

الله

شرك
الطاعة

Shirk of Obedience



By Shaykh Abū 'Alī al-Anbārī

Shirk of Obedience

By Shaykh Abū ‘Alī al-Anbārī

(May Allāh accept him from amongst the shuhadā)

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Our lesson today, if Allāh (ta'ālā) wills, is with regards to shirk in at-tā'ah (obedience). So seeking the help of Allāh: this is a word built on two parts: shirk and obedience. What is the meaning of shirk? And what is the meaning of at-tā'ah? And what is the meaning of shirk at-tā'ah?

The meaning of shirk: it comes in the narration of 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd (radiyallāhu 'anhu) when he asked the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam), "What is the greatest sin?" The Messenger (sallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam) said, "That you set up a partner with Allāh, when He created you" (Agreed upon).

The meaning of a partner: a like, equal, and peer. So whoever sets up a partner for Allāh in His rubūbiyyah has committed shirk. And whoever sets up a partner with Allāh in His ulūhiyyah has committed shirk. And whoever sets up a partner with Allāh in His asmā was-sifāt has committed shirk. This is the meaning of shirk.

As for the definition of at-tā'ah: its meaning with regards to the Arab (i.e., in the Arabic language) is compliance and yielding.

As for the definition of shirk at-tā'ah: it is to consent¹ to constitutions, fabricated man-made laws, and tribal codes. So whoever affirms belief in the constitutions that govern the lands and the people today, follows the man-made laws (like them the tribal codes), has committed shirk with Allāh ('azza wa jall) and the type of shirk here is called shirk at-tā'ah.

Before going further into this kind of shirk, one must know what the existence of shirk means in relation to the book of deeds man will have on the Day of Resurrection, and it can be arranged into three issues:

The first issue: that this type of sin is not forgiven by Allāh (ta'ālā) and the evidence for that is His (ta'ālā) saying, "Indeed Allāh does not forgive shirk, but forgives what is less than that from what He wills." If anything comes but it is less than shirk than it is forgivable, falling under His will (mashī-ah), as for shirk than it is absolutely not forgivable in front of Allāh ('azza wa jall).

The second issue: the presence of shirk in the book of deeds for man means his deeds will become worthless. In other

¹ The Arabic word is "iqrar" and also "aqarra" comes later and it carries the definitions of: acknowledge, concede, approve, confirm, endorse, sanction, affirm, along with others.

words, this man who commits shirk with Allāh (‘azza wa jall), whether shirk of du’ā, shirk of tā’ah, shirk in love, shirk in will and intent, shirk in likening, shirk in fear, if there is shirk present in his book of deeds it will ruin the rewards of all the acts of worship that is found with those who are affiliated with Islām. He could have performed salāh, fasted, and memorized the Book of Allāh (‘azza wa jall), and usually these deeds gain rewards, but because of the presence of major shirk they will all become worthless. The evidence for that from the Book of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) is in sūrah al-An’ām where Allāh (subhānahu) mentioned eighteen prophets by name then at the end of narrating their blessed names He said, “But if they had committed shirk (ashrakū) all that they used to do would have been of no benefit to them.” The meaning of no benefit: all their deeds that would have been rewarded would become futile.

Similarly, He said about the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam), “That if you should commit shirk, your work would surely become worthless.” And far be it that the prophets of Allāh would commit shirk with Allāh (‘azza wa jall), and far be it that the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam) would commit shirk with Allāh (‘azza wa jall). But, undoubtedly, this speech was for the ummah of the last of prophets. I understand from these āyāt that man, regardless of the status he has reached with Allāh (‘azza wa

jall), even if it is the status of prophethood, if he commits shirk then his status will not intercede for him in any way because shirk is a sin that Allāh (‘azza wa jall) will not forgive.

And here comes the question: Allāh (subhānahu wa ta’ālā) is just, so if man commits some type of shirk but had good deeds, as we had previously stated, how does the justice of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) take its course with regards to those good deeds that carry rewards? And how is it related with regards to the shirk that comes nullifying all those good deeds? The answer is in the hadīth of the Prophet (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam) where he said, “The kāfir will have his reward hastened to him in the dunyā but in the akhirah he will not have anything.” So in return for those actions that would be rewardable, Allāh (tabāraka wa ta’ālā) has ruled that he will not have anything left on the Day of Resurrection because of that presence of shirk. Instead Allāh (tabāraka wa ta’ālā) will exchange those rewardable actions and compensate him with worldly matters, which could be: wealth, a spouse, good health, and so on. The main issue is the point that he will not have any rewardable actions in his book of deeds onYawmal-Qiyāmah because the shirk laid those actions to waste. This ends the second issue.

