

## **A Christian Considers A Muslim's Defence Of The Quran.**

*The Muslim's argument is in plain script. Our replies are in italics*

### **The Argument.**

Calling the Qur'an amazing is not something done only by Muslims, who have an appreciation for the book and who are pleased with it. It has been labeled amazing by non-Muslims as well. In fact, even people who hate Islam very much have still called it amazing.

*We note that no names are mentioned and no evidence is offered. We are just expected to believe it. I wonder who these enemies are who say it is 'amazing'. Do they mean incredible? Anyone could say this about anything! We could say it about Peter Pan. Such vague statements mean nothing.*

One thing which surprises non-muslims who are examining the book very closely is that the Qur'an does not appear to them to be what they expected. What they assume is that they have an old book which came fourteen centuries ago from the Arabian desert; and they expect that the book should look something like that - an old book from the desert. And then they find out that it does not resemble what they expected at all.

*This is called 'setting up a man of straw'. That means it is portraying something in a way which is easy to knock down. The Quran did not come from the Arabian Desert. It was written in cities. Muhammad was a merchant and came from Mecca and moved to Medina, although he did at one stage go into 'the desert' for meditation purposes. (He did not, of course, write the Quran. He could neither read nor write. He is said to have recited it, although that is unprovable. Unlike the life of Jesus we have no contemporary records). But I wonder how many non-Muslims really think that the Quran was a book from the desert? I suspect not many. And what they will find is that it talks a great deal about fighting and killing enemies, and that it teaches Muslims to extort money from Christians and Jews at the point of a sword when they are in the minority. (And I do not think that any fair-minded Muslim will deny that. In fact they are quite proud of the fact).*

Additionally, one of the first things that some people assume is that because it is an old book which comes from the desert, it should talk about the desert. Well the Qur'an does talk about the desert - some of its imagery describes the desert; but it also talks about the sea - what it's like to be in a storm on the sea. Some years ago, the story came to us in Toronto about a man who was in the merchant marine and made his living on the sea.

*Ah, such 'stories'. How useful they are. Note that we are not given its source. Such unidentified stories are very useful. They can confirm anything we like! They are usually apocryphal, and invented by Arabian story-tellers.*

A Muslim gave him a translation of the Qur'an to read. The merchant marine knew nothing about the history of Islam but was interested in reading the Qur'an. When he finished reading it, he brought it back to the Muslim and asked, "This Muhammed, was he a sailor?" He was impressed at how accurately the Qur'an describes a storm on a sea. When he was told, "No as a matter of fact, Muhammed lived in the desert," that was enough for him. He embraced Islam on the spot. He was so impressed with the Qur'an's description because he had been in a storm on the sea, and he knew that whoever had written that description had also been in a storm on the sea. The description of "a wave, over it a wave, over it clouds" was not what someone imagining a storm on a sea to be like would have written; rather, it was written by someone who knew what a storm on the sea was like.

*Now I have been in a storm at sea and this does not sound to me like a storm at sea. Indeed it sounds very vague. Wave on wave is what happens whether there is a storm or not, and clouds*

*over it are simply a natural feature of any storm. It sounds more like the words of a poet who is talking poetically and vaguely. Our friend makes mysteries out of commonplaces! Incidentally Muhammad met many sailors. He had wide contacts. So he may well have learned a great deal about storms at sea. But he certainly did not reveal it here.*

This is one example of how the Qur'an is not tied to a certain place and time. Certainly, the scientific ideas expressed in it also do not seem to originate from the desert fourteen centuries ago.

*Muhammad was not a man of the desert. He was a relatively civilised man, a merchant.*

Many centuries before the onset of Muhammed's Prophethood, there was a well-known theory of atomism advanced by the Greek philosopher, Democritus. He and the people who came after him assumed that matter consists of tiny, indestructible, indivisible particles called atoms.

*This is in fact an overstatement of the actual position, and of course he has now been proved to be wrong. But his theory did not become generally accepted. It was one of a hundred theories. Nor did he define atoms like this. This is a modern definition read back for the sake of the story.*

The Arabs too, used to deal in the same concept; in fact, the Arabic word dharrah commonly referred to the smallest particle known to man.

*Examination of the use of dharrah will reveal the fact that this is not true. It will simply reveal that it means something very small (like a grain of mustard seed). This is an attempt to read modern science into an ancient word. As most readers do not speak Arabic those who do can make Arabic mean whatever we like! Are you really suggesting that Arabs really knew about electrons and quarks?*

Now modern science has discovered that this smallest unit of matter (i.e., the atom, which has all of the same properties as its element) can be split into its component parts. This is a new idea, a development of the last century;

*No it is not a new idea. It was the idea that the atom was indivisible that was the new idea which proved to be wrong. Most people did not doubt that things could be split up smaller and smaller and smaller. That was simply logical.*

yet, interestingly enough, this information had already been documented in the Qur'an which states: " He [i.e., Allah] is aware of an atom's weight in the heavens and on the earth and even anything smaller than that..."

*The Quran could not have said that. Arabic had no word for 'atom'. This is paraphrase. Citing it as evidence is just pure deceit based on taking advantage of people's ignorance of Arabic. What was being said was that Allah is aware of the weight of the smallest thing, and things even smaller. This is called hyperbole.*

Undoubtedly, fourteen centuries ago that statement would have looked unusual, even to an Arab. For him, the dharrah was the smallest thing there was. Indeed, this is proof, that the Qur'an is not outdated.

*All it is saying is that the dharrah is not the smallest thing. So the Arabic, which said that it was, was wrong!*

Another example of what one might expect to find in an "old book" that touches upon the subject of health or medicine is outdated remedies or cures. *Why should we expect to find this? It would really depend on the aim of the book? The Bible is an old book but it also does not teach outdated remedies or cures. Nor do many other ancient books. Indeed the Bible hygiene laws were remarkably up to date.*

Various historical sources state that the Prophet gave some advice about health and hygiene,

yet most of these pieces of advice are not contained in the Qur'an. At first glance, to the non-Muslims this appears to be a negligent omission. They cannot understand why Allah would not "include" such helpful information in the Qur'an.

*Note the use of the term 'non-Muslim' referring to a person who believes whatever the writer wants him to believe for the purpose of his argument. He is not a person who really exists!. Incidentally the 'historical sources' are merely Muslim traditions the source of which is unknown, and are of doubtful reliability. But we may well ask, if He was inspiring Muhammad, why did Allah not give him good medical advice to put in the Quran? Now that would have been convincing, if it was genuine.*

Some Muslims attempt to explain this absence with the following argument: "Although the Prophet's advice was sound and applicable to the time in which he lived, Allah, in His infinite wisdom, knew that there would come later medical and scientific advances which would make the Prophet's advice appear outdated.

*If Allah was so knowledgeable why did he not give his prophet remedies that were true and which did work and which could not be outdated? By the way he later contradicts this for he claims that the Quran speaks of the supposed 'healing properties of honey'.*

When later discoveries occurred, people might say that such information contradicted that which the Prophet had given. Thus, since Allah would never allow any opportunity for the non-Muslims to claim that the Qur'an contradicts itself or the teachings of the Prophet, He only included in the Qur'an information and examples which could stand the test of time."

*Why did He not also include that which was for the good of mankind? Anyway He slipped up for the Quran contradicts itself in many other ways.*

However, when one examines the true realities of the Qur'an in terms of its existence as a divine revelation, the entire matter is quickly brought into its proper perspective, and the error in such argumentation becomes clear and understandable. It must be understood that the Qur'an is a divine revelation, and as such, all information in it is of divine origin.

*Well that is what Muslims believe. But there is no evidence for it. And we must ask here, which version of the Quran? There were a number of versions of the Quran, and these continued even though an attempt was made to suppress them. There is plenty of proof of this including differing quotations from the Quran on ancient coins, and ancient manuscripts of the Quran which have been discovered and found to diversify from each other.*

Allah revealed the Qur'an from Himself. It is the words of Allah, which existed before creation, and thus nothing can be added, subtracted or altered.

*How then could there be a number of versions? Arabic history itself reveals that there were a number of versions. And there are differing versions even today in different parts of the world.*

In essence, the Qur'an existed and was complete before the creation of Prophet Muhammed, so it could not possibly contain any of the Prophet's own words or advice. An inclusion of such information would clearly contradict the purpose for which the Qur'an exists, compromise its authority and render it inauthentic as a divine revelation. Consequently, there was no "home remedies" in the Qur'an which one could claim to be outdated; nor does it contain any man's view about what is beneficial to health, what food is best to eat, or what will cure this or that disease. In fact, the Qur'an only mentions one item dealing with medical treatment, and it is not in dispute by anyone. It states that in honey there is healing. And certainly, I do not think that there is anyone who will argue with that!

*Well I will argue with it. Honey is not in fact particularly a healing produce even though like most foods it is pleasant to eat. I have been warned off honey as being similar to sugar and therefore best used sparingly. I am told by experts that it is not good for us. I do not find honey in use as a medicine in most modern hospitals. This is simply assuming what he wants to prove!*

If one assumes that the Qur'an is the product of a man's mind, then one would expect it to reflect some of what was going on in the mind of the man who "composed" it. In fact, certain encyclopedias and various books claim that the Qur'an was the product of hallucinations that Muhammed underwent. If these claims are true - if it indeed originated from some psychological problems in Muhammed's mind - then evidence of this would be apparent in the Qur'an. Is there such evidence?

