TRANSCRIPT

A BAN SHARIA WEEKLY WEBINAR SERIES

Sharia vs. the Constitution:
Only One Can be the Supreme Law of the Land

Thursday, July 30, 2026
https://bansharia.com/webinar-sharia-vs-the-constitution/
Media File: Webinar_Sharia_Constitution.mp4

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

Frank Gaffney: [00:00:00] Welcome to this very special edition of our webinar series for the BanSharia.com Coalition, focusing on what is arguably one of the most important issues of our time: the extent to which we are doomed to submit to Sharia, a program of Islam that I think is best described as a political, military, and legal strategy for conquest that goes by the name of Sharia.

This particular program is focused on the question of whether we are doomed as a nation to follow what has increasingly been taking [00:01:00] place in Western Europe and other parts of the world, where Sharia has been insinuated into non-Muslim countries and has inexorably supplanted—or, at the very least, created a parallel system of governance or law—to the detriment of the freedoms and sovereignty of the countries in question.

This question arises because a similar, if not yet quite as advanced, syndrome is occurring inside the United States. We thought it would be worthwhile to take stock of the incompatibility of Sharia with the U.S. Constitution and the freedoms that [00:02:00] it guarantees. Those freedoms, of course, are a gift from our God and one that we have been privileged to benefit from for about 250 years.

The question we will explore is whether the nature of Sharia means that only one of these systems can operate, and whether, if we are unsuccessful in stopping the metastasizing of Sharia in America, our Constitution and constitutional republic are doomed.

To explore all of this, I am very pleased to say that we have assembled a remarkably formidable group of experts on various aspects of [00:03:00] freedom, our form of government, the nature of our polity, and the popular appreciation of the liberties that

most of us take for granted—which makes the rising tide of Sharia supremacism in the United States all the more perilous.

We are going to start with a colleague whom we have come to admire tremendously and who has been very active in raising awareness about problems such as Sharia and other forms of totalitarianism. His name is Alex Newman. He is the president of the Liberty Sentinel Media Group. He is a very active podcaster, television-show host, and contributor to myriad programs, [00:04:00] both in video and in print.

An author many times over, he is one of the most trenchant observers of what is going on, as well as an activist opposing threats to our American experiment. We are delighted to kick off this program with Alex. The floor is yours, sir.

Alex Newman: All right, folks. There are many different things I would like to address.

I am going to try to cram them all in. I want to start with the fact that I recently came from the future. Before returning to the United States after living around the world, my last home was in Sweden. I can tell you that you do not want to become Sweden, for many reasons. One of the main reasons is that the nation has now been absolutely overrun with Islamic migrants.

The little town outside of which our home was located used to be built around a small church. It was a delightful little town. [00:05:00] We had two police officers in our entire county. By the time we left, we had begun calling it Little Mogadishu, and that was a very accurate representation of what had happened.

You could not leave anything in your car because it would be stolen. By the time we left, I think we had eight or ten police officers in the county, and that was not nearly enough to keep up with the explosion of crime. Churches were being vandalized and defaced, and everywhere you saw the imposition of Sharia law on helpless victims, particularly women, children, and others.

You have open murders of people. They murdered an Iraqi refugee because he was publicly mocking the Quran in Stockholm. The police were unable to do anything to stop it. That is a preview of what will be coming. If you look at some areas of Sweden, the Swedes are already a minority, including cities such as Malmö.

If you look at their government-school systems, the overwhelming majority of the children in those schools are now Islamic. Swedish is now being treated as a second language in those schools. That is a [00:06:00] preview of what will come to the entire West if we are not careful.

The Dutch are now a minority in Amsterdam. The British are a minority in London. The Germans are a minority in Frankfurt. Muhammad is the most popular name for boys across Western Europe, and they intend to do exactly the same thing here.

One thing I want to say early on is that this problem did not develop in a vacuum. There were deliberate reasons why the communists and globalists in the parliaments of these countries, and in our own Congress, invited in millions of Muslims—tens of millions in Europe and certainly many millions in the United States. I think the numbers are actually undercounted.

One reason they did this was that they hoped to use these Islamic totalitarians as a battering ram to break down what remains of the foundations of what we call the West, Christendom, Judeo-Christian civilization, or the free world.

They cannot stand it, and they know that liberals and the godless on their own are not very effective in launching [00:07:00] the kind of serious attacks that will be needed to take down what remains of our civilization. I think they believe Muslims will be a useful tool in this.

A little historical context is also important because it seems to have been almost completely forgotten across the Western world.

Islamic invasions have targeted the Western world since the time of Muhammad. To know what that looks like, ask the people who lived on the Iberian Peninsula under Islamic occupation for centuries. Ask the people of North Africa. Those were once Christian nations and societies that were completely taken over by Islamic armies. The options were essentially to lose your head or convert to this diabolical false religion called Islam.

It is not a pretty picture. For centuries, Europeans fought back courageously and valiantly. Charles Martel turned them back in France. The people of Austria and the Austro-Hungarian Empire turned them back. But wherever Islam spread and its numbers became sufficiently large, freedom died, civilization died, [00:08:00] and Islamic tyranny emerged in its place.

This is true even in the modern era. Look at Lebanon. Lebanon was once a Christian nation. Today it is a hellhole ravaged by Hezbollah and others.

It is not something we want in our countries. I think many Americans regard this as a distant or hypothetical threat far in the future. They do not realize that plans are being laid at this very moment to collapse our civilization.

