

Abdul Qadeem Zalloom

Democracy is a System of Kufr

**It is forbidden to adopt, implement or
call for Democracy**

Abdul Qadeem Zalloom

Democracy is a System of Kufr

**It is forbidden to adopt, implement or
call for Democracy**

From the Publications of Hizb ut Tahrir

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ فَإِن تَنَزَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ
فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِن كُنتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا ٥٩
أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ ءَامَنُوا بِمَا أَنزَلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أَنزَلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ يُرِيدُونَ أَن يَتَحَاكَمُوا
إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَن يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ وَيُرِيدُ الشَّيْطَانُ أَن يُضِلَّهُمْ ضَلَالًا بَعِيدًا ٦٠ وَإِذَا قِيلَ
لَهُمْ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ وَإِلَى الرَّسُولِ رَأَيْتَ الْمُنَافِقِينَ يَصُدُّونَ عَنْكَ صُدُودًا ٦١﴾

“O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger ﷺ, and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger ﷺ, if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination. Have you seen those (hypocrites) who claim that they believe in that which was sent down to you, and that which was sent before you, and they wish to for judgement (in their disputes) to the Taghut (false judges) while they have been ordered to reject them. But shaytan wishes to lead them astray (60) And when it is said to them. “Come to what Allah has sent down to the Messenger ﷺ,” you will see the hypocrites turn away from you with aversion.” [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:59-61]

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

- Democracy, which the Kafir West promotes in the Muslim countries, is a system of Kufr. It has no connection to Islam, remotely or closely. It completely contradicts the Shariah rulings of Islam, whether in the comprehensive, or partial issues. It also contradicts Islam regarding the source from which it came, as well as the basis on which it is established. It completely contradicts Islam, both in the thoughts and the systems it has brought.

That is why it is decisively Haraam for the Muslims to adopt, implement or call for it.

- Democracy is a ruling system set down by man, in order to be free from the oppression of the rulers, and their domination of the people, in the name of religion. It is a system whose source is man. It has no connection to either revelation or religion.

The basis of its origin is that the rulers in Europe used to claim that the ruler was God's representative on earth. So, he ruled man with a divine right and authority. They claimed that it is God who gave the ruler the legislative and executive authority. It is an authority to rule the people, with the law the ruler himself legislated. This is because he derives his authority from God, and not from the people. These rulers used to oppress the people. They used to dominate them as the master dominates his slave, in the name of their claim.

So, a struggle took place between the people and the rulers. The philosophers and the thinkers began to set out and study the subject of ruling. They put down a system to rule the people, which is the system of Democracy. Democracy is a system in which the people are to be the source of all authority. The ruler derives his authority from the people, whilst sovereignty is for the people. The people possess their own will and practise it themselves. They progress according to their desires. No one is to have any master over them. They are their own masters. They are to be the ones who determine the legislation by which they rule, and proceed according to. They are

the ones who appoint the ruler to rule them, by representing them in legislation, which the people themselves legislate.

Therefore, the source of the system of Democracy is all the people. It has no connection to either Revelation or Deen.

- Democracy is a Western word and term. It depicts the rule of the people, for the people and by the legislation of the people. Thus, the people are the absolute masters. They possess sovereignty and hold its reins. They practise their own will, and steer themselves. No one is answerable to any authority, other than the authority of the people. The people are the ones who legislate the systems and laws, in their sovereign capacity, via their representatives, whom they choose. They implement these systems and laws, that they legislated, through the rulers and judges. The people appoint the rulers and judges, who derive their authority from the people, in their capacity as the source of this authority. Each and every individual has the same right as everyone else, in terms of establishing the state, appointing the rulers and legislating systems and laws.

In principle, in democracy, all the people rule themselves by themselves. In principle, all the people should all gather in one public place, at once, to legislate the systems, and pass laws, with which they will rule and administer their affairs, whilst issuing judgements for that which requires judgement.

However, it is normally not possible for all the people to come together in one place, so that all of them form the legislative body. Therefore, instead, the people choose and elect representatives, so that they may form the legislative body. Those people constitute the parliament. Parliament in the system of Democracy is what represents the popular will. It is the political embodiment of the popular will of the masses. Parliament chooses the government. Parliament also chooses the head of state, so that he is the ruler and representative, in implementing the popular will. Parliament derives its authority from the people who choose it. They elect its members to rule them, with

the systems and laws they have legislated. So, the people are the masters. They are the ones who determine the laws. They are the ones who choose the ruler who implements these laws.

Democracy obliges the provision of universal freedoms for everyone. This is so that the people are masters over themselves. They can practise their sovereignty. They can steer their will completely by themselves, by enacting laws and systems of life, as well as choosing their ruler, without any pressure or compulsion. Democracy obliges that freedoms are provided for every individual of the community. This is so that he can realise his sovereignty, practise his will and steer his will himself, with absolute freedom, without any pressure or compulsion.

The universal freedoms are represented by four freedoms, which are,

1. Freedom of belief
2. Freedom of opinion and expression
3. Freedom of ownership
4. Personal freedom

- Democracy emanated from the creed of separating religion from life. It is the creed upon which the capitalist ideology is established. It is the creed of the vague, compromise solution. It was the result of a compromise reached between the kings and emperors of Europe and Russia, on the one hand, and the philosophers and thinkers, on the other, after a struggle. The kings and emperors used religion as a means to exploit the peoples, oppress them and spill their blood, under the claim that they are God's representatives on earth. They used the priests as a cover. Consequently, a terrible conflict broke out between them and their peoples, during which the philosophers and thinkers came forwards. Some of the philosophers and thinkers rejected religion altogether. Some of them recognised it.

Others called for its separation from life, and consequently from the state and ruling.

This conflict resulted in the idea of a compromise solution, the idea of separating religion from life. This inevitably resulted in the separation of religion from state. This idea is the creed on which the capitalist ideology is established. It is the intellectual basis upon which all the capitalist thoughts are built. The separation of religion from life is the basis upon which the intellectual direction is fixed, as well the viewpoint about life. It solves all the problems in life upon this basis. It is the intellectual basis which the West carries, and calls the world to adopt.

This creed removed religion and the church from both life and the state. It removed them from the legislation of systems and laws. It removed them from the appointing of rulers and investing authority within them. Consequently, it became imperative for the people to choose the system themselves, and put down the systems and laws. The people were to hold to account the rulers who rule them, according to these systems and laws, whilst the rulers derive their authority from the popular will of the masses.

It is from all this, that the system of Democracy has arisen. The idea of separating religion from life is the creed from which democracy has emanated. It is the intellectual basis upon which all the thoughts of democracy are founded.

- Democracy is established upon the basis of two ideas:

- 1- Sovereignty for the people
- 2- The people are the source of authority

These are the two ideas that the philosophers and thinkers in Europe brought about, during their struggle with the emperors and kings. They did so to destroy the idea of the divine right of kings and emperors, which was prevalent in Europe, at the time. The kings and emperors thought that they had a divine right over the people. They

thought that they alone have the right to legislate, rule and pass judgements. They were the state, whilst the people were their subjects. The people had no right to legislate or hold authority, pass judgement or hold any right over anything. They were in the position of a slave, who has neither opinion nor will. His only job is to obey and execute.

These two ideas came to completely abolish the idea of the divine right of kings and emperors. These ideas gave legislation and authority to the people. That is because the people are the masters. They are not the slaves of the kings and emperors. They are the masters of themselves. No one has sovereignty over them. They must possess their own will. They alone must guide their will, otherwise they will be slaves. This is because slavery means that one is guided by the will of another. If the people are not guided by their own will, then they remain as slaves. To emancipate the people from slavery, they themselves must be the only ones to guide their will. Thus, they will have the right to legislate any law that they want, and abolish and invalidate any law they do not want. They possess absolute sovereignty. They have the right to implement the legislation they legislate. They choose the ruler and judge that they want, so they apply the legislation that they want. They are also the source of all authority. The rulers derive their authority from them.

As a result of the success of the revolutions against the emperors and kings, and the demise of the idea of the divine right of kings, two ideas were imposed. Firstly, the sovereignty for the people. Secondly, the people are the source of authority, and the object of the implementation and execution. They are the basis on which the system of Democracy is established. The people came to be the legislators, in their capacity as those who possess sovereignty. They also came to be the executive, in their capacity as the source of all authority.

- Democracy is ruling by the majority. So the members of the legislative body are chosen by the majority vote, from the people who

voted. The majority of the houses of representatives undertakes the passing of laws, giving the vote of confidence to governments, or divesting them of it. The majority determines all the resolutions of the houses of representatives, councils, institutions and bodies. Whilst the election of the rulers by the people is directly, or via their representatives, it will always be by the majority of votes, from the individual voters of the people.

All this is why the majority is the prominent feature of the system of Democracy. The view of the majority is the actual yardstick that expresses the view of the people, according to the viewpoint of the system of Democracy.

- This is a brief explanation of Democracy in terms of its meaning, source, how it emerged, the creed from which it emanated, the basis upon which it is built, and the matters that must exist to enable the people to implement Democracy.

From this brief explanation, the following five points become clear,

1. Democracy is a result of the minds of men. It is not from Allah ﷻ. It does not rely on the Revelation from the heavens. It has no connection to any Deen Allah ﷻ has revealed to His Messengers (as).
2. It has emanated from the creed of separating religion from life. It consequently separates religion from the state.
3. It is established on two ideas. Firstly, sovereignty is for the people. Secondly, the people are the source of all authority.
4. Democracy is the rule of the majority. The selection of rulers, and the members of parliament, is undertaken by majority vote. All decisions in democracy are taken by the majority opinion.
5. Democracy advocates the universal freedoms which are:
 - a) Freedom of belief

- b) Freedom of opinion and expression
- c) Freedom of ownership
- d) Personal Freedom

These freedoms must be made available to every individual citizen, so that he can practise his sovereignty, and direct it himself. He can then undertake his right to participate in the selection of the rulers, and members of parliament, with absolute freedom, and without any pressure or compulsion.

- Looking at the first of the five points, it becomes clear that Democracy is from the systems of Kufr. It is not from Islam and has no relation with Islam whatsoever.

