

Democracy is a system of Kufr

It is forbidden to adopt, implement or call for it



**Al-Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB**

e-mail: info@khilafah.com
website: <http://www.khilafah.com>

Al-Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB
e-mail: info@khilafah.com
website: http://www.khilafah.com

Abdul Qadeem Zalloom

Second Edition
Rabi' al-Awwal 1416 AH - August 1995

ISBN: 1 899 57420 4

Translation of the Qur'an

It should be perfectly clear that the Qur'an is only authentic in its original language, Arabic. Since perfect translation of the Qur'an is impossible, we have used the translation of the meaning of the Qur'an throughout the book, as the result is only a crude meaning of the Arabic text. [TMQ]

Qur'anic *Ayat* and transliterated words have been *italicised* in main part of the book.

سُبْحَانَكَ - subhanahu wa ta'ala
سَلَامٌ - sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam
RA - radhi allaho anha/anho
AH - After Hijrah
CE - Common Era



يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ
مِنْكُمْ فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِنْ
كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا
، أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ آمَنُوا بِمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مَا
أُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَحَاكَمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ قَدْ
أُمِرُوا أَنْ يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ وَيُرِيدُ الشَّيْطَانُ أَنْ يُضِلَّهُمْ لَوْلَا بَعِيدًا
، وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ وَإِلَى الرَّسُولِ رَأَيْتَ
الْمُنَافِقِينَ يَصُدُّونَ عَنْكَ صُدُودًا.

Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim

'O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (saw), and those in authority from amongst you.. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger (saw), 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, for judgement (in their disputes), to refer to the Taghut (false judges) while they have been ordered to reject them? But shaytan wishes to lead them astray. And when it is said to them: "Come to what Allah has sent down to the Messenger (saw)," you will see the hypocrites turn away from you with aversion'. [TMQ: An-Nisa: 59-61]



Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim



The democracy which the *Kaafir* West promotes in the Muslim countries is a system of *Kufr*. It has no connection whatsoever with Islam. It completely contradicts the rules of Islam whether in the comprehensive or partial issues, in the source from which it came, in the '*Aqeedah* from which it emanated, in the basis on which it is established and in the thoughts and systems it has brought.

That is why it is definitely forbidden for the Muslims to adopt, implement or call for it.



Democracy is a ruling system set down by man in order to free themselves from the injustice of the rulers and their domination of the people in the name of religion. It is thus a system whose source is human beings and it has no connection to divine revelation or religion.

The origin of its emergence is that the rulers in Europe used to claim that the ruler was God's representative on earth and that he ruled people with a mandate from God. They claimed that it was God who gave the ruler the legislative and executive authority, i.e. the authority to rule the people with the Law that he himself legislates, because he derives his authority from God and not from the people. Thus they used this claim to oppress the people and

dominate them just as the master dominates his slave.

Hence a struggle took place between them and the people. Philosophers and thinkers began to study the subject of ruling and laid down a system to rule the people - which is the democratic system - in which the people are the source of authority. Therefore the ruler derives his authority from the people, and sovereignty will be for the people. They possess their own will, exercise it themselves and they execute it according to their wish. No one has any authority over them. They are the master. They are the ones who enact the laws by which they govern and proceed according to them. They are the ones who appoint the ruler to rule them on their behalf through the legislation which the people lay down.

Therefore, the entire source of the democratic system is the people. It has no connection with divine revelation or religion.



Democracy is a Western word and a Western term applied to “ruling of the people, for the people by the legislation of the people.” Thus the people are the absolute master and they possess the sovereignty. They hold its reigns of power, exercise their own will and run it by themselves. They are not answerable to any authority other than their own authority. They are the ones who enact the systems and laws - in their sovereign capacity - via their representatives whom they choose. They also implement the systems and laws which are enacted through the rulers and judges whom they appoint, and 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 enacting the systems and laws.

The origin of democracy, i.e. that the people rule themselves by themselves, is that the people, all together, should gather in one public place and legislate the systems and pass the laws that govern them, run their affairs and judge in all matters that require judgement.

Since it is normally not possible for all the people to come together in one place so as to make the legislative body, the people choose their representatives so as to be the legislative body. These representatives constitute the Parliament. Thus Parliament, in the democratic system, is what represents the general will. It is the political embodiment of the general will

of the masses. It is Parliament, that chooses the government and chooses the head of state in order to be the ruler and in order to be representative in implementing the general will. Parliament derives its authority from the people who choose it in order to rule them with the systems and laws it has legislated. So the people are the masters, and they are the ones who pass the laws and they are the ones who choose the ruler who implements these laws.

The people are the masters over themselves such that they can exercise their sovereignty and run their will entirely by themselves by enacting laws and systems of life and choosing their rulers without any pressure or compulsion. The general freedoms are the foundations, and Democracy obliges that they are provided for every individual of the community in order to realise his sovereignty, exercise his will and run it himself with absolute freedom and without any pressure or compulsion.

Their general freedoms are represented in the four freedoms, which are:

- 1. Freedom of belief**
- 2. Freedom of opinion**
- 3. Freedom of ownership**
- 4. Personal freedom**



Democracy emanated from the creed of separating religion from life, which is the creed on which the capitalist ideology is established. It is the creed of the vague compromise solution, which was achieved by the struggle between the kings and emperors of Europe and Russia on the one hand, and the philosophers and thinkers on the other. This is because the kings and emperors used religion as a means to exploit the people, oppress them and spill their blood under the claim that they are God's representatives on earth. They used to use the priests as cover. Consequently, a terrible conflict broke out between them and their peoples. During the struggle the philosophers and thinkers came out. Some of them rejected religion altogether and some of them recognised it, but called for its separation from life and consequently from the state and ruling.

This conflict resulted in the idea of the compromise solution, which is the idea of separating religion from life's affairs. This naturally resulted in the separation of religion from state. This idea is the creed on which the

capitalist ideology is established. It is its intellectual foundation on which all its thoughts are built, its intellectual direction is fixed, as well as its viewpoint about life. It solves all problems in life on the basis of this creed. Thus it is the intellectual leadership which the West conveys and calls the world to adopt.

Since this creed removed religion and the church from life and from the state, consequently they were removed from the legislation of systems and laws, and from the appointment of rulers and investing them with the authority. It then became imperative for the people to select their system of life themselves and lay down the systems and laws, and to establish the rulers who rule them with these systems and laws and who also derive their authority from the general will of the masses.

This is the way that the democratic system emanated. So the idea of separating religion from life is the creed from which democracy emanated, and is the intellectual foundation on which all thoughts of democracy are built.



Democracy is established on the basis of two ideas:

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

These are the two ideas, which the philosophers and thinkers in Europe initiated during their struggle with the emperors and kings to destroy the idea of the divine right (of kings), which was prevalent in Europe at that time. Due to such ideas the kings thought that they had a divine right over the people, that they alone had the right to legislate, rule and pass judgements, and that they are the state. They considered themselves the state, and the people as their subjects, who have no right to legislate, hold authority, pass judgement or have any right in anything. They held the position of a slave who has no opinion of his own nor any will. Whose job is only to obey and execute.

Thus, those two ideas came to completely abolish the idea of the divine right of kings, and to give legislation and authority to the people. That is, the

people are the master and they are not slaves to the kings. They are their own masters and no one has sovereignty over them. So they must possess their own will and they must execute, otherwise they will be slaves. This is because slavery means to be controlled by the will of another. If they do not control their own will themselves then they remain as slaves. To liberate the people from slavery, they themselves must be the only ones who execute their will. So they must have the right to legislate the laws that they want and abolish and invalidate the laws that they don't want. They must possess the absolute authority. They have the right to implement the legislation they enact and choose the ruler they want and judge how they want to implement the legislation, which they choose. They are the source of all authority and 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, the two ideas of sovereignty is for the people and the people are the source of authorities were laid down for implementation and execution. They formed the basis on which the democratic system was established. So the people became the legislators in their capacity as those who possess the sovereignty. And they became the executive in their capacity as the source of authority.



Democracy is the rule of the majority. Thus the members of the legislative body are chosen by the majority votes of those from the people who have voted. Passing laws, giving a vote of confidence to governments, or divesting them of it in the representative councils, are undertaken by the majority. All the resolutions issued in the representative councils, cabinets and all the councils, institutions and bodies are taken by the majority. The election of the rulers by the people either directly or via their representatives is decided by the majority of votes from the people.

That is why the majority is the prominent feature of the democratic system. The view of the majority is thus the true measure that expresses the view of the people, according to the viewpoint of the democratic system.



This is a brief explanation of democracy in terms of its meaning, source, how it emerged, the creed from which it emanated, the foundation upon which it was built, and the matters that it obliged in order to enable the people to implement it.