The third issue: whoever in his book of deeds has shirk present, Allāh has forbidden him from entering Jannah. Allāh

says in the noble ayah, “Whosoever ascribes partners with Allāh, for him Allāh has forbidden Jannah. His abode is the Fire. For the doers of evil there will be no helpers.”

That abode in the akhirah is either a home of bliss or a home of torment and punishment, with no third. Since Allāh (‘azza wa jall) has forbidden anyone who committed shirk the entrance into Jannah, that would necessitate his only place would be Hell-fire, and we seek refuge in Allāh from that.

If we have truly taken note and paid attention to these āyāt that mention the fate of man that is between the hands of Allāh (‘azza wa jall), then from here it is obligatory and crucial for us to outline, detail, and break this issue of shirk down and to be aware of it from every angle. For if one is saved from this sin of shirk, then what is less than that is forgivable with the permission of Allāh (it is important to mention that I am referring to major shirk and I am not speaking about minor shirk).

So it is a must for one to know the details of the shirk of du’ā , shirk of tā’ah, and then after that ask yourself, “Did I free myself from those types of shirk or not?” Because if man was to enter Hell-fire, and he was not a mushrik with Allāh, then he will eventually be taken out of it with the permission of Allāh. A man could enter Hell-fire for his sins and

disobedience, but at the end of the matter, Allāh (tabāraka wa taʿālā) will show him mercy and take him out. So it is vital to not have shirk if one was to enter Hell-fire, so to have the hope in Allāh (ʿazza wa jall) that one does not stay forever in Hell-fire, hence the interest should be in this issue of shirk, its explanations, and its minute details.

Now we come to our topic of shirk in at-tāʿah, and we said previously it is consenting, for whomsoever consents and sees it permissible that the man-made laws and these constitutions should be ruled and judged with is committing shirk with Allāh. The proof for that from the Book of Allāh (ʿazza wa jall) is in sūrah al-Anʿām, “And do not eat of that upon which the name of Allāh has not been mentioned, for indeed, it is grave disobedience (fisq). And indeed do the shayātīn inspire their allies [among men] to dispute with you. And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be mushrikīn.”

Before going into the details of this ayah, we should be aware of the reason of revelation, as knowing the reason will help you in understanding it. The narration by imām at-Tirmithī (rahimahullāh) states, “It was narrated from ibn ʿAbbās (radiyallāhu ʿanhu) that he said: ‘Some people came to the Prophet (sallallāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam) and said we eat what we kill and we do not eat what Allāh killed, then Allāh (ʿazza wa

jal) revealed, ‘And do not eat of what upon which the name of Allāh has not been mentioned.’” Imām at-Tirmithī said about this hadīth that it is *hasan gharīb* (these are among the terms of imām at-Tirmithī).

Similar to that, ibn al-‘Arabī (*rahimahullāh ta’ālā*) mentioned this in his *tafsīr*. Ibn Kathīr mentioned a narration from ibn ‘Abbās (*radiyallāhu ‘anhu wa ardah*) and said, “Some people came to the Prophet when Allāh (*‘azza wa jall*) revealed, ‘And do not eat of what upon which the name of Allāh has not been mentioned.’” He said, “The Majūs said to Quraysh, ‘Oppose Muhammad and say, ‘What you slaughter with your knife is *halāl* and what Allāh slaughters is *harām*?’ Then Allāh (*‘azza wa jall*) revealed, ‘And indeed do the devils inspire their allies [among them] to dispute with you. And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be *mushrikīn*.’”

The reason of revelation was also narrated by ibn Abī Hātim (*rahimahullāh ta’ālā*) *mursal* from Sa’īd ibn Jubayr who said that, “The Jews opposed the Messenger (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*).” And a narration of Abū Dāwūd is connected to Sa’īd ibn Jubayr from ibn ‘Abbās (*radiyallāhu ‘anhu*) that he said, “The Jews opposed the Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam*).” So we now have two narrations in which it is stated

that the Jews are the ones who opposed, not the Majūs who taught the mushrikīn of Makkah.

Ibn Kathīr (rahimahullāh ta'ālā) rejected the narration which says that the Jews are those who raised the question and said, "This matter (that the Jews are those who opposed) requires a revision for three reasons: first, the Jews consider the dead animal as harām and thus, how do they oppose the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam) in the dead animal? Second, this is a Makkan ayah, meaning the ayah was revealed in Makkah, and you know that in Makkah Allāh ('azza wa jall) honored it so that not one Jew lived there." Then, ibn Kathīr (rahimahullāh ta'ālā) mentioned a third reason and said, "The narration that is mentioned by at-Tirmithī that some people came to the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam) did not mention the Jews."

