

Fr. Perozich comments —

In Nostra Aetate, Proclaimed By His Holiness Pope Paul VI On October 28, 1965, #3 says:

3. The Church regards with esteem also the Moslems. They adore the one God, living and subsisting in Himself; merciful and all-powerful, the Creator of heaven and earth,(5) who has spoken to men; they take pains to submit wholeheartedly to even His inscrutable decrees, just as Abraham, with whom the faith of Islam takes pleasure in linking itself, submitted to God. Though they do not acknowledge Jesus as God, they revere Him as a prophet. They also honor Mary, His virgin Mother; at times they even call on her with devotion. In addition, they await the day of judgment when God will render their deserts to all those who have been raised up from the dead. Finally, they value the moral life and worship God especially through prayer, almsgiving and fasting.

Gavin Ashenden is a British Catholic layman, author and commentator, and Associate Editor of the Catholic Herald. Formerly a priest of the Church of England, and subsequently a continuing Anglican bishop, he was appointed Chaplain to the Queen from 2008 until his resignation in 2017, (Wikipedia).

He offers a view counter to Nostra Aetate's claim that Moslems adore the one God as do we Christians. He also exposes omissions in the document. His points are highlighted by me in the article below.

It illustrates stark differences between two religions, two gods, and two prophets.

In an article "A line Muhammad would not cross, Hamas did" by [Lt. Col. James Zumwalt](https://www.wnd.com/2023/10/line-muhammad-not-cross-hamas/) Published October 20, 2023, [<https://www.wnd.com/2023/10/line-muhammad-not-cross-hamas/>], Zumwalt comments on religion and quotes former Muslim and son of a founder of Hamas, [Mosab Hassan Yousef](#).

Zumwalt contrasts Ron Hubbard's religious revelation with that of Mohammed, and then quotes Yousef.

[L. Ron] Hubbard's religion does not promote violence towards nonbelievers; sadly, Muhammad's does, having promoted bloody violence for over a millennium. As Yousef boldly declares despite threats to his life: **"The problem is not in Muslims. The problem is with their God. They need to**

**be liberated from their God. He is their biggest enemy.
It has been 1,400 years they have been lied to.”**

Any Muslim who might say this would be subject to a death sentence.
Any Catholic priest who might say this would be subject to laicization.
Any Catholic layman such as Gavin Ashenden might be targeted by Muslims, but he is safe from the wrath of the church leaders.

Why did King Charles choose to highlight Ramadan while ignoring Lent?



Gavin Ashenden

March 11, 2025



Ash Wednesday is intended to be an annual crossroads in the life of a Christian. This year it may also have acted as a crossroads in the life of the monarchy and of the British establishment.

For a Christian, Lent operates as a moment to renew the choice to be a disciple. The ministry of Jesus begins in the early part of the Gospels, with an overt confrontation with the devil. Three archetypal temptations are played out. Jesus exposes the pattern of temptation, overcoming and rejecting it. He leads the way through the blandishments of evil, through death, and towards eternal life; on Ash Wednesday, Christians renew their commitment to follow him.

But the second temptation might have caught the eye of the establishment this year in particular. It warns that **political power and influence must not be gained at the expense of spiritual integrity**. That seems to have posed a dilemma to King Charles, which he may have failed to understand.

When the King was crowned, there was a great deal of interest in the way in which he intended to exercise his constitutional role as Supreme Governor of the Church of England – the state church.

He had already, over the years, expressed an interest in the rights of all religions. He spoke of being a defender of faith in general, which, at first sight, seemed a noble and wise cause. But having made the choice to defend faith in general, a second choice then appeared swiftly on its heels.

Despite the relativism of our culture, **it is clear to any reasonably well-read observer that the different religions present different gods with different goals and different ethics**. And while they do share some universal values in common, at certain points they stand against and contradict one another, and the would-be pilgrim is forced to choose between them.

It is deeply unpopular to point out that Mohammed and Jesus present two different gods, with two different sets of ethics, requiring two different modes of surrender.

