

Counterjihad Brussels 2007 Conference

European Parliament (18 October) / Flemish Parliament (19 October)

Thursday, 18 October: 10:30-11:00*

Creeping Dhimmitude at the United Nations

By

David G. Littman

I am speaking today in a private capacity, not as an NGO, but four oral statements that I delivered to the United Nations Human Rights Council last month – and an earlier one – are available on the back desk, with some written NGO statements attached [Use UN ref.no. via Google to 'link' to these texts.]

I would like to start with a prologue. In January 1971 I discovered a rare gem in the library of St. Anthony's College, Oxford and – encouraged by Professor Bernard Lewis, then in London – I co-edited a slim volume, *Arab Theologians on Jews and Israel* under the pseudonym, "D.F. Green." (1) It contains a brief introduction and extracts from 25 lectures pronounced by senior Muslim scholars in 1968 at *The Fourth Conference of the Academy of Islamic Research*, under the auspices of Al Azhar University. These scholarly Islamic transactions were published in 1970 (in Arabic and English) by the Egyptian Government Printing Offices, thus providing official backing.

Forty years ago it was disheartening to witness the principal religious leaders of the Arab-Muslim world convening for the sake of glorifying a Jihad ideology and vilifying another religion and an entire people, shunning neither expressions of abuse, nor the worst invectives – with lecture titles such as, *The Jews are the Enemies of Human Life as is Evident from their Holy Book*. The Supreme Judge of Jordan spoke on *The Jihad is the Way to Gain Victory*, and various forms of Jihad were strongly recommended by speakers. Jews are frequently denoted as the "enemies of Allah" or the "enemies of humanity." This latter expression is even to be found in the opening speech of Egypt's then vice-president. The Mufti of the Lebanon preferred the expression – "dogs of humanity". (2)

These clerics affirmed then – as do others nowadays, and also the Iranian and Syrian presidents – that they differentiate meticulously between Zionism and Judaism and are against Zionism, but not against Judaism. There cannot be a more trenchant disproof than the arguments used at this 1968 Conference. Zionism's odium is described as emanating from the perversity of Judaism. Zionists and Jews are treated synonymously. And this theological mindset has remained intact 40 years later – even greatly magnified – yet it is minimized by those who still refuse to see with their eyes and hear with their ears the clear message from Syria and Iran, from Hizbollah and Hamas, and from the Jihadist hosts . Perhaps it's time to republish a fourth edition, titled: *Muslim Theologians on Jihad and on Jews and Israel* – in the hope that readers may learn that today's 'culture of hate' and of Jihad is nothing new.

[Dr. Abdul Halim Mahmoud, then Head of the Islamic Research Academy and Rector of Al Azhar University, later published *Jihad and Victory* in which he made the same point about the Jews according to Scripture: (3)

Allah commands the Muslims to fight the friends of Satan wherever they are found. Among the friends of Satan – indeed among the foremost friends of Satan in our age – are the Jews. The Jews have laid down a program for the destruction of humanity, through subverting religion and ethics. They have already begun their control of the mass media, and their propaganda. They have falsified knowledge, violated standards of literary truth, and put conscience in the service of breaking down to implement this program with their money, and destroying humanity. As a consequence of such activities, the Jews have succeeded in gaining control and seizing power. But Allah – praise be to Him – will wreck the edifice that the Jews have built and eliminate their destructive machinations and double-dealing.]

On 4 April 2002, Al-Azhar Grand Sheikh Muhammad Sayyid Tantawi – the highest ranking cleric in the Sunni world – referred to the Jews as “*the enemies of Allah, descendants of apes and pigs.*” (3) And *fatwas* by Muslim Brotherhood Sheikh Yousef Al-Qaradhawi use racist, genocidal language. (4)

In any counter-Jihad context, it would be advisable to reiterate, *ad nauseam*, hard irrefutable facts. For instance, the slogan of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood movement, founded in 1928, which is the blueprint for all the “Jihadist Martyrdom” Bombers states: “*Allah is our objective. The Prophet is our leader. The Qur’an is our law. Jihad is our way. Dying in the way of Allah is our highest hope.*” This is virtually identical to article 8 of the 1988 Hamas Charter 60 years later, whose article 2 states that it is “*one of the wings of the Muslim Brotherhood Movement in Palestine.*” (5)

Article 7 cites a genocidal *hadith* on the killing of Jews, widely preached, and not only in mosques: [The Prophet, Allah bless him and grant him salvation, has said: “The Day of Judgement will not come about until Muslim fight the Jews (killing the Jews), when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees. The stones and trees will say: Oh Muslim, Oh Abdulla (Slave of Allah), there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him.”]

This bloody Jihad tale was repeated in a sermon on 30 March 2007 by Hamas spokesman, Ismail Radwan, on the official Palestinian TV – partially financed by the European Union. Soon after, a Hamas website provided a video of a Jihadist declaring with relish and without scruples or concern: My message to the loathed Jews is that there is no god but Allah. We will chase you everywhere! We are a nation that drinks blood, and we know that there is no blood better than the blood of Jews. We will not leave you alone until we have quenched our thirst with your blood, and our children's thirst with your blood. We will not leave until you leave the Muslim countries. In the name of Allah, we will destroy you, blow you up, take revenge against you, purify the land of you pigs that have defiled our country. This operation is revenge against the sons of monkeys and pigs. [Palestinian Media Watch – <http://www.pmw.org.il>]

* * * * *

Now, allow me to provide examples since 1986 on taboo subjects at the UN Commission on Human Rights. Although I have often quoted extensively from the genocidal Hamas Charter – even making available copies in Arabic and an English translation in Feb. 1989 – Hamas was never condemned by any UN body, not even after its election and the brutal putsch in Gaza three months ago. On the contrary, at the request of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) a special meeting was held during the 2004 Commission to commemorate Sheikh Yassin, founder and spiritual leader of Hamas, who co-drafted, with Abd al-Aziz al-Rantisi, the Hamas genocidal Charter that endorses, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (6) and preached Jihad in all its forms. (7)

Dhimmitude at the UN Commission on Human Rights became normative from the mid-1980s on themes such as: hostage-taking in Lebanon, the *fatwa* against Rushdie, Jihadist terrorism, etc. (8)

The Universality and Indivisibility of Human Rights and the CDHRI of 1990

We often hear about “the universality and indivisibility of human rights” but such idealistic goals are utopian, as they can be nullified by devious attempts to redefine human rights. The reasons given for non-compliance are often religious. The Islamic Republic of Iran has always had major objections to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Iran’s representative – speaking in 1981, two years after the Islamic Revolution, and again on 7 December 1984 at the UN in New York – could not have been clearer, and Iran’s position has not changed an iota on the principles clearly stated then:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which represents a secular understanding of the Judeo-Christian tradition, cannot be implemented by Muslims and does not accord with the system of values recognized by the Islamic Republic of Iran.; his country would therefore not hesitate to violate its provisions, since it had to choose between violating the divine law of the country and violating secular conventions. (9)

In 1989, the same year as Khomeini's Rushdie *Fatwa* a Committee of Legal Experts meeting in Teheran (10) sponsored a new "Declaration of Human Rights in Islam", adopted in Cairo in 1990. It established *shari'a* law as "*the only source of reference*" for the protection of human rights in Islamic lands, thus giving it supremacy over the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (articles 24 and 25). The CDHR in Islam was to "*serve as a general guidance for Member States in the field of human rights*" and its preamble reiterates an unchangeable religious tenet on the historic role of the Islamic Ummah: "*which God made the best nation that has given mankind a universal and well-balanced civilization.*"

[The Member States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference,

Reaffirming the civilizing and historic role of the Islamic Ummah, which God made the best nation that has given mankind a universal and well-balanced civilization in which harmony is established between this life and the hereafter and knowledge is combined with faith; (...)]

