

# REACTIONS TO THE BOOK “A LOOK OF FAITH AT THE QUR’AN”

---

Two explicit reactions, one in support, the other in refusal, ensued after the publication of the book “A look of Faith at the Qur’an”.

The first reaction is an article written by the Sheikh ZY (Dignitary of the Higher Islamic Legal Council). This supportive article should have appeared in an Arabic Islamic journal. This publication was forbidden, but the author of the article sent a copy, signed by his own hand to Pierre. We reproduce its contents translated from the Arabic.

## 1. First Reaction: Article of the Sheikh Z Y

To M. the Teacher

With regards to the book "A look of Faith at the Qur’an": a new book by the Christian scholar Pierre was completed the 13th of October, 1984. The book is composed of 136 pages of average size; it is divided into four chapters:

1st chapter: The reference to the Qur’anic text

2nd chapter: The litigation points

3rd chapter: The main points of agreement

4th chapter: Invitation to reflection.

The author mentions a Qur’anic verse in the introduction: "O People to whom the Book (*the Bible: Torah and Gospel*) has been revealed, believe in that We have revealed (*the Qur’an*) confirming the truth of that which you already have before" (Qur’an IV; Women,47). And the author says that this book is a brief study of the original Divine Intention, an inviting study to open oneself with faith to the Qur’an, and from the Qur’an to the Gospel and the Torah, which are both certified by the Qur’an. The Qur’an indeed affirms that it confirms its two predecessors and does not contest them. In fact, the Lord says to the believers in the Qur’an: "We believe in what has been sent down upon us (*the Qur’an*), and sent down upon you (*the Torah and the Gospel*)" (Qur’an XXIX; The Spider,46).

The author says: “I advise the readers to open themselves to the content of this book with objectivity, in rising above the confessional mentality to which they pertain to, and to any narrow confessional mentality. Our aim is to liberate ourselves from the confessional mind and the abominable religious racism that has infiltrated into each one of us without our knowledge. We can only liberate ourselves with knowledge, true knowledge of what God has said in the inspiration. It is this knowledge that is capable of freeing us from the chains of traditions and deviating ideas regarding the teachings of the Bible and Qur’an. And the author appeals on the Qur’anic verse: “They to whom We brought the Book (*The Bible*) before this present Revelation (*the Qur’an*) believe in it (*the Qur’an*). And when it is recited to them, they say: 'We believe in it (*the Qur’an*); it is the Truth from our Lord. We had indeed been Muslims before it'. These shall be paid their wages twice..." (Qur’an XXVIII; The Narrative,52)

The author adds: “What consoles the heart of every true believer with regards to this verse is, on one side, the opening up of Christians to the Qur’an in the past, without fanaticism, and on the other, the double reward of God when they say that they were Muslim before the Qur’an. If a Christian today proclaims that he is a Muslim before the Qur’an, he would arouse against himself the spite of many traditional Christians and Muslims. Here appears the abyss between God’s original desire and the traditions that have deviated them, these traditions created by man.

And the author is astonished that despite the Qur'an's testimony in favor of the Torah and the Gospel, repeated so many times, there have been many scholars who wanted to interpret the verses of the Qur'an independently of the Bible: as if they were disgusted by the Bible. On the contrary, they pride themselves on not referring to the Bible. It is why their interpretation has become alien to the logic of the inspiration. It carries in it the seeds of division between brothers, when the Qur'an has asked not to separate between prophets, and what God has inspired them. The Qur'an says: "Do not argue with the People of the Book except **in the best manner**, save the wicked (*of the Bible*) among them, and say: 'We believe in what has been sent down upon us (*the Qur'an*) and sent down upon you (*Bible*). Our God and yours is One God, and to Him we submit." (Qur'an XXIX; The Spider,46).

And the author adds: "All those who read the Bible and the Qur'an objectively, without tension, will augment their insight, and will understand that certain Biblical stories are also reported by the Qur'an: from the Creation of the world, passing through Noah, Abraham and the twelve Apostles, the breaking of the Covenant by the Jews, and finally, the mentioning of the Messiah which the Qur'an reports with such honor and respect. Why then, does one shy away from the Qur'an? Why move away from one of the two Books in particular, when we find in the Bible an extra bit of Light compared to what is in the Qur'an? Many of those who discuss religion, do it with enthusiasm, but without the knowledge that is inspired in the Bible. And their ignorant enthusiasm causes them to fall into the nets of extremism. This attitude is abominable to God and his prophets".

The author also says that, as Christians, we understand the essence of Islam starting from what the Qur'an itself says of Islam, purifying it from all the traditional attributes, which have culminated like parasites along the centuries and throughout the events, to deform the purity of the face of Islam. The author also writes: we are perfectly aware, that in the eyes of the Qur'an, the Muslim (submitted) is he who surrenders himself to God in doing Good, "has held fast to a handle most secure" (Qur'an XXXI; Luqman,22). Because there are those who submit to God, but do not do good. But happy is every Muslim who surrenders to God and who does good by making an effort to understand, and in reading the Books that the Lord has inspired. Happy this man, whether he is Muslim, Christian, or pagan.

The author again certifies in saying: "This study aims to inculcate the spirit of openness and goodwill among the faithful of good faith, non-racists, and non-fanatics from all confessions, without any compromise. Believers from all confessions, who are able to free themselves of their prejudices, will realize in reading the inspired divine Books -calmly and at safe distance from challenges, provocations and personal ideas- that this Inspiration is One. Its Source is One, and it comes from one God. They will discover with joy, that they are brothers, embracing each other mutually, after having believed that they were enemies killing one another."

Pierre says: "I named this book 'Look of faith at the Qur'an' because, to men, I am a priest and Christian and, in their opinion, a Christian does not believe in the Qur'an, despite that the Qur'an is nobody's monopoly. It is the inspiration of God addressed to all those who love spiritual life, and aspire to sublimate their thoughts, so they may sit next to the Creator, and live eternally from his breath and in his company".

Pierre says: "I believe in God, I believe in Jesus, the Christ of God and believe in his prophet Muhammad. I believe there are but two communities, not a third: the community of the blessed believers, and the community of the banished fanatics, belonging to any people, any nation, and any religion".

And we, in our turn, greet Pierre, this generous soul, for having drawn our attention with much kindness, as we have greeted before him, Ambassador Nasri Salhab, hoping to see many more of these books of faith that have their result.

Signature of the Reverend Sheikh Z Y

## 2. Second reaction: Response to the articles of Sheikh KR

The second reaction consists of a series of five articles written by the Sheikh KR and appeared in an Arab review. Pierre responded in a newspaper to the first four articles.

