

I wrote this letter before some time ago. So some criticisms on *your debating art* won't apply now. Quran verses are taken from the Sahih International translation and Hadees are taken from Sunnah.com. Read this completely (in a free time you have) and write a reply.

Dear Hassan,

~~I'm tired of debating with you. I have been debated same issues with many other Muslims. But I haven't seen anyone who argue without reason like you. Whenever I show a problematic issue related to Islam, they will try to explain me that it's not what I think, giving the references and information I didn't know regarding the issue instead of showing Sinhala racists' or Monks' wrong acts as a retaliation.~~ I think that your logic is that I can't criticize others while my own people/religion do the same things. I agree with you to a certain extent. To a certain extent? Why I disagree with you to a certain extent?

1. I have criticized some ideological aspects of Islam. Not the wrong actions of Mawulawis or certain group of Muslims. But you have shown me actions of Sinhala racists or wrong acts by monks as the reply. While I'm criticizing a doctrine, you are criticizing the people. If you want to play the *Tu Qoke* fallacy even then you have to show me such aspects of Buddhism. If the Buddha have killed his political opponents just for writing critical poems about him you can show it. I can show you that prophet Muhammad (PBUH) have done that. You can see it from early biographies on him like the works by Ibn Ishaq and Ibn Sad.

When I criticize Islam for allowing female war captives to be raped, I'm showing a inhumanity in a religion. Not the inhumanity of it's followers or Ulemas. So it's illogical to show Buddhist monks who have sexually abused little monks as an excuse. If you can find evidences that Thripitaka or Buddha have given the foundation for it you can show it. If it's so I have no right to criticize yours for allowing female war captives to be raped. But even then it does not erase the inhumanity of yours. (ie. sex slavery, killing apostates, killing critics of Islam – after this section I will prove that all these acts are not acts of people who are misguided, But acts influenced by Prophet's statements/acts and verses of Quran)

2. The Buddhist terrorism (as you called it) is not influenced by sayings or actions by the Buddha while Islamic Terrorism (ISIS, Boko Haram, Al-Qaida) is influenced by the sayings and actions done by the prophet Muhammad (PBUH).

3. The racist actions we see from some monks and some Sinhala-Buddhists does not fit to the dictionary definition of terrorism. For example suicide bombings, mass killings – the very actions done by ISIS and other classical Islamic movements are examples for terrorism. But when a ordinary people of different religious communities conflict it's called a riot. Not terrorism. If I hit you in immediate anger, is it terrorism? If you hit me in immediate anger, is it terrorism? it's just a conflict of two or group of people. To be terrorism it must be organized and per-planned. I have come across many research papers, media reports on Islamic terrorism but none about a Buddhist one. And even if we call these riots as terrorism you can't show how it's linked to Buddhist teachings. In Buddhism, there are five rules called five precepts which must be followed by every lay Buddhist follower in their daily life. First one of them is avoid killing any living animal. (to little ant to human).

Ayesha Suhair is a devote Muslim woman and a civil rights activist. She too criticize Bikku politics, Mhavamsa, Dharmapala and Sinhala-Buddhist nationalism/racism. But in her study done about anti-Muslim and Anti-Islamic movements is Sri Lanka she says;

Globally, Buddhism is widely accepted as a non-violent religion. This comparative lack of violence is partly explained by the fact that Buddhists have not sought to proselytize vigorously and Buddhism does not emphasize a monopoly on truth unlike its monotheistic counterparts. The Buddha was an advocate of the “middle path” and much in Buddhism favours the cause of peace-making. The Buddha rejected fanaticism and self-indulgence, leading instead a balanced, sober and gentle life despite having been born into royalty. His teachings emphasize the importance of non-attachment and non-aggression. In the Dhammapada, the most widely read Buddhist scripture, the Buddha is quoted to have said, “Hatred is never appeased by hatred in this world. By non-hatred alone is hatred appeased. This is an eternal law.”

(Dynamics of Sinhala Buddhist Ethno-Nationalism in Post-War Sri Lanka)

4. I once explained this fact to you. But it seems like you have forgot it. When debating over a issue one should not raise an argument again and again after it being dispelled by an opponent.

Now on the basis that both of us must follow above rules I will present my criticism on Islam giving the references. I will not argue about it's spiritual teachings or other religious obligations. I will show only inhuman aspects which all of us will agree as a crime according to our consciousness. You can show if I'm wrong giving the references. When you giving the references try only to give references that are in written format, since I can't watch videos because the Internet data package I'm using gives only minimum data. But I will **read any material** you give.) if it's in English or Sinhala.)

1. Have any Islamically correct argument to prevent Muslims creating caliphate and expanding it?

The prophet have once said that caliphate will come again before the apocalypse.