Cairo Declaration Published in *A Compilation of International Instruments* (1997)

A classic example of dhimmitude at the UN occurred when the 1990 "Cairo Declaration of Human Rights in Islam" was published by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights as the last text in, *A Compilation of International Instruments. Volume II: Regional Instruments*. (1997) (11)

[On 14 September 2000, several months after our request, the Association for World Education received a brief reply from the Office of High Commissioner Mary Robinson on the reasons for the CDHRI's inclusion in Vol. II:

The Member States which have acceded to and ratified United Nations Human Rights Conventions remain bound under all circumstances by the provisions of those texts, as well as by the *ergo omnes* obligations under customary international law.

We were then informed that had the Cairo Declaration not been included, the OIC countries could easily have called for a vote at the General Assembly and would have obtained an automatic majority.]

[Already in 1998, Volume II was circulated to all 26 independent members of the UN Sub-Commission on Human Rights at the request of the veteran Moroccan member Ms Halima Warzazi, and the Cairo Declaration was then cited in Resolution 1998/17, regarding the Situation of Women in Afghanistan, which states in a preamble:

Fully aware that the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam, adopted by the Organization of the Islamic Conference in 1990, guarantees the rights of women in all fields,

This was followed by seven operative paragraphs, two of which are particularly pertinent to this amalgam:

3) Considers that the current policies of the Taliban as regards the female population of the territories under their control constitute a flagrant violation of the principles of Islam and international law;

4) Calls upon Muslim religious leaders and scholars to give special attention to the plight of women in Afghanistan with a view to bringing the policies and practices of the Taliban into line with the true spirit of Islam and human rights law;

In fact, a reference to "*rights of women*" may be found in article 6 (a) of the Cairo Declaration but it merely states that: "*Woman is equal to man in human dignity, and has rights to enjoy as well as duties to perform...*" However, these "*rights to enjoy*" are all "*subject to the Islamic Shariah*" (article 24), and article 25 is clear: "*The Islamic Shariah is the only source of reference for the explanation or clarification of any articles of this Declaration.*" Thus, the "rights" and "duties" of women are prescribed by *shari'a*, in which there is no gender "equality" between Muslim men and women, nor between Muslims and non-Muslims.]

In 1996 the OIC had reached a decision – again at a Teheran Summit Meeting – which Pakistan's Ambassador Munir Akram reiterated at the Commission on Human Rights in 1999, when he called for:

pragmatic and constructive steps to counter the negative propaganda against Islam; to remove and rectify misunderstandings; and to present the true image of Islam: the religion of peace and tolerance.

Such affirmations soon became the norm at the Commission and since at the Human Rights Council.

A 'Blasphemy' Accusation at the Commission on Human Rights (April 1997)

On 18 April 1997 the OIC began to impose this viewpoint on the final day of the Commission when the Indonesian Ambassador – speaking for the OIC, probably on the initiative of the Iranian ambassador –

criticised a passage in the Report on Racism by Special Rapporteur Maurice Glélé-Ahanhanzo of Benin. The indignation was caused by an alleged “*offensive reference*” contained in a passage – commonplace and irrefutable – from a highly-respected Tel Aviv University publication on antisemitism worldwide that he had reproduced in his report under the section named, ‘Islamist and Arab Anti-Semitism’:

The use of Christian and secular European anti-Semitic motifs in Muslim publications is on the rise, yet at the same time, Muslim extremists are turning increasingly to their own religious sources, first and foremost the Qur’an, as a primary anti-Jewish source. (12)

This truism became a “*defamation of our religion Islam and blasphemy against its Holy Book Qur’an.*” That evening, because the “debate” would have continued till midnight, the ambassadors of all 53 States – including the United States and several Western countries, whose representatives wished to return home – finally adopted Chairman’s decision 1997/125, by which the Commission effectively:

Expressed its indignation and protest at the content of such an offensive reference to Islam and the Holy Qur’an; affirmed that this offensive reference should have been excluded from the report; requested the Chairman to ask the Special Rapporteur to take corrective action in response to the present decision. (13)

Interestingly, no one attempted to refute the alleged “*outrageous reference*”, merely heaping allegations and scorn sufficed to ensure that it was never repeated. Perhaps a reluctance to address the facts resulted from the massive and irrefutable evidence over decades that Islamic preachers do use religious sources – including traditional Qur’anic interpretations – for derogatory and hateful references against Jews and infidels, while encouraging Jihadist terrorist activities aimed at all and sundry, and this continues today.

Tightening the Net of Dhimmitude

The 1997 accusation of “blasphemy” was an attempt to impose self-censorship on Special Rapporteurs. It succeeded in this case. (14) For seven consecutive years the chastised Special Rapporteur on Racism, who had received no backing – not even from Israel’s ambassador who encouraged the deletion of the “blasphemous passage” – omitted any reference, in his annual reports, to antisemitism in those regions where it was, and still is, rampant: in most Arab countries, Iran, and elsewhere in the Muslim world.

In autumn 1997 – barely six months after what we had named the “Blasphemy Affair”, the newly elected Iranian President Mohammed Khatami called for a global “Dialogue of Civilizations.” In early 1998, Iran even appealed for a “*revision of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.*” Later, in November the High Commissioner’ Office for Human Rights hosted, jointly with the OIC, a seminar in Geneva entitled: “Enriching the Universality of Human Rights: Islamic Perspectives on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” (15)

[At that event, 20 Muslim experts presented papers. The opening remarks by OIC Secretary-General Dr. Azeddine Laraki contain the traditional affirmation of the divine origin of the Islamic *shari’a* and its binding supremacy over all legislation or UN Declarations and International Covenants.] (16)

“Defamation of Islam” Resolution at the Commission on Human Rights (1999)

A few months later, Pakistani Ambassador Munir Akram, on behalf of the OIC, reaffirmed that:
Islam, one of the principal religions of the world, is being slandered in different quarters, including in human rights forums.