As the great Rich Higgins, director of strategic planning on Donald Trump's first National Security Council, pointed out, there is currently an alliance of Islamists, jihadists, socialists, communists, and globalists seeking to take down the United States of America—not just as a nation, but even as an ideal.

To see what that looks like, take a look at New York City. They have already captured the most important city in America, with the possible exception of Washington, D.C. It is

by far the most important financial capital in our nation and the largest city in our nation. I think many small-town [00:09:00] Americans believe that is a distant threat that will not affect them.

You are absolutely mistaken. I have only about three minutes left, so I want to spend them talking about something I think will be critical to combating this threat: restoring a proper understanding of the First Amendment.

So much of this jihad being perpetrated against our country is based on a ludicrous understanding of the First Amendment to our Constitution.

The First Amendment prohibits Congress from establishing a religion or interfering with the free exercise thereof. When those words were written and those documents were ratified by the states, that had a radically different meaning from what it has today. The historical evidence is overwhelming.

We will soon release a report examining court decisions, all our founding documents, and the writings of our Founding Fathers—the men who wrote these documents—to make it crystal clear that they never intended to put Islamic tyranny, godlessness, paganism, [00:10:00] Satan worship, or human sacrifice on par with the Judeo-Christian foundation of this nation.

That is an indisputable fact. It was not until the 1960s that courts began adopting this radical interpretation under which “religion” means anything and everything. The danger of that should be obvious. Look at the places where paganism or Islam dominates.

That was never the intent. I want to read a couple pieces of evidence so that we understand what we are discussing. All our founding documents are very clear. In fact, our Constitution contains a reference to “our Lord.” Clearly, they were not talking about Muhammad or Allah.

Clearly, they were talking about Jesus Christ. I want to quote Joseph Story, who spent 33 years on the U.S. Supreme Court and was one of our most accomplished jurists. He wrote extensively on this question. In [00:11:00] his 1833 *Commentaries on the Constitution*, he said:

“Every American colony, from its foundation down to the Revolution, did openly, by the whole course of its laws and institutions, support and sustain in some form the Christian religion.

“Indeed, in a republic, there would seem to be a peculiar propriety in viewing the Christian religion as the great basis on which it must rest for its support and permanence, if it be what it has ever been deemed by its truest friends to be—the religion of liberty.”

He also pointed out very clearly that the First Amendment was intended “not to countenance, much less to advance, Mohammedanism, Judaism, or infidelity by prostrating Christianity, but to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment.”

That was the purpose of the First Amendment. Every one of the 13 states explicitly acknowledged the God of the Bible, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Almost all of them required you to profess belief in the Bible and that [00:12:00] God to serve in public office.

This notion that we must import millions of Muslims and allow them to do whatever they want because of the First Amendment is completely false.

There is no right to impose Sharia in this country. There is no right to strip people of their individual liberties, which is what Sharia requires. You receive the death penalty for leaving Islam.

I am just about out of time. We will be releasing that report soon, but we must no longer tolerate this perverted interpretation of the First Amendment that purports to authorize all of this.

Frank Gaffney: Alex, thank you. What a splendid overview of the problem we are facing.

I would like to play a prerecorded video from our friend Pastor Paul Blair because I think it is very complementary to what you have just described. He has been deeply studying and preaching about Sharia and its implications for Judeo-Christian civilization broadly, of which our nation here in the [00:13:00] United States is a part.

Rev. Paul Blair: The biggest issue we have here in America, Frank, is that most of us grew up in a Christian nation. The foundation of our country began with the Pilgrims landing at Plymouth and then the Great Puritan Migration. The influence of Christianity on the development of our country is beyond question.

We have simply assumed that Islam is like another denomination of Christianity: that Muslims can move in, be good neighbors, and, if we tolerate them, they will tolerate us. You mow your yard, we mow ours, and we get along just fine.

They do not understand Islam, going all the way back to the Great Commission of both religions.

In the Christian Great Commission, we are to go into all the world and preach the Gospel. But I cannot make someone believe. That is up to the conviction God places upon them and whether they choose to believe. My job is to take the message to them, be a good neighbor, and love my neighbor as I love myself.

But in Islam, the great commission is to fight them until there is no more unbelief and the religion is [00:14:00] for Allah alone.

When you look at Muhammad's life, his entire life and mentality are contrary to what we have adopted or understand as normal in Christianity. Islam is not just like a Presbyterian church moving in down the street. They are not coming to America to assimilate and become good citizens.

We know this from their own writings and documentation. Going back to the time of Muhammad and continuing through what we have now seen from the Muslim Brotherhood and documents confiscated by the FBI during searches, we know what their goal is.

Their goal is to immigrate to America, multiply, vote as a bloc, and ultimately not coexist as Americans, but turn America into part of the global Islamic caliphate.

The idea that Sharia is compatible with the [00:15:00] Constitution exists because we, as American Christians, do not realize that Sharia is itself a constitution. There can be only one ultimate rule of law in a country. It will either be the United States Constitution, with the liberties secured for us by the Constitution, or it will be Sharia.

Anyone who thinks both can coexist is ignorant of the subject. Anyone who thinks Sharia is anything close to what we understand as normal and natural, promoting the freedom we have enjoyed here in America, is ignorant of the subject.

There will be a clash of civilizations and ideologies, and only one will come out on top.

