<u>Linda Sarsour</u> (arabic: صر صور), is a self-proclaimed progressive activist, dealing with issues regarding Muslims in both the U.S. and abroad. Born and raised in Brooklyn, NY, she is a child of Palestinian parents. At the age of 17, Sarsour was placed into an arranged marriage, and by her mid-20s, already had three children.

Sarsour's political career began at the Arab American Association of New York (AAANY), where she began volunteering shortly after the September 11th attacks in 2001. She was appointed to the position of Executive Director at AAANY after the then-current director was killed in a car accident. Sarsour served as Executive Director from 2011 to 2017.

AAANY <u>formerly listed</u> the Qatar Foundation International (QFI) as one of its supporters, but this has been removed from the official website as of 2017. QFI describes itself as "the U.S.-based member of Qatar Foundation (QF)." The Foundation is <u>funded by the government of Qatar</u>, which in turn has shown support for the Muslim Brotherhood and even <u>harbored political exiles from the Brotherhood</u> via its news organization, *Al-Jazeera*. Al-Jazeera, the largest news establishment in the Arab world, has been known to promote pro-Brotherhood propaganda. The Qatari government even provided Egypt with 8-billon dollars worth of loans after the Brotherhood candidate Mohamed Morsi rose to power in 2012. Furthermore, the following excerpt from <u>Counter-Jihad Report</u> regarding AAANY illustrates QF's association with the Brotherhood:

Qatar Foundation also has a relationship with the <u>International Institute of Islamic Thought</u>, a U.S. Muslim Brotherhood entity that came under a terrorism-financing investigation after 9/11. The Deputy Director of Qatar Foundation's Center for Islamic Legislation and Ethics, Dr. Jasser Auda, is a <u>teacher</u> for IIIT programs. His <u>bio</u> also says he is "affiliated" with IIIT.

IIIT is listed by the U.S. Muslim Brotherhood as one of "our organizations and the organizations of our friends" in a <u>secret 1991 memo</u>. The document articulates the objective of its American network as a "kind of grand <u>jihad</u> in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within..." Clarion's <u>full report</u> on IIIT leaves no doubt that the group is Islamist in nature.

The Qatari government <u>supports terrorism</u> via groups like the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, Al-Qaeda, and it's splinter groups such as Al-Shabaab in Somalia and the Yemen division of Al-Qaeda. To recap, Qatar has supported terror groups through finances, and through QF has also supported AAANY, of which Linda Sarsour was Executive Director.

I would like to point out the 1982 Brotherhood document, titled <u>*The Project*</u>, which is self-described as:

...a global vision of a worldwide strategy for Islamic policy [or "political Islam"]. Local Islamic policies will be drawn up in the different regions in accordance with its guidelines. It acts, first of all, to define the points of departure of that policy, then to set up the components and the most important procedures linked to each point of departure; finally we suggest several missions, by way of example only, may Allah protect us.

The subsequent Brotherhood document released in 1991, called simply <u>*An Explanatory Memorandum*</u>, outlines their strategies for the North American region, which includes the official Strategic Goal dating back to 1987:

Enablement of Islam in North America, meaning: establishing an effective and a stable Islamic Movement led by the Muslim Brotherhood which adopts Muslims' causes domestically and globally, and which works to expand the observant Muslim base, aims at unifying and directing Muslims' efforts, presents Islam as a civilization alternative, and supports the global Islamic State wherever it is.

The Memorandum also covers their intention to deconstruct Western society covertly:

The process of settlement is a "Civilization-Jihadist Process" with all the word means [sic]. The Ikhwan [Brothers] must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand Jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and "sabotaging" its miserable house by their hands, and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated, and God's religion is made victorious over all other religions. ...It is a Muslim's destiny to perform Jihad and work wherever he is and wherever he lands until the final hour comes, and there is no escape from that destiny except for those who chose to slack. But, would the slackers and the Mujahideen (Jihadists) be equal?

The last line of the above excerpt refers directly to Qur'an 4:95, which states:

Not equal are those believers remaining [at home] - other than the disabled - and the mujahideen, [who strive and fight] in the cause of Allah with their wealth and their lives. Allah has preferred the mujahideen through their wealth and their lives over those who remain [behind], by degrees. And to both Allah has promised the best [reward]. But Allah has preferred the mujahideen over those who remain [behind] with a great reward...

