

Robert Spencer

Testimony before Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government

February 10, 2026

The US constitution and Sharia are incompatible, and the conflict between the two legal systems will grow as Sharia adherents increase in number in the West. This fact has been obscured by misinformation about what Sharia is. When the city of Keller, Texas scrapped an anti-Sharia resolution in January 2026, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, stated that “like canon law for Catholics and halacha for Orthodox Jews, sharia refers to the rules that Muslims follow, including praying five times a day, fasting in Ramadan, giving in charity, and following the laws of the land in which they live.”

If that were really all that Sharia was about, no reasonable person would have any problem with it. CAIR doesn't mention, however, that Sharia is inherently political, supremacist, expansionist, and violent. Far from being the “Islamophobic conspiracy theories” of CAIR's imagining, these are facts that Muslim authorities on Sharia openly attest.

Reliance of the Traveller, or Umdat al-Salik, is a classic manual of Islamic sacred law, that is, Sharia. In 1990, Dr. Taha Jabir al-Alwani, President of the International Institute of Islamic Thought and president of the Fiqh Council of North America, stated that this Sharia manual was useful as “a textbook for teaching Islamic jurisprudence... or as a legal reference for use by scholars, educated laymen, and students.”

The most prestigious institution of Islamic learning in the world, al-Azhar in Cairo, stated in 1991 that the same manual of Sharia “conforms to the practice and faith of the orthodox Sunni Community.”

We read in this guide to Sharia that “Jihad means to war against non-Muslims,” and that jihad is a communal obligation upon the Muslim community. When a Muslim land is attacked, even in defense against its aggression, it becomes personally obligatory upon every Muslim. The object of this war is to establish the hegemony of Sharia over the conquered land. For non-Muslims, this means an institutionalized, highly codified second-class status that denies them basic rights.

Non-Muslims living under Sharia must “pay the non-Muslim poll tax (jizya)” that is specified in the Qur'an. This religion-based tax is designed to indicate, as the renowned Islamic scholar Ibn Kathir explained, that the non-Muslims who are paying it are “disgraced, humiliated and belittled.”

The non-Muslims in this state of disgrace and humiliation are not allowed to build new houses of worship or repair old ones, so their communities are in a perpetual state of decline. They are forbidden to make any public display of their religion. They are relegated to the most menial jobs in society, for they are forbidden to hold authority over Muslims. If

they say anything critical about Islam, Muhammad, or the Qur'an, they are liable to be put to death.

From all this it is clear that Sharia is not simply Muslim personal religious law. On the contrary, Sharia law-based legal and civic institutions are contrary to America's founding principles and may violate federal law and the Constitution.

The death penalty for mentioning what Reliance of the Traveller terms "something impermissible about Allah, the Prophet, or Islam," that is, blasphemy, is directly at variance with First Amendment protections of the freedom of speech. The Islamic imperative to establish the hegemony of Sharia as the law of the land, as it is today in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, is at variance with the First Amendment principle that the United States will not have an established religion.

Even in its personal aspects, Sharia contradicts U.S. law. The Qur'an states that a man should "beat" a woman from whom "he fears disobedience." Domestic violence is a crime in U.S. law, but it is not a crime under Sharia. Britain began establishing Sharia courts several years ago, with the understanding that cases that came under the purview of British criminal law would be referred to the British courts. Instead, the Muslim Arbitration Tribunal on its website urged the Crown Prosecution Service to "reconsider" bringing criminal charges brought against Muslim men who had been accused of domestic violence.

This was no aberration. As Sharia is considered divine law, those Muslims who adhere to it consider it always to take precedence over the laws of the land.

Moreover, emigration to a new land to bring Sharia to it is also an Islamic imperative. The Qur'an promises a reward from Allah to those who "emigrate for the sake of Allah," which means for the purpose of bringing Sharia to a non-Muslim land. Thus the conflict between Sharia and the U.S. Constitution will only grow as the Muslim population in the U.S. grows, for among that population will always be some Muslims who take these imperatives with the utmost seriousness.



Robert Spencer  
Testimony before Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government  
February 10, 2026

When the city of Keller, Texas scrapped an anti-Sharia resolution in January 2026, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, stated that “like canon law for Catholics and halacha for Orthodox Jews, sharia refers to the rules that Muslims follow, including praying five times a day, fasting in Ramadan, giving in charity, and following the laws of the land in which they live.”<sup>1</sup>

If that were really all that Sharia was about, no reasonable person would have any problem with it. CAIR doesn’t mention, however, that Sharia is inherently political, supremacist, expansionist, and violent. Far from being the “Islamophobic conspiracy theories” of CAIR’s imagining, these are facts that Muslim authorities on Sharia openly attest.

It is also important to note that Omar Ahmad, the cofounder and longtime Board chairman of CAIR, once said, “Islam isn’t in America to be equal to any other faith, but to become dominant. The Koran should be the highest authority in America, and Islam the only accepted religion on earth.”<sup>2</sup>

When these words were initially published in a news report, Ahmad denied saying them; however, the reporter who had been present when Ahmad spoke, Lisa Gardiner of the *Fremont Argus*, maintained that her story was accurate.<sup>3</sup>

Adding to the likelihood that Ahmad’s words had indeed been reported accurately was a similar statement from longtime CAIR spokesman Ibrahim Hooper: “I wouldn’t want to create the impression that I wouldn’t like the government of the United States to be Islamic sometime in the future.”<sup>4</sup>

In service of that goal, the Muslim Brotherhood says in a captured internal document that its goal in the United States is “eliminating and destroying Western civilization from within, and sabotaging its miserable house...so that it falls, and Allah’s religion is victorious over other religions.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “CAIR-Texas Welcomes Scrapping of Keller Council’s Anti-Muslim ‘Sharia’ Resolution,” Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), January 7, 2026, [https://www.cair.com/press\\_releases/cair-texas-welcomes-scrapping-of-keller-councils-anti-muslim-sharia-resolution/](https://www.cair.com/press_releases/cair-texas-welcomes-scrapping-of-keller-councils-anti-muslim-sharia-resolution/).

<sup>2</sup> Art Moore, “Did CAIR founder say Islam to rule America?,” *WorldNetDaily*, December 11, 2006, <https://www.wnd.com/2006/12/39229/>.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, April 4, 1993, quoted in Daniel Pipes and Sharon Chadha, “CAIR: Islamists Fooling the Establishment,” *Middle East Quarterly*, Spring 2006, <https://www.meforum.org/middle-east-quarterly/cair-islamists-fooling-the-establishment>.

<sup>5</sup> Mohamed Akram, “An Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal for the Group in North America,” May 22, 1991, Government Exhibit 003-0085, US vs. HLF, et al. P. 7 (21),

In 2007, Abdul Alim Musa, an imam in Washington, DC, stated that as far as he was concerned, the goal of Muslims in America should be to “establish an Islamic State of America by 2050.”<sup>6</sup>

One of America’s best-known Muslim leaders and a highly sought-after figure on the Muslim speaking circuit, Siraj Wahhaj, said in 1992: “If only Muslims were clever politically, they could take over the United States and replace its constitutional government with a caliphate.”<sup>7</sup>

These are not the boasts or braggadocio of isolated individuals. They represent a core Sharia imperative.

*Reliance of the Traveller, or Umdat al-Salik*, is a classic manual of Islamic sacred law, that is, Sharia. In 1990, Dr. Taha Jabir al-Alwani, President of the International Institute of Islamic Thought and president of the Fiqh Council of North America, stated that this Sharia manual was useful as “a textbook for teaching Islamic jurisprudence... or as a legal reference for use by scholars, educated laymen, and students.”<sup>8</sup>

The most prestigious institution of Islamic learning in the world, al-Azhar in Cairo, stated in 1991 that the same manual of Sharia “conforms to the practice and faith of the orthodox Sunni Community.”<sup>9</sup>

We read in this guide to Sharia that “Jihad means to war against non-Muslims,” and that jihad is a communal obligation upon the Muslim community.<sup>10</sup> When a Muslim land is attacked, it becomes personally obligatory upon every Muslim. This doesn’t mean that every Muslim takes up this obligation, but this is what Islamic law states. The object of this war is to establish the hegemony of Sharia over the conquered land. For non-Muslims, this means an institutionalized, highly codified second-class status that denies them basic rights.

---

[https://centerforsecuritypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Explanatory\\_Memoradum.pdf](https://centerforsecuritypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Explanatory_Memoradum.pdf). Accessed October 30, 2024.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Spencer, “DC Imam wants to establish an ‘Islamic State of North America no later than 2050,’” Jihad Watch, November 9, 2007, <https://jihadwatch.org/2007/11/dc-imam-wants-to-establish-an-islamic-state-of-north-america-no-later-than-2050>.

<sup>7</sup> Laura L. Rubinfeld, “Democrats Embrace Siraj Wahhaj: Supporter of Cop-Killer, Al Qaeda and Hamas,” FrontPageMagazine.com, August 29, 2012, <https://www.meforum.org/islamist-watch/democrats-embrace-siraj-wahhaj-supporter-of-cop-37450>.

<sup>8</sup> *Reliance Of The Traveller: The Classic Manual Of Islamic Sacred Law*, translated by Nuh Ha Mim Keller (Beltsville, Maryland: Amana Publications, 1997), xviii.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, xx.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 599.

Non-Muslims living under Sharia must “pay the non-Muslim poll tax (jizya)” that is specified in the Qur’an.<sup>11</sup>

The Qur’an states: “Fight against those do not believe in Allah or the last day, and do not forbid what Allah and his messenger have forbidden, and do not follow the religion of truth, even if they are among the people of the book, until they pay the jizya with willing submission and feel themselves subdued.” (9:29).