*Some would say, yes. The people who say this would also say that there is such evidence. But one man's hallucination is another man's vision. Those who believe the visionary argue for the truth of what he says. Those who believe he was hallucinating simply call them hallucinations. What does that prove? That you accept what you want to accept.*

In order to determine whether or not there is, one must first identify what things would have been going on in his mind at that time and then search for these thoughts and reflections in the Qur'an. It is common knowledge that Muhammad had a very difficult life. All of his daughters died before him except one, and he had a wife of several years who was dear and important to him, (Editor's note - whom he married when she was nine years old) who not only proceeded (preceded?) him in death at a very critical period of his life. As a matter of fact, she must have been quite a woman because when the first revelation came to him, he ran home to her afraid. Certainly, even today one would have a hard time trying to find an Arab who would tell you, "I was so afraid that I ran home to my wife." They just aren't that way. Yet Muhammed felt comfortable enough with his wife to be able to do that. That's how influential and strong woman she was.

*And so all these Arabs fail to follow Muhammad. How strange if they believe he was inspired. So Muhammad had a sympathetic wife? Many men have sympathetic wives. I have a sympathetic wife.*

Although these examples are only a few of the subjects that would have been on Muhammed's mind, they are sufficient in intensity to prove my point. The Qur'an does not mention any of these things - not the death of his children, not the death of his beloved companion and wife, not his fear of the initial revelations, which he so beautifully shared with his wife - nothing; yet, these topics must have hurt him, bothered him, and caused him pain and grief during periods of his psychological reflections, then these subjects, as well as others, would be prevalent or at least mentioned throughout.

*Why should they? Perhaps he liked keeping such experiences to himself. Many authors do not tell us about their families. Perhaps they are not mentioned because Muhammad did not write the Quran (He could neither read nor write). Perhaps we might have had better reason for believing that the Quran did come from Mohammed if his amanuensis had mentioned them?*

A truly scientific approach to the Qur'an is possible because the Qur'an offers something that is not offered by other religious scriptures, in particular, and other religions, in general. It is what scientists demand.

*But does it? I have not noticed any scientists clamouring for the Quran. The examples that follow are simply made to fit what is wanted. They do not actually reflect scientific statement the meaning of which is undoubted. Anyone can twist vague statements to mean what they want them to mean. People have done it with the Bible too.*

Today there are many people who have ideas and theories about how the universe works. These people are all over the place, but the scientific community does not even bother to listen to them. This is because within the last century the scientific community has demanded a test of falsification. They say, "If you have theory, do not bother us with it unless you bring with that theory a way for us to prove whether you are wrong or not." Such a test was exactly why the scientific community listened to Einstein towards the beginning of the century. He came with a new theory and said, "I believe the universe works like this; and here are three ways to

prove whether I am wrong!". So the scientific community subjected his theory to the tests, and within six years it passed all three.

*This is actually not true!!! It took a long time for Einstein's theories really to take root. And they still do not know how far they are true. But the question is irrelevant in this context.*

Of course, this does not prove that he was great, but it proves that he deserved to be listened to because he said, "This is my idea; and if you want to try to prove me wrong, do this or try that." This is exactly what the Qur'an has - falsification tests. Some are old (in that they have already been proven true), and some still exist today. Basically it states, "If this book is not what it claims to be, then all you have to do is this or this or this to prove that it is false." Of course, in 1400 years no one has been able to do "This or this or this, " and thus it is still considered true and authentic.

*Then why do such a vast number of thinking people still not accept the Quran? In fact many people have proved that the Quran contradicts itself. Thus this statement is the fervent belief of a believer not an objective fact. It simply says some Muslims believe the Quran, so they believe it is true and authentic. Millions believe the Bible. They too consider the Bible true and authentic. And at least its background can be historically examined. There is no genuine history in the Quran.*

I suggest to you that the next time you get into dispute with someone about Islam and he claims that he has the truth and that you are in darkness, you leave all other arguments at first and make this suggestion. Ask him, "Is there any falsification test in your religion? Is there anything in your religion that would prove you are wrong if I could prove to you that it exists - anything?" Well, I can promise right now that people will not have anything - no test, no proof, nothing! This is because they do not carry around the idea that they should not only present what they believe but should also offer others a chance to prove they're wrong. However, Islam does that. A perfect example of how Islam provides man with a chance to verify its authenticity and "prove it wrong" occurs in the 4th chapter. And quite honestly, I was surprised when I first discovered this challenge. It states: "Do they not consider the Qur'an? Had it been from any other than Allah, they would surely have found therein much discrepancy."

*Every ancient religious book claims to be true and that it does not contain discrepancy. The difficulty is in genuinely proving it. This is a clear challenge to the non-Muslim. Basically, it invites him to find a mistake.*

*But that is what non-Muslims have done. Many mistakes have been discovered. Some are mentioned on this site. Thus men have discovered many mistakes in the Quran. This challenge only bears weight to people who know absolutely nothing about the Quran.*

As a matter of fact, the seriousness and difficulty of the challenge aside, the actual presentation of such a challenge in the first place is not even in human nature and is inconsistent with man's personality.

*But this was not a challenge. It was merely an incorrect statement. It merely says that Muhammad claimed not to be wrong. I have met many people like that.*

One doesn't take an exam in school after finishing the exam, write a note to the instructor at the end saying, "This exam is perfect. There are no mistakes in it. Find one if you can!". One just doesn't do that. The teacher would not sleep until he found a mistake! And yet this is the way the Qur'an approaches people.

*Very foolishly then. For there are many discrepancies. Besides I have marked examination papers which were perfect and had nothing wrong in them. And that is the challenge the examinees were laying out to their markers by handing them in. So how was Muhammad different?*

Another interesting attitude that exists in the Qur'an repeatedly deals with its advice to the reader. The Qur'an informs that reader about different facts and then gives the advice: "If you want to know more about this or that, or if you doubt what is said, then you should ask those who have knowledge." This too is a surprising attitude. It is not usual to have a book that comes from someone without training in geography, botany, biology, etc., who discusses these subjects and then advises the reader to ask men of knowledge if he doubts anything.

*Well I have read many books which do exactly that. Popular writers on a subject often refer us to experts in order to back up their ideas, (even when they are wrong). It is quite usual. So you are simply trying to build up a rarity which is not true.*

Yet in every age there have been Muslims who have followed the advice of the Qur'an and made surprising discoveries. If one looks to the works of Muslim scientists of many centuries ago, one will find them full of quotations from the Qur'an.

*Ditto re the Bible. It used to be the ancient habit with scientists in order to substantiate their work. So of course, having made a discovery they tried to relate it to the Quran in order to make it acceptable to common people. It was possible because the Quran uses picturesque language which can be made to mean anything.*

These works state that they did research in such a place, looking for something. And they affirm that the reason they looked in such and such a place was that the Qur'an pointed them in that direction. For example, the Qur'an mentions man's origin and then tells the reader, "Research it!"

*Religious men often claim to be 'guided' to sources of knowledge. Kepler declared 'I am thinking God's thoughts after him!' The Bible also mentions man's origin and tells us to look into it. So what? Most religions look into man's origin, and so do atheists.*

It gives the reader a hint where to look and then states that one should find out more about it. This is the kind of thing that Muslims today largely seem to overlook - but not always, as illustrated in the following example. A few years ago, a group of men in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia collected all if the verses in the Qur'an which discuss embryology - the growth of the human being in the womb. They said, "Here is what the Qur'an says. Is it the truth?" In essence, they took the advice of the Qur'an: "Ask the men who know." They chose, as it happened, a non-Muslim who is a professor of embryology at the University of Toronto. His name is Keith Moore, and he is the author of textbooks on embryology - a world expert on the subject. They invited him to Riyadh and said, "This is what the Qur'an says about your subject. Is it true? What can you tell us?" While he was in Riyadh, they gave him all of the help that he needed in translation and all of the cooperation for which he asked. And he was so surprised at what he found that he changed his textbooks. In fact, in the second edition of one of his books, called *Before we are born...* in the second edition about the history of embryology, he included some material that was not in the first edition because of what he found in the Qur'an. Truly this illustrates that the Qur'an was ahead of its time and that those who believe in the Qur'an know what other people do not know.

*Now I quite frankly do not believe this. This is called wishful thinking or exaggeration. The Quran says nothing about embryology. Indeed it could not because the words necessary to define embryology were not known. What happened was that the Arabic scholar scientists translated the Arabic to fit in with modern ideas. These folk tales are easy to invent in order to prove anything. Let us rather have full documentation.*

I had the pleasure of interviewing Dr. Keith Moore for a television presentation, and we talked a great deal about this - it was illustrated by slides and so on.

*Big deal!!!!*

He mentioned that some of the things that the Qur'an states about the growth of the human

being were not known until thirty years ago.

*If he did say this, and we have no proof, it was not because the Quran said it but because the modern Arabic scholars interpreted the Quran in this way. This picture of simple Arab scholars coming to some great learned professor in the West so humbly is contrary to all we know about Arab scholars. What happened was probably that they challenged him with their ideas and he accepted some of them. That is what happens among scholars whether they are Arabic or not. It has nothing to do with what the Quran actually taught. Only what they said it taught in agreement with their researches.*

In fact, he said that one item in particular - the Qur'an's description of the human being as a "leech-like clot" ('alaqah) at one stage - was new to him; but when he checked on it, he found that it was true, and so he added it to his book.

