

Episode 84

1- AIDS 2- The prophecy on the propagation of Islam

The author : Father Zakaria Boutros
The publisher: www.fatherzakaria.com

Sheik Ahmad Didat, the Islamic proselytiser uttered many calumnies against Christianity in a book named "the accouterment of fighting" "this book has been considered a reference for many Muslims, attacking Christianity through the questions within it

1- That book has a sun shine obvious calumnies and lies against Christianity and the Holy Bible, it strays the simple people who lack the knowledge

2- Actually Ahmad Didat himself admitted that he quoted his book from the book "Revelation of the truth" by the jurisprudent Rahmat Allah Al-Hindi

He said literally: I encountered in a main warehouse, a book bitten by insects named "Revelation of the truth" "...I read that book and I worked with what I learned from it (see the book "that's my life" by Ahmed Didat, page 19, 20)

3- Actually Didat wrote that book in English language under the title" (Combat Kit), but the translator gave it the title "the accouterment of fighting" to lighten the meaning of the English title that was showing the Islamic terrorism

4- In the original English version of the book, Ahmad Didat uttered 54 calumnies against the Holy Bible in its two testaments the old and the new one, strangely the translator translated only 44 of them and excluded ten calumnies, probably as they included very obvious concoctions!!!

AIDS and homosexuality

1- Among those issues not translated to Arabic, Ahmad Didat wrote in his book in the English version, under the title: (AIDS and homosexuality)

**2- He mentioned what was written in the New Testament in Romans 1: 22- 27:
"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and traded the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed animals, and creeping things. Therefore God also gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonored among themselves, who exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this reason, God gave them up to vile passions. For their women changed the natural function into that which is against nature. Likewise also the men, leaving the natural function of the woman, burned in their lust toward one another, men doing what is inappropriate with men, and receiving in themselves the due penalty of their error"**

3- Sheikh Ahmad Didat didn't comment on that part with any word

4- By mentioning that part, Didat had attested for the Holy Bible, that was written two thousands years ago, as it mentioned about AIDS transmitted by homosexuality, saying:" and receiving in themselves the due penalty of their error"

5- By ignoring that part in the translation, the translator thought that Didat didn't realize that this part was attesting for the Holy Bible and not aspersing in it, therefore he excluded it from the Arabic translation

Could Didat be with such credulity imagined by the translator? Then what could be his aim of mentioning that part?

1- Maybe he wanted to give an impression that the Holy Bible was inciting for homosexuality??

2-Obviously, we can rebut that by saying that: the preceding verses to that part mentioned the sins and evil doings committed by the wicked , then he announced God's wrath on those committing such sins , that part Didat shouldn't hide while he mentioned the part mentioned before (it is like saying " Approach not the prayer ", and ignoring the second part "when you are in a drunken state"

3- We didn't expect from an eminent and famous scholar to have such style of Disregarding the people's thinking and presenting half facts only

4-The most important of all is: why did Sheikh Didat wonder from the mentioning of human sins and homosexuality in the Holy Bible?

5- Didn't the quran mention that in the story of Lot? {The Heights chapter (Surat Al-A'raf) 80, 81, The Ants chapter (Surat An-Naml) 55 and the spider chapter (Surat Al-Ankabut) 29}:"And Lot said to his people: "Do you commit the worst sin, you practice your lusts on men instead of women. Nay, but you are a people transgressing beyond bounds."