Hadhrat Huzaifa narrated that the Messenger of Allah said: Prophethood will remain among you as long as Allah wills. Then Caliphate (Khilafah) on the lines of Prophethood shall commence, and remain as long as Allah wills. Then corrupt/erosive monarchy would take place, and it will remain as long as Allah wills. After that, despotic kingship would emerge, and it will remain as long as Allah wills. Then, the Caliphate (Khilafah) shall come once again based on the precept of Prophethood.

- Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Mishkat, Chapter Al-Anzar Wal Tahzir

To this foretell of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) to be correct, Muslims must create the caliphate in our times, like IS is doing.

But If you are going to create a caliphate you will invade other (non-Muslim) countries also? Thus you will destroy the peace of the world and fill it with endless wars. And you will impose Islamic ruling system on countries which you have been conquered? Thus you will destroy the freedom of that country, and its peoples and governments ambitions to rule the country according to their own values, principals and laws. Have any Islamically correct argument to prevent Muslims creating the caliphate and expanding it?

2. have any Islamically correct argument to prevent Muslims from wage war demanding full sharia in their non-Muslim countries?

Muslims are allowed to wage war against non-Muslims if they are being persecuted. Forceful prevention of religious practice is considered as an action of religious persecution and thus allows them to fight against the non-Muslims or government in their country. In many countries it's prohibited to practice provisions regarding the criminal law of Islam. One can say this is a forceful prevention of religious practice because according to Quran, Muslims must follow the full Islamic code. (see Quran 5:49, 5:50, 4: 44) If such thing is going to happen, have any islamically correct argument to prevent them from fighting demanding the full Shariah in their non-Muslim countries?

3. religious intolerance of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)

Narrated Ibn 'Umar:

Allah's Messenger (SA) said: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshiped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Messenger (SA), and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah."

Reference : Sahih al-Bukhari 25

In-book reference : Book 2, Hadith 18

USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 1, Book 2, Hadith 25
(*deprecated numbering scheme*)

Narrated Abdullah:

When the Prophet (SA) entered Mecca on the day of the Conquest, there were 360 idols around the Ka'ba. The Prophet (SA) started striking them with a stick he had in his hand and was saying, "Truth has come and Falsehood will neither start nor will it reappear"

Reference : Sahih al-Bukhari 4287

In-Book reference : Book 64, Hadith 320

USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 5, Book 59, Hadith 583
(*deprecated numbering scheme*)

'Ikrimah said:

'Ali burned some people who retreated from Islam. When Ibn 'Abbas was informed of it, he said: If it had been I, I would not have burned them, for the Messenger of Allah (SA) said: Do not inflict Allah's punishment on anyone, but would have had killed them on account of the statement of the Messenger of Allah (SA). The Apostle said: Kill those who change their religion. When 'Ali was informed about it he said: How truly Ibn 'Abbas said!

Grade : Sahih (Al-Albani)

Reference : Sunan Abi Dawud 4351

In-book reference : Book 40, Hadith 1

English translation : Book 39, Hadith 4337
(*deprecated numbering scheme*)

4. terrorism of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)

Narrated Ibn 'Umar:

Allah's Messenger (SA) said: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshiped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Messenger (SA), and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah."

Reference : Sahih al-Bukhari 25

In-book reference : Book 2, Hadith 18

USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 1, Book 2, Hadith 25
(*deprecated numbering scheme*)

According to Oxford dictionary a terrorist is a person who uses unlawful violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims.

5. allowing the female war captives to be raped

Rape can be defined as doing sexual intercourse with a woman opposing to her wish. To say raping war captives is prohibited in Islam, one of the following must be met.

1. There must be a Quran verse or Hadith saying it's necessary to seek their consent for sex.
2. There must be a Quran verse or Hadith declaring that "raping a right hand posses is a crime" and specifying the punishment for it.

If none of those can be found it's fair to say Islam has allowed female war captives to be raped. Because Islam have allowed Muslims to have sex with those captives but have done nothing to prevent them from being raped by the owners. Since Muslims say Islam is a complete way of life or a legal system can be applied to every time, everywhere and practical than any other such system in the world, we will see such a loophole as an intentional silence on the matter and did so knowing the consequences.

According to Quran 4: 24 one can have sex with even a married woman if she's in his possession. There's a hadith in Sunan Abu dawood which gives context of the revelation of this verse.

Abu Sa'id Al Khudri said "The Apostle of Allah (SA) sent a military expedition to Awtas on the occasion of the battle of Hunain. They met their enemy and fought with them. They defeated them and took them captives. Some of the companions of Apostle of Allah (SA) were reluctant to have relations with the female captives because of their pagan husbands. So, Allah the exalted sent down the Qura'nic verse "And all married women (are forbidden) unto you save those (captives) whom your right hand posses." This is to say that they are lawful for them when they complete their waiting period."

