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Nearly twenty years after South Africa’s racist regime came tumbling down, apartheid has again become a loaded charge in international politics. Seizing on the universal revulsion against the idea that any nation’s citizens should be deprived of rights on the basis of ethnicity, gender, religion or race, the Muslim enemies of the state of Israel and their left-wing allies are falsely accusing Israel of practicing apartheid toward Palestinian Arabs.

The charge is self-evidently absurd. Israel is the Middle East’s only tolerant democracy, the only Middle Eastern state where women and gays have equal rights, and where even Palestinian Arabs enjoy a level of freedom without parallel in the Arab world. In Israel, Arabs enjoy full political rights, serve in the parliament, and sit on the highest court. The Israeli constitution outlaws discrimination
against Arabs or any other group.

The charge that Israel is an apartheid state does not rest on Israeli policy or practice. Instead, it was concocted as an ideological weapon in a sixty-year war against Israel’s very existence. The charge is designed to weaken Israel’s self-defense against an armed, terrorist aggressor that specifically targets defenseless women and children. It is meant to delegitimize the Jewish state and bring about its destruction.

The global campaign to condemn Israel as an apartheid state is being conducted by the Muslim Brotherhood and its surrogate, Hamas, and by its sponsored organizations like the Muslim Students Association, which has been the chief promoter of “Israeli Apartheid Weeks” on college campuses across America.

Coming from Islamic supremacist groups like the Muslim Brotherhood, these accusations constitute a spectacular case of projection. In fact, the system that most closely resembles South Africa’s apartheid is the one that the Brotherhood aspires to impose on all humanity: the system of Islamic law, or Sharia. The people who suffer apartheid-like
discrimination today are the inhabitants of Muslim states all over the world.

Under Islamic law, bigotry and apartheid are manifested chiefly against three victim groups: women, non-Muslims, and gays.

Women

Islamic law mandates severe restrictions on women’s mobility, that is, on their basic human right to be free. While they are not confined to separate townships as were blacks in apartheid South Africa, they are confined all the same. One legal manual directs: “A husband may permit his wife to leave the house for a lesson in Sacred Law, for invocation of Allah (dhikr), to see her female friends, or to go to any place in the town. A woman may not leave the city without her husband or a member of her unmarriageable kin accompanying her, unless the journey is obligatory, like the hajj. It is unlawful for her to travel otherwise, and unlawful for her husband to allow her to.”

In other words, women may travel only at the whim of their masters—their husbands or fathers. And while this law is unenforced in much of the
Islamic world today, its restoration is the goal of the Muslim Brotherhood and the Islamic supremacists it has inspired. Amnesty International notes that in Saudi Arabia, which prides itself on its scrupulous adherence to Islamic law, “women . . . who walk unaccompanied, or are in the company of a man who is neither their husband nor a close relative, are at risk of arrest on suspicion of prostitution or other ‘moral’ offences.”

In line with this kind of thinking, women all across the Muslim world live under restrictions on their marital options, their professional opportunities, and more. There are glaring instances of discrimination in law. For instance, Sharia prescribes that a son’s inheritance should be twice the size of a daughter’s, in accordance with the Qur’an: “God charges you, concerning your children: to the male the like of the portion of two females” (4:11). A woman’s testimony in court is worth only half that of a man, as also mandated by the Qur’an: “And call in to witness two witnesses, men; or if the two be not men, then one man and two women, such witnesses as you approve of, that if one of the two womenerrs the other will remind her” (2:282).
Female genital mutilation

In many Islamic countries, women endure genital mutilation, a practice sanctioned by Islamic law. Female genital mutilation is designed to diminish a woman’s sexual response, so that she will be less likely to commit adultery. One hadith has Muhammad saying: “Circumcision is sunnah for men and an honor for women.” On the basis of this and other statements, female genital mutilation is justified in Islamic law. An Islamic legal manual states: “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’]).” As if it weren’t horrific enough in itself, the procedure is normally performed without anesthetic, on adolescent girls.