The **savior** and the **warlord** do not follow the same road. Indeed, the **warlord** claims that the records describing the **savior** and his work have been falsified. The **warlord** claims the **savior** did not overcome death, nor does he have the right to forgive sins.

The **warlord** tells the followers of the **savior** that they have been misled by their documents, that they are to revoke them and to submit to him and his different God. The **warlord** declares that the **savior** was wrong in offering a relationship with God as a tender father. God is instead beyond reach and unknowable: a fierce ethical power that requires submission as the response to an encounter with his **warlord** prophet.

This presents a serious conundrum to anyone promoting a multicultural society. The essential problem is that the religions founded by Mohammed and Jesus are antithetical to one another. The history of Islam is one of conquest and control. When it constitutes a majority in society, it will tolerate the followers of Jesus only in very strict and humiliating conditions.

Christianity is more generous. It is more confident that when faced with a choice between the **warlord** and the **savior**, the human heart is more vulnerable to love and forgiveness than it is to the presentation of power and control.

Given such a confidence, there is much to be said for being generous in a Christian society to the followers of Islam. In a secular society it might be sensible to ensure a level playing field between the two contraction religions. But the United Kingdom is not only a secular society. It is a complex hybrid between the secular and the Christian. Downing Street may be secular, but the Royal Household is Christian.

So the arrival of Ramadan and Lent at almost the same time offered an opportunity to take the temperature, so to speak, of the

positions of both the political government on one hand, and the constitutional monarchy on the other.

It was no surprise when the Prime Minister, Sir Keir Starmer, offered his best wishes for Ramadan to the 6 million Muslims in the UK, but it seemed a little awkward and ungenerous to ignore the 45 per cent of society who identify in some form or other as Christians.

We might have expected that His Majesty the King could be relied upon to respect and encourage his subjects with good wishes for Lent, while at the same time offering his courteous acknowledgment of Ramadan. Apparently not.

It came as something of a shock when the King ignored the Christian community at the beginning of Lent. In fact, not a single member of the Royal Family appeared to have had any Lenten engagement with the Christian Church, state or otherwise, on Ash Wednesday.

The King not only published his warmest good wishes for Ramadan, but followed it up with an extraordinary act of symbolic hospitality to the Islamic community by opening St George's Hall at Windsor Castle to a celebration of the Iftar meal, which is taken after the call to Maghreb prayer announcing sunset.

Simon Maples, Visitor Operations Director at Windsor Castle, justified this unusual event by explaining that the King had been "championing religious diversity and encouraging interfaith conversation" for many years.

St George's Hall is more than a useful space. It has a symbolic role as representing the heart of the monarchical identity. It is normally used to entertain heads of state and for special banquets. But on the Sunday before Lent, the call to Islamic prayer echoed throughout the building to signal the time to break the fast.

"It's very kind of the Royal Family to open their home to us," one woman told the BBC. Another added: "We never thought we'd be here breaking Iftar. We've come a long way."

Islam and Christianity are in competition with each other. Both are required to evangelize and both set out to build the society around them on the ethical values each embodies. The veiling of women and the observance of Sharia law are among some of the more contentious ambitions of Islam's influence in a post-Christian Europe.

The only way Christianity can survive in Europe, and the only way to make Europe Christian again, is through a renewal of evangelization on behalf of the Church.

The priorities of King Charles in placing multicultural hospitality before fidelity to his vows to be Defender of *the* Faith may signal an abandonment of that aspiration by the monarchy and perhaps a *de facto* renunciation of its exclusively Christian allegiance.

If that is the case, and the Protestant state-church project has chosen the political attractions of multiculturalism before the teaching and requirements of Jesus, **it places an even greater responsibility on the shoulders of the Catholic Church, whose commitment to the Gospel first nurtured the faith in the British Isles. It may have to convert them all over again. At least we know it can; it only remains for it to discover that it must.**

(LONDON, ENGLAND – FEBRUARY 26: King Charles III and Queen Camilla meet British Muslim women at a female led restaurant and help pack donation boxes ahead of Ramadan, at Darjeeling Express, Kingly Court, Carnaby Street on February 26, 2025 in London, England | Photo by Eddie Mulholland – WPA Pool/Getty Images)