

**“Tell them the truth...
After all, that’s all I ever tried to do.”**

Why I Resigned from Tarrant County College

Paul Derengowski, ThM

Those are the last words I spoke to Josue Munoz and Sharon Wettengel the night I resigned my teaching position at Tarrant County College: “Tell them the truth... That’s all I ever tried to do.” They were words I never thought I would utter when I first took the post of teaching the Great World Religions, Bible History I & II, and Philosophy classes three and a half years ago at TCC. They were words that brought to a close, at least on my end, a week’s worth of libelous accusations and a mini-tribunal that questioned everything from the content of my course on world religions to my motives for teaching in the first place. They were what I desired that TCC administrators would do for my students as I left the building for the last time. But, a bit more context is necessary to really understand why I made my final decision.

First, let me say how much I loved and appreciated teaching the classes afforded to me. Not only was I blessed to hone and shape my teaching style (which most appreciated, although one cannot please everyone), dig deeper into subjects that have always piqued my interest, but more importantly, I got to work with students with ambitions to make themselves better people. It always thrills my soul to hear from previous students who had gone on to the next level, perhaps to continue their education in a more prestigious school, to travel the world fulfilling their dreams, or simply made a little more on the paycheck because they excelled as employees. When the student succeeded, it made it worth all the late nights grading papers and planning for the next day’s instruction. Nevertheless, despite all the years of preparation and satisfaction to help others “Achieve the Dream,” things took a drastic left-hand turn November 8th when two Muslim students took exception to the documented response I gave them which was the result of a question regarding their beloved “prophet.” It was the first step in a calculated personal attack intended to not only disrupt the flow of information, which other Muslim students in other schools across the country have engaged, but to hopefully silence another perceived “enemy” of Islam.

“You Need to Learn How to Study”

It is not uncommon teaching a world religions class to have points of disagreement. In fact, it is expected. The whole idea of religion itself is somewhat nebulous and I make that clear at the

outset when discussing just what religion entails. But just because it is nebulous and people do not always agree does not mean that truth is nebulous or that at any time a student was censored in his quest to express what he thought it meant. Questions and comments were always encouraged, and by the end of the day most disagreements typically involved misunderstood communication and only needed a bit of clarification. All, or most parties, respected one another personally, and many friends were made, even though there could be still disagreements on matters of interpretation of history or doctrine.

The accusation that I needed to learn how study, or that my educational pedigree and background were bogus, or that even the personal credentials of those who had written published material from a Muslim perspective, stepped beyond the lines of rational discussion and an effort to reach mutual understanding. Yet, that is the course that Mohamad Khorchid and Randa Bedair, both admitted members of the Islamic religion, took during the November 8 class period as I attempted to explain the historically verifiable exploits of Islam's founder, Muhammad ibn Abdallah ibn Abd al-Muttalib (aka Muhammad), whereby he ordered the raid of a caravan at Nakhlah which resulted in the death of at least one caravan member, the apprehension of two others, and seizure of "the booty." A major problem with the mission, which was ordered to provide financial sustenance to the Muslims who had defected from Mecca to Medina, is that Muhammad's followers acted on the last day before Ramadan ended, and that was a religious violation in both Arabia and Islam. Both Mohamad and Randa sarcastically questioned the credibility of the story during the previous lecture, with Randa even claiming she had never heard of such a thing, as well as the Quranic source where Muhammad justified the plunder, even though prior to the lectures on Islam, both were asked out of curiosity how well they thought most Muslims knew their history and doctrine. They both affirmed "Very well." So, I told both Mohamad and Randa that I would get them the sources, which I did, and read them both, verbatim, in class.

According to Dr. Muhammad Husein Haykal, which is a respected Muslim scholar in many circles, who speaks quite favorably of Muhammad, in his book *The Life of Muhammad*, and one of several Islamic scholars who have reported the same incident, using the same Quranic references as support,¹

‘Abdullah ibn Jahsh arrived in Medinah together with the two Quraysh captives and the donkey caravan loaded completely with goods. He had already earmarked one-fifth of the booty to the Prophet. But when the Prophet saw them, he said: "I have not instructed

¹ A. Guillame, *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq's Sirat Rasul Allah* (Oxford: Oxford, reissued 1967), 287-88; Martin Lings, *Muhammad: His Life Based on the Earliest Sources* (Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 2006), 139-40; Muhammad b. Umar al-Waqidi, trans. by Rizwi Faizer, *The Life of Muhammad* (London: Routledge, 2011), 8-11; Maxime Rodinson, *Mohammed* (New York: Pantheon, 1971), 163; Ali Dashti, *23 Years: A Study of the Prophetic Career of Mohammad* (Costa Mesa: Mazda, 1994), 86-87; David S. Margoliouth, *Mohammed and the Rise of Islam* (New York: Cosimo, 1905), 244-46; Karen Armstrong, *Muhammad: A Biography of the Prophet* (London: Phoenix, 1991), 170-71.

you to fight during the holy months.” He stopped the caravan in its place as well as the two captives ‘Abdullah ibn Jahsh and his companions and, later on, they were further scolded and punished by their fellow Muslims for what they had done. The Quraysh seized the opportunity to spread the propaganda everywhere that Muhammad and his companions had violated the sanctity of the holy month by having killed, robbed and captured. The Muslims of Makkah answered that the event had taken place not in the holy months but during the following month of Sha‘ban. The Jews immediately joined the chorus of Quraysh propaganda with the hope of engaging the Muslims in a war with the Quraysh over a case in which the Muslims were apparently in the wrong according to Arabian custom. It was then that God revealed the judgment:

It was at this point that I brought out my copy of the Qur’an and read the reference that Haykal, *et al*, referenced as the revelation that Muhammad supposedly received as justification for the receiving the booty, after all, from Nakhlah. My copy was published in Saudi Arabia under the auspices and supervision of “Under-Secretariat for Publications and Research Ministry of Islamic Affairs, Endowments, Da‘wah, and Guidance.” So, this was not a translation that many Muslims criticize when it comes to Quranic translations; that it was somehow skewed or inaccurate. In fact, aside from maybe Adullah Yusuf Ali’s rendition of the Qur’an, this translation ranks high for its credibility. So, starting at Surah 2:216 I read, “*Jihad* (holy fighting in Allah’s Cause) is ordained for you (Muslims) though you dislike it, and it may be that you dislike a thing which is good for you and that you like a thing which is bad for you. Allah knows but you do not know.” Then Haykal quoted 2:217, which was read in its totality,

They ask you concerning fighting in the Sacred Months (i.e. 1st, 7th, 11th and 12th months of the Islamic calendar). Say, “Fighting therein is a great (transgression) but a greater (transgression) with Allah is to prevent mankind from following the way of Allah, to disbelieve in Him, to prevent access to *Al-Masjid Al-Haram* (at Makkah), and to drive out its inhabitants, and *Al-Fitnah* is worse than killing.” And they will never cease fighting you until they turn you back from your religion (Islamic Monotheism) if they can. And whosoever of you turns back from his religion and dies as a disbeliever, then his deeds will be lost in this life and in the Hereafter, and they will be the dwellers of the Fire. They will abide therein forever.