He introduced an OIC resolution entitled “Defamation of Islam” which he justified by falsely comparing “*the emergence of a new manifestation of intolerance and misunderstanding and misconceptions of Islam and Muslim peoples in various parts of the world*” – with what he referred to as: “*Anti-Semitism in the years of the past.*” He built his case on the “blasphemy” decision, as he explained: “*It has already been claimed that Islamic scriptures incite Muslims to violence. This assertion was even included in a*

human rights report and excised only after the commission acted on this blasphemy." He then announced seriously – without any raised eyebrows at the plenum session of the Commission – that:

It was Islam which gave the world the first Charter of Human Rights in the Holy Qur'an; the Declaration of Human Rights in Prophet Muhammed's last address; and the first Refugee Convention in the Constitution of Medina. (17)

Although resolution 1999/82 was finally called “Defamation of Religions” no one was misled as only “Islam” was named. In 2000 this resolution was renamed: “Combating the defamation of religions”.

[The preamble referred to the 1998 UN seminar on "Islamic Perspectives on the UDHR", and an operative paragraph expressed "*deep concern that Islam is frequently and wrongly associated with human rights violations and with terrorism.*" Western countries consistently refused to vote for this resolution, which regularly receives an automatic majority from the OIC and friendly countries.]

2001: UN Year of “Dialogue Among Civilizations” Initiated by President Khatami

Already, in 1998, on Iran’s initiative and with OIC backing, the year 2001 was officially designated by the General Assembly as a “United Nations Year of Dialogue Among Civilizations” – even while the Rushdie *fatwa* still remained operative. Then came the murderous 9/11 Jihadist attack on America, two days after the end of the infamous Durban Conference on Racism where NGOs and Iran targeted Israel.

In March 2002 the OIC organised yet another “Symposium of Human Rights in Islam” at the Palais des Nations, just prior to the 58th session of the Commission. High Commissioner Mary Robinson addressed the Symposium, and under the title: *A greater need for an understanding of Islam*, she read from a text – later placed on the back table – the following appreciation of Islam that was much appreciated by all:

No one can deny that at its core Islam is entirely consonant with the principles of fundamental human rights, including human dignity, tolerance, solidarity and quality. Numerous passages from the Qur'an and sayings of the Prophet Muhammad will testify to this. No one can deny, from a historic perspective, the revolutionary force that is Islam, which bestowed rights upon women and children long before similar recognition was afforded in other civilisations. Custom and tradition have tended to limit these rights, but as more Islamic States ratify the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, ways forward for women are being found and women are leading the debate. And no one can deny the acceptance of the universality of human rights by Islamic States. (18)

Whether she believed this or simply read from a text prepared by her advisor is anyone’s guess, but at the back of the room could be found statements by the participants as well as piles of copies of the Cairo Declaration of Human Rights in Islam – but no sign of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, usually available in the five official languages.

[In 2000, prior to the “Dialogue initiative”, a bill by moderates in the Iranian Parliament tried to increase the marriage age for girls – 18 before the 1979 Revolution – from 9 years to 15 was overruled by the mullahs. They claimed it would be against Islamic teachings to change it as “*Islamic scholars had put a lot of efforts into these laws*” – based on Muhammad’s consummation of his marriage with Aicha when she was nine years old (she became his wife when she was seven, arriving with her toys – according to reliable Muslim sources).] (19)

[For another comparison of this “cultural relativism,” Camelia Sadat, daughter of President as-Anwar Sadat, explained on Egyptian TV in January 2006 how her father and President Abdel Gamal Nasser had illegally arranged her marriage in the 1950s when she was barely 12 years old.] (20)

[Jihad by Sudan Denounced at the UN by Dr John Garang and Former Prime Minister Al-Mahdi]

[In 1999, the Sudanese delegation had managed to muzzle a charismatic African leader, the late Dr John Garang, accredited by Christian Solidarity International. The veteran head of the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM), later nominated as Sudan’s Vice-President just before his untimely death in summer 2005, came to the UN Commission on Human Rights as the representative of the long-suffering Christian and animist in Southern

Sudan. On 23 March 1999 he was twice stopped on a ‘point of order’ by the delegation of Sudan before he could ask a key question on “*the genocidal character of the war in Sudan*”

In 1992, the regime in Khartoum declared Jihad in Khartoum against the people of southern Sudan and the Nuba mountains. Since then, Jihad has been declared again and again. I ask this very important question: is the Jihad a religious right of those who declare and wage it or is it a violation of the human rights of the people against whom it is declared and waged?)] (21)

[A day later the former Sudanese Prime Minister Al-Sadiq Al-Mahdi sent his letter to Mary Robinson, in which he referred to Jihad and slavery in Sudan – his letter was widely circulated at the Commission. Under the title, *War Crimes*, he asked (his 5th question): “*Is it legitimate for the ruling regime in an Islamic State to call for a JIHAD against its citizens, be they Muslims or Christians?*” He concluded by writing that: although no one would justify slavery today, under *shar’ia*, “*the traditional concept of JIHAD does allow slavery as a by-product.*”]

[Religious Sensitivities: “Traditional or Customary Practices”/ Female Genital Mutilation (FGM)]

[A last example: familiarly known as “traditional practices,” the barbaric crime of female genital mutilation was mentioned in the context of “cultural relativism” by Radhika Coomaraswamy, the former Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women who occupied that post for nine years. Her 2003 Report has a very pertinent summary which is reproduced in our written statement: Traditional or Customary Practices”/ Female Genital Mutilation (FGM): E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/27] (22)

[Two years ago at the Sub-Commission (9 August 2005), and on 8 February 2007, we again appealed for a frank recognition that it was inexact to insist that there is no Islamic religious justification for this barbaric female genital mutilation. We provided the Shafi’i *fiqh* religious ruling – in both Arabic and English – which can leave no doubt that the Al-Azhar rulings (*fatwas* of 1949, 1951, especially of 1981) contribute to the ongoing practice of FGM in Egypt. Despite the 1997 Egyptian legislation outlawing FGM, 97% of Egyptian girls are still subject to this barbaric practice according to recent UNICEF reports; and over 90% of the female population in North Sudan. Over 300 million women bear this stigma worldwide and roughly 3 million girls in thirty-two countries – including more and more thousands in Europe within the immigrant population – are sexually mutilated every year – 90% in 29 OIC Muslim countries. Finally, the matter became widely public a month ago when on 20 September 2007 the *New York Times / International Herald Tribune* published a full page article on, *An Egyptian custom’s time to go: Genital cutting inflames country* by Michael Slackman] (23)

[Accusations of Blasphemy and “Defamation of Islam”: 2004 Session of the UN Sub-Commission]

