TRANSCRIPT

A BAN SHARIA WEEKLY WEBINAR SERIES

Sharia's Taqiyya
and Fraudulent Oath-taking

Wednesday, July 15, 2026

https://bansharia.com/webinar-sharias-taqiyya-and-fraudulent-oath-taking/

Media File: Webinar_Takiyya.mp4

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

[00:00:00] **Frank Gaffney:** Welcome to this very special program in the webinar series sponsored by our BanSharia.com coalition. We are putting forward the most important issues that we believe Americans need to understand about Sharia, the political, military, legal strategy for conquest, as well as doctrine and ideology and agenda of authoritative Islam.

[00:00:46] It is derived, it appears, not so much from the Quran, though that is clearly a source, but also from the life, the teachings, the sayings, the admonitions, the [00:01:00] proscriptions of the so-called perfect man, Muhammad. One of his very well-honed practices and teachings and requirements of his followers is that they lie.

[00:01:20] They engage in what is known, using an Arabic term, as taqiyya. To advance the faith, it is not simply condoned that one deceives, dissembles, lies, but it is actually obligatory. And the implications of that in Western societies, notably, but not exclusively, the United States of America, is hard to overstate.

[00:01:54] We have, in short, people who [00:02:00] are commanded by their program, Sharia, to lie, raising their right hand and placing their left sometimes on the Bible, increasingly often on the Quran, a book that as we will hear tells them they must lie to infidels. And they nonetheless proceed to repeat the words to the effect of, some offices have slightly different formulations at the state level, the local level, the federal level.

[00:02:47] But they all have essentially the same common denominator, that the oath taker will swear to God [00:03:00] freely and without any [00:03:06] prevarication that they will faithfully support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

[00:03:19] What are the implications if they are lying in so doing? If instead they are committed not to supporting and defending the Constitution, but replacing it,

overthrowing it, and the government based upon it, in the furtherance of their commitment to Allah and the triumph of his Sharia worldwide?

Well, that is the subject we will be exploring today with several of our most important [00:04:00] contributors to the BanSharia.com project, as well as to the cause of freedom more generally here in the United States and around the world.

[00:04:14] We're going to begin, as we often do, with a man who is absolutely unsurpassed in terms of his command of the teachings, the doctrine, the practice of Sharia. His name is Robert Spencer. He is arguably one of, if not the foremost scholar of Islam outside of the Muslim faith.

He is the author of something on the order of, I believe, thirty-four different books, most of them touching on or being very directly [00:05:00] related to Islam, Sharia, jihad, the Prophet Muhammad. And what we turn to him with great regularity to do is to help set the ground, level set, if you will, the nature of these ideas, these practices like taqiyya, and what it does require of adherents to Sharia.

[00:05:38] Let's go via video to Robert Spencer's opening comments for this very important conversation about taqiyya and fraudulent oath-taking.

[00:05:51] **Robert Spencer:** The idea of having Muslim congressmen and senators and Muslims swearing in on the Quran [00:06:00] ignores the actual contents of the Quran and basic tenets of the Islamic faith, notably the concept that has become quite well known in the United States since 9/11 of taqiyya, which is specifically a Shiite concept, but in the broader sense, religious deception that is sanctioned by the Quran itself and is consequently something that all Muslims, Sunni and Shia, will adhere to.

[00:06:28] This is *Towards Understanding the Quran*, which is an abridgment of *Tafhim al-Quran*, a commentary on the Quran by Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi, who was a Pakistani Islamic scholar who died in 1979, and his works are internationally influential and revered today.

For example, they are so revered that recently in Bangladesh, a man was beaten and arrested [00:07:00] for burning, not the Quran, but a copy of *Tafhim al-Quran*. That's how much respect *Tafhim al-Quran* is held in in many areas of the Islamic world.

[00:07:07] And when we turn to, in this book, chapter 3, verse 28 of the Quran, we read in the Quran passage: "The believers may not take unbelievers for their allies in preference to the believers. Whoever does this has nothing to do with Allah, unless he does so in order to protect himself from their wrongdoing."

[00:07:41] Maududi adds a note to that, and this is his note: "This means that it is lawful for a believer, helpless in the grip of the enemies of Islam and in imminent danger of

severe wrong and persecution, to keep his faith concealed and to [00:08:00] behave in such a way as to create the impression that he is on the same side as his enemies."

[00:08:09] A person whose Muslim identity is discovered is permitted to adopt a friendly attitude toward the unbelievers. Note that that's a matter of permission in extreme circumstances and not an ordinary situation. In order to save his life, if he considers himself incapable of enduring the excess to which he may be subjected, he may even state that he is not a believer.

[00:08:36] Now, that passage, that explanation from Maududi, this revered figure in Islamic scholarship, clearly states that there are circumstances in which a Muslim may pretend to be on the side of his enemies. Now, you might object at this point that Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib and Zohran Mamdani, the mayor of [00:09:00] New York, and others, they're not in any danger for their lives.

[00:09:03] They're not in extreme circumstances, and this passage is clearly only envisioning a circumstance in which a Muslim lies to the unbelievers in order to save his life. However, it must also be understood that there is a state of perpetual war in the eyes of many Muslims and in the teachings of the Quran and Sunnah between Muslims and non-Muslims, and that in those circumstances, there is a tradition attributed to Muhammad in which he said, "War is deceit," and another in which he allows for lying between a husband and a wife.

[00:09:44] A husband can lie to his wife in order to calm her down in some difficult circumstances and in wartime. So the Quran is, according to Maududi, envisioning deception of the unbelievers [00:10:00] in extreme circumstances of war, and Muhammad is permitting lying in extreme circumstances of war. And the Quran also says, "Fight them until persecution is no more and religion is all for Allah," chapter 8, verse 39.

