



# The Clarion\* Call

## \* THE CLEAR CALL OF A BATTLE TRUMPET

JESUS SAID, "MY SHEEP RECOGNIZE MY VOICE. I KNOW THEM, AND THEY FOLLOW ME." (JOHN 10:27)

From the desk of:

The Reverend Dr. Kenneth L. Beale, Jr.

This publication is privately funded.

Readers may reproduce it for widest distribution,  
but only in its full context.

Volume 2 ♦ Issue 3

Summer 2013

## Shariah Law

### ... A Foreign and Domestic Threat to America's Rule of Law

#### Definition

The *rule of law* is an ambiguous term that can mean different things in different contexts:

##### *Rule according to law –*

No individual can be ordered by the government to pay civil damages or suffer criminal punishment except in strict accordance with well-established and clearly defined laws and procedures.

##### *Rule under law –*

No branch of government is above the law, and no public official may act arbitrarily or unilaterally outside the law.

##### *Rule according to a higher law –*

No written law may be enforced by the government unless it conforms with certain unwritten, universal principles of fairness, morality, and justice that transcend human legal systems.

#### History

The *rule of law* is a concept explained in classical time. In Greece, Aristotle wrote that "law should be the final sovereign; and personal rule, whether it is exercised by a single person or a body of persons, should be sovereign in only those matters which law is unable, owing to the difficulty of framing general rules for all contingencies." In ancient Rome, the *Corpus Juris Civilis* established a complex body of procedural and substantive rules, reflecting a strong commitment to the belief that law, not the arbitrary will of an emperor, is the appropriate vehicle for dispute resolution. In 1215, *Magna Charta* reined in the

corrupt and whimsical rule of King John by declaring that government should not proceed except in accordance with the law of the land. During the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas argued that the *rule of law* represents the natural order of God as ascertained through divine inspiration and human reason. In the seventeenth century, the English jurist Sir Edward Coke asserted that the "king ought to be under no man, but under God and the law." With regard to the legislative power in England, Coke said that "when an act of Parliament is against common right and reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, the Common Law will control it, and adjudge such act to be void."

In the United States, what was the spirit that motivated the Founding Fathers? What was the essence behind the American Revolution? The fifty-six signers of the *Declaration of Independence* pledged their sacred honor to make America free and independent in the preamble: "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which *the laws of nature and of nature's God* entitles them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." In that one (run-on) sentence, the Founders forcefully declared *why*

they must separate themselves from Great Britain. The *why* is because of "... *the laws of nature and of nature's God ...*" Today, these eight words seem to carry no special significance; but in their day, that eight-word phrase described a complete *philosophy of life*. This nation was founded on a *rule of law* as opposed to a *rule of men*.

We can recapture the meaning of that phrase ... and thus understand much of the motivation and spirit behind the American Revolution ... by turning to the source largely responsible for those words – *Blackstone's Commentaries on the Law*. Introduced in 1766, *Blackstone's* became the law book of the Founding Fathers. Notice *Blackstone's* explanation of *the laws of nature* – "Man, considered as a creature, must necessarily be subject to the laws of his Creator, for he is entirely a dependent being. ... And consequently, as man depends absolutely upon his Maker for everything, it is necessary that he should in all points conform to his Maker's will. This will of his Maker is called the *law of nature*.... This *law of nature* ... [coexisting] with mankind and dictated by God Himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this."

This, then, was the understanding of our Founders in reference to *the laws of nature* — they are the will of

(continued ... on page two)

(continued ... from page one)

God for man. Blackstone continued: “And if our reason were always ... clear and perfect ... the task would be pleasant and easy; we should need no other guide but this [*the law of nature*]. But every man now finds the contrary in his own experience; that his reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error. This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of Divine Providence; which ... hath been pleased, at sundry times and in diverse manners, to discover and enforce its laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the Holy Scriptures.” Very simply: The Holy Scriptures, containing the laws of the God who created nature; thus termed *the laws of nature’s God* — the second half of the phrase in the *Declaration*. Notice Blackstone’s conclusion which couples these two phrases: “Upon these two foundations, *the law of nature* and the law of revelation [*the law of nature’s God*], depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these.”

So, the meaning of the eight-word legal phrase in the opening lines of the *Declaration* was expounded in America for years before the Revolution, and accurately identifies the spirit undergirding that conflict.