[At a 2004 meeting of the Sub-Commission we quoted from our written statement, E/CN.4/2004/NGO/27, in which we referred to a passage attributed to the Prophet Muhammad with the exact Qur’anic citation. It was used in Al-Azhar textbooks for instructing on the beheading of infidels. Although the Arabic text was clear, it was considered blasphemous by Sudan’s representative, and by other ‘experts’. Although it is considered ‘freedom of religion’ for a Muslim to preach this in a mosque, or teach it in a school, an infidel blasphemes when quoting and criticizing the same sacred text, as it was pronounced. Pakistan’s “independent expert” of the Sub-Commission even complained on a point of order asking Chairman Soli Sorabjee (India), unsuccessfully, to censure AWE’s oral statement.] (24)

[Then, after it was made, Pakistan’s representative made an indignant reply (10 August 2004), condemning what he called a “defamation of Islam.” He reiterated that: “*Islam was a religion of peace grouping 1.5 billion people in the world, and it was unacceptable that this religion should be thus despised.*” He declared that his government would take steps to protect UN organs such as the Sub-Commission from being thus abused. This accusation, a ‘secular’ form of *fatwa*, was repeated by Pakistan’s ambassador to the UN three days later in a highly unusual concluding statement during the final meeting when he then spoke on behalf of all the OIC countries. This failure to distinguish between the reporting of facts – with full documentary evidence – and the ongoing accusation of “defamation of Islam” is deeply troubling. This has become standard practice over the past decade at the United Nations whenever Islam is mentioned in connection with any human rights abuse. No matter who raises the subject – NGO representative, a Government delegate or Special Rapporteur – any mention of Islam in such a context has slowly become a taboo subject. Since 1999 I have called it dhimmitude – and ‘Growing Islamism at the United Nations.’]

Attempted censorship at the UN Sub-Commission on Human Rights (August 2005)

On 8 August 2005, Pakistan Ambassador Massoud Khan made a statement to the UN Sub-Commission on Human Rights for the OIC, in which he expressed serious concern at “*the rise in Islamophobia in recent months*” and “*the tide of defamation of Islam*” – even declaring: “*the prefix of ‘Islamic’ before terrorism is a sacrilege.*” His political text is revealing in many respects, not least for its veiled attack against three NGOs (AWE, IHEU, AWC) for whom we had delivered a joint oral statement on 26 July 2005 on another taboo subject entitled, “the radical Ideology of Jihad” – again quoting from article 8 of the Hamas Charter. There were four indignant interruptions on a ‘point of order’ from members.

[The reactions of the Pakistani, Moroccan and Cuban members – 3 of the 26 “independent experts” of the Sub-Commission – provide a glimpse into a bizarre aspect of that defunct UN Human Rights body, whose resolutions depended on a tacit consensus that restricted reactions on taboo subjects. Once again, no one dared to intervene – neither the Russian chairman, nor members from Western countries. It was one more indication of “Creeping dhimmitude at the UN”. Later, Pakistan’s ambassador even referred to “*some NGO representatives, who are packaging their crass propaganda as scholarly research in their bid to spread hatred against Muslims.*”]

Our 26 July 2005 text is available with each ‘point of order’ – reproduced verbatim from the UN tape – to give a vivid picture of such happenings. Attached is the invitation for the 18 April 2005 day-long NGO Parallel Commission Conference: “Victims of Jihad: Muslims, Dhimmis, Apostates and Women” – with speakers: Bat Ye’or, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, Johannes Jansen, Ibn Warraq, myself and others. (25)

Status of Islam at the UN / ‘Danish Cartoons Affair’ / Proposed Islamic Charter

The new rules of conduct being imposed by the OIC and acceded to by many States – for politically and religiously-correct reason – give the representatives of OIC countries an exceptional status at the Human Rights Council that has no legal basis and no precedent. These rules give cause for grave apprehension. The recent (October 2007) negative developments for NGO rights at the new Council are ominous.

[Will discussion on political issues within the Islamic States now be prohibited at the United Nations, thus contradicting “*the right to freedom of opinion and expression*” enshrined in article 19 of the UDHR? Unless the right to freedom of speech and expression is protected, this precious liberty – a pillar of our society – risks erosion in international organizations and this fear is growing with recent events.]

[In a subsequent 4 February 2006 press release by the OIC Secretariat’s Observatory on Islamophobia, a major point was stressed. It was: “*the consistent pattern and continuity of sacrilege and blasphemy being committed in the name of freedom of speech by some publications in Europe.*”]

On 18 Jan. 2006, OIC Secretary-General Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu “*denounced and strongly disapproved the recurrence of the publication of blasphemous and insulting caricatures of Prophet Mohammed...*”

[He affirmed that these:

misguided Islamophobic acts, by deeply hurting the feelings of one fifth of the humanity, go beyond the freedom of expression or press and they violate international principles, values and ethics enshrined in the various resolutions and declarations of the United Nations. Unfortunately, acts of sacrilege of the holy Islamic symbols harm and contradict various efforts and initiatives aiming at contributing to the entrenchment of an atmosphere of dialogue among civilizations, cultures and religions, including the UN adopted OIC initiative ‘Dialogue among Civilizations.’]

One passage from this text speaks volumes:

It is the common sense that Islamophobic acts, which are also against the internationally promoted common values, can not and should not be condoned in the pretext of freedom of expression or press. Principle of freedom of expression can not be promoted by offensively hurting and trampling on the sincere religious beliefs of millions of people.

The Final Communiqué of the OIC’s Third Extraordinary Session of the Islamic Summit, held in Mecca a month earlier (7-8 December 2005), and only covered by the media in regard to the Iranian President’s reiterated threats against Israel, provides a clear message in regard to the UN system of human rights:

The Conference called for considering the possibility of establishing an independent permanent body to promote human rights in Member States as well as the possibility in preparing an Islamic Charter on Human Rights in accordance with the provisions of the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam and interact with the United Nations and other relevant international bodies. (26)

[This call from Mecca to the UN found an echo when Sheikh Yousef Al-Qaradhawi – in his sermon aired on 3 February 2006 on Qatar TV – declared: “*We are not a Nation of Jackasses*” and then came to the same point: The [Muslim] nation [of Muhammad] must rage in anger.” And: “We must rage, and show our rage to the world.” He called for the UN to act: “the governments [of the world] must be pressured to demand that the U.N. adopt a clear resolution or law that categorically prohibits affronts to prophets – to the prophets of the Lord and his Messengers, to His holy books, and to the religious holy places.]

[As a follow-up, Omar Bakri Mohammad, leader of the Islamist group al-Muhajiroun, exiled from Britain, told the BBC in Beirut that “*in Islam*” those who “*blasphemed*” against the prophet must be executed.]

[On 8 February a press release was issued by the High Commissioner’s Office stating that the Rapporteur on racism (Doudou Diene), freedom of religion or belief (Asma Jahangir) and promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression (Ambeyi Ligabo) had made a call for tolerance and dialogue.