Were it not for clear proof in the form of documents, money trails, and evidence gathered by intelligence agencies, one would be expected to dismiss the Muslim Brotherhood as a paranoid, xenophobic conspiracy theory. However, there are many seemingly-benign organizations that have been repeatedly identified as front groups for the Brotherhood and similar terror groups. A <u>few examples</u> include the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), the International Relief Fund for the Afflicted and Needy (IRFAN), the Muslim Student Association (MSA), and the Muslim Association of Canada (MAC).

Therefore, it stands to reason that the AAANY is just another organization under the far reach of the Brotherhood, albeit more indirectly than an organization such as CAIR. Despite AAANY's associations with Qatar, and by proxy the Muslim Brotherhood, skeptics might be willing to dismiss warnings about Sarsour, pointing out that she was co-organizer of the 2017 Women's March on Washington and has been vocal on women's rights throughout her political career. However, she <u>has said of critics</u> of radical Islam, Brigitte Gabriel and Ayaan Hirsi Ali:

Brigitte Gabriel=Ayaan Hirsi Ali. She's asking 4 an a whippin'. I wish I could take their vaginas away - they don't deserve to be women.

I would also like to point out that Hirsi was a victim of FGM, or *female genital mutilation*, a horrendous procedure often practiced in Islamic countries.

Sarsour has also shown support for Shariah law, which, among other abhorrent practices, calls for the subjugation of women and the death penalty for apostates. She <u>writes on twitter</u>,

Sharia Law is misunderstood & has been pushed as some evil Muslim agenda. Some Muslims r oppressors for sure

You'll know when you're living under Sharia Law if suddenly all your loans & credit cards become interest free. Sound [sic] nice, doesn't it?

10 weeks of PAID maternity leave in Saudi Arabia. Yes PAID. And ur worrying about women driving. Puts us to shame.

Read <u>this</u> piece on #Sharia Law from the Associate Religion Editor at @HuffPostRelig. Educate yourself.

The link referred to in the last tweet is a Huffington Post article, which dismisses the severity and cruelty of Shariah - and waters it down to something along the lines of a spiritual path, more or less. The piece also makes blatantly false claims about the Islamic system of law, stating that, " It's also a living body of law... and is still being examined with fresh eyes by Muslim scholars and believers today." If one actually knows how Shariah was codified, however, it is clear that this cannot in practicality be a "living body of law," since the person whose life it is based upon is long-dead. Those who purport that Shariah is something other than oppressive are either ill-informed or disingenuous.

Shariah is based firstly from the Qur'an, and then from the Hadith. The *Hadith* are the sayings of both the Prophet Muhammad and his followers, and reveal the life and practices of the Prophet. There are several collections of these sayings, and they are extensive - with 2,230 quotes in <u>Sahih al-Bukhari</u> alone (excluding repetitions). Muslims revere Muhammad as the "best of creation" and the <u>ultimate example</u> to emulate. Therefore, his life and actions are to be an example for Muslims. While there are positive entries in the Hadith, there are also inexcusable quotes calling for so much as the killing of women and children:

The Prophet passed by me at a place called Al-Abwa or Waddan, and was asked whether it was permissible to attack the pagan warriors at night with the probability of exposing their women and children to danger. The Prophet replied, "They (i.e. women and children) are from them (i.e. pagans)." I also heard the Prophet saying, "The institution of Hima is invalid except for Allah and His Apostle." [Sahih al-Bukhari 4:52:256]

It is narrated by Sa'b b. Jaththama that he said (to the Holy Prophet): Messenger of Allah, we kill the children of the polytheists during the night raids. He said: "They are from them." [Sahih Muslim 19:4322]

Some Zanadiqa (atheists) were brought to 'Ali and he burnt them. The news of this event, reached Ibn 'Abbas who said, "If I had been in his place, I would not have burnt them, as Allah's Apostle forbade it, saying, 'Do not punish anybody with Allah's punishment (fire).' I would have killed them according to the statement of Allah's Apostle, 'Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him.'" [Sahih al-Bukhari 8:84:57]