Sheikh Muhammad Sayyed Tantawi, the late grand imam of Cairo’s al-Azhar University, the most prestigious educational institution in the Islamic world, declared that female genital mutilation is “a laudable practice that [does] honor to women.” The BBC called Tantawi “the highest spiritual authority for nearly a billion Sunni Muslims.” Female genital mutilation is almost universally practiced.
among Muslim women in Egypt (91 percent have undergone it there, according to a 2008 survey), and is widely practiced also in Iraqi Kurdistan (65.4 percent of women have suffered it there) and elsewhere. The World Health Organization estimates that as many as 140 million women and girls worldwide have been victims of this barbaric and horrifying practice.

**Veiling**

Of course, the most visible manifestation of Islamic gender apartheid is the covering and sequestering of women, both of which are mandated by Islamic law. The Qur’an directs that women must “cast down their eyes and guard their private parts, and reveal not their adornment save such as is outward; and let them cast their veils over their bosoms, and not reveal their adornment save to their husbands, or their fathers,” and a few others (24:31).

What it means to “cast their veils over their bosoms, and not reveal their adornment” is not immediately clear, but one hadith adds more detail. In this story, the daughter of Abu Bakr, one of Muhammad’s leading companions (and first successor), came to
see the prophet while “wearing thin clothes.” “O Asma,” exclaimed Muhammad, “when a woman reaches the age of menstruation, it does not suit her that she displays her parts of body except this and this, and he pointed to her face and hands.”

In our own day, this covering has become the foremost symbol of Islamic apartheid directed at women.

**Wife-beating**

Spousal abuse exists in all cultures, but only Islam gives it divine sanction. The Qur’an says: “Men are the managers of the affairs of women for that God has preferred in bounty one of them over another, and for that they have expended of their property. Righteous women are therefore obedient, guarding the secret for God’s guarding. And those you fear may be rebellious admonish; banish them to their couches, and beat them.” (4:34)

Muhammad was once told that “women have become emboldened toward their husbands,” where-upon he “gave permission to beat them.” He even struck his favorite wife, Aisha. One night, thinking
she was asleep, he went out. Aisha surreptitiously followed him. When he found out what she had done, he hit her, as she recounted: “He struck me on the chest which caused me pain, and then said: Did you think that Allah and His Apostle would deal unjustly with you?”

The Pakistan Institute of Medical Sciences has determined that over 90 percent of Pakistani wives have been struck, beaten, or abused sexually. Some were punished for offenses on the order of cooking an unsatisfactory meal, others for failing to give birth to a male child.

In 1984, Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradhawi, who is one of the most respected and influential Islamic clerics in the world, wrote: “If the husband senses that feelings of disobedience and rebelliousness are rising against him in his wife, he should try his best to rectify her attitude by kind words, gentle persuasion, and reasoning with her. If this is not helpful, he should sleep apart from her, trying to awaken her agreeable feminine nature so that serenity may be restored, and she may respond to him in a harmonious fashion. If this approach fails, it is permissible for him to beat her lightly with his hands, avoiding her face and other sensitive parts.”
When the East African nation of Chad tried to institute a new family law that would outlaw wife-beating in spring 2005, Muslim clerics led resistance to the measure as un-Islamic.\textsuperscript{14}

Muslim men bring this religiously sanctioned violence with them when they immigrate to the West, even to the United States. The prominent American Muslim leader Dr. Muzammil H. Siddiqi, former president of the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), has said that “in some cases a husband may use some light disciplinary action in order to correct the moral infraction of his wife. . . . The Koran is very clear on this issue.”\textsuperscript{15}

**Polygamy**

The Qur’an tells men that they may have four wives, as well as sex slaves (“what your right hands own”): “If you fear that you will not act justly towards the orphans, marry such women as seem good to you, two, three, four; but if you fear you will not be equitable, then only one, or what your right hands own; so it is likelier you will not be partial” (4:3). Women possess no such privileges. Instead, they are reduced to the status of commodities by the dehumanizing practice of polygamy.
Polygamy is legal in the great majority of Islamic countries, and it is creeping into Western nations as well. *The New York Times* reported in 2007 that “Immigration to New York and other American cities has soared from places where polygamy is lawful and widespread, especially from West African countries like Mali, where demographic surveys show that 43 percent of women are in polygamous marriages.” And these immigrants are bringing polygamy—which has long been outlawed in the United States—along with them.