In this passage, Muslims are explicitly directed to make war against and subjugate Jews and Christians, the “People of the Book,” who once subjugated enter the *dhimma*, the protection of the Muslims, and become *dhimmis*, protected (or guilty) people. A Qur’an commentary, the *Tafsir al-Sadi*, explains: “This verse contains instructions to fight the disbelievers among the Jews and Christians.”<sup>12</sup>

Islamic tradition places this command within the context of Muhammad’s attempt to take on the army of the Christian Byzantine, or Eastern Roman, Empire. The renowned Islamic scholar and authority on the Qur’an, Ibn Kathir, says: “Allah commanded His Messenger to fight the People of the Scriptures, Jews and Christians, on the ninth year of Hijrah, and he prepared his army to fight the Romans and called the people to Jihad announcing his intent and destination.”<sup>13</sup>

The *Tafsir al-Sadi* adds that the “aim of that fighting” is so that non-Muslims turn over “wealth that is given in return for the Muslims not fighting them and allowing them to stay among the Muslims, granting them safety for their lives and their property.”<sup>14</sup> A hadith depicts Muhammad saying: “I have been commanded to fight against people so long as they do not declare that there is no god but Allah, and he who professed it was guaranteed the protection of his property and life on my behalf.”<sup>15</sup> That is, his property and life are not protected if he does not make this declaration.

The nineteenth-century Islamic scholar Allamah as-Sawi specifies that the payment of the jizya signifies that the non-Muslims are “humble and obedient to the judgements of Islam.”<sup>16</sup> According to legend, the Bedouin commander al-Mughira bin Sa’d explained to the Persian Rustam that he “must pay the jizya while you are in a state of abasement,” and elaborated: “You pay it while you are standing and I am sitting and the whip hanging is over your head.”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 602.

<sup>12</sup> Abdur-Rahman Nasir as-Sadi, *Tafsir as-Sadi*, Nasiruddin al-Khattab, trans. (Riyadh: International Islamic Publishing House, 2018), IV, 75.

<sup>13</sup> Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir* (abridged) (Riyadh: Darussalam, 2000), IV, 405.

<sup>14</sup> *Tafsir as-Sadi*, IV, 75.

<sup>15</sup> *Sahih Muslim* 21a. <https://sunnah.com/muslim:21a>.

<sup>16</sup> “Surat at-Tawba: Repentance, Tafsir,” op. cit.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

Ibn Kathir says that the dhimmis must be “disgraced, humiliated and belittled. Therefore, Muslims are not allowed to honor the people of Dhimmah or elevate them above Muslims, for they are miserable, disgraced and humiliated.”<sup>18</sup> The seventh-century jurist Sa’id ibn al-Musayyab is said to have declared: “I prefer that the people of the dhimma become tired by paying the jizya since He says, ‘until they pay the jizya with their own hands in a state of complete abasement.’”<sup>19</sup> The Qur’anic scholar As-Suyuti elaborates that this verse “is used as a proof by those who say that it is taken in a humiliating way, and so the taker sits and the dhimmi stands with his head bowed and his back bent. The jizya is placed in the balance and the taker seizes his beard and hits his chin.”<sup>20</sup> Yet another Islamic scholar, Zamakhshari, agreed that the jizya should be collected “with belittlement and humiliation.”<sup>21</sup>

With remarkably little variation, throughout Islamic history whenever Islamic law was strictly enforced, this is generally how non-Muslims were treated. Although today they’re often presented as tolerant toward the Christians, Ibn Kathir says that these rules “ensured their continued humiliation, degradation and disgrace.”<sup>22</sup> The Christians agreed not to “restore any place of worship that needs restoration”; “ride on saddles, hang swords on the shoulders, collect weapons of any kind or carry these weapons”; or “publicize practices of Shirk,” that is, worshiping others besides Allah. They also agreed not to build “crosses on the outside of our churches and demonstrating them and our books in public in Muslim fairways and markets” or “sound the bells in our churches, except discreetly, or raise our voices while reciting our holy books inside our churches in the presence of Muslims, nor raise our voices [with prayer] at our funerals, or light torches in funeral processions in the fairways of Muslims, or their markets.”<sup>23</sup>

The twentieth-century *Tafsir Anwarul Bayan* laments that “in today’s times, the system of Atonement (Jizya) is not practised at all by the Muslims. It is indeed unfortunate that not only are the Muslim States afraid to impose Atonement (Jizya) on the disbelievers (kuffar) living in their countries, but they grant them more rights than they grant the Muslims and respect them more. They fail to understand that Allah desires that the Muslims show no respect to any disbeliever (kafir) and that they should not accord any special rights to them.”<sup>24</sup>

The twentieth-century Muslim Brotherhood theorist Sayyid Qutb argues that these rules should be revived, for “these verses are given as a general statement, and the order to fight

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibn Kathir, IV, 406.

<sup>19</sup> “Surat at-Tawba: Repentance, Tafsir.”

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Muhammad Aashiq Ilahi Bulandshahri, *Illuminating Discourses on the Noble Qur’an (Tafsir Anwarul Bayan)*, Afzal Hussain Elias and Muhammad Arshad Fakhri, trans. (Karachi: Darul Ishaat, 2005), IV, 441.

the people of the earlier revelations until they pay the submission tax with a willing hand and are subdued is also of general import.”<sup>25</sup>

Likewise, the twentieth-century Pakistani politician and Islamic scholar Maulana Maududi states that unbelievers have “absolutely no right to seize the reins of power in any part of God’s earth nor to direct the collective affairs of human beings according to their own misconceived doctrines. For if they are given such an opportunity, corruption and mischief will ensue. In such a situation the believers would be under an obligation to do their utmost to dislodge them from political power and to make them live in subservience to the Islamic way of life.”<sup>26</sup>

The non-Muslims in this state of disgrace and humiliation are not allowed to build new houses of worship or repair old ones, so their communities are in a perpetual state of decline. They are forbidden to make any public display of their religion. They are always to be humiliated, and so are relegated to the most menial jobs in society, for they are forbidden to hold authority over Muslims. If they say anything critical about Islam, Muhammad, or the Qur’an, they are liable to be put to death.<sup>27</sup>

From all this it is clear that Sharia is not simply Muslim personal religious law. On the contrary, Sharia law-based legal and civic institutions are contrary to America’s founding principles and may violate federal law and the Constitution.

The death penalty for mentioning what Reliance of the Traveller terms “something impermissible about Allah, the Prophet, or Islam,” that is, blasphemy, is directly at variance with First Amendment protections of the freedom of speech.<sup>28</sup> The Islamic imperative to establish the hegemony of Sharia as the law of the land, as it is today in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, is at variance with the First Amendment principle that the United States will not have an established religion.

Even in its personal aspects, Sharia contradicts U.S. law. The Qur’an states that a man should “beat” a woman from whom “he fears disobedience.”<sup>29</sup> Domestic violence is a crime in U.S. law, but it is not a crime under Sharia. Britain began establishing Sharia courts several years ago, with the understanding that cases that came under the purview of British criminal law would be referred to the British courts. Instead, the Muslim Arbitration Tribunal on its website urged the Crown Prosecution Service to “reconsider” bringing

---

<sup>25</sup> Sayyid Qutb, *In the Shade of the Qur’an (Fi Zilal al-Qur’an)*, M. A. Salahi and A. A. Shamis, trans. (Leicester, England: The Islamic Foundation, 1999), VIII, 126.

<sup>26</sup> Sayyid Abul A’la Mawdudi, *Towards Understanding the Qur’an (Tafhim al-Qur’an)*, Zafar Ishaq Ansari, trans. (Leicester, England: The Islamic Foundation, 1995), III, 202.

<sup>27</sup> *Reliance of the Traveller*, 608-9.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 609.

<sup>29</sup> Qur’an 4:34.

criminal charges brought against Muslim men who had been accused of domestic violence.<sup>30</sup>

The sanction of wife-beating is just the beginning. The Qur'an allows for marriage to pre-pubescent girls, as it stipulates that Islamic divorce procedures "shall apply to those who have not yet menstruated" (65:4). Throughout a woman's life, she is viewed as a possession of a man, to be used as he wills: "Your women are a tilth for you, so go to your tilth as you will" (2:223). Her testimony is worth only half of his: "Get two witnesses, out of your own men, and if there are not two men, then a man and two women, such as you choose, for witnesses, so that if one of them errs, the other can remind her" (2:282). It rules that a son's inheritance should be twice the size of that of a daughter: "Allah directs you as regards your children's inheritance: to the male, a portion equal to that of two females" (4:11).

The Qur'an also allows men to marry up to four wives, and even grants men permission to have sex with slave girls: "If you fear that you shall not be able to deal justly with the orphans, marry women of your choice, two or three or four; but if you fear that ye shall not be able to deal justly, then only one, or one that your right hands possess, that will be more suitable, to prevent you from doing injustice" (4:3).

Islamic law stipulates that a man's prayer is annulled if a dog or a woman passes in front of him as he is praying. A hadith has his favorite wife, Aisha, saying: "The things which annul the prayers were mentioned before me. They said, 'Prayer is annulled by a dog, a donkey and a woman (if they pass in front of the praying people).' I said, 'You have made us (i.e. women) dogs.'" <sup>31</sup>

In another hadith, Muhammad says that most women end up in hell: "I looked into Paradise and I saw that the majority of its people were the poor. And I looked into Hell and I saw that the majority of its people are women."<sup>32</sup> When asked about this, he explained that women were "ungrateful to their companions (husbands) and ungrateful for good treatment."<sup>33</sup> Another version of this has him explaining that women are "deficient in intelligence and religious commitment" – in intelligence because the testimony of one man is equal to that of two women, and in religious commitment because women are not to pray or fast while menstruating.<sup>34</sup>

Saudi Arabia, which bases its legal system strictly upon Sharia, frequently encounters criticism for its discrimination against women: they are not allowed to appear in public

---

<sup>30</sup> Tom Peck, "Sharia Courts interfered to protect domestic abusers, MPs told," Independent, October 31, 2016.