Here the translation of Pierre's response:

### Unity of faith, not the dissimulation of the texts:

I read in the review, your reaction to my book "Look of Faith at the Qur'an: Unity of the Biblical-Qur'anic Inspiration". I respond to your Reverence because some close friends, authentic Muslims, have asked me with insistence to do so, after having been convinced by my answers to your attacks. They have thus asked me to answer publicly so that nobody, including you, can believe that you are right.

Firstly, permit me me to draw your attention on some remarks. You said: "The author forced himself to reconcile the texts of the Torah, Gospel and Qur'an. And from where has he the right to do so? ... The truth is, that he has stumbled in his style of conciliation and has walked around the truth, so that the conciliation has become an elusion". You repeat this in the introduction, always the same, in the four articles reported by the review. And yet, in my book, and contrary to what you say, I did not provide a single effort "of conciliation". Such an effort is conceivable only between texts that contradict or oppose each other; this is not the case with the inspired Books. Speaking of the conciliation between the inspired Books, implies that they are not in harmony with each other. Yet, there is nothing like that here. That is why I think you are right in saying, with regards to conciliation: "From where has he the right to do so?", since the problem from the start does not exist. I have tried to find an agreement between the believers of these inspired Books, not between the inspired Books themselves which, from the start, are in agreement. Is it this you are blaming me for? If this effort of conciliation between believers is a sin, I then merit hell, as I burn with zeal to see believers in agreement and united with love around the unique God. And how could there not be harmony between the Books of God? The Qur'an declares explicitly, that it certifies the Bible, not that it contradicts it, and that the God of the Qur'an is the same as the One of the Bible, as I have demonstrated in my book, supporting myself on some Qur'anic verses which I repeat here:

"O People to whom the Book (*the Bible*) has been revealed, believe in what We have revealed (*the Qur'an*), confirming the truth of that which you already have (*the Bible*), before." (Qur'an IV; Women,47)

And yet, what the "people of the Book" had with them, in the VIIth century AD, was the Bible in its current text. Would the Qur'an have testified for the Bible if it had been falsified -according to your statements- in the preceding centuries?

The Qur'an also says to the people of the Book: "Our God and yours is One God (*the same*). To Him we submit." (Qur'an XXIX; The Spider,46)

The logical conclusion of these inspired words is that: to believe in God in the Qur'an, is to believe in God in the Bible, to Whom we all "are resigned" (i.e. "Muslims"). It is why the Qur'an considers the apostles of Jesus Christ "Muslims", even before the arrival of the Qur'an. Sane logic leads us to conclude that from the same God emanates one sole inspiration, a unique divine intention, and one salutary plan that we must strive to discover incessantly until we reach the goal which, by the grace of God, will delight and blossom us. In fact, God's intention is one in the Bible and Qur'an, even if the style and the literary forms are different. The latter depends on the society, the place and the moment when the inspiration was given. God, as you know, speaks to each people according to their language and mentality as the Qur'an reveals: "We sent no Messenger except with the language of his people..." (Qur'an XIV; Abraham,4).

What I endeavor to seek, is the unity of the faith that originally existed in the heavenly Books inspired by God in the various languages, and according to the societies to whom God addressed Himself. I never tried to find an agreement between these inspired Books, as you say: "From where has he the right to do so", since this agreement already exists?

My intention appears in the title of my book: "Unity of the Biblical-Qur'anic Inspiration" and not "Attempt of reconciliation between the Bible and the Qur'an".

This is why I did not understand the reason for your fit of anger. Furthermore, several respectable believers and well-educated Muslims congratulated me for this happy initiative, including wise religious chiefs which you know and who know you. Besides, from the onset, I warned the reader, provided he is attentive, notifying him on page 1 that, "this book is a brief study of the true concept of the divine inspiration. It is an invitation to open oneself with faith to the Qur'anic inspiration, and through it, to the Gospel and the Torah attested by the Qur'an. It is a look of faith at the divine inspiration in general, to assemble believers with the discovery of the unity of the Biblical-Qur'anic inspiration..."

Thus, as the attentive reader will have noticed, the thread of my research is clear: it is to discover the unity of the faith, already existent, in the inspired Books and not an effort of conciliation between the Books.

Now, permit me, Reverend Sheikh, to express my disappointment and my regret, feelings shared by others, with the scornful, aggressive and provocative style which you have adopted in your response, not that I consider myself as an important personality, I am not, but because I am a simple man, a man whom your Reverence ignores, with his dignity like all men. The prophet Muhammad has never reacted like you, but chose the best of attitudes and recommends it to believers. We were expecting from a man of religion, a discussion and a dialogue using "the best" of attitudes according to the Qur'anic commandment. Especially that in your introduction you say: "I had recourse to God the Almighty so that He would inspire me the Good and correct logic". And yet, I note that you had recourse to poets, philosophers and men of science, not God. In the name of God, I ask you then: how can you accuse me of elusion, I, who refer to His Words from the luminous book of the Qur'an, and not human ideas?

You have still tried, as far as you could -and I want to believe that it was in good faith- to disfigure the content of my book, by not mentioning a single positive idea. You have spoken of tritheism as if I believe in three gods, even when I have denounced it as heresy. You have spoken of the divinity of the body of Christ, whereas I speak of the Spirit that has animated this body, created as Adam's body. I have explained why the Christ, only, is considered by the Qur'an as the Spirit of God. It is why I said that you have tried to disfigure the content of my book in mentioning half-truths, defending with enthusiasm the unity of God, a unity in which I believe, without your long speeches. You have disfigured, as it suited you, certain passages of my book, before people who were unaware of it, without mentioning a single positive point, presenting it as content with animosity and hatred towards the Qur'an, Islam and the Truth. However, the opposite is true and satisfied with the testimony of my conscience and the support of my good friends, authentic Muslims. And that God forgives you, Reverend and respectable Sheikh KR!

However, I ask each reader to be aware of the content of my book before passing judgement. (Today, it is found on the site: <http://www.pierre2.net>).

I seized the opportunity to inform the readers and yourself, Reverend, that my book has been translated in French and on its way to English, German and Italian, if God wills it. This work has planted in the heart of many believers in the West, love for the Qur'an, for its noble prophet and for Islam. It has contributed in destroying blind fanaticism, especially in the West, in presenting the Qur'an in its purity, the prophet Muhammad in his limpidity, and Islam in its innocence, not an intolerant, vanquished and divided Islam -as Christianity is too- because of the aggressive fundamentalism of both communities. It is why my soul exalts in God because of these translations,

because the faith, the Bible, the Qur'an, the prophets, the apostles, Christianity and Islam are the monopoly of no man; no one can claim to limit them, whatever his hierarchy or culture.