Grade : Sahih (Al-Albani)

Reference : Sunan Abi Dawud 2155

in-book reference : Book 12, Hadith 110

English translation : Book 11, Hadith 2150

These women whom said to be Muslims had sex with, were being captured by Muslims by killing their husbands, fathers and other relatives. And they were to be sold by Muslims at the next slave market they arrived to buy weapons for Muslims. Would such a woman gladly consent to sex with a

army who killed their husbands and fathers? And there's no mention about seeking their consent. There's no mention about seeking the consent of female war captives for sexual relations in any Hadith regarding the matter. Nor even in the Quran.

As Sayyyad Abul Ala Maududi notes Shafi-i and Maliki Mazhabs have considered even a married woman captured with her husband too legal for her Muslim owner to have sex with!

In Islam rape is a category of Zina crimes. Zina crimes include any sexual action considered as illegal in Islam. Zina crimes only applies to free-Muslims. It does not apply to war captives since they are considered as a "property" acquired by the war (war booty.) Maududi too says that war captives regardless of their gender will be considered as "properties." They can be sold or transferred to another owner like any other object. According to the "ඉස්ලාම්හිතිකාව විවෘත දැසින්" by ACJU too even the "people" who were captured in a jihad, will be considered as "objects/goods" in Islamic law.

6. looting of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)

The first successful raid occurred at the place of Nakhla in a sacred month which was considered by Arabs as unlawful and sacrilege to killing. Muhammad gave instructions to Ibn Jash by a sealed letter telling that letter should be read only after they arrived the place. They camped in the way and waited for a caravan. What happened hereafter have been described as follows in the *Sira*.

A caravan of Quraysh carrying dry raisins and leather and other merchandise of Quraysh passed by them, Amr b. al-Hadarami, Uthman b. Abdullah b. al-Mughira and his brother Naufal the Makhzumites, and al-Hakam b. Kaysan, freedman of Hisham b. al-Mughira being among them. When the caravan saw them they were afraid of them because they had camped near them. Ukkasha, who had shaved his head, looked down on them, and when they saw him, They felt safe and said, They are pilgrims, you have nothing to fear from them. The raiders took council among themselves, for this was the last day of Rajab, and they said, If you leave them alone tonight they will get into the sacred area and will be safe from you; and if you kill them, you will kill them in the sacred month, so they were hesitant and feared to attack them. Then they encouraged each other, and decided to kill as many as they could of them and take what they had. Waqf shot Amr b. al-Hdarami with an arrow and killed him, and Uthman and al-Hakam surrendered. Naufal escaped and eluded them. Abdullah and his companions, took the caravan and the two prisoners and escape to Medina with them.

(ishaq p. 287)

This happened before the war of Badr. In other words Muslims attacked Meccans before Meccans came to a war with them. Badr war too was a caravan raid, not a war wage for protect their lives. Yes. Quraish send a armed brigade with that caravans. Why? To protect it from a possible attack from Muslims, since Muslims had begun to raid their caravans. They send army to defend themselves. But Muslims interpret this as a persecution against them, their religion! Even a protective measure against their violence or a response to their intolerance is "persecution" to them. We see this mentality of Muslims even today.

Prophet Muhammad did 70+ such caravan raids.

Muhammad's Sources of Income

Note that the following Hadith has been removed from the Internet and that it may be found at the indicated reference.

Narrated Ibn 'Umar that the Prophet (SA) said, **"My livelihood is under the shade of my spear,(1) and he who disobeys my orders will be humiliated by paying Jizya"**^[1]

Sahih Al-Bukhari, Vol. 4, p. 104

Also note the accompanying footnote:

Footnote: (1) **"Under the shade of my spear" means "from war booty"**.

See Also

- [Violence Under Muhammad \(Primary Sources\)](#) - A hub page that leads to other articles related to *Violence Under Muhammad (Primary Sources)*

References

1. ↑ The Translation of the Meanings of Sahih Al-Bukhari, Arabic-English, Vol.IV (page 104) by Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, Islamic University—Al-Medina Al-Munawwara

Categories: [QHS](#) | [Muhammad](#)

7. hatred on Jews

It has been narrated by ‘Umar b. al-Khattib that he heard the Messenger of Allah (SA) say

I will expel the Jews and Christians from the Arabian Peninsula and will not leave any but Muslim.

Reference : Sahih Muslim 1767 a

In-book reference : Book 32, Hadith 75

USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 19, Hadith 4366

(deprecated numbering scheme)

‘Umar bin Al-Khattab expelled all the Jews and Christians from the land of Hijaz. Allah’s Messenger (SA) after conquering Khaiber, thought of expelling the Jews from the land which, after he conquered it belonged to Allah, Allah’s Messenger (SA) and the Muslims. But the Jews requested Allah’s Messenger (SA) to leave them there on the condition that they would do the labor and get half of the fruits (the land would yield). Allah’s Messenger (SA) said, “We shall keep you on these terms as long as we wish.” Thus they stayed till the time of ‘Umar’s Caliphate when he expelled them to Taima and Arha.