<sup>31</sup> Muhammed Ibn Ismaiel Al-Bukhari, *Sahih al-Bukhari: The Translation of the Meanings*, translated by Muhammad M. Khan, Darussalam, 1997, vol. 1, book 8, no. 511.

<sup>32</sup> Bukhari, 6546; Imam Muslim, *Sahih Muslim*, Abdul Hamid Siddiqi, translator, Kitab Bhavan, revised edition 2000, no. 2737.

<sup>33</sup> Bukhari 29.

<sup>34</sup> Bukhari 1951.

without their heads covered, they must have a male “guardian’s” permission to venture outside the home, and most notoriously, for many years were not allowed to drive, until Saudi authorities began moving away from strict adherence to Sharia. This was based upon a general concern to prevent “corruption,” as one Saudi Islamic scholar detailed: “taking off hijab, loss of modesty, leaving the house too much, streets becoming overcrowded, going against and defying her husband, and depriving some of the youth from driving.”<sup>35</sup> The *Washington Post* reported in 2015 that, “because of these factors, international bodies consistently rank Saudi Arabia low on matters of gender equality. In 2014, the World Economics Forum ranked it 130 out of 142 countries in its annual report on gender equality.”<sup>36</sup>

Do the Saudis not understand Sharia? Was Saudi Arabia just a hardline Sharia state, while other Muslim countries implemented an interpretation of Sharia that was kinder to women? If so, where exactly was that interpretation of Sharia?

The world’s other renowned Sharia state is the Islamic Republic of Iran. Women hardly fare better there than they do in Saudi Arabia. On March 19, 2017, Iranians celebrated the birthday of Fatima, one of the daughters of Muhammad, the prophet of Islam. Iran’s Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, seized the opportunity to expatiate on the evils of how women are treated in the West. Not surprisingly, he blamed the Jews: “Making women a commodity and an object of gratification in the Western world is most likely among Zionist plots aiming to destroy the society.”<sup>37</sup>

That Zionist plot didn’t just include the objectification of women, but the very idea of the equality of men and women: “Today, Western thinkers and those who pursue issues such as gender equality regret the corruption which it has brought about.”<sup>38</sup>

Did the Ayatollah Khamenei have a superficial understanding of Sharia, confined to the “basics”? Did he misunderstand Sharia? Khamenei is a *marja*, a source of emulation – an honorific given in Shi’ite Islam to clerics who have devoted years to intensive study of Islam, and are therefore to be emulated in their teachings and actions by their followers and students. When a cleric becomes a *marja*, he is given the title Grand Ayatollah, and is considered to be one of the foremost authorities on Shi’ite theology and law. As of this writing, there are only 64 Grand Ayatollahs worldwide for the world’s two hundred million Shi’ite Muslims. Khamenei is among them.

Is it likely that this man, who has devoted his life to understanding Islam correctly and communicating it properly, would get it wrong on the crucial questions of gender equality and women’s rights?

---

<sup>35</sup> “According to Islam is it permissible for women to drive?,” *Islamquest*, September 24, 2006.

<sup>36</sup> Adam Taylor, “The facts — and a few myths — about Saudi Arabia and human rights,” *Washington Post*, February 9, 2015.

<sup>37</sup> “Women and men are different in some cases, similar in others,” *Khamenei.ir*, March 19, 2017.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

Khamenei wasn't simply expressing his private opinion, either. Human Rights Watch reported that "women's rights are severely restricted in Iran, to the point where women are even forbidden from watching men's sports in stadiums. That ban includes Iran's national obsession – volleyball.... Women confront serious discrimination on issues such as marriage, divorce, and child custody. Women have been sent to jail for publicly speaking out in favor of equal rights for women. Because the government wants Iran's population to grow, it's even moving to ban voluntary medical procedures women can undergo to avoid becoming pregnant. And that's just the beginning."<sup>39</sup>

Julie Lenarz of Britain's Human Security Center charged that in Iran, "women are stoned for being raped."<sup>40</sup> This is because of the assumption, quite widespread among Muslims, that women are responsible for making sure that men are not tempted to commit sexual sins, and likewise responsible if men do so anyway. This is the rationale behind the veil, which is mandatory for women in Iran. In March 2017, the al-Arabiya news agency reported that there had been an increase in acid attacks in Iran, with men spraying acid in the faces of women whom they deemed to be improperly veiled.<sup>41</sup>

On Sept. 16, 2022, in Tehran, the Iranian morality police arrested Mahsa Amini, a 22-year-old woman, for not wearing her hijab properly. Amini later died in a hospital in Tehran, and numerous Iranians charged that she had been tortured to death while in custody.<sup>42</sup> All over the country, protesters took to the streets to protest not against the hijab laws, but against the repressive and brutal Sharia state itself.

Other women, and male protesters as well, were killed as the Iranian regime ruthlessly applied the Qur'anic injunction to "strike terror in the enemies of Allah" (8:60). The protests went on for months until the regime began summarily executing protesters, and even then some indomitably courageous Iranians continued to take to the streets to demand their freedom.

Iran has a women's soccer team that competes internationally. However, in September 2015 the husband of its captain, Niloufar Ardalan, forbade her to participate in the Asian Football Confederation's women's championship competition in Malaysia.<sup>43</sup> This was in accord with Sharia. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty reported: "Ardalan says she will not be able to compete in an upcoming tournament in Malaysia because her husband has refused to grant her permission to travel abroad as required by Islamic laws enforced in Iran."<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> "Women's Rights In Iran," Human Rights Watch, October 28, 2015.

<sup>40</sup> Benjamin Weinthal, "Iran Sentences Woman to Death by Stoning," *The Jerusalem Post*, December 10, 2015.

<sup>41</sup> "Alarming rates of acid attacks in Iran back on the rise," Al Arabiya, March 20, 2017.

<sup>42</sup> "Two years after Mahsa Amini's death in Iran, protest movement endures harsh persecution," France 24, September 15, 2024.

<sup>43</sup> Golnaz Esfandiari, "Iranian Female Soccer Star Faces Husband-Imposed Travel Ban," Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, September 14, 2015.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

One of the world's foremost female critics of Islam, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, was a victim of female genital mutilation – the excision of the clitoris – as a child in her native Somalia. Female genital mutilation is a disturbingly common practice among many Muslims. The idea behind it is that this cutting reduces women's sexual pleasure, so as to render them more easily controlled. Sarsour was likely to have known that Hirsi Ali was a victim of female genital mutilation when she wrote her tweet, as Hirsi Ali's harrowing description of what happened to her gained international attention after she wrote about it in her 2007 memoir *Infidel*:

Grandma caught hold of me and gripped my upper body... Two other women held my legs apart. The man, who was probably an itinerant traditional circumciser from the blacksmith clan, picked up a pair of scissors. With the other hand, he caught hold of the place between my legs and started tweaking it, like Grandma milking a goat...

Then the scissors went down between my legs and the man cut off my inner labia and clitoris. I heard it, like a butcher snipping the fat off a piece of meat. A piercing pain shot up between my legs, indescribable, and I howled. Then came the sewing: the long, blunt needle clumsily pushed into my bleeding outer labia, my loud and anguished protests, Grandma's words of comfort and encouragement... When the sewing was finished, the man cut the thread off with his teeth. That is all I can recall of it.

I must have fallen asleep, for it wasn't until much later that day that I realized that my legs had been tied together, to prevent me from moving to facilitate the formation of a scar. It was dark and my bladder was bursting, but it hurt too much to pee. The sharp pain was still there, and my legs were covered in blood. I was sweating and shivering. It wasn't until the next day that my Grandma could persuade me to pee even a little... When I just lay still the pain throbbed miserably, but when I urinated the flash of pain was as sharp as when I had been cut."<sup>45</sup>

*Reliance of the Traveller* stipulates that "circumcision is obligatory (for every male and female) (by cutting off the piece of skin on the glans of the penis of the male, but circumcision of the female is by cutting out the bazr 'clitoris' [this is called *khufaadh* 'female circumcision'])" (parenthetical and bracketed material as in the original).<sup>46</sup>

Why is it obligatory? Because Muhammad is held to have said so: "Abu al-Malih ibn Usama's father relates that the Prophet said: 'Circumcision is a law for men and a preservation of honour for women.'"<sup>47</sup> Another hadith depicts Muhammad recommending

---

<sup>45</sup> Ayaan Hirsi Ali, *Infidel*, Free Press, 2007. Pp. 31-3.

<sup>46</sup> *Reliance of the Traveller*, 64.