*Here is a perfect example of what I have said. This Arabic word is given a meaning which fitted in with their researches. Did Dr Moore speak Arabic? The original word does not mean 'a leech-like clot'. That is a later interpretation which Moore simply thought would make a good illustration. He could have used 'an ink blob'.*

He said, "I never thought of that before," and he went to the zoology department and asked for a picture of a leech. When he found that it looked just like the human embryo, he decided to include both pictures in one of his textbooks.

*Did Dr Moore really reduce embryology to a matter of pictorial illustrations? That is not what embryology is about. So the Arabic scholars had researched embryos, discovered what they looked like, looked in the Quran, and made a word mean what they wanted it to mean to fit in with it, and then claimed it was divine revelation?. People do it with Greek and Hebrew all the time. This is a lovely story but is irrelevant. Perhaps too someone can look up its source. It sounds like a fairy tale to me.*

Dr. Moore also wrote a book on clinical embryology, and when he presented this information in Toronto, it caused quite a stir throughout Canada. It was on the front pages of some of the newspapers across Canada, and some of the headlines were quite funny. For instance, one headline read: "SURPRISING THING FOUND IN ANCIENT BOOK!!!"

*There are many instances of such exaggerated statements in headlines. People love to 'find' ancient wisdom in ancient books. It happens regularly. But it is always by misrepresenting what they really said in order to produce headlines. Just think of this. An obscure Arabic word is given a meaning by modern Arabic scholars that fits in with their research in embryology and then it becomes a seventh wonder of the world.!!! And all it turns out to be is what an embryo looks like, using a vague description which has been read into an ancient Arabic word whose meaning is vague. Some proof! Some discovery!*

It seems obvious from this example that people do not clearly understand what it is all about. Possibly the main one being the writer of this article?

As a matter of fact, one newspaper reporter asked Professor Moore, "Don't you think that maybe the Arabs might have known about these things - the description of the embryo, its appearance and how it changes and grows? Maybe there were not scientists, but maybe they did some crude dissections on their own - carved up people and examined these things." The professor immediately pointed out to him that he [i.e., the reporter] had missed a very important point. All of the slides of the embryo that had been shown and had been projected in the film had come from pictures taken through a microscope. He said, "It does not matter if someone had tried to discover embryology fourteen centuries ago, they could not have seen it!".

*But some modern Arab scientists with a microscope did see it and took an obscure Arabic word and claimed for it what was not true. Why should Muhammad use a word of something that no*

*one could see or understand? He was using a commonly used word. The Western equivalent is 'chimera'. His purpose in speaking (he did not write it, because he could not write) was to be understood. Do you really think that if I had said something looked like a blob people would be amazed because it was a description of something that could be said to look like a blob? The Arab scientists gave the word a meaning which fitted in with what they had seen under their microscopes. Professor Moore was possibly only courting publicity*

**All of the descriptions in the Qur'an of the appearance of the embryo are of the item when it is still too small to see with the eye, therefore, one needs a microscope to see it.**

*But there are no descriptions in the Quran of an embryo. No one even knew what an embryo was. If it is saying man came from a blob why not say so. This is all playing with words.*

**Since such a device had only been around for little more than two hundred years, Dr. Moore taunted, "Maybe fourteen centuries ago someone secretly had a microscope and did this research, making no mistakes anywhere. Then he somehow taught Muhammad and convinced him to put this information in his book. Then he destroyed his equipment and kept it a secret forever. Do you believe that? You really should not unless you bring some proof because it is such a ridiculous theory." In fact, when he was asked "How do you explain this information in the Qur'an?" Dr. Moore's reply was, "It could only have been divinely revealed."!**

*So now we have it Dr Moore was at least a potential Muslim for he believed the Quran to be divinely inspired! He was arguing religiously not scientifically. Case destroyed. How often men have done the same thing from the Bible.*

**Although the aforementioned example of man researching information contained in the Qur'an deals with a non-Muslim, it is still valid because he is one of those who is knowledgeable in the subject being researched. Had some layman claimed that what the Qur'an says about embryology is true, then one would not necessarily have to accept his word.**

*So he was not a Muslim but he believed the Quran to be divinely inspired? Is that not a contradiction? And besides Dr Moore did not know Arabic. So how could he claim such things? He was simply naively believing what he was told.*

**However, because of the high position, respect, and esteem man gives scholars, one naturally assumes that if they research a subject and arrive at a conclusion based on that research, then the conclusion is valid.**

*What, all of them? Phew. So we must believe everything that any scholar tells us because he has researched it? Even when they contradict each other?*

**One of Professor Moore's colleagues, Marshall Johnson, deals extensively with geology at the University of Toronto. He became very interested in the fact that the Qur'an's statements about embryology are accurate, and so he asked Muslims to collect everything contained in the Qur'an which deals with his speciality. Again people were very surprised at the findings.**

*No doubt they were. They were surprised that modern Muslim scholars had such knowledge. But it was not from the Quran. The Quran was dragged in to give the ideas respectability. No one would have got the ideas by reading the Quran. (It had been around for a thousand years without anyone spotting them, even Muslim scholars).*

**Since there are a vast number subjects discussed in the Qur'an, it would certainly require a large amount of time to exhaust each subject. It suffices for the purpose of this discussion to state that the Qur'an makes very clear and concise statements about various subjects while simultaneously advising the reader to verify the authenticity of these statements with research by scholars in those subjects.**

*Anyone who knows the Quran knows that it actually makes 'clear and concise' statements about very little. It speaks in poetic language which can be given a multitude of meanings, like most*



*poetry. We can make a lot of it mean exactly what we want it to mean.*

And as illustrated by the Qur'an has clearly emerged authentic. Undoubtedly, there is an attitude in the Qur'an which is not found anywhere else. It is interesting how when the Qur'an provides information, it often tells the reader, "You did not know this before." Indeed, there is no scripture that exists which makes that claim.

*Actually the Bible constantly claims to tell men what they did not know before. That is what revelation is all about.*

All of the other ancient writings and scriptures that people have, do give a lot of information, but they always state where the information came from.

*Yes, in the case of the Bible they say it came from God.*

For example, when the Bible discusses ancient history, it states that this king lived here, this one fought in a certain battle, another one had so many sons, etc. Yet it always stipulates that if you want more information, then you should read the book of so and so because that is where the information came from.

*True, it sometimes cites sources because it is such an important book that it could not be left to one man who could neither read or write, and who thus had to depend on other people's memories in order for it to be written down years later. The Bible sometimes quotes sources. But that shows that it is reliable and factual. It actually uses historical sources. On the other hand much of its history does not cite sources. It was contemporary with what happened (unlike the Quran). The writer here demonstrates his ignorance of the Bible.*

In contrast to this concept, the Qur'an provides the reader with information and states that this information is something new.

*And so vague that it is neither history or explicit, but open to varied interpretations.*

Of course, there always exists the advice to research the information provided and verify its authenticity. It is interesting that such a concept was never challenged by non-Muslims fourteen centuries ago.

*But people have been researching information long before the Quran came into being. And how does the writer know that no one challenged it? We have very little knowledge about what people said 1400 years ago. We do not know whether they challenged it or not.*

Indeed, the Makkans who hated the Muslims, and time and time again they heard such revelations claiming to bring new information; yet, they never spoke up and said, "This is not new. We know where Muhammad got this information. We learned this at school."

*But that is precisely the problem There is very little genuine factual knowledge described in the Quran to any depth at all. However, we note that the writer knows all about what the Makkans said? But we have no literature written by the Makkans so how does he know? All we have is what their opponents claim that they said. Not a very reliable source.*

They could never challenge its authenticity because it really was new!

*But a large part of the Quran is a mixture of garbled Old Testament stories, and extracts from Gnostic literature. It is only new to people who have never read either.*

In concurrence with the advice given in the Qur'an to research information (even if it is new), when 'Umar was caliph, he chose a group of men and sent them to find the wall of Dhul-Qarnayn. Before the Qur'anic revelation, the Arabs had never heard of such a wall, but because the Qur'an described it, they were able to discover it.

*A pretty fairy story. Alice also found Wonderland. King Arthur found Avalon. No doubt some traveller told Muhammad about the wall if it really did exist. Muhammad met many travellers.*

*He was a seeker after knowledge, and incorporated it into his visions.*

As a matter of fact, it is now located in what is called Durbend in the Soviet Union.

*There is no wall that has been called Dhul-Quarnayn since the seventh century in Durbend. Where is the evidence? It was just a story spun by a Muslim storyteller. It is easy to find a wall and call it Dhul-Quarnayn afterwards. I have one in my back garden. I have just called it Dhul-Quarnayn. Now what does that prove?,*

It must be stressed here that the Qur'an is accurate about many, many things, but accuracy does not necessarily mean that a book is a divine revelation. In fact, accuracy is only one of the criteria for divine revelations. For instance, the telephone book is accurate, but that does not mean that it is divinely revealed. The real problem lies in that one must establish some proof of the source the Qur'an's information. The emphasis is on the reader. One cannot simply deny the Qur'an's authenticity without sufficient proof.