Reference : Sahih al-Bukhari 3152

In-book reference : Book 57, Hadith 60

USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 4, Book 53, Hadith 380

(deprecated numbering scheme)

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (SA) as saying:

The last hour would not come unless the Muslims will fight against the Jews and the Muslims would kill them until the Jews would hide themselves behind a stone or a tree and a stone or a tree would say: Muslim, or the servant of Allah, there is a Jew behind me; come and kill him; but the tree Gharqad would not say, for it is the tree of the Jews.

Reference : Sahih Muslim 2922

In-book reference : Book 54, Hadith 105

USC-MSA web (English) reference : Book 41, Hadith 6985
(*deprecated numbering scheme*)

8. Ordering to kill his critics by the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)

Only months after his arrival in Medina, Prophet Muhammad ordered the assassination of a centenarian man who had criticized him. Abu Afak, who was said to be 120 years old, had composed a poem, in which he lamented that people had become followers of Muhammad and have turned against each other. Ibn Sa'd reports this story as follows:

Then occurred the "sariyyah" [raid] of Salim Ibn Umayr al-Amri against Abu Afak, the Jew, in [the month of] Shawwal in the beginning of the twentieth month from the hijrah [immigration from Mecca to Medina in AD 622], of the Apostle of Allah. Abu Afak, was from Banu Amr Ibn Awf, and was an old man who had attained the age of one hundred and twenty years. He was a Jew, and used to instigate the people against the Apostle of Allah, and composed (satirical) verses [about Muhammad]. Salim Ibn Umayr who was one of the great weepers and who had participated in Badr, said, 'I take a vow that I shall either kill Abu Afak or die before him.' He waited for an opportunity until a hot night came, and Abu Afak slept in an open place. Salim Ibn Umayr knew it, so he placed the sword on his liver and pressed it till it reached his bed. The enemy of Allah screamed and the people, who were his followers, rushed to him, took him to his house and interred him.

(The Kitab al Tabaqat al kabir, Vol. 2, p 31)

When Asma bint Marwan, a Jewish mother of five small children heard this, she was so outraged that she composed a poem cursing the men of Medina for letting a stranger divide them and make them assassinate a venerable old man. Again, Muhammad went to his pulpit and cried out: "Who will rid me of Marwan's daughter?" Umayr bin `Adiy al-Khatmi who was with him heard him, and that very night he went to her house and killed her. In the morning he came to the apostle and told him what he had done and he [Muhammad] said, 'You have helped Allah and His apostle, O `Umayr!' When he asked if he would have to bear any evil consequences, the apostle said, 'Two goats won't butt their heads about her.'"

(From pp. 675-676 of The Life of Muhammad , which is A. Guillaume's translation of Sirat Rasul Allâh by Ibn Ishaq)

After receiving praise from Muhammad for the assassination of Asma, the killer went to her children, bragged about committing the murder, and taunted those little kids and their clan.

Ibn Sa'd notes:

Now there was a great commotion among Banu Khatma that day about the affair of bint [daughter of] Marwan. She had five sons, and when `Umayr went to them from the apostle he said, 'I have killed bint Marwan, O sons of Khatma. Withstand me if you can; don't keep me waiting.' That was the first day Islam became powerful among B. Khatma; before that those who were Muslims concealed the fact. The first of them to accept Islam was `Umayr b. `Adiy who was called the 'Reader' and `Abdullah b. Aus and Khuzayma b. Thabit. **The day after bint Marwan was killed the men of B. Khatma became Muslims because they saw the power of Islam.**

(Ishaq pp. 675-676)

He have done or ordered or approved many other such murders which goes beyond even the limit of forty. As I know any other religious leader haven't killed their critics. Jesus or Buddha or Baha'i haven't done so. Both Jesus and Buddha discussed religious issues with other contemporary leaders and when anyone criticized them they never become outraged.

composing a poem is a peaceful way of expressing one's disagreement. Only a psychopathic narcissist will respond to it by killing them. Just like Muhammad criticized the religion of Quraish; Just like the Quran is condemning the Jews calling them "apes" and "pigs", they (Asma b. Marwan and Abu Afak) too criticized the Muhammad, who seems to them misguided. Whether that view is correct or not is not relevant. But they have a right to express their opinion. But the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) or his followers did not admit that others too have same rights that Muslims had. (Have this mentality changed even the today? They won't give non Muslims to practice their religions in Muslim majority countries. But asking even for allowing to practice religious laws for their community from their non-Muslim governments. If I were a Muslim I will oppose to build any Mosque in my non-Muslim country until the fellow Muslims in Muslim majority countries give full religious rights to My non-Muslim friends there, even they were not in permanent residency) "We, Muslims can criticize them, their religion/gods and and their leaders, But they can't criticize ours. If they did so they'll lose lives." It seems like that was the mentality of the Prophet Muhammad. And the at that time such things were common or there are many other people (Kings/modern day political leadres) who have done such acts is not an excuse. Even in a era which is barbaric, a religious leader must do the correct thing. He can't act immorally. He had the duty to correct the morality of the time. Looking at how Muhammad react idol worshipping, we can't accept that he was afraid to question them because they were widely practiced. At least he would have not use such tactics. If he did so because everyone of his time act similarly, that means he is a opportunistic one.