<sup>47</sup> Ahmad Ibn Hanbal 5:75; Hamdun Dagher, *The Position of Women in Islam*, Light of Life, 1997.

moderation in the practice, but by no means forbidding it outright: “Narrated Umm Atiyyah al-Ansariyyah: A woman used to perform circumcision in Medina. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said to her: ‘Do not cut severely as that is better for a woman and more desirable for a husband.’”<sup>48</sup>

It is commonly claimed to be an East African problem, and indeed, according to an Egyptian government report, 92 percent of Egyptian women between the ages of 15 and 49 had had their genitals mutilated.<sup>49</sup> But female genital mutilation is also common among Muslims in many other areas of the world. 93 percent of Muslim women in Malaysia have suffered this procedure, and it is common also in Indonesia.<sup>50</sup> In one province in Iran, 60 percent of the women have suffered FGM.<sup>51</sup> These extraordinarily high rates are directly related to the encouragement that Muslim clerics give to the practice. An April 2016 *Times of India* report noted that attempts to stamp out the practice in Mumbai had been stymied by a Muslim cleric (from the same Dawoodi Bohra sect to which the Michigan doctors belonged) urging, obliquely but unmistakably, that it be done. Syedna Muffadal Saifuddin declared: “The act has to happen! If it is a man, then it is right, it can be openly done, but if it is a woman then it must be done discreetly, but then the act has to be done. Please understand what I am trying to talk about.”<sup>52</sup>

At least some Muslim leaders in non-Muslim countries, including some in the West, agree with Saifuddin. A Muslim cleric in Russia said that “all women should be circumcised.”<sup>53</sup> Even in the United States, a leading U.S. Muslim jurist from the Assembly of Muslim Jurists of America (AMJA) said it was an “honor” in Islam.<sup>54</sup>

And so it is becoming more common in the West. A marabout – a Muslim holy man – was arrested in France in 2012 for having it done on his daughters.<sup>55</sup> In the UK, there were 5,500 cases of FGM in 2016 alone.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Abu-Dawud Sulaiman bin Al-Aash’ath Al-Azdi as-Sijistani, *Sunan abu-Dawud*, Ahmad Hasan, translator, Kitab Bhavan, 1990, no. 5251.

<sup>49</sup> Nick Thompson, “Female genital mutilation: Why Egyptian girls fear the summer,” CNN, June 25, 2015.

<sup>50</sup> Gabrielle Paluch, “Female genital cutting in Thailand’s south,” *Al Jazeera*, April 2, 2015; Marie Dhumieres, “Female genital mutilation persists in Indonesia,” *Global Post*, April 16, 2015.

<sup>51</sup> Hajir Sharifi, “Study reveals shocking FGM prevalence in Iran,” Rudaw, July 4, 2015.

<sup>52</sup> Mohua Das, “Bohra cleric urges female genital mutilation?,” *Times of India*, April 29, 2016.

<sup>53</sup> Roland Oliphant, “Outrage in Russia after religious leaders back female genital mutilation,” *The Daily Telegraph*, August 18, 2016.

<sup>54</sup> “AMJA Senior Committee Member: Female Genital Mutilation Is ‘an Honor’ per Islam,” *Translating Jihad*, April 27, 2012.

<sup>55</sup> Craig Mackenzie, “Islamic holy man and his wife are jailed for mutilating the genitals of their four daughters,” *Daily Mail*, June 3, 2012.

<sup>56</sup> Sofia Petkar, “REVEALED: Thousands of Female Genital Mutilations STILL taking place illegally in Britain,” *Express*, March 7, 2017.

Imam Afroz Ali, founder and president of the Al-Ghazzali Centre for Islamic Sciences and Human Development in Sydney, Australia, declared that “Islamic law permits by definition, by prophetic statement and by practice female circumcision.”<sup>57</sup>

And then there is rape. The Western world is facing a rape crisis.

In 2015, there were 62.02 rapes per every 100,000 people in England and Wales. By 2022, that rate had grown to 117.3, second in the entire world only to the tiny Caribbean nation of Grenada.<sup>58</sup> Sweden was sixth in the world in 2022 with 85.6 rapes per 100,000 people, up from 56.29 in 2015.<sup>59</sup> During the same seven-year span, the rape rate in France nearly tripled, going from 20.09 per 100,000 people in 2015 to 58.94 in 2022.<sup>60</sup> In Germany, there was a relatively low 8.56 rapes per 100,000 people in 2015, but by 2022, that rate had almost doubled to 15.06.<sup>61</sup> By comparison, the rape rate in the United States remained fairly static, going from 38.85 in 2015 to 41.82 in 2022.<sup>62</sup>

Meanwhile, in 2016, Muslims comprised 6.1 percent of the population of Germany, 6.3 percent of the United Kingdom, 8.1 percent of Sweden, and 8.8 percent of France.<sup>63</sup> Since then, millions of Muslim migrants have settled in those countries and others in Europe. According to the British Census, “the proportion of the overall population who identified as ‘Muslim’ increased from 4.9% (2.7 million) in 2011 to 6.5% (3.9 million) in 2021.”<sup>64</sup> 800,000 Muslims entered Germany in 2015 alone.<sup>65</sup> Because of the low birth rates among the native populations and the high birth rates among the migrants, many predicted that there would be Muslim majorities in many Western European countries by the end of the twenty-first century.

Did the massive influx of Muslims into Europe account for the sharp rise in rape rates? The reflex action of Western political and law enforcement authorities, as well as the Western media, is to regard such questions as offensive and “Islamophobic,” and hence unworthy even to be asked, much less answered. Yet this is not simply an instance of the *post hoc*,

---

<sup>57</sup> Rachel Baxendale, “Female circumcision is a right, says imam,” *The Australian*, December 24, 2012.

<sup>58</sup> United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, crime-violent-offences, <https://dataunodc.un.org/crime-violent-offences>. Accessed April 17, 2025.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> “Europe’s Growing Muslim Population,” Pew Research Center, November 29, 2017, <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2017/11/29/europes-growing-muslim-population/>. Accessed April 17, 2025.

<sup>64</sup> Prabhu Chawla, “Europe facing identity challenge,” *New Indian Express*, July 15, 2024, <https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinions/columns/pc/2024/Jul/15/europe-facing-identity-challenge>. Accessed April 17, 2025.

<sup>65</sup> “Germany to Spend \$6.6 Billion on 800,000 Refugees and Migrants,” *NBC News*, September 7, 2015, <https://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/europes-border-crisis/billions-migrants-germany-spend-6-6b-800-000-newcomers-n422811>. Accessed April 17, 2025.

*ergo propter hoc* fallacy: the rise in rape rates followed a rise in the number of Muslims in Europe, therefore Muslims are responsible for the rise in the number of rapes. However unwelcome the fact may be, there is a good reason to think that Europe's rape problem is a component of its problem with Islam.

This may appear to be counterintuitive at first glance, for rape rates in Muslim countries are generally extremely low. In Pakistan, the rape rate in 2022 was 2.22 per 100,000 people.<sup>66</sup> In Indonesia, the world's most populous Muslim country, it was 0.52 in the same year.<sup>67</sup> In Iraq, it was 2.53 in 2021.<sup>68</sup> So how can it possibly be argued that Muslims are responsible for the rise in the number of rapes in Europe, when they don't commit the same crime in any significant numbers in their home countries?

The answer is twofold. One is that many rapes go unreported in Muslim countries because the behavior involved simply isn't considered a crime. As we shall see, Islamic law, based on words attributed to the Islamic prophet Muhammad himself, forbids a woman to refuse sexual intercourse to her husband under any circumstances. With such a rule in place, how can a rape ever even be said to have occurred? It never could in the context of a marriage; it could only take place when a man forces himself upon a woman who is not his wife.

The second reason is as shocking as it is unmistakable: the Islamic religion forbids the rape of Muslim women, but it does not forbid the rape of non-Muslim women. In fact, the Qur'an specifically allows for this as a legitimate sexual outlet for Muslim men. And such activity doesn't make its way into crime statistics, as it is not considered to be a crime at all.

In light of these two factors, it's no surprise whatsoever that rape rates in Muslim countries would be low to nonexistent, but that mass Muslim migration into Europe would account for the continent's new rape crisis.

"The punishment for rape in Islam," says the popular fatwa site Islam Question & Answer, "is the same as the punishment for zina, which is stoning if the perpetrator is married, and one hundred lashes and banishment for one year if he is not married."<sup>69</sup>

However, several passages of the Qur'an make it not at all clear that the prohibition of rape applies to non-Muslim women at all. The Qur'an tells Muslims to "marry the women who seem good to you, two or three or four, and if you fear that you cannot do justice, then one, or those that your right hands possess. In this way it is more likely that you will not do injustice." (4:3) A bit later, the Qur'an enumerates the women whom a Muslim man is forbidden to marry: "Forbidden to you are your mothers, and your daughters, and your sisters, and your father's sisters, and your mother's sisters..." and so on (4:23). This long list

---

<sup>66</sup> United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, crime-violent-offenses, op. cit.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> "What is the ruling on the crime of rape in Islam?," Islam Question & Answer, August 21, 2005, <https://islamqa.info/en/answers/72338/punishment-for-rape-in-islam>.

concludes with this: “And all married women except those whom your right hands possess.” (4:24)

The renowned medieval Qur’anic scholar, Ibn Kathir, whose commentary on the Qur’an is still widely popular among Muslims today, explains this passage by noting that Muslim males “are prohibited from marrying women who are already married,” but that there is one key exception to this rule: Muslims may marry, or simply have sexual relations, with “those whom you acquire through war, for you are allowed such women after making sure they are not pregnant.”<sup>70</sup> Islamic law doesn’t allow a man to marry a married woman, but this poses no problem when it comes to captive women, for, as one manual of Islamic law stipulates, “when a child or a woman is taken captive, they become slaves by the fact of capture, and the woman’s previous marriage is immediately annulled.”<sup>71</sup>

Ibn Kathir quotes a tradition of Muhammad in which the prophet of Islam allows his men to have sexual relations with captive women; nothing whatsoever is said about obtaining the women’s consent. “Imam Ahmad recorded that Abu Sa’id Al-Khudri said, ‘We captured some women from the area of Awtas who were already married, and we disliked having sexual relations with them because they already had husbands. So, we asked the Prophet about this matter, and this Ayah [verse] was revealed...Consequently, we had sexual relations with these women.’”<sup>72</sup> Ibn Kathir adds that other respected Islamic authorities agree on this, including “At-Tirmidhi, An-Nasa’i, Ibn Jarir and Muslim in his Sahih.”<sup>73</sup>

The hadith collection Sahih Muslim, which Muslims consider along with Sahih Bukhari to be the most reliable source of traditions about Muhammad, contains a version of this story that differs only slightly from the one that Ibn Kathir records. Muhammad’s men hesitate before engaging in sex with the women they have captured, but once again neither the women’s marital status nor their consent is the issue. Instead, they are unsure that they should go ahead “because of their husbands being polytheists.”<sup>74</sup> Muhammad, however, tells them that it is all right to go ahead.