*No the position it the other way round. You have to prove its authenticity. That is the problem Millions of Muslims just believe it because they will be disapproved of in Muslim society if they do not.*

If, indeed, one finds a mistake, then he has the right to disqualify it. This is exactly what the Qur'an encourages. Once a man came up to me after a lecture I delivered in South Africa. He was very angry about what I had said, and so he claimed, "I am going to go home tonight and find a mistake in the Qur'an." Of course, I said, "Congratulations. That is the most intelligent thing that you have said." Certainly, this is the approach muslims need to take with those who doubt the Qur'an's authenticity, because the Qur'an itself offers the same challenge. And inevitably, after accepting it's challenge and discovering that it is true, these people will come to believe it because they could not disqualify it.

*That is strange. I have had no difficulty in finding errors and contradictions.*

In essence, the Qur'an earns their respect because they themselves have had to verify its authenticity. An essential fact that cannot be reiterated enough concerning the authenticity of the Qur'an is that one's inability to explain a phenomenon himself does not require his acceptance of the phenomenon's existence or another person's explanation of it.

*But I have discovered many errors and inaccuracies in the Quran (see my Home Page and click on 'contradictions'. What now?*

Specifically, just because one cannot explain something does not mean that one has to accept someone else's explanation. However, the person's refusal of other explanations reverts the burden of proof back on himself to find a feasible answer. This general theory applies to numerous concepts in life, but fits most wonderfully with the Qur'anic challenge, for it creates a difficulty for one who says, "I do not believe it."

*I do not find the challenge difficult. Nor do I accept your explanation. But the burden of proof is on you. The Quran does not convince me that it is anything other than the work of a poetic dreamer with a hard streak.*

At the onset of refusal one immediately has an obligation to find an explanation himself if he feels others' answers are inadequate. In fact, in one particular Qur'anic verse which I have always seen mistranslated into English, Allah mentions a man who heard the truth explained to him. It states that he was derelict in his duty because after he heard the information, he left without checking the verity of what he had heard. In other words, one is guilty if he hears something and does not research it and check to see whether it is true. One is supposed to process all information and decide what is garbage to be thrown out and what is worthwhile information to be kept and benefited from at a later date. One cannot just let it rattle around in his head. It must be put in the proper categories and approached from that point of view. For example, if the information is still speculative, then one must discern whether it's closer

to being true or false. But if all of the facts have been presented, then one must decide absolutely between these two options. And even if one is not positive about the authenticity of the information, he is still required to process all of the information and make the admission that he just does not know for sure. Although this last point appears to be futile, in actuality, it is beneficial to the arrival at a positive conclusion at a later time in that it forces the person to at least recognize, research and review the facts. This familiarity with the information will give the person "the edge" when future discoveries are made and additional information is presented. The important thing is that one deals with the facts and does not simply discard them out of empathy and disinterest.

*That is what this website is about. I hope the writer has done the same thing with the Bible as I have done. That is why I believe it, because it is backed up by archaeology, science, psychology and philosophy. But there is not sufficient factual material in the Quran for this to be possible. Of course, the writer has not studied the Bible in depth. He actually knows little about what the Bible says as he demonstrates later on.*

The real certainty about the truthfulness of the Qur'an is evident in the confidence which is prevalent throughout it; and this confidence comes from a different approach - "Exhausting the Alternatives." In essence, the Qur'an states, "This book is a divine revelation; if you do not believe that, then what is it?"

*It is a conglomeration of ideas put together by a number of different writers, partly based on visions of Muhammad, together with information gleaned by Muhammad from Jews and Gnostic heretics? All sacred works are confident. Even those that are false.*

*In other words, the reader is challenged to come up with some other explanation. Here is a book made of paper and ink. Where did it come from? It says it is a divine revelation; if it is not, then what is its source?*

*The answer of course is clear. It is the result of 6th-10th century Arabic thought and dreams put into the mouth of Muhammad (who himself never wrote a word).*

*The interesting fact is that no one has with an explanation that works. In fact, all alternatives have been exhausted. As has been well established by non-Muslims, these alternatives basically are reduced to two mutually exclusive schools of thought, insisting on one or the other. On one hand, there exists a large group of people who have researched the Qur'an for hundreds of years and who claim, "One thing we know for sure - that man, Muhammad, thought he was a prophet. He was crazy!" They are convinced that Muhammad (SAW) was fooled somehow. Then on the other hand, there is another group which alleges, "Because of this evidence, one thing we know for sure is that that man, Muhammad, was a liar!" Ironically, these two groups never seem to get together without contradicting. In fact, many references on Islam usually claim both theories. They start out by saying that Muhammad (SAW) was crazy and then end by saying that he was a liar. They never seem to realize that he could not have been both!*

*So now here I am a member of a third group! Incidentally, of course, a man can be both crazy and a liar. A crazy man is not necessarily a liar, and a liar is not necessarily a crazy man. But someone can easily be both. Although I do not think Mohammad was either. He was a visionary who partly deluded himself, and then his ideas were taken up by others who expanded on them. After all they were very profitable. They meant that Christians and Jews could be soaked for taxes and all on a religious basis. They also meant that men could be tyrannised, with it then being justified by the Quran. Just read the early bloody histories of the rise of Islam. It was at the point of a sword. And think what material benefits it brought to the successful Arab tribesmen which they saw as justified by the Quran. And they evangelised by putting a sword to people's necks and saying 'accept or die'. And we are expected to believe that God (Allah) actually condoned it!. How different from Jesus Christ Who rejected the use of the sword and sent His disciples out to preach the Word of God.*

*For example, if one is deluded and really thinks that he is a prophet, then he does not sit up late at night planning, "How will I fool the people tomorrow so that they think I am a prophet?" He truly believes that he is a prophet, and he trusts that the answer will be given to him by revelation. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the Qur'an came in answer to questions. Someone would ask Muhammad (SAW) a question, and the revelation would come with the answer to it. Certainly, if one is crazy and believes that an angel put words in his ear, then when someone asks him a question, he thinks that the angel will give him the answer. Because he is crazy, he really thinks that. He does not tell someone to wait a short while and then run to his friends and ask them, "Does anyone know the answer?" This type of behavior is characteristic of one who does not believe that he is a prophet. What the non-Muslims refuse to accept is that you cannot have it both ways. One can be deluded, or he can be a liar. He can be either one or neither, but he certainly cannot be both! The emphasis is on the fact that they are unquestionably mutually exclusive personal traits.*

*Not at all. A deluded man can be a liar as well. I have known many deluded men who were also liars. Mohammed probably did think that God helped him with his answers. I know many people today who think that God helps them with their answers, even divinely inspires them. But I would not trust their answers for all that.*

*The following scenario is a good example of the kind of circle that non-Muslims go around in constantly. If you ask one of them, "What is the origin of the Qur'an?" He tells you that it originated from the mind of a man who was crazy. Then you ask him, "If it came from his head, then where did he get the information contained in it? Certainly the Qur'an mentions many things with which the Arabs were not familiar." So in order to explain the fact which you bring him, he changes his position and says, "Well, maybe he was not crazy.*

*Or else he possibly denies that the Quran mentions things with which Arabs were not familiar. We do not even know what Arabs in the 6th century were familiar with so how can he say? But Muhammad regularly questioned travellers. Thus he might well have come up with knowledge that was new to Arab tribesmen. I could do the same myself. But do try not to assume that all non-Muslims hold the same views (any more than all Muslims do). .*

*Maybe some foreigner brought him the information. So he lied and told people that he was a prophet." At this point then you have to ask him, "If Muhammad was a liar, then where did he get his confidence? Why did he behave as though he really thought he was a prophet?"*

*But no one portrays more confidence than a liar. Otherwise he would not get away with it. However, I do not consider that Muhammad was a deliberate liar. He left that to many of his followers.*

*Finally backed into a corner, like a cat he quickly lashes out with the first response that comes to his mind. Forgetting that he has already exhausted that possibility, he claims, "Well, maybe he wasn't a liar. He was probably crazy and really thought that he was a prophet." And thus he begins the futile circle again.*

*And so we have this theoretical person who conveniently behaves like an utter fool and also behaves like a cat. But who he was no one knows because he too is a delusion.*

*As has already been mentioned, there is much information contained in the Qur'an whose source cannot be attributed to anyone other than Allah. For example, who told Muhammad about the wall of Dhul-Qarnayn - a place hundreds of miles to the north?*

*Possibly someone who came from Dhul-Qarnayn? Travellers went hundreds of miles. Traders came from Russia to Arabia. Nothing unusual about that.*

*Who told him about embryology?*

*No one. He knew nothing about embryology. His vague words are twisted to mean what people want them to mean in the modern day.*

*When people assemble facts such as these, if they are not willing to attribute their existence to a divine source, they automatically resort to the assumption someone brought Muhammad the information and that he used it to fool the people. However, this theory can easily be disproved with one simple question: "If Muhammad was a liar, where did he get his confidence? Why did he tell some people out right to their face what others could never say?"*

*Because he was a visionary. Visionaries are always confident about the truth of their visions however wrong they prove to be. So are tricksters. Have you never heard of a 'confidence' trickster? His method is to be confident.*