Before we demonstrate Democracy's contradiction with Islam, as well as the Shariah rulings regarding its adoption, we want to show that Democracy is not actually implemented, even in the oldest democratic nations. All of Democracy is based on lies and deception. We shall clarify its corruption and rottenness. We shall expose what Democracy has brought of misfortune and affliction to the world, as well as the extent of the corruption of societies, in which Democracy is implemented.

- Democracy in its true meaning is an imaginary idea that cannot be implemented. It never existed. It never will exist. Bringing all the people in one place permanently, to look after the public affairs, is impossible. All the people, altogether, assuming ruling and the will is also impossible. That is why they resorted to trickery regarding Democracy. They interpreted and explained it away. They created for Democracy what is known as the head of state, the government and the parliament.

Despite this, its meaning after this interpretation, still does not agree with the reality. It does not exist in reality. It is not true that the head of state, the government and members of parliament are elected

by the majority vote. It is not true that the house of representatives is the political embodiment of the popular will of the masses. It is not true that Democracy represents the majority of the people. All of this cannot be further than the truth and the reality. In fact, the members of parliament are elected by the minority of people. They are not elected by the majority.

This is because the post for a single member in Parliament has several nominated candidates, not one alone. The votes of the voters in the constituency are divided amongst all the candidates. Whoever gets the most votes in the constituency does not have the majority of all the votes of the eligible voters in the constituency. Therefore, they are delegated from this minority and are its representatives. They are neither delegated by the majority of the population, nor do they represent it.

The same applies for the head of state, whether he was elected directly by the people, or via members of parliament. He is not elected by the majority votes of the people. He is elected by the votes of a minority, as is the case with the members of the houses of representatives.

This is all asides from the fact that the heads of state and elected representatives, in the oldest democratic countries, like the United States and Britain, represent the will of the capitalists, from the major players in industry, finance and agriculture. They do not represent the will of the people, or of its majority. The major capitalists are those who bring those who will secure their interests into power, or into the representative assemblies. They are the ones who fund the costly elections for the head of state, or membership of the houses. As a result, they have control of the heads of state, and the members of the houses of representatives. This is a well-known reality in the United States.

In Britain, the Conservatives are the rulers. The Conservative Party represents the major capitalists from industry, finance, landowners and the class of aristocratic lords. The Labour Party does not come to power, except when there is a particular political

situation, that necessitates the removal of the Conservatives from power. That is why the rulers and the members of houses of representatives in the United States and Britain only represent the capitalists. They do not represent the will of the people or of its majority.

That is why the statement that the houses of representatives, in democratic countries, represent the view of the majority is a lie and deception. It is also a lie and deception that they derive their authority from the people.

The legislation passed in these houses of representatives, and the resolutions issued by those states, are all considered in the same manner. They are only made in the interests of those capitalists.

As for the counter arguments that the ruler is answerable before the houses of representatives, which embodies the popular will of the people, whilst the major decisions are not taken except with the agreement of the majority of the elected representatives, they do not accord with either truth or reality.

The British Prime Minister, Anthony Eden, declared the Suez war on Egypt, without informing parliament or informing the ministers who participate in ruling, outside of two or three ministers. During the Suez war, Congress requested the top-secret file, and the rationale for the provision of funding, from the US President, John Foster Dulles. Dulles completely rejected handing over the file to Congress. De Gaulle used to take decisions without his ministers knowing. Even King Hussein used to take important and dangerous decisions, without the knowledge of his ministers or members of parliament.

Therefore, the view that the houses of representatives in the democratic countries represent the opinion of the majority, that the rulers are elected by the majority opinion and that they rule by what the majority legislate and want, is a view which that is against the truth and the reality. It is a lie and deception.

This is in the old democratic countries. As for the houses of representatives in the Muslim World they are of less importance. They

are in name only. In the Muslim World, no parliament dares oppose the personage of the ruler, or challenges him or his system of rule. The Jordanian parliament, for example, has always been elected in the name of re-establishing democracy, and providing the freedoms. However, the parliament did not dare to oppose, in order to account King Hussein or the corruption of his rule. This is despite all the members of parliament knowing that corruption and economic collapse is due to the corruption of the ruling royal family, and due its pilfering of funds. Despite this, not a single member of parliament opposed that. Instead, they went against Zayd al-Rafaa'i and certain ministers, whilst knowing that Zayd al-Rafaa'i and these ministers are nothing but small players. They did not dare to take any action, without the knowledge and permission of the king.

This is from one angle. From another angle, the majority of laws that the government enacts, such as bills, are first sent to parliament, but then the select committees study them. The select committees then gives their opinions and recommendations, whilst the members of parliament simply give their approval. Many of the representatives do not know anything about the reality of these laws, because it is not within their area of expertise.

Therefore, the view that the legislations passed, by parliaments in democratic countries, express the popular will of the people, and that they represent the people's sovereignty, is a statement which goes against the truth and reality.

- One of the glaring shortcomings of the system of Democracy relates to ruling and governments. It is in the case that there are no large parties in the democratic country, which allows them to win an absolute majority in parliament. Consequently, this does not allow them to form a government of their own, exclusive ruling. In such a country, governing remains unstable. Governments collapse, constantly, under the weight of successive political crises. This is because it is difficult for the government to maintain the confidence of the parliamentary majority. This compels them to move towards

dissolution. Months may pass without the head of state being able to form a new government. It will keep the ruling in the country paralysed, and partially functional. The head of state may be forced to dissolve parliament and hold new elections, wishing to change the balance. This is so as to be enable the formation of a new, stable government. This keeps the ruling unstable. It keeps the policy of ruling unstable and marginally functional. This instability is particularly seen in democratic countries like Italy and Greece, in which there are many, many parties. There is not one single, major, large party, which can win an absolute majority. That is why the haggling and horse trading between parties remains perpetual.

Small parties may then also dominate other larger parties, which offer them the chance to participate, in forming a coalition government. They then impose difficult conditions, to realise their particular interests. Thus, small parties, who represent only a few, control other parties. Then they dominate the country's policies, and the decisions of the government.

- One of severest afflictions on humanity is the idea of universal freedoms brought by the democratic system. It has caused nothing but disaster for humankind. It has caused societal decadence in democratic countries, to a level lower than that of animals.

The idea of freedom of ownership, and the fact that benefit is the criterion of action, has caused great misery. It has resulted in the large capitalists becoming in great need of raw materials to run their factories, as well as consumer markets to sell their products. This has pushed these capitalist countries to compete for the colonialization of the developing world. These capitalist nations seize the wealth of the developing world and monopolise its resources. They suck the blood of its people, in a manner that completely contradicts with all the humanitarian, ethical and spiritual values.

The severity of greed and desire became acute among these capitalist countries. It led to their loss of any humanitarian, ethnical or

spiritual values. It led to their competition over unlawful gain to trade with the blood of peoples. It led to their inciting war, tensions and strife between states and peoples. All this is so that they can sell their products, and expand their military industry, which has accrued huge profits.

It is ridiculous and disgusting that the colonialist democratic countries, like the United States, Britain and France, boast and brag about democratic values and human rights, whilst they trample over all humanitarian and ethical values. They squander all the rights of humans, and even the blood of humans. Thus, Palestine, South East Asia, Latin America, Africa, South Africa, Iraq, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Chechnya are the striking examples that slap them in the face. These examples expose the extent of their lies and deception, and the extent of their impudence and insolence, as well.

- As for the idea of personal freedom, it has turned societies in democratic countries, into animalistic and base societies. It has taken them to a level of filthy promiscuity, that even animals cannot descend to. Allah ﷻ spoke the truth when He said, ﴿أَرَأَيْتَ مَنْ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ أَفَأَنْتَ تَكُونُ عَلَيْهِ وَكِيلًا ۚ ۴۳ أَمْ تَحْسَبُ أَنَّ أَكْثَرَهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ أَوْ يَعْقِلُونَ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ سَبِيلًا ﴿﴾ **“Have you (O Muhammad [saw]) seen him who has taken his own desire as good? Would you then be a guardian over him? (43) Or do you think that most of them hear or understand? They are only like cattle; nay, they are even farther astray from the Path.”** [TMQ Surah al-Furqan 25: 43-44]

The practice of sex is permitted in these democratic societies, as if it is merely drinking water. It is permitted via legal rulings, legislated by the parliament of those democratic countries, with the backing of their churches. This legislation has permitted sex and cohabitation between the male and the female with absolute freedom, when each of them reaches the age of eighteen. This is without the state, or fathers, having any authority to prevent these sexual practices.

The matter is not just restricted to legislating the permissibility of natural sexual practices. It has moved on to legislating the permissibility of abnormal sexual practices. Some democratic countries have even permitted marriage between the sexually deviant people. They have allowed a man to marry a man, and a woman to marry a woman.

Personal freedom is why one of the normalized and common sights you will see in streets, roads, parks, buses, concerts and festivals is that the young boys and girls will exchange kisses, embraces, hugs, flirt and behave immodestly. This is without drawing any attention or surprise, because it is considered normal and natural for them,

One of these matters is also that women would enjoy the sun in summer, getting a tan in the parks, naked as the day their mothers bore them, except with a fig leaf to cover their private parts. Likewise it is common for women to walk in the summer semi-naked, covering only a little of their body.

The abnormal and strange sexual practices have flooded these lowly democratic countries. Homosexuality has increased between men. Lesbianism has increased between women. Sex with beasts and cattle has also increased. There is also an increase in the practice of group sex between males and females, who have sex together at the same time. The likes of such orgies are not to be found even in the domain of beasts and cattle.

One of the American newspapers published a statistic revealing that there are 25 million gays in America. The homosexuals demand that the legitimacy of their marriages be recognised. They are demanding that they must be given the same rights enjoyed by non-homosexuals. One paper published a statistic that a million people in America have incestuous sex with their close relatives such as mothers, daughters and sisters.

This animalistic promiscuity has given rise to the spread of Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs), the worst of which is the devastation of AIDS. It has also given rise to the many children of

fornication, born outside of wedlock. One of the newspapers published that 75% of English people are the sons of fornication.