Perhaps the following this example (Sunnah) by Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) Ayathollah Khomeini (May Allah be pleased with him) issued a Fatwa to kill Salmon Rushdie, one of the greatest novelists of the century for writing the novel "Satanic Verses." It's translator into Japanese, Hithoshi Thagarishi was assassinated. It's translator into Italian, Eththore Caprioli was severely injured. Wiliam Nygard, one of the Muhammad cartoonists was knifed. Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gog too was killed for directing the film "Submission." It's script writer ex-Muslim Ayyan Hirsi Ali too have received death threats.

Muhammad have condoned killing of a Jewish slave woman, with the her unborn child by her master for blaming him (Muhammad).

Narrated Abdullah Ibn Abbas: A blind man had a slave-mother who used to abuse the Prophet (ﷺ) and disparage him. He forbade her but she did not stop. He rebuked her but she did not give up her habit. **One night she began to slander the Prophet (ﷺ) and abuse him. So he took a dagger, placed it on her belly, pressed it, and killed her.** A child who

came between her legs was smeared with the blood that was there. [...] He sat before the Prophet (ﷺ) and said: Messenger of Allah! I am her master; she used to abuse you and disparage you. I forbade her, but she did not stop, and I rebuked her, but she did not abandon her habit. I have two sons like pearls from her, and she was my companion. **Last night she began to abuse and disparage you. So I took a dagger, put it on her belly and pressed it till I killed her. Thereupon the Prophet (ﷺ) said: Oh be witness, no retaliation is payable for her blood.**

—Sunan Abi Dawud 4361, Eng Book 39, Hadith 4348, Book 40, Hadith 11

Check [this page](#) also on this matter.

9. Human rights violations in Sharia rulings

proving the rape

In Islam rape is a variation of sexual relations outside of marriage (Zina crimes) which are considered as crimes against God. However raped woman can prove she's innocent (not willing of the action) and thus avoid being punished for fornication or adultery. The punishment for fornication is lashing and punishment for adultery is stoning to death.(Sunan Abu Dawood 38: 4421, 38: 4429) To prove such a crime one must bring 4 Muslim eyewitnesses according to the Quran 24: 4. Those must be male Muslims or a male witness can be substituted with two female eyewitnesses. Because Quran 2: 282 says that witness of a woman is half of that of a man. If someone accused another of such crime but failed to bring such witnesses he/she will be charged for false accusation against a good Muslim (according to Quran 24: 13) and must be punished by 80 lashes according to Quran 24: 4.

In other words if a raped woman failed to provide four Muslim males who have seen she's being raped/ hearing she's yelling etc she too considered as guilty of the act and will be punished for fornication or adultery. rape is not a thing done by it's perpetrators allowing anyone to witnessing about it except the victim. So it's not practical to demand eyewitnesses (it too is four!) to prove she have being raped. it's true that presumption of innocense must be guaranteed to the suspect of the rape, but isn't that must be guaranteed to the woman also? She too should be considered as innocent of Zina crime until it's proven by witnesses that she have willingly participated in it.

However under modern legal traditions women will not face such a burden, regarding the rape.

Freedom of religion

'Ikrimah said:

'Ali burned some people who retreated from Islam. When Ibn 'Abbas was informed of it, he said: If it had been I, I would not have burned them, for the Messenger of Allah (SA) said: Do not inflict Allah's punishment on anyone, but would have had killed them on account of the statement of the Messenger of Allah (SA). The Apostle said: Kill those who change their religion. When 'Ali was informed about it he said: How truly Ibn 'Abbas said!'

Grade : Sahih (Al-Albani)

Reference : Sunan Abi Dawud 4351

In-book reference : Book 40, Hadith 1

English translation : Book 39, Hadith 4337
(deprecated numbering scheme)

All four Sunni Madhabs and Jafari Madhab of Shite Islam accepts that the punishment for apostasy is death penalty.

Freedom of expression

criticizing or showing lack of respect for anything considered sacred in Islam (eg. Allah, Muhammad, Shariah ruling) is a crime (blasphemy) and if done by a Muslim it will be regarded as an act of apostasy and hence punishable by death. The Sunnah of the Prophet confirms this. The Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) have condoned killing of a Jewish slave woman, with the her unborn child by her master for blaming him (Muhammad).

