

June 9, 2010

### Chapter 3 Holy War

**Introduction.** Religious intolerance?

**“Washington Post reporting.** October 19, 2007, by Jacqueline L. Salmon and Valerie Strauss, Washington Post staff writers:

**“U.S. Prodded to Shut Fairfax Saudi School - Federal Panel Wonders Whether Religious Intolerance is Being Fostered.** *A federal panel yesterday urged the State Department to shut down a Saudi government supported private school in Northern Virginia unless it can prove it is not teaching religious intolerance. . . . It leveled particular criticism at the Islamic Saudi Academy, which operates two campuses in Fairfax County, expressing “significant concerns” that the school is promoting a brand of religious intolerance that could prove a danger to the United States. . . . it is concerned about the textbooks used in the school because those used by schools in Saudi Arabia promote violence against Christians, Jews, Shias, and polytheists.”<sup>1</sup> (Emphasis added)*

What does this have to do with the Last Days?

The Bible tells us that in the Last Days, a false religion will arise that will dominate the entire world and lead to the conversion of all except those whose names are in the Lamb's book of life. The Bible tells us to look for a “beast” that wages holy war against Jews and Christians. This chapter will be an historical overview of those who have waged “holy war” against Jews and Christians, beginning with the first century AD. It will conclude with an interpretation of the identity of the religious empire that will dominate the world in the Last Days.

**“Holy War” versus Other Type of War.** First, let's define some terms. For our purposes, a “holy war” is a war waged by the adherents of a religion on behalf of the supreme being of that religion, including a war waged because of a religious instruction or command within that religion. It is a war considered to be “just” by one's religion because the supreme being of that religion calls for it. The foe in a holy war is another religion (waged against the followers of that religion), nation, or people group, along with the intent of subjugation or conversion by the adherents of that religion.

For purposes of this writing, holy war includes two other aspects specifically required by scripture. First, the war is waged against one of two specific religious groups the Bible refers to as the “saints” or the “holy people;” and, second, the war is waged by an “unbelieving” religious empire (unbelief refers to unbelief in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob or His Christ) against the saints or the holy people. The “saints” are defined by scripture as those who “hold to the testimony of Jesus” (Revelation 12:17); and the “holy people” are defined by scripture as the Jews (Isaiah 62:11-12). The unbelieving empire is symbolized in scripture in various ways, but in each case the empire is clearly unbelief in God or His Christ. In some cases, the unbelieving characteristic is revealed through specific blasphemies against God. In other cases, the characteristic is revealed by some “antichrist” factor as we will see following. Finally, holy war in the Biblical context is not waged to *preserve* one's religion, but to advance it or to subjugate others to it.

In the first three centuries of Christianity, most Christians were pacifists by virtue of Christ's command to "love one's enemies," or to "turn the other cheek."<sup>2</sup> This was in spite of ten separate persecutions of Christians by the Romans, until the fourth century when Roman Emperor Constantine the Great was converted to Christianity. Also important in the fourth century was Bishop Saint Augustine of Hippo (354 - 430 AD). Through the spiritual leadership of Saint Augustine, Christians reevaluated their stance on Christian involvement in war. Six criteria were developed allowing Christians to participate in what became identified as "just war."<sup>3</sup> The so called "just war" criteria is not to be confused with the concept of "holy war" for purpose of this writing. They are two separate and different concepts. For example, President George Bush declared a "War on Terror" following the September 11, 2001 attacks on America, including the receipt of Congressional authorization for the use of military force.<sup>4</sup> This declaration of war was not based on a religious reason but rather the inherent right of a nation to defend itself, one of the six criteria of a "just war." Conversely, some within Islam looked at this war from an entirely different perspective. The war was a war waged by a religious empire against a pagan empire, i.e., America. *It was a jihad against the Great Satan, America.* Osama bin Laden described it this way:

*"On that basis, and in compliance with Allah's order, we issue the following fatwa to all Muslims [a "fatwa" is a religious decree by an appropriate Islamic official that must be obeyed by all Muslims]:*

*. . . to kill the Americans and their allies -- civilians and military -- is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, . . . This is in accordance with the words of Almighty Allah, . . . We -- with Allah's help -- call on every Muslim who believes in Allah and wishes to be rewarded to comply with Allah's order to kill the Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it. We also call on Muslim ulema, leaders, youths, and soldiers to launch the raid on Satan's U.S. troops and the devil's supporters allying with them, and to displace those who are behind them so that they may learn a lesson. "<sup>5</sup> (Emphasis added)*

*"Praise be to God, who revealed the Verse of the Sword to His servant and Messenger in order to establish Truth and eradicate falsehood. Praise be to God, who has said: "When the forbidden months are over, wherever you find the polytheists, kill them, seize them, besiege them, ambush them—but if they turn [to God], maintain the prayer, and pay the prescribed alms, let them go on their way, for God is most forgiving and merciful." (Qur'an 9:5). . . . And prayers and peace and blessings be upon our Prophet Muhammad, who said, "I was sent with a sword in my hands so that only God Almighty is worshiped without equal. He put my sustenance in the shadow of my spear, and disgraced and humiliated those who oppose my order. . . ." (From the Hadith collection of ibn Hanbal, vol 5, book 3, no. 5,409). He also said: "Banish the polytheists from the Arabian peninsula."<sup>6</sup> (Emphasis added)*

Consider this example of a call to *holy war* issued by Pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont, 1095 AD, which inaugurated the Crusades. The call is reported by the chronicler, "Fulcher of Chartres," who was one of four known chroniclers of the sermon by the Pope to his gathered bishops at Clermont. We will interpret below whether the Crusades fit the Biblical definition of a "holy war" but for now this call serves as an example of the basic concept of a religious war:

*". . . there remains still an important work for you to do. Freshly quickened by the divine correction, you must apply the strength of your righteousness to another matter which*

*concerns you as well as God. For your brethren who live in the east are in urgent need of your help, . . . For, as the most of you have heard, the Turks and Arabs have attacked them and have conquered . . . . They have killed and captured many, and have destroyed the churches and devastated the empire. If you permit them to continue thus for awhile with impunity, the faithful of God will be much more widely attacked by them. On this account I, or rather the Lord, beseech you as Christ's heralds to publish this everywhere and to persuade all people of whatever rank, foot-soldiers and knights, poor and rich, to carry aid promptly to those Christians and to destroy that vile race from the lands of our friends. . . . Moreover, Christ commands it. All who die by the way, whether by land or by sea, or in battle against the pagans, shall have immediate remission of sins. This I grant them through the power of God with which I am invested. O what a disgrace if such a despised and base race, which worships demons, should conquer a people which has the faith of omnipotent God and is made glorious with the name of Christ! With what reproaches will the Lord overwhelm us if you do not aid those who, with us, profess the Christian religion! . . . .<sup>7</sup>*  
(Emphasis added)

**Bible Prophecies of “Holy War.”** The Bible includes a very narrow definition for holy war. The following Bible passages prophesy of a specific type of war, i.e, a religious war, waged against one of two specific religious groups, i.e., holy people (Jews) and/or Christians by an “unbelieving” empire.

Daniel 7:21-22 *"I kept looking, and that horn was waging war with the saints and overpowering them until the Ancient of Days came, . . ."* (Emphasis added)

Daniel 7:23-25 *"Thus he said: 'The fourth beast will be a fourth kingdom on the earth, which will be different from all the other kingdoms and will devour the whole earth and tread it down and crush it. . . . 'He will speak out against the Most High and wear down the saints of the Highest One, and he will intend to make alterations in times and in law; and they will be given into his hand for a time, times, and half a time."* (Emphasis added)

The battle waged by the 4<sup>th</sup> beast of Daniel 7 will be discussed at length following. For now, notice who this battle is waged against: the “saints,” i.e., the followers of Jesus Christ.<sup>8</sup> Since the battle is specifically described as being waged against the adherents of a religion (as opposed to a nation or political kingdom), this battle has a *religious motivation*. Also, Daniel 7 describes this empire twice; first, in Daniel 7:7-8 where the empire of the 4<sup>th</sup> beast is introduced and, Daniel 7:21-26 which describes this empire in later conflicts at the end of the age. Also, Daniel 7:25 prophesies that the empire will blaspheme the “Most High.” This empire is “unbelieving” since it wages war against the “saints,” and it blasphemes the God of the saints.