Allah's Apostle said, "The Hour will not be established until **you fight with the Jews**, and the stone behind which a Jew will be hiding will say. "O Muslim! There is a Jew hiding behind me, **so kill him**." [Sahih al-Bukhari 52:177]

The prophet of Islam boasted, "I have been made victorious with terror." [Sahih al-Bukhari: 4.52. 220]

Additionally, if anything within the Hadith seem to contradict the Qur'an, then the Qur'an is counted as correct every time. Muslims may defend Shariah, stating that the many peaceful verses of the Qur'an would overwrite any violence in the Hadith. However, they fail to mention the concept of <u>abrogation</u>, a system of how some Quranic verses actually overrule others. This idea is actually put forth through what is known as the <u>Verses of Abrogation</u>, one of which is Surat Al-Baqarah 106:

¹⁰⁶For any verse that **We abrogate or remove from memories**, We bring another which is better than it, or similar to it. Do you not know that Allah has power over all things?

Note that Al-Baqarah is one of the later surahs chronologically, being 87th of 114.

Chapters, or *Surahs*, of the Qur'an that were written later automatically nullify ones written earlier, if there is any contradiction between them. Unfortunately, most of the peaceful verses were written early on, when Muhammad was first proselytizing in Mecca and the surrounding area. Muhammad emigrated to Medina in 622 (Muslims call this the *Hijrah*), and the most violent parts of the Qur'an were written at this time. As they came after the Meccan surahs, the Medinan surahs abrogate any contradictions between the two. The Qur'an is traditionally organized starting with the longest surahs and ending with the shortest, in that order. However, this was not the order in which it was written, and <u>must be re-arranged</u> to see how verses are then sorted and abrogated. Take, for example, the Verse of the Sword (5), which appears in the second-to-last surah and is not abrogated by any other verse:

⁴...So fulfill the treaty with them until [the end of] its term. Indeed Allah loves the Godwary). ⁵Then, when the sacred months have passed, kill the polytheists wherever you find them, capture them and besiege them, and lie in wait for them at every ambush. But if they repent, and maintain the prayer and give the zakat, then let them alone. Indeed Allah is allforgiving, all-merciful. ⁶If any of the polytheists seeks asylum from you, grant him asylum until he hears the Word of Allah. Then convey him to his place of safety. That is because they are a people who do not know.

-Verses 5 & 6, Surat al-Tawbah, Qur'an

These verses state that after the term of treaty with the "polytheists," (non-Muslims who were not Christian or Jewish), the Muslims were to "kill them wherever [they found] them," unless they repented and paid the obligatory tax, or *zakat*. While the Muslim army was to give asylum to those who asked, it was only until they had been told about Islam. If the polytheists rejected Islam, then they were considered fair game and subsequently subjugated and killed.

Surat al-Tawbah has many more disturbing entries, which automatically overwrite any peaceful verses via abrogation:

²⁰Those who have believed and migrated, and waged jihad in the way of Allah with their possessions and persons have a greater rank near Allah, and it is they who are the triumphant.

²³O you who have faith! Do not befriend your fathers and brothers if they prefer faithlessness to faith.

²⁸ The faithful should not take the faithless for allies instead of the faithful, and whoever does so, Allah will have nothing to do with him, except when you are wary of them out of caution. ²⁹Fight those who do not have faith in Allah nor [believe] in the Last Day, nor forbid what Allah and His Apostle have forbidden, nor practice the true religion, from among those who were given the Book, until they pay the tribute out of hand, degraded.

³³ It is He who has sent His Apostle with the guidance and the religion of truth, that He may **make** it prevail over all religions, though the polytheists should be averse.

³⁸O you who have faith! What is the matter with you, that when you are told: 'Go forth in the way of Allah,' you sink heavily to the ground? Are you pleased with the life of this world instead of the Hereafter? But the wares of the life of this world compared with the Hereafter are but insignificant. ³⁹If you do not go forth, He will punish you with a painful punishment, and

replace you with another people, and you will not hurt Him in the least, and Allah has power over all things.

