

No Title: Was Islam ever implemented throughout its history?

Due to the current situation of the Muslims, it is natural that the Ummah would start looking for a solution to its problems and dedicate its resources in order to alleviate itself from the catastrophes that confront it. In its efforts to solve its problems, it is also natural that the Muslim Ummah would realize that Islam is the only solution because it is deeply rooted in the minds of Muslims and embodies the history, language, culture, and sentiments of the Muslim Ummah. As a result of such a realization, the Muslim Ummah would naturally work to bring Islam back into existence.

Today, more Muslims are beginning to return to their Islamic roots, and the Muslim Ummah is exerting a tremendous amount of energy and resources in order to change its situation. In their attempts to create a revival, those movements who are working to reestablish Islam have faced, and will continue to face, two important and central issues:

I) Was Islam ever implemented throughout its history? & Did Islam define a political system?

II) Was Islam Implemented Throughout Its History?

I) Was Islam ever implemented throughout its history? Did Islam define a political system?

The contemporary view states that Islam was implemented for only a few years during the era of Muhammad (saaw), after which the implementation of Islam ceased to exist. Those who adhere to such a view believe that, immediately after the death of Muhammad (saaw), the Generation of the Sahabah was one of turmoil, executions, and chaos followed by oppression and tyranny at the hands of successive generations no different than the oppression facing the Muslims today. Based on this notion, it would be impossible to even think of implementing Islam in the 20th century because the Sahabah - the best generation of Muslims, the generation whom Allah (swt) praised in the Qur'an and whom Muhammad (saaw) described as akin to the stars in the sky, the generation responsible for transmitting and preserving the Qur'an and the Sunnah - failed miserably in their implementation of Islam.

With such a feeling pervading the Muslim Ummah, the question comes: If the Sahabah, the best generation of Muslims, failed in their implementation of Islam, then what is the use of Islam? If the Muslim Ummah has prejudged that Islam cannot be implemented, then the natural tendency would be to forget about the comprehensive system of Islam and dismiss it as a pipe dream, and instead cling to the rituals and the individualistic aspects of Islam. As a result, the Muslims would never have the initiative to implement the Shariah. Islam would remain in the Qur'an and the Sunnah while impotent in the affairs of life, Muslim lands would always remain under occupation, the Muslim Ummah would continue to be subjugated by other systems and ideas, and the world would continue to suffer from Islam's absence.

Regarding the political system of Islam, Fahmi Huwaydi, one of the "Islamist" writers who is widely revered and respected by the Muslim world and the Islamic movements, quotes the following in the publication *Al-Majalla*, December 17, 1995 issue:

"Every individual wishes that the term *Khilafah* maintains its bright image, particularly the *Khilafah Rashida*, which manifested the Islamic dream and symbolized the bright age of Islam...But the Muslim mind will never perceive it as neither part of the Deen nor the ultimate shape of the political system in Islam because, according to the unanimous agreement of the experts, Islam did not define any shape in the political system. Islam put more emphasis on the values and on the foundation of ruling such as freedom, *Shura*, and enjoining *Al-Ma'ruf* and forbidding *Al-Munkar*. After that, Islam is not concerned about the framework which would apply these concepts. Those who talk about one head of state, one army, one central authority without boundaries, didn't bother to look under their feet and ask: how, when, and where?"

"Yes, the hope of bringing *Khilafah* back remains a legitimate dream for every Muslim, but this legitimacy will be aborted when those who are calling for this dream insist on redrawing the map of the globe the way it was fourteen centuries ago... Furthermore, because they started upon a destructive simplification, they don't talk about advanced shapes that will join the Islamic states

together, such as a Confederacy of Islamic unions similar to the European Community, or establishing mutual economic or military interests in gradual stages. Instead, those who dream of Khilafah make the issue of Khilafah full of fanciful and baseless talk as well as force us to deal with it as a form of entertainment, useless chatter and downright nonsense.

"Those who make their concern and their issue to reestablish the Khilafa Rashida mock us and cheat us whether they mean it or not. They mock us because history does not repeat itself. And they cheat us because they retreat from, and waive themselves of, any responsibility to the reality by withdrawing from the minefields surrounding the Islamic work and by flying in the air trying to catch the impossible."

Abdul-Qader 'Auda, another renowned and respected scholar wrote, in his book, *The Legal System of Islam* (Vol. 1, pp. 290-291):

"Some would think that dividing the world into Dar-ul-Islam and Dar-ul-Kufr requires that the Muslim countries be under one rulership. This assumption is baseless. The Islamic theory is not built based on the pretense of one government but rather on the basis of what Islam wants. And Islam wants all Muslims to be one hand under one direction and taken care of by one policy. The most simple picture to achieve this is to have all Muslim lands under one government, but this is not the only shape that fulfills the objectives of Islam. It is possible to achieve those goals while we have many countries and states in Dar-ul-Islam as long as they follow one direction and one policy. Islam does not contradict with the political system of the United States, or of the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth, and the systems currently established in the Arab World."

Such excerpts reflect the general sentiments among the Muslims that Islam did not define a political system aside from just emphasizing some concepts, such as Shura, justice, equality, and brotherhood, and that any system that observes and implements these concepts can be called Islamic. Based on such a notion, the current regimes in the world, or any other manmade political structure, whether it is a monarchy, a parliamentary system, or a theocracy, could potentially meet the criterion of an Islamic political system as long as they establish the general concepts emphasized by Islam. As a result, Islam would remain a simplistic religion that would easily be absorbed into the existing world order and would leave no tangible effects in the global political arena.

Many scholars, books, publications, and movements have tried to answer these questions, but the ambiguity and faulty information have only exacerbated the confusion, and the issues remain unresolved without a correct answer. As long as these issues remain unanswered and full of distorted facts, the Muslim Ummah will persist in its belief that Islam has no well defined political system and that the implementation of Islam is mission impossible. As a result, the need to answer these questions becomes a paramount issue and a vital step for the Muslim Ummah to reconstruct its outlook towards Islam and to restore its ideological and political initiative.

Did Islam define its political system?

Major political systems

Many political systems of varying shapes have existed around the world. Muslims and Non-Muslims have mistakenly used these systems in order to categorize the Islamic Political system. The confusion in distinguishing Islam from other systems and in defining the political structure of Islam necessitates an overview of the political systems that have existed or continue to exist:

Democratic:

Many of the governments of the Western world have a democratic structure that gives sovereignty to the people. The Democratic system itself manifests in several forms. In the Presidential system such as in the United States, the sovereignty belongs to the people, who elect the president, Congress, Judges, and various other representatives to govern them on their behalf. The Republican

system consists of a republic that represents the people and organizes the society's affairs. The Constitutional Monarchy consists of a King who delegates his sovereignty to the people through the parliament.

