



Texas Imam Ousted After Supporting Trump's Muslim Ban

They say "Politics makes strange bedfellows," and none stranger than a Texas imam who is siding with Donald Trump — on the presidential candidate's proposal to temporarily ban Muslim immigration into the United States. And politics can also make one strangely unemployed: The imam, Dr. Nidal Alsayyed, has just been forced to resign from his religious directorship for taking his position.



Trump made his proposal December 7, <u>saying</u> "It is obvious to anybody the hatred [among some Muslims] is beyond comprehension. Where this hatred comes from and why, we will have to determine. Until we are able to determine and understand this problem and the dangerous threat it poses, our country cannot be the victims of horrendous attacks by people that believe only in jihad, and have no sense of reason or respect for human life." Under Trump's plan, the moratorium would remain in place "until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on," as his campaign put it.

Dr. Alsayyed weighed in the very next day, <u>telling</u> KFDM, "I certainly see it to be wise; [sic] that the US government should stop temporarily accepting any new Muslim immigrants (refugees and non refugees) into the United States; [sic] But my justification to that is based on the fact that we can hardly distinguish who is Muslim and who is not! Islam is not about an ID card or last name! or shouting 'Allahu Akbar!!' I believe the situation nationally is getting mixed up and certainly agree with Mr. Trump on closing the door until further understanding is achieved."

{modulepos inner text ad}

But the imam apparently hadn't achieved the necessary understanding with his flock: Within days he was forced to leave his directorship at the Islamic Society of the Triplex, a mosque in Beaumont, Texas.

Alsayyed's position began "shifting after lingering questions about the backgrounds of the couple responsible for the mass shooting in San Bernardino," reported KFDM on Friday. The news organ continued, as transcribed by Fox 4:

"But the way it happens when you see this mass shooting and you see some people coming with such a very peaceful background and all of the sudden the intelligences themselves, the agencies are not able to figure out what's happening, why all of a sudden this guy or this girl or that lady open fire and kill 15 people, because American Muslims are not doing their job in the country. So we need to stop, we need to stop taking new ones until we fix the existing situation," Dr. Alsayyed said.

The religious leader said there is a problem with some American Muslims seeing a conflict between following their religious beliefs and their patriotism to the U.S., and an issue differentiating the religious community and its political role. He said the two should not mix.

"I came to know this morning from some close contacts and friends over 102 Imams, religious people in Houston, were fired and forced to be basically leave their jobs, leave their mosques only because they did not get along with the political agenda for their board members," he said.



Written by **Selwyn Duke** on December 15, 2015



Muslims who take Dr. Alsayyed's position are, apparently, almost as rare as bacon in a halal grocery. One other, however, is a man this writer has often cited: Dr. Mudar Zahran, a Jordanian opposition leader and self-described "orthodox Muslim." Going even further than Alsayyed, Zahran — who himself is a refugee living in Europe — <u>said</u> in an October edition of "The Glazov Gang" that the current wave of Muslim refugees should be kept out of Europe. Yet something else Zahran mentioned is relevant here.

Alsayyed claims that Trump's plan accords with Islamic law because, "The text [5:32] of the holy Qur'an says the loss of one life is equivalent to killing the whole mankind." As Zahran instructs us to ask of such claimants, however, "[W]hich Islam are you referring to?"

What does Zahran mean? Unbeknownst to most, the Koran is only 16 percent of the Islamic canon. There are two other books as well: the Sira and Hadith. And while nine percent of the Koran itself contains violent political/religious (jihadist) language, the figures for the Hadith and Sira are, respectively, 21 and 67 percent. In all three books taken together, 31 percent of the words are devoted to jihad. (In contrast, the New Testament has zero percent devoted to violent political/religious struggle.)

Zahran only mentioned the Hadith in his interview. As he put it, however, referring to the Islamic violence long making headlines, "This is all written down, 95 percent of it, in the Hadith. So when a Muslim comes to you and says 'No, Islam is not ISIS, Islam is not [about] taking over Europe, Islam is not [about] killing the Jews,' tell them, 'Okay, which Islam are you referring to? It's in the Hadith. It's in your books that claims [sic] that the prophet has said it.'" Hadith is "basically ISIS," Zahran continued.

This brings us to the assertion, made by the FBI itself, "that the more 'devout' a Muslim, the more likely he is to be 'violent,'" as *Wired* reported in 2011. And analogizing the matter places this in perspective. A secular Jew may occasionally attend a friend's son's Bar Mitzvah, but only a pious one would study the Torah (Old Testament); a cafeteria Catholic might attend church on Christmas and Easter, but only a devout one would read the Bible and know his catechism. Likewise, a nominal Muslim might have had some exposure to the Koran growing up, but only a serious Muslim would deeply imbibe it — and only a zealous one would delve into the Sira and Hadith at all.

And be exposed to that much more call to violent jihad.

Yet the jihadist language contained in the Koran alone is worrisome, say critics. As *Wired* also wrote in 2011, "Those destructive [jihadist] tendencies cannot be reversed, [sic] an FBI instructional presentation adds: 'Any war against non-believers is justified' under Muslim law; a 'moderating process cannot happen if the Koran continues to be regarded as the unalterable word of Allah.'" Jihad Watch's Robert Spencer also weighed in, commenting on Alsayyed's quoted passage (5:32): "First, note that it is not a general prohibition of killing — there are big exceptions for those who kill 'for a soul or for corruption in the land.' Second, this is not a general command, but one only for the Children of Israel. Third, 'many of them, after that ... were transgressors' — so all it is really saying is that Allah gave a command to the Children of Israel and they transgressed against it."

So "Which Islam?" indeed. Interviewer Jamie Glazov said to Zahran at one point, "There are Muslims who would see you as not a very good Muslim if you're opposed to Sharia law." And such believers appear legion. According to an American Thinker analysis of Pew Research Center data, a majority of Muslims worldwide <u>favor</u> making Sharia law the law of government, and 600 million Muslims <u>support</u> the death penalty for those who leave Islam. Moreover, Germany, which has been a primary destination for Muslim migrants, <u>already has</u> between 8,000 and 44,000 Islamists on its soil.







Yet according to the mainstream media, it's Donald Trump, Nidal Alsayyed, Mudar Zahran, and those agreeing with them who are the radicals.





Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.