



Mothers pay for the in-action of Muslim Armies stationed throughout the world? When will Muslims learn that united we are strong divided we fall!

Modernizing History

"All who die by the way, whether by land or by sea, or in battle against the pagans, shall have immediate remission of sins. This I grant them through the power of God with which I am invested. O what a disgrace if such a despised and base race, which worships demons, should conquer a people which has the faith of omnipotent God and is made glorious with the name of Christ!"

With these closing words Pope Urban II launched the first crusades against the Muslims in 1095. At the Council of Clermont he called on the Christians to fight "the enemies of the Lord" in the East and to restore the land of Palestine to the rule of Christianity. However, his present-day successor Pope John Paul II, in an unprecedented volte-face apologised for the Crusades and sought God's forgiveness for the sins of Roman Catholics through the ages. In March 2000 in one of the celebrations marking the beginning of the new Christian millennium he stated, "We are asking pardon... for the use of violence that some have committed in the service of truth...". The phrase "violence in the service of truth" is an often-used reference to the treatment meted out to heretics during the Inquisition, the Crusades, and forced conversions of native peoples.

In a similar case in March 1998, President Clinton on a trip to Uganda acknowledged that the United States was wrong to benefit from slavery. He said the U.S. had not always done the right thing by Africa, and that perhaps its worst sin had been that of neglect and ignorance. The President was taking tentative steps towards what seemed like a public apology for America's role in the slave trade.

In November of the same year (1998), numerous cases concerning the treatment of prisoners of war (PoWs) by the Japanese began to surface in the media. Several war veterans from various countries like America, the Netherlands and Britain have been demanding monetary compensation from the Japanese for the suffering they endured in the PoW camps. The veterans filed lawsuits and started legal proceedings against the Japanese government and even against some business firms like Nippon Steel.

The common thread running through these seemingly disparate events is the drastic reassessment of past events, an effort to right some historical wrongs. Countries, peo-

ples and societies who look back into their past are being forced to re-evaluate it in a different light. What was once acceptable and right has now become unacceptable and wrong. That which was praiseworthy has now become deplorable and vice versa. Yesterday's freedom fighters are now considered today's terrorists. Nations that develop nuclear warheads in this age run the risk of being isolated when a few decades ago it was the measure of advanced nations. Invading and colonising a country was quite acceptable in the 19th century, whereas any nation entertaining such notions today is carpet-bombed and strangled with international sanctions. And the list of historical reassessments goes on...

So, why does this occur, why does the perception of right and wrong keep shifting and changing? We are told that man is constantly learning from his mistakes, that we are becoming more responsible and mature in our outlook. The advocates of this view highlight principles like democracy, freedom and human rights which they claim have become de facto standards of human decency replacing dictatorships, suppression and crimes against humanity as proof of mans conceptual progression.

This view is false as it assumes the acceptance of specific Western values and norms as the universal standards of right and wrong. The fact of the matter is constantly changing criteria of right and wrong is a phenomenon only peculiar to man made viewpoints. Since the West discarded religion and adopted secularism it has glorified the limited mind of man and overestimated its capability to the point of elevating it to the level of Law-maker. Herein lies the explanation of the inconsistency of criteria and the reason for the West's need to constantly re-evaluate history. Rules and laws of any society reflect the perception of what is considered good and praiseworthy or what is regarded as reprehensible and blameworthy. Therefore, when the limited mind of man is assigned the authority to dictate what is right and wrong the rules and laws it gives rise to share this limited nature of the mind and its shortcomings. In effect, when society decides to change its mind about certain things, the rules and regulations are altered to reflect this change. For instance, if the overwhelming British public opinion is for the legalisation of cannabis the government may

have no choice but to legalise it. The inevitable result is legislative contradiction and the meaninglessness of justice as it becomes relative within man-made systems. Issues previously considered as criminal will become legal and acceptable and vice versa. Little wonder then that the Pope under pressure from the secular onslaught, felt compelled to apologise for what is now considered a crime sanctioned by the Church against humanity.

For justice to have any meaning it must be free from relativity and subjection to continuous re-examination. This means the rules and laws governing the affairs of mankind should have fixed criteria that don't fluctuate. It is quite obvious the man-made systems of the West are incapable of delivering this solution. Only Islam, as a complete system, possesses these qualities. The rules and regulations of Islam do not change over time because they do not originate from the limited mind of man; they are legislated by his Creator, Allah (swt).

