

Some thoughts about sharia law

This article is from the "Among Friends" section of the Church of God Big Sandy's Web site, churchofgodbigandy.com. It was posted for the weekend of Aug. 28–29.

By Dave Havir

BIG SANDY, Texas—With all the discussion about the Muslim mosque and "cultural center" potentially being built about five blocks away from Ground Zero in Manhattan, I decided to read about the matter.

I first went to articles at some of my favorite watering holes (including jewishworldreview.com and americanthinker.com). What struck me about their perspective was their concern about sharia law. I have included a few of those articles later in this edition of "Among Friends."

Then, I decided to read authors who expressed a completely different point of view. I have to admit that I read many more articles than I ever intended to read.

Here is a list of only a few of the articles.

- At gothamist.com on Aug. 25, 2010, an article quoted Ron Paul as saying: "This is all about hate and Islamophobia."
- An article by Peter Beinart titled "America Has Disgraced Itself?" was posted at thedailybeast.com on Aug. 17, 2010.
- An article by Patrick Goodenough titled "Ground Zero Mosque Controversy, As Viewed From the Muslim World" was posted at cnsnews.com on Aug. 16, 2010.
- An article by Borzou Dargahi titled "New York Mosque Controversy Worries Muslims Overseas" was posted at latimes.com on Aug. 23, 2010.
- An article by Abed Z. Bhuyan titled "Mosque Near Ground Zero? 'It's About The Community, Stupid' " was posted at washingtonpost.com on Aug. 23, 2010.
- An article titled "Statement of Muslim American Imams & Community Leaders on Holocaust Denial" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Aug. 23, 2010. This article was about eight leading Muslims who visited Germany and issued an official statement in support of the Holocaust.
- An article titled "US Muslims Should Be American First" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Aug. 23, 2010.

- An article by Hasan Zillur Rahim titled "Moving Away From Ground Zero" was posted at theamericanmuslim.org on Aug. 25, 2010.
- An article by Jason Linkins titled "Ground Zero Mosque Opposition: The Paranoia About Sharia Law" was posted at huffingtonpost.com on Aug. 25, 2010.
- An article by Bill Warner titled "A Short Overview of Sharia Law" was posted at westernfrontamerica.com on March 4, 2004.
- An article titled "Sharia Law in UK Is 'Unavoidable' " was posted at bbc.co.uk on Feb. 7, 2008. This article quoted the Archbishop of Canterbury making the controversial statement.
- An article titled "Reaction in Quotes: Sharia Law Row" was posted at bbc.co.uk on Feb. 8, 2008. This article gave various quotes reacting to the comments by the Archbishop of Canterbury.
- An article titled "Williams in Synod Sharia Address" was posted at bbc.co.uk on Feb. 11, 2008. This article discussed the Archbishop of Canterbury explaining his comments (without apology) to the Church of England's general synod.
- An article titled "Sharia Law 'Could Have UK Role' " was posted at bbc.co.uk on July 4, 2008.
- On Aug. 25, 2010, telegraph.co.uk posted the headline "Sharia Courts Operating in Britain" and then ran an older article from Sept. 14, 2008. The older article by Richard Edward was titled "Sharia Adopts Islamic Courts to Enforce Sharia Law."
- An article by Bill Sherman titled "Legislator's Proposal Would Ban Use of Sharia Law" was posted at tulsaworld.com on July 18, 2010.
- An article by Dick Morris and Eileen McGann titled "Ground Zero Mosque: The Real Issue" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 19, 2010.
- An article by Ali Gomez (a grand mufti of Egypt) titled "Is Sharia Law Reconcilable With Modernity?" was posted at washingtonpost.com on Aug. 23, 2010.

After finally reading all of these articles and many more, I decided to make the following 13 articles available to you.



An article by Thomas Catan titled "Mosque Planner Says Opposition Goes 'Beyond Islamophobia' " was posted at wsj.com (*The Wall Street Journal*) on Aug. 23, 2010.

The article quoted Daisy Khan (who is spearheading the project with her husband, Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf) as saying: "We are deeply concerned, because this is like a metastasized antisemitism. It's beyond Islamaphobia. It's hate of Muslims."

The article continued: "Ms. Kahn, appearing on ABC News' 'This Week' on Sunday, vowed to push ahead with plans to build a 15-story complex two blocks from the site of the 9/11 terrorist attacks in lower Manhattan, saying there was 'too much at stake.' "



An editorial by Arnold Ahlert titled "An Unholy Alliance Of Radicals" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 19, 2010.

It said: "With regard to the Ground Zero mosque, I am truly fascinated by the progressive elitists' newfound enthusiasm for religious tolerance.