God willing, we will awaken as Americans, recognize the threat of Sharia and Islam, and stand against it before it is too late.

The Constitution does not give us rights. The Constitution limits [00:16:00] the scope of government. We, the people of the United States, came together and created this document limiting the role and responsibility of the federal civil government over us.

Many of the Founders involved in the debate at the Constitutional Convention would not support or ratify it unless they secured the Bill of Rights, just to ensure that there was no way the government could grow out of control and become tyrannical.

We have taken these God-given rights for granted: religious liberty, freedom of speech, and the right to defend our homes, families, and property.

None of that exists in Islam. America is built on the idea that all men are created equal and that there is no class system.

Everyone in America has the same guaranteed protection under our rule of law. From the [00:17:00] very foundation, that is not the case under Sharia. Islam has different levels. If you are a non-Muslim, you have no rights.

If the Muslims in control at the time are feeling particularly confident or gracious, they may let you live if you pay protection money, or the *jizya* tax.

However, you do not have the same rights as a full Muslim believer. If you are a woman, you have no rights either. There is definitely a class system governing the privileges people have under Sharia.

The things we take for granted—our entire approach to life, our right to own and sell property, engage freely in business, and believe or not believe in certain sects of Christianity or anything else—are not available under Sharia.

To be Sharia-compliant as a citizen [00:18:00] of a Muslim world, you have to profess faith—or rather, you must be submissive. That is where the difference between Christianity and Islam is so stark.

Muslims do not even have this concept of belief. It is simply submission.

In Christianity, we are compelled by the evidence, and God asks us to believe in Him. We then choose to bend the knee and surrender to the Lord based on the overwhelming evidence of our faith.

Christianity is a fact-based faith. It is built on the foundation of the empty tomb. If the tomb was not empty, Jesus did not rise from the dead. But because the tomb is empty, Jesus is Lord, and we choose to place our faith in Him and obey Him.

Islam is imposed purely through force, fear, and intimidation. You must bend your knee, surrender, and submit yourself completely to Islamic control over [00:19:00] every facet of your life.

Some people do not realize how extensive that is. When you read *Reliance of the Traveller*, their codified rule of law, there are, I think, three pages devoted to how to go to the bathroom properly.

When we say Sharia covers every facet of life, that is not hyperbole or an overstatement. When you devote three pages to how someone should properly use the restroom, you have created a system of governance so completely totalitarian that it covers even the most private and intimate matters of day-to-day life.

There is no comparison between the two.

Sadly, because of the things we take for granted from growing up as Christians in this great, free country, we do not recognize everything we have. Sharia imposes complete

handcuffs and complete totalitarian [00:20:00] control from the top down. It is 180 degrees opposite from what we have taken for granted and enjoyed here in America.

Elizabeth Yore: I want to talk about the severe, practical, real-life consequences of Sharia for our Constitution and the rule of law that I experienced firsthand in countless trial cases.

This is a civilizational and legal clash between one nation under God, based on the rule of law, testimony, evidence, and truth, and Sharia.

I saw the truth clash with Sharia firsthand. Specifically, I was general counsel at the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children. I handled all the international child-abduction cases under the Hague Convention, which was designed to create a mutual system for returning children who had been abducted, based on the best interests of the children.

Approximately 103 countries have now joined this treaty. As you would expect, only about 12 Muslim-dominated countries have joined, and they were relatively late to do so. [00:21:00] Most Muslim-majority nations declined to join because the secular convention's mandates regarding the best interests of children and custody clash with domestic Islamic family law.

I witnessed firsthand what happened in those cases. I am sure many people remember *Not Without My Daughter* with Betty Mahmoody. There were many similar cases, and they are still happening today.

I want to share a couple of cases that point out the clash of cultures and between our constitutional legal system, which is based on truth and honest testimony, and Sharia. I faced endless legal battles involving Sharia while handling these international cases.

I handled cases involving children who were abducted to Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and other countries.

What happened in the United States was quite interesting. We had American-born mothers [00:23:00] who married Muslim men born overseas. When a divorce occurred and the couple had children, they would go into divorce court in America.

Many of these American mothers would tell the court, "He has told me that he is going to take the children to Syria, for example, and that he will not return."

The courts would be dismissive of the mothers' claims. They would often bring in the father and have him raise his right hand, frequently on the Bible, and swear that he would not abduct the children or that, if he took them to Syria, Saudi Arabia, or Jordan for visitation, he would return them.

The mothers, who understood the impact of Sharia after years of marriage, would say to the court, “This is like having him put his hand on a comic book. It means nothing.”

Sure enough, time and again, those court orders failed. No matter what kind of structure the courts [00:24:00] imposed, even attempting to take away their passports, these men had additional passports and left.

I had a woman testify in court that her ex-husband’s apartment had been cleared of all its furniture. She had learned that he had purchased one-way tickets overseas for himself and the children.

The court would not listen to that testimony. The children were abducted to Muslim-dominated countries.

The American-born women had absolutely no ability to visit or even see their children. Under Sharia divorce law, the man says, “I divorce you,” three times, and the woman has no rights.

These children went into a deep black hole. They were American children.

We had one case that I think highlights not only the ignorance of American judges, but also how Muslims would exploit our system. [00:25:00] This particular Muslim father brought in his imam.

The imam spoke to the court and said that he would personally verify that the father would return the children. He swore, as a man of the cloth, that he would obey the court order and ensure that the father did as well.