As a reaction to the oppressive theocracies of the European Middle ages, the Democracies that emerged delegated the authority to the people and divided that authority into the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial branches to safeguard against the emergence of a centralized authority that could possibly evolve into a dictatorship.

Absolute Monarchy/Dictatorship:

In this system, the sovereignty belongs to the King or to a single individual who holds absolute power. These systems still exist in the Gulf states, Jordan, and some parts of Africa.

Theocracy:

The Theocratic system gives sovereignty to the clergy whose are considered divine. The justification for such a notion comes from the saying of Jesus in the Bible: "Whatever you decide in the Earth will be decided in the Heavens, whatever you tie in the Earth will be tied in the Heavens, and whatever you untie in the Earth will be untied in the Heavens." The government justifies its existence on the basis that they are the shadow of God on Earth, and they cannot be questioned as a result. Such a system existed in Europe during the Middle Ages.

Empire:

The Imperial political system consists of many nations with different cultures and ethnicity's held together by force or coercion. The center or capital possesses a bulk of the power and wealth, while the surrounding regions are looked at as subservient to the central authority. The citizens of the capital or center are considered privileged and possess a special status, while those who live elsewhere under the jurisdiction of the empire are considered inferior under the law. Many empires existed in the past, such as the Roman and Persian Empires, and more recently the British Empire, but today no such political system exists.

Federation/Confederation:

Confederations are voluntary associations of independent states that agree to certain restrictions on their freedom of actions and establish a limited central authority to secure some common purpose. Federations refer to a group of states that establish a central executive authority to implement policies or supervise joint activities.

The Uniqueness of Islam

The question that comes after surveying the various political systems of the world: What makes Islam different and unique from all other systems? One individual would observe that, in a monarchy, the ruling is inherited by the ruling family, while the ruling is not inherited by Islam. ' Umar (ra) refused the request by the Companions of the Prophet (saw) to nominate his son as the next Khalifah. Another individual would claim that the President has a limited term in a Republic, whereas the Khalifah has no term limit as long as he rules by Islam. Both examples are correct and valid, but the underlying difference that distinguishes Islam from all other systems lies in the issue of sovereignty.

All of the systems other than the Islamic political system share a commonality among them by giving sovereignty to a human being, whether to one individual or to the people. Islam maintains its uniqueness in this regard by stating that the sovereignty belongs only to Allah (swt).

- In Islam, Allah (swt) is the sole source of legislation, and nobody has the right to legislate, delete existing laws, or modify the Shariah in any manner.
- All Muslims, both citizens and rulers, submit to the Islamic Laws in their totality.

- Islam bestowed the authority upon the Ummah to select a ruler who assumes a well defined function: To implement the legislation that came from the Sovereign Lord, Allah (swt).

An abundance of evidences from the Qur'an and Sunnah exist that clearly establishes this fundamental principle. For instance, Allah (swt) says:

The ruling is for none but Allah [Yusuf 12, 40]

And to Allah belongs the Ghayb of the Heavens and the Earth, and to Him return all affairs [Hud 11, 123]

Although such a principle is simple and clearly defined in Islam, it cannot be overlooked because there exist many people who liken the Islamic State to a dictatorial theocracy in which the Khalifah acts as "God's viceroy on Earth" and possesses Divine authority that cannot be questioned or held accountable. In the Islamic State, the Khalifah has neither the sovereignty nor the authority, nor is he God's Shadow, infallible, or above criticism. Many individuals intentionally or inadvertently distort the functioning of the Islamic State by claiming that it means "The ruling of the Mullahs."

In the Islamic State, Islam rules, the sovereignty belongs to Allah (swt), and Allah (swt) has delegated the Muslim Ummah with the authority to rule by Islam. In order to carry out this function, the Muslims are obliged by Islam to select one Khalifah to assume the responsibility of implementing Islam, and they pledge full obedience to him only as long as he assumes the task of implementing the Islamic Laws that the Muslim Ummah selected him for. Once he steps outside the boundaries of his position and begins implementing non-Islamic rules, the same sovereign, Allah (swt), has obliged the Muslims to disobey him, to remove him, and to replace him with another person who would assume the responsibility of ruling.

In a theocratic state, the government or ruling party acts as the representative of God on Earth, and all sovereignty and authority belong to it, no matter what constitution or policies the government adopts. The theocratic governments are not selected by the people because the people have no authority, and, as a result, they impose themselves upon the people and force the obedience from the people. Also, the theocratic system claims to be the spokesman for God, and as such, whatever legislation and policies are adopted by the government are binding upon the people. In Islam no one can stake such a claim because it is established that Muhammad (saaw) was the last person to ever speak on Allah's (swt) behalf, and he left behind the Islamic Shar'iah contained in the Qur'an and the Sunnah as Allah's (swt) Constitution for all humanity. All the decisions, laws, codes, systems, thoughts, and canons are derived and extracted solely from the Islamic texts, and the Khalifah is assigned by the Muslims to implement those laws and codes.

The Islamic Political System also differs from a dictatorship or a monarchy because the dictatorial and monarchical systems give the sovereignty and the authority to a single human being or to a select few. The monarch or dictator has complete sovereignty to legislate, based upon his own initiative, as well as the complete authority to implement those laws. In the Islamic State, the Khalifah does not have the sovereignty as this belongs to Allah (swt), and the Khalifah must submit to Allah (swt) and is bound by the Islamic Shar'iah. Also, the Khalifah has no authority to begin with, but is given the authority conditionally by the Muslim Ummah to rule by Islam. Unlike a monarchy or a dictatorship, the Khalifah has complete authority only as long as he rules by Islam and implements the Islamic Laws, whereas the monarch or the dictator can implement any law that he wishes or deems fit. The Islamic system differs from a monarchy because the Khalifah is not selected based on heredity, nor is the position or ruling inherited. The Ummah selects the Khalifah based upon its decision that such a candidate meets the criterion established by Islam and that he possesses the qualifications to assume the post of ruling.

The Islamic State, and in particular the Ottoman State, has been mistakenly associated with an empire. In the empire, the various people are held together by coercion and force, whereas in the

Islamic State, people of different ethnic backgrounds were bonded together by the Islamic Creed and shared the Islamic Culture. If force and coercion were applied throughout the Muslim world, then the people would abandon Islam after the ruling system was abolished. However, throughout the history the people willingly embraced Islam and adhered to Islam even after the Islamic Ruling System was dismantled, to the extent that the same people are fighting to reestablish the Islamic Rule. In the empire, a special status is conferred to the center and its inhabitants, while the Islamic State considered all the regions as part of the State rather than subservient to the center. Also, the Islamic rules were applied equally in every part of the Islamic State including its capital, and everyone was considered a citizen of the Islamic State without any special status given to anyone. Moreover, the Islamic Political System has no resemblance to a Federation or a Confederation because the Islamic State consists of Wilayaat (regions) which are not autonomous and are centralized under the authority of the Khalifah.