⁴¹Go forth, whether [armed] lightly or heavily, and wage jihad with your possessions and persons in the way of Allah. That is better for you, should you know.

⁷³O Prophet! Wage jihad against the faithless and the hypocrites, and be severe with them. Their refuge shall be hell, and it is an evil destination.

⁸⁸But the Apostle and the faithful who are with him **wage jihad with their possessions and persons**, and to such belong all the blessings, and it is they who are the felicitous. ⁸⁹Allah has prepared for them gardens with streams running in them, to remain in them [forever]. That is the great success.

Upon viewing this evidence, it is clear that jihad against non-Muslims is not only accepted, but mandatory for those who are called to it. Furthermore, it abrogates verses which call for peace with nonbelievers. Because Shariah is based on the Qur'an and Hadith, and the Qur'an abrogates the Hadith in the case of contradiction, it is correct to say that obligatory jihad is an integral part of the Shariah. However, that is only the tip of the *very* large iceberg that is Islamic jurisprudence. Shariah calls for the beating of women, killing of apostates and homosexuals, and many more unimaginable penalties. A complete book of Sunni Islamic law is available as *Reliance of the Traveller*, which is the codification of the Shafi'i school of jurisprudence. There are <u>three other schools</u> under Sunni Islam, but they agree on the majority of what Shariah entails.

Linda Sarsour's defense of Shariah law is woefully ignorant at best. However, during her speech to ISNA (an organization mentioned previously in this article), <u>she identified</u> Siraj Wajjah as her "favorite person in the room." Any amount of research on <u>Wahhaj</u> will inform the reader that he was an unindicted co-conspirator in the 1993 World Trade Center attacks. She cites him as a mentor of hers, which is extremely concerning. It is safe to assume that Sarsour knows full-well what is heard when she <u>calls for jihad</u> against the current presidential administration. After all, she was raised in the United States and understands the word's connotation. Granted, she claims that the type of jihad she was referring to was the *greater jihad*, that is, of spiritual warfare, and not the *lesser jihad*, which is physical warfare. While the concept of the greater and lesser jihads are present in Islam, one must learn to read between the lines with someone like Sarsour, who has many connections to known terrorists. (I do encourage the reader to disregard some of Shapiro's overbearing partisan language in the linked article, for the sake of learning about Sarsour's contacts over the years.)

But what was truly the "greater jihad?" Take, for example, when Sarsour states in her speech to ISNA that the Prophet said the best form of jihad was "a word of truth in front of a tyrant ruler or leader; that is the best form of jihad." She is citing Hadith 18,449 of the *Musnad Aḥmad* collection, and it is verified as *sahih*, or authentic. But if one reads the following entry from Sahih al-Bukhari (the hadith of which are all verified as *sahih*; Bukhari is <u>second only to the Qur'an</u>), we can see how the Prophet viewed the topic when questioned on it:

A man came to Allah's Apostle and said, "Instruct me as to such a deed as equals Jihad (in reward)." He replied, "I do not find such a deed." Then he added, "Can you, while the Muslim fighter is in the battle-field, enter your mosque to perform prayers without cease and fast and never break your fast?" The man said, "But who can do that?" Abu- Huraira added, "The Mujahid (i.e. Muslim fighter) is rewarded even for the footsteps of his horse while it wanders bout (for grazing) tied in a long rope." [4:52:44]

I heard Allah's Apostle saying, "The example of a Mujahid in Allah's Cause-- and Allah knows better who really strives in His Cause----is like a person who fasts and prays **continuously**. Allah guarantees that He will admit the Mujahid in His Cause into Paradise if he is killed, otherwise He will return him to his home safely with rewards and war booty." [44:52:46]

The Prophet said, "A single endeavor (of fighting) in Allah's Cause in the forenoon or in the afternoon is better than the world and whatever is in it." [4:52:50]

Allah's Apostle said, "Know that **Paradise is under the shades of swords.**" [4:52:73]