*Such confidence depends completely upon being convinced that one has a true divine revelation. For example, the Prophet (SAW) had an uncle by the name of Abu Lahab. This man hated Islam to such an extent that he used to follow the Prophet around in order to discredit him. If Abu Lahab saw the Prophet (SAW) speaking to a stranger, he would wait until they parted and then would go to the stranger and ask him, "What did he tell you? Did he say, 'Black.'? Well, it's white. Did he say, 'Morning.'? Well, it's night." He faithfully said the exact opposite of whatever he heard Muhammad (SAW) and the Muslims say. However, about ten years before Abu Lahab died, a little chapter in the Qur'an was revealed to him. It distinctly stated that he would go to the Fire (i.e., Hell). In other words, it affirmed that he would never become a Muslim and would therefore be condemned forever. For ten years all Abu Lahab had to do was say, "I heard that it has been revealed to Muhammad that I will never change - that I will never become a Muslim and will enter the Hellfire. Well I want to become a Muslim now. How do you like that? What do you think of your divine revelation now?" But he never did that. And yet, that is exactly the kind of behavior one would have expected from him since he always sought to contradict Islam. In essence, Muhammad (SAW) said, "You hate me and you want to finish me? Here, say these words, and I am finished. Come on, say them!" But Abu Lahab never said them. Ten years! And in all that time he never accepted Islam or even became sympathetic to the Islamic cause. How could Muhammad possibly have known for sure that Abu Lahab would fulfill the Qur'anic revelation if he (i.e., Muhammad) was not truly the messenger of Allah? How could he possibly have been so confident as to give someone 10 years to discredit his claim of Prophethood? The only answer is that he was Allah's messenger; for in order to put forth such a risky challenge, one has to be entirely convinced that he has a divine revelation.*

*But I can tell you of hundreds of cases of people who said such things of others. All it tells us is that Muhammad said he would never accept the truth and he never accepted the truth. Nothing remarkable in that. I will tell you now that Gary Miller will never become a Christian. Does that make me divinely inspired? The prejudice of his mind is such that he is unlikely to be converted. He closes his mind to truth and invents in his defence whatever is suitable. He will die in darkness.*

*Another example of the confidence which Muhammad (SAW) had in his own Prophethood and consequently in the divine protection of himself and his message is when he left Makkah and hid in a cave with Abu Bakr during their emigration to Madeenah. The two clearly saw people coming to kill them, and Abu Bakr was afraid. Certainly, if Muhammad (SAW) was a liar, a forger and one who was trying to fool the people into believing that he was a prophet, one would have expected him to say in such a circumstance to his friend, "Hey, Abu Bakr, see if you can find a back way out of this cave." Or "Squat down in that corner over there and keep quiet." Yet, in fact, what he said to Abu Bakr clearly illustrated his confidence. He told him, "Relax! Allah is with us, and Allah will save us!" Now if one knows that he is fooling the people, where does one get this kind of attitude? In fact, such a frame of mind is not characteristic of a liar or a forger at all.*

*But it is precisely what we would expect from a visionary, whether right or wrong! Especially one who was being written about by others. Many men of many religions have behaved in exactly the same way. It is simply called 'belief'.*

*So, as has been previously mentioned, the non-Muslims go around and around in a circle, searching for a way out - some way to explain the findings in the Qur'an without attributing them to their proper source. On one hand, they tell you on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, "The man was a liar," and on the other hand, on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday they tell you, "He was crazy." What they refuse to accept is that one cannot have it both ways; yet they refuse to accept is that one cannot have it both ways; yet they need both excuses to explain the information in the Qur'an.*

*Actually you can have it both ways for men can be crazy and liars. But I have not said that about Muhammad. Deluded, yes in some things. But that is a different matter.*

*About seven years ago, I had a minister over to my home. In the particular room which we were sitting there was a Qur'an on the table, face down, and so the minister was not aware of which book it was. In the midst of a discussion, I pointed to the Qur'an and said, "I have confidence in that book." Looking at the Qur'an but not knowing which book it was, he replied, "Well, I tell you, if that book is not the Bible, it was written by a man!" In response to his statement, I said, "Let me tell you something about what is in that book." And in just three to four minutes I related to him a few things contained in the Qur'an. After just those three or four minutes, he completely changed his position and declared, "You are right. A man did not write that book. The Devil wrote it!" Indeed, possessing such an attitude is very unfortunate - for many reasons. For one thing, it is a very quick and cheap excuse. It is an instant exit out of an uncomfortable situation.*

*But of course it may also be true. And even Muslims believe that he was responsible for the Satanic verses. However he was of course wrong. It was written by men. The question then is, who inspired them, God? Or the Devil? or human hope? or drugs? or just their own dreams and hopes?*

*As a matter of fact, there is a famous story in the Bible that mentions how one day some of the Jews were witnesses when Jesus raised a man from the dead. The man had been dead for four days, and when Jesus arrived, he simply said, "Get up!" and the man arose and walked away. At such a sight, some of the Jews who were watching said disbelievingly, "This is the Devil. The Devil helped him!"*

*This story cannot be found in the Bible. It is actually a mixture of a number of Bible accounts put together and all mixed up by someone who does not even bother to read the Bible. The man who was dead four days was Lazarus (John 11). No one ever said anything about the Devil there. (Read it for yourself). The words about the Devil were said about Jesus because He cast out devils (Matthew 12)*

*Now this story is rehearsed often in churches all over the world, and people cry big tears over it, saying, "Oh, if I had been there, I would not have been as stupid as the Jews!" Yet ironically, these people do exactly what the Jews did when in just three minutes you show them only a small part of the Qur'an and all they can say is, "Oh, the Devil did it. The devil wrote that book!". Because they are truly backed into a corner and have no other viable answer, they resort to the quickest and cheapest excuse available.*

*But a moment ago what they said according to you was that he was a liar and deceiver. So you have changed your tune already.*

*Another example of people's use of this weak stance can be found in the Makkans' explanation of the source of Muhammad's message. They used to say, "The devils bring Muhammad that Qur'an!"*

*So both ancients and moderns come to the same conclusion? The devil lay behind some of the teachings of Muhammad. In fact Muslims have to agree that in the Quran there are verses written under the Devil's inspiration. That is part of their own teaching. They are called*

*popularly 'the Satanic Verses'. And no one knows where they begin or end.*

*But just as with every other suggestion made, the Qur'an gives the answer. One verse in particular states: "And they say, 'Surely he is possessed [by jinn], 'but it [i.e., the Qur'an] is not except a reminder to the worlds." Thus it gives an argument in reply to such a theory.*

*This is not an argument. It is simply a statement.*

*In fact, there are many arguments in the Qur'an in reply to the suggestion that devils brought Muhammad (SAW) his message. For example, in the 26th chapter Allah clearly affirms: "No evil ones have brought it [i.e., this revelation] down. It would neither be fitting for them, nor would they be able. Indeed they have been removed far from hearing."*

*Well, anyone could say that. And the Quran actually admits that it has within it words spoken by the Devil, the so-called Satanic verses.*

*And in another place in the Qur'an, Allah instructs us: "So when you recite the Qur'an seek refuge in Allah from Shaytaan, the rejected." Now is this how Satan writes a book? He tells one, "Before you read my book, ask God to save you from me."?*

*Yes, that is exactly what I would expect the Devil to do. He is very tricky.*

*This is very, very tricky. Indeed, a man could write something like this, but would Satan do this?*

*Yes that is how the Satanic verses got into the Quran. Even Muslims admit that it happened .*

*Many people clearly illustrate that they cannot come to one conclusion on this subject. On one hand, they claim that Satan would not do such a thing and that even if he could, God would not allow him to; yet, on the other hand, they also believe that Satan is only that much less than God. In essence they allege that the Devil can probably do whatever God can do.*

*Such people would be foolish and do not exist. Only Satanists believe that Satan is as powerful as God, because they believe in him as god.*

*And as a result, when they look at the Qur'an, even as surprised as they are as to how amazing it is, they still insist, "The Devil did this!" Thanks be to Allah, Muslims do not have that attitude.*

*But they do not look at the Quran and think how amazing it is. They often ask why it is so confusing. And what a surprise that Muslims believe it! Is that not what a Muslim is, a believer in the Quran?.*

*Although Satan may have some abilities, they are a long way separated from the abilities of Allah. And no Muslim is a Muslim unless he believes that. It is common knowledge even among non-Muslims that the Devil can easily make mistakes, and it would be expected that he would contradict himself if and when he wrote a book. For indeed, the Qur'an states: "Do they not consider the Qur'an? Had it been from any other than Allah, they would surely have found therein much discrepancy."*

*But we have found in it much discrepancy! It does not read to me like a book sent by God. It reads more like a hotch potch of information put together by a poet visionary which very much favours Arab tribesmen. And again what about the Satanic verses?*

*In conjunction with the excuses that non-Muslims advance in futile attempts to justify unexplainable verses in the Qur'an, there is another attack often rendered which seems to be a combination of the theories that Muhammad (SAW) was crazy and a liar. Basically, these people propose that Muhammad was insane, and as a result of his delusion, he lied to and misled people. There is a name for this in psychology. It is referred to as mythomania. It means simply that one tells lies and then believes them. This is what the non-Muslims say Muhammad (SAW) suffered from.*

*The usual nonsense statement. Some may say this but very few non-Muslims say this. They*

*simply say that he deceived himself on some things as many men do, not that he had mythomania.*

*But the only problem with this proposal is that one suffering from mythomania absolutely cannot deal with facts, and yet the whole Qur'an is based entirely upon facts. Everything contained in it can be researched and established as true.*