In addition, the Islamic Political system has many checks and balances as well as internal mechanisms that ensure that the rulers carry out their delegated functions and implement the Islamic rules. Islam obliges the Muslims to have at least one party (Hizb) to hold the rulers accountable based on Islam and to maintain the Islamic thoughts and political awareness amongst the public, as Allah (swt) commands:

Let there arise out of you a group of people inviting to Khayr (Islam), enjoining Al-Ma'ruf (what Islam allows and commands), and forbidding Al-Munkar (what Islam prohibits). [Al-Imran 3:104]

Also, the Prophet (saw) emphasized this obligation when he stated in one Hadith,

"By Him in Whose Hand my soul is, you must order what is Al-Ma'ruf (what Islam allows and commands) and you must forbid what is Al-Munkar (what Islam prohibited), otherwise Allah will send His punishment upon you. And then if you pray to Him (to ask Him), He would not answer you."

Islam has also mandated the Muslims to establish a Consultative Assembly, or Majlis-as-Shura, in order to hold the rulers accountable and to advise the rulers. And the Court of Unjust Acts, or Mahkamat al-Madhalim, oversees cases between the people and the State and has the power to dismiss the Khalifah from his post if he does not rule by Islam. No such system of checks and balances exists in a theocratic state or a dictatorial system. Based upon such conclusive evidence, it would be impossible for anyone to conclude that the Islamic political system bears any resemblance to a theocracy, a dictatorship, an empire, or any other system. Such clearly established principles negate the possibility of claiming that Islam did not define its political system as unique. Yet, because of the misunderstandings that still exist among some circles, such a point, to some persons, would not suffice and demands a more extensive explanation.

Islam's Definition Of Politics

In spite of the systematic campaign to suppress any notion of politics in Islam, the evidences to prove that Islam specified a unique and well-defined political system remain abundant, based upon several facts:

Islam is a comprehensive way of life that covers every facet of human existence, from the relationship between the individual and Allah (swt) to various relationships among human beings that define the shape of the social framework. In the Qur'an, Allah (swt) says:

Today I have completed your Deen [Al-Ma'ida 5, 3]

It (the Qur'an) is not a forged statement but a confirmation of Allah's existing Books, and a detailed explanation of everything. [Yusuf 12, 111]

Because the Qur'an has confirmed that Islam is a complete system, then, as a system, it must include a structure to organize all the affairs of life. The political structure of any system constitutes

the most vital aspect of the system because it provides the practical mechanism that will enable any idea to be realized in the sphere of application. Without a political system to organize its affairs, any society would fall into chaos. It would seem impossible to imply that Islam is a complete way of life, yet leave a vacuum regarding the political structure. By the same token, it would seem impossible to conclude that Islam defined explicit rules for performing the prayer, using the bathroom, organizing the family, marriage & divorce, inheritance, explaining every minute detail using very specific terms and definitions, and to simultaneously conclude that Islam did not define the political structure without which Islam would never materialize as a system or as a way of life.

If the Muslims believe that Allah (swt) is perfect in all of His attributes and affirm that the Qur'an is the speech of Allah (swt) by saying "Sadaqallahu al-Adheem (Allah speaks the truth)" after every recitation, then how can the Muslims, after reciting the Ayat that affirm that Islam is complete and contains everything, claim that Islam left the political system undefined? Stating such a claim implies either that Allah (swt) made such claims but forgot to include the political structure, or that Allah (swt) made a miscalculation by leaving Muhammad (saaw) with an unfinished message, or that Allah (swt) told a lie (ma'adullah !!). Any person who believes in Islam yet proclaims such nonsense should acknowledge the implications of his ideas and seriously question them.

Muslims believe that the ultimate sovereignty belongs to Allah (swt). Because the rules that Allah (swt) legislated are contained in the Qur'an and Sunnah, the Muslims, as a fundamental aspect of believing in Islam, must submit their thoughts, feelings, and judgments to the Hukm Shar'ii. The Qur'an mentions the topic of ruling in numerous places:

O you who believe, obey Allah, His Messenger, and those in authority over you. [An Nisa'a 4, 59]

Whosoever doesn't rule by what Allah has revealed, they are the Disbelievers

[Al-Ma'ida 5, 44]

Whosoever doesn't rule by what Allah has revealed, they are the Oppressors.

[Al-Ma'ida 5, 45]

Whosoever doesn't rule by what Allah has revealed, they are the Transgressors. [Al-Ma'ida 5, 47]

And rule them by what Allah has revealed, and follow not their vain desires

[Al-Ma'ida 5, 49]

Such Ayat clearly establish the obligation of the Muslims to govern according to the Hukm Shar'ii. It would seem inconceivable that Islam would mandate upon the Muslims to establish Islam and then leave the political system with its explanation and details ambiguous or non-existent.

The Sunnah of Muhammad (saaw) also describes the political system in depth. Some individuals claim that the Sunnah does not constitute a source of legislation or is secondary to the Qur'an in authority. Both claims have no validity because the Qur'an establishes the Sunnah as a source of legislation as well as a primary source with the same authoritative weight as the Qur'an. In several places, Allah (swt) in the Qur'an commands the Muslims to obey the Messenger:

It is not for a believer, man or woman, when Allah and His Messenger have made a decision, that they should have any option in their decision. And whoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he has indeed gone astray

[Al-Ahzab 33, 36]

But no, by your Lord, they can have no faith until they make you (O Muhammad) judge in all disputes between them, and find no resistance against your decisions, and accept them with full submission [An Nisa'a 4, 65]

And whatsoever the Messenger gives you, take it, and whatsoever he forbids you, abstain from it [Al-Hashr 59, 7]

The Sunnah is a part of the revelation itself because Muhammad (saaw) is guided by Allah (swt) in delivering the message. In the Qur'an, Allah (swt) states,

Nor does he speak of his own desire. It is only an inspiration that is inspired

[An-Najm 53, 3-4]

Those who claim that the Sunnah does not constitute a source of Hukm Shar'ii are outside the pale of Islam because the Qur'an affirms the Sunnah as a source of Islamic legislation.

Allah (swt) commanded Muhammad (saaw) in the following Ayah's:

And establish the Salat (prayers) and give Zakat... [Al-Baqarah 2, 43]

And proclaim to mankind the Hajj [Al-Hajj 22, 27]

O you who believe! Fasting has been prescribed to you as it was prescribed to those before you, that you may become Al Muttaquun (the pious).

[Al-Baqarah 2,183]

And so rule between them by what Allah has revealed and follow not their vain desires... [Al-Maidah 5, 49]

These Ayat speak of praying, fasting, giving Zakat, performing Hajj, and ruling, as well as ordering Muhammad (saaw) to perform these acts. They do not mention the details and the methods of praying, fasting, performing Hajj, or ruling, yet Muhammad (saaw) performed all of these actions in a specific way that is narrated in the Seerah and documented in many Ahadeeth. For Muslims, all these Ayat have the same legislative value because they came from the same Qur'an which was revealed by the same Creator, Allah (swt), and their explanations have the same legislative value because they came from the same Sunnah. The way Muhammad (saaw) prayed is an obligation, as well as the way he fasted, made Hajj, gave the Zakat, and ruled.