After pointing out that Haykal was not the only Islamic source I possess which reveals the same information on Nakhlah and points to the exact same Quranic reference, one would have thought that I had just committed a mortal sin worthy of the death penalty. For both Mohamad and Randa became combative, accusatory, and irrational, even to the point of discrediting their own holy book. I needed to learn how to study or my Ph.D. pursuit is totally fallacious if I could not find a better source than Haykal, were their immediate accusations. A question from Randa asked why I was even focusing on this at all.

When I responded to Randa's question about relevance, I reminded her that Mohamad was the one who raised the question in the previous class, and that I assured him that I would bring him the references. Her retort was to accuse me of only being critical of Islam; that I had not been that way of any of the other religions up to that point (which was a bald-faced lie). Not only had I been critical of Hinduism and Buddhism's ideas involving circularity in time, reincarnation, and the occult practice of yoga, but we critically analyzed the ideas of *sallekhana* in Jainism, what I call "free willyism" in Christianity (which included a critical discussion of even my pastor's practice of the invitation), and the Jews constant rebellion by having the oracles of God, yet failing repeatedly to obey them, resulting in their temporary separation from God as His "chosen people." So, for Randa to make such an accusation was so far out of line as to border on ulterior motive for even making it.

The remainder of the lecture amounted to nothing more than one big, constant interruption. If Mohamad or Randa were not interrupting me with questions and commentary that were either irrelevant or incoherent, they were interrupting others in the class who were trying to ask me questions. And then when I tried to answer the other student's questions, then it was more personal accusations. For instance, one student tried to ask me about the implementation of Shari'a Law, particularly in reference to an article from *Reliance of the Traveler*, which dealt with dhimmitude. Before the student could finish asking her question and where and why such a law would be applicable, Mohamad loudly interrupted her in mid-sentence, to which she snapped at him, "Would you please stop interrupting me while I'm trying to ask the professor a question?" He backed down momentarily, only to continue his bellicose diatribe later. The bottom line is that neither Mohamad, nor Randa, were going to listen, regardless of the answer and the source of justification for it. In 20/20 hindsight the whole evening seemed orchestrated for disruption, much like Muslims have done elsewhere to thwart the telling of the truth about their oppressive religion.

A Concern for Safety

At about 8:15 p.m. that evening Mohamad lost total control, jumped up, shouted what others thought was a physical threat to my being after one student gave a second statement of what she thought about Islam, explaining the scariness of Muhammad's behavior. Mohamad blurted out "you should be scared." His emotional outburst, once again, had to do with a question about his personality change when he arrived at Medina. Mohamad accused me of not citing authentic material, even though I was quoting directly from the Qur'an as I held it up before the class.

Later, another question involved whether I thought that because the Qur'an contained allusions to the Creation story, as well as others, like that found in the Bible, that that would give it a sense of credibility. When I pointed out that Muhammad admitted that there was nothing new with him, and others point out that much of his information was culled from Jews and Christians in the areas where he lived (Mecca and Medina), as well as that the Qur'an's version of those

stories were as some have noted, perverse, Mohamad Khorchid angrily responded, “That’s not even taught in the book!” and he was gone.

My immediate thoughts were, just because it is not mentioned in the book, does that somehow make my response invalid? There are all kinds of things not mentioned in the book which are a part of history and doctrine of the faiths we have discussed. Does that mean we should not reveal or discuss them, even though they are matters of fact? Later on, my questions would come up in another context which would lead to my decision to resign.

My other thought was, Is this guy about to do something stupid? It was such a shock that after class was over I made my way to the Campus Police office and filed a report. Although Dr. Barbara Coan was somewhat critical of why I did such a thing, given that I did not express precisely what I was asking for in the report, such shortsightedness on her part failed to take into account that I sat in Sargent Jeffries office for the better part of 30 minutes explaining to him what had just occurred that evening, which led to my writing of the report itself. Then after that exercise, I had another discussion with another officer. So, while the report itself may not have contained an encyclopedically detailed explanation of the price of tea in China, between what was in the report and the discussions I had with two campus security officials, we all knew exactly why I was there, what my concerns were, and why it was necessary to put them on notice. A Muslim student became belligerent and threatened the safety of everyone.

After class one student informed me that Mohamad had secretly recorded the lecture (as loosely as that term fits given the events of that evening), which I had made clear at the start of the semester was off-limits. No one was to use any kind of electronic device in class, including laptop computers, because I have learned through experience that they are a distraction. Moreover, the Tarrant County College Student Handbook makes it clear on page 41, “All electronic devices should be turned off during class unless prior approval is received from the instructor.” Mohamad never sought that approval, but knew from the start my policy regarding his recording device, and chose to circumvent authority once again, as per the rationale he was overheard stating, to take it to the dean, most likely for the express purpose of defaming me.

Interestingly enough, he did manage to admit to both Dean Josue Munoz and Ms. Sharon Wettengel that he did record the lecture, but no one ever said anything about whether it was unethical, immoral, or simply a violation of the student code. No one ever said whether or not they even listened to it, probably because Mohamad knew there was nothing juicy to incriminate me with. To add insult to injury, Mohamad had the audacity to lie to both Mr. Munoz and Ms. Wettengel, by confusing a conversation we had had several weeks before this whole incident took place with one he should have had, had he had a problem with the lecture. He made it sound as if we had talked about his outburst, which we never did, and he now felt justified in going over my head with whatever specious complaint he had—recording in hand.

Also prior to the end of class, Randa decided she did not want to participate any longer, so she gathered up her personal belongings and abruptly left the class as well. For at least a few minutes the remainder of the students and I had a peaceful discussion on the Five Pillars of Islam; no one was cutting each other off, probably in part because we were all somewhat shocked over what had just taken place during the previous hour. When class was concluded, those wanting to leave did so. For six or seven other students, including the student who informed me of Mohamad's recording effort, they remained behind to discuss their concerns and impressions over the antics of Mohamad and Randa, which I tried the best I could to rationalize. None of us could figure out the hostility, especially given that my statements were fully documented by Islamic sources, including the Qur'an, other than maybe Mohamad was going to do something even more stupid, which is why I filed the police report afterwards. Clearly the class period was one of the most bizarre displays of student conduct that I have encountered since the days of substituting at a Middle School years ago. At that time the inanity was based purely on immaturity; this time I'm not so sure it wasn't by design. The shock, though, of that evening was only the tremor of even more unethical, illegal, and bizarre behavior to come.