*What an extraordinary statement. Most of what it says is not even open to any method of testing whether it is true or not. It is purely theological and mythical dogmatism. It is not provable fact. (Nor do all people who say others are deluded say that they cannot also sometimes speak of facts. Many deluded people can say very sensible things. Their delusion only affects a part of their existence. But our writer will invent any strange idea to try to prove his point).*

*Since facts are such a problem for a mythomaniac, when a psychologist tries to treat one suffering from that condition, he continually confronts him with facts. For example, if one is mentally ill and claims, "I am the king of England," a psychologist does not say to him "No you aren't. You are crazy!" He just does not do that. Rather, he confronts him with facts and says, "O.K., you say you are the king of England. So tell me where the queen is today. And where is your prime minister? And where are your guards?" Now, when the man has trouble trying to deal with these questions, he tries to make excuses, saying Uh... the queen... she has gone to her mother's. Uh... the prime minister... well he died." And eventually he is cured because he cannot deal with the facts.*

*How wonderful it would be if it was as easy as this. Our friend has had little to do with psychiatry. Such strongly deluded people are not so easily convinced. Their minds are not working properly. On the other hand not all deluded people are like this. There are many types of delusion.*

*If the psychologist continues confronting him with enough facts, finally he faces the reality and says, "I guess I am not the king of England."*

*No he simply looks at you with scorn. He knows he is the king of England whatever the facts. Just like Muslims know what the Quran is (in their opinion) regardless of the facts.*

*The Qur'an approaches everyone who reads it in very much the same way a psychologist treats his mythomania patient. There is a verse in the Qur'an which states: "Oh mankind, there has come to you an admonition [i.e., the Qur'an] from your Lord and a healing for what is in the hearts - and guidance and mercy for the believers." At first glance, this statement appears vague,*

*Yes, and at second and third glance. Does the Quran really see all people as deluded madmen? What a frightening thought.*

*but the meaning of this verse is clear when one views it in light of the aforementioned example. Basically, one is healed of his delusions by reading the Qur'an. In essence, it is therapy. It literally cures deluded people by confronting them with facts.*

*Or helps deluded people to think that they are not deluded by deluding them even further? Look what it does to Muslim terrorists. I would say that it disillusiones them as well once they study it carefully enough.*

*A prevalent attitude throughout the Qur'an is one which says, "Oh mankind, you say such and such about this; but what about such and such? How can you say this when you know that?" And so forth. It forces one to consider what is relevant and what matters while simultaneously healing one of the delusions that the facts presented to mankind by Allah can easily be explained away with flimsy theories and excuses. It is this very sort of thing - confronting people with facts - that had captured the attention of many non-Muslims.*

*Again we have his mythical non-Muslims who swallow whatever they are told and think just what he wants them to think but who do not really exist*



*In fact, there exists a very interesting reference concerning this subject in the New Catholic Encyclopedia. In an article under the subject of the Qur'an, the Catholic Church states, "Over the centuries, many theories have been offered as to the origin of the Qur'an... Today no sensible man accepts any of these theories."!! Now here is the age-old Catholic Church, which has been around for so many centuries, denying these futile attempts to explain away the Qur'an.*

*Firstly we must point out that IF it is true then it is not the Catholic church but one writer in the Catholic church. And all he is actually saying is that some ideas people have had are not true as he disagrees with them. He can hardly be in a position to say that all ideas that men have had about it are untrue. He is simply saying that some people have strange ideas about the Quran just as some have about the Bible, and that now we do not accept the oddest of these ideas. Indeed he is just as emphatically rejecting Muslim ideas of the past. He is not saying that we therefore accept them as true. He will simply bring out his own arguments against the Quran being verbally inspired.*

*Indeed, the Qur'an is a problem for the Catholic Church. It states that it is revelation, so they study it.*

*Actually very few people in the Catholic church study it. They do not say that it is revelation. They say Muhammad taught that it was revelation. So they are prepared to be fair and read it.*

*Certainly, they would love to find proof that it is not, but they cannot.*

*But they disagree with you. And they think that they can. They think that they have proved it is not verbally inspired. As have I.*

*They cannot find a viable explanation.*

*Well that is the writer's view, not theirs. They think that they HAVE found a viable explanation.*

*But at least they are honest in their research and do not accept the first unsubstantiated interpretation which comes along. The Church states that in fourteen centuries it has not yet been presented a sensible explanation. At least it admits that the Qur'an is not an easy subject to dismiss.*

*They admit nothing of the sort. Were they to say such a thing it would just be arrogance. Are you really suggesting that they rejected what Thomas a Kempis said about the Quran? This is a dishonest and invalid conclusion. Read the whole article, not just a generalisation!!*

*Certainly, other people are much less honest. They quickly say, "Oh, the Qur'an came from here. The Qur'an came from there." And they do not even examine the credibility of what they are stating most of the time.*

*Actually no one really knows where the Quran came from. Top scholars do not consider that the usual explanation is correct. They think that it was a tale invented by the story-tellers. There is much evidence which throws great doubt on the traditional 'history'.*

*Of course, such a statement by the Catholic Church leaves the everyday Christian in some difficulty. It just may be that he has his own ideas as to the origin of the Qur'an, but as a single member of the Church, he cannot really act upon his own theory. Such an action would be contrary to the obedience, allegiance and loyalty which the Church demands. By virtue of his membership, he must accept what the Catholic Church declares without question and establish its teachings as part of his everyday routine.*

*Large numbers of everyday Christians are not Roman Catholics. The opinion of people who just believe what a church says are not worth having. (They are as irrelevant as a Muslim claiming that the Quran is inspired just because he himself believes it). A huge number of Christians do not accept that what the Roman Catholic church says is true. They examine the facts for themselves. But they still reject the Quran as a verbally inspired book.*

*So, in essence, if the Catholic Church as a whole is saying, "Do not listen to these unconfirmed reports about the Qur'an," then what can be said about the Islamic point of view?*

*This really is a most dishonest piece of writing. He has taken a vague statement by one person, given it a slant that it does not have and then claims it as the position of the Catholic church. This is pure dishonesty. The Catholic church does not say this. It has varying views.*

*Even non-Muslims are admitting that there is something to the Qur'an - something that has to be acknowledged - then why are people so stubborn and defensive and hostile when Muslims advance the very same theory? p>The non-Muslims have admitted nothing of the kind. It is only the twisted mind of the writer that is trying to convince us of something that is not true. This is not argument it is twisting words. There is of course 'something' in the Quran. It contains some words written down by people a hundred or more years after Muhammad died. But the question not answered is how reliable they are.*

*This is certainly something for those with mind a to contemplate - something to ponder for those of understanding!*

*It certainly is. To ponder whether someone who argues so dishonestly should even be listened to.*

*Recently, the leading intellectual in the Catholic Church - a man by the name of Hans - studied the Qur'an and gave his opinion of what he had read.*

*How incredible. He is supposed to be the leading intellectual in the Catholic church (what huge claim) and yet he does not even know his full name !!!!!!!*

*This man has been around for some time, and he is highly respected in the Catholic Church, and after careful scrutiny, he reported his findings, concluding, "God has spoken to man through the man, Muhammad." Again this is a conclusion arrived at by a non-Muslim source - the very leading intellectual of the Catholic Church himself!*

*There are hundreds of leading intellectuals in the Roman Catholic church. But they do not all speak with one voice on this or any other subject. No evidence is given for this man's existence, or for what he is supposed to have said. Quite frankly (and I am not a Roman Catholic) it sounds very much like what a Muslim would like to put on a Roman Catholic scholar's lips. Besides he could easily have said God spoke to man through Voltaire, or Shaw even though they were not believers. God speaks to us in many ways.. We might say that God has spoken to us through two world wars but that does not make the world wars divine revelation. God can speak through people who are in error on many things. But this is not really what Hans Kung said. It is a total distortion of the truth.*

*I do not think that the Pope agrees with him,*

*No I do not think that he does either. So they hardly accept him as the leading intellectual of the Catholic church. Our writer plays with truth as though it was computer game.*

*but nonetheless, the opinion of such a noted, repute public figure must carry some weight in defense of the Muslim position.*

*It just might if that was what Hans Kung said. But it was not, or at least not as interpreted by the writer. Otherwise Kung would declare himself a Muslim. And he is just one out of hundreds of intellectuals both in and outside the Roman Catholic church.*

*He must be applauded for facing the reality that the Qur'an is not something which can be easily pushed aside and that, in fact God is the source of these words.*

*Quick leap from one to the other. How easily and quickly our writer makes us all Muslims, whether we like it or not. Who said it should be pushed aside? Certainly it should be given fair consideration. But that does not mean that it should be accepted. It must be shown to be what it is. An interesting example of Arabic thought.*

As is evident from the aforementioned information, all of the possibilities have been exhausted, so the chance of finding another possibility of dismissing the Qur'an is non-existent.

*But we haven't even started. There are many more reasons for dismissing the Quran as a divinely inspired book, its vagueness, its discrepancies, its mixed moral attitudes, its attitude towards women, its contradictions, its mixing up of history, to name but a few.*

For if the book is not a revelation, then it is a deception; and if it is a deception, one must ask, "What is its origin" And where does it deceive us?"

