

STRIKING BAATIL

"In reality, We (Allah) strike baatil (falsehood) with the Haq. It then smashes out the brains of baatil. And, lo, it (baatil) suddenly disappears."
(Qur'aan)

Al-Haq

21 Rabiuth Thaani 1443 – 26 November 2021

THE BAND OF HAQ

"There will ever remain a band from my Ummah fighting on the Haq until the Day of Qiyaamah. Those who oppose them and those who do not aid them, will not be able to harm them."
(Hadith)

P.O. BOX 3393 - PORT ELIZABETH - 6056 - SOUTH AFRICA

Page | 1

MUSLIM CITIZENS IN NON-MUSLIM COUNTRIES

Question

Please comment on the following statement made by a modernist:

"It is a settled Shariah principle that a Muslim citizen residing in a modern non-muslim constitutional state, based on the rule of law, enters into an explicit or tacit agreement with the state, in terms of which he or she is obliged to obey all neutral laws and regulations, enacted in the public interest, which fall within the very wide category of mubah or what is described as merely permitted or neutral matters, examples are traffic and town planning laws."

The modernist backs up his claim with a reference from Ad-durul Mukhtaar which says: "...Because obedience to the Imaam in things which are not sinful is Fardh. The action of the Imaam centres on expediency." The objective of the modernist is to convince Muslims that it is a requirement of the Shariah for them to obey the government's corona protocols, and if they disobey, they will be sinful.

Is this correct in terms of the Shariah? Will a Muslim who disobeys the laws of the kuffaar country of which he is a citizen be deemed sinful in terms of the Shariah?

Answer

The brains of the modernist is convoluted with kufr, hence he is not blessed with the bounty of brain-application. What he has disgorged in his statement is rubbish. It is clear that this chap is a bootlicker of the kuffaar. With his bootlicking, he seeks to appease his kuffaar masters with his egregious misinterpretation of the texts of the Shariah.

The statement which the moron has ripped out of *Ad-Durrul Mukhtaar* has no relationship with a kuffaar state. It applies to an Islamic state, and none of the present Muslim lands governed by kuffaar regimes is an Islamic state, not even

Afghanistan where currently the “Taliban” have treacherously betrayed the Ummah by violating their Covenant with Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The “*Imaam*” mentioned in the quote by the moron modernist refers to the Khalifah or the Sultan or the Haakim of an Islamic state. It does not refer to the president or regime of a non-Muslim country or to any of these tyrannical plastic regimes in Muslim countries. It is absolutely preposterous to even hallucinate that it is **Fardh** for a Muslim to obey man-made laws, and disobeying such laws being sinful, thereby making him liable for Jahannam in the Aakhirah. The consequence of disobeying Fardh is Jahannam, and its denial is kufr. Therefore, in terms of the stupid theory of the jaahil modernists Muslims who disobey the ‘neutral’ laws of those who wallow in kufr and janaabat are destined for Jahaanam, while the kufr entity of the country only views such infraction with relative insignificance, which could be rectified by payment of a monetary fine.

Thus, in terms of the convoluted logic of the moron modernist, a Muslim who denies and rejects the hallucinated *fardhiyat* of traffic and town planning laws enacted by those who wallow in *janaabat*, *najaasat* and *kufr* becomes a *murtadd*. This is the tacit conclusion based on his moronic ‘fardh’ ascription to manmade laws of the kuffaar.

Also, the term *fardh* in the context of the statement cited from *Ad-Durrul Mukhtaar* does not have the technical Fiqhi meaning. It merely conveys the importance and essentiality of obeying the MUSLIM IMAAM in all rules/laws which are permissible in Islam and formulated in the interests of the Ummah. Disobedience of such laws enacted by even the Imaam of the Islamic state is not sinful if not oppressive. Disobeying zulm of even the Khalifah is never punishable nor castigatory. But, disobeying even the beneficial ‘neutral’ laws of a kuffaar entity is not punishable in the Aakhirat. The appellation of ‘fardh’ assigned to obedience in this context is the effect of substance abuse.

While *Ad-Durrul Mukhtaar* is concerned with the Imaam of an Islamic State, the moron rips out a Shar’i issue from its context to apply it to a “modern non-Muslim constitutional state”. The descriptive term, ‘modern’ in the context used by the jaahil is laughable. Just how does western ‘modernity’ fit into the puzzle created by the chap? A kaafir state, whether ‘modern’ or non-modern, whatever this may mean, is Darul Kufr/Harb. Today all kuffaar states and all Muslim lands governed by the murtaddeen and kuffaar are ‘modern’ since the era of the Middle Ages has become antique eons ago.

