</td>
<td>وَقَالَ الرَّسُولُ ﷺ رَبَّ يَا رَبَّ ۚ إِنَّ قَوْمِي أَتَخَذُوا هَذَا الْقُرْآنَ مُهْجُورًا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Surah Al-Furqaan 25:27-30 The ex post facto lament on the Day of Judgment by believers of having taken someone for a friend and being led astray by them, in the language of the Holy Qur'an is a categorical ad-
monishment before the fact, referring to those who come posing as friends and not overtly as enemies. This is a warning to all peoples to be wary of their own kind betraying them, for one usually takes those whom one knows and trusts as one's friends, guardians, protectors, guides, and imams. **Only friends can betray because the concept of betrayal is tied to trust.** In other words, the Holy Qur'an, *Al-Furqaan*, is warning the simpleton mind in every age to be wary of false friends, false imams, *Trojan Horse, Machiavelli*, who win the public trust with *cognitive infiltration*, and all the rest of the techniques of deception used in betrayal where the ones being betrayed do not realize it then. The purpose of the warning is obvious – so that the believers can shrewdly protect themselves from that outcome rather than lament on the Day of Accountability that they did not know. If they still don't wakeup today to their false friends and false imams who often come wearing the garbs and turbans endearing to the public mind, then the Prophet of Islam's strong lament is also recorded. Referring to the misled people as “my people” to show his deep anguish, the Prophet of Islam cries out that they did not take the Guidance in the Holy Qur'an seriously, shackling its meaning down to idiocy, down to their own whim and fancy, making the *Deen-e-mubeen* “mahjoor”!

These verses of Surah Al-Furqaan, 25:27-30, also unequivocally strike down false notions fed to the masses to legitimize taqlid of the fallible jurist that the follower may claim exemption from condemnation in Afterlife if one's own intention is good and one followed an imam who leads one astray by honest mistake of his ijtihad: **“Ah! Woe is me! Would that I had never taken such a one for a friend! He did lead me astray from the Message (of Allah) after it had come to me! Ah! the Evil One is but a traitor to man!”**
Sadly, no Muslim mind ever believes that these admonishments can ever apply to it. These always only apply to all the other fools over there in the other sects! The Sunnis believe this of the Shia with as much divine conviction as the Shias believe this of the Sunni, both opening the door wide open to Dr. Machiavelli to come rape them both.

This characteristic of self-righteousness is itself an inherent part of the religion of man. The fear and discomfort of cognitive dissonance evidently inhibits its very occurrence. Without experiencing cognitive dissonance, the psychological state of inner mental conflict between two contrarian positions, no transformation can transpire. Which is why, when faced with contrarian facts or evidence, the degree to which a man violently resists giving up his prior beliefs is directly proportional to his inner insecurities and is an index to his desires (as philosopher Bertrand Russell observed of the frailty of the human mind). Desires of which he may himself be unconscious of, as its seat is in the subconscious mind. Freud established this as an empirical fact of the irrational mind at the turn of the twentieth century. It is what the multi-trillion dollar global advertising industry is built upon. It is why masses of human beings fall easy prey to anyone who can cater to their base desires and insecurities – the sine qua non for the mass success of both religion and marketing. Advertising professionals and Machiavelli understand this human frailty better than the common mind. It is the cornerstone of success for well-designed propaganda as well as marketing campaigns. It is why the ministry of truth (as Geroge Orwell termed it in Nineteen Eighty-four) all around the world have come into existence to more effectively make the public mind. So who is your imam now?

Which is why, at the risk of stating the obvious once again, in the matters of the straight path, the Author of the Holy Qur'an is categorically making each human being accountable for his every decision, including the decision to follow or not to follow others, to have one's mind made or not made by others. There is no exemption for “oops!”
for anyone as these categorical verses of Surah Al-Baqara 2:166-2:167 and Surah Al-Furquaan 25:27-30 unequivocally assert. Neither in this life which becomes hellish not just for oneself but also for others when one follows false imams. Nor evidently in the Afterlife of Islam where everyone is called to account in the company of the “imam” they each followed: **“One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams”** (Surah al-Israa’, 17:71). So if one followed a false guide and did not realize it, there is no “oops!” exemption!

After this analytical presentation, why should anyone still believe that the holy marja-e-taqlid is exempt from the condemnation of verse 16:25? That those who follow him are exempt from the condemnation of verses 2:166-2:167 and 25:27-30? Precisely, because of a socialized culture of religion rather than of learning that dominates the public mind.

If one was born a Hindu instead of a Muslim, one would be shouting the virtues of Krishna from the mandirs. Today, the Hindu mind is on safer ground because Machiavelli has found little use for it in fueling imperial mobilization. If for nothing else, then just for that reason alone this subject is of grave public concern. The “arc of crisis” like a spreading fire, as the world is continually witnessing, spares no one in its path. To put it out effectively takes getting the core fundamentals that are being harvested for this purpose in the name of Islam, better scrutinized in the public eye. Virtually all of these so called axioms of faith are the creation of Machiavelli, are not supported in the Good Book, and hence are not part of the religion of Islam expressed in it.

While much has been stated about both “militant Islam” and “moderate Islam” being alien to the religion of Islam, the third part of the trifecta for the recipe of creating perfect storm for Muslim on Muslim violence, “revolutionary Islam” and its enabling axiom of “taqlid”, has escaped forensic scrutiny by the more learned minds who surely have better “ma'rifat” (deeper understanding) of the subject. The analytical mind that goes on facts permits no room for absurdities.
and gratuitous assumptions of faith. Things have to make logical sense given all the facts, and all their linkages. Some linkages are directly visible, while others are made visible by the logic of adding two plus two correctly equal to four. This analytical deconstruction of “taqlid” without prejudice by a layman, is the product of that basic arithmetic. A challenge directly to the valih-e-faqih du jour to respond, explain, and refute if there is any Qur'anic truth on his side. Silence is the domain of cowards. No one who claims Imam Ali as his guide has even a passing acquaintance with cowardice.

The controlling practice of “taqlid” as it has unfolded in Muslim civilizations, the underpinning of sects that were manufactured when the largely sheepish masses were encouraged to follow the anointed imam of their natural socialization by birth thus dividing into schools of thought, is a man-made divisive construct of the church of man. Its purpose is predatory social control of man by fellow man, be it among the Shia, the Sunni, the Ismaili, or any other group-think composition, in any religion. Like Christianity, the man of cloth as the interpreter of faith for the Muslims became a useful tool.

Is man so feeble minded, so inadequate in his talents, so corrupted in his heart, that he needs a fierce looking bearded shepherd until eternity to “Islamize” him? What an insult to God's creation --- and to God, that He Created such an absurdity in which imperfect man shall forever remain beholden to another imperfect man for guidance. Such an absurd God can only exist in the mind of Mephistopheles to enslave and control fellow man.

Any place where fallible man is anointed as the interpreter of faith for another, or obedience is demanded in the name of the divine, is a place where social control is being practiced in the name of the divine. Lift the pious robes and underneath one shall find, linked to the predatory social control, a bountiful and easy harvest of public's wealth being paid into the coffers of the pulpit, and empire. Perhaps this is why it is often hard to find clergy who is familiar with honest toil and labor. The bulging waist-lines alone testify to the vulgar em-
pirical truth of virtually all priestly class living off of public donations in the name of religion.

The superman rulers have comprehended this vile modus operandi of social control far more perceptively than the sheepish public they govern! And the clergy class in every religion has served that ruling interest with an iron-clad regimentation from time immemorial. (Superman is reference to Nietzsche's superman and not to the Marvel comic book hero; the ubermensch, the uber alles, deems himself above all the others, is beyond good and evil, tells noble lies and thinks nothing of it, and strives with his own “will to power” instead of superstitious religions to achieve lordship over mankind who refuse to evolve past their sheep state.) But when the clergy class has itself become the state, the public has been reduced to intellectual servitude to fellow man in the name of divine. To have done that damage to the pristine religion Islam which its Author claims to have “perfected” as the Divine Guidance System revealed to free man from the clutches of fellow man, is an immodest and unpardonable travesty for which verse 16:25 of Surah An-Nahl plainly vouches: “Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear!”

Unsurprisingly, no Muslim and his pope is going to give up their socialized interpretation of religion anymore than a socialized Zionist Jew is going to give up Zionism and a Brahmin priest is going to give up racism. And it is not because they each don't know or realize that their respective ideology is misanthropic and leads to the enslavement of the 'lesser peoples'. Knowing this general fact of obduracy about His Own Creation which, by His own Admission, “He fashioned him in due proportion” (see Surah As-Sajdah verses 32:07-32:09), is perhaps why the Author of the Holy Qur'an proffered that straightforward Admonition to people driven by self-interests and socialization bias even when truth has clearly been made manifest from error, of scores only being settled on the Day of Judgment. That, in this life, to whole-
heartedly “strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” (Surah Al-Maeda 5:48)

Therefore, as per the noble advocacy of this verse to eliminate conflict among mankind, one may hastily conclude that if “taqlid”, or any other harmonious system for that matter, leads to that wonderful race in all virtues, all power to it. That is the point – that any principled system can be made as virtuous in theory as it can be made evil in practice. The choice is evidently left up to man in the Holy Qur'an. The problem comes in when it is the latter and reduces an entire nation in willing servitude to the whims and ideas of one man, the self-anointed *philosopher-king*, with his subjects loving their state of bondage in the name of the Divine.

For those unfamiliar with the principal axiom of the Divine Guidance System of the religion of Islam, the topic is covered in the tutorial derived from this study: *What does the Holy Qur'an say about Taqlid - Blind Following the Non-Infallible?* (http://tinyurl.com/what-quran-says-about-taqlid). The axiom of inerrancy is also extracted into a tutorial due to its enormous significance in understanding the exhortation to obey the Messenger and which cannot be extended to anyone else but the inerrant “ulul amar”: *What does the Holy Qur'an say about Inerrancy of Prophet Muhammad?*. (http://tinyurl.com/what-quran-say-about-inerrancy)
What does the Holy Qur'an say about Government?

To resume and reach respectable closure on the earlier thread on the examination of Qur'anic Beatitudes and the pulpits' appeal to divinely sanctioned rule in its many different formulations by fixing the Indeterminates to suit their socialization bias, we can now appreciate that there are layers of meaning to these metaphorical verses not resolved by the Determinates, and hence are Indeterminate. And unless these do become resolved by Determinates, either by acquiring new understanding, or new knowledge that is discovered over time that makes comprehending the Indeterminates in the light of the Determinates better, these categorically remain Indeterminate and open-ended! Perhaps the Messenger had explained their hidden meanings to his contemporaries. Those who believe they still retain these explanations accurately in their socialization context, can of course believe whatever they like – they are socialized, nay entirely indoctrinated, into these belief systems anyway with little real choice exercised by them.

Indeed, the more honest ones among them openly proclaim their religion as an inheritance, especially the descendants of the Ahlul Bayt. They announce it publicly too --- by prepending “Syed” and similar appellation before or after their name to advertise to the world that their lineage descends directly from the Prophet of Islam. The pontiffs advertise it proudly too, by wearing the black colored turban tied in a specific way to indicate their special status as the children of the Prophet and his Ahlul Bayt. And the most open and bold admission is of course by the Western educated Aga Khan IV, who avers that he is the 49th continuous hereditary imam of the Ismaili Nizari Shia Muslims. A global imam without territory who exercises complete control as well as full responsibility over his flock from his one of a kind headquarters in France. He also represents the best spirit of the pluralism of Islam among all Muslim sects by his social welfare work worldwide, benefitting all peoples, as principally advocated in
Surah Al-Hujraat 49:13 (see below). No other Muslim sect or imam can hold a candle to, or lay claims to, such demonstrated pluralism. However, the proverbial pound of flesh has equally been extracted from these long running hereditary imams as well. Witness the Aga Khan's most unusual level of co-option in working hand in glove with empire in: Ismaili Muslims and Aga Khan's Doctrine of Neutrality (http://tinyurl.com/Aga-Khan-Neutrality). And further witness the exhibition of banal self-righteousness that is little different from all the other Muslim sects' despite genuine attempts at pluralism, in: The Amman Message (http://tinyurl.com/Amman-Message-Aga-Khan). A pluralism when it is not in conflict with self-righteousness!

When religion is an inheritance, and makes one self-righteous, one can at best acquire mastery and scholarship only upon one's inheritance.

We observe that fact in practice. It is foolish to require anyone to give up their inheritance --- it is what defines us like our gender, it is who we are, the tribe and nation we belong to.

That empirical fact of the hard genetic structure which expresses itself in the plurality of strains that is mankind, has evidently been extended to its programming, i.e., religion, as well. That undeniable fact of empiricism too is categorically recorded in Surah Al-Maeda, 5:44-48 (See Islam and Knowledge vs Socialization, http://tinyurl.com/Islam-Socialization)
However, the men and woman of understanding among them, (أولو الأئثاب), must also force their pulpits to publicly acknowledge to their own flock that their fixing of an Indeterminate is drawn from sources outside the pages of the Holy Qur'an, from their respective holy books and sectarian dogmas. If one is to stay within the pages of the Holy Qur'an, one is forced to leave these matters as the Author Himself counsels in verse 3:7, as metaphorical, and therefore, Indeterminate. Meaning, as unknowns, without feeling any inner compulsion to fix their meaning at all.

Observe that despite the arguable metaphorical allusions to divinely sanctioned rule in its Indeterminates, the Holy Qur'an does not categorically prescribe in its Determinate verses any kind of governance, never mind specify who must rule apart from أولي الأمر of verse 4:59 previously analyzed, and which is itself left as an Indeterminate. It is arguably to transpire only in some unknown and unspecified epoch whence all the Qur'anic Beatitudes quoted above are finally realized: “It is I and My messengers who must prevail”. Thus far, that allegorical promise of both the Holy Bible and the Holy Qur'an have not been realized. We still live in a world of tyranny run by vile Hectoring Hegemons, now even more sophisticated than ever, employing diabolical instruments and philosophies to continually corral mankind from one misery to another under different Hegelian Dialectics. So who governs in the mean time? Sensibly, the people have to govern themselves! The Holy Qur'an has categorically prescribed its recipe that man must willingly stand up to these usurpers and exploiters of mankind among them (see http://tinyurl.com/Surah-Asr-Tafsir). However, the Holy Qur'an has not prescribed in its Determinate verses what such governance must look like that stands up to tyranny, except for some desirable general characteristics of righteous collectivism which it categorically prescribes for realizing the good Islamic society that is the harbinger of justice for all mankind.

In fact, these Qur'anic platitudes are not that much different in principle from what Solon, the ancient Athenian law-giver, advocated
for social responsibility. When asked which city he thought was well-governed, Solon said: “That city where those who have not been injured take up the cause of one who has, and prosecute the case as earnestly as if the wrong had been done to themselves.”

For that matter, even the United States Constitution and its famous American Bill of Rights are not inconsistent with the Holy Qur'an. There isn't anything in that manmade republican governance principle that is intrinsically in conflict with the Good Book. In fact, it can be cogently argued to be implementing some of the principles of Islam itself. Unlike others claiming the divine right to rule through 4:59, the American Constitution however does not claim itself to be divine – but Declares itself to be self-evident for the spelled out inalienable rights of the people.

It is a travesty that all these lofty platitudes on lovely parchment have been instrumented in society with the same inimical zest for justice and fairness as any other lovely words in any Sacred text from time immemorial, including the Ten Commandments, and the Holy Qur'an. This topic has been examined in depth in Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization (see http://tinyurl.com/Islam-Socialization).

Rule in the name of divine went away during Christendom's reformation period. It was replaced by people choosing to govern themselves. Whereas, it has been the principal raison d'être of governance of all Muslim empires and Caliphates, including latter day Muslim oligarchic states. None of which is to be found in the Determinates of the Holy Qur'an itself; appeal is always made to its Indeterminates in every era to justify and sanction man's rule in the name of divine.

There is surely no name more abused for narrow self-interests than the name of Divine since the dawn of civilization. In the past it was to verse 4:59 that thirteen centuries of Muslim empires looked to justify their rule. In the contemporary present, the principle of vilayat-i faqih in the Islamic Republic of Iran has most imaginatively made that appeal inter alia to both 4:59 and 28:5, asserting that its clergy
class are representatives of those inheritors of the promise made in 28:5, and therefore must be obeyed as per 4:59. The ubiquitous practice of “taqlid” (already examined above) helped secure that blind obedience to religious authority from the sheepish masses. While Iran today proudly boasts of being the only Eastern nation which disobediently stands up to the Western hegemons as the permanent enemy of the Great Satan, its majority public meekly bows their head in blind obedience to their popes in full conviction of eternal salvation.

One can see that the Indeterminates permit open interpretation – and that's the premeditated diversity engine of the religion of Islam. When diversity based on the Indeterminates does not sow discord, is in the spirit of Islam as categorically outlined by its Determinates, then it is theologically not deprecated in the religion of Islam as should be evident from all the preceding discussions. It is the sowing of discord by interpreting what is metaphorical and allegorical in the Holy Qur'an that is deprecated. If interpretation was in fact not expected by the Author despite His Counsel against it, arguably there'd be no Indeterminates in the Book which claims itself a Divine Guidance for all mankind. The ambiguity in its specification is prima facie evidence of its sophisticated and pragmatic engine to seed diversity because man, by the very nature of his construction (creation), will argue and dispute, be socialized and group-think: “If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” (Surah Al-Maeda 5:48). The Qur'anic guidance system endeavors to take man from that disputative warring state of nascent creation, to willingly rising to a stature in which he will come to excel the angels. Only the journey on the road of “fuss-tabi-qul-khairaat” (فاستَبِقُوا الْخَيْرَاتْ), “so strive as in a race in all virtues”, can take a disputative, ethnocentric, tribalistic, nationalistic, and fiqhilistic people to the heights of that station. It is self-evident that part and parcel of striving “as in a race in all vir-
tues” includes standing up to tyrants and creating social justice. All people are capable of doing that. What further Divine intervention is needed?

To even begin the process of transformation of coming together on the Determinates of the Holy Qur'an, since no Muslim sect is going to give up their emotional and theological attachments to their historical legacy any time soon, if ever, the realities of the matter and the dangers of fratricide facing Muslims, call for immediate co-existence of sects as they are. Arguably therefore, so long as the interpretations and fixing of the Indeterminates do not sow discord among Muslims as per verse 3:7, why should any particular fixing by one sect be deemed any more holier than any other sect's? All fixing make recourse to material outside the Holy Qur'an anyway --- whatever may be deemed to be its sacredness by the socialization in the respective sect. It is still not in the Holy Qur'an.

That is the singular recognition which must finally be truthfully admitted from every pulpit in order to form any kind of coherence among the disparate Muslim sects.

The abstractions Determinate and Indeterminate naturally permit such realization to first be articulated, and then percolated inwards, outwards, upwards, and downwards. A bold public admission of just this reality of the actual sources of their beliefs, driven from all Muslim pulpits, either voluntarily, or through state power according religious rights to Muslim sects, is the first step of coming together as one Muslim nation – without coercing anyone to change their emotional attachments to their respective heroes of history or come under the stewardship of any one sect's ideology.

Consequently, regardless of which Muslim sect or political group defines their nation's philosophical and national characteristics, if they employ the Determinate verse 5:48 of Surah Al-Maeda as the cornerstone of their state's constitution ; if they espouse the fairness expressed in the Biblical Golden Rule: “Do unto others as you have
others do unto you”, and adopt the powerful corollary that naturally falls out of it as their force majeure to preempt exploitation: “no one shall take unfair advantage of another”; and make these worthy first principles of fairness and justice the very foundation of their governance structures whereby all civil, political, and religious rights are accorded to its citizens irrespective of their own theological beliefs with equality and without prejudice, both in theory and in practice, such a state would be sufficiently Islamic to legitimately call itself an “Islamic state” – even if it was entirely a secular state! It would be irrespective of the rest of its colorful artifacts, whether theologically drawn from the Indeterminates and therefore not something to be sown discord over as verse 3:7 clearly avers, or a separation of state and religion in terms of the philosophical outlook of the state itself! What does it matter to the ordinary man and woman what type of state it is if the state gives the public the liberty to better themselves in fairness, justice, is not exploitive, does not usurp, does not plunder, is not a vassal of foreign powers, and lends all its denizens the opportunity to believe and practice as a community what they each commonly hold sacred?

As one can immediately see, an almost infinite array of diverse governance systems are possible under that enlightened rubric – only limited by the creative energies of the people and their enlightened stewards. The stony silence of the Holy Qur'an on the governance structure, and its explicit categorical articulation of the general social principles to enact among Muslims in its Determinates, yields only this logical deduction, and no other!

This isn't a utopia. Many Muslim governments exist today – they can just as easily adopt the political recommendations noted above to eliminate fratricide and foster amity among Muslims in their own nations. That would of course only be possible if these states were themselves not part of this Machiavellian fratricide, state sponsored, both nationally and globally, as surrogate vassals of the hectoring hegemons.
Therefore, if any presumptuously “Islamic” state sheds the blood of Muslims in the name of Islam, sows discord, then it is clearly not an Islamic state by definition of the religion of Islam – but a tyrannical state no different than any other tyrannical state, Islam's lofty symbols proudly adorning its national flag notwithstanding.

What is perhaps of utmost most significance however, is the recognition that the Hectoring Hegemons not only perceptively understand these matters concerning the religion of Islam, they also understand the cracks, fissures, and lacunas among the Muslim sects, and how to both tickle these further, and how to harvest the subsequent fruits. They know how to invent new sects just as well as they know how to create revolutions by harnessing the indigenous discontent which they ab initio create in the first place.

As in recent past, internecine warfare is the unnatural destiny that has been planned for Muslims in the twenty-first century as well – and they had better wizen up before it is enacted on the scale which has been apportioned. To appreciate the urgency, and just how much of an existential necessity it is to immediately overcome sectarianism which continues to directly play into the hands of hectoring hegemons, see the excerpt from the political novel (or historical fiction) “Memoirs Of Mr. Hempher, The British Spy To The Middle East” (http://tinyurl.com/excerpt-memoirs-of-mr-hempher). It is sure to distress the naïve and the erudite mind alike to learn just how accurately the hectoring hegemons understand and exploit the cracks and lacunas among the two major sects of Islam comprising nearly 99 percent of the 1.6 to 2 billion Muslims on planet earth today.
Conclusion

This case study set out to examine the question posed at the beginning:

What are the inherent impediments for studying the message of the Holy Qur'an which make the Book so amenable to self-serving interpretation, socialization, and even bastardization by anyone?

If the reader's mind hasn't been entirely asleep through this long perusal, the discovery that the presence of Indeterminates in the Holy Qur'an which necessitates going outside of its pristine pages to resolve them, is primarily responsible for the paradox that the Holy Qur'an has itself contributed to its subversion, must be disconcerting to the honest mind. The Muslims, generation after generation, have themselves contributed to this state of affairs by remaining ossified in the narratives of history rather than progressively evolving their understanding of the principles of Islam as espoused directly in the text of the Holy Qur'an. That lamentable fact has arrested their evolution as a people, mired them in rituals and rites which dominate their socialization and their practice of religion, and opened them to sectarian schisms which has made them easy prey to the supermen and Machiavelli. The unfortunate truth of these observations is straightforwardly validated by the lamentable fact that even in today's modernity, one which is run exclusively by superior intellects who use game theory, psychology, social engineering, and political science to orchestrate “imperial mobilization” under the primacy imperatives of the new White Man's Burden for one-world government, even the best among the Muslim scholars and intellectuals, politicians and states-
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men, poets and dreamers, pressmen and prostitutes, remain nonethe-
less wiser. In fact, many have become *house niggers* willingly carry-
ing the *White Man's Burden*. And like the Muslim masses, many also
offer their daily prayers on time, keep all their fasts, feed the poor, and
perform their *Hajj*, preferably multiple times. And if one informs them
that they are in fact destined for hell, hell right here on earth, they
confidently reply that they are looking forward to Heaven elsewhere.
Solution Space

The ease with which the masters of religion divided the Muslims since its very inception, with even far greater ease the Muslims can become united on the Holy Qur'an by acquiring intimacy with the abstractions natural to the Holy Qur'an: Determinates and Indeterminates. The Muslims have been made victims by their own pulpits no differently than the Christians. Neither the Sunni nor the Shia pulpit is able to reason, nor logically prove their differentiating theology from the Holy Qur'an directly, blanket assertions with appeal to authority and historical sources being their only blunt instrument of argumentation. This is clearly visible among both the Shia and Sunni pulpits each of which have created their own sacred axioms that they each swear by, based exclusively on the scribes of history and selective fixing of the Indeterminates to suit their respective socialization bias. That has led to the senseless differentiation which is guaranteed to be irreconcilable under any one sect's ideological banner, remaining perennially ripe for a good harvest by Machiavelli in every era.

Adoption of the Qur'anic abstractions Determine and Indeterminate in promulgating the understanding of the religion of Islam from both the Shia and Sunni pulpits, permits a mutual co-existence with greater amity and friendship among all the major Muslim sects. It simultaneously raises awareness of the actual sources of their own religion from which the Muslim mind draws its various beliefs. These simple abstractions lend a vocabulary and nomenclature to even begin sensible and rational discussions of matters that have previously often been steeped in blind faith, shrouded in ignorance, clothed in baseless assertions, and ripe for gratuitous cognitive infiltration into the religion of Islam.

It permits the Muslim mind to “legally” agree to disagree on matters which are Indeterminate without calling each other misguided or kafir, while automatically permitting rational agreements to be forged on what is Determine. This also resolves forging agreement on mat-
ters that fall on the delicate boundary between what is **Determinate** and what is **Indeterminate**, as for instance is betrayed by the two different parsing of verse 3:7 along the Shia-Sunni sectarian divide. Which parsing is correct is itself an **Indeterminate**. Therefore, what is not categorically deemed **Determinate** by both pulpits is sensibly treated as **Indeterminate** by definition, rather than sow discord. That approach is counseled by verse 3:7 itself.

Only under that singular categorical banner of the **Determinates** of the Holy Qur'an, can Muslims ever forge themselves into one Muslim nation. The **Determinates** also easily permit expunging abhorrent ideologies, gratuitous doctrines, dogmas, and practices which have vilely infiltrated the religion of Islam as amply demonstrated by the examination of the question of “taqlid” above. Self-interest of both the pulpit and the throne is clearly brought to light in that examination because the question is a **Determinate** question, most emphatically and straightforwardly answered in the Holy Qur'an. Similarly, the Principle of Inerrancy is stated so plainly in the Holy Qur'an that the self-interest of the entire Sunni pulpit in asserting the contrary in service of the caliphates and Muslim empires is most clearly visible. Without vilely negating that first **Determinate** principle of the Holy Qur'an, the very first Caliph after the death of the Prophet of Islam could never have occupied the rulership of the nascent Muslims – and perhaps the history may have unfolded differently! These are clear examples of guile, deception, subterfuge, and hijacking, among both Shiadom and Sunnidom. If it is so easy for power to subvert the **Determinates**, just imagine how easy it is to fill the **Indeterminates**! By the same yardstick, sympathetic power can equally affect the alternate outcome. But why would power slaughter its own prized goose that lays the golden egg in every epoch?

The benefits of rational assemblage of the worldwide Muslim public mind on the **Determinates** of the Holy Qur'an today is so obvious that to even state it fourteen-fifteen centuries later sounds entirely platitudinous; sort of like rehearsing the lofty Ten Commandments in
wonderment as if they were just revealed yesterday! Only narrow self-interests of both the pulpit and the throne preclude that assemblage!

Nevertheless, the lead principle to drive this *Muslim umma* unification process globally while retaining the rich diversity among Muslims, is the *verse of unification*, verse 5:48 of Surah Al-Maeda of the Holy Qur'an. Its rational adoption as the political and spiritual mandate of all Muslim sects, tribes and nations in its myriad civilizations from the East to the West, organically launches the Muslim public mind on that road to political and spiritual recovery without being under the headmastership of any sect and their specious dogmas. The rest will happen naturally, over time, by the natural system dynamics unleashed with the adoption and active promulgation of that simple political science first principle from the Holy Qur'an itself.

This evolution of the understanding of the religion of Islam among the Muslims is the only choice to survive in the coming age without both, internecine warfare that is diabolically crafted by Machiavelli, and losing the spirit of their religion further to the shell of empty rituals.

The Machiavelli in the meantime is active by way of divide and conquer to spread the scourge of Secular Humanism in all civilizations to wipe out all traces of theism. The religion of Islam, evidently, is its most resolute obstruction (see [http://tinyurl.com/Islam-vs-Secular-Humanism](http://tinyurl.com/Islam-vs-Secular-Humanism)). It is foolhardy to not capitalize on one's natural advantage in the art of war! The full spectrum capitalization of that asset is the principal raison d'être of this report.
Proposal to the Pulpits

As the first baby step towards better understanding their own differences – the Shia and Sunni pulpits are invited to proclaim their own beliefs at their own learned scholarly level, using these new abstractions. Then let's sit together to examine what each sect has itself determined to be **Determinate** vs. **Indeterminate** on matters that are differentiating between Shia and Sunni pulpits. It will surely surprise them both! Just as it has surprised this scribe how easy and straightforward the resolution is – its only obstruction being the hectoring hegemons and their insidious vassals throughout the Muslim world. It is perhaps for this insightful realization that a pen awarded to this scribe's little boy a score years ago by the Sunday School in California in the United States of America, for Qur'an recitation on stage at age 4 or 5, had inscribed on it the farsighted statement:

“Those who differentiate between Shia and Sunni are neither of the Sunnis nor of the Shias.”
Self Study Guide for Seekers of Understanding
(أولو الأليب)  

Incestuous self-reinforcement is the bane of objective scholarship. This is why the scientific process came into existence to study any matter objectively. Putting the data and its analysis before others to scrutinize and adjudicate, enables defeating all forms of crippled epistemology and ingrained bias which are often a consequence of incestuous self-reinforcement. One has the opportunity to examine the same data, and examine the analysis performed on that data, conduct one's own experiments so to speak, and either substantiate or refute the thesis and conclusions so reached. This process, when honestly followed, itself advances not just the state of understanding, but enables new discoveries.

But the scientific process itself, carried out by human beings, is also beholden to the limitations of the human being in his subconscious ability to be perfectly objective on any matter. This means all the natural forces of bias that the human mind is unconsciously susceptible to that work their magic to co-opt the rational mind from seeing matters, reality, existence, the way it actually is, have to be overcome to ensure objectivity at the cognitive level and accuracy in the pursuit of understanding by the scientific method. A faulty method in implementation, or its deliberate corruption due to vested interests, will only lead to faulty results and false conclusions in the name of science and objectivity.

This is all the more crucial in social sciences where subjectivity is inherent and inescapable – the species is studying itself. And also because the social sciences can be diabolically harnessed to Machiavellianly foist unpopular political agendas on the public mind disguised as science, or, by appeal to suitably co-opted scientific authority, peddle propaganda and “religion” as science (see “Disambiguating Religion, Science and Psychological Warfare Operations”,
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There are many examples that illustrate the truth of this statement that span the gamut of engineering unpopular public policy, from the eugenics movement in the early twentieth century to limit immigration to selected races to global warming in the early twenty-first to usher in carbon credit for limiting growth. All based on appeal to pseudo science and deployed with the full force of perception management of the public mind!

Religion is the same way.

The forces of subconscious bias infecting the human mind include (the following breakdown is adapted from the more detailed examination of the forces of co-option in “The Art and Science of Co-option”, http://tinyurl.com/art-and-science-of-co-option):

- **(1) socialization bias** (nurture, social programming, learning);
- **(2) perception bias** (nature, hardware, DNA, limits imposed by the five perception senses and the brain capacity, natural inclination, propensity, hardwired intellectual capacity to think and reflect, IQ or Intelligence Quotient, hardwired psychological bent of mind, EQ or Emotional Quotient, hardwired spiritual capacity to transcend materialism, proclivity toward transcendentalism, awareness, consciousness, animatism, superstition, etc., SQ or Spiritual Quotient);
- **(3) data availability bias** (what data is used, what books one reads for instance);
- **(4) confirmation bias** (how data is used to preselect a desired outcome, narrowing the scope of data, massaging the data to confirm an a priori conclusion);
- **(5) presuppositional bias** (culturally ingrained presumptions or prejudices or affinities, loves and hates,
that transcend the individual and are rooted in the value system of the civilization one grows up in, such as: Orientalism – looking down upon the East, *uber alles*, master race, exceptionalism, superiority complex; and its opposites: inferiority complex, *house niggers*, Uncle Toms, Occidentosis – East looking to the West or to the white man for solutions thinking it superior; Triumphalism – aspiring to universalize one's own values and beliefs thinking all others inferior, Capitalism, Communism, Democracy, Christianity, Islam, Secular Humanism, Scientific Materialism, Dogmas of Science and Medicine, etc.).

All these factors underwriting *incestuous self-reinforcement* (reinforcing what is already believed whether consciously or instinctively), create an inescapable *mind-lock* from which cognitively escaping to objectivity and impartiality remains elusive for most people. These largely unquantifiable factors contribute to the formulation of one's worldview and instinctualize the subjectivity in perspective that man is irreparably plagued with for his fundamental loves, hates, beliefs, and sense of attachment that may span the gamut from tribal to civilizational. This subjectivity is hard to transcend as it colors the cognitive mind *ab initio*, subliminally, subconsciously, and overcoming it is akin to performing brain-surgery upon one's own brain. A self-referential problem that requires a great deal of wherewithal to get a handle on, and to attempt to rise to some level of objectivity by creating distance from self. The hard problem of Epistemology, the human limits to knowing despite the most accurate application of the scientific method, is examined further in Part-IV.

The question posed in Part-I is empirical and not rhetorical: “*everyone quotes their favorite verses to justify their own narrow positions;*”. However, has the author of this report done anything different, as far as the alert reader is concerned, when the report inter alia asserts in Part-III:
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It sure explains empirical reality coherently, but most importantly, in self-sufficiency and self-consistency drawn solely from the Holy Qur'an and no other source!

How is the skeptical reader, and the seeker of understanding desirous of being counted among those addressed as اهل الالب in the Holy Qur'an, to defend their levying that same charge of Part-I against this report beyond their own knee-jerk emotional reaction which the report is sure to induce in a Muslim?

Only by following the scientific process! And by being aware of the natural forces of bias infecting the human mind. This study is not about faith, or about questioning faith. It is about epistemology – how we know what we know. It is about rational examination of data and its analysis akin to what one might pursue in any academic science. Here, logical reasoning as the standard of analysis, “aql ki kassoti” as one might say in Urdu, and not faith, is applied to the study of a complex Book whose author is named “Author” in this examination. What is the Author specifying in His Own Words? That is the primary yardstick driving this investigation of what the Author means and wants to convey in his own Words.

This endeavor of due diligence is as simple and as straightforward as the effort expended for any honest book report written by a college, or even high school, student, nay even elementary school student. The student can cheat and read the Cliff notes, seek other writers' opinions and commentaries, ask his parents, or he can faithfully read the assigned book directly and see what its own author is saying in her own words without projecting his own a priori conclusions and presuppositions upon it. This is so basic an academic value that even to state it in the classroom implies that there is a basic need for making this statement --- because all the students in the class are cheating! The Holy Qur'an itself condemns such short cuts taken by the lazy mind, or the mind prejudiced by all the artifacts of bias enumerated above, as not the best way of understanding its Message: “Do they not then reflect
on the Qur'an? Nay, on the hearts there are locks.” (Surah Muhammad 47:24)

That minimal level of basic due diligence, the prerequisite to acquiring “ma'rifat” on any subject, makes it apparent what the Author of the Holy Qur'an in his own best wisdom has chosen to leave ambiguous, metaphorical, open ended, temporal, timeless, accessible only to the “Rasikhoon-fil-ilm” (3:7), and what He has chosen to state categorically, straightforwardly, without being colored by others projecting their own two cents worth on what the Author means from the tunnel vision and co-opting constraints of their own epoch, both time and space. For indeed, in comparison to any author's own words for what he wants to convey, everyone else's description of what that author wants to convey pale in comparison. Own words always trump others' explanations of it. The truth of that statement is universal and without doubt. It is self-evident. When that is a truism for even ordinary authors, it is a grotesque perversity and corruption beyond measure to not apply it sensibly to the Author of the Holy Qur'an. The fact that one see this travesty transpiring timelessly in virtually every Muslim microcosm where pulpit is big business, is the state organ, or the state itself, is its own self-incriminating condemnation.

The lazy mind, the foolish mind, the socialized mind, the undisciplined mind, the uninformed mind, the conformant mind, the parrot mind, and societies that nurture them, all lose for the simple want of individual due diligence. Co-option takes care of the rest who do try to overcome these mental chains. Co-option is a pivotal and defining constraint for not just honest intellectual scholarship, but also for the ordinary individual seeking to do the right thing but deeming “united we stand” the better part of valor. It permits the continuation of the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness! See The Art and Science of Co-option (http://tinyurl.com/art-and-science-of-co-option).

This author, an ordinary engineer in Silicon Valley California in a past life, well-versed in building systems that work and interoperate from initially incomplete or ambiguous specifications or merely wish
lists, and in developing and writing specifications ab initio to create systems which work and solve customers' problems and for which customers paid real money to purchase, has explored the stated inquiry question from that analytical perspective, of a systems architect who is hypothetically tasked to engineer the system specified in the Holy Qur'an. In order to do so, the Qur'anic specification must first be understood by him. And understood in terms of what its Author has specified, and not what this author has imagined the Author has specified, interpreted, or what others have thought what the Author has specified. Compliance testing reins in the fertile imagination of an engineer to ensure that the specification is followed rigorously and accurately:

- by “Functional Tests” (employing the electrical engineering parlance) which the Author will administer for pass or fail on the Day of Accountability (this means no interpretation, akin to understanding the DMV driver's manual correctly in order to pass the road test, or an engineering spec in order to build the product as specified by the authors of the spec);

- by seamless interoperability with others pursuing similar mandate (this means being constrained to the Determinates, akin to driving on the public roads in harmony and without causing fatal accidents or discord with all the other drivers).

This study of the Holy Qur'an, and Part-IV that follows which looks at the primary sources of understanding the religion of Islam outside of the Holy Qur'an, have principally been conducted thus far with the left-half brain, logic-only mind, of a practical scientist engaged in existential battles like the metaphorical Mr. Spock (and not an ideologue ensconced in some ivory tower who has never lived in the real world, never competed for livelihood, never fought an enemy, never stood up to Machiavellian power with courage and fortitude, and never lived the hell on earth except on paper and on television).
Often called upon to make urgent split-second factual analysis of weighty matters – at times ambiguous with incomplete or probabilistic data, at times concrete with accurate data, and at times cloaked in layers of deception by the enemy where the data itself is misleading – on which depend the life and death survival decisions of his Captain, Mr. Spock cannot ever be wrong in his analysis, logical deductions, and recommendations. But his recommendations may or may not be acceptable to the Captain who steers his own decision making process by more than just his own left-half brain. The Captain can never refute Mr. Spock's analysis and deductions, and at times his right-half brain led decisions appear illogical to Mr. Spock. And yet, invariably turn out to be more effective in certain cases that require gut-feel, intuition, insight, faith, spiritual know-how; all esoterica that remain beyond the purview of empirical analysis and logical reasoning. The limitations of Mr. Spock and this approach to studying a divine text have already been addressed in the preamble of Part-II.

The fact that Mr. Spock classified the divine text as a ciphertext which must be deciphered correctly to a single plaintext, i.e., uncover the meaning intended to be conveyed by the Author of the Holy Qur'an as in a law book or the DMV driver's manual, rather than as a book of literature and poetry which may interpreted according to each individual's bent of mind and proclivity, is the first axiom that could itself be perceived as being in error by the right-brain dominant human mind that feels more than it is able to think and reason. Is the Holy Qur'an not intended as guidance for them too? They can neither reason effectively nor think clearly – but who is to say that they do not understand the spiritual essence of the Divine Guidance better than those empiricists who can think and reason? No reference decoding is available today to adjudicate! The Messenger and those designated “ulul-amar” of verse 4:59 are no longer living among us to tell us who is right, and who isn't.

Which is why a sensible and rational interpretation of remnant of Allah, “That which is left you by Allah is best for you”؟، ﷺ ﺑَقِيتَ ﺍﻟلَّهُ.
مُخْتََر لَكُمْ، inter alia, is the verse 5:48. It is the categorical best for all of us: “so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.” It works for both types of people, those who think and analyze, and those unable to reason for themselves and follow by faith, sect, emotionalism, socialization, indoctrination, superstition, and whatever or whoever appeals to the insecurities of their own sub-conscious mind.

More importantly, as the rational protocol for understanding the message of the Holy Qur'an demands, it permits staying within the pages of the Holy Qur'an, solely referring to its Determinate verses for guidance in understanding what its Indeterminate are proclaiming, and therefore all sects and schools of thought among Muslims can easily come to agree upon such a first order common ground. These are the rational seeds for the making of the “Muslim Ummah” – one people, though divided in geography, race, culture, and civilization, wholly undivided in the core beliefs and core values, basing them exclusively on the Divine Scripture they each posses in common that they each unequivocally proclaim to be un-adulterated by human hand.

Of course, socialized Muslims following the schools of jurisprudence that assert in their respective eschatological doctrines that it refers to the Awaited Savior and the Last of the Divinely appointed Imams – who, for the majority of Shias is Imam Mahdi (AS) who is already born twelve centuries ago but in Occultation by Divine Command and waiting patiently for the right conditions before he reappears by the Will of God to fill the earth with justice; and for the majority of Sunnis is also Imam Mahdi (RA) but who is yet to be born in some future time by the Will of God for the same purpose – will remain socialized in their own inherited dogmas regardless of how rational, compelling, straightforward, natural, non convoluted, non supernatural, and self-empowering the resolution is in the Holy Qur'an itself when one let's it speak. This is why mullahs in every sect, often
indistinguishable from their more learned brethren who call themselves “alim” and feel affronted if not given due deference as the “signs of God” on earth, are able to control the public mind so easily.

The feeble quality of the public mind that Adolph Hitler spoke of in Mein Kampf, and which he called for the press to exploit to engineer the public’s consent to their own enslavement in the name of national education and enlightenment, is the same quality exploited by the leaders of religion. But with far greater authority and effectiveness due to the presumption of divine mandate!

Waiting for Allah, not just in day to day affairs, but to intervene in the Last Days to finally bring “haq”, justice, to mankind, is a dogma that has usually only worked in the service of primacy – and thus for good reason it cannot be found in any of the Determinates of the Holy Qur'an. For, if “haq” is only to be brought about at the End Time, and only through Divine intervention of sending yet another emissary Imam to lead mankind to institute justice among themselves, then what is the point of this profound religion of “haq” preaching truth and justice to mankind? That paradox alone invites reflection making the resolution obvious: Why is the Holy Qur'an not categorical about this subject? Why is it silent on this aspect of Eschatology? Why does it not use “ayat-e-muhkamat” (آیات مَحکمَات), the foundational verses as per verse 3:7 whose meaning is straightforward and clear, for this topic? The answer really is obvious – except for socialization and the attendant biases that accompany it!

Honest intellectual pursuit of all these paradoxical questions taken up in this study, with competence and wherewithal, “ma'rifat”, permits exercising the left half-brain to counter the socialization into religion by birth, which, lamentably, is often indistinguishable from superstition. Where will that honest pursuit of reflecting on the Holy Qur'an as the singular unadulterated Scripture containing some Message by its Author, ultimately lead to --- it is foolish to presuppose an answer as that would only be theoretical at this time! Anyone can forge any theory of platitudes. The empirical reality is that fourteen centuries
into the Holy Qur'an, and mankind still lives in the Age of Jahiliya. Progress today is empirically captured by the record of the past one hundred years and can be summed up in the great material progress, great world wars, great poverty, and great misery for the majority of mankind.

Let empiricism speak the loudest and with honesty for the Message of the Holy Qur'an if its mission is to guide mankind. The scorecard as of this writing, in the second decade of the twenty-first century, says little of the collective acumen of Muslims. Drowning in a surfeit of piety, they are subjugated, colonized, and bombed from continent to continent. Villainy is cunningly perpetrated in the name of Islam, from “militant Islam” and ISIS/ISIL on the one hand, to “moderate Islam” and “reform Islam” on the other, while the Muslim governments appear helpless before it all, running helter-skelter between competing narratives crafted for them by predatory minds far superior. That scorecard is not Mr. Spock's gratuitous thinking, but merely an empirical observation of the stoic validity until present, of the verse of the Holy Qur'an itself: “Then the Messenger will say: 'O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.'” (Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30)

Thus the import, nay mandate, for thinking afresh with new intellectual tools to forge a new direction is clear. The traditional scholars of Islam, both in the East and the West, have only taken us down the past. They are ill-equipped to take us into a future that is different for Muslims in a world as modern, sophisticated, and complex as the one that mankind is living in today. Minimally bringing the left half-brain to accurately decipher and comprehend the message of the Holy Qur'an minus the incestuous self-reinforcements, independent of what the mullahs, the ayatollahs, the exegeses writers, the hadith compilers, and the historical narratives penned a thousand years ago say it means, is the first step to heed that aforementioned drastic Qur'anic warning to Muslims.