The family unit has broken up in these societies. It has lost compassion between fathers, sons, mothers, brothers and sisters. It has become common to see dozens, if not hundreds, of old men and women walking the streets. They visit parks accompanied by dogs, which share with them in their living, eating and even sleeping. The pet is their close friend in their solitude. This is because each one lives on his own without a companion, or someone to sit with them, except the dog.

- These are examples of what values of Democracy has produced, in terms of the universal freedoms they chant about. It is one of the forms and faces of their culture that they take pride in and call people to. They convey these freedoms to the world so that the people may share this ugly cultural face. If the freedoms indicate anything, they indicate the extent of the corruption, rottenness and stench of Democracy.

Yet, the Kafir West has been able to find a market for its corrupt thoughts of Democracy, in the Muslim countries.

It has done so despite the clarity of what Western democratic countries have reached, in terms of stooping to the level of dirty animals, due to the unleashing of desires by personal freedom.

The West has done so despite what one sees of the calamities and misfortune inflicted on the world, and the plundering of the people, by Western democratic colonialism. The people around the world are colonized and backward due to the theft of their wealth, the plunder of their resources, the impoverishment of their population, the humiliation of the peoples, and making their countries into consumer markets for Western industries and products.

It has done so despite the fact that Democracy, in its true meaning, is not implementable. As for the new meaning given to

Democracy, as a result of interpretation and explaining it away, it does not agree with the reality. It does not exist in reality either.

The West has marketed Democracy despite the lies and deception found in the speech of democrats, that parliament represents the popular will. They falsely claim they are the political embodiment of the popular will of the masses. They falsely claim they represent the majority opinion. They falsely claim that legislation passed by majority vote of representatives, expresses the will of the majority of people. This is besides the deception in their speech, that rulers are chosen by the majority of people, and that they derive their authority from the people.

The West has marketed democracy despite the blatant failings of the democratic system regarding ruling and the rulers, when there are no large parties in the country that can form an absolute majority, in the houses of representatives.

Thus, despite this and much more, the Kafir West has been able to find a market for its corrupt thoughts of Democracy in the Muslim countries.

- So how was the Kafir West able to find a market in the Muslim countries for the Kaafir democratic thoughts, that have nothing to do with the Shariah rulings of Islam?

It is because the Kaafir European nations, that bear an intense animosity for Islam and the Muslims, harbour a vile hatred for Islam and Muslims. Allah ﷻ spoke the truth when He said, **﴿قَدْ بَدَتِ الْبَغْضَاءُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَمَا تُخْفِي صُدُورُهُمْ أَكْبَرُ﴾** **“Hatred has already appeared from their mouths, but what their breasts conceal is far worse.”** [TMQ Surah Aali Imran 3:118]

They had realised that the secret of the Muslims’ strength is Islam. This is because the Islamic ‘Aqeedah is the origin of this great strength for the Muslims. The West drew up a hellish plan to attack the Muslim World through a missionary and cultural invasion. Through this

invasion, the West conveyed its culture and thoughts, part of which is Democracy, as well as its civilisation and its viewpoint about life. It began to call Muslims to the Western culture. It desired that the Muslims would take it as a basis of their thinking and viewpoint about life, diverting them away from Islam, and distancing them from being restricted to Islam, and adhering to the implementation of its Shariah rulings. This was to make it easy for the West to destroy the Islamic State, the Khilafah State, and consequently the implementation of Islam and its rulings in life, state and society. This was so that the Muslims adopt the West's thoughts, systems and Kafir laws, to implement and apply them instead of Islam. This was so that the Muslims are far from Islam and so it is possible to control them. Allah ﷻ spoke the truth when He said, ﴿وَلَنْ تَرْضَىٰ عَنْكَ الْيَهُودُ وَلَا النَّصَارَىٰ حَتَّىٰ تَتَّبِعَ مِلَّتَهُمْ قُلْ إِنَّ هُدَىٰ اللَّهِ هُوَ الْهُدَىٰ وَلَئِنِ اتَّبَعْتَ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ بَعْدَ الَّذِي جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ لَأَنْتَ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ﴾ **“Never will the Jews nor the Christians be pleased with you (O Muhammad [saw]) till you follow their religion. Say: Verily, the guidance of Allah that is the only guidance. And if you (O Muhammad [saw]) were to follow their (Jews and Christians) desires after what you have received of the Knowledge, then you would have against Allah neither any Wali (protector) nor any helper.”** [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah 2:120]

This missionary and cultural invasion intensified at a time when the Muslims increased in their intellectual and political decline, towards the last days of the Uthmani Khilafah, in the second half of the Nineteenth Century CE. This was at a time when the balance of power had shifted in favour of the European nations. This shift was after the intellectual and industrial revolution in Europe, and after the inventions and scientific discoveries through which Europe came to proceed in rapid steps towards advancement and progress. This shift was at a time when the 'Uthmani State remained stagnant. Its weakness increased day by day. All this opened the doors for the Western culture and the Western thoughts, civilisation and systems to enter the lands of Muslims.

In their missionary and cultural invasion of the lands of Muslims, the European countries employed the style of belittling Islam, distortion of its rulings and creating doubt in the mind of Muslims. They wanted to make Muslims resent Islam and think that it is the reason for their backwardness and decline. They did so whilst glorifying the West and its culture, and raising the status of its thoughts and democratic system, whilst speaking about its systems and laws in glowing terms.

Also, the West relied on the deception, so it made the Muslims think that its culture did not contradict the culture of Islam. It falsely claimed the Western culture has been taken from Islam, and that its systems and laws do not go against the rulings of Islam.

The West also dressed the democratic thoughts and system in the garb of Islam. They claimed Democracy does not go against or contradict Islam. They claimed Democracy is from Islam because it is itself Shura (consultation), enjoining the good and forbidding the evil and accounting the rulers. The effect of all of this on the Muslims was huge. It led to the Western thoughts and culture being dominant amongst the Muslims.

It also led them to adopt certain systems and laws at the end of the 'Uthmani State. Then, after the destruction of the Khilafah state, it led Muslims to adopt most of Democracy's systems and laws. This had an effect on the educated people and politicians. It even had an effect on the carriers of the Islamic culture, some Dawah carriers and on the Muslim masses.

As for the educated people, many of them were affected by the Western culture. They were educated on the basis of the Western culture, whether they had studied in the West or in the Muslim countries. This is because the curriculums in the Muslim countries that had been set down after the First World War, were formed on the basis of the philosophy of the West and its viewpoint about life. This was such that many of the Muslims came to admire and praise the Western culture. They even glorified the West that brought it. They came to disapprove of the Islamic culture and the Shariah rulings of

Islam, whenever they contradicted the Western culture. Some of the educated Muslims came to detest Islam, just as the Kafir West detested Islam. They harboured intense animosity against Islam, Islamic culture, systems and rulings, just as the Kafir West does. They became mouthpieces of propaganda for the West, its culture, thoughts and systems. The attacked Islam, its culture, rulings and system, whilst disparaging it.

As for the politicians, they devoted themselves to the West and its system of Democracy. They tied themselves to the West and made it their focus of attention. They sought help from the West. They depended on the West. They made themselves guardians of the West's laws and systems. They made themselves submissive slaves to protect Western interests and implement the West's conspiracies. They declared Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ as an enemy. They waged a war against political Islam and the sincere people who carried its Dawah. They did this exerting all their effort to prevent the re-establishment of the Khilafah, and the return of ruling by all that Allah ﷻ has revealed.

As for the carriers of the Islamic culture, they had a lack of awareness about Islam. They had a lack of comprehension of the reality of Islamic rulings and the reality of Western culture, thoughts and systems. They had a lack of comprehension about the contradiction of the Western culture, thought and viewpoint about life, with the Islamic creed, rulings, culture and viewpoint about life.

That happened because of the great weakness that befell the minds of the Muslims in understanding Islam and its rulings. This was due to the erroneous understanding of the Islamic Shariah for application on society. Islam came to be explained in ways which could not be supported by its Shariah texts. Its rulings came to be interpreted, to agree with the existing reality. This was instead of the existing reality being formed according to the Shariah rulings of Islam. So, they adopted rulings which had no link to the Shari'ah. They also adopted rulings with a weak linkage to Islam, under the pretext of an erroneous principle laid down by them, which states, لا يُنكر تغيُّر الأحكام

بتغير الزمان “Changing rules according to the changing of time is not rejected.”

Thus, on the tongues of many, Islam came to be interpreted so that it agrees with every philosophy, culture, thought and ideology. This was even if they went against the rulings of Islam and its viewpoint about life. They also said that the culture and thoughts of the West do not contradict the culture and rulings of Islam. They claimed that this was because the Western culture had been taken from the culture of Islam, originally. They said that the democratic system of ruling, and the capitalist system of economy, do not contradict with the Shariah rulings of Islam. This is even though their reality is that they are systems of Kufr. They said that Democracy is from Islam, and that the universal freedoms are also from Islam, even though they completely contradict Islam.

They confused this with what is allowed for the Muslims to adopt, such the science of medicine, pharmacy, engineering and chemistry. This is as well as sciences like agriculture, industry, transport and communication systems and other such sciences. These are all permitted to adopt, as long as they do not go against Islam.

However, what was not allowed to adopt is anything that relates to the beliefs and the Shariah rulings. This is because it is not allowed to take any such thing, except if it has been brought by the Messenger ﷺ in the Kitaab and the Sunnah, as well as whatever the Kitaab and the Sunnah indicate in terms of Analogy (Qiyas), and the Ijmaa (Unanimous Consensus) of the Sahabah.

With this, the Kafir West was able to market its culture and viewpoint about life in the lands of Muslims. It was able to market the thoughts of its system of Democracy, its economic system and the universal freedoms.

