



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

65 Years Defending Our Christian Faith



Dr. David Noebel

Volume 65, Number 8

The Transgender Fallacy by Arthur Schaper

August 2025

There is a spirit resurrecting across the United States, a welcome force for the restoration of Good against Evil, the reintroduction and reinforcement of all things right and well that made Western civilization possible.

I am writing about the pro-family movement, which is witnessing a necessary resurgence in the United States.

Ten years ago, the United States Supreme Court imposed one of its most egregious decisions: *Obergefell v. Hodges*. Blasting through constitutional amendments established by the several states, *Obergefell* imposed same-sex “marriage” on the entire country. Judicial fiat, a threat to democracy, and a disturbing revision of our constitution’s foundational principles marked the reception of this disordered court decision.

LGBT propaganda, promotion, and punishment have been unleashed on the country ever since. A backlash against the abuses of this coercive agenda has risen up, from boycotts against major businesses pushing “pride” to a growing recession of attendance and support for pride parades in public squares and city centers.

The latest Supreme Court rulings should have all pro-family conservatives cheering, too. The Supreme Court upheld the rights of parents to opt out their children from listening to LGBT-themed stories and propaganda. The Supreme Court also upheld age verification laws for access to pornographic websites. This necessary reform protects children from the harms of these illicit, explicit images, and also protects children (and adults) from sexual confusion. Just listen to the testimonies of former homosexuals Christopher Yuan and Greg Quinlan, and they will relate how their encounter with Hugh Hefner shaped their warped sexual behaviors before they were set free.

The United States Supreme Court also upheld bans on sexual mutilation of minors, rephrased in Orwellian fashion as “gender-affirming care” by trans militants. The Court has also announced that it will take up *Chiles v. Salazar*, which will adjudicate whether governments have the right to criminalize so-called “conversion therapy”—i.e., therapies that help individuals to break free of unwanted homosexual attractions and identity dysphoria. LGBT activist are particularly alarmed by this case, because if the Court strikes down those therapy bans, it will further undermine the lie that people are “born that way.” Successful reparative, restorative, and reintegrative therapies have helped thousands of individuals deal with homosexual attraction and transgender confusion. Removing the legal barriers in twenty states will mark a cultural turning point against the LGBT agenda as a whole.

The pro-family revolution is rising, and the laws of nature are advancing.

But why now?

Two so-called “gay” conservatives, Andrew Sullivan and Douglas Murray, have indicated in their distinct, British-American fashion that the whole “LGBT movement” has gone too far.

Sullivan writes in “How the Gay Rights Movement Radicalized, and Lost Its Way”: “A funny thing happened in the wake of these [gay rights] triumphs. Far from celebrating victory, defending the gains, staying vigilant, but winding down as a movement that had achieved its core objectives—including the end of HIV in the United States as an unstoppable plague—gay and lesbian rights groups did the opposite. Swayed by the broader liberal shift to the ‘social justice’ left, they radicalized.”

Douglas Murray writes in “Standing up to bullying, unscientific transgender activist mob”: “By presenting the complex issue of trans as the inevitable next step in a campaign for ever more rights, our societies in the West took a mad turn.

“After all, the acceptance of other arguments were [sic] based on the idea that the people getting their rights were equals—and that society would not need to change itself or alter its fundamentals in order to grant these rights.

“The moral force of both movements were [sic] founded on the basis of ‘Just like us.’ And that is how they succeeded.

“The ‘trans-rights’ movement, by contrast, turned everything completely on its head. They insisted not just that some people feel that they have been born in the wrong body, but that nobody is born with any discernible biological sex.”

Yes, they both wisely, rightly decry the madness of transgenderism. Yes, they point out the vile insanity of believing that sex is just a social construct, and that one can change one’s sex like flipping a light switch or changing clothes.

But a more sinister problem lurks beneath the whole transgender movement. How did our country, and Western culture in general, begin accepting and normalizing the notion that men could become women? Why are we facing the anti-biological onslaught of men invading women's sports, cells, and selves?

Before there was transgenderism as a political movement, there was the homosexual movement.