Narrated Abdullah Ibn Abbas: A blind man had a slave-mother who used to abuse the Prophet (ﷺ) and disparage him. He forbade her but she did not stop. He rebuked her but she did not give up her habit. **One night she began to slander the Prophet (ﷺ) and abuse him. So he took a dagger, placed it on her belly, pressed it, and killed her.** A child who came between her legs was smeared with the blood that was there. [...] He sat before the Prophet (ﷺ) and said: Messenger of Allah! I am her master; she used to abuse you and disparage you. I forbade her, but she did not stop, and I rebuked her, but she did not abandon her habit. I have two sons like pearls from her, and she was my companion. **Last night she began to abuse and disparage you. So I took a dagger, put it on her belly and pressed it till I killed her. Thereupon the Prophet (ﷺ) said: Oh be witness, no retaliation is payable for her blood.**

—Sunan Abi Dawud 4361, Eng Book 39, Hadith 4348, Book 40, Hadith 11

Nadr Ibn Al-Harith a pagan doctor was killed for ridiculing the Quran verses, saying pagan mythologies are interesting than the stories of the Quran.

Only months after his arrival in Medina, Prophet Muhammad ordered the assassination of a centenarian man who had criticized him. Abu Afak, who was said to be 120 years old, had composed a poem, in which he lamented that people had become followers of Muhammad and have turned against each other. Ibn Sa'd reports this story as follows:

Then occurred the "sariyyah" [raid] of Salim Ibn Umayr al-Amri against Abu Afak, the Jew, in [the month of] Shawwal in the beginning of the twentieth month from the hijrah [immigration from Mecca to Medina in AD 622], of the Apostle of Allah. Abu Afak, was from Banu Amr Ibn Awf, and was an old man who had attained the age of one hundred and twenty years. He was a Jew, and used to instigate the people against the Apostle of Allah, and composed (satirical) verses [about Muhammad]. Salim Ibn Umayr who was one of the great weepers and who had participated in Badr, said, 'I take a vow that I shall either kill Abu Afak or die before him.' He waited for an opportunity until a hot night came, and Abu Afak slept in an open place. Salim Ibn Umayr knew it, so he placed the sword on his liver and pressed it till it reached his bed. The enemy of Allah screamed and the people, who were his followers, rushed to him, took him to his house and interred him.

(The Kitab al Tabaqat al kabir, Vol. 2, p 31)

When Asma bint Marwan, a Jewish mother of five small children heard this, she was so outraged that she composed a poem cursing the men of Medina for letting a stranger divide them and make them assassinate a venerable old man. Again, Muhammad went to his pulpit and cried out: "Who

will rid me of Marwan's daughter?' Umayr bin `Adiy al-Khatmi who was with him heard him, and that very night he went to her house and killed her. In the morning he came to the apostle and told him what he had done and he [Muhammad] said, 'You have helped Allah and His apostle, O `Umayr!' When he asked if he would have to bear any evil consequences, the apostle said, 'Two goats won't butt their heads about her.'" (From pp. 675-676 of *The Life of Muhammad*, which is A. Guillaume's translation of *Sirat Rasul Allâh* by Ibn Ishaq)

Violence and Hatred against LGBTIQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans-gender, Inter-sexual, Queer) People

Narrated Abdullah ibn Abbas: The Prophet said: If you find anyone doing as Lot's people did, kill the one who does it, and the one to whom it is done... (Sahih)

—[Sunan Abi Dawud \(4462 / 40:112 / 39447\)](#)

Narrated Ibn Abbas: the Prophet cursed effeminate men and those women who assume the similitude [manners] of men. He also said: "Turn them out of your houses." He turned such and such a person out, and Umar [a principal companion of Muhammad] also turned out such and such person.

—[Bukhari \(6834 / 8:82:820\)](#) & [Bukhari \(5886 / 7:72:774\)](#)

Domestic Violence

Men are in charge of women by [right of] what Allah has given one over the other and what they spend [for maintenance] from their wealth. So righteous women are devoutly obedient, guarding in [the husband's] absence what Allah would have them guard. But **those [wives] from whom you fear arrogance** – [first] advise them; [then if they persist], forsake them in bed; and [finally], **strike them**. But if they obey you [once more], seek no means against them. Indeed, Allah is ever Exalted and Grand.

- 4: 34

Marital Rape

Your wives are a place of cultivation [i.e., sowing of seed] for you, so come to your place of cultivation however you wish and put forth [righteousness] for yourselves. And fear Allah and know that you will meet Him. And give good tidings to the believers.

- 2: 223

Narrated Abu Huraira:

Allah's Messenger (SA) said, 'If a husband calls his wife to his bed (i.e. to have sexual relation) and she refuses and causes him to sleep in anger, the angels will curse her till morning.'

Reference : Sahih al-Bukhari 3237

In-book reference : Book 59, Hadith 48

USC-MSA web (English) reference : Vol. 4, Book 54, Hadith 460
(*deprecated numbering scheme*)

Based on above (Quran verse and Hadith) Islamic jurists does not recognize that there's a marital rape exist in Islam. If a woman was physically damaged during a sex act, only then such an act will be considered as an offense.