[00:10:17] So if you're going to fight them until persecution is no more, you're defending yourself. But if you're going to keep on fighting the unbelievers until religion is all for Allah, then you're going to be fighting in an offensive capacity. Consequently, there is a perpetual state of war between the Muslims and the non-Muslims.

[00:10:37] Sometimes it's a hot war, sometimes it's carried out by means of infiltration, subversion, and other stealth methods. But in any case, the deception is a tool of war. As Muhammad very clearly stated, war is deceit.

And so when we have these [00:11:00] representatives and other Muslim politicians holding office in the United States, we have to ask ourselves whether they are doing the same thing when they take the oath of office that politicians from a Christian background, whether or not they're believers, or other politicians are doing.

[00:11:21] They're swearing to uphold the Constitution, and yet they adhere to a system that considers its laws to be political as well as superior to the Constitution. And so they also hold to this religion that allows them to deceive in order to further the aims of this group.

Consequently, it would seem as if when they take the oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution, we really have to ask ourselves whether that can be trusted.

[00:11:58] And people will say, "Oh, this is [00:12:00] terrible, racism and Islamophobia." Is it really when the Quran actually says that you do not take the unbelievers as allies unless you're doing it to protect yourself from their wrongdoing? And when one of the foremost Islamic scholars of the twentieth century explains that this means that under certain circumstances you pretend to be on the side of your enemies.

[00:12:24] Really, the willful ignorance about Islam and the assumption that it's a religion of peace that's been hijacked by a tiny minority of extremists, and that the moderates are going to come and save the day and turn back their extremist brethren, these are comforting myths, but that's all they are, is myths.

[00:12:43] If they were remotely true, we would see by this time, twenty-five years after 9/11, massive, huge movements within the Islamic world to teach against the understanding of Islam that Al-Qaeda and ISIS and the rest manifest. [00:13:00] We would see Muslims who attack Al-Qaeda and ISIS and the rest of them and claim to be against the Muslim Brotherhood and against CAIR, we would see them having massive followings within the United States instead of the minuscule followings among Muslims that they actually have.

[00:13:20] It's time that we become realistic about what Islamic teaching really is and what its implications are for American society, and we are far, far from doing that at this point. Thank you.

[00:13:35] **Frank Gaffney:** Robert Spencer, as always, thank you. This is an incredibly important contribution to this conversation. You're citing from the Quran, you're citing from one of its most important scholars, Maududi. You're talking about the practice of Islam over 1,400 years. [00:14:00] And you're making absolutely clear that we are in fact at war, not because the Western world or Judeo-Christian civilization seeks it, but because that is the nature of Islam.

The house of Islam versus the house of war, as it's known, is very much the state in which we find ourselves. The aspiration for conquest of the Western world is abundantly evident, and the use of lying and deception, deceit is war, is all around us. It's just a matter of being willing to see it, to understand it, and to respond appropriately.

[00:14:50] Karen Siegemund is the next woman up then. Karen, usually we have you [00:15:00] clean up batting. We have had some adjustments in the lineup, so we're going to ask you to speak to all of this, and we will have a conversation about it after you conclude.

Welcome. Let me just say by way of introduction, you of course have contributed to each of these webinars, so I think you really don't need one. But the work that you do at the American Freedom Alliance is simply incalculably important.

[00:15:19] You have, for a decade and a half, I think now, been in the forefront really of helping the rest of us understand the various threats we face from totalitarians of different stripes. You have been particularly, I think, seized with, as we all need to be, the green part of the so-called red-green, or if you will, red-green-blue, if you throw in the globalists' axis.

[00:15:56] And in the course of programs [00:16:00] that you've been conducting at AFA, both in Los Angeles and elsewhere across the country, you have helped, well, lift up and call attention to those who are, like you, freedom fighters, challenging and trying to prevent the success of those who would destroy our beloved country.

[00:16:27] I'm proud to call you a friend as well as a frequent collaborator, including in these briefings, and I'm very grateful to you for stepping up and telling us a little bit about your perceptions of the implications of people lying when they take an oath to support and defend the Constitution, and by so doing, obtain not just the privilege of representing some constituency, [00:17:00] but of wielding power, ostensibly to the benefit of those constituents, but not so much if they are pursuing instead the agenda of destroying the Constitution and the Republic founded upon it, and the freedoms that those constituents hold dear.

Over to you, ma'am.

[00:17:23] **Karen Siegemund:** Thanks so much. And it's always an honor to be part of this, and back at you, Frank, for dedication and commitment to freedom fighting, especially in the face of this and other threats, the red, green, blue, of course.

[00:17:37] Yeah, AFA was founded with one of the main purposes of combating the threat of Islam throughout the West. So I am from a long line of this. And interestingly, the first event that I hosted with AFA in 2016 was *Islam and Western Civilization: Can They Coexist?* We had an incredible lineup of speakers, [00:18:00] including you and many of the big names, many who are on this series. We had Robert Spencer as well, many people involved in this.

And to the point, that got us immediately on the SPLC hate list because thou shalt not speak against Islam for whatever reason. There's a whole panoply of reasons. But

anytime one warns against threats to the United States, to the West, to Judeo-Christian principles, that's a flag to the SPLC that they must come after us because they are really on the side of those who hate us.

[00:18:39] So it's an extraordinary thing for the organization, SPLC, that sets itself up as defending against fascism and totalitarianism and various threats, hate groups, I guess, in a nutshell, that they themselves have been one [00:19:00] of the worst hate groups, and we were very honored to be on their list for the work that we do.