Muslims perform the canonical & supererogatory prayers, make Hajj, give the Zakat, and fast exactly the way Muhammad (saaw) explained in the Sunnah, taking into account every movement and meticulous detail. When it comes to the ruling aspect, the same person begins making excuses, justifications, and theories to justify their claims that Islam left the ruling ambiguous or that Islam did not define the ruling structure, or that it is a better left unturned, for its mere discussion would lead to "Fitna". The Muslims, as believers in Allah (swt) and followers of Muhammad (saaw) must take Islam in its entirety, as Allah (swt) said:

O you who believe! Enter into Islam completely and follow not the footsteps of Satan. [Al-Baqarah 2, 208]

The Muslims cannot take the Ayat in the Qur'an that speak to praying, fasting, Zakat, and Hajj, and follow the ahadeeth that describe the way Muhammad (saaw) performed these acts, while ignoring those Ayat and ahadeeth that oblige the Muslims to rule by Islam and describe how Muhammad (saaw) ruled, unless they wish to be like those whom Allah (swt) described:

Then do you believe in a part of the Book and reject the rest? What is the recompense of those who do so among you, except disgrace in the life of this world, and on the Day of Resurrection they shall be consigned to the most grievous torment. [Al-Baqarah 2, 85]

The Prophet (saw) mentioned in many ahadeeth the details of the political system that would come after him as well as the methodology by which the Khalifah would assume his position:

Abu Hurayra reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said,

"Bani Isra'eel were ruled by their prophets. Whenever a prophet died, another prophet succeeded him, but there will be no more prophets after me. There will soon be Khulafah and there will be many. 'O Messenger of Allah, what shall we do ?' asked the Companions. He replied, 'Fulfill the Bay'aa given to them one after another, and give them their dues...' (Bukhari and Muslim)

Imam Muslim reported on the authority of Abu Sa'eed Al-Khudri that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said,

"When the Bay'aa has been given to two Khulafah, kill the latter of them." (Muslim)

Imam Muslim reported on the authority of 'Abdullah Ibn Amru Ibn ul 'Aas that the Messenger of Allah (saaw) said,

"Whosoever gives a Bay'aa to an Imam giving him the clasp of his hand and the fruit of his heart should obey him as long as he can, and if another comes to dispute him you must strike the neck of that man." (Muslim)

"...whosoever dies without a Bay'aa (to a Khalifah) on his neck dies a death of Jahiliya." (Muslim)

The mentioned Ahadeeth clearly point to the Khilafah as the political system of Islam and designate the Khalifah as the head of the Muslims. In addition, they describe the Bay'aa as the method for appointing the Khalifah, the obligation of giving a Bay'aa upon every Muslim, as well as the conditions upon the Bay'aa. Many other Ahadeeth also describe the function of the Khalifah, the process of removing a Khalifah and the conditions for doing so:

Abu Huraira narrates that the Prophet (saw) said,

"The Imam is a shield behind which the Muslims fight and get protected." (Al-Bukhari)

Ibn 'Umar narrates:

"The Prophet (saw) said, 'It is obligatory for one to listen to and obey (the Muslims ruler's orders) unless they order one in disobedience; but if an act of disobedience is imposed, one should not listen to or obey it.'" (Al-Bukhari)

'Auf bin Malik narrates:

"The Messenger of Allah (saw) said, 'The best of your rulers are those whom you love and who love you, who invoke Allah's blessings upon you and you invoke His blessing upon them. And the worst of your rulers are those whom you hate and who hate you and whom you curse and who curse you.' It was asked, 'Shouldn't we overthrow them with the help of the sword?' He said, 'No, as long as they establish the Salat among you.'" (Muslim) In this Hadith, the word Salah indicates the rule by Islam.

'Ubada ibn as Samit narrates,

"The Messenger of Allah (saw) called us and we took the oath of allegiance to him. Among the injunctions he made binding upon us was, 'Listening and obedience (to the Ameer) in our pleasure and displeasure, in our adversity and prosperity, even when somebody is given preference over us, and without disputing the delegation of powers to a man duly invested with them, until you see clear Kufur of which you have a clear proof from Allah.'" (Muslim)

Based on these Ahadeeth, the Muslims are obliged to obey the Khalifah as long as he rules by Islam. The Sunnah also explains that the Muslims must disobey and remove the rulers if they implement Kufur.

The Seerah, being a documented account of the life of the Prophet (saw), also explains the political system of Islam by outlining the methods and means by which the Prophet (saw) established and maintained the political system. Two instances documented in the Seerah explain the method for appointing a Khalifah:

- When Muhammad (saaw) approached the tribe of Banu 'Amr asking for the authority (Nussrah), they asked him, "Would we have the authority after your death?" He (saw) replied, "This belongs to Allah," indicating that the decision to select a Khalifah resides with the Muslim Ummah.
- When the Ansar gave Muhammad (saaw) the authority, they were asked, "Do you know on which terms you are giving pledge to this man?" They replied, "Yes, we know," and then asked Muhammad (saaw), "If we fulfill this pledge, what will we get in return?" The Messenger of Allah said, "Al Jannah," further indicating that, after his death, it is up to the Ummah to select a Khalifah.

After the death of Muhammad (saaw), the Sahabah deferred the burial of his body and convened for a period of time (two or three days, depending on the narration) to select the next Khalifah who would succeed the Prophet (saw) in the position of ruling. Afterwards, they selected Abu Bakr, who immediately resumed the post and assumed the functions of the head of state. Because the Sahabah lived with the Prophet (saw), had the best understanding of the Deen, and served as the mechanism that transferred the Qur'an and the Sunnah throughout the generations, and because Allah and His Messenger (saaw) both praised them, their unanimous consensus provides a source of legislation. From their understanding of the Prophet's (saw) actions, the Sahabah unanimously consented that selecting the Khalifah is a vital issue, to the extent that they deferred the burial of the Prophet's (saw) body.

After Abu Bakr left, he nominated 'Umar as the next Khalifah, after which the Sahabah selected 'Umar and gave him the Bay'aa. Before 'Umar died, he chose six persons and asked them to select the Khalifah from amongst themselves, after which they selected 'Uthman. Later, after 'Uthman's assassination, the Sahabah selected 'Ali as the next Khalifah. Throughout their generation, the Sahabah consistently applied the Qur'an and the Sunnah by selecting the Khalifah who performed his delegated functions of implementing the Shar'iah and carrying Islam to the world.