In Daniel 8:21f, a “king” is prophesied to wage war in the “final period of the indignation” (8:19). The “final period of the indignation” will be interpreted in future chapters as the 7 year period of Tribulation just prior to the 2<sup>nd</sup> coming of Jesus Christ. The war that is described is waged against the “holy people,” the Jews:

Daniel 8:24 *"His power will be mighty, but not by his own power, And he will destroy to an extraordinary degree And prosper and perform his will; He will destroy mighty men and the holy people."* (Emphasis added)

This king is prophesied to “*magnify himself in his heart . . . and . . . will even oppose the “Prince of princes. . .”*” As we will interpret in a later chapter, the “Prince of princes” is a reference to Jesus Christ. The empire of Daniel 8 has to be an unbelieving empire since it opposes the King of Kings, and Prince of princes, Jesus Christ.

In Daniel 11:36f another “king” arises who “prosper[s] until the indignation is finished” (11:36). “At the end time” (11:40), he will enter the “Beautiful Land” (Jerusalem or the land of Israel) and “pitch the tents of his royal pavilion” (set up his headquarters) between the “seas and the beautiful Holy Mountain” (the modern day location of the Gaza Strip) (11:45). Once again, we find a religious war waged against either Jews or Christians. This empire appears to wage his war over an extended period of time until the “indignation is finished.” That is, similar to the religious war described in Daniel 7, this war begins at an earlier period only to be completed in the Tribulation period when the “indignation is finished.” This king is prophesied to “magnify himself above every god, and will speak monstrous things against the God of gods.” (11:36). Clearly, the empire represented by this king is not an empire aligned with the God of gods but an unbelieving empire that blasphemes the God of gods.

In Daniel 12, an “angel” completes the telling of his prophecy to the prophet Daniel. Daniel asks the angel how long it will be until the prophecy is fulfilled. Here is the angel’s answer:

*Daniel 12:7 “I heard the man dressed in linen, who was above the waters of the river, as he raised his right hand and his left toward heaven, and swore by Him who lives forever that it would be for a time, times, and half a time; and as soon as they finish shattering the power of the holy people, all these events will be completed.”*

The angel is prophesying of a religious war – it is waged against the “holy people.” Once again, this is a holy war waged against Jews or Christians. In this case, the Jews are the foe of the Empire, as was the case for Daniel 8 and Daniel 11, both of which were wars waged at the end of the “period of indignation,” i.e., the end of the Tribulation period, the last 3 ½ years of the 7 years preceding the 2<sup>nd</sup> coming of Jesus Christ.

In Revelation 12, the great dragon, satan, wages war against a “woman” and her “offspring.” The woman is almost universally interpreted by Bible scholars to symbolize the true covenant people of Israel.<sup>9</sup> The woman’s offspring is defined by the text itself. Verse 17 provides:

*Revelation 12:17 And the dragon was enraged with the woman, and went off to make war with the rest of her offspring, who keep the commandments of God and hold to the testimony of Jesus.” (Emphasis added)*

The woman’s “offspring” are defined as those, “*who . . . hold to the testimony of Jesus.*” Once again, the text is specific. Just as the war waged by the 4<sup>th</sup> beast of Daniel 7 was against the “saints,” so this war is against the “saints,” i.e., Christians. This war is not limited to the Tribulation Period, but begins with the birth of Christ when satan was thrown down from heaven (Revelation 12:4, 8-11) and continues until the saints are no more, i.e., they are raptured. This kingdom is also an “unbelieving” kingdom since it is the dragon, satan, that wages it. The 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of Revelation will tell us how he wages this war.

In Revelation 13:1-10, a “beast” appears from the sea. The beast is given the power, authority, and throne of the dragon (satan) (13:4). This beast also “makes war with the saints” (13:7).

Once again, we find a religious war waged against one of two religious groups, Jews or Christians, by an unbelieving foe, the "beast." Notice how many times the word "worship" appears in the text:

Revelation 13:4 *"and they worshiped the dragon, because he gave his authority to the beast; and they worshiped the beast, saying, "Who is like the beast, and who is able to wage war with him?" . . . 7 And it was given to him to make war with the saints and to overcome them; . . . 8 And all who dwell on the earth will worship him, everyone whose name has not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb who has been slain. . . 12 And he exercises all the authority of the first beast in his presence. And he makes the earth and those who dwell in it to worship the first beast, . . . 15 And there was given to him to give breath to the image of the beast, that the image of the beast might even speak and cause as many as do not worship the image of the beast to be killed."* (Emphasis added)

Why use the word "worship" to describe humanity's response to the "beast"? Members of the military respect those who are officers and demonstrate that respect by saluting and following orders. Officers might be revered as great leaders, even feared. But worshiped? I respect the President of the United States; *but I don't worship him*. "Worship" is what people give to their god; to the "spiritual head" of their faith whomever that might be. How do we explain the references to "worship" unless the "beast" is a metaphor for the *spiritual head of a false religion*? (Revelation 14:11, 16:2, 19:20, 20:4). Revelation 13 gives characteristics for this "beast": he will be given a mouth "speaking arrogant words and blasphemies . . . against God, to blaspheme His name and His tabernacle, that is, those who dwell in heaven" (13:5). Clearly, the empire represented by this beast is "unbelieving"; it blasphemes God and His Christ.

In Revelation 17, another "beast" appears. This one is scarlet in color. A "woman," described as a "harlot," rides the scarlet beast. Notice one of the characteristics the text provides for the woman:

Revelation 17:6 *"And I saw the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus. And when I saw her, I wondered greatly."*

The woman is drunk with the "blood of the saints (and the "witnesses of Jesus")." Why is she thus described? Because she has killed so many of the saints. Once again, it is the saints that are the foe of the empire the harlot is aligned with; and, the empire is clearly "unbelieving" since it martyrs those who are Christian. Here is another scripture that describes those saints who have been slain by the harlot:

Revelation 6:9-11 *"When the Lamb broke the fifth seal, I saw underneath the altar the souls of those who had been slain because of the word of God, and because of the testimony which they had maintained; and they cried out with a loud voice, saying, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, will You refrain from judging and avenging our blood on those who dwell on the earth?" And there was given to each of them a white robe; and they were told that they should rest for a little while longer, until the number of their fellow servants and their brethren who were to be killed even as they had been, would be completed also."*

Notice who is named by the martyrs as the cause of their death: *"How long . . . will you refrain from avenging our blood on those who dwell on the earth."* The phrase, "those who dwell on

the earth,” refers to “unbelievers,” (those whose names are not in the Lamb’s book of life<sup>10</sup>):

Revelation 17:8 "*The beast that you saw was, and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss and go to destruction. And those who dwell on the earth, whose name has not been written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, will wonder when they see the beast, that he was and is not and will come.*"

The harlot who rides the scarlet beast has been interpreted by some to be the head of the Catholic Church, the Pope. *The Pope is not an unbeliever in Jesus Christ.* He cannot be interpreted to be the harlot because the harlot is an unbeliever. Those who maintain this position support it by virtue of the many who have been slain by the Catholic Church for the crime of heresy. We will look at the identification of the “harlot” in a later chapter. For now, how can the Pope be the “harlot” when the text specifically describes those who have been slain as the saints, and those who have committed this evil as “*those who dwell on the earth*,” i.e., unbelievers? The characteristic of unbelief has been mentioned to be present in each of the aforementioned prophecies for the purpose of supporting the conclusion that the empire that wages holy war is an unbelieving empire. The phrase “those who dwell on the earth” is never used in the Bible to describe the Church of Jesus Christ and those who are a part of it. Rather, this phrase only describes only those who have never received Jesus Christ as personal Savior. The Pope, and the Catholic Church, are not in this group.