- Before we present the clarification of how Democracy contradicts with Islam and the Shariah rulings, we wish to present the issue of what is permitted for the Muslims to adopt from the other

nations and peoples, and what is forbidden to take from them. This is according to what the Shariah texts and rulings indicate. Thus, we say the following:

1- Regarding all actions coming from man, and all things relating to the actions of man, the origin of these matters is the emulation of the Messenger ﷺ, and being restricted by the rulings of his Message. The generality of the ayahs of rulings indicate the obligation of referring to the Shariah, and adhering to the Shariah rulings. Allah ﷻ said, ﴿وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ﴾ **“And whatever the Messenger gives to you, take it and whatever he forbids for you, abstain from it. And fear Allah for indeed He is swift in punishment.”** [TMQ Surah al-Hashr 59:7], and He ﷻ said, ﴿فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ﴾ **“But no, by your Lord, they can have no iman, until they make you the judge in all disputes between them.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:65]. He ﷻ said, ﴿وَمَا﴾ **“Whatever you may differ about, its judgment rests with Allah.”** [TMQ Surah ash-Shuraa 42:10]. He ﷻ said, ﴿فَإِن تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ﴾ **“And if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it Allah and His Messenger ﷺ.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:59]. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said in the hadith narrated by Bukhari and Muslim, «مَنْ عَمِلَ عَمَلًا لَيْسَ عَلَيْهِ أَمْرُنَا فَهُوَ رَدٌّ» **“Whosoever does an action and it is not from our matter, then it is rejected.”** He ﷺ said, «مَنْ أَحْدَثَ فِي أَمْرِنَا هَذَا مَا لَيْسَ مِنْهُ فَهُوَ رَدٌّ» **“Whosoever innovates in this matter of ours and it is not from it then it is rejected.”**

This indicates that the basis is the obligation of following the Shariah, and restricting the actions and things to the Shariah. It is not allowed for the Muslim to advance towards doing anything, or leaving anything, except after knowing the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding it. If it is obligatory (waajib), or is it recommended (mandoob), he thus advances towards performing it. If it is forbidden (haraam) or disliked (makrooh), he thus leaves it. If it is it permitted (mubaah), he has a choice over whether to leave it, or not.

Thus is why the basis of the actions of man is that they are restricted to the judgement of Allah ﷻ. As regards things relating to the actions of man, the basis is that they are allowed, as long as there is no evidence prohibiting them. That is because the Shariah texts have permitted all things, and the Shariah texts have come in a general ('aam) form and they include everything. He ﷻ said, ﴿أَلَمْ تَرَوْا أَنَّ اللَّهَ سَخَّرَ لَكُمْ مَا فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ﴾ **“Have you not seen that Allah has subjected for you whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth.”** [TMQ Surah Luqman 31: 20]. The meaning of Allah’s subjugation of all that is in the heavens and the earth to man, is His permissibility of all that is in them for man. He ﷻ said, ﴿هُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مَا فِي الْأَرْضِ جَمِيعًا﴾ **“He is the One Who created everything in the earth for you.”** [TMQ Surah al-Baqarah 2:29]. He ﷻ said, ﴿يَأْتِيهَا النَّاسُ كُلُوا مِمَّا فِيهَا﴾ **“O humanity! Eat from what is lawful and good on the earth”** [TMQ Surah al-Baqarah 2:168]. He ﷻ said, ﴿هُوَ الَّذِي جَعَلَ لَكُمْ الْأَرْضَ ذَلُولًا فَامْشُوا فِي مَنَاكِبِهَا وَكُلُوا مِنْ رِزْقِهِ﴾ **“He is the One Who smoothed out the earth for you, so move about in its regions and eat from His provisions.”** [TMQ Surah al-Mulk 67:15]. In this manner all the ayahs have come in a general form. Their generality indicates the permissibility of all things. Thus, the permissibility of all things has come according to the general address of the Legislator. If a thing is forbidden, then it must have a specific text, due to the generality of the evidence. The specific text indicates the exception of this thing, to the general permission. This is such as His ﷻ saying, ﴿حُرِّمَتْ عَلَيْكُمْ أَلْمَيْتَةُ وَالذَّمُّ وَلَحْمُ الْخَنزِيرِ وَمَا أِهْلٌ لِّغَيْرِ اللَّهِ بِهِ وَالْمُنْخَنِقَةُ وَالْمَوْفُوذَةُ وَالْمُتَرَدِّيَّةُ وَالنَّطِيحَةُ وَمَا أَكَلَ السَّبُعُ إِلَّا مَا ذَكَّيْتُمْ وَمَا ذُبِحَ عَلَى النُّصُبِ﴾ **“Forbidden to you are carrion, blood, and swine; what is slaughtered in the name of any other than Allah; what is killed by strangling, beating, a fall, or by being gored to death; what is partly eaten by a predator unless you slaughter it; and what is sacrificed on altars.”** [TMQ Surah al-Maaidah 5:3]

Therefore, الأصل في الأشياء الإباحة “the origin of things is that they are permitted.”

2- The Islamic Shariah contains rulings of all past events, current problems and all possible incidents that may happen. Nothing

has happened in the past, or is happening at present, or will happen in the future, except that each and every one of those matters has a ruling from the Shariah. The Islamic Shariah encompasses all actions of man, completely and comprehensively. He ﷺ said, ﴿وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ﴾ **“We have sent down to you the Book (the Qur’an) as a clarification of everything, a guidance, a mercy, and glad tidings of those who have submitted for those who have submitted themselves to Allah.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nahl 16:89]. He ﷺ said, ﴿مَا فَرَّطْنَا فِي الْكِتَابِ مِنْ شَيْءٍ﴾ **“We have left nothing out of the Book.”** [TMQ Surah al-Anaam 6:38]. He ﷺ said, ﴿الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ﴾ **“Today I have perfected your faith for you, completed My favour upon you, and chosen Islam as your way.”** [TMQ Surah al-Maaidah 5:3] Thus, the Islamic Shariah did not neglect a single thing from the actions of servants, whatever they may be. It either sets up an evidence (daleel) for an action, with a text in the Quran and the hadith, or it puts an indication (imaarah) in the Quran and the hadith that warns against it. The cause (baa’ith) is for its legislation, in order for it to apply to everything within that indication (imaarah), or this cause. It is not permitted in Shariah for a person to undertake an action that has no evidence (daleel) for it, or an indication (imaarah) evidencing its judgment. This is because the generality of His saying, the Most High, ﴿تَبَيَّنَا لِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ﴾ **“A clarification of everything.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nahl 16:89]. It is also because the explicit text that Allah ﷻ has perfected this Deen.

3- Based on the preceding discussion, it is possible to be clear about what is allowed for the Muslims to take from other nations and people, and what is not allowed for them to take.

As for the thoughts relating to sciences, industry and inventions, as well as the material forms produced from this knowledge and its evidence, resulting from industry and industrial progress, it is allowed to take them, unless they go against Islam. When they contradict Islam, it is forbidden to take them.

This is because all these thoughts relating to sciences, industry inventions, as well as the material forms produced from these, do not

relate to the beliefs or the Shariah rulings that treat the problems of man in life. They are all from the permitted things, which man uses in his life's affairs.

The evidence for that are the general ayaats mentioned regarding the permission to benefit from all things present in the universe for man. It is also due to what has been narrated by Muslim that the Prophet ﷺ said, **وَإِذَا أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ دِينِكُمْ فَخُذُوا بِهِ، وَإِذَا أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ رَأْيِي، فَإِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ»** **“Indeed I am only a human being like you. When i order you to do something from matter of your Deen then take it. And when I order you about a thing from the matters of the world, I am but a human being.”** It is also due to his ﷺ saying mentioned in the hadith of the cross pollinating of date palms, **«أَنْتُمْ أَغْلَمُ بِأَمْرِ دُنْيَاكُمْ»** **“You are more knowledgeable about the matters of your world.”** Also, people used to manufacture during the days of the Messenger ﷺ and he ﷺ was silently consenting about this. This was to the extent that some of them used to make weapons. Khabab (ra) made swords in the pre-Islamic era, and continued to do so after his reversion to Islam (ra). In the Seerah of Ibn Hisham, there is a report about when Al-Aas bin Wael Al-Sahmi bought swords from Khabab. When Khabab Al-Aas came to collect the payment, he said to him, mockingly, **“I will pay you in Paradise.”**

Therefore, everything, other than the beliefs or rulings, is allowed to be taken, as long as it does not contradict Islam, and as long as there is no specific evidence prohibiting it.

Thus, it is allowed to take all sciences relating to medicine, engineering, maths, astronomy, chemistry, physics, agriculture, industry, communications, navigation, geography, economic science which studies production, the improvement in economic production, generating means and improving them. These are universal sciences which are not unique to Islam, capitalism or communism. All of them are allowed to be taken, as long as they do not contradict Islam. Consequently, it is not allowed to adopt Darwin's theory which states that the origin of man is the primate, because it contradicts the saying of Allah ﷻ **﴿ خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ صَلْصَلٍ كَالْفَخَّارِ ﴾** **“He created humankind**

from ‘sounding’ clay like pottery.” [TMQ Surah ar-Rahman 55:14]. It contradicts His ﷺ saying, ﴿وَبَدَأَ خَلْقَ الْإِنْسَانِ مِنْ طِينٍ ۖ ثُمَّ جَعَلَ نَسْلَهُ مِنْ سُلَالَةٍ مِّنْ مَّاءٍ مَّهِينٍ﴾ “And He originated the creation of humankind from clay. (7) Then He made his descendants from an extract of a humble fluid.” [TMQ Surah as-Sajdah 32:7-8]. It also contradicts His ﷺ saying, ﴿وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ أَنْ خَلَقَكُمْ مِّنْ تُرَابٍ﴾ “One of His signs is that He created you from dust.” [TMQ Surah ar-Rum 30:20]

Just as it is allowed to take these sciences, it is also allowed to take the products of industry, machines, tools and material forms. It is allowed to adopt all types of factories, and all types of industry, except for factories that make statutes, alcohol and Christian crosses because there is Shariah text to prohibit them. It is also allowed to take from industries, including heavy industry and military industry, such as tanks, aeroplanes, rockets, satellites, nuclear, hydrogen, electronic or chemical bombs, tractors, lorries, trains and ships. It is also allowed to take from light industry, such as consumer luxuries and small arms manufacture. It is also allowed to take manufacture of laboratory instruments, medical instruments, agricultural, furniture, carpets and consumer products. All of this is allowed to adopt, because they are from the permitted things, whose permissibility has been established by general evidences. Taking them will constitute the adopting the Shariah ruling, which is the permissibility in things. This is emulation of the Shariah of the Messenger ﷺ because they are from the permitted things (mubaahaat). The Mubaah is a Shariah ruling from the rulings of takleef which are, the obligatory (al-waajib), the recommended (mandoob), forbidden (haraam), the disliked (makrooh) and the permitted (mubaah).