The Prophet said that *no deed* equaled that of what the mujahideen, or jihadis, practiced. He clearly states that the one who acts out *jihad* on the battlefield is akin to someone who performs prayers and fasts constantly. Here, Muhammad is obviously speaking of a physical jihad as the greatest, and equates it to the most devout of spiritual acts in Islam. In the example of 44:52:46, one cannot make the claim that Muhammad speaks of spiritual jihad, because he directly references "war booty." Take also this excerpt from <u>Wikislam</u>, which cites its own sources directly from the Hadith:

In all six major Hadith collections (Sahih Bukhari, Sahih Muslim, Dawud, al-Sughra, Tirmidhi and Ibn Majah), **jihad almost always refers to the "lesser" outward physical struggle** and not the "greater" inward spiritual struggle. As an example, **there are nearly 200 references to jihad in the most trusted collection of hadith, Sahih Bukhari, and every single one assumes that jihad means literal warfare**.

<u>This</u> fabricated hadith does not appear in any of the famous hadith collections and is inconsistent with the teachings found in corroborated (Mutawatir) sahih hadith. Some of these hadith state that fighting jihad is second only to the belief in Muhammad and Allah, and that standing for an hour in the ranks of battle is better than standing in prayer for sixty years.

Furthermore, Muhammad himself refutes the claim that the "greater" jihad is the inward spiritual struggle, when **he states the best jihad is that of a man whose "blood is shed and his horse is wounded".**

It is clear that those who claim that the "greater jihad" is that of spiritual warfare are either misinformed or being outright deceptive. If one ignores the concept of abrogation, then it is possible to cherrypick and assume that the good overrules the bad. However, abrogation tells us that even if Muhammad himself had called only for peace, his words would still be overwritten by the words of Surat al-Tawbah of the Qur'an. Therefore, it must be assumed that the greater jihad is, in fact, the physical warfare of the mujahideen.

It is unknown if Sarsour is also aware of the Islamic concept of *taqiyya*, which supposedly allows Muslims to deceive non-Muslims when it is beneficial for them or it furthers the cause of Islam. Of course, that's not to say that the average Muslim practices taqiyya or is even aware of it. I would like clarify that most Islamic scholars assert that taqiyya is only to be used in times of duress, and to defend oneself from harm under persecution of non-Muslims. That being said, the term is <u>vaguely-used in the Qur'an</u> and could be easily interpreted as a means to ill-willed deception, especially when paired with verses such as 3:28 above. It would not be a far stretch to assume that groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood would have no problems implementing this version of taqiyya, in order to further their form of cultural jihad.

When Sarsour defends Shariah law, is she being purposefully deceptive or is she merely unaware of its tenets? Without knowing the mind of another, we cannot say for sure. But personally, I am of the opinion that Sarsour is well aware of what is contained in Shariah law, and often diverts talking points in order to draw attention away from its negative aspects. Take, for example, her aforementioned tweet regarding maternity leave in Saudi Arabia. She claims that the ten weeks of paid maternity leave somehow overshadow the fact that driving is prohibited for women in that country. If Sarsour were honest, she would cite the very

Shariah she defends as reason women cannot drive there - they are not allowed to leave the house save a male relative or their husband and his permission. It is a form of control over women, and to ensure their dependence upon men. No doubt Sarsour is familiar with the effects of Shariah on millions of people throughout the Muslim world: there is no freedom of speech, very few rights for women, and harsh punishments for open disbelief.

Sarsour belittles the suffering of those who have no voice in her attempts to normalize Shariah. She also deceives the credulous or uneducated in Islam into believing a lie about the nature of *jihad*. Knowing that she confides in people like Wahhaj, worked for an organization funded by the Qataris, and has defended Shariah law multiple times, one must wonder about her intentions. But instead of answering legitimate questions about her faith, she persists in vehemently <u>name-calling her detractors</u> *islamophobes*, *xenophobes*, and *racists*.

So I will speak more than a *word of truth* regarding the "activist" Linda Sarsour: she gladly plays the victim and distorts the truth, while claiming to be a proponent of the truth. She claims to fight for the rights of women and the oppressed, but defends a system of law that oppresses everyone under its rule. She claims to practice peace, but uses the language of extremism and associates herself with those who practice it. A word of truth about Linda Sarsour is *liar*.