Punishments for adultery & premarital sex

If a married Muslim woman or man had sex with another married Muslim man or woman who is not married with them, both must be stoned to death. If unmarried Muslim couple sex with each other, both will be given hundred stripes according. If one of them are married, then the married one must be stoned to death. Crimes are something harmful to others such as theft, robbery, slander, murder etc. Adultery or premarital sex are not such acts hence shouldn't be punished. At least shouldn't give such severe punishments. Government should not be interfere with people's choices of their personal lives though they are sins or immoral acts according to scriptures. But separation of religion and government (secularism) is a concept which is alien to Muslim mind.

Amputation of hands as the punishment for theft.

[As for] the thief, the male and the female, amputate their hands in recompense for what they earned [i.e., committed] as a deterrent [punishment] from Allah. And Allah is Exalted in Might and Wise.

- 5: 38

Theft is considered as a minor offense in every modern legal system, which means penalty is a fine/imprisonment while robbery and looting is considered as crimes which gives heavy penalties since the latter two involves duress and hence much severe form of crime. Theft is an innocent act if compared. Though the verse ends saying Allah is "wise" this ruling shows how ignorant he is. If a person who is poor and have no way to earn money commit a theft for living, even then his hand will be amputated. Now he losing a hand will worsen his situation because it's an impairment for any kind of labor. Because of that he has no choice other than thieving again. And then his other hand will be cut off and then he will miserable than ever before. Maybe die in hunger. How wise and compassionate is Allah?

Court Procedure

Sharia courts traditionally do not rely on lawyers; **plaintiffs and defendants represent themselves. Trials are conducted solely by the judge, and there is no jury system.** There is **no pre-trial discovery process, and no cross-examination of witnesses.** Unlike common law, judges' verdicts do not set binding precedents[95][96] under the principle of *stare decisis*,[97] and unlike civil law, sharia is left to the interpretation in each case and has no formally codified universal statutes.[98]

The rules of evidence in sharia courts also maintain a distinctive custom of prioritizing oral testimony.[99] Witnesses, in a sharia court system, must be faithful, that is Muslim.[100] **Male Muslim witnesses are deemed more reliable than female Muslim witnesses, and non-Muslim witnesses considered unreliable and receive no priority in a sharia court.** [101][102] In civil cases in some countries, a Muslim woman witness is considered half the worth and reliability than a Muslim man witness.[103][104] In criminal cases, women witnesses are unacceptable in stricter, traditional interpretations of sharia, such as those found in Hanbali madhhab.[100]

- from Wikipedia page on Shariah

Any rational person will see that such a pre-modern court procedure will not work as thorough and careful investigation of the case and thus in many cases lead to injustice. Death of Rizana is a familiar example on this regard. If she had a chance to get a legal representation she would have the chance to prove she's innocent. At least if the court ask professionals to provide technical evidences (forensic evidences) on the case, they would have known that it was not a murder but the child has choked accidentally. But she had to be victim in a country where legal procedure (?) which gives more priority on oral testimonies than the technical evidences. And she had no way to get the chance of legal representation at least to complain the unjustness of the procedure since Islamic law does not allow to such a chance.

10. Rights of non-Muslims under a Islamic State

it's said repeatedly by Muslims that Islamic rulers treated well to the non-Muslim subjects under their authority and gave them full rights as non-Muslims and thus did no discrimination. But even the pact between the caliph 2nd Umar and Christians of Jerusalem had following restrictions on non-Muslims despite it's beginning sentence which promise to protect lives, property and other rights of non-Muslims.

- Obligation to show deference toward Muslims. If a Muslim wishes to sit, non-Muslim should be rise from his seats and let the Muslim sit.
- Palm Sunday and Easter parades were banned.
- Prohibition against hanging a cross on the Churches.
- Muslims should be allowed to enter Churches (for shelter) in any time, both in day and night.
- Obliging the call of prayer by a bell or a kind of Gong (Nakos) to be low in volume.
- Prohibition against rebuilding destroyed churches, by day or night, in their own neighborhoods or those situated in the quarters of the Muslims.
- The worship places of non-Muslims must be lower in elevation than the lowest mosque in town.
- The houses of non-Muslims must not be taller in elevation than the houses of Muslims.
- Prohibition against building new churches, places of worship, monasteries, monks or a new cell. (Hence it was also forbidden to build new synagogues, although it is known that new synagogues were built after the occupation of the Islam, for example in Jerusalem and Ramle. The law that prohibits to build new synagogues was not new for the Jews, it was applied also during the Byzantines. It was new for the Christians.)
- Prohibition against preaching to Muslims in an attempt to convert them from Islam.
- Prohibition against preventing the conversion to Islam of some one who wants to convert. == Muslims have the right to gain converts from other religions, But they have no right to do the same on Muslims.