6- And it was mentioned in The Poets chapter (Surat Ash-Shu'ara') 165:"Go you in unto the males of the mankind"

7- That's the style of Sheikh Didat in blinding the Muslims, so they just pick what he is telling them without inspecting or investigating it

8- Actually Sheikh Didat and his followers in his style as Sheikh Al-Sharawy were those who had founded the sectarian turbulence

9- Isn't it our role to rebut such straying calumnies? And after all they are accusing us by provoking the turbulence!!! Amazing

The prophecy on the propagation of Islam

In the translation of the book "the accouterment of fighting" the first issue concerning the Holy Bible was under the title:" A Revelation from the Arabic land"

He mentioned what was written in Isaiah 21:13, 14, saying that: this part was pointing to the burden upon Arabia and its responsibility in conveying the message of Islam to the whole mankind

Let us read from the Holy Bible what was mentioned by Ahmed Didat, and then discuss each word to see his calumnies by the true and logic proof

1- The book of Isaiah said:" The burden on Arabia. In the forest in Arabia you will lodge, you caravans of Dedanaites they brought water to him who was thirsty. The inhabitants of the land of Doma met the fugitives with their bread"(Isaiah 21:13, 14)

2- the translator of Didat' book commented on that part saying:" the Qulinz English version titled that part under:" the burden and responsibility put on the Arabic peninsula"

3- Ahmed Didat added: the burden is certainly was the responsibility of conveying the message of God to the whole mankind, saying that the book of Isaiah declared that Almighty God had put that burden on Arabs

4- He mentioned the reference (Isaiah 21:13, 14) without mentioning the text of the Holy Bible we have just mentioned before, to purport the reader that it includes the definite proof, while in fact it doesn't

**-Actually whoever read the original text written by Didat in English, will find it totally different from the Arabic translation, the original English text is on the internet:
www.jamaat.net/combatkit/combat.html**

- By Looking to the original English text mentioned by the translator in page 13 you will find it different from the translation

- Although Didat didn't mention the text of that part of the Holy Bible in his book in English, but the translator had mentioned the text, and he changed the word (Dedanaites) to the word (Fadadine) and I don't know what did he mean by that word? In the Arabic dictionaries it means areas of land (in Arabic" Fadadine" is the pleural of "Fadan" which is a certain unit of measurement of the land area)

- Besides, How did he dare to alter the words of the Holy Bible?? Is that of the scientific honesty?

- Also the translator mentioned what he named" the Qulinz English version", we don't know from where he got that name of that version, he should mention who printed that version? Who published it? Where it was published?

- Isn't that ambiguity of the reference considered to be deceiving of the reader?

- And Didat himself didn't mention that name in his book, but he mentioned "The Christian Bible" and he also didn't mention any details about that name he gave: where was it published? Who published it? When was it published? Was that a book of witnesses of Yahweh, those conversationalist heretics? Why all of that obscuring and ambiguity?

-Why all of that camouflage and purporting the people that what was mentioned was the truth without mentioning its origin?

Did the Holy Bible foretell about the responsibility of propagation of Islam being put on the Arabs?

1- Didat in his original English text mentioned "The burden upon Arabia", actually the word "burden" has another meaning that is "defeating the Arabic peninsula"

2- As he used to do, Didat used his camouflage, as there is a difference between the expressions (Burden of Doma) that was used in the previous verses of that part , pointing to the responsibility of Doma in Syria and the expression of (Burden upon Arabia) that was pointing to defeating the Arabic peninsula

Let us see the real meaning of that part of the Holy Bible as said by the Christian scholars of exegesis

We as Christians can't give ourselves the right of explaining the quran, but we refer to the eminent annotators and jurisprudents, so how does any Muslim whoever he is give himself the right of explaining the Holy Bible without reference to the scholars of exegesis to clarify matters?

What is the exegesis of that part mentioned by Ahmed Didat about the Burden upon Arabia in conveying Islam to the mankind?