While they strongly deplored the depictions of the Prophet Muhammad and were:
distressed by the grave offence they have caused to the members of the Muslim community, they are equally concerned by the reactions that followed the publications, including those acts of violence and intolerance that have targeted members of different religious communities. They strongly condemned death threats against journalists and intimidation of the media as well as the loss of lives, threats and other forms of violence that have occurred over the past few days, often directed at people with no responsibility for, or control over, the publications.” They generally urged all parties “to refrain from any form of violence and to avoid fuelling hatred. They also encourage States to promote the interrelated and indivisible nature of human rights and freedoms and to advocate the use of legal remedies as well as the pursuance of a peaceful dialogue on matters which go to the heart of all multicultural societies.](27)

The ‘Danish Cartoons Affair’, later revived and hatched at the December Mecca Summit, revealed just how powerful Islamism and creeping dhimmitude have become. A century after the ‘Dreyfus Affair’ – a turning point in the history of France when the Church was separated from the State – we may wonder how many Emile Zolas (non-Muslims and Muslims) will write “J’accuse” letters to oppose those who would libel liberty and the freedom of opinion and expression, and of the press? (28)

Surely, the barbaric slaughter of Theo Van Gogh, beheadings on TV by Jihadists and murderous mobs and “Jihadist Martyrdom” bombers worldwide stain Islam more than any caricatures could?

We have stated on many occasions at the UN that “*those committing such barbaric acts in the name of Islam gravely blemish its reputation in the eyes of the world*” and have called on UN bodies to act on this grave matter, constantly cited the writings and voices of many courageous moderate Muslims but, unfortunately, nothing has as yet been initiated.

Teaching of Hate Unacceptable in the Second Decade of Human Rights Education (2004-2014)

[The current second UN decade for human rights education is the time for UN bodies to speak out firmly in regard to human rights educational attitudes in general, and toward peace and the “Other”; and also to condemn any teaching of “Jihad and Martyrdom,” especially as it relates to beheading “infidels” or “apostates.”]

The international community should heed the Iranian president’s words – especially his politicidal reference in October 2005, and reiterated since then – not just to wipe Israel off the map, but to engage in “*the struggle between the Islamic world and the front of the infidels.*” This is the key to the Jihadist ideology – a clash between a tolerant society – “Western” or otherwise, where freedom of speech is enshrined and those forces that wish to destroy the “Other”, whether in the East, West, North or South.

Now is the time to examine systematically school textbooks used by all States members of the UN and especially the 43 Member States of the Council of Human Rights. So long as UNESCO and other human rights bodies do not address this blatant misuse of school textbooks in Egypt and Saudi Arabia – and other

OIC countries in the Middle East – that teach their youth a ‘culture of hate’, backed by an ideology of “Jihad and Martyrdom in the path of Allah,” there will be little hope of attaining peace and reconciliation anywhere in the world among peoples and religions. On many occasions over the years, we have raised the question of this ‘culture of hate.’ A detailed article on this is available on the table. (29)
On 25 September 2007 at the Council, we also raised the question of “Iran’s Global War Curriculum”, which “prepares its students for a global war against the West in the name of Islam.” (30) The very latest Saudi animated hate film on ‘Child Martyrdom’ was shown on Hamas TV on Friday last, 12 October 2007 – less than a week ago. (31)

Sixth Session of the UN Human Rights Council (10-28 September 2007)

Last month’s 6th session demonstrated that the Human Rights Council is not “*restoring credibility... on Human Rights*” as was hoped [by Kofi Annan’s High-Level Panel in 2004], but may soon “*out-Commission the Commission*” as we predicted it would last year. The first week ended with the UN Special Rapporteur on Racism presenting his report on ‘defamation of religions’. Nowhere does he even mention the term “Jihad” or “Jihadist terrorism”. In these 21 pages, Mr. Doudou Diène refers briefly to antisemitism and “Christianophobia” [1 page and 1½ pages] but one-third of his report – over seven pages – deals with “Islamophobia” and the “defamation of religions” (almost totally devoted to Islam). (32)

To illustrate the gravity of “Islamophobia” by recent developments, Diène mentioned the manifestation outside the European Union Parliament in Brussels on 11 September 2007 against the “Islamization of Europe” that took place despite the mayor’s refusal to give an authorisation.

[He referred to the “intellectual and ideological theorisation of Islamophobia” by Norman Podhoretz (editor-in-chief of the influential review *Commentary*, advisor to a U.S. presidential candidate), in his latest book: *World War IV: The Long Struggle Against Islamo-fascism*; and increasing restrictions on the construction of mosques in Europe. He also stigmatised the campaign by the right-wing Swiss UDC political party to stop further building of minarets, and a caricature showing a ‘black sheep’ being kicked out of Switzerland by three white sheep.]

At that time, only a month ago on 13 September, Pakistan’s Ambassador Masood Khan, once more speaking for the OIC, reiterated that: “*Denunciations of terrorisms and extremisms have been made by opinion leaders of the Muslim world. A matching response has not been forthcoming.*” He added:

Equating certain religions with terrorism would have far reaching consequences for its followers. Even terrorist acts carried out by non state actors, in the name of religion, should be de-linked from religion to ensure freedom of religion or belief.

Yet it is a fact that no ambassador of the OIC, nor any senior Muslim cleric, has condemned the reiterated calls of non-state actors to kill in the name of Allah and Islam, and all efforts for four years to add a single phrase in Commission and Human Rights Council resolution on “Combating defamation of religions,” sponsored annually by the OIC, have proved futile. (33)

Ambassador Khan declared in another statement that “*the OIC has been cautioning that Muslims are being demonized and dehumanised as Jews were in the interwar period in the last century.*” Such an absurd comparison totally ignores the fact that the demonization of the Jews is inscribed in sacred Islamic texts and continues to be propagated worldwide today by several senior Muslim clerical and political leaders. He also referred to “*recent acts of defamation in the shape of blasphemous sketches in Sweden and posters in Switzerland.*”

On September 20, while delivering our third oral statement to the 6th session of the Council (also available) a representative of Egypt – one of the 47 Member States – raised a ‘point of order’ twice in an attempt to censor our joint statement .

His second intervention came after our quotation from the Hamas Charter’s Jihad slogan in article 8 The Egypt delegate objected that references to “religion” and to “Allah” were not relevant and that

such declarations were “unwise”. Council President, Romanian Ambassador Toru Romulus da Costea allowed me to finish the statement.

After delivering a second strong criticism of President Ahmadinejad (34) in a 25 Sept. statement, we then learned from the Secretary of the Council that while criticism of a Head of State by NGOs was now accepted, any mention of “Allah” should be avoided – and that was perhaps why the Egyptian delegate had made his second ‘point of order’. This would seem to indicate one more step on the descent to dhimmitude . It is another dire development at the new Council on Human Rights.

