

India: PM Narendra Modi Hints At Change to "Triple Talaq" Islamic Divorce Law

As reported for the A.M. program, by Aussie ABC's South Asia correspondent, James Bennett.

A heartening sign of growing resistance to Islam in India.

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-10-25/india's-prime-minister-wishes-in-on-triple-talaq-divorce-law/7961574>

"India's Prime Minister Narendra Modi Hints at Change to Controversial "Triple Talaq" Islamic Divorce Law'.

"India's Muslim men can still unilaterally divorce their wives simply by saying so.

This practice is part of the classical Sharia of Islam, and it is not only in India that Muslim men do it. – CM

'Now, amid a constitutional challenge to the practice (and it's about time that there was such a challenge! – CM), India's Prime Minister Narendra Modi has thrown his weight behind banning the so-called "triple talaq" – but he is facing criticism for taking a politically-motivated stand.

He is the non-Muslim leader of a majority-non-Muslim country whose laws are not based upon nor should they accommodate the antihuman and inhuman sharia of Islam. PM Modi has every right to take a political – and moral – stand against a practice the continued permission of which, in India, is legally, politically and socially destructive. Let there be one set of laws in non-Muslim India, and let that set of laws be unapologetically non-Islamic. And if Muslims in India do not like that, and desire to live by the sharia, then they should be told that they should depart and go live in Pakistan

or in Bangladesh, both of which were established expressly to be Islamic states, for Muslims.

'Yesterday, Mr Modi told a rally that it was the Government's constitutional "duty" to give Islamic women their rights.

He is using rights in the sense of individual human rights; the right to basic, decent treatment (as understood by the average Infidel). – CM

"Should the rights of Muslim daughters not be protected? Should Muslim mothers and sisters not be protected? Should Muslim sisters not be given equal rights?" he asked, rhetorically.

Of course, under the sharia, women qua women do not receive equality: not before the law, where their testimony weighs less than a man's (and nothing at all, it is not even admitted, in cases involving sexual misconduct); not in inheritance, where a daughter receives less than a son; not under the rule of qisas, compensation, where the blood-money paid if a woman is killed is half that of what is required for the death of a man. – CM

'Opponents of the change like Mr Muchhala believe the Prime Minister's comments are "absolutely" politically motivated, ahead of a major state election.

'Mr Modi leads a Hindu nationalist government, previously criticised for failing to defend **Muslims who have been victims of religiously-motivated violence.**

Mr Bennett, South Asia correspondent for Australia's ABC: before going to India, did you even consider reading Konrad Elst, or K S Lal, or just V S Naipaul? You write a paragraph that represents Muslims as victims, whilst entirely eliding the many, many occasions, in contemporary and historic India, when Muslims have been very active perpetrators. You omit the fact that Muslims have inflicted vast amounts of religiously-

motivated, religiously-commanded-and-commended violence, against Hindus, and Sikhs, and Buddhists, in India, for over a millennium, and still engage in it, whenever they think they can get away with it. – CM

'Under Sharia law, Muslim men can divorce women by saying "talaq" three times.

Women, on the other hand, have no such option; under the sharia it is made extremely difficult and expensive for a woman to seek and to get a divorce, even from a violent and downright murderous husband. – CM

'Mr Modi's detractors believe he has weighed in now to court the vote of Muslim women in populous Uttar Pradesh, which goes to the polls next spring.

'Regardless, the Prime Minister's stance is significant.

'The battle between religious freedom (*which in the case of Islam boils down to the demand to have "freedom to behave atrociously against coreligionists and against non-adherents"* – CM) and universality is one of India's longest-running social issues.

'For Arshia Ismail, it has meant a five-year nightmare. She had been married for 10 years, when one night, in 2011, her husband declared simply that he had already divorced her, several days earlier.

"I was shocked", she said, flipping through an endless stream of painful paperwork in her unit in suburban Delhi.

"Never in my wildest dreams did I imagine that he would give me talaq (divorce)."

'The triple talaq is a Sharia law practice which allows men to end a marriage, simply by saying "talaq" – or, divorce – to their wives, three times in succession.