*The Jerusalem Post* reported in July 2005 on the importation of polygamy into Europe and the United States along with mass immigration from Islamic countries. “Interestingly,” the *Post* noted, “Europe, while welcoming the reform of the Family Law in Morocco that made polygamy almost impossible, and pressuring Turkey to put an end to the practice (the country’s ban on polygamy is commonly overridden), is at the same time turning a blind eye to the existence of the practice within its own borders.” Thus, the report continued, “Immigrants from Mali, Egypt, Mauritania, Pakistan and other countries who come to live in Europe often bring along their extended families, which may contain two, three and even four wives, and all of their offspring.”
Mufti Barkatullah, a senior imam in London, stated in 2004 that there were as many as four thousand polygamous families in Great Britain. Dr. Ghayasuddin Siddiqui, of the Muslim Parliament in Britain, gave a lower estimate but still suggested that the practice was widespread: “I’ve come across one man who has five wives and I would estimate that there are 2,000 men in polygamous marriages in Britain. Of those, 1,000 have multiple wives based here and the other 1,000 have one here and others in different countries.” By late 2004, the British government, pondering whether or not to accept what seemed to be inevitable, was even considering legalizing polygamy for tax purposes.  

Non-Muslims

Unlike modern-day Judaism and Christianity, Islam has no real tolerance for other religions. In Islamic states, Muslims enjoy a privileged status while denying basic rights to non-Muslims precisely because they are not adherents of the Islamic faith. This apartheid is rooted in the Qur’an, which commands Muslims—in so many words—to make war against non-Muslims, primarily Jews and Christians, “until they pay the tribute [jizya] out of hand and have been humbled” (9:29).
Dhimmis and the jizya

The Qur’an refers to Jews and Christians as “People of the Book.” Islamic law calls them dhimmis, which means “protected” or “guilty” people—the Arabic word suggests both. They are “protected” because, as People of the Book, they have received genuine revelations (“the Book”) from Allah and thus differ in status from out-and-out pagans and idolaters like Hindus and Buddhists. (Historically, the latter two groups have been treated even worse by Islamic conquerors, although as a practical matter their Muslim masters ultimately awarded them dhimmi status.) The People of the Book are “guilty” because they have not only rejected Muhammad as a prophet but distorted the legitimate revelations they received from Allah.

Because of this guilt, Islamic law dictates that Jews and Christians may live in Islamic states, but not as equals of Muslims. One Muslim jurist explained that the caliph must “make jihad against those who resist Islam after having been called to it until they submit or accept to live as a protected dhimmi-community—so that Allah’s rights, may He be exalted, ‘be made uppermost above all [other] religion’ (Qur’an 9:33).”19 While Jews, Christians,
and other non-Muslims are allowed to practice their religions, they must do so under severely restrictive conditions that remind them of their second-class status at every turn.

This second-class status was, according to Islamic tradition, first articulated by Umar ibn al-Khattab, who was caliph from 634 to 644. According to the Qur’anic commentary of Ibn Kathir, the Christians made a pact with Umar, pledging: “We made a condition on ourselves that we will neither erect in our areas a monastery, church, or a sanctuary for a monk, nor restore any place of worship that needs restoration nor use any of them for the purpose of enmity against Muslims.” This, of course, allowed Islamic authorities to seize churches whenever they wanted. Since testimony of Christians was discounted, and in many cases disallowed, it was often enough for a Muslim just to charge that a church was being used to foment “enmity against Muslims,” and then it could be appropriated.