Paradoxically, representatives of OIC countries – notably Iran and Pakistan – always begin their statements with the Qur’an’s first words: “*In the name of Allah, the Merciful, the Compassionate. Praise be to Allah*”.... As is well-known by most Muslims and students of the Qur’an, this first *surah* ends with a strong criticism against “*those who have incurred Your wrath*” and “*those who have gone astray*”, which implicitly refers in general to all “Jews” and to all “Christians”. [Our understanding that mention of “Allah” by NGOs was now taboo at the Council was confirmed after the closure of the 6th session (28 September) when we asked the Secretary for a clarification. He raised his eyes, stating that “they” did not want a mention of the Divine Name – other than as a prayer before a statement.]

One of the latest examples of this “Islamophobia” campaign by Muslim States was delivered on 25 September by Ambassador Khan, again speaking for the OIC on the subject of ‘Defamation of Religions’. There was no official reaction to this very grave calumny by any State Members, but a strong letter of complaint – initiated by UN Watch and signed by numerous NGOs – was sent to Ambassador Khan on September 28, the last day of the session. One paragraph of his statement is enough to show the depths of the duplicity that is often used by the OIC in human rights forums:

Accommodation of Muslims and their religious aspirations in the Western world will create space for political and social harmony. All is not dark. Enlightened communities and opinion leaders in Europe and North America are trying to steer their societies in that direction. It is, however, surprising that in many instances Holocaust survivors, instead of promoting such harmony, are campaigning against Muslim symbols in the Western world. They should be the most ardent advocates against discrimination. Islamophobia is also a crude form of Anti-Semitism.

The wheel of false analogies and twisted fabrications has come full circle; it will not disappear. [Two articles in Tuesday’s International Herald Tribune on “Islamic Jihadi Media with an American accent” and “What Drives young European Muslims to Jihad” (16 October 2007) might well be described, if read, by the ambassador of Pakistan and Special Rapporteur on Racism as pure “Islamophobia.”]

Conclusion

To conclude, let us all remember that it is now 62 years since the horrors of the Second World War and the founding of the United Nations: a body often more ‘Divided’ regionally, politically and spiritually, than ‘United.’ The principal aim of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights was to create a framework for a world society that was in need of universal codes based on mutual consent in order to function. We must always remain vigilant to prevent these international standards being contested by those who call into question – at the United Nations or elsewhere – the universality of these principles of human rights. Creeping dhimmitude at the Council, and elsewhere, should be denounced for what it is.

In his analysis of Plato’s criticism of democracy, Sir Karl Popper refers to a so-called ‘paradox of freedom’ and a ‘paradox of tolerance’. His words shall be my conclusion today at the European Parliament in Brussels:

“Unlimited tolerance must lead to the disappearance of tolerance. If we extend unlimited tolerance even to those who are intolerant, if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the onslaught of the intolerant, then the tolerant will be destroyed and tolerance with them ... We should therefore claim in the name of tolerance, the right not to tolerate the intolerant. We should claim that any movement preaching intolerance places itself outside the

law, and we should consider incitement to intolerance and persecution as criminal, in the same way as we should consider incitement to murder, or to kidnapping, or to the revival of the slave trade.” (35)

* * * * *

David G. Littman is a historian who has published several articles and a book on Jews and Christians (*dhimmi*) under Islam, mainly in the 1970s and 1980s. Since 1986 he has been a human rights defender for several NGOs at the United Nations in Geneva, and for the last ten years a representative of the Association for World Education, and again since 2003 for the World Union for Progressive Judaism (WUPJ). Nearly 100 of his earlier oral and written statements to the Commission and Sub-Commission on Human Rights were published in “Human Rights and Human Wrongs at the United Nation” (WUPJ, 1986-1991, N° 1 to N°11). Recently, he edited several articles on various comparative and current human rights themes, which were published – with some recent oral and written NGO statements – in “Human Rights and Human Wrongs at the United Nations,” Part 5 (pp. 305-472), edited by Robert Spencer, *The Myth of Islamic Tolerance: How Islamic Law Treats Non-Muslims* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2005, pp.593). See also: www.dhimmi.org (section: United Nations), although not updated.

*** Passages in brackets and smaller type were not pronounced in the 30 minutes. Notes added. For the link to UN documents, search Google with the UN ref., i.e. E/CN.4/2003/NGO/4 (etc.)**

Notes:

1. D.F. Green was the pseudonym of David G. Littman [D.] and Yehoshafat (Fati) Harkabi [F.] for this publication. It appeared in English (3 editions), French (2 editions) and German (1 edition) from 1971 to 1976. Yehoshafat Harkabi (d. 1994) participated in the Israeli-Arab armistice negotiations held in Rhodes in 1949. From 1955-1959 he served as chief of Army Intelligence of the Israel Defence Forces and was in charge of Strategic Research in the Israel Ministry of Defense. He later received degrees from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Harvard University and became full professor at the Hebrew University. He wrote two landmark studies: *Arab Attitudes to Israel* (Hebrew, 1967; English, 1971) and *Palestinians and Israel* (French 1972; English 1974; German 1979). He published several other books.
2. See Lebanese Sheikh Nadim al-Jisr’s eye-opening lecture: “Good tidings about the decisive battle between Muslims and Israel, in the light of the Holy Qur’an, the Prophetic Traditions, and the Fundamental Laws of Nature and History.”
3. (Cairo, 1974), pp.148-50
4. This is a commonplace statement today: www.palestine-inf/arabic/palestoday/readers/mashoor/120401/htm. For a detailed study on this racist phenomenon, see Aluma Solnick, “Based on Koranic verses, interpretations, and Traditions, Muslim clerics state: The Jews are the descendants of apes, pigs, and other animals,” and English trans. in MEMRI, Special Report – N° 11, November 1, 2002: (<http://memri.org/bin/opener.cgi?Page=archives&ID=SR01102>). Also: “An Egyptian intellectual campaigns to change the religious discourse led by Al-Azhar,” by Ahmad Abd Al-M’uti Higazi, in *Al-Sharq Al-Awsat* (London), Sept. 16, 2002 (“Those who quote [religious scriptures] and impose the word [namely, the chief clerics] are the ones responsible for producing fundamentalist terror.”) English translation, in MEMRI, Special Dispatch – No. 436, Nov. 3, 2003: <http://memri.org/bin/opener.cgi?Page=archives&ID=SP43602>. Al-M’uti Higazi sharply criticized Al-Azhar University and Sheikh Muhammad Sayyid Tantawi and Egyptian Mufti Dr. Ahmad Al-Tayyeb.). See also in “Harbingers of Change in the Antisemitic Discourse in the Arab World” by Yigal Carmon, President MEMRI, <http://memri.org/bin/opener.cgi?Page=archives&ID=IA13503>: English trans. in Inquiry and Analysis Series – No. 135, April 23, 2003: see IV. A New Recommendation by Al-Azhar: Stop Calling Jews ‘Apes and Pigs’ (March 2003). This decision followed a decisive request to the Islamic Research Institute from the Egyptian Foreign Ministry to examine the matter – after receiving strong complaints from the Egyptian Embassy in Washington.
- 5 Al-Quaradawi, Head of European Council for Fatwa and Research, President, the International Association of Muslim scholars (IAMS), spiritual guide of the Muslim Brotherhood, and friend of the Mayor of London and other dignitaries.
6. In 1988, an Egyptian Islamist monthly, *Liwa’al-Islam*, commemorated the 60th anniversary foundation of the Muslim Brotherhood (1928) with a publication showing two crossed swords and a Koran and black text in the sky: “The Muslim Brotherhood/Sixty Years of Jihad,” in Johannes J.G. Jansen, *The Dual Nature of Islamic Fundamentalism*, London: Hurst & Co., 1997 (cover). On this form of terrorism, see Patrick Sookhdeo, *Understanding Islamic Terrorism: The Islamic Doctrine of War*. Pewsey, Wiltshire: Isaac Publishing, 2004; Ibid, *Global Jihad: The Future in the Face of Militant Islam*. McLean, VA: Isaac Publishing, 2007; Andrew Bostom, *The Legacy of Jihad: Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2005.
7. Joint written statement by AWE / AWC / WUPJ / IHEU / SWC / ICJW: [The 1988 Covenant of the Palestinian Islamic Resistance Movement – Hamas](#): joint by AWE / WUPJ: E/CN.4/2006/NGO/239 & [The Binding Charter of the Current Government of the Palestinian Authority Islamic Resistance Movement](#): A/HRC/S-1/NGO/4. See articles 22 & 32. on *The Protocols*. And, see MEMRI – Special Dispatch Series N° 619 (3 Dec. 2003); N° 623 (8 Dec. 2003);