[00:19:06] The whole notion of taqiyya is particularly fascinating, just that inherent in the ideology is the notion that lying is okay. As you point out and is part of my refrain, conquest is the thing, and anything that serves the purpose of conquest is not only okay, but a requirement, a mandate.

[00:19:33] And while, as Robert Spencer pointed out, the language of it is, you know, you're allowed to lie in the face of losing your life or if you're under threat. But the bigger picture, much writ large, as he also pointed out, is that if you consider that you're always in a state of war, Muslims are always in a state of war against the rest of the world in order to conquer us.

[00:19:58] In a state of war, these [00:20:00] things are, again, permissible because all things are permissible for conquest. So things like taqiyya, which is deception, dissimulation, lies, concealment, any of those things is perfectly fine.

It's hard to wrap our minds around this. We, coming from a Judeo-Christian heritage and background where the truth shall set you free, where truth is a major biblical value in the Old and New Testaments, those are the cornerstones of how we operate.

[00:20:36] They form such a fundamental underpinning for the social contract that we live under that it's hard for us to fathom that the opposite is true among those who want to destroy us. But this is one reason they do seek, and again, you mentioned the red and green, why the left together with the green, [00:21:00] Islam, seeks to take down our biblical underpinnings because it's one of the major bulwarks against them.

[00:21:09] When you believe that the truth is important, it's hard to fathom other people see it differently. But we absolutely must be aware of this. So that's a key element, just the biblical versus Quranic view of the world and the truth versus dissimulation. It's why Judeo-Christianity must be destroyed.

[00:21:33] It's also, I find it fascinating when you read about if you go to Google or you go to your favorite search engine or AI platform and ask it about taqiyya, it will just say, you know, it's only under threat and it's not normally okay. But may I point out the meta-ness of that, because that in itself is taqiyya.

[00:21:58] Taqiyya says it's [00:22:00] okay to lie about what taqiyya is, and there we are. So as people are not aware that jihad, in fact, means war and conquest, it's not just an internal struggle. Islam is fraught with misrepresentations and lies because we cannot forget conquest is the thing.

Now, you mentioned about one's oath. The oath of office is supposed to be to uphold the Constitution, but part of the language is "without purpose of evasion." If you're a Muslim, and whether your hand is on the Bible or the Quran, you are taking it with purpose of evasion. If you're taking it on the Quran, it's even worse.

[00:22:49] But a really important part about all of this, the taqiyya aspect, yes, but Muslims in office who again are [00:23:00] dissimulating, they have access to our most sensitive information. It's not just about representation. It is about literally having the enemy in the camp being entitled to and acting on our most sensitive national-security information.

[00:23:19] So to have the other side on our national-security team is so fraught with danger, it doesn't even bear wrapping one's mind around. They don't undergo security checks. And again, they would lie. So the better the Muslim, the more deceptive they will be. The more adherent they will be to conquest.

The less they will take their oath to the Constitution as anything important. Seeking to undermine and destroy us and conquer us is key. The United States is the great Satan. We have to be taken down, [00:24:00] and to do that however one can is advocated for, and of course, getting into our governance is one of the scariest of all.

[00:24:12] So taqiyya just is part of the march, part of the conquest, is something we absolutely have to pay close attention to, but also in the bigger picture, recognize it as a tactic of dissembling, of dissimulation, and of conquest.

So it's deeply terrifying, especially when people are not sufficiently aware of this conquest tactic. It's a military tactic, it's an ideological tactic, and at any level where it's used, it is used in order to take us down.

So another great topic for this important series, Frank. Thank you.

[00:24:59] **Frank Gaffney:** [00:25:00] It's just central to what the founders of our republic had in mind when they stipulated that people, starting with the President of the United States, had to take a formal oath before God to the Constitution.

[00:25:14] Yeah. To protect and defend it, and to assure that enemies foreign and domestic would not be permitted to undermine it, supplant it, destroy it. They, after all, many of them, actually put their lives on the line to give this country the opportunity to have a Constitution with the freedoms that it guarantees, and those from God, by the way, but that it nonetheless guarantees.

[00:25:44] And so Karen, it's kind of hard, as I said, to overstate what a threat this [00:26:00] represents to the entire American experiment, that we would be indulging with this notion that, well, somehow it doesn't really matter that people take this oath with purpose of evasion or in any other way. Their fingers crossed, you know, they didn't pinky swear. Whatever you want to call it, it is somehow not central to the idea of public service.

[00:26:22] And by the way, we haven't touched on this, but it's not just, of course, office holders, it's also other government employees. It's military personnel. And this goes all the way down the food chain, if you will, from federal to the most local of [00:27:00] entities that are responsible for public service.

If none of this matters, if we don't actually care whether you are committed to our republic and its constitutional underpinnings, surely we're not long for this world as a constitutional republic. Are we, Karen?

[00:27:29] **Karen Siegemund:** The way that you frame this is deeply disturbing. We have to care. And as the founders knew and said, without moral biblical values as an underpinning of this great experiment of the Constitution, it's not going to work.

[00:27:46] To a certain degree, that even comes down to, when we say there's no difference, the truth versus your truth, my truth, whatever. This whole notion of getting away [00:28:00] from the value of truth, already the waters are muddied. But then when you add this layer onto it, that lying is part of your credo, it's broken, possibly beyond repair, and it has to matter.

The truth has to matter. The Constitution has to matter. Our rights being given to us from God has to matter. And of course, no such equivalence occurs in the Quran. There are no rights given by... That's just not how it works.