A conundrum is presented when the government acts in strict accordance with well-established and clearly defined legal rules and still produces a result that many observers consider unfair or unjust. Before the American Civil War, for example, African-Americans were systematically deprived of their freedom by carefully written codes that prescribed the rules and regulations between master and slave. Even though these slave codes were often detailed, unambiguous, and made known to the public, government enforcement of them produced negative results.

Do such repugnant laws comport with the *rule of law*? The answer to this question depends on *when* and *where* it is asked. In some countries

the political leaders assert that the *rule of law* has no substantive content. These leaders argue that a government may deprive its citizens of fundamental liberties so long as it does so pursuant to a duly enacted law. At the Nuremberg Trials, some of the political, military, and industrial leaders of Nazi Germany unsuccessfully advanced this argument as a defense to Allied charges that they had committed abominable crimes against European Jews and other minorities during World War II.

In other countries the political leaders assert that all written laws must conform to universal principles of morality, fairness, and justice. These unwritten principles of equality, autonomy, dignity, and respect are said to transcend ordinary written laws that are enacted by government. This is often known as Natural Law or higher law theory. These leaders argue that as a necessary corollary to the axiom that “no one is above the law,” the *rule of law* requires that the government treat all persons equally under the law.

The principle of rule of law is violated whenever a person or group in a society has unchecked power and can disobey the law without fear of punishment. This is the case with dictators and their friends and family in some countries; or countries where the government has a media monopoly and can publish lies or cover up government misconduct with no fear of consequences.

#### **America’s Balance of Power**

In establishing a *rule of law* system of government in the U.S., our Founders were faced with the question: How could they guarantee that some powerful group would not take over the government, violate the *U.S. Constitution* at will, and refuse to be subject to its requirements? Their solution was a *separation of powers*, so that the power of government would be divided among various groups. Each group protecting its own interests, would have some authority to provide ‘check’ on the power of other groups and thus there would be a ‘balance’ between the various groups that held

power. This system of ‘checks and balances’ was designed to protect the nation from any powerful person or group that might arise and abuse their power. With respect to the *separation of powers* between the legislatures and the courts, the U.S. was set up to have a system by which one group would *make the laws* (i.e., U.S. Congress, and state and local legislatures and boards), and another group would *interpret and apply the laws* (i.e., the courts), and would decide if the laws were consistent with the *Constitution*. As the *U.S. Constitution* was originally set up, judges had absolutely no role in making any new laws, nor did they have any role in amending the *Constitution*. The principle is that those who *judge* the laws should not be those who also *make* the laws. Thus, the highest authority in the nation is not any person or group of persons, but a document. There is a ‘higher law’ above the lawmakers, and therefore even the lawmakers are to be subject to the *rule of law*. This system protects America from a tyranny of a majority of people who may be swept away by the urgent needs of a particular crisis, thereby making decisions that would erode or destroy some of the pillars on which this nation was founded. (refer to the Postscript — page 4)

#### **Foreign Threat of Shariah Law**

A real threat comes from an international terrorist movement that is sometimes called Islamic Jihadism. This term refers to a number of loosely related Islamic terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda, Hamas (a Palestinian group), Hezbollah (based in Lebanon), Muslim Brotherhood (in several countries, but strongest in Egypt), and various other radical Islamic movements with similar convictions and goals. And why has the U.S. become the target? According to Lawrence Wright (book: *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*, 2006), they are against America because it is regarded as “the locus of Christian power” and “viewed through the eyes of men who were spiritually anchored in the seventh century” when Christianity was not just a rival, it was the archenemy. “To them, the Crusades

(continued ... on page three)

(continued ... from page two)

were a continual historical process that would never be restored until the final victory of Islam.”

Wright goes on to explain how radically opposed to Western values this brand of Islam is: “By returning the rule of shariah [Islamic law governing all of life], radical Islam could draw the line against the encroaching West. Even the values that America advertised as being universally desirable—democracy, transparency, the rule of law, human rights, the separation of religion from governments—were discredited in the eyes of the jihadis because they were Western and therefore modern.” These American values are against Islam because they are placed in the hands of human authority ... that which belongs only to Allah. So anyone who disagrees with this joyless understanding of Islam the militant Muslims believe they are justified in killing the ‘infidel’ [one who does not accept Islam]; indeed, it is a divine duty to kill the workers of Satan [the U.S. is frequently referred to as ‘the great Satan’]. The results of a reign of strict shariah [translated as ‘the path’] is a loss of human freedom; essentially reducing human beings to dehumanizing slavery ruled by the Islamic religious leaders. Radical Islamic opposition to Israel must also be understood in this light. Whereas Islam is the dominate religion in all the countries of the Middle East that surround Israel, the presence of Judaism as the dominate religion in Israel stands out as an intolerable exception; and therefore many Muslim leaders declare that Israel has no right to exist and they will not rest until all the Jews are driven out of the land of Palestine or driven into the sea. Then pure Islamic rule can be established in Palestine as well. [Besides, Israel is allied to the U.S.]