It is the reason for which I stop here, on the remarks of your Reverence, on N ° 8 of the review: "Each prophet who came, cancelled the law of his predecessor as a result of alliances and various times, until God put an end to prophecy, accomplishing His message by the last of His prophets: Muhammad. Thus, the law of Muhammad has cancelled that of Jesus. Now, between Jesus and our Prophet (Muhammad), there is no other prophet; we know then by this fact, that it is not permitted to practice any religion other than Islam".

I am shocked Reverend, that you consider the prophet Muhammad as "your" prophet; he is the prophet of God, the prophet of the Universe, of all those who believe in him, and whom I am a part of. He is the monopoly of no man, but it is us who belong to him. No community can say that an apostle or a prophet is their own, or the Messiah is "Our Messiah". As these messengers have a greater dimension than our capacity, and nobody can monopolize them. The faith, the prophets, the apostles and God are for all, whether some would admit it or not!

You then speak Reverend, of the "Law of Jesus". But Jesus never established another "Law", but that of Love, justice and judgement with a mature conscience. How can such "a Law" be abolished? Did the Qur'an speak of the abolition of the "Law" of Jesus by Muhammad, or are these but human thoughts?

The Gospel says: "The law was given through Moses, grace and truth have come through Jesus Christ" (John 1,17). As for what you say: "It is not permitted to practice any religion other than Islam, and the religion in the eyes of God is Islam", I am among those who preach this with an ardent and lively faith. But I preach a Qur'anic Islam, not a confessional and fanatical one, divided and torn by its own contradictions. The beloved prophet Muhammad said: "Be careful, do not become again after me as irreligious people beating one another." (Discussion N ° 204)

The numeration of the Discussions of the Prophet is drawn from the Arabic book "Manhal Al Waridin", by Sheikh Sobhi Saleh.

So where is Islam today? Do you see it in the different Muslim communities who kill themselves? Where is the faith today? I ask myself with desolation and sadness, as my love for the faith, the unique God, the Qur'an and Islam is profound, but saddened.

What Islam is your Reverence speaking of? You are in a valley and I in another... and I meditate with desolation the words of the beloved prophet Muhammad in his spiritual "Discussions": "There will come a time when only the drawing of the Qur'an will remain, and of Islam only its name. People will claim Islam, but they will be the most distant of it".

This time has come with the apparition of evil incarnated in the Israeli entity. This entity, you know well, announces a Zionist Christ and denies Jesus, the true Christ.

This "christ" of Israel is the Antichrist of which the Gospel and the prophet Muhammad in several of his spiritual "Discussions" spoke of, where he says among other things: "I do not fear for you except for the Antichrist. If he appears while I am with you, it is I who will refute his arguments, but if he appears then when I am no longer with you, then it will be for each one of you to find the arguments (*against him*), and then, God will be my successor beside each Muslim" (Discussion N ° 1806).

The Zionist Antichrist has appeared, deceiving mankind, and the beloved Muhammad is not with us. In this case, each man today is responsible for his own arguments and God is the only successor of Muhammad beside the believers until the end of the world. I say to all those who claim to be the successors of Muhammad: "You are deceived! This is not true, because the beloved prophet himself warned us himself, by saying to us that now, there is no longer any other successor but God". I believe and my faith is firm, and profoundly established, that we have reached the moment

when each person must seek, himself, his own arguments to justify his conscience and faith before God. Today, God Himself takes the reins in his hands to lead all Muslims, whom I am a part of. Permit me still, to remind you Reverend, what the Qur'an reports: "The Bedouins say: 'We believe.' Say: 'You do not believe. Instead you may say: "We surrender," but faith has not entered your hearts'" (Qur'an XLIX; The Chambers,14).

This Islam of the Bedouins is that which is widespread today. The beloved prophet warned us against this kind of faith and this "Islam" which I reject and denounce. Numerous are these modern "Bedouins" who say: "We believe and we are Muslim, but they are neither believers nor Muslims, having submitted (*Islamized*) not to God, but to Israel, the enemy of God, and hate one another. The examples are numerous in the Arab countries and I am not alone, to be sorry and sad with the Muslims' betrayal of the authentic Islam, as I am not alone in my pain to see the Christians betraying the true Christianity.

I have relied in my research on the words of God and His directives, putting into practice His commandment to discuss religious subjects based only on a "Luminous Book". The Luminous Book that I took as a guide is the Qur'an as I have mentioned on page 11 of my book where I say: "God requires prudence from believers in the search of spiritual truths. He asks them always, to lean on the inspired Books and to ignore rumors propagated by the troublemakers. God warns in saying: "Among people is one who argues about God, without knowledge, without guidance, without a Luminous Book (Qur'an XXII; The Pilgrimage,8). The Luminous Book we resort to understand the spirit of the Qur'an is the Qur'an itself".

As for you, Reverend, trying to demonstrate at all costs that the Gospel is falsified, you have resorted to the sayings of certain "Western scholars", neglecting to resort to those of the Orient, like the two great Muslim scholars, the late Reverends Muhammad Abdo and Afaghani who have confirmed with firmness, the authenticity of the Bible. How much I would have liked that you, as a man of religion, respond to me on the basis of Qur'anic texts. They only, can convince me. I had however, warned readers of my book, in saying that one of the most important principles in my research, as I value before all, to safeguard the faith, consists of the continual return to the text of the Qur'an to avoid any distractions. The calm and posed reader has, without any doubt, grasped this point which, in my view, is of greatest importance. You will find this principle mentioned in page 11 of my book.

The scholars to whom you had recourse to in your responses have misled many people. It is why -and whatever the eminence of their science and culture- I prefer the luminous Book and its directives over them.

You have strived with an astonishing determination to find non-Qur'anic evidence to prove the falsification of the Bible, and especially the Gospel, as if you port an angst towards this Holy Book. Your work is condemned by God in the Qur'an which, as I will show a bit further, considers "lost", those who refuse the Gospel (Qur'an II; The Cow,115). You avoided to refer yourself to the Qur'an and have relied on a long list of Western, anti-Biblical "scholars". Permit me then, Reverend, to draw your attention to four points:

1. To find a proof of the falsification of the Gospel -and there are none- is equivalent in contradicting the Qur'an, which attests it. You present the Biblical translation of the Vulgate as a proof of the falsification of the Holy Scriptures. This translation, as you well know, was made by St Jerome, starting from Hebrew for the Old Testament and Greek for the New Testament. To translate the Bible does not mean to falsify it. The translation was named "Vulgate", ie "popular", as it was translated in Latin, the "popular" and universal language at the time. What wrong is there in translating it? Where is the falsification? And what is the harm in correcting the text and improving it after having it translated? The Vulgate's text is that which existed at the time of Muhammad, and which was recognized canonical by the Council of Trent in Italy in 1546. It is the text employed by all the Catholic and Orthodox Christian Churches. The Protestants

refuse seven books of no importance of the Old Testament, but recognize that the other books are canonical, non-falsified. As for the books of the New Testament, all the Christian confessions are in agreement on their authenticity.