“Urgent Appeal”: Human Rights Day (10 Dec. 2002) to UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Sergio Vieira de Mello from the Association for World Education (E/CN.4/2003/NGO/4).

8. Urgent Appeal to UN Secretary-General, Acting High Commissioner for Human Rights, Chairman of the UNCHR. UN & the Grave Worldwide Cultural Clash (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2004/NGO/25*); Muslim Brotherhood/Hamas/Hezbollah/Al-Qaeda: Terror Legacy of “Jihadist-Martyrdom-Bombings (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2004/NGO/26) by the WUPJ. In this context, on 30 Dec. 2002, Hamas leader Abd al-Aziz al-Rantisi posted an appeal to establish a Jihad army in Iraq: The enemies of Iraq crave life, while Muslims crave martyrdom. There he declared: “*The martyrdom operations that shock can ensure that horror is sowed in the [enemies’] hearts, and horror is one of the causes of defeat.*” (Arabic Hamas website on 30 Dec. 2002: www.palestine-info.info/arabic/palestoday/readers/articles/rantese/30-12-2002, and on two other Arabic sources. English translation in “Hamas Spokesman: Iraq Must Establish a Suicide Army” in MEMRI, Special Dispatch Series – No. 457, 9 Jan. 2003 (www.palestine-info.info/arabic/palestoday/readers/articles/rantisi/20-6-02.htm))

9. Rushdie Affair: Syndrome and Historical Overview – The Right to Life & Human Rights Mechanisms, AWE written statement (60th session / 2004 UNCHR: E/CN.4/2004/NGO/242), republished in Robert Spencer (ed.), *The Myth of Islamic Tolerance: How Islamic Law Treats Non-Muslims* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2005), ch. 38, pp. 398-406.

10. At the UN General Assembly’s Third Committee; see summary record: A/C.3/39/SR.65, § 91-95.

11. Adopted in Teheran by the OIC at the 19th Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers (45 States, (26-28 Dec. 1989).

12. Volume I (First Part) is subtitled: *Universal Instruments*. Volume II: *Regional Instruments* (United Nations: New York and Geneva, 1997). Vol. II alone has the imprint: “Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,” and on the front cover a red horizontal band at the top stating: “50th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” (OIC States are not from any particular ‘region’, like “Europe”, “North America”, “Africa”, etc.)

13. In the Special Rapporteur’s Report on Racism: E/CN.1997/71, E-3, chap. 2, §27. Quoted from (ed.) Dina Porat et al., *Anti-Semitism Worldwide 1995-1996* (Tel Aviv: Anti-Defamation League and World Jewish Congress, 1996): 4.

14. Summary Record: E/CN.4/1997/SR.68; for a more exact version, hear the verbatim UN interpretation; summary record: E/CN.4/1997/SR.70; Corrigendum, E/CN.4/1997/71/Corr. of 8 July 1997.

15. René Wadlow and David G. Littman, “Dangerous Censorship of a UN Special Rapporteur”, in *Justice* 14 (Sept. 1997): 10-17; also in articles published in *MEQ* (1997) and *Midstream* (1998); republished in Robert Spencer (ed), *The Myth*, Section 5: “Human Rights and Human Wrongs at the United Nations” chapter 29, pp. 337-50.

16. Held on 9-11 Nov. 1998. The Conference was financed by the OIC at a cost of about \$500,000.

17. Provisional publication of the UNOHCHR: HP/IP/SEM/1999/1, part I, 15 March 1999, p. 6 (GE.99-40940).

18. UN recording (29 April 1999) and abbreviated in the summary record E/CN.4/1999/SR.61, § 1-2. For an analysis of the “Constitution of Medina,” see Moshe Gil, “The Constitution of Medina: A Reconsideration,” *Israel Oriental Studies* (Jerusalem) 4 (1974): 44-65. Others ambassadors spoke similarly; Sheikh Jassim Bin Nasir ath-Thani, head of Qatar’s delegation declared: “*There is no doubt that Islam, which preceded the Universal Declaration on Human Rights by fourteen centuries was first in declaring equality among humans in all rights & responsibilities, and in defining rights and freedoms both for individuals and groups.*” (1 April 1999 E/CN.4/1999/SR.13 § 95).

19. Compare Mary Robinson’s affirmations with that of Ann Elizabeth Mayer in her study, *Islam and Human Right: Tradition & Politics* (Westview Press, Boulder, SF; CA/Pinter, London, 1991), p. 6. In chapter 5, “Discrimination Against Women and Non-Muslims,” she writes: “*In these circumstances, reference to Islamic criteria on rights is not likely to result in respect for the principles of equality and equal protection of the law as mandated in international human rights law; instead, such references tend to undermine the rights involved and to afford legal rationales for discrimination.*” (p. 108). An attempt by a Muslim author at an analysis of this problem led to his conclusion that: “*Although doctrinal Islam does not stand in dire need of reinterpreting its juridical tenets, it surely needs reformulation of its human rights doctrine specifically in reference to gender, non-revealed religions, and equality between and among Muslims and non-Muslims.*” (Mahmood Monshipouri, “The Muslim World Half a Century after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Progress and Obstacles,” in *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights*, Vol. 16, No. 3, Sept. 1998, pp.287-314.)

20. Muhammad Ali Sheikh, quoted in the Iranian Parliament, in “Iran Bill to End Marriage at 9, Guardian Consent Still Needed,” *International Herald Tribune*, 10 August 2000.