### **Domestic Threat of Shariah Law**

While some people have been sounding an alarm of warning for years about what is termed as ‘creeping shariah,’ most people either haven’t paid attention or don’t care ... because they’ve been taught a narrative that multiculturalism and tolerance is politically correct. Many Americans need to understand that

while Islam is a misunderstood ideology, many Muslims purposely want it to be misunderstood. If people are taught that Islam is merely a ‘religion of peace’ with a few radicals, the focus will remain on tolerance and dialogue—all the while keeping people ignorant of the geopolitical goals of Islam ... which has always been the desire for worldwide dominance. Islam literally means ‘submission.’ Contextually, submission to Allah’s will in every area of personal and societal life ... including government ... to which all must submit. Islam is more than a religion; it is an ideology. And it is a far cry from a ‘religion of peace.’ Yet, those of us who express to the contrary a cautionary word of its worldwide permeation toward domination are viewed as intolerant bigots and “Islamophobes.” Mind you, these are the same people who compare Bible-believing Christians to the Taliban, or to so-called extremists. This is a willful display of complete ignorance of Muslim persecution of Christians all over the world. Some research estimates well over 100,000 believers are martyred annually for naming the name of Jesus Christ ... many of whom were missionaries.

Settlement of Islam has already happened all over Europe, Great Britain, Canada and the U.S. In 1974, before a gathering of the General Assembly at the U.N., Algerian President Boumedienne said, “One day millions of men will leave the southern hemisphere of this planet to burst into the northern one; but not as friends ... they will burst in to conquer, and they will conquer by populating with their children. Victory will come to us [Islam] from the wombs of our women.” In 2007, the U.S. General Accounting Office reported that nearly 10,000 people from terrorist Muslim states were given Diversity Visas from 1999 to 2006. According to a U.S. Census report on Religion in 2010, Islam was the fastest growing religion in the U.S. In the last 10 years, the numbers of Muslims have grown by more than 1.6 million to over 2.6 million. Cities such as Dearborn, Michigan and Murfreesboro, Tennessee are predominant Muslim communities.

It’s been proven statistically that Muslims have a far higher birthrate than Western Christians. It would seem that the words of the Algerian President’s speech nearly 30-years ago is coming to pass.

Those who have paid attention have witnessed the establishment of Islam in America, not only by a huge increase in mosque construction and learning centers, but also in American public education. It is in education where Islam makes the transition from a religion to a culture. Many Americans believe the false narrative of a *wall of separation* and believe that our public schools are no place for teaching Biblical principles (i.e., the 10 Commandments or Creationism) but have no problem with Islam being taught and promoted in schools ... because it is taught under the auspices of multiculturalism. From charter schools across the nation which promote the Gülen Movement which seeks to promote shariah compliancy, to a Texas High School in which a Geography teacher encouraged students to dress in Islamic clothing (and had them refer to 9/11 hijackers as freedom fighters instead of terrorists), our nation’s schools are becoming breeding grounds of Islamic indoctrination and conversion. Where is the outrage when a public school class takes a field trip to a local mosque and students are encouraged to participate in Islamic prayer? Imagine the firestorm had this class been taken to a local Baptist church and invited to watch a baptism?

Then there are Islamic organizations such as *Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR)*, who always watch to make sure Muslim’s constitutional rights are being protected, while at the same time promoting their own ideologies which limit others’ rights. Consider when *CAIR* complained that a school in Detroit Michigan was being too accommodating to Christians when teachers handed out permission slips so parents could allow their kids to attend off campus Bible study classes. This is the same group whom in Dearborn, pushed public schools to accommodate Muslim students to

(continued ... on page four)

(continued ... from page three)

leave early on Fridays in order to attend Muslim prayers and allow Muslim students to “comfortably pray” on school grounds.