Sullivan and Murray are brilliant men. What they cannot admit to, however, is that their particular brand of preferences is part of the problem. They can talk about the anti-biological bigotry of men in dresses, or women cutting of their breasts and hair to butch up as boys. But lesbians were cutting off their hair. Men were misusing their lower halves to engage in destructive conduct with one another as well.

The normalization of homosexuality is *contra* biology. The gay "rights" movement is anti-biological, and it is also illogical. Yes, there are only two sexes. Douglas Murray set the record straight (no pun intended) on Bill Maher's program a few months ago. But those two sexes have a complementarity in sexual intercourse that cannot express itself between two individuals of the same sex. It is a misuse of organs for a man to use another man as if he were a woman, and for a woman to do the same to another woman as if she were a man.

Neither of these men can claim to care about biology when they insist that they were "born that way." There is no evidence to justify that cult-like assertion. In fact, as recently as 2019, a longitudinal study tracking 500,000 subjects confirmed that there is no "gay gene." Would either of these men be willing to address this biological fact, too?

Furthermore, Sullivan and Murray can cast calumny on cross-dressing as a civil right. But since when was it sensible to do the same thing with sodomy? Two men abusing each other and calling it "love" was deemed a mental illness until the homosexual activists, using abusive tactics similar to what the trans tyrants engage in today, cudgeled and bullied the American Psychiatric Association to stop. The gay gaslighting is unmistakable.

Furthermore, the glib use of the term "civil rights" in association with homosexuality is aberrant as well as abhorrent. Invidious discrimination against individuals on account of their integumentary melanin count or the diversity of their ethnic background is wrong. Individuals did not choose those distinctions, and they cause no harm to the body politic. Homosexual conduct is harmful to the individual, and the normalization of this conduct has unleashed untold problems in societies. Militant homosexuality in Sodom and Gomorrah led to divine judgment, but also among the tribesmen of Benjamin. Venereal disease spread like the plague

throughout the bath houses of Imperial Rome because of men doing the unseemly with other men. Let's not forget the harms done to children in the Greek city-states and the Ottoman Empire, as well as the collapse of entire city-states (see ancient Greco-Roman historian Polybius's eyewitness accounts), and the marauding of homosexual gangs in Medieval Europe to the present day. Read also the harrowing accounts of the Ugandan martyrs, who chose execution versus submitting their bodies to the unwanted advances of King Mwanga II.

Sullivan and Murray would mock my arguments, certainly. Perhaps I have slipped and fallen down the slippery slope fallacy? Quite the contrary. When the Massachusetts Supreme Court imposed same-sex "marriage" on the Commonwealth in 2003, government institutions changed the marriage licenses from "Husband and Wife" to "Partner A and Partner B." Male and Female were erased, effaced, and replaced with a cold, inert non-binary pairing. That is transgenderism at the outset. If sex does not matter when it comes to marriage, then it does not matter at all. Hence, the boys invaded the girls' locker rooms, their fitting rooms, and all the others.

The argument against transgenderism is going our way. The pro-family forces are rising, but we cannot allow the current celebrations to distract from the origins of the problem. We have the T because of the LGB, and we must tell the truth about the entire alphabet of sexual dysfunction if we hope to eradicate this entire agenda and make male and female great again. We have to make marriage great again, too, and that means making Mom and Dad great again.

—*American Thinker*, June 30, 2025

LGBTQ+ and Your Children

by Andrea Widburg

All little kids like sparkles. Drag queens sparkle. All little kids like fairies. Drag queens pretend to be fairies. All little kids like bright colors. Drag queens cover themselves in bright colors, and the LGBTQ+ movement bathes itself in all the colors of the rainbow. All little kids love simple, bright songs. Drag queens constantly sing those songs. And little kids hang out in libraries and elementary schools...and that's where drag queens have been heading for years.

But through it all, a vocal LGBTQ+ cohort insisted that they were not groomers who were targeting children. That was far-right paranoia and homophobia.

And the thing is that, unless they were sick, sick pedophiles, like men in Georgia and England [*charged with heinous crimes against children*], non-activist gays

and lesbians who are not pedophiles and just want to live quietly gay lives without drama and politics, meant it. However, according to Andrew Sullivan, a gay leftist, that compact is now broken.