21. English translation in “Daughter of the late Egyptian President Sadat Tells of Marriage at Age 12 to Abusive Husband”, Dream 2 TV, 8 January 2006: http://www.memri.org/bin/opener_latest.cgi?ID=SD108506; Special Dispatch Series – N° 1085, 3 February 2006.

22. Dr. John Garang at his press conference before, which I chaired as CSI's Geneva representative to the UN.

23. Radhika Coomaraswamy, Section VII: Religious Extremism and Harmful Traditional Practices, § 61 & 62, E/CN.4/2003/75.

24. Gad-al-Haq: *Khitan al banat*, pp. 3119-3125, in Sami A. Aldeeb, *Mutilé*, Institut Suisse de Droit Comparé, 1993, p. 191. Exact translation from Arabic is: "e4.3 Circumcision is obligatory (for every male and female) by cutting off the piece of skin on the glans of the penis of the male, but circumcision of the female is by cutting out the clitoris." (called HufaaD). Translation by Nuh Ha Mim Keller: "e4.3 Circumcision is obligatory (O: for both men and women. For men it consists of removing the prepuce from the penis, and for women, removing the prepuce (Ar. Bazr) of the clitoris (n: not the clitoris itself, as some mistakenly assert). (A: Hanbalis hold that circumcision of women is not obligatory but sunna, while Hanafis consider it a mere courtesy to the husband.)" See "The Reliance of the Traveller. The classic manual of Islamic sacred law 'Umdat al-Salik' by Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri (c. 769/1368) in Arabic with facing English text, commentary & appendices edited and translated by Nuh Ha Mim Keller." Revised Edition: Amana Publishers. Beltsville, Maryland, 1997 by Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri. (ISBN 0-915957-72-8). **The book is published with the warrant of Sheikh 'Abd al-Wakil Durubi and the Warrant of Sheikh Nuh 'Alil Salman. It is also published with the Certification of Al-Azhar University.**

25. *Commentary of the Surahs of Muhammad, Al-Fath, Al-Hujarat and Qaf, Grade 11* (Cairo: Al-Azhar, Arabic, 2002), p. 9. English trans. see, *Jews, Christians, War and Peace in Egyptian School Textbooks*. March 2004 (Compiled,trans., edited by Arnon Groiss (Center for Monitoring the Impact of Peace: New York/Jerusalem), 2004, pp. 146-47; and see *The Laws of Islamic Governance [al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyyah]* by [Abu'l-Hasan] al-Mawardi. English translation by Asadullah Yate, London: Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd., 1996. Dr. Yate, a Cambridge University scholar and a Muslim, gives a full Qur'anic source (p.76): "When you encounter those who deny [the Truth] then strike [their] necks." (Qur'an 47:4).

26. The 'posting' on www.iheu.org/uncampaign includes the joint oral statement of 26 July 2005; the 12 NGO written statements listed therein and adapted from the NGO Parallel UNCHR Conference on *Victims of Jihad: Muslims, Dhimmis, Apostates, Women* of 18 April 2005 by Johannes Jansen on Jihad ideologies and their Muslim victims (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/8); Hamouda Bella on Muslim victims of Jihad in Sudan ((E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/16); David G. Littman, on The culture of 'Jihad and Martyrdom in Egyptian school textbooks and The culture of hate in Saudi Arabian textbooks and growing Arab reactions (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/2; (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/3); (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/4); Bat Ye'or on Jihad ideology and Negationism lead to an exclusion from humanity' (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/31); Ibn Warraq on Apostasy, Islamic law and human rights (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/6); Simon Deng on Genocide and Slavery: Crimes against humanity in Sudan (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/15); Taslima Nasreen on The plight of Muslim women in Bangladesh, and other Muslim states (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/28); Ayaan Hirsi Ali on Women victims of Islam (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/29); and two other statements by Azam Kanguian and Caroline Fourest; also our formal complaint to the chairman with the verbatim UN-taped transcript indicating the four 'points of order'; and precise responses by Roy Brown (President of the International Humanist and Ethical Union) to the Ambassador's points in his 8 Aug. 2005 statement for the OIC.. None of this material displays any form of 'Islamophobia' or 'defamation of Islam' – just the plain facts which are irrefutable.

27. <http://www.oic-oci.org/ex-summit/english/fc-eexsumm-en.htm>. See, II. In the Political Field, §13.

28. "Human Rights Experts call for Tolerance & Dialogue on controversy over representations of Prophet Muhammad" <http://www.unhcr.ch/hurricane/hurricane.nsf/view01/EC806806182D5F16C125710F0059C630?opendocument>

29.. The "Dreyfus Affair" was a turning point in the history of France's Third Republic – mainly as a result of Emile Zola's article "J'accuse!", published in Georges Clemenceau's *L'Aurore* on 13 January 1898. Finally, in 1905, a law was passed separating the Church from the State. In 1906 the French Court of Appeal pronounced that the evidence against Dreyfus was totally unsubstantiated. He received the Légion d'Honneur on 28 July 1906.

30. David G. Littman, "A Culture of Hate Based on 'Jihad and Martyrdom': Saudi Arabian and Egyptian Schoolbooks Today," *Midstream* (New York), March/April 2005, pp. 6-11. (Also E/CN.4/Sub.2/2005/NGO/2; NGO/3; NGO/4); CMIP, *Jews, Christians, War and Peace in Egyptian School Textbooks*. Compiled, translated and edited. by Dr. Arnon Groiss. New York & Jerusalem: CMIP, March 2004, chapter 11, pp. 146-56. See Syrian Sheikh Abu Hamza Al-Masri's with views on 'Martyrdom and the Love of Death,' in his Friday sermon delivered at Finsbury Park Mosque (London) on 23 April 2004, in which he announced that: "The Ideology of Martyrdom is spreading now in our [Islamic] Nation." Excerpts in English from MEMRI: Special Dispatch Series; 762, 12 Aug. 2004: <http://memri.org/bin/opener.cgi?Page=archives&ID=SP76204>;

31. Arnon Groiss, *Geopolitical Affairs*, 10 January 2007 – CMIP.

32. Math ab alshahad Agency, Translated by MEMRI, 16 October 2007.

33. A/HRC/6/6

34. Joint written statement (AWE / IHEU / AWE): Appeal to condemn calls to kill in the name of God: A/HRC/6/NGO/5.

35. AWE Written statement: E/CN.2/2006/2 recapitulating the reiterated politicidal/genocidal threats by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the applicability of the UN Charter (1945) and the Convention on the Prevention of Genocide (1948):

36. David Miller (ed.), *A Pocket Popper* (Fontana Paperbacks, GB, 1983), ch. 25: The Paradoxes of Sovereignty (1945), pp. 319-325; pp. 445-46 (note 4, Plato, *Republic*, 564 A (Popper: “Less well known is the *paradox of tolerance*. Unlimited...”))