One useful way to think about this abstraction for those who pos-
sess both half brains in some balanced non-zero quantity, might be:

- the right-half brain feels a compelling need to climb a specific mountain but does not know how except to extol the virtues of climbing that mountain in verse and oratory;

- the left-half brain comes up with the practical analysis for such a journey, the engineering and logistics plan to get there, and the battle plan to defeat the many anticipated obstructions lurking in the path including those that are unpredictable like the bad weather, flash floods, and robbers hiding in bushes;

- the right-half brain sustains the human spirit with faith and fortitude throughout that agonizing journey to finally be able to climb that mountain with any kind of engineered plan rather than to merely have dreamed of climbing it.

One can no more engineer a plan with one's right-half brain than one can imagine success with one's left-half brain in the face of hopelessness and dark clouds. The reader's job is to verify the engineered plan, which means to first understand the specification in order to even be able to adjudicate, before he and she embarks on that arduous journey to climb that mountain with nothing but faith sustaining thine spirit, and nothing but shrewd planning guiding thine little “zulfıqar”[13]. Just another way to think about how to engage the human mind (intellect plus intuition – respectively the left and the right half brains) to its fullest potential.

Yet another useful way to look at this abstraction of the human mind and human intellect that encompasses both objective logic and subjective insight, is to recognize that cognitive reasoning based on the five perceptive senses that can be made fairly objective, and therefore falsifiable, is the contribution of a functioning left-half brain to human knowledge of the surrounding world. Intuitive reasoning, sense
of the abstract, sense of beauty, sense of harmony, sense of insecurity, all of which is non-quantifiable and subjective, but which enhances insight, wherewithal, wisdom, commonsense, shrewdness, sophistication, street-smartness, deeper understanding, “ma'rifat”, creativity, etc., and which transcend the available empirical data and what is made visible to the five perceptive senses, is contributed by the right-half brain to human awareness. One without the other is incomplete. One can no more live without logic than one can live without insight and foresight, love and feelings. Those who do are reduced to being useful idiots and useless eaters. Without a functioning right-half brain, the human mind is reduced to a mere computational resource, devoid of any insight and feelings. Without a functioning left-half brain, the human mind becomes steeped in superstition and base desires; desires which may be unconscious, but which drive beliefs and actions like voodoo, without rhyme or reason.

The rational analysis presented here therefore, to be of any use to anyone, should be examined solely for what it is, and not with religious sentiments, beliefs, and socialization bias (right-half brain) interfering with the facts and logical analysis (left-half brain). The logic of inquiry here is only on what is objective, or can be made objective. Let the subjective insights be the reader's own contribution to her own deeper understanding; to be built upon what is objectively, and falsifiably (meaning, can be shown to be either true or false), reasoned here.

For the reader's convenience, the table below lists all the verses of the Holy Qur'an which appear in the examination of the question: Why it is easy to hijack the Holy Qur'an and the religion of Islam, and upon which the analysis and deductions of this report are based. But only to the best ability of this scribe who is obviously not Mr. Spock, is as socialized into his own ethos, and is as limited in his intellectual capabilities by virtue of being fully human, as anyone else. The only difference from other earnest seekers of understanding perhaps being, that this scribe has cognitively endeavored to rise to the
many challenges outlined in this report; to remain aware of his own limitations in perfectly overcoming all the subconscious forces of bias working against the cognitive mind, cradling it, cajoling it, luring it, enticing it, towards comfort zones. The ancient adage: *know thy self to know the world*, has never been more true than in this endeavor to become objective about what pertains to one self. Anyone with even a modicum of seriousness in their disposition can surely rise to the same challenges of epistemology, how do we know what we know, and better the analysis!

Minimally, the profound scholar of Islam who claims a higher station by virtue of greater learning, the “muballig”, the ayatollah, the imam, the exponent of the religion of Islam as an authority figure claiming to be the inheritor of the Prophetic mission and its authority, is invited to demonstrate what he or she might believe is in logical error. Silence is not just plain cowardice, but also a bold admission of the inability of the pretenders who have seated themselves comfortably on the pulpit of the noble Prophet of Islam to engage intellectually once the aura of their untouchable robe is stripped off. Silence of learned scholars is an equal admission that “iss hammaam mein sub nungay hain” (every one is naked in the bath hall)!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Verse Reference</th>
<th>Verse Reference</th>
<th>Verse Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aal-'Imran 3:7</td>
<td>Al-insaan 76:3</td>
<td>Al An'ama 6:83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an-Nisaa' 4:59</td>
<td>al-Israa' 17:71</td>
<td>Muhammad 47:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Maeda 5:48</td>
<td>Al-Ahzab 33:36</td>
<td>Al-Maeda 5:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Baqara 2:2, 3</td>
<td>Al-Waqia 56:77, 78, 79, 80, 81</td>
<td>An-Najm 53:1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Baqara 2:185</td>
<td>Al-Furqan 25:1</td>
<td>Al-Fatiha 1:6 1:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim 14:1</td>
<td>Maryam 19:97</td>
<td>Ta-Ha 20:114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ahzab 33:35</td>
<td>Ibrahim 14:4</td>
<td>Al-Baqara 2:134, 141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Asr 103:1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Al-Baqara 2:166, 167</td>
<td>Al-Qasas 28:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Fajr 89:27, 28, 29, 30</td>
<td>Ash-Shura 42:23</td>
<td>Al-Mujaadila 58:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Maeda 5:3</td>
<td>Al-Ahzab 33:28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34</td>
<td>Al-Anbiya 21:105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Baqara 2:128</td>
<td>Al-Baqara 2:124</td>
<td>Surah Ta-Ha 20:135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunus 10:19, 47</td>
<td>Al-Ahzaab 33:40</td>
<td>Surah An-Nahl 16:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hujraat, 49:13</td>
<td>Al-Kauthar 108:3</td>
<td>Surah At-Takwir 81:19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Verses of the Holy Qur'an principally employed in Part-II and Part-III to examine the question: Why it is easy to hijack the Holy Qur'an and the religion of Islam. Click on verse number to listen to the Arabic recitation by Shaykh Mahmoud Khalil al-Husary. The verse in oral Arabic trumps the written version.

Given that there are 6236 total verses in the Holy Qur'an, and it is itself a deep bottomless ocean, this study has barely scratched the surface of acquiring an analytical understanding of the singular Sacred
Scripture of Islam. But to the extent this study has dived into this ocean, its discoveries just on this one narrow question are before the reader to adjudicate, to validate, to refute, to enhance, or to remain indifferent.

Continued in Part-IV

Footnotes

[7] The contemporary and popular English translation of M.H. Shakir by TTQ, New York, has dropped all his footnotes in their hard copy edition (with posthumous apologies to the author!). The scribe possesses the original first edition with its sporadic footnotes intact. Similarly, the extensive footnotes in the English translation of Yusuf Ali have been openly doctored in posthumous reprints published by Amana Publications, Saudi Arabia. The scribe also possess a copy of the 1934 first edition with the unadulterated original footnotes intact.


[9] Ibid. pg. 3

[10] Lord Acton


[12] David Ben-Gurion had lucidly explained the utility of crisis creation during the violent fabrication of the Jewish State in Palestine: “What is inconceivable in normal times is possible in revolutionary times; and if at this time the opportunity is missed and what is possible at such great hours is not carried out – a whole world is
lost”. This diabolical political science principle was reiterated some three score years and ten later by Rahm Emanuel, American President Barack Obama's Jewish White House Chief of Staff (January 20, 2009 – October 1, 2010), whose father was part of the terrorist gang “Irgun” that had so successfully utilized the Ben-Gurion principle for the creation of Israel in Palestine. Speaking to the Wall Street Journal, Rahm Emanuel emphasized: “you never want a serious crisis to go to waste. And what I mean by that is an opportunity to do things that you think you could not do before.” Watch the news clip in: http://youtube.com/watch?v=tM5ZdO-lgEE (at time 1m 3s)

[13] Name of the legendary double-pincer sword of Imam Ali ibn Abi Ṭālib before which no nemesis could stand for long in mortal combat. Legend has it that the sword was given to Imam Ali by the Prophet of Islam after (or during) the battle of Uhad in the second year of the Hijra, 614 A.D. The intellect, given to every individual in mankind by the Creator in varying amounts, called “aqal”, is akin to that famous sword. One need only learn to sharpen it, and to wield it with both skill and expertise, and no hectoring hegemon can ever prevail with their weapons of mass deception in any battle. It is the only effective antidote against the villainy of perception management.
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Chapter I  Part4

Case Study: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to Hijack?

Part-IV

Introduction to Muslim Historiography

We now turn our focus of study on the holy scribes of Muslim history and the timelines of both, the “wassael-e-sunni” and the “wassael-e-shia”. Meaning, all the primary Muslim written sources of religious narratives and history scholarship which exist today. Together these comprise less than a handful of the earliest primary written works entirely responsible for the state of Muslim dysfunction today. The understanding of the Religion of Islam today simply cannot be divorced from the work of these fallible hands – none of whom are mentioned in the Holy Qur'an. Therefore, to gratuitously assert that the
Holy Qur'an, a Book “without doubt”, must depend upon these authors' books to explain itself to mankind, is patently absurd. But what is even more absurd is to base aspects of faith upon these books which are not to be found in the **Determinates** of the Holy Qur'an.

That first absurdity is the sine qua non of all other absurdities plaguing the Muslim mind from antiquity to modernity. It begins with theological dispersion due to self-interpretations, initially appearing harmless as merely differences of opinion, but which naturally lead to the creation of different schools of thought, which subsequently become canonized into sects if they can serve narrow imperial interests, or gather sufficient following, becoming “Islam”; and culminates in Muslims killing Muslims to advance those same imperial interests. This is the basic continuum of subversion of the Religion of Islam which is common to both antiquity and modernity. Some of it is unwitting, as the religion and Arabs expanded into other civilizations. As much as the new religion transformed them, these alien cultures also imparted their own tenor to what became “Islam”. Fourteen centuries hence, we are the recipient of all of that combination “Islam”. This “Islam” is ripe for harvest in the hands of Machiavelli.

Here is one of them accurately capturing what that combination word “Islam” now entails – and as the Muslim mind will quickly grasp, it has nothing to do with the religion of Islam:

> “It is difficult to generalize about Islam. To begin with, the word itself is commonly used with two related but distinct meanings, as the equivalents both of Christianity, and Christendom. In the one sense, it denotes a religion, as system of beliefs and worship; in the other, the civilization that grew up and flourished under the aegis of that religion. **The word Islam thus denotes more than fourteen centuries of history, a billion and a third people, and a religious and cultural tradition of enormous diversity.**” --- Bernard Lewis, Crisis of Islam, pg. 1

---

Muslims and Imperial Mobilization
Understanding the dialectical mechanisms of that Machiavellian process – one which has tied such a *Gordian knot* on the religion of Islam that even fourteen-fifteen centuries later it is still working its miracle in the service of empire – is the driving motivation in this study. However, if the earlier Parts only succeeded in offending the sensibilities of the gentle mind without inducing *cognitive dissonance* – its main objective – what follows will also only induce a migraine headache instead of *metanoia*, the key objective of this study.

As was reasoned previously, every generation has the new opportunity to start afresh – for the natural cyclical process of birth and death can also have a beneficial cleansing effect upon the baggage of legacy. Why should a new generation born into their own times be shackled by what went before? Which is why the Holy Qur'an itself advocates starting afresh for every man and woman rather than remain shackled by the holiness of others who came before:

“When the Holy Qur'an so clearly vouches for that separation from the people who went before without equivocation: “*Of their merits there is no question in your case!*”, then how can it endorse the acceptance of their workmanship for you to follow for your merit? That would create a contradiction!

Indeed, the Holy Qur'an unequivocally confirms that conclusion with the following categorical warning:
“(On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them. (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:166)

And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as an anguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire.” (Surah Al-Baqara, 2:167)

It must first be acknowledged at the outset that unlike other Messengers and Prophets, for instance Prophet Jesus and Prophet Moses mentioned among the five Great Prophets in the Holy Qur'an, the Prophet of Islam had remarkably succeeded in creating a ruling state in his own lifetime. Despite the rather humble beginnings in 613 A.D. in Medina, the power of the state for officially documenting Islam's first years and its Messenger's teachings had already come into existence during Prophet Muhammad's own lifetime. That's primarily how and why we have the same pristine text of the Holy Qur'an reaching us today some fourteen-fifteen centuries later as was delivered by the Prophet of Islam and sanctioned by his state power. Without state power during the lifetime of the Messenger himself, the Holy Qur'an would possibly have suffered the same fate as Prophet Jesus' Gospel. We can see that even in that case, it took Emperor Constantine's state power of the Roman empire to set what became the New Testament at the First Council of Nicaea in about 325 A.D. And it further took state power of the emerging British empire during the sixteenth century to further fix it into the King James Version that is today the primary source of the English language Bible in Western Christianity. That
same state power of Islam which brought us the Holy Qur'an in its exact pristine state such that all Muslims today agree on that fact, was also put to good use for establishing ad hoc political successions and its copious narratives immediately after the death of the Prophet of Islam. State power can obviously cut both ways! And so can narratives. Deriving articles of faith from the narratives of history is always risky business. For any people.

Since there is no mention of any of the temporal rulers who came after the Prophet of Islam in the Holy Qur'an by name, is the Holy Qur'an silent upon such an important existential matter as the Messenger's immediate political succession? Prophet Muhammad, after all, unlike any other Messenger in recorded history who brought a Book, was already an all powerful political ruler when the Holy Qur'an asserted the perfection and completion of its Message in verse 5:3 in 623 A.D. The Messenger died within a few months soon afterwards. Verse 4:59 patently established the existence of some apostolic heirs to whom the Author of the Holy Qur'an had devolved the same command obedience as to the Prophet of Islam. The analysis in this study previously uncovered the logical criterion that such heirs to the Messengership of the Prophet of Islam to act as his successor Exemplars, could only emanate from his *Ahlul Bayt*. While the fact that the Messenger left apostolic heirs is irrefutable due to the unequivocal declaration of verse 4:59; but that these heirs must be from the *Ahlul Bayt* is a logical deduction derived from the rest of the Holy Qur'an. Is that deduction principally correct? Can it be logically refuted and the refutation itself stand the acid test of logic from the Holy Qur'an?

Noteworthy here is the uncanny deterministic beauty of the *Indeterminates* which is always predictable due to the momentous declaration of the Holy Qur'an in verse 3:7. That, *Indeterminates* tend to take on any meaning the public mind or the pulpit wishes to attribute to them; that, doing so may lead to a false path; that, it is even easy to know that it is a false path if it sows discord among mankind; and that, not all people will understand that point. Therefore, the only ra-
tional and final adjudication of **Indeterminates**, at least for those who do comprehend that point, is by way of empiricism of the Prophet's own explanation. Provided an explanation was given, and also recorded with the same due diligence as the Holy Qur'an for those to come in later times.

After all, the speech of the Messenger, the *Speaking Qur'an*, the *Qur'an-e-Natiq*, the Exemplar who "**does not err, nor does he go astray; Nor does he speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed.**" (Surah An-Najm 53:2-4, see Part-III), commanded the same obligatory obedience for Muslims as the speech of the Author Himself as per the explicit declaration of verse 4:59. Therefore, why should the Messenger's Speech not be accorded the same pristine preservation by Muslim state power after the Messenger's demise as the Holy Qur'an? So the Muslim public mind, too indoctrinated to be skeptical of power, and too lazy to study matters on its own, innocently imagines that the Messenger's acts and speech, just as his life story, are indeed authentically preserved. What's more, of the same exact content as when the Messenger was Exemplifying for his followers in person; sufficiently exact to use fourteen-fifteen centuries later for deriving their religion.

Therefore, it is reasonable to inquire that when a deduction from the Holy Qur'an is singularly logical, is there any empirical evidence from the pen of these scribes to unequivocally adjudicate that logic today?

Specifically, if the Messenger left apostolic heirs to bear the great burden of 4:59, then who are they? And if he did not leave heirs, the Holy Qur'an is falsified for 4:59. Most Muslims would instinctively reject the latter as being repugnant to their religion. Therefore, they are forced to look for the former. By simply asking that right question, Muslims automatically open the doors to understanding the matter for themselves. It is the successful prevention of asking that question throughout history that is remarkable – for the question itself is rather obvious and falls right out of even a simple study of the Holy Qur'an.
The history's scribes have played a most crucial role in documenting, and omitting to document, the reactionary epochs of the first few centuries of the meteoric rise of Islam as a world religion and in fixing the Indeterminates of the Holy Qur'an to match that historic rise. It is principally the works of these scribes of history from whence virtually all Muslims, divided into sects and theologies that often violently opposed each other throughout history and continue to do so even today, derive their differentiating understanding of the religion of Islam. Extensive “sharia” systems, i.e., systems of jurisprudence, have evolved along sectarian and partisan boundaries that inevitably anchor their uncommon rulings to what is documented by these early scribes, some of them jurists and scholars themselves. These early scribes carrying the burden of religion upon their backs, sometimes with lashes from state power, and other times in cooperation with state power, followed the same differentiating principle recursively, tracing the genealogy of their own verdicts and narratives to the Prophet of Islam through mostly oral scribes of the earliest period, say the first two centuries of Islam. Generations of these oral scribes became the source material of the first written scribes in subsequent centuries. And it is that latter work which has reached modern times. Therefore, the primary works of these written scribes of history, the sine qua non of sectarianism, is the next focus of forensic examination.

It will be witnessed in what follows that Muslim scholarship at its earliest written sources which have reached us today, while living through the vicissitudes of “imperial mobilizations” of rulers and dynastic empires that soon followed the early succession period, grotesquely suffers from both, historiography by partisans of power, and hagiography by partisans of victims of that power. That is the common characteristic of the primary epistemology in virtually all Muslim scholarship – just as it is in any scholarship of any people emotionally attached to their subject. While such attachments can lend considerable insight denied to outsiders of that time and space, emotions and sympathies, it can also take away some measure of objectivity. That is
not to say that outsiders are any more objective. As we have wit-
nessed, that scholarship can just as easily suffer from other psycho-
logical cataracts, such as the all too familiar “orientalism” (looking at 
the East with jaundiced eyes), “occidentalism” (looking at the West 
with jaundiced eyes), not to forget deliberate demonization, obfusca-
tion, and myth construction with half-truths, quarter-truths, and funda-
mental lies wrapped in veneers of truth.

Therefore, all history, even in its most pristine narrative form, har-
bors a germ of falsehood and has to be prudently examined with a fo-
rensic eye to improve its reality to myth ratio. Sometimes, a narrative 
may capture a world of events to accurately express the perception of 
reality, like Plato's depiction of the trial and defence of Socrates; but it 
cannot be shown that Socrates ever uttered any of those sentences 
which Plato attributes to him in his famous trilogy: The Apologia, The 
Crito and The Phædo, all of which have reference to the trial, impris-
onment and death of Socrates. At other times, there are fundamental 
impediments to capturing the reality as it actually is, rather than as it 
is perceived – and once again Plato gives a defining example of it in 
his classic Simile of the Cave in his most seminal book: The Republic.
Problem of Defining History – What is History?

Here is the fundamental problem. It was first described by this author in his deconstruction of the Zionist conquest of Palestine, in the pamphlet: *How to Return to Palestine*.

Begin Excerpt

As a practicing engineer – used to examining complex systems in order to build them – turned social scientist, puzzled by this bizarre empiricism of the slaughter of the goy in massive numbers and the systematic destruction of their power-base, with the Jews successively coming out on top after each slaughter-cycle in such a short span, I decided to probe deeper. This paper is the result of my progressively refined research into this question since that very day of infamy, September 11, 2001. Since the day when I had decided to dump all a priori pre-suppositions, and all pied-pipers, and had curled up with William Shirer's *Rise and Fall of The Third Reich*, and Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, to attempt to comprehend the Nazi's self-inflicted *Operation Canned Goods* as a pretext for their war of *German Lebensraum*. I have, by now, studied countless historical narratives to understand current affairs and empirical matters always cloaked in deception. My comprehension today is layered upon facts uncovered by many a rational, un-afraid detective who has tread this path before me.

But it is not mere facts which create perspectives. Although, no doubt, facts must be built upon in order to be empirical in one's analysis. In an age when:

- “deception is the state of mind and the mind of state”;
- when power decides what is fact and what is recorded as
fact in its primary documentation and in the popular Press, which in turn are subsequently used by others down the chain of narrators echoing what was by fiat deemed to be fact, as absolute fact, without being cognizant of that very fact of fiat;

- when the enactment of puppetshows is construed as displaying “facts”, and recorded as such by historians;

facts by themselves are meaningless in such a landscape when “waging war by way of deception” upon the public is the norm rather than the exception.

So, for instance, is it a fact that '19 Muslim Jihadis' rammed hijacked airplanes into two tall buildings bringing both of them down into their own footprint (watch wtc1, wtc2), bringing a third tall building down into its own footprint a few hours later without even hitting it (watch wtc7)? In this example, the scientific observation that three very tall buildings comprising millions of tons of steel exploded into powder and/or collapsed into their own footprint at near free-fall speed, is an unarguable empirical fact. And the only fact. The rest, who dunnit, how it was done, and why it was done, as officially recorded in the current affairs books and the Press, are assertions by the fiat of power using its control of the narrative, i.e., the Mighty Wuritzer. The official narratives of today are the absolute facts of the historians of tomorrow with no minority report on the official record. Popular dissenting voices of course are merely 'conspiracy theories' (http://tinyurl.com/Anatomy-Conspiracy-Theory), shortly to be medically diagnosed as victims of delusions suffering from mental illnesses for which medical and legal groundwork is now being laid.

George Orwell captured the hard reality of historiography and its significance to the manufacturing of myths that come to control the public mind in the present, in the opening pages of his seminal fable “Nineteen Eighty-Four”. Written in the aftermath of World War II when narrative control of the causes of the two inexplicable world
wars and their cataclysmic events were at its zenith, Orwell blurted out the key political axiom underwriting what passes as “knowledge”:

“Who controls the past, controls the future;
who controls the present, controls the past”

Therefore, as is empirically evidenced throughout history and in our present modernity, control of the narrative of history, and of current affairs, has been the imperative of all rulers from time immemorial. It is a tool as old as hegemony, as old as mankind. Only fools, and imperial scholars in the service of empire, whether playing their protagonist or antagonist in fake opposition, ignore it, omit to disclose it, or minimize its impact on the theology and doctrines they happen to be preaching to their flock. And that's also how we can identify the mercenaries and prostitutes despite the color and style of their garb, robe, wedding dress, or turban. It is to be expected that they are presented to the public in the most pious and virtuous moral tones that Machiavelli and Hegelian Dialectic can muster.

Ergo, it follows that the purported facts of history, as well as of current affairs, have to be treated as being more akin to clues, at times false clues and red herrings as in a crime scene, rather than as statements of fact. Therefore, the most rational model for understanding history and its linkages to current affairs, is the forensic one. Like the forensic eye of a crime detective, such as Agatha Christie's famous fictional character Hercule Poirot, pondering upon the interconnections of clues, statements of purported eyewitnesses, drawing deductions, making logical inferences, and using new methods for uncovering unknown clues not visible to the naked eye in the visible light spectrum, such as employing ultraviolet and infrared regions of the spectrum to see what the naked eye can't perceive – all part and parcel of the forensics employed for apprehending a convoluted crime, solving a puzzle.
Thus, studying history and current affairs is like studying a crime scene or solving a puzzle. Its path is almost like the weaving of the many horizontal and vertical threads on a loom to fashion a carpet, or knit a Jacquard. That fashions a perspective from the underlying clues borne of empiricism. Weaving many perspectives from the same empirical elements, just like weaving many carpets from the same colored threads, is possible. And just like some detectives are plain wrong, and one right in identifying the real criminal, the same challenges beset the study of history. To find that right one master criminal, or the right perspective which explains the engagement of power and its narrative, surrounded *tous azimuth* by an endless trail of false clues, patsies taking the fall, and lies turned into sacred truths.

To the extent that a perspective is empirical, cohesive, is able to coherently resolve the riddles of power and its infestations of the mind, it cannot be refuted by mere assertions, threats, and calumny. It can stand in a court of law on its own merit, provided of course, it isn't a kangaroo court administering the sovereign's justice, a Military Tribunal administering the victor's justice, or a tournament of justice run by the Queen of Hearts from Alice in Wonderland.

**End Excerpt**

We can easily appreciate from the preceding analysis of historiography that conclusions derived from the records of history must always remain tentative; subject to refinement – for history can just as much lie as it can tell the truth. But even that truth, when history does factually convey it, is often merely a chronicle of visible events, dates and places, who came into and out of power when, which battles were fought and won, speeches that were handed down, etc. It is almost always devoid of any examination of the hidden forces and invisible motivations that shaped those events, sometimes near, sometimes far, and sometimes disparate. There is obviously never an examination of history as a crime scene. Sometimes, truth from fiction is as indis-
cernible for history as it is for current affairs. GIGO epistemology straightforwardly ensures that outcome – garbage of current affairs manufactured by the Mighty Wurlitzer (see http://tinyurl.com/Mighty-Wurlitzer) becomes the veritable records of history for future generations to examine as “truths”.

We can even experience that for ourselves today in how myths masquerade as truth from all pulpits in the service of power. What makes the past pulpits any more holier, any more different? It is the same God now as was then. The same gods too. And the same man, as well as the same superman.

Ergo, if today we see deceit with our own eyes in the inflection of power and its narratives, it is foolish to expect that the past was any different. The fact is that it isn't any different. To assert exceptionalism that it is some how different when it comes to Muslims, that these ancient scholars and scribes were extra holy, immune to human tendencies empirically understood today from the many disciplines of social sciences – from psychology to sociology, from psychological warfare to the banality of evil – and that these past scribes left a veritable trail of guidance which should be followed by future generations, contradicts the Determinate verses of the Holy Qur'an itself. See verses 2:134, and 2:166--167 of Surah Al-Baqara quoted above.

Which is also why every sensible Muslim scholarship today, virtually across all sects, does not treat the works of these ancient Muslim scribes as being as authentic as the Holy Qur'an. The problem is that it almost universally also treats many of these works as being only slightly less authentic than the Holy Qur'an! While the Holy Qur'an is the foundation of faith for Muslims, history too has been parsed on the yardstick of faith more than on the yardstick of intellectual rigor, to create a severely crippled epistemology. The tragedy is that Muslim faith is based more on that crippled epistemology than on the Determinates of the Holy Qur'an itself.

The primary written scribes and scholars of Muslim history did
indeed develop some reasonable **rejection criterion** to filter out the preceding epochs' historical noise when chronicling facts and events – material which patently conflicted with the Holy Qur'an, or the empirical reality, and thus was just too easily falsified because of it as more myth than historical reality – in sound historical scholarship. However, these very same holy scribes of “Islam” also found imaginative ways of filling in the many **Indeterminates** of the Holy Qur'an with the most atrocious and absurd **acceptance criterion** deemed to be “signals”, in totally bogus penmanship. By modern standards these cannot stand up to any rigorous intellectual scrutiny. Today we'd call such scholarship “hearsay”, i.e., “he said, she said”. An entire pious industry got developed on hearsay with specious rules to confer some legitimacy to quackery. Were the same processes applied today to any other matter, or as rules of evidence in legal court to understand a crime, it would be dismissed as nothing but hearsay; quackery wearing the pious robe of faith. Concatenated with the holy works of successive generations of even more imaginative Arab, Persian, and Indian subcontinental scribes incestuously employing GIGO epistemology (i.e., Garbage-In Garbage-Out) on these handful of earliest written sources, these together succeeded in inducing the cognitive and spiritual infiltration of the religion of Islam.

It is that first historical noise and rulership precedents harvested due to the **Indeterminates** in the name of religion, and subsequently amplified in every age according to each epoch's natural proclivity to perpetuate their own socialization biases and self-interests, which has continually shackled the understanding of the religion of Islam into the “foolish nonsense” the Holy Qur'an vouches:

> 'Then the Messenger will say: “O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.”' (Surah Al-Furqaan 25:30)

وَقَالَ الرَّسُولُ يَا رَبِّ إِنَّكَ لَمْ تُخْرِجْنَاهُمْ هَذَا الْقُرآنَ مُهْجُورًا
A useful backdrop to cradle the examination of these works of fallible minds and hands is to simultaneously conduct a rational thought experiment: If all these primary written books were to get suddenly wiped off from the face of existence by a magical hand, what understanding of the religion of Islam would be left behind for mankind? That understanding is principally what is being taught by the Author of the Holy Qur'an in His Book to all succeeding generations after the epoch of the Prophet of Islam.

Since the Author did not mandate the existence of these primary written works in the Holy Qur'an when He asserted that He perfected the religion of Islam: “This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion.” (Surah Al-Maeda 5:3), these books of fallible minds and hands are therefore irrelevant to the Author of the Holy Qur'an. What the Author of the Holy Qur'an deems irrelevant, the enlightened Muslim mind cannot justify as relevant. Only the perversely indoctrinated mind naturally gravitates towards the absurd, unable to see the absurdity of arguing against the Book which it also believes as the untampered word of God!

At the same time, another useful backdrop to keep in mind are the discoveries made previously in this study: that indeed, while the Author did not mandate the existence of these books written by fallible hands in the Holy Qur'an, He mandated two things to the people of the time which are not further documented in the Holy Qur'an: “O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you.” (Surah an-Nisaa' 4:59). To obey the Messenger means to follow his directives as the Exemplar of the Holy Qur'an, and the same meaning for “those charged with authority among you”. Furthermore, verse 5:35 of Surah Al-Maeda stated the requirement of seeking (الوسيلة) categorically, unbounded by time and space, even if the “Wasilah” itself is unspecified in the verse. But since the Author deliberately chose not to record their Exemplariness, their decisions and directives in the Holy Qur'an, it fol-
ows that their Exemplariness, and their decisions and directives, could arguably only have been pertinent for the peoples living in the respective epochs of the Messenger and “those charged with authority among you”. That is because the public already knew who was meant – but we no longer know without resorting to the fallible and partisan scribes of history. That sensible inference is of course tempered and even discouraged by the categorical statement of 5:35 as previously examined.

However, if only for a moment, we entertain the aforementioned thought experiment, we suddenly observe that remarkably, both shia and sunni differentiation immediately goes away. Obviously this is only a thought experiment and not about to transpire in the real world, but it lends clarity to the matter as to the primary source of sectarian schism among the sects. Once that seed was planted millennia ago by the Holy Qur'an itself, the natural outcome with the passage of time is the mushrooming divergence into all sorts of beliefs and practices that is simply not in the Holy Qur'an. At least, not in the Holy Qur'an that is completed to perfection by the verse 5:3. And that Holy Qur'an is deliberately ambiguous on many fronts as the Indeterminates already examined in Part-II.

With the aforementioned thought experiment at the back of one's mind, the proportionate significance of these primary written books potentially rematerializes. These primary works, commentaries upon these primary works, and commentaries upon commentaries ad infinitum, no longer define articles, expositions and prescriptions of faith that is narrated by fallible minds and hands. Rather, this historical legacy is now treated as the revealing and well documented history of a people who rose to political power from the pagan sands of Arabia under the leadership of a monotheistic Prophet, and who dominated the affairs of the known world for nearly a millennia through several empires that ruled in the name of the religion brought by their Prophet.

In that rational and commonsensical perspective, these historical narratives and commentaries, compilation of prayers and invocations,
and wisdom taught through parables and anecdotes, can finally be studied and benefitted from accordingly, as a treasure trove of Muslim heritage like any other peoples' heritage: an amalgam of officialdom, reportage, recording of prior events often carried by word of mouth for generations, narratives explaining those events, folklore, myths, fiction, half truths, quarter truths, and grains of truth sprinkled in the mix as veritable statements of empirical fact.

That is how history principally is --- a narrative --- the professional pulpits' self-serving endeavors throughout the ages to extract divine interpretations out of it to administer a fossilized religion to the public notwithstanding.

This thought experiment is just something to keep at the back of one's mind while perusing what follows. It lends useful perspective that, just as the Muslim mind imputes these same considerations to the compilation of the Bible for instance, that perhaps their own hagiographic historiography ought to be subjected to that same yardstick. If the Muslim pulpit has a problem with the Bible introducing the alien concept of Trinity from Islam's point of view, what egotistical considerations of godly exceptionalism prevents it from reflecting on what, and how much, could have infiltrated into the religion of Islam's own theology in the guise of pious penmanship of holy scribes?

The entire domain of eschatology, the domain of savior and the so called Divine Rule, the domain of statements attributed to the Prophet of Islam in the most reliable Hadith literature that he might never have made, are all in this category. Conversely, the statements actually made by the Prophet of Islam as its Exemplar and not recorded by the most pious scribes of history due to political considerations, or distorted and misrepresented, or not emphasized to their contextual significance, are also in the same category. No religion may be extracted from that compendium of what is --- to claim its station holier than the Bible!

When one has the Holy Qur'an, why would a Muslim mind reach
for its bible version – except just out of curiosity, or to inform oneself of the rich heritage of Muslims, and only in such educational context, instead of trying to extract “religion” from the fallible scribes of history!

It is for the Muslim mind to adjudicate how much it is willing to be controlled by its socialization biases by birth, how much by incessantly self-reinforcing GIGO epistemology of its pulpits, and how much by the empirical understanding before it using that magnificent mind itself to adjudicate matters.

Since most people are just ordinary human beings and not the ever logical and all rational Mr. Spock of Part-II, perhaps they don't wish to be rational, logical, and all left-brained; perhaps our emotional makeup is what primarily defines our existence for many of us. If that wasn't the case at least to some extent, there'd hardly be any reason to believe in the Unseen in the first place which requires far more than logical empiricism to apprehend. The Author of the Holy Qur'an clearly understands that fact about human beings. After all, He does indeed claim in His Book that it is “A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds.” (56:80); and that it is He Who Fashioned man:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“He Who has made everything which He has created most good: He began the creation of man with (nothing more than) clay, (32:07)</td>
<td>ٱلَّذِی أَحْسَن كُلْ شَیۡءٍ خَلَقۡهُ وَبَدَأَ خَلَقَ ٱلۡإِنۡسَان مِن طَیۡنَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But He fashioned him in due proportion, and breathed into him something of His spirit. And He gave you (the faculties of) hearing and sight and feeling (and understanding): little thanks do ye give!” (Surah As-Sajdah 32:09)

---

Caption Surah As-Sajdah verses 32:7-9 declares that the Author of the Holy Qur'an “fashioned”, designed, engineered, man in “due proportion” (and not as a random event)

Therefore, when “He fashioned him in due proportion, and breathed into him something of His spirit. And He gave you (the faculties of) hearing and sight and feeling (and understanding)”, He, the Author of the Holy Qur'an, surely must also Know the psychological bent of every human mind, borne of its natural socialization and cultural programming due to being born in a specific nation and specific tribe. The Author therefore also Knows the “fitrat”, i.e., nature, of every man, specifically, what he is susceptible to. Only because of the empirical fact of natural socialization by birth, that the Author of the Holy Qur'an strongly Countenances the pursuit of: فاستَبِقُوا الْخِيْرَات, instead of theological upmanship, clearly predicting that the human mind that He Fashioned, and that He Knows well, will face grave difficulty overcoming its natural programming which is naturally self-reinforcing by incestuous self-selection and confirmation bias, without expending considerable striving.
Problem of Epistemology – Hard and Soft Limits to Knowing

While natural programming of the human mind may appear to be a fine point to those unfamiliar with the making of the human mind, it is a crucial one nevertheless. Epistemology, how we know what we know, cannot be ignored in any learned scholarship that claims to be in genuine pursuit of “knowing”, the discovery of what is, without imparting any personal coloring of one's own to it. Meaning, keeping the observer and the observed separate and non-influencing, often impossible in social sciences where man is observing his own species. And of course, also impossible in the Schrödinger's cat physics paradox, of the act of observation itself disturbing the observed, and therefore making it paradoxical to learn what was the state of the observed before one tried observing it! In the human sense, since the mind that is being used to understand the world, is part of that world itself, there is an automatic self-referential limit to what is objectively knowable. It is the limiting factor of epistemology whereby the judgment of the mind not only colors what is being observed, but is unable to objectively observe itself. It carves a self-limit for discovering what is using the scientific method. Its well-known processes, which basically involve four recursive steps, or stages, any of which may be absent or combined in a given endeavor: (1) theorizing, hypothesizing, modeling; (2) testability (of the model), observability, reproducibility (by others); (3) measurability, quantifiability; and (4) predictability, anticipatability (based on the model); cannot deal with self-reference.

That fundamental limit was discovered/proved by the twentieth century Austrian logician, mathematician and philosopher, Kurt Friedrich Gödel, and has come to be known as Gödel's incompleteness theorem. How far does this fundamental limit extend from its self-ref-
rential hard limit clearly depends on the observer. Some minds are more limited in their abilities to be objective than others and hence encounter the limits of knowability sooner than they need to. The ultimate knower of all things therefore, even by its philosophical definition, the one who can transcend this hard limit, is the one outside of the domain of all things. That is the definition of God, both philosophically as well as mathematically. And it is precisely that definition of God that is also categorically expressed in the Holy Qur'an.

Only God can be the Knower of all things. Aleem (العليم). It is no surprise that (العليم) is among the 99 names of God in the Holy Qur'an, each name expressing a characteristic of God that can only apply to God in its most superlative degree. Which is why postulating the existence of God is so much easier than proving His existence --- the superlative degrees can only apply to the one who is by definition God. Which is why atheism that seeks only empiricism as its standard for argument and falsification falls on its face philosophically. Agnosticism is philosophically far more tenable and even sensible. And the super atheist of the twentieth century, Lord Bertrand Russell, admitted it as such in his debate with a priest in New York in 1948 that was broadcast by the BBC (see The Existence of God – A debate between Bertrand Russell and Father F. C. Copleston, Chapter 13, Why I am not a Christian, Routledge), that atheism cannot be proved or disproved, just as theism cannot be proved or disproved, and therefore they are both similar in terms of having beliefs on either end of the spectrum which cannot be falsified, and consequently the more tenable state is that of agnosticism. While empiricism is neutral towards both if we ignore existence as a self-evident proof in itself, philosophy swings the balance on the side of theism. Atheism is an absurdity of the one-half brained creature quite unlike the logical Mr. Spock who would straightforwardly see the philosophical logic of at least a philosophical God, one who can know all things, one who is not constrained by the material laws of nature and above it by definition. But when laws of nature is made god, then that axiom automatically pre-
cludes the existence of a philosophical God, and thus remains crippled philosophically by accepting the limits to knowability. Nothing is knowable outside of the laws of nature, which is limited by empiricism as its defining epistemology.

By definition then, accepting the limits to absolute knowability confines knowability, alongside the imagination to believe that something greater than what's knowable by the mind can exist. If one accepts such limits to existence, one can really not make any sensible or rational statement of what one admits is beyond the realm of existence, i.e., nothing exists outside of the laws of nature. Thus, atheism remains crippled by absurdity as it ventures to make a negative statement outside the limits of its own self-defined limits to knowability. The atheist dug his own grave by making the laws of nature his supreme god because Gödel's incompleteness theorem provides a hard mathematical limit to perfect knowability, or perhaps better stated, proof of perfect knowability that what is knowable within the laws of nature is both complete and self-consistent. Since there is nothing outside of the laws of nature as the atheist's axiom of faith, his knowledge remains subjected to Gödel's incompleteness theorem. Therefore with his incomplete knowledge, he cannot deny that something does not exist for such an assertion logically requires complete and perfect knowledge in order to provably know what exists and what does not exist. For the theist however, the laws of nature are but a part of creation, like all other creation, even if the former may appear to be mechanistically governing the inner workings of the rest of creation. And thus, philosophically at least, there can exist one who can know beyond the laws of nature by being outside of the creation that is governed by the laws of nature! It violates no principle of logic to imagine it and is self-consistent with its own axiom of faith of theism. Ergo, God! An entity that is not governed by the laws of nature by definition, but who created the laws of nature as God, and transcends His own creation.

To Mr. Spock's fascination, the Holy Qur'an introduced man to
just such a philosophically adjudicated God, self-consistent with the mathematical idea that in order to have perfect knowledge of a system, one must exist outside of it, and beyond it, and if one postulates that it is possible to have perfect knowledge of the system that is governed by the laws of nature, then one is also compelled to postulate God who must exist outside of that system. It is only logical. And conversely, in order to deny that God exists, one must also deny that perfect knowledge can exist, and then one is caught in one's own inconsistency trap for one cannot assert something does not exist if one accepts that perfect knowledge does not exist. For only perfect knowledge can provably claim what does and does not exist! Q.E.D.

Atheists who by definition claim absolute knowledge by asserting the negative, die by the hand of *reductio ad absurdum*. Which is why Bertrand Russell, as the philosopher-mathematician who understood logic, was way smarter than his modern progeny to quickly squirrel out of that charge of atheism by claiming agnosticism. And he did so in the very second sentence uttered by him in that debate with Father F. C. Copleston! For the sensible types who accept hard limits to knowledge amenable to both logic and the human mind and who don't make absurd claims beyond its logical purview, there is natural limits to perfect knowing. This has direct implications for epistemology and assertive axioms of faith which are its consequent; statements that cannot be proved to be true and are simply assumed to be true by faith alone because they might appear sensible, obvious, appeal to the heart or mind, or for convenience. The entire Euclidean Geometry is built upon such an axiom of faith for instance, that parallel lines don't meet at infinity! No one can prove this axiom to be true but it is both convenient and sensible under the assumption of non-relativistic physics in everyday existence.

Now that we better understand the unconquerable hard limits to knowing, to objective study, to absolute knowledge, that man is not God, and also understand the role of axioms in epistemology, it is easier to accept even the softer but somewhat more conquerable limits to
knowing that are the consequent of our very nature of being a socialized species which defines our worldview from birth. It outlines and confines our “system” of existence so to speak. This human system has its own set of axioms, its presuppositions of faith, values, and beliefs that become ingrained into cultures and civilizations and which are taught to its every new generation born as “truths”. This natural human process of socialization and cultural memory creates a self-perpetuating system of subjectivity, and of myths that come to govern even the minutest details of daily lives spanning the gamut of existence from behavior to beliefs.

Even if there was no deliberate social engineering to make the public mind in calculated directions, the nature of human societies by definition creates social control that is beholden not always to a group of people, but to shared memory, shared habits, shared ethos, all of which drive the social norms and values, and consequently both individual and collective behavior. In other words, to be part of society is to be part of some behavior and belief control system by definition. To get an accurate and more objective knowledge of our own “system”, we have to extract ourselves from the confines of our worldviews and baseless presuppositions, and rise above them. The truth of this statement is most assuredly beyond doubt. It is in fact self-evident. No reasonable person can deny its commonsense even from their own daily experience of life. The uncomfortable fact that the subconscious human tendency towards a priori conclusions and predisposition, despite all earnest protestations of due diligence in having no presuppositions, appears to be the inherent nature of socialization bias, and of the subjectivity therein, and of the religiosity and self-righteousness conferred to one's socialized perspective, makes it hard to transcend our ingrained worldviews. Recall from the text in Part-II that the left and right half brains are abstractions of the logic and intuition functions of the mind loosely mapped to the brain geography and not necessarily a hard physical demarcation. Logic and rational reasoning abilities of the IQ (Intelligence Quotient) dominated left-half brain is quite unable
to penetrate that socialization shield of soft bias subconsciously built up by the EQ (Emotional Quotient) dominated right-half brain. The latter evidently cocoons, or at least interferes with, the left-half's logic function of the mind in as yet unquantifiable but still visibly undeniable ways.