"Aren't there the same people who have spent the last few decades doing their best to exorcize virtually any expression of religion from the public square? Aren't these the same people whose fellow-travelers in Hollywood have done their utmost to debase Christianity and its adherents at every opportunity? . . .

"Didn't the president himself ridicule Americans who 'cling' to religion? So why are progressives suddenly gung-ho regarding religious freedom?

"One can only speculate, but I suspect it has far more to do with the particular religion under discussion than it does religion per se.

"For example, if progressives held the expression of Islam to the same standard as they do Christianity, one would be at a total loss to explain how the public school system in California mandates the teaching of Islam in the seventh grade, including the study of Koranic *scripture*. One would be at a loss to explain why a public school in Nyssa, Oregon, *required* seventh-grade students to dress up as Muslims as part of a four-week course on Islam.

"When the former case went to litigation, it got as far as the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, which ruled that such manifestations of Islam in the California curriculum—including the wearing of Islamic religious symbols, or shouting 'Praise be to Allah' when prompted by teachers—didn't violate the First Amendment's establishment clause.

"Can anyone imagine the same court permitting students to say, 'Praise be to Jesus'?

"So why the double standard? The most plausible explanation centers around an old Arabic expression: the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

"Nothing threatens the status of progressive elitists, largely secular and left-ist, more than American Christians, largely religious and right-leaning. It irks the progressives to no end that the 'Religious Right' feels accountable to a 'higher power'—one that *isn't* government controlled by progressives.

"What other group of people have an even greater contempt for Christians? Islamic radicals—and more than a few so-called 'moderate Muslims.' It is no secret that vast numbers of Muslims around the world consider Christian 'infi-

dels' second-class citizens (dhimmis) at best, and utterly beneath contempt at worst.

"Both groups see Christianity as the foremost obstacle to their remarkably similar ambitions: for Muslims, the permanent entrenchment of a world-wide religious caliphate. For American progressives, the permanent entrenchment of big-government run by the Democratic party.

"Thus, the ruling element within both groups has embraced marriage of convenience, with each group using the other—until such time when the inevitable showdown between them occurs.

"In the meantime, this temporary alliance explains many things.

"It explains the deafening silence of American feminists with regard to the often brutal treatment of women in Muslim countries.

"It explains the Obama administration's determination to expunge any reference to a 'war on terror' or Islamic participation in same from our national vocabulary . . .

"It explains why Christian-bashing is a regular Hollywood staple, even as Islam remains studiously off limits.

"It explains why the Army's top officer, Gen. George Casey, was seemingly more concerned about the death of 'diversity' than 13 American soldiers murdered at Fort Hood.

"It explains why so many progressives push the idea that America's foreign policy 'justified' the 9/11 atrocity.

"And it most assuredly explains the all-out effort by progressive elitists to tar anyone opposed to a mosque near Ground Zero as a bigot.

"Both progressive and Islamist elites—and it is important to make the distinction between the political operators in both groups and ordinary liberal Americans and genuinely moderate Muslims—know that an America guided by even the most temperate expressions of Christianity, such as the reference to a 'Creator' in the Declaration of Independence, is one which will not succumb to their grandiose ambitions. At least not all at once.

"This is precisely why the strategy of incrementalism—the bit-by-bit undermining of American customs, language and culture—has been adopted by both groups . . .

"Incrementalism explains why Americans are *expected* to unquestioningly accept the idea that the Ground Zero project's leader, Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf, is a 'moderate' Muslim, despite the fact that he refuses to condemn Hamas as a terrorist group and referred to America as 'an accessory' to the 9/11 atrocity.

"It is this incrementalism that allows progressive elites to insist the 'majority of Muslims are on America's side,' absent any convincing evidence—and much evidence to the contrary.

"And it is the more advanced version of incrementalism found in Europe that has resulted in the creation of wholly segregated Muslim enclaves that police in England and France refer to as 'no-go zones'—and the Archbishop of Canterbury to comment on the 'unavoidability' of Sharia Law in the UK.

"Both progressives and the so-called moderate Muslims attached to the Ground Zero mosque *know* this project is deeply offensive to almost seventy percent of Americans. They also know it has *nothing* to do with freedom of religion, which most of the people opposed to this project have made crystal clear . . . What is the reason that it is *necessary* to build a mosque in that precise location?

"Not why *can* you, but why *must* you?

"Radical Islam and progressive elitism are all about establishing beachheads.

"Establishing those beachheads requires unstinting assaults on traditional values, be they assaults on Christianity, internationally accepted rules of war, the concept of assimilation, or the difference between freedom of religion and freedom *from* it.

"Neither group will be satisfied until their power becomes absolute, or, at the very least, until they're the only two dogs left in the fight for the civilized world.