4- It is not allowed to take from anywhere else, except from the Islamic Shariah, for the thoughts relating to the ‘Aqeedah, the Shariah rulings and the thoughts related to the culture of Islam and its viewpoint about life, as well as all rulings which treat the problems of man. They must all be according to what has been brought by the Revelation from the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ, and whatever they indicate by way of Qiyas (analogy), or Ijma’

(Unanimous Consensus) of the Sahaba (ra). It is not allowed to take from anything else absolutely.

This is because:

a) Allah ﷻ has ordered us to take everything from the Messenger ﷺ and that we should stay away from what he ﷺ has forbidden us. He ﷻ said, ﴿وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا﴾ **“And whatever the Messenger gives you, take it, and whatever he forbids you, abstain from it.”** [TMQ Surah al-Hashr 59:7]. The particle ما ‘maa’ (whatever) is in the general form. It obligates the adoption of everything the Messenger ﷺ has brought in terms of rulings, as well as staying away from everything he ﷺ has forbidden us from. The understanding (mafهوم) of the ayah is that we must not take anything, other than what he ﷺ has brought.

b) Allah ﷻ has ordered the Muslims to obey Him and His Messenger ﷺ when He ﷻ said, ﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ﴾ **“O you who believe! Obey Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:59] Obedience to Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ cannot take place without acting upon the rulings of the Shariah which Allah revealed to His Messenger ﷺ, and adopting them.

c) Allah ﷻ ordered the Muslims to adhere to the judgement of Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ, just as He ﷻ ordered them to refer to the judgement of Allah ﷻ and the judgement His Messenger ﷺ, whether in dispute or disagreement. Allah ﷻ said, ﴿وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُمْؤِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ﴾ **“It is not for a believing man or woman, when Allah and His Messenger decree a matter, to have any other choice in that matter.”** [TMQ Surah al-Ahzab 33:36]. He ﷻ also said, ﴿فَإِنْ تَنَزَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ﴾ **“If you dispute in a matter, then refer to Allah and His Messenger, if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:59]

d) Allah ﷻ ordered His noble Messenger ﷺ to judge between people with all that Allah ﷻ has revealed of the Shariah. He ﷻ warned

﴿وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَمُهَيِّمًا عَلَيْهِ فَاحْكُم بَيْنَهُم بِمَا أَنْزَلْنَا﴾
 ﴿And We have sent down to you (O Muhammad [saw]) the Book (this Quran) in truth, confirming the Scripture that came before it and muhaminan (witness) over it. So judge between them by what Allah has revealed, and follow not their vain desires, diverging away from the truth that has come to you.” [TMQ Surah al-Maaidah 5:48]

e) Allah ﷻ forbade the Muslims from taking anything from other than the Islamic Shariah when He ﷻ said, ﴿فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ﴾
 ﴿يُحْكُمُوا لَكَ فِي مَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ﴾ “But no, by your Lord, they can have no iman, until they make you the judge in all disputes between them.” [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:65]. He ﷻ said, ﴿فَلْيَحْذَرِ الَّذِينَ يُخَالِفُونَ عَنْ أَمْرِهِ أَنْ تُصِيبَهُمْ﴾
 ﴿فِتْنَةٌ أَوْ يُصِيبَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ﴾ “And let those who oppose the Messenger’s commandment beware, lest some affliction befall them or a painful torment be inflicted on them.” [TMQ Surah an-Nur 24:63] And when He ﷻ said, ﴿يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُتَحَاكَمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَنْ يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ ۗ وَيُرِيدُ﴾
 ﴿السَّيْطَانُ أَنْ يُضِلَّهُمْ ضَلَالًا بَعِيدًا﴾ ٦٠ “They wish to go for judgement (in their disputes) to the Taghut (false judges) while they have been ordered to reject them.” [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:60]. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, «كُلُّ عَمَلٍ لَيْسَ عَلَيْهِ أَمْرُنَا فَهُوَ رَدٌّ» “Every action that is not from our matter is rejected.”

These texts clearly indicate the obligation of adhering to all of what the Messenger ﷺ brought. We do not allow anything except what Allah ﷻ has made allowed. We do not prohibit anything except what Allah ﷻ has prohibited. Whatever the Messenger ﷺ did not bring we will not take it. Whatever he ﷺ did not prohibit, we will not prohibit.

The particle ما ‘maa’ (whatever) has been linked as a Qareenah in both His ﷻ saying, ﴿وَمَا آتَاكُم﴾ “And whatever (maa) the Messenger gives you” and His ﷻ saying, ﴿وَمَا نَهَاكُم﴾ “and whatever (maa) he forbids you” with His ﷻ saying, ﴿فَلْيَحْذَرِ الَّذِينَ يُخَالِفُونَ عَنْ أَمْرِهِ﴾
 ﴿أَنْ تُصِيبَهُمْ فِتْنَةٌ أَوْ يُصِيبَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ﴾ ٦٣ “And let those who oppose the Messenger’s commandment beware, lest some affliction befall them

or a painful torment be inflicted on them.” [TMQ Surah an-Nur 24:63]. So, the restriction to abiding with all that the Messenger ﷺ brought, is clearly manifest. Taking from anyone else is a sin and the one who does so, will be punished. Allah ﷻ negated the Iman of those who refer for judgement, regarding actions, from anyone other than the Messenger ﷺ, when He ﷻ said: ﴿فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ﴾ **“But no, by your Lord, they can have no Iman, until they make you the judge in all disputes between them.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:65]. This indicates the decisiveness of referring judgement to all that the Messenger ﷺ has brought. This is so, not in the least, because Allah ﷻ warned His Messenger ﷺ that He will punish the people concerning what Allah has revealed to him ﷺ. He ﷻ said, ﴿وَاحْذَرَهُمْ أُنْ يَفْتِنُوكَ عَنْ بَعْضِ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْكَ﴾ **“And let those who oppose the Messenger’s commandment beware, lest some affliction befall them or a painful torment be inflicted on them.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nur 24:63]

Moreover, Allah ﷻ censured those who wish to refer for judgement for anything other than what the Messenger ﷺ brought. He ﷻ censured those who wish to refer for judgement to the rules of Kufr when He ﷻ said, ﴿أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ ءَامَنُوا بِمَا أَنْزَلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أَنْزَلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَحَاكَمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَنْ يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ ۗ وَيُرِيدُ الشَّيْطَانُ أَنْ يُضِلَّهُمْ ضَلَالًا بَعِيدًا﴾ **“Have you seen those (hypocrites) who claim that they believe in that which has been sent down to you, and that which has been sent down before you, and they wish to go for judgement (in their disputes) to the Taghut (false judges) while they have been ordered to reject them. But Shaytan wishes to lead them far astray.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:60]. It indicates that going for judgement to anything other than what the Messenger ﷺ brought is going astray (Dalaal). This is because it constitutes going for judgement to the Taghoot, which is an authority of Kufr. Muslims have been ordered to reject Taghut and disbelieve in it.

- Accordingly, it is not allowed to take the Western culture, and what emanates from its systems and laws, because Western

culture contradicts with the culture of Islam. This is apart from the administrative systems and laws. It does not include them because they are from the mubahaat (permitted). These are allowed to be taken as 'Umar b. al-Khattab (ra) took from the Dawawin (administrative record keeping) of Persia and Rome.

The culture of the West is based on the creed of separating religion from life, and separating religion from the state.

This is whilst the Islamic culture is based on the Islamic Creed. It obliges that the life and state must be guided by the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ, according to the Shariah rulings.

The Western culture is established on the basis of benefit. It makes benefit the criterion of all actions. That is why it is a culture of pure benefit. It gives no importance to anything other than the beneficial, material value. That is why it has no spiritual, ethical or humanitarian value.

This is whilst the culture of Islam is established on a spiritual basis, which is the belief (Iman) in Allah ﷻ. It makes the Halaal and Haraam the criterion of all actions in life. It guides all actions and values according to the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ.

Happiness according to the Western culture is to provide man with the optimum level of sensual pleasure and the means to achieve it.

This is whilst the Islamic culture views happiness as the attainment of Allah's Good Pleasure (Ridwaan) and to organise man's instincts and organic needs according to the Shariah rulings.

Therefore, it is not allowed to adopt the ruling system of Democracy, capitalist economic system or the universal freedoms present in western countries. It is not allowed to adopt the democratic constitutions and laws, the monarchical and republican ruling systems, usurious banks, stock markets and world money markets. None of these are allowed for us to take. They are all systems of kufr and laws of kufr, which contradict with the rulings and systems of Islam.

- Similarly, it is not allowed to adopt the Western culture and whatever emanates from it in terms of the thoughts and systems. It is not allowed to take the Communist culture, because it completely contradicts with the culture of Islam.

Thus, the Communist culture is established on the basis of the creed that there is not Creator for this universe. It claims that matter is the origin of things. It claims that all things in the universe result from matter, according to dialectical materialism.

This is whilst the Islamic culture is established on the certain fact that Allah ﷻ is the Creator of this universe and that all that exists is created by Him ﷻ. He ﷻ has sent Prophets ﷺ and Messengers ﷺ to the whole of humanity. He ﷻ enjoined on them to follow what Allah ﷻ has revealed to them, in terms of orders and prohibitions.

The Communist culture takes the view that the system must be taken from the means of production. Thus, in the feudal society the sickle was the means of production. It was from this sickle that the feudal system arose. When society evolves to Capitalism, the machinery is the means of production. It is from this new means of production that the capitalist system arises. Thus, its system is taken from dialectical materialism.