The scarlet beast upon which the harlot rides is described in another verse. This beast will lead an alliance of ten nations/groups that will wage war against the “Lamb,” i.e., Jesus Christ:

Revelation 17:14 "*These will wage war against the Lamb, and the Lamb will overcome them, because He is Lord of lords and King of kings, and those who are with Him are the called and chosen and faithful.*" (Emphasis added)

The scarlet beast (and his Alliance of ten) will wage war against the “Lamb,” a prophecy that, once again, will be fulfilled in a religious conflict against Christ and His followers (actually, at the return of Christ) by an unbelieving foe.

**Conclusion.** Throughout the prophecies of the Last Days, there is a “thread” that is present in every passage: a *religious war being waged against the Jews or Christians by an unbelieving foe*. That is, Jews or Christians are the foes in the war; and, a metaphor is given in the text to represent the opposing kingdom of unbelievers that wages this holy war against them. All we need do is find the “kingdom” that is represented in the metaphors and we will be able to determine the identity of the instrument of the “dragon,” i.e., satan (Revelation 13:4), in the Last Days.

Another interesting fact needs to be mentioned. In passages where the Jews are the foes in the religious war, the war includes an end of days conflict that overpowers the Jews. Looking at the passages just reviewed, this takes place in Daniel 8:24, 11:41, and 12:7. In future chapters, we will see the same prophecy fulfilled in Ezekiel 38 and 39. These are all future prophecies. They have yet to be fulfilled relative to the Jews; and, their future fulfillment will not necessarily be by those kingdoms that defeated the Jews prior to the time of Christ, i.e., the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, or Romans.

**The Bible Describes a Holy War that Extends Over Many Years.** As we will see, history is filled with wars that have been waged for religious reasons. Some of those waged during the medieval period include the French Wars of Religion (1562 - 1598) and the Thirty Years War (1618 - 1648). However, most of these wars are short term in duration, i.e, fifty years or less. The holy war that the Bible pictures is a longer term war, waged by different "kings," but all of whom are of the same empire. One of the passages that causes us to conclude that this is a war of many years is Revelation 17. It describes the "harlot" who rides the "scarlet beast." The "beast" has seven heads and ten horns. The ten horns are defined by the text for us: they are all "ten kings" who have "yet to receive their kingdom" (17:12). The seven horns are defined as "kings"; "five have fallen, one is, and the other has not yet come" (Revelation 17:10). Looking only at Revelation 17, we can conclude that the period of reign for these different kings has to be over a very extended period of human history. In fact, these passages, in total, represent the whole of human history subsequent to the time of conquest of Israel by the Babylonians, Persians, and Greek kingdoms (the time after the birth of Christ). Thus, the holy war we are looking for is one that will last for an extended period of time, include many conquests, and many "kings," but all of the same unbelieving spiritual empire that will wage war against Jews and Christians.

**Who Has Waged Holy War Against Jews and Christians in History?** With these factors in mind, i.e., war against Jews and Christians, and secondly, a religious war waged by unbelievers in God or His Christ, the field of potential candidates is narrowed significantly. Israel has, historically, had many enemies. The Assyrians (721 BC), Babylonians (586 BC), Greeks (350 BC), Romans (Ancient Roman Empire, 44 BC - 476 AD), Byzantines (Eastern Roman Empire, 476 AD - 1453 AD) and Muslims (635 AD - present). *But which of these nations is predominantly composed of unbelievers, and continues to the modern day at enmity with Christians (or Jews)?* Lastly, which of these engages in that war as an act of religious duty, i.e., a holy war?

Rome, Byzantium, and Islam are the only ones of the aforementioned group whose dominion does not end prior to the birth of Christianity. Therefore, we can automatically eliminate Assyria, Babylon, and Greece because their dominion precedes the birth of Christianity and, what remains of these kingdoms today is actually reconstituted as nations/lands predominantly Islamic. The short list, therefore, includes Rome, Byzantium, and Islam, including those prior kingdoms that have now been absorbed by Islam. In addition, we must also add the modern day Roman Catholic Church, not as a country, but as a religion. At first glance, we should be able to eliminate Byzantium and the Roman Catholic Church because both of these are "Christian" and the Bible prophecies of an unbelieving empire waging a religious war against Christians. Nevertheless, we will look at both of these groups and conclude whether they meet the Biblical tests for a "holy war."

Ancient Roman Empire (Rome through the fourth century AD). Ancient Roman military conquests were not waged for religious reasons but non-religious reasons. Rome's conquests provided the economic power and resources (through an expanding tax base) that Rome needed to sustain its existing populations and grow its military. Although the Roman Empire did not wage conquests against Jews or Christians for religious reasons, persecution of Christians occurred on numerous occasions under separate Roman Emperors.<sup>11</sup>

Historian Justo L. Gonzalez describes the first century religious context of Rome as multi-

cultural in nature, and composed of the worship of many gods. From a Roman perspective, the unity of conquered peoples was best insured as long as everyone believed that all worshiped the same gods, but with different names for those gods.<sup>12</sup> Christians and Jews stood out in this context because they believed in one God, to the exclusion of all other gods. Thus, Christians and Jews were seen as fanatics and exclusionists, impacting the uniformity and unity of Roman society. Thus, *they had to be removed*.<sup>13</sup>

From the time of Roman Emperor Nero (54 - 69 AD) to the conversion of Emperor Constantine (early fourth century AD), Christians were persecuted (according to Historian Peter Stearns, this persecution was not constant.<sup>14</sup>). Another reason for the persecution of Christians was the refusal of Christians to honor the Emperor as God. According to Gonzalez, Romans saw the worship of the ruling Roman emperor as a means of fostering societal unity and a test of loyalty to the Emperor. For Christians to refuse to worship the emperor (including the refusal to burn incense before the emperor's image) was an act of disloyalty that required condemnation and action by the Roman authorities.<sup>15</sup>

The Roman Empire (Western Empire) began its decline in power in the third and fourth centuries AD. The Western Empire was forever impacted by Christianity, when, in the early fourth century, the Roman Emperor, Constantine, was converted to Christianity around 312 AD.<sup>16</sup> Historian Peter Stearns estimates that at the time of Constantine's conversion, 10% of the Roman Empire was already Christianized.<sup>17</sup> Constantine's conversion all but ended Roman persecution of Christians for the remainder of the duration of the Empire in the formal issuing in 313 AD of the *Edict of Milan*, a document jointly entered into between Constantine (the Emperor of the Western Roman Empire) and Licinius Augustus, the Emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire (Constantine later became the sole emperor of both Western and Eastern Empires in 324 AD).<sup>18</sup>

With Constantine's conversion, Christianity continued its spread through the entire Roman Empire, which by the fourth century included Spain, Italy, Greece, the Middle East, Egypt, and North Africa. This spread continued after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire (generally accepted to be September 4, 476 AD when Romulus Augustus was deposed; and further defined by the defeat of the Romans at the hands of the Germanic peoples.<sup>19</sup>). Historian Gonzalez reports that the decline and collapse of the Western Roman Empire did not result in the decline of Christianity within those regions previously under the dominion of the Romans. Conquered Christians felt the need to evangelize the victors (the Germanics).<sup>20</sup> Following the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, the Eastern Empire (the "Byzantine Empire") emerged, with its capital city, Constantinople (modern day, Istanbul, Turkey). The Byzantines, of course, were Christians (Eastern Orthodox Church), and Constantinople was the capital city of the Church.