Mr. Postman: Is There a Letter in Your Bag for Me?

There were no flair-ups between Tuesday, November 8 and Thursday, November 10, even though I did contact Sharon Wettengel about Mohamad and Randa's behavior, and my having to file a police report the night before. November 10 was the night of the student's second mock trial, and everyone participated, played their roles, and we all had a great time learning about Warren Jeffs and the FLDS.

I passed along the information to Sharon that the student gave to me about Mohamad's illicit recording, and told her that Mohamad was apparently up to something given his unethical behavior. She would later call me back to inform me that Mohamad had spoken to her about the previous evening, as well as his recording, but for some reason misled her into believing that he and I had discussed any misgivings. Sharon and I had agreed that before he decided to go over my head to discuss his complaint that it would at least be best for him to talk to me first, personally, and then proceed if there was not any possibility of resolve. He told her that he had spoken to me, which was a complete lie, which is why he was now speaking to her. To this day I have not spoken to Mohamad about anything, even though he assured Sharon that he would be contacting me to set up a time and date to iron out whatever his concerns were. That never happened.

The following morning, Friday, November 11, I received an email from Randa Bedair asking me about a quiz grade that I had assessed her for leaving class early the previous night. Earlier in the semester I had explicitly told everyone that if they chose to leave before the class was officially concluded, and that if they did not have a prior agreement that they could leave, then

they would receive not only a zero for whatever work was turned in that evening, they would be counted as absent. Randa, apparently still upset from Tuesday evening's "discussion," asked, "Is there a good reason why you gave me a 0 on my quiz in which I fairly made 6/6 on it? If it is about me leaving class, It was 8:20 when I left the room." In response I wrote, "You actually left before 8:20, it was 8:18 by the clock on the wall, while I was still lecturing on the Five Pillars. So, you are correct in your conclusion as to why you received the zero, as per a statement I made about six weeks ago to the whole class over leaving early. Thanks for asking, though. Have a good weekend." About an hour and twenty minutes later Randa threatens, "That's fine, I will speak to Mrs. Sharon Wettengel about it. You have a good weekend too!" I immediately contacted Sharon, again, to let her know about Randa's threat, which I never heard about again, most likely because Randa knew she was in error, and she had other plans, which were much more devious in mind. Later she would confess that she did leave early in her libelous letter.

On Monday morning, November 14, an email was forwarded to me by one of my students that I did not respond to until 2:18 p.m. Who was the original emailer? Why, it was none other than Randa Bedair. Randa, apparently feeling the only way she could deal with the inequities of her own religion, as well as her unethical behavior, spent the weekend culling together what she thought was decisive information which she concluded meant that I was a hateful, biased, religiously intolerant, slanderous, ill-speaking, intellectually dishonest, unrighteous, discriminating, violating individual, who she was not going to listen to any longer. And who were the recipients of her personally insulting diatribe? Why, none other than all the students in the class, including two who had never attended the class at all. Was I sent a copy? Why, of course not. Why? Because this had nothing do with TCC, the facts about Islam, the lecture itself, or the resolving of any issue according to the Student Handbook or just plain common decency. This had to do with a personal vendetta to exact revenge regardless of how dubious the plan was concocted. It is tantamount to what has sometimes been seen elsewhere in the news, when some juvenile girl, who does not like a teacher or perhaps even her father, exacts revenge on him by accusing him of sexually molesting her. He is immediately taken into custody and convicted at least in the minds of those willing to listen to her, even before there is a trial. She then sheepishly walks away with a smirk on her face thinking, "I got him." One could almost see the smirk on Randa's face just before pressing the Enter button on her keyboard to send out her malicious email.

After thanking the student who sent me the email I wrote to her stating that, "Randa and Mohamad both decided to do a little character assassination, which is consistent with what I've had to deal with in the past." Here I was referring to the libelous antics of the Muslim Student Association, which is a group affiliated with fun-loving terrorist groups like Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood, on the TCC campus a couple of years ago. After crashing their proselytization event that it attempted to mask as "Islam Exposed," one malicious comment after another could be viewed about me online or via email sent between those who just did not like to

be really exposed for the deception they were perpetrating. I continued, “If Randa wants to poison the well, that’s fine. I’ll stand by what I’ve written and my sentiments in the context in which they were written, because Islamic history, doctrine, and behavior like hers, provide the precedent. See you in class tomorrow.” Unfortunately, tomorrow never came.

Immediately I got on the phone, again, and called Sharon Wettengel, the department chair in the Humanities division at the Southeast Campus, explaining to her what Randa had done. At that time Sharon was definitely supportive of me, but as time wore on, it was clear I was being singled out; I was going to be left to fight this on my own. But once the law is subverted, and those in charge refuse to fulfill their duty to uphold the very rules and regulations that they have created to keep civility and order, then just what chance did I really have of defending anything, let alone myself? As a fellow educator, who does not work at TCC, mentioned to me, if the administration had done their job at the outset, both Randa and Mohamad would have been immediately suspended from school, with the only option of returning through a strict reapplication process, with limited opportunity for approval. Instead, the administration became complicit in Randa and Mohamad’s terroristic actions. Various and sundry reasons were either stated or implied for their complicity. I was the problem because I was not “neutral” enough. My Christian worldview was the problem, because it made students feel threatened. My motives were impure, because it is not the role of an educator to warn anybody about the pitfalls and dangers of cult recruitment. Forget what Randa and Mohamad did, which clearly violated the student code of conduct. The professor is the problem; let’s get rid of him.

The content of Randa’s smear campaign actually reveals more about her character, or lack thereof, than anything it said about me. Below is the full text of what she wrote, in italics, along with a few questions and comments that I would have liked to have asked or made, if she would have followed proper protocol in dealing with her unreasonable and cowardly outrage. But, once again, she was not interested in the truth or facts, as she eventually makes clear below, but only in taking out someone she felt was a threat.