This is whilst the Islamic culture takes the view that Allah ﷻ has given man a system to guide his life. He ﷻ sent our master Muhammad ﷺ with this system. He ﷻ conveyed this system to the people and he ﷻ obliged them to proceed according to it.

The Communist system takes the view that the materialistic system is the criterion in life. As it evolves, so does the criterion.

This is whilst the Islamic culture views the Halaal and Haraam, the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ, are the criterion of actions in this life. Thus, the Halaal is acted upon, and the Haraam is left alone. This does not evolve. It does not change. It is not determined by benefit or materialism. Instead, it is determined by the Shari'ah alone.

Therefore, there is a complete contradiction between the Communist culture and the Islamic culture. That is why it is not allowed to take Communism. It is not allowed to take any single thought from their thoughts, and any system from their systems.

It is not allowed to take the idea of dialectical materialism, or the abolition of the concept of private property, or the idea of abolishing the private ownership of land. It is not allowed to take the idea of the deification of persons, or the idea of worshipping persons. It is not allowed to take any other thoughts of this atheistic culture. Its culture and its system are all thoughts of kufr. The systems of kufr contradict with the creeds, thoughts and systems of Islam.

- Now, we come to Democracy. It is time to demonstrate its complete contradiction with Islam. This is in the source from which it came, the creed from which it emanates, the basis on which it has been established and the thoughts and systems it has brought.

The source from which Democracy came is man. Man's ration is the sovereign in Democracy. Reference is made to human ration for judgement on actions and things, as pretty or ugly. The source of Democracy is the philosophers and thinkers of Europe, who came to prominence during the terrible struggle between the emperors and kings of Europe and their peoples. Democracy is man made. The sovereign in Democracy is the mind of men.

As for Islam, it contradicts this. Islam is from Allah ﷻ which He revealed to His Messenger Muhammad bin 'Abd Allah ﷺ. He ﷻ said, ﴿وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۗ ۙ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ﴾ **“Nor does he speak of his own whims. (3) It is only a revelation sent down to him.”** [TMQ Surah an-Najam 53:3-4]. And He ﷻ said, ﴿إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ فِي لَيْلَةِ الْقَدْرِ﴾ **“Indeed, We sent this Quran down on the Night of Qadr.”** [TMQ Surah Al-Qadr 97:1]

So, the One Who issues rulings is Allah ﷻ Alone. So, the sovereign is the Divine Law and not the mind. The function of the mind is restricted to understanding the texts that Allah ﷻ has revealed. He

ﷺ said, ﴿إِنِ الْحُكْمُ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ﴾ **“Indeed the ruling is only for Allah ﷻ”** [TMQ Surah Yunsuf 12:67]. He ﷺ said, ﴿فَإِن تَنَزَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَزُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ﴾ **“If you dispute in a matter, then refer to Allah and His Messenger, if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:59]. He ﷺ said, ﴿وَمَا اٰخْتَلَفْتُمْ فِيهِ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَحُكْمُهُٓ إِلَى اللَّهِ﴾ **“Whatever you may differ about, its judgment rests with Allah.”** [TMQ Surah ash-Shuraa 42:10].

- As for the creed from which democracy emanated, it is the creed of separating religion from life, and separating religion from the state. It is the creed that is built on the compromise solution between the Christian clergy and the philosophers. The kings and emperors of Europe used the clergy to cover their exploitation and oppression of the peoples, as well as their spilling of blood, in the name of religion. They wanted everything to be under their subjugation, in the name of religion. As for the philosophers and thinkers, they rejected both religion and the authority of the clergy.

This creed does not reject religion entirely. Instead, it abolished its role in life and in the state. As a consequence, it made man the one who will lay down the system.

This creed was the intellectual basis on which the West built its thoughts and from which its system emanated. It is on its basis that the intellectual orientation and viewpoint about life was determined. It is the basis from which Democracy emanated.

As for Islam, it completely contradicts this. It is based on the Islamic ‘Aqeedah which obliges that all affairs of life and state are directed by the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ. They are directed by the Shariah rulings emanating from this creed. Man has no right to devise his own system. Instead, it is incumbent on him to proceed according to system devised for him by Allah ﷻ.

On the basis of this creed, the culture of Islam has been established, and its viewpoint about life has been fixed.

- As for the basis on which Democracy is established, it has two aspects.

1- Sovereignty is for the people.

2- The people are the source of all authority.

Democracy made the people possess their own will, and to direct it, and not the kings and emperors. It is the people who will execute this will. Since the people have sovereignty, possess will and direct it, they came to possess legislation. Legislation is an expression of the practise of the will of the people, and its direction. It is an expression of the popular will of the masses. The people undertake legislation via the representatives they elect. The representatives legislate on the behalf of their voters.

The people have the right to legislate any constitution, system or law. The people have the right to abolish any constitution, system or law, according to what they deem beneficial. They have the right to change the ruling system from a monarchical one to a republican system and vice versa. The people have the right to change the republican system, from a presidential system, to a parliamentary system, and the other way round. This has happened, for example, in France, Italy, Spain and Greece. Democratic systems of ruling were changed from monarchical to republican, and then from republican to monarchical.

The people also have the right to change the economic system from being capitalist, to socialist, and vice versa. Their representatives legislated the permissibility of apostatizing from one religion to another, or to no religion at all. The representatives legislated the permissibility of fornication, homosexuality and making money from sexual relations.

Since the people are the source of authority, the people choose the ruler they want to apply the legislation they have made. They choose who rules them by their own legislation. They have the right to remove the ruler and put another one in his place. They are the ones

who possess the authority. The ruler is the one who derives his authority from the people.

As for Islam, sovereignty is for the Shariah and not for the Ummah. Allah ﷻ is the sole Legislator. Even the entire Ummah does not possess the right to legislate a single ruling. If all the Muslims met together, and agreed to permit usury to revive the economic situation, it has no value. If they all agreed to allow special places for fornication, so that it does not spread among people, it has no value. If they all agreed to abolish private property, or the obligation of fasting, to enable increases in production, it has no value.

It also has no value to if they all agreed to the adoption of universal freedoms. Such a consensus leaves the Muslim with the freedom to believe in the creed he wants. It leaves him to increase his wealth using all the means of growth, even using the prohibited means. It allows the personal freedom to enjoy his life as he wants, in terms of drinking alcohol and committing fornication. Such a consensus has no value in Islam. It does not even have the weight of the wing of a fly. If a section of the Muslims advance towards these freedoms, then they would be fought, until they retreated from them.

Thus, the Muslims are restricted in all actions of life according to the orders and prohibitions of Islam. It is not allowed for them to do any action, that contradicts the Shariah rulings of Islam. It is not allowed for them to legislate even a single ruling. Therefore, Allah ﷻ is the only Legislator. He ﷻ said, **﴿فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ﴾** **“But no, by your Lord, they can have no iman, until they make you the judge in all disputes between them.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:65]. He ﷻ said, **﴿أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ ءَامَنُوا بِمَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أُنزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَحَكَّمُوا إِلَىٰ الظَّالِمِينَ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَنْ يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ ۗ وَيُرِيدُ الشَّيْطَانُ أَنْ يُضِلَّهُمْ ضَلَالًا بَعِيدًا﴾** **“Have you seen those (hypocrites) who claim that they believe in that which has been sent down to you, and that which has been sent down before you, and they wish to go for judgement (in their disputes) to the Taghut (false judges) while they have been ordered to reject them. But Shaytan wishes to lead them far astray.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:60]. Referring for judgement to the Taghut

constitutes referring for judgement to what Allah ﷻ has not revealed. It is referring to the rulings of Kufr made by man. He ﷻ said, ﴿أَفَحُكْمَ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ يَبْغُونَ وَمَنْ أَحْسَنُ مِنَ اللَّهِ حُكْمًا لِقَوْمٍ يُوقِنُونَ﴾ **“Do they then seek the judgement of (the Days of) Ignorance? And who is better in judgement than Allah for a people who have firm belief.”** [TMQ Surah al-Maaida 5:50] The ruling of jahilliyah is the ruling which the Messenger ﷺ did not bring from his Lord. It is the rule of Kufr legislation by man. He ﷻ said, ﴿فَلْيَحْذَرِ الَّذِينَ يُخَالِفُونَ عَنْ أَمْرِهِ أَنْ تُصِيبَهُمْ فِتْنَةٌ أَوْ يُصِيبَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ﴾ **“And let those who oppose the Messenger’s commandment beware, lest some affliction befall them or a painful torment be inflicted on them.”** [TMQ Surah an-Nur 24:63]. The opposing the Messenger’s ﷺ order which has been warned of, is following what man has legislated, and leaving what the Messenger ﷺ has brought. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, «مَنْ عَمِلَ» **“Whosoever does an action and it is not from our matter, then it is rejected.”** What is meant by “our matter” in the hadeeth, is Islam.

There are definite ayahs and hadiths that clarify that sovereignty is for the Shariah alone. They clarify that Allah ﷻ is the legislator and that it is not allowed for man to legislate. They clarify that the people are obliged to guide all their actions in this life according to the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ.

Islam gave the task of implementing the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ to the Muslims. Implementation of the orders and prohibitions of Allah requires an authority to implement them. Therefore, authority has been given to the Ummah. The Ummah has the right to choose the ruler, so that he may implement the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ. This ruling is taken from the hadeeths of Bayah. They gave the right of appointing the Khaleefah to the Muslims through the Bayah pledge on the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of the Messenger ﷺ. He ﷺ said, «مَنْ مَاتَ وَلَيْسَ فِي عُنُقِهِ بَيْعَةٌ مَاتَ مِيتَةً جَاهِلِيَّةً» **“Whosoever dies without a Bayah pledge on his neck he will die the death of Jahiliyya.”** It is narrated on the authority of ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Amr, who said, I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say, «وَمَنْ بَايَعَ إِمَامًا

فَأَعْطَاهُ صَفْقَةً يَدِهِ، وَثَمَرَةَ قَلْبِهِ، فَلْيُطِيعْهُ إِنْ اسْتَطَاعَ، فَإِنْ جَاءَ آخَرَ يُنَازِعُهُ فَاصْرِبُوا عَنْقَ «الْآخِرِ» “He who pledged his Bayah to an Imam giving him the clasp of his hand and the fruit of his heart shall obey him as long as he can, and if another comes to dispute with him, you must strike the neck of that man.”