From this brief explanation the following becomes clear:

1. Democracy is the product of the human mind and not from Allah ﷻ. It does not rely on the divine revelation, nor has it any connection to any religion revealed by Allah to His Messengers.

2. It emanated from the creed of separating religion from life, and consequently separating religion from the state.

3. It was established on two ideas:

- a) **Sovereignty is for the people**
- b) **The people are the source of authority**

4. Democracy is the rule of the majority, and the selection of rulers and the members of parliament are decided by the majority of voters. All decisions in democracy are taken by the majority vote.

5. Democracy advocates the general freedoms, which are:

- a) **Freedom of belief;**
- b) **Freedom of opinion;**
- c) **Freedom of ownership, and**
- d) **Personal freedom.**

These freedoms must be provided to every individual citizen, so that he can exercise his sovereignty and direct it by himself, to enable him to undertake his right in the selection of the rulers and the members of parliament with absolute freedom and without any pressure or compulsion.



Looking at clause 1 it becomes clear that democracy is a system of *Kufr*, and that it is not from Islam and has no connection to it whatsoever.

Before we demonstrate its contradiction with Islam and explain the opinion of the *Shar'a* regarding its adoption, we want to explain that democracy has not even been applied in the ancient democratic nations. It is only based on lies and deception. We shall clarify its corruption and rottenness and what it has brought to the world in terms of misfortune and

affliction, and the extent of the corruption of societies in which democracy is implemented.



Democracy, in its true meaning, is an imaginary and inapplicable idea. It never existed and it will never exist. Bringing all the people in one place permanently to look after the public affairs is impossible. That all the people should assume the ruling and the will is also impossible. That is why they resorted to tricks regarding democracy and interpreted it loosely and created for it what is known as the head of state, the government and the parliament.

Despite this, its meaning after the interpretation still does not agree with the reality and it does not exist in reality. The fact that the head of state, the government and members of parliament are elected by the majority vote, and that the house of representatives is the political embodiment of the general will of the masses, and that it represents the majority of the people, all of which cannot be further from the truth and the reality. This is because the members of parliament are elected by the minority of people and not by the majority, where many people nominate themselves for election in every constituency and there is not a single candidate only. Thus the votes of the electorate are divided in each area. Whoever gets the majority of votes in each constituency would not have obtained the majority of the elector's votes in the area. Thus the winners in the elections would have obtained the minority rather than the majority of votes of the people. Accordingly they would be delegated by, and representative of, the minority and not the majority.

The same argument applies to the head of state, whether he is elected directly by the people or via the members of parliament. He is not elected by the majority of votes of the people but by the minority of votes, as is the case with the MPs.

This is aside from the fact that the heads of state and MPs in the ancient democratic countries, like America and Britain, represent the will of the capitalists from the businessmen and big landowners. They do not represent the will of the people or their majority. The big capitalists are the ones who bring to power or into the representative assemblies those who will realise their interests. They are the ones who pay for the costs of the elections for the post of head of state and the membership of parliament. As a result,

they have control over the head of state and the members of parliament. This is a well known reality in America.

In Britain the Conservatives are the rulers. The Conservative party represents the big capitalists from business, landowners and from the class of aristocratic lords. The Labour party does not come to power except when there is a particular political situation which necessitates the Conservatives relinquishing power. That is why the rulers and the members of parliament in America and Britain only represent capitalists. They do not represent the will of the people nor their majority.

That is why the statement that parliaments in democratic countries represent the view of the majority is a lie and a deception; and that they derive their authority from the people is a lie and a deception as well.

The laws passed in these parliaments, and the decisions issued by these states, take into consideration the interests of those capitalists more than the interests of the people or their majority.

Moreover, the statement that the ruler is answerable before parliament, which embodies the general will of the people, and that the great decisions are not taken without the agreement of the majority of the Parliamentary members, does not comply with the truth or the reality. As an example, Eden declared the Suez war on Egypt without informing parliament or informing the ministers in his cabinet, apart from two or three ministers. During that war the Congress requested from him the file of the High Dam and the reasons which led to the withdrawal of the offer of its finance, but he completely refused to hand over the file to Congress. Degaul used to take decisions without the knowledge of his ministers. Even King Hussein used to take important and serious decisions without the knowledge of his ministers or members of parliament.

Therefore, the view that parliaments in the democratic countries represent the opinion of the majority and that the rulers are elected by the majority opinion and that they rule by what the majority legislate and want, is a view that is contrary to the truth and the reality, and it is but a lie and a deception.



This is regarding the deep-rooted democratic countries. As for the parliaments in the Islamic world, they are of less importance. They are in name only. In the Islamic world no parliament dares to raise objections against the ruler, or challenges him or his system of ruling. Thus the Jordanian parliament, for example, which has been elected in the name of re-establishing democracy and providing freedom, did not dare to account King Hussein or the corruption of his ruling, despite the fact that all members of parliament know that the corruption and the economic collapse is due to the corrupt ruling of the royal family and due to its theft of the wealth. Despite this, not a single member of parliament objected to that. Rather they attacked Zayd al-Rifaa'i and certain ministers whilst knowing that Zayd al-Rifaa'i and the ministers are but junior employees who do not dare to do any action without the knowledge and permission of the King.

This is from one angle. From another angle, the majority of laws, which the government enacts as draft bills, she sends them to parliament in order to be studied by the special committees, which give their opinion and then the members of parliament give their approval. However, many of them do not know anything about the reality of these laws because they are not from their area of expertise.

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



One of the manifest shortcomings of the democratic system that relates to ruling and governments, is that when there are no large parties in the democratic country that are capable of getting an absolute majority in parliament, and are consequently unable to form a government on their own, then ruling in such a country remains unstable and governments fall constantly under the pressure of successive political crises. This is because it is difficult for the government to gain the confidence of the parliamentary majority thus compelling it to resign. Months may pass without the head of state being able to form a new government, which will keep the ruling in the country paralysed and almost inactive. The head of state may be forced to dissolve the parliament and hold new elections, wishing to change the balance of power so as to be able to form a new government. This keeps the ruling unstable and keeps the ruling policy shaking and almost inactive. Italy and Greece are examples of such

democratic countries in which there are many parties. There is no one big party there, which can get the absolute majority. That is why there is compromise between these parties. Small parties may dominate other parties, which make them an offer to participate in forming a government. Thus they impose difficult conditions to realise their particular interests. Such small parties, who only represent a minority, control the other parties and dominate the country's policies and the decisions of government.



One of the severest afflictions brought to humanity is the idea of general freedoms initiated by the democratic system. This idea caused nothing but disaster for humankind and societal decadence in democratic countries to a level lower than that of the animals.

This is because the idea of freedom of ownership, and the fact that benefit is the criterion of actions, has resulted in the mass capitalism, which became in need of raw materials to run their factories and consumer markets to sell their products. All that has pushed these capitalist countries to compete for the colonisation of the developing countries world, seizing their wealth, monopolising their resources and sucking the blood of their peoples in a manner, which completely contradicts all humanitarian, ethical and spiritual values.

The ruthlessness of the greed and ambition became acute among these capitalist countries as well as their loss of any humanitarian, ethnical or spiritual values, together with their competition over unlawful gain to trade with the blood of peoples and to incite intrigues and wars between the states and peoples, so that they can sell their products and manage their military industry which has accrued huge profits.

How ridiculous and disgusting it is that the colonialist democratic countries like America, Britain and France boast and brag of democratic values and human rights, and at the same time they trample all over all the humanitarian and ethical values. They squander all the human rights and even the blood of humans. Thus, Palestine, South East Asia, Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, South Africa, Iraq, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Chechnya are the best evidence which slaps them in the face and highlight the true extent of their lies, deceit, and also the extent of their impudence and their insolent faces.



As for the idea of personal freedom, it has turned societies in the democratic countries into animalistic and base societies. It has taken them to a level of filthy promiscuity that even animals cannot reach. Allah ﷻ spoke the truth when He ﷻ said:

أَرَأَيْتَ مَنْ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ أَفَأَنْتَ تَكُونُ عَلَيْهِ وَكِيلًا ، أَمْ
تَحْسَبُ أَنَّ أَكْثَرَهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ أَوْ يَعْقِلُونَ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا
كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ سَبِيلًا

'Have you (O Muhammad) seen him who has taken as his ilah (god) his own desire (Havah)? Would you then be a Wakil (disposer of his affairs) over him? 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: Al-Furqan: 43]

The practice of sex is permitted in these democratic societies like the drinking of water via legal provisions enacted by the parliaments of those democratic countries and agreed to by their churches. These legislations have permitted sex and cohabitation between males and females with absolute freedom, once they both reach the age of 18 without the state or their fathers having any authority to prevent these sexual practices.