1- The verses mentioned in the Holy Bible are:" The burden on Arabia. In the forest in Arabia you will lodge, you, caravans of Dedanaites they brought water to him who was thirsty. The inhabitants of the land of Doma met the fugitives with their bread"(Isaiah 21:13, 14)

2-Who were those" caravans of Dedanaites"? , Sadly, Sheikh Didat didn't mention the text escaping from those words, as that part didn't apply to the caravans of Muhammad , but the translator had changed those words for the reader not to realize that this subject was not concerning Muhammad at all , so he translated it in a bizarre meaningless words "you ,caravans of Fadadine" instead of " you, caravans of Dedanaites"

3- As the Holy Bible explained, The Dedanaites are the sons of Dedan, the son of Jokshan, the son of Keturah the wife of Ibrahim (see the book of genesis 25:2,3), so was Muhammad from the Dedanaites for that prophecy to point to him?, was he from Keturah or from Hajar and Ismail as the Muslims say?

4- Did Didat study those verses to know their meanings? If he did, he wouldn't fall in such disgraceful mistake

5- Most likely when he found the words:" caravans" and" they brought water to him who was thirsty" he wished that it would be pointing to Muhammad , so Satan put that in his wish, exactly as he put the words" the great Gharaneek " in Muhammad wish when he said:" " Have you then considered Al-Lât, and Al-'Uzza (two idols of the pagan Arabs) And Manât (another idol) , the other third?, those great Gharaneek (great idols), their intercession are well accepted...and Gabriel told him that those words were from Satan

6- Or probably Didat was confused, similar to the joke of Muhammad latif the famous football matches commenter in Egypt when he was commenting on a match of port saeed team, with the player mussa'd nour within the team, he said: is mussa'd nour the brother of "amoud nour"? "" Amoud nour" means in Arabic the stadium light", he continued his joke saying, definitely not, it is just a similarities in names (as the player will never be the brother of the stadium light)

So probably that what happened with Didat , as he thought that the caravans of Dedanaites were the Muslims' caravans, so we are telling him that they are not the same, but it's just a similarity in names

What was the real meaning of those verses?

1-The fact that Sheikh Didat didn't know or tried to ignore was that: this part he mentioned was a prophecy on the defeat and demolishing of the Arabic nation after one year of that prophecy

2-That was mentioned in the next verses as the rest of the prophecy said (Isaiah 21:16, 17):" For the Lord said to me, "Within a year, as a worker bound by contract would count it, all the glory of Kedar will fail, and the residue of the number of the archers, the mighty men of the children of Kedar, will be few; for the lord, the God of Israel, has spoken it."

3-Sheikh Didat agrees with us that Kedar symbols the Arabs, as he said in his book" the accouterment of fighting, page 12"{ Kedar is one of the sons of our grand father Ismail, and one of the ancestors of Muhammad}

4-So the prophecy said:" all the glory of Kedar will fail"(meaning the Arabs)

5-That what exactly happened by the army of Ashore (Ashore Banibal) in the seventh century B.C (1)

6- How could such an eminent Islamic proselytiser perform that camouflage, to stray the readers?

7- Wouldn't he rather study well those subjects he is handling, in the light of the exegesis and the history books, instead of uttering such nullified calumnies and deliberate sophistries?

8- Is that what he justify for himself to do under the doctrine of Islamic hypocrisy (Taquiah) and permission of lies that was permitted by Muhammad in his converses??

As Muhammad permitted the lying in his converses in:

1- Narrated yakoub Ibn Saad, from his father:" the messenger of God permitted lying except in three occasions; in the war, in reconciliation with people, and the husband's lying to his wife"(2)

2- it was mentioned that:" lying is all sin, except that you use for the benefit of a Muslim or that you use to defend the God's religion"(3)

3- That last converse is showing how liars are all the Islamic proselytisers

4- If the religion is based on lying, so how could man reach the truth through it?

5- It is enough to know that the Christ said that he is the truth and the life

6- That's why he said "You will know the truth, and the truth will make you free."

(1)" The history of Ashore Banibal "page 261- 290 (in English)
And "the simplified Arabic encyclopaedia" page 167

(2)" Fath Al-Bare in the exegesis of Sahih Al-Bokhary" converse number 2495

(3)" The labourers' treasure" by Al-Motaquey Al-Hendy, 2447