It has been narrated that ‘Ubaadah b. Saamit said, **«بَايَعْنَا رَسُولَ ﷺ عَلَى السَّمْعِ وَالطَّاعَةِ فِي الْمَكْرَهِ وَالْمُنْشَطِ ﷺ»** “We gave Bayah to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to hear and obey in weal and woe.” There are many other hadiths which clarify that the Ummah is the one which appoints the ruler, via the Bayah pledge on the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ.

Even though the Shariah gave the authority to the Muslims to delegate someone who would rule them via the Bayah pledge, it did not give the Muslims the right to remove the ruler, as in the system of Democracy. That is due to the presence of authentic hadeeths which obligate the obedience to the Khaleefah, even if he is unjust, as long as he does not order a sinful action. It was narrated by Ibn ‘Abbas who said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, **«مَنْ رَأَى مِنْ أَمِيرِهِ شَيْئًا يَكْرَهُهُ فَلْيُصْبِرْ، فَإِنَّهُ مَنْ فَارَقَ الْجَمَاعَةَ شِبْرًا فَمَاتَ، فَمِيتَتُهُ جَاهِلِيَّةٌ»** “If anybody sees in his Amir something which displeases him, he should remain patient. He who separates himself from the authority of Islam (Sultan) by even so much as a hand span and dies there upon, he has died the death of the days of ignorance.” It was narrated by ‘Awf b. Maalik who said that I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying, **«...وَسَرَارُ أَيْمَتِكُمْ ﷺ»** “...and the worst of your Imams are those whom you hate and they hate you and you curse them and they curse you.” We asked, “O Messenger of Allah, shall we not them declare war on them?” He ﷺ said, **«لَا، مَا أَقَامُوا فِيكُمْ الصَّلَاةَ، أَلَا مَنْ وَلِيَ عَلَيْهِ وَالٍ فَرَاهُ يَأْتِي شَيْئًا مِنْ مَعْصِيَةِ اللَّهِ فَلْيَكْرَهُ مَا يَأْتِي مِنْ مَعْصِيَةِ اللَّهِ وَلَا يَنْزِعَنَّ يَدًا مِنْ طَاعَةٍ»** “No! As long as they establish prayer among you. If anyone were to be ruled by a Wali and saw him committing a sin, let him abhor the sin committed against Allah, but let him not separate his hand from obeying the ruler.” Establishing the Salah means the ruling by Islam.

It is not allowed to disobey the ruler except when he exhibits Kufur Buwaah as mentioned in the hadeeth of ‘Ubaadah b. as-Saamit regarding Bayah. It has been mentioned that، **«فَبَايَعْنَاهُ، فَقَالَ فِيمَا أَخَذَ عَلَيْنَا، أَنْ بَايَعْنَا عَلَى السَّمْعِ وَالطَّاعَةِ فِي مَنْشَطِنَا وَمَكْرَهِنَا وَعُسْرِنَا وَيُسْرِنَا وَأَثَرَةً عَلَيْنَا، وَأَنْ لَا نُنَازِعَ إِلَّا أَنْ تَرَوْا كُفْرًا بَوَاحًا عِنْدَكُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِيهِ بُرْهَانٌ»** “We gave him the Bayah pledge. Among the conditions on which he took the Pledge from us, was that we were to listen and obey (the orders) both at the time when we were active and at the time when we were tired, and at our difficult time and at our ease. We are to be obedient to the ruler and give him his right, even if he did not give us our right. We are not to fight against him, unless we noticed him having open Kufur (disbelief), for which we would have a evidence with us from Allah.””

The body possessing the right to remove the Khaleefah is the Court of Unjust Acts (Mahkamatul Mazaalim). That is because the occurrence of any matter in which the Khaleefah is removed, or deserves to be removed, is an unjust act. It must be eliminated. It is also a matter that needs to be substantiated, before a judge. It is the Court of Unjust Acts that passes judgement regarding the elimination of injustices in the Islamic state. Its judge is the one who has the mandatory powers to substantiate the Unjust Act (Mazlama) and pass judgment regarding it. That is why the Court of Unjust Acts is the body that will decide whether such a matter has taken place or not. It will decide the matter of removing the Khaleefah.

- Considering that Democracy is the rule of the majority and legislation of the majority, then the selection of rulers, members of houses of representatives, members of institutions, authorities and bodies, will take place according to the majority. The enactment of legislation in houses of representatives and the decisions taken in cabinets, authorities, institutions and bodies, are all made according to the majority opinion.

As for in Islam the issue is quite different,

Legislative matters do not depend on the opinion of the majority or the minority. They depend on the Shariah texts because the only Legislator is Allah ﷻ. The Khaleefah is the only one possessing the mandatory powers to adopt rulings necessary to look after the affairs of the people and to administer the ruling. Thus, the Khaleefah adopts the rulings from the Shariah texts found in the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ, based on the strongest evidence through a correct ijtihaad. The Khaleefah is not obliged to refer to the Majlis of the Ummah, for their opinion regarding the rulings they want to be legislated. This is even though that is allowed for him to do so. The Khulafaa Rashidoon (ra) used to refer to the Sahabah (ra) to for their opinions, when they wanted to adopt a ruling. This happened with 'Umar b. al-Khattab (ra) when he wanted to adopt a ruling regarding the lands conquered in ash-Sham, Egypt and Iraq. He consulted the Muslims regarding this matter.

If the Khaleefah refers to the Majlis of the Ummah, to take its opinion regarding rulings which he wants to adopt, the opinion of the Majlis is not binding for him, even if it is through a Unanimous Consensus or majority. The Messenger ﷺ did not give in to the opinion of the Muslims, who opposed the Treaty of al-Hudaybiyyah. There were many who opposed. Yet, he ﷺ rejected their opinion and continued to conclude the Treaty and told them, «إِنِّي عَبْدُ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولُهُ وَلَنْ أَخَالَفَ أَمْرَهُ» **“Verily, I am a slave of Allah and His Messenger. I shall never disobey His order.”** The Noble Sahabah (ra) made a Unanimous Consensus that the Imam has the right to adopt specific rulings, and order that they be acted upon. It is obligatory on the Muslims to obey and leave their own opinions. From this the following, well-known Shariah Principles have been derived, “أمر الإمام يرفع الخلاف” “The order of the Imam removes the dispute,” “أمر الإمام نافذ ظاهراً وباطناً” “The order of the Imam is implemented openly and secretly,” and “للسلطان أن يُحْدِثَ مِنْ الْأَقْضِيَةِ بِقَدْرِ مَا يَحْدُثُ مِنْ مَشْكَلاتٍ” “It is for the Sultan to pass decrees according to the problems that occur.” Moreover, Allah ﷻ ordered the obedience to those in authority when He ﷻ said, ﴿فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ﴾ **“And if you differ in anything amongst**

yourselves, refer it Allah and His Messenger ﷺ.” [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:59]. Those in authority (ulul amr) are the rulers.

As for legislation regarding technical and intellectual matters requiring expertise, thought, scrutiny, the consideration here is the correctness, and not the majority or minority. So, in military matters recourse is made to military experts. In fiqhi jurisprudential matters reference is made to the Fuqaha and mujtahideen. In issues to do with medicine, medical specialists and consultants are consulted. In matters regarding engineering, the knowledgeable engineers are referred to. In intellectual matters, the competent intellectuals are consulted. The consideration in such matters is the correct opinion, and not the majority opinion. The correct opinion is taken from where it is expected to be found. They are the people of expertise, and not the majority.

Given that most members of representative councils among the Muslims or the West are not experts, they do not have any understanding or awareness of such matters. Therefore, the opinion of the majority of representative councils, regarding these matters, are of no benefit or value. Their agreement or opposition to such things is not borne of awareness and comprehension, or of knowledge. Therefore, the majority opinion regarding these matters is not considered to be binding. The evidence for that is what happened with the Messenger ﷺ when he took the opinion of al-Habbaab bin al-Munzir (ra) in the battle of Badr. Habbaab (ra) was an expert when it came to encampments for fighting. When he indicated to the Messenger ﷺ that he ﷺ should leave the place in which they had encamped, as long as it is not revelation, because it was not the best encampment for fighting. So the Messenger ﷺ took his opinion and encamped in the place he had shown. The Messenger ﷺ left his own opinion and did not consult the Sahabah (ra) regarding this matter.

As for the matters from which actions arise without the need for reflection, deliberation and deep thought, then such matters are taken according to the majority opinion. This is because the majority understands the matter and can easily voice its opinion regarding it, in

accordance with what it deems as beneficial. For example, do we elect such and such person or not?, Shall we go out to fight or remain to fight? Shall we travel in the morning or by night? Shall we go by plane, ship or train? Such matters are understood by everyone. They are able to give an opinion for such matters. The view of the majority in this regard will be recognised and adopted. It will be binding. The evidence for that is what happened with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the Sahabah (ra) in the battle of Uhud. The Messenger ﷺ and the senior Sahabah took the view that they should not go out of Madinah to fight. However, the opinion of most of the Sahabah (ra), especially the youth, was that they should go out to confront Quraysh outside of Madinah. The opinion revolved around whether to go out or to remain. Since the majority took the view that they should go out and fight, the Prophet ﷺ took their view. He ﷺ left the opinion of the most senior Sahabah. He ﷺ went out to Uhud to meet the Quraysh.

- The idea of universal freedoms is from the most prominent thoughts brought by Democracy. They are considered one of the important bases. Through them, the individual is able to practise his will and guide it as he wills, without pressure or compulsion. The people will not be able to express their public will, unless the universal freedoms are available to all of their individuals.

The freedoms of the individual are sacred in the system of Democracy. It is not allowed for the state or individuals to transgress these freedoms. The capitalist democratic system is considered an individualistic system. The protection and preservation of the universal freedoms is considered as one of the most important tasks of the state.