“The rule is to none but Allah.” (TMQ 6:57)

Since man is unable to attribute the qualities of right and wrong to actions with certainty, Islam absolved him of this responsibility. Islam made the halal and haram permanent criteria. Whatever Islam designates as good and acceptable or bad and unacceptable shall remain so for all times and places. Therefore, reviewing Islamic history in light of contemporary changes with a view to correct the Shari'ah rules for faults or apologise for their application is unnecessary and preposterous to say the least.

Nevertheless, the kuffar would like nothing much than for us to adopt their corrupt viewpoint in such matters. On the 23rd of September 2000 the US congress made a move to pass a bill, sponsored by the Armenian community in America to press Turkey for financial compensation and the return of provinces granted to Armenia in 1919 but which were later recaptured as Armenia fell to the Soviet Army. Likewise, on the 18th of January 2001 the lower house of the French parliament unanimously approved a bill which attempts to label with genocide the 1915 quelling of the Armenian nationalistic rebellion by the Uthmani Khilafah against its authority.

Under no circumstances should Muslims make an apology or express regret for applying Islam. It was through the application of Islam that the vast numbers of humanity came under the shade and mercy of this deen, turning them into this distinguished Ummah.

“Verily you are the best Ummah brought unto mankind, enjoining the right, forbidding the evil and believing in Allah.” [3:110]

Acknowledgement of this foul idea could amount to accepting to condemn what the Messenger of Allah (saw) and his Sahabah (ra) accomplished. The kuffar would have us call into question their noble deeds. They desire that we denounce the expulsion of the jews from the Arabian Peninsula by the Messenger of Allah (saw) and from Jerusalem by Khaleefah Umar (ra), even though this remains valid to this day despite Yasser Arafat's efforts to the contrary.

A study of the history of Islam reveals that the world experienced under the leadership of Islam such peace and justice modern man can only imagine. The Islamic Ummah has no reason to rectify its magnificent history. It is the West that has unleashed incalculable misery upon humanity that has cause for concern.

Source: Salihu Mahmud ((Khilafah.com))

Organ Scandal

Just as the people are not safe from the horrors of the creed of capitalism in life (crime, sexual promiscuity, corruption, greed) it has become abundantly clear that neither is anyone safe from it in death. Recently the Chief UK Medical Officer Liam Donaldson revealed that the practice of stripping organs without permission from babies and adults dead or alive and then stockpiling them is widespread and common practice.

Almost 105,000 organs, body parts and fetuses had been retained across the country in 210 NHS trusts and medical schools. What has become horrifyingly clear is that Post Mortems were only smoke screens in order to harvest body parts.

The organ scandal first broke in Bristol in 1998 when it became clear that staff at the hospital had been keeping hearts following surgery at the hospital. And in September it was announced that Birmingham's Diana Princess of Wales Children's Hospital and the Alder Hey Children's Hospital, in Liverpool, had been harvesting organs and tissues from the babies who died at their hospitals.

The same two hospitals in January 2001 were caught up in the cash for tissues row, which revealed that both the Birmingham and Liverpool hospitals had given Thymus glands, removed during heart surgery from live children, to a pharmaceutical company for research. They then received cash donations from the company involved.

Contrary to arguments that such organs are needed for the advancement of medical science, it was revealed 16,000 organs removed during coroners' post-mortem examinations may have been kept for teaching or simply stored for no purpose, in breach of the UK law. Professor Dick van Velzen, the pathologist at Alder Hey even kept the head of a child stored in a jar.

Thus it can be seen that in a capitalist society, the material benefit acts as a self evident proof and overrides any other consideration or value be it ethical, humanitarian or spiritual. In this case the material benefits of teaching and research were seen as sufficient justification to ignore the wishes and feelings of individuals, parents and families.

This is because there is no consideration in their actions, and their only criterion is the materialistic value which is manifested in the benefit. The West has made the materialistic value, which is the benefit, to be its criterion in life and made it the only respected value among all values. As a result, the spiritual, moral, and human values have been lost in the western societies.

However it is simply not a matter of consent. The taking of organs from the human being whether dead or alive should be measured by the Sharii texts. Based on the text, it is made clear what can be taken and what should be avoided regardless of the benefit and harm or the "manfah" (merit) and "madarah" (demerit). This is because what matters is the law of Allah, since it is Allah that legislates and not humans. The role of the mind is to understand the text and not to legislate the text and the laws.