- **Christians** were forbidden to show their religion in public, or to be seen with **Christian books or symbols in public**, on the roads or in the markets of the Muslims.
- Prohibition of **Christians** and **Jews** against raising their voices at prayer times.
- Funerals should be conducted quietly.
- **Non-Muslims must host a Muslim passerby for at least 3 days and feed him.**
- **prohibition against riding with a saddle.**

Are these restrictions different in nature from those that black people had to face under the Apartheid laws? (In fact Apartheid laws are not so much inhuman if compared) What if the restrictions like this imposed on Muslims in Sri Lanka? Will you tolerate it? How will you feel if you were in a discriminated situation like the Christians of Jerusalem? *Do Unto others as you do unto yourself!*

Jizyah

Fight those who do not believe in Allah or in the Last Day and who do not consider unlawful what Allah and His Messenger have made unlawful and who do not adopt the religion of truth [i.e., Islam] from those who were given the Scripture – [fight] until they give the jizyah willingly while they are humbled.

- Quran 9: 29

Jizyah is a tax levied upon Christians, Jews etc under a Islamic state. Some apologetics claim that this is extracted from non-Muslims instead of Zakath giving by the Muslims, but according to following passage (from the Thafseer Ibn Kathir) and statement by the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) after it, the purpose of the Jizyah is humiliating the non-Muslims.

Allah encourages the believers to show enmity to the idolators and to dissociate from them, affirming that they do not deserve to enjoy a covenant of peace, because of their Shirk in Allah and disbelief in Allah's Messenger

(This matter (Islam) will keep spreading as far as the night and day reach, until Allah will not leave a house made of mud or hair, but will make this religion enter it, while bringing might to a mighty person (a Muslim) and humiliation to a disgraced person (who rejects Islam). Might with which Allah elevates Islam (and its people) and disgrace with which Allah humiliates disbelief (and its people).) Tamim Ad-Dari **who was a Christian before Islam** used to say, "I have come to know the meaning of this Hadith in my own people. Those who became Muslims among them acquired goodness, honor and might. **Disgrace, humiliation and Jizyah befell those who remained disbelievers."**

Thafseer Ibn Kathir

Narrated Ibn 'Umar that the Prophet (SA) said, "My livelihood is under the shade of my spear and **he who disobeys my orders will be humiliated by paying Jizya**"

- Sahih Al-Bukhari, Vol. 4, p. 104 (The Translation of the Meaning of Sahih Al-Bukhari, Arabic-English by Dr. Muhammad Mushin Khan, Islamic University – Al Medina Al-Munawara. Vol. IV, page 104)

following are two excerpts which is taken from Wikipedia page on Sharia

...In classical jurisprudence monetary compensation for bodily harm (*diya* or blood money) is assessed differently for different classes of victims. *Diya* for the death of a free Muslim man is twice as high as for Jewish and Christian victims according to the Maliki and Hanbali madhhabs and three times as high according to Shafi'i rules.^[121] Several legal schools assessed *diya* for *Magians* (*majus*) at one-fifteenth the value of a free Muslim male.^[121] According to Human Rights Watch and the US State Department, in Saudi Arabia Jewish or Christian male plaintiffs are entitled to half the amount a Muslim male would receive, while for all other non-Muslim males the proportion is one-sixteenth.^{[125][126][127]}

...Witnesses, in a sharia court system, must be faithful, that is Muslim.^[100] Male Muslim witnesses are deemed more reliable than female Muslim witnesses, and non-Muslim witnesses considered unreliable and receive no priority in a sharia court.^{[101][102]}

imagine how miserable the situation of a non-Muslim who is wronged by a Muslim or accused by a Muslim for a crime, if the Muslims who are witnessing on that case were biased for their people and gave wrong facts to the court in order to do favor to the their Muslim friend? Looking at how Muslims biased towards their race, and trying to justify everything than any other kind of people we can sure about that it will be the reality in such a situation. Apart from that possible risk, this is a clear discrimination based on ones religion. If someone's character is good he will be honest regardless of religion or race. How do you feel if we impose a law which rejects non-Buddhists' witnesses ? And note that not telling lies is one of the Buddhist five precepts which everyone must follow in their daily life.

11. Democracy under a Islamic State

Islamic state is a theocracy which means the all the laws will be from Islamic fiqh and no man-made laws or no such procedures like elections and making laws by representations of the people will be allowed. So there will be no democracy. The ruler will be the Caliph, the leader of Islamic community (an Islamic scholar chosen by Muslims) and he will held absolute authority like a dictator. No one can sue against him or criticize him. If anyone criticize him then it will be a blasphemy, and if anyone criticize Islam it will be a treason since the governing body also is the same entity. In other words there's no Free speech. Minorities will not receive same rights as Muslims. **Certain religion and it's scholars will serve as sole authorities regarding every governing matter and thus will take away the rights of other faiths.** Choosing judges and the leader from a certain religious group, itself is a discrimination against others groups. In summary there will be no free speech, equal rights to all religious groups, democracy in a Islamic state.

- Sachintha Madushan