2. The "scholars" which you have mentioned are but the links of a chain of agents of international Zionism and the universal atheistic freemasonry. Many of these "scholars" infiltrated into the Christian clergy, Catholic in particular, in order to sow confusion and to spread this false doctrine of Biblical falsification, which the Qur'an is innocent of. Their words are not new and many Biblical scholars have responded to these calumnies, like Jean Daniélou, Karl Rahner, Paul Claudel, the Biblical School of Jerusalem headed by the Dominican monks of the convent of St Etienne in Jerusalem, etc...

The Vatican has denounced and dismissed several of the fake scholars that you cite and warned against many others. Moreover, the archaeological discoveries have falsified your "scholars". Indeed, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, dating 200 years BC, prove the authenticity of the Old Testament and other discoveries attest that of the New Testament, as I demonstrated in my book (*Paragraph 3.5.2*).

We would have appreciated it if you mentioned the great orientalist scholar, Louis Massignon, who believed in the Gospel and in the Qur'an and who took defense of Islam and its mysticism. This man is an apostle of openness and peace, of agreement and unity between the believers of the East and of the West. He was a celebrated orientalist who won the confidence of the true Christian and Muslim believers.

I do not wish to expand and mention lists of scholars and their words -as you have done- whatever the valor of their arguments and the grandeur of their virtues, for I rely only on the divine inspiration. I limit myself in the citation of men of science, not to imitate the over-proud who show off their cultural "muscles" to impress psychologically, the simple and naive. Having recourse to scholars ports naught, in any case, to the incredulous who have "eyes but do not see and ears but do not hear", as the Lord says in His luminous Book.

3. The majority of scholars which you have mentioned attack not only the Gospel, but the Qur'an too. They reject the evangelical doctrines attested by the Qur'an, like Mary's virginity. These people are the apostles of the evil struggle against the Qur'anic inspiration. It is true that they recognize the authenticity of the Qur'anic text, but they reject the content. They have put all their research at the service of the Israeli entity and claim that their discoveries result in the support of Israel. They teach that Israel is the people of God and that Palestine is their divine right. They impose on the Christians of the West, solidarity with the Jews of the East and the West. They apply pressure on the Vatican -especially on those amongst them who are infiltrated- that they recognize Israel.

The aim of these "scholars", in propagating the doctrine of falsification, is to remove all confidence in the gospel because it denounces the Jews. I cite to you as an example, what the Christ says to the Jews who refuse Him: "You are from your father, the devil..." (John 8,44). The ultimate aim of the doctrine of the falsification of the Gospel is double:

1. To consider all the anti-Israeli texts as falsified.
2. To destroy the Christian faith in Jesus as the Christ, so to lead to the presentation of a Zionist "Christ", considered by the Gospel as the Antichrist, Jesus being the true Christ as the Qur'an also confirms.

The infiltration of the Zionist, or zionized scholars up till the heart of the Church has bore many fruits. You are certainly aware, Reverend, that the Second Vatican Council has put forward a declaration of justification of Jews in 1964. Recently still, on the 25th of June 1985, the Vatican

put forth a declaration where it demands Christians to get closer to Jews. On this proposal, I refer you to the article of Mr. Youssef Elias Daher in the newspaper "Al-Safir", dated 10-11-1985. The title of the article is: "The final declarations of the Vatican on the attitude towards the Jews".

I mention this so that we are more prudent, and that we have recourse only to the luminous Book to avoid the punishment of the apostles led astray by falsification, and of those who will believe in it.

4. How can the Bible be falsified when the Qur'an says: "Those to whom We revealed the Book (*the Bible*) recite it as it should rightly be recited. They believe in it. But those who repudiate it, they are truly lost" (Qur'an II; The Cow,121).

The "losers" in God's eyes, are not those who take defense of the correct reading of the Bible, but the impious who calumniate it under the pretext of falsification.

God adds in the Qur'an: "So let those who follow the Gospel judge in accordance with what God revealed in it. Whoso judges not in accordance with what God revealed, these are the dissolute". (Qur'an V; The Table,47). Would God want us to judge from what is falsified?!

How can those who believe in the Qur'an -or who claim to believe in it- believe in the falsification of the Bible, when the Qur'an attests and certifies it, witnessing that it is read "correctly"? Does not this mean that the Qur'an blesses and approves the text of the Gospel? What additional proof is needed for you, Reverend, but the testimony of God Himself! As far as I am concerned, I am satisfied with the guarantee of the Qur'an against all transgressions, and I am satisfied with it as a guarantee of the veracity of my words.

You have said about me: "he has stumbled and run around the truth in his words". How can you claim this when I based my research on the Qur'an? I have not run around the truth; this is in the Qur'an and my research emanates from this Holy Book. Others run around the truth in choosing to follow the errors of some scholars instead of questioning the Qur'an. I have chosen for my part, the honor in referring to the Qur'an and to resign myself with its content without resistance and compromise.

You have criticized me, Reverend, because I have written that the Qur'an, speaking of animal sacrifices, said: "Their flesh and their blood shall not reach up to God" (Qur'an XXII; The Pilgrimage,37). Why do you churn out your anger at me, when all I did was mention a Qur'anic verse? Your revolt does not affect me because it is directed against the words of God. He alone will respond to you as his Majesty sees fit.

Then, you go on further when I wrote that God in the Qur'an directs man towards monogamy and not polygamy. God says about this: "If you fear you will be fair to them all (*towards your wives*), then marry one only" (Qur'an IV; Women,3) ... "You will not be able to act equitably with your wives, even if you apply yourself to do so" (Qur'an IV; Women,129). God in saying: "even if you apply yourself to do so, will not be able to act equitably with your wives", distances the believer away from polygamy. But it is also necessary for this believer to be intelligent, insightful and able to grasp the intention of God at the first divine sign.

I have mentioned these verses of the Qur'an in my book, basing my sincere research on them. But you have attacked me with virulence, without mentioning a single convincing Qur'anic verse, and had recourse to poems of poets. The weakness of your Qur'anic argumentation has done nothing but reinforce my conviction of being on the right path, and my determination to move forward still.