[00:28:26] So if your belief system is counter to the Judeo-Christian belief system, there is a mismatch here just to first order that's really problematic. If your belief system is such that ours is wrong and must be destroyed, and we give you the keys to the kingdom, [00:29:00] for whatever reason, either we don't think it's important, we don't understand the distinction, we think, you know, diversity and coexist are such happy buzzwords, and who are we to say one is better than the other?

Well, I'll tell you who we are. We're us. We are the inheritors of the greatest nation ever created on the face of the earth. And if we don't recognize that, and why it's the greatest nation, not just that it is, but why it is, and what those, I call them the load-bearing walls. The load-bearing walls of Judeo-Christian values, biblical values, you cannot throw those out and expect this experiment to still stand.

[00:29:40] We want 250 more. We cannot let people in who make decisions on our national security, or at any level, who work in it at any level, as you say, all the way down, and expect it to last. It simply won't.

We need honor, we need [00:30:00] truth to be a value that we adhere to. We need freedom. We need everything in the Bible, Judeo-Christian values. You throw that out, and you throw the whole thing out.

[00:30:15] And one of the things that we talk about, Frank, is not only do we need to warn about the specific threats, but we need to recognize what our strengths are, why they're our strengths, but also the fact that they're come after with such virulence and vehemence and violence reveals the extent to which these are so important to us.

[00:30:37] So you can tell the importance of a value or a principle to the continuation of this country by the vigor with which it's attacked by anybody, and certainly by Islam. So truth, honor, the Bible, we know how important those are by the extent to [00:31:00] which they're being rejected, and it's a terrifying, terrifying prospect.

And that's, again, the ignorance that is sown so assiduously, keeping us in the dark to these things, is part of how they win. So combating this is so important, Frank.

[00:31:19] **Frank Gaffney:** I couldn't agree more. And Karen, to just drill down a little bit further on this idea of putting people who it must be assumed, if they are in fact what they profess to be, faithful Muslims, are unable to execute faithfully their oath of office, access to highly sensitive information.

[00:31:46] You mentioned, you know, that elected officials are, I believe, as a general rule, if not essentially without exception, not subjected to [00:32:00] background checks.

[00:32:01] **Karen Siegemund:** That's right.

[00:32:02] **Frank Gaffney:** Other than what they get in the process of getting elected, which we have told ourselves is sufficient. But how many times have we learned to our surprise or horror even, that people have gotten into elective office under false pretenses?

[00:32:24] Stolen valor, for example, or having engaged in some sort of, I don't know, corporate or personal, even criminal behavior, let alone the kind that you would find disqualifying. We've been watching this thrashing going on in Maine of late with respect to the Democratic nominee for Senate.

[00:32:53] But in this case, you could even have people who have ostensibly been through a background [00:33:00] check. I'm thinking just to pick a couple of names out of recent prominent office holders in the Biden administration. Maher Bitar, who was in charge of intelligence for the National Security Council during the Biden administration.

He worked in the Obama administration as well. He worked for Adam Schiff on the Hill as well. He's been working, as I understand it, for the Democratic Party as well, again, with access, as you said, to some of the most sensitive information imaginable.

[00:33:39] And a background of having worked for the Palestinian front organization known as UNRWA, in the United Nations.

This is the kind of thing that it's almost, to use your expression, hard to get your head around. [00:34:00] The guy who's sitting on the flow of information to and from the President of the United States involving intelligence information. Man, if that's in the wrong hands, that's a serious problem indeed.

[00:34:17] Ariane Tabatabai, a woman who was widely suspected of being an asset of the Iranian government, had positions in the Defense Department, in the office of the Secretary of Defense, very sensitive positions. I believe at the State Department as well. You know, what could possibly have gone wrong with that if that oath was faithlessly taken?

[00:34:44] And then of course, there are members of Congress, André Carson, a senior member of the Intelligence Committee for years, I think still to this day. Keith Ellison, now the Attorney General of [00:35:00] Minnesota, but for many years a member of Congress. Of course, Rashida Tlaib and Ilhan Omar.

The question has to be asked, have they freely and without purpose of evasion sworn an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States when, in fact, there's abundant evidence that their loyalties lie elsewhere, and that they are vehemently opposed to this country and seeking to take it down?

[00:35:36] I think this is a matter of record in all of those cases. I'm sure we'll get criticized for pointing that out, but it goes right to the heart of this matter. As Muslims professing to be faithful Muslims, are they engaged in taqiyya? And if [00:36:00] so, is that contributing to real vulnerabilities to our country?

[00:36:06] I see we have another guest with us. His name is John Bennett. John is, speaking of elected officials, a man who served in the Oklahoma State House of Representatives with great distinction. He had served prior to that in uniform, as I recall, as a United States Marine, seeing combat in some pretty unsavory places in which Sharia was the law, including places that, as I recall, an American official helped write a Sharia constitution for the new government.

[00:36:51] Sharia is something that John Bennett has been training Americans about since he left the [00:37:00] Oklahoma State House. He has been working very closely of late with a wonderful organization founded by Lieutenant General Mike Flynn and his sister Mary called America's Future. And both in that capacity and others, he has, I

think, done an immensely important service by helping teach political leaders, law-enforcement personnel, military intelligence personnel, community leaders, and members about what Sharia entails.

[00:37:39] And we couldn't be more pleased to have him here to address this topic with us of taqiyya and the extent to which it can create this phenomenon of fraudulent oath-taking.

John Bennett, thank you [00:38:00] so much for finding a few minutes with us. Welcome. Floor is yours, sir.