Sahih Muslim also contains another variant of this tradition, in which the men hesitate because they hope to exchange the captive women for ransom:

Abu Sirma said to Abu Sa’id al Khadri (Allah he pleased with him): O Abu Sa’id, did you hear Allah’s Messenger mentioning al-azl [*coitus interruptus*]? He said: Yes, and added: We went out with Allah’s Messenger on the expedition to the Bi’l-Mustaliq and took captive some excellent Arab women; and we desired them, for we were

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir* (abridged) (Riyadh: Darussalam, 2000), II, 422.

<sup>71</sup> Ahmed ibn Naqib al-Misri, *Reliance of the Traveller (‘Umdat al-Salik): A Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law*, translated by Nuh Ha Mim Keller, (Amana Publications, 1999), o9.1-2.

<sup>72</sup> Ibn Kathir, II, 422, op. cit.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj, *Sahih Muslim*, translated by Abdul Hamid Siddiqi, (New Delhi: Kitab Bhavan), revised edition 2000, no. 3432.

suffering from the absence of our wives, (but at the same time) we also desired ransom for them. So we decided to have sexual intercourse with them but by observing azl (Withdrawing the male sexual organ before emission of semen to avoid-conception). But we said: We are doing an act whereas Allah's Messenger is amongst us; why not ask him? So we asked Allah's Messenger, and he said: It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born.<sup>75</sup>

Once again, no one involved seems troubled in the slightest degree by the question of whether or not these women consent to sexual intercourse. They are captives. They are slaves. Consent is simply not a factor.

### **Not in marriage, either**

In fact, consent wasn't a factor in Islamic marriage, either. A hadith depicts Muhammad saying: "If a husband calls his wife to his bed [i.e. to have sexual relation] and she refuses and causes him to sleep in anger, the angels will curse her till morning."<sup>76</sup>

And: "By the One in Whose Hand is the soul of Muhammad! No woman can fulfill her duty towards Allah until she fulfills her duty towards her husband. If he asks her (for intimacy) even if she is on her camel saddle, she should not refuse."<sup>77</sup>

If wives had no right to refuse sexual relations, what chance did slave women have?

A twentieth-century commentary on the Qur'an, the *Tafsir Anwarul Bayan*, reflects the same understanding of the passage, and defends the practice as a just punishment for the unbelievers' refusal to accept Islam: "During Jihad (religion war), many men and women become war captives. The Amirul Mu'minin [leader of the believers, or caliph—an office now vacant] has the choice of distributing them amongst the Mujahidin [warriors of jihad], in which event they will become the property of these Mujahidin. This enslavement is the penalty for disbelief (kufr)."<sup>78</sup>

The same Qur'an commentary specifies that the rules about taking infidel women captive and enslaving them do not apply only to the Muslims of Muhammad's time, but for all time: "None of the injunctions pertaining to slavery have been abrogated in the Shari'ah. The reason that the Muslims of today do not have slaves is because they do not engage in Jihad (religion war). Their wars are fought by the instruction of the disbelievers (kuffar) and are halted by the same felons. The Muslim [sic] have been shackled by such treaties of the

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., no. 3371.

<sup>76</sup> Sahih Bukhari 4.54.460, <https://sunnah.com/bukhari:3237>. Accessed March 20, 2025.

<sup>77</sup> Ibn Majah 1853, <https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:1853>. Accessed March 20, 2025.

<sup>78</sup> Muhammad Aashiq Ilahi Bulandshahri, *Illuminating Discourses on the Noble Qur'an (Tafsir Anwarul Bayan)*, Afzal Hussain Elias and Muhammad Arshad Fakhri, trans. (Karachi: Darul Ishaat, 2005), I, 501.

disbelievers (kuffar) whereby they cannot enslave anyone in the event of a war. Muslims have been denied a great boon whereby every home could have had a slave. May Allah grant the Muslims the ability to escape the tentacles of the enemy, remain steadfast upon the Din (religion) and engage in Jihad (religion war) according to the injunctions of Shari'ah. Amen!"<sup>79</sup>

The Qur'an returns to the theme of the captives of the right hand later, stating: "O prophet, indeed, we have made lawful to you your wives to whom you have paid their dowries, and those whom your right hand possesses of those whom Allah has given you as spoils of war," and on through the list of women with whom sexual relations are permitted (33:50). From this passage we learn that "those whom your right hands possess" are "the spoils of war," just as a Pakistani Christian had stated about how the Muslims in his country viewed non-Muslim women.

Another Qur'anic passage makes it absolutely clear that Muslim men may use those whom their right hands possess in a sexual manner: "The believers are successful indeed, who are humble in their prayers, and who shun vain conversation, and who give alms, and who guard their private parts, except from their wives or those that their right hands possess, for then they are not blameworthy." (23:1-6)

Another influential commentary on the Qur'an, the Tafsir al-Jalalayn, explains this verse in a straightforward manner: one must guard one's private parts "except from their wives or those they own as slaves, in which case they are not blameworthy in approaching them."<sup>80</sup> A twentieth-century Islamic scholar of international renown, Syed Abul Ala Maududi, agrees, saying that in this Qur'an verse, "it is made clear that one need not guard one's private parts from two kinds of women – one's wives and slave-girls."<sup>81</sup>

One other Qur'an passage reiterates the major points of all this: "Indeed, the torment of their Lord is before which no one can feel secure and those who preserve their chastity except with their wives and those whom their right hands possess, for thus they are not blameworthy." (70:28-30)

Islam Question & Answer contains this question: "In Ar-Raheeo Al Makhtum (The Sealed Nectar)," a popular biography of Muhammad, "the author says in the section called 'The Prophet Household' that the Prophet (S.A.W.) had four concubines. 1. Why is it that having concubines is not haram? 2. Can other muslims have concubines?"<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., I, 502.

<sup>80</sup> Jalalu'd-Din al-Mahalli and Jalalu'd-Din as-Suyuti, *Tafsir al-Jalalayn*, translated by Aisha Bewley (London: Dar Al Taqwa Ltd., 2007), 730.

<sup>81</sup> Sayyid Abul A'la Mawdudi, *Towards Understanding the Qur'an (Tafhim al-Qur'an)*, Zafar Ishaq Ansari, trans. (Leicester, England: The Islamic Foundation, 1995), VI, 81.

<sup>82</sup> "What is the Ruling on Intimacy with Slave Women?" Islam Question & Answer, March 18, 2004, <https://islamqa.info/en/answers/13737/what-is-the-ruling-on-intimacy-with-slave-women>. Accessed March 4, 2025.

The answer begins: “With regard to your question about it being permissible for a master to be intimate with his slave woman, the answer is that that is because Allaah has permitted it.”<sup>83</sup> The author of the fatwa then quotes the Qur’an passage (23:6) about guarding one’s private parts except from his wives and those whom his right hand possesses. He offers one caveat, that the slave woman must not have been sold to someone else: “That is subject to the condition that he has acquired her in a proper manner, and that this slave woman has not been given by her master in marriage to another man to whom she is still married. The reason why this is permitted is that this slave woman belongs to him, either because he has paid money to buy her or he has fought for the sake of Allaah (and acquired her among the war booty).”<sup>84</sup>

The fact that the slave woman must have been taken as the spoils of war was all-important. The site quotes a Shaykh al-Shanqeeti saying: “The reason for which people may be taken as slaves is if they are kaafirs [unbelievers] who are waging war against Allaah and His Messenger. If Allaah grants victory to the mujaahid [jihadist] Muslims, who are offering their souls, their wealth and all their resources and everything that Allaah has given them so that the word of Allaah might prevail over the kuffaar [unbelievers], then these kuffaar may become slaves, unless the imam chooses to let them go or to ransom them if that serves the interests of the Muslims.”<sup>85</sup>

So Islam forbids rape, but it is clear from the Qur’an, the words of Muhammad according to Islamic tradition, and Islamic scholars that using captive women sexually is not considered rape. Infidel women can be taken as spoils of war, and what happens to them after that is entirely at the discretion of their Muslim captors.

Islam is unique even in comparison to the acceptance of rape as a weapon of warfare in other cultures, for it combines all of these motivations. Infidel women are taken as the spoils of war, but the goal is ultimately the expansion of the Islamic community and the diminishment of the infidel community. And so rape of infidel women is also useful as a means to humiliate the defeated infidel force, as well as a means of social control and to aid in the redrawing of ethnic boundaries. On top of all that is the divine sanction given to it all. Rape of infidel women in a jihad war is not just something the commanders permit, as a means to humiliate the infidels. It is a holy act.

Many would insist, however, that none of this illuminates the question of whether Islam condones the rape of infidel women, for in our own day, such rapes do not take place in the context of a war, as no war currently exists between the Islamic world and non-Muslims. However, this is to take a Western and modern view of what constitutes warfare.