In fact, the father abducted the children, and they never returned. There was literally nothing that could be done. The countries to which the children were abducted were not part of an international treaty.

These mothers had no right [00:26:00] to go to those Islamic countries and fight for custody of their children, even when they had international parental-kidnapping warrants.

Even when they had custody orders from the United States, those orders were meaningless.

My concern is that there was complete ignorance about *taqiyya*, about lying to the court. There was a total lack of understanding of how the American judicial system was being exploited by people who knew precisely how to do so.

What was especially sad and tragic was that so many of these mothers were facing a ticking clock. Their little girls were going to be married off at age 12, perhaps to cousins overseas.

Keep in mind that none of these children had ever been overseas. This was a completely different culture. They had never traveled [00:27:00] to these countries, so the mothers were frantic to recover them.

Literally none of them recovered their children through any intervention by the State Department. Some mothers were forced to hire former Special Forces personnel to locate their children and bring them home.

This is still happening in Spain and France with Algerian families.

This phenomenon highlights how our courts have been duped. They presume that everyone approaches the court system with the same loyalty to the rule of law and that their oath has the same meaning as an American's oath.

Sharia and the constitutional rule of law in America are like oil and vinegar. [00:28:00] They do not mix.

We need to be very clear that our judges, prosecutors, and police must understand how Muslims approach our court system through the lens of Sharia.

Interestingly, the Feeding Our Future case in Minnesota highlights this particularly well. Seven or eight Somalis were on trial for billions of dollars in fraud.

During the federal trial, one of the defendants and one of the defendant's brothers developed a highly sophisticated plan to bribe one of the [00:29:00] jurors to obtain a not-guilty verdict.

Thank goodness the juror spoke up. But it was a very elaborate plot. Again, it demonstrated a lack of respect for our rule of law and the constant effort to cut corners and exploit the system, based on our lack of knowledge and ignorance about *taqiyya* and Sharia.

Although this is a subset of cases, it involves international law, domestic law, and family law. I think it is a warning shot to all Americans.

I have often said that I wish I could go on a college tour and speak to American women, saying, "Look, this is the reality. Betty Mahmoody was not a one-off case. It happens. It continues to happen."

We [00:30:00] must begin educating people about *taqiyya* and educating our judges that imams do not respect our constitutional law. They respect Sharia.

Taqiyya is an integral factor in every legal and nonlegal interaction in which they approach the American judicial system.

That is my personal experience. It was heartbreaking and infuriating because we were completely helpless. These were American-born children who disappeared into a black

hole, never to be seen again, because the court system in the United States was ignorant and failed to protect them.

I am happy to answer any questions, but that is my small slice of constitutional law versus Sharia law.

Dr. Karen Siegemund: Liz, what an utterly heartbreaking set of [00:31:00] circumstances you have been immersed in, but how wonderful that you are taking this on.

This topic of Sharia and the Constitution struck me as singularly important when I first began hearing that we needed to worry about Islamic incursions into the United States.

My first reaction was, “That is a ridiculous thing to worry about. We have the Constitution, which will surely protect us.”

It took me some time to recognize that the reality is slightly different.

For one thing, our perspectives are entirely different. Let us consider: “All men are created equal.” No. “Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” No. “Endowed by our Creator with inalienable rights.” No. Self-governance? No. The voice of the people? No.

The First Amendment and our freedoms, as Alex and Paul were talking about? Absolutely not. Where apostasy [00:32:00] is a crime, it is difficult to imagine anything more inimical to everything upon which we were founded.

Let us also not forget that conquest is the goal. Conquest is the number-one goal—global conquest throughout the West.

As we were discussing, Alex has already set the stage by looking into the future at Sweden, Berlin, London, and France. Poland is one of the last holdouts. Hungary had been, but Hungary seems to have fallen as well.

The sheer numbers are not in our favor—and by “our,” I mean Judeo-Christian. Yes, I am going to include the Judeo part, because it is fundamental to who we are.

Where those foundations are undermined, a vacuum is obviously created for Islam to enter.

It was noted that this is the red-green-blue [00:33:00] alliance. The communists and globalists together have created the circumstances in which Islam can make inroads. Without that, Islam would not have been able to do so.

We have seen that throughout Europe, and we are seeing it here. The neutralization of our founding principles, both in Europe and here, leaves us vulnerable.

We may believe the Constitution protects us, but so many things we have seen lately make it clear that the Constitution does not provide as many protections as one might hope, because too many people—one of Liz Yore's points—are completely ignorant about it.

When you have a woman on the Supreme Court who cannot say what a man or woman is because she is not a biologist, the Supreme Court itself is not going to protect us, [00:34:00] because the Supreme Court consists of people. The people the left brings in to supposedly support us are not on our side. Even at that level, we have fallen.

Look at the other ways in which we have fallen, including the administrative state itself. It is not specifically authorized in the Constitution, yet it has far more influence over our daily lives than anyone would have imagined.

We saw Anthony Fauci's "testimony" yesterday and the damage one man can do when he has far too much power. He practically single-handedly took down this country.

Of course, it was not truly single-handed. It was with the help of the Chinese and the World Health Organization, which are tied together.

If we think documents such as the Constitution will protect us, we need to be very careful. [00:35:00] It is a contract that requires men and women to understand it, abide by it, and recognize its importance. This system works only with a moral and biblical people. Otherwise, it falls apart.