[00:38:03] **John Bennett:** Thank you for having me on. Thank you for being a patriot. And Dr. Karen, thank you for being a patriot as well. We appreciate everything you do.

So it's a very important topic, and thank you guys for being engaged in it and trying to alert people to it all the way up and down, from the citizens all the way up to the highest offices in the land.

[00:38:23] Educating people is a very important step because most have no idea what Sharia is. We have allowed the enemy that is practicing Sharia to tell us what Sharia is, and because of that, we weren't able to formulate a counteraction plan. They even counter, through the media and other places, the truth when we speak the truth about what Sharia truly is.

[00:38:44] So it's been quite a battle. But as you were saying, Frank, and you're absolutely right, we don't know. It's hard to combat an enemy that you don't know if they're telling the truth or telling a lie, especially when their core doctrine, that is supported and [00:39:00] commanded by a deity, commands them to lie to promote Islam and to push Islam on the earth.

[00:39:07] As a matter of fact, Islam itself says its goal is to impose Allah's divine law, which is Sharia law, on every person on earth, and the goal to do that is through jihad, which is literally and legally defined in Islamic law as warfare against all non-Muslims.

So it's very important that we take the first step and understand correctly what is their doctrine, what is taqiyya, how do they use it, what is deception that they use, and why do they do it, how do they do it, and then understand that we can connect these dots and see the big picture, and then be able to formulate a counteraction plan to stop them from what they're doing.

[00:39:47] So it's very important what you're doing, Frank, as well as you, Dr. Karen. Thank you guys so much.

And once the citizens, law enforcement, those that have taken an oath [00:40:00] realize what it is, and then realize that they have a duty and an obligation, and they

have a moral responsibility to push back, call it out for what it is, and stop Sharia from imposing itself over our laws and our U.S. Constitution. Until we get to that point, we're not going to be able to stop it.

And if we don't stop it, we're going to wind up just like they are in Europe today. And in my personal assessment, in everything going on that we see today, Europe is on its knees and they have a knife to their throat, and I'm not sure they can come back from it, and they've been trying to warn us for years.

[00:40:37] And typically, here in the United States, whether it's arts, language, clothes, I mean, you name it, everything starts in Europe, and a couple years later it makes its way to the United States.

I don't think we have that long here in the United States because the Muslim Brotherhood, the Islamic movement, has been here at least [00:41:00] since 1963, and they are well-funded. They have doctrine, they have strategy and written plans to execute that strategy, and we're getting our butts kicked because we're not even on the same battlefield.

But they all say they want Sharia, all of them. No matter what movement it is, no matter what sect of Islam it is, Shia, Sunni, they all say the same thing: "We want Sharia."

[00:41:21] So Frank, thank you guys in Texas. Thank you for your organization, for alerting people to this and taking a stand.

[00:41:27] **Frank Gaffney:** John, thank you so much. If we can just enlist your further thoughts on this subject, John. You have both military experience and experience in elective office.

One of the issues that we're talking about beyond this practice of taqiyya is the implication that there is a complete incompatibility between it and serving, with an oath being required for that service, to a very different program than [00:42:00] Sharia.

[00:42:01] What are your thoughts, sir, about the fact that we not only have people running for office who are making no secret of their attachment to their Muslim practice of Sharia on the one hand, and yet who are going to claim that they can faithfully take this oath of office. Zohran Mamdani comes to mind as a particularly prominent example of this syndrome at the moment.

[00:42:30] And whether, beyond just the inherent problem that that represents, this idea that once they're in office and have, as Karen was pointing out, among other things, access to very sensitive information, the ability to exercise power and control over the rest of us, and possibly do material harm to the country in the process, they should continue to be allowed to [00:43:00] serve with a proper understanding of this conflict.

[00:43:04] **John Bennett:** They shouldn't be allowed to serve at all if they subscribe to anything that is anti-constitutional, and that's exactly what Sharia is. I mean, it doesn't take a genius to pick up a book and read it.

Reliance of the Traveler is Sharia law written in English, and a lot of people say, "Well, that's not a good translation." Well, Al-Azhar University, who train scholars in Egypt on Sharia law, they have verified that this Reliance of the Traveler, this English version, is the most accurate translation to the Arabic original. Not to mention 80% of the Islamic world, they only speak English and read English, so this book was written for them to understand.

[00:43:49] So you could pick up a Reliance of the Traveler, read it, and literally see in black and white what they're commanded, and their doctrine commanded by Allah, which is a complete [00:44:00] way of life.

It's not a religion. They just use a deity to advance their agenda, and they do it in America very well because we think that we have to give them First Amendment rights, which we don't, because Sharia clearly violates our U.S. Constitution, including the First Amendment.

[00:44:13] In Islam, if you don't submit to Allah, if you don't convert to Islam, if you're a Christian, a Jew, or a Zoroastrian, you have to submit to Islam, convert to Islam, die, or you get a third option, which others don't, and that is to pay the jizya or poll tax. It's a slave tax, and you can live as a subservient slave to Islam, but you don't have to convert to Islam.

[00:44:33] So they say, "Well, you've got a choice, so it's not compulsory." It is. They force you to do it. And for everyone else outside of those categories, you convert or you die. Well, killing someone is against the law in the United States of America.

[00:44:54] No other so-called, quote-unquote, religion nowhere commands that you [00:45:00] convert or you die, or even become a slave. Nowhere but Islam does it, and these things are anti-constitutional and they're against our laws.

They literally will cut your hand off or cut off limbs for specific crimes in Islam. They're commanded to do this, and they're doing it in Sharia-compliant enclaves in Muslim-controlled countries. These are against the laws of the United States of America.