This visibility of their being separate functional entities that directly affect the understanding of reality is easily seen in the marked contrast between the characters of Mr. Spock and Captain Kirk in the Star Trek fable explored in Part-II. It is mentioned here only as a reminder of the full context of how the non-logic subjective mind can both help and hinder the objective logic mind. The only effective antidote to overcome the hindrance aspect which cripples human epistemology and the consequent understanding of reality, is increasing self-awareness. One must rationally attempt to compensate for all the accumulated filters of years of socialization biases by new cognitive filters that can negate their distortion effects of subjectivity. Know thy self to know the world! In electrical engineering parlance, it's like having compensation filters in the signal processing path to improve its signal to noise ratio – an analogy more apt for social sciences than may first be apparent to the un-initiated. Think of tuning an AM radio signal. It uses a tuned LC circuit to reject the noise and extract and amplify the broadcast signal. Uncrippled epistemology in the social sciences as well as in physical sciences that purports to understand and know reality the way it is, shares this common characteristic --- the requirement to remove the layers of noise first in order to even receive the signal. Its accurate detection, extraction, decoding, verification of correct decoding, and making sense comes much later. History is exactly like that --- wrapped in accumulated layers of generations of socialized noise and willful as well as subconscious self-interests. The narratives that survive do so either by rulers' sanctions, or by oral history that is passed from generation to generation until it gets penned when the new rulers permit it. What is the signal? It needs that basic AM radio tuned circuit abstraction for detection, extraction, and mak-
This is perhaps why the Holy Qur'an, while accepting socialization as a human fact of God's own Creation, has also laid such categorical emphasis on striving for “haq” (knowing reality, truth, justice, calling a spade a spade even against one's own self) under all conditions, for everyone among mankind, whereby, striving for overcoming one's “nafs”, the personal inclination and whim due to natural bent of mind, proclivity, socialization, predisposition, self-interests, and desires and fears (both conscious and subconscious), is termed the greater jihad and is made a hard co-requisite to the reflective study of the Holy Qur'an (for instance see Surah Al-Waqia, 56:78-79: “In a Book well-guarded, Which none shall touch but those who are clean (purified)

This is also why the sensible first order model of a cryptogram ciphertext from which the plaintext message needs to be accurately extracted, with graduated access control to its meaning based on shedding all biases as precondition, developed in this study is the most apt model for logically deciphering the message contained in this most unique Book of all books. Without this perceptive model that lends some measure of objectivity to the study of the Holy Qur'an, socialization bias virtually determines its entire meaning for both an individual and his society. That exercise of socialization, for the lack of a more sanitizing description, lays the first foundation of indoctrinating systems to control public behavior. For religion to have any philosophical significance beyond man-made as a method of social control, and beyond personal as a method of self-catharsis and self-gratification, meaning, for religion to be viewed as being of Divine origin and Divine purpose as the Divine Guidance from a Transcendental Source rather than of human origin, accurately deciphering its specification irrespective of the observer, mandates such a rational model for understanding it.

The fact that virtually zero understanding of this aspect of social science is betrayed by any notable Muslim scholar that has passed by
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this scribe's slovenly gaze over the years of his study, bespeaks of the moribund state of intellectual thought in Muslim scholarship which has progressively only degenerated into incestuously self-reinforced dogmas and doctrines that find scant support in the **Determinates** of the Holy Qur'an.

The proof of that pudding is in its eating. It is self-evident by just looking at the state of Muslims and at the state of the enemies of Muslims – both are driven almost exclusively by their respective socialized predisposition instead of what the Good Book itself says. The same text is interpreted by them based on their own narrow socialization bias when subconscious, and pathetic self-interests when conscious. The staunchest enemies of the Muslims, the Jews, are driven exclusively by their blind hatred of Prophet Muhammad and Islam, just as they are driven by their blind hatred of Christ and Christianity – although the two are today cozy bed fellows of strange mutual convenience with the Jew wagging the goy in their combined onslaught against Islam and Muslims – and both enemies of Muslims exaggerate and amplify their hatred along their respective narrow socialization biases in about the same measure as the Shia and Sunni Muslims are each driven by their blind love of Prophet Muhammad and Islam, while differing in their respective understanding exactly along their own narrow socialization biases. Qualitatively, to the observant student of sociology at least, one who has succeeded in distancing himself to some measure from what he is observing, these are different manifestations of the same primary phenomena: socialization under crippled epistemology. It yields a plentiful harvest of useful idiots for Machiavelli and Übermensch.

The Case Study in Mantra Creation in the report on *The Mighty Wurlitzer* explains how the socialization biases and cultural memories of the unwary public are cunningly harvested for their own perception management. Specific attention is paid to the works of Edward Bernays and political psychologists referenced therein --- a social science field that appears to be entirely foreign to the Muslim intellect. That
unsophisticated public mind, Muslim and non Muslim alike, is easy picking for the diabolical Western hegemons who have today penetrated not just psychology and behavior control, but are rapidly moving towards full spectrum human control. See Zbigniew Brzezinski's presaging in *Between Two Ages*, Aldous Huxley's dystopic fable: *A Brave New World*, and Aldous Huxley's talk at the University of California, Berkeley, titled *The Ultimate Revolution*, March 20, 1962, all fully referenced and examined in *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, ibid., to realize how little independence of thought even an intellectual really exercises upon his own mind today.

The trifecta of the forces of nature, nurture, and perception managers all conspire to extract obedience and conformity from the human mind. The truly independent mind may exist only in philosophy, in fables, and as an abstraction. It arguably cannot exist in socialized man. Especially when he is compelled to “United We Stand”. Self-serving forces of co-option and cognitive dissonance ensure that outcome, often subconsciously when one is not an outright mercenary or superman. This complex reality directly colors the acquisition of knowledge, and the subsequent expression of knowledge. Especially for studying the untermensch, the lesser peoples, meaning others different from us, their belief systems, their value systems, their histories, their literatures, and their civilizations whence one man's treasures become another man's trash.

A telling quote from Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay of the British Empire, speaking to the British Parliament to redefine the Indian subcontinent's education policy under British colonial rule, captures the veritable truth of these words which have universal import for the pursuit of all social sciences:
"I have no knowledge of either Sanscrit or Arabic. But I have done what I could to form a correct estimate of their value. I have read translations of the most celebrated Arabic and Sanscrit works. I have conversed, both here and at home, with men distinguished by their proficiency in the Eastern tongues. I am quite ready to take the oriental learning at the valuation of the orientalists themselves. I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the Western literature is indeed fully admitted by those members of the committee who support the oriental plan of education." --- Minute on Indian Education, Minute by the Hon'ble T. B. Macaulay, dated the 2nd February 1835

While the aforementioned example is one of shocking denigration from a colonizing power flushed with the hubris of imperialism and suffering from the superiority complex of all conquerors, the same qualitatively applies in converse as well, when one is hagiographically studying one's own civilization, literature, history, or religion, and gloats as Macaulay does in the above example. Also when one is suffering from an abject inferiority complex as the colonized and enslaved people and studying the ruling class whereby everything that is one's own is deemed inferior and unworthy. It is often accompanied by a mad rush to adopt everything foreign, from ideas, language, and solutions to objects, lifestyles, and amenities.

The first step towards objectivity therefore, on any subject, is none other than becoming aware of one's own innate subjectivity, and its immersion in crippled epistemology, and confronting it head on. Everything else just follows from it.

No sensible person can deny the truth of these words for the matter is self-evident. Except perhaps when applying to one self. This scribe has yet to meet a person, from the man of cloth to the man of science, arts, humanities, or letters, who believes he is anything but
objective! That is the tragedy of man from time immemorial; living and dying self-righteously off of a crippled epistemology! Which is why this scribe calls this age the *Age of Jahiliya*. It is an age from which self-awareness has been most cunningly stripped off and substituted with, as Zbigniew Brzezinski put it in *Between Two Ages*, “narrow-gauged specialists or superficial generalists”. This makes for a perfect golden age for the Machiavellian scientific controllers behind the scenes as depicted in Plato's *Allegory of the Cave*. The age, and the methods of human behavior control in that age, go hand in hand:

“In the technetronic society the trend seems to be toward aggregating the individual support of millions of unorganized citizens, who are easily within the reach of magnetic and attractive personalities, and effectively exploiting the latest communication techniques to manipulate emotions and control reason. Reliance on television—and hence the tendency to replace language with imagery, which is international rather than national, and to include war coverage or scenes of hunger in places as distant as, for example, India—creates a somewhat more cosmopolitan, though highly impressionistic, involvement in global affairs.”


The possibilities of scientific human control in the technetronic society is also examined in great depth in Bertrand Russell's *Impact of Science on Society*, 1952, where the British Fabian philosopher of the oligarchic ruling class made the argument for absolute control of the masses finally being made possible in the modern scientific era. It was the same wine in a new bottle which was corked by Zbigniew Brzezinski for the same oligarchy in *Between Two Ages* some two decades later. The British philosopher observed that global scientific control in a world police-state is the only effective way for a stable society to exist in which all the undesirable *useless eaters* have been population controlled like game on a natural preserve, and the preferred races,
mainly the European white man, given unlimited liberty to procreate their superior progeny at will. Russell's purpose being the same as Brzezinski's, Huxley's, Wells', and many others going all the way back to Plato. While the latter was warning the public against the Übermensch social engineers with the best of intent to have noble men become their wise shepherd as the philosopher-king, others arguably presaged the techniques of mind manipulation and behavior control as a self-serving self-fulfilling prophecy for the Social Darwinian Übermensch continuing as their natural shepherd in the scientific era just as he has been from time immemorial with more primitive techniques:

“There is, it must be confessed, a psychological difficulty about a single world government. The chief source of social cohesion in the past, I repeat, has been war: the passions that inspire feeling of unity are hate and fear. These depend upon the existence of an enemy, actual or potential. It seems to follow that a world government could only be kept in being by force, not by the spontaneous loyalty that now inspires a nation at war.” --- Bertrand Russell, Impact of Science on Society, 1952, Chapter 2, General Effects of Scientific Technique, pg 37

As one can easily see, these dystopic forces of social engineering have direct implications for the creation, promulgation and acquisition of knowledge; for both suppression of accurate knowledge, and for making it difficult to acquire the pertinent facts and analysis in a timely manner when its widespread public disclosure can prevent a fait accompli. Control of knowledge, of reporting of events of history and current affairs, and of the perceptive understanding of these matters, is the cornerstone of controlling humanity. Control, control, control, is the mantra of the superman in every era --- Why? Because he claims to know best because of his higher intelligence, greater wealth, or the privilege of being closer to God, if not god himself. Aldous Huxley warned of the grotesque reality of that style of social control for inducing voluntary servitude, and the arrival of the scientific era.
which is enabling this brave new world of engineered social control at an accelerated pace. Huxley called it the era of the *Ultimate Revolution* in social control, an era in which people can be made to love their servitude:

> 'You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them! If you are going to control any population for any length of time you must have some measure of consent. It's exceedingly difficult to see how pure terrorism can function indefinitely. It can function for a fairly long time, but I think sooner or later you have to bring in an element of persuasion. An element of getting people to consent to what is happening to them.  

Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude!

This is the, it seems to me the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say.' --- Aldous Huxley, The Ultimate Revolution, speech at the University of California, Berkeley, March 20, 1962, minute 04:06

Overcoming such dystopic forces of social engineering requires overcoming the reality captured by Brzezinski, of the macro economics of nations and the rapid pace of scientific development fashioning “narrow-gauged specialists or superficial generalists” who are content to labor hard all day long, and loving it.

This counter exercise to perverse social control requires a great deal of societal transformation in who wields its power, an exercise which is nothing short of revolutionary, the least of which, to begin its public demand, is the public:
acquiring a perceptive understanding of power and its role in the making of the human mind;

acquiring wherewithal of social forces by not merely training to become blind-folded economic widgets chasing the “American Dream”;

acquiring knowledge that leads to better understanding of reality and the forces that have shaped it, and continue to shape it;

and consequently, requiring the expenditure of a great deal of mental and physical personal energy despite the needs of the stomach and career and for which there may not be any immediately gratifying pot of gold waiting at the end of the rainbow.

A tall order to think important, let alone to pursue, in an age that is by design engineered to fashion only “a large number of men who are content to labor hard all day long”:

'The economic well-being of the nation depends on the presence of a large number of men who are content to labor hard all day long. Because men are naturally lazy they will not work unless forced by necessity to do so.' --- Bernard de Mandeville, The Fable of the Bees, 1705

These are all the very real forces behind the man-made soft limits to knowledge, difficult to overcome, but not impossible to overcome. Nevertheless, it is also not so straightforward to overcome either because in the age of universal deceit, to discover the truth is a revolutionary act!! The levels of co-option hiding in the dark recesses of the human mind, and in the human stomach, are not separated from the pursuit of this revolutionary act. And it all hinges upon the Qur'anic prescription of “jihad-un-nafs” – the first principle from which all truth shines through its protective layers.
Now we understand the full dimensions of the many impediments to both acquiring knowledge of reality the way it actually is, past and present, and using that knowledge productively rather than just for amusing ourselves when we do dare to seek it forthrightly.

Therefore, the public mind that is largely unable to fully indulge in such strenuous mental (and spiritual) effort to extract signals from a sea of epistemological noise, should instead be guided on the following **Determinate** path of the Holy Qur'an rather than embark on some self-appointed *la mission civilisatrice* to get all others to agree with one's own narrow worldview:

> “If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; **it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.**” (Surah Al-Maeda, verse fragment 5:48)

One can decide for oneself what one is now, and rather strive to be: a programmed robot unable to reason beyond the worldview inherited, meaning 98% of the Muslim mind; or trenchantly able to confront that incestuous programming by reasoning just one single step beyond?

In the first case, the path is clear:

- Strive to implement verse 5:48 of Surah Al-Maeda without taxing one's mind, imagination, and emotional makeup too much.

- One may stay happily attached to one's own sect (by birth or by inclination), fiqh, books, and set of beliefs, and instead, focus on pursuing *فَاسْتَيْدِّهَا الْخَيْرَاتَ* in this life in relationship to others. Let the Afterlife take care of its own – and should one disagree with others in matters of faith: “**it is He that will show you the truth of the mat-**
ters in which ye dispute.”

- That does not mean to dig up one's favored interpretation from the Holy Qur'an to condemn others, but rather, to build consensus on the common **Determinates** of the Holy Qur'an and leave the **Indeterminates** to people as their own choice.

- But do keep in mind the Author's promise that one shall be *raised* with the Imam one followed: “One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams” (يَوْمَ نَدْعُوُ كُلَّ أُبْنَىٰ يَمْهَمْ) (Surah al-Israa' 17:71). The word “Imam” according to The Arabic-English dictionary of the Holy Qur'an in this scribe's reference is defined as: “Leader; President; Any object that is followed, whether a human being or a book or a highway”. The “imam” one follows is obviously one's choice. Permit the same right to choice to others without passing judgment, and suddenly, for the vast majority of Muslim public divided into sectarianism from birth, we get one hundred different self-righteous sects able to live peacefully with each other, accommodating each other, and competing with each other “as in a race in all virtues.” (فَاسْتَنْفِقُوا الْخَيْرَاتِ)

- Surely the Biblical follower would be looking at this remarkable religion of Islam with some envy – given the burden put upon the poor Crusading soldier to go save everyone's soul in order to save his own! In Islam, worry about your own soul. Obviously, this commonsense has never transpired among any people, and is surely not about to transpire among Muslims either – left to their own devices. See the Path Forward in Part-III.

In the second case the journey is more strenuous:

- One surely can get out of one's own shoes and endeavor
to look at one's own epistemology with the same measure of objectivity that one employs to condemn others'.

- This new path does require expending strenuous mental activity. Firstly, in becoming cognizant of one's own socialization and perception biases. That exercise requires a heightened degree of self-awareness, an acute penchant for intellectual honesty, and an intellect that is able to bear witness against its own self and against its own heroes when called for. Such an intellect is not born pre-built any more than a child is born with its clothes on. It has to be developed and sharpened on the anvil of ego suppression in an honest search for truth, especially for the objective study of any matter that one is emotionally attached to. Secondly, only with an intellect that soars on Mt. Fuji in purposeful honesty and cognizant of its own limitations, can one put the necessary scrutinizing filters on the mind to cancel out one's natural socialization biases and proclivity towards self-selecting sources seeking subconscious confirmation of presuppositions, in order to create some detachment between the subject under study and the observer. This exercise takes one on a road much less traveled, especially by the Muslim mind – scholar and laity alike – perpetually weaned on the scholarship of incestuous self-reinforcement. But this arduous journey on the road less traveled may serendipitously take one to wherever truth dwells:
'I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I,
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.'
(The Road Not Taken by Robert Frost)

Only the journey of a people on that road not taken can eventually lead to the fulfillment of the divine prayer to fashion the fractious Muslims into a single nation without extracting everyone else from its definition: “Our Lord! make of us Muslims, bowing to Thy (Will), and of our progeny a Muslim nation, bowing to Thy (will);” (2:128) --- for all the roads taken obviously have not!

We begin next with the timeline of all the earliest primary written works of Muslim history and Muslim scholarship in existence today which is the source of all secondary works, commentaries, histories, and analyses throughout the past one thousand years. Let the evidence of where Muslims get most of their Islam from speak for itself.
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Part-I


[6] pgs 44-45  Zbigniew Brzezinski, “War on Terror” as a “self-fulfilling prophecy”: ‘To argue that America is already at war in the region with a wider Islamic threat, of which Iran is the epicenter, is to
promote a self-fulfilling prophecy.


14. Zahir Ebrahim, Editor, Three Political Dialogs To Screw Your Enemy: Protocols of the Elders of Zion, The Prince, The Art of War,

[15] pg 46 Zahir Ebrahim, Egypt and Tunisia – The 'arc of crisis' being radicalized!

[16] pg 46 Zahir Ebrahim, Unlayering the Middle East War Agenda: Making Sense of Absurdities,
http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/unlayering-middle-east-war-agenda.html

http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,919995,00.html


[19] pg 47 Zahir Ebrahim, Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order,

Part-II

[20] pg 52 Imperial mobilization, see Zbigniew Brzezinski, “Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization.”, The Grand Chessboard, 1997


[22] pgs 63-65 Zahir Ebrahim, Prisoners of the Cave, 2003, see Introduction for excerpt from Plato's Simile of the Cave, URL:
yth-of-the-Cave

[23] pg 64 Abdus Salam quoting Albert Einstein, Nobel Speech, 1979,

[24] pg 67 Charles Townes, 1964 Nobel physics laureate,

[25] pg 67 Abdus Salam, op. cit., also see

[26] pg 67 Arthur L. Schawlow, 1981 Nobel Prize in Physics,

[27] pg 67 Max Planck, 1918 Nobel Prize in Physics, cited in
Critique of Western Philosophy and Social Theory By David Sprintzen, also see
http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/1918/

[28] pg 67 Richard P. Feynman, 1965 Nobel Prize in Physics, Surely
You are Joking Mr. Feynman, also see

[29] pg 68 Zahir Ebrahim, Behavior Control: Architecture of Modern
Propaganda,
http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html

[30] pgs 68-70 For left-half brain over-dominance, see Zahir
Ebrahim, Morality derived from the Intellect leads to Enslavement!,

[31] pgs 69-70 Allama Iqbal, Zarbe-e-Kaleem, text from
http://youtube.com/watch?v=TsuXQSJci6o
[32] pgs 63, 70  Extending footnotes [1] and [2]. The well-justified skepticism on “Sir” Dr. Allama Iqbal and his service to empire is based on his acts, despite his eloquent “revolutionary Islam” lyrics having captivated the overly simpleton Muslim imagination from the shores of the Nile to the heights of Kashgar for generations, is the consequent of the appellation “Sir”. This one tiny dangling imperial prefix to his name, like the loose dangling thread of a tightly knitted woolen sweater, when tugged, quickly unravels the entire garment. The knighthood naturally leads to taking a more scrutinizing look at this poet's role in the British empire and begs the obvious question: how was “Sir” Dr. Allama Muhammad Iqbal of service to the British Empire for which the white man rewarded this brown-skinned Indian Muslim revolutionary with the coveted knighthood of their empire so vast, that even the sun never dare set on all its dominions? Most Muslim intellectuals are inhibited from doing even this basic scrutiny due to the culture of hero worship that has surrounded this most sacred poet laureate. The shocking fact that “Sir” Dr. Allama Muhammad Iqbal accepted the imperial knighthood, instead of simply declining it with a “no thank you” in the first place, or renouncing it like his counterpart Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore did after the Jallianwala Bagh massacre by the British imperial troops, patently identifies this poet laureate of the Muslims and of Pakistan state, as a condemnable hypocrite (in the language of the Holy Bible), a “munafiq” (in the language of the Holy Qur'an), and Übermensch, superman (in the language of Nietzsche). The creator of the brilliant Hegelian Dialectic of marde-momin against the Nietzschean superman, his Ph.D. thesis advisor in Germany himself being a direct student of Hegel, “Sir” Dr. Allama Muhammad Iqbal's actual acts of both commission and omission on the global imperial chessboard of his time, his sudden meteoric rise from the backwaters of a small unknown town of Sialkot to world prominence and glorification orchestrated by the British empire herself, and in whose laurels he composed great suck-up lyrics (eulogy when Queen Victoria passed away, on the occasion of coronation of King George V, on other occasions after World War I in praise of the British king, etc., and the newspaper report of the time of his allegedly having killed a prostitute Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam 2015
in Lahore's red light district with the British rulers of India looking the other way and uncharacteristically refusing to investigate that crime of murder in their own slave colony when it was they who inflicted upon their dominions their famous penal code as the avant-garde law-givers for the rule of law to the backward natives, their *la mission civilisatrice*, the *white man's burden*, have never quite died away despite Pakistan cleansing and sanctifying his memory as the sacred father of Pakistan), all brazenly bespeak of this cherished poet-revolutionary of the Muslims being the British empire's most prized asset for *divide et impera*, divide and conquer, a Trojan horse carefully cultivated, groomed, and planted among the Muslims in India to create the demand for dividing the huge Indian subcontinent during the British empire's retrenchment phase from overt world domination. This subject is scrutinized in these reports:

[32a] Zahir Ebrahim, Sacred Cow: Allama Iqbal - marde-momin or superman?,
http://faith-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2012/12/allama-iqbal-marde-momin-or-superman.html ;


Indeed, “Sir” Allama Iqbal makes for a very revealing touchstone for identifying both superman hypocrites and indoctrinated useful idiots among Muslims even today. See who willfully ignores and omits the fact that “Sir” Allama Iqbal is a knight of the British empire when celebrating him as the illustrious flag-bearer of *Deen-e-Shabbiri* (the Religion of Islam as exponentiated by Imam Hussein ibn Alī ibn Abī Ṭālīb, the revered grandson of the Prophet of Islam, nick named Shabbir, and his followers in Karbala, and his immediate surviving progeny in the aftermath of Karbala, whereby all of them under the stewardship of their Imam refused to bow before the reigning empire of the time)! See Letter to Shia Muslim pontiff of Pakistan, Syed
Jawad Naqvi, [32c] below, the Iran trained eloquent and passionate orator to suddenly rise to national prominence as the flag-bearer of “revolutionary Islam” under the command of the valih-e-faqih of Iran. The Pakistani pontiff celebrates the poetic dispensation of this long dead British empire's asset in almost every speech he gives, without pause for reflection that this superman poet is the knight of the same Western empire that looted India for nearly two centuries, and which eventually succeeded in militarily destroying the two dominant Muslim ruling states in Asia under the Ottomans and the Mughals respectively, taking over their territories and their treasures. The role of “Sir” Allama Iqbal in aiding and abetting the British empire is entirely drowned out by regurgitating his verses extolling the virtues of revolutionary Islam. Thus, daily misleading thousands of his young student audience, not just in his own seminary, but those who tune in to his lectures and courses over the internet, who appear to hang on to his divine words amidst boisterous sloganeering against the West with “amreeka murdabad” “israel murdabad”.


No one dares to challenge or interlocute this new phenomenal Shia religious motivational speaker in Pakistan who, on the one hand, is trying to elevate the wherewithal of the beleaguered Shia Muslims of Pakistan about their religion, as well as about current affairs that has pushed their backs to the wall with repeated slaughters of innocent civilians from Quetta to Parachinar, but is evidently doing so most selectively, with omissions and distortions according to his own ideological agenda of bringing “revolutionary Islam” to Pakistan under the leadership of the Iranian valih-e-faqih.

George Orwell could not have been more prescient in his perceptive statement of how difficult it is to confront deceit in the age of universal deceit, “In the age of universal deceit to tell the truth is a revolutionary act.” Wherever one turns, one sees only scoundrels telling half-truths and quarter truths at best, by cunningly lying by omission, by cleverly omitting to disclose facts to their audience that are inconvenient to their narratives. It makes for the most diabolical form of propaganda warfare, and Aldous Huxley captured its impact most ably in his Preface to his fable A Brave New World: ‘Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals.’ (See Aldous Huxley, 1946 Preface to Brave New World, 1931, Harper, pg. 11)

[33] pg 75 The sentence “see what the Holy Qur'an means to you” is in reference to a similar statement made in the Preface of the English translation titled: The Sublime Quran, by the translator Laleh Bakhtiar, who evidently advocates that literary approach to the study of the Holy Qur'an. This approach is ubiquitous in modernity and the Western mind attuned to reading fine literature especially gravitates towards this absurd style of studying the Holy Qur'an. The model for studying the Holy Qur'an as a cipher text developed here demonstrates the egregious error of the specious method “see what the Holy Qur'an means to you”. The pithy saying in Urdu captures this situation aptly: half a doctor danger to the body, half a mullah danger to the soul!

pgs 106 and 304 Part-IV  For reference to “prisoners of the cave”, see Plato's *Simile of the Cave* in *The Republic*, Machiavelli's *The Prince*, and Zahir Ebrahim's *The Mighty Wurlitzer*, to understand perception management, and how it is used for behavior control of the public from time immemorial, from antiquity to modernity. The natural human processes of both myth amplification and truth attenuation due to self-interest, as well as due to the recursive inheritance of a crippled epistemology that is further distorted by each generation before bequeathing it to the successive ones, deeply underwrites epistemology. This reality of the matter calls for the often holily sanctified narratives of history to be revisited by honest scholars and intellectuals in every age in order to acquire a clearer and more forensic understanding of the epistemology of the recorded narratives of interest to them rather than just accepting history as fact. It is perhaps due to this profound appreciation of manufactured and synthetic epistemology that George Orwell presciently penned in his dystopian fable *Nineteen Eighty-four*: “Who controls the past
controls the future, who controls the present controls the past.” The narratives of 9/11 being sanctified today as “fact” during our own lifetime precisely fall on this template. One can observe the narratives of the *who* and the *why* in its first generation of sanctification and easily perceive how the young first generation growing up in the present era is already believing these fairy tales as “religion”. For an alternative view away from this populist fairy tale of “militant Islam” attacking America on September 11, 2001, that is constantly morphing into new formidable terrors threatening to “take over the world”, see:

[35a] Zahir Ebrahim, FAQ: Prove to me that the 9/11 Narrative is a Big Lie, http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/911-sacred-cow-of-science.html ;


[35e] Lastly, the unraveling of some of the most cunning *Übermensch* minds who have deceived the public trust by playing fake opposition to PAX Americana in the guise of being mankind's stewards: Songbird or Superman – You Decide!, by Zahir Ebrahim, http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/09/songbird-or-superman.html


[38] pg 117 Section IV Adopting a Systematic Systems Approach, Extending footnote[5]. For *How to Study the Holy Qur'an*, see Murtada Mutahhari, *Understanding the Uniqueness of the Qur'an*, http://www.al-islam.org/al-tawhid/unique-quran.htm. The reality of the fact of ingrained socialization and perception bias natural to all human beings, is unfortunately not acknowledged by Allama Mutahhari in his exposition, even though this fact of socialization bias is explicitly part of the teachings of the Holy Qur'an in both its emphasis on the separation of righteous beliefs (Haquq-Allah 42:10) from righteous acts (Haquq-al-ibad 5:48), and in accepting multiculturalism as an empirical reality of existence. See Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization (op. cit.) for the system of verses that categorically impart this understanding of pluralism in the Religion of Islam – the Religion that its Author categorically asserts in verse 5:3 is perfected and completed as a Divine Favor to man. That lack of forthright recognition of socialization into tribes and nations of birth
equally extending to socialized groups and sects of birth, that reaching absolute truth may be virtually impossible for socialized man, that man will naturally gravitate towards his own tribe and nation with which he shares common bonds of culture, heritage, ethos, and shared memory, fortunately does not detract from this formidable Persian Shia Muslim scholar's sensible examination of how to study the Holy Qur'an. And despite that fact that Allama Murtada Mutahhari consequently does lend somewhat of an a priori conclusion to such study based on his own narrow socialization bias of Shia theology which is amply in evidence in his exposition. It is indeed hard to find any scholar of great caliber who fervently believes in the dogmas of his religion, whatever the religion might be, who would not be at least a bit colored by socialization and confirmation biases, and by subconscious presuppositions of a priori assertions of “truths” as axioms of faith, even as he might genuinely labor to teach others how to study his religion and letting them arrive at their own conclusions AFTER such study! This unfortunate lack of understanding up front has caused Mutahhari to pepper his exposition with Shia presuppositions, which it would have been far more objective to have demonstrated as directly falling out of the Holy Qur'an after its study rather than in a guide book that shows how to study it! Any book that endeavors to teach how to study the Holy Qur'an and then peppers it with one's own presuppositions can only command like-minded audience and not a general audience. This has indeed limited Mutahhari's penetration among the majority of Muslims who are Sunni Muslims and averse to reading any Shia scholarship regardless of merit. The most famous contemporary Sunni Muslim scholar of the Indian subcontinent and later Pakistan, the late Maulana Maudoodi, was once heard confessing that he had never read any Shia Muslim scholarship in his entire life of scholarship (source of this confession is Allama Jawad Naqvi of Lahore Pakistan in one of his speeches)!

[39] pg 118 Switching pronouns Surah Abasa 80:1-12: the most shocking example of this sorry fact of pronoun fixing for narrow self-interests is demonstrated by some translators of verses 80:1-12 of Surah Abasa. While no explicit reference to the Prophet of Islam is
made in these verses, or in the entire Surah, some Sunni translators drawing upon early tafsirs dating back to the Abbasside dynastic rule, have added the word (Prophet) in parenthesis to indicate it is the Prophet of Islam who is being chastised by Allah for the mistake of turning away from the blind man: “(The Prophet) frowned and turned away” (80:1, tr. Yusufali); the un-stated motivation of the early scribes being to argue that the Prophet made mistakes and was not inerrant, and therefore anyone could succeed the Prophet of Islam as the temporal ruler of the nascent but rapidly expanding Muslim empire after the Prophet's demise. That wicked legacy has been blindly mimicked by subsequent scholars without reflection upon what the Holy Qur'an is itself stating most plainly on that subject of inerrancy! This is shocking mistreatment of the Prophet of Islam by Muslim scribes shilling for the ruling interests who had become caliphs and rulers by making recourse to verse 4:59, the Verse of Obedience, despite the most clear exposition of the Principle of Inerrancy being the co-requisite for succeeding the Prophet of Islam. To patronize the rulers, the Muslim pulpit evidently had no compunction even belittling their own noble Prophet! This unfortunate mistreatment concerning the stature of the Prophet of Islam has now become the permanent ethos of the majority Sunni sect and remains a point of major contention with the minority Shia sect. Speak of Western hectoring hegemons hijacking Islam for imperial mobilization! Pious Muslims beat that subversion to the punch by a long shot. See article: What does the Holy Qur'an say about Inerrancy of Prophet Muhammad? which explores this topic further, http://islam-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/08/what-does-quran-say-about-inerrancy.html

Part-III

[40] pg 132 See article: What does the Holy Qur'an say about the Ahlul Bayt, which summarizes the findings of this Case Study, http://islam-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/03/what-does-quran-say-about-ahlul-bayt.html
[41] pgs 134, 151  Harvard University Lecture Discusses Qur’an Translations, The Harvard Crimson, October 29, 2010, 'The Qur’an is fundamentally untranslatable, according to Bonn University Professor Emeritus of Semitic Languages and Islamic Studies Stefan Wild. In a lecture sponsored by the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Wild said yesterday that the sacred Islamic text cannot be perfectly replicated in another language. ... Wild’s lecture—titled “The Qur’an Today: Why Translate the Untranslatable?”—was the final installment of the three-part Fall 2010 H.A.R. Gibb Arabic & Islamic Studies Lectures series.'

[42] pg 163  The statement “wasn't Qur'an alone sufficient” is in reference to Caliph Umar, the companion of the Prophet of Islam who became the second Muslim Caliph to rule Muslimdom, and under whose watch Jerusalem was conquered and his version or understanding of Islam spread to distant shores. He is recorded to have uttered the famous “Qur'an alone is sufficient for us” statement when the Prophet of Islam, during his last days of terminal illness, had supposedly asked for some ink and paper to be brought to him so that his Last Will and Testament could be written down for posterity. Myth or reality? Part-V deals with what these scribes of history have written, and not written, or watered down with half-truths, from which, while no “religion” can sensibly be derived, a forensic sense of the political climate of the time can still be inferred. Especially the context for verse 33:36 condemning the believers among the companions of the Prophet of Islam for following “clearly the wrong path”. The forensic scrutiny of historical data to update our largely hagiographic understanding of the early period of Islam after the death of its Prophet, evidently requires the same “cleansed hearted” considerations that are prerequisite for the perceptive study of the Holy Qur'an.

allah-by-zahir-ebrahim.html


[45] pg 220, 271  The Golden Rule: *Do unto others as you have others do unto you.* From the Bible: Matthew 7:12, Luke 6:31; Old Testament Mosaic Law. Also Socrates; Confucius; Solon; others.


[50] pg 223  Ayatollah Khomeini, Islam and Revolution, translated by Hamid Algar, 1981,
Extending footnote [12] Machiavellian forces, transcending the immediate, the national boundaries, and what's visible like the iceberg, which manipulate global affairs and what is made to look like “happenstance” of history, can only be seen by distancing oneself from the immediate and what's happening near to you; “With your mind as high as Mt. Fuji you can see all things clearly. And you can see all the forces that shape events; not just the things happening near to you.” Witness the hard empiricism of the theory of “revolutionary times” which wasn't just limited to the diabolical construction of the Jewish state in Palestine:

(a) Fomenting and harvesting “revolutionary times” with self-inflicted or manufactured terror is explained in the tutorial “Understanding Self-Inflicted Terror”, http://tinyurl.com/Manufacturing-Terror;
(b) Examine the contemporary case of fashioning "militant Islam" as the Hegelian Dialectic to seed "revolutionary times" and blaming it for 9/11, http://tinyurl.com/Fabricating-Pirates;
(c) Examine the creation of ISIS and its extreme barbarianism reminiscent of Biblical times to continue the "revolutionary times" in the name of fighting the constantly "mutating Islam", http://tinyurl.com/Understanding-ISIS;
(d) Examine how Insurgency and Counter-insurgency are used as the Hegelian Dialectic to endlessly sustain "revolutionary times" in a self-fulfilling prophecy, http://tinyurl.com/Insurgency-Counterinsurgency;
(e) Examine the early fomenting of "revolutionary Islam" in Pakistan as a Hegelian Dialectic, http://tinyurl.com/revolutionary-islam-pawn

See article: What does the Holy Qur'an say about Taqlid?, which is based on this study but which also explores this topic ab initio, from first principles, by first examining the fundamental basis of the guidance system in the religion of Islam, http://islam-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/08/what-does-quran-say-about-taqlid.html
Part-IV

[53] pg 299 See Leon Festinger for cognitive dissonance.

[54] pg 299 Metanoia, Greek word for transformation, often used in Biblical literature to denote a change of heart due to repentance. Used here in the context of radical transformation of one's perspective due to the discomfort of cognitive dissonance induced by contradictions. For instance, a closely held prior false belief that is contradicted by empirically supported new evidence or understanding. To move to the new belief, or to become even more convinced of prior false belief, is the result of resolving cognitive dissonance. The stubborn irrational mind resolves it by the latter, becoming even more adamant about prior belief now known to be false. The rational self-aware mind however resolves it by abandoning the former false beliefs in the face of the new awareness. This scribe has come to the cold realization that without the onset of cognitive dissonance, no metanoia is possible in the human mind. In other words, facts and empiricism are not sufficient to induce transformation by themselves. It requires a concomitant emotional and psychological discomfort, the realm of the right-half brain, for the analysis of the left-half brain to leave its indelible mark upon the human mind and the human will. And even there, Leon Festinger predicted and proved that the human mind will gravitate towards becoming even firmer in its prior false beliefs as a means of resolving its cognitive dissonance, instead of accepting the new coherent reality. What finally induces Metanoia, the kick to the human mind to accept the hard facts of rational analysis of its own left-half logical brain, or its own troubled conscience because of it, and to have the facts of reality prevail upon the emotional and stubborn right-half brain steeped in recalcitrance, no one can really predict. Conversely, what human forces prevail upon the left-half brain to not make it accept what only the right-half brain can intuitively and spiritually perceive, no one can predict either. As examined in Part-II, the human mind is the most complex and sophisticated system in creation. It can do science and discovery and overcome the illogic of superstition with bravery, and yet also
accurately perceive that which science and logic cannot comprehend nor measure. Recall from the fable of Star Trek that Captain Kirk's human mind always beat out Mr. Spock's stellar logical one in the end in every battle of reality and survival. Perhaps not the perfect metaphor, but Rabindranath Tagore's poetic allusion comes closer to capturing some of its limitations: “A mind all logic is like a knife all blade. It makes the hand bleed that uses it.” Which is why all Holy scriptures of world religions, especially the Holy Qur'an, and also the Holy Bible, put so much emphasis on the heart. It is not illogical to surmise that the fountainhead of metanoia, transformation, is also secreted therein. Embolden the heart and man is indomitable. Enslave the heart and man is chained for life. Victor Hugo's novel *Les Misérable*, the quintessential depiction of metanoia, and the story of the transformation of General Hur ibn Riyahhee in the historic event of Karbala, in 680 A.D., in which the first Muslim imperial state army under the command of this general who switched sides at the last minute before his armed to the teeth military killed the besieged noble grandson of the noble Prophet of Islam, Imam Hussein ibn Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, in a barbarianism that has brought the condemnation of all who have studied that ignominious chapter of Muslim history, capture this truth most vividly.

[55] pg 300 For details on how the *First Council of Nicaea* canonized the four books of the New Testament and destroyed other gospels, see Muhammad 'Ata ur-Rahim, Jesus: Prophet of Islam, 1991

[56] pg 304 For reference to Simile of the Cave, see [35], op. cit.


[58] pg 306 watch wtc1
http://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/north_tower-collapse.mpeg ;

[59] pg 306 watch wtc2
http://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/south_tower-collapse.mpeg ;
[60] pg 306  watch wtc7
http://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/wtc_7_cbs.mpg

[61] pg 315  Surah As-Sajdah verses 32:7-9, and the statement: 'The Author therefore also Knows the “fitrat”, i.e., nature, of every man,' also see Metanoia, op. cit., and How to Study the Holy Qur’an, op. cit.

[62] pg 323  Zahir Ebrahim, Case Study in Mantra Creation, Report on the Mighty Wurlitzer - Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare,
http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html#Case-Study-Mantra-Creation

[63] pg 324 “truly independent mind may exist only in philosophy”, Zahir Ebrahim, What Have I Learnt as a Student of Truth? The Art and Science of Co-option,

http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00generallinks/macaulay/txt_minute_education_1835.html ; cached
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Islam and Muslims in the Service of Empire

Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization

The very foundation of hegemony and empire lie in the public holding largely facile views of truths essential to the rulers

I sometimes like to tee off my writings on the human condition from the opinions I hear being expressed among the common man, in the grapevine, or in the news media. The quoted perspective below is from an unknown website written by an anonymous person. It expresses the seeds of a crucially pertinent topic to the human condition which is examined in considerable depth in this article.
'On occasions, I feel Muslims ‘lose’ something when it comes to religion. I am speaking about the second last prophet Jesus or Isa (E-sa) peace be upon him. ... My general opinion of Muslims is that they tend to take on a facile view of Christianity ... I get the feeling that this may be because: If an increase in discussions by Muslims of Jesus (pbuh) were to take place, it would be perceived as “being Christian”.'[1]

Where to seek knowledge, wisdom, when all bearers of knowledge and wisdom, both in the East and the West, appear to be shilling for self-interest? When the bearers of knowledge today also appear to be the greatest manipulators and predators of man? And when the knowledge seeker too is naturally beholden to socialization and susceptible to accepting facile world views ingrained since birth?

The interesting perspective embodied in that quote which inspired me to address this issue, is along the lines which reduce to the following empiricism: Human beings in general don't tend to appreciate what is not part of one's own socialization. Furthermore, with suitable inculcation, this lack of appreciation can span the gamut of behavior from remaining largely indifferent to being outright antagonistic to what's not perceived as one's own. The limit of that of course being intense doctrinal hatred and warfare.

This is pretty much a universal trait. An observable universal truism if there is one. And just as applicable to one as to another.

Upon this truism is the manipulative jingoism of antiquity to modernity constructed. We see this from tribalism to ethnocentrism, sectarianism to religionism, racism to culturalism, and nationalism to patriotism.
It is even the basis of the following formulation in Zbigniew Brzezinski's The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives:

“More generally, cultural change in America may also be uncongenial to the sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial power. That exercise requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification.” The Grand Chessboard, pgs. 211-212

I mention that not to needlessly digress, but only to point out the universality of the principle that the seeding theme being responded to and developed, has outlined just one instance of.

**The Face of Religion of Islam in the Holy Qur'an**

Recognizing this innate psychological trait of mankind (one presumes) is why the author of the Qur'an, which Muslims of course believe is the Creator (while other's believe was a lunatic), makes an extraordinary pronouncement on this very topic in Surah Al-Maeda – behold the unmatched principle of **Pluralism and Multi-culturalism** that is integral to the Holy Qur'an:
It was We who revealed the Torah (to Moses); therein was guidance and light. By its standard have been judged the Jews, by the Prophet who bowed (as in Islam) to Allah’s will, by the Rabbis and the Doctors of Law: for to them was entrusted the protection of Allah’s Book, and they were witnesses thereto: therefore fear not men, but fear Me, and sell not My Signs for a miserable price. If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than) Unbelievers. (5:44)

We ordained therein for them: “Life for life, eye for eye, nose for nose, ear for ear, tooth for tooth, and wounds equal for equal.” But if anyone remits the retaliation by way of charity, it is an act of atonement for himself. And if any fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than) wrong-doers. (5:45)

And in their footsteps We sent Jesus the son of Mary, confirming the law that had come before him: We sent him the Gospel: therein was guidance and light, and confirmation of the law that had come before him: a guidance and an admonition to those who fear Allah. (5:46)

Let the people of the Gospel Judge by what Allah hath revealed therein. If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (no better than) those who rebel. (5:47)
To thee We sent the Scripture in truth, confirming the scripture that came before it, and guarding it in safety; so judge between them by what Allah hath revealed, and follow not their vain desires, diverging from the Truth that hath come to thee.

To each among you have We prescribed a Law and an Open Way.

If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues.

The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute. (5:48) Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48

Caption Holy Qur'an Surah Al-Maeda verses 5:44-48 on Islam's fundamental acceptance of plurality of beliefs, and its enjoining mankind to strive for good alone as in a race in all virtues, while staying within their own socialized belief systems. Observe that there is no “saving” by conversion in Islam as in the religion of the Christian; and there is also no everlasting certificate of virtue as “god's chosen people” as in the religion of the Jew; and nor any class hierarchy by birth as in the “karma” infused religion of re-birth of the Hindu. Mankind in Islam is judged by his and her acts alone, of both commission and omission, as per the Qur'anic Accountability Equation: Output / Input. How much more egalitarian, and explicit, can Islam's singular scripture, the Holy Qur'an, be? And yet, the incessant propaganda barrage against Islam
and its noble Messenger, as in the FBI training presentation graph (see *The face of Jews' Islam* “violent Islam” below), as in “International Burn a Quran Day” (see Christian pastor Terry Jones below), continually succeeds among the “information-age” soaked Western minds – just as indifference, apathy, and fatalism of “god is running the world”, continually succeeds among the religion-soaked Muslim minds. Facile? Or, the veritable success of perception management by The Mighty Wurlitzer (http://tinyurl.com/mightywurlitzer)?

And to ensure that the point is not lost here, permit me to highlight the solution-space outlined in the above passage by none other than the presumed Almighty Creator of mankind: “To each among you have We prescribed a Law and an Open Way. If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people, but (His plan is) to test you in what He hath given you: so strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to Allah; it is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute.”

The Author of the Qur'an is in fact most emphatic about “matters in which ye dispute”:

> And in whatever thing you differ, its decision is unto God. Holy Qur’an, Surah Ash-Shura 42:10

If one were to judiciously extract the core first-principle from that straightforward and explicit multicultural pronouncement, while also observing that:

- the Author of the Holy Qur'an affirms that It did not deny Its Message or Its Messengers to any among mankind (even though only a very few are explicitly mentioned in the Holy Qur'an such as in Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48 above):
And verily We have raised in every nation a messenger, (proclaiming): Serve Allah and shun false gods. Holy Qur’an, Surah An-Nahl 16:36;

| ولقد بعثنا في كلٍّ أمة رسولًا أن عبدوا الله واجتنبوا الطاغوت |

And for every nation there is a messenger. And when their messenger cometh (on the Day of Judgment) it will be judged between them fairly, and they will not be wronged. Holy Qur’an, Surah Yunus 10:47;

| ولكلّ أمة رسولٌ فلما جاء رسلُهم قضِي بينهم بالقسط وهم لا يظلمون |

Surely We have sent you with the Truth as a bearer of good news and a warner; and there is not a people but a warner has gone among them. Holy Qur’an, Surah Faatir 35:24;

| إنا أرسلناك بالحق بشيرًا ونذيرًا وإن من أمة إلا خلأ فيه نذير |

- and that furthermore, the Author of the Holy Qur'an even requires anyone who accepts Its teachings to also accept all Its past Revelations to all peoples as an article of faith:

And who believe in that which has been revealed to you and that which was revealed before you and they are sure of the hereafter. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:4;

| والذين يؤمنون بما أنزل إليك وما أنزل من قبلك وبالأجرة هم يوقدون |

one would discover a most progressive and natural principle of freedom of choice that is universally applicable to all of mankind, to peoples of all beliefs, and to peoples of no belief:

- [to] mind one's own business for what one does not feel is one's own, as in the case of what's outside one's own sphere of socialization; and

- [to] compete with each other in virtuous conduct as in a race in all virtues (ファッションًا الخيرات) Surah Al-Maeda
5:48) rather than theological upmanship of whose understanding of religion is the greatest!