*And the answer is that its source was a visionary who sometimes had distorted visions. And it deceives us because the visionary sometimes got it wrong. (He even allowed Satan to deceive him, by his own admission).*

Indeed, the true answers to these questions shed light on the Qur'an's authenticity and silence the bitter unsubstantiated claims of the unbelievers. Certainly, if people are going to insist that the Qur'an is a deception, then they must bring forth evidence to support such a claim. The burden of proof is on them, not us!

*I can provide a multitude of such proofs. But actually the burden of proof is on you. We treat it as we treat any other book, and look into it to find out of what genre it is. And we find it lacking and often unclear.*

One is never supposed to advance a theory without sufficient corroborating facts; so I say to them, "Show me one deception! Show me where the Qur'an deceives me! Show me, otherwise, don't say that it is a deception!"

*Let him but come to this website and he will certainly find some of them.*

An interesting characteristic of the Qur'an is how it deals with surprising phenomena which relate not only to the past but to modern times as well. In essence, the Qur'an is not an old problem. It is still a problem even today - a problem to the non-Muslims that is.

*You are right about that. It is certainly a problem to Muslims. It has caused so much of Arab belligerence and so many martyr bombers, and all in the name of Allah. So it is obviously not as clear as the writer suggests.*

For everyday, every week, every year brings more and more evidence that the Qur'an is a force to be contended with - that its authenticity is no longer to be challenged! For example, one verse in the Qur'an reads; "Do not the unbelievers see that the heavens and the earth were joined together, then We clove them asunder, and made from water every living thing? Will they not then believe?"

*But there is nothing new here it is simply a summary of Genesis 1. And everything is not made of water.*

Ironically, this very information is exactly what they awarded the 1973 Noble Prize for - to a couple of unbelievers. The Qur'an reveals the origin of the universe - how it began from one piece - and mankind continues to verify this revelation, even up to now.

*I suggest anyone that who reads what the 1973 Nobel prize (which one?) was all about may find it is not quite what the Quran says. I could have told them that. Our writer does love to deal in vague dogmatically interpreted statements of a meaningless kind.*

Additionally, the fact that all life originated from water would not have been an easy thing to convince people of fourteen centuries ago.

*But all life does not come from water. Everything is not made up of hydrogen and oxygen. Just another false generalisation of the Quran which is not true to fact.*

Indeed, if 1400 years ago you had stood in the desert and told someone, "All of this, you see (pointing to yourself), is made up of mostly water," no one would have believed you. Proof of that was not available until the invention of the microscope. They had to wait to find out that cytoplasm, the basic substance of the cell, is made-up of 80% water. Nonetheless, the evidence did come, and once again the Qur'an stood the test of time.

*Ah, now it is MAINLY water. That is different. But that is not what the Quran said. And it was the Bible which first made water prominent in creation. That is where Muhammad got it from.*

In reference to the falsification tests mentioned earlier, it is interesting to note that they, too, relate to both the past and the present. Some of them were used as illustrations of Allah's omnipotence and knowledge, while others continue to stand as challenges to the present day. An example of the former is the statement made in the Qur'an about Abu Lahab. It clearly illustrates that Allah, the Knower of the Unseen, knew that Abu Lahab would never change his ways and accept Islam. Thus Allah dictated that he would be condemned to the hellfire forever. Such a chapter was both an illustration of Allah's divine wisdom and a warning to those who were like Abu Lahab. *a good guess based on his obduracy?*

An interesting example of the latter type of falsification tests contained in the Qur'an is the verse which mentions the relationship between the Muslims and the Jews. The verse is careful not to narrow its scope to the relationship between individual members of each religion, but rather, it summarizes the relationship between the two groups of people as a whole. In essence, the Qur'an states that the Christians will always treat the Muslims better than the Jews will treat the Muslims.

*Which is presumably why Muslims treat both equally badly, and still martyr them today. But how on earth can we judge whether Jews as a whole have treated Muslims worse than so-called Christians as a whole?. This is simply an opinion not a provable fact.*

Indeed, the full impact of such a statement can only be felt after careful consideration of the real meaning of such a verse. It is true that many Christians and many Jews have become Muslims,

*It is also true that many Muslims have seen the truth and become Christians, and even more so now that they are not instantly put to death for being so. In Indonesia millions are turning to Christ.*

but as a whole, the Jewish community is to be viewed as an avid enemy of Islam.

*Because they will keep winning. It was not the Jews who started the wars. But once they had won it gave them false ideas.*

Additionally, very few people realize what such an open declaration in the Qur'an invites. In essence, it is an easy chance for the Jews to prove that the Qur'an is false - that it is not a divine revelation. All they have to do is organize themselves, treat the Muslims nicely for a few years and then say, "Now what does your holy book say about who are your best friends in the world - the Jews or the Christians? Look what we Jews have done for you!" That is all they have to do to disprove the Qur'an's authenticity, yet they have not done it in 1400 years. But, as always, the offer still stands open!

*How kind. But very unlikely. And not because of anything that the Quran says. Most people who are threatened with extermination take up such an attitude.*

All of the examples so far given concerning the various angles from which one can approach the Qur'an and have undoubtedly been subjective in nature;

*Yes, very subjective, and based on vagaries.*

However there does exist another angle, among others, which is objective and whose basis is mathematical. It is surprising how authentic the Qur'an becomes when one assembles what

might be referred to as a list of good guesses. Mathematically, it can be explained using guessing and prediction examples. For instance, if a person has two choices (i.e., one is right, and one is wrong), and he closes his eyes and makes a choice, then half of the time (i.e., one time out of two) he will be right. Basically, he has a one in two chance, for he could pick the wrong choice, or he could pick the right choice. Now if the same person has two situations like that (i.e., he could be right or wrong about situation number one, and he could be right or wrong about situation number two), and he closes his eyes and guesses, then he will only be right one fourth of the time (i.e., one time out of four). He now has a one in four chance because now there are three ways for him to be wrong and only one way for him to be right. In simple terms, he could make the wrong choice in situation number one and then make the wrong choice in situation number two; OR he could make the wrong choice in situation number one and then make the right choice in situation number two; OR he could make the right choice in situation number one and then make the wrong choice in situation number two; OR he could make the right choice in situation number one and then make the right choice in situation number two. Of course, the only instance in which he could be totally right is the last scenario where he could guess correctly in both situations. The odds of his guessing completely correctly have become greater because the number of situations for him to guess in have increased; and the mathematical equation representing such a scenario is  $1/2 \times 1/2$  (i.e., one time out of two for the first situation multiplied by one time out of two for the second situation). Continuing on with the example, if the same person now has three situations in which to make blind guesses, then he will only be right one eighth of the time (i.e., one time out of eight or  $1/2 \times 1/2 \times 1/2$ ). Again, the odds of choosing the correct choice in all three situations have decreased his chances of being completely correct to only one time in eight. It must be understood that as the number of situations increase, the chances of being right decrease, for the two phenomena are inversely proportional.

*But the writer has already told us how much information there is in the Quran, so three or four examples of something correct would only be minimal. he is inconsistent.*

Now applying this example to the situations in the Qur'an. If one draws up a list of all of the subjects about which the Qur'an has made correct statements, it becomes very clear that it is highly unlikely that they are all just correct blind guesses.

*No, many of them come from the Bible. But we have yet to see this remarkable list.*

Indeed, the subjects discussed in the Qur'an are numerous, and thus the odds of someone just making lucky guesses about all of them become practically nil. If there are a million ways for the Qur'an to be wrong, yet each time it is right, then it is unlikely that someone was guessing.

*But the subjects are not discussed. They are simply stated, and usually in such a way that they can mean a number of things. The one thing that the Quran is NOT is exact. Thus each can interpret it as he wants. So he gives us three examples out of a million. Wonderful odds.*

The following three examples of subjects about which the Qur'an has made correct statements collectively illustrate how the Qur'an continues to beat the odds. In the 16th chapter the Qur'an mentions that the female bee leaves its home to gather food. 12 Now, a person might guess on that, saying, "The bee that you see flying around - it could be male, or it could be female. I think I will guess female." Certainly, he has a one in two chance of being right. So it happens that the Qur'an is right. But it also happens that was not what most people believed at the time when the Qur'an was revealed.

*Now with the lack of information available to us how can we know what people of those days believed or knew about bees? But if Muhammad knew then we can be sure that others would know as well. Anyway Arabs always expected the women to do the collecting. Muhammad was just picturing the life of bees as being like that of humans. .*

Can you tell the difference between a male and a female bee?

*Yes. And I suggest that the Muslim saw that those creatures which took food back to the den were mainly the females, so it assumed that the bees that took pollen back to the hive were female. Very sensible conclusion but hardly requiring divine knowledge.*

Well, it takes a specialist to do that, but it has been discovered that the male bee never leaves his home to gather food. However, in Shakespeare's play, Henry the Fourth, some of the characters discuss bees and mention that the bees are soldiers and have a king. That is what people thought in Shakespeare's time - that the bees that one sees flying around are male bees and that they go home and answer to a king. However, that is not true at all.

*No that is not true. The drones are soldiers. They defend the hive. and Shakespeare said nothing about them 'flying around'. But can anyone tell me what Shakespeare's thoughts have to do with Muslims? This is another example of the writer's method of mixing up lots of information and hoping that the ignorant see it as proof.*

The fact is that they are females, and they answer to a queen. Yet it took modern scientific investigations in the last 300 years to discover that this is the case.