Treating women the way they're commanded to treat women, and treat women and little children, pedophilia is against the law in the United States of America, yet somehow we think because they claim that Sharia is a religion, that we're supposed to let them do that.

[00:45:37] Nowhere in our Constitution does it say you have a First Amendment right once whatever you're doing commits violence, acts of violence, or controls or enslaves

people, and that's exactly what Sharia does. We cannot allow this to happen, but yet we see it in America today, and they're doing it through the [00:46:00] political process. It's called civilization jihad.

[00:46:03] And Frank, you're very familiar with the largest terrorism-financing trial in United States history, the U.S. versus Holy Land Foundation trial, where their entire plan was exposed in detail. But yet we still have organizations that were identified in that trial still operating with impunity here in the United States today, and every one of them are pushing for Sharia.

[00:46:26] **Frank Gaffney:** And John, as you know, I think you're referring to this book in particular—

[00:46:30] **John Bennett:** Yes.

[00:46:31] **Frank Gaffney:** *Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal of the Group in North America.* And it very explicitly defines, as direction from one of the top Muslim Brotherhood operatives in the United States, what civilization jihad is, and it goes as follows:

"The Brotherhood must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand [00:47:00] jihad in eliminating and destroying Western civilization from within, and sabotaging its miserable house by their hands," meaning the unbelievers—

[00:47:10] **John Bennett:** Yep.

[00:47:11] **Frank Gaffney:** "And the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated, and Allah's religion is made victorious over all other religions."

[00:47:22] Now, if that is your program, if that is what you are pursuing because it is deemed to be Allah's will as described, as commanded in Sharia, you cannot be supporting Western civilization—

[00:47:36] **John Bennett:** That's right.

[00:47:37] **Frank Gaffney:** And at its core, our Constitution.

John, this is incredibly important stuff. And one other aspect of it that Karen and I were talking about before you joined us, I think, but I just would appreciate your insights as a veteran.

[00:47:56] We had the phenomenon of [00:48:00] green-on-blue violence in some of the countries in which we were operating, notably in Afghanistan, I think to some extent in Iraq as well. I believe if memory serves, you served in one or both theaters. Right.

That was a nominal ally engaged in violence against Americans, sometimes murderous violence at that. There were people who didn't take the oath to support and defend the

Constitution, but they were people who were supposedly fighting for the same purpose as our personnel were.

[00:48:57] But we do have experience with others, notably the Fort Hood shooter, for example, who did take that oath of office.

Could you speak to this question of [00:49:00] whether or not, as we're seeing ever larger numbers of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and the like in our military converting to Islam. They're making a big push. As I recall, if I'm not mistaken, John, Abdurahman Alamoudi, the man who was a key advisor to the Clinton-Gore administration for Muslim relations, engineered the use of a Muslim Brotherhood front organization to be the chaplains in not just our prisons, but also in our military.

[00:49:42] He went on to serve, I think a decade or two, in supermax prison for being an Al-Qaeda financier and a guy who was convicted of plotting to kill the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia. In other words, a very bad hombre.

Could [00:50:00] you speak to this question of whether we should be concerned that Muslims in our military, who again, not just because they're Muslim, but because they are adhering to Sharia, actually could pose a threat to our other military personnel and their mission, sir?

[00:50:20] **John Bennett:** Yes, absolutely, Frank, and you're spot on with that. Through civilization jihad, which means many, many lines of effort, many, many lines of operation, they have insinuated themselves in all aspects, all walks of life: citizens, law enforcement, churches, in our military, all walks of life. And they all are following the same exact doctrine and the same exact commands that they're commanded, to impose Allah's divine law on earth.

[00:50:49] So it doesn't matter what organization or group that they're in. If they are Muslims, and by the way, as you all know, a Muslim is not a race. It's what someone is simply called that submits to Islam, which is a complete way of life, and is governed by Sharia, which is Allah's divine law.

[00:51:14] So if a Muslim says, "Well, I don't follow all that," well, either one, they're lying due to taqiyya, as you mentioned earlier; or two, they don't know. They probably do know. Or three, they are being deceptive and lying to promote Islam and Sharia.

But they're doing it in all aspects of our government with the same goal, and that is to impose Allah's divine law on earth. And it doesn't matter where they are or what they're doing. So if they're within our own government, they need to be sought out, they need to be vetted, and they need to be pushed out if they're following this doctrine.

[00:51:43] And if they're not following the doctrine, then they are in fact not Muslims, because even Muslims, according to Allah's divine law, their own law, they're

commanded to be killed if they commit apostasy. And all the scholars in authoritative Islamic [00:52:00] schools, Shia and Sunni, all say the same thing about apostasy or leaving Islam.

[00:52:05] And one of the things that constitutes leaving Islam is not following all of it as you're commanded to. Now, you don't have to follow all of it as long as you're doing it to impose Islam, and then in that format you do it through taqiyya by lying to others when you're actually truly following it.

[00:52:23] But my point is, our own government doesn't even know how to vet these people because they don't know Sharia. It's all about Sharia, and everything that we do, investigate, look into, vet through, has to be through the lens of Sharia. And if we know that, then we can properly vet them. But until then, everyone needs to be on guard, and they cannot be insinuated, especially in very sensitive parts of our government.

[00:52:51] **Frank Gaffney:** Thank you.

Karen, I want to bring you into this too because, and again, John, you may have missed some of this, but one of the points that our colleague Robert [00:53:00] Spencer made is a larger issue here of what is the nature of the problem within Islam. And I think we'll probably dedicate a full program to this.