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

That is why one of the everyday and natural scenes that one will see in streets, roads, parks, buses and festivals is that the young boys and girls will exchange kisses, embraces, hugs, flirt and behave immodestly without drawing any attention or causing any surprise, because all of this is considered normal and natural in their view.

One of these accepted things is that women enjoy the sun in summer getting a tan in the parks, naked as the day their mothers bore them, except for something the size of a little plant leaf to cover their private parts. Likewise it is normal and natural for women to walk in summer semi-naked

covering only a little of their body.

Such abnormal and strange sexual practices have come to fill these low democratic countries. So homosexuality has increased between men and lesbianism has increased between women, as well as sex with all animals. Also on the increase is the practice of group sex between males and females who all have sex together at the same time, the likes of which is not to be found even in the domain of beasts and animals.

A statistic was published by one American newspaper, which said that there are 25 million homosexuals in America demanding that the legitimacy of their marriages be recognised and that they should be given the same rights enjoyed by heterosexuals. Another paper published a statistic that a million people in America have sex with their relatives such as mothers, daughters and sisters.

From this animalistic promiscuity has spread the sexually transmitted diseases, the worst of which is the devastation of AIDS. Also arising from this are the many children of fornication, to the point that one newspaper published that 75% of English people are the sons of fornication.

The family has broken up in these societies. It has lost the compassion between fathers, sons, mothers, brothers and sisters, to the point that it became natural to see tens if not hundreds of old men and women walking the streets and visiting parks accompanied by dogs which share with them their living, eating and even sleeping. They became their only close friends in their solitude. This is because each one of them lives on their own without a companion or someone to sit with them except a dog.



These are examples of the values that democracy has produced in terms of the general freedoms they praise. It is one of the aspects and faces of their culture which they take pride in and call people to, and convey to the world so that the people may share with them this ugly cultural face. If these examples indicate anything then they indicate the extent of the corruption and rottenness of this democracy and the smell of its stench.

Despite what the Western democratic countries have reached in terms of stooping to the level of dirty animals due to the unleashed personal

freedoms, which became obvious like the daylight.

Despite what one sees of the calamities and misfortunes inflicted on the world by the Western democratic colonialists, and what the colonised and the developing countries suffered at their hands due to the theft of their wealth, the plunder of their resources, the impoverishment of their population and the humiliation of their peoples, and making their countries into consumer markets for their industries and products.

Despite the fact that democracy in its true meaning is not applicable, and despite after the new meaning given to it as a result of interpretation, it does not agree with the reality and nor does it exist in reality.

Despite the lies and deception found in the speeches of democrats: that parliaments represent the general will, they are the political embodiment of the general will of the masses, and they represent the majority opinion, and legislation passed by the majority vote of the representatives express the will of the majority of people. Also other deception of their speeches is that the rulers are chosen by the majority of people and that they derive their authority from the people.

Despite the blatant failings of the democratic system regarding ruling and the rulers when there are no large parties in the country which can be a majority in the Parliament.

Despite all this and much more, the *Kaafir* West has been able to find a market for its corrupt thoughts of democracy in the Islamic Lands.



How was the *Kaafir* West able to find a market in the Islamic Land for the *Kaafir* democratic thoughts, which have nothing to do with the rules of Islam?

That was because of the *Kaafir* European nations, which bear an intense animosity for Islam and the Muslims and harbour a vile hatred for Islam and Muslims. Allah Almighty spoke the truth when He ﷻ 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: Al-Imran: 118]

After they had realised that the secret of the Muslims' strength is Islam. This is because its '*Aqeedah*' is the origin of this great strength for the Muslims. These nations drew up a hellish plan to attack the Islamic world through a missionary and cultural invasion in which they conveyed their culture, thoughts (part of which is democracy), civilisation and their viewpoint about life. They began to call Muslims to their culture, wishing that the Muslims would take it as a basis of their thinking and viewpoint about life, so as to divert them away from Islam and distance them from being restricted to it and from implementing its rules. This was to make it easy for them to destroy the Islamic State - the Khilafah State - and consequently the application of Islam and its rules in life, state and society so that the Muslims adopt their thoughts, systems and *Kufr* laws and implement them instead of Islam; thus they stray away from Islam and become under their control. Allah ﷻ spoke the truth when He ﷻ said:

وَلَنْ تَرْضَى عَنْكَ الْيَهُودُ وَلَا النَّصَارَى حَتَّى تَتَّبِعَ مِلَّتَهُمْ قُلْ
إِنَّ هُدَى اللَّهِ هُوَ الْهُدَى وَلَئِنْ اتَّبَعْتَ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ بَعْدَ الَّذِي
جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ مَا لَكَ مِنَ اللَّهِ مِنْ وَلِيٍّ وَلَا نَصِيرٍ

"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." [Al-Baqarah: 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. At that time the balance of power had changed to the advantage of the European nations 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 while the 'Uthmani State remained stagnant and its weakness increased day by day. This opened the door to the Western culture and the Western thoughts, civilisation and systems to enter the Muslim countries.

In its missionary and cultural invasion of the Muslim lands, the European countries employed the style of disparaging Islam, distorting its rules and creating doubt in the mind of the Muslims. They made the Muslims resent Islam and think that it was the reason for their backwardness and decline. They made them glorify the West and its culture at the same time, and exalt the status of its thoughts and its democratic system, and speak about its systems and laws in glowing terms.

The West also relied on deception, making the Muslims think that its culture did not contradict the culture of Islam because its culture has been taken from Islam, and that its systems and laws do not contradict the rules of Islam.

The West granted the democratic thoughts and system the attribute of Islam, and that they do not disagree with or contradict Islam. Rather that these are from Islam because they are the *Shura*, enjoining the good and forbidding the evil and accounting the rulers. The effect of all of this on the Muslims was great. It made the Western thoughts and culture dominate them.

This also led them to adopt certain systems and laws towards the end of the 'Uthmani State, and after the destruction of the Khilafah State it led them to adopt most of the systems and laws.

This affected the educated people, politicians, and even the carriers of the Islamic culture and some *Da'wah* carriers and the Muslim masses.

As for the educated people, many of them were affected by the Western culture, on whose basis they were educated, whether they had studied in the West or in the Islamic countries. This is because the curricula in the Islamic countries had been set down after the First World War, on the basis of the philosophy of the West and its viewpoint about life until many of them came to relish and pursue the Western culture and glorify the West which

brought it. They came to disapprove of the Islamic culture and the rules of Islam when they contradicted the Western culture. They came to detest Islam as the *Kaafir* West detested Islam. They harboured intense animosity for Islam, Islamic culture, systems and rules like the *Kaafir* west. They became the mouthpieces of propaganda for the West, its culture, thoughts and systems to attack Islam, its culture, rules and system and to disparage it.

As for the politicians they devoted themselves to the West and its system, and they tied themselves to it and made it their ideal. They sought help from the West and relied upon it and they made themselves guardians of the Western laws and systems, and obedient servants to protect their interests and implement their conspiracies. They declared their animosity to Allah and His Messenger ﷺ. They waged a war against political Islam and the sincere people who carried its Call. They exerted all their effort to prevent the re-establishment of the Khilafah and the return of ruling by the word of Allah; may Allah ﷻ destroy them for their lies.

As for the carriers of the Islamic culture, this was due to their lack of awareness about Islam, lack of understanding of the reality of Islamic rules and the reality of Western culture, thoughts and systems, and due to their lack of understanding about the contradiction of the Western culture, thoughts and viewpoint about life with the Islamic Creed, rules, culture and viewpoint about life.

This happened because of the great weakness that befell the minds of the Muslims in understanding Islam and its rules. It was also due to the erroneous understanding of the Islamic *Shari'ah* for application in society. So Islam came to be explained in ways, which could not be supported by its texts, and its rules came to be interpreted to agree with the existing reality instead of changing the existing reality to comply with the rules of Islam. So they adopted rules which had no link to the *Shari'ah* or had a weak link under the pretext of an erroneous principle laid down by them which states: 'Changing of rules to accord with the changing of time is not rejected.' On the tongue of many, Islam came to be interpreted in such a way that it agrees with every school of thought, idea and ideology even if it contradicted the rules of Islam and its viewpoint about life. They said that the culture and thoughts of the West do not contradict the culture and rules of Islam, because they have been taken from the culture of Islam. They said that the democratic system of ruling and the capitalist system in economy do not

contradict the rules of Islam, even though in their reality they are a system of *Kufr*. They said that democracy is from Islam and that the general freedoms are from Islam even though they completely contradict with Islam.

As a result of that, what is allowed for the Muslims to adopt, such as the science of medicine, pharmacy, engineering and chemistry, as well as sciences; such as agriculture, industry, transport and communication systems, and other such sciences that are permitted as long as they do not contradict Islam, were confused with what was not allowed to be adopted, in terms of anything that relates to the beliefs and the *Shari'ah* rules. This is because these matters are not allowed to be taken except from what has been brought by the Messenger in the *Kitaab* and *Sunnah* and whatever they alluded to, in terms of analogy (*Qiyas*) or the *Ijma'a* of the *Sahabah*.