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

Islamic law regarding the obligation to jihad establishes a situation in which, at least in modern times, a state of perpetual war exists between the Islamic world and non-Muslims. Classic Sunni law stipulates that jihad is *fard kifaya*, that is, a general obligation upon the entire Muslim community. If some of the Muslims are discharging the responsibility of waging jihad, others need not do so. A manual of Islamic law explains that “jihad is a communal obligation....When enough people perform it to successfully accomplish it, it is no longer obligatory upon others.”<sup>86</sup>

However, there is a significant caveat. If infidels attack a Muslim land, the obligation to jihad becomes *fard ayn*, that is, required from each individual in the entire Muslim community worldwide. Once infidels attack, jihad is “obligatory for everyone” when “the enemy has surrounded the Muslims...on every side, having entered our territory, even if the land consists of ruins, wilderness, or mountains, for non-Muslim forces entering Muslim lands is a weighty matter that cannot be ignored, but must be met with effort and struggle to repel them by every possible means.”<sup>87</sup> In such cases, “every able bodied man who has reached puberty and is sane” must wage jihad.<sup>88</sup>

Nowadays, numerous Islamic authorities have pointed to the American incursions in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as to the very existence of the state of Israel, to declare that the infidels are at war with Islam, and thus jihad is obligatory upon every Muslim. In this scenario, a Muslim who travels to Britain or France or Germany and rapes a woman may consider that he is entirely justified in doing so, in light of the Qur’an’s permission to use the “captives of the right hand” in this way. They are, after all, the spoils of war.

The Qur’an itself also provides justification for the idea that perpetual war exists between Muslims and non-Muslims when it says: “And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is all for Allah.” (8:39). If Muslims are to fight non-Muslims until there is no more persecution, then the fighting has an end point. If, on the other hand, Muslims must fight on until “religion is all for Allah,” then they must continue fighting even against those who are minding their own business, but whose religion is not “for Allah.” This establishes endless warfare between Muslims who take this command to heart and the non-Muslim world, and allows for non-Muslim women to be violated as the spoils of war in virtually any circumstance.

Non-Muslim women also bring all this upon themselves by not obeying Islam’s modesty laws, as Islam Question & Answer argued. The Qur’an says: “O prophet, tell your wives and your daughters and the women of the believers to draw their veils close around them. That will be better, so that they may be recognized and not molested. Allah is always forgiving, merciful.” (33:59) The implication of this is clear: women who cover themselves are not to

---

<sup>86</sup> *Reliance of the Traveller*, o9.1-2, op. cit.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

be molested, but those who do not are fair game, as the veil is protection against molestation.

There is no shortage of contemporary authorities who have advocated for this practice, which is understandable, given its widely recognized Qur'anic foundation. In February 2004, a Muslim in Britain asked the South African Mufti Ebrahim Desai was asked on his own fatwa site, Islam Q & A Online, a series of questions on this topic. The questioner began by explaining: "Recently I saw a question on the status of women taken as prisoners during Jihad."<sup>89</sup> His questions included one that had in mind the well-being of the captive woman, as well as the apparent transgression of the Islamic marriage vow that would be involved in having sex with slave women: "Don't you think sex without marriage is a disgrace to that particular woman? Please give a detailed reply to this point as to why sex is allowed without marriage."<sup>90</sup>

The questioner also asked: "To what sort of women does this rule apply. I mean can they be ordinary citizens (mothers/sisters/wives of men) of any city Muslims capture or they must have taken part in the battle against Muslims so that this rule may apply to them."<sup>91</sup>

The mufti began his answer by exonerating Islam of any role in originating slavery, although this had nothing to do with anything the questioner had asked about: "Firstly, it should be borne in mind that slavery was not something that was introduced by Islam; on the contrary, it was something that had its roots planted long before the advent of Islam. It would not be an exaggeration to state that slavery is probably as old as war itself, because it is one of the consequences of war."<sup>92</sup>

After a lengthy justification of the practice of enslaving prisoners of war, Desai said: "In the 'Jihads' (Islamic wars) that took place, women were also, at times, taken as prisoners of war by the Muslim warriors. These women captives used to be distributed as part of the booty among the soldiers, after their return to Islamic territory. Each soldier was then entitled to have relations ONLY with the slave girl over whom he was given the RIGHT OF OWNERSHIP and NOT with those slave girls that were not in his possession. This RIGHT OF OWNERSHIP was given to him by the 'Ameerul-Mu'mineen' (Head of the Islamic state.) Due to this right of ownership, it became lawful for the owner of a slave girl to have intercourse with her."<sup>93</sup>

"It may, superficially, appear distasteful," Desai continued, "to copulate with a woman who is not a man's legal wife, but once Shariah makes something lawful, we have to accept it as

---

<sup>89</sup> "Recently I saw a question on the status of women taken as prisoners during Jihad." Islam Q & A Online with Mufti Ebrahim Desai, February 24, 2004, <https://www.webcitation.org/mainframe.php>. Accessed March 6, 2025.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

lawful, whether it appeals to our taste, or not; and whether we know its underlying wisdom or not.”<sup>94</sup> He nonetheless went on to explain that wisdom, saying that “the LEGAL possession that a Muslim receives over a slave woman from the ‘Ameerul-Mu‘mineen’ (the Islamic Head of State) gives him legal credence to have coition with the slave woman in his possession, just as the marriage ceremony gives him legal credence to have coition with his wife. In other words, this LEGAL POSSESSION is, in effect, a SUBSTITUTE of the MARRIAGE CEREMONY.”<sup>95</sup> Since “a slave girl can be possessed and even bought and sold, thus, this right of possession, substituting as a marriage ceremony, entitles the owner to copulate with her.”<sup>96</sup>

As a result, “permission to have intercourse with a slave woman was not something barbaric or uncivilised; on the contrary, it was almost as good as a marriage ceremony.”<sup>97</sup> What if she was already married? The mufti has a ready answer: “if a slave woman was married previously in enemy territory to a non-Muslim, and is then captured alone, i.e. without her husband, it is not permissible for any Muslim to have relations with her until her previous marriage is nullified, and that is done by bringing her to an Islamic country and making her the legal possession of a Muslim.”<sup>98</sup>

Desai explains that it is not only not necessary to marry a slave woman, or even possible to do so. This is because Islamic law requires that the groom give his bride a dowry; as a slave doesn’t own anything, but everything she has is the property of her owner, it is not possible to give her anything that would become her own. And so no dowry, and hence no marriage, is even possible.

Mufti Desai argued that “it would be difficult to implement” this system today, “because of the stringent conditions attached to it. Firstly, the prisoners have to be captured in ‘Jihaad’ in the true sense of the word. Then again, If true ‘Jihaad’ did break out somewhere, there are still a number of other laws and conditions to abide by which are far too stringent for any Islamic country in the world to abide by in this time and age when people’s personal gains and whims and desire are being given preference to [sic] over Islamic Law.”<sup>99</sup>

This would appear to rule out the abuse of infidel women in this way today, but that actually depends on the point of view of individual Muslims as to whether jihad is being waged against unbelievers today. The mufti did maintain that if jihad is being waged, taking slave women as spoils of war was an integral part of that struggle: “According to Islamic Law, captive female prisoners are also part and parcel of the booty...The Ameerul-Mu‘mineen (Head of the Islamic State) remains the guardian of the female prisoners until he allocates

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

them to the soldiers. Only after a soldier has been allotted a slave girl, and made the owner of her, will she become his lawful possession.”<sup>100</sup>

Another online fatwa site, IslamQA.com, gave the same view: “Islam allows a man to have intercourse with his slave woman, whether he has a wife or wives or he is not married.”<sup>101</sup> This teaching “is indicated by the Qur’aan and Sunnah, and this was done by the Prophets. Ibraaheem (peace be upon him) took Haajar as a concubine and she bore him Ismaa’eel (may peace be upon them all). Our Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) also did that, as did the Sahaabah, the righteous and the scholars. The scholars are unanimously agreed on that and it is not permissible for anyone to regard it as haraam or to forbid it. Whoever regards that as haraam is a sinner who is going against the consensus of the scholars.”<sup>102</sup>

The site states that “the scholars are unanimously agreed that it is permissible,” and quotes one such scholar, Ibn Qudaamah, saying: “There is no dispute (among the scholars) that it is permissible to take concubines and to have intercourse with one's slave woman, because Allaah says...” Then the site quotes Qur’an 70:28-30: “Indeed, the torment of their Lord is before which no one can feel secure and those who preserve their chastity except with their wives and those whom their right hands possess, for thus they are not blameworthy.” (70:28-30)

As a result, the fatwa says, “the wife has no right to object to her husband owning female slaves or to his having intercourse with them.”<sup>103</sup> Another fatwa on the IslamQA site answers the question of whether a married Muslim man commits adultery by having sex with his slave: “Allaah has permitted intimacy with a slave woman if the man owns her. This is not regarded as adultery as suggested in the question.”<sup>104</sup>

In May 2011, an Egyptian sheikh, Abu-Ishaq al-Huwayni, began a justification of the sexual enslavement of infidel women by situating it within Islam’s doctrine of jihad. Al-Huwayni began by noting that the modern era was one of war between Muslims and non-Muslims, and that Muslims should regard this as a positive development: “We are in the era of jihad. The era of jihad has come over us, and jihad in the path of Allah is a pleasure. It is a real pleasure. The companions (of the Prophet) used to compete to (perform jihad).”<sup>105</sup> Al-

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> “Ruling on having intercourse with a slave woman when one has a wife,” IslamQA.com, June 12, 2011, <https://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http://www.islamqa.com/en/ref/10382&date=2011-06-13>. Accessed March 6, 2025.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> “Intercourse with a slave woman is not regarded as zina (adultery),” IslamQA.com, December 26, 2002, <https://islamqa.info/en/answers/20802/intercourse-with-a-slave-woman-is-not-regarded-as-zina-adultery>. Accessed March 6, 2025.