You were also angry at me because I said that divorce, which was anarchic at the time of Arab ignorance, is scorned in the Arab world today, after the passage of the Qur'an's vivifying breath. What is there in these remarks which make you so angry? I remind you of the words of the noble prophet Muhammad in his Discussions: "For God, divorce is the most odious of the permitted

things (*of the "permissible" things*). I do not have to comment on these prophetic words, as there is a wisdom for those who are capable of understanding.

You say in your response (review N ° 9 p 82) that God has no resemblance or an image, as the New Testament frankly declared in several places, that the vision of God in this world is impossible. The verse of John 1,18 says: "No one has ever seen God". Why Reverend, do you mention only half of the verse which seems to show that you are right on the impossibility of seeing God, and not mention the whole verse which contradicts your claim: "No one has ever seen God; it is the only Son, who is nearest to the Father's heart, who has made Him known"? And why do you not mention the words of Jesus, the Christ, to His apostles in John 14,9: "Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father"? In eliminating the verses of the Gospel which contradict your ideas, your research becomes subjective, and deprived of any credibility. How can you then accuse others of elusion?

You say to me that you do not believe in the verses which you did not mention because they are falsified! ... Very well! If the Gospel is falsified, then it should not be mentioned at all. I will then discuss with you with the best of arguments in drawing your attention to what the Qur'anic interpretation of Jalalein reports with regards to the first verse of the Sura "the Night Journey". Muhammad says therein: "I have seen my God the Almighty". My sole comment on this regard, which contradicts your affirmation, is the following: the vision of God in this world is possible, and in fact, took place. The New Testament, contrary to what you claim, does not deny this possibility... if it is not for the impious and the wicked, but for men of a pure conscience. In fact Jesus, the Christ, said: "Happy are the pure in heart: they shall see God" (Matthew 5,8). But you will certainly find me some philosophical and scientific arguments to deny the possibility of seeing God. I leave these false arguments to those who appreciate them. As for me, I lend my ear but to the Gospel, the Qur'an, and to the spiritual Discussions of the prophet Muhammad.

In your response, you have mentioned "the Gospel" of Barnabas and a whole list of other non-canonical gospels for Christians. You seem to place these latter at the same level of the canonical Gospels, if not higher. Why did you not tell the reader what I explained in my book with regards to the false gospel of Barnabas? I demonstrated that this "gospel" is a false testimony against the Gospel and the Qur'an because it affirms that Jesus is not the Christ. I mentioned, moreover, the verses of this pseudo-gospel that claim it, concluding that these teachings are contrary to those of the Gospel, which announces that Jesus is truly the Christ, and are also contrary to the teachings of the Qur'an, that Jesus -and no other- is the true Christ. You know, Reverend Sheikh, that many of the Muslims believe that "the gospel" of Barnabas is the only true one. Why have you kept secret the truth on this "gospel"? Why did you not reveal it to the readers, leaving them in ignorance? Why have you concentrated your attacks on the true Gospels? Why hide the truth, when you are a spiritual guide? Why?

I underline that I wrote my book, convinced that the precious Qur'an is the property of no one, and that Islam is the monopoly of no one. I wanted to present them as I see them and understand them. I have exposed my arguments with sincerity and have depicted the beautiful and tender face of Muhammad as I have known him and loved him, so that those who have a false image of him -due to the fault of some who disfigured the Qur'an, Islam and Muhammad- can equally love him too.

My book contains a new research and a new concept. I have drawn the attention on some important points which remained obscure for a long time. In discovering them, many have awoken and have rejoiced. No one can ever extinguish this ray of light. You have responded to me with an obsolete logic and teaching, which convinces but those who are doomed to perdition. For the days of fanatic logic which attack the inspired Books are over. This logic has failed... and from where would it be given to succeed? Here are the Heavenly Books going their way, defying time, enemies and events. They have no need for the testimony of any man to remain; God protects and confirms them, and any sincere and mature conscience believe in them. Many in the near and distant past

have attacked the Gospel; they have descendants and disciples on earth. But the Gospel remains like a rock on which the stubborn enemy is shattered. Many have attacked and continue to attack the Qur'an. But it is the same rock which dashes the fanatics who fight it.

I thank you, Reverend Sheikh, for your response. You did yourself an effort and some research. I thank you because your response has tranquilized my heart and confirmed my faith. Now, I am even more attached to the content of my book than before, having noted the weakness, if not the absence, of any valid argument to the contrary.

Of course, I do not expect that all Muslims and Christians share my convictions. This is not the most important. I am not waiting for all to agree with what I wrote. Many of those who praised me do not share all my points of view. This is natural and even positive. But what remains important, is the freedom to express opinions with conviction, and to exchange ideas with love, without attacking others and accusing them of elusion or other things. After all, religion is to act towards the others with "the best" behavior. I am therefore fully prepared to meet your Reverence, if you will, and if you think it may be helpful, for a calm and cordial discussion. We can exchange ideas freely, far from any distortion, fanaticism or provocation, given however, that our discussion is made on the basis of a "luminous Book", and that it is not based on the sayings of poets, philosophers and scholars, as I have had enough. And because that is the commandment of God.

### 3. Sheikh KR's response

I have read in a newspaper, Pierre's response to the points which he has raised again, even though I have already responded to them. In his response, Pierre accuses me of having been angry. With love and sincerity, I tell him that I had no interest in this, only for manifesting the truth. In responding, I did not exceed the rights of courtesy and discussion, based on logic and good reflection. I add that Pierre criticized my style of discussion, but then he fell into the same trap. The proverb says: "Do not criticize a morality and then fall into the same mistake".

As for what Pierre says at length with on the conciliation between believers, I will summarize as follows: The conciliation between believers must be made on healthy and stable bases, unshakeable by storms that come to move us. This is agreed upon by any wise person. I therefore, call upon all righteous people: How can one reconcile between the belief in the Unique and that of Three? Between those who deny the crucifixion and those who affirm it? Between those who believe in a unique God, who has neither wife, nor child, and those who affirm to the contrary? Between those who say during the Mass: "Mary, Mother of God" and those who deny it, saying God is above all that?

These are but a few examples of the doctrinal and controversial questions between Christians and Muslims.

Yes, we can become closer and cultivate agreement in cultivating love between men, because man, despite everything, is man's brother.

This is possible based on God's word who says: "Men! We created you man and woman and made of you people and tribes so that you know each other". God adds: "God does not forbid you to be associated with those who do not attack your religion, nor drive you out from your homes. Be righteous towards them, because God likes the righteous ones".

If the beliefs of some are opposed to that of others, does this mean animosity, fights, exile, and the stripping of others must prevail? Certainly not!

The divine inspiration's unity is part of the Muslim doctrine; he thus believes in it and if he attacks or despises one of God's prophets, he denies Islam and falls in heresy and apostasy.