**Conclusion.** The Ancient Roman Empire certainly persecuted Christians; yet, by the fourth century AD, the Romans were "Christianized." After this point, they were no longer unbelievers in Christ; and, the Roman Empire (West) collapsed within 150 years thereafter, anyway.

The Holy Roman Empire. In the late eighth century, Charlemagne (Charles the Great) of France led his armies to conquer the Saxons and Frisians. Forced baptism and conversion to Christianity was required by Charlemagne resulting in the baptism of thousands of pagans, including the death of those who refused baptism.<sup>21</sup> Charlemagne was crowned emperor on

12/25/800 by Pope Leo III reviving the Western Roman Empire.<sup>22</sup> Thereafter, the Roman Empire was completely divided between the Empire in the West and the Byzantine Empire in the East. The revived empire (the Western Empire) was called the “Holy Roman Empire” because Pope Leo III declared King Charles as having been chosen by God as emperor.<sup>23</sup>

The Holy Roman Empire cannot be the prophesied “foe” of Christians since the conflict waged by the Empire required conversion to Christianity, not the other way around.

The Crusades. The timing of the Crusades came at a time when Christians of Palestine were being subjected to ever increasing brutalities at the hand of the Islamic Seljuk Turks.<sup>24</sup> Following is a quote from a letter to King Henry IV of England from Pope Gregory VII (1074) describing the situation which ultimately led to the Crusades some years later:

*“We hereby inform you that the bearer of this letter, on his recent return from across the sea [from Palestine], came to Rome to visit us. He repeated what we had heard from many others, that a pagan race had overcome the Christians and with horrible cruelty had devastated everything almost to the walls of Constantinople, and were now governing the conquered lands with tyrannical violence, and that they had slain many thousands of Christians as if they were but sheep. If we love God and wish to be recognized as Christians, we should be filled with grief at the misfortune of this great empire [the Greek] and the murder of so many Christians. But simply to grieve is not our whole duty. . . . Therefore we beseech you by the faith in which you are united through Christ in the adoption of the sons of God, and by the authority of St. Peter, prince of apostles, we admonish you that you be moved to proper compassion by the wounds and blood of your brethren and the danger of the aforesaid empire and that, for the sake of Christ, you undertake the difficult task of bearing aid to your brethren [the Greeks]. Send messengers to us at once inform us of what God may inspire you to do in this matter.”<sup>25</sup> (Emphasis added)*

Pope Gregory VII was unsuccessful in gathering sufficient forces to march against the Turks. However, almost twenty years later, Pope Urban II, Gregory’s successor, issued a call to “retake the land” from the Amalekites (Muslims). This call proved to be successful and began the 300 year long Crusades. Pope Urban’s initial appeal went out on November 27, 1095 at the Council of Clermont to a gathering of bishops (see previously quoted sermon in this chapter). Included within the call was the emblem of the cross attached to the uniforms of all soldiers. All priests were empowered by Urban II to give the sacred symbol and its promised blessing to any who joined the army, regardless of their allegiance to Jesus Christ. In fact, personal belief in Jesus Christ, his death on the cross, his resurrection on the third day, and his bodily appearance that evidenced God’s hand in it all, according to the scriptures (1 Corinthians 15:3-4), became irrelevant for one’s salvation. Salvation was guaranteed to the warrior of the cross! In Pope Urban’s sermon to his bishops, he states,

*“Moreover, Christ commands it. All who die by the way, whether by land or by sea, or in battle against the pagans, shall have immediate remission of sins. This I grant them through the power of God with which I am invested.”<sup>26</sup> (Emphasis added)*

On June 13, 1099, the Crusaders launched their successful onslaught against the Muslims who held Jerusalem. Their victory was celebrated with unbridled vengeance against the Muslims. Authors Ergun and Emir Caner quote a chronicler of the event as follows:

*Some of our men . . . cut off the heads of their enemies; others shot them with arrows, so that they fell from towers; others tortured them longer by casting them into flames. . . it was necessary to pick one's way over the bodies of men and horses. But these were small matters compared to what happened at the Temple of Solomon. . . Men rode in blood up to their knees and bridle reins. Indeed it was a just and splendid judgment of God that this place should be filled with the blood of the unbelievers, since it had suffered so long from their blasphemies. . . .*<sup>27</sup>

The First Crusade was the only successful Crusade during the next three centuries of battle for the Holy Land; and, Jerusalem was held by the Crusaders for 88 years over the next 900.<sup>28</sup> When the city eventually returned to the Islamic powers under Salah al-Din (1187 AD), it remained under Muslim dominion until the twentieth century.<sup>29</sup> Yet, for well over three hundred years, the Crusades continued. Countless deaths occurred, including men, women, and children.

History records the despicable actions of the Crusaders against the Jews as they made their way to the battlefield against Islam as well as their unbridled blood letting in Jerusalem:

*"[Twelve thousand] Jews in the Rhine Valley alone were killed as the first Crusade passed through. Some Jewish writers refer to these events as the "first holocaust." Once the army reached Jerusalem and broke through the city walls, they slaughtered all the inhabitants that they could find (men, women, children, newborns). After locating about 6,000 Jews holed up in the synagogue, they set the building on fire; the Jews were burned alive. The Crusaders found that about 30,000 Muslims had fled to the al Aqsa Mosque. The latter were also slaughtered without mercy."*<sup>30</sup>

**Were the Crusades "holy war"?** Certainly, the Crusades were "holy war" since they were waged by Christians to retake Palestine in the name of Christ and Christianity. In fact, the Pope offered salvation to all who gave or shed blood in that effort. However, *the Bible prophesies of holy war waged against Christians by unbelievers, not by Christians against unbelievers.* We have looked at scripture after scripture and found this characteristic present in every passage. The Crusades may have constituted holy war when they were waged; but they do not constitute holy war within the meaning of the Bible.

**Roman Catholic Church's Persecutions of Christians.** History is filled with many instances of the deaths of those considered heretics by the Roman Catholic Church. Early in its history, the Roman Catholic Church began a centuries long practice of confronting what it deemed to be heresy through a series of "inquisitions." The Inquisitions were begun, first, against the "Donatists" (in the fourth century), and then later, against the "Cathars" and the "Waldensians" (twelfth century and later). The Church had *jurisdiction only over baptized members of the Church* (which encompassed most of the population).<sup>31</sup> Other than the heresies of the fourth century, the Inquisitions generally included four different, separate historical occurrences: the Medieval Inquisition, the Spanish Inquisition, the Portugese Inquisition, and the Roman Inquisition. A review of these persecutions is beyond the scope of this writing.