“Good morning classmates...” Good morning? Really? Do you, Randa, honestly think what you were doing was “good,” and that by sending out this piece of perversity was going better everyone’s morning, much less afternoon or evening? What exactly is “good” about ruining the reputation of another person by maliciously lying about them? Or was this your warped way of trying to draw a parallel between the lecture on Muhammad’s activities, where the actual accounts were pointed out to you, and what I’ve allegedly done, and incredible sources you supplied are your only hope of vindication? Do you even know who it is that you’ve aligned yourself with to try and demean me? And you call your peers “classmates,” but did you ever stop to think that, except for maybe Mohamad Khorchid, what you were about to do was like sticking your soiled underwear in their faces and then falsely assuming that they would like it? Did it ever cross your mind that except for you and Mohamad that your classmates actually

respected me, as their professor, and that they could trust me to deal fairly with their concerns, no matter what they were, if they would only approach me like a human being, and not like an uncivilized animal under the instruction of a seventh-century warlord? Or were you simply being cunning and disingenuous as you stabbed them in the heart, not caring about their feelings, since only your feelings counted, given that you assume that the world revolves around you?

“I am Emailing you all some information that you might find interesting, relating to our World of Religions teacher.” Actually, Randa, you were sending disinformation for the express purpose of defamation, and you were hoping that your “classmates” would be shocked, enraged, and sympathetic with your selfish and perverse little cause. For the disinformation was not relative to me, but a caricature of me. And you, amid your blind hatred of your own religion, decided that someone needed to pay the price for your self-deception and distorted ego. And instead of channeling that vehemence toward the proper source, which is Islam, you decided to take out your malicious wrath on me.

“After the other day in class, I couldn’t help but feel that he was teaching my religion of Islam in such a hatred and bias way...” So, your feelings, Randa, are what guided your decision to act irrationally? Perhaps if you would have put aside the very thing I’ve discussed before, which is a major obstacle when making rational decisions dealing with religion, you would not have slipped into the egregious errors you have made. For the documented evidence was quoted to you verbatim. It had nothing to do with feelings, but the cold hard facts, from the Muslim perspective. Muhammad did exactly as I spoke; you were given the data, but chose ignorance over being informed, and are now seeking vindication. Well, I pity you, because if you continue on with such behavior in other walks of life, you will not only live to totally regret life, but others will eventually regret that you ever lived. You’ll be despised, because of your wantonness to despise others for all the wrong reasons.

“And to my findings, he was...” Really? That’s all of the sudden a revelation to you? Were you not paying attention on day one, when I openly professed my “bias,” or what I call my Christian worldview? Were you also not paying attention on day one when I expressed the fact that everyone has a worldview, and that regardless of who taught the class, a bias (i.e. worldview) would be an inherent part of the instruction, and that it would be up to you to take the information and make of it what you will? Yet, only now you’ve come to some startling revelation that I was biased through your findings, which really only amounted to what I told you in the first place, even though most of your “findings” are really nothing more than mean-spirited innuendo?

“This man has been teaching our class in his point of view, in the way that he thinks it should be...” Again, another profound conclusion, given what was just written above,

and what was conveyed on the opening day. Assuming that what you are saying here is a complaint, who would have been more qualified to teach the class, Randa? Yourself, who knows basically nothing about any of the religions, including her own? Or myself, who has spent 30 years studying religious ideology, and has earned as few advanced degrees along the way, all of them coming with some kind of academic honor, including my current project of writing a Ph.D. dissertation on religion? Why, given your acute insight, it would be you, would it not? Now, just how many of your “classmates,” much less anyone else with an ounce of common sense, would agree with your insight?

“He is not being informative about religions, but rather creating a religious intolerance.” So, when I stood there in class on November 8th, answering your and Muhammad’s question from the previous session, reading verbatim from the Qur’an, I was not being informative? Perhaps if you weren’t so busy creating an atmosphere of “religious intolerance” toward the information coming from your own book, you could have discovered much useful information about Islam that should have caused you to stop and think about just what it is that you’re trying to defend. Perhaps you also would not have been so caught up in politically correct nonsense, whereby you chose do whatever it took to cause a commotion, just to stop the flow of objectively verifiable information that you frequently confuse with “religious intolerance.”

“This is a philosophy class, he is supposed to be opening our minds and getting us to understand why other people believe certain things...” If this comment was not so incredulous, it would almost be laughable. First you lampoon me for being biased, but now you complain that I was not doing my job of opening your mind and getting you to understand why people believe certain things. Which way do you want it, Randa? Do you want non-bias, which is impossible, or do you want me to open your mind and import understanding, which would necessitate critically evaluating various worldviews in contrast to my own, and then letting you decide which has the better argument? Frankly, if your criticism is going to have any merit at all, you would choose the latter. But, given your already made-up mind, which is imbued with an apparent overload of logical contradictions and irrational conundrums, you are not open to anything, including objective information about your own religion. So, why hypocritically or contradictorily criticize at all?

“I’m sure some of you have felt that he does slander other religions’ beliefs and speaks ill of some as well.” There’s nothing like the ol’ divide and conquer method, especially when one doesn’t have a leg to stand on, right Randa? Besides, is slander, libel, and lying determined by feeling or facts? Because many people “feel” that they have been slandered or libeled, yet when the objective facts are revealed, those “feelings” were more about preference that were either in or out of touch with the facts. The same applies to those assuming to know the truth. If it “feels” good to them, then it must be true, right

Randa? It is only after the facts are introduced, which are interpreted according a consistent worldview, that the truth either prevails or fails and slander, libel, and lying are identified. And I cannot remember making a statement in class that I could not back up with the cold, hard facts. So, unless you can point to something specific where I have erred, then who is the one that is committing acts of libel or slander by accusing me of something that cannot be proved by the facts?

“I knew me and Muhammad were not crazy speaking up against how he was teaching.” No, you were not crazy; you were irrational, if not bordering on insane, and your subsequent behavior proved it. Why? Because there’s a big difference between speaking up and merely making a loud noise, and speaking up and making logical, coherent sense. Moreover, there is a big difference between attacking the argument versus attacking the person. The former requires careful reasoning skill coupled with a careful assessment of the objective data; the latter simply requires an empty argument coupled with enough mean-spirited foolishness to share it. And given all the nonsense you’ve gathered, and were foolish enough to spew, just what would cause a sensibly thinking person to concur with your mean-spirited foolishness?