The Pact of Umar is not a historical document, but was written centuries after the fact. Yet many of its provisions are echoed in Islamic law and are still part of Sharia today. “The subject peoples,” according to a contemporary manual of Islamic law, must
“pay the non-Muslim poll tax (jizya)” and “are distinguished from Muslims in dress, wearing a wide cloth belt (zunnar); are not greeted with ‘as-Salamu alaykum’ [the traditional Muslim greeting, ‘Peace be with you’]; must keep to the side of the street; may not build higher than or as high as the Muslims’ buildings, though if they acquire a tall house, it is not razed; are forbidden to openly display wine or pork . . . recite the Torah or Evangel aloud, or make public display of their funerals or feastdays; and are forbidden to build new churches.” If they violate these terms, the law further stipulates that they may be killed or sold into slavery at the discretion of the Muslim leader. Dhimmis were also strictly forbidden, on pain of death, to proselytize among Muslims—a prohibition accompanied by a similar death sentence for Muslims who left Islam. Both of these, along with the other provisions of dhimmitude, remain part of Islamic law today.

These are the laws that largely governed the relations between Muslims and non-Muslims in Islamic states for centuries, until Western pressure brought to bear on the weakened Ottoman Empire in the mid-nineteenth century led to the emancipation of the dhimmis. Here and there, the laws were relaxed or ignored for various periods, but they al-
ways remained on the books, ready to be enforced again by any ruler with the will to do so.

Is dhimmitude a relic of the past? It would be, except for the determination of the most dynamic forces in the Muslim world, most importantly the Muslim Brotherhood, to restore it. Christians in the Middle East have been under pressure from Muslims for decades, so that in the region of Palestine, for example, the Christian population has declined by 70 percent over the last one hundred years. In Iraq, half of the nation’s prewar 700,000 Christians have now fled the country since the fall of Saddam Hussein. A onetime Iraqi liquor store owner now living in Syria lamented that “at least 75% of my Christian friends have fled. There is no future for us in Iraq.”

That is true of Christians in many Muslim countries. In 2012, Christians in Sudan faced an escalating series of attacks from Muslims. In April, a Muslim mob used clubs, iron rods, fire, and a bulldozer to destroy a church and a Bible school in Khartoum, after a Muslim cleric, Muhammad Abdel Kareem, told a crowd of Muslims, “Tomorrow at 8 a.m., Muslims in this area must gather in front of the infidels’ church and destroy them.” As they demolished the
church and school, beat staffers, and burned Bibles they found inside, the Muslims shouted “Allahu akbar” and “No more Christianity from today on—no more church from today on.”

This violence is increasingly accompanied by demands for the jizya, the poll tax mandated for the “People of the Book” in the Qur’an. The jizya constitutes a key element of the Muslim community’s sustenance, as the caliph Umar (634–644) said when he instructed the Muslims: “I advise you to fulfill Allah’s Dhimma (financial obligation made with the Dhimmi) as it is the Dhimma of your Prophet and the source of the livelihood of your dependents (i.e. the taxes from the Dhimmi).”

In March 2007, Muslim gangs knocked on doors in Christian neighborhoods in Baghdad, demanding payment of the jizya. Yassir al-Burhami, a leader of the Salafists, an Egyptian movement of rigorist Muslims, reiterated some of the classic Islamic laws regarding the dhimmis in December 2011: “Appointing infidels to positions of authority over Muslims is prohibited. Allah said: ‘Never will Allah grant the infidels a way [to triumph] over the Believers.’” (Qur’an 4:141) He also declared that the Muslims of Egypt should begin again to collect the
jizya from the Christians.

From the charter of the Islamic Resistance Movement, better known as Hamas, comes a statement of the Muslim Brotherhood’s attitude regarding tolerance: “Under the shadow of Islam, it is possible for the members of the three religions: Islam, Christianity and Judaism to coexist in safety and security. Safety and security can only prevail under the shadow of Islam, and recent and ancient history is the best witness to that effect. . . . Islam accords his rights to everyone who has rights and averts aggression against the rights of others.” Hamas doesn’t spell out the deprivation of rights entailed by living “under the shadow of Islam,” but the absence of Jews and the deplorable state of Christians in the Gaza Strip, which Hamas controls, leaves little doubt about where this is leading. Gaza represents the golden age that today’s jihadists and Islamic supremacists want to restore.