That is correct. It is sharia. It is not some weird fringe thing; it is not a distortion or misinterpretation; it is plain old orthodox, bog-standard Islam as historically practised in all parts of the lands dominated by Islam, for 1400 years. – CM

'Ms Ismail suddenly found herself a divorcee, alone.

'Now, however, she is among an overwhelming majority of India's roughly 90 million Muslim women [who are] hoping that a fellow victim's case could see it ruled unconstitutional.

As it damn well should be; and a whole bunch of other items of "Muslim personal law" should be ruled unconstitutional, and banned, similarly. – CM

'Zaki Soman, from the India Muslim Women's Movement, described the practice as a "one-sided, absolutely arbitrary, unilateral form of divorce, where the man has all the power".

One-sided, arbitrary, and despotic = Islam. An English scholar of Islam, writing in the 19th century, named Palgrave, defined Islam's concept of godhead as "a pantheism of Force".

The divorce law of Islam is just one example of the kind of thing that Islam is. Ms Soman should leave Islam and find something else. Except, of course, if she left Islam, the sharia assassins would be out after her... – CM

'She is challenging the constitutionalism of the practice in India's Supreme Court.

"It's about gender justice", she said.

If you really want gender justice, Ms Soman, you need to ditch Islam altogether. Gender injustice, sacralised and institutionalised misogyny, is hardwired into Islam. Wafa Sultan, a Syrian ex-Muslim, in her book "A God Who Hates", states succinctly – "Allah hates women". – CM

"it's about Quranic rights in Islam (what? *what* rights? – CM)

and it's about constitutional rights as citizens of India".

In the end, you have to be loyal to the Ummah or loyal to Infidel India. – CM

'Religious Freedom Versus Universal Rights'

'This issue has divided India from the dawn of its post-colonial independence.

'Seeking to accommodate multiple faiths, India's laws from marriage, divorce and inheritance – matters deemed "personal law" – were left largely up to each religion.

Given that the single biggest non-Hindu religious bloc in India was and is Islam, this was a grave mistake. – CM

'Now, nearly 70 years on, the issue remains highly contentious – a battle between advocates of a single secular law, and opponents (*most or all of whom seem to be Muslims; I would hazard the guess that the Christians, for example, are quite happy with the idea of a single secular law – CM*) who argue that that would trample on religious freedom.

'Among them is Yusuf Muchhala, the lawyer for the All India Muslim Personal Law Board, which is fighting [against] Ms Soman's case.

"There's a large number of Muslims who feel that the Sharia law being divine, there should be no interference by any outside agencies", he said.

*Well, if that's the case, given that the sharia – besides the myriad ways that it permits and encourages men to abuse and degrade women and girls – **also** includes all sorts of ugly and cruel rules about how to mistreat and enslave, exploit and degrade anyone who isn't a Muslim, you should be requested and required to pack your bags and tootle off to Pakistan or Bangladesh, rather than remaining in Hindu-majority India where, whether you like it or not, the law of the land is not*

– nor ever should be – the sharia. – CM

“In India we have a plurality of religion, plurality of cultures, and we have also to respect that.”

Until we Muslims become powerful enough to force everybody else to Submit... – CM

‘But Ms Soman argued that India’s constitution does not allow women to be treated differently.

“The right to religious freedom nowhere means a free license to the male of the Muslim community to subjugate the woman”, she said.

The sharia is just such a license. It is also a license to the Muslim community to humiliate, degrade and terrorise – even to kill – non-Muslims. – CM

‘Significantly, it now appears that the Government may agree with her.

‘Even if Ms Soman’s court challenge does fail, there is an indication that the days of oral divorce may be numbered.”

I certainly hope so. I hope that under Modi the dangerous accommodations permitted to Islam, and the Muslims, may cease.

There should be, in India, a single – secular – law and if Muslims don’t want to live under it, they should be strongly encouraged to leave; if they insist on remaining, but then insist on breaking Indian law, in order to practise the sharia which is in breach of Indian law, then Indian Infidel law must be enforced, without hesitation or apology. It is past time that, in India, the process of Islamisation was halted, and began to be reversed. And banning something as manifestly unjust and cruel as the “triple talaq” would be an excellent first step in that necessary and desirable process of de-Islamisation of India.- CM