*But that is not what the Quran said. It merely said that female bees left their hives to obtain food (just like human women did). Nothing there about what scientific investigation has revealed. (It does not even say that only females did it). All that tells us is that there were female bees and they left the hive and obtained food just as is true of all living creatures. What is divinely revealed about that?. It is simple common sense.*

So back to the list of good guesses, concerning the topic of bees, the Qur'an had a 50/50 chance of being right, and the odds were one in two.

*The odds were a lot better than that. They were a dead cert. Females of all species seek for food. And Arab warriors would not expect males to seek for food. They were butchers - of men. they would expect the same of the bees.*

In addition to the subject of bees, the Qur'an also discusses the sun and the manner in which it travels through space.

*No it does not. It speaks vaguely about the sun and the reader then plays with the language to make it mean what he wants it to mean.*

Again, a person can guess on that subject. When the sun moves through space, there are two options: it can travel just as a stone would travel if one threw it, or it can move of its own accord.

*Or it could be propelled by heavenly forces, or it could be moved by God, or it could be swayed by magnetic forces or gravity, and so on. That is now five alternatives.*

The Qur'an states the latter - that it moves as a result of its own motion. To do such, the Qur'an uses a form of the word sabaha to describe the sun's movement through space. In order to properly provide the reader with a comprehensive understanding of the implications of this Arabic verb, the following example is given. If a man is in water and the verb sabaha is applied in reference to his movement, it can be understood that he is swimming, moving of his own accord and not as a result of a direct force applied to him.

*So we conclude that the sun is swimming? This is making words mean what you want them to mean when they can mean any number of things. It is called deceiving the ignorant.*

Thus when this verb is used in reference to the sun's movement through space, it in no way implies that the sun is flying uncontrollably through space as a result of being hurled or the like. It simply means that the sun is turning and rotating as it travels.

*The word has made no mention of turning and rotating. This is all in the mind of the writer. First it is swimming, now it is turning and rotating. But the original word did not mean that.*

*That is read into it by the writer. Originally he said it meant moving of its own accord. It is a wonderful Arabic word this. It means everything we want it to mean at a particular time. And besides, the sun does not move of its own accord, so the Quran is wrong.*

Now, this is what the Qur'an affirms, but was it an easy thing to discover? Can any common man tell that the sun is turning? Only in modern times was the equipment made available to project the image of the sun onto a tabletop so that one could look at it without being blinded. And through this process it was discovered that not only are there three spots on the sun but that these spots move once every 25 days. This movement is referred to as the rotation of the sun around its axis and conclusively proves that, as the Qur'an stated 1400 years ago, the sun does, indeed turn as it travels through space.

*The word used in the Quran said nothing of the kind. This is being read in by the writer, who then pretends that the Quran said it.*

And returning once again to the subject of good guess, the odds of guessing correctly about both subjects - the sex of bees and the movement of the sun - are one in four!

*They would have been had it not been for the fact, as we have demonstrated, that the assumption would be that the worker bees were female because it was women who fed their households, and had it really talked about the rotation of the sun, which it did not. The latter is not stated.*

Seeing as back fourteen centuries ago people probably did not understand much about time zones, the Quran's statements about this subject are considerably surprising.

*But it was the Bible that connected the sun with time zones in Genesis 1.14. The Quran gives no further knowledge on it. It sees the sun as swimming in the sky. Some revelation!!*

The concept that one family is having breakfast as the sun comes up while another family is enjoying the brisk night air is truly something to be marvelled at, even in modern time. Indeed, fourteen centuries ago, a man could not travel more than thirty miles in one day, and thus it took him literally months to travel from India to Morocco, for example. And probably, when he was having supper in Morocco, he thought to himself, "Back home in India they are having supper right now." This is because he did not realize that, in the process of travelling, he moved across a time zone. Yet, because it is the words of Allah, the All-Knowing, the Qur'an recognizes and acknowledges such a phenomenon.

*No it does not. It is the modern writer with scientific knowledge at his disposal who interprets it like this. Had it been clear then that Muslim eating his food in Morocco would have known that in India the time would be different. So he did not see the Quran as teaching that!!*

In an interesting verse it states that when history comes to an end and the Day of Judgment arrives, it will all occur in an instant; and this very instant will catch some people in the daytime and some people at night.

*It actually obtains all this from the Bible. It was what Jesus said. You will notice that he has not quoted the verse, If he did you would find that it did not quite say in context what he says it did.*

This clearly illustrates Allah's divine wisdom and His previous knowledge of the existence of time zones, even though such a discovery was non-existent back fourteen centuries ago. Certainly, this phenomenon is not something which is obvious to one's eyes or a result of one's experience, and this fact, in itself, suffices as proof of the Qur'an's authenticity.

*No actually it demonstrates what you can do with words if you try hard enough. It demonstrates that the Quran is vague enough to be given a number of meanings.*

Returning one final time to the subject of good guesses for the purpose of the present example, the odds that someone guessed correctly about all three of the aforementioned subjects - the sex of bees, the movement of the sun and the existence of time zones - are one in eight!

*You mean , of course, if these things had really been clearly stated in the Quran so that they left no room for an alternative meaning. But as we have seen that is not so.*

Certainly, one could continue on and on with this example, drawing up longer and longer list of good guesses.

*Then why don't you. Have you run out of examples already?*

and of course, the odds would become higher and higher with each increase of subjects about which one could guess. But what no one can deny is the following; the odds that Mohammed an illiterate, guessed correctly about thousands and thousands of subjects, never once making a mistake, are so high that any theory of his authorship of the Qur'an must be completely dismissed - even by the most hostile enemies of Islam!

*But let us see these thousands and thousands of guesses that you speak about. Where are they? The three that he has already 'quoted' have proved not to be very convincing.*

Indeed, the Qur'an expects this kind of challenge. Undoubtedly, if one said to someone upon entering a foreign land, "I know your father. I have met him," probably the man from that land would doubt the newcomer's word, saying, "You have just come here. How could you know my father?" As a result, he would question him, "Tell me, is my father tall, short, dark, fair? What is he like?" Of course, if the visitor continued answering all of the questions correctly, the skeptic would have no choice but to say, "I guess you do know my father. I don't know how you know him, but I guess you do!" The situation is the same with the Qur'an. It states that it originates from the One who created everything. So everyone has the right to say, "Convince me! If the author of this book really originated life and everything in the heavens and on the earth, then He should know about this, about that, and so on." And inevitably, after researching the Qur'an, everyone will discover the same truths.

*You mean the truths that it does not reveal all the wonderful things that he is talking about?*

Additionally, we all know something for sure: we do not all have to be experts to verify what the Qur'an affirms. One's iman (faith) grows as one continues to check and confirm the truths contained in the Qur'an. And one is supposed to do so all of his life.

*But we have not yet been convinced that the Quran gives us even one truth that all men did not know!! May God (Allah) guide everyone close to the truth.*

*And may our Lord Jesus Christ bring us all to Himself as He does so. SUPPLEMENT An engineer at the University of Toronto who was interested in psychology and who had read something on it, conducted researched wrote a thesis on Efficiency of Group Discussions. The purpose of his research was to find out how much people accomplish when they get together to talk in groups of two, three, ten, etc. The graph of his findings: people accomplish most when they talk in groups of two. Of course, this discovery was entirely beyond his expectations, but it is very old advice given in the Qur'an:*

*Which it obtained from the Bible. The disciples were sent out by Jesus two by two.*

*Additionally, the 89th chapter of the Qur'an mentions a certain city by the name of 'Iram (a city of pillars), which was not known in ancient history and which was non-existent as far as historians were concerned. However, the December 1978 edition of National Geographic introduced interesting information which mentioned that in 1973, the city of Elba was excavated in Syria. The city was discovered to be 43 centuries old, but that is not the most amazing part. Researchers found in the library of Elba a record of all of the cities with which Elba had done business. Believe or not, there on the list was the name of the city of 'Iram. The people of Elba had done business with the people of 'Iram!*

*No I actually do not believe it. The library at Elba is not easy to translate, the place names are even more difficult to understand and many such guesses have been made about different place*



*names which have proved untrue. The script at Elba could not give the name 'Iram in Arabic. It did not have the linguistic capability. The script at Elba was proto-Hebrew. So the script would not allow it. Thus that is just not true. It plays on people's ignorance. However, the Bible is full of ancient place names which have subsequently been verified by archaeology. All it proves is that such and such a city did exist. But it proves nothing about the later source except that it had historical information. Nothing wonderful about that. What does interest me (just assuming for a moment that his argument had been correct), is that the writer was surprised to find that a place named in the Quran actually existed. We Christian EXPECT places mentioned in the Bible to exist.*

*"Say, 'I exhort you to one thing - that you stand for Allah, [assessing the truth] by twos and singly, and then reflect.....' In conclusion I ask you to consider with care the following: "And they say, 'Why are not signs sent down to him from his Lord?' Say, 'Indeed, the signs are with Allah, and I am but a clear warner.' But is sufficient for them that We have sent down to you the Book [i.e. Qur'an] which is rehearsed to them? Verily, in that is mercy and a reminder to people who believe."*

*Why should 'the Book' not mean the Bible (which Muhammad enjoined all to read). And this is true of the Bible. So read the Bible and find the truth.*