The universal freedoms, which Democracy brought, do not mean the liberation of colonized peoples from the countries that colonize them, exploit their wealth and plunder their resources. This is because the idea of colonialism is one of the results of the freedom of ownership, which Democracy itself has brought.

Similarly, it does not mean the emancipation from slavery and emancipation from its bondage. Thus, emancipation has no reality in today's world.

Instead, the universal freedoms mean the four freedoms and they are,

- 1- Freedom of belief
- 2- Freedom of opinion and expression
- 3- Freedom of ownership
- 4- Personal freedom

These universal freedoms, in all their four categories, are not present in Islam. A Muslim is bound in all his actions by the Shariah rules. He is not free in any action. There is no freedom in Islam, but for the freedom related to emancipating slaves from bondage and slavery, which is a matter that came to an end, a long time ago.

The four freedoms completely contradict Islam and its rulings in everything and that is because,

- Freedom of belief means that man has the right to believe the creed he wants. He has the right to profess the religion he likes without compulsion or pressure. He has the right to leave his creed and religion and move to another new creed and religion. He has the right to move to no religion at all. He has the right to do all do this with the absolute freedom, without any compulsion or pressure. The Muslim has the right to change to Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism or Communism with complete freedom. The state, or anyone else, has no right to prevent him from doing so.

This is whilst Islam forbids the Muslim from leaving the creed of Islam and converting to Judaism, Christianity, Buddhism, Communism or Capitalism. The one who apostatizes from Islam is obliged to recant. If he returns, he will remain in Islam. If he does not, he is killed. His wealth is confiscated and he is separated from his wife. The Messenger of ﷺ said, «مَنْ بَدَّلَ دِينَهُ فَاقْتُلُوهُ» **“Whosoever changes from his Deen, kill him.”**

If the apostates are an entire community and they persist in their apostasy, then they are fought until they recant, or they are exterminated. This is what happened to those who apostatised after he ﷺ departed to the Sublime Companion ﷺ. Abu Bakr (ra) fought them fiercely, until those who remained returned to the fold of Islam.

- As for the freedom of opinion and expression, in the system of Democracy, it means that the individual has the right to carry any opinion, or thought, whatever this opinion, or thought, may be. He has the right to state any opinion, or thought. He has the right to call to any opinion, or thought, with the absolute freedom, without any limit or restriction, whatever this opinion, or thought, may be. He has the right to express this using any available means, without the state. or anyone else, having any right to prevent him from doing so, as long as he does not violate the freedom of others. Anything banning the carrying of an opinion, or expressing it, or calling to it, is considered a violation of the freedom of opinion and expression.

As for Islam, the issue is different. The Muslim is bound in all his actions and sayings by all that the Shariah texts have brought. He is not allowed to do any action, or make any statement, except if the Shariah evidences have come allowing it. Accordingly, the Muslim only has the right to hold any opinion, express any opinion and call to any opinion, as long as the Shariah evidences allow it. As for when the Shariah evidences forbid him from doing this, then the Muslim is not allowed to hold, express or call to this opinion. If he does so, he will be punished. Thus, the Muslim is restricted regarding the holding, expressing and calling to an opinion by the Shariah rulings. He is not free in this regard.

Islam obliges that the truth is spoken at all times. Thus, in the hadith of 'Ubaadah b. as-Saamit regarding the Bayah, **«...وَأَنْ نَقُولَ بِالْحَقِّ، لَا نَخَافُ فِي اللَّهِ لَوْمَةَ لَائِمٍ»** **“And we (pledged to) speak the truth wherever we are, and in serving Allah we should fear the blame of the blamer.”**

Islam also obliges the Muslims to hold the rulers with opinion and to account them for their actions. Umm 'Atiyah narrated on the authority of Abu Sa'eed who said: that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, «أَفْضَلُ الْجِهَادِ كَلِمَةٌ حَقٌّ عِنْدَ سُلْطَانٍ جَائِرٍ» **“The best jihad is the word of truth spoken to a tyrant ruler.”** Abu Umaamah narrated that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ answered the one who asked in him in Aqaba, ‘Which Jihaad is the best O Messenger of Allah?’ He ﷺ said, «كَلِمَةٌ حَقٌّ» **“A word of truth spoken to the a tyrant ruler.”** He ﷺ also said, «سَيِّدُ الشُّهَدَاءِ حَمْرَةٌ وَرَجُلٌ قَامَ إِلَى إِمَامٍ جَائِرٍ فَنَصَحَهُ فُقِّتَلَهُ.» **“The master of martyrs is Hamza, and a man who stood up to a tyrant ruler to advise him and got killed.”**

This is not freedom of opinion and expression. Instead, it is the adherence to the rulings of the Shariah. Shariah stipulates the permissibility of stating an opinion in certain cases, and the obligation to express opinion in other cases.

- As for the freedom of ownership, it is the freedom which resulted in the capitalist economic system. It consequently created the idea of colonializing peoples, plundering their wealth and looting their resources. It means that man from the onset is permitted to possess wealth. He can increase wealth using any means or styles. He has the right to own money and increase it using the style of colonialism, the looting of wealth and theft of resources of the colonialized peoples. He can increase wealth by hoarding, speculation, usury, lying, deception, cheating, criminal fraud, gambling, fornication, homosexuality, exploiting the woman's femininity, manufacture of alcohol and its sale, as well as with bribery and other such styles.

As for Islam, it contradicts this freedom regarding the ruling of ownership of wealth. It fights the idea of colonializing peoples, the idea of plundering their resources and seizing their wealth. It fights the idea of usury (riba) whether with compound interest or simple interest. Thus, usury (riba) in all its forms is prohibited. Islam has defined the causes of ownership, the causes of increasing ownership and the manner in which ownership can be disposed. It prohibited all other

causes. It obliged the Muslim to adhere to these causes in owning the wealth, in increasing this wealth and the manner in which he spends this wealth. He is not left free to accrue wealth and spend as he wills. Instead, he is restricted to the Shariah rulings legislated for him. He has been forbidden from acquiring wealth and increasing it through looting, plunder, theft, bribery, usury, gambling, fornication, homosexuality, fraud, deception, cheating, criminal fraud, manufacture of alcohol and its sale, use of the woman's femininity and other such causes, which Islam forbade.

All of these are forbidden causes of acquiring and increasing wealth. Any wealth acquired via them is forbidden for the Muslim to own. The one who does this will be punished.

Accordingly, it becomes clear that there is no freedom of ownership in Islam. Instead, the Muslim is restricted in his ownership and spending of wealth by the Shariah rulings, which the Shari'a brought. It is not allowed to violate these rulings.

- As for personal freedom, it is the freedom to escape from all restrictions. It is the freedom to free oneself from all spiritual, ethical and humanitarian values. It is the freedom to destroy the family and make it lose its essence and cohesiveness. Freedom is the idea in whose name all the grave offences are committed. It is the idea in whose name all the prohibited things are made permitted. It is personal freedom that has led Western societies to be animalistic societies. It has disgraced man and brought people to a level that is worse than cattle and beasts.

This is the freedom that decided that it is from man's right that he conducts the personal behaviour and life in the form he pleases, with absolute freedom. He can do so without the state, or anyone else, possessing any right of standing as a barrier between him and the undertaking of how he wants to conduct himself and behave. It is permitted for the individual fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, alcohol, nudity and the pursuit of any type of work, however base it

may be. He can do so with the utmost freedom, without any limit, restriction, compulsion or pressure.

The rulings of Islam completely contradict this personal freedom. There is no personal freedom in Islam. The Muslim is restricted by the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ, in all his actions and behaviour. It is forbidden for him to do any action Allah ﷻ has prohibited. If he advances towards such a prohibited action, he will be sinful and he will be severely punished.

Islam forbade fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, alcohol, nudity and other grave offences. For each offence, Islam has given a preventative punishment.

It ordered the Muslims be shaped by the virtues, morals, and commendable characteristics. It made the Islamic society one of purity and integrity. It is a society of high values.

From all that we have discussed above, it is evidently clear that the Western culture, values and viewpoint about life, Democracy and universal freedoms, all completely contradict Islam and its rulings. They are Kufr thoughts, Kufr culture, systems of Kufr and laws of Kufr. It is due to ignorance, or deception, that some claim that Democracy is from Islam. It is through ignorance or deception, that they claim that Democracy is Shura itself, enjoining the good and forbidding the evil and accounting the rulers.

However, Shura, enjoining the good, forbidding the evil and accounting the rulers are all Shariah rulings which Allah ﷻ legislated. He ﷻ ordered the Muslim to adopt and adhere to these as Shariah rulings.

As for democracy, it does not constitute any Shariah rulings. It is not from the legislation of Allah ﷻ. Instead, it is from the creation and legislation of man.

Democracy is other than the Shura. Shura is to voice ones opinion. As for Democracy, it is the viewpoint about life. Democracy is

the legislation of constitutions, systems and laws, which man makes from his mind. He legislates based on the benefit that his mind perceives. He does not legislate based on Revelation.

That is why it is forbidden for the Muslim to adopt Democracy, call for it or establish parties on its basis. It is not allowed to take Democracy's viewpoint about life, or implement it or make it the basis of the constitution and laws. It is not allowed to take Democracy as a source for the constitution and laws. It is not allowed to make Democracy a basis for education or the objective of education.

It is obligatory on the Muslims to completely discard Democracy. It is filth. It is the rule of Taghut, Kufr, Kufr thoughts, systems of Kufr and laws of Kufr. It has no relation to Islam whatsoever.

It is obligatory on Muslims to install Islam comprehensively in a position of application and implementation in life, state and society.

﴿وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ
وَنُصَلِّهِ ۖ جَهَنَّمَ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا﴾

“And whoever contradicts and opposes the Messenger ﷺ after the right path has been shown clearly to him, and follows other than the believers' way. We shall keep him in the path he has chosen, and burn him in Hell. What an evil destination.” [TMQ Surah an-Nisaa 4:115]

This book was completed by the Help and Grace of Allah ﷻ on Sunday, 3rd of Dhul Qa'da 1410 AH, corresponding to 27 May 1990 CE.