It is important to note that the Protestant Church also had its own "inquisitions." Some of the most notable leaders in medieval Protestant Christian history, e.g., Martin Luther (1483-1546)

and Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), supported the killing of Christians considered to be heretics. The Protestants viewed the “Anabaptists” (from the Greek word meaning “re-baptizers”) as heretics because Anabaptists believed in believer’s baptism by immersion following conversion. Anabaptists (forerunners of the Amish and Mennonite faiths) believed infant baptism was not valid and that the combination of church and state was wholly destructive to the Church. Martin Luther’s position on the Anabaptists follows:

*“[Anabaptists] are in no case to be tolerated. . . . These are thieves and murderers of whom Christ spoke in John 7, persons who invade another man’s parish and who usurp another man’s office. . . . They must neither be tolerated nor listened to, even though they seek to teach the pure Gospel, yes, even if they are angelic and simon-pure Gabriels from heaven. . . . “If he refuses [to keep his mouth shut]. . . consign the scamp into the hands of his proper master.” . . . Luther, then, advocated that Anabaptists be hung for heresy, the only proper punishment for a treasonous wretch. There was no other option for the radicals for they were a threat not only to society; but to Christianity in general.”<sup>32</sup> (Emphasis added)*

The first Christian killed for the crime of re-baptism was Felix Manz who was drowned in Lake Zurich on January 5, 1527, by the Zürich council after it had passed an edict that made adult re-baptism punishable by drowning. Manz was the first Swiss Anabaptist to be martyred at the hands of Protestants.<sup>33</sup>

**Conclusion.** The Roman Catholic Church has certainly put to death those it considered heretics within Christianity; yet, such actions by the Church were not to wage holy war but to protect the Church from those the Church considered a threat to the Church. Whether we agree with their interpretation of scripture or of their actions (and certainly I do not) is not the point. The holy war we are looking for is waged by an unbelieving empire at enmity with Christians (or Jews). The Roman Catholic Church has not taken life for this purpose. Notwithstanding the Church’s actions in the past, the Roman Catholic Church today is perhaps society’s “loudest voice” in defense of the Kingdom of Christ. How is it possible to interpret the Catholic Church today as the instrument of satan to destroy the Church when the Catholic Church does all it can to preserve the Church!

If one interprets the Roman Catholic Church as having participated in “holy war” within the meaning of the Bible, so must the Protestant Church be included. The Protestant Church also put to death those it considered heretics. Anabaptists were drowned for their refusal to practice infant baptism. Certainly, the Bible cannot be interpreting Christians, whether Protestant or Catholic, as the empire under which satan will destroy Christianity. We are not trying to find “sinners.” We all qualify for that definition. We are looking for the Biblically defined *unbelieving empire* that wages holy war against Jews or Christians in the Last Days. This empire cannot be the Roman Catholic Church or the Protestant Church since neither of these groups are unbelievers in Jesus Christ.

**Has Islam Waged Holy War throughout its History?** In 610 AD, around the age of 40, the Prophet Muhammad received his first revelation of the Qur’an while on retreat near Mecca.<sup>34</sup> For 23 years following this night, Muhammad remembered aspects of this revelation and applied them to actual occurrences in his life and the lives of his followers. These recollections of Muhammad over the ensuing years were collected after his death in the “Qur’an,” the holy book for Muslims. By the year 622, the new religion had grown within the Bedouin desert clans.

Muhammad and his small band of desert tribesmen became a threat to the leading tribe of Mecca, the Quraysh. On September 17, 622, Muhammad and his followers fled for their lives to Medina. This celebrated journey is known as the “Hijrah” (emigration) and is considered by Muslims to be the first year of Islam and the beginning of the Muslim calendar.<sup>35</sup>

In the years following 622, Muhammad was able to achieve a feat that no human being has achieved either before or since: he was able to unite the entire Arabian Peninsula under a single banner. However, in the year 632, only ten years into the Islamic era, Muhammad died.<sup>36</sup> Because of the suddenness of his death, Muhammad had not selected a “successor” (referred to as “caliph”) to lead Islam upon his death. This important task was left to his inner circle of followers, known as his “Companions.” There were two possible choices. Ali ibn Abi Talib (hereafter “Ali”), Muhammad’s son-in-law and husband of Muhammad’s daughter Fatima, and Abu Bakr as-Sadiq (hereafter “Abu Bakr”), a close companion of Muhammad and his first convert to Islam. Ali was the closest male relative of Muhammad and many followers (the “shi`at Ali,” the “faction of Ali,” later known as “Shi`ites”) believed he should be caliph by virtue of his blood relationship to Muhammad. However, others believed that Ali was too young and leadership was of critical importance due to the likelihood of desertion among the bedouin tribesmen who had aligned together under Muhammad’s leadership. Ultimately, the majority chose Abu Bakr as the first caliph of Islam.

When Muhammad died unexpectedly in 632 AD, Islam was in crisis. Islam’s founder had died; and Muslims saw their alignment together as contingent upon Muhammad’s continued leadership. With his death, many left the faith, becoming “apostates.” The job of returning the “apostates” to Islam became the primary role of the 1<sup>st</sup> Caliph of Islam, Abu Bakr.<sup>37</sup> The Ridda Wars (“Apostate Wars”) ensued.<sup>38</sup> At first Abu Bakr had little success in returning the apostates to Islam. Raiding parties were sent outside Arabia to procure subsistence for the struggling band of Muslims. Surprisingly, these *raiding parties were successful*. Victory after victory occurred, and an unintended result was the consequence. The Apostates returned to Islam; the “booty” was all they needed to realign with the teaching of Muhammad.<sup>39</sup>

Historian Ira Lapidus describes the first Arabian conquest of the Middle East and surrounding regions as follows:

*“The Arab conquests are popularly understood to have been motivated by a lust for booty or a religious passion to subdue and convert the world to Islam. Whatever the motives involved, they were in part the outcome of deliberate state policy and in part accidental. . . . At first the small tribal groups were mainly searching for booty, . . . What began as inter-tribal skirmishing to consolidate a political confederation in Arabia ended as a full-scale war against the two empires [Arabia and Byzantium]. In the wake of the battle of Ajnadayn, the Arabs moved against the Byzantine province of Syria. They took Damascus in 636. Baalbek, Homs, and Hama soon surrendered. The rest of the province, however, continued to resist. Only in 638 was Jerusalem taken. Caesarea fell in 640. Finally, in 641, the Arabs took the northern Syrian and Mesopotamian towns of Harran, Edessa, and Nasibin. . . . The next Byzantine province to fall to the Arabs was Egypt [in 641].”<sup>40</sup>*

Historian Bat Ye’or describes the eighth century Arabian conquest of Babylon and Persia (modern day Iraq and Iran):

*“Led by brilliant and fearless leaders, the Muslims overcame the Persian armies and seized*

*Babylonia, Susiana, Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Persia, pushing on as far as the Sind (713) and beyond the Syr-Daria (751). In the West, they conquered all the Christian provinces of the eastern Mediterranean, from Syria and Palestine to Egypt, North Africa and through Spain, before suffering defeats at Narbounne (720) and at Poitiers (732).*<sup>41</sup>

By the end of the tenth century, the 1<sup>st</sup> wave of Islamization of the Middle East, North Africa, and Egypt had reached its zenith. The second wave of Islamization was in the lands of the Turks in the thirteenth century. Yet, unlike the first wave of Arabic conquest which met resistance at every turn, the Turks embraced Islam. By the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Islamized Turks plundered their way across Europe and the Balkans, beginning an occupation that would last 500 years.<sup>42</sup> Constantinople, the “Rome of the East,” would not fall until 1453, but fall it did, and Istanbul became the name of this once great Byzantine city. With the fall of Constantinople, the mighty Byzantine Empire, the successor to the Western Roman Empire, ended. Next, Serbia was conquered in 1459; then Bosnia in 1463, and Herzegovina in 1483. Turkish expansion continued with the conquest of Wallachia, Moldavia, and eastern Hungary and was only checked in Vienna in 1683 and Poland in 1687.<sup>43</sup>

Perhaps the clearest evidence of Islam’s advance against Christians (or Jews) of the Middle East, Egypt, North Africa, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor is to consider the religious heritage of these areas in the centuries after the birth of Christ but before the beginning of Islam in the seventh century AD. Prior to the Muslim advance, these areas were predominantly Christian; certainly, with different beliefs within Christianity providing the religious climate for much conflict, but nevertheless, predominantly, Christian. These areas are now predominantly Muslim. The land that Christ had walked, the churches that the Apostle Paul had planted, were now under the dominion of Islam.