But just very quickly, Robert has recently authored a very important essay. I think he calls it the Islam versus Islamism split. It is an essay that appeared in a publication of the Ideological Defense Institute, and the full title of it is "The House of Islam: The Case Against the Islam-Islamism Divide."

[00:53:39] And I wonder if perhaps both of you might just respond to this proposition, which is that the challenge that we're facing is not that there is some small faction of Muslims who embrace this sort of outlier interpretation of Sharia and [00:54:00] are therefore giving rise to the kind of very dangerous dynamic we've been describing here.

But in fact, it is basically the body of Islam itself, its adherents writ large, authoritative Islam, with, yes, some perhaps outliers that don't, but they're inconsequential because they are deemed by the vast majority as apostates and therefore very much subject to, among other things, capital punishment and to be disregarded.

[00:54:35] Could you speak to these points, and how they bear on this issue of how widespread the problem of Sharia compliance and therefore adhering to this command to lie to infidels is?

[00:54:52] **Karen Siegemund:** First, let me just add to something before, which was, I myself had a top-secret security clearance, and it [00:55:00] wasn't a trivial thing to get.

And the idea of somebody working next to me, jumping through the hoops that I had to jump through every day to keep things secret and secure and protected from the enemy, to imagine that the person I was sharing an office with was the enemy, is just a stunning thing to think about.

[00:55:26] At that time during the Cold War, we knew who the enemy was. We recognized it and took steps in that direction. We need to be identically aware, cognizant, and defending ourselves against things in the exact same way.

[00:55:53] So to the point about Islam versus Islamism, I would say, okay, back to the Cold War, the Soviet Union was the enemy. Were all Russians bad? No. But I think it was a fair assumption that if the guy next to me in my [00:56:00] office was Russian, I'm not going to trust him.

If you're an adherent of Islam, if you say you're a Muslim, end of story. It's on you then, not us, but the individual to contend with the fact that, at least on the surface, you're not our friend. At least on the surface, you're waging war against us. At least on the surface, conquest is the thing.

[00:56:22] You want to renounce that? By all means, apostasy, I get that that's obviously a massive problem. The more people who do it, the more... right? Courage begets courage. We know plenty of apostates who live under all kinds of threats all the time, Nonie Darwish being one, and my favorite.

And she's the one who said, "How do you tell a religion from a cult? A cult will kill those who leave it. A religion will not." That's a very easy [00:57:00] way of, at least to first order, getting to this issue of religion being protected.

If you're going to kill those who leave, maybe we ought not grant you protection under the First Amendment. So to, about the divide, Islam, Islamism, Islamists, and all of that, are you an adherent of the Quran to any extent? Then by default, as a national-security issue, sorry, no. As by default as a national-security issue with communists, default was sorry, no.

[00:57:23] So it's just very, very clear to me. We know who's for us, we know who's against us, and that's just all there is to it. It's very clear.

[00:57:45] **John Bennett:** Very well put. I'll give you the Marine version of it. If I give you a bowl of a thousand M&Ms and tell you, "Hey, you can have all the M&Ms you want, but be careful, there's two or three of them in there that are poison," how many of them are you going to eat? None of them, and you're [00:58:00] not going to let anyone else eat out of that bowl either because you just don't know.

[00:58:04] And I would also go as far to say, and I say this with 100% confidence, just because a Muslim does not follow all of what Islam commands doesn't mean there's a

different version of Islam. There's only one version of Islam, one Allah, one Muhammad. There's only one set of commandments, and all of the scholars, the jurists, in the authoritative, universally taught, authoritative Islam all teach the exact same thing.

[00:58:41] Islam is the problem. Does a Muslim follow all of it or not? Doesn't matter. If they're a Muslim, they're saying, "I am an adherent of Islam," which means they are an adherent of Sharia, and that is antithetical to us here in [00:59:00] America, to our Constitution. And it is a very present danger and threat to our national security and homeland security, and it needs to be stopped.

[00:59:10] There have been many, many scholars and Muslims say there's no such thing as moderate Islam or radical Islam. There's only Islam. They're literally saying it in YouTube videos now. It's like they could care less. They're completely out in the open, and it 100% lines up with their doctrine, which we see in Sharia.

[00:59:34] So we've got to be careful because a lot of the times, especially in the past, we've noticed in our line of work, they try to say, "Well, these people are moderate Muslims, and these people are radicals. There's a difference. Let us help you address them."

What they're doing is dividing, confusing, and making Americans think, well, there is this rainbow-and-unicorn version of Islam, [01:00:00] when in fact there's not. And as long as they do that, Islam will always be a moving target, which it has been for decades, even within our own government, and that is why we've never, ever been able to properly address it and stop it.

[01:00:14] **Frank Gaffney:** John Bennett, thank you very much. Eminent expert on Islam and Sharia, so much so that in the aftermath of 9/11, he was the duty expert for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And his insights, his collective work, much of which informed *Sharia: The Threat to America*, is one of the reasons why we're so keen to have him with us.

[01:00:42] Steve, I know that you have a limited amount of time. Thank you for the work you do at Unconstrained Analytics. You're joining this conversation at its tail end, but your thoughts about taqiyya and fraudulent oath-taking would be most welcome at this point, sir.

[01:01:00] **Stephen C. Coughlin:** I think the thing to know about taqiyya is a lot of people think they can make a decision to lie. But if you go to a book called *The Reliance of the Traveler*, in Book R, Section 8, it has a section that specifically concerns the duty to lie.