In my humble view, this is simply outstanding, nay, mind-blowingly progressive and liberal, advocacy of mutual tolerance to a fractious mankind that is psychologically prone to tribalism, ethnocentrism, the modern version of it being nationalism – all by the natural artifact of birth and socialization into a tribe, religion, and nation!

By the admission of the Author of the above verses, it is by design that the Creator made mankind into separate peoples, tribes and nations, and gave each of them their own localized affiliations and emotional attachments: “If Allah had so willed, He would have made you a single people” (أَمْثَلَ وَاحِدَةٌ Surah Al-Maeda 5:48). The Author proclaims that it is He Who deliberately Fashioned man in due proportion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He Who has made everything which He has created most good: He began the creation of man with (nothing more than) clay, (32:07)</th>
<th>ﺍﻵْذِى ﺍٰخْـسَـنَ كُلٍّ شَيْءٍ خَلْقٍ وَبَدَأَ خَلْقَ الْإِنسَانِ مِن طِينٍ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And made his progeny from a quintessence of the nature of a fluid despised: (32:08)</td>
<td>ﻧَٰٓاَمَثَلَ تَمَّ ﺛُمَّ جَعَلَ نَسْلَتَهُ ﻣِن مَّاءٍ مَّهِينٍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But He fashioned him in due proportion, and breathed into him something of His spirit. And He gave you (the faculties of) hearing and sight and feeling (and understanding): little thanks do ye give! (Surah As-Sajdah 32:09)</td>
<td>ﻧَٰٓاَمَثَلَ ﺛُمَّ سَوْىٌ ﻭَنَّفَعَ فِيهِ ﻣِن ﺭُوحِ ٰٓاَلًٰسْمَعَاءْ ﻭَالَّذِي ﺍٰلِصْرَ ﻭَالْأَفْدِىَةُ ﻓَلِيَلاً ﻣَآ ﻛَشْكُرُونَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Surah As-Sajdah verses 32:7-9 declaring that the Author of the Holy Qur'an fashioned man in due proportion (and not as a random event)

Therefore, when “He fashioned him in due proportion, and
breathed into him something of His spirit. And He gave you (the faculties of) hearing and sight and feeling (and understanding)", He surely must also Know the psychological bent of every human mind, borne of its natural socialization and cultural programming due to being born in a specific nation and specific tribe. The Author therefore also Knows the “fitrat”, i.e., nature, of every man and woman. Specifically, what he and she is most susceptible to. Only because of this empirical fact of natural socialization by birth that the Author of the Holy Qur'an strongly Countenances the pursuit of: فَأَخْتَلُفَواْ أَوْلُواْ كَلِمَةَ سَبِقَتْ مِن رُّبَّكَ لْفَضْلِ يَدُّهُمْ فِي مَا فِيهِ يَخْتَلُفُونَ, instead of theological upmanship, clearly predicing that the human mind which He Fashioned in due proportion, and which He Knows well, in its most natural state will face grave difficulty overcoming its socialized programming without expending considerable striving!

Of course, when own looks at evolutionary biology and social psychology, that is also the natural outcome of how mankind has developed from many different tribes and nations across the earth.

And the Author of the Holy Qur'an provides guidance du jour taking empiricism of mankind's present and future condition into account, while also inexplicably asserting that in the past, mankind was but one people (arguably suggesting a single social source of mankind before its geographic spread on earth into tribes and nations):

Mankind was but one nation, but differed (later). Had it not been for a Word that went forth before from thy Lord, their differences would have been settled between them. Holy Qur'an, Surah Yunus 10:19

What is apparent from even these few quoted verses in accurate and full context of the Holy Qur'an, is that for all future times from its Last Messenger's revelation of the Holy Qur'an, which was itself declared by the Author of the Holy Qur'an as the completion of its favors and the perfection of its religion which it named “Islam” (see verse
5:3 Surah Al-Maeda below), the Holy Qur'an unequivocally accepts, and guarantees, diversity of beliefs based on the natural artifacts of individual and group socialization!

Contrast the aforementioned principled understanding of the religion of Islam which unequivocally enjoins mankind to “strive as in a race in all virtues” in its singular scripture the Holy Qur'an, to the propaganda manual of the prominent Anglo-American Jew, Professor Bernard Lewis of Princeton University: Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror. Billed in the West as “a leading Western scholar of Islam”, [a] the “vulgar propagandist”, [b] and the obvious heir apparent to Dr. Joseph Goebbels for the construction of the present global Fourth Reich, namely, one-world government, speciously devoted much verbiage to Islam's “Triumphalism” in order to scare the Western public mind into waging West's perpetual “war on terror” against “Islamofascism”! The FBI training presentation titled “Militancy Considerations” made by another Jew to America's foremost law enforcement agency to poison their mind against Islam and American Muslims (see below), not to forget the likes of America's favorite Christian pastor burning a copy of the Holy Qur'an in Florida while proclaiming “Islam is of the Devil” to further embellish the propaganda line on West's “war on terror” (also see below), all have an imposing propaganda pedigree to be sure! What is perhaps the saddest and the most despicable fact in all this is that many Muslim intellectuals worldwide, men and women of arts, science, and letters, not to forget statesmen and politicians, have become a willing appendage of this Western perception management of the public mind as the inveterate House Niggers and Uncle Toms of empire (http://tinyurl.com/faq-intellectual-negro).

Whereas the Holy Qur'an itself proclaims: if you don't prefer the message of Islam, no problem – “there is no compulsion in religion” (see verse 2:256 Surah Al-Baqara below). Follow the guides, imams, prophets, that were sent to your own people and on the Day of Judgment, declares the Holy Qur'an: “One day We shall call together all
human beings with their (respective) Imams” (see verse 17:71 Surah al-Israa' below) and “it will be judged between them fairly, and they will not be wronged.” (see verse 10:47 Surah Yunus above).

The clear message of the Holy Qur'an to everyone among mankind, Muslim and non Muslim, whatever sect, whatever ethnicity, whatever nation, and whatever epoch, is to compete for virtuous conduct (فَاسْتَيْقَفَوا الْخَيْرَاتِ) amongst themselves – not for resources, not for territories, not for hegemony, and not power!

The Holy Qur'an continually harkens mankind towards dealing with each other in full justice, even unequivocally averring that God loves those who are just and deal equitably with each other:

For Allah loveth those who judge in equity. Holy Qur'an Surah Al-Maeda 5:42

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ

That straightforwardly puts to rest all religious and sectarian arguments for all times! Just that much is sufficient to both repel all propaganda against Islam, and eliminate all internecine fracture points and facile views among Muslims. But we have only just begun.

The obvious overarching point to ponder here is that why go through all this repetition once again if justice among mankind is the core first-principle the Holy Qur'an is teaching for mankind's conduct amongst each other? Everything else of course naturally follows from that core first-principle. But it is not a new or unfamiliar concept.

The following Biblical Commandment from antiquity was, and still is, at least in my view, both complete and sufficient for governing the peaceable, equitable, and virtuous conduct of mankind:

“Do unto Others as you have others do unto you.” The Bible: Matthew 7:12, Luke 6:31; Old Testament Mosaic Law; Socrates; Confucius; Solon
So, why does mankind need anything more than that one primary fundamental Biblical statement? Indeed, one can easily surmise that all beneficial national constitutions, international and local laws, trade treaties, foreign policies, inter and intra governing principles, and even effective principles for dispute resolutions, are logically derivable from just that one ancient first principle, for a fairly equitable co-existence of mutual benefit for all mankind. There'd be no room for masters and slaves under the corollaries derived from such an egalitarian first principle!

While that universal pithy wisdom is deemed Biblical, I have found evidence of its truism in other antiquity as cited above. For instance, Solon the Athenian law giver, according to Plutarch's Lives, when asked which city he thought was well-governed, said:

“[That city where those who have not been injured take up the cause of one who has, and prosecute the case as earnestly as if the wrong had been done to themselves.]” Solon in Plutarch's Lives

Even beyond divine religion, in the realm of logic and rational empiricism alone, the following operations-research (OR) logical formulation due to Bertrand Russell, a man of considerable beliefs in no religion, is the most commonsensical recipe of governing peaceable human conduct. In my own succinct rendition, Bertrand Russell's formulation goes something like this (and I am putting it in single quotes to indicate that the formulation belongs to Russell but the words may not all be his):

'Maximize individual happiness while minimizing social conflict for optimizing the overall common-good.' (Bertrand Russell's prescription to do away with religion as the bearer of moral law, probably in 'Why I am not a Christian' and similar writings)

With just a little bit of reflection, one will see that Bertrand Rus-
sell captures the beneficial essence of many religions, including Islam, in at least so far as “haquq-al-ibad”, i.e., the rights of man upon man, otherwise known as moral law, are concerned, quite admirably.

By just using rational empathetic logic which hinges on spreading virtue rather than glory, vice, hegemony, and conquest, one can come up with reasonably equitable methods of governing oneself in any age, and among any peoples.

However, the Author of the Holy Qur'an advocating the path of mutual co-existence to mankind through the perfection of its message which it called “Islam”, is just as meaningless as man coming up with his own protocol for mutual co-existence using his own sensible logic and reason, if man is unwilling, or unable, to implement the protocol:

This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion. Verse fragment Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Maeda 5:3, 632 AD

“Hegemony is as old as mankind.” Zbigniew Brzezinski, The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives, 1996 AD, pg. 3 – the book's dedication reads: “For my students—to help them shape tomorrow's world”

Thus, if nihilist followers of Zbigniew Brzezinski's predatory foreign policies which predicate upon primacy and its geostrategic imperatives because they believe that “Hegemony is as old as mankind” so why change it, choose sociopathic mass psychology to mobilize the public to villainy and infamy by bequeathing to them only facile worldviews, well, that's not because there is any shortage of great platitudinous recipes in either the divine books of antiquity, or the modern mind of reason as the Deistic philosophers of eighteenth
century enlightenment argued (of which Bertrand Russell was the atheist legatee).

That choice, of exercising villainous hegemony or equity and benevolence upon the ‘untermenschen’, is entirely man's of course. The Author of the Holy Qur'an itself asserts that such a choice between life's governing principles is entirely up to mankind in all its diversity of existence, and is neither a monolithic diktat of triumphalism, nor a choiceless matter like being born to one's parents:

There is no compulsion in religion. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:256

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا إِكْرَاهُ فِي آลِيَةٍ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There surely came over man a period of time when he was a thing not worth mentioning. 76:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>هِلَّ أَتَى عَلَى الْإِنسَانِ جِينٌ مِّن الْزَّوْرِ لَمْ يَكُنْ شَيْئًا مَّذْكُورًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Surely We have created man from a small life-germ uniting (itself): We mean to try him, so We have made him hearing, seeing. 76:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>إِنَّا خَلَقْنَا الْإِنسَانَ مِن نُطْفَةٍ أَمْشَاجٍ نِّبْتِهِ فَجَعَلْنَا سَمِيعًا بَصِيرًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Surely We have shown him the way: he may be thankful or unthankful. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-insaan 76:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>إِنَّا هَدِينَاهَا السَّبِيلَ إِمَّا شَاكِرًا وَإِمَّا كَفُورًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The overarching point being, at the risk of being repetitious, whatever the religion, whatever the people, and whatever the culture and geography, man naturally gravitates firstly towards one's own kith and kin, and secondly towards one's own socialization which principally gives birth to one's dominant worldview. It is all but a truism that just as one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter, one man's “messiah” is another man's lunatic.

And Islam, recognizing this natural human tendency for partisanship and tribalism due to socialization from birth, proffered the above quoted solution of Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48 to those who believe in Islam, and also to those who wish to learn about Islam, that this relig-
ion, this way of life, this “deen” which Allah perfected for those who wish to believe in it of their own free will, does not bring the threat of forced triumphalism to mankind.

That Islam cherishes diversity and enjoin the people to compete only in virtuous conduct (فَانْتَهُوا إِلَى الْخُطَائِ) amongst themselves even as they live in their own respective socialization of birth, faiths, tribes and nations, forming a diverse multicultural milieu of mankind.

That, if God wanted to, mankind could have been made into all one people just as they were in the past and “their differences would have been settled between them” (see 10:19 Surah Yunus above).

That, if people disagree in matters of theology, religion, and other esoterica upon which faith is often based, to leave the resolution of such disagreements to God alone (see 42:10 Surah Ash-Shura above) --- lest the Muslims at any time in the future, senselessly imbued with empire and its 'la mission civilisatrice', criminally come to carry the 'white man's burden' (http://tinyurl.com/the-white-mans-burden):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>And if your Lord had pleased, surely all those who are in the earth would have believed, all of them; will you then force men till they become believers?</th>
<th>وَلَوْ شَاء رَبُّكَ لَأَمْنُ مَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كُلَّهُمْ جَمِيعًا أَفَانَتْ نَكْرَةَ النَّاسِ حَتَّى يُكْتُنِّوا مُؤْمِنِينَ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And it is not for a soul to believe except by Allah's permission; and He casts uncleanness on those who will not understand. Holy Qur’an, Surah Yunus 10:99-100</td>
<td>وَمَا كَانَ لِنَفْسٍ أَنْ يُؤْمِنَ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ وَيَجْعَلُ الرَّجُسَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ لا يَعْقِلُونَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48, Yunus 10:99-100, and other supporting verses quoted above in their full context, put to rest in finality, all false charges brought by Western war-mongers, of their merely defending themselves from Islam's “Triumphalism” in their holy war against “Islamofascism”.

Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam 2015
As these unambiguous verses in their complete context clearly convey in the direct words of the Holy Qur'an itself, there isn't any “Triumphalism” in Islam. It is a charge more suited to Pauline Christianity (today's mainstream Christianity of almost every denomination and sect), whereby, to “save” mankind from eternal damnation, the unworthy humanity has to all be converted to belief in Christ!

All such charges are vulgar propaganda against Islam, conveyed today no differently than it was conveyed during the Christian Crusades, by some very diabolical “Western scholars of Islam” in order to cultivate facile views among their ignorant Western peoples. (See for instance, Bernard Lewis, Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror, 2001)

Without such facile views, the masses cannot be readily mobilized against “Islamofascism” in the fabricated “clash of civilizations”.

As Zbigniew Brzezinski, former American president Jimmy Carter's National Security Advisor, self-servingly but accurately presaged in his American Mein Kampf, The Grand Chessboard:

“Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization ... except in conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being.” The Grand Chessboard, pg. 36. (See Pastor Terry Jones below for how Islam is used to forge a public threat)

The directive of Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48 is also very explicit for Muslims. There is no ambiguity in it. These are not allegorical verses ( مثابهات); their meaning is very straightforward, categorical, established, and unequivocally clear ( آيات مختملات). See verse 3:7 of Surah Aal-'Imran for the Holy Qur'an's own definition of these two types of verses in it. (In addition to correctly making the distinction between categorical and allegorical verses, every verse and verse fragment of the Holy Qur'an has to be parsed and understood in the entire context of the Holy Qur'an, and not just in isolation of its occurrence or in just
its own local context, or else it can easily lead to constructing a facile and even false understanding of the meaning being conveyed in the Divine Guidance. See the case study *Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack? Part-II. [2]*

Although, it must be admitted that, the universal principle of virtuous and amicable co-existence among the diversity of nations as outlined in Surah Al-Maedah 5:44-48, and the corollaries to be deduced from it and from several verses like it in the Holy Qur'an, require at least a modicum of reflection with some basic ability to think and reason soundly. Faith, on the other hand, does not.

Parrots memorizing the Holy Qur'an as an inheritance can no more come to understand its message than any other talking parrot, regardless of the beauty of its voice and feathers! But they can of course be brimming with faith. Any faith! That is how reason came to be split away from faith, and vice versa, by the loudest exponents of religion thriving under empires which cultivated and harnessed blind faith and its attendant rituals to engineer consent among the public for their rulership.

Were deep contemplative reasoning and the use of raw intellect to understand the message in the *Book of faith* a defining characteristic of Muslim pulpits, the scholars of Islam flourishing under the nearly thirteen centuries of Muslim dynastic empires would have long extinguished the flames of sectarianism among the Muslims. In fact, the empires themselves would have become moribund and perhaps never have arisen in the first place since there is no “empire” in the unadulterated religion of Islam.

The divisiveness among Muslims arising in the very epoch of the Prophet of Islam from immediately after his death – not due to any misunderstanding of the Holy Qur'an or the Prophet of Islam's explanations of it for twenty-three years, for the Exemplar only lived, taught and died among the same people, but purely due to narrow self-interests and narrow tribalistic world views which persisted despite
their conversion to Islam – would not have transpired in the Muslim polity. Muslims united by their common faith would have endeavored to stay “ummat-e-wahida”, (أمة واحدة), one people, after the death of the Prophet of Islam just as is reported by historians that Muslims were united during his Apostolic leadership from the seat of his first Islamic government in Medina. Narrow self-interests triumphing over their newly acquired faith and absolute obedience to the Prophet of Islam, ab initio planted the pernicious seeds of absolutist rule as governance first principle of caliphate, by reinterpreting the teachings of the Prophet of Islam to support their claims to power.

This rise of ordinary peoples to the seat of Apostolic power was especially facilitated by open-ended verse like the Verse of Obedience, 4:59 of Surah an-Nisaa', which was willfully interpreted to favor whoever acquired the seat of power by whatever means.

The dynastic empires to come subsequently endowed official scribes, and systematically encouraged independent jurists, narrators, and scholars in a culture of flourishing theology to interpret the imperial religion for their masses in a way that wasn't inimical to their continuing in power – legitimizing whichever was the ruling power by omission and commission. It is the religion that has reached us today as the canonized “Islam”. It brings with it a plethora of “holy” books that were anointed as “authentic” by both the scholarly consensus and official sanction throughout the ages. Narrow self-interests masquerading as national interests gave rise to the caliphates by setting the precedence for interpreting the verses of the Holy Qur'an and the supposed sayings of the Prophet of Islam as suited to acquiring and maintaining political power. That political power in turn defined what was popular “Islam” for the masses with the assistance of Muslim scholars and jurists. (Ibid.)

Today, we are merely their socialized inheritors, and quite unable to understand the original totality of teachings of the religion of Islam as espoused in the Holy Qur'an and expounded by the Messenger and its Exemplar, beyond the socialized rituals and living for Heaven and
the Hereafter lifestyle taught by the early occupiers of the pulpit of Islam. Few scholars of Islam take the totality of their beliefs and understanding of Islam exclusively from the Holy Qur'an even today. Most make willful resort to pages outside the Holy Qur'an to help them interpret the verses of the Holy Qur'an and Islam which in fact define their beliefs and practices, which they subsequently bequeath to their respective socialized flock from virtually all pulpits --- the seedbed of flourishing sectarianism and disunity among Muslims. That disunity is empirical.

For, these earliest sources of first resort outside the pages of the Holy Qur'an, are indeed the works of these very same partisan scholars of empire who had either hijacked Islam for legitimizing the rule by those hungry for power, or interpreted Islam, chronicled Islam, and echoed the hand me down narrations of the Prophet of Islam, all according to their respective socialization biases and natural bent of mind. Meaning, according to their own opinions or comprehension at best. None of these scribes are anointed for this task in the Holy Qur'an – at least none are mentioned as the go to sources in its 6236 verses. Yet we see that virtually all Muslims, divided into sects and living historical memories as their dominant ethos, rely largely on these partisan scribes for their own understanding of Islam, each claiming their beliefs and practices superior to all others! Facile?

Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. The religion of Islam, with Qur'anic verses like the Verse of obedience, verse 4:59 of Surah an-Nisaa' (examined below as the riddle of obedience), provided the foundational basis to the Muslim elites hungry for power, or glory, not to ignore the boundless riches of hegemony, to extract absolute obedience from the Muslim masses with the help of these flourishing interpretations and narratives throughout history.

Thus even today, we have a dynastic kingdom ruling Islam's two most holiest cities, Mecca and Medina. All Muslims still pay homage to the legitimacy of these dynastic kings, directly or indirectly, whenever we go for pilgrimage to Mecca! Facile?
More details can be gleaned in the investigative case study on how the Holy Qur'an itself contributed to its own subversion in what prima facie appears to be a fascinating Plan *By Design*. A plan to naturally seed diversity of viewpoints. A plan in which algebraic variables instead of definite constants are sprinkled judiciously in all the key symbolic verses which, had they been clearly Determinate and categorical instead of requiring mankind to solve riddles and systems of algebraic equations to figure out their values, such a crown as the Holy Qur'an itself opening the *Pandora's box* to a plurality of interpretations could not have been laid upon its head. (Ibid.)

The reason for repeated entreaties in the Holy Qur'an for reflection and deep thought with a cleansed heart, is very clear for this reason alone (see below). One needs a minimal ability to reason soundly, in addition to being able to do basic arithmetic correctly; not just add two plus two equal to four, but also add two plus two to equal four when instead of two constants being added, two variables in two equations are being added. For instance, if \( x+y=4 \) and \( x-y=0 \), what are \( x \) and \( y \)? If that mental ability is exercised without deceit and without political reservations, all truth follows. If that ability is suppressed, only facile views follow.

Sociopathy of hegemony is the real problem. A problem that is as old as hegemony, as old as mankind. It thrives on the facile mind. Consequently, the sociopaths who often rise to power easily, ensure that the public mind stays facile. Making the public mind is the first art of governance from caliphate to democracy --- for unlike a dictatorship, ruled at the point of the bayonet, caliphate to democracy depend on a measure of consent from the governed. Unless that governance is changed first, until the non sociopaths in society force their way into ruling power to devalue the villainy of the facile mind, all Divine Books will be “mahjoor” (25:30) and the public mind shall forever remain chained to its unturning neck in Plato's Cave.
This “ma'rifat”, wherewithal, is of course predicated on knowing that there is even a riddle to solve, and then correctly setting up the riddle before attempting to solve it. Often times, even that awareness does not exist --- that the Holy Qur'an hides many a riddle in its mellifluous verses. Fourteen centuries have passed and yet the Good Book still remains a Book of paradoxes and riddles. Some **Determinate** and easily soluble, others open-ended and **Indeterminate**, meaning, not known whether or not they have unique solutions and which ones if any are correct and which ones aren't --- as there is no absolute reference present today to compare the answers to. It is virtually akin to decoding a cipher. Indeed, viewing the Holy Qur'an as a cipher text leads to its much greater understanding because emphasis now shifts to viewing its verses as a sophisticated and deep message comprising both plain text and riddles couched in symbolic language, all of which requiring much reflection of the whole to decipher the message in accurate context rather than treated as a straightforward concatenation of individual unconnected verses in plaintext which it isn't. (Ibid.)

Evidently, it is well-nigh impossible to find a scholar of Islam with any colored turban who even knows basic algebra, let alone be able to solve algebraic riddles and ciphers! In the age of universal deceit, which has in fact always existed, and is virtually guaranteed to always exist so long as mankind in its present form exists, both self-righteous fools and Machiavelli will continue to dominate the world. The consequent of which will continue to be the domination of facile world views. Everything but setting up and solving the algebraic riddle \( x+y=4 \) correctly! Never mind when it is \( x+y=z \) and the many equations are not independent in the three variables. Recognizing what is what, what is **Determinate** and what is **Indeterminate**, is the heart of the problem. It is explored in the aforementioned case study. (Ibid.)
The fascinating riddle of multi-culturalism in the Holy Qur'an

Pertinent to the topic at hand, Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48 bears such a momentous general concept of acceptance of others in the religion Islam, that this concept is even formulaically rehearsed countless times each day in daily prayers by its adherents without any reflection whatsoever. For, if one spent even 10 minutes thinking about what many "pious" among Muslims likely repeat at least 17 times daily, if not more, one would easily see that very core-principle at work for oneself.

That repetitive formulation is Surah Al-Fatiha of the Holy Qur'an, its very first Surah. It is recited countless times daily by Muslims as a prayer. Just look at it with some reflection rather than rehearsing it as a parrot and matters become transparent. And what does it say?

First let's see what it does not say:
1. there is no mention of the word “muslim” in it ;
2. nor is there any mention of the noble name of the harbinger of the Qur'an, its Exemplar.

If one were not so imbued with one's own socialization since birth, one would surely ask the following question to oneself: why not?

If Islam is the last Testament, its Prophet the last Messenger, and the Holy Qur'an the last Word on the matter of Divine Guidance to mankind, why have the following riddle in its the most essential Surah:

Show us the straight path, 1:6

إِهْدِنَا الصَّرْصَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ
Why command the reciter of that Surah to beseech the Creator to show him or her the “straight path”, a path that is not named or labeled or identified in any other way other than as the “straight path”, a singular path, and only identified as the path of those whom (plural) have been bestowed “divine favors” (plural), or who have been divinely favored? But no names are mentioned for any further identification!

Why send the poor seeker of divine wisdom in search of solving what appears to be a complicated riddle?

How is he, or she, to know what those unknown “quantities” are?

Is the man of faith simply to be socialized into fixing those unknowns – like choosing a value for the variable “x” in an elementary school level algebraic expression – by his parents, grandparents, teachers, scholars, culture, civilization, by osmosis, diffusion, vicariously?

Given that the average intelligence of the masses in any nation is rather low, and the Author of the Holy Qur'an if it is indeed the Creator of man would certainly have known that, why then did the Author of the Holy Qur'an not straightforwardly just say for all and sundry Muslim to understand in its most oft recited Surah: follow the path laid out in the Holy Qur'an, follow the path of Muhammad, its last Messenger and Exemplar?

How ironical that what the Surah calls a “straight path” is not identified straightforwardly!

All Muslims feel they already know (by virtue of their socialization) that that's what is implied. But that's not what the Surah Al-Fatiha says at all. One is only interpreting it to mean that based on one's own socialization bias!
Chapter VII

The answer to the riddle, as invariably in all Qur’anic riddle cases, the Holy Qur'an itself also provides.

The author of the Qur'an has repeatedly alluded to Its Word as the Book of Reflection which none shall approach, except with a cleansed heart.

So, not everyone can glean the wisdom of the Qur'an even though they may be reading or mouthing its words – how interesting!

And the solution to the riddle is hinted, inter alia, in the afore-quoted verses from Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48. It is still obviously not the complete solution, but we are an inch closer to solving the riddle.

For one thing, we learn that the solution is multicultural, and is indeed very much socialization dependent.

Different peoples will naturally have different perspective on what is “divine favor”, who those favored ones are, and are thus encouraged to seek out the path followed by those whom they naturally psychologically feel closer to – that is the basis for what appears to the riddle of Surah Al-Fatiha, 1:6-7.

And Surah Al-Maeda 5:44-48 quoted above is an exemplary partial hint to solving that riddle.

Wow! What an incredible Book!

Nevertheless, it is still a Book of reflection first and foremost, which none shall penetrate, except with a cleansed heart. The rest are naturally misled. The Author of the Holy Qur'an even asserts that only It Guides Whom It pleases and leads others astray. Is this just rhetorical tautology? The Western mind un-attuned to the language of the Qur'an often thinks so.
Who can understand the Holy Qur'an and who cannot – in the Holy Qur'an’s own words

Here are some verses from the Holy Qur'an on the cleansed heart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>That this is indeed a Qur'an Most Honourable, 56:77</th>
<th>إِنَّهُ لْقُرْآنٌ كَرِيمَ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a Book well-guarded, 56:78</td>
<td>في كتاب مكثون</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which none shall touch but those who are clean (purified): 56:79</td>
<td>لا يَمْسَهُ إِلَّا الْمَطْهَرُونَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds, 56:80</td>
<td>تنزِيلٌ مِّن رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem? 56:81, Surah Al-Waqia, 56:77-81</td>
<td>أَفِي هَذَا الْحِدِيثِ أَنْتُمْ مَذْهِبُونَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those are they whose hearts, ears, and eyes Allah has sealed up, and they take no heed. Surah An-Nahl, 16:108</td>
<td>أُولَٰئِكَ الَّذِينَ طَبَعَ اللَّهُ عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ وَسَمَعَهُمْ وَأَبْصَارَهُمْ وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمْ الْعَافِلُونَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allah hath sealed their hearing and their hearts, and on their eyes there is a covering. Theirs will be an awful doom. Surah Al-Baqara, 2:7</td>
<td>حَتَّى اللَّهُ عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ وَعَلَى سَمَعَهُمْ وَأَبْصَارَهُمْ غَيْشَةً وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ غَيْبِي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In their hearts is a disease, and Allah increaseth their disease. A painful doom is theirs because they lie. Surah Al-Baqara, 2:10</td>
<td>فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرْضٌ فَرَادَهُمُ اللَّهُ مَرَاضِيًا وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ بَما كَانُوا يَكْذِبُونَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Nay, on the hearts there are locks. Surah Muhammad 47:24</td>
<td>أَفَلا يَتَبَيَّنُ لَهُمُ الْقُرْآنُ أَمْ عَلَى قُلُوبِ أَفْقَالَاهَا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption A few verses from the Holy Qur'an on the
cleansed heart metaphor.

The understanding of the message contained in the Holy Qur'an is only made accessible to those who try to approach its contents not with pre-conceptions, or agendas bearing the diseases of the heart, or other prejudices, but with a genuine desire to learn what exactly is the Book Saying! Only the purified ones, “al-muttaharoon” may approach its full understanding. The meaning of the Qur'anic word in the context of the Holy Qur'an is layered and nuanced. The Holy Qur'an explains itself, as it continually points them out in terms of various defining characteristics in its own emphatic explanation of whom it is intended for, who will be able to extract its message, who its custodians are, and who it is not going to benefit at all:

This is the Scripture whereof there is no doubt, a guidance unto those who ward off (evil). Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:2

The Holy Qur'an by its own statement is a guidance only for those who are “muttaqin” (هدى للمتقين), and not for others! The “muttaqin” characteristics are further defined, inter alia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who believe in the Unseen, and establish worship, and spend of that We have bestowed upon them;</th>
<th>الْذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْغَيْبِ وَيَقِيمُونَ الأَصْلُوَةَ وَمَّا رَزَقْنَهُمْ يَنفَقُونَ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And who believe in that which is revealed unto thee (Muhammad) and that which was revealed before thee, and are certain of the Hereafter.</td>
<td>وَالْذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا آَنَّا قَبْلَكَ وَبَعْدَهَا هُمُ الْيَوْمَ يَعْفُونَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These depend on guidance from their Lord. These are the successful. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:3-4-5</td>
<td>أَوْلَئِكَ عَلَىٰ هَذَا مَنْ رَبِّهِمْ وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These “muttaqin” (must) approach the scriptures with an at-
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tempted cleansed heart in order to incrementally endeavor in seeking its meaning. And they will succeed in comprehending its message dependent only on the level of their spiritual cleansing – that's a promise of the Holy Qur'an! Different seekers of guidance will have different levels of comprehension of the Holy Qur'an based on how much “muttaqin” and how much “al-muttaharoon” they are!

This is why the Holy Qur'an further differentiates among them – all Muslims, believers in Islam, are not equal in the sight of the Author of the Holy Qur'an who identifies Itself as “the Lord of the Worlds” (زَٰبُ ٱلْعَالَمِينَ):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of Allah is (he who is) the most righteous of you. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Hujraat, verse fragment 49:13 (see full verse below)</th>
<th>إنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عَنْدَ ٱللَّهِ أَنفُقَكُمْ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is one who worships devoutly during the hours of the night prostrating himself or standing (in adoration), who takes heed of the Hereafter, and who places his hope in the Mercy of his Lord— (like one who does not)? Say: 'Are those equal, those who know and those who do not know?' It is those who are endued with understanding that receive admonition. Holy Qur’an, Surah Az-Zumar 39:9</td>
<td>أمَّنِ هُوَ قَائِتُ أَنَايْنَ ٱلْلَّيْلِ سَاجِدًا وَقَائِمًا يَتَحَذَّرُ الآخَرَةَ وَيَرْجُو رَحْمَةَ رَبِّهِ قَلُّ هُلَّ يَسْتَوِي ٱلْذِّينَ يَعْلَمُونَ وَٱلْذِّينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ إِنَّمَا يَتَذَكَّرُ أَوْلُو الأَلْبَاب</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incredible!

How does one embark on such a mission of a cleansed hearted journey to understand the Holy Qur'an today and overcome, in a meaningful way, one's socialization biases and natural tendencies, to actually be counted among those even mildly “honoured in the sight of Allah” rather than being among those who are “in a state of loss” (see Surah Al-Asr below)? If the Holy Qur'an claims to be a book of
guidance for all mankind for all times rather than merely a revered scripture of antiquity, then clearly it must be comprehensible today in today's epoch, offer prescriptive principles to adhere to which are vibrant, effective and pertinent for today's living conditions, just as they must be for tomorrow's living conditions, and just as they were for the time of the Prophet of Islam when the Holy Qur'an reputedly revolutionized that Age of Jahiliya.

Well, the answer the Holy Qur'an itself provides in its very first Surah, Surah Al-Fatiha, verse 1:6-7 quoted above – to beseech the Creator in daily supplication to “Show us the straight path, The path of those whom Thou hast favoured.”

The fascinating riddle of “Al-Wasilah”

Evidently, according to the prima facie prescription of Islam itself, the cleansed hearted journey to understand the Holy Qur'an for Muslims (like all other peoples seeking divine guidance) can only be undertaken by seeking out the path of some unnamed people whom God has favored. This is further underscored:

O ye who believe! Do your duty to Allah, seek the means of approach unto Him, Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Maeda 5:35

Caption Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Maeda 5:35, Verse of Wasilah, unequivocally putting to bed for all times the
argument on how to approach Allah: “O ye who believe! Do your duty to Allah, seek the means of approach unto Him,” Who are these “means of approach unto Him”? See below Surah Al-Baqara verse 2:166-2:167, and Surah An-Nahl 16:25, for Qur'anic constraints on “Wasilah”, whereby both followers and leaders are respectively condemned! Who specifically then meets the highly constrained requirements of “Wasilah” of this pivotal verse 5:35 wherein “believers” are commanded to “seek the means of approach unto Him,” as an obligatory “Duty to Allah”?

It follows therefore, rather straightforwardly in fact from the logic of the Qur'anic Message, that ONLY “the path of those whom Thou hast favoured” as proclaimed in Surah Al-Fatiha 1:7, and subsequently clarified as “seek the means of approach unto Him,” the “Wasilah” (الوسيلة) in Surah Al-Maeda 5:35, can exemplify, interpret, and explain the journey of the straight path ( الصراط المستقيم )!

Verse 1:7 teaches the supplicant to beseech the Creator to show the path of His Favored Ones. And verse 5:35 commands the supplicant to first seek the means of approach unto Him as his duty to the Creator, in order to even approach the straight path! The Author of the Holy Qur'an specifies how to seek Guidance from His Scripture in order to approach Him --- to seek His designated “Wasilah”!

In simpler words for the language and logic challenged, let's break that down step by step. This is what is meant by reflection when the Author repeatedly invites reflection on the verses of the Holy Qur'an with a cleansed heart: “Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Nay, on the hearts there are locks.” – for its greater meaning is only understood when one thinks and reasons through the whole because the whole is much larger than the sum of its individual parts. There is a great deal of advanced understanding contained even in very simple verses when their obvious interconnections are grasped. These are the
low hanging fruits of the tree so to speak, within reach of anyone who is willing to reach up to pluck them, but is not available when one makes no effort at reflection or stays mired in its Cliff notes:

- By the proclamation of the Holy Qur'an itself, the supplicant, the seeker of the straight path, cannot approach the Creator directly, but only through the specified means, of seeking the “Wasilah”, the means of approach unto Him.

- For emphasis, it is even presented as a “duty” of the “believers” to first seek the “Wasilah”!

- And it is further emphasized that only the Author's own favored ones can delineate the straight path unto Him.

- The Author's own favored ones, and not the believers' favorite ones, are veritably the Wasilah, the means of approach unto Him.

- The Holy Qur'an categorically affirms that the straight path is indeed a guided journey under the leadership of the Divinely Favored Imams, Al-Wasilah, and not a solo journey by one's own interpretation, imagination, due diligence! Al-Wasilah must specifically be sought and followed for the journey on the straight path in order to benefit from Divine Guidance. The rest are led astray because they end up on the paths of the wrong types of people!

- Since the straight path is singular, it follows that all the favored ones who are Al-Wasilah, the show-ers of the straight path upon whom God has bestowed favors, the Guides to follow, the Imams who lead on that path, are directing believers to the same one path without making an error and without disagreeing with each other one iota. Like the airline flight path, once divined by the ATC, is singular and has no margin of error --- it has to be exactly followed without deviation.
● It follows that *Al-Wasilah* are inerrant by the very definition of their job function!

Mind blowing... putting to bed all facile views pertaining to the path of spiritual guidance and spiritual ascendance in the pristine Religion of Islam. [c] This is not the man-made Islam penned by the hand of man. But the untampered and unadulterated Islam that eagerly beckons when one approaches the study of its singular Scripture with even a moderately cleansed heart! Imagine the depth of understanding one may be able to reach with greater self-control of the mind to remove all vestiges of socialization bias, confirmation bias, self-interest and perception management.

Putting it together with verse 39:9 of Surah Az-Zumar then makes that rhetorical question obviously prescriptive, rather than being merely tautological: “Are those equal, those who know and those who do not know?”

Meaning, it further follows that these “Wasilah”, the show-ers of the *straight path* upon whom God has bestowed favors, the Guides to follow, the Imams who lead on that *straight path*, must also be the ones highest in knowledge and understanding of that *straight path* among those whom they guide. Otherwise, how can they guide others more knowledgeable than themselves? Or, if their own understanding concerning this *straight path* was error prone? Especially of an obscure path which Allah ordained that no man may otherwise know of his and her own accord, except through those who were divinely favored. Which, of course, also automatically implies that their teacher can be none among those whom they have been *divinely chosen* and ordained to guide! And the Holy Qur'an precisely confirms this, that their teacher is only Allah, in verse 6:90 of Surah Al An'am: “These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance”!
These are they whom Allah guided, therefore follow their guidance. Say: I do not ask you for any reward for it; it is nothing but a reminder to the nations. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al An'aam 6:90

That there is a didactic significance to the notion of “Wasilah” for knowing and approaching the straight path, and which is not to be dismissed as merely allegorical (متشابهات), is emphasized again:

One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams Holy Qur’an, Surah al-Israa' 17:71

A brief explanation of the word “Imam” (إمام) is perhaps in order as few Muslims evidently comprehend it – judging from the honorific which they continually adopt for themselves and ascribe to every tom dick and harry who can regurgitate in Arabic or tie a turban on his head. The word “Imam” is frequently used in the Holy Qur'an. Its meaning fortunately is unambiguously explained by the Holy Qur'an itself. We don't have to use a language dictionary nor hijack Qur'anic terminology as a common noun when it clearly is not intended to be. (See Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation for how Qur'anic terminology, the word “Islam” itself, is hijacked with semantic overload by Machiavelli; see this class of reading errors called “Aliasing error” in What does the Holy Qur'an say about the Ahlul Bayt. [2a])

But first, let's see what the language dictionary says about the word. The Arabic-English dictionary of the Holy Qur'an in the hands of this scribe defines the common noun “Imam” thusly:

Imam: “Leader; President; Any object that is followed, whether a human being or a book or a highway”.
The fascinating riddle of the “Imam” – A Divine family's story

However, in the language of the Holy Qur'an, the terminology “Imam” is a proper noun when referring to apostolic leaders whom Allah chose above all others – as in the following verses where its clearest meaning is made manifest for those upon whose eyes there is no covering, and upon whose ears and heart there is no lock of self-interest or self-deception:

| Surely Allah chose Adam and Nuh and the descendants of Ibrahim and the descendants of Imran above the nations. | إننَّ اللهُ أَصْطَفَى عَالِمْ وَتُوحِى وَعَالِمْ إِبْرَاهِيم وَعَالِمْ عَمَّانٌ عَلَى عَالِمْينَ  
| | |  
| Offspring one of the other; and Allah is Hearing, Knowing. Holy Quran, Surah Aal-e-Imran 3:33-34 | دِرَىٰ بَغْضُهَا مَنْ بَغْضٍ وَأَللَّهُ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ  
| | |  
| And when his Lord tried Ibrahim with certain words, he fulfilled them. He said: Surely I will make you an Imam of men. Ibrahim said: And of my offspring? My covenant does not include the unjust, said He. Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Baqara, 2:124 | وَإِذَا أَبَلَّاهُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ رَبُّهُ ٍكَلَّمَهُ اٍفَتَمِينِينَ قَالَ إِنِّي جَاعِلُكِ لِلنَّاسِ إِمَامًٌ قَالَ فَمَنْ دَرِيَّتَيْنِ قَالَ لَا يَبْتَلَلُ عَحْدَيْنِ الْطَّلِيمِينَ  

Caption Verses of Holy Qur'an explaining its use of terminology of “Imam”

Thence we see that when verses 17:71 and 10:47 (quoted above) respectively state: “One day We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams”, “And for every nation there is a messenger. And when their messenger cometh (on the Day of Judgment) it will be judged between them fairly, and they will not be wronged”, the word “Imam”, like “Messenger”, a proper noun,
prima facie refers to those guides and leaders whom Allah has chosen to lead men (and women) onto the *straight path* from a specific Divine family, “*Offspring one of the other*” as per verse 3:34, and in the progeny of Prophet Ibrahim as per the Covenant in verse 2:124. “Imam” is thus one Divine family's story! That's what the Good Book itself says right before one's eyes. But being perpetual victims of facile views, Muslims tend to follow anyone with a turban on the pulpit with the title “imam” – and therein lies the *pièce de résistance* of conundrums. The “tahreef”, corruption, alteration, of the meaning of the Qur'anic word “Imam” and its replacement with the dictionary meaning common noun “imam” is only part of the problem.

Apart from the logical reasoning noted earlier for the solution to the obvious puzzle that why can't one just read the Holy Qur'an and be done with the dispensation of divine guidance directly from it rather than seek out the path of some *favored ones* who are not even straightforwardly identified in the most common Surah; that why does one, even today fourteen centuries later, in obligatorily repeating Surah Al-Fatiha in mandatory daily prayers, have to seek that *straight path* of divine guidance via some “Wasilah” who also remain unnamed in the Holy Qur'an, except for the fact that we are told they are in the progeny of Prophet Ibrahim? How are we to identify them today? But that's not the end of the conundrum, only its beginning!

If only the business of divine guidance were so straightforward – for the average intelligence level of humanity is certainly not up to solving complex riddles in order to pursue faith by way of reasoning about it (which is why the vast majority are simply socialized into their respective belief system by birth, and stay in it for their entire life). That empirical reality must be accounted for otherwise the Holy Qur'an remains just un-implementable theory.

The first of these accountings for the empirical reality of socialization already mentioned above, is to compete with each other in virtuous conduct (فاستَبِقُوا الْخُيْزَات Surah Al-Maeda 5:48 above) as individual behavioral responsibility, rather than in theological upmanship
among God's religions brought by different Messengers among whom there is no difference (Surah Al-Baqara 2:285 below).

Now, we have the second empirical reality. It is proffered to not only “seek the means of approach unto Him”, but also that “We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams” on the Day of Reckoning.

What if the socialization of a Muslim polity is outright, or partially, based on falsehoods, half-truths, three-quarter truths, and subtle distortions that have crept into the divine teachings? What if that which is followed is not accurately the teachings of the Messengers and Imams dispatched by God to every people – including to the Muslims?

Since: “We shall call together all human beings with their (respective) Imams”, and the false “imams” will disclaim their followers (see verses immediately below), we have both, a practical and a theological problem. Finding the “straight path” just got a lot harder and trickier – because now there is a penalty attached to getting it wrong and following false teachers and false leaders despite the best of plebeian intentions!

Therefore, to ensure correct guidance for the supplicant of the straight path that they don't end up mistakenly following false paths, false prophets, false leaders, false imams, false pontiffs, false kings, false khalifas, false pulpits, and false paths laid out by usurpers, tyrants, and impostors, while thinking they are following the divinely guided straight path, the following verses of the Holy Qur'an proffer the clearest admonishment (آيات مُحکمات) of perpetual vigilance as the caveating qualifier to seeking the straight path (الصَّرَاطُ الَّمُسْتَقِيمُ) of only those people whom God hath favored (أَتْعَمَّتْ عَلَيْهِم):
(On the day) when those who were followed disown those who followed (them), and they behold the doom, and all their aims collapse with them. 2:166

And those who were but followers will say: If a return were possible for us, we would disown them even as they have disowned us. Thus will Allah show them their own deeds as an distinguish for them, and they will not emerge from the Fire. Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:167

Let them bear, on the Day of Judgment, their own burdens in full, and also (something) of the burdens of those without knowledge, whom they misled. Alas, how grievous the burdens they will bear! Surah An-Nahl 16:25

Caption Holy Qur’an Surah Al-Baqara 2:166-2:167 unequivocally disclaiming followers, and Surah An-Nahl 16:25 unequivocally disclaiming false imams who will equally be apportioned their due for misguiding the foolish people without knowledge who followed them!