In a *New York Times* op-ed piece entitled “How the Gay Rights Movement Radicalized, and Lost Its Way,” he articulates his understanding of the sane gay approach to children:

The gay rights movement, especially in the marriage years, had long asked for simple liberal equality and mutual respect—live and let live. Reform, not revolution. No one’s straight marriage would change if gay marriage arrived, we pledged. You can bring up your children however you like. We will leave you alone. *We will leave your children alone.* (Emphasis mine.)

He continues that the transgender movement broke that implied promise:

But in the wake of victory, L.G.B.T.Q.+ groups reneged on that pledge. They demanded that the entire society change in a fundamental way so that the sex binary no longer counted. Elementary school children were taught that being a boy or a girl might not have anything to do with their bodies, and that their parents had merely guessed whether they were a boy or a girl when they were born. In fact, sex was no longer to be recognized at birth—it was now merely assigned, penciled in. We got new terms like “chest-feeding” for “breastfeeding” and “birthing parent” for “mother.”

Just to make it completely clear, Sullivan reiterates the “we’re not groomers” aspect of sane homosexuality:

In the gay rights movement, there had always been an unspoken golden rule: Leave children out of it. We knew very well that any overreach there could provoke the most ancient blood libel against us: that we groom and abuse kids. You can bring up your children however you like, we promised. We will leave you alone. We will leave your children alone.

So what did the gender revolutionaries go and do? They focused almost entirely on children and minors. Partly because the adult issues had been resolved or close to it, and partly because true cultural revolutions start with the young, it meant overhauling the education not only of children with gender dysphoria, but of every other kid as well.

Well, yes, of course. That’s what revolutionaries do. As Lenin is reputed to have said, “Give me four [or six or eight] years to teach the children and the seed I have sown will never be uprooted.” Whether he said it or not, it’s true: Catch ‘em while they’re young and their minds are malleable, and, while it’s eventually possible to uproot those ideas, what was planted by gently pushing a small seedling into soft fertile soil, will have turned

into a towering, deep-rooted oak that requires a whole team with saws and tractors to remove.

Sullivan goes on in this vein, trying desperately to separate the transactivists from the homosexuals and lesbians, but it’s tough going. (Let me refer you again to the Georgia and England pedophile stories, linked above.) What makes it even tougher going is that a lot of the LGBTQ+ members aren’t even bothering to deny anymore that they want your children.

Representative of this is a person named Zinnia Jones who has almost 31,000 followers on X and another almost 20,000 followers on Bluesky (although there’s likely to be overlap between the two accounts) who shared a video.

The person in the video is so “un-sexed” that I have no idea whether this is a man pretending to be a woman or a woman pretending to be a man. (I think it’s the former, so I’ll call Zinnia “he.”) He begins by boasting about going to college, where impressionable young adults can be found, and says that he now has children of his own. (I can’t even...)

But then Zinnia goes on to explain his life before he discovered he was “trans.” And for that reason, the video is worth watching for the insights it provides into how someone can become a radical “transgender” activist.

It’s clear from what Zinnia says that he suffered serious trauma during key developmental moments in his life, including a violently abusive father and a collapsing home life. Since his mother seems to have been there for him, it’s probable that he over-identified with her.

Ultimately, it seems that the extreme trauma Zinnia describes destroyed his sense of self in and even ownership over his own body. No wonder he wanted a different body. Believing himself to be a girl must have represented a complete escape from trauma.

What Zinnia describes is tragic and, normally, I’d feel pity. But that pity dies when the person that this damaged boy became says loudly and clearly that he wants to take his trauma and bring that same brokenness to your children. Thus, Zinnia, in tweets broadcast to tens of thousands of followers, savagely attacks the entire notion that children are off limits:

“In the gay rights movement, there had always been an unspoken golden rule: Leave children out of it.”

Uh, we never agreed to that. Queer and trans kids are the LGBTQ community’s children, much more than they belong to their assigned families, given how those families treat them

That opening tweet in that thread has been viewed around 147,000 times, although thankfully, it’s gotten only 2,600 or so likes, which is a fairly solid negative ratio.