To say that we are safe because of the Constitution is to ignore the realities on the ground, as Liz Yore has seen in the courts, as Paul has seen, and as we see time and again.

Remember how we looked to the Supreme Court to declare Obamacare unconstitutional? We all knew it was unconstitutional.

Lo and behold, they found a way to make it constitutional.

With everything related to COVID, our elections, and many other issues, we continue looking to [00:36:00] the Constitution and the courts to resolve things that seem obvious to us.

But when you have someone like Barack Obama, who taught constitutional law at one of the better law schools—he was not technically considered a professor—you have to realize that we are in truly dire straits.

The Constitution can protect us only to the extent that men and women understand it. Increasingly, we do not.

Increasingly, to Alex's point, we do not understand the First Amendment. We do not understand the various elements of our government that are supposed to protect us.

Students are not taught the goodness and greatness of this country, Judeo-Christian values, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or their rightness.

We just lost the [00:37:00] challenge concerning the Fourteenth Amendment and birthright citizenship. If you are born here, regardless of who your parents are, you are a citizen.

Yet, as Liz noted, children are being abducted and young girls are being lost forever. We do not even know whether they may return under a different guise. Our children are incredibly vulnerable. It is truly horrifying.

Think about the edifice of this country, which is literally encoded in the Constitution of the United States. When people swear on the Bible or the Quran, an oath is supposed to be taken without the purpose of evasion.

With *taqiyya*, they take it for the express purpose of evasion. We are incredibly vulnerable.

Why are we so vulnerable? Because the left has taken massive [00:38:00] sledgehammers to the edifice of our country, including education and our institutions.

The administrative state, the deep state, the capture of our institutions, and the left's long march through them have all thrown open the doors to this kind of incursion—to conquest—while leaving us completely vulnerable.

We no longer have the knowledge, institutional confidence, or civilizational confidence that a self-governing, sovereign nation must possess to survive.

We need more education, not only about the evils and threats being perpetrated against us, but also about our own goodness and greatness. We need to rebuild our strength.

Our judges need this education, but so do our teachers, [00:39:00] our girls, and everyone who plays a role. We must understand where we are vulnerable and ensure that we are no longer vulnerable.

I speak to people all the time who say, as I once did, "Why are you so worried about this? We have the Constitution. We have the courts."

This webinar specifically highlights why you cannot simply sit back, rest, and say, "It is all taken care of."

That is not how a self-governing nation works, and we are increasingly vulnerable.

Frank, now that you are back with us, thank you for hosting this. It is terrifically important.

Frank Gaffney: Usama brings a very special insight to this topic as president of the Straight Way of Grace Ministry. He is the author of *Exposing the Truth About Jihad*, a two-volume set—one about the holy war in the Bible [00:40:00] and one about the unholy war in the Quran.

Usama, thank you so much for joining us to talk specifically about your insights into the obvious differences between, and incompatibility of, Sharia—as the antithesis, really—of our Constitution. Over to you, sir.

Usama Dakdok: Sure. Thank you so much. First of all, I would like to make a quick correction here.

Most people in this country, in every interview I have done, know I am Egyptian. I grew up in Egypt, so they automatically think I was a Muslim. I always say that I grew up in a Christian home in a Muslim country, so I learned about Islam in school because that is part of our education. In Egypt, everybody has to learn about Islam.

That is where people get confused and think I was a Muslim. No, I grew up in Egypt. I studied Sharia, Islamic law. I did not study every type of material in Sharia, but I obviously studied the subjects of marriage and divorce, which I believe are very important, especially for all the women of the [00:41:00] West who marry a Muslim man

and cannot see anything wrong with saying, “Why not have Sharia and live by Sharia?” They do not realize that, if we practice Sharia fully in America—which is the goal of Muslims—these women will lose their liberties, their freedoms, their children, and their lives, in another way, for being married to a Muslim man if they ever try to end that marriage.

Sharia is a topic I believe we need to discuss. I was listening to my dear sister speaking. I am sorry that I do not know too many names—Dr. Karen. It is good to meet you and good to have all of you here.

Most Americans I speak to say, “Do not worry,” as you said. “We have our Constitution.”

We have to understand that, when the Constitution was written, it was not written by Almighty God, nor were those who wrote it guided by the Holy Spirit in such a way that they knew the future. They did not know that a cult called Islam would come to America. They had no idea that would be the case.

As I have always said, and will [00:42:00] repeat again, if the Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution had known something about Islam, I promise you they would have added to the amendments or the Constitution that we would never allow Muslims

to practice Islam in America, because it goes against everything we Americans believe, our Constitution, and our freedom.

Obviously, they did not. Even when they talked about religion, they were talking about Christianity and different denominations among Christians. But somehow, today's liberals think that, when we talk about religion and freedom of religion, that means everybody can practice his religion in America.

I am sorry, but that is not the case. If we allow Muslims to practice pure Islam as it is written in Allah's word in the Quran, prescribed by Muhammad in his sayings in the Hadith, and demonstrated by how Muhammad lived in the Sunnah, that will lead to one thing: the destruction of freedom of religion in America. [00:43:00] Very simple.

Even if we look at *Reliance of the Traveller*, written by Muslims and translated into English since 1991—which, sadly, I do not think our legislators have bothered even to examine—it contains brief passages about different topics of Sharia.