“It wasn’t the information and facts we were debating against so much, he was teaching it all wrong, and taking so many things out of context, focusing on the ugly things instead of teaching the actual religion itself...” And here we finally arrive at the crux of your argument and actions. Let me see if I understand this stellar bit of convoluted reasoning. Your tirade was not about the information and facts, which implies that your real motive for raising the ruckus had nothing to do with the truth. Therefore you turn around and assert that something was taken out of context, even though I was teaching the facts, which one cannot be doing both at the same time. Moreover, you don’t state exactly just what was taken out of context; you merely assert it. Then you claim I was only focusing on the “ugly things,” which is another admission that I was telling the truth, but you just didn’t like it. But then you fail to note that it was you and Mohamad who raised the question in the first place. I merely provided the documented source of information, from Islamic sources, including the Qur’an, to substantiate what I said all along: that the Muhammad of Islam was not a nice guy when he reached Medina, and his words and actions proved it, just like yours do right now. Then you go on to complain that I should have taught the actual religion itself, which once again defies the source of information stemming from Islamic sources, as well as contradicts your own commentary that I was teaching the facts. Randa, if the Qur’an does not teach the actuality of Islamic belief, yet Imams, Sheiks, and Mullahs the world around glorify the Qur’an as something special, then why are you a Muslim at all, if you’re going to demean the Qur’an and call your leaders liars? Are you starting to see just how completely irrational and illogical this whole statement, if not email, really is?

“I will let you all read what our teacher has written about Islam and Mormonism, the two religions he continues to speak out against in our class.” First of all, thanks for directing everyone to my website. Given the misleading propaganda on all the pro-Islamic and pro-Mormon sites that only want to tell part of the story and leave out all the “ugly” parts, I’m sure that those who actually do visit my site will find what I’ve written a breath of fresh air. At least that is what others have told me. Second, I don’t recall ever “speaking out” against any particular religion in class. Rather, I simply pointed out from firsthand sources particular statements of belief that are either “ugly,” irrational, or defy common sense, like justifying the murder and plunder of caravans on a supposed holy day to support one’s mission of vengeance. I defer to Sura 2:216-217 once again in your own holy book as evidence. Nevertheless, given the absence of any specific reference to anything contrary to the truth that I’ve written about either Islam or Mormonism, then would it be safe to say that you either have not read any of the material, or if you have, that you cannot refute it? If so, how is this fallacious mode of argumentation any different than what you have exhibited either in class or behind my back in the form of this email? Moreover, why should anyone pay one ounce of attention to your plea to agree with you?

“I will not be attending this man’s class again, and I will be showing the dean of our school.” Whether you ever attend another class of mine, anywhere, at any time, or whether you show all the deans in every school on the face of the earth what you think you’ve discovered, is irrelevant. The bottom line is that you could not refute the evidence regarding your illustrious founder, Muhammad, and his diabolical justification for the murder and robbery of those that he hated. Why? Because it is right there in the Qur’an for all to see! In addition, no matter how hard you try and poison the well by attempting to gather disciples to follow your ill-conceived plan to smear me personally is equally irrelevant. Why? Because that still would not refute the evidence to support what I was teaching. So, engage in all the mindless and yes, bigoted, behavior that you so desire. Until to come to grips with the real world, eventually, “He who sows iniquity will reap vanity, and the rod of his fury will perish,” will be your ignominious epitaph.

“This is not right at all, and a person shouldn’t feel discriminated against or violated in such a way in a learning environment as me and Mohammed did that day.” Wow. You want to preach on what you think is right after engaging in the illicit defamation of someone you don’t like because they were telling the truth? And you’re concerned about you being discriminated against, while engaging in the kind of irrational discrimination that you have, whereby you placed everyone from the administration, to your professor, to your peers in a position of having to somehow demonstrate compassion and sympathy for your otherwise vile and inconsistent behavior? Perhaps if you would have dealt with reality in a more coherent and respectable manner, by simply acknowledging what is actually in your own religious text, then everyone would have been spared this little

episode that is reminiscent of the description that others had of Muhammad, namely that he was demonically possessed.

“By the way...He gave us both zero’s on our quizzes we fairly earned 6/6 on that day in class, and an absence because we left a few minutes early...” Ah, yes, the mean, old professor actually followed up and implemented what he said he would do, should the student decide to break classroom protocol. That’s always worthy of libeling the professor before the rest of the class, is it not, Randa? Or did you simply and conveniently forget that six weeks ago everyone was notified, in class, of what would happen should one do as you now confess to have done on November 8th? And what about the “I left at 8:20” story? Are you now admitting that you lied previously? It has been said that confession is good for the soul, but Randa, it would seem that you’ve still got a long way to go in the confessional before your darkened soul will ever be able to relay the light of truth.

“We weren’t going to sit there any longer and allow him to slander our beliefs the way he was that day...” Once again, vacuous accusations in light of the evidence is only indicative of someone who has conceded the argument, but also of one who is living in a delusional dream world. One cannot commit slander by teaching the facts. You admitted above that the facts were taught, but that you didn’t like how they were taught. So, this whole issue is not about the truth or facts, but about your subjective personal preference which sees that the ends justifies the means, regardless of who might get hurt along the way. Why not just admit to the narcissistic psychopathy that infects your whole being? For that would be closer to the reason why you could not sit in class any longer and listen to the truth from your own sources, than to try and place blame elsewhere for your degenerate disability.

“Enjoy:” Actually, I’m sure that anyone in their right mind was saddened. Saddened that someone would stoop so low to get her way, that she would engage in libel, defamation, and character assassination just to get her way, and then make a back-stabbing appeal to others to join her in her degenerate quest. Once again, Randa, “He who sows iniquity will reap vanity, and the rod of his fury will perish.” Soon, you will reap what you’ve sown, and then we’ll see just how much you “enjoy” it.

The rest of Randa’s rambling included Internet links to various blog articles and sites, some of which were the product of my writing, some of which were dubious in nature and were produced by Mormon antagonists, who in the past took the same low road as Randa did in her diatribe, to try and smear me publicly. The Mormon blogs are only worth dignifying in the sense that they, like Randa, fail to deal with anything of fact, even though they tried real hard to pick and choose comments out of context to make it look like I was everything but a human being. Subjective emotion drove them to ignore facts and arguments involving the truth about Mormonism, just

like subjective emotion drove Randa and Mohamad to ignore the facts and arguments regarding the truth about Islam. As for my blog comments on Islam and Muslim profiling, those would come up later during the little inquisition I would face before Dr. Barbara Coan, Josue Munoz, and Sharon Wettengel. Therefore, I'll reserve comment until then to explain what I was getting at when I made them.

Once again, this malicious letter only reflected more about Randa than anyone else. It is so full of logical fallacies and innuendo that one could use it as classroom material on what logically not to do in order to make one's case about anything. And only a fool, or someone with as fallacious a thinking apparatus sitting on one's shoulders, would be duped by it. Sadly, though, there are those in the TCC administration who were duped because they have bought into the "myth of neutrality" nonsense taught in academia.