Thus the *Kaafir* West was able to market its culture and viewpoint about life and market the thoughts of its democratic system, thoughts of its economic system and its thoughts regarding the general freedoms in the Islamic countries.



Before we explain how democracy contradicts with Islam and explain the rule of the *Shar'a* regarding its adoption, we wish to address the issue of what is permitted for the Muslims to adopt from the other nations and peoples and what is forbidden to be adopted, according to what the *Shar'a* texts and rules indicate. Thus we say the following:

1- All actions coming from man and all things related to the actions of man, the origin in these matters is to follow the Messenger ﷺ and to be restricted by the rules of his Message. The generality of the *Ayah* of *Abkaam* indicate the obligation of referring to the *Shar'a* and adhering to the rules of the *Shar'a*: Allah ﷻ said:

وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا

"Whatever the Messenger brought to you take it, and whatever he forbade you, leave it."
[TMQ: Al-Hashr: 7]

He ﷺ said:

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّى يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ لَا يَجِدُوا فِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَيُسَلِّمُوا تَسْلِيمًا

'But no, by your Lord, they can have no Iman, until they make you the judge in all disputes between them.' [TMQ: An-Nisa: 65]

He ﷺ said:

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

'And if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it Allah and His Messenger.' [TMQ: An-Nisa: 59]

And the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said in the *Hadeeth* narrated by Bukhari and Muslim:

مَنْ عَمِلَ عَمَلًا لَيْسَ عَلَيْهِ أَمْرُنَا فَهُوَ رَدٌّ .

Whosoever does an action and it is not from our matter/Deen then it is rejected.'

مَنْ أَحْدَثَ فِي أَمْرِنَا هَذَا مَا لَيْسَ مِنْهُ فَهُوَ رَدٌّ

'Whosoever innovates anything in this matter/Deen of ours and it is not from it then it is rejected.'

This indicates that the origin is the obligation of following the *Shar'a*, and restricting the actions and things to it. It is not allowed for the Muslim to undertake anything or leave it except after knowing the rule of Allah regarding it, whether it is obligatory (*Waaajib*) or recommended (*Mandoob*), and thus he performs it. Or whether it is forbidden (*Haraam*) or disliked (*Makrooh*), thus he leaves it. Or whether it is permitted (*Mubaah*) so he has a choice whether to do it or leave it.

This is why the basis of the actions of man is that they are restricted to the

judgement of Allah ﷻ. With regard to things connected with the actions of man, the origin is that they are allowed, as long as there is no evidence to prohibit it. This is because the *Shari'ah* texts have permitted all things and the texts have come as general ('*Aam*) and they include everything. He ﷻ said:

أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ سَخَّرَ لَكُمْ مَافِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ

"Do you not see that Allah has subjugated to you (*Sakbara*) what is in the skies and what is in the earth?" [TMQ: Luqman: 20]

The meaning of Allah subjugating everything in the skies and the earth is to permit everything in them. He ﷻ said:

هُوَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مَا فِي الْأَرْضِ جَمِيعًا .

"It is He Who had created to you all what is in the earth." [TMQ: Al-Baqarah: 29]

And He ﷻ said:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ كُلُوا مِمَّا فِي الْأَرْضِ حَلَالًا طَيِّبًا

"O people, eat of what is in the earth, *Halaal* and good..." [TMQ: Al-Baqarah:168]

And He ﷻ said:

هُوَ الَّذِي جَعَلَ لَكُمْ الْأَرْضَ ذُلُولًا فَامْشُوا فِي مَنَاكِبِهَا وَكُلُوا مِنْ رِزْقِهِ

"It is He Who made the earth manageable for you. So travel through its tracts and enjoy of His sustenance." [TMQ: Al-Mulk: 15]

In this manner all the verses permitting the things have come as general. Their generality indicates the permissibility of all things. Thus, the permissibility of all things has come through the general speech of the Legislator. If a thing is forbidden then it must have a text that specifies the general evidence, thus indicating the exclusion of this thing from the general permission. Such as His ﷻ saying:

حُرِّمَتْ عَلَيْكُمُ الْمَيْتَةُ وَالدَّمُ وَلَحْمُ الْخَنزِيرِ وَمَا أُهْلَ لِغَيْرِ
اللَّهِ بِهِ وَالْمُنْخَنِقَةُ وَالْمَوْقُوذَةُ وَالْمُتَرَدِّيَةُ وَالنَّطِيحَةُ وَمَا
أَكَلَ السَّبْعُ إِلَّا مَا ذَكَّيْتُمْ وَمَا ذُبِحَ عَلَى النُّصُبِ

'Forbidden to you (for food) are: al-Maytatah (the dead animals -that have not been slaughtered), blood, the flesh of swine, and the meat of that which has been slaughtered as a sacrifice for other than Allah, or has been slaughtered for idol etc., or on which Allah's Name has not been mentioned while slaughtering, and that which has been killed by strangling, or by a violent blow, or by a headlong fall, or by the goring of horns, and that which has been (partly) eaten by a wild animal - unless you are able to slaughter it (before its death) - and that which has been sacrificed (slaughtered) on the Nusub (stone alters)'. [TMQ: Al-Ma'idah: 3]

Therefore, the origin of things is that they are permitted.

2- The Islamic *Shari'ah* contains rules for all past events, current problems and all possible incidents that may happen. Everything that has happened in the past or is happening at present or will happen in the future, each and every one of those matters has a rule in the *Shari'ah*. The Islamic *Shari'ah* encompasses all actions of man, completely and comprehensively.

He ﷺ said:

وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ تِبْيَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُدًى وَرَحْمَةً
وَبُشْرَىٰ لِلْمُسْلِمِينَ

'And We have sent down to you the Book (the Qur'an) as an exposition of everything, a guidance, a mercy, and glad tidings to those who have submitted themselves to Allah.' [TMQ: An-Nahl: 89]

He ﷺ said:

مَا فَرَّطْنَا فِي الْكِتَابِ مِنْ شَيْءٍ

'Nothing We have omitted from the Book.' [TMQ: Al-Anam: 38]

And He ﷺ said:

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتِمَمْتُ
عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

'This day, I have perfected your religion for you, completed My Favour upon you, and chosen for you Islam as your way of life (Deen).' [TMQ: Ma'idah: 3]

Thus the Islamic *Shari'ah* did not neglect a single thing from the actions of the humans whatever they may be. The *Shari'ah* either states an evidence for the action as a text in the Qur'an and the *Hadeeth*, or it places a sign in the Qur'an and the *Hadeeth* to indicate its aim (of the action) and the reason (*Illah*) of its (action) legislation; so that the *Shari'ah* rule applies to any and every action that includes that sign or that reason. It is not possible to find any human action that does not have an evidence or a sign that indicates its rule. This is due to the general meaning of His ﷺ saying, "*exposition of everything*", and due to the explicit text that Allah ﷻ has completed this *Deen*.

3- Based on the preceding discussion it becomes clear what is allowed for the Muslims to take from the other nations and peoples and what they are not allowed to take.

So all the thoughts relating to science, industry, inventions etc., and all the material forms resulting from science and its advancement and from industry and its progress, are allowed to be taken unless they contradict Islam. When they contradict Islam then it is forbidden to take them.

This is because all these thoughts relating to science, industry and inventions and all these material forms which result from them do not relate to belief or to the *Shari'ah* rules which solve the problems of man in life. Rather they are from the permitted things which man uses in his life's affairs.

The evidence for that is the general *Ayaat* mentioned regarding the permission for man to benefit from all things present in the universe. It is also due to what has been narrated by Muslim that the Prophet ﷺ said:

إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ إِذَا أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ أَمْرِ دِينِكُمْ فَخُذُوهُ
وَإِذَا أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ أُمُورِ دُنْيَاكُمْ فَإِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ .
رواه مسلم .

“Indeed I am only a human being like you. When I order you to do something from the 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 *Hadeeth* of cross pollinating the date palm:

أَنْتُمْ أَذْرَى بِشُؤُنِ دُنْيَاكُمْ .

“You are more knowledgeable about the matters of your world.”

It is also due to the fact that the Prophet ﷺ sent some of his companions to the Jurash of Yemen to learn how to make swords.