It says in *Reliance of the Traveller*, which I know for sure from the major sources, that there is no such thing as freedom of religion in Islam. You are a Muslim because you were born to a Muslim father. It does not matter whether you believe, because Islam is not built on belief but on the *shahada*, which, sadly, most people discuss in America without knowing its depth.

Shahada means to bear witness. The first pillar of Islam says, "I bear witness there is no god except Allah, and I bear witness that Muhammad is the messenger of Allah."

I am sorry, but that is a false witness. Why? [00:44:00] Because in Islam, to say the *shahada*, to bear witness, you must see with your eyes, hear with your ears, smell with your nose, touch with your hand, or taste with your tongue.

You have to use some of these senses that God—or Allah Almighty, to Muslims—has given to humans. Without them, you cannot be a witness. As a matter of fact, witnessing in Islam is very complicated. We could talk about it for an hour.

For a case of adultery, for example, you must have four eyewitnesses. Not just one or two. And simply seeing a man and woman naked in bed does not mean they committed adultery, because there is another sin discussed in the Quran called *lamam*.

By the way, the only accurate English translation that discusses *lamam* is my translation.

It has been available for the last 15 years or so. What is *lamam*? *Lamam* is everything a man can do with a woman in bed without having intercourse. If there is no intercourse, there is [00:45:00] no adultery.

What constitutes a witness to adultery? Four men seeing a man having sexual relations with a woman, seeing the actual act—not simply seeing them in bed together.

When we talk about *shahada* in Islam, people simply say the statement without believing it. That fits perfectly with other verses in the Quran. Allah says in Quran 49:14, "The Bedouins said, 'We believe.'" Allah corrects them by saying, "Do not say, 'We believe,' but say, 'We surrender,' for faith has never entered your hearts."

The early Arab Bedouins were Muslims. They said the *shahada*, but they never believed.

Anyway, the *shahada* is one of the pillars of Islam. When a man or woman says it, he or she automatically becomes a Muslim. But what if I want to leave Islam? You cannot leave Islam. Why? Because Muhammad said, "Whoever changes his religion, kill him."

The Quran says, *falyamut wa huwa kafir*—he must die as an infidel. There is no freedom of religion in [00:46:00] Islam. You are a Muslim because your father is a Muslim. You are a Muslim because you took the *shahada*. You said these two sentences, which, sadly, we now teach in public schools all over America.

"Oh, the *shahada*, the first pillar of Islam." Then we say Muslims believe there is no god except Allah. No. Muslims bear witness. They do not even have the courage to say it correctly, because that would expose the falsehood in the first pillar of Islam.

If we understand in America that this is Islam—you are a Muslim and cannot leave Islam—then, if you leave Islam, your parents, brothers, cousins, and the people in the mosque where you pray have an obligation to kill you. Where is the freedom of religion?

When we talk about religion in our Constitution, we are talking about Christianity and different denominations within the religion, not Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and everything else.

No. That is not what the Founding Fathers were talking about. But once again, they did their best. They created this great Constitution, which [00:47:00] has lasted wonderfully for 250 years, but they did not know the day would come when Muslims would be in America and practice Islam in America.

My dear sister, Dr. Karen, was talking about taking an oath on the Quran. How do you say this? Taking an oath on the Quran.

Quran 2:225 tells Muslims it is acceptable to lie when giving an oath: "Allah will not hold you responsible for your mere utterances in an oath, but He will hold you responsible for that which your hearts have earned."

That is the Quran and its teaching. We may say, “Let Muslims swear on the Quran.” No. We should never allow anybody to swear on the Quran, especially when the book teaches that it is acceptable to lie while giving an oath.

I will share more as we continue, because I do not know exactly what direction you want to take with today’s topic.

Frank Gaffney: This is very helpful. Sharia-adherent [00:48:00] Muslims can take the oath of office required of government employees at every level. The precise wording is sometimes somewhat different, but it is all basically the same idea: You must swear to God to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

If you cannot freely take that oath without prevarication and the like, I believe you are ineligible to serve in such a position.

Usama Dakdok: Yes, absolutely right.

Frank Gaffney: If we wind up having people falsely swear the oath of office—or, alternatively, they are actually apostates, which gets them into a different kind of trouble—but if they are perjurers, that should be disqualifying. I would say that should apply to people who are already in those [00:49:00] offices, as well as those trying to enter them.

Liz, perhaps I could ask you to address this from a legal point of view. You have served in government yourself. You have taken oaths like this at the state level and probably at the federal level too.

What are your thoughts on this as a truly important aspect of the fight over whether we are going to have one supreme law of the land, try somehow to have two, or allow ours to be supplanted by the other?

Elizabeth Yore: Frank, this is absolutely the most important issue when you hone in on this clash of civilizations. This is it.

We, as Americans, take an oath to support the Constitution, with its Bill of Rights and all its laws. Yet [00:50:00] we have this other group of people who, first, do not support the Bill of Rights and do not support the Constitution as constructed.

We are using the same language, but with completely different intentions. As a result, you will see this bubbling up, as I discussed concerning the courts.

If we merely go through the motions, are we so naïve as to think that going through the motions is enough? In fact, we need to look beneath the surface and determine whether we are going to hold our oath of office to this country and this Constitution sacred.

If not, then those who take the oath of office with no intention of keeping it or following through on it must leave the government, because that is the glue that holds our country together. That is how we function [00:51:00] as a society at every level, from local offices requiring an oath of office all the way to the Supreme Court.