At least this modernist jaahil who has set himself up as a ‘mujtahid’, has saved his skin from the fatwa of kufr by predicating the obedience to “neutral laws and regulations” which are presumed to be such enactments which are not in conflict with the Shariah. At least he grudgingly and tacitly acknowledges that it is

Islamically permissible to disobey such laws of the kufr state which are in conflict with the Shariah.

No one has any issue with compliance with ‘neutral’ rules and regulations which are not in violation of the Shariah, and which are designed for the benefit of the people. However, despite the beneficial objectives of such rules and regulations, whimsical and wilful disobedience is not sinful in terms of the Shariah. Thus, his claim that the Muslim “*is obliged to obey*” such laws should not be understood to mean that it is technically *Waaajib*, and that disobedience of such manmade laws is sinful.

The modernist moron, dwelling in confusion states that the Muslim citizen living in a non-Muslim state “*enters into an explicit or tacit agreement with the state*” to obey all the trash enacted by the state. Here the fellow mentions two opposites: *explicit* and *tacit*. What are his grounds for claiming the existence of an explicit agreement between Muslim citizens and the state? On the basis of which document of obedience, which sacrament of allegiance do Muslim citizens pledge obedience, the violation of which will render them fussaag and denial kuffaar? The moron should explain the basis for claiming that there exists an *explicit* agreement.

In a bid to cover his moronity, he paradoxically says “*or tacit*”. What is the basis for even this hallucinated *tacit* or implied agreement? The reality is that there is no agreement whatsoever with the state, neither explicit nor tacit. Just as all non-Muslims in the non-Muslim state are citizens, Muslim of a “modern non-Muslim constitutional state” are also citizens. Citizens are not outsiders. They are not in the country on the basis of temporary visas. There are not in the category of the *Musta'min* (one who enters Darul Kufr with a visa).

Muslims born in the country, just like all other non-Muslims, are citizens by virtue of their birth in the land. They are not citizens by virtue of some agreement and acceptance by the government installed by the population. The government is supposed to be the servant of the citizens although practically these institutions have become oppressors and brutal tyrants. Muslim citizens are not the recipients of a favour bestowed to them by the government. Citizenship is their natural attribute and status which cannot be extinguished by even gross rebellion, leave alone infractions pertaining to the ‘neutral’ rules and regulations.

If the outsider Muslim who is not a citizen of darul kufr, knows that he will be required/compelled to act in conflict with the Shariah in the non-Muslim state, then it will be haraam for him to enter with a visa. The principle of *Laa ghadra fi daaril harb* (There is no treachery in darul harb), applies to a Muslim who acquires permission (a visa) from the kuffaar state to visit daarul kufr. This Muslim is obliged to obey all the laws which the moron describes as “neutral”,

that is, such laws which are not in conflict with the Shariah. If he is requires to submit to haraam, then it will be haraam for him to visit daarul kufr/harb.

But germane to Muslim citizens in the non-Muslim state, the issue of *ghadr* does not apply. It is perfectly permissible to adopt measures to save oneself from the *zulm* (*oppression and injustice*) of the state. Such action which the government regards as unlawful will not constitute *ghadr* in terms of the Shariah. Some of our greatest Fuqaha and Aimmah Mujtahideen living in Darul Islam under the rule of a valid Ameerul Mu'mineen had also sided with the rebels to displace the existing Khilaafat, e.g. the Khilaafate of Bani Umayya with the Khilaafate of Banu Abbaas. And this they did despite the Shariah having been fully implemented by the Ameerul Mu'mineen of the time, despite the State being a properly constituted Darul Islam.

These Fuqaha who were also Auliya of high rank understood the Laws of the Qur'aan and Sunnah which a million moron modernists will never be able to comprehend even if they are reborn. The moron should tell the baboons in the mountain regarding the '*fardhiyat*' of obeying kuffaar regimes on the basis of some hallucinated 'explicit' or 'tacit' covenant. He will find even baboons ridiculing his *jahaalat*.

The moron modernist has fabricated his stupidity on the basis of hallucination due to perhaps substance abuse. He is clearly a bootlicker, and the objective of life of all bootlickers is the haraam boodle which is the focus of the existence.

Insha-Allah, as time permits, the other stupidities of the moron shall be rebutted.