Jews

While Christians suffer under Islamic rule, a special animus is reserved for Jews. This originates with the prophet Muhammad, who said that the end
times will not come until Muslims murder Jews “wherever they find them” (Sahih Muslim 6985). Under Islam, Jews must be deprived of rights and subjugated to Muslims until the end of days, when they will be massacred.

In January 2009, the most popular Islamic preacher in the world, Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradhawi, said on al-Jazeera, “Throughout history, Allah has imposed upon the [Jews] people who would punish them for their corruption. The last punishment was carried out by Hitler. By means of all the things he did to them—even though they exaggerated this issue—he managed to put them in their place. This was divine punishment for them. Allah willing, the next time will be at the hand of the believers.”

Al-Qaradawi continued: “I’d like to say that the only thing I hope for is that as my life approaches its end, Allah will give me an opportunity to go to the land of Jihad and resistance, even if in a wheelchair. I will shoot Allah’s enemies, the Jews, and they will throw a bomb at me, and thus, I will seal my life with martyrdom.”

The popular Saudi Sheikh Muhammad Saleh al-Munajjid, whose sermons circulate widely in the
Islamic world, vividly enunciated the Islamic apartheid mentality when he preached that “the Jews are defiled creatures and satanic scum. The Jews are the helpers of Satan. The Jews are the cause of the misery of the human race, together with the infidels and the other polytheists. Satan leads them to Hell and to a miserable fate. The Jews are our enemies and hatred of them is in our hearts. . . . Jihad against them is our worship.” According to the sheikh, Muslims should therefore “educate their children to Jihad. This is the greatest benefit of the situation: educating the children to Jihad and to hatred of the Jews, the Christians, and the infidels; educating the children to Jihad and to revival of the embers of Jihad in their souls. This is what is needed now.”

Jew-hatred in the Islamic world is even more virulent than South African apartheid, which did not call for the destruction of its victims, only their separate and second-class status. Dawud Walid, leader of the Michigan chapter of the Hamas-linked Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), recently wrote that Jews have incurred Allah’s wrath, and that the prophet Muhammad was “correct” to have massacred them.
Gays

“God is very straightforward about this—not we Muslims, not subjective, the Sharia is very clear about it, the punishment for homosexuality, bestiality or anything like that is death. We don’t make any excuses about that, it’s not our law—it’s the Koran.”

So spoke Sheikh Khalid Yasin in 2005. Yasin is an American-born, England-based Islamic preacher who is in great demand all over the United States as a speaker on Islamic issues. His speaking tours are sponsored by the Muslim Students Association. Despite the controversy generated by these views, Yasin continues to be an important figure on the Muslim Students Association’s lecture circuit. Rather than repudiate Yasin’s views, Muslim groups that profess moderation have only sought to limit the publicity surrounding his speaking engagements, so as to head off negative criticism. For example, a lecture by Yasin in May 2008 at Sinclair Community College in Dayton, Ohio, sponsored by Dayton’s Masjid at-Taqwa, brought public attention to his views on gays and other issues; so later that month, the Islamic Society of Greater Columbus, Ohio—a chapter of the Islamic Society of North America, a
Brotherhood front—waited until the day of his first appearance in the Columbus area to announce that Yasin would be speaking at four local mosques.\textsuperscript{32}

If Muslim Students Association members were to turn to the words of popular Islamic preachers and scholars, they would find only confirmation of Yasin’s death sentence on gays. In “Homosexuality Is a Major Sin,” Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradhawi agrees, saying that homosexuals should be executed. “While such punishments may seem cruel,” he explains, “they have been suggested to maintain the purity of the Islamic society and to keep it clean of perverted elements.”\textsuperscript{33} Another Islamic scholar, Muhammad Saleh al-Munajjid, in “Homosexuality and Lesbianism: Sexual Perversions,” quotes the prophet Muhammad himself: “Whoever you find committing the sin of the people of Lut [that is, Lot, the biblical prophet who fled Sodom and Gomorrah], kill them, both the one who does it and the one to whom it is done.” Al-Munajjid adds, “That is, if it is done with consent.”\textsuperscript{34}