But we have been playing this game. We have had our heads in the sand. We have not discussed *taqiyya*. There is an expression by G.K. Chesterton: “We become so tolerant that our brains have fallen out.”

It is absolutely insane. We need to decide whether we are going to have a functioning court system and a functioning system based on the rule of law, truth, the pursuit of truth, and testimony that can be weighed, or whether we are going to deal with a completely apostate culture that refuses to abide by the laws of this country.

We are seeing it in Minnesota. You were not here for my talk, but [00:52:00] in Minnesota there is a federal trial involving billions of dollars in Feeding Our Future fraud, ripping off the American public. During the trial, one of the defendants attempted to bribe—and was convicted of bribing—one of the jurors.

This is it in Technicolor. They have no respect for the Constitution or the rule of law.

Are we going to pretend that it does not exist, or are we going to look it squarely in the eye and say, “We cannot have a functioning government with people whose belief is that they may lie to the infidel”?

If we do not, we are simply playing games. We will continue to be haunted, deceived, and suffer [00:53:00] enormous consequences.

I have seen it firsthand in divorce court, child-custody court, and international law. We have to be honest about this.

We have to educate people, and we cannot play games anymore. We cannot pretend it does not exist.

This is integral to Muslims. *Taqiyya* is, for them, as if we were to put our hand on the Bible and swear to God that we were telling the truth.

In my mind, I think you have identified the real issue. We have to be grown-ups about this once and for all.

Europe has not been.

Usama Dakdok: I lived in Egypt, the Muslim country of Egypt, the most educated country. We do not give an oath on the Quran. You do not raise your right hand and put your left hand on the Quran. [00:54:00] The left hand in Islam is the unclean hand. It

should never be used to touch the Quran unless, after performing *wudu*, you hold the Quran with both hands, not just one.

I do not know who these Muslims are—whether Rashida Tlaib or Ilhan—

Frank Gaffney: Ilhan Omar.

Usama Dakdok: Omar, or Rashida Tlaib. Do they know anything about Islam? Does Rashida Tlaib know anything about Sharia, putting her left hand on the Quran? That is forbidden. I do not know how they could come up with that.

We have mentioned *taqiyya* a couple or three times already. It is Quran 3:28, and I will read what I have here. My bold statement before that verse says: "Muslims who make friends with infidels lose their salvation, but Muslims can make temporary"—and I say it again—"temporary friendships with infidels only while Muslims are weak, until they have the upper hand."

Then I ask people to read [00:55:00] Quran 47:35.

Here is the verse concerning *taqiyya*, Quran 3:28: "Believers, do not take the infidels for friends rather than believers. Whoever does this has nothing to do with Allah, except—"

Whenever we read a verse in the Quran and encounter the words *except*, *unless*, *but*, *when*, or *if*, those are very important words.

Here is the exception: "Except that you should guard yourselves against them cautiously." Here is the word *taqiyya*: to protect yourself or guard yourself from them cautiously. "Allah Himself warns you, and to Allah is the final return."

The verse is very clear. All Muslims who pretend to be our friends in America are either not Muslims or are Muslims who practice *taqiyya* to protect themselves.

The great scholar al-Jalalayn interpreted that verse by stating that a Muslim can take an infidel as a friend with the tongue, [00:56:00] not with the heart: *bil-lisan duna al-qalb*.

That is exactly what *taqiyya* is. I pretend that you are my friend: "Oh, you are my friend. I love your family. I love your country." It continues until they have the upper hand.

That is not my interpretation. That is al-Jalalayn.

Then he went to Quran 47:35, where Allah said, "Do not be weak. Do not cease fighting. Do not call for peace when you have the upper hand."

Muslims can be friendly and live in peace with infidels only when they do not have the upper hand. Al-Jalalayn, al-Tabari, and al-Qurtubi—all the scholars of Islam—said you can be friends with them if you are in a foreign land and do not have enough people or enough power. That is when you are weak and do not have the upper hand.

We have to know that. Otherwise, we will be deceived into believing Muslims are our friends when, in reality, they are not.

I am not speaking [00:57:00] generally, because plenty of Muslims have never read these two verses from the Quran. They do not even know the Quran teaches that.

I am talking about Muslim politicians and the Muslim Brotherhood, who are currently running for office across this country. These are not ordinary Muslims who do not know their right hand from their left. These are the ones chosen by CAIR, ISNA, and all these jihad organizations for the purpose of infiltrating and invading America.

Frank Gaffney: Thank you, Usama.

Karen, any thoughts on the clarity required here? I think there are some Muslims running for office in your state at the moment, and indeed across the country, as Usama said.

Must this be vetted as part of the process of establishing eligibility and faithfulness in office among these people?

Dr. Karen Siegemund: I would say Muslims [00:58:00] themselves are, of course, problematic, as Usama just described. But I would also say it is the left that infiltrates and opens the door for Muslims.

We have a candidate in Los Angeles. She claims not to be a Muslim. She is a deep leftist and a Democratic socialist here in Los Angeles.

We need to be very aware of the danger people like her pose too. Until fairly recently, we recognized that, if you were a communist, you could not be allowed into the country or permitted to hold office.

McCarthy was right. We all know this. Communist infiltration was a very bad thing.

We have relaxed our vigilance. Along with opening the doors to that comes opening the doors to everything else we are seeing.

We need to regain the recognition and caution we once had concerning communists. We also know that [00:59:00] Islam is a religion wrapped around an equally damaging, dangerous, destructive, and pernicious totalitarian ideology.