Therefore, everything that is not from the belief or from the (*Shari'ah*) rules 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, and the science of navigation, geography, and the science of economics which studies production, its improvement, initiating its 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, Darwin's theory which states that the origin of man is the monkey, this is not allowed to be adopted because it contradicts the saying of Allah ﷻ:

خَلَقَ الْإِنْسَانَ مِنْ صَلْصَالٍ كَالْفَخَّارِ

“He created man from sounding clay like pottery” [TMQ: Ar-Rahman: 14]

And His ﷺ saying;

وَبَدَأَ خَلْقَ الْإِنْسَانِ مِنْ طِينٍ ثُمَّ جَعَلَ نَسْلَهُ مِنْ سُلَالَةٍ مِنْ
مَاءٍ مَهِينٍ .

“And he began the creation of man from clay 'And made his progeny from the quintessence of despised fluid” [TMQ: As-Sajdah: 7-8]

And His ﷺ saying:

وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ أَنْ خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ تُرَابٍ

“Amongst His signs is that He created you from dust” [TMQ: Ar-Rum: 20]

Just as it is allowed to take these sciences, it is also allowed to take what results from them of industry, tools, machinery and material forms. So it is allowed to take all types of factories and all types of industry except factories, which make statues, alcohol and crosses because there are texts that prohibit them. Whether these industries are military or not, and whether these industries are heavy industry like tanks, aeroplanes, rockets, satellites and nuclear, hydrogen, electronic or chemical bombs, tractors, lorries, trains or steamships. Or whether they are light such as consumer industries and light weapons. Or the manufacture of laboratory instruments, medical instruments, agricultural tools, furniture, carpets and consumer products. All of this is allowed to be taken because they are from the permitted things whose permissibility has been brought by general evidences. Taking them will be an adoption of the *Shari'ah* rule, which is the *Mubaah*. It will also be following the *Shari'ah* of the Messenger ﷺ, because they are from the permitted things (*Mubaahaat*). The *Mubaah* is a *Shari'ah* rule from the commandments of Allah, which are: The obligatory (*al-Waajib*), the recommended (*Mandoob*), the forbidden (*Haraam*), the disliked (*al-Makrooh*) and the permitted (*Mubaah*).

4- As for the thoughts related to the 'Aqeedahhh and the *Shari'ah* rules, and the thoughts related to the culture of Islam and its viewpoint about life, and the rules which treat the problems of the humans, all of these must be according to the *Shari'ah*. They are not allowed to be taken except from the Islamic *Shari'ah*, i.e. from what has been brought by the revelation of the

Book of Allah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger and whatever they indicate to, namely the *Qiyas* (analogy) and the *Ijma'a* (consensus) of the *Sahabah*. They are categorically not allowed to be taken from anything else.

That is because:

a) Allah ﷻ has ordered us to take everything from the Messenger ﷺ and that we should stay away from what he has forbidden us. He ﷻ said:

وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا

“And whatever (Maa) the Messenger gives you take it, and whatever (Maa) he forbids you, abstain from it” [TMQ: Al-Hashr: 7]

The particle “*Mad*” is in the general form which obliges the adoption of everything the Messenger ﷺ has brought in terms of *Abkaam* (rules), and to stay away from everything he has forbidden us. The understanding (*Ma'foom*) of the *Ayah* is that we should not take anything other than what he ﷻ has brought.

b) Allah ﷻ has ordered the Muslims to obey Him and His Messenger when He ﷻ said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ

“O you who believe, obey Allah and obey the Messenger.” [TMQ: An-Nisa: 59]

The obedience to Allah and His Messenger cannot be fulfilled without acting upon and adopting the rules of the *Shari'ah*, which Allah revealed to His Messenger ﷺ.

c) Allah ﷻ ordered the Muslims to adhere to the judgement of Allah and His Messenger ﷺ. He also ordered them to refer to the Judgement of Allah and the judgement His Messenger in case of dispute or disagreement

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا لِمُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا
أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ

“It is not fitting for a believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by

Allah and his Messenger, to have any option about their decision.”
[TMQ: Al-Ahzab: 36]

And when He ﷻ said:

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ
ؤُمْنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ

“If you have a dispute over anything, then refer it to Allah and the Messenger, if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day.” [TMQ: An-Nisa: 59]

d) Allah ﷻ ordered His noble Messenger ﷺ to judge between people with what Allah ﷻ has revealed of the *Shari'ah*. And He ﷻ warned him about deviating from any part of this when He ﷻ said:

وَأَنْ أَحْكَمَ بَيْنَهُمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ
وَاحْذَرُهُمْ أَنْ يَفْتِنُوكَ عَنْ بَعْضِ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْكَ

“And so judge (you O Muhammad) between them by what Allah has revealed and follow not their vain desires, but beware of them lest they turn you far away from the some of that which Allah has sent down to you.” [TMQ: Al- Ma'idah: 48]

e) Allah ﷻ forbade the Muslims from taking anything from other than the Islamic *Shari'ah* when He ﷻ said:

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّى يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ

“But no, by your Lord, they can have no belief (Iman), until they make you the judge in all disputes between them.” [TMQ: An-Nisa: 65]

And when 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: An-Nur: 63]

And when He ﷺ said:

يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَحَاكَمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَنْ
يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ

“They wish to go for judgement (in their disputes) to the Taghut (false judges) while they have been ordered to reject them.” [TMQ:An-Nisa: 60]

And when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

مَنْ عَمِلَ عَمَلًا لَيْسَ عَلَيْهِ أَمْرُنَا فَهُوَ رَدٌّ .

“Every action that is not from our matter (Deen) is rejected.”

These texts clearly indicate the obligation of adhering to all of what the Messenger ﷺ brought. We do not permit anything other than what Allah has made permissible (Halaal), and we do not prohibit anything other than what Allah has prohibited (Haram). Whatever the Messenger ﷺ did not bring, we will not take it and whatever he did not prohibit we will not prohibit.

And since the particle “Maa” has been linked with His ﷺ saying:

وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ

“And whatever (Maa) the Messenger gives you” [TMQ: Al-Hashr: 7]

and His ﷺ saying:

وَمَا نَهَاكُمُ عَنْهُ

“And whatever (Maa) he forbids you.” [TMQ: Al-Hashr: 7]

And in His ﷺ saying:

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: An-Nur: 63]

The restriction to whatever the Messenger brought is manifestly clear. And that taking from anyone else is a sin and the one who does so will be punished. Allah ﷻ negated the belief (Iman) of those who refer for judgement regarding actions from anyone other than the Messenger ﷺ when He ﷻ said:

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّى 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: An-Nisa: 65]

This indicates the decisiveness of referring, for judgement, to whatever the Messenger ﷺ has brought. Not least because Allah ﷻ warned His Messenger ﷺ lest he be seduced by people from anything that Allah has revealed to him when He ﷻ said:

وَاحْذَرُوا أَنْ يَبْتَغِيَ غَيْرُكُمْ مِمَّا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْكُمْ .

“And beware that they might divert you away from anything that Allah has revealed to you” [TMQ: Al-Ma'idah: 49]

Moreover, the Qur'an censured those who wish to refer for judgement to anything other than what the Messenger ﷺ brought, i.e. they wish to refer for judgement to the rules of *Kufr*, when He ﷻ said:

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ آمَنُوا بِمَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا
أُنْزِلَ 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: An-Nisa: 60]

This indicates that referring for judgement to anything other than that which the Messenger ﷺ brought means going astray (*Dhalaal*). This is because it constitutes referring for judgement to the *Taghut*, i.e. to *Kufr*, which Allah ﷻ ordered the Muslims to reject.



Therefore, it is not allowed to take the Western culture and what emanates from it of systems and laws because it contradicts with the culture of Islam; except the administrative systems and canons, which are from the *Mubahaat* and are allowed to be taken, as 'Umar b. al-Khattab took the *Dawawin* from Persia and Rome.

The culture (*Hadharah*) of the West is based on the creed of separating religion from life and separating religion from the state.

Whereas the Islamic culture (*Hadharah*) is based on the Islamic Creed and it obliges that the life and state should be run by the commands and prohibitions of Allah, i.e. the *Shari'ah* rule.

The Western *Hadharah* is established on the basis of benefit and it makes benefit the criterion of all actions. That is why it is a culture (*Hadharah*) 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 values.

Whereas the *Hadharah* of Islam is established on a spiritual basis, which is the belief (*Imaan*) in Allah, that makes the *Halaal* and *Haraam* the criteria of all actions in life and governs all the actions and values according to the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ.

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

Whereas the Islamic *Hadharah* views happiness as the attainment of Allah's Pleasure (*Ridwaan*) and to organise man's instincts and organic needs in accordance with the *Shari'ah* rules.

Therefore it is not allowed to adopt the democratic ruling system, capitalist economic system or the general freedoms present in Western countries. Thus democratic constitutions and laws, and the monarchical and republican ruling systems, usurious banks, stock markets and world money markets, none of these are allowed for us to take because they are all systems of *Kufr* and laws of *Kufr* which contradict with the rules and systems of Islam.