And specifically, the following admonishment is especially for the Muslims, in their blindly casting about for guides and imams, leaders to show them the way, benefactors, rulers, and interpreters of faith whom they obey as their vali, guardian, and ending up with false friends who betray their trust or who are themselves misled and take their followers to hell on earth as well as in the Hereafter:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Day that the wrong-doer will bite at his hands, he will say, 'Oh! Would that I had taken a (straight) path with the Messenger!' 25:27</th>
<th>وَيَوَمَ يُغَضَّنُ الظَّالِمُ عَلَى يَدَيْهِ يُفْجِرُ يَا لَيْتِنِي أَتَحَدَّثْ مَعَ الرَّسُولِ سَبِيلًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Ah! Woe is me! Would that I had never taken such a one for a friend!' 25:28</td>
<td>يَا وَيَلِنِى لَيْتِنِي لَمْ أَتَحَدَّثْ فَلَنَا خَيْلًا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'He did lead me astray from the Message (of Allah) after it had come to me! Ah! the Evil One is but a traitor to man!' 25:29</td>
<td>لَقَدْ أَضَلَّنِى عَنَّ الْذِّكَرِ بُعْدَ إِذْ جَاءَنِي وَكَانَ الشَّيْطَانُ لِلنَّاسِ حُدُولًا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then the Messenger will say: 'O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.' Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Furqan 25:30</td>
<td>وَقَالَ الرَّسُولُ ۖ يَا رَبِّ إِنَّ فَوْمِي أَتَحَدَّثَنَا هَذَا الْقُرآنُ مَهْجُورًا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caption Surah Al-Furqan 25:27-30 making it shockingly plain that the religion of Islam would become so distorted and misrepresented among the Muslims that even the Messenger of Allah who brought the revelations will lament on the Day of Judgment that his own people shackled its meaning, “mahjoor”, to erudite study, stale rituals, and mindless recitations to seek Heaven, instead of living its meaning as a vibrant constitution of life which singularly hinges on not just disaffirming all falsehoods (kalima), but also actively striving to end them (103:3) – “mahjoor” includes that woven by Machiavellian power through their proxy agents planted as Trojan Horse to shackle it, the great betrayal of trust by the turbans who have occupied the pulpit in the service of empire: 'O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.'

This lament of betrayal by Muslims on the Day (of Accountabil-
ity) creates a fascinating *riddle of obedience* when juxtaposed next to verse 4:59 of Surah an-Nisaa’, the *Verse of Obedience*, which makes obedience to a third unnamed party besides Allah and his Messenger, the “ulul-amar”, compulsory:

```markdown
“O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you. If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger, if ye do believe in Allah and the Last Day: That is best, and most suitable for final determination.” Surah an-Nisaa’ 4:59

Caption Verse 4:59 of Surah an-Nisaa’, the *Verse of Obedience*, itself opening the door to a riddle, the *riddle of obedience*, the source of abuse by all rulers and empires who have lorded over the Muslim public in the name of Islam, and the primary reason for the fundamental bifurcation between Sunni and Shia sects whereby each understands this verse solely in accordance with their respective socialization.

Who are these third unnamed entity, mentioned in plurality, “those charged with authority among you” (وَأُولِي الْأُمْرِ مُنْتَكِمْ), that the Muslim public mind is enjoined to obey at the same command precedence level as God and His Messenger, during the lifetime of the Prophet of Islam (the command is in present tense), and thereafter (appears open-ended?), while simultaneously not becoming a victim of the aforesaid lament? What a riddle!

And no turban today appears any closer than he was yesterday to having any expertise in simple algebra to solve this puzzle outside of his own narrow sphere of socialization, or outside of his self-serving pusillanimous service to rulers who make recourse to this verse to de-
mand obedience from the public in the name of God. This riddle and its impact upon Muslim polity over the past fourteen centuries, and still counting, is examined in the aforementioned case study. [op. cit.]

Speak of facile views! The Prophet of Islam, vouches the Holy Qur'an, will himself complain on the Day of Reckoning that: “Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.” The disturbing consternation, expressed in the language of the Qur'an, is an admonishment so that people have the opportunity to rectify it, and not a foregone conclusion.

Something all the latter day mosque going holy turbans sporting white flowing beards with self-righteous piety stamped upon their forehead, not to ignore the pious mother of man who hides in black tent as the ultimate mark of her virtue and obedience to God, might worry about, at least a little. While the tyrants run supreme strangulating mankind with mere perception management, the Muslim mind bows in ever more fervent obeisance to who knows which god --- for it is surely not the God that conveyed the religion of Islam in the Holy Qur'an!

What a challenge for the earnest seeker of the straight path (الصَّرَاطُ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ), especially when religion intersects with imperial mobilization and its diabolical confre, the Machiavelli, as it has done since time immemorial.

How is a Muslim, born and raised under the cloud of sectarian schisms and empire's favored version of Islam, to navigate this minefield which is replete not just with socialization artifacts of birth, culture, and historical baggage, but also ongoing false friends cultivated from the highest pulpits in every generation?

Not a single Muslim thinks these admonishing verses apply to him or her – as is typical of all self-righteous indoctrination. See “Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation”, the 600 page Fatwa on Terrorism, and the CAIR report for contemporary examples of false friends and Trojan horse institutions devilishly implanted among
Muslims for precisely this purpose of diabolically manufacturing consent and engineering controlled dissent for aiding imperial mobilization. Well-intentioned people seeking guidance hither and thither continually fall for them! The modus operandi of this betrayal by friends who present themselves as being on the side of the weak (the weak being perennially ripe for cognitive infiltration by false friends as their predicament inclines them naturally to the well-known Biblical and Qur'anic beatitudes that have become more of a gift to Machiavelli than do anything for the weak, such as the “meek shall inherit the earth” in the Bible, and “And We desired to bestow a favor upon those who were deemed weak in the land, and to make them the Imams, and to make them the heirs,” in Surah Al-Qasas verse 28:5 in the Holy Qur'an), is examined in The Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird. [2b]

One needs to be fully awake and thinking in the matters of faith no differently than in any other matter of political science – for faith and political science continually intersect to ensure both the support of religion, and no interference from religion, in the pursuit of empire's business. Whereas God's “deen” has nothing to do with empire! And this is the most significant fact of the matter from which all macro good and evil follow, for every people, of every religion, and no religion.

Furthermore, the cleansed hearted learning for the journey of the straight path (الصِّرَاطُ المُسْتَقِيمُ) is not just with the intellectual left-half brain, i.e., cognitive, analytical, logical, reasoned, based on empirical knowledge. But also with the poetic and linguistic right-half brain, i.e., with feelings, emotions, empathy, intuitions, insights, inspiration, all of which may transcend the causality principle of cold objective intellectual empiricism. (Think Mr. Spock vs. Captain Kirk in the fable of Star Trek television series of the 1960s). For a discussion of why these are independent human faculties and why both are necessary to pilot human wisdom and spiritual learning towards the straight path, see the essay Morality derived from the Intellect leads to Enslave-
The report *Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack? Part-II* further dwells upon this bifurcation of left and right half brain metaphors and what the *language of the intellect* (verses like 67:3-4 see discussion below), and the *language of the heart* (verses like those quoted above), respectively speak to in the context of the overarching spiritual teachings of the Holy Qur'an (such as in verse 20:114 discussed below). One without the other is at best one-eyed! More often, usually blind.

Seeing with the spiritual eye is how the journey of the *straight path* even becomes discernible. But it is not a spiritual journey of the Sufis and dervishes withdrawn from the affairs of this world – it is a bold physical life's journey of *striving* in this world amidst all its travails and tribulations as further outlined in the recipe of a successful life in Surah Al-Asr discussed below. The inner motivation to embark and to stay on that journey of the straight path is principally seeded only with the spiritual eye to even perceive the straight path (الصُّرَاطُ المستقَيمِ), and the urgency to be on it – for one does not know how much time one has remaining to one's life.

This is why the Holy Qur'an refers to the spiritual condition of being lost in darkness away from the *straight path* in similitude like: “on the hearts there are locks” and “Allah hath sealed their hearing and their hearts, and on their eyes there is a covering.”
That's the *cleansed heart* metaphor – inter alia, a genuine desire to learn using all human faculties at our disposal. Whereas anyone may pick up a copy of the Qur'an, read it, torch it, defecate on it, shoot at it, and of course, even recite it in the most surreal and melodious of incantations that is prized by all Muslims worldwide. The *cleansed heart* is an empirical demand not just of the Author of the Holy Qur'an to those who seek its teaching, but also of rational commonsense.

Don't bring perceptual, ingrained, confirmation, or prejudicial biases to reading any book or else you won't comprehend the complete message that was put in the book by its author. You'll only get what you want to hear, believe, confirm, or argue, to serve your own narrow self-interests! That's indeed how fine literature and poetry is supposed to be read, argued, and enjoyed – using one's own interpretation and imagination. A fine book of poetry or allegorical fiction can reasonably mean different things to different people – and they can argue about it all day if they like without loss of sensibilities.

But try doing that to a city's handbook of traffic laws, or the tax laws! One has to precisely understand what the authors of the traffic regulations – the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) – mean in the
full letter, the full intent, and the full spirit of the regulations if one wants to pass that pesky written test to get one's driver license. More importantly, in order to be a safe driver which only comes about by repeatedly putting into best practice what one has learnt in theory. The practice helps clarify the theory, and the theory helps refine the practice.

Indeed, the Holy Qur'an is like any other convoluted law book – one has to absorb it with concentration, contemplation, and with the clear motivation to exactly comprehend what its Author had in mind. This is also a common topic of exposition by genuine scholars of Islam. But unfortunately it has been relegated to dusty old books in local Muslim languages which few ordinary people read. The advent of the internet has made at least some of these works accessible in translation to anyone today and there is hardly any excuse for the lack of commonsense on how to sensibly study the complex and unusual text of the Holy Qur'an. [5]

Acquiring such non-facile theoretical Qur'anic knowledge, and living it in practice in the straight path (الصُّرَاطُ الْمُسْتَقِيمُ) established by those whom God hath favored, just made both the comprehension and practice of the Religion of Islam a lot harder than the prostrations stamped upon the forehead! (See: Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack? Part-I, Part-II)

Furthermore, hijacking the Qur'an for vested interests also just got easier. Deliberately purveying facile views on Islam serve their own diabolical agendas. Let's take a moment to examine the intent behind Terry Jones', the 'Burn a Quran' pastor in Gainesville Florida, statement to CNN.
‘(CNN) — In protest of what it calls a religion “of the devil,” a nondenominational church in Gainesville, Florida, plans to host an “International Burn a Quran Day” on the ninth anniversary of the September 11, 2001, attacks. The Dove World Outreach Center says it is hosting the event to remember 9/11 victims and take a stand against Islam. With promotions on its website and Facebook page, it invites Christians to burn the Muslim holy book at the church from 6 p.m.
to 9 p.m.

“We believe that Islam is of the devil, that it’s causing billions of people to go to hell, it is a deceptive religion, it is a violent religion and that is proven many, many times,” Pastor Terry Jones told CNN’s Rick Sanchez earlier this week.

Jones wrote a book titled “Islam is of the Devil,” and the church sells coffee mugs and shirts featuring the phrase.

“I mean ask yourself, have you ever really seen a really happy Muslim? As they’re on the way to Mecca? As they gather together in the mosque on the floor? Does it look like a real religion of joy?” Jones asks in one of his YouTube posts.

“No, to me it looks like a religion of the devil.”

“In Islam, many actions that we consider to be crimes are encouraged, condoned or sheltered under Islamic teaching and practice, though. Another reason to burn a Quran.” (CNN, July 29, 2010) [6]

When someone utters of a scriptural religion of 2 billion peoples which unequivocally enjoins justice and equity among mankind regardless of religion, which unequivocally forbids committing excesses in the land, unequivocally forbids the killing of innocent people, and unequivocally likens the virtue of saving one innocent person from injustice being akin to saving an entire peoples, that: “to me it looks like a religion of the devil”, is not just simple ignorance:

- “For Allah loveth those who judge in equity.” Holy Qur'an Surah Al-Maeda 5:42
- “... so strive as in a race in all virtues.” Holy Qur'an Surah Al-Maeda 5:48
● “On that account We ordained for the Children of Israel that if any one slew a person unless it be for murder or for spreading mischief in the land, it would be as if he slew the whole people; and if any one saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of the whole people. Then although there came to them Our Messengers with Clear Signs, yet, even after that, many of them continued to commit excesses in the land.”

Holy Qur'an Surah Al-Maeda 5:32

Furthermore, to go to the bother of writing a full book-length treatise egregiously titling it: 'Islam is of the Devil', seems to be following directly in the footsteps of the propaganda manuals written by the “foremost Western scholar of Islam”, Princeton University professor emeritus of Near Eastern Studies, primarily of Islamic history, Bernard Lewis, such as Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror.

Clearly Terry Jones' case isn't the simple situation of mere prejudice, of being mistaken about Islam in the information age of 2011, of an orientalist misreading the Holy Qur'an. Pastor Terry Jones actually went ahead and torched a copy of the Holy Qur'an in March 2011. [7] Such demonstrated malice is beyond ignorance. It is designed to inflame, to hurt, to elicit an uncontrolled response from the Muslims. No hate laws were applied to Pastor Terry Jones of course in the name of free speech any more than these were applied to the Danish cartoonist drawing hideous caricatures of the Prophet of Islam in 2006 under guidance from his own Jewish conferees in America, Daniel Pipes and company. [8] Instead, Terry Jones is now smugly mounting a campaign for becoming the president of the United States for 2012! [9]

It is easy to misread into Terry Jones' misanthropy as being either an isolated case of a crackpot jackass (as the Western media projects it to be), or an example of revived Crusades against Islam (which Muslims holding facile views are wont to believe). It is neither. Apart from perhaps personal malice, it is entirely political science in the same vein as all propaganda manuals are. And the word “Islam” is the
scapegoat! As I had summed it up in September 2010:

'(yawn.... sooo reminiscent of Bible Burning in Zioni-
stan [9a] and pissing-spitting on the symbols of Chris-
tianity for advanced entertainment and mirth [9b] —
common progenitors and instigators [9c] harboring
more or less equal contempt for the faith of all 'unter-
mensch' and thenceforth, without fear of accountabil-
ity or retribution, nurturing the figment of a “clash of
civilizations” to justify the ongoing murderous “Impe-
rial Mobilization”)' [9d]

That Machiavellian maligning of Islam as “doctrinal motivation”
(see Brzezinski quote at the beginning) is examined in the report “Hi-
jacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation” [10] where I take an in-
depth look into the Dynamics of Mantra Creation of Islamofascism,
starting with the crafty Jewish penmanship of Bernard Lewis in the
service of “imperial mobilization”.

I should just add in passing that the unenviable destiny of all such
vulgar propagandists who at the peak of their hubris fuel unspeakable
war-mongering upon mankind, is perhaps timelessly captured in the
Goebbels family's fate! [11] But only under the spectre of victor's jus-
tice.

Returning back to inadvertently misunderstanding the Holy Qur'an as opposed to deliberately distorting it for vested interests as
illustrated above, it should be obvious to any sensible person that
memorizing the Holy Qur'an like a tape recorder has zero pertinence
to understanding its message, never mind comprehending it suffi-
ciently as “muttaqin” for practicing its spirit beyond its daily rituals. I
hope I can be forgiven for drawing the apt parallel of the pleasure of
daily Qur'anic recitation with daily reciting the DMV driver's handbook just for the pleasure of hearing the sound of the latter instructive words!

That is in effect what the Muslims have done with the Holy Qur'an – read the DMV handbook for the sheer pleasure of hearing the sounds and rhythm of its words and sentences! As useful as that might be to wean oneself from sleeping pills, can one pass the DMV test that way? “Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem?” demands the Author of the Holy Qur'an, while simultaneously asserting “In a Book well-guarded, which none shall touch but those who are clean”!

Clearly, the warning to Muslims (and non-Muslims alike) by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to not make a mockery of the “well-guarded Book”, is very emphatic, repetitive, and unequivocal (آيات مكتمل). Even verse 25:30 of Surah Al-Furqaan vouches a severe condemnation of the Muslims themselves by none other than the Messenger who brought them the Holy Qur'an: “Then the Messenger will say: 'O my Lord! Truly my people took this Qur'an for just foolish nonsense.'” The primary focus is veritably on understanding the message: “Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Nay, on the hearts there are locks.” (refer to Surah Muhammad, 47:24 quoted above) as it commonsensically should be, and not on its mere recitation, memorization, ritual reverence, and ritual practice: “Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem?” (refer to Surah Al-Waqia, 56:81 quoted above). Of course, as all Muslims will surely testify, there is a more profound effect upon the spirit on hearing or reciting the Holy Qur'an in its original Arabic than doing the same to the DMV driver's handbook in any language!

The Holy Qur'an, first and foremost, is an aural recitation, not a written word. The authenticity and correctness of the written copy of the Qur'an, as Muslims are aware, is testified by a hafiz of the Qur'an, one who has memorized it in its exactness, like a tape recorder, and the memorization has itself been authenticated by his teacher – suc-
cessively going back to the time of the Prophet of Islam when the Prophet himself (the historical narrative unanimously states) approved the full recitation as it exists today. (For a history of its written compila-
tion see: *Some Old Manuscripts of the Holy Qur'an*) [12]

As divisive as Muslims are, and in as many sects as we are di-
vided in, and in as many languages we speak on all five (or six) conti-
nents that we live, one thing we agree upon is the text of the Qur'an –
that it remains unchanged.

There is nothing which unites the fractious 2 billion Muslims
more than the text of the Holy Qur'an. The following verse asserts that
unlike previous scriptures, the Author of the Holy Qur'an takes the re-
sponsibility of protecting its Message from man's corruption:

```
We have, without doubt, sent down
the Message; and We will assuredly guard it (from corruption). Holy
Qur'an, Surah Al-Hijr 15:9
```

This is perhaps why there is so much emphasis among Muslims of
all nations, cultures, and civilizations since the very time of the
Prophet and the spread of Islam, to learn the memorization of the Holy
Qur'an as both a sacred as well as a utilitarian virtue. Its verbatim per-
fect memorization continually protects the Holy Qur'an from tamper-
ing by those who own the printing presses. And it protected the Holy
Qur'an in antiquity from malicious scribes working for kings, and
from copying errors. And we see the proof of the pudding in its eating
even today, fourteen centuries later. But while the text of the Holy
Qur'an all Muslims agree remains the same, they all slightly disagree
on what it means! See Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hi-
jack? Part-II for a first of its kind forensic examination into this mat-
ter.

Sticking with the recitation of the Qur'anic Word for the moment,
there is also something undeniable and uncanny about the calmness
and feeling of spiritual peace which comes with reciting a Surah from
the Holy Qur'an as an act of worship. Such calmness does indeed
benefit many Muslims temporally – meaning, in the here and the now.
Our psychiatric bills are almost negligible (unless we are physically
being bombed to smithereens on a daily basis), and Prozac™ sales
never took off among the Muslim nations as it did in the West. Em-
pirically speaking, it is undeniable that even memorization, recitation,
and parroting by the ordinary peoples has brought Muslims through-
out the fourteen centuries some very unique benefits of spiritual
strength and empowerment to withstand daily vicissitudes of life and
tyrans.

Nevertheless, common sense tells us that something has terribly
gone wrong here.

**We have kept the shell and thrown away its fruit! [12a]**

The Muslims have come to believe, or been led to believe, collec-
tively, that making the Arabic offering of the Qur'an to Allah with its
attendant rituals will take one to *Heaven*!

More recitation offerings to Allah will bring more *Heaven* in the
*Hereafter* by compensating for our failings in the here, of both com-
missions and omissions.

Personal elevation of the spirit notwithstanding – the Shaman
priest too derives much elevation of the soul in reciting his mantras as
does the Hindu swami reciting the Vedas (for man, evidently, is natu-
rally endowed with a spiritual bent of mind that seeks psychological
comfort in the pursuit of the “why” of existence) – often times the
words being recited are in a foreign tongue (Arabic) which the vast
majority of Muslims on earth don't even speak or understand!

Of the nearly 2 billion Muslims on planet earth today, just about
10% are native speakers of Arabic. A few others speak it as a second
language.

But most Muslims mouth the words of the Holy Qur'an formulai-
cally in its original Arabic, or in its transliteration into their local language script, for some vague notion of reaping rewards in the Hereafter.

Acts of courage, valor, dignity, self-respect, standing up for what’s right, standing up to oppression, tyranny, breaking the bonds of servitude, have all been replaced by joyous recitations.

Muslims do such pious recitations every opportunity we get, which is mostly on deaths and death-anniversaries of loved ones. We solemnly bring down the Qur'an from the topmost shelf of our choicest closet or bookcase, often kept wrapped in many layers of fine silk to preserve its dignity from dust and spiders, and gather around with friends and family to “finish” mouthing the Qur'an a maximum number of times as blessings and reward for the dear departed. More often than not, because of our busy lives, unable to gather sufficient number of people to mouth the Qur'an, we farm off the task to the nearest mosque and get children studying there to come-over and do so in proxy services in lieu of some food and generous gratuity to the mullah. More money we spend in such efforts, more we feel our prayers have traveled farther into purgatory relieving the burden of accountability on our loved ones!

As per the concept of sadqa-jariya, it is believed by many Muslims that such Qur'anic recitations and prayers of good-will help those who are no longer in this world when their loved ones miss them and pray for mercy for their souls (as opposed to forget them or curse them). Let's just accept, to avoid any red herring contentions, that it helps the damned to be less damned in purgatory if they leave a good legacy of love and charitable works behind. For those rare virtuous people not damned, perhaps the prayers of the living helps them gain greater Heaven. Sadqa-Jariya is a unique concept in Islam which helps foster love, brotherhood, and charitable works that keep on accruing benefit to one even after one has left this abode, so long as the good-will left behind keeps bearing fruit for those still living.
But does such ceremonial mouthing of the Holy Qur'an help us while we are still living?

And during Ramadan of course, we again rush to “finish” mouthing all its 114 chapters divided into 30 sections, in just under 27 days as the fast-path to Heaven. If we overshoot by one day, we are in panic mode to finish the remaining sections quickly before the night of moon-sighting for the next day's Eid festivities.

When do Muslims actually study the Holy Qur'an to comprehend its message for the here and the now, as one would study the DMV handbook? Or more aptly, as one studies to learn one's profession and trade?

How much more facile than that can anyone get?

The fascinating acceptance of ALL Previous Prophets, of the Jews, of the Christians, and of the un-named peoples in every time and every space, making ALL of them comparable, equal, without difference, to the Prophet of Islam

Returning to the topic of the remarkable pluralism of Surah Al-Fatiha and Surah Al-Maeda, what does the Author of the Holy Qur'an commend to Muslims about His many Prophets, Apostles, and Messengers?
Witness:

Say (O Muslims): 'We believe in Allah and that which is revealed unto us and that which was revealed unto Abraham, and Ishmael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes, and that which Moses and Jesus received, and that which the prophets received from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them, and unto Him we have surrendered.' Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:136

The Messenger believeth in what hath been revealed to him from his Lord, as do the men of faith. Each one (of them) believeth in Allah, His angels, His books, and His messengers. 'We make no distinction (they say) between one and another of His messengers.' And they say: 'We hear, and we obey: (We seek) Thy forgiveness, our Lord, and to Thee is the end of all journeys' Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Baqara 2:285

This is principally why Muslims do not return the villainous propaganda warfare waged against Prophet Muhammad by the Judeo-Christian soldiers carrying the white man's burden – for instance, like the Danish cartoons of 2006, and the American movie of 2012, dehumanizing the noble Prophet of Islam – with counter propaganda warfare against the prophets of antiquity whom the Christians and the Jews revere. For, the Holy Qur'an enjoins the Muslims to revere these same prophets of antiquity and to “make no distinction between one and another of His messengers.” (See many similar verses, e.g. 4:163, 6:83, 57:26).
This is despite the Holy Qur'an simultaneously vouching that the earlier messages brought by these prophets of antiquity had been lost or distorted by the impudence of human hands (see Surah Al-Maeda 5:12-16), and that Islam now superseded them all as the last Testament to mankind which the Author had Himself undertaken to safeguard: “We have, without doubt, sent down the Message; and We will assuredly guard it” (Surah Al-Hijr 15:9 quoted earlier), with no more Messengers and Testaments to come in future times (see Surah Al-Ahzaab 33:40).

But does the Author of the Holy Qur'an forbid Muslims reading other people's books?

No! I have not found any occasion when such a travesty has been advocated.

Does the Author of the Qur'an forbid speaking to the people of other nations?

No! I have not found any occasion when such a travesty has been advocated.

To the contrary, the author of the Qur'an emphatically states the following:

O mankind! Lo! We have created you from male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that ye may know one another. Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight of Allah, is the best in conduct. Lo! Allah is Knower, Aware. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Hujraat, 49:13

And how can “ye may know one another” (لَتَعْلَمُوا) unless ye talk to each other, partake of each others joys and sorrows?

The straightforward logic of verse 49:13 in full context demon-
strates that the Author of the Qur'an made the religion of Islam both non-isolationist, and non-triumphalist to the core!

Does the Author of the Qur'an forbid Muslims imbibing themselves of knowledge and wisdom from any source?

No! I have also not found any occasion when such a travesty has been advocated.

Quite the opposite in fact. The Author of the Qur'an commands Its own last Messenger to pray to his Creator to increase his own "ilm" as a virtue:

and say: My Lord! Increase me in knowledge. Holy Qur’an, Surah Ta-Ha, 20:114

And therefore, since the Author's last Messenger is also the Exemplar for his followers, the commandment is to the Exemplar's followers as well, i.e., to the Muslims, to do the same: “and say: My Lord! Increase me in knowledge.” This pithy prayer is recited by many Muslims in their daily prayers. It is also plastered prominently on the entrance doors of universities and seminaries. Unfortunately, this increase evidently hasn't come to pass for a vast majority of us.

What's more, the author of the Qur'an even advocates pursuing boundless “ilm” thusly:

Thou seest not, in the Creation of the All-Merciful any imperfections. Return thy gaze, seest thou any fissure, Then return thy gaze, again and again. Thy gaze comes back to thee dazzled, aweary. Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Mulk, 67:3-4

The profound significance of these pithy verses of Surah Mulk to
knowledge, to “ilm” acquisition can perhaps also be judged from the fact that Muslim physicist Dr. Abdus Salam rehearsed it in Stockholm upon accepting The Nobel Prize in Physics 1979, boldly stating at the Nobel Banquet on December 10, 1979, before other Nobel laureates, scientists and dignitaries, the Nobel Foundation and the Royal Academy of Sciences, that: “This in effect is, the faith of all physicists; the deeper we seek, the more is our wonder excited, the more is the dazzlement for our gaze.” [13]

But does the author the Qur'an advocate such pursuits, single-mindedly, to the exclusion of all else, such that such pursuits become the self-serving pursuit of the 'American Dream’?

Or, is such an advocacy for the pursuit of “ilm” as a noble endeavor, made an essential component of a greater all encompassing moral imperative by the author of the Qur'an? A categorical imperative which devolves upon man an even greater system of personal and social responsibility for which the wholehearted pursuit of “ilm” is necessary, but not sufficient?

The answer is obvious, despite the question not being merely rhetorical.

It is plainly given by the author of the Qur'an in the pithy Surah Asr, in the verse fragment:

\[
\text{and those who strive for haq, Holy Qur’an, Surah Al-Asr, 103:3}
\]

The Qur'anic word “haq” خُق (pronounced 'huq' like 'hug' and not like 'faq') is an all encompassing word and its single-word translation into English is impossible. It means all of the following (and then some): firstly “haqeeqat”, meaning reality the way it actually is, Truth; secondly rights, “haq”, when applied to man and his social relations, meaning truth, justice, rectifying injustice, not violating rights, not being unjust, demanding one's own rights, not permitting
others to violate one's own rights, not being untruthful, etceteras. It is
the converse of deception, usurpation, batil, fraud, tyranny, false gods,
misunderstanding reality from the way it is, or its misinterpretation, or
its misapprehension, or its deliberate misrepresentation, mischaracter-
zation, etceteras. That one momentous word of the Holy Qur'an
equally covers the antonyms of Machiavelli and the Mighty Wurlitzer.
Lastly, and most importantly, the religion of Islam is “deen-ul-haq”,
Divine Revelation is “haq”, all that the Holy Qur'an states is “haq”, all
that the Prophet of Islam explained of it, or adjudicated upon it, is
“haq”; and conversely, denying any of it, not following it, or ignoring
it, or adulterating it, is the opposite of “haq”. All of these plurality of
meanings are contained within the Holy Qur'an itself. Which is why
the Qur'anic vocabulary cannot be simply looked up in the Arabic lan-
guage dictionary per se, except to discover its roots in the Arabic lan-
guage and what it might mean in that language. But rather, its Qur'anic
meanings are defined in the specific context of its usage in the Holy
Qur'an itself. The Holy Qur'an is its own dictionary! (See the absurd
method adopted for translating the Holy Qur'an into English by an
American woman who wanted to “bring reform to Islam” in Cri-
tique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran, http://tinyurl.com/Cri-
tique-Laleh-Bakhtiar-Zahir).

It is but simple logic and commonsense to deduce that the pursuit
of accurate knowledge in all matters is an essential prerequisite to the
pursuit of “haq” in all matters – lest one be deceived, be manipulated,
end up believing in falsehoods, and act unjustly.

The aforementioned tiny but self-sufficient verse fragment of the
Qur'an forms the foundational basis for what is called “jihad”, striving
as a moral imperative, in other verses of the Qur'an:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>And strive they with their wealth and their lives in the way of God; they are the truthful ones. Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Hujraat 49:15</th>
<th>وَجَاهَدُوا بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنفُسِهِمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam 2015 413
But what should they “strive” ( وَجَاهَدُ ) for, inter alia, with their wealth and their lives, without any expectations in return from their fellow man, to be so nobly designated as the “truthful ones” ( الصَدِيقُونَ ) by none other than the one who claims to be their Creator?

The Qur’anic answer, once again unequivocally provided by the author of the Qur’an in the Qur’an itself, is in Surah Asr.

It is to principally strive for “haq” ( وَتَوَاصِرُوا بِالْحَقِّ ) with all of one's wealth, resources, talents, and energies! The lack of striving of which, the Author of the Holy Qur’an emphatically re-asserts in the same Surah Al-Asr, leads to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo! man is in a state of loss Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Asr 103:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>انَّ الْإِنْسانَ لِفِي حُسْرَٰتِ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For completeness, reproduced below is the full recipe of the pithy Surah Al-Asr for a noble life which is “not in a state of loss”, one which is not perpetually full of facile views, ignorance, apathy, vile servitude to the harbingers of inequity and injustices, and wild revolutions and further injustices in the name of redressing injustices. Notice what's stated and what's omitted in this self-sufficient tiny Surah. There is no reference to Muslims, or to Islam, or to any particular people or religion. It is directly addressed to man ( الإِنْسانُ ), “insaan”, to every people of all religions, and to people of no religion, the overarching context for which has already been elucidated above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By the declining day, (103:1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>وَالْعَصْرِ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo! man is in a state of loss (103:2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>انَّ الْإِنْسانَ لِفِي حُسْرَٰتِ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Save those who believe,
and do good works,
and strive for “haq”,
and are patient (103:3)

Caption Surah Al-Asr, Chapter 103 of the Holy Qur'an (see full exposition [14])

The aforementioned few words of the Author of the Holy Qur'an, as straightforward as they appear to be, still do require plenty of reflection and context to grasp the full import of its message towards an equitable and mutually beneficial multicultural co-existence without the imposition of anyone's values and/or “facile views” upon another.

It is important to re-emphasize for the first of the four clauses of verse 103:3 of Surah Al-Asr quoted above, even at the risk of being repetitious once gain, that on theological matters of belief, including no belief, when one disagrees with another, the dispute is not up to man to decide. It is for some abstract entity called “God” to decide, as already quoted from the author of the Qur'an in the preceding discussion. It is not the business of man what another's beliefs are. That business is God's, and is defined as being among the Rights of God upon man, the “haquq-Allah”. No mortal may interfere in that Right even if, due to their own natural socialization and/or self-ascribed learnedness, they perceive that some Right of God is being violated by others holding a facile view. This clear demarcation of respective Rights in Islam between the Rights of God (beliefs) and the Rights of man (moral law), ends for all times, at least from Islam's point of view, all arguments of the type: whose conception of god is better; is there a god or isn't there; etc.

Everyone gets to believe in whatever theology they want! The Author of the Holy Qur'an in defining the religion of Islam, already took the inherent differences in beliefs, natural inclinations, bent of
mind, and perception biases due to the very nature of socialization of man into account!

Thus, apart from friendly discourse, any forceful disputation with another on the nature of their personal beliefs is transgressing the limits set by the author of the Qur'an for Islam's practitioners:

And if your Lord had pleased, surely all those who are in the earth would have believed, all of them; will you then force men till they become believers? Holy Qur'an, Surah Yunus 10:99

Wonderful.

This leaves man, as per the other three clauses of Surah Al-Asr verse 3 quoted above, in his short gift of life, to not worry about saving another's soul, but to primarily contend with his own conduct with his fellow man, the previously mentioned “haquq-al-ibad”.

The commonsense advocacy of that method of conduct, of doing good to fellow man, of striving for “haq” in removing injustices from oneself and from fellow man, and being patient in adversity rather than committing suicide or becoming a suicide bomber, is beneficial guidance to all mankind no differently than the Biblical commandment: “do unto others as you have others do unto you”, and Bertrand Russell's non-religious and secular formulation: 'Maximize individual happiness while minimizing social conflict for optimizing the overall common-good', are beneficial for all mankind.

(Note caveat on unbridled emphasis on intellect alone and the religion of deception which it naturally birth-pangs upon mankind called Secular Humanism, in: Morality derived from the Intellect leads to Enslavement!)

Take from whichever system of thought that naturally resonates
with one; but don't be iniquitous to oneself, or to another; and the only practicable method to achieve that enlightened state of affairs regardless of the belief system one is socialized into, is the pursuit of “ilm” (in order to minimally be able to differentiate truth from falsehoods), social justice, and benevolence, as if in a race in all virtues instead of being in a race for Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives – i.e., imperial mobilization. This is the prima facie principal message of the Author of the Holy Qur'an. There is absolutely no drive for empire, or triumphalism, in the principled teachings of the Holy Qur'an which describes itself as the completion of a divine favor of a “deen” in verse 5:3 (الإسلام بينًا), and a divine guidance only to the “mutaqeen” in verse 2:2 (هَذَى الْمُتَّقِينَ).

(The Holy Qur'an's self-description naturally begs the obvious question which is addressed in the aforementioned case study Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack? Part-II: where is empire in the Holy Qur'an? Especially, as were witnessed in the Ummayad, Abbaside, Fatimide, the Spanish Moor, and the Ottoman dynastic empires during the heyday of Arab and Mongol Muslim domination of the world for nearly a millennium?)

If only man were to take heed of any of this platitudinous stuff from any of the Books of wisdom among mankind, and implement that which is his preferred choice by socialization or natural inclination, in his respective tribe and nation.

That singular failure to implement moral platitudes, from time immemorial, is the one fundamental problem of social failure to strive in “haq”? That social failure is the first cause for the creation of unjust empires and tyrants, and their subsequent quest for hegemony and domination of tribes and nations of the world as was justified by Zbigniew Brzezinski in his own American Mein Kampf of 1996 titled The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives: “Hegemony is as old as mankind.”

It is because of this empirical fact that the author of the Qur'an, in
what it claims to be its last Testament to mankind, has laid such strong emphasis on striving for “haq” – even making it the underpinning of a life which is at a loss in its absence (إن الإنسان لفى خَيْرٍ). Otherwise, the Biblical wisdom “do unto others as you have others do unto you” is still sufficient general principle among any enlightened peoples. However, while the latter was merely advisory, striving for “haq” has been made compulsory in Islam! In order to comprehend just how difficult that is in practice, and always has been, which is evidently why it has been made a cornerstone of Islam in the Holy Qur'an, please see the full exposition of Surah al-Asr. (op. cit.)

And what has man, “insaan”, done about such striving for “haq” as the principal engine of human development and social progress?

Nothing.

Caught between facile world views on the one hand, and bread and circuses on the other, man continues to be manipulated into voluntary servitude to tyrants of modernity just as he was in antiquity. While one may arguably understand the servitude in the Dark Ages to the tyrants of antiquity, in the modern information age, the Technetronic Era (term coined by Zbigniew Brzezinski), for the disease of the Dark Ages to persist is indicative of something far deeper which has not changed despite the march of civilizations, liberations, exponential increases in public knowledge, and the Technetronic progress.

Those who pursue “ilm”, knowledge, don't necessarily do so to strive for “haq”, or to redress the human condition, but for their own narrow self-interests to achieve their own version of the 'American Dream'. As the knowledge bearers, they are often either the direct harbingers of, or the silent bystanders to, the untold crimes against humanity. In the Technetronic Era of today, the former are the scientists, engineers, and technicians of empire laboring under facile delusions of all kind.

Tyranny of course only flourishes when many good men, and many good women, learned and pious, too busy pursuing their 'Ameri-
can Dreams', stay silent, indifferent.

That is just too well-worn a statement to be anything but one of the best moral clichés of all time. Edmund Burke wasn't the first to think of it. All the sages throughout the ages have reflected upon it. And Solon, the Athenian law giver, as noted previously, even made coming to the aid of fellow man a legal obligation (as opposed to solely being a moral one imparted by religions)!

Apart from the copious evidence of blood-stained pages of recorded history, the obvious import of accurate knowledge to the pursuit of “haq” as its principled primemover, can also be contemporarily judged by the empirical fact that due to the Muslims having a rather facile view of their own religion throughout history, and remaining quite ignorant of its interplay with imperial matters in every epoch, “jihad” was once again vilely harvested for an imperial agenda in the modern epoch with nothing but snake oil.

---

The face of Brzezinski's Islam “God is on your side”

This time around by Zbigniew Brzezinski for “giving to the USSR its Vietnam War” in Afghanistan 1979-1988 by creating the “Mujahideens”. It is worth reproducing here Zbigniew Brzezinski's 1998 interview to French magazine Le Nouvel Observateur for his own confessions of the utility of promulgating facile world views to accomplish this:
'Question: The former director of the CIA, Robert Gates, stated in his memoirs ["From the Shadows"], that American intelligence services began to aid the Mujahadeen in Afghanistan 6 months before the Soviet intervention. In this period you were the national security adviser to President Carter. You therefore played a role in this affair. Is that correct?

Brzezinski: Yes. According to the official version of history, CIA aid to the Mujahadeen began during 1980, that is to say, after the Soviet army invaded Afghanistan, 24 Dec 1979. But the reality, secretly guarded until now, is completely otherwise. Indeed, it was July 3, 1979 that President Carter signed the first directive for secret aid to the opponents of the pro-Soviet regime in Kabul. And that very day, I wrote a note to the president in which I explained to him that in my opinion this aid was going to induce a Soviet military intervention.

Question: Despite this risk, you were an advocate of this covert action. But perhaps you yourself desired this Soviet entry into war and looked to provoke it?

Brzezinski: It isn't quite that. We didn't push the Russians to intervene, but we knowingly increased the
probability that they would.

**Question:** When the Soviets justified their intervention by asserting that they intended to fight against a secret involvement of the United States in Afghanistan, people didn't believe them. However, there was a basis of truth. You don't regret anything today?

**Brzezinski:** Regret what? That secret operation was an excellent idea. It had the effect of drawing the Russians into the Afghan trap and you want me to regret it? The day that the Soviets officially crossed the border, I wrote to President Carter. We now have the opportunity of giving to the USSR its Vietnam war. Indeed, for almost 10 years, Moscow had to carry on a war unsupportable by the government, a conflict that brought about the demoralization and finally the breakup of the Soviet empire.

**Question:** And neither do you regret having supported the Islamic fundamentalism, having given arms and advice to future terrorists?

**Brzezinski:** What is most important to the history of the world? The Taliban or the collapse of the Soviet empire? Some stirred-up Moslems or the liberation of Central Europe and the end of the cold war?

**Question:** Some stirred-up Moslems? But it has been said and repeated Islamic fundamentalism represents a world menace today.

**Brzezinski:** Nonsense! It is said that the West had a global policy in regard to Islam. That is stupid. There isn't a global Islam. Look at Islam in a rational manner and without demagoguery or emotion. It is the leading religion of the world with 1.5 billion followers. But what is there in common among Saudi Ara-
bian fundamentalism, moderate Morocco, Pakistan militarism, Egyptian pro-Western or Central Asian secularism? Nothing more than what unites the Christian countries.' (source Global Research [15])

It is also worth reproducing here how Brzezinski fashioned these “Some stirred-up Moslems”:

**News voice over 1980:** “US National Security Advisor Brzezinski flew to Pakistan to set about rallying resistance. He wanted to arm the Mujahideen without revealing America's role. On the Afghan border near the Khayber Pass, he urged the Soldiers of God to redouble their efforts”

**Brzezinski 1980:** “We know of their deep belief in God, and we are confident that their struggle will succeed. That land over there, is yours, you'll go back to it one day, because your fight will prevail, and you'll have your homes and your mosques back again; because your cause is right; God is on your side.” [enthusiastic clapping by the future 'Mujahideens']

**Brzezinski in the studio speaking to the interviewer:** “The purpose of coordinating with the Pakistanis will be to make the Soviets bleed, for as much, as long, as possible.” (transcription is mine from the documentary video clip [16])

The mass ignorance and the facile world views that lay behind “their deep belief in god” among the Muslims was devilishly harvested with “god is on your side” to leave the Muslim civilization of Afghanistan into dust, and to set the stage for the future disintegration of Pakistan, with nothing but “Some stirred-up Moslems”!

It is the same fundamental lack of wherewithal today among the Muslims which is also enabling the same grandmasters to wage the perpetual 'Global War on Terror' upon the world as the age-old pretext
for “imperial mobilization” on The Grand Chessboard. The enemy in yesteryear was crafted as Communism. The enemy today is crafted as Islam. (See Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation, op. cit.) That enemy is being taught to be feared worldwide, including to the world's foremost policing agency of the sole superpower, the FBI.

The face of Jews' Islam “violent Islam”

Caption The face of Jews' Islam “violent Islam”. As
reported by Wired on September 14, 2011, an FBI training presentation titled “Militancy Considerations” measures the relationship between piety and violence among the texts of the three Abrahamic faiths [the god's chosen people obviously coming out on top!!!] As time goes on, the followers of the Torah and the Bible move from “violent” to “non-violent.” Not so for devotees of the Koran, whose “moderating process has not happened.” The line representing violent behavior from devout Muslims flatlines and continues outward, from 610 A.D. to 2010. In other words, religious Muslims have been and always will be agents of aggression. Watch the FBI Presentation Video artfully Hijacking Islam. See its full deconstruction in FBI Muslims and Militancy Considerations --- Heads up. [16a] See Islam vs. Secular Humanism and World Government for its full implication upon future generations of Muslims in the West. [16b] See the two compendiums of social engineering: Hijacking the Holy Qur'an and Islam, and The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity, for Machiavellian methods of perception management applied to the public mind. (Image source wired.com) [16c]

In both endeavors, Muslim rulers and their intelligence apparatuses played, and are still playing, prostitutes to empire against the common-good of their own public.

Evidently, all empires, past and present, from antiquity to modernity, are built upon promoting facile views of certain truths among their public, and among their prostitutes.

St. Augustine of Hippo had aptly summed this matter millennia ago:
“When the King asked him what he meant by infesting the sea, the pirate defiantly replied: 'the same as you do when you infest the whole world; but because I do it with a little ship I am called a robber, and because you do it with a great fleet, you are an emperor.”’ St. Augustine, The City of God Against The Pagans, pg. 148

Man against Superman

It is not surprising then, that the One who claims to be the Creator of man, the Author of the Holy Qur'an, correctly gauged the natural psychology of the masses among mankind and how they will be manipulated by the devil's apprentices, and for which it universally advocated the pursuit of “ilm” and “haq” for every “insaan” in a lifelong striving it termed “jihad” as the only effective counter to facile world views from which all evil follows.

It is therefore also not surprising then, that the superlative devil's apprentices too, from time immemorial, also recognized that encouraging facile views among the masses was essential in order to rule them!

Thus was created the narrow specializations and superficial generalization of education systems since the dawn of the Industrial Age, to craft the “likha parrha jahils” of modernity, meaning, literate morons with pieces of paper proclaiming their august qualifications. It wasn't just by the happenstance of rapid knowledge expansion of the
Technetronic Era, as Zbigniew Brzezinski speciously implied in his 1970 book *Between Two Ages*, that the following has transpired:

>'... it can be argued that in some respects “understanding” ... is today much more difficult for most people to attain. ... It is simply impossible for the average citizen and even for men of intellect to assimilate and meaningfully organize the flow of knowledge for themselves. In every scientific field complaints are mounting that the torrential outpouring of published reports, scientific papers, and scholarly articles and the proliferation of professional journals make it impossible for individuals to avoid becoming either narrow-gauged specialists or superficial generalists. The sharing of new common perspectives thus becomes more difficult as knowledge expands; in addition, traditional perspectives such as those provided by primitive myths or, more recently, by certain historically conditioned ideologies can no longer be sustained.' Zbigniew Brzezinski, Between Two Ages, 1970, pg. 15

Let me highlight the two key empirical observations from that aforementioned passage: “**make it impossible for individuals to avoid becoming either narrow-gauged specialists or superficial generalists. The sharing of new common perspectives thus becomes more difficult as knowledge expands;**”. The self-serving cyclic argument of Brzezinski is that firstly, ignorance about knowledge, due to the sheer explosion in knowledge, is the natural outcome of scientific modernity. Secondly, that people can no longer easily reach a common “understanding” of their common condition. Both those observations are empirically true today. But one can easily imagine an alternate modernity where that need not be the case despite the abundance of knowledge explosion.

It was the corporatization of knowledge in the service of empire in
the vast military-industrial-academe complexes of the industrialized world, and its tight coupling to the exercise of hegemony, that has made it so. Science and technology today equate with hegemony. Therefore, since the quest for hegemony is perpetual, those pursuing science and technology have to continue slaving in the service of empire as “narrow-gauged specialists.” It is a self-serving, self-sustaining game of flourishing ignorance.

And it isn't just incidental to knowledge explosion as Brzezinski has tried to portray it. It is in fact according to a premeditated plan, deftly put into motion at the very onset of Western industrialization, for the crafting of “a large number of men who are content to labor hard all day long.”

Here is Bernard de Mandeville in the eighteenth century, cleverly planting the very seeds of modern self-serving ignorance of the people for a production-consumption economy wherein, human masses are deemed only useful as economic widgets for the economic well-being of a nation:

'The economic well-being of the nation depends on the presence of a large number of men who are content to labor hard all day long. Because men are naturally lazy they will not work unless forced by necessity to do so.' Bernard de Mandeville, The Fable of the Bees, 1705

This man-made value system of human beings as economic widgets “content to labor hard all day long”, has today spread like a virus across the full gamut of gainful employment in the globalized corporate world, from blue collar to white collar, from traders to craftsman, from superficial generalists to narrow-gauged specialists.

That philosophy, to create “a large number of men who are content to labor hard all day long ... forced by necessity” espoused in The Fable of the Bees, inspired Adam Smith, the author of Wealth of
Nations, to propose the pursuit of selfish industriousness for the overall common good. Of course, common good primarily of the ruling class with trickle-down economics, but that's just buried in the definition of common good where the common man labors hard all day long, and the elites enjoy the good. Patterned upon the bees collectively making that marvelous tasting honey, each bee narrowly staying busy in its own specialized micro-task, while the queen bee rests and enjoys all the benefits, lies the entire edifice of modern civilization. It hinges entirely upon what Bernard de Mandeville stated 300 years ago. At the risk of being repetitious, it needs to be emphasized once again: “The economic well-being of the nation depends on the presence of a large number of men who are content to labor hard all day long ... forced by necessity.”

This 300 years old philosophy of inculcating selfish, myopic, narrow-gauged industriousness for the common good has been easily adapted to the high-tech Technetronic Era of modernity which naturally requires highly specialized, passionate, skilled, ultra-hard working bees “content to labor hard all day long” due to their natural fascination with the subject. It goes hand in glove with creating specialized narrow-gauged morons with advanced university degrees who can very patriotically “United We Stand” for the common good while staying productively engaged in narrow specializations in the economy.

Kept perpetually too busy to either think independently from the herd even when capable of doing so, or to pursue knowledge outside of their narrow-gauged spheres of specializations by the sheer demands of time and the endless debt-bills in pursuit of their endless “American Dreams”, statecraft today relies on inflicting exactly The Fable of the Bees upon man for its own functioning as an empire. In this scheme of things, vast amounts of useless information has been recast as knowledge, and parrots have been turned into learned savants. While wisdom and commonsense have been driven out from the acumen of men and women “content to labor hard all day long ...
forced by necessity.”

That pursuit, by its very nature, promotes holding only facile world views among the dreamers of the 'American Dream'. The more one is invested in one's American Dream, the more one automatically becomes to losing that dream if one wakes up to “ilm”. Natural psychological forces do the rest, by automatically bringing to the cognitive surface incessant rationalizations and self-delusions to maintain status quo in order to suppress the discomfort of cognitive dissonance. (See Leon Festinger's study of mental gymnastics for harmonizing dissonance.) The end result is that one prefers to maintain only a nodding acquaintance with “ilm”, remaining mostly content with what's salutarily written on that piece of decorative parchment necessary for becoming an economic widget. The devil's apprentices building their palatial heavens right here on this earth, have further ensured that the very nature of participating in modernity also only permits the hardworking bees just sufficient time and inclination for either very superficially-broad, or very narrow-gauged specialized acquaintance with “ilm”.

We have already seen above that without “ilm”, striving for “haq” is impossible. Thus, between self-deception, deception by Machiavelli, and full time engagement in bread and circuses, one automatically becomes a captive audience to one's ignorance in all important matters which occupy the elites enjoying all that common good from the work of those “content to labor hard all day long.” This diabolically induced state of ignorance makes one easy putty in the rulers' cold calculating hands. The cumulative impact of this to society is exactly as presaged by Brzezinski in Between Two Ages – a must read ode to legitimizing the tyranny of the elite in the Technetronic Era (subtitle of the book). The era of global scientific dictatorship.

The proof of this is the empirical evidence that the most industrialized, most powerful, the greatest and richest Republic on earth today whose economic foundation was laid by Adam Smith, trumped the foundation of liberty and separation from empire laid by its founding
fathers with the prime directive that it was to be a Republic. It has sil-
ently descended into a police-state without a murmur of protest from
either its super-educated or its rank and file. They both today stupidly
stand together in line to have their body cavities examined, groped,
molested, humiliated, or irradiated with deadly radiation every time
they travel by air. Soon, it will be every time they visit a shopping
mall, governmental office, school, and perhaps even getting on and off
highways to and fro from work. Mobile radiation scanners are already
deployed in many cities which scan all passerbys, cars, trucks, for the
so called “terrorists”. The rulers meanwhile have their own private
jets which take off and land on private runways and terminals bypass-
ing the fate of the masses. No radiation scanners violate their physical
being, and no perverts molest their women and children.

All this travesty only exists because the public is continually
taught the facile view, or forced to acquiesce to the facile view at the
threat of themselves being labeled “terrorist”, that they are under mort-
tal threat from the “terrorist”.

Sociopathy of hegemony is the real problem

Referring back to Zbigniew Brzezinski's ode to hegemony quoted
at the very beginning, the method of circumventing domestic impedi-
ments to the “sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial
power” become empirically self-evident:
“Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat. [Because] the pursuit of power is not a goal that commands popular passion, except in conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being.” Zbigniew Brzezinski, The Grand Chessboard, pgs. 211, 44

Sociopathy of hegemony is the real problem. A problem that is as old as hegemony, as old as mankind.

Sociopathy thrives on the facile mind. Consequently, the sociopaths who often rise to power easily, ensure that the public mind stays facile. Making the public mind is the first art of governance from caliphate to democracy --- for unlike a dictatorship, ruled at the point of the bayonet, caliphate to democracy depend on a measure of consent from the governed. Unless that governance is changed first, until the non sociopaths in society force their way into ruling power to devalue the villainy of the facile mind, all Divine Books will be “mahjoor” (25:30) and the public mind shall forever remain chained to its unturning neck in Plato's Cave. [16d]

Q.E.D.

As the aforementioned examination discloses, in this perpetual battle between good and evil, strong and weak, hegemons and victims, wolves and sheep, rulers and masses, evidently both sides have been well equipped. But unfortunately, it is only the one side which has continually figured out, from time immemorial, how to capitalize on its own core strengths and others' weaknesses. And it has artfully trapped the other in bread and circuses.

This was the craft of kings from antiquity who ruled in the name
of the divine for their own private interests with “all authority is an extension of god's authority”. And is now the craft of Machiavelli in modernity who showed the prince how to rule for private interests in the name of democracy with “god is on your side”. Indeed, it is only upon that singular characteristic that the following observation of Zbigniew Brzezinski in his own bible of hegemony, The Grand Chessboard, is so penetratingly accurate even today: “Hegemony is as old as mankind.” (pg. 3)

The very foundation of hegemony and empire lie in the public holding largely facile views of truths essential to the rulers. It doesn't matter which view they hold, in fact, they can hold any view they want, so long as it is not the whole truth, and is anything but the truth.

Like every people, such facile views are also promoted by Christians themselves of their own religion upon their own masses – never mind others doing it for them – when it is convenient to the exercise of imperial power. There is virtually no exception to this empiricism throughout the pages of recorded history. It exists among every people, including Jews, Hindus, Muslims, Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, etc. Pick an empire and its people have been subjected to facile world-views which have served the interests of empire. Indeed, the first imperative of all empires is always primacy. That exercise requires subverting the religion or beliefs of the people, preferably by giving them new absurdities to believe in. For if you can convince the public of absurdities that are convenient to your own imperial mobilization agenda, you can get them to accept anything.

And modernity is no exception.

Promulgating Zionism among the Jews, and Christian Zionism in the Bible Belt of America, readily come to mind.

The following is just one example. A facile sermon ostensibly from the Holy Bible, by a Christian preacher harkening back to the divine kings of antiquity to teach his own flock to “Honor the King.
Do it anyway, whether the king deserves it or not”:

“I am free to submit to authority. I am free to make myself a slave.

My friends, you are free, you are free to respect and appreciate the authority of the government that god gives to you - Honor the King!

The way you talk about your government, it's so easy to complain isn't it? It is so easy to criticize, it is so easy to find fault.

Honor the King. Do it anyway, whether the king deserves it or not. All authority, all authority is an extension of god's authority!” (‘New American Theology of Civil Submission', transcription is mine from a Youtube video of the sermon cited by prisonplanet.com [17], April 14, 2008)

Caption New American Theology of Civil Submission – the Christian pulpit brazenly in the service of king and empire in the name of God which would make even George Orwell roll in his grave!

What can be a more self-servingly facile view of Christianity than that Orwellian double-speak?

Any Muslim's facile views of Christianity surely pale in comparison!

As is amply evidenced above, anyone can promote facile views, and also be the victim of them. To remove facile views on any subject, including Christianity and Islam, it is commonsensical to go directly to its source. Approach the Good Book with a desire to understand what the Book actually says, whether or not one believes or accepts it – as when writing an A+ book report for a high school English honors class – and one shall know.

Worn out from holding facile views in the land of absurdities,
journalist and “accidental theologist”, Lesley Hazleton tried it. She sat down one day to read the Holy Qur'an as “an agnostic Jew reading someone else's Holy Book” – by her own description. And what she found -- as a non-Muslim, a self-identified “tourist” in the Islamic holy book -- wasn't what she had expected. It ended for her the tyranny of facile views on Islam and the Holy Qur'an. Watch [18].

Summation and Impact Analysis

To finally bring this long riposte to a summation, the short theme being keyed off here has posed a good specific question whose general answer has been explained to those Muslims who can understand the wisdom of the Qur'an. Ignorance, like being naked at birth, is the natural state of being. But we don't go prancing about as civilized adults in the au natural state of our body anymore than we should as civilized adults, of the au natural state of our mind!

Having facile views is natural, of others especially, but is not limited to the 'other'. One can be just as ignorant of what's one's own as illustrated above. And as an antidote to holding facile views, the full spectrum pursuit of knowledge as the precondition for the pursuit of a noble life – to be counted among the “truthful ones” – is rationally advocated by the author of the Qur'an as a categorical imperative for the civilized and harmonious co-existence of man.

That quest for harmonious co-existence at times requires measured and effective self-defence against predators, both physical and psychological. And the prescription for that striving against man's natural predators, the sociopaths and tyrants from among mankind it-
self, is captured by the universal striving for “haq”. Meaning, just as the natural state of creation is the jungle, but we don't live in one as a civilized people, the natural law of the jungle too is not the law of civilization. That law, the Qur'anic prescription of striving for “haq”, is the most well balanced and comprehensive prescription that exists in any book of wisdom from time immemorial. It prescribes how to be effective and pragmatic in standing up to barbarians without ourselves becoming one. It offers the criterion for resolving the existential dilemma often faced by all peoples of conscience, whether to confront, or to be co-opted. To know what it is, one still needs to acquire its “ilm”, as with everything else. We no more naturally know it in our au natural state of ignorance and barbarianism than we are born with our clothes on.

Interestingly, it is also a commonsense wisdom. Acquire Knowledge – 'even if one has to journey to China', as the Prophet of Islam is reputed to have also stated to his followers in that Age of Jahiliya (ignorance).

The difficulty of physically journeying to China is of course considerably less today. However, we continue to suffer another Age of Jahiliya in our modernity today. One that is dominated by facile views and deception all around. The most pervasive of these facile views among Muslims today is their own self-deception to avoid taking on the responsibility for rectifying their own subjugated condition. It is that oft heard self-serving proclamation of the pious and the scoundrel alike: “Allah chala raha hai”. Meaning, “God is running the world”. [18a] Its natural but specious corollary which incapacitates action against tyranny then easily follows: “let Allah take care of his world while I take care of my camels.” (with reference to context to the story of the Prophet of Islam's grandfather having made that fabled statement in pre-Islam Arabia when the king Abraha had assaulted Mecca before the birth of the Messenger.)

The devil's apprentices who actually are running the world, from time immemorial, deliberately cultivate such servile dogmas and fac-
ile views among the foolish masses living in their *au natural* mental state. To await their favorite *savior* or *messiah*; to patiently suffer life for the future expectation of reward in heaven; to focus on taking care of one's own camels and to leave the affairs of state to god, president, or king, except to vote every four years as that's called “democracy” which one must worship; etceteras, while the rulers continue to enjoy their own unlimited heavens right here on earth.

The devil's apprentices also find an irresistibly natural fertile soil among the Muslims for imperial plowing and harvesting. Divided into partisan sects from birth, each having not just a different understanding of the early history of their religion, but also a slightly different understanding of the religion of Islam itself despite possessing the same Holy Qur'an that they all share, Muslims rush to draw upon their respective sectarian narrations of history and doctrinal mumbo jumbo (that's the only way I can fairly describe what pious Muslim scholars utter from their highest pulpits to indoctrinate their flock), to dignify their pathetic silence to tyranny. That's the “good Muslim” variety (sic!). The “bad Muslim” of course rush to join “Al Qaeda” (sic!). The Muslim ethos, born in servitude to the crown and pulpit, [18b] cultivated into co-option, [18c] and dreaming of rewards in heaven, lends naturally to the Hegelian Dialectic of “good Muslim” vs. “bad Muslim”. [18d]

And precisely that facile world view was engaged from the very day of 9/11 by Muslim scholars with assistance from the many Trojan Horses and Uncle Toms. It made, and still continues to make ten years later, the otherwise un-cogenous task of “*imperial mobilization*” all that much more un-impedimental for invading and occupying “bad Muslim” nations while the “good Muslims” who stay silent, or support the empire's narratives, are applauded and rewarded for their “United We Stand”. See for instance, the 2010 600 page Fatwa on Terrorism [19] which earned its Uncle Tom author a place next to the massa at the World Economic Forum in 2011.

As one can hopefully appreciate very clearly by now, the observa-
tion by Zbigniew Brzezinski: “Hegemony is as old as mankind”, has only been true because of an almost infinite gamut of facile views being deftly cultivated among the peoples who have lived and died for maintaining the glory of their rulers from the very beginning of civilization.

Where to seek knowledge, wisdom, when all bearers of knowledge and wisdom, both in the East and the West, appear to be shilling for self-interest? When the bearers of knowledge today also appear to be the greatest manipulators and predators of man? And when the knowledge seeker too is naturally beholden to socialization and susceptible to accepting facile world views ingrained since birth?

See the CAIR report [20] for the difficulties faced in overcoming facile views by even the most learned and pious when their own chiefs mislead them. For writing and disseminating that response to CAIR report pointing out its significant omissions, one Muslim board member of one of the largest Muslim community and mosque of California Bay Area responded: “Whose interests are you serving? Hateful zionists or the hateful christian zioinists or both? Take me off your list.”!

It will be noticed that I have refrained from offering any specific solutions here beyond what is naturally obvious by way of commonsense, or automatically falls out from the text of the quoted passages from the Holy Qur'an. Instead, I have focussed mainly on highlighting the myriad dimensions of the problem-space surrounding the cultivation of self-serving facile views birthed by socialization but aliased as “knowledge” and “wisdom”. Apart from vested self-interests, it is the improper rush to solutions by short attention span sincere peoples which often preclude really understanding the problem domain to the depth of ab initio, which in turn precludes any effective redressing. Thus, it is observed that most invariably end up applying palliative ointments to symptoms of systemic diseases which instead of healing, continue to eat-away a people from within. See “The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity” [21] for more aspects of the problem domain.
That vile curse of modernity, wrought by hectoring hegemons, is the common challenge for all people of faith, as well as no faith. Namely, self-preservation from predatory forces disguised as friends and governments who thrive mainly by cultivating facile and outright nonsensical views among the public as gospel truths! Even the best and the brightest often get taken in by both socialization and self-interests, and end up 'United We Stand' with what is in fact absurdities.

Additional real world examples of how very difficult this endeavor of seeking knowledge which can help separate truth from falsehoods, has become in the super-abundance of our information-age due to a) self-absorption in the pursuit of the proverbial 'American Dream'; b) being perpetually kept busy between bread and circuses throughout our adult lives; and c) Machiavellian total perception management being the cornerstone of modern statecraft; can be found in "The IVY League Morons Syndrome" [22] and “Response to 'Why I'm leaving Harvard". [23]


How we ended up in this tortuous New Age of Jahiliya where every-thing the public is made to believe is either facile or false; where liberty is to get people to love their own servitude obeying orders; and where happiness is in the public being content laboring hard all day long for the benefit of the few; is examined in depth in my response to a brilliant scientist inducted into the National Inventors Hall of Fame in 2011, “The Fable of the Bees”. [26] The fable of the bees directly underwrites “The Art and Science of Co-option” such that even when one wants to escape the Age of Jahiliya, co-option ensures a Janus face with shackles of permanent silence. [27] For the more suave of mind and avant-garde in intellectual thought bearing the hefty weight of imammate of millions of followers worldwide, it becomes a bridge
through tyranny, the Doctrine of Neutrality. [28] The cumulative end result of all these, despite their respective self-rationalizations, is greater than the sum of its individual parts: the production of our Age of Jahiliya for which all bear a measure of culpability.

Footnotes

[a] See the (late) Jewish American professor at Harvard University, Samuel P. Huntington, and his Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, wherein he incestuously anointed his Talmudic tribe-mate with the lofty epithet: “In 1990 Bernard Lewis, a leading Western scholar of Islam, analyzed 'The Roots of Muslim Rage,' and concluded:

'It should now be clear that we are facing a mood and a movement far transcending the level of issues and policies and the governments that pursue them. This is no less than a clash of civilizations – that perhaps irrational but surely historic reaction of an ancient rival against our Judeo-Christian heritage, our secular present, and the worldwide expansion of both. It is crucially important that we on our side should not be provoked into an equally historic but also equally irrational reaction against our rival.’” pg. 213.


[b] Epithet from Jewish American scholar Professor Noam Chomsky of MIT for his Jewish imperialist tribe-mate at Princeton, Professor
Bernard Lewis. In a candid interview on CBC, Noam Chomsky stated:

“... now, until Bernard Lewis tells us that, and that's only one piece of a long story, we know that he is just a vulgar propagandist and not a scholar. So yes, as long as we are supporting harsh brutal governments, blocking democracy and development, because of our interest in controlling the oil resources in the region, there will be a campaign of hatred against us!” --- Interview to Evan Solomon, CBC, part-2, at minute 5:50, December 9, 2003, http://youtube.com/watch?v=bieFwutoqvA

[c] A non-Muslim inquisitive reader may perhaps sensibly stop to ponder at this point that why did the Author of the Holy Qur'an not directly impart its Self-proclaimed Divine Guidance directly to each human being instead of employing the “Al-Wasilah”, Messengers and Imams? Instead of mandating Muslims to seek some unnamed: “means of approach unto Him,” the “Wasilah”, arguably, in an alternate system of Provenance, every human being could have just as easily been his or her own Imam, his or her own Wasilah, employing his or her own inner moral compass – the perfect egalitarian system with direct connection to the Creator, with the Creator speaking to each human being directly – thus obviating the need for Chosen Messengers, Chosen Imams and Chosen Wasilah to start with.

It may be speciously argued that this could have perhaps avoided the corruption of the pulpit by rulers and the concomitant bloodshed of several millennia altogether! Why such an obvious earthly measure was not adopted by the Self-proclaimed All Knowing and All Seeing Author of the Holy Qur'an, may at best only be baselessly speculated upon by the brilliant intellectual – for that's clearly not the method adopted by the Author of the Holy Qur'an to offer its Guidance to mankind – leading to even more idle chatter and furtherance of even more facile unfounded views of Islam. We don't waste time speculating the endless what ifs that the fertile imagination can conjure up, but rather spend it in understanding why the Guidance
system of Islam is the way it is. In this study when we ask why, it is to understand the Author's Message, and not to better the Author. The latter critique is often brought by atheists and those inimical to Islam.

[1] The first extempore version of this missive was submitted to the tiny anon website as comment for the article which inspired delving into this topic: http://lwtc247.wordpress.com/2011/06/09/jesus-isa-alahti-salam/#comment-5241


This fact of ingrained socialization bias is unfortunately not acknowledged by Mutahhari in his exposition even though it is embedded in the teachings of the Holy Qur'an in its emphasis on the separation of righteous beliefs (Haquq-Allah 42:10) from righteous acts (Haquq-al-ibad 5:48). The Holy Qur'an calls itself Al Furqaan, the criterion, by which to judge both for one's own strivings in the path of “haq”. That lack of recognition fortunately does not detract from Murtada Mutahhari's sensible examination of how to study the
Holy Quran despite that fact that he does lend an a priori conclusion to such study based on his own socialization which is amply in evidence in his exposition. It is in fact hard to find a scholar of any religion who fervently believes in that religion, who would be immune to such a priori conclusions even as he might endeavor to teach others how to study the religion and letting them arrive at their own conclusions AFTER that study!

This appears to be the inherent nature of socialization and of the subjectivity, and hence the religiosity, conferred to it by the right-half brain. This is perhaps why the Holy Qur'an while accepting socialization as a human fact, has also laid so much emphasis on striving for “haq” under all conditions for everyone among mankind whereby, striving for overcoming the nafs, the personal inclinations due to proclivity and socialization, is termed the greater jihad and a co-requisite to the reflective study of the Holy Qur'an. See Part-II of Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack? (Ibid.) for some inherent impediments in its path.


[9a] Press Release, Project Humanbeingsfirst.org, May 25, 2008,

[9b] Zahir Ebrahim, November 16, 2009, Response to Gilad Atzmon's 'In Defence Of Larry David' : Don't see the courage or the genius in pissing and spitting on others' sacred things, pee and spit on your own!, http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/03/respto-gilad-larrydavid-jews-piss-spit.html

[9c] “progenitors” Satanic Pictures By Israel Shamir, http://www.israelshamir.net/English/Satanic.htm


[12a] Sentiment attributed to Imam Ali, the father of the progeny of the Prophet of Islam, paraphrased from Najhul Balagah. To appreciate the import of this statement, one has to understand the person who expressed his consternation with it, an unsurpassed victim of facile views of the Muslims of his time, and evidently, that vile legacy still endures. See What does the Holy Qur'an say about the Ahlul Bayt?, http://islam-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/03/what-does-
quran-say-about-ahlul-bayt.html


[16] Zbigniew Brzezinski, 'God is on your side' news clip, http://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/god_is_on_your_side.wmv


[18] On Reading the Koran, Lesley Hazelton TED talk filmed Oct 2010,
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Chapter X

The Noble Path
Denying to Caesar what is not Caesar’s

Islam – Surah Al-Asr of the Holy Qur'an

What does the Holy Qur'an say about Haq - Truth and Justice?

Abstract

There is evidently a great deal of confusion among the pious regarding Islam's pathway to Heaven. Mosques in the United States as in all Muslim countries are filled in Ramadan with worshippers seeking the spiritual blessings of the Night of a thousand
nights of prayer. In their efforts at spiritual self-cleansing for a life that is not in a state of loss, most ignore the abysmal fact that tyranny is spreading faster than virtue, worldwide. Few dare to stand up to it as readings of the Holy Qur'an resonate throughout Ramadan. The pulpits worldwide of both Sunnidom and Shiadom lead the flock in obsessing about ritual worship. What does the Holy Qur'an have to say about the life that is not in a state of loss?

Sunday, July 31, 2011, Ramadan eve in the United States, Muslim year 1432 A.H.

Reproduced here is the full recipe of the pithy Surah Al-Asr of the Holy Qur'an for a noble life which is “not in a state of loss”.

Notice what's stated and what's omitted in this self-sufficient tiny Surah which evidently requires reflection in inverse proportion to its length.

There is no reference to Muslims, or to Islam, or to any particular people or religion.

The Surah is directly addressed to man, “insaan” (إنسان), to every people of all religions, and to people of no religion (the over-arching pluralistic context for peoples of different faiths has previously been established in the article: Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization).
Caption: Islam: The AND Logic of Surah Al-Asr of the Holy Qur'an, Chapter 103* (Engineering representation of the semantic logic of Surah Al-Asr; author's conception)
By the declining day, (103:1) 

Lo! man is in a state of loss (103:2) 

Save those who believe, 
and do good works, 
and strive for “haq”, 
and are patient** (103:3) 

The logic of the verses 2-3 is the **AND** conjunctive clause. Meaning, a concatenation of conditions joined by the AND clause (Arabic و). Every one of the listed conditions in such a statement has to be individually true in order for the overall statement to be true. Otherwise the statement is false.

Being a techie engineer, I have depicted this AND conjunction in electrical engineering parlance in the top figure using a simple electronic device called the AND Gate. One can purchase it for a few cents at Radio Shack. The logic device is made out of a few transistors and implements this AND conjunctive clause function.

The 4-input AND Gate in the diagram captures the logic of Surah Al-Asr verses 2:3 with exact precision. Those more inclined to be “Left-brained” (logic, math, and problem-solving dominated) than “Right-brained” (art, creativity, and language dominated) can perhaps appreciate the import of Surah Al-Asr better in this representation.

Imagine that an LED is attached to the pin labeled **Output** (metaphor for a man's life).

- It glows green (to indicate a life which is not at a loss) only if all four inputs of the AND Gate labeled I1, I2, I3, and I4 are TRUE (represented by a “one” in the truth table). Observe that
there is only a single statement in the truth table when the LED is ever green.

- It glows red (to indicate a life which is at a loss) if one or more input is FALSE (represented by the corresponding “zero” in the truth table). Observe that there are fifteen statements in the truth table representing all the remaining permutations for which the LED is red!! The obvious first statement of all zero inputs clearly captures the vile hectoring hegemons of the planet and is of no surprise to anyone. But the remaining fourteen can indeed be very surprising.

Meaning:

- it doesn't matter how many prayers one offered and how many Hajj one performed to “believe” (أمانَّا);
- or how many hungry mouths one fed, how many hospitals and schools one built, and how honestly one earned one's income and paid one's zakat to do “good works” (عملُنا الصَّلِحَاتُ);
- if one didn't strive to oppose falsehoods and uphold “haq” (حق), the life, even if otherwise piously and well-lived, is still one of “loss” (خُسُر).

I am not making this up. That's what the Holy Qur'an itself states, unequivocally – reflect on it yourself while further recalling the admonishment of the Author of the Book of Reflection:

'That this is indeed a Qur'an Most Honourable, In a Book well-guarded, Which none shall touch but those who are clean: A Revelation from the Lord of the Worlds. Is it such a Message that ye would hold in light esteem?' Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Waqia, 56:77-81

Witness that the hardest thing to do in modern life is to stand up to oppression and tyranny (واتواصِّنّا بِالْحَقِّ). And also to persevere in adversity when one is experiencing the jackboots of the new Nazis
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Whereas the easiest thing to do is to sit in a mosque, and/or to feed the hungry in atonement of a guilty conscience.

We already see what the pious Muslims worldwide tend to excel in. We pay our zakat, khums, fitra (religiously mandated donations) on time, pray our namaz on time, and keep our fasts on time. Aspire to go for Hajj at least once, while the privileged take great pride in performing it repeatedly. Many among the oppressed are also incredibly patient in affliction. Indeed, we are so patient that we oft proclaim “Allah chala raha hai” (God is running the world), “Allah malik hai” (God is our provider), and often cry ourselves to sleep with utmost sabr (patience in the sense of resignation to fate), repeating to ourselves with quivering lips and glistening eyes: “hasbun allahu wa naimal wakeel” (Allah is sufficient for us and most excellent is the Protector, Arabic: حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-e-Imran 3:173).

According to the testimony of Surah Al-Asr, take it any which you want, the fact remains that most of us are still in خُثَر unless we stand up to oppression and unequivocally affirm حق with some measure of constancy to the best of our individual capacity. While it is true that only Allah can be the fair judge of that capacity and to what measure each individual is at a loss and not at a loss, silence and acquiescence to tyranny are the obvious antithesis of حق. And that, lamentably, seems to be the modus vivendi of the majority of Muslims today.

The crafting of that antithesis, evidently, has also come about courtesy of the imperial scholars subverting the meaning of the religion of Islam in the service of tyrants and kings throughout the ages, modernity being no exception. Language being the first target of corruption.

Thus، وَتَوَاصِّيْنَا بِالْحَقِّ has been reduced to some nonsensical gibberish by the pious turbaned man on the pulpit to mean: just talk about
justice 

with utmost earnestness while occupying oneself in the mosque believing 

أَمَّنْوَا اِلْحَقَّ! 

The ex-

position of 

from the pulpit and among the masses never includes standing up to kings, rulers, governments, and to their usur-

pation, oppression, injustices, and “imperial mobilizations” writ large in the blood of the masses.

The *ullema* (plural for the Muslim man on the pulpit) today, as yesterday, selectively focus people's attention with verses from the Holy Qur'an that exhort people to *good works* and *belief* promising a pleasing *Hereafter* (e.g. Surah Al Baqara 2:25), to mask their crafty omissions in the service of empire.

Keeping the masses occupied in rituals and salvation, and “*rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's,*” is not merely a Biblical saying (Matthew 22:21). That semantics has existed from time immemorial. Its biggest harbingers have always been the man on the pulpit.

Witness the 600-page one-sided Fatwa on Terrorism by the vaunted “scholar of Islam”, the posterboy of “moderate Islam” who issued a jurist's proclamation (*Fatwa*) against the terrorism of the pirates (see [http://tinyurl.com/Fabricating-Pirates](http://tinyurl.com/Fabricating-Pirates)) but not the emperor's. For services rendered to empire, the *house nigger* (see Faq: What is a house nigger) soon found a place-setting at the *massa's* table. As previously examined in Islam vs. Secular Humanism and World Government, the religion of Islam was hijacked from its very early days to service “empire” - Muslims' own. Nothing has principally changed today except for the color of the imperial flag.

Liberating the meaning of the religion of Islam, the *Deen-ul-Haq* (religion of حق) from the clutches of the so called scholars and jurists among Muslims is only as difficult as the uncongeniality of pondering the message of the Holy Qur'an directly, with one's own head and commonsense, rather than merely mouthing its melodic and soothing verses which no doubt are magic to the soul.
To strive for “haq” (وَتَوَاصَّرُوا بِالْحَقِّ) against anyone's tyranny requires no man's sanction – when Allah Itself has sanctioned it for every man and woman (إِنَّهُمْ أَشْهَرُ) in creation.

The Qur'anic word “haq” (pronounced 'huq' like 'hug' and not like 'faq') is an all encompassing word and its single-word translation into English is impossible. It means all of the following (and then some): firstly “haqeeqat”, meaning reality the way it actually is, Truth; secondly rights, “haq”, when applied to man and his social relations, meaning truth, justice, rectifying injustice, not violating rights, not being unjust, demanding one's own rights, not permitting others to violate one's own rights, not being untruthful, etceteras. It is the converse of deception, usurpation, batil, fraud, tyranny, false gods, misunderstanding reality from the way it is, or its misinterpretation, or its misapprehension, or its deliberate misrepresentation, mischaracterization, etceteras. That one momentous word of the Holy Qur'an equally covers the antonyms of Machiavelli and the Mighty Wurlitzer. Lastly, and most importantly, the religion of Islam is “deen-ul-haq”, Divine Revelation is “haq”, all that the Holy Qur'an states is “haq”, all that the Prophet of Islam explained of it, or adjudicated upon it, is “haq”; and conversely, denying any of it, not following it, or ignoring it, or adulterating it, is the opposite of “haq”. All of these plurality of meanings are contained within the Holy Qur'an itself. In Surah Al-Asr, without limitation, (وَتَوَاصَّرُوا بِالْحَقِّ) is presented in its most general form, of striving for “haq”, hence against all falsehoods, and therefore contains within it all these semantics. A most tall order indeed!

That is the momentous import of Surah Al-Asr – that tiniest Surah of the Holy Qur'an comprising a mere 27 words (as counted for the English translation used here). Its utility as a rallying call for denying to Caesar what is not Caesar’s, for affirming to God what is God's, and to man what is man's, remains unsurpassed.

But, at the end of the day, only Allah is also the final Judge of the extent to which we each did our own due diligence to Allah's Guidance given our individual trials and tribulations, and our individual
bounties and blessings, **on all four criterion** for a life which only Al-
lah shall Deem as “**not in a state of loss**”! We have been given the
criterion to adjudicate by, but the extent we each succeeded, or failed,
only He shall Judge on the Day of Judgement because only He Knows
of the full burdens of each and every soul:

| “On no soul doth Allah Place a burden greater than it can bear. It gets every good that it earns, and it suffers every ill that it earns.” Surah Al-Baqara, verse fragment 2:286. | لا يَكَلِفُ اللهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وَسَعَهَا لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَعَلَيْهَا مَا أَكْسَبَتْ |

Those who don't believe in such a Day, they have nothing to worry about today. But those who do, may ponder on the truth table. Only one row shows “pass”!

**Q.E.D.**

The holy month of Ramadan, a joyous month of fasting and re-
flection, commences tomorrow (or the day after) worldwide for 1.6 billion Muslims. Perhaps while rushing to “finish” the recitation of the Holy Qur'an in this month for nourishing the starved soul, the hun-
ger in the stomach from not eating all day will be matched with a hun-
ger in the intellect from not thinking at all.

**Ramadan Mubarak.**

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Sunday, July 31, 2011
**Footnotes**

* For those “Left-brained” readers with a precision oriented engineering bent of mind, there is an implicit A/D convertor at each of the four inputs in the figure above to characterize the threshold of conversion from a “zero” to a “one” for every individual. This is consistent with the Accountability Equation of the religion of Islam for every individual: **Output / Input**, wherein, the Output is the individual's voluntary behavior, choice of acts, performance, thoughts, beliefs; and Input is the individual's involuntary assets and liabilities, more specifically: inheritance, DNA, innate abilities and limitations, psychological bent of mind, involuntary nurturing and opportunities or lack thereof due to the general lot in life, and life's trials and tribulations upon which the individual exercised little or no control. The calculus of **Output / Input** is merely the verse fragment of Surah Al-Baqara 2:286: “On no soul doth Allah Place a burden greater than it can bear. It gets every good that it earns, and it suffers every ill that it earns.” expressed mathematically. Thus, for the purpose of individual Accountability in reference to Surah Al-Asr, in order to be fair and just to every individual given their respective limiting or extenuating circumstances, the measurement of individual Accountability is sensibly not Absolute Output, but Relative Output / Input, whereby the threshold of a “one” or “zero”, i.e., threshold of pass or fail on every criterion, in this abstraction is also set individually for every human being. And according to the religion of Islam, only God has the perfect knowledge to determine this threshold for every human being. This also automatically implies not to judge others, of who is “pass” and who is “fail”. That determination is exclusively the Right of Allah, Haquq-Allah, in the religion of Islam! See the travesty done to minorities among Muslims for political reasons by encroaching upon this Haquq-Allah, as for instance: What Role did Shias Play in Condemning Qadianis to Kafirdom in Cahoots with Sunni Scholars in 1974? (http://tinyurl.com/The-Plague-of-
Kafirdom).

**رَابِعَةٌ وَتَوَاصِّبُوا بِالصَّبْرِ**

To strive with perseverance, constancy, steadfastness – and not passivity or self-defeatist resignation to fate. The word “sabr” is often misused, at times deliberately, to incapacitate strident action in the face of adversity. Once again, linguistic hijacking permits subversion of the mind and consequently controlling of mass behavior. The popular meaning of the word “sabr” in the Muslim public mind has been transformed into what is perhaps most closely akin to the Hindu Karma --- it is just one's lot in life to be born under oppression, so grin and bear it for in the next life one will surely be compensated for the full resignation to fate in this one! No devil could have incapacitated human endeavor to strive to better their condition more than this hijacking of semantics.

Short URL: http://tinyurl.com/Surah-Asr-Tafsir
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Chapter XIII

Case Study
Subversion of the Holy Qur'an from within, or, yet another useful idiot for “reform Islam”?

Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran

To: Laleh Bakhtiar laleh@bakhtiar.org
From: Zahir Ebrahim | Project Humanbeingsfirst.org
Date: Monday, August 8, 2011, 8th of Ramadan, 1432
Subject: Your translation of verse 103:3

Dear Dr. Laleh,
AsSalaam O Alekum once again. I hope this blessed month of Ramadan is bringing you and your family much spiritual ascension.

Thank you for your prompt reply to my inquiry letter. I understand fully what you have stated regarding your reasons for translating as: “and ones who have acted in accord with morality”.

However, I must admit that your reply did not intellectually satisfy me. This long letter, inter alia, explains why. I am an intellectually very curious person and oddities stand out to me like puzzles begging to be solved. I can't resist picking them up. But before I proceed, I would like to state up front that: I am not a scholar. That I don't mince words and state things straightforwardly. That I have read your Preface in The Sublime Qur'an very carefully; I have read every single page of your excellent website; watched every single video of your youtube channel; absorbed many other interviews and news reports going all the way back to March 31, 2007 to the astonishing headline in the Sunday Times: Wife-beating rejected in ‘new’ Koran when your translation of the Holy Qur'an was
first released, to the most recent one I could find, your interview of April 14, 2011 with Tim King at Salem News: Laleh Bakhtiar Discusses Evolution of Islam. And what I was really searching for was your teacher and mentor whom you reference time and again, Professor Seyyed Hossein Nasr's opinion of your translation. I did not find it. I would appreciate if you would send it to me if it exists. I would deem it a most disturbing and quite understandable indictment of your work if your own teacher has not publicly proffered his qualified opinion as a respected Muslim scholar of the religion of Islam, on his own student's most momentous work of translating the Holy Qur'an.

You replied to me in your letter: 'I had asked fifty friends to describe what “righteous” means and none of them could do so. It means: morally right or acting in accord with moral law or characterized by morality. Therefore, I arrived at one who does or acts in accord with morality.'

If you would kindly refer to Surah Al Baqara, the Holy Qur'an itself informs one what “righteous” means. You don't have to ask fifty learned friends or arrive at your own meaning for what it means when the text of the Holy Qur'an itself clearly defines it:

'It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces to the East and the West; but righteous is he who believeth in Allah and the Last Day and the angels and the Scripture and the prophets; and giveth wealth, for love of Him, to kinsfolk and to orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and to those who ask, and to set slaves free; and observeth proper worship and payeth the poor-due. And those who keep their treaty when they make one, and the patient in tribulation and adversity and time of stress. Such are they who are sincere. Such are the Allah-fearing.' (Surah Al-Baqara 2:177, Pickthall's translation)
What most Muslims understand from "عملوا الصُّلُحَت" is what is described for “righteous” behavior above: “and giveth wealth, for love of Him,”

The fuller description of "عملوا الصُّلُحَت" entailing, inter alia, “and giveth wealth, for love of Him, to kinsfolk and to orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and to those who ask, and to set slaves free; and observeth proper worship and payeth the poor due.”

You could have easily used the definition of “righteous” from 2:177 to capture the correct semantics already unequivocally established by the Holy Qur'an: “and giveth wealth, for love of Him,” for "عملوا الصُّلُحَت" in your translation. There are many other verses of the Qur'an which also explain "عملوا الصُّلُحَت" very precisely. For instance: Surah Al-Munafiqoon 63:10. There was no need to ask fifty friends their permission to use in the translated language what the Author of the Holy Qur'an has made plainly manifest in the source language. That mindset of primary fidelity to semantics over form would have trivially led you to use one of the following more appropriate English words as other translators had used:

- “and do good,” by Shakir;
- “and do good works,” by Pickthall;
- “and do righteous deeds” by Yousuf Ali;
- “and do righteous deeds,” by Arberry;
all English translations I have encountered except yours are similar.

اور نیک کم کیے (aur naik kaam kiaey – and did good deeds – in all Urdu translations with minor variations)

None among the many translations in English and Urdu I have seen have used “morality” as the synonym which you have uniquely used to translate 

• “and ones who have acted in accord with morality” by Laleh Bakhtiar, The Sublime Quran

So, against the unequivocal guidance directly from the Holy Qur'an, you went a different route and chose a different word, the weakest possible synonym which doesn't even fit in the context of as examined in detail further down.

You justified your choice in your letter:

'You will find the 129 times that salaha appears, the word is translated the same depending upon whether or not it is the perfect form of the verb or active participle. As I mentioned in the Preface, I began with the words in order to assure internal consistency and reliability in the translation. I was told by a friend that this is how they translated the KJV and that it is called formal equivalence.'

If I understand what you are telling me without any ambiguity, you didn't choose the obvious words for translating even though any number of them would have been the most closest in semantics to the Arabic than your choice, primarily because of the artifacts of the translation process you have adopted by choice.
Loss of Semantic Equivalence

In other words, in order to “religiously” maintain your academic notion of “internal consistency” and “formal equivalence”, you deliberately sacrificed Semantic Equivalence!!

I just cannot believe that any reasonable translator of the Holy Qur'an would ever make such a tradeoff. There is no religion in the translation process. You are not submitting a Ph.D. thesis on translation. Your translation is not being judged by academics for pedantic attributes and academic purity.

The actual religion is in the observing of the original semantics of the Holy Qur'an in the translated language so that the reader can exactly comprehend from a translated verse and Surah what his counterpart in Arabic understands. That's the only prime directive for the translation of the Holy Qur'an.

This idea is called **Semantic Equivalence**. It is a terminology which I have borrowed from my profession as a computer scientist and engineer, to denote the function, or properties, which I am expressing here. Two entirely different representations of data are Semantically Equivalent if they express the same semantics despite their outwardly differing forms. E.g., a verse in Arabic and its counterpart in English.

In a human language translation the exact or perfect Semantic Equivalence is difficult to attain because of nuances and subtleties of context, vocabulary disparity, grammar disparity, audience disparity necessitating reframing, etc. Therefore, striving primarily for Semantic Equivalence in translation yields the best possible translation for two reasons:

- the policy of holding Semantic Equivalence as an invariant does not permit any translation artifacts to get in the way of a correct translation; there is now no “religion” about the process, and each translation situation is dealt with in accordance
to its own requirement and is not needlessly hampered by constraints coming from other previous translation situations;

- and the resulting translation is as close in semantics to the original as was practicably possible given all the target language weakness and target audience reframing constraints.

The poor reader is not holding an English translation of the Holy Qur'an in his hand to learn Arabic from the Holy Qur'an. He is reading the English translation primarily to understand its meaning because he can't read Arabic directly. All other matters are secondary for him. And if the meaning is sacrificed because the translator has some other notions of what academic and linguistic properties a great translation of the Holy Qur'an must contain, then you lost on all counts because you failed to perform your highest order duty to the reader: Semantic Equivalence.

If the translation process sacrifices some semantics because of translation artifacts, in this case upholding “internal consistency” and “formal equivalence” paradigm which the translator has arbitrarily chosen to inflict upon her translation, the translation process itself is incorrect, or flawed in its implementation.

Dear Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar, your translation is in manifest error because your governing principle for translation is in manifest error. You have sacrificed Semantic Equivalence for some “formal equivalence” process which you have arbitrarily deemed to be of a greater virtue than retaining the exact semantics expressed in the Holy Qur'an itself, for explaining verse:

`\text{تَرَحَلَّوا الصَّلَحَتِ وَ عَمَلُوا الصَّلَحَتِ}`

Do you understand what I mean here? By your own argument of ‘I began with the words in order to assure internal consistency and reliability in the translation.’, you chose not to use the obvious word for عملُوا الصَّلَحَتِ because it conflicted with your sensibilities for your “internal consistency” requirement! Even when the semantics of the expression called for it, you re-framed another English word there which is less suitable just because it solves “internal consistency”. And you
did this because you never had Semantic Equivalence as your invariant. Instead, you maintained “formal equivalence” and internal consistency” as invariants.

The word “invariant” is also borrowed from computer science to help me articulate my thoughts with precision. In this instance, it means to hold some property as true at all times during the translation process, to not compromise on it.

Achieving Semantic Equivalence is obviously a huge problem when translating into a nuance-poor, limited spiritual language like English which does not have an equivalently nuanced syntactical richness in its grammar and syntax, nor equivalently nuanced semantic richness in its vocabulary. Which is why striving for “internal consistency” at all cost automatically creates the problem which I observe in your translation of ُوُعَمَّلَوا الصَّلَيْحَة

There just aren't that many nuanced words in English to capture all the thousand nuances of the usage of a word in Arabic to achieve both “formal equivalence” and Semantic Equivalence simultaneously. The translation must be permitted to internally become “inconsistent” in the usage of the words in different situations – your main gripe with previous translations. The word “inconsistent” is used in the context of your own terminology “internal consistency”. I think such inconsistency, if that's what you wish to call it, is a livable and mostly inconsequential artifact when the prime goal is Semantic Equivalence – and nothing, absolutely nothing may stand in its way.

If the two languages were exactly matched in linguistic properties, and there was no drastic reframing for the target audience such that you have to deliberately water things down to make it understandable, you'd automatically achieve both Semantic Equivalence and “formal Equivalence” (as you have defined it) – by definition – in a correct translation process.

When the two languages are not matched, the precedence always goes to Semantic Equivalence for a good translation.
Let me state the overarching policy invariant of an accurate translation system in the most precise way I can.

Giving precedence to Semantic Equivalence as a translation policy automatically implies that the translator is open to “inconsistently” re-using words when necessary for the accurate framing of the translation in the target language:

- primarily for Semantic Equivalence with the source being translated,
- and not primarily for “internal consistency” of words in the target translation,
- or “formal equivalence” of words with the source being translated.

That does not of course preclude maintaining “internal consistency” and “formal equivalence” as part of best practices in a translation wherever it is achievable, while still maintaining the Semantic Equivalence invariant.

Even though the vocabulary here is borrowed from Computer Science, I am certain you are already more than familiar with these ideas being a professional and very accomplished translator. However, the precise vocabulary permits us to think precisely as you already well know also as a professional psychologist, and because of it, you can now recognize the problem with your system of translation more precisely.

You never explicitly made Semantic Equivalence your translation policy. You pretended that it will just fall out from your word focussed system due to your “formal equivalence” policy.

In this letter, I am really trying to prove to you that Semantic Equivalence does not automatically fall out by narrowly focussing on word etymology and word semantics and trying to keep “internal consistency” in the target language. While certainly useful and perhaps necessary tools, these tools are not ends unto themselves.
Let me restate for emphasis:

[Point One] The “Formal equivalence” notion which you have developed is only a tool, a means to an end, and not the end in itself. The end is Semantic Equivalence.

The terminology “internal consistency” and “formal equivalence” is as you have defined in your Preface to The Sublime Quran. Semantic Equivalence is as I have defined in this letter.

You will surely agree with the following commonsensical observations:

- **The user of a translation of the Holy Qur'an does not care what process a translator adopted for the translation.** A sensible Muslim user of a translation of the Holy Qur'an already understands that the Holy Qur'an is a most unusual *Divine Book* unlike any other book on the New York Times Best Seller list. And therefore, that its translation must entail specialized processes and esoteric knowledges of many Arabic disciplines, most obvious being masterful scholarship of the entire Holy Qur'an itself. A **sensible reader quite understands that just the mastery of Arabic grammar and Arabic linguistics while a prerequisite for the translation of the Holy Qur'an, is grossly insufficient, when it would be quite adequate for translating any other book.** A sensible reader of a translation of the Holy Qur'an understands that when the translation is not commissioned by an authority or paymaster, that for individual scholars of the Holy Qur'an undertaking it, it must be a painstaking and all consuming task, a labor of love rather than pecuniary gain. While appreciating all this implicitly, a user of a translation of the Holy Qur'an still does not particularly care or concern himself with what process is adopted for the translation because he does not have the knowledge or the skill to judge its merit anyway. **A user of the translation of the Holy Qur'an just implicitly**
assumes that the translator of the Holy Qur'an, it being such a complex book, must know what he or she is doing. And that is perhaps the only shortcoming that the innocent user may be faulted for – being naïve in making that gratuitous assumption.

● **The user of a translation of the Holy Qur'an only cares for the end result which he is holding in the palm of his hand opened to a Surah,** that it be semantically equivalent to the source language, that it be as accurate in conveying the original meaning as is humanly possible in the translated language in letter, spirit, and the full context of the Holy Qur'an.

Consequently, as a translator addressing the expectations of the sensible Muslim user of the translation of the Holy Qur'an, you must then also agree with the following burden which automatically falls upon the translator:

● Any self-proclaimed purity of any translation process which looses Semantic Equivalence, has a problem with it which must be fixed.

● Any re-framing of the source semantics for the understandability of the target audience which looses Semantic Equivalence has a problem with it which must be fixed.

● And therefore, the translation process and the re-framing must be continually evaluated and re-tuned for exception handling wherever necessary, in order to continuously satisfy the primary big-picture expectation of the user of the translation of the Holy Qur'an: Semantic Equivalence.

[Point Two] **Semantic Equivalence is obviously inclusive of the requirement to frame the translation not just to the target language, but also to the target audience context.**

That is always a most difficult task if the semantics in the source language find no natural equivalence in the mind of the target audi-
ence. While I can appreciate your quoting somewhere (I can't locate the reference now), that to convey the message of the Holy Qur'an in the language of the people, there is only so much one can do to cater to the target audience mental level and sociological context while strictly maintaining strong Semantic Equivalence. If the necessary reframing to reach the mental level of the target audience starts encroaching upon the integrity and fidelity of Semantic Equivalence, as it did when you stated: 'I had asked fifty friends to describe what “righteous” means and none of them could do so. ... Therefore, I arrived at one who does or acts in accord with morality', then the translator has to start making conscious and deliberate tradeoffs for just how strong a Semantic Equivalence she wants to maintain vs. writing an Idiot's guide to the Holy Qur'an which is also a commendable act. One can obviously always write levels of translation, one for children, one for newbies, one for experts, one for aliens, etc. The issue is when one is making tall claims of fidelity like what The Sublime Quran is making for its process of “internal consistency” and “formal equivalence”, while gratuitously throwing away Semantic Equivalence when reframing for target audience context and consequently yielding a more inaccurate translation. When trying to achieve all that The Sublime Quran started out to do as disclosed in its Preface, it must have surely been a delicate balancing act, more art than science, in which that idea of re-framing for target context can only be taken so far and no farther, lest it diminish Semantic Equivalence from its highest possible achievable level.

[Point Three] **Semantic equivalence is also obviously inclusive of the natural requirement that the translator keep their own biases and prejudices out of the translation process to the extent possible.**

That is also a most difficult task when the biases are deeply ingrained in the society itself and one is unaware of them. For example, “Orientalism”. That is how the West ended up with the prejudicial translations of the Holy Qur'an in the eighteenth and nineteenth centu-
ries. The imperialist translators held the orient in utmost contempt, or if not outright contempt, then at least as inferiors! Witness this explicitly in Lord Macaulay speech of 1835 to Britannia's Parliament where he advocated a new education policy for the Indian subcontinent natives claiming: “that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia.” No degree of any purist process could ever have been adopted by those scholars of empire to remove such “Orientalism” from their translations of the Holy Qur'an – unless they removed their ingrained prejudices first! And how can imperialists ever do that?

We see it around us even today! The latter day equivalent of “Orientalism” of yesteryear in the Western sociological context is “bring reform to Islam”. It is the new plague of “Occidentosis” from the West which now infects the modern progressive Westernized Muslim mind. That accurately descriptive neologism as you are well aware is the title of the book by the Iranian Jalal Ali Ahmad. We all have susceptibility to ingrained perception biases just because we are human beings. You have of course admirably noted your attempt to be consciously unbiased yourself by asserting that your translation is non-sectarian. Non-sectarian of course does not imply personal bias free. Moreover, it can also mean “mainstream” – see Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack? Part-I. More on “bring reform to Islam” in part 3 (below).

Dissecting your translation process

So let's look at how your method actually went wrong for غرباء theصلحت based on how I have inferred your translation system worked. Please correct my misunderstanding here because I am simply reconstructing your system in my mind. You have a giant symbol table and a word boundary concordance. The symbol table may or may not require transliteration of Arabic into English before insertion and lookup. This is akin to the Macintosh database you have mentioned in
your interviews, but the precise terminology is drawn from computer science.

You came to verse 103:3. First thing you did was insert its words into the symbol table and it gave you a link to '129 times that salaha appears,' in the concordance. You then applied your internal consistency algorithm for word selection which suggested that the right consistent word to use for this instance of was “righteous”. You asked 'fifty friends to describe what “righteous” means and none of them could do so'. Therefore, you decided to reframe. As you described it to me in your reply letter: 'It means: morally right or acting in accord with moral law or characterized by morality. Therefore, I arrived at one who does or acts in accord with morality.' That automatically fixed your translation of to: “acted in accord with morality”.

Did I get it right? At least to the first order approximation?

This is a pretty slick system I must admit, and surely yields “formal equivalence” as well as “internal consistency”. Worth a Ph.D. thesis at MIT (which is my alma mater) and a Nobel Prize in Computer Science (if it is ever instituted). But it got the translation wrong!

And that's the heart of the matter isn't it? Let me prove it to you differently this time.

Which steps did the translation go wrong? In two places.

Instead of doing all your mechanical operations on etymological word boundary – which you wouldn't have been doing if you weren't writing a Ph.D. thesis as a student in a new highly specialized discipline, and which you also wouldn't have been doing if you were a already masterful scholar of the Holy Qur'an instead of just a masterful scholar of classical Arabic – had you just paid attention to the semantics of the full verse fragment in the full context of the Holy Qur'an, the error would not have occurred. Allah has already defined the semantics of as depicted in 2:177 and many other verses. You tried to infer it from its etymology alone. Even
though etymologically you came up with the correct word “righteous”, it is evident that you have a poor understanding of what it means in the semantics of the Holy Qur'an.

It is self-evident from your own statement 'It means: morally right or acting in accord with moral law or characterized by morality.' that you did not fully understand or appreciate the meaning of this verse in its context of Surah Asr as primarily pertinent to doing good works for *haquq-al-ibad*. You instead concentrated on looking up words mechanically. When you discovered that the right word in English was “righteous”, you didn't go back to the Holy Qur'an to ascertain its correct semantics.

You instead came up with your own definition: 'It means: morally right or acting in accord with moral law or characterized by morality.' While that may well be the correct general meaning of that word, I don't know, I didn't check, but let's assume that it is, it is still irrelevant for the specific context of this verse.

And that is one of the key moment of translational error in the translation process itself. Error number 1.

Because at this stage of the translation process, the real look up for establishing the full semantics of the english word “righteous” which the etymological search gave you, instead of solely being in the Oxford English language dictionary, should have mainly been in the Holy Qur'an itself. That would have automatically taken you to 2:177 and many others like it, which would have defined “righteous” for you very precisely in the full context of the Holy Qur'an, inter alia: “and giveth wealth, for love of Him, to kinsfolk and to orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and to those who ask, and to set slaves free; and observeth proper worship and payeth the poor-due.”

Then you should have returned back to Surah Al-Asr and tried to understand what that Quranic meaning of “righteous” meant in the specific context of Surah Al-Asr in order to select the most appropriate and closest synonym for that concept in the English
language irrespective of any “internal consistency” and other translation artifacts. That would have lead to properly re-framed choices that would be easy for the target audience to understand in the primary context of *haquq-ul-ibad* of this verse fragment:

- “and do good works,” if translating into English
- اور نيک کي کي if translating into Urdu

The above choices is what you see in the majority of translations of the Holy Qur'an in both English and Urdu.

For error identification to the translation process itself, I'd say this is error number 2: Not choosing the right synonym due to your artificially self-imposed “internal consistency” constraint.

Some academic sure led you astray dear Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar!

These errors I readily surmise are repeated time and again in your translation of the Holy Qur'an because you are evidently NOT a scholar of the Holy Qur'an itself. Scholarship of Arabic grammar and Arabic linguistics, does not automatically confer the scholarship of the Holy Qur'an. It is your misperception, or your unfortunate hubris, if you sadly think so.

**Additional aids for the user to assist in achieving Semantic Equivalence**

Now let's look at how to facilitate proper reframing for a target audience which is sociologically alien to the original sociological context of the East where the Holy Qur'an originated, and where many matters are implicitly understood due to socialization, due to daily interaction with the Holy Qur'an and Islam within the culture itself – from radio, television, social functions – where Qur'anic language and Islamic concepts have become a part of the local vernacular and forms its lingua franca. Words such as “InshaAllah”, MashaAllah”, Alhamdolillah”, are uttered at least a thousand times each day by almost
every person in a Muslim society. Even Christian sweepers in Pakistan who come to clean a Muslim home will often use these terms, and may even have some passing acquaintance with their meaning. West does not share such a sociological framework.

Thus facilitating the understanding of the translation of the Holy Qur'an is necessary because reframing alone does not re-create the Semantic Equivalence automatically in the mind of the Western reader as it does in the mind of the Eastern reader.

The KWIC index can be very useful for this purpose. It stands for Key Word In Context. It is like an ordinary index except with one addition. Each word in the index has a short context statement attached to it. Let me use the word “righteous” to show how it works. The index entry “righteous” would contain a short context statement perhaps excerpted from 2:177, and like an ordinary index, would list the page number on which it occurred for verse 103:3. If the same word “righteous” is used in a different context than the previous one in another Surah, it is repeated as a new index entry in the KWIC index with the new context statement. If it is used in the same context in another Surah, then just an additional page number is appended to the first entry.

I am sure you must be more than familiar with this – many books have KWIC indexes. This of course makes the index a bit bigger, takes a bit longer to compile, is also more art than science and relies a great deal on the translators judgment just like the translation does, but that's just life. A KWIC index in The Sublime Quran would solve so many of your problems. For instance, your problem: 'fifty friends to describe what “righteous” means and none of them could do so'. Is easily addressed in the KWIC index. You could simply excerpt 2:177 as the context statement.

Your other concerns for why you felt you needed to reframe Allah to God is also straightforwardly solved in the KWIC index. Your deplorable decision to reframe Allah to God for the specious rationalizations you have given in your Preface is examined further down in this
letter.

A KWIC index, and the changes to your translation process as outlined here, will enable you to maintain a very strong Semantic Equivalence for your future edition of The Sublime Quran. Which, I earnestly hope, you will compose but only after acquiring the masterful Scholarship of the Holy Qur'an first. I’ll buy a copy of that edition. I plan to return the 6th Edition, 2009 I purchased back to the bookstore as a totally unsatisfactory product.

**Examining the impact of your choice of word for translating وَ عَمَلُوا الصُّلُحَتُ**

Now let's examine the harm done by using “acted in accord with morality”. What will the Western audience understand by it? Only how they understand the word “morality” vicariously.

In the West, “to be moral” and “morality” generally mean not to be immoral in personal ethics. Conversely, for the more positivists who act rather than merely refrain, to be moral in personal ethics. To act morally doesn't necessarily imply to the Western mind to do good social works for others, *fallahi kaam* (charitable works), righteous deeds, solely for the love of Allah, as reflected in the afore-quoted 2:177.

I have found no place in Western sociological framework of modernity where the concept of morality has been directly equated with doing good charitable works for others, never mind for the sake of Allah. There is no general notion of وَ عَمَلُوا الصُّلُحَتُ in the lingua franca of the West as it is in the Muslim societies of the East. There is really no precedence to draw semantics to a word which inherently implies personal morality as noted in the Ten Commandments, or in the so called Christian Puritanical work ethic, or in rare cases when one sees someone drowning and recalls the Good Samaritan. Except perhaps for Solon, the Athenian statesman and lawmaker of antiquity who
made it a moral duty to come to the aid of fellow man with selfless moral acts, I am not sure that it necessarily even existed in Western history.

For instance, Bill Gates who does charitable works and gives away hundreds of millions of dollars to vaccinate poor children in India and China, is never referred to in “moral” terms. Only in “generosity” terms, or “philanthropic” terms. Whereas people who don't lie and cheat and kill and deceive and usurp and plunder are thought in “moral” terms.

I will lay a wager with you that if you went back and again asked the same fifty friends whom you had earlier asked 'to describe what “righteous” means and none of them could do so', to define what “morality” means, that you will likely get the same answer.

So instead, a more productive wager is if you now ask them what they actually understand by “acted in accord with morality” as you used in your translation of Surah Asr, that they will say something similar to what I have described above on the usage of the term “morality”. This will enable you to validate your translation with the same friends whom you trusted for not using “righteous” as the synonym in the first place (as if a focus group of fifty friends is the best modality for collecting cultural linguistic data for reframing a Divine Book). If that is your yardstick for reframing, then the same yardstick will also be validation for you.

My bet is that barely any in your Western focus group of fifty friends will suggest what automatically springs to the mind of the Eastern Muslim who has grown up in Muslim society and whether or not he knows Arabic, when you ask him what عملوا الصالحات means, even if you don't put the translation اور نيک کم کی before him, many in the streets of Pakistan will tell you that 'do naik amal, charitable works, for the sake of Allah', which is quite close to 2:177: “and giveth wealth, for love of Him,”.

Few persons in the West reading your translation for عملوا الصالحات
as “acted in accord with morality” will likely ever come up with anything remotely close to doing charitable works. It simply would not occur to them in their sociological and cultural linguistic context that “acted in accord with morality” could ever mean doing good works and deeds for fellow man. He would immediately think of his personal ethics, don't murder, don't plunder, don't lie, etc., in accordance with his understanding of what individual morality means in the West. But had you used the word “do good deeds” - he would have most assuredly learnt that his duty and responsibility transcends his individualism and explicitly requires him to not just be doing no harm to fellow man, but doing actual good deeds for fellow man.

If I have succeeded in tickling your concern and not made a total fool of myself in presumptively writing you this long letter as if you would really care to know the critical opinion of a non-scholar about your monumental work, you can mitigate your concern by creating a KWIC index as a palliative.

Other translational artifacts of word focussed translation system

Let's now look at some common problems which I immediately perceive arising by using word based translation of your system. Surely you must exercise exception handling yourself as these are so basic, and they directly fail your system of “formal equivalence” on word boundary.

The problem occurs with semantics when two or more words are put together in a sentence to create a semantics greater than the sum of the meaning of the individual words.

The expression “It is raining cats and dogs.” is neither about “cats”, nor “dogs”, nor animals, nor living creatures. Idiomatic, allegorical, metaphorical, and other esoteric compound expressions fall into this category. I refer to them as complex expressions in this letter.
– whose semantics is not necessarily reflected in the meanings of each individual word.

Example: “It is raining cats and dogs.” A semantic equivalence translation into another language will neither include the word “cats” nor “dogs”. And there goes your formal equivalence method on individual word boundaries. Keeping Semantic Equivalence, the statement translated correctly to (reverse translated): “it is raining heavily”!

If the translator did not recognize that this was an idiomatic expression and applied “formal equivalence” by looking up the words “cats”, “dogs”, “raining”, or, decided to do a literal translation, it will create gibberish in the target language no matter how you compose it. Translated incorrectly using “formal equivalence” on word boundary (reverse translated): “cats and dogs are falling from the sky”.

Translating such complex expressions is thus self-evidently error prone for the following exact reasons:

- First, the translator does not have domain expertise in the subject matter he is translating and therefore does not recognize a complex expression.
- Second, the complex expression’s semantics is alien to the sociological context of the target audience and reframing cannot adequately express it, thus necessitating interpretation for that specific sociological context.
- Third, the meaning of the complex expression itself is unknown in the source language.

I am sure you are already familiar with such limitations to a much deeper level as a professional translator, and must have encountered them while translating the Holy Qur'an. Therefore, I surmise that you
must have had to ignore the individual word meanings and tried to examine what the complex expression meant in the full context of the Holy Qur'an.

In such cases therefore, translating the complex expression must have bypassed your “internal consistency” and “formal equivalence” constraints because in order to be reasonably accurate, you would have had to compose its translation the best way you could for achieving Semantic Equivalence without worrying about word usage constraints. I would be most grateful if you would kindly confirm or correct my perception. Or advise if you did not encounter any such complex expressions in the Holy Qur'an which could not be handled on word boundary.

A good translation system would have consistent policies to deal with complex expressions. Whether to translate, whether to reframe, whether to just pass it intact transliterated, etc.

Wondering how you dealt with some of these matters with any consistency, I looked up your translation for ﻚﺎﻨَّ ﻣِﻦْ ﺟَنَّ “He had been among the jinn” (Surah Al-Kahf 18:50, The Sublime Quran). You did not reframe the word ﺟَنَّ because reframing is clearly impossible. You simply transliterated it phonetically to “jinn”. You also applied the same transliteration to “Iblis” وَإِذْ قَالُوا ﺍِلْمَلاِكَةُ ﺃَسْجُدُوا لِآنَّمْ ﺃَسْجُدُوا إِلا إِبْلِيسَ and did not reframe it to “Devil” when it was certainly possible to reframe to the sociological context of the West had you wanted to: “And mention when We said to the angels: Prostrate to Adam! So they prostrated but Iblis” (Surah Al-Kahf 18:50, The Sublime Quran).

But you chose to reframe Allah from the very sentence of the Holy Qur'an as dealt with below. This indicates to me that you really didn't have a well defined, well articulated, consistent policy to deal with such things despite all this hoopla about your pristine translational process. That despite your claims to being sectarianly un-biased and devoid of imparting personal values to the translational process,
you in fact permitted personal values to interfere in the matter of translating the most momentous word in the Holy Qur'an, Allah.

This fact is exactly betrayed by this anomaly that you did not also reframe “Iblis” to “Devil” for all the same reasons you gave for re-framing Allah to God. I see that you have capitalized “Iblis” correctly, and so you know it is a proper noun and referring to a particular “jinn”. But you are also aware that Allah is a proper noun, it is the name of God, a unique singular noun, the very basis of the monotheism of Islam. Allah is the first of God's 99 names. Yet you reframed the very first proper noun, the very unique name Allah, the one most recognized among Muslims the world over, to a general name “God” – yes even though they are semantically equivalent in the same way that a proper noun is equivalent to a unique singular noun in representing that same singular entity but with a name.

Thus by your inconsistency of translation, while you acquaint the Western world with the Quranic name of the devil “Iblis”, you don't acquaint the Western world with the Quranic name of God, Allah. The reframing is clearly arbitrary and driven primarily by your overarching policy preferences for your translation project.

As you can clearly see, you do have an MRD (Marketing Requirements Document, see below) in which your overarching policy preference has been specified. This is why the same class of word is transliterated vs. reframed differently based entirely on personal bias and overarching policy preference rather than on a consistent value-free translation policy of how to handle similar words and proper nouns consistently in the translation process. While you claimed to be non-Sectarian and value-free in your translation implying you were presenting a very objective translation of the Holy Qur'an. But what I have just demonstrated unequivocally is that you have applied overarching policy preferences to the translation. This is discussed below.

But returning to the main point which I wish to emphasize here. Having direct domain expertise in the subject matter being translated
determines the credibility and fidelity of the translation, and not just expertise in the language of its expression which is taken for granted for any expert translator applying for a translation job.

For deriving your own logical arguments against the traditional understanding of 4:34 in your translation of the Holy Qur'an, you endeavored to acquire some domain expertise for that specific verse fragment in order to arrive at the most logical, sensible translation. Your utmost priority in that case was indeed Semantic Equivalence. You strived to achieve it. You didn't just do word look ups alone in your database, but you researched the Holy Qur'an, presumably from end to end, for gaining a deeper understanding of just that one single verse fragment in the entire context of the message of the Holy Qur'an.

And I maintain that one can't get away with not doing such due diligence in even far greater depth and deliberation for every single verse of the Holy Qur'an, all 6236 verses. Semantic Equivalence as the single unique invariant to uphold demands it. And that surely requires explicit masterful scholarship of the Holy Qur'an.

I would like to say that your argumentative logic for 4:34 based on citing 2:231 is prima facie sensible and wise. I can't refute it and nor would I wish to if it makes sense – but I am not a scholar, never mind erudite in the mysteries of the Holy Qur'an and Islam. If the Holy Qur'an has gone into such minutiae of what to do with your wife in the bedroom and other domestic matters, just as it has gone into other minutiae on legislative matters, it surely must have some Wisdom, some pertinence. I do not possess the domain expertise to comprehend it. I just seek the low hanging most visible fruits and that's plenty for me.

So – 'don't beat your wife' or 'divorce her amicably', is just as great a platitude as 'if you kill your wife you go to jail pal.'

The Ten Commandments didn't prevent any killings whatsoever.

Neither did the Bible.
And neither did the Holy Qur'an.

The early Muslims killed each other in the most horrendous inter-necine bloodshed right after the death of Prophet of Islam. Recall the bloody battles of Jaml, Siffin, Naharwan. In Jaml, the holy wife of the Prophet of Islam along with his many famous companions were pitted against the son in-law of the Prophet of Islam who also happened to be the Ameer-ul-momineen and 4th Caliph of the Muslims at that time. The Prophet's own grandson was mercilessly slaughtered along with all his male family members and children save one in the hot plains of Karbala by Qur'an toting Muslims. His womenfolk and children including the granddaughters of the Prophet of Islam, were mercilessly beaten up, incarcerated, dishonored, marched barefoot in chains to Damascus to the court of the Muslim caliph all the way from the burning plains of Mesopotamia by the same Qur'an toting Muslims. I believe you are more familiar with Muslim history than I.

You really can't be so naïve in making so much headline making public hoopla on 4:34 in the Western media as to believe that what's written in a holy book modulates crimes, greed, lust, power, among people do you?

And what happens in a bedroom is entirely of passion – the good and the bad. No Holy Book has moderated crimes of passion when reason is lost in anger any more than it has moderated the premeditated slaughter undertaken with full reasoned planning and heartless execution.

Anecdotally speaking, as a student at MIT decades ago, I spent an evening field trip for my psychology studies in Behavior Control with other students and professor Steve Chorover (http://bcs.mit.edu/people/chorover.html), in the Walpole prison near Boston. We were surrounded by the most respectable looking white folks attired in dinner jackets, smoking pipes and cigars. All had been convicted for manslaughter for crimes of passion, including murder. We didn't of course know it at the time what their crimes were as part of the study. More
to the point here, it does not matter what's written in any holy book – Muslims' or Christians' or Hindus' or Jews'. People will do what people will do in anger, and in premeditation. No moral code in a book can stop it.

It is your grave misconception that Muslims beat their wives because the Holy Qur'an gives them permission to beat their wives. Muslims also kill their wives, do honor killings of their children and family members, and a thousand other grotesque and equally criminal things in Muslim societies – and the Holy Qur'an strictly forbids it all.

And Muslims do no more horrendous acts than the pious Western Christians and holy Western Jews who commit the most heinous crimes, and monumental crimes against humanity which are on-going even as I write this. The white man today is calculatingly killing and raping far more Muslim women on a daily basis with “shock and awe”, drone attacks, military occupation, to the thunderous silence of Western champions of human rights than any Muslims assaulting their wives in domestic quarrels because of 4:34. But of course it is Islam which needs to be reformed first with a new translation of the Holy Qur'an. Daniel Pipes must be feeling rather pleased with himself for this fortuitous gift. More in part-3 below where your statement to Salem News “bring reform to Islam” is examined.

Reframing Allah to God and overarching policy preferences

Before I finally end this layman's dissection of your translation of the Holy Qur'an which I hope you will offer corrections for its misperceptions, I briefly wish to comment on your reframing of Allah to God in your translation.

In the aforementioned dissection, I have identified Semantic Equivalence as the holy grail of any translation system dependent only
upon the overarching goals and policies of the translation project, and not dependent upon the artifacts of the translation process.

Here I look at the overarching policy preferences which define the flavor and scope of the end product. In marketing terms, it is what would go into the MRD (Marketing Requirements Document) for any consumer product before its development is commissioned or undertaken.

The MRD policies depend entirely on the motivation for the translation which in turn determines the specific translation policies to use in the translation system. I will specifically limit my self to the translation of the Holy Qur'an and not speak in general terms.

For a most unusual spiritual living holy book which is read or recited daily in the vast majority of homes among the 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide, to attempt to translate the Holy Qur'an is a burden. A great burden which I am certain you have felt. No translator can escape feeling it.

It is a burden because it can make a great deal of impact. This impact can be both positive, as well as NEGATIVE.

Religion has been the most common Trojan Horse to control people from time immemorial. From the Dark Ages of Christianity to the modern times, we see all Holy Books abused for social and political control. Some of this is discussed in later parts.

Suffice it to say here that a Holy Book like the Holy Qur'an is not in a political and social vacuum. It is not just a religious issue. A new translation of the Holy Qur'an can just as easily be used as a tool of subversion and cognitive infiltration for “introducing beneficial cognitive diversity”, as for promulgating genuinely fresh translation full of innocence. The big words in that preceding sentence are borrowed from a Harvard Law professor who is or was President Obama's information tzar. He deemed the utility of what he called “beneficial cognitive diversity”, meaning promulgating dissension and de-focus in the guise of promoting diversity of views, of immense significance to
statecraft. He identified how to effectively use “cognitive infiltration” to subvert from within. It is not a new thing. It has existed for as long as mankind has existed. And every empire has subverted religion for imperial purposes. See Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization, Islam vs. Secular Humanism and World Government, Case Study in Mantra Creation and Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack? Part-I for how cognitive infiltration is made to work on your enemy's religion.

Even a superficial glance at history will show how it has worked on one's own religion to control one's own people in the name of religion. You have yourself made passing reference to Muslim history in one of your videos and how it has been ruled by successive tyrants save one in the often glorified Muslim dynastical empires of the 700 year supremacy of Muslims. The religion of Islam was their first point of subversion in order to rule. They employ both mercenaries as well as useful idiots for their agendas.

So when undertaking the translation of the Holy Qur'an, as when dealing with any consumer product to inform, to educate, to entertain, to make their lives easier, and to subvert, some overarching strategic policy calculus always goes into its MRD.

Very clearly, for your translation, The Sublime Quran, there were several key overarching policy points that you have described in your Preface which went into your translation project. Your Allah to God reframing was explicitly done according to those overarching policies and beliefs. Some may call it an agenda, or personal preference, or subjective bias, or the MRD requirement for defining the overall parameters of the translation project. These are all equivalent terms.

I will just briefly examine only the actual significance of your policy as I see it. All references are to your Preface. I invite you to refute it if you can. I invite you to converse with me in more depth if you wish. Or, if there is overriding benefit in what I say, then be convinced by it on the anvil of logic for your next most excellent edition of The Sublime Quran.
You say people in the West are unfamiliar with the word Allah, and for “inclusiveness”, you reframed Allah to God.

Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar, if in these times of information age and global village, people picking up the Holy Qur'an aren't able to tell that Allah means God, then God help them!

No learned Jewish Rabbi I suspect would ever reframe Yahweh, Jews' most sacred name for God, as anything but Yahweh, and with great religious and cultural pride. That's because the agenda of the Rabbis is to theologically unite the Jews of Diaspora, instill and affirm Jewish fraternal-hood, and make the goyems of the world aware of the Jewish heritage (among other matters). When I go to study Judaism, the first thing I learn is how to pronounce their name for God. And I learn it with respect and am quite happy to know it.

No learned Hindu Swami I suspect would ever reframe the names of all their gods into English “God”. So Ram has stayed Ram, Vishnu has stayed Vishnu, Ganpati Papa has remained Ganpati Papa and so on so forth. Even Bollywood movies which are watched with great interest in the West have endeavored to popularize the names of their Hindu gods with great cultural pride.

But look what you have accomplished:

- You did not teach in your translation of the Holy Qur'an that the name of its Author is pronounced Allah.

- You separated your Western Muslim audience not just from the Eastern Muslims who ubiquitously utter Allah at every street corner and a thousand times each day, but also from the beauty of uttering the name Allah as they read your translation.

- Imagine that your translation of the Holy Qur'an, or one like it with even more artifacts of “bring reform to Islam”, by the fiat of power became the equivalent of the King James Version of the Bible in the West. (see KJV in part 2) Even before one single generation has passed on, those weaned on such a
sanctioned translation of the Holy Quran will not know the word Allah. Perhaps they may also not know many things in the “reformed Islam”.

Just the aforementioned significance of your overarching policy trumps every single argument you have presented to the public in your Preface to justify your not using the name of Allah. I hope this alone is sufficient to convince you.

But permit me to continue.

If the real intent of your translation of the Holy Qur'an was to genuinely teach the religion of Islam as defined in the Holy Qur'an to Muslims of the West by bringing the words of the Holy Qur'an closer to them in their own native language, rather than merely be the Nobel prize winning intellectual reference book for the departments of Middle Eastern Studies in the over 2000 universities in America, then the first thing to teach would be the name Allah. Just as every Muslim child among the 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide is taught from the very first day of birth when Azaan is gently echoed in their ears.

Your policy itself is specious. Do you think that the suave Western Muslim who informs himself from your Holy Qur'an will never say Bismillah? Right there is the name of Allah shining through it. So what did you achieve by omitting it from the translation? Or have you primarily written this Qur'an for non-Muslims who couldn't care less?

As part of the virtuous practice of Islam, learning the beautiful 99 names of Allah is considered an act of worship. So is your translation of the Holy Qur'an merely for academic studies in American universities? They don't read the Holy Qur'an as an act of worship. At best for comparative religious studies. Even there they won't know from your translation that God is named Allah in Islam. But Muslims do read the Holy Qur'an as an act of worship. In fact, we tend to err in the opposite direction – we don't study it enough to uncover its meanings. So what did you achieve by masking the name Allah out from the translation?
A sensible self-aware translator who was genuinely concerned with all the matters listed in the Preface of The Sublime Quran could also have addressed them more effectively as follows:

- Required the reader picking up the Holy Qur'an for the first time to minimally get acquainted with how God is pronounced in Islam. It is pronounced as Allah.

- Provided a simple introduction page where it was explained that the name of God in Islam is Allah, that it is the same one God that all human beings think of when they think of a monotheist creator irrespective of their religion.

- Just as you employed the Preface to explain the virtues of your translation system, you could have devoted a page, right before the very first Surah to explain this so that no one would miss it.

You made the point that Muslims don't have monopoly on the word Allah and that others use it too. How is that relevant? Muslims don't care how many different religions use the word Allah for God in their translated works in Arabic. We are delighted that Christian Arabs and Jewish Arab use it. All we care is that we as Muslims use the word Allah for God because Allah has so defined it in his own religion of Islam for us Muslims.

For a translation of the Holy Qur'an to drop the word Allah is a travesty in the best case. It is agendist in the worst case – one which gels from supping with Daniel Pipes to come up with every possible specious reason for dropping Allah as among the baby steps for “moderate Islam”.

I understand that your work strives to speak to the average American who knows no better, who is so dumbed down that Allah has to be translated as God before he will understand the Holy Qur'an, or feel at home even opening it, and to be “inclusive” of all dumb jack asses too lazy to learn that the name used for God in Islam is Allah, but energetic enough to spend hours upon hours reading the Holy Qur'an.
Honestly, where will you find such a silly oxymoron even in America? Only in your imagination.

The zenith of any virtuous scholarship dictates not pandering to the lowest level of public intelligence, nor to anyone's ignorance. A scholarship must instead endeavor to pull the audience up, not lower itself to their level of ignorance in order to pander to the new mantra of “inclusiveness”. Another name for it is “beneficial cognitive diversity” and you cannot convince me otherwise. But I hope I have convinced you.

Part-2

Your reference to the King James Version of Bible (KJV)

I would like to comment at length on your repeated reference to the King James Bible which you have cited with some veneration in the Preface, in your reply letter “I was told by a friend that this is how they translated the KJV and that it is called formal equivalence.”, and elsewhere in your public interviews attempting to confer indirect credibility to your translation techniques by association. Or at least that is how it appears to me. You have repeated “I was told by a friend ...KJV” countless times, even in your reply letter to me. Apart from the fact that you also appear to be hedging when you caveat it with “I was told by a friend”, you also appear to be laboring under
considerable misperceptions.

I know only a little bit about the King James Version of the Bible – but what little I do know is quite sufficient for me to hold the following judgment unequivocally. I would like to share it with you.

KJV fixed into the Bible in English from its source renderings all the mumbo jumbo of Christian theology necessary for promulgating the British empire and its _la mission civilisatrice_. That's the first order overarching problem in the so called "seminal" translation of the Bible. It has been fixed by a King seeking empire. (see details below) Do you honestly believe that Jesus, had anything to do with empire or kings? Then how comes empire is rushing to adopt Jesus? Only because the “Jesus” they are adopting serves their interests. And endless generations of people will be born and socialized into that officially sanctioned “Jesus” with utmost piety and faith.

Moreover there is absolutely no internal consistency of thought in it. Show me internal consistency in the Holy Bible for the translational properties you claim, even for syntax and vocabulary, writing style, never mind semantics! One would of course have to also study the original in order to demonstrate those imaginary translational properties for the translated version now won't one?

Who has access to the original sources? Can you access and read the Greek and who knows which other texts that went into the translation source set?

Thus anyone can make any academic claim about the Bible and get away with it. The claims cannot be authenticated so why not make them. They can write papers and publish them in respectable journals – who is gonna be able to verify it? They can even offer its purity of translation method as the reason for KJV's longevity too. Or the blessings of the Holy Ghost as the reason for its longevity.

However those who have studied history and the power of empires to promulgate their values ought to know better about how religion is used.
The reason for the longevity of KJV translation has little to do with the “purity” of its translation process or its linguistics. No doubt the Holy Bible inspires immense faith among believing Christians just as the Holy Qur'an inspires among believing Muslims. For Christian people of faith, such matters as the method “they translated the KJV and that it is called formal equivalence.” is totally irrelevant, whether that statement is true or not. It plays no role in their faith. No Christian reads the Bible for its linguistic content. They read it because it is the word of God for them. It is their prayer book and that's the end of it. As a prayer book, it is as Holy to the Christians as the Qur'an is Holy to the Muslims. They each accept the religion they open their eyes in and are socialized into.

Empiricism indicates that the reason for the longevity of KJV translation and its global ubiquity had a lot to do with the East India Company and Britannia's la mission civilisatrice upon the 'untermenschen' which they carried on for 400 years.

That mission has evidently now been taken over by the legatees of the previous empire in exactly the same fashion – watch this video of the mission of “Jesus” to Afghanistan, and read this report by Jeremy Scahill. Billy Graham's son spoke of bringing bread and “Jesus” to Iraq in 2003 with such missionary zeal that I felt I was seeing the East India Company operate under a new flag to bring the latest edition of KJV to the Muslims.

I know the white man's burden all too well. Lord Macaulay separated us in the Indo subcontinent from our native languages proclaiming (reproducing the quote already given for the emphasis it deserves): “that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia.” And the white man taught us English in the sub-continent at the نیزه (point of a lance) of colonialism. Even today the Muslims are more familiar with the Bible than the West is familiar with the Holy Qur'an.

That system of occupation and colonization, the free trade mantra
of the East India Company backed by the naval armada of home Britannia, is the real unhidden secret of why KJV is ubiquitous today. Not because of linguistics or purity of translation or other such silly nonsense. But because of empire. It is the same way as when the Bible became ubiquitous in the Roman Empire, and thereafter as the Crusaders' legacy.

If you read the modern day Bible, including the “new” ones derived from KJV with any degree of interest and fascination, you would already know that the New Testament is a hodge-podge, nay a veritable kitchen sink of ideas which has misled the modern Christians even in understanding their own lofty religion of Jesus. This is independent of faith. People believe in all sorts of things and are willing to die for their beliefs. This is looking analytically at what it's actually saying. See for instance this nonsense [tinyurl.com/islam-knowledge-socialization#Submit-to-Authority-Honor-the-King] sermon for promulgating servitude to the rulers, drawn directly from the KJV Bible Romans 13. A sermon that is reigning supreme in the West's police states today to corral its good citizenry to obedience to tyranny.

Or witness the criminal support for Christian Zionism that is dug out from the verses of the Bible by America's Bible Belt for directly aiding in the dispossession and genocide of an innocent peoples from their own ancestral homeland even while the rest of the world watches. The former President George W. Bush's largest electoral base was in the Evangelical Bible Belt which is demonizing Islam on a daily basis. Have you watched the 700 Club? They brought him to power twice.

The Evangelical pastor in Florida even had Qur'an burning festivities. The pastor's book, titled “Islam is of the Devil”, is a direct outcome of using the Holy Bible to demonize the Muslims and our religion. I don't know what exactly they draw upon from the Bible to malign the religion of Islam and Muslims, but 700 Club et. al., are always holding the KJV prayer book in one hand while they berate
Muslims and the religion of Islam with the other. They are today the lead drum-beaters for “reforming Islam” (my next topic below)

All these KJV endorsed matters the moral Christians, those human beings with any inner moral compass, find appalling and disgusting. But they evidently also find maintaining dignified silence as the better part of valor.

The following are statements of fact which gave birth to KJV. English was just many broken dialects which could not even be understood by people of the same immediate geography in 1600 AD, until Francis Bacon/Shakespeare/King James I (all these names overlap in time and whether nom de plumes or not, these literary identities shared the same agendas for language promulgation as the King) made concerted efforts to create a new vocabulary and standard language for the empire being birthed.

The Bible translation sanctioned by the King, and the Shakespeare plays, were the two most significant language contributions for promulgating the new imperial lingua franca and the imperial State religion to the rest of the world. This motivation is little different than the first canonical compilation of the Bible which was sanctioned by the Council of Nicea to adopt Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire. So let me repeat that aforementioned statement once again: Do you honestly believe that Jesus, had anything to do with empire? Then how comes empire is rushing to adopt Jesus? Only because the “Jesus” they are adopting serves their interests. And endless generations of people will be born and socialized into that officially sanctioned “Jesus”!

Do we care what methods of academic purity the Council of Nicea employed to standardize the New Testament as it exists today? Which, as legend goes (as documented in the book Jesus Prophet of Islam by Muhammad Ata Ur Rahman if I recall correctly), the Council of Nicea prayed to the Holy Ghost to guide them in the selection of the most accurate gospels which most closely endorsed Trinity. It is
recorded, perhaps only anecdotally I am not sure since it sounds entirely absurd, that the Council at the end of their deliberations, finally put all existent gospels in a room, locked the door from outside, invited the Holy Ghost to sort out the most authentic rendering of the teachings of the Father and the Son and to percolate those gospels to the top of the stack, unlocked the door next day, picked up the top four gospels as the official sanctioning of the Holy Ghost of divine Christianity for all mankind for all times, and burned all the rest. The top four just happened to be Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John – all advocating Pauline Christianity, the Holy Trinity, or not inimical to it.

If we are sensible, do we not examine the final result at the end of any process to adjudicate the goodness of the process itself? Or, do we blindly adjudicate the result by the supposed purity of the process – irrespective of what result we get?

Do we assume the fruit is sweet just because the gardener has done his due diligence in watering the tree?

Or do we go by the sensible saying, the proof of the pudding is in the eating?

In the case of the Council of Nicea, we see that a great deal of self-serving selectivity went into that original Bible compilation which has now ruled Christendom in every language for over 1700 years. That is the source base for KJV.

The near universality of the Bible among 3 billion Christians, the largest religious group on earth today, is no more a testimony to the method of its astonishing compilation by super-natural forces for the veritable teachings of noble Jesus than KJV is for its 17th century re-rendering.
Part-3

Your interview with Tim King of Salem News and “bring reform to Islam”

You made an interesting hypothetical argument for your famous verse 4:34 in your interview to Salem News [2]:

'LB: First of all, I asked: When this verse was revealed to the blessed Prophet, who was unlettered, did he sit back and say: Let me see. Is this a transitive or intransitive verb? No. We know from his behavior that he “went away.”'

While the Prophet of Islam may have been christened “unlettered”, ummi, he was also the harbinger of a grammatically correct Holy Qur'an which has in fact, defined the grammar for the Arabic language and who would know this more than translator of the Holy Qur'an. Do you seriously imagine that the Prophet of Islam was merely a glorified parrot when he uttered the directives of God from his “unlettered” mouth?

For heaven's sake, the Prophet of Islam is also called the “Speaking Qur'an”. A speaking Qur'an which does not know its own grammar?

Why preface your comment in that interview statement with the word “unlettered” unless you meant to imply that the Speaking Qur'an didn't understand the lovely language of the Holy Qur'an, or its imposing grammar, or its unmatched syntax, but only its semantics? Does that make any logical sense? Or does it indicate an absurdity looming up?
Please refer to the very first revelation of the very first verse of the Holy Qur'an: ‘‘Read in the name of your Lord Who created.’’ (Surah Al-Alaq 96:1) Is the Author of the Holy Qur'an clowning around that It tells Its own Prophet to ‘‘Iqra’’, Read, if the Prophet can't ‘‘Iqra’’? I will leave you as the expert in Arabic etymology to figure out all the many meanings of ‘‘Iqra’’. At least one of them, the most common, is to Read. Suffice it to suggest here that ‘‘unlettered’’ semantics can only mean the Prophet had no human teacher. The Prophet of Islam's teacher was the Author of the Holy Qur'an directly. The One who made Muhammad His Ullul Azam Prophet and taught him all the ilm. It was confirmed by the Prophet of Islam himself: ‘‘Ana madinatul ilmi ...’’ I am the city of knowledge. Otherwise, how could the Author of the Holy Qur'an command the Prophet to ‘‘Read in the name of your Lord’’ if the Prophet couldn't read?

Therefore, all allegations, insinuations, snide remarks, and gratuitousprefacingof any kind which imply directly or indirectly that the Prophet of Islam was illiterate, or could not Read, or didn't understand the grammar of the Holy Qur'an even when he is himself the Speaking Qur'an, or that he was just a talking parrot of Islam, are at best misinformed.

Moreover, no talking parrot would ever be commanded to be obeyed at the same level of precedence as the Author of the Holy Qur'an Himself: ‘‘يا أيها الذين آمنوا أطيعوا الله وأطيعوا الرسول’’ (O you who believe! obey Allah and obey the Messenger verse fragment Surah An-Nisa 4:59). Unless of course if one now wishes to call Allah an absurd deity who on the one hand gives command obedience precedence to His Ullul Azam Messenger equal to His own command obedience, and on the other hand deprives his Messenger of the ilm to match that comparable command obedience stature.... driving one deeper and deeper into the pit of ignominy.

Q.E.D.
Dear Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar: No respectable translator of the Holy Qur'an can obviously be unaware of such straightforward low hanging fruits of the Holy Qur'an about the Prophet of Islam. Therefore, I hope that I only hastily misunderstood your gratuitously prefacing of “unlettered” to the hypothetically constructed rhetorical question: 'When this verse was revealed to the blessed Prophet, who was unlettered, did he sit back and say: Let me see. Is this a transitive or intransitive verb? No. We know from his behavior'. And that you naturally agree one hundred percent with the unarguable logic I have demonstrated above.

Perhaps you might consider leaving a clarifying amendment with Tim King to be posted in the same interview so that no one comes away with the grotesque misimpression that an expert grammarian translator of the Holy Qur'an has thought the Prophet of Islam himself did not know the grammar of the very Qur'an of which he was the sole Exemplar, and that the translator of the Holy Qur'an knows more than the Messenger of Allah. People nowadays will believe any absurdity if presented by an “expert”.

Your statement “bring reform to Islam”

You made another disturbing statement in that interview to Salem News which is an outright gift to the likes of “moderate Islam” flag bearers such as Daniel Pipes: 'Yes, of course, Tim. And I would like to add that the other problem I have faced here in the States is that mainstream publishers and their agents are often not supportive of the attempt by American Muslims to bring reform to Islam. I would hope that this would change in time.'

The Western hegemons have the mantra of “reforming Islam” and you have the desire to “bring reform to Islam.” I am deeply disturbed by this synergy. For the translator of the Holy Qur'an to be relaying the same message as the agents of empire that is bombing Muslim na-
tions to smithereens while carrying to them their *la mission civilisatrice*, is unforgivable. Any time anyone uses the words “*bring reform to Islam*” in the media, I sense either an agent or asset of empire, or a useful idiot.

Please see my carefully researched work in this domain if unfamiliar with what I speak of. Here is a link [3] to a very detailed study in psychological warfare. The link directly points to a section within it titled *Taking a Deeper Look into the Dynamics of Mantra Creation: Islamofascism*. It unarguably demonstrates the clear diabolical abuse of the word “Islam”. You have inadvertently heaped the exact same abuse as Bernard Lewis of Princeton who wrote the famous book: “Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror”, and the late Samuel Huntington of Harvard made famous among Muslims by his book “The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order”

You surely could not have meant 'reform the religion of Islam' for which the Holy Qur'an stated: “This day have I perfected for you your religion and completed My favor on you and *chosen for you Islam as a religion*;” (Arabic انَّ الْيَومَ أُكْلِمْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ مِنْ ذَٰلِكَ وَٰمِسِيرُكُمْ إِلَّآ إِسْلَامٍ Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Maida 5:3 )

**You are going to reform what Allah [perfected]?**

You surely must have meant to say 'reform the misunderstandings among the Muslims regarding Islam.'

Then why not just say exactly what you mean?

Does the statement “*bring reform to Islam*” mean the same thing as *'bring reform to Muslims'* to a grammarian and linguist who has translated the Holy Qur'an from Arabic into English which requires expert syntax AND semantics command of both languages?

The word “Islam” is different from the word “Muslim” even though they might share the same root. One is not interchangeable with the other. Who more than the translator of the Holy Qur'an would know that fact! Yet you made that mistake by stating: *“bring reform*
Dear Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar: Why do you gratuitously overload the semantics of the word Islam in this way? I have heard you repeat your “reform Islam” mantra line time and again and therefore I know that unlike the previous case examined above, this utterance mistake is not just a mis-spoke. As a professional psychologist with a Ph.D. in that discipline, you surely cannot be unaware of the power of psychological warfare.

The study link which I mentioned above meticulously dissects how the word “Islam” is Machiavellianly misused to synthesize the mantra of “militant Islam”. The Hegelian Dialectic of that is “moderate Islam” and its flag-bearer is “reform Islam”. Please read the subsection titled: 'The Collateral Damage to Language for Synthesizing the Doctrinal Motivation of Islamofascism' as part of this letter. That entire subsection is immediately pertinent and is not merely a study reference. It is incorporated into this letter by reference.

When one is not part of that imperial game, one might think it prudent to not inadvertently contribute gratuitous ammunition to that game.

You surely cannot be unaware of the larger political context in which the mantra of “reform Islam” is being pushed forward in the West. Every time you utter the words “bring reform to Islam” you will find the agendist and the news media flocking to you like flies drawn to sweet sweet honey. Haven't you noticed it already? If not, do look for them – these will be all the “reform” oriented closet Secular Humanists (from both the Left and the Right) praising your work, the various feminists who have little to do with practicing Islam in their own lives but will be advocating for your saintly mantra of “bring reform to Islam.”

Therefore, sanity, wisdom, and commonsense in these diabolical times indicate to not make so much public hoopla about your eureka moment on 4:34 whose practical utility itself is nil as already demon-
Glamorizing this issue in the West, as you have evidently been doing over the past four years – it's the first thing for instance which is brought up in your interview with Tim King at Salem News as if that's the sum total of your work in The Sublime Quran, and look at the eye catching propagandizing title of the Sunday Times of 2007 cited at the very top – is hardly going to be beneficial to Muslims. Is that your interest – to be of benefit to Muslims? We neither benefit from your translation of the Holy Qur'an as I have already demonstrated in part-1 above, and nor do we benefit from your “bring reform to Islam.”

Even if you are an American Muslim and you feel that you have nothing to do with other backward Eastern Muslim nations who use 4:34 to beat their wives, and that your interest is only the Western English enabled progressive and suave Muslims of America who don't use 4:34 to beat their wife, then may I remind you that America today is a police state. And your country is waging perpetual wars upon many Muslim nations simultaneously. The casualty incurred by “shock and awe”, in drone attacks, and in prison and judicial abuses upon Eastern Muslim women whose human rights you are so concerned about far outstrip any injuries in domestic abuse pertinent to 4:34. The sheer number of Muslim women killed, raped, incarcerated, made homeless, and deprived of their loved ones since 9/11 by American bombs doesn't seem to bother very many American women activists.

The abuse suffered by this frail woman who was sentenced to 86 years in prison by an American judge evokes few expressions of genuine sympathy from American women championing women's rights among Muslims in our Muslim countries.

Today, almost all Western champions of human rights for our Muslim nations only carry the empire's message, its la mission civilisatrice, its white man's burden. Muslims of the East remain unimpressed.
Anyone shouting “reform Islam”, “moderate Islam” is an asset, agent, stooge, or useful idiot of empire's Hegelian Dialectic.

We have plenty of native informants and house negroes in our Muslim nations who echo the same message. And they derive much mileage in empire's media, its universities, its talk show circuits, its think tanks, etc. More and more Western Muslims are daily joining that group. I have written a detailed FAQ describing the characteristics of the 'Intellectual Negro', my neologism, to identify a mutated strain of the house negro which is new to modernity:

'This Negro, the “Intellectual Negro”, is very sophisticated, and often very intelligent with advanced academic and/or public credentials. [He or She] will appear to be an outspoken voice of dissent in favor of the downtrodden and the oppressed, typically from the 'left-liberal' nexus, but will still devilishly manage to echo the massa's core message.'

Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar, thank you very much for your time. If I have misperceived, misinterpreted, or just got it plain wrong, I would be most happy if you would offer corrections. Where I am correct, I thank my Creator Allah for His many gifts which feebly enabled me to articulate the truths in this letter in the state of fasting such that you agreed they were truthful. Where I made a mistake, I beg your forgiveness.

May Allah reward you and your family for your strivings for Haq.

Best wishes,

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

California
Correspondence with Laleh Bakhtiar

To: laleh@bakhtiar.org
From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org
Subject: The Sublime Quran
Date: Thu, Aug 4, 2011 at 7:36 PM

Dear Dr. Laleh,

Assalaam Alekum, Ramadan Mubarik.

I am writing you because today I purchased a copy of The Sublime Quran, your translation of the Holy Qur'an, and would like to ask a question pertaining to your translation.

I purchased your book after reading the Preface as it impressed me immediately. When I looked at the fruit of your method of formal equivalence by turning to one of my favorite surah's, I was puzzled. And I write to inquire if you might perhaps explain it. Surah Al-Asr, 103, you have translated "وَعَمِلُوا الصَّلِيمَات" as "and ones who have acted in accord with morality". How did pious deeds, or righteous deeds, or good works translate as "accord with morality"? They are not equivalent by any means. I am not a linguist but the meaning each brings to mind is completely different. Especially when you exactly noted in the Preface that other translations suffered from interpretation and you were going to adhere to strict formal equivalence? This is what attracted me to your translation.

If you can kindly explain your reasoning for that choice of word, I can
better understand other cases of "unusual" translation which will surely arise as I read through your momentous work.

May Allah reward you and your family for your strivings for Haq.

Best wishes,

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

California

---

To: “Project Humanbeingsfirst.org”

From: Laleh Bakhtiar laleh@bakhtiar.org

Subject: The Sublime Quran

Date: Fri, Aug 5, 2011 at 3:44 AM

Dear Zahir Ebrahim,

Alaykum salam. Ramadan mubarak to you and yours, as well.

Thank you for your question.

You will find the 129 times that salah appears, the word is translated the same depending upon whether or not it is the perfect form of the verb or active participle.

As I mentioned in the Preface, I began with the words in order to assure internal consistency and reliability in the translation. I was told by a friend that this is how they translated the KJV and that it is called formal equivalence.
I had asked fifty friends to describe what “righteous” means and none of them could do so. It means: morally right or acting in accord with moral law or characterized by morality. Therefore, I arrived at one who does or acts in accord with morality.

I hope this answers your question.

Peace,

Laleh Bakhtiar, Ph. D.

---

Footnotes
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Appendix-A: Letter to the Distributor of Laleh Bakhtiar's Sublime Quran

To: Kazi Publishers and Distributors Chicago info@kazi.org

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Subject: Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran By Zahir Ebrahim

Date: Tue, Aug 9, 2011 at 12:27 AM

Dear Kazi Publishers,

Assalaam Alekum. Ramadan Mubarak.

I noted that you are featuring the beautiful cover of The Sublime Quran on the front page of your website and you are also listed as Distributors on its copyright page. Therefore, I would like to draw your kind attention to my detailed critique of the translation. Its URL for online and PDF are listed below. The critique was sent to Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar and an excerpt of the critique is reproduced below. It was also shared with many Muslim mosque boards and Muslim organizations with an introduction letter prefacing it which is what I am sending you.

Thank you for your time.

Zahir Ebrahim.

California

---------- Appended Letter ----------
From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 5:39 PM

Subject: Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran By Zahir Ebrahim

To: Muslim mosque boards, Muslim organizations, and Muslim friends and colleagues

AsSalaam O Alekum.

I have written a very detailed critique of an English translation of the Holy Quran called The Sublime Quran using my standard for evaluation, inter alia, Surah Al-Asr.

This English translation is written by a very famous American Muslim woman scholar who has translated dozens of inaccessible Eastern Muslim scholarship into English, including from Farsi, some of which I have greatly benefited from myself. Her name is Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar and she is (or was) a protégé of Seyyed Hossein Nasr, University Professor, The George Washington University, when Nasr was teaching at Tehran University in 1964.

If you are into reading books, or browsing books in your mosque bookstore, you would be quite familiar with the name Laleh Bakhtiar. That is what first prompted me to pick up her translation of the Holy Qur'an in my local bookstore just a few days ago as I went to purchase a copy to read and study during this blessed month of Ramadan. The Preface of her translation fascinated me, so instead of purchasing what I intended to purchase, a big print copy of Shakir's translation which I find easiest to read in English, I purchased her's. I brought it home and said to myself, let me see how she has translated Surah Asr, my favorite Surah, before I spend my time reading the rest.

And that's when I immediately wrote her my first inquiry letter. She graciously replied the very next day. And that has led to this 36 page
critique which I wrote between the 4th of Ramadan and today, the 8th of Ramadan, August 8, 2011. I am only copying the beginning excerpt from the letter I sent to Laleh Bakhtiar containing my critique. If you are interested in perceptively understanding how religion and empire politically intersect, why we are suddenly seeing new translations of the Holy Quran in English by people not fully equipped to undertake such a momentous burden, why we have the "reform Islam" mantra being taken up from Left to Right by even pious holy men and holy women to complement no-religion friends like Pervez Hoodbhoy, Daniel Pipes, Bernard Lewis, et. al., then you might click on the Read more link below. You will surely not be disappointed at the heavy overdose of intellectual vitamins it shall offer you for reflection. To swallow or not is as always, your own choice.

Thank you for your time,

with best wishes,

Zahir Ebrahim

---------- Appended Letter ----------

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Aug 8, 2011 at 4:30 PM
Subject: Your translation of verse 103:3 تَرَحَّلَوا الصُّلُحَت in The Sublime Quran
To: Laleh Bakhtiar  laleh@bakhtiar.org
Cc: Seyyed Hossein Nasr University Professor The George Washington University  msirat@gwu.edu

Kazi Publisher's Reply

To: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com
From: Kazi Publications info@kazi.org
Subject: Re: Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran By Zahir Ebrahim
Date: Tue, Aug 9, 2011 at 5:20 AM

Alaykum salam.

Ramadan mubarak to you and your family as well.
Thank you for your email. I will respond once I have a chance to go through it.
Wassalam.
Liaquat Ali
Manager
Zahir’s Response

To: Kazi Publications info@kazi.org
From: Project Humanbeingfirst.org
Subject: Re: Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran By Zahir Ebrahim
Date: Thu, Aug 11, 2011 at 9:07 AM

To: Kazi Publications

Dear Mr. Liaqat Ali, Manager,

Assalaam Alekum. Thank you for your quick reply and good wishes. Once again same to you and your family. I look forward to: “I will respond once I have a chance to go through it.”

By way of this letter I would just like to take the time to advise Kazi Publications, the distributor of Laleh Bakhtiar's The Sublime Quran, of the fact that I returned my purchase of the same to the bookstore (Barnes and Noble). The reason for this return is stated in the Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran: “I plan to return the 6th Edition, 2009 I purchased back to the bookstore as a totally unsatisfactory product.”

Below are some comments on what I discovered browsing your excellent website in relation to this subject.

I found it revealing that kazi.org has featured this translation of the Holy Quran on its front page with glowing recommendations from re-
viewers none of whom appear to be Muslim scholars of the religion of Islam. The fact that the only named review Kazi publications could put up for this translation of the Holy Quran, Product ID: 3288, is by this academic: William O. Beeman, Professor and Chair of Anthropology and specialist in Middle East Studies at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis-St. Paul Minnesota, formerly of Brown University ---- is telling. [William O. Beeman's own description of his erudite qualifications to judge an English translation of the Holy Qur'an is revealing: “I am a specialist in Middle East Studies, Japanese Studies, Central Asian Studies, linguistics, performance studies, and I am also a professional opera singer.”]

I am actually not surprised that no well known Muslim scholar of the religion of Islam in the West or the East could be found to write a positive review good enough to sell this book by its own distributor.

In fact, the omission of any endorsement from the most famous person that Laleh Bakhtiar cites and credits for getting her started on the path to Islam back in Tehran in 1964, S. H. Nasr, speaks volumes.

She draws association to this most prominent and respected scholar of Islam continually, including in the Preface “Seyyed Hossein Nasr for his spiritual presence in the life of this translator”. His name is even mentioned in the very second sentence of her wikipedia entry: “Born to an American mother and Iranian father in New York, Bakhtiar grew up in Los Angeles and Washington, D.C., as a Catholic. At the age of 24, moved to Iran with her Iranian husband, an architect, and their three children, where she began to study Islam under her teacher and mentor, Dr. Seyyed Hossein Nasr at Tehran University, studying Quranic Arabic, eventually converting in 1964.”

Having such a distinguished scholar as “teacher and mentor” surely must be Allah's great blessing. One should feel honored to mention their teacher. But the innocent public name dropping also sets public expectations. And we see that even though the same "teacher and mentor" who is Alhamdolillah still living, teaching, mentoring, as
University Professor at The George Washington University (http://www.gwu.edu/~religion/faculty/index.cfm#nasr), does not seem to have his review posted on kazi.org. A pretty strong indictment I should say, if silence itself is permitted to speak.

There are at least 41 English Translations of the Holy Quran which I can list, not counting all the new ones being introduced in America to “bring reform to Islam”. That is Laleh Bakhtiar's own quote from her interview with Salem News. Some of these translations are quite inimical to Islam, like Sale's – I am sure he also wanted to “bring reform to Islam”. And some just incredible enduring works of service to all mankind, like Shakir's and Yusuf Ali's. No Muslim ever reads Sale's translation to inform themselves of what's in the Arabic Holy Qur'an, for if they have any knowledge of imperialism, they well understand its “orientalism”. I should say that Laleh Bakhtiar's translation reeks of “occidentosis”.

If that new English word sounds unfamiliar, one can gain familiarity with it by reading the book: “Occidentosis – A Plague From The West By JALAL AL-I AHMAD” [PDF], Translated by R Campbell, Introduction by Hamid Algar, written 1961 in Iran and banned until published after the Iranian Revolution. Mizan Press 1984. Evidently, a majority of Iranians in Iran have inoculated themselves well against this infestation of the mind which once plagued their entire society before the Iranian Revolution. Today, its few mutated strains sadly still continue to infect many of Iranian heritage living in Diaspora.

The very first introductory statement for The Sublime Quran, Product ID: 4607, carried on the very front page of kazi.org reads: “Laleh Bakhtiar This is the first edition of the Quran translated by an American woman. This modern, inclusive translation refutes past translations that have been used to justify violence against women.” I am not sure who has the capacity to evaluate reviewer comments at Kazi.org, no name is mentioned under that review, but it is an ignorant lede statement. The Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran goes into the specifics of why it is ignorant. And my new article: Hijacking the
word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation situates that calculated ignorance in the global context in which the war on terror is being fought, Muslims maligned, and Islamophobia spread, precisely to demand “bring re-form to Islam”.

With continued best wishes for this blessed month of Ramadan,

Zahir Ebrahim
Project Humanbeingsfirst.org
California

---

Zahir's Followup Letter a month later after being greeted by stoned silence from all quarters

To: Kazi Publications info@kazi.org

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Subject: Re: Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran By Zahir Ebrahim

Date: Mon, Sep 12, 2011 at 1:19 AM

Dear Kazi Publishers, Mr. Liaqat Ali,

Assalaam Alekum. Eid Mubarak,

This is regarding your featuring The Sublime Quran as a bookseller and distributor. I just wanted to let you know that I sent multiple letters to various Muslim scholars to review Laleh Bakhtiar's The Sub-
lime Quran. It is unsurprising that none have responded thus far. You may find these letters here:

Letter to Hamid Algar inviting comment on Laleh Bakhtiar's Translation of the Holy Qur'an By Zahir Ebrahim

Letter to Ali Quli inviting comment on Laleh Bakhtiar's Translation of the Holy Qur'an By Zahir Ebrahim

Letter to S H Nasr on his silence on Laleh Bakhtiar's Translation of the Holy Qur'an

My previous letter to you concerning the absence of Muslim Qur'anic scholar reviewers on your own website is here:

Letter to the Distributor of Laleh Bakhtiar's Translation of the Holy Qur'an By Zahir Ebrahim

Just for completeness, my two cents worth of critique is here:

Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran

And the political science which contains both Laleh Bakhtiar's translation of the Holy Qur'an, as well as her gratuitous mantra of “bring reform to Islam” in synchronicity with the rise of Islamophobia and neo-cons calls for "moderate Islam", is here:

Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation

The latest two reports on the rise of Islamophobia in America, from CAIR, and from Americanprogress, both play in the same cesspool of political science and this can be gleaned respectively in the following two letters to them:

CAIR Documenting Islamophobia on the rise in the USA – Calling CAIR to Account for its Omissions By Zahir Ebrahim

Zahir Ebrahim's response to Fear, Inc. The Roots of the Islamophobia Network in America

And like yours, their only response to challenge is silence. Islam is big business in America and salesmen and scholars alike peddle in its
wares.

This is my last self-initiated correspondence to you. If you have any questions, please feel free to write.

Best wishes,

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Appendix-B: Letters to Scholars of Islam challenging them to break their stone-silence on Laleh Bakhtiar's translation of the Holy Qur'an

To: Seyyed Hossein Nasr, University Professor, The George Washington University msirat@gwu.edu

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Subject: Your silence when Laleh Bakhtiar is selling her ignorant translation of the Holy Qur'an by drawing association to your name is silent endorsement

Date: Thu, Aug 25, 2011 at 11:20 AM

Dear Dr. Nasr,

Assalaam Alekum,

The following letter was sent to Kazi Publications in Chicago, the distributors of Laleh Bakhtiar's translation of the Holy Qur'an titled The Sublime Quran. As you can glean in the letter, your evaluation of the translation is nowhere to be found. Your silence, and absence of challenge to the translation, is an endorsement by default in the mind of many people.

Therefore, I would like to request your public comment on her translation. As just an ordinary human being who has looked at the translation and found it not only wanting in fidelity to the original, but its author seemingly pursuing an agenda which by her own admission is to “bring reform to Islam”, what worldly considerations hold an ex-
pert back when the word of God perfected by the statement 5:3 of the Holy Qur'an and revered by 1.6 Billion Muslims, is targeted for "reform"? As you are well aware, that agenda is shared by Daniel Pipes, Bernard Lewis, and the late Samuel Huntington et. al., all circus clowns beating the Hegelian Dialectic "militant Islam" vs. "moderate Islam" to “bring reform to Islam”. The import of this shared message is deconstructed in my article: Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation.

Please review the following correspondence with Kazi Publishers and you will realize why your silence must be broken. When scholars of Islam remain silent, us poor plebeians have to take up their slack with limited or zero impact. As you are well aware, the world today bows before “experts” – even when they spew garbage. The Muslim condition today is the most deplorable of any time in history – our pulpits are today almost universally occupied by such “experts”. In that milieu, when genuine knowledgeable experts speak, their opinion carries far for people pay attention – just as they pay attention to useful idiots and mercenaries. When a genuine expert's name is used to draw associations and credibility to oneself, the expert's silence is aiding and abetting those who do so. And when such scholars also remain silent when the religion is being abused, they condemn themselves by their silence. The test of integrity is daily, constant, and al Furqan invites us to this test daily, constantly, by [inter alia] nahin anil munkar and amar bil maroof.

Most Sincerely,
Zahir Ebrahim
Project Humanbeingsfirst.org
California

To: Sayyid Ali Quli Qarai, Translator of the Holy Qur’an, Centre for Translation of the Holy Qur’an, Iran altawhid@gmail.com

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Subject: Translation of the Holy Qur'an

Date: Sat, Sep 3, 2011 at 12:45 PM

Dear Mr. Ali Quli Qarai,

AsSalaam o Alekum.

I would like to invite your learned comment on my layman's opinion of the translation of the Holy Qur'an titled: *The Sublime Quran*, done by the well-known American-Iranian Psychologist and prolific translator of religious books into English, Dr. Laleh Bakhtiar, who has publicly declared her intentions to “bring reform to Islam”.

My layman's opinion in the form of a letter of critique written to Laleh Bakhtiar, is at this URL:


My letter written to The Sublime Quran's Distributor, Kazi Publica-
tion in Chicago, is at this URL:


My letter written to the respected American-Iranian scholar whom Laleh Bakhtiar acknowledged as her first mentor in the Preface of her translation “Seyyed Hossein Nasr for his spiritual presence in the life of this translator”, inviting his comment on the translation done by his own protégé, is at this URL:


As a translator of the Holy Qur'an yourself, and unfortunately I have not had the privilege of browsing it as I have not found a copy easy to acquire, your opinion in this matter will be most valuable.

Moreover, your publicly voiced comment on *The Sublime Quran* will be of far greater import to the public coming from another translator of the Holy Qur'an, than from an ordinary person.

I noticed that you sought, or were given unsolicited, terrific endorsements for your own translation of the Holy Qur'an by other scholars of Islam (http://www.imamreza.net/eng/imamreza.php?id=1389). That is great 'amr bil maroof'. What about 'nahn anil munkar' however when a situation calls for it? The stoned silence of scholars on this matter is not only disturbing, but outright condemning as well of pursuing self-interests and nothing more. The same scholars who wrote nice praise for your translation, Dr Muhammad Legenhausen, Prof. Hamid Algar, appear to be silent for Laleh Bakhtiar's translation – or at least I haven't been able to locate their comments on it. I hope you will be more forthright in your opinion – for scholars will surely be the first ones waiting in a long line to Account for every word they spoke, and did not speak by omission.

Finally, I would like to humbly invite your learned comment on my on-going study, being just an ordinary layman of course and not a
scholar, of Why it is Easy to Hijack the Holy Qur'an. Here are the URLs for two parts completed thus far:


Thank you for your time. May Allah reward you generously for your strivings on the path of Haq.

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

California


To: Hamid Algar, Professor of Persian and Islamic Studies. Near Eastern Studies and Persian Literature. Islamic culture, religion, philosophy, Sufism and the Qur'an. Department of Near Eastern Studies, UC Berkeley algar@berkeley.edu

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Subject: Translation of the Holy Qur'an

Date: Sat, Sep 3, 2011 at 1:31 PM

520 Muslims and Imperial Mobilization
Dear Prof. Algar,

AsSalaam o Alekum.

I am forwarding you the following letter which I just wrote to Mr. Ali Quli Qarai. It cites your endorsement of his English translation of the Holy Qur'an and notes your silence on another translation by someone whom you are surely more familiar with as a scholar of Islam than I as just merely an ordinary plebeian.

And I would like to make the same humble request to you as I make to Mr. Ali Quli Qarai. As someone who has benefited from your imposing work, having read some of them, your public comment on this matter is most pertinent. If you have already publicly commented on *The Sublime Qur'an*, I would be most grateful if you would kindly forward me your comment as I have been unable to locate it by google search.

Silence speaks volumes on many fronts. To me it speaks mainly of co-option in these times when Islam and Muslims are being assaulted on all fronts by way of deception, and with bombs, and not of profound wisdom of a sage living in ivory towers or detached from the mayhem. It matters little what else people speak on, or do, when they remain silent on what they must speak on and don't do – a truism you will surely agree with wholeheartedly.

I would send this letter to Dr Muhammad Legenhausen as well, the other person who is referenced in my letter to Ali Quli Qarai as having endorsed Mr. Quli's translation of the Holy Qur'an with glowing words – except that I have been unable to locate his email address. If you have his email address, I would be most grateful if you would share it with me or kindly forward this letter to him.

Thank you for your time. May Allah reward you generously for your strivings on the path of Haq.
Best wishes,

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org


The Road Ahead

This book has demonstrated two principal constructs of social engineering for making the human mind when it comes to hijacking the religion of Islam. One witting, the other unwitting:

- (1) How Islam is deliberately distorted and resemantized for imperial mobilization by rulers and empires.
- (2) How Islam is distorted by Muslims themselves due to the open endedness and impreciseness of some key verses of the Holy Qur'an which lends the Guidance intended to be conveyed to mankind in those verses to a plurality of interpretations, borne largely of socialized understanding, leading to multiple schools of thought and sectarian divisiveness.

Chapter 2 through Chapter 25 have painstakingly deconstructed the details of the former, scrutinizing a wide range of templates and case studies from both current affairs and recent history of imperial mobilization.

Chapter 1 has painstakingly examined the latter in an extended case study which takes up about a third of the book, Part-V of which is still work in progress.
In summary, chapters 2 through 25 have attempted to teach the public mind, the mass mind and their high-falutin scholars attuned to “United we stand” with the core narratives of power, how to parse *Machiavelli* and *Newspeak* being used by their rulers for extracting both their consent, and their blood tribute, for waging *total war* using “Islam” as the pretext. US President Barack Obama, speaking at the Pentagon Memorial Service in Arlington, Virginia on the 11th anniversary of 9/11, September 11, 2012, had carefully reminded the world public once again that it is “Islam” America is waging its lifetime of World War IV against: “I’ve always said that our fight is with Al Qaeda and its affiliates, not with Islam or any other religion,”. Today, “its affiliates” include “Sunni Islam's” new contribution to world menace, a borderless terrorist state the likes of which has not been witnessed since the passing of the Dark Ages and the Crusades, the “Islamic caliphate” or ISIS. “Shia Islam” under the supreme state leadership of its valih-e-faqih in post revolutionary Iran has of course always been ready to offer its own blood tribute to empire's “arc of crisis”. Its morbid record of internecine warfare surpasses all Muslim on Muslim violence in the annals of the twentieth-century, and now to be further surpassed in the twenty-first. For both “Islams” carefully nurtured in the top secret military laboratories of Western think-tanks like the Rand Corporation, blood is cheap, both theirs as well as their enemies. These two “Islams” are being staged into the theatre of the absurd for endlessly sustaining “imperial mobilization” on the solid bedrock of Muslim on Muslim violence.

“Islam” never fails to deliver to empire. In yesteryear it was mainly to leave empire alone and to not interfere with the rulers – the “moderate Islam”, “seek Heaven Islam”. Today it is to actively help empire promote itself as the good guys, as the moral force in the world – the “militant Islam” and “revolutionary Islam”. Convince people of absurdities and you can get them acquiescing to atrocities, including offering their own blood tributes for a parcel in Heaven. Voltaire had expressed this Machiavellian design way back in the eight-
teenth century: “Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.” Chapters 2 through 25 have tried to make the public mind become intimately aware of the vile absurdities it has been made to accept, and how the superlative narrative control and perception management system of empire actually works. The system harnesses the best talents worldwide, including from among the Muslims, our own house niggers. The implanted false beliefs have been diabolically augmented by real terror system manufactured by empire itself, as propaganda alone is often insufficient as the sole prime-mover of human motivation to lay down their lives for the cause of the patricians, and both together have been essential in mobilizing the public for World War IV globally. As the chapters unravel, there is, in point of fact, no “global war on terror” except as pretext for “imperial mobilization” to one-world government. The plurality of “Islams” and the plurality of “terror” and the plurality of narratives are only its best friends. All who have participated in any aspect of this deception, wittingly (as ideologues and mercenaries) or unwittingly (as useful idiot and stooges), are criminals. Being a fool, and becoming a tool in Machiavelli's hand, is also criminal. This book has demonstrated how the mind also easily fools itself into co-option when self-interest is at stake, and for which it seeks justifications and excuses. “I didn't know” is the best one ever invented! This book has endeavored to take that excuse away for the generations growing up in our epoch!

Timeless fables such as Nineteen eighty-four have surely captured this tortuous and dystopic reality far more engagingly than my little endeavor, which has humbly deconstructed the actual reality of Muslim blood tributes to their masters with far less wit and with much greater mental anguish. The harsh knowledge expatiated in my book, and the intellectual, emotional, and spiritual strength it has taken to continually endear myself to this subject for over a decade of activism, since the day of 9/11, has not failed to extract its own tribute!

The most pleasure I have had is in developing Chapter 1. This
book-length treatise came about somewhat serendipitously as explained in Part-I. The chapter has grown organically over the past four years as the study deepened, and ripened, both in the mind and on the page. It could perhaps be better organized and condensed if composed afresh. In its current presentation despite its length, it is quite effective for anyone who wants to learn the path of inquiry, as opposed to someone who just wants to pluck the fruit. In other words, the study teaches the thought processes necessary for rationally deciphering and comprehending the Holy Qur'an by the logical mind. The journey itself is the destination --- a message that has come to be lost on the fast world. Robert Pirsig captured that journey for the modern mind in Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance.

Chapter 1 has demonstrated before the public mind that most difficult path of being objective about any matter that pertains to self. This especially includes religion but is not limited to it. The French philosopher known as Voltaire cited above, and quoted mainly by the modern literati for his treasury of pithy wisdom which often border on truism, such as “Man is free at the instant he wants to be”, is a tad harder to apply when the chains of servitude are internal. In the limit, it is a self-referential problem. Chapter 1 has provided the basic tools for a journey on that path. This journey is the sine qua non for overcoming both self-deception and artifacts of socialization.

Imagine Chapter 1 as that motorcycle journey and its length would only bother the child too much in a hurry to get home. Others, namely those who wish to learn how to fish, it cannot but help change their outlook on their own understanding of the religion of Islam --- a Book that needs accurate deciphering like a cryptogram. There is only one correct plaintext which the ciphertext carries in its secrecy envelop. Like any cipher, it can also yield a plurality of plaintext. But how do you separate the gibberish plaintext from the singular correct plaintext? The problem is compounded when the deciphering leads to multiple correct sounding plaintext which are in fact incorrect. This is a mathematical problem which even school children are familiar with
as the simple substitution cipher which can produce both gibberish as well as meaningful sentences when deciphered but which are in fact not the one that was originally encrypted. In technical terms, this is called collisions. The collision-space of the Holy Qur'an is tremendously huge. There is no reference plaintext available today to compare it with. Meaning, the noble Prophet of Islam who as both its Messenger and its Exemplar, was mandated by the verses of the Holy Qur'an to be the final arbiter among his people of the correctly deciphered plaintext from all the other spurious versions, has been dead for fourteen centuries. And so, today, virtually every Muslim, scholar and laity alike, mufti and ayatollah alike, mullah and imam alike, among all Muslim sects without exception, gravitates to his or her own socialized version of the plaintext. This is a statement of fact based on empiricism. It is an observation beyond doubt. It is self-evident.

The singular lesson to learn from this book, if there is any lesson to learn at all, is that the latter aspect, the socialized religion of Islam as opposed to its singular plaintext understanding, is what principally enables the hijacking of the religion of Islam by empire. This too is an empirical fact. Only its public recognition is woefully absent. And that too is principally due to the willful social engineering of the pulpits by rulers from the very early spread of Islam to ensure that the Muslim public mind continues to misperceive the religion of Islam, continues to not obstruct and not interfere with the designs of the rulers who make their own heaven on earth while encouraging the public to seek their heaven elsewhere. This book has unraveled how that travesty transpires ab initio, from first principles, directly from the verses of the Holy Qur'an.

This scrutiny without prejudice, and akin to solving any technical or intellectual problem in engineering and science by first perceptively understanding the problem domain, has automatically pointed the way forward to its rectification. Though the engineered Solution Space identified in Chapter I Part-3 Section V appears very simple in
its presentation, its implication can be far reaching. That is due to both its philosophical elegance as well as its practicability.

The solution, unsurprisingly, falls out of the Holy Qur'an itself. It is not my invention even though the abstractions used to explain it are. Even that I don't know how these occurred to me --- I think my formal education in computer science and mathematics as well as my engineering craft as systems architect building real world systems, must have helped in compartmentalizing the problem as explained in Part-II. My natural resistance to narrative control, and fascination with detective stories of Sherlock Holmes and Agatha Christie's Hercule Poirot since childhood, must have provided the necessary skepticism. But ultimately, as a Muslim, I do feel that there is a Power greater than me... and, not all mysteries can be explained in a lifetime. This book being one of them. Before 9/11, I could not even imagine I'd write a book of resistance, or stand up to liars and the deception of rulers, or fight back. I do not know or understand the source of that fighting spirit, but it is the same spirit which endears me to this intellectual labor of love.

The proposed solution space is simple enough an intellectual exercise that even a high school student can undertake it on her own. It will surely transform her. From classrooms in Sunday schools to pulpits pursuing the inquiry at their appropriate levels of introduction and audience acumen with even a modicum of seriousness will surely transform society.

It is not that we do not now understand how to begin rectifying the noise and distortions accumulated over fourteen centuries of imperial mobilizations and self-serving incestuous self-reinforcements. The impediment is that no pulpit and no ruler has the will to alter the existing paradigms of power due to their own narrow self-interests. Status quo confers power and authority upon them. Which pulpit and which pope would like to admit to their flock that much of what they believe actually comes from pages outside the Holy Qur'an written by ordinary people just like them? If these scribes of history are presumed to
be super pious and super holy men then so what? They are still not named as authors to go to in the Holy Qur'an to understand the Holy Qur'an! The paradoxes examined in the study are shocking enough by themselves even for the learned mind. Imagine the cognitive dissonance in the public mind! It will take a great deal of wise social annealing to not create public discontent and it is not readily apparent what altruistic forces of truth and integrity exist in any society today to deal with it.

Consequently, as a first baby step, it is really up to individual people, ordinary people, to take up that gauntlet of examination on their own. They will receive no help from their pulpit, from their ullamas, any time soon. Just the act of their asking that question and persistently seeking answers in any kind of voice will easily get them ostracized from their community. Anyone bold enough to undertake it in any country flying the flag of Islam can see themselves permanently retired, early.

All these sectarian constructs that encourage “following” their respective popes lest the laity might sin if he uses his own head, are the first real impediment to this transformation. I do not foresee it happening voluntarily or naturally. The forces of social engineering in every society will always prevent it. To overcome this behavior control that remains anchored in narrative and thought control, will require an equally powerful and opposite force which can liberate Muslims from their pulpits. These revered pulpits of “Islam”, irrespective of their particular parochial school of thought and flavor of sect and dogma, remain as bound in shackles put on their ethos by the venerated scribes of history as in earlier generations. That is the best case scenario, when the pulpit is only beholden to its own socialized ethos and no Machiavellian forces are controlling it. The more real situation is that empire will always stand in the way of any real transformation. Principal rulers and their power-brokers will continue to purchase and define pulpits, scholarship, communication systems, education systems, political systems, and also surrogate rulers and vassals.
Top down transformation is virtually impossible in the reality of Machiavellian power today and its infinite ability to preempt, corrupt, and co-opt. Serendipity of course can always strike early – but one can hardly bank on it!

The insurmountability of the problem is perhaps why the mind so easily inclines towards the superstitions of the Last Days. The 1.6 to 2 billion Muslims are not unique in that respect. We have a vastly superior precedent set for us by the 3 billion Christians also waiting for their particular flavor of the Last Days. The Jews are in a similar same boat, awaiting their own savior. This has become a self-fulfilling prophecy in every Abrahamic generation from time immemorial since the rulers also prefer that the masses continue their Waiting for Allah!

Short of a benign superpower driving transformation for the welfare of humanity, it may happen organically only in a new society, in new generations, and new civilizations coming to Islam, or on another planet when man reaches there, whence the guidance of the religion of Islam will surely spread primarily from the text of the Holy Qur'an, and not from books of narratives and histories penned by the hand of the holy man which have become their own religion.

As the final thought before closing, it bears restating that this is not a book of faith. It is a work of intellect by an ordinary student of truth searching for truth in all matters with the few neurons that he has been gifted with. All matters are related, and interlinked, and never merely the sum of its components. The whole is often greater than the sum of its parts. Understanding the making of the human mind takes insight into that greater whole some of which takes more than just the five quantitative senses to perceive. It is the distinction in the famous Western fable of Star Trek between Mr. Spock and Captain Kirk. It is perhaps apropos to revisit the insightful observation of physicist Max Planck quoted in the opening chapter of this book:

“Modern physics has taught us that the nature of any system cannot be discovered by dividing it into its
component parts and studying each part by itself, since such a method often implies the loss of important properties of the system. We must keep our attention fixed on the whole and on the interconnection between the parts. ... The same is true of our intellectual life. It is impossible to make a clear cut between science, religion and art. The whole is never equal simply to the sum of its various parts.”

As one of my youngsters once put it to me after carefully scrutinizing all the evidence I had put before my children on a case that I had been working on, in paraphrase: “you asserted that if I followed the trail of evidence you are presenting, I'd reach the exact same conclusion as you. But I don't.” I responded, rather taken aback since we were role playing a hypothetical court room scenario and I had specifically asked that my entire analysis be judged solely on the evidence before them and not on their own knowledge or beliefs about it; it was my way of sanity-checking the completeness of the evidence for a report I had written and I thought I had presented my entire case with Mr. Spock's pristine logic: what if future history, meaning, future confessions, revelations from declassified state secrets as Zbigniew Brzezinski's on how he caused the Soviet Intervention in Afghanistan in 1979, or under victor's justice as was administered to the leaders of Nazi Germany at Nuremberg in 1946, etceteras, bears out the whole truth that the evidence already before the public today reveals to me? My youngster's prompt reply, and I quote it from memory almost verbatim for I have never forgotten it: “then I will think that you had remarkable insight into the matter.”

So much for compartmentalizing any matter into logic vs intuition. Knowing for oneself and proving to others are entirely different things. Even in science. We can see that in Global Warming for instance, or how the WTC towers, especially building 7, could collapse or decimate into dust so catastrophically. Which is why this book is only the intellectual journey in a domain where intuition and insight
based on what has gone before are most crucial in averting the same history from transpiring again. This book is neither the first word on the subject of understanding the whole, nor certainly the last. Only accept from this humble endeavor what you cannot refute. I quoted the mind of Socrates using the words of an English playwright* at the very beginning of this book in the Preface, and I would like to also bid the reader adieu with the same invitation:

‘Agree with me if I seem to you to speak the truth; or, if not, withstand me might and main that I may not deceive you as well as myself in my desire, and like the bee leave my sting in you before I die. And now let us proceed.’

Thank you.

Zahir Ebrahim
California, United States of America
April 17, 2015

Footnote * Classicist Edith Hamilton, via historian Eustace Mullins' The World Order, Foreword, 1985
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http://pacificfreepress.com
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[8] pg. 629 Caption Electrical Engineering representation of the AND Logic of Surah Al-Asr of the Holy Qur’an, by the author - just another way to think about the AND conjunctive clause, a sixth grade level grammar representation depicted in electrical engineering parlance.
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Other Sources

[10] About pg xliii Dedication wording respectively spun from Caroll Quigley's dedication in Tragedy and Hope, and Zbigniew Brzezinski's dedication in The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives. Their books are dedicated to the harbingers of dystopia. My book is dedicated to those who rise to interdict it.
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Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to Hijack?

This book which you now hold in your hands is abridged from Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam – Muslims and Imperial Mobilization, 2015 Revised Second Edition. This compilation is a case study in social engineering exploring the meta question: why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to misinterpret for self-interests, and consequently, so easy to hijack for “imperial mobilization”? The book is not about faith, or on proselytizing Islam, but about understanding how the public mind is made on such a complex text as the Holy Qur'an.

The religion of Islam since its inception had been hijacked into an absolutist system for the exercise of imperial power by Muslim rulers. Anyone on the throne or the pulpit could interpret the verses of the Holy Qur'an any which way they liked, simply by making recourse to outside narratives written by their own favored scribes. By thus fixing the values of the Indeterminates in the Holy Qur'an to suit narrow self-interests, it was easy to hijack Islam to motivate the public to accept Muslim empires in the name of Islam. Fanning the flames of gratuitous interpretations by overzealous scholars and fixing these Indeterminates throughout the ages with partisan and imperial narratives, reinforced different socialized interpretations among the masses of the same common text of the Holy Qur'an. It made divide et impera (divide and rule) even simpler.

How is one to prevent the hijacking of the Holy Qur'an from a self-serving understanding for oneself due to the inevitable socialization and perception biases, before one can even begin to interdict the pious pulpits and superpower think-tanks hijacking Islam for imperial mobilization? Hegemony, they say, is as old as mankind. Can it be effectively resisted? Or, is mankind doomed to the perpetual battle of Darwinian primacy until the Last Days?