I sincerely doubt Zinnia is unique. The LGBTQ+ movement, which is deeply radical, has unleashed something dangerous within the sexual fringes of American society. And please note that I'm not accusing Zinnia of pedophilia. I have no reason to believe that he wants to have sex with children. Instead, he is a cult leader who wants to ensure that his movement, which is biologically incapable of procreation, nevertheless continues to "reproduce."

While there are traditional gays and lesbians—the Scott Bessents, Ric Grennells, Dave Rubins, Spencer Klavans, and Scott Preslers of the world who want to do nothing more than have legal, same-sex private lives—the radical movement opened a Pandora's Box of broken, deviant people who definitely want your children.

—*American Thinker*, June 28, 2025

The "No King" Protest Protesters

by Todd Baumann

If China is involved in the recent No Kings protests across the US, it's potentially an act of war.

The circumstantial evidence is on full display. Rep. Erick Swalwell (D-Calif.) was on hand at a No Kings protest this weekend. It was Swalwell who was compromised by a female Chinese spy and served on the House Intelligence Committee. Yet he feels emboldened to stand with No Kings without consequence.

That is a problem all by itself.

We're constantly told these riots are highly organized and coordinated. What we're not told is who is responsible. Who's funding the travel, the signage, the livestreams, the paid organizers? We're told there are progressive groups behind it. If there are CCP financiers behind it, we should know. Our law enforcement officials should tell us.

The media avoid questions like the plague. The Biden-holdover bureaucrats in the Intelligence Community won't say. And the current FBI director, Kash Patel, seems to be staring into space while Attorney General Pam Bondi offers no public clarity. If this is what decisive national security leadership looks like, the American people are right to be concerned.

To be fair, Patel did say he's looking into foreign influence here. Historically, an announcement like this is meant to assure the American people that something is being done. In reality, it rarely goes beyond that. The assurance dies on the vine and is replaced by other shiny toys from future news cycles.

Meanwhile, George Soros's son—long rumored to help bankroll these sorts of operations—just married Huma Abedin, daughter of Saleha Abedin, a Muslim Sisterhood leader. The "wedding" took place on the same day as the original No Kings day of protest. There are mountains of evidence that Huma's connections to the group should have prevented her from ever obtaining a security clearance when she served secretary of State Hillary Clinton. All those who looked the other way, to include elected Republicans, are dirty.

Transparency is a weapon against subversion. And right now, America's enemies—foreign and domestic—are exploiting our institutions' fear of naming names.

Law enforcement will monitor your grandmother's Facebook posts but can't seem to track down who's coordinating national mayhem from an open website. Our institutions will label soccer moms as extremists but refuse to identify the shadowy organizers behind nationwide street violence.

If you want to understand how countries collapse, this is how it starts: government paralysis in the face of orchestrated chaos. It's weakness at the top that trickles down to confusion at the street level. And in today's environment, that confusion breeds political fallout. If Republican voters perceive the current leadership as ineffective in restoring order and calling out enemies foreign and domestic, they may stay home in the upcoming midterm elections. And if Democrats are able to paint Republicans as unable to control the streets, the GOP could face a massive midterm wipeout.

Worse still, the vacuum of strength invites another Trump impeachment. Don't laugh. We've seen this movie before. The media will reframe Trump's every word as incitement, every rally as a threat, and every response to the chaos as a pretext for political attack. The left understands the game: Create the crisis, blame the response, then use the hysteria to destroy opponents. Right now, there is no clearer crisis than the fire on America's streets—and no clearer void than the silence of those sworn to stop it.

It is long past time for real answers. Who owns the No Kings domain? Who receives the emails? Who paid for the infrastructure? Who designed the logo and coordinated the livestream? These are not unsolvable mysteries. This is Investigatory Work 101 in the digital age. If the FBI and DOJ can't get us these answers, then what exactly are they doing?

Every day they stay silent, more Americans lose faith. And if this silence continues, the only kings left will be those hiding behind the throne—unaccountable, unelected, and unchecked.

—*American Thinker*, June 19, 2025

• • • • •

Meet Neville Roy Singham

by Isabel Vincent

A shadowy US billionaire who is bankrolling radicals, including groups involved in this week's riots in Los Angeles, faces being hauled before a Congressional committee, according to a Republican lawmaker.