Historian Philip Jenkins in his book, *“The Lost History of Christianity,”* describes the “lost” religion of Christianity in the Middle East as follows:

*“Given that the destruction of Christianity has not been much studied, we can make certain general observations, stressing above all the role of states. Though churches may lose political influence under Christian states or in predominantly Christian societies, though they might be secularized, they do not vanish . . . . In most of these cases, churches collapsed or vanished because they were unable to cope with the pressures placed upon them by hostile regimes, mainly Muslim. While religions might sicken and fade, they do not die of their own accord: they must be killed.”<sup>44</sup> (Emphasis added)*

Note Jenkin’s words emphasized above: “. . . churches do not vanish. . . . they do not die of their own accord: they must be killed.” Christianity did not vanish from the Middle East. It was “killed.” How did that death occur? In various ways, some violent and some nonviolent, but all leading to the conversion or subjugation of Christians (and Jews) of the Middle East. In time, this area of the world was completely Muslim.

Was the Islamization of these areas the result of violent holy war? For many peoples of the Middle East, yes. For others, no; at least, not sudden! Here is historian Bat Ye’or’s account:

*“By the time the Prophet died (632) nearly all the tribes of the Hijaz [western Arabia] had rallied to Islam, idolatry had been vanquished in Arabia, and the Peoples of the Book, Jews and Christians, were paying tribute to the Muslims. . . . After unifying the peninsula, he [Abu*

*Bakr, who succeeded Muhammad] carried the war (jihad) - beyond Arabia. The jihad provided non-Muslims with an alternative: conversion or tribute; refusal forced the Muslims to fight them till victory. Arab idolaters had to choose between death or conversion; as for Jews, Christians, and Zoroastrians, if they paid tribute and accepted the conditions of conquest, they could buy back their right to life, freedom of worship, and security of property."<sup>45</sup>*

As Bat Ye'or points out, Muslims offered non-Muslims the option of surrender and conversion before the beginning of a conflict. If surrender was chosen, non-Muslims, other than Jews, Christians, or Zoroastrians, were required to convert to Islam or face death. Jews, Christians, or Zoroastrians referred to as "*Ahl al-Kitab*" ("People of the Book")<sup>46</sup> could pay "tribute" (a tax called "jizya"), along with accepting the conditions of Islamic dominion, and they would retain their right to life, freedom of worship, and security of property. The tax was paid annually at a public ceremony requiring the conquered to demonstrate, publically, subjection to their Muslim conquerors (Qur'an 9:29). As we will see in our next chapter, the *Ahl al-Kitab*, i.e, the People of the Book, became known as "Dhimmi." In many cases, particularly in the Middle Ages, the annual tax (jizya) was required to be paid with the children of the conquered. Among the conditions of the Dhimmi contract was that the People of the Book could not maintain their houses of worship nor build new ones, nor could they evangelize others to their faith. The result of accepting Dhimmitude was that the lives of People of the Book living at the time of Muslim conquest were spared but within one to two generations their houses of worship were in shambles, and their children had been claimed by the Muslims for tax payment ("janissaries" were armies of the children of Christians who had been claimed by the Muslims in payment of the jizya. Their role in jihad was to provide personal protection to the sultanate). What was the result of dhimmitude to Christians and Christianity? It "killed" it, not suddenly, but slowly, within one or two generations.

Consider this comment by Phil Jenkins in his book, "*The Lost History of Christianity*" as he describes the impact upon a religion which no longer has a place to worship or a priest to lead in that worship:

*"And yet this older Christian world perished, destroyed so comprehensively that its memory is forgotten by all except academic specialists. During the Middle Ages, and especially during the fourteenth century, church hierarchies were destroyed, priests and monks were killed, enslaved, or expelled, and monasteries and cathedrals fell silent. As church institutions fell, so Christian communities shrank, the result of persecution or ethnic and religious cleansing. Survivors found it all but impossible to practice their faith without priests or churches, especially when rival religions offered such powerful attractions."*<sup>47</sup>

Was the Muslim conquest violent or nonviolent? Does it matter? The result was the same. The people were Islamized either at the time of conquest upon conversion or over an extended period of years as their lives were literally "worn out" as Dhimmi.

**Have Islam's Wars Been Religiously Motivated, i.e., Holy War?** It is impossible for this writing to posit example after example of Islam's religiously motivated holy wars throughout its history. Some examples have been provided and each chapter will provide others. Regardless, the place where we must make the determination of a religious motivation is not history alone; in fact, the words of the Qur'an are the key to this determination. The Muslim

word for “holy war” is “jihad.” Here are some definitions from experts in Islam.

Historian, Bernard Lewis, defines “jihad” as follows:

*The term so translated is “jihad,” an Arabic word with the literal meaning of “effort,” “striving,” or “struggle.” In the Qur’an and still more in the Traditions, commonly though not invariably followed by the words “in the path of God,” it has usually been understood as meaning “to wage war.” The great collections of Hadith (Traditions) all contain a section devoted to jihad, in which the military meaning predominates. . . According to Muslim teaching, jihad is one of the basic commandments of the faith, an obligation of the Muslim community as a whole; in a defensive war, it becomes a personal obligation of every adult male Muslim. In such a situation, the Muslim ruler might issue a general call to arms. The basis of the obligation of jihad is the universality of the Muslim revelation. God’s word and God’s message are for all mankind; it is the duty of those who have accepted them to strive unceasingly to convert or at least to subjugate those who have not. This obligation is without limit of time or space. It must continue until the whole world has either accepted the Islamic faith or submitted to the power of the Islamic state.”<sup>48</sup> (Arabic transliterations omitted from quote; emphasis added).*

Key to our understanding of jihad is Lewis’ description that it is an unceasing “striving” to convert or subjugate all those who have not accepted it. Therefore, *jihad is perpetual*. It is not necessarily violent because “striving” is not always violent; but it is necessarily unending. Author Karen Armstrong puts it this way:

*“It was the duty of the Muslim state (the House of Islam) to conquer the rest of the non-Muslim world (the House of War) so that the world could reflect the divine unity. Every Muslim must participate in this jihad and the House of Islam must never compromise the House of War. . . Until the final domination of the world was accomplished, therefore, Muslims were in a perpetual state of war.”*<sup>49</sup> (Emphasis added)

Author Ibn Warraq describes “jihad” as follows:

*“The totalitarian nature of Islam is nowhere more apparent than in the concept of jihad, the holy war, whose ultimate aim is to conquer the entire world and submit it to the one true faith, to the law of Allah. To Islam alone has been granted the truth – there is no possibility of salvation outside it. It is the sacred duty – an incumbent religious duty established in the Qur’an and the Traditions<sup>50</sup> – of all Muslims to bring it to all humanity. Jihad is a divine institution, enjoined specially for the purpose of advancing Islam. Muslims must strive, fight, and kill in the name of God.”* (Emphasis added)

Author Bat Ye’or adds the following:

*“The aim of jihad is to subjugate the peoples of the world to the law of Allah, decreed by his prophet Muhammad. Mankind is divided into two groups, Muslims and non-Muslims. The former compose the Islamic community, the “*umma*,” who own the territories of the *dar al-Islam* governed by Islamic law. Non-Muslims are “*harbis*,” inhabitants of the *dar al-harb*, the lands of war, so called because they are destined to come under Islamic jurisdiction, either by war (“*harb*”), or by the conversion of their inhabitants. . . . Consequently, the jihad is the means whereby possessions considered illegally usurped by non-Muslims are*

restored to Muslims. That is why every act of war in the dar al-harb is legal and immune from censure. As the jihad is a permanent war, it excludes the idea of peace but authorizes temporary truces related to the political situation ("muhadana").<sup>51</sup> (Emphasis added)