There has been between Arab and non-Arab Muslims on the one hand, and Israel and the Zionists on the other hand, an animosity and combat from the dawn of Islam up till the present day.

Despite this, if a Muslim attacks Moses, God's prophet, he apostasies and is excommunicated from Islam. The inspiration's unity is a doctrine decried by the Qur'an and affirmed by our prophet and God's prophet, Muhammad.

I have demonstrated in the newspaper in detail, the elements of this research and I see no reason of repeating myself.

Pierre raised an interpretation and some questions on what God had said: "O People to whom the Book has been revealed, believe in what We have revealed, confirming the truth of that which you already have, before." (Qur'an IV; Women,47)

The interpreters have mentioned in which occasion this inspiration was given: "Ibn Isaac said: The prophet spoke to some Jewish chiefs and said to them: 'You Jews, fear God and resign to God; you know that what I bring to you is the truth'. They said: 'We do not know that Muhammad'. They apostatised, they did not know and remain stubborn in their apostasy. God thus has inspired this verse!"

As for the confirmation in question, in the verse, it means: Their knowledge of the quality of the prophet and their stubbornness despite this, remained in apostasy.

God furthermore denounced, in several verses, those who falsify the Bible. We suffice to mention the following verse: "Misfortune to those who write the Book with their hand and then say: 'This comes from God' to earn dishonest money. Misfortune to them for what their hands have written and misfortune to those who wrote to acquire a profit".

God has invited the people of the Book by this call: "You people of the Book, come to a word of agreement between you and us, that we adore only God, let us not associate to Him anything, and that we do not become lords between us, in the place of God".

This divine invitation is always valid and the door is always wide open to those who want to respond to it. As for the verse to which Pierre referred to: "Those to whom we gave the Book read it correctly; they believe in it and those who do not believe in it are the losers", Katada interpreted it as follows: "They are the prophet's friends; the book is the Qur'an". Abu Moussa El-Ashaari has said: "The one who follows the Qur'an is led by it into Paradise's meadows". Omar Ibn-El-Khattab has said: "It is those who, by reading a verse of mercy, ask God for it, or a verse of punishment, have recourse to God".

Pierre has made some comments on polygamy, referring to the verse of the chapter of the Women: "You could never be equitable towards your wives even if you wanted to". To be equitable here, means the fondness of the heart (an equal affection is impossible). This is a fact that man does not control, but that God alone controls. The prophet Muhammad had several women; as did his successors and this was not forbidden.

Pierre also spoke about God's vision in this world. This question is discussed by the learned. What we tend to believe, I would even say what we prefer to believe, is that God's vision is forbidden in this world, and that his vision in the other world is without any possible comparison, this according to the word of God: "Nothing is similar to him; he sees and hears all".

There are still other questions which do not deserve a lengthy explanation, as my response to the book has covered all the subjects.

I thank Pierre and congratulate him from all my heart for the beautifully expressed words, among others, that the Antichrist is the Christ of the Jews. I thank him for frankly expressing his faith in the Qur'an and for manifesting his love for the prophet Muhammad and for his brothers, the other prophets.

(Sheikh KR ends in thanking us for the invitation to a cordial dialogue and by courtesies).

## 4. Second response to Sheikh KR

Reverend Sheikh KR, I read your response in a newspaper. I am delighted that you are in agreement on the fact that the Antichrist is the Zionist's "christ", the fabricated State of Israel. My first response was an indication to this satanic state and the denunciation of its charlatanism and its injustice. I permit myself to send you my book "The Antichrist in Islam", as our beloved prophet Mohammad speaks of it in his Discussions. His prophetic words allow us to conclude that the Antichrist is the State of Israel.

However, this belief implies many new commitments on the religious and spiritual levels, and it does not suit those who are harmed by these upheavals. The apparition of the Antichrist means that we have arrived to the time of corruption, against which the Lord Jesus, the Christ, as well as the prophet Mohammad warned us against. With this charlatan's appearance, a new era thus begins in the world, where God alone is the successor to all the prophets and Muhammad as well, as the latter revealed himself. This succession of God, for believers, aims to liberate them from the hegemony of the alleged humane succession which exploits them: tradesmen of religion and the mercenaries who continue to tie the consciences of the poor and simple with chains that God alone can rupture. Such is the divine wisdom which, today, opens a new door to welcome the hearts who aspire to free themselves from the weight of material things, and to fly high towards God, so to live in his presence, his eternal divine company, from now.

Any human claim on any prophetic succession is therefore in vain today, as the prophet Muhammad says in his Discussion (1806): "I do not fear for you, except from the Antichrist. If he appears while I am with you, it is me who will refute his arguments, but if he appears when I am no longer with you, it is up to each one of you to find the arguments (*against him*) and **then God is my successor** beside every Muslim".

And yet the Antichrist has appeared! So, Muhammad's successor today, is God.

That being said, I respond sequentially, to the points which you raised in your response in the newspaper:

1) You say: "The conciliation between believers must be made on a healthy and stable basis... How can one reconcile between the belief in the Unique (God) and that of Three? Between those who deny the crucifixion and those who affirm it? Between those who believe in a unique God, who has neither wife nor child, and those who affirm to the contrary? Between those who say during Mass "Mary, Mother of God" and those who deny it...?"

My answer is the following:

A) The unity of the Qur'anic-Biblical inspiration which I preach is the stable and unshakeable base to reconcile believers with one another. On the contrary, the principle of the falsification of the Gospel on which you base yourself is not a stable ground for the conciliation, as it contradicts the Qur'an and the Gospel at the same time. It is rejected by many Muslim scholars (which I have mentioned the Muslim clerics: Muhammad Abdo and Afaghani) and Christians.

B) The conciliation between the belief in (divine) uniqueness and triplicity (three gods) is impossible, but on the other hand, the reality the Unique and Trinitarian God is a fact revealed by God and explained in my book "A Look of faith at the Qur'an". I summarize the explanation herein: Man, his word and his spirit, are but one and the same person, not three persons. Likewise, God, his Word and his Spirit, are one and the same essence. God revealed this so that we know that the Christ is the Word of God and his Spirit, not the Word and Spirit of another God. No other prophet has been qualified in this way.