The Little Inquisition or Jihad Mission Accomplished

From Friday to Monday very little transpired as far as movement to know what was to happen to Randa and Mohamad. Clearly from both Sharon and I's perspective, they were in the wrong. She told me later on Friday that she would be contacting Mr. Rusty Fox, who is the Vice President of Student Development, since this was a disciplinary issue. Two students attacked a professor, verbally, complete with all the threats, and they needed his intervention to exact the proper disciplinary action. From the Student Handbook, page 41, "Upon the recommendation of a classroom, laboratory or clinical instructor, the Vice President of Student Development Services may administratively withdraw any student from a class because of the student's disruptive, disrespectful or insubordinate behavior."

On Monday I finally had the opportunity to speak with Rusty Fox on the phone. He was quite adamant that I was to talk with Dr. Barbara Coan about the matter, and if it could not be resolved, then he would take it from there. In other words, the buck was being passed, and a decision was already made to turn this into an academic issue rather than a disciplinary one. I, as the professor, was the problem, not the students perpetrating the offense. Later both Sharon Wettengel and I were miffed by the decision, as we sat in Dr. Coan's office waiting for the inquisition to begin. Because academics were only indirectly involved here, and when they became the focal point, rather than illicit behavior, it was not hard to discern just where this was going.

On Tuesday afternoon, November 15, about 2:00 p.m., I received a call from Dr. Coan's office. The secretary informed me that Dr. Coan wanted to see me immediately. She asked if I could be in her office at 3:00 p.m., which was an impossibility given the time it would take for me to get ready and make the drive. So, 5:00 p.m. was decided upon, because Dr. Coan had a function to attend later than evening. I arrived promptly, went upstairs to see Sharon for a few minutes, and then we both went to the meeting together.

At first Dr. Coan was cordial, but as the meeting progressed, it was clear that she was not fully onboard in my defense. In her hands she had copies of Randa's libelous diatribe, along with copies of pages from my website, the latter of which became the centerpiece of the discussion. She made a rather interesting confession that she agreed with much of what she had read from my site, but because of a few images and comments on the site, one could tell she was walking on eggshells as she addressed me. Why? Because just like Randa and Mohamad, those images and comments conveyed stark realities that she did not want to address, and rather than conform her worldview (which she claimed to be Christian) to reality, she decided to side with the irrational and seek a way to blame me.

Dr. Coan's inquiry essentially boiled down to four main attacks. I classify them as attacks, because in the end, they really had nothing to do with why Mohamad came unscrewed on November 8, nor why Randa decided to engage in character assassination through her covert email. Therefore, Dr. Coan concluded (1) Your website is offensive. (2) Your method of teaching is not neutral. (3) The syllabus is inappropriate. (4) What's your purpose? Oh yeah, and the students would briefly be brought up amid the preparation for lynching.

Your website is offensive.

My site, the Christian Apologetics Project, was started by myself in 2009. It's not flashy and does not have all the bells and whistles that some websites have. It was never intended to. It's an information site, not an entertainment site. I started it to publish my effort to deal with Christian belief in contrast to those who either make Christian claims, but yet are not Christian, or other beliefs that in the end are hostile toward biblical Christianity. Christian apologetics has been a part of my life almost from the time I became a Christian in 1981. I earned a Masters Degree in Apologetics, graduating with Highest Honors, from Biola University, and the site itself is simply the product of my heart's desire to serve God the best way I know how by defending the Christian faith. As I note on the site, CAPRO originally started as Apologetics Online in 2007, but a change in software also forced a change in name. Regardless, it is a "project" constantly evolving, which is "...devoted to a defense of the biblical Christian worldview." And for that, I make no apologies.

Dr. Coan, who claimed during the meeting to be a born-again Christian, took exception to a couple of links on my site, one which was visual, the other dealing with a statement. As pertaining to Islam, the site depicts on the right side of the header the Twin Towers, and if one looks really close, one can see the second plane about to strike the South Tower on that incredibly sad day known as 9/11. She asked whether I thought such an image might be intimidating to a Muslim student. I responded by telling her "It was a part of history." Muslims were responsible for the heinous act then, just like they are responsible now. She then panned through some of the articles in the menu to try and point out how it might be construed as unfair; there were no articles depicting Islam in a positive light. I responded by telling her that if she

would simply go to the bottom of the introductory page on Islam, under “Islamic Research,” she would find links to sites like the Muslim Brotherhood, the ISNA, MSA, and Islam Online. So far, so good, right? Wrong.

Staying with the subject of Islam, yet changing websites, to a blog I wrote on Townhall.com back in 2009, she brought up an article that Randa cited in her attempt to smear me. The article itself was titled, “The system worked... We want to fix that problem.” It is an article that is critical of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano and her ineptitude on how to deal with terrorism, specifically as it related to a thwarted terrorist effort made by underwear bomber, and Muslim exponent, Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab. He was the “religion of peace” follower who attempted to blow up a plane over Detroit back in December of 2009 in his jihadist war against the West. Because Napolitano—and a whole host of other misguided and spineless individuals who seem hell-bent on destroying America, rather than protecting her—was conflicted in explaining just how Abdulmutallab managed to get on board the airliner, I listed three steps to “fix” the problem of Islamic terrorism. One, forbid the existence of Islamic terrorist front groups like CAIR to set up shop in the United States. Two, place all mosques under 24/7 surveillance. Three, profile Muslims, given that they are the main, and habitual, perpetrators of things like attempting to blow up planes over American cities. Dr. Coan read the third solution to me, which I stated,

Third, every Muslim should be profiled, and if caught breaking the law—even if it’s spitting on the sidewalk—should be deported or executed, depending on the level of offense. If deported that Muslim should be given the strict order “Don’t ever come back! You’re no longer welcome here!” If executed, then the rest of the Muslim community can thank Allah for the infidel sending the criminal (not martyr) to his reward. At least the rest of humanity won’t have to be concerned about him wreaking senseless havoc in this world anymore.

Her main question dealt with deporting the Muslim and telling them not to come back. I stand by the remedy. If the Muslim wishes to live in America, then abide by American law and allow Americans to live according to the dictates of their conscience, regardless of their religious persuasion. However, given the Islamic worldview, as driven by the anti-Semitic and caustic commands given in the Qur’an, along with examples relayed in the Hadith and Shari’a Law, the true-blue Muslim has no intention of abiding peacefully with his American or Western neighbor. Instead, he is to fight in the cause of Allah, and subject the infidel to pain, misery, and death, with the express promise that those who refuse to convert to Islam will suffer in hellfire (2.190, 193, 244; 3.151. 4.56, 76, 84, 89, 95; 5.35; 8.39, 65, 67; 9.5, 12, 29, 36, 38, 123; 22.39; 47.4; 60.1; 98.6). He is to conquer the world for Allah, by force if necessary, and failure to do so is to jeopardize his commitment as a Muslim, as well as possibly forfeit a blissful, if not lustful, time in the afterlife. There is no middle ground. Such ideology applies to both religion and politics, since in Islam there is no difference between the two. One either complies or dies. Exceptions come at a premium, and often those end in oppression and death as well. Just

look at what is going on in Iran, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Nigeria. And the only way to quash such diabolic zeal is to act swiftly, justly, and finally with those true blue Muslims who seem more intent on circumventing U. S. Law, than abiding by it. It's the message and method that Napolitano and company just do not seem to get, but is quite effective, although not flawless, when it is employed. The tiny nation of Israel is a classic example of effectively profiling Muslims. Americans should do the same. Dr. Coan had no response.