Islam defined a political system and gave the Muslims the authority to elect a Khalifah. Because all Muslims share one creed, the Islamic 'Aqeedah, then Islam is one and no two Islamic States will exist. Once the Khalifah assumes his position, he extracts the rulings and canons solely from the Islamic Shar'iah because the sovereignty belongs to Allah (swt) and the Islamic system has no legislative body. In this way Islam established the foundation of the political system upon very clear precepts: The sovereignty belongs to Allah (swt), the authority belongs to the Ummah, the leadership in Islam is one, and only the Khalifah can adopt the Ahkam Shar'iah.

Muhammad (saaw) ruled with a specific system based upon this foundation and assigned certain persons to carry out the functions of the state. He chose deputies to assist him in running the affairs of the state and consulted with the Sahabah and his wives on certain issues. Muhammad (saaw) also settled disputes and selected judges to carry out the judicial functions of the society, and he led the army and chose others to command the army at specific times. He (saw) also selected certain people to assume the administrative functions of the state as well as executed foreign policy by sending delegations and signing treaties with other rulers.

After Muhammad (saaw) died, the Sahabah immediately carried all of these functions and positions within the same context that Islam defined. In terms of its foundation, its overall structure, as well as its details, Islam explicitly defined all aspects of the political system.

All of the evidences clearly show that Islam outlined a political system, defined its structure and shape in extensive detail, as well as delineated a practical method for establishing and maintaining the political system through the Sunnah of the Prophet (saw).

The Current Situation

The immediate question that emerges is: If this issue is very clear, then why do many Muslims claim that Islam did not define the political system? The roots of the current intellectual crisis that pervades the Muslim Ummah did not occur haphazardly and suddenly. Since the Crusades, the

West initiated a methodical ideological and cultural invasion with the sole aim of alienating the Muslims from Islam and eliminating Islam as a political entity. Such a campaign was well-defined and systematic and addressed specific issues aimed at undermining Islam, such as the notion that Islam has no political system. After many centuries of confrontation, the West succeeded in reconstructing the Muslim mentality, to the extent that Muslims began to debate the validity of Islam itself while aspiring to the Western culture ideas with adoration.

To maintain their success, the West worked on a very clever policy: After eliminating Islam and installing their puppets, the West, on the political front, suppressed the emergence of a real democratic system from surfacing in any Muslim countries while applying the Capitalist economic system in its full capacity throughout Muslim lands. The imperialist nations have striven to maintain this status quo because the implementation of a real democratic system would give the Ummah to express its opinion. The Ummah's opinion is very clear: It wants Islam. In many instances when the Muslims were afforded the ability to vote, they would select the "Islamists" regardless of their agenda. Should any opportunity to express its opinion present itself, then what happened in Algeria as well as in many other countries would replicate itself throughout the entire Ummah, opening the door for the Ummah to reestablish Islam as a political force in the world. Currently no opportunity exists for the Muslim Ummah to present itself upon its platform. The current world order is very keen on allowing any outlet for the Muslim Ummah to have its own independent policy.

Alongside the oppressive regimes, the West adopted the Capitalistic economic policy, ensuring that the Muslim lands would serve as no more than a market for the West to fuel its economy and a dumping ground for Western culture. Through this policy, the West made sure that the Muslim world would never free itself from Western control.

As a result of the cultural and intellectual invasion of the West, the Muslim Ummah views Islam as a spiritual, ritualistic, & individualistic religion indistinguishable from Judaism or Christianity. Khatibs can stand at the pulpit and describe minute aspects of 'Ibadah and the individualistic aspects of Islam with ease and grace, but when topics such as the political or economic systems are raised, the same Khatibs reply with vague, abstract terms that have little or no practical significance. When any talk of Islam from a systemic perspective materializes, the Muslims refuse to accept the concepts and, instead, begin to throw red herrings & engage in a play on words to appease the Ummah.

The West ensured that the Muslims, by their own initiative, would refuse central concepts such as the Islamic political system, to the degree that when the Khilafa's death certificate was signed in 1924, a scholar and Azhar graduate named Ali Abdel Raziq immediately issued a book claiming that Muhammad (saaw) never acted as ruler, imam, judge, or political leader, and that Khilafah is not a part of Islam at all. He also claimed that the Muslims would convene and choose any political system to take care of their worldly affairs, but emphasized that Islam is exclusively for the individual and such a political system would not constitute a part of Islam. After issuing the book, Al Azhar issued a Fatwa calling for the destruction of his certificate and claiming that he is out of Islam. In spite of Azhar's response, that book was published immediately after the death of the Khilafah, leading one to conclude that the publishing of such a book was precisely timed to coincide with the destruction of Khilafah.

Since the elimination of the Islamic State, tides upon tides of lectures, publications, curricula, and movements have materialized in order to further distort Islam and to keep the Islamic concepts dead in the minds of the Muslims. And every day, a new book is published that creates another justification to validate the false claim that Islam has no political system. Some of these claims state flatly that Islam has no politics, while others try to beat around the bush and state that Islam speaks to politics but not in any detail, or that Islam is separate from politics, or that Islam and politics can

neither be separated nor mixed together, or that Islam didn't define the details of the ruling system, or that Islam has a political system but is impossible to implement.

All of these justifications and claims serve one purpose: To convince the Muslims that Islam has no political system or didn't define one. Because the political system is the mechanism to implement Islam, then holding firmly to such a conviction would keep Islam dead as a system and keep the Muslim Ummah colonized ideologically, economically, and politically by others. Writers such as Huwaydi or any other writer who calls for the same ideas are considered a perpetuation of the Abdel Raziq's legacy. With the Ummah's rejection of Abdel Raziq's claim, the West & their agents strived to present the same ideas in a guise that the Ummah would readily accept. As a result, the entire Ummah has unknowingly absorbed such ideas, leading many persons to unknowingly clamor behind Abdel-Raziq's claims.

II) Was Islam Implemented Throughout Its

History?

An Ideological Perspective

In spite of the distorted portrayals of Islamic history, one aspect has maintained a constancy and clarity that no amount of twisting facts can conceal: Muslims progressed in all facets of life and performed many achievements throughout their history. For thirteen centuries since the birth of Islam, the Muslims expanded their rule to encompass virtually all of Asia and Africa, as well as large portions of Europe. The nations throughout the world willingly adopted Islam to the extent that the same people today - even in the absence of any Islamic culture for centuries - are at the forefront of the Ummah demanding the return of Islam. Throughout their history, the Muslims produced some of the greatest scientists, thinkers, and historians whose works and accomplishments are still marveled at and utilized today. Civilization under the Muslims flourished in all facets, citizens under Islamic rule thrived that even today's upper class would envy, and even the non-Muslims living in Europe who were at war with the Muslims documented that justice, peace, and wealth were the norm in Muslim lands.