[01:01:19] And it basically... I'll just open this conversation up by reading it to you verbatim: "When it is possible to achieve such an aim by lying, but not by telling the

truth, it is permissible to lie if attaining the goal is permissible, and obligatory to lie if the goal is obligatory."

Well, what does that mean? It means if the only way Islam can spread its word out into the world or to achieve its mission is to lie, there is the duty to lie.

[01:01:39] And what does that mean? It means that you have to ask yourself what's going on when you're making major decisions in any type of formal capacity, what their associations are. Do they have associations where they might be beholden in some kind of formal way to this rigid understanding of Islamic law, which is in fact Islamic law, so that it is compulsory and not just agreeable for a Muslim to have to conform to?

[01:02:01] Giving a misleading impression is also one of those things that I think come into that category. And I'm just trying to pull my thoughts together here.

[01:02:30] When it is possible, there's no harm in giving a misleading impression if required, if the interests are countenanced by sacred Islamic law. So I think as you run into people who have associations, especially any entity that could be associated with the Explanatory Memorandum that was admitted into a federal court of law for the Holy Land Foundation case, explicitly stating that their mission was to create a civilization alternative to Western civilization in the West—

[01:02:56] This was the Muslim Brotherhood's document, and it [01:03:00] survived appeal in court for having it taken down. You should be under warning that they're going to say what they have to say to get by.

Now, am I saying every time you're talking to somebody from one of those organizations, they're lying to you? No. Because I don't know. But what I am saying is, whereas the burden of proof for people generally might be, well, you know, unless they say something, I'm going to go with what they say.

[01:03:25] When you have an organization that's beholden to this book, for example, this book of Islamic law called *The Reliance of the Traveler*, that they themselves vetted and approved in America, then you have to have a shifting of the burden of proof in your mind to say, "I cannot now just rely on that. I have to have evidence of truthfulness." Otherwise, you're basically violating a duty of care and a duty of competence.

[01:03:52] **Frank Gaffney:** And Steve, this was something that you were extraordinarily mindful about and impactful in warning of, that part [01:04:00] of where we have gone so astray in the pursuit of these various kinetic operations against the people who perpetrated 9/11 and other enemies who are part of this Muslim enterprise, this Sharia-conquest program specifically, is that there has been a failure on the part of too many in the West, including military personnel, intelligence personnel, other political figures and the like, to exercise appropriately that duty to care, that duty to know.

[01:04:45] And again, we're very deeply grateful to you for what you've written in this Team B book, *Sharia: The Threat to America*, your own book, *A Catastrophic Failure*, and in your writings and work at Unconstrained Analytics.

[01:05:00] Just if we may wrap this very important program up with a contribution from another of our very important non-Muslim experts on Islam, Raymond Ibrahim, the author as well of numerous books of analysis and history regarding this program.

[01:05:24] And he said this to the point of what we're told often, Karen, you mentioned this at the outset, that if you go to a search engine, you're going to get treated to a little taqiyya because oftentimes it's said, "Well, it's the Shia sect of Islam that engages in this," and the rest, the Sunnis, the vast majority, don't practice this lying for the faith.

[01:05:53] Here's what Raymond Ibrahim wrote back in 2008 for the Middle East Forum. Quote, [01:06:00] "The primary Quranic verse sanctioning this," is the one that I think Robert referred to, but he says that, quote, "According to the authoritative Arabic text, *Al-Taqiyya fi al-Islam*, quote, 'Taqiyya, deception, is of fundamental importance in Islam. Practically every Islamic sect agrees to it and practices it. We can go so far as to say that the practice of taqiyya is mainstream in Islam, and that those few sects not practicing it diverge from the mainstream.

[01:07:00] Taqiyya is very prevalent in Islamic politics, especially in the modern era." Unquote. So I hope what we've given you folks is a grounding in an underlying and very formidable problem in our dealing with Sharia and the mainstream of Islam that adheres to it, and that is thereby commanded to engage in taqiyya — deception, deceit, lying for the purposes of advancing the conquest that Islam is all about.

The question that we must address as a nation, particularly on the eve of midterm elections in which not a few Sharia-adherent, self-professed Muslims are running for elective office at various levels, including federal, is: Will they disavow Sharia?

[01:08:00] Will they make it a condition of office that they reject what it requires of them, and that they will take faithfully an oath of office that requires of them explicitly that they will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, so help them God?

[01:08:33] And if they won't, they should be disqualified from taking that office, even if elected to it. But even if they do, going back to what we've just been talking about for the past hour and a quarter, can they be faithfully trusted when they say they are rejecting taqiyya and what it requires of them? These are such momentous questions.

[01:09:00] We need a national debate about them. It should take place, in my estimation, in the context of these elections. It is one of the reasons why our BanSharia.com project is dedicated to having these elections serve as a focus of their

conduct on Sharia, on banning Sharia. Because at the end of the day, if we fail to do so, we will find ourselves, I fear, over time if not in short order, submitting and ultimately being conquered by people set on the destruction of this country pursuant to Sharia.

[01:09:53] So we invite you to join us. BanSharia.com is where you can find out more information about all of this, of course — all of our webinars, as well as the campaign that we will be getting underway here, I hope in earnest in the next week or two, with a focus on making banning Sharia a voting issue in America at every level, in every state, with the question put to every candidate: Will you commit to preventing the imposition of Sharia using every power at your disposal so that we remain the United States of America, a constitutional republic, one nation under God?

[01:10:42] Thank you all for listening. Thank you to our wonderful participants — Steve Coughlin, John Bennett, Karen Siegemund, Robert Spencer. God bless you all, and we'll look forward to talking with you next week. Same time, same station.