You've got to be neutral.

Another criticism that Dr. Coan raised concerned my personal insights and opinions over whether I thought certain religions were in error, or simply cults. It was her opinion, however, and an erroneous one that I pointed out to her, that classes were to be taught neutrally; that the professor was not to have any position on any topic, especially a class like World Religions. The student could opine, but the professor should keep his opinions to himself. My objection came in the form of pointing out her that such a notion is otherwise known as the "myth of neutrality." The myth of neutrality basically asserts that facts, or at least perceived facts, about any given subject can be discussed or taught apart from a worldview which interprets them. What I tried to point out to her is that it takes a worldview to deal with the data in the first place, before the data can be taught as either true or false, or an opinion formulated. Otherwise, one is left with what someone once called "stupid things," which refers to "facts" without a point of reference. Of course, Dr. Coan objected, but as I told Sharon Wettengel later on, I could have made both Dr. Coan and Mr. Munoz look silly, but I remained composed, as I listened to Dr. Coan repeatedly contradict herself in her attempt to condemn my objective approach to pedagogy versus her neutrality (which really is nothing more than a sophisticated way of saying truth is relative, and is a contradictory assumption in itself).

Mr. Munoz attempted to illustrate the need for neutrality by giving a lame example of how some alleged student elsewhere came away from a course in politics or history, and never knew where the instructor stood on the subject. My thought, although I never expressed it, was if the instructor was truly presenting the facts, then how did he know they were facts if he consistently applied a relativistic worldview in preparation to teach them? Because in the world of relativism, nothing is black or white, nothing is right or wrong, nothing is good or evil, up or down, et cetera. And as soon as someone says otherwise—for example, by condemning the flying of two airliners into the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center—then that person immediately has made an absolute determination. But absolute as based on what objective criteria, if all is neutral? Moreover, just what worldview offers a point of reference that does not start with man being the measure of all things? Finally, Munoz's illustration was not about neutrality, but epistemology, or how one knows anything. In other words, the student in the illustration was not confounded by the professor's neutral position, but about a lack of information whereby the student would know where the professor stood. So, what Munoz and Coan were advocating was not the education of the student, but keeping the student in the dark

concerning pertinent points of fact. Therefore, all I could do was sit there musing that this guy has not thought through his illustration very clearly. For if we applied what he said to the study of World Religions, then atrocities like 9/11, Jonestown, and the molestation of pre-teen girls by Warren Jeffs, would all have been justified under the guise of neutrality. And just how sickeningly irrational is that?

The syllabus is inappropriate.

A third criticism offered during The Little Inquisition dealt with the appropriateness of my syllabus. Three and a half years ago I received a call a week before class was to start, and was asked if I would be interested in teaching both the World Religions and Bible History I classes. After catching my breathe, given the absolute shortness of time to prepare material, I feverishly put together what is today's syllabus for both classes, and would later do the same for Introduction to Philosophy and Bible History II. It was tough on both myself and the students, as we trudged our way, week by week, trying to hurry along with not only reading the text, but creating quizzes and exams, projects and activities as well. Frankly, I'm amazed that as many students decided to stick with the classes in the manner that they did. Perhaps it was because a human being was teaching, and not a "neutral" robot reading the book to them, that kept them interested and moving along. Nevertheless, with a few tweaks along the way, the syllabus for the World Religions class has remained stable for the past couple of years, as I faithfully submitted it to Lien, the secretary and my good friend, in the Humanities main office. No question was ever raised concerning its validity or appropriateness.

That said, however, because I had linked reading assignments to my site, all of the sudden the latter part of the syllabus became invalid. The links could lead the students to possibly be offended by what they saw, even though as mentioned above, Dr. Coan stated that she agreed with much of what my site had to say, and none of the articles she was alluding to, namely the ones on Islam, were required reading. Only those dealing with Cults and Cultism, Mormonism, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Scientology were linked, mainly because the class textbook said little to nothing about those religions, yet they are prominent in the study of religion, if not "great" religion, in our contemporary setting. When I asked what could be taught in lieu of invalidating the remainder of the syllabus, Dr. Coan's response was to teach from the book. When I explained that we were done with the book when we finished the lecture on Islam—which Randa and Mohamad successfully short-circuited via their interruptions—there was no reply. For the past three and a half years I've been teaching on cults and cultism, with the past three showing a video produced by the History Channel, and now, all of the sudden, because two Muslim student's inappropriate behavior, the syllabus could not be taught, and that without a possible suggestion to fill the lacuna. My thought was, why even continue the course? Anyway, Dr. Coan proceeded to instruct Sharon on which subjects were to be nixed, which was all of them.

What's your purpose?

The final point which really stuck out as a source of personally criticism of my teaching effort dealt with motive, specifically as it related to a comment, once again, on my website. As part of the course we study only a handful of what someone once again has labeled “the unpaid bills of church,” or the cults. Mormonism, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Scientology, are the real focus, although both Islam and Atheism are listed on my site as cults as well. Those who know anything about the cults from a theological perspective, and are not afraid to use the “C” word to describe them, know exactly what I’m talking about. Nevertheless, the comment that raised Dr. Coan’s criticism is the one found at the end of the introductory page on my site, capro.info, dealing with cultism.

It is the expressed desire of CAPRO to aid in preparing the reader to be wary of cult recruitment and indoctrination. For once a person has been hooked into joining a cult, it is almost impossible to retrieve that friend, family member, or co-worker from the cult. Therefore it is with God’s blessing that you review the information placed here, for preventative intervention is going to be the best remedy to avoid becoming the victim of the cult.

“Do you believe it is your purpose in teaching here to keep students out of the cults,” asked Dr. Coan. It was a question she asked three or four times, to which I responded, “My purpose is to teach the truth in the most objective way possible, in order that the student may make an informed decision.” “But are you saying that you’re trying to keep students out of cults like Islam?” Again, “My purpose is to teach the truth in the most objective way possible, in order that the student may make an informed decision.” “But what if they join a cult,” asked Josue Munoz. “Then that is their decision,” I responded.