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

This is because the communist *Hadharah* is established on the basis of the creed that there is no Creator for this universe, and that matter is the origin of things and that all things in the universe result from it through the dialectic materialism.

Whereas the Islamic culture (*Hadharah*) is established on the fact that Allah is the Creator of this universe and that all things existent in it are created by Him. And that He ﷻ has sent Prophets and Messengers to the whole of mankind and that He enjoined on them to follow what Allah has revealed to them in terms of commands and prohibitions.

The communist *Hadharah* takes the view that the system must be taken from the means of production. Thus, in the feudal society the axe was the means of production, and from this the feudal system was taken. When society evolved to capitalism the machinery was the means of production, and from this the capitalist system was taken. Thus, its system is taken from dialectic materialism.

Whereas the Islamic *Hadharah* takes the view that Allah ﷻ has given man a system to guide his life. And He ﷻ sent our master Muhammad ﷺ with this system and he conveyed it to the people and he 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.

Whereas the Islamic *Hadharah* views that the *Halaal* and *Haraam*, i.e. the

commands and prohibitions of Allah, are the criteria of actions in this life. Thus the *Halaal* is acted upon and the *Haraam* is left, and none of them changes or evolves. These criteria is not affected by benefit or materialism. Rather they are determined by the *Shari'ah*.

Therefore, there is a complete contradiction between the communist culture and the Islamic culture. That is why it is not allowed to take it just as it is not allowed to take any of its thoughts nor any of its systems.

Thus it is not allowed to take the idea of dialectic materialism or the abolition of the concept of private property or the idea of abolishing the private ownership of land. Similarly as it is not allowed to take the idea of the deification of people or the idea of worshipping people, or any other thoughts of this atheistic culture, for they are all systems and thoughts of *Kufr* that contradict with the creed, thoughts, systems and rules of Islam.



Now we examine democracy, to demonstrate its complete contradiction with Islam, in the source from which it came, the creed from which it emanated, the basis on which it has been established and the thoughts and systems it has brought. The source from which democracy came is man. The sovereign in democracy to which reference is made for judgement on actions and things as pretty (*Husn*) or ugly (*Qabih*) is the mind. The origin of this 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 was thus laid down by people, and the judge (sovereign) in it was the human mind.

As for Islam, it is the opposite of this. Islam is from Allah, which He revealed to His Messenger Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah ﷺ. He ﷺ said:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ، إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

"Nor does he utter of his own desire. It is no less than Inspiration sent down to him"
[TMQ: An-Najm: 3-4]

And He ﷻ said:

إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ فِي لَيْلَةِ الْقَدْرِ

"We have indeed revealed it (this message) in the night of power"
[TMQ: Al-Qadr: 1]

The sovereign to which reference is made for judgements is only Allah ﷻ i.e. the *Shari'ah* and not the mind. The function of the mind is restricted to understanding the texts that Allah ﷻ has revealed. He ﷻ said:

إِنَّ الْحُكْمَ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ

"Indeed, judgement (Hukm) is only for Allah" [TMQ: Al-Anam: 75]

And He ﷻ said:

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

"And if you were in dispute in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger ﷺ" [TMQ: An-Nisa: 59]

And He ﷻ said:

وَمَا اخْتَلَفْتُمْ فِيهِ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَحُكْمُهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ

"Whatever it be wherein you differ, the decision thereof is with Allah."
[TMQ: Ash-Shura: 10]



As for the Creed from which democracy emanated, it is the creed of separating religion from life and the separation of religion from the state. This is the creed that is built on the compromise solution between the Christian clergy who used to be utilised by the kings and emperors and used as a means for the exploitation and oppression of the peoples, and sucking their blood in the name of religion, and those who want everything to be under their subjugation in the name of religion - and the philosophers and thinkers who rejected religion and the authority of the clergy.

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

This creed was the intellectual principle on which the West built its thoughts and from which its system emanated. And on its basis their intellectual orientation and their viewpoint about life were determined. And from this creed democracy emanated.

As for Islam, it is completely contrary to this. It is based on the Islamic 'Aqeedahh which obliges that all affairs of the life and state are directed by the commands and prohibitions of Allah, i.e. by the *Shari'ah* rules that emanate from this creed. Accordingly, man has no right to devise his system, rather it is incumbent on him to proceed according to the system devised for him by Allah ﷻ.

On the basis of this creed the culture (*Hadharah*) of Islam has been established and its viewpoint about life has been determined.



As for the basis on which democracy is established they are two:

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

Democracy allowed the people possessing their own will and the right to exercise it, rather than kings and emperors. It is also the people who execute this will. Since the people had the sovereignty and possessed the will and exercised it, they came to possess the legislation, which is an expression of their practise and execution of their will, just as it is an expression of the general will of the masses. They undertake legislation via the representatives that they elect so that they can legislate on their behalf.

They have the right to legislate any constitution, system or law and they have the right to abolish any constitution, system or law according to what they deem as beneficial. They have the right to change the ruling system from a monarchical one to republican system and vice versa just as they have the right to change the republican system from a presidential system to a parliamentary system and vice versa. This is what happened, for example, in France, Italy, Spain, and Greece, where the systems of ruling were changed from monarchy to republican and from republican to a monarchy.

They also have the right to change the economic system from being capitalist to socialist and vice versa. Through their representatives they legislated the permissibility of apostatising from one religion to another or to no religion at all. Just as they legislated the permissibility of fornication, homosexuality and earning money from it.

Since the people are the source of authority, then the people choose the ruler they want, in order to apply the legislation they have made, and to rule them with it. They have the right to remove the ruler and put another one in his place. They are the ones who possess the authority and the ruler derives his authority from them.

As for Islam, sovereignty is for the *Shar'a* and not for the *Ummah*. Allah ﷻ is the only Legislator; the *Ummah*, the whole of it, does not possess the right to legislate even one single rule. If all the Muslims met and agreed to permit usury (*Riba*) so as to revive the economic situation; or if they agreed to allow special places for fornication so that it does not spread among the people; or if they agreed to abolish private property or the obligation of fasting to enable an increase in production; or if they agreed the adoption of general freedoms which leave the Muslim with the freedom to believe in the creed he wants, and leave him to increase his wealth using all the means of growth, including the prohibited means, and which allow him the personal freedom to enjoy his life however he wishes in terms of drinking alcohol and committing fornication. This agreement of the *Ummah* would have no value and would not be equal, in the view of Islam, even to the wing of a gnat. If a section of the Muslims undertook any of this, then they would be fought until they reverted from this. Thus, the Muslims are restricted in all actions of life to the commands and prohibitions of Islam. It is not allowed for them to do any actions which contradict the rules of Islam, just as it is not allowed for them to legislate even a single rule. Therefore, Allah ﷻ is the only Legislator. He ﷻ said:

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّى يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ

"But no, by your Lord, they can have no Iman (faith), until they make you the judge in all disputes between them" [TMQ: An-Nisa: 65]

And He ﷺ said

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ آمَنُوا بِمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا
أُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَحَكَّمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ
أُمِرُوا أَنْ يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ

“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?” [TMQ: An-Nisa: 60]

Referring for judgement to the Taghut constitutes referring for judgement to other than what Allah has revealed, i.e. it is referring to the rules of Kufr made by man. He ﷺ said:

أَفْحَكَمَ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ يَبْغُونَ وَمَنْ أَحْسَنُ مِنَ اللَّهِ حُكْمًا لِقَوْمٍ
يُوقِنُونَ

“Do they then seek the judgement of (the Days of) Ignorance (Jahiliyyah)? And who is better in judgement than Allah for a people who have firm belief?”
[TMQ: Al-Ma'idah: 50]

The rule of Jahiliyyah is the rule which the Messenger ﷺ did not bring from his Lord, it is the rule of Kufr legislated by man. He ﷺ 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: An-Nur: 63]

Opposing his ﷺ order, which He ﷺ has warned of, is following what man has legislated and leaving what the Messenger ﷺ has brought. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

مَنْ عَمِلَ عَمَلًا لَيْسَ عَلَيْهِ أَمْرُنَا فَهُوَ رَدٌّ .

‘Whosoever does an action and it is not from our matter (Deen) then it is rejected’. What is meant by “our matter” in the Hadeeth is Islam.

There are definite *Ayah* and *Ahadeeth* which clarify that sovereignty is for the *Shar'ah*, and that Allah ﷻ is the legislator, that it is not allowed for man to legislate and that they are obliged to conduct all their actions in this life according to the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ.