"Until then their alliance will resemble America's alliance with Josef Stalin's Russia during WWII: a marriage of convenience designed to defeat the greater evil of Nazism.

"Right now, the 'greater evil' is conservatism and Christianity. Both must be brow-beaten into submission.

"And while much of this endeavor has been ongoing, much of it has occurred 'beneath the radar' of average Americans.

"It took 9/11 to make us realize that radical Islamists had indeed declared war on America.

"It took the election of the most radical president and Congress in history to make Americans realize that progressive elitists are every bit as intent on 're-ordering' America as the Islamic radicals are.

"The Ground Zero mosque is nothing more [than] the latest flashpoint in this sorry saga. It is an attempt to push the envelope of 'tolerance' for two entities both determined to impose their worldview—by any means necessary.

"It won't be the last one."



An article by Charles Krauthammer titled "Sacrilege At Ground Zero" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 13, 2010.

It said: "When we speak of Ground Zero as hallowed ground, what we mean is that it belongs to those who suffered and died there—and such ownership obliges us, the living, to preserve the dignity and memory of the place, never allowing it to be forgotten, trivialized or misappropriated . . .

"While no one objects to Japanese cultural centers, the idea of putting one up at Pearl Harbor would be offensive.

"And why Pope John Paul II ordered the Carmelite nuns to leave the convent they had established at Auschwitz. He was in no way devaluing their heartfelt mission to pray for the souls of the dead. He was teaching them a lesson in respect: This is not your place; it belongs to others. However pure your voice, better to let silence reign."

It later said: "Location matters. Especially this location. Ground Zero is the site of the greatest mass murder in American history—perpetrated by Muslims of a particular Islamist orthodoxy in whose cause they died and in whose name they killed.

"Of course that strain represents only a minority of Muslims. Islam is no more intrinsically Islamist than present-day Germany is Nazi—yet despite contemporary Germany's innocence, no German of goodwill would even think of proposing a German cultural center at, say, Treblinka.

"Which makes you wonder about the goodwill behind Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf's proposal. This is a man who has called U.S. policy 'an accessory to the crime' of 9/11 and, when recently asked whether Hamas is a terrorist organization, replied, 'I'm not a politician . . . The issue of terrorism is a very complex question.' "



An article by Jason Mattera titled "Ground Zero Imam Says U.S. Worse Than al-Qaeda" was posted at humanevents.com on Aug. 23, 2010.

It said: "New audio has surfaced of the imam behind the controversial mosque near Ground Zero allegedly telling an audience overseas that the United States has been far more deadly than al-Qaeda."

The article quoted Feisal Abdul Rauf at a 2005 lecture sponsored by the University of South Australia as saying: "We tend to forget, in the West, that the United States has more Muslim blood on its hands than al-Qaeda has on its hands of innocent non Muslims."

The article said: "After discussing the U.S.-led sanctions against Iraq under Saddam Hussein, Rauf went on to argue that America is to blame for its testy relationship with Islamic countries."

The article quoted him as saying: "What complicates the discussion, intra-Islamically, is the fact that the West has not been cognizant and has not addressed the issues of its own contribution to much of the injustice in the Arab and Muslim world."

The article said: "The audio was uncovered by blogger Pamela Geller of Atlas Shrugs."



An editorial by Steven Emerson titled "A 'Moderate Muslim' Exposed" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 24, 2010.

It said: "In a taped speech [to an Australian audience in July 2005], [Imam Feisal Abdul] Rauf made a number of comments that would make anyone who is not concerned about the mosque at the Ground Zero site rethink their support for the man tasked with heading the 'bridge-building' center."

Mr. Rauf is the leader of the effort to build a mosque near the site of the 9/11 terror attacks in New York.

The article quoted various portions of the speech.

The article quoted Mr. Faul as saying: "We tend to forget, in the West, that the United States has more Muslim blood on its hands than al Qaida has on its hands of innocent non Muslims. You may remember that the US-led sanctions against Iraq led to the death of over half a million Iraqi children. This has been documented by the United Nations. And when Madeleine Albright, who has become a friend of mine over the last couple of years, when she was Secretary of State and was asked whether this was worth it, said it was worth it."

When discussing his view that the United States supported authoritarian regimes and nations taking actions into their own hands, the article quoted Mr. Faul as saying: "Collateral damage is a nice thing to put on paper but when the collateral damage is your own uncle or cousin, what passions do these arouse? How do you negotiate? How do you tell people whose homes have been destroyed, whose lives have been destroyed, that this does not justify your actions of terrorism? It's hard. Yes, it is true that it does not justify the acts of bombing innocent civilians, that does not solve the problem, but after 50 years of, in many cases, oppression, of US support of authoritarian regimes that have violated human rights in the most heinous of ways, how else do people get attention?"

