



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on August 4, 2016

Democratic Convention Star Khizr Khan Has History of Defending Sharia

Khizr Khan, the Pakistani-born lawyer (and “gold star father”) who received national attention following his speech at this year’s Democratic National Convention, during which he attacked Republican presidential nominee, Donald Trump, by name, has a history of defending Sharia — the Islamic legal system — going back as far as 1983. During that year, Khan defended (at least in concept) Sharia in an academic paper titled “[Juristic Classification of Islamic Law](#),” which he wrote while studying in Saudi Arabia:



The invariable and basic rules of Islamic law are only those prescribed in the Shari’ah (Quran and Sunnah), which are few and limited. *All other juridical works* which have been written during more than thirteen centuries are very rich and indispensable, but they *must always be subordinated to the Shari’ah* and open to reconsideration by all Muslims. [Emphasis added.]

Taking into consideration that “Juristic Classification of Islamic Law” was written as an academic paper, and as such, presents arguments on both sides of each issue for consideration, the reader must determine which side Khan advocates — adhering strictly to Sharia or “reconsidering” other judicial works interpretively. One opinion on this was offered by a journalist with impressive credentials — Paul E. Sperry, who was a media fellow at the Hoover Institution, and previously was the Washington Bureau Chief at *Investor’s Business Daily* and *WorldNetDaily*. In his recent analysis of Khan’s paper, Sperry observed that Khan explained that Sharia is derived from the Quran and Sunnah, and that the Quran “is the absolute authority from which springs the very conception of legality and every legal obligation.”

Khan also noted that Quranic law includes “constitutional law,” writing: “Family law is laid down in 70 injunctions; civil law in another 70; penal law in 30; jurisdiction and procedure in 13; constitutional law in 10; international relations in 25; and economic and financial order in 10.”

Presumably, “all other judicial works,” which Khan said must always be subordinated to the Sharia under Islamic law, include the U.S. Constitution, which Kahn pointed to during his harangue at the convention:

Donald Trump, you are asking Americans to trust you with their future. Let me ask you: Have you even read the United States Constitution? I will gladly lend you my copy. In this document, look for the words “liberty” and “equal protection of law.”

Trump responded:

While I feel deeply for the loss of his son, Mr. Khan who has never met me, has no right to stand in front of millions of people and claim I have never read the Constitution, which is false, and say many other inaccurate things.



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on August 4, 2016

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Had it not been for the fact that Khan and his wife, Ghazala, were the parents of Captain Humayun S. M. Khan — who was killed in Iraq in 2004 after an explosive-laden vehicle drove into the gate of his compound while he was inspecting soldiers on guard duty — the speech would have been dismissed as just so such partisan rhetoric. However Khan’s status as a “Gold Star Father” has granted him apparent bullet-proof immunity from any and all criticism, especially from Trump. Like most people, Americans honor their fallen warriors, and such honor is often extended to the families of fallen soldiers, whether the families have done anything to deserve such honor or not. It is simply considered poor form to say anything that might cause more emotional suffering to those who grieve.

While it might legitimately be said that Khan’s very public condemnation of Trump invited a response, the mass media and political figures disagree. And the criticism of Trump’s response to Khan has come not only from Democrats, but from prominent Republicans, as well.

Speaking aboard Air Force One, White House Principal Deputy Press Secretary Eric Schultz, while not addressing any specific portions of Trump’s comments about Khan or his wife (about whom, Trump said: “I’d like to hear his wife say something.”) said honoring Gold Star families should rise “above politics.”

“Families who make the ultimate sacrifice for this country’s freedom and this country’s safety deserve nothing but our country’s honor and gratitude and deepest respect,” Schultz said.

While statements of that sort might be expected from a member of the Obama administration, some Republicans also jumped on the bandwagon. Senator Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) said in a statement: “This is going to a place where we’ve never gone before, to push back against the families of the fallen.”

The GOP’s 2008 presidential nominee, Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.), issued a lengthy a statement on August 1 that said in part:

In recent days, Donald Trump disparaged a fallen soldier’s parents. He has suggested that the likes of their son should not be allowed in the United States — to say nothing of entering its service. I cannot emphasize enough how deeply I disagree with Mr. Trump’s statement. I hope Americans understand that the remarks do not represent the views of our Republican Party, its officers, or candidates....

I claim no moral superiority over Donald Trump. I have a long and well-known public and private record for which I will have to answer at the Final Judgment, and I repose my hope in the promise of mercy and the moderation of age. I challenge the nominee to set the example for what our country can and should represent.

Speaking of McCain’s “public and private record,” since he took such great pains to chastise Trump for what he regarded as inappropriate comments toward the family of a fallen soldier, we wonder if McCain has erased from his memory the ungallant way in which he acted toward Dolores Apodaca Alfond, chairwoman of the National Alliance of POW/MIA Families, whose pilot brother Captain Victor Apodaca was missing in action in North Vietnam. One would think that McCain, a former Navy pilot who was shot down and held as a POW in North Vietnam for five and a half years would have felt great empathy for Alfond and treated her with as much respect and courtesy as he expects Trump to show toward the Khans. But that was not the case.