China-based Neville Roy Singham will be called to testify about his funding of myriad non-profits including radical anti-Israel and Marxist groups.

They include the Party for Liberation and Socialism, which has been heavily involved in protest against US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents in Los Angeles this week, although there is no evidence they have been directly involved in any of the violence which has erupted there.

"If he refuses to appear, he will be subpoenaed, and if he ignores that he will be referred to the DOJ for prosecution," said Florida Rep. Anna Paulina Luna in a post on X in all capital letters earlier this week.

The congressional committee will be looking at Singham's links to the Chinese Communist Party, according to Luna.

In April, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary urged the Department of Justice to investigate the People's Forum and Code Pink, leftist activist groups affiliated with Singham and his wife Jodie Evans.

Born in Chicago, the software entrepreneur and his activist wife now live in Shanghai but still funnel plenty of money back to the US.

Although they deny working for the Chinese government, they share offices with the Maku Group, a propaganda network which promotes the Chinese Communist Party abroad.

"Evidence suggests that The People's Forum and Code Pink have been funded and influenced by... Singham and the communist Chinese government, both of which are foreign principals.

"The evidence also suggests that The People's Forum and Code Pink have engaged in political activities that directly advance the communist Chinese government's political and policy interests," said committee chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa).

Last year, the House Ways and Means Committee asked the IRS to revoke the exempt status for the People's Forum, a Manhattan-based non-profit financed by Singham. That group helped organize anti-Israel demonstrations in the city a day after the October 7, 2023 Hamas attack on Israel that left 1,200 Israelis dead.

Some of the group's members were also behind the violent demonstrations at an encampment for Gaza at Columbia University last year.

"The Singham network operates as a coordinated movement incubator, a term used by the People's Forum

itself," said Alex Goldenberg, senior advisor to the National Contagion Research Institute, a think tank that tracks disinformation on social media platforms.

"It combines media, publishing and organizing under one roof."

Most of the groups linked to Singham operate out of a Chelsea, New York, office and cafe where People's Forum regularly offers courses with titles such as "Racial Capitalism" and "Spanish for Social Justice."

Among the Singham-linked non-profits are BreakThrough News and a radical book publishing company, 1804 Books.

"These groups do not operate independently," Goldenberg told *The Post*. "They share leadership, funding, and a unified ideological mission closely aligned with the Party for Socialism and Liberation, a revolutionary Marxist organization, expanding its presence on college campuses and in major cities."

The Party for Socialism and Liberation was recently tied to Elias Rodriguez, the suspect in the shooting deaths of two Israeli embassy staffers in Washington DC last month. In 2017, Rodriguez attended a police brutality demonstration as part of the radical socialist group, which immediately distanced itself from him in the wake of the shooting.

Singham, 71, has not always been against the accumulation of capital. He is the founder and former chair of Thoughtworks, a tech consulting company which he sold to a private equity firm in 2017 for \$785 million.

"Roy Singham is incredibly charismatic," said a source who did not want to be identified.

Evans, 70, co-founded the anti-war group Code Pink, and sits on the board of the People's Forum.

She is the co-author of *China is not our Enemy*, written with Mikaela Nhondo Erskog, a researcher at another group funded by Singham.

In another extreme example, Evans and another activist with Code Pink traveled to North Korea in 2015 as part of a delegation of "Women Cross DMZ," a pro-North Korean non-profit based in Hawaii.

—*New York Post*, June 11, 2025

Rome's Number One History Lesson

by Vince Coyner

In the Louvre, there's a famous painting by the French Artist Jacques-Louis David depicting the Intervention of the Sabine Women. In it, the Sabine men, whose daughters were stolen by and then married to Romans in the mid-8th century BC, returned to avenge Roman treachery and retrieve their offspring. The scene

depicts a woman standing between the belligerents, imploring them to cease fighting:

If you are weary of these ties of kindred, these marriage-bonds, then turn your anger upon us; it is we who are the cause of the war, it is we who have wounded and slain our husbands and fathers. Better for us to perish rather than live without one or the other of you, as widows or as orphans.