While Islam has been enabled in all sectors of U.S. society from schools, the workplace and government, the one place in which it never should have ever been established is in the Christian Church. Some western churches have fallen into a false and dangerous doctrine known as Chrislam. While not new, Chrislam has gained some momentum in recent years ... especially in the liberal churches in America. People are led to believe that the God of Christianity is the same as the Islamic god Allah. This could not be further from the truth. Islam does not, nor will it ever recognize as Christians do that Jesus Christ is God the Son, the 2nd person of the Triune God, the true nature of God. To Muslims, Jesus is a great prophet, although not as great as Mohammad. Surah 4:171 says in part that “Jesus ... only a messenger of Allah ... Far is it removed from His transcendent majesty that he should have a son.” The Bible makes it clear in St. John 1 who Jesus is. In the Old Testament, Isaiah (which was written hundreds of years before Mohammad even existed) describes Jesus in Chapter 9:6 – “For to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government will be on His shoulders. And He will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.” Islam also teaches that Jesus never died on the cross: “They slew him not nor crucified him, but it appeared unto them.” (Surah 4:157) Muslims cannot conceive of the idea that God would have one of his prophets’ die in such an undignified way. These are not just minor belief differences – this is the core doctrine of the Christian faith. Whether out of fear of being called intolerant, or believing that building bridges to find common ground between the two faiths will somehow bring Muslims into a relationship with Jesus — for Christians to believe Chrislam is a good thing and by failing to teach the Gospel message, is in effect submitting to Islam.

Certainly a factor that gives Islamic radicals ‘ammunition’ to vilify the U.S. is the very evident moral breakdown in our society ... which they can criticize in order to argue that America needs the imposition of strict Islamic law. The radicals point to widespread moral decline characterized by alcoholism, addiction to drugs and gambling, pornography, marital unfaithfulness, sexual immorality before and after marriage, undisciplined and disrespectful children in schools, the breakdown of parental authority, extensive shoplifting and employee theft, dishonesty in all areas of life, and more. At this point Christians should realize that historically it has been the proclamation by Christian pastors of the moral law of God and the universal accountability before God that has brought positive moral transformation in many societies. But such will not come unless a substantial number of people in America have their hearts transformed by the Gospel that proclaims forgiveness of sins and the opportunity for new life through faith in Christ Jesus. Christians would do well to earnestly pray for a spiritual revival in America ... just as occurred twice before (prior to the American Revolution and the Civil War).

There are many other ways in which Islam has gained such a foothold in the U.S. to where shariah has been instituted: From food production, companies and restaurants submitting to Islamic law by preparing Halal foods to a rise in shariah style honor killings which involve beheadings and murders within the Islamic community. We even have had state courts decide to allow shariah to be used in place of U.S. law. One such egregious example was the 2009 case of a Muslim woman whose request for a restraining order against her Moroccan husband who had serially tortured and raped her was denied by New Jersey family court Judge Joseph Charles. The judge ruled on the grounds that the abusive husband had acted according to his Muslim (shariah) beliefs, and thus not with criminal intent. Fortunately, a N.J. appellate court overturned the ruling in July 2010, making clear that

the U.S., the laws of the land derive from the *Constitution* and the alien dictates of shariah have no place in a U.S. courtroom. Still, the fact that such a reversal was necessary is instructive.

Shariah law is completely antithetical to the *U.S. Constitution*. Remember that Islam is an ideology, but under shariah, it is law. People who don’t understand this have no idea of the ramifications of America falling to shariah law. They may have a hard time with Christians wanting to say the *Pledge of Allegiance* with the words, “One nation under God” or to have public displays of the Ten Commandments or nativities etc. But these same people have no idea of what life would be like under Islamic rule and Shariah law. One only has to look at countries such as Saudi Arabia, or see groups such as the Afghani Taliban to know that shariah is discriminatory, and degrading toward, in the Islamic term, infidels.

Patrick Henry is attributed to have said, “It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians; not on religions, but on the Gospel of Jesus Christ! For this very reason peoples of other faiths have been afforded asylum, prosperity, and freedom of worship.” If America were to become an Islamic nation under shariah, there would be no asylum afforded to anyone – but Muslims. Shariah dictates that non-Muslims be given three choices: convert to Islam and conform to shariah; submit as second-class citizens (dhimmis); or be killed. This is why we must view shariah as a real threat to the American way.

#### Postscript

There is another noteworthy domestic threat – **activist judges**. There has developed a weakness in the system that justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have discovered over time. If a case came to the Supreme Court and the *Constitution* did not say something that the Supreme Court justices wanted to say or thought it should say, they could claim to ‘discover’ new principles in the *Constitution*, and no one would have power to overrule them. Whatever they thought was important, they could simply create a new law and call it an ‘interpretation’ of some part of the *Constitution*, and suddenly it would become the ‘highest law’ of the land.