<sup>105</sup> “Egyptian Shaykh: Jihad Is Solution to Muslims’ Financial Problems,” *Translating Jihad*, May 31, 2011, in Billy Hallowell, “Egyptian Cleric: Poverty Can be Solved by Selling Humans 'Like Groceries,’” Blaze Media,

Huwayni stated, in accord with the Qur'an's guarantee to the righteous of prosperity in this world as well as the next (24:55), that the Muslim community was not doing so well because of its failure to obey Allah's commands to wage jihad: "The poverty that we're in—is it not due to our abandonment of jihad? But if we could conduct one, two, or three jihadist operations every year, many people throughout the earth would become Muslims."<sup>106</sup>

If Muslims returned to waging jihad, they would be able to take captives, and profit from doing so. *Da'wa* is the call to unbelievers to accept Islam, which in Islamic theology should precede jihad, with jihad being waged against those who decline the invitation to convert to Islam:

And whoever rejected this *da'wa*, or stood in our way, we would fight against him and take him prisoner, and confiscate his wealth, his children, and his women—all of this means money. Every *mujahid* who returned from jihad, his pockets would be full. He would return with three or four slaves, three or four women, and three or four children. Multiply each head by 300 *dirhams*, or 300 *dinar*, and you have a good amount of profit. If he were to go to the West and work on a commercial deal, he would not make that much money. Whenever things became difficult (financially), he could take the head (i.e. the prisoner) and sell it, and ease his (financial) crisis. He would sell it like groceries.<sup>107</sup>

After his remarks sparked a controversy, al-Huwayni appeared on an Islamic television channel, al-Hikma TV, on May 22, 2011 in order to clarify his remarks. The chief cause of the controversy, however, was not that al-Huwayni had spoken about buying and owning slaves, but that he had given some of his hearers the impression that he was saying that Muslims could be enslaved. He thus hastened to assure his television audience that he had meant to speak only of the enslavement of non-Muslims. First, he outlined Islamic doctrine regarding waging war against infidels, including the right of the victorious jihad warriors to seize the spoils of war from their vanquished enemies:

It is clear that offensive jihad, which I was talking about in that interview, that its purpose is to call people to Islam, and it is not permissible for anyone to hide the divine guidance from the people, under any name. They rejected Islam and the *jizya*, that's it. The Prophet (PBUH) said: "If they refuse, then seek Allah's aid and fight them." If fighting occurs, there is going to be a winner and a loser. If the army of the Muslims is victorious, it will take spoils. Taking spoils is a fixed ruling in the Qur'an. Allah permitted it at the day of the Battle of Badr, as it is (recorded) in Surat al-Anfal. Allah Almighty said: "And know that out of all the booty that ye may acquire (in war),

---

June 1, 2011, <https://www.theblaze.com/news/2011/06/01/egyptian-muslim-cleric-poverty-can-be-solved-by-selling-humans-like-groceries>. Accessed March 6, 2025.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

a fifth share is assigned to Allah, and to the Messenger, and to near relatives, orphans, the needy, and the wayfarer, if ye do believe in Allah and in the revelation We sent down to Our servant on the Day of Testing, the Day of the meeting of the two forces. For Allah hath power over all things” [Qur’an 8:41].<sup>108</sup>

Al-Huwayni emphasized that his position was firmly rooted in Islamic tradition, based on the teachings of the two collections of hadiths, traditions of Muhammad’s words and deeds, that Muslims considered most reliable, Sahih Bukhari and Sahih Muslim. The taking of the spoils of war, he said, was a special privilege that Allah gave to the followers of Muhammad, although he had not given any similar privilege to any of the followers of earlier prophets:

This (position) on spoils is clear. There is also the saying in the two Sahihs [Sahih Bukhari and Sahih Muslim] from Abi-Hurayra, the first of which is, “One among the prophets (PBUH) raided...” In the other hadith from Yusha bin Nun, the Prophet (PBUH) said, “When Allah saw our weakness, he made it permissible for us,” meaning spoils. The Prophet (PBUH) said, “Spoils were not permitted for any masters besides you.” Allah Almighty forbade (the taking of) spoils for all nations before us. He permitted it on the day of the Battle of Badr, as agreed to by all scholars. Not a single Muslim scholar has a problem with this.<sup>109</sup>

Al-Huwayni emphasized that these spoils of war included not just the belongings of defeated enemy warriors, but prisoners as well, provided that they were not Muslims:

“Spoils” refers to what? It refers to people and wealth. The people are those who are taken prisoner. I want to say that it is not at all permissible to take prisoners from among Muslims, even if they are heretics, because the rule for Muslims is that they are free, and not prisoners. Jihad, as I stated in the beginning, is between Muslims and non-Muslims, from among the infidels. But if two Muslims fought each other, like from Iraq and Iran for example; if Iraq invaded Iran to occupy it, it would not be permissible for an Iraqi man to take a Shi’ite woman captive, because she is Muslim, even though she’s a heretic. Likewise if Iran invaded Iraq, it would not be permissible for one of their men to take a Muslim woman captive, because she is free.<sup>110</sup>

Non-Muslims, however, could not expect the same protections:

Therefore jihad is only between Muslims and infidels. That between Muslims and Muslims is called oppression, or fighting: “If two parties among the believers fall into

---

<sup>108</sup> Shaykh Abu-Ishaq al-Huwayni, "When I want a sex slave, I just go to the market and choose the woman I like and purchase her," al-Hikma TV, May 22, 2011, [https://wikiislam.net/wiki/Qur%27an,\\_Hadith\\_and\\_Scholars:Rape\\_of\\_Slaves,\\_Prisoners,\\_and\\_Wives](https://wikiislam.net/wiki/Qur%27an,_Hadith_and_Scholars:Rape_of_Slaves,_Prisoners,_and_Wives). Accessed March 6, 2025.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

a quarrel...” [Qur'an 49:9]. They are called “believers,” and this name is not taken from them, even though they are fighting. “If one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses...” Here they are called transgressors, but the name of believers is still not taken away from them. In the verse directly following this one, Allah Almighty says: “The believers are but a single brotherhood...” They were brothers, even though a party of them transgressed against the other, and some of them fought each other. But the name of believers was not taken from them.

Al-Huwayni concluded that this meant that Muslim warriors could legitimately seize non-Muslim women as sex slaves:

Do you understand what I'm saying? Spoils, slaves, and prisoners are only to be taken in war between Muslims and infidels. Muslims in the past conquered, invaded, and took over countries. This is agreed to by all scholars — there is no disagreement on this from any of them, from the smallest to the largest, on the issue of taking spoils and prisoners. The prisoners and spoils are distributed among the fighters, which includes men, women, children, wealth, and so on.<sup>111</sup>

Al-Huwayni invoked Qur'an passages on “those whom your right hands possess” to justify this teaching:

When a slave market is erected, which is a market in which are sold slaves and sex-slaves, which are called in the Qur'an by the name milk al-yamin, “that which your right hands possess” [Qur'an 4:24]. This is a verse from the Qur'an which is still in force, and has not been abrogated. The milk al-yamin are the sex-slaves. You go to the market, look at the sex-slave, and buy her. She becomes like your wife, (but) she doesn't need a (marriage) contract or a divorce like a free woman, nor does she need a wali [guardian or protector]. All scholars agree on this point — there is no disagreement from any of them.

These slaves could still enter paradise if they converted to Islam. Their slavery would thus lead to their salvation:

These are called slaves. The Prophet (PBUH) talked about them in the hadith narrated by al-Bukhari in his Book of Jihad: “Allah is delighted at a people who enter the Garden in chains.” Also as narrated by Abu-Dawud: “They are led to the Garden in chains.” Naturally, many people might not understand someone being jerked along in chains in order to enter the Garden. This is because all people, even the worst of the unbelievers, say the garden is for them and no others. They run to the Garden without anybody pulling them in chains.

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

The meaning of the hadith is this: these slaves were in a religion other than Islam. However, when they were conquered, and defeated, and taken prisoner, they came to live in the land of Islam. Then when they witnessed the justice, compassion, and mercy of Islam, they became Muslims. These did not convert to Islam except in the chains of war. If they had not been chained, bound, and had their freedom taken from them, they would not have converted to Islam. Therefore this hadith is referring to these slaves.<sup>112</sup>

The possibility that a slave could turn to Allah and ultimately enter paradise, as well as Qur'anic commands to free individual slaves under certain prescribed circumstances, amounted for al-Huwayni to the idea that Islam actually forbids slavery:

I am very shocked and surprised at those who say that we permit slavery. We don't call people to become slaves. In fact, there are vows to free the necks (i.e. slaves). The same Islam which permits us to take slaves, also urges us to free their necks....<sup>113</sup>

However, just as forcing a slave to engage in sexual intercourse was not rape, so also the sex slavery as allowed in the Qur'an and sanctified by the example of Muhammad was perfectly acceptable as far as al-Huwayni was concerned, and he didn't appear to see any contradiction between approving of this practice and insisting that Islam did not permit slavery. He continued:

When I want a sex slave, I just go to the market and choose the woman I like and purchase her. I choose the man I like, one with strong muscles, or if I want a boy to work in the house, and so forth. I choose one, and pay him a wage. I employ him in a variety of different tasks, then I sell him afterwards. Now, the country that I entered and took captive its men and women — does it not also have money, gold, and silver? Is that not money? When I say that jihad — offensive jihad — with the well-known conditions that I already mentioned from the hadith of the Prophet (PBUH), from the hadith of Burayda in Sahih Muslim, the coffers of the Muslims were full. Would someone who is pious and intelligent — would he say that this is a type of poverty? Or that it is a type of wealth? No — this will fill the coffers of the Muslims with riches and wealth, but as we said, with the recognized conditions.<sup>114</sup>

Another voice justifying the seizure and enslavement of infidel women was a female Kuwaiti politician, Salwa al-Mutairi, who in a May 2011 video unhesitatingly recommended the practice:

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

Peace, mercy, and blessings of Allah be upon you. My name is Salwa al-Mutairi. I received a message that was a little strange. A merchant told me that he would like to have a sex slave. He said he would not be negligent with her, and that Islam permitted this sort of thing. He was speaking the truth. The topic that he brought up is an old topic. I have been working on it for two years now.