The men stopped fighting, and eventually the Sabines became Roman citizens. This strategy of conquest and integration would characterize Rome for much of the next 1100 years. Other than perhaps Egypt, most conquered lands became essentially Roman. This is demonstrated by the extensive Roman ruins found in places like Britain, Portugal, Algeria, Turkey, and more. Although most would never become Roman citizens, their lives would have had similar characteristics throughout the Empire.

Romans didn't just do forced acculturation through outside conquests. When armies would attack Rome and were defeated, which they almost always were, the Romans would sell those women and children who had traveled with the invading army into slavery. The men, if not sold into slavery, would be conscripted into the Legions, but sent to regions far from their native lands. Again, it forced its culture on others, not vice versa.

The result of this was that for most of its history, Rome faced relatively few consequential internal rebellions beyond civil wars between rival generals. In the 4th century AD, however, that would change. As the Huns moved east from the steppes, they began attacking various tribes that would then plead with Rome for asylum. Sometimes willingly and sometimes not, the Romans allowed the Goths, Vandals, and others to move into the Empire.

What was different now was that, rather than breaking up these foreign powers and disbursing their members throughout the Empire, the Romans allowed them to settle intact on Roman lands. These were armed groups living in their own communities, separate from the Romans and maintaining their cultures with no assimilation demanded. This would be a recipe for disaster, and Rome, after having lasted for more than a millennium, was gone within a century.

The leaders of the United States and the EU should have paid a little closer attention in history class because they're mimicking the mid-4th century Roman Empire...

In both the US and the EU, politicians have either tolerated or encouraged an open border for much of the last quarter century. The result is that the United States today houses upwards of 30 million illegal aliens, while in Europe, the number may be half that.

In both cases, most of the immigrants crossing the borders come from countries with far higher crime rates,

far lower income levels, and very different cultures. In the United States, illegal immigrants largely come from Mexico and Latin America, while in Europe, they come from Syria, Afghanistan, and other countries in Asia and Africa.

As immigrants have often done throughout history, these new arrivals, when they move to a new place, seek out brethren from their home countries or people with whom they share customs or languages. Indeed, that's exactly what the Italians in New York did at the turn of the century.

The difference here, however, is that when the Italians moved to New York or the Irish moved to Boston, their goal was to integrate and become Americans. Today's immigrants to the United States don't seem to have that same desire. They may want to become citizens to stay permanently, but that doesn't mean they want to be American. Indeed, half of American Hispanics are from Mexico, and a significant portion of them believe that America's Southwest is stolen land that rightfully should be returned to Mexico. At the same time, most of Europe's newly arrived are from Islamic nations, and their allegiance is to Islam, not their new homes.

That's a problem because successful societies are built around core, fundamental values that are shared by the overwhelming majority of the population. Ideas such as free speech and freedom of religion, individual rights, and private property, which exist in Europe and America to varying degrees, while they were not always core tenets of Western civilization, are so today, or at least were until quite recently. Without those shared fundamental notions, it's difficult for Western nations to function properly.

It's one thing for a nation to have competing powers within the existing framework (think: Democrats and Republicans), but it's another thing altogether if the competing power wants to split off a quarter of the nation or wants to impose Sharia law.

Recent events have demonstrated exactly how deep the problems are. Across Europe over the last two years, there have been giant pro-Hamas demonstrations, some of which devolved into violence. Across the United States, Donald Trump's attempt to begin to ramp up deportations has been met with violence against ICE agents, and in California, it devolved into riots with law enforcement members being pelted with rocks, bottles, and various incendiaries while cars were set afire, stores looted, and the LAPD headquarters attacked.

Of course, demonstrations and riots happen in any country, but when they are symbols of a bigger fissure, that's a problem. In both cases, these illegals and their predecessors, many of whom have been legalized, seek to fundamentally change the nature of the countries they now call home.

Of course, invaders always want to change the nature of the place they invade, just as the Romans did as they were growing their empire. The difference is that when the Romans invaded a new land, the people already there usually fought them to maintain their culture. They usually lost, but at least they had enough pride in their culture to fight for it.