An article in *U.S. Veterans Dispatch* describes the meeting between the senator and the sister of the



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on August 4, 2016

MIA. Unfortunately our space here is limited and the article is lengthy, but a few excerpts will suffice to present the picture:

Apodaca ... was offering testimony critical of the Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs. [McCain] rushed into the hearing room to confront her.

[McCain was] angry and his voice very loud, he accused her of making “allegations ... that are patently and totally false and deceptive.”

Making a fist, he shook his index finger at her and said she had insulted an emissary to Vietnam sent by President Bush. He said she had insulted other MIA families with her remarks. And then he said, through clenched teeth: “And I am sick and tired of you insulting mine and other people’s [patriotism] who happen to have different views than yours.”

By this time, tears were running down Alford’s cheeks. She reached into her handbag for a handkerchief. She tried to speak: “The family members have been waiting for years — years! And now you’re shutting down.” He kept interrupting her. She tried to say, through tears, that she had issued no insults. He kept talking over her words. He said she was accusing him and others of “some conspiracy without proof, and some cover-up.” She said she was merely seeking “some answers. That is what I am asking.” He ripped into her for using the word “fiasco.” She replied: “The fiasco was the people that stepped out and said we have written the end, the final chapter to Vietnam.” “No one said that,” he shouted. “No one said what you are saying they said, Ms. Alford.” And then, his face flaming pink, [McCain] stalked out of the room, to shouts of disfavor from members of the audience.

McCain and others criticized Trump for defending himself against Khan’s charges made before a nationwide audience at the Democratic National Convention, but no one has suggested that Trump verbally browbeat Mrs. Khan to the point of reducing her to tears!

But returning to Khan — is he merely the father of a war hero who has been unfairly persecuted, or does he have personal baggage that should be called into question?

A report in *Breitbart* notes that in 1983, the same year he wrote “[Juristic Classification of Islamic Law](#),” Khan wrote a very sympathetic review of a book compiled from a seminar held in Kuwait called “Human Rights In Islam” in which he pointedly praised the keynote address of Allah K. Brohi, a Pakistani pro-jihad Islamic jurist who was one of the closest advisors to Pakistan’s former dictator General Zia ul-Haq — who is regarded as the father of the Taliban movement.

During the time he served as Pakistani minister of law and religious affairs, Brohi enacted a strict form of Sharia in the nation, bringing back Sharia punishments, such as amputations for theft and demands that rape victims produce four male witnesses or face adultery charges. He also made insulting the Muslim prophet Muhammad a crime punishable by death. Brohi and Zia also issued a law that required judges to consult mullahs on every judicial decision for Sharia compliance.

Breitbart reported that in his book review, Khan, far from taking issue with Brohi’s extreme interpretation of human rights, asserted that Brohi “successfully” explains them and argues his points “convincingly.” (The review lists Khan as “director” of an Islamic center in Houston, and was published in the *Texas International Law Journal*.)

“The keynote speech of Dr. A.K. Brohi, former Pakistani minister of legal and religious affairs, is a hallmark in this book,” Khan wrote in his review. “It successfully explains the Islamic concepts of ‘right’



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on August 4, 2016

and ‘just’ in comparison to their Christian and Judaic counterparts.”

Since Khan is obviously sympathetic to the Islamic concept of what is right and just, in comparison with the Judeo-Christian concept expressed in our Declaration of Independence and protected in our Constitution, one wonders on what grounds Khan dared to challenge Trump’s understanding of the Constitution.

As the *Breitbart* writer summarized Khan’s position: “In context, Khan concurs that human rights can only be guaranteed through the establishment of Sharia’s moral and legal code.”

Another article about Khan’s past posted by Infowars.com notes that Khan co-founded the *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Muslim Law*, “an academic periodical that seeks to defend the arcane Sharia law to a legal system based on Western jurisprudence.”

It was smart politics for the Democrats to have enlisted Khan as their mouthpiece to taunt Trump and elicit his response, which was characteristically imprudent and politically damaging. But their ploy was designed to accomplish more than scoring some points against Trump.

A more important goal was discussed in a recent article in *The New American*, which quoted from journalists Theodore Shoebat and Walid Shoebat [proprietors of Shoebat.com], who — after pointing out that Khan once wrote a paper entitled “In Defense of OPEC” — expressed their opinion: “It is likely that Khan is a Muslim plant working with the Hillary Clinton campaign, probably for the interest of Muslim oil companies as well as Muslim immigration into the U.S.”

The Shoebats continued with their theory: “It is obvious that Khan is upset, that a Trump victory will eliminate and destroy decades of hard work to bring in Islamic immigration into the United States which was spearheaded by agents in Saudi Arabia like Khan and Huma Abedin’s father (Sayed Z. Abedin).”

As *The New American* observed, “Whether or not the above is accurate, it certainly is true that Hillary Clinton will, just as her former boss Barack Obama has done, encourage Muslim immigration into the United States.”

Trump’s views on restricting migration from predominantly Muslim nations where terrorism has grown rampant have actually contributed to his popularity. The entire confrontation between Trump and Khan may have been engineered to reduce Trump’s appeal and divert the immigration argument into a side issue — whether or not Trump has shown sufficient respect for the parents of a fallen Iraq veteran who happened to be Muslim.

Related article:

[The Donald vs. Khizr: Is it All Just a Khan Job?](#)



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.



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.

Subscribe