When asked why Muslims commit suicide bombings, Mr. Rauf belittled the fanatical religious motivation of such attacks and said: "But what makes people, in my opinion, commit suicide for political reasons [has its] origins in politics and political objectives and worldly objectives rather than other worldly objectives. But the psychology of human beings and the brittleness of the human condition and how many of us have thought about taking our own lives, we may be jilted, had a bad relationship, you know, didn't get tenure at the university, failed an important course, there's a host of reasons why people feel so depressed with themselves that they are willing to contemplate ending their own lives. And if you can access those individuals and deploy them for your own worldly objectives, this is exactly what has happened in much of the Muslim world."

When asked about Israel, Mr. Rauf said that he does not favor the plan to establish a Palestinian state beside Israel. He said: "The differences, perhaps, may lie on whether the solution lies in the two-state solution or in a one-state solution. I believe that you had someone here recently who spoke about having a one land and two peoples solution to Israel. And I personally—my own personal analysis tells me that a one-state solution is a more coherent one than a two-state solution. So if we address the underlying issue, if we figure out a way to create condominiums, to condominiumise Israel and Palestine so you have two peoples co-existing on one state, then we have a different paradigm which will allow us to move forward."

The article said: "A one-state solution is a euphemism for the destruction of Israel, because Palestinian Muslims will quickly outnumber the Jewish resident[s] of Israel. Such a position is advocated by radical groups, such as the Palestinian Islamic Jihad."

The article concluded: "Rauf, who is on a trip to the Middle East sponsored by the State Department, gave the speech on July 12, 2005, at the University of South Australia."



An article by Charles Krauthammer titled "Moral Myopia at Ground Zero" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 20, 2010.

It said: "It's hard to be an Obama sycophant these days. Your hero delivers a Ramadan speech roundly supporting the building of a mosque and Islamic center near Ground Zero in New York. Your heart swells and you're moved to declare this President Obama's finest hour, his act of greatest courage.

"Alas, the next day, at a remove of 800 miles, Obama explains that he was only talking about the legality of the thing and not the wisdom—upon which he does not make, and will not make, any judgment.

"You're left looking like a fool because now Obama has said exactly nothing: No one disputes the *right* to build; the whole debate is about the propriety, the decency, of doing so.

"It takes no courage whatsoever to bask in the applause of a Muslim audience as you promise to stand stoutly for their right to build a mosque, giving the unmistakable impression that you endorse the idea. What takes courage is to then respectfully ask that audience to reflect upon the wisdom of the project and to consider whether the imam's alleged goal of interfaith understanding might not be better achieved by accepting the New York governor's offer to help find another site."

The article noted that since Mr. Obama refused to discuss the matter, some others waded into the water. Dr. Krauthammer proceeded to quote some of their comments.

He wrote: "He [Richard Cohen of *The Post*] concedes that putting up a Japanese cultural center at Pearl Harbor would be offensive, but then dismisses the analogy to Ground Zero because 9/11 was merely 'a rogue act, committed by 20 or so crazed samurai.'

"Obtuseness of this magnitude can only be deliberate. These weren't crazies. They were methodical, focused, steel-nerved operatives.

"Nor were they freelance rogues. They were the leading, and most successful, edge of a worldwide movement of radical Islamists with cells in every continent, with worldwide financial and theological support, with a massive media and propaganda arm, and with an archipelago of local sympathizers, as in northwestern Pakistan, who protect and guard them.

"Why is America fighting Predator wars in Pakistan and Yemen, surveilling thousands of conversations and financial transactions every day, and engaged in military operations against radical Muslims everywhere from the Philippines to Somalia—because of 19 crazies, all of whom died nine years ago?

"Radical Islam is not, by any means, a majority of Islam. But with its financiers, clerics, propagandists, trainers, leaders, operatives and sympathizers—according to a conservative estimate, it commands the allegiance of 7 percent of Muslims, i.e., more than 80 million souls—it is a very powerful strain within Islam. It has changed the course of nations and affected the lives of millions. It is the reason every airport in the West is an armed camp and every land is on constant alert.

"Ground Zero is the site of the most lethal attack of that worldwide movement, which consists entirely of Muslims, acts in the name of Islam and is deeply embedded within the Islamic world. These are regrettable facts, but facts they are. And that is why putting up a monument to Islam in this place is not just insensitive but provocative."



An editorial by Frank J. Gaffney Jr. titled "Coming to Grips With Shariah" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 10, 2010.