What we see across the West today is just the opposite. From Sweden to the UK to Spain and the US, leaders have for years worshiped at the altar of guilt and sought to repent by welcoming millions from cultures far different than their own. Most of these leaders have been under the delusion that, if they welcome these invaders with open arms, give them shelter, food, phones, and more, the invaders will somehow respect the culture of their new homes and assimilate accordingly.

Not only have the invaders failed to assimilate, but many have also attacked the very people and culture that welcomed them. From skyrocketing rapes and bombings in Sweden to knife crime and rape rings in the UK to drug dealing and taking over apartment complexes in Denver, these illegals have made it perfectly clear that they see their new homes not as refuges from some dysfunctional dystopia, but rather as fertile ground to be exploited. They have no intention of assimilating, and in reality, who can blame them? If a nation doesn't care enough about its citizens and its culture to protect them, why should anyone else?

Here in America, we finally have a leader who understands the danger and is doing something about it. If the leaders of Europe don't follow Donald Trump's lead soon, they may find that it's too late.

—*American Thinker*, June 11, 2025

Islam's Religion of Peace Exposed

by Janet Levy

A database search of 12 million books published in the 300 years before 9/11 reveals only one instance of the phrase "Islam is a religion of peace." It appears in fiction and is spoken by Ayatollah Mahmoud Haji Daryaei, an Iranian leader in Tom Clancy's thriller *Executive Orders*.

But the dangerous notion that Islam is peaceful has been so frequently reiterated by world leaders, clerics, and the liberal media-academia complex that it has taken on the status of COWDUNG—a facetious near-acronym for "conventional wisdom of the dominant group."

Denying 1,400 years of history, these apologists would have us believe that extremist Islam is a perversion. Their sanitized version presents Islam's prime motif of violent jihad—or religious war against

infidels—as an individual's "inner struggle" for spiritual growth.

To expose these falsehoods—which have circled the globe before the truth even got out of bed—conservative authors Tommy Robinson and Peter McLoughlin wrote *Mohammed's Koran: Why Muslims Kill for Islam*. First published in 2017, the bestselling book saw a second edition and faced an Amazon ban in 2019. (Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and many terror manuals remain available.)

In light of Robinson's early release from a British prison a few days ago, an overview of this important book seems fitting. The authors assert that the key to understanding what the Koran signifies to Muslims is *naskh*, an interpretive guideline indicating that in the Koran, what comes after negates what precedes it. Later verses remain valid even if they contradict earlier ones.

By presenting the *Koran* in reverse chronological order, the authors allow us to see how quotes on peace and the absence of compulsion in religion that Islam's apologists cherry-pick hold little significance because they precede more violent dictates. The authors utilize a widely popular 1930 translation of the Koran by Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, a British convert to Islam, while shedding light on a deception it created. More on that later.

Their 101-page introduction outlines the history of Mohammed's religion and its misrepresentation after 9/11. It mentions that in the 19th and 20th centuries, authors as diverse as Winston Churchill and Samuel Huntington could openly criticize Islam as frenzied and violent. British Prime Minister William Gladstone (1809-98) proclaimed that "So long as there is this book, there will be no peace in the world."

The authors indicate that there were two phases in the Prophet's life, each corresponding to different sections of the Koran. In the first phase, Mohammed lived in Mecca with a few followers and no power; the related section is benevolent and peaceful. In the second phase, following the *Hijra* to Medina, he emerged as a powerful warlord focused on conquest; the Koranic section for this phase is overtly violent and abrogates what is stated in the first.

During the first phase, survival required Mohammed to foster good relations with the Meccan tribes. Therefore, he preached tolerance, presented himself as peaceful, and refrained from discussing jihad. However, respect for other religions faded once he gained power. He executed defeated tribes and demanded either conversion or submission to Islam.

The oft-quoted *ayat as-sayf*—or Verse of the Sword (Koran 9:5) from the chapter titled Surat at-Tawbah—which sanctions the massacre of infidels, comes from the latter phase of Mohammed's life. It abrogates 120 earlier *ayats*, including Koran 2:256, which speaks of "no

compulsion in religion.” To Muslims, Mohammed’s later words represent the unchanging word of Allah. The authors’ reverse presentation exposes the deception of apologist quote masters.