I was working with this man, a young man, who (liked) women a lot. I was sympathetic to his situation, and also dedicated to my work. I was given the opportunity to visit Mecca, and when I did so, I brought up (this man's) situation to the muftis in Mecca. I told them that I had a question, since they were men who specialized in what was *halal*, and what was good, and who loved women. I said, "What is the law of sex slaves?"

The mufti said, "With the law of sex slaves, there must be a Muslim nation at war with a Christian nation, or a nation which is not of the religion, not of the religion of Islam. And there must be prisoners of war."

"Is this forbidden by Islam?" I asked.

"Absolutely not. Sex slaves are not forbidden by Islam. On the contrary, sex slaves are under a different law than the free woman. The free woman must be completely covered except for her face and hands. But the sex slave can be naked from the waist up. She differs a lot from the free woman. While the free woman requires a marriage contract, the sex slave does not—she only needs to be purchased by her husband, and that's it. Therefore the sex slave is different than the free woman."

Of course, I also asked religious experts in Kuwait (about this issue), and they told me about the problem with the passionate man, or even the man who is committed to his religion. For every good man in our religion, the only solution for him—when forbidden women come around, if he's tempted to sin, then the solution to this issue is for him to purchase sex slaves. I hope that Kuwait will enact the law for this category, this category of people—the sex slaves....

I hope that a law will be enacted for this category, and they will open the door for this, just as they have opened the door for servants (to come into the country). They should open the door for sex slaves, by enacting a sound law, so that our children don't waste away in the abyss of adultery and moral depravity. Allah-willing, this will work out. I believe, look, the (sex slaves could come from) a country like Chechnya, where there is a war between an (Islamic) state and another state. Certainly there are prisoners. These prisoners could be purchased. They could be purchased and sold to the merchants in Kuwait. This is better than (the merchants) committing that which is forbidden. There is nothing wrong with this.

Harun al-Rashid [the Abbasid caliph from 786 to 809] had many more sex slaves than this. When he died he had 2,000 sex slaves. But he only had one wife. This was not forbidden. Our *shari'a* permits such a thing as this. Praise be to Allah, here in Kuwait there are many merchants who are committed (to Islam). I hope the best for Kuwait, Allah-willing.<sup>115</sup>

A Muslim state must [first] attack a Christian state—sorry, I mean any non-Muslim state—and they [the women, the future sex-slaves] must be captives of the raid. Is this forbidden? Not at all; according to Islam, sex slaves are not at all forbidden. Quite the contrary, the rules regulating sex-slaves differ from those for free women [i.e., Muslim women]: the latter's body must be covered entirely, except for her face and hands, whereas the sex-slave is kept naked from the bellybutton on up—she is different from the free woman; the free woman has to be married properly to her husband, but the sex-slave—he just buys her and that's that.<sup>116</sup>

The popular Saudi preacher Muhammed al-Arifi echoed all this in a fatwa that granted jihad warriors in Syria permission to engage in “intercourse marriage” with captive women.<sup>117</sup> He warned them, however, that this “intercourse marriage” should be of a brief duration, “in order to give each fighter a turn.” He said that women who complied with this would gain a place in paradise, as the practice “boosts the determination of the Mujahideen in Syria.” These women did, however, have to be at least fourteen years old, and divorced or widowed.

Another Saudi Islamic scholar, Sheikh Saleh Al-Fawzan, agreed. In a February 2018 lecture, he noted:

The Muslims captured women in the [630] Battle of Awtas....They took from the [infidels] money and women as booty. The Companions of the Prophet Muhammad became confused. It was customary for the owners of women captured at war to take them as concubines. They have the right to take them as concubines and have sex with them, by virtue of possessing them. The possession of a captured woman outweighs her marriage contract. It allows the master to have sex with the woman he owns. This is called concubinage.

But the Prophet's Companions were confused, because Allah has made married women haram, and these women had infidel husbands. So Allah sent down the

---

<sup>115</sup> “Islamic Sex Slaves!!!,” Skeptical Science, June 26, 2011, <https://www.skeptical-science.com/religion/islamic-sex-slaves/>. Accessed March 6, 2025.

<sup>116</sup> Raymond Ibrahim, “Muslim Woman Seeks to Revive Institution of Sex-Slavery,” FrontPage Magazine.com, June 6, 2011, <https://www.meforum.org/muslim-woman-seeks-to-revive-institution-of-sex>. Accessed March 6, 2025.

<sup>117</sup> Steve Emerson, “Fatwa Permits Rape of Syrian Women,” Newsmax, January 10, 2013, <https://www.newsmax.com/Emerson/fatwa-rape-Syrian-women/2013/01/10/id/470865/>. Accessed March 6, 2025.

verse ‘married women except those you possess.’ When a woman is taken captive, her marriage contract to her [infidel] husband is annulled. If she is taken captive, she becomes property of the Muslims, and the infidel’s marriage contract with her is annulled. She becomes the property of the Muslim, and he can take her as a concubine.”<sup>118</sup>

These teachings were issued as other Muslims were applying them in large numbers, not in Muslim countries, but in Britain and on continental Europe.

As Sharia is considered divine law, those Muslims who adhere to it consider it always to take precedence over the laws of the land. We will almost certainly be seeing similar incidents in the near future in the U.S., as the Muslim population grows, and with it, the influence of Sharia.

The growing influence of Sharia will also increase anti-Semitism. Most analysts ascribe the presence of anti-Semitism among Muslims to anger over Israel’s supposed mistreatment of the Palestinians. They ignore, however, the fact that the Qur’an itself contains a great deal of anti-Semitic material. The Muslim holy book depicts the Jews as inveterately evil and bent on destroying the wellbeing of the Muslims. Official Palestinian Authority television once featured two girls reciting a poem that included this stanza:

You who murdered Allah’s pious prophets  
Oh, you who were brought up on spilling blood  
You have been condemned to humiliation and hardship  
Oh Sons of Zion, oh most evil among creations  
Oh barbaric monkeys, wretched pigs.<sup>119</sup>

This was a specifically Qur’anic imprecation. The verses about killing the prophets and spilling blood, as well as the idea that the Jews have been condemned to humiliation, echoed Qur’an 3:112; and the monkeys and pigs came from Qur’an 2:62-65; 5:59-60, and 7:166.

Meanwhile, the Qur’an also says that not only have they disbelieved in revelations from Allah and killed the prophets, but they even dare to mock Allah himself: “And the Jews say, ‘The hand of Allah is chained.’ Chained are their hands, and cursed are they for what they say.” They “strive throughout the land corruption, and Allah does not like corrupters.” (5:64).

---

<sup>118</sup> “Senior Saudi Islamic Scholar Sheikh Saleh Al-Fawzan In 2018: According To Islamic Law, Muslims Have The Right To Take Captive Women As Concubines And Have Sex With Them Even If They Are Married To An Infidel – Archival,” Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI), February 22, 2018, <https://www.memri.org/tv/snr-saudi-islamic-scholar-sheikh-saleh-fawzan-right-captive-women-concubines-married-infidel-archive>. Accessed March 20, 2025.

<sup>119</sup> Itamar Marcus and Nan Jacques Zilberdik, “Little girls on PA TV: Jews are the ‘most evil among creations, barbaric monkeys, wretched pigs,’ condemned to ‘humiliation and hardship,’” *Palestinian Media Watch*, July 7, 2013.

Allah gave food laws to the Jews because of their “wrongdoing,” and for “... their averting many from the way of Allah” (4:160), and by doing so, “repaid them for their injustice” (6:146). Some Jews are “avid listeners to falsehood” who “distort words beyond their usages.” These are “the ones for whom Allah does not intend to purify their hearts,” and they will be punished not just in hellfire but in this life as well: “For them in this world is disgrace, and for them in the Hereafter is a great punishment” (5:41).

Jews dare to deny divine revelation, claiming that “Allah did not reveal to a human being anything,” to which Muhammad is told to respond, “Who revealed the Scripture that Moses brought as light and guidance to the people? You [Jews] make it into pages, disclosing some of it and concealing much” (6:91).

In light of all this, it is understandable that Muslims should not get close to such people: “O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is of them. Indeed, Allah guides not the wrongdoing people” (5:51).

What’s more, the Jews are “the most intense of the people in animosity toward the believers” (5:82). This, too, resonates in the contemporary Islamic consciousness. In the United States, the Muslim presence is not large enough as yet to require Jews to conceal outward signs of their identity, or to consider emigrating in large numbers. However, there is ample evidence that just such a situation is coming, if Muslim immigration is not reduced. Because Muslims believe that the Qur’an is the perfect guidebook for living in all times and places, it is nothing short of inconceivable that Muslims in the U.S. will give up or reform Qur’anic anti-Semitism. Not only will that fact have consequences; it already has.

Moreover, emigration to a new land to bring Sharia to it is also an Islamic imperative. The Qur’an promises a reward from Allah to those who “emigrate for the sake of Allah,” (4:100) which means for the purpose of bringing Sharia to a non-Muslim land. Thus the conflict between Sharia and the U.S. Constitution will only grow as the Muslim population in the U.S. grows, for among that population will always be some Muslims who take these imperatives with the utmost seriousness.