This viewpoint based on the Halaal and Haraam is the viewpoint that the Khilafah will hold in all matters. Abhorrent practices such as removing organs from dead

bodies in post mortem examinations will not be “common practice”. Rather the Khilafah’s medical guidelines and policies will make it clear that such practices are a sin and indeed punishable acts.

Unlike the Capitalist doctors, Allah has made the dead body sacred and harming it forbidden as is the case when he is alive. Aisha, the mother of the believers, may Allah bless her, narrated that the Prophet of Allah peace be upon him said: “Breaking the bone of a dead person is just like breaking it when he is alive.” (Narrated by Imam Ahmad, Abu Daoud, and Ibn Habban). Imam Ahmad narrated that Amir Ibn Hazm Alansari said: the Prophet of Allah peace be upon him saw me leaning on a grave and said: **“Do not harm the owner of this grave”**. Imam Muslim and Ahmad narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayra that the Prophet of Allah peace be upon him said: **“For somebody to sit on a piece of burning charcoal and burns him is better for him than to sit on a grave.”**

These ahadith also shows that violating the dead body and hurting it is like violating the living body and hurting it. So, as it is not allowed for one to hurt the living by cutting his tummy, cutting his neck, taking out his eye, or breaking his bone; similarly, it is not allowed for the dead. Hence to remove the eye of the dead person, or to cut him open to remove his heart, kidney, liver, or lungs, to transfer it to another person who needs it, is to mutilate the dead body. Bukhari narrated that Abdullah Ibn Zaid Alansari said: **“The Prophet of Allah peace be upon him prohibited looting and disfiguring”**. Imam Ahmad, Ibn Majah, and Nasaii narrated that the Prophet of Allah peace be upon him sent us on an expedition and said: **“Go in the name of Allah, and for the sake of Allah. Fight those who disbelief in Allah. Do not mutilate, betray, or kill children”**.

It thus becomes clear that it is forbidden for anybody including a doctor to cut open the dead person, and to take an organ from the dead to give it to somebody else; this is considered a violation on the dead person’s sacredness. This is hurting and disfiguring it. Violating the dead body and mutilating it is certainly forbidden by the Shariah even if an organ is essential for another’s survival

The consent of the family to the removal of organs has no significance to the issue. This is because the body of the person after his death is not owned by anybody. Thus, the family cannot consent to donate one of his organs because they do not own his body and they have no authority to act on it.

However it is allowed for a person during his life to donate an organ or more, with his free will, to another person who needs the donated organ, like the hand or kidney. This is because the person has a legal (sharii) authority ,if his hand was severed or his eye was removed by another person; he can take the “diya” (blood money), or he can forgive for severing his hand or taking out his eye. The fact that he is allowed to forgive the severance of his hand or removal of his eye means that he can donate the “diya”; this means that the person owns the



“diya” and, therefore, he owns the organ which he donates its “diya”. The fact that he owns his organs means that he has the right to act on them. Therefore, that person can donate his organ to somebody who needs it. Allah has allowed forgiveness for qisas and diyat. He said: **“But if the relatives (or one of them) of the killed (person) forgive their brother (the killer) something (i.e. not to kill the killer by accepting the blood money in intentional murders) then the relatives should demand blood money in a reasonable manner, and the killer must pay with handsome gratitude. This is an alleviation and a mercy from your Lord.”**

However there is a requirement that the organ should not be vital for his own life such as his heart, liver or lungs. This is so, because donating such an organ will cause death to that person, and he will be killing himself. Allah Says: **“Do not kill yourselves.”** Imam Muslim narrates that Thabit Ibn Addahak said that the Prophet of Allah peace be upon him said: **“... and whoever kills himself with a tool, then Allah will punish him with that tool in hell fire.”** Imams Bukhari and Muslim narrated on the authority of Abu Hurayra that he said that the Prophet of Allah peace be upon him said: **“Any one who throws himself from a mountain to kill himself, then he is in hell fire.”** Similarly there is also Sharii text that specifically forbids donating testicles.

Oh Muslims

We must ensure that the criteria of the West does not become our criteria. Where material benefit is respected more than the commands and prohibitions of Allah. Know that only Islam and its implementation in the form of the Khilafah guarantees safeguarding the sanctity of the human being in life and in death.

Source: Abu Ayesha (Khilafah.com)