Mohammed’s religion expanded only after he integrated robbery and killing into it. Thus, war and plunder are intrinsic to Islam. The authors state that “strive in Allah’s way” always refers to jihad, and “gardens” to Paradise, the reward for jihadis. Those words inspire today’s terrorists as much as they did medieval warriors.

Unlike Buddhism or Christianity, whose founders advocated love and peace, Islam has often been linked to bloodshed and subjugation. As a result, after 9/11, it became crucial for Islam to present a gentler image to the world, which still struggles to connect with a religion tied to violence by a warlord. Many world leaders became unwitting accomplices in this deception.

To prevent reckless attacks on large Muslim communities within their borders and to appear fair while pursuing Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, Western leaders such as George W. Bush, Jacques Chirac, and Tony Blair began to express platitudes about Islam being inherently peaceful. Shortly thereafter, religious leaders joined this initiative. Islamists allied with left-leaning figures in the media and academia to weaken Westerners’ resistance to Islam.

The authors note how post-9/11 academic works relied on a deception that had been practiced from the mid-19th century to the early 20th century. Before World War II, the available translations of the Koran, some by non-Muslims, were chronological and reflected the true intent of Islam.

The most popular was one by James Medows Rodwell. Flipping through its pages, one might think the chapter numbers are hopelessly jumbled. However, it follows a chronological order, concluding with the most violent chapters, 9 and 5. Robinson and McLoughlin argue that anyone reading the Koran in English during that time would have understood that the peaceful verses were annulled and that, toward the end of his life, Mohammed was calling for “genocide and apartheid.”

But by the 1950s, with the increase of Muslim immigrants to the West, the Rodwell translation was “crowded out” by the Pickthall version, which is not only turgid but also obscures the intent with a neat yet misleading chapter numbering. The chapters themselves follow the non-chronological, traditional presentation,

written a few years after Mohammed’s death and based on recitations by those who had reportedly memorized the previously unwritten revelations.

Many of these memorizers, the fiercest warriors of Islam, were dying in battle. Fearing that the revelations might be lost, early Muslims recorded various recitations. This resulted in many versions, which were ultimately unified into one in Arabic that is now accepted as the final word.

The authors claim that the Pickthall translation lacks the necessary information “to make sense of the illogical ordering of the chapters.” They contend that its publication in an Everyman’s Library edition, which replaced the Rodwell version, was part of a “wider movement of the educated elite submitting to Muslim demands to frame Islam” to accommodate Islamic supremacists.

They say that, nevertheless, the elite, had they been careful readers, could not have missed Islam’s belligerence. Introductions to both translations note the fearsome early wars to establish a Caliphate. The authors suggest that the publication of several confusing, chronology-concealing translations from the 1990s onward was deliberate. This “thicket of misleading Koran translations provided the background” against which “the Grand Lie” that Islam is peaceful flourished.

After 9/11, self-proclaimed moderate Muslim leaders—some of whom had visited the White House, advised the Pentagon, and lectured FBI cadets on a peaceful Islam—continued to inform Muslims living in the US that their ultimate goal was to transform America into an Islamic state. Their moderation and patriotism were merely a façade for conquest.

Robinson and McLoughlin’s book contains all the background needed to see past the Grand Lie and understand that a) Muslims are to remain in perpetual jihad until the world is converted or subjugated; b) they are to besiege, enslave, or kill non-Muslims; c) they are not to make friends with Jews or Christians; d) they are to wage war even if they find it hateful; and e) they may deceive infidels without fear of sin.

The authors write: “Muslims around the world must laugh at the freedom-loving, democracy-loving West, where our elected leaders can lie to us blatantly about the doctrines and history of Islam.” Their book—a bold attempt to stop the lying—is a must-read for the free world.

—*American Thinker*, June 3, 2025

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz (1913-2009) has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and is offered free of charge to anyone asking for it. The Crusade’s address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is 719-685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (CACC is a 501C3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. You may also access earlier editions of *The Schwarz Report* and make donations at www.schwarzreport.org. Permission to reproduce materials from this Report is granted provided that the article and author are given along with our name and address. Our daily blog address is www.thunderontheright.org.