Islam gave the Muslims the task of implementing the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ. Implementation of the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ requires an authority to implement them. Therefore, the authority has been given to the *Ummah* i.e. the right to choose the ruler so that he may implement the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ. This is taken from the *Ahadeeth* of the *Bai'ah* which gave the right of appointing the Khaleefah to the Muslims through the pledge on the Book of Allah and the *Sunnah* of the Messenger ﷺ. He ﷺ said:

مَنْ مَاتَ وَلَيْسَ فِي عُنُقِهِ بَيْعَةُ يَمِينَةِ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ

“Whosoever dies without a Bai'ah on his neck he will die the death of Jahiliyyah”; 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 صَفَقَةَ يَدِهِ وَثَمَرَةَ قَلْبِهِ فَلْيَطِيعْهُ إِنْ
إِسْتِطَاعَ فَإِنْ جَاءَ آخَرُ بَنَازَعَهُ فَاضْرِبُوا عُنُقَ الْآخَرِ .

“He who pledged his Bai'ah 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. as-Saamit said:

بَايَعْنَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى السَّمْعِ وَالطَّاعَةِ
فِي الْمَكْرَهِ وَالْمَنْشَطِ .

‘We gave Bai'ah to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to hear and obey in weal and woe’. There are many other *Ahadeeth* which clarify that the *Ummah* is the one who appoints the ruler via the *Bai'ah* on the Book of Allah and the

Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ.

Even though the *Shar'a* gave the authority to the Muslims to delegate someone to rule them via the pledge (*Bai'ah*), it did not give them the right to remove the ruler as in the democratic system. This is due to the presence of authentic *Ahadeeth* which oblige the obedience to the Khaleefah even if he is unjust, but as long as he does not order a sinful action. It is narrated by Ibn 'Abbas, who said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

مَنْ رَأَى مِنْ أَمِيرِهِ شَيْئًا يَكْرَهُهُ فَلْيَصْبِرْ فَإِنَّهُ مَنْ فَارَقَ
الْجَمَاعَةَ شِرًّا فَمَاتَ فَمِيتَتُهُ جَاهِلِيَّةٌ .

'If anybody sees in his Amir something which displeases him, he should remain patient, for he who separates himself from the authority of Islam (Sultan) by even so much as a handspan and dies thereupon, he dies the death of the days of ignorance.' It is narrated by 'Awf b. Maalik, who said: "I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say:

(... وَشِرَارُ أَيْمَتِكُمُ الَّذِينَ تُبْغِضُونَهُمْ وَيُبْغِضُونَكُمْ
وَتَلْعَنُونَهُمْ وَيَلْعَنُونَكُمْ . قَالَ : قُلْنَا يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ أَفَلَا
تُنَابِذُهُمْ عِنْدَ ذَلِكَ ؟ قَالَ : لَا ، مَا أَقَامُوا فِيكُمْ الصَّلَاةَ ،
أَلَا مَنْ وُلِّيَ عَلَيْهِ وَالٍ فَرَأَاهُ يَأْتِي شَيْئًا مِنْ مَعْصِيَةِ اللَّهِ فَلْيَكْرَهُ
مَا يَأْتِي مِنْ مَعْصِيَةِ اللَّهِ وَلَا يَنْزِعَنَّ يَدًا مِنْ طَاعَةٍ .

'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 then declare war on them?' He ﷺ said: '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 withdraw his hand from obeying the ruler.'" Establishing the prayer means ruling by Islam, by mentioning part of Islam (*Salah*), but meaning all of it.

It is not allowed to rebel against the ruler except when he displays *Kufr* *Buwaah* (clear *Kufr*) as mentioned in the *Hadeeth* of 'Ubaadah b. as-Saamit

regarding *Bai'ah*, which said that;

((... فَبَايَعْنَاهُ فَقَالَ فِيمَا أَخَذَ عَلَيْنَا أَنْ بَايَعْنَا عَلَى السَّمْعِ
وَالطَّاعَةِ فِي مَنْشَطِنَا وَمَكْرَهِنَا وَعُسْرِنَا وَيُسْرِنَا وَأَثَرُهُ عَلَيْنَا
وَأَنْ نُنَازِعَ الْأَمْرَ أَهْلَهُ إِلَّا أَنْ تَرَوْا كُفْرًا بَوَاحًا عِنْدَكُمْ مِنَ
اللَّهِ فِيهِ بُرْهَانٌ))

"The Messenger of Allah ﷺ invited us so we pledged our Bai'ah to him to hear and to obey, in weal and woe, in ease and in hardship and evil circumstances and that we would not dispute with the people in authority, unless you witness flagrant Kufr of which you have a conclusive proof from Allah."

The body that possesses 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 which must be eliminated. It is also a matter that needs to be proved before a judge. The court of unjust acts is the body which passes judgement regarding the elimination of injustices in the Islamic state, and its judge is the one who has the mandatory powers to prove the unjust act (*Mazleme*) and pass judgement regarding it. That is why the court of unjust acts is the body which will decide whether such a matter has taken place or not, and it will decide the matter of removing the Khaleefah.

Democracy is the rule of the majority and legislation of the majority. Thus the selection of rulers, members of representative councils, members of institutions, authorities and bodies will take place according to the majority. Just as the enactment of legislation in parliaments and taking decisions in councils, authorities, institutions and bodies are all done according to the majority opinion.

In Islam the issue is quite different:

Legislative matters do not depend on the opinion of the majority or the minority. Rather, they depend on the *Shari'ah* texts because the legislator is only Allah ﷻ. The one possessing the mandatory powers to adopt the laws necessary to look after the affairs of the people and to administer the ruling

is exclusively the Khaleefah. Thus he adopts the rules from the *Shari'ah* texts found in the Book of Allah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger, based on the strongest evidence through a correct *Ijtihad*. The Khaleefah is not obliged to refer to the *Majlis al-Ummah* or to adopt their opinion regarding the rules they wish to legislate, even though that is allowed for him. The Rightly Guided *Khulafa'a* used to refer to the *Sahabah* to adopt their opinions when they wanted to adopt a rule. This happened with 'Umar b. al-Khattab when he wanted to adopt a rule regarding the lands conquered in ash-Sham, Egypt and Iraq. He consulted the Muslims regarding this matter.

If the Khaleefah refers to the *Majlis al-Ummah* to take their opinion regarding rules, which he wants to adopt, the opinion of the *Majlis* is not binding on him even, if it is a consensus or majority opinion. The Messenger ﷺ did not submit to the opinion of the Muslims who opposed the treaty of al-Hudaybiyyah - and they numbered many - he rejected their opinion and continued to conclude the treaty and told them:

((إِنِّي عَبْدُ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولُهُ وَلَنْ أُخَالِفَ أَمْرَهُ))

“Verily, I am the servant of Allah and his Messenger. I shall never disobey His order.”

And the Noble *Sahabah* made an *Ijma'a* that the *Imaam* has the right to adopt specific rules and to order that they be acted upon. It is obligatory on the Muslims to obey him and leave their own opinions. From this fact the following well known principles have been derived: “The order of the *Imaam* resolves the dispute”; “The order of the *Imaam* is implemented openly and secretly”; “It is for the *Sultaan* to pass decrees according to the problems that occur.” Not to mention that Allah ﷻ ordered obedience to those in authority when He ﷻ said:

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ

“O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger ﷺ and those in authority (*ulul amr*) from amongst you.” [TMQ An-Nisa: 59]

Those in authority (*ulul amr*) are the rulers.

The technical and intellectual matters that require expertise, thought,

scrutiny are treated just like legislation. Consideration in these matters is given to the accuracy and not to the majority or minority. So in military matters, recourse is made to military experts. In *Fiqhi* (jurisprudence) matters reference is made to the *Fuqaha* and *Mujtahideen*. In issues related to medicine, specialist doctors are consulted. In matters regarding engineering, the renowned engineers are referred to. In intellectual matters, the distinguished intellectuals are consulted, and so on and so forth. The consideration in such matters is given to the correct opinion and not to the majority. The correct opinion is taken from where it is expected to exist, and that is the people of expertise and not the majority.

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

As for the matters which can be done without the need of study or contemplation, then such matters are decided according to the majority opinion, because the majority understand it and can easily voice their own opinion regarding it in accordance with what they deem as beneficial. For example: 'Do we elect such and such person or not? Shall we go out (to fight for example) or not? Shall we travel in the morning or at night? Shall we go by aeroplane, ship or train?' Such matters are understood by everyone and they are able to give an opinion about it, so the view of the majority in this regard will be recognised and adopted and will be binding. The evidence for this is what happened with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the *Sahabah* in the battle of Uhud. The Messenger ﷺ and the senior *Sahabah* took the view that they should not leave Madinah, whilst the opinion of most of the *Sahabah*, especially the youth, was that they should go out to meet Quraysh

outside Madinah. The opinion revolved around whether to go out or not.

Since the majority took the view that they should go out and fight, the Prophet ﷺ took their view and left the opinion of the most senior *Sahabah*, and he went out to Uhud to meet the Quraysh.