It said: "Suddenly, it seems, everyone is talking about Shariah. In particular, growing controversies over proposed mosques at Ground Zero and other sites are becoming powerful 'teaching moments'—raising awareness about the repressive theo-political-military-legal doctrine that animates the builders and that their fellow adherents seek to impose on the entire world.

"This is a most welcome development in light of the grave and growing threat by this agenda and the concerted effort being made—here and elsewhere, through violent jihad and the stealthy kind—to realize that goal.

"Unfortunately, too many Americans still remain unaware of the magnitude of the danger we face from Shariah. Worse yet, their ability to comprehend this threat, let alone respond appropriately to it, is being seriously disserved by

people who know better—or should. Specifically, the public is being seriously misled by 1) some journalists and politicians who are obscuring the true nature of Shariah and 2) Shariah practitioners who engage in deliberate deception to facilitate the penetration of their doctrine into Western societies.”

The article pointed out that The New York Times’ front-page article on Sunday, Aug. 8, 2010, titled “Battles Around Nation Over Proposed Mosques” accurately reported the growing concern about mosques that “seek to replace the U.S. Constitution with Islamic Shariah law.” Yet The Times proceeded to dismiss the notion.

Mr. Gaffney’s article continued: “He [New York City mayor Michael Bloomberg] categorically rejected the idea that it was reasonable, let alone necessary, to determine the source of funds for the \$100-plus million mega-mosque near Ground Zero.

“In other words, the Mayor seemingly is indifferent to whether the funding for the mosque sponsored by the Cordoba Initiative (named for the capital city of the Moorish conquerors of Spain and the site where they triumphally transformed a Catholic church into a massive mosque) might be the Saudis, with their version of Shariah known as Wahhabish.

“This cavalier attitude is absolutely stupefying insofar as, two years ago this month, the New York Police Department issued a report warning that Wahhabi mosques in America were incubators for ‘homegrown’ Islamic radicals.

“The Mayor has a duty to know a lot more than he evidently does about Shariah. He certainly has an obligation to figure out whether—as is true of, by some estimates, 80 percent of the mosques in America—the Ground Zero Mosque is going to fit the profile of a Wahhabi-associated facility.”

Mr. Gaffney then described his perception that Shariah’s adherents lie about their intent when they say that “there is no conflict with the U.S. Constitution in Shariah law.”

His article said: “Now, even the most superficial review of Shariah shows that statement to be preposterous and misleading. In fact, among other Constitution-affronting features, Islamic law prohibits democratic law-making. It requires the replacement of constitutions and governments like ours with a global theocracy governed by Islamic law. It brutalizes women and otherwise treats them as second-class citizens and authorizes the murder of homosexuals and apostates.

“Shariah is, in short, wholly incompatible with our legal system, freedoms and way of life.”

Mr. Gaffney quoted a report by the NYPD as saying: “This [Shariah] ideology is proliferating in Western democracies at a logarithmic rate. The Internet, certain Salafi-based non-governmental organizations, extremist sermons/study groups, Salafi literature, jihadi videotapes, extremist-sponsored trips

to radical madressas and militant training camps abroad have served as 'extremist incubators' for young, susceptible Muslims—especially ones living in diaspora communities in the West . . .

"Americans across this country are struggling to understand the true nature of the threat we face from Shariah. They are entitled to straight talk about the extent to which it is being insinuated, promoted and legitimized not only in mosques but by financial institutions, banks, academic institutions and government agencies. Those who fail to provide such unvarnished truths are part of the problem, and should be treated accordingly."



An editorial by Frank J. Gaffney, Jr. titled "Obama's 'Teachable' Shariah Moment" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 17, 2010. Following are excerpts from the article.

On Friday night [Aug. 13], Barack Obama gave his full-throated endorsement to a mosque and "cultural center" on private property that has been purchased in Lower Manhattan adjacent to the site where the World Trade Center's twin towers once stood.

By Saturday, however, he wanted the American people to know that he was not commenting on "the wisdom" of putting such a mosque by that hallowed ground—just "the right" of its backers like Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf to do it, pursuant to the Constitution's protection of religious freedom.

Unfortunately for the President—but fortunately for the country—it is too late for such ludicrous contortions and dissembling. However much Mr. Obama and his fellow Democrats now regret his original White House statement, it has created a "teachable moment." Not just about the Ground Zero mosque but about the larger enterprise it is intended to serve: bringing the law of Saudi Arabia and Iran, shariah, to America.

Imam Rauf makes no bones about that being his purpose. So do some of his most prominent backers, like the Muslim Brotherhood front, the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR), and the Brotherhood's Palestinian franchise, the designated terrorist group Hamas.