Here are a few verses from the Qur'an:<sup>52</sup>

- "Fighting is prescribed for you, and you dislike it. But it is possible that you dislike a thing which is good for you, and that you love a thing which is bad for you. But Allah knows, and you know not" Qur'an 2:216
- "Let those fight in the cause of Allah who sell the life of this world for the Hereafter. To him who fighteth in the cause of Allah, whether he is slain or gets victory soon shall we give him a reward of great (value)" Qur'an 4:74
- "Seize them and slay them wherever you find them: and in any case take no friends or helpers from their ranks." Qur'an 4:89
- "Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies, of Allah and your enemies, and others besides, whom ye may not know, but whom Allah doth know. Whatever ye shall spend in the cause of Allah, shall be repaid unto you, and ye shall not be treated unjustly." Qur'an 8:60
- "Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the Religion of truth, from among the People of the Book, until they pay the Jizyah with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued." Qur'an 9:29
- "But when the forbidden months are past, then fight and slay the pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war); but if they repent, and establish regular Prayers and practise regular Charity, then open the way for them: for Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful." Qur'an 9:5
- "When you meet the unbelievers, strike off their heads; then, when you have made wide slaughter among them, carefully tie up the remaining captives." Qur'an 47:4

Here is one of many examples in the modern day of Muslims submitting to the Qur'anic teaching:

**"CONFLICT IN IRAQ. Hostages' fingers sent to U.S. officials in Iraq. The fingers of five hostages -- one of them a University of Florida student -- were sent to U.S. officials in Baghdad.** BY HANNAH ALLAM, DOMINICK TAO AND JENNIFER LEBOVICH, March 13, 2008.

BAGHDAD -- U.S. authorities in Baghdad have received severed fingers belonging to five men -- one of them a student on leave from the University of Florida -- who were taken hostage more than a year ago in Iraq, U.S. officials said Wednesday. Four of the men had been working as contractors when they were captured in a brazen ambush of their 43-truck supply convoy on Nov. 16, 2006. Authorities confirmed the five fingers belonged to hostages Jonathon Cote, 25, a UF student; Joshua Munns, of Redding, Calif.; Paul Johnson Reuben, of Buffalo, Minn.; Bert Nussbaumer of Vienna, Austria, and Ronald J. Withrow, an American who was kidnaped separately from the others. The FBI is investigating the grisly development.<sup>53</sup>

Another modern example is found in the Palestinian organization known as “ Hamas.” Hamas is an acronym for the Arabic words translated “ Islamic Resistance Movement.” Hamas is the Sunni Islam organization that at times has controlled a majority of seats in the elected legislative council of the Palestinian National Authority. In the January 2006 election, Hamas took 76 of the 132 seats and Fatah took the remaining 43 seats.<sup>54</sup> Hamas’ charter includes the following: “ *There is no solution to the Palestinian question except through Jihad.*”<sup>55</sup>

The slogan for Hamas is:

*“ God [Allah] is its target, the Prophet is its model, the Qur’an its constitution: Jihad is its path, and death for the sake of God [Allah] is the loftiest of its wishes.”*<sup>56</sup>

Hamas believes that “ the land of Palestine is an Islamic *Waqf* (trust) consecrated for future Muslim generations until judgment day,” and, as such, the land cannot be negotiated away by any political leader. Hamas’ covenant states that “ so-called peaceful solutions and international conferences are in contradiction to the principles of the Islamic Resistance Movement,” stating that there is no solution for the Palestinian question except through Jihad.”<sup>57</sup>

**Ishmaelites as the Enemies of God.** In the previous chapter we referenced Psalm 83. It is worth mentioning again, but for a different reason. All the people groups included in verses 6 - 8 below are Muslims today. The text establishes Islam as a never ending enemy of God when it describes the sons of Ishmael as “ thine enemies” (v 83:2), who have “ made a covenant” against God (v 83:5); and, the unending covenant of the Ishmaelites is to “ wipe Israel off the face of the earth” (83:4).

*Psalm 83:2 “ For, behold, Thine enemies make an uproar; And those who hate Thee have exalted themselves. 3 They make shrewd plans against Thy people, And conspire together against Thy treasured ones. 4 They have said, “ Come, and let us wipe them out as a nation, That the name of Israel be remembered no more.” 5 For they have conspired together with one mind; Against Thee do they make a covenant: 6 The tents of Edom and the Ishmaelites; Moab, and the Hagrites; 7 Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek; Philistia with the inhabitants of Tyre; 8 Assyria also has joined with them; They have become a help to the children of Lot.”* (Emphasis added)

This is a perpetual unending war that will continue until the return of Jesus Christ. It is an unbelieving empire committed to eliminate Israel. It is holy war within the meaning of the Bible.

**Conclusion.** Only Islam has a history rooted in enmity toward God’s people whether Jews or Christians. Islam is the modern day “ Ishmaelites and Edomites” of Psalm 83. In the Last Days, they will continue their jihad that began almost 3,000+ years ago. Why is it important to identify the enemy of God in the interpretation of Bible prophecy? Find the unbelieving empire that wages holy war against Jews and Christians and you will have found the hand of satan in the Last Days. Islam is that hand.

<b>Summary of Key Points in Chapter 3</b>	
Point 1	Biblical “holy war” is a war waged by an “unbelieving” religious empire (unbelief in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob or His Christ) against either Jews or Christians for the purpose of conversion or subjugation to the unbelieving empire.
Point 2	Biblical holy war is prophesied to be waged specifically against one of two religious groups, Jews or Christians. Daniel 7:21-22, 23-25; 8:24; 11:36, 45; 12:7; Revelation 12:17; 13:7; 17:6; 17:8, and 17:14 all include one of these two groups as the foe of the unbelieving empire that wages the holy war.
Point 3	The Ancient Roman Empire, the Holy Roman Empire, the Crusades, the Inquisitions by the Roman Catholic Church, the Protestant Church, and the wars or killings by them do not constitute Biblical holy war because they were not waged by an <u>unbelieving empire</u> against Jews or Christians.
Point 4	Islam has waged holy war, i.e., jihad, against Jews, Christians, and others, throughout its history. The Middle East, Asia Minor, Egypt and North Africa, were, prior to the seventh century AD, predominantly Christian. These areas are now Muslim. Conversion to Islam may have been sudden (as in a holy war conflict) or extended over years through the persecution and taxation imposed by Islam upon “Dhimmis,” along with the prohibition by Islam of evangelization by Christians or maintenance of houses of worship.
Point 5	The Qur’an is filled with verses that authorized forced conversion or subjugation of non-Muslims to Islam.
Point 6	The Ishmaelites have been enemies of God and the Jewish people since ancient times. Psalm 83:2-8 prophesies of a never ending effort to remove the Jewish people from the face of the earth.
Point 7	Why is it important to identify the empire at enmity with God in the interpretation of Bible prophecy? Find the unbelieving empire that wages holy war against Jews and Christians and you will have found the hand of satan in the Last Days. Islam is that hand.