The idea of having general freedoms is one of the most prominent thoughts brought by democracy, and they are considered one of its important foundations, since through them the individual is able to exercise his will and execute it as he wishes, without force or compulsion. The people will not be able to express their general will unless the general freedoms are available to all individuals.

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

The general freedoms which democracy brought do not mean the liberation of the colonised peoples from the colonialist states that colonise them, exploit their wealth and plunder their resources, because the idea of colonialism is one of the results of the freedom of ownership, which democracy has brought.

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

Rather the general freedoms mean the four freedoms and they are:

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

These general freedoms in their four categories are not present in Islam. A Muslim is bound in all his actions by the *Shari'ah* rules and he is not free in any action. There is no freedom in Islam, except the freedom of liberating slaves from bondage, although slavery came to an end a long time ago.

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



Freedom of belief in the democratic system means that man has the right to believe in the creed he wishes and he has the right to profess the religion he likes without compulsion or pressure. Similarly he has the right to leave his creed and religion and move to another new creed and religion, or he has the right to move to no religion at all. He has the right to do all of this with the utmost freedom, and without any compulsion or pressure. So the Muslim has the right to change to Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism or communism with complete freedom, and without the state or anyone else having any right to prevent him from doing so.

On the other hand, Islam forbids the Muslim from leaving the creed of Islam, or to apostatise to Judaism, Christianity, Buddhism, communism or capitalism. The one who apostatises from Islam is asked to repent; if he returns he will remain in Islam and if he does not repent his wealth is confiscated and he is separated from his wife, then he is killed. He ﷺ said:

مَنْ بَدَّلَ دِينَهُ فَاقْتُلُوهُ .

“Whosoever changes his religion kill him!”

If the *Murtaddeen* (apostates) are a group and they persist in their apostasy, then they are fought until they return, otherwise they are exterminated. This is what happened with those who apostatised after the death of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, where Abu Bakr fought them fiercely until those of them who were not killed returned back to Islam.



Freedom of expression in the democratic system means that the individual has the right to carry any opinion or thought, whatever this opinion or thought may be; and he has the right to express any opinion or thought; and he has the right to call for any opinion or thought with the utmost freedom and without any limit or restriction, whatever this opinion or thought may be. He has the right to express this using any available means, and 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. So anything that bans the carrying of an opinion or expressing it or calling for it is considered a violation of the freedom.

As for Islam, the issue is different. The Muslim is bound in all his actions and sayings by what the *Shari'ah* texts have brought. He is not allowed to do any action or make any statement unless the *Shari'ah* evidences have allowed that. Accordingly, the Muslim has the right to carry any opinion, make any statement and call for any opinion as long as the *Shari'ah* evidences allow it. However, when the *Shari'ah* evidences forbid him from doing this, then the Muslim is not allowed to carry, say or call for such opinion, and if he does so he will be punished. Thus the Muslim is restricted, in terms of carrying, speaking and calling for an opinion, by the *Shari'ah* rules. He is not free in this regard.

Islam obliges that the truth is spoken at all times. Hence, in the *Hadeeth* of 'Ubaadah b. as-Saamit regarding the *Bai'ah*,

(...) وَأَنْ نَقُولَ بِالْحَقِّ حَيْثُمَا كُنَّا ، لَا نَخَافُ فِي اللَّهِ لَوْمَةً
لَا نَمُ)

“...and we (pledged to) speak the truth wherever we are, and in serving Allah we should fear none.”

Islam also obliges the Muslims to oppose 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 كَلِمَةُ حَقٍّ عِنْدَ سُلْطَانٍ جَائِرٍ

“The best jihad is the word of truth spoken to a tyrant ruler.”

And 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:

كَلِمَةُ حَقٍّ عِنْدَ سُلْطَانٍ جَائِرٍ .

“a word of truth spoken to a tyrant ruler.”

He ﷺ also said:

سَيِّدُ الشُّهَدَاءِ حَمْزَةٌ وَرَجُلٌ قَامَ إِلَى إِمَامٍ جَائِرٍ فَنَصَحَهُ
فَقَتِّلَهُ .

“The master of martyrs is Hamza, and a man who stood up to a tyrant ruler to advise him and was killed.”

Such an action is not freedom of opinion. Rather it is the adherence to the rules of the *Shari'ah*. It is the permissibility of expressing about an opinion in certain cases and the obligation of doing that in other cases.



Freedom of ownership in the democratic system - which is the freedom that resulted in the capitalist economic system and consequently created the idea of colonising people, plundering their wealth and looting their resources - means that man is firstly permitted to possess wealth and then to increase it using any means or manner. He has the right to own wealth and increase it using the style of colonialism, looting of wealth and stealing the resources of the colonised peoples, by hoarding, speculation, usury, excessive fraud, deception, gambling, fornication, homosexuality, the use of a woman's femininity, and also through the manufacture of alcohol, its sale, and by bribery and other such means.

Islam, on the other hand, contradicts this freedom in terms of the rules of ownership of wealth. It fights the idea of colonising people and the idea of plundering their resources and seizing their wealth, just as it fights the idea of usury (*Riba*) whether with compound interest or simple interest. Thus usury (*Riba*), in all of its forms, is prohibited. Islam has defined the means of ownership of wealth, the means of its growth and the manner in which it can be spent, and it prohibited all other means. It obliged the Muslim to adhere to these means of owning wealth, of increasing this wealth and the manner in which this wealth is spent. The Muslim is not left free to spend as he wills. Rather, he is restricted to the rules legislated for him and he has been forbidden from owning wealth and increasing it through looting, plunder, theft, bribery, usury, gambling, fornication, homosexuality, fraud, deception, excessive fraud, manufacture of alcohol or its sale, the use of a woman's femininity, and other such forbidden means of possession or increase of possession.

All of these are forbidden means of owning and increasing wealth. Any wealth acquired via these means is forbidden for the Muslim to own, and the one who does this will be punished.

Thus it becomes clear that there is no freedom of ownership in Islam. Rather, the Muslim is restricted in his ownership and spending of wealth by the *Shari'ah* rules which *Shar'a* brought, and he is not allowed to violate such rules.



The personal freedom in the democratic system 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 to make it lose its entity and cohesion. It is the freedom in whose name all the grave offences are committed and all the prohibited things become permitted. It is the freedom, which has led Western societies to become animalistic societies that have disgraced man and brought the people to a level worse than cattle and animals.

This is the freedom, which decided that it is the right of man to conduct his personal behaviour and life in the form he pleases, with absolute freedom and without the state or anyone else having any right to prevent him from any conduct or behaviour he wants. It is the freedom which permitted for him fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, alcohol, nudity, pursuit of any type of work however base it may be, with the utmost freedom and without any limit, restriction, nor any compulsion or pressure.

The rules of Islam completely contradict with 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 has prohibited. If he were to commit any such prohibited actions he would be sinful and he will be severely punished.

Islam forbade fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, alcohol, nudity and other grave offences; and for each offence it has determined a deterrent punishment.

It also ordered the Muslims to acquire virtues, morals and the commendable characteristics, and made the Islamic society to be one of

purity and integrity and a society of high values.

From all that we have discussed previously, it is extremely clear that the Western culture (*Hadharah*), values and Western viewpoint about life, Western democracy and the general freedoms, all completely contradict with Islam and its rules. 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, that it is *Shura*, that it is enjoining the good and forbidding the evil and that it is accounting the rulers.

In fact *Shura*, enjoining good and forbidding evil and accounting the rulers are *Shara'i* rules which Allah (Glorified and Exalted be He) legislated, and ordered the Muslims to adopt and adhere to as *Shara'i* rules. Whereas democracy does not constitute any *Shara'i* rules, and nor is it from the legislation of Allah ﷻ, rather it is from the invention and legislation of man.

It is other than the *Shura*. *Shura* is to voice one's opinion, while democracy is a viewpoint about life. It is the legislation of constitutions, systems and laws, which man makes from his own mind, and which he legislates according to the benefit that his mind perceives, and not according to the divine revelation.

That is why it is forbidden for the Muslim to adopt it, call for it or establish parties on its basis, or to take its viewpoint about life, to apply it, to take it as the basis or source for the Constitution and laws or to make it a basis for education or objective.

It is obligatory on the Muslims to completely discard democracy. It is filth. It is the rule of *Taghut*. It is *Kufr*, thoughts of *Kufr*, systems of *Kufr*, laws of *Kufr*, which have no connection to Islam whatsoever.

It is also obligatory on them to implement and enforce the whole of Islam in life, state and society.

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

“And whoever contradicts and opposes the Messenger 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: An-Nisa: 115]

This book was completed by the help and grace of Allah ﷻ on Sunday on the 3rd of Zul Q'ida 1410AH corresponding to 27 May 1990.