In fact, according to the *New York Post*, on Sunday, Mahmoud al-Zahar, an Hamas co-founder and leader in Gaza, told WABC Radio host Aaron Klein: "We have to build the mosque [at Ground Zero]. We have to build everywhere. In every area we have [as] Muslim[s], we have to pray and this mosque is the only site of prayer."

Al-Zahar also enthused about shariah, calling it the "tradition of Islam" which "is controlling every source of our life as regards to marriage, divorce, our commercial relations." He added ominously that, "Even the Islamic people or Muslims in [the United States] are living now in the tradition of Islam."

What else have we learned so far from Mr. Obama's teachable shariah moment? We now know that the President is willing to associate with members of the Muslim Brotherhood (MB), not just in Cairo—where he insisted they be invited to hear his famous paean to Islam next year—but in the White House. For example, leaders of known MB front groups like Ingrid Mattson of the Islamic Society of North America and Salam al-Marayati of the Muslim Public Affairs Council were in the company at the Iftar dinner Friday [Aug. 13] when Mr. Obama fervently embraced the Ground Zero mosque.

This is an important insight since we know from uncontested evidence submitted by the government in the largest terrorism finance trial in U.S. history—the Holy Land Foundation case—that the Muslim Brotherhood's mission in America is "destroying Western civilization from within and 'sabotaging' its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God's religion is made victorious over all other religions."

What on earth is the President of the United States doing fraternizing with, and thereby legitimating, operatives of an organization with such a seditious mission—to say nothing of endorsing their most immediate priority: the Ground Zero Mosque?

We have also learned that the Obama administration insists that Imam Rauf, another Brotherhood apparatchik, is a "moderate." Never mind the abundant evidence to the contrary—not the least his statement that he wants to bring shariah to America.

There is much more yet to be learned, of course.

For example: Why is the U.S. government promoting the Brotherhood's effort to penetrate our capital markets via "shariah-compliant finance," including its direct ownership of a huge player in that field, AIG?

Which other shariah-adherent Muslims are getting their expenses paid by the State Department as they network around the globe on behalf of their seditious agenda?

How much is this outrageous program costing, and what does Foggy Bottom have to show for it?

Why did Team Obama cosponsor a UN resolution last Fall imposing "shariah blasphemy" laws that utterly conflict with the First Amendment's protection of free speech?

As he hosted the Ramadan fast-breaking dinner at the White House on Friday [Aug. 13], President Obama showed his true colors on shariah. Trying to dress up the Ground Zero mosque or any other aspect of this brutally repressive, totalitarian and inherently unconstitutional program as a matter of "religious freedom" does not pass the giggle test.

Shariah is about power, not faith, and no amount of Obama subsidies, solidarity or spin on behalf of that agenda will persuade the American people to allow the so-called "tradition of Islam" to supplant our civil liberties, form of government and way of life.



An article by Frank J. Gaffney Jr. titled "The 'End Of The Beginning' on Shariah" was posted at jewishworldreview.com on Aug. 24, 2010.

It said: "Our countrymen are also becoming more knowledgeable about shariah and why simply moving this advocate and his Islamic 'cultural center' complex a few blocks away will not mitigate the danger they pose.

"Specifically, the public is learning of the obligation on shariah's adherents to impose this toxic program everywhere via jihad—holy war, waged by violence or by stealth.

"Thanks to the Ground Zero mosque controversy, Americans are also getting a crash-course on the preeminent perpetrator of the stealthy form of 'civilization jihad,' the Muslim Brotherhood. While its tactics may differ from, say, al Qaeda's, the Brotherhood's objectives are identical: the supremacy of Islam and the establishment of a theocratic ruler, the Caliph, who is to govern worldwide in accordance with shariah.

"As spokesmen from various Brotherhood front groups (notably, the Council on American Islamic Relations, the Muslim American Society and the Muslim Public Affairs Council) have been vociferously demanding that the construction of a megamosque is a test of our religious tolerance, more and more of us are realizing that this is what is known in shariah as taqqiya, lying for the faith."

It later said: "As public awareness of and concern about shariah intensifies, the Muslim Brotherhood and its friends are employing taqqiya frantically in the hope of maintaining the obscurity so critical to their stealth jihad.

"Notably, on the margins of Sunday's event, Salam al-Marayati of the Muslim Public Affairs Council—who attended Obama's iftar dinner on the 13th—tried to deflect criticism of Shariah, saying it is subject to various interpretations. He and his friends would have us believe that the jihad it orders means nothing more than 'internal struggle' to practice one's faith properly.

"Some, like Feisal Rauf, go so far as to insist that shariah is compatible with the U.S. Constitution.

"Fortunately, not all Muslims adhere to or seek to impose shariah. If we start in a concerted way to empower those that do not, and effectively counter those—like the Muslim Brotherhood—that do, we may just be at the end of the beginning of this war to keep America shariah-free."