The Muslims either achieved all of these feats without a system or under a specific system based upon a well-defined ideology. To claim that the Muslims performed all of these astonishing accomplishments in the absence of a coherent & comprehensive system contradicts reality. Any society without a system would live in perpetual chaos, turmoil, and confusion that would allow no room for progress of any sort. Before Islam, the Arabs were a loose conglomerate of warring tribes steeped in idolatry that had no significance in the world arena. From the time Islam was revealed, the Arabs rose from savagery and stagnation to the pinnacle of civilization, and, within a generation, the Muslims rose to a superpower that dominated the political currents of the world. Today, the Muslims, in the absence of any unique system or ideology, have stooped to the level of the pre-Islamic Arabs in spite of their vast resources. The Muslims could only have achieved such a dramatic social revolution that produced advancement in all walks of life for thirteen centuries under a specific system based upon a clear ideology, the absence of which has shackled the Muslim Ummah in a state of regression.

The system that the Muslims applied could either have been Islamic or Kufr. No one claims that the Muslims implemented Kufr during the Generation of the Sahabah, the Era of the Tabi'een, and the succeeding thirteen centuries. Such an idea does not exist in the works of any Muslim historian or scholar, no matter how grim or distorted his portrayal of Islamic history is. Today, with all of the resources of the Ummah, the Muslim nations are the most poverty stricken part of the world, and everyone agrees that Islam is not implemented today in any part of the world. The progression and advancement that Muslims accomplished for the past thirteen centuries could only have emanated from Islam's implementation.

Because Islam is deeply embedded in the culture and sentiments of the Muslims, a gap would exist between the people and the systems if Kufr was implemented, and such a conflict would stifle the possibility of any progression to take place, as the current situation shows. In addition, Islam is a spiritual-political creed in which both aspects are intertwined. The Qur'an that states,

He is the Ever-Living. La Ilaha Illa Huwa (None has the right to be worshipped but He), so invoke Him making your worship pure for Him Alone.

[Ghafir 40, 65]

is the same Qur'an that states,

And whosoever does not rule by what Allah has revealed, they are the Kafiroon (Disbelievers). [Al-Maidah 5, 44]

Islam is a complete system comprised of organic parts. Thus, even the partial implementation of the Islamic System would not function, let alone abandoning all of it.

Also, today's Muslims, particularly those living in the West, have noticed how, in just a generation, the Muslims are being assimilated into the non-Islamic societies in greater numbers. If Kufr was implemented upon the Muslims for thirteen continuous centuries, then it would be inconceivable to imagine that one billion Muslims spanning all ethnicities and nationalities would exist today as a result. After exploring all the avenues, the fact that the Muslims implemented Islam throughout their history remains the only possibility that supports the historical evidences and provides a realistic picture.

The Controversy

The West exerted a tremendous effort to alienate the Muslims away from Islam, employing several tactics in order to achieve this aim. Among their many maneuvers, they succeeded, through the Orientalists, in constructing a picture of the Islamic history as a grim era full of oppression and tyranny. As a result, many Muslims use such a scenario to counterattack any movement towards reestablishing Islam. In order to legitimize their arguments, they present two particular points. They bring the example of the Umayyads and claim that its rule was that of a monarchy; and they cite stories of problems and incidents that occurred in history, exaggerate them in scope, and use them to justify their claim that Islam was not implemented. Examining the validity of such claims requires a more thorough and exhaustive study of the history.

The Case Of The Bay'aa

Although the Khilafah remained with a single family during the time of the Umayyads and Abbasids, their ruling was not considered a monarchy for the following reasons:

- The sovereignty was never given to the Head of State, nor did the Head of State ever claim himself to be sovereign. Throughout the Islamic history, the Muslims always referred to the Hukm Shar'ii as the source of their legislation and not to any particular individual.
- The Office of the Khilafah was never conferred upon individuals solely on the basis of inheritance. Although the Khilafah remained within a single family for several generations at a time, such an incident does not constitute inherited ruling because the Bay'aa was always given. In a monarchy, the son of the King or the ruler, by sole virtue of his family relationship, would immediately assume the ruling position afterwards. During the Islamic history, no Khalifah was ever appointed or designated to his post without the Bay'aa. Those few who did assume the Khilafah without a Bay'aa performed an illegitimate seizure of power and were quickly removed.

Some persons quote the Hadeeth of the Prophet (saw) in which he mentions that after the Prophethood there will arise a Khilafa Rashida (rightly-guided Khilafah) followed by a biting rule, or Mulkan 'Adoodan. They claim that the Umayyads and later generations were monarchies

because even the Hadeeth mentions the word Mulkan, which is derived from Malik, or ruler. Such an argument is built upon a false interpretation because the word Mulk means "authority" and the word Malik can either mean "a ruler" in any context or "a ruler within a monarchy system." Thus, rulership does not immediately connote kingship or monarchy but can mean the rulership in any system. Allah (swt) mentions in the Qur'an:

So they routed them by Allah's Leave, Da'ud killed Goliath, and Allah gave him (Da'ud) the Mulk [Al-Baqarah 2, 251]

Nobody can claim that Da'ud was a king because he would have to declare himself sovereign, an impossible act for a prophet. In this context, Da'ud was given the authority to implement the revelation he received from Allah (swt), in the same manner that the Khalifah has the authority to rule only by Islam.

The controversy over the Bay'aa hovers around the incident in which Mu'awiya took the Bay'aa on his son, and such an incident is used to justify the claims that monarchical rule followed the generation of the Sahabah. Such a conclusion results from failing to distinguish between misapplying the rules and abandoning them altogether. Mu'awiya's case demonstrates a misapplication of the Shar'iah in which the Bay'aa was taken in the wrong manner. Furthermore, Mu'awiya based his understanding on Abu Bakr's actions when he nominated 'Umar before the termination of his Khilafah. In the same manner, Mu'awiya selected his son. Although Abu Bakr asked the opinions of the Muslims as opposed to Mu'awiya, such an act does not indicate that Mu'awiya abandoned the Shariah because the Bay'aa was still taken.

Also, Mu'awiya understood that giving the Bay'aa ahead of time and having the ruler select the next Khalifah would save Muslim blood from fighting and tension as a result of a political vacuum left by the Khalifah's absence. The Muslims at the time just experienced a period of tension and turmoil as a result of the political void left by the assassinations of Uthman and 'Ali. Such an experience would undoubtedly have had a profound effect upon the thinking of the later Muslims, to the extent that they would mistakenly misapply the Bay'aa by selecting the Khalifah in advance to safeguard themselves from the emergence of another political vacuum. In spite of the misapplication, the Bay'aa was given consistently throughout the thirteen centuries of Islamic rule. Thus, the case against the Bay'aa has no basis for claiming that Islam was not implemented.

