

Glad Tidings

“And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers...” (Acts 13:32)

Vol. XXVII

January 22, 2017

No. 4

The Choice

(Jerry Fite)

Choosing between two religions can be offered by setting forth the full teachings of each for comparison, or, one can attack one religion leaving you with only the other religion to embrace. The latter approach is the one taken by the late Muslim debater, Ahmed Deedat.

As a youth working in a Muslim store in South Africa, Mr. Deedat felt the barbs of “Christian” trainees from a nearby “Christian seminary”. Their “incessant insults” on Islam “infused a stubborn flame” in him to “counteract” their onslaught of his religion. Encouraged by a book recording the techniques used by Muslims in India to “turn the tables” on the “Christian missionaries”, Ahmed pursued a life of debates with those professing Christianity wherein he used the Bible to undermine the Christian faith.

Ten of his booklets were compiled in two volumes, each entitled “The Choice: Islam and Christianity”. Volume one contained four of his booklets, and volume two offered material from six of his previous published booklets. While the Quran is quoted and the religion of Islam praised, the approach in “The Choice” is to put the Bible and Christianity on the hot seat, discrediting the Bible and accepted beliefs.

Ahmed Deedat charged the Bible with being a ‘PORNOGRAPHIC’ Book. Reading the Bible, you discover accounts of

“incest” such as Lot’s daughters with their father, Reuben with his father’s wife, and Judah with his daughter-in-law. While the Bible records the sins of man, even incest, the Scriptures do not condone them. Mr. Deedat’s charge that “God did not have a single word of reproach for him”, regarding Ruben, (Vol. 2; page31) fails to consider all that is written regarding the affair. In Genesis 49:4, and I Chronicles 5:1, both Jacob and God-breathed Scripture characterize it as “defilement” that cost Reuben his birthright as the firstborn.

Ahmed Deedat considers the Bible as a “CONTRADICTORY” Book. David was moved to number his people. 2 Samuel 24:1 says “the Lord tempted” or “moved” David, while I Chronicles 21:1 records as fact that “Satan... provoked” David to so act. Ahmed challenges the mind by emphasizing the Lord is not Satan, yet the same action is attributed to both in the Scriptures.

A broader understanding of Scripture shows that these two passages do not contradict one another, but are complementary in revealing an important distinction. God “allows” man to be tested or tempted, but Satan does the actual “enticement”. God was angry. Whether at this time He was displeased with His people’s sin, David’s hidden pride, or both, we do not know. But we do know He allowed Satan to expose David’s pride, and manifest Satan as Israel’s adversary due the hurtful consequences of David’s sin.

The Muslim polemic also argues that the Bible is a “MISUNDERSTOOD” Book. While this is always a possibility, is it misunderstood regarding whether Jesus died on the cross or not? Roman soldiers, with no apparent incentive to promote Christianity, examined the body of Jesus, and the bodies of the two who were crucified at the same time with Him. They broke the legs of the two robbers crucified with Jesus, to speed up their death, but did not break Jesus’ legs because they “saw that He was dead already” (John 19:33).

Instead of acknowledging the truth from the context, Ahmed Deedat blasphemes the Scripture by assuming Jesus was alive. Then he adds his own reasoning: “no modern-day stethoscope was used to verify death; nor did anyone touch his body or feel his pulse before concluding that He was ‘already dead’” (Vol. 2; page 188). Mr. Deedat does not know the soldiers did not touch Jesus. However, was anyone ever accurately determined dead before the “modern” stethoscope was available?

Ahmed Deedat died August 8, 2005 suffering from a paralyzing stroke leaving him bed ridden for the last nine years of his life. Mr. Deedat resisted all his life having doctrines “pushed down his throat”. I wonder if he decried cutting the throats of those who refuse Islam? Did he ever resist thrusting Sharia Law upon the conquered?