An article by Lance Fairchok titled "Excusing Islam for the Fort Hood Massacre" was posted at americanthinker.com on Aug. 25, 2010.

It said: "On 5 November 2009, Major Nidal Malik Hasan, a U.S. Army psychiatrist and devout Muslim, opened fire on his fellow soldiers at Fort Hood, TX, killing 13 and wounding 32. As he fired, he shouted 'Allahu Akbar,' which means 'God is Great,' an Islamic declaration of faith.

"On 10 August 2010, the Department of Defense (DoD) released 23 pages of recommendations from an independent review of the Fort Hood massacre. It is not as pure a whitewash as the first Fort Hood report, called 'Protecting the Force.' It actually has some relevant recommendations. However, it so assiduously avoids the central issue that it becomes a masterpiece of political correctness . . .

"There is not a single mention of Islam, Islamic radicalization, jihad, jihadists, or religious extremism in the entire document. Nor is there any other word or phrase that would indicate to the reader that Hasan was anything other than a mentally disturbed murderer."

The article quoted Anwar Al-Awalaki (who preached to Major Hasan and his family at the Dar al Hijrah Islamic Center in Falls Church, Va.) as saying: "Nidal Nasan is a hero. He is a man of conscience who could not bear living the contradiction of being a Muslim and serving in an army that is fighting against his own people. This is a contradiction that many Muslims brush aside and just pretend that it doesn't exist. Any decent Muslim cannot live, understanding properly his duties towards his Creator and his fellow Muslims, and yet serve as a U.S. soldier."

The article said: "Al-Awlaki goes on to say Muslim soldiers in the U.S. military should follow Hasan's example."

It later said: "For the faithful, denying jihad is apostasy. The commands of the Quran are not metaphors. Muslims take them very seriously. Take the time to read their holy book. This is what they believe.

"*Quran 8:39*—So, fight them till all opposition ends and the only religion is Islam.

"*Quran 5:51*—O you who believe! Take not the Jews and Christians for friends. They are friends one to another. He among you who taketh them for friends is one of them. Lo Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk.

"*Quran 8:7*—Allah wished to confirm the truth by His words: 'Wipe the infidels out to the last.'

"*Quran 8:12*—I shall terrorize the infidels. So wound their bodies and incapacitate them because they oppose Allah and His Apostle.

"Ishaq 369 (From the Hadeeth [oral tradition]): Thereupon Mas'ud leapt upon Sunayna, one of the Jewish merchants with whom his family had social and commercial relations and killed him. The Muslim's brother complained, say-

ing, 'Why did you kill him? You have much fat in your belly from his charity.' Mas'ud answered, 'By Allah, had Muhammad ordered me to murder you, my brother, I would have cut off your head.' Whereas the brother said, 'Any religion that can bring you to this is indeed wonderful!'

"Major Hasan acted on what he read in the Quran and the teachings he absorbed in his mosque. For the Department of Defense to pretend otherwise is an act of politically correct delusion."



An article by D.L. Adams titled "War for Islamic Sharia Law" was posted at americanthinker.com on Feb. 7, 2010.

It said: "If the mission in Afghanistan is two-fold—the defeat of the abysmal Taliban and the creation of a stable, democratic state—then it would appear that we are not doing well.

"The same could be said of 'nation-building' in Iraq. The true measure of our efforts in both beneficiary countries should be based upon an examination of the foundations of these countries that we have created with the blood of our best and our treasure. When such an examination is made, the result can be only horror.

"The constitutions of Iraq and Afghanistan for those who love democracy, freedom, and liberty are failures. If the constitution is a failure, then what kind of nation can be built then upon it? . . .

"Iraq and Afghanistan are both Islamic states (specifically stated as such in their constitutions). The people of both beneficiary states are therefore in service to Islam (i.e., the state of Islam and Islam is a state). This is not any form of 'democracy' that most Americans can countenance or reasonably support.

"After WW2, Douglas MacArthur remained in Tokyo to impose a new constitution on the defeated Japanese. The new Japanese constitution removed the power of the Emperor and created an American-style democracy in which the people have power over the government through the constitution. This approach completely overturned the old order of Japanese totalitarian empirical rule."

The article quoted the 98th article of Japan's constitution as saying: "This Constitution shall be the supreme law of the nation and no law, ordinance, imperial rescript or other act of government, or part thereof, contrary to the provisions hereof, shall have legal force or validity."

The article quoted the 99th article of Japan's constitution as saying: "The Emperor the Regent as well as Ministers of State, members of the Diet, judges, and all other public officials have the obligation to respect and uphold this Constitution."