The religious aspect gives it a patina of acceptability, but we truly need to recognize, acknowledge, and communicate throughout the land the damage it can do. As with communism, so with Islam.

They are sometimes the more violent arm. But they would not be able to make the headway they have without the left and the globalists.

They work together to take us down.

Do we need to be aware? Absolutely. Should we vet people much more thoroughly? Yes.

As you and I discussed during the last webinar, obtaining a security clearance was once a major ordeal. I had a top-secret clearance at one time. [01:00:00] But when you are an officeholder, you do not have to go through the process of obtaining a top-secret or higher security clearance.

When you are elected—obviously not at the mayoral level, but at higher levels—you are given access to our nation's most sensitive national-security information.

That is a danger. These are the things that keep one awake at night. It is terrible.

Frank Gaffney: On that point, Karen, I think it is important to say that, traditionally, at least in Congress—and I do not know about lower levels of government, but I suspect it is true there too—if you are serving in an elected position, you are not given a background check. The background check is supposed to be that the public vetted you through the electoral process.

That is not necessarily so by any means, especially if *taqiyya* is a factor in the mix, [01:01:00] along with a willingness fraudulently to take oaths.

Alex, are you still with us? I want to give you an opportunity to say a final word, if you are.

You may be gone, but, if so, thank you very much for contributing.

We are about at the end of our time. I am beside myself that I missed so much of this fascinating conversation.

What I hope has been imparted to this audience is that there is an inherent incompatibility between the Constitution of the United States and Sharia.

There can be only one supreme law of the land, and, by its own terms in Article VI, that must be the Constitution of the United States.

Several of you whom I have been able to hear have discussed how the framers, [01:02:00] Founders, and drafters of our Constitution did not contemplate that there would be people with a different view of their solemn responsibilities to support and defend the Constitution—people who would falsely take that oath of office and go unchecked in doing so.

Yet that is where we find ourselves now, as part of a much larger failure—I think Liz was making this point too—to be resolute, vigilant, and clear that certain individuals, beliefs, and conduct are unacceptable.

I would say these are political beliefs. I do not believe this is a religious issue protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

I cannot remember whether it was said here or during several other recent conversations on this subject, but [01:03:00] former President Dwight Eisenhower pointed out: “You cannot use the Bill of Rights to destroy the Bill of Rights.”

That is not permitted.

Frank Gaffney: We are going to have to come to grips with this as a political, military, legal, and strategic threat to the Constitution we revere and that many of us have ourselves taken an oath to support and defend.

We are not saying this is true of all Muslims, but we are saying it is true of Sharia-adherent ones. Those happen to be the people who run the program, whether they are members of the Muslim Brotherhood or Sharia scholars of other kinds.

They understand that they are permitted to lie—and, [01:04:00] in fact, I believe obliged to lie if it will advance their program. They will do so whether taking an oath to support and defend the Constitution or in other ways material to our form of government and our freedoms under the Constitution of the United States.

Usama Dakdok: Brother Frank, if you do not mind, I will share a quick Hadith here.

Concerning lies, Muhammad said: “It is lawful to lie in three cases: a man to his wife so that she will be pleased with him; at a time of war, to the enemy, because war is deception; or to make peace between Muslims, between brothers.”

In simple words, as a Muslim believer, you can lie to your wife, your enemy, and your friends. That covers everyone.

How can we trust a Muslim who believes in a prophet who taught that it is acceptable to lie to everybody all the time? This is unacceptable under how we run our [01:05:00] country according to our Constitution. We should not have this.

Frank Gaffney: This goes back to a frequent refrain of these programs, does it not?

If Muslims believe Muhammad is the perfect man and that they are to emulate him, then deception, lying, *taqiyya*, and subterfuge are all part and parcel of their program.

Usama Dakdok: There are many different kinds of lies. We are talking about general lying. What about *kitman*?

That is also acceptable in Islam. What is *kitman*? If I know somebody is going to fly an airplane into a tower, I simply keep it to myself. I do not say anything because, if it is Allah’s will, it is going to happen. Who am I to stop Allah’s will?

You can see that, if there are any terrorist activities in the West, other Muslims know about them.

There is no way a man can make a bomb in his kitchen while his entire family sees, smells, and knows about it, and they say nothing. It is because that is another practice in Islam called *kitman*. You do not tell anyone because it may be the will of Allah.

Frank Gaffney: I believe we have [01:06:00] come to the end of our time together.

I want to thank each of you: Elizabeth Yore, Alex Newman, Paul Blair, Usama Dakdok, and, of course, Karen Siegemund.

I simply want to say that I think this has explored and exposed an absolutely vital part of where we are in trying to protect our country against Sharia and its adherents.

I think we must make this a voting issue. That is part of a campaign we hope to launch in earnest—really, its second phase.

It began initially in February in Texas with the effort to seek and actually secure a decisive victory for Proposition 10 on the Republican primary ballot, in which 1.9 million Texans agreed [01:07:00] with the proposition that Texas should prohibit Sharia law.

We want that to be the case across the country. We are going to do everything we can as an organization, coalition, and movement under the banner of BanSharia.com to make that happen.

Thank you to all of you for being with us. Please stay abreast of everything we are doing in these respects at BanSharia.com.

God bless each and every one of you as you seek truthfully and faithfully to support and defend our Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

God bless our country, and God bless you all.