The Qur’an characterizes those who “practice your lusts on men in preference to women” as “transgressing beyond bounds” (7:81).\textsuperscript{35} A contemporary Muslim writer, Shaykh Abdul-Azeez al-Fawzaan,
called homosexuality “one of the most sinful acts known to humankind” and said that it was “evidence of perverted instincts, total collapse of shame and honor, and extreme filthiness of character and soul.”\textsuperscript{36}

Islamic legal views on punishment for homosexuality vary. Among the Sunni schools of Islamic jurisprudence, the Hanafi school mandates a severe beating for the first offense, and the death penalty for a repeat offender. The Shafi‘i school calls for a hundred lashes for an unmarried homosexual, death by stoning for a married one. The Hanbali school requires stoning across the board.

Islamic scholars who endorse the death penalty differ on how homosexuals should be executed. In another exposition of Islamic teaching on these issues, “Death Fall as Punishment for Homosexuality,” Sheikh Abdel Khaliq Hasan ash-Shareef states, “Some scholars hold the opinion that the homosexual should be thrown from a high building as a punishment for his crime, but other scholars maintain that he should be imprisoned until death.” He adds that “if the man survives the death fall, the judge has the right to sentence him to death.”\textsuperscript{37}
The most famous incident involving Islam’s attitude toward homosexuals occurred at Columbia University in September 2007, when the Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad declared, “We don’t have homosexuals like in your country. We don’t have that in our country.” If Ahmadinejad’s claim had any truth, it was because his regime and its predecessors had killed them all, or had tried to do so. The Islamic Penal Law Against Homosexuals in Iran calls for the death penalty for sodomy, and one hundred lashes for lesbianism for the first three offenses, with death for the fourth offense.

On July 19, 2005, two teenage boys, Mahmoud Asgari, 14, and Ayaz Marhoni, 16, were hanged in a particularly brutal manner in Iran for the crime of homosexual activity—although Iranian officials insisted that the death sentence was for the rape of a third boy. But Asgari and Marhoni were not alone. The Iranian gay and lesbian rights group Homan estimates that the Iranian government has put to death four thousand homosexuals since 1980. According to Scott Long, director of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Rights Program at Human Rights Watch, Iranians who are suspected of being gay commonly face torture. Hossein Alizadeh of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Com-
mission said that Iranian gays live with “constant fear of execution and persecution and also social stigma associated with homosexuality.”

Homosexuality is a capital offense not only in Iran, but also in Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Yemen, and Mauritania. In Malaysia, it can draw a twenty-year prison sentence. It is illegal also in Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bosnia, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Somalia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, and elsewhere. In 2003, the Islamic bloc at the UN killed a resolution on human rights for homosexuals by introducing a series of amendments removing all reference to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

Disapproving of homosexuality and considering it sinful is one thing; appointing oneself the executor of what one assumes to be the divine wrath is quite another. Everyone, Muslim and non-Muslim, regardless of his views on homosexuality, should stand against this religiously sanctioned brutalization and killing.
Human Rights Abuse

The de facto Islamic apartheid perpetrated against women, non-Muslims, and gays in the Muslim world constitutes a massive human rights abuse, which for the most part has been ignored by international human rights organizations. Their general indifference to the plight of victimized groups in Muslim countries is a disgrace, and an indictment of all their “human rights” work.

The human cost of institutionalized oppression under Sharia continues to mount, even as the West grows every day more reluctant to offend Muslims by criticizing Islam’s apartheid practices and other abuses sanctioned by Islamic law. This indifference to suffering is an international scandal. It is time for all free people to stand up for the rights of women, gays, and people of all religions in the Muslim world. They deserve better.
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