C) It is impossible to reconcile between "what" denies the crucifixion and "what" confirms it, but we must work to unite "those" who deny the fact and "those" who confirm it. I explained in my book that the Qur'an's formulation of Christ's crucifixion leaves a door open to the following

interpretation: The Jews were not able to extinguish Christ's message in killing him. As the Qur'an speaks of the death and resurrection of Jesus, as I have explained. This confirms the Biblical words. In any case, to believe or not to believe that the Qur'an denies the crucifixion is not an obstacle in believing in the unity of the inspiration when we are mature and free of fanaticism. Unless you are one of those who adore God to the letter, not those who seek the divine intention through the words. I also remind you that the Qur'an condemned the worshipers of God according to the letter, in saying: "Among people is one who worships God, but to the letter. If good befalls him, he grows content with it. But if an ordeal befalls him, he turns his face about, losing this world and the next. This is the most manifest bereavement." (Qur'an XXII; Pilgrimage,11)

D) The Gospel does not preach that God has a wife with whom he has sexual relations, and from whom bears children, as you suggest. In my book, I speak of the title of Son of God, explaining that the Christ is born from Mary, not through the intermediary of a man, but by a word of God which said: "Be! And it was". This truth was revealed to us by the Bible and the Qur'an.

E) I do not accuse those who say "Mary is the Mother of God", and do not qualify them as impious who associate to God other gods. These believers base themselves on the evangelic inspiration with regards to the incarnation of God, not the incarnation of one of the gods -this would be "association", which is to say, associate to God other gods- because there is but one God. The divine incarnation took place in the body of Christ. This revelation is clear: it is rejected by some who do not understand it according to the wisdom of the divine religion, which confounds the philosophers of the falsification of the Gospel. They carry the responsibility; the Qur'an has nothing to do with this calumny of the falsification.

Mary is the Mother of the body of Christ, created as Adam was created; she is not the mother of the Divine Spirit, which animated this body and employed it as an instrument to propagate his light into the world. The quality of "Mother of God" attributed to Mary is a temporal quality, not eternal, whom "God chose... and chosen above all the women of the world" (Qur'an III; Family of Imran,42). She, alone, was thus chosen for the profound reasons inspired by God, reasons accepted by spiritual men and rejected by materialists. And that those who understand see clearly. Mary is but the "Servant of God", as she says herself in the Gospel. She is a creature like all human beings and differs from others only because she alone was chosen to be the temporal Mother of Him who is the Word of God and the Spirit of God, amongst men. It is the reason for which the prophet Muhammad, blessed is he, admirable in his perspicacity and discernment, had said: "No man is born without being touched by the devil, from his birth he screams because of this satanic touch: except for Mary and her son".

This verse of the Discussions is reported in the interpretation of "Jalalein", after verse 31 of the Sura of the Family of Imran. Any perspicacious man, endowed with some discernment, can understand why, only Jesus and Mary were not touched by the devil.

After having presented you my sincere arguments, I declare: Let us first work to unite believers on the same side, as in our unfortunate Lebanon -like on the outside- confessions which believe in the same doctrine, mutually kill and exile each other, in a fratricidal war. It is why, I fully agree with you Reverend, when you say: It is possible to reconcile and bring them closer together, in cultivating love between men, in you referring to Qur'anic verses. It is for this that I am working too, with God's help; as there is no compulsion in religion! (Qur'an II; The Cow,256) Religion is for God. Land and country are for all, and I believe in the peaceful coexistence between a believer and an atheist, if the mutual behavior is good. Because God alone is the judge of the consciences and much will be demanded from those who have received much and believed much! ...

2) You say: "The inspiration's unity is a doctrine decried by the Qur'an and affirmed by our prophet and the prophet of God, Muhammad". I do not wish to enter into an unhealthy competition and compare the inspired Books, or the prophets, getting myself into an escalation that religion and

the prophets condemn. But, I pose the following question to your Reverence: How can you reconcile between the inspiration's unity in which you believe in, and the doctrine of the Gospel's falsification that you preach? You speak as if God the Almighty were powerless to safeguard his inspiration from falsification.

3) You say: "Pierre created an interpretation and some questions on what God had said: "O People to whom the Book (*the Bible*) has been revealed, believe in what We (*God*) have revealed (*the Qur'an*), confirming the truth of that which you already have (*the Bible*)". You have explained this verse as so: The Qur'an's attestation does not refer to the Bible, but to Muhammad, which the "Jewish leaders" have even rejected.

And yet, in Jalalein's interpretation, we find the contrary to your assertion. It is written therein: "O People to whom the Book has been revealed, believe in what We have revealed, confirming the truth of that which you already have (*the Torah*)" (Qur'an IV; Women,47).

The Qur'anic attestation then well points to the Bible, as I have said. I did not walk around the truth in my research, as you accuse me. This attestation of the Bible -not of Mohammad- by the Qur'an, arises from the words of this same verse where God invites people of the Bible to believe in "what it" inspired (*ie the Qur'an*), attesting "that" which they already had with them (*ie the Bible*). "That", does not indicate to a person. If the verse was aimed at Muhammad, it would have said: "**The one** who is with you" and not "that which is with you". Moreover, God says: "attesting that which is with you"; and yet the prophet Muhammad was not with these Jews who rejected him. What was with them, in their possession, in all sincerity and honesty, was the Bible.

I end this important topic in pointing out the following: If the Qur'anic verse intended to indicate Muhammad, it would have been inspired for example as so: "You who received the Book, believe in what We have inspired, attesting the one (*Muhammad*) you hate and fight".

4) You say: "As for the verse to which Pierre refers to: "Those to whom we have given the Book, read it correctly", Katada has interpreted it as follows: "They are the the prophet's friends"; the book is the Qur'an" (not the Bible). My response to you is that this verse's interpretation by Jalalein says that he was inspired with regards to a group coming from Ethiopia and converted to Islam. And yet, we know that the inhabitants of Ethiopia were Copts, Christians, and their Book was thus the Bible. The fact that they became Muslim, which is to say that they recognized Muhammad as a prophet of God, is a proof that they were not Muslim yet, friends of the prophet, and that by consequence, the Book in question is indeed the Bible. Furthermore, the Qur'an was not yet grouped as a book. This was done much later, under Osman Ibn Affan. It is for this that myself and others have a quite different opinion from that of Katada's, and follow Jalalein's point of view.

5) You assert that the interpretation of the following Qur'anic verse: "You could never be equitable towards your wives even if you tried" is as follows: "To be equitable here, means the fondness of the heart". My answer: Let it be! But God says nonetheless: "If you fear being unjust from an emotional point of view, the fondness of the heart, then only one wife is needed", and then God adds: "You could never be equitable towards your wives even if you tried". Just one woman should thus be taken. Add to this that it is easier to be just and equitable in material things, than in the affective domain. If the exact interpretation was the fondness of the heart, it would be a stronger reason to marry one woman, because affection -for spiritual people, not the sensual ones- is much stronger and more important than the material.