The whole five or six minutes of badgering me about why I would want to try and prevent the student from ending up in a cult seemed to border on the incredulous. It was like they would rather have the student get sucked into a cult, like Islam, than to think critically about the data and make an informed decision based on a sound worldview. Maybe that’s why nothing was done during the MSA debacle under the guise of “Islam Exposed” in 2009, where two TCC students were proselytized into the cult. Perhaps the reality is that many TCC officials ultimately don’t care about the spiritual welfare of the student, even though they put on a pretense of caring in their policy books, but find it more convenient to look the other way than actually address the deception when it occurs. Maybe if these same officials would have simply attended my class with the same “open mind” that they hypocritically wish others would adopt as their worldview, then the statement on my website would make more sense to them. But, then again, maybe they are involved in any one of a number of cults and the occult, and would rather remain disclosed, while hiding behind the pretense of all the neat postmodern buzzwords like “neutrality,” “tolerance,” and “diversity,” so that it will be that much easier to pick off young and impressionable students who are unwary of their agendas. The Lord only knows for sure.

Oh yeah, the students.

As a sideshow, I managed to bring up the real reason we were supposed to be meeting, and that was Randa and Mohamad. When asked about Randa's email, Dr. Coan said that it had been deemed legal, I assume by TCC counsel. Really? Why didn't TCC counsel, or whoever she was alluding to, contact me? After all, I had contacted Angela Robinson's office, which represents TCC for issues like this, but no one ever returned my message. When I asked Dr. Coan, "You mean defamation of character is now legal?" Her short response was that if I wanted to pursue that angle, then I would have to get my own lawyer. Interesting, I thought to myself, Is this a part of the neutrality fallacy that she had swallowed? I thought of a dozen scenarios that would illustrate the inanity of Dr. Coan's response, but I thought, why? Her mind was made-up before the door closed. This was about getting rid of me, not dealing with the real issue.

When Mohamad was brought up, Mr. Munoz at least asked me for the details leading up to all the chaos. But after explaining what happened, there was no outrage or concern. He didn't even grunt. Once again, it was a "we'll call them in tomorrow and talk with them, and we'll have you present to see if we can work things out." My thought was, no, we won't. My prescription was to get rid of them altogether. Suspend them with a failing grade, and place on their transcripts a detailed explanation why, so as to warn other academic institutions, just in case they decided to get in elsewhere and pull the same stunts in the name of Allah there. They attacked a college professor, maliciously, and placed two dozen other TCC student's lives in jeopardy that night. There was nothing left to talk about. Have some guts and do what's right for a change, instead of kowtowing to your mythological neutrality god and letting evil reign.

The Decision

I was summarily dismissed from the meeting. Apparently all three had a function to go to shortly thereafter, but wanted a few moments to commune with each other over what had just been discussed. The teacher's lounge is where I ended up. It was about 6:15 p.m. So, I sat there, by myself, doing my own bit of contemplation, wondering what in the world was going on. Where was this all going? Where could it go?

At about 6:30 Josue and Sharon showed up in the lounge. Josue informed me that they had decided to cancel that night's class, for whatever reason, I'm still not sure. Anyway, I responded by saying that by doing away with the remainder of the syllabus schedule, he really ought to consider cancelling the rest of the semester. His response was that if I felt that way about it, he could always find someone else to take the remaining class periods until the end of the semester. At that moment, I knew it was over.

They left to head back to their offices, probably to make final preparations to get ready for their function. I followed a few moments later, after standing in the hall thinking about the gut-wrenching decision I was about to make. Sharon was just unlocking her door and entering when I walked up. Josue took a couple of minutes to go to the restroom right across the hall. I had my

badge and key in hand and extended it to give them to Sharon. She had a sad look on her face, almost conflicted, because she knew what I was doing before I said a word. She asked that I wait so that we could talk about it, but I replied that after what I heard downstairs, the talking had already been done. Josue then walked up, to which I immediately said, “I resign.” Josue looked somewhat stunned, but with almost a twinkle in his eye he said, “Oh. Can we get that in writing?” I said, “Sure.” Sharon then said if I wanted to address the students to explain what I was doing; I declined. It hurt badly enough anyway. So, I told her, “You do it. Just tell them the truth. They’re adults. After all, that’s all I ever tried to do.” I turned around and walked. My life was over as a professor at TCC.

Final Comments

To Randa Bedair and Mohamad Khorchid, your actions betray your true characters. Not only did you act shamefully, despicably, recklessly, and carelessly, you provided the perfect illustration of what happens to those who really and truly follow Islamic principles. Lying, cheating, and stealing all for the sake of Allah. Surely you must be proud. My heart breaks for you.

To all the students I leave behind, thank for you allowing me to be your professor. Through adversity—which included that first exam and all those fun “gifts” I kept giving you—you have performed admirably. You are the reasons that made what I did not a job, but a blessing from God. May God bless each and every one of you in the days, months, and years ahead. And when you reach the end of the path of life, may you stand before Him and have Him say, “Well done, thou good and faithful servant.”

To my immediate colleagues and co-workers I wish you all the best in your professional careers. Justin, thank you for hiring me. Thank you for the latitude to teach as a teacher should. Lien, my friend and person I adored the most, you’re the best (even though you would never return my phone calls J). John and Mark, thanks for going out of your way to fill in for me when I needed to be gone. Bright, sharp, intelligent, TCC is fortunate to have you both. Sharon, thanks for the numerous conversations and confidence you placed in me. I’m sorry things turned out the way they did, and how you were put in the impossible spot that somewhat compromised our friendship.

To the TCC administration—Barbara Coan, Josue Munoz, and Rusty Fox—who mishandled this case terribly, what a disappointment you have been. You all were given the opportunity to serve God, but chose to serve mammon instead. And by choosing to protect your bellies, you jeopardized, and will continue to jeopardize, every other student and employee associated with TCC. In fact, the precedent you set by failing to act appropriately in quashing this terroristic act of jihad by these two Muslim students may cost someone his/her life someday. God forbid if that happens. Nevertheless, if it does, you won’t have to look far to see the bloodletting, because

it will already be on your hands. But, then again, maybe it will be your head they will want next, so it won't matter then, just like it doesn't matter to you now. You will have your reward and so will they.

Mr. Munoz, you wanted my resignation in writing, well here it is, to the best of my recollection. I resign, under duress. May you and those who placed me in the position to have to resign, enjoy the notoriety of having your name Googled and to have to explain your actions. Just remember, if and when you have to, "Tell them the truth...After all, that's all I ever tried to do."