The Case Of History Books

To legitimize their claims that Islam was not implemented during its history or that Islam cannot be implemented, some individuals refer to incidents described in history books that portray life under Islamic rule as a dismal existence in which oppression, misery, and persecution were the norm. In reality, these books often follow the footsteps of the Orientalists whose career was to attack & undermine Islam from every angle. The contents of such books point to isolated incidents that do not speak for the Ummah or the general state of affairs, and cannot be used to develop a clear picture of the society and the contemporary events that faced it. Many of these sources, if not all of them, are plagued with distorted facts and inflated statistics.

Moreover, such books contradict common sense. For instance, Khalifah Haroon al-Rashid is often the target of malicious attacks by these books that accuse him of a myriad of crimes - ranging from adultery to alcoholism to theft - as well as portray him as a tyrannical despot who sponsored mass executions and ruled the people with an iron fist. Yet the same Khalif Haroon - who spent alternating years performing Hajj and waging Jihad, who built a water transport system that the Saudi regime cannot build today with their wealth and resources, and who saw the Islamic civilization rise to its zenith under his reign - was also nicknamed "Al-Rashid" and called the "Sixth Guided Khalifah." Many other contradictions and distortions are found in such books that aim only at undermining Islam and presenting a distorted picture.

The Muslim Ummah must take the initiative and objectively reexamine its history by scrutinizing its sources. No longer can the Muslims afford to dwell on the dark images and continue to repeat the Orientalists' attacks. Islamic history remains a history full of glimmering achievements and a shining example of civilization that portrayed humanity as a society of unparalleled justice, mercy, and advancement for thirteen centuries.

A Historical Perspective

Throughout its history, the Islamic State implemented the Islamic System in its entirety based upon several evidences:

- In the numerous books of Fiqh produced during the Islamic rule, the Fuqahah discussed relevant issues for the purpose of applying them in the society. The study of Fiqh has purely practical connotations, laying down the rules and regulations to deal with the various issues pertinent during each generation. No Fiqh book contains, or refers to Roman or Greek Law, or any source other than the Hukm Shar'ii as legislative sources.
- Every Faqih states his methodology for Ijtihad, and explains the sources of legislation he will adopt, the schools of thought he will adhere to, as well as his methods and criteria for interpreting the text. The fact that all the Fuqahah exclusively referred to the Hukm Shar'ii in deriving their methodology and criteria indicates that Islam was the sole source of legislation.
- Throughout the history of the Islamic State, the courts maintained detailed documents of court proceedings and trials that took place. These judicial records date back to the 10th century AD and are still preserved in Cairo and other parts of the Muslim world. Examining these documents reveals that all the terminology emanated solely from Islam, and all the cases and agreements were decided exclusively on the basis of the Hukm Shar'ii.
- In the international sphere, the Islamic State carried Islam to the world through Da'wah and Jihad and continued to expand the horizons of Islamic rule since its conception in Madinah. The Khulafah consistently applied the same foreign policy of conveying Islam to the world, always taking the conflicts to the doorstep of other nations and never subjugating themselves to the agenda of a foreign entity. When the 'Uthmani State decided to join the international community in 1856, Europe insisted that they abandon their foreign policy based upon Islam, indicating that even the Europeans recognized the 'Uthmani State as Islamic.

Some would mention that, during the Crusades, there were elements within the Islamic State that aided the European Crusaders against the Muslims. Such a case was the exception rather than the norm, resulting from the presence of puppets who were working against the State without the Khalifah's orders. Yet during that time, when the Muslims were at an intellectual demise, they influenced the Crusaders to the extent that some remained behind and still exist today as evidenced by the presence of Christian families in Palestine. Even the Tatars, who sacked Baghdad and directly occupied the Islamic State, could not escape the influence of Islam. When the Muslims finally expelled them, they accepted Islam, returned to give the Bay'aa to the Khalifah, and carried the banner of Islam to Russia and the Far East. No other incident in history witnesses that a nation conquered a people, and the conquerors soon carried the culture and ideas of the conquered! Only through the implementation of Islam and the power of the Islamic Ideology could the Muslims have profoundly influenced their invaders in spite of the intellectual decline and fragmentation existing within the Ummah at the time.

Many incidents during the Islamic history show that the Muslims misapplied the Shar'iah and made several miscalculations. Any person should not expect a different scenario because Muslims, including the Khalifah, are human beings. As human beings, the Muslims are subject to the same capacity to make mistakes and perform incorrect decisions as any other nation or people. The notion that the Khulafah represent a special class stems from the Clergy mentality that places the

authority as a separate sect privileged by divine ordinance, and no such concept exists in Islam. The Khulafah, as human beings, are not infallible, and they executed the Shar'iah in a humanly manner in their capacity as human beings, and not in a godly or prophetic manner.

The Islamic State is a human society populated by human beings, and the Muslims run the affairs of the State in a humanly manner. The idea of a utopian society populated by angels cannot exist in a world of human beings. The presence of mistakes and problems reaffirms the human factor in Islamic history. Although the idea and the system are correct and perfect, the application of that idea and system would vary because those who are applying it are humans who are not infallible.

In some instances, the application of Islam reached to such low levels that the Khalifah's position was reduced to a symbolic role while the real power rested with the regional governors and their families. In spite of such a disparity, none of these families or governors ever usurped the position of Khilafah. Although the Fatimids did declare Khilafah, such an incident was the exception rather than the norm, and, more importantly, the Fatimids were not Muslim. Imam Suyuti (ra) never included the Fatimiyyeen as a valid Khilafah in his book, History of the Khulafah, and their lineage was doubted by the scholars and historians. Even during the last centuries of Islamic rule, the Muslims adopted the Shar'iah as the sole basis of their rules and regulations. During the Khilafah of Sultan Abdel Hameed II, towards the end of the Islamic State, the Islamic system still existed, and Abdel Hameed II simply assumed the role of rebuilding the system and attempting to cleanse it of the corruption that seeped into its structure.

The historical facts unanimously indicate that Islam was implemented in its full capacity as a system. The misapplications that occurred serve to demonstrate the fallibility of human beings and their imperfections.

The Roots Of The Controversy

In order to approach the issue with more clarity and awareness, the Muslim Ummah should understand where such notions came from and why they emerged. The idea that Islam was not implemented in its history serves two main purposes:

- To undermine Islam by convincing the Muslims that Islam failed in its implementation.
- To undermine the Khilafah by elaborating upon the many calamities the Khilafah faced during its existence.

By illustrating how the Balkans were occupied during the Khilafah, how the Crusaders conquered Palestine, and how the Khilafah subjected the Muslims to tyranny and monarchies, the Muslims would develop a negative portrayal of the Khilafah as representative of everything bleak in their history, and would soon look at the Khilafah with disdain and scorn & as something that gave the Muslim Ummah nothing but problems. By undermining Islam, the Muslims would continue to perceive their history from a dark point of view, eventually surrendering to hopelessness and despair, and ultimately forfeiting any attempt at working for Islam & striving to reestablish the Islamic system.