A jurisprudence (Fatwa) of the Egyptian Minister for religious affairs (Wakf), Dr. El Ahmadi Aboul Nour, published in the newspaper of 20-11-1985 consolidates my conviction even more. He writes, in effect: "Some imagine that when God gave them a financial generosity, a second wife was permitted to them, especially if there has been a repulsion or divisions with the first. We can say that as long as there is no acceptable justification for polygamy, this becomes forbidden and constitutes a sin." Dr. Aboul Nour mentions the reasons "of disorders and discords, which

replace calm and stability, sowing hatred and hardness" in the second marriage. He cites as a living example that of an employee who, after his second marriage, neglected his first family, which broke down and so did he. This is but a number of examples of the evil created due to the second marriage.

If such is the condition of the second marriage which, according to this minister's decision -who is the authority in one of the largest Muslim countries- is forbidden and constitutes a sin, what about a third and a fourth marriage? I conclude that the most odious of the "permissible" for God, after the divorce, is polygamy.

To justify polygamy, you refer yourself to the numerous wives of the prophet Mohammad. And yet these, as you know, were more numerous than four and thus exceeded the number limited by the Qur'an. Your argumentation on this point is not convincing, as the aim of the prophet's marriages was to unify the opposing tribes and to reconcile them through the matrimonial connection. They were not due to a seduction or a fondness of the heart. And what God allowed Muhammad, his prophet and ours, he does not allow to any man, as there is no valid reason for that today. The Qur'anic verses themselves enlighten us, and judge between you and I.

6) You say with my regard: "He still spoke about God's vision in this world. This question is controversial by the scholars. What we tend to believe, I would even say: what we prefer to believe, is that God's vision is forbidden in this world". My answer is that the opinions of the "scholars", as you know, do not interest me because I do not wish to philosophize around a subject that is clear-cut by the divine inspiration and the prophets. It's very simple. In my preceding article, I intentionally mentioned the word of the prophet Muhammad in the interpretation of Jalalein of the first verse of the chapter "the Night Journey", where he says: "I have seen my God".

I have trust in the experience of the prophets without listening to scholars and philosophers who want to prevent me from seeing God. I thus deploy the wings and fly up to answer the call addressed by God and his prophets to the pure hearts, asking them to rise and channel their thoughts beyond the material and man's restricted logic. I climb up the summits so to be able to contemplate my God, helped by his holy and almighty grace.

I mention here an example to clarify my thought: It is about a dialogue between a blind person and a clairvoyant. The sighted says to the blind person: "Look how beautiful the sun is at its rising!" The blind man answers: "No, nobody can see the sun". The sighted says again: "But yes! I see it!" And the blind man says: "But no, nobody sees it!". I say that both are right. The clairvoyant sees and rejoices; and the blind man does not see. The important is to put, if possible, peace between the two, leaving the clairvoyant to rejoice for his vision, and in praying for the cure of the blind.

By this example, I do not want to undermine anyone, believe me. I quote it, being obliged to clarify my answer, and I do it with great love, not to confound. My goal is not to offend, but to testify for a truth. Also, neither in my current answer, nor in my first answer, do I have the intention to offend anyone, as you accuse me of. Yes, I have tried to testify, and with firmness, but with great respect, in favor of the Divine Inspiration's unity to honor God before pleasing men. I wish, however, to excuse myself in advance before those who feel targeted by the example given, repeating still that such is not my intention. But I believe in the prophets and in what God revealed to them and I make every effort to invite believers to rise towards the highest summits of the Spirit, so to be in the Creator's company, like many believers and mystics have done -Christian and Muslim- including the Muslim mystic El Hallaj.

7) You claim having responded in detail in the newspaper to the question of the Divine Inspiration's unity. But you did not do so at all. Likewise, you avoid responding to my remarks on the alleged gospel of Barnabas which you mentioned, and I demonstrated its falseness; you also avoided responding to the subject on the impossibility of annulling the "law" of Jesus, which has no other law but love and justice, not of cult and material tradition, which must be annulled.

8) In your fifth response to my book you take defense of the Qur'an and speak at length of its grandeur, its influence on the Arabic language and the Prophet Mohammad's impeccable style. You present all this, leaving the reader to believe that I am not convinced by it. However, I have never tackled these subjects in my book, believing firmly in the fact of the miraculous Qur'an, in its literary and spiritual genius, convinced that it was really inspired to our dear prophet Mohammad. My faith in this is total. And yet, here you present these subjects in the setting of your response to my book, as if I did not believe in it. You thus intentionally pursued in your determination to disfigure the content of my book.

9) As for the examples which you cited in your fifth response on the question of the Heavenly Table (The Eucharist), they simply mean that the efforts of interpretation will always continue. The truth on this "Heavenly Table" will be discovered, only by those who humble themselves and ask the Gospel its true sense because, like you say (p 95 of your 5th response): "The general opinion with regards to this Table is that it descended from Heaven with, above, a consumable food of which God alone knows the essence". God has defined its essence in John's Gospels in chapter 6,51-63, Matthew in chapter 26,26-29, Luke 22,19-20 and Mark 14,22-25, as well as in the first letter of Paul to the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 11,17-33. However some, do not believe in it and refuse it, as the Jews rejected it in the past, and others too, still today. I explained the sense of this Heavenly Table in my book (paragraph 5.3).

10) You reiterate in your fifth response on the Qur'an's call which invites "People of the Book, let us rally around a discourse common to us and you: that we worship none but God, that we associate nothing with Him, that we do not take each other as lords apart from God". (Qur'an III; Family of Imran,64). Notice that the Qur'an, knowing that the people of the Bible associate no "person" to God, asks them not to associate "nothing" with God (*like money for example*). We have responded to this noble invitation, my companions and myself, and have found the common word of understanding between sincere Muslims and Christians, not others. We submitted ourselves (*Islamized*), not only to God, but to all the inspired Books too, as the Qur'an commands in saying: "The faithful believe in God, His angels, His Books (*in the plural*) ..." (Qur'an II; The Cow,285).

We believe in the Torah, the Gospel and the Qur'an.

In my opinion, you are well-right to say: "The monotheism of certain people is a monotheism far away from the unique God and stained with polytheism, as God says: "Most of them believe not in God unless they associate other gods with Him." (Qur'an XII; Joseph,106) I am of this opinion too, because there are many who believe in God, but associate to Him many other "things" like money, glory and pleasures, as I mention in my book. There are others who claim to believe in monotheism, but associate to God the worship of their own mentality, refusing the Books inspired by God for our salvation, because their narrow materialistic mentality is incapable of rising in order to understand the sublimity of their spiritual content. Incapable to understand these Holy Scriptures, they calumniate them and treat them as falsified. May God help us to sow peace, even between enemies.

(Pierre ends by asking the review to publish all the answers to Sheikh KR in order to be fair and just).

Pierre