- 1 Washington Post, October 19, 2007, section B, p. 1, by Jacqueline L. Salmon and Valerie Strauss, Washington Post Staff Writers.
- 2 Ergun Mehmet Caner and Emir Fethi Caner, *Christian Jihad*, p. 21.
- 3 "Just War" criteria have been developed by Christian theologians beginning with Augustine of Hippo (354 - 430AD). The just war criteria were developed by Augustine as a means of helping Christians with the ethics of war. Unlike pagans, Christians were to be guided with by the teachings of Jesus Christ, including to "love thy enemies." Thomas Aquinas (1225 - 1274) also contributed greatly to the criteria which sought to develop a "blue print" for Christians to engage in ethical warfare. This effort resulted in six broad requirements to be met for Christian warfare to be considered "just": 1) Just cause - force may be used to correct or limit a public evil, in self-defense, or to preempt an anticipated attack. 2) Legitimate authority - only a legitimately constituted public authority may declare war. 3) Right intention - the ultimate goal of the use of force is to reestablish peace. 4) Probability of success - force may not be used in a futile cause. 5) Proportionality of violence - the overall destruction expected from the use of force must be outweighed by the good to be achieved by the force. 6) Principle of last resort - force may only be used after all peaceful alternatives have been genuinely attempted and failed. See Ergun Mehmet Caner and Emir Fethi Caner, *Christian Jihad*, Appendix A, for a complete discussion of the Just War Criteria as developed by Augustine.
- 4 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War\\_on\\_Terrorism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_on_Terrorism), (accessed March 6, 2008).
- 5 Available at, <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/docs/980223-fatwa.htm> (accessed March 6, 2008).
- 6 The words are those of Osama bin Laden who quotes from the Qur'an (Muslim holy book) and from the "hadith," the collection of the sayings of Muhammad. Bruce Lawrence, Editor, *Messages to the World, the Statements of Osama bin Laden*, p 187.
- 7 <http://www.milestonedocuments.com/documents/full-text/urban-iis-call-to-crusade/> (accessed April 16, 2010).
- 8 Stephen Miller, p. 209.
- 9 Robert L. Thomas, *Revelation 8 - 22, An Exegetical Commentary*, p. 120. Garland Eldon Ladd, *A Commentary on The Revelation*, p. 167. . It is also important that we realize the significance of an interpretation that fails to include Israel within the interpretation of Revelation 12. Jesus put it this way: Luke 11:23 "He who is not with Me is against Me; and he who does not gather with Me, scatters." In Revelation 12 there are two sides: God's side and the devil's side. Clearly, the Christian Church is envisioned to be on God's side by virtue of its inclusion in Revelation 12:17 - "the dragon . . . went off to make war with the rest of her offspring, who keep the commandments of God and hold to the testimony of Jesus." If the Jewish people are not included as a foe *against satan* (along with the Christian Church), then they are a foe *against God*; it is either one side or the other, not a third side. In order for Old Testament passages such as Micah 4 cited above to be fulfilled, then the Jewish people would, by necessity, have to be included by God in the prophecy of Revelation 12. The interpretation of the woman as Israel also allows for the fulfillment of New Testament prophecy of the salvation of Israel in the Last Days: Romans 11:25 "For I do not want you, brethren, to be uninformed of this mystery, lest you be wise in your own estimation, that a partial hardening has happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles has come in;<sup>26</sup> and thus all Israel will be saved; just as it is written, "The Deliverer will come from Zion, He will remove ungodliness from Jacob."<sup>27</sup> "And this is My covenant with them, When I take away their sins."<sup>28</sup> From the standpoint of the gospel they are enemies for your sake, but from the standpoint of God's choice they are beloved for the sake of the fathers;<sup>29</sup> for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable."
- 10 Robert L Thomas, *Revelation 1 - 7, An Exegetical Commentary*, p. 447.

- 11 Ergun Mehmet Caner and Emir Fethi Caner, *Christian Jihad*, pp. 39 - 45.
- 12 Justo L. Gonzalez, *The Story of Christianity*, Volume I, p. 15.
- 13 Gonzalez, p. 15.
- 14 Stearns., p. 168.
- 15 Gonzalez, p. 16.
- 16 Bart Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus*, p 72.
- 17 Stearns, p 265.
- 18 Leonard B. Glick, *Abraham's Heirs, Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe*, p 26.
- 19 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decline\\_of\\_the\\_Roman\\_Empire](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decline_of_the_Roman_Empire) (accessed March 26, 2008)
- 20 Gonzalez, p. 218.
- 21 Gonzalez, p. 268-270.
- 22 Gonzalez, p. 266.
- 23 Ergun Mehmet Caner and Emir Fethi Caner, *Christian Jihad*, p. 73.
- 24 Caner, p. 84-85.
- 25 <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/g7-cde1078.html> (accessed April 16, 2010).
- 26 <http://www.milestonedocuments.com/documents/full-text/urban-iis-call-to-crusade/> (accessed April 16, 2010).
- 27 Caner, p. 100.
- 28 Thomas F. Madden, *A Concise History of the Crusades*, p. 213.
- 29 "After World War I, the League of Nations approved the British Mandate of Palestine with the intent of creating a "national home for the Jewish people." In 1947, the United Nations approved the partition of the Mandate of Palestine into two states, one Jewish and one Arab. The Arab League rejected the plan, but on May 14, 1948, Israel declared its independence. The new country's victory in the subsequent Arab-Israeli War expanded the borders of the Jewish state beyond those in the UN Partition Plan. Since then, Israel has been in conflict with many of the neighboring Arab countries, resulting in several major wars and decades of violence until this day. Since its foundation, Israel's boundaries and even the State's very right to exist have been subject to dispute, although Israel has signed peace treaties with Egypt and Jordan, and efforts are being made to reach a permanent accord with the Palestinians."  
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Israel> (accessed April 5, 2008).
- 30 Caner, p. 199.
- 31 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inquisition> (accessed April 6, 2008).
- 32 Caner, p. 163.

- 33 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Felix\\_Manz](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Felix_Manz) (accessed April 24, 2010).
- 34 Glasse', p 280.
- 35 Ibid., p 281.
- 36 Ira M. Lapidus, *A History of Islamic Societies*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, p. 32.
- 37 Bernard Lewis, *The Arabs in History*, p. 50.
- 38 Peter Stearns et al., p 287.
- 39 Bernard Lewis, p. 50.
- 40 Ira M. Lapidus, p. 31-33.
- 41 Bat Ye'or, *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam, From jihad to Dhimmitude*, p 43.
- 42 Paul Fregosi, *jihad*, p 209.
- 43 Bat Ye'or. p 54 - 55.
- 44 Philip Jenkins, *The Lost History of Christianity*, p. 30.
- 45 Bat Ye'or, *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam, From Jihad to Dhimmitude*, p 39.
- 46 "Ahl al-Kitab." In *The Oxford Dictionary of Islam.*, edited by John L. Esposito. *Oxford Islamic Studies Online*, <http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t125/e74> (accessed May 14, 2010).
- 47 Philip Jenkins, p. 22-23.
- 48 Bernard Lewis, *The Political Language of Islam*, p. 72-73.
- 49 Karen Armstrong, *Holy War: The Crusades and Their Impact on Today's World*, p. 40-41, as quoted in *Jerusalem Besieged, From Ancient Canaan to Modern Israel*, Eric H. Cline, p. 148.
- 50 "For Muslims there are two sources of religious reference: First, the Qur'an, which is their revealed scriptures as provided to them by the Prophet Muhammad through his revelation by "Angel Gabriel;" and, two, the "Sunnah," plus the "Hadith." The Sunnah is the customary practice of the Islamic community in observation of his actions and listening to the teachings of the Prophet during his lifetime. "Hadiths are narrative accounts of these same actions and pronouncements, rather like "hearsay" records of what the Muhammad did and said." As quoted from, Timothy R. Furnish, *Holiest Wars, Islamic Mahdis, Their Jihads, and Osama bin Laden*, p. 11.
- 51 Bat Ye'or, *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam, From Jihad to Dhimmitude*, p 40.
- 52 The verses from the Qur'an that are provided are taken from an article by Bassam Koury at <http://www.answering-islam.org/Terrorism/peace-loving.html> (accessed March 15, 2010). The article also includes an important discussion of the doctrine in Islam referred to as "abrogation." This doctrine holds that verses in the Qur'an that are later in chronology supercede or "abrogate" earlier verses in the Qur'an. Thus, "Let there be no compulsion in religion" 2:256, the verse cited by many to support Islam as a religion of peace, has been "abrogated" by the verses listed.

53 <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/world/story/454624.html> (accessed March 13, 2008).

54 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hamas> (accessed January 4, 2009).

55 Ibid.

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid.