



## *Repelling the Hallucinogenic Ideas That “Islam is Intolerant” Episode 1*

Courtesy of al-Mustaqeem

---

Listed below are some of the doubts raised by Robert Spencer who sees himself as one who is fully able in explaining Islam.

Let us examine Mr. Spencer’s argument regarding the issue

He says

Often when I discuss issues related to dhimmitude in public forums or on radio, Muslims bring up verse 2:256 of the Qur'an, "There is no compulsion in religion" -- as if the existence of this verse proves that there could be no legal superstructure mandating the oppression of non-Muslims such as I have outlined.

Firstly, and foremost, We ask who is Robert Spencer to even be discussing in depth matters related to Islam in the first place. It is a fundamental principle among us that one does not do anything unless it is preceded with knowledge. While reviewing the matter below it will be clear the lack of knowledge thereof that Spencer tries to squander.

So he said

But 2:256 itself has a quite interesting interpretative history in Islamic tradition

We will bring forth bi ithnillah the actuality of what the ayah actually is meaning and how it is viewed later on

So He states

In *Onward Muslim Soldiers* I detail how the influential radical Muslim theorist Sayyid Qutb insists that 2:256 means that dhimmis must not be forced to accept Islam -- but he does insist that they should be stripped of all political power and placed in a subordinate position in society.

Firstly, had Spencer any knowledge of anything, he would have understood that Sayyid Qutb, particularly his works, especially his tafseer, is rejected by near unanimous agreement of the muslim scholars and is not a source reference for any interpretation, classical, modern, or otherwise. While a great deal of muslims may favor his works, their understanding gained from his ideology does not constitute the actuality of the “Islamic understanding” that Spencer is so convinced at pasting to it.

Secondly, let us analyze the implication of his word. He states “

but he does insist that they should be stripped of all political power and placed in a subordinate position in society”

Let us reverse the argument to his favor. He nor anyone else for that matter among the islamaphobes insist that Muslims should be stripped of political power in the United States and placed in a subordinate position in society. That is that they fundamentally reject anyone to be a Muslim in positions of authority unless their faith is subjugated to nullification of many of the article tenets of their belief thus nullifying their Islam basically in order for such an idea (of Muslims being in positions of power) to ever occur in the wonderful land of America.

So it is 100% pure hypocrisy on his part and those of his ilk to use this as an argument for the “injustice and intolerance” that Islam “supposedly” has.

So he continues

Qutb was echoing traditional Islamic views

Let us examine this “echoing” that Spencer speaks of

Spencer discusses how Qutb’s view of the verse does not necessarily entail what he would like for it to entail. Here is what the reputable and reliable authorities in Islam have produced

In the Tafseer al-Jalalayn there occurs in explanation of the verse (Ayah)

لَا إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ قَدْ تَبَيَّنَ الرُّشْدُ مِنَ الْغَيِّ فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِالطَّاغُوتِ وَيُؤْمِنَ بِاللَّهِ فَقَدِ اسْتَمْسَكَ بِالْعُرْوَةِ الْوُثْقَىٰ لَا انْفِصَامَ لَهَا وَاللَّهُ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ

There is no compulsion in, entering into, religion. Rectitude has become clear from error, that is say, through clear proofs it has become manifest that faith is rectitude and disbelief is error: this was revealed concerning the Ansār [of Medina] who tried to compel their sons to enter into Islam; so whoever disbelieves in the false deity, namely, Satan or idols (tāghūt, 'false deity', is used in a singular and plural sense), and believes in God, has laid hold of the most firm handle, the tight knot, unbreaking, that cannot be severed; God is Hearing, of what is said, Knowing, of what is done.

The meaning of this verse was that fundamentally islam which is the way of rectitude and the fortification of success is clear and distinct from error such as disbelief in Islam. Then al-Imaam Suyuti highlighted the nuzool (reasons for its revelation) by which the nuzool may be specific, yet the Imaams of Usool (Islamic jurisprudence) highlighted its application in the amm (general sense). This extraction of the meaning is or has gone through rigorous scientific approach from the Imaams of Fiqh and Sunnah which Spencer has not an iota of an ounce of knowledge regarding this. Still not pleased, okay

The famous sahabi the explainer of the Quraan given attestification by the prophet Muhammad himself salallahu alaihi wa sallam Abdullah Ibn Abbass explains the ayah as follows

{ لَا إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ قَدْ تَبَيَّنَ الرُّشْدُ مِنَ الْغَيِّ فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِالطَّاغُوتِ وَيُؤْمِن بِاللَّهِ فَقَدِ اسْتَمْسَكَ بِالْعُرْوَةِ الْوُثْقَىٰ لَا انفِصَامَ لَهَا وَاللَّهُ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ }

(There is no compulsion in religion) no one from among the people of the Book and the Magians should be coerced to believe in the divine Oneness of Allah after the Arabs' embrace of Islam. (The right direction is henceforth distinct from error) faith from disbelief and Truth from falsehood. The following was revealed about Mundhir Ibn Sawi al-Tamimi: (And he who rejecteth false deities) the command of the devil and the worship of idols (and believeth in Allah) and in what has come forth from Him (hath grasped a firm handhold) has taken in trust "there is no God save Allah" (which will never break) will never cease, vanish or perish; it is also said that this means: for him who believes in it, the bliss of Paradise will never cease and he will never be taken out of Paradise, nor will he perish by staying in the Fire. (Allah is Hearer) of this speech, (Knower) of its reward and bliss.

Two points

1. Ibn Abbass included the "Magoos" (Magians) into the verse despitethe fact that the majority of Muslim scholars have not viewed the maginas to be "ahlil-Kitaab" or the People of the Book.
2. Since it implies as well the non ahlul-kitaab, that pretty much makes the nass (text) of the ayah to be taken upon its literal import as is the fundamental rule with the quraan unless there is something specific which would necessitate "t'awil"

Still not convinced.

Haafidh Ibn Kathir states in his tafseer

Allah said,

[لَا إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ]

(There is no compulsion in religion), meaning, "Do not force anyone to become Muslim, for Islam is plain and clear, and its proofs and evidence are plain and clear. Therefore, there is no need to force anyone to embrace Islam. Rather,

whoever Allah directs to Islam, opens his heart for it and enlightens his mind, will embrace Islam with certainty. Whoever Allah blinds his heart and seals his hearing and sight, then he will not benefit from being forced to embrace Islam."

It was reported that the Ansar were the reason behind revealing this Ayah, **although its indication is general in meaning**. Ibn Jarir recorded that Ibn `Abbas said [that before Islam], "When (an Ansar) woman would not bear children who would live, she would vow that if she gives birth to a child who remains alive, she would raise him as a Jew. When Banu An-Nadir (the Jewish tribe) were evacuated [from Al-Madinah], some of the children of the Ansar were being raised among them, and the Ansar said, `We will not abandon our children.' Allah revealed,

[لَا إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ قَدْ تَبَيَّنَ الرُّشْدُ مِنَ الْغَيِّ]

(There is no compulsion in religion. Verily, the right path has become distinct from the wrong path.)"

Abu Dawud and An-Nasa'i also recorded this Hadith. As for the Hadith that Imam Ahmad recorded, in which Anas said that the Messenger of Allah said to a man,

«أَسْلِمَ»

قالَ كَارِهًا أُجْذِنِي إِلَيَّ: قَالَ:

«وَأِنْ كُنْتَ كَارِهًا»

("Embrace Islam." The man said, "I dislike it." The Prophet said, "Even if you dislike it.")

First, this is an authentic Hadith, with only three narrators between Imam Ahmad and the Prophet . However, it is not relevant to the subject under discussion, for the Prophet did not force that man to become Muslim. The Prophet merely invited this man to become Muslim, and he replied that he does not find himself eager to become Muslim. The Prophet said to the man that even though he dislikes embracing Islam, he should still embrace it, `for Allah will grant you sincerity and true intent.'

Thus it is proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that while the verse was revealed through a specific situation, its message is general in application and Ibn Katheer mentions "Do not force ANYONE" in the beginning passage

Never was Islam established through the abandonment of this fundamental and it will never be established through its abandonment and the actions of the few who do oppose this principle cannot be pasted on to be something "Islamic" which the deceivers wish achieve as Spencer cleverly attempts to do.

He states

In fact, this deceptively simple phrase historically has had a myriad of meanings. Here are some of them, mostly premodern, deriving from two outstanding recent books, Patricia Crone's *God's Rule: Government and Islam* (Columbia University Press) and Yohanan Friedman's *Tolerance and Coercion in Islam* (Cambridge University Press), augmented by my own research. Proceeding from least liberal to most liberal, the no-compulsion phrase is considered variously to have been:

1. We will examine this myriad of meanings that he tries to paste on Islam
2. And lastly, he takes his information from two unqualified people in the explanation of Islam. So not only does he belligerently speak about Islam with absolutely no knowledge, he also references others of his same caliber (in their lack of education of Islamic orthodoxy) thus making his blunder of an explanation regarding this issue all the more preposterous.

We will examine how they have (mis)understood the verse from their own words. He adds to his article. We will only examine that which is needing some clarification.

*Abrogated:* The passage was overridden by subsequent Koranic verses (such as 9:73 "O Prophet! Struggle against the unbelievers and hypocrites and be harsh with them").

We say. How and where? The majority of scholars have viewed it to be not abrogated and only a few viewed it.

Secondly, the "supposed" ayah that he misconstrues as the abrogating verse has no connection to the verse in question either directly nor implicitly.

This is a clear example of deceptualizing the meaning and intent of the ayah purposefully. That is because if the explanation of Islam was allowed to occur through the wants of the people then how was Spencer prevented from applying the verse "Do not let your hatred of a people cause you to be unjust" to be the abrogator of the verse he quotes in 9:73

Again he brings

*Purely symbolic:* The phrase is a description, not an imperative. Islam's truth is so obvious that to coerce someone to become a Muslim does not amount to "compulsion."; or else being made to embrace Islam after defeat in war is not viewed as "compulsion."

This is another clear cut example of pure ignorance operating at its best which would be the worst for the people of intellect and reason.

The only symbolical nature behind the verse was its being transformed from its particular and made mandatory upon its application in a general or universal level.

Secondly, Yes Islam's truth is too obvious and made pristine clear as the daylight sun and no one in our history took this reality to mean that coercion to Islam was not coercion as he deceptively articulates in this passage of what Muslims view of Islam's pristine clearness.

Next

*Spiritual, not practical:* Governments may indeed compel external obedience, though they of course cannot compel how Muslims think.

I'm deeply surprised that the various Jewish tribes in Madeenah were "compelled" to obedience for 10 years.

Likewise I am surprised at how the governments such as the khilaafa Umawiyah or the Abbasiyyah or the Uthmaaniyyah "compelled" people of other faiths into islam leaving a considerable number of non muslims within Islamic lands. Governments are only dictated to the direct enforcement of Islamic law to Muslims fully and only partially to non muslims, and coercing them into islam is not from among the dictates of any Islamic state to impose on non muslims, never was it done in Islamic history by which both muslim and non muslim historians CONFESS with factual proofs.

He continues with more rhetoric as his explanation

*Limited in time and place:* It applied uniquely to Jews in Medina in the seventh century.

That pretty much make all the muslim jurists throughout the Muslim world throughout the annals of Islamic history throughout the various sultanates and kingdoms who did abide by this Islamically mandated code of law as "heretics" since they took the "specific" application of this verse and made it general.