A New Perspective

Although such facts are used to undermine Islam, the Muslims should not ignore them, but should approach them from the correct angle. The Muslims should acknowledge the fact that every nation undergoes problems, and those problems serve to illustrate the human factor. Humans make mistakes, and the Muslim Ummah is no exception. Instead of condemning their history and discarding it behind them, the Muslims should look to their history as a building block to examine the mistakes that were made, study the reasons and implications behind them, and use this understanding towards building a better future for the Muslim Ummah.

In the 19th century, the United States experienced the Civil War which consumed over a million lives and decimated the entire nation economically, morally, and politically. Yet the American people admire the Southern Generals as heroes and look to the Civil War itself as a factor that strengthened the building of the nation. The dispute between 'Ali and Mu'awiya pales in comparison to such incidents, yet other nations study their history with respect and objectivity. As a result of 'Ali and Mu'awiya, the Muslims dismember themselves via the flames of the Shia-Sunni controversy and continue bickering & deride their history with shame and ridicule. During the American Civil War, the South accepted the aid of the Europeans against their own "fellow Americans," while Mu'awiya flatly rejected the Roman Emperor's offer to help him against 'Ali and even threatened him. In spite of such examples as well as the unheralded prosperity that took place under Islamic rule, the Muslims are trained to look at their history with less pride and enthusiasm than any other Ummah.

Instead of relegating their history to the dustbin or making fruitless conversation over who was guilty, the Muslim Ummah can approach their history to pinpoint where the mistakes were made and why they happened, and take the steps to ensure that the same mistakes would not repeat themselves. For example, during its later stages, the 'Uthmani State allowed the missionaries to operate without restriction. The missionaries were used by the Europeans to spread their ideas and infiltrate the Islamic thought with concepts such as nationalism, patriotism, and secularism. The end result was that the Muslims began to debate Islam itself and many regions of the Islamic State were aroused by nationalistic feelings and revolted against the Khalifah. In the future, the Islamic State of the future would restrict the movement of any such organization and would keep a cautious eye in order to prevent any such movement from surfacing within its frontiers.

Furthermore, Mu'awiya was a governor for many years, and such a lengthy term enabled him to acquire power, which weakened the central authority of the State and eventually led to the conflict that emerged between him and 'Ali. In order to prevent any governor from accumulating too much power, the Islamic State should limit the term of the Wulaa'.

Also, the relative power of the Khalifah to the regional governors was an indicator of the stability and effectiveness of the Islamic State. During the rule of the Umayyads and early Abbasids, the Khulafah were very keen on maintaining the central authority of the State, and they dealt very firmly with the governors as well as deviant groups who worked to undermine Islam. It is not coincidental that the Islamic civilization reached its zenith during this period. When the later Abbasids became lax in their authority over the governors and deviant groups, the situation deteriorated to the extent that, at the onset of the Crusaders, many of these regional governors and deviant groups, such as the Fatimids and Karamitahs, assumed virtual autonomy and wrested control of large regions of the Muslim lands from the center. Such events should be a clear warning for the Muslims that the unity of the Ummah and the preservation of the central authority are vital issues that the Muslim Ummah would have to safeguard in order to maintain the future Islamic State.

Conclusion

Because the sovereignty belongs to Allah, the Muslims should always surrender to the Allah's rulings as found in the Islamic texts when discussing any issue, evaluating any idea or concept, or initiating any agenda or action. Regardless of how many justifications or excuses circulate amongst the Ummah, the fact remains that Islam defined a unique political system, provided a detailed and well-defined political structure, established the political system as the practical mechanism to implement and carry Islam, and obliged the Muslim Ummah to establish the political system. The Orientalists have capitalized upon Islamic history to portray a bleak picture of life under Islamic rule. Many people, even sincere Muslims, have begun to amplify the Orientalist attacks that succeed only in justifying the claims that Islam is not valid. Such claims are not excuses for the

Muslims to claim that Islam has no political system or that it doesn't work. On the Day of Judgment, Allah (swt) will judge the Muslims for their deeds, not their excuses.

The ruling constitutes an integral part of the belief in Islam because Allah (swt) mentions in the Qur'an:

They (the prophets) are those whom We gave the Book, Al-Hukm (the ruling), and the Prophethood. But if they disbelieve therein, then we have entrusted it to a people who are not disbelievers. [Al-Anam 6, 89]

Nobody can claim that Muhammad (saaw) was not given the ruling because the Ayah clearly indicates that, as a prophet, Muhammad (saaw) received the ruling along with the book and the prophethood. To claim that Islam does not have a ruling system would denote a denial of the Ayah in the Qur'an, and individuals who make such claims with clear knowledge of the truth are out of the folds of Islam. Also, "they" in the Ayah is addressed to the polytheists among the Quraysh, and the "people who are not disbelievers" refers to the Sahabah. In this Ayah, Allah (swt) is stating that those who disbelieve in any of the three aspects, whether it is the Book, the Prophethood, or the ruling, would be similar to the disbelievers among the Quraysh who fought and opposed Muhammad (saaw). And the Sahabah, in order to fulfill the criterion of "people who are not disbelievers," would have to believe in the ruling and work for its establishment. Based upon this Ayah, Allah (swt) likens those who oppose the ruling or those who oppose the work for Islam's establishment to the polytheists among the Quraysh. Thus, any attack against the political system of Islam or those who work to establish it are against Islam itself, and the Ummah has to deal with them as such.

Most importantly, the Muslims must understand that, in spite of what history says, Islam is correct: Allah is still Allah, the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe; the Qur'an and the Sunnah still remain as guidance for humanity and the system from Allah. Islam will always remain for anyone to accept or reject as he or she desires, and no excuses - whether it comes in the guise of, "Islam was not implemented, so what's the use?" or any other justification - will change Islam in any aspect. Nations, like people, experience falls and shortcomings that add to the growth of the nation in the same manner that an individual's failures build experience and knowledge that act as stepping stones for future success.

Today, the Muslim Ummah has fourteen centuries of history as a deposit in their ideological account that can be withdrawn & utilized in their movement to reestablish the Islamic State and attain its rightful status. Allah (swt) mentions the Muslim Ummah's status in the Qur'an:

We have made you a just Ummah, that you be witnesses over mankind and the Messenger be a witness over you [Al-Baqara 2, 143]

You are the best Ummah ever raised up for mankind; you enjoin the good, and forbid the evil, and you believe in Allah [Al-Imran 3, 110]

The Muslims should aspire towards nothing less because Muhammad (saaw) indicated that the Khilafah will return based on the path of Prophethood. Such Ayat and Ahadeeth should provide a source of confidence in Islam to motivate the Muslims to strive for the supremacy of Allah's (swt) Deen. The Muslim Ummah has a responsibility to mankind by establishing Islam and carrying Islam to the world. Such a monumental responsibility has no room for dwelling on distorted images of Islamic history or useless bickering about whether 'Ali or Mu'awiya was guilty.

Khalifornia Publications