The article quoted article 2 of Iraq's constitution as saying: "Islam is the official religion of the State and it is a fundamental source of legislation" and "No law that contradicts the established provisions of Islam may be established."

The article quoted article 1 of Afghanistan's constitution as saying: "Afghanistan is an Islamic Republic, independent, unitary and indivisible state." It quoted article 3 as saying: "In Afghanistan, no law can be contrary to the beliefs and provisions of the sacred religion of Islam."

The article continued: "Both Afghanistan and Iraq are Islamic states, as codified in their new American-supported constitutions. Sharia law is the law of Islam. Islamic law supersedes any laws in the constitution that are not Sharia law-compliant.

"Any review of the implementation of Sharia law anywhere in the world (or of Sharia *itself*) shows it to be brutal, cruel, misogynistic, anti-homosexual, anti-free speech, supremacist, anti-democratic, and anti-freedom of religion among its many unpleasant qualities.

"Even in Afghanistan as late as 2006, a Muslim Afghan convert to Christianity was sentenced to death for leaving Islam. Only American outrage prevented the implementation of the Sharia death penalty."

It later said: "Sharia law is derived from the Koran, Sira, and Hadith, the three foundational documents of Islam. Sharia law therefore has the authority of both Allah and Mohammed, as it is the codification of their commands and the words, deeds, and example of the prophet. American support of this barbaric 'legal system' anywhere on this planet is folly.

It later said: "No American who loves our Constitution and the freedoms guaranteed under it should accept Sharia law anywhere in this country or actively support it elsewhere.

"How can it be countenanced that American soldiers are told that they fight and die for 'freedom' in Iraq and Afghanistan when in fact our soldiers fight to prop up two Sharia states?"



An article by Nonie Darwish titled "To Kill an Apostate" was posted at aina.com (Assyrian International News Agency) on Aug. 2, 2010. Ms. Darwish is the president of Former Muslims United (FMU).

It said: "Some Muslim leaders in America deny that there are any threats to the lives and safety of Muslims who decide to leave Islam . . . Muslim groups who call themselves 'moderate' are strangely silent about the persecution, torture, killing, and imprisonment of apostates, women, and non-Muslims all over the Muslim world.

"All they seem to care about is pacifying the American public and convincing them that Islam is a 'religion of peace,' while hiding from view the fact that

1.2 billion Muslims are living under the tyranny of Sharia Islamic law, and how that tyranny is creeping into the West.

"Whenever asked about what is happening in the Muslim world and its tragic impact on the West, critics are accused of being 'Islamophobes' who need sensitivity training . . . They want us to disregard those who issue fatwas of death against Western politicians such as Geert Wilders, cartoonists, film makers, apostates, and practically anyone who dares ask the difficult questions Islam has refused to answer since its inception."

It later said: "FMU sent over 165 letters (Muslim Pledge for Religious Freedom and Safety from Harm for Former Muslims) to various Muslim leaders in America. We needed their support and for them to prove how dedicated they are in reforming the radicals whom they believe are not true Muslims. The pledge states they repudiate the laws and commandments that condemn apostates to death or discrimination under Islam.

"But unfortunately, Muslim groups operating in America have not signed our plea letter or even responded. Only two Muslim reformists signed the pledge, Dr. Zuhdi Jasser and Mr. Ali Alyami.

"On September 24, 2009, however, two days after we mailed our pledges, [Sheila] Musaji [editor of *American Muslim*] wrote an article."

Ms. Darwish quoted Ms. Musaji as saying: "We live in a country where such freedom [of religion] is a foundational principle and must be defended. We must continue to insist on the Islamic principle that there is 'no compulsion in religion.' "

Ms. Darwish continued in her article: "Musaji is an educated Muslim and she must be fully aware that the 'no compulsion in religion' verses have been abrogated by all the learned Imams of Islam who wrote the Sharia and who found commandments in Koran and Hadith to justify killing apostates.

"She posted a list of a few peaceful verses in the Koran while willfully ignoring the majority of Islamic scriptures stating otherwise."

It later said: "After world condemnation of Islamic tyranny, many Muslim countries are working around the law of apostasy by still killing apostates, but for a different stated reason.

"If a Muslim declares publicly that he has left Islam and why, this in itself is considered treason, and thus, governments can arrest apostates, torture, imprison, and kill that person. But they officially state it as treason, as if the person had committed espionage or some other crime against national security.

"As long as a Muslim keeps silent about his apostasy and acts as a Muslim, he is left alone. But the minute he or she starts attending a church, all hell breaks loose. They are arrested for disturbing the peace, causing *fitna* [chaotic] divisions, and treason: that is the modern way of killing apostates