After mentioning these three reasons, ibn Kathīr said, "And at-Tabarī (meaning ibn Jarīr rahimahullāh ta'āla) mentioned numerous narrations from ibn 'Abbās and none them mentioned the Jews." Then ibn Kathīr said, "This is what is preserved." Meaning, that those who came to the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wa sallam) were from Quraysh, motivated by the Majūs or by themselves. This is the reason of revelation.

Imām ash-Shanqītī (rahimahullāh ta’āla rahmah wāsi’ah) said, “There is an agreement from the people of knowledge that the reason this ayah was revealed was because the mushrikīn said to the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam), ‘How do you eat a sheep that you have slaughtered and do not eat a sheep killed by Allāh (‘azza wa jall)?’ So Allāh (ta’ālā) revealed, ‘And do not eat of that upon which the name of Allāh has not been mentioned, for indeed, it is grave disobedience (fīsq). And indeed do the shayātīn inspire their allies [among men] to dispute with you. And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be mushrikīn.’”

Therefore, look with me at the beginning of the ayah and that it points to two legislations: the legislation of Allāh (tabāraka wa ta’ālā), “And do not eat of that upon which the name of Allāh has not been mentioned,” and the jāhili legislation that was common in Makkah when they used to eat the dead animal, and this is the legislation of the mushrikīn. Thus, there are two types of sharī’ah in front of us: the Sharī’ah of Allāh (‘azza wa jall), “And do not eat.” And the sharī’ah of the mushrikīn, “eat from the dead animal.”

Allāh (tabāraka wa ta’ālā) forbids us from that, and then, He mentions some matters regarding the condition of one who opposes the Sharī’ah of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) and obeys the sharī’ah of the mushrikīn. This conflicting legislation, what is

the situation of one who obeys it? Allāh (tabāraka wa ta'ālā) said, "And indeed, it is fisq." Meaning, if you were to go against My legislation and obey the legislation of the mushrikīn and eat the dead animal this fisq is ruled upon you: "And indeed, it is fisq."

The meaning of fisq according to the scholars of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah: al-'Izz ibn Abdus-Salām (rahimahullāh ta'ālā) said in his tafsīr, "Al-fisq is disobedience or disbelief." Ibn Jarīr (rahimahullāh ta'ālā) like that mentioned the same definition in his tafsīr. As for imām al-Qurtubī (rahimahullāh ta'ālā) in his tafsīr he relays from ibn 'Abbās (radiyallāhu 'anhu wa ardāh) that he said, "Al-fisq is disobedience," and in another narration from him: "Al-fisq is disobedience." As for imām ash-Shanqītī (rahimahullāh ta'ālā), he explained al-fisq in his tafsīr of sūrah ash-Shūrā and said, "Al-fisq is leaving from the obedience of Allāh (ta'ālā) and following the legislation of the Shaytān."

Thus, you can conclude that the scholars of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah said about al-fisq here that it is either disobedience or disbelief. Why do we have the tafsīr of this word here? Why is it sometimes said that it is disobedience and at others disbelief? That is because al-fisq is divided into two parts: either it is fisq asghar (fisq of a lesser degree) which does not take its doer outside the Millah, and the

evidence of *fiṣq asghar* from the Book of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) is in sūrah al-Baqarah (the ayah of debt), “Let no scribe be harmed or any witness. For if you do so, indeed, it is *fiṣq* in you.” The meaning of this ayah is that if a man gave a loan to a man, and they came with a scribe and two witnesses, Allāh (‘azza wa jall) says that it is not allowed for neither the creditor nor the debtor to harm the scribe or one of the witnesses. If you were to harm the scribe or the witness, then your action is *fiṣq*. Without doubt, this *fiṣq* does not take its doer outside the Millah of Islām. Thus, what is this *fiṣq* called? It is called *fiṣq asghar*.

As for the *fiṣq akbar* (major *fiṣq*), its evidence is the saying of Allāh (ta’ālā), “And [mention] when We said to the angels, ‘Prostrate to Ādam,’ and they prostrated, except for Iblīs. He was of the jinn and departed (fafaṣaqa) from the command of his Lord. Then will you take him and his descendants as allies other than Me while they are enemies to you? Wretched it is for the wrongdoers as an exchange.” Therefore, when Iblīs disobeyed Allāh (‘azza wa jall) in relation to prostrating to Ādam, Allah called his disobedience as *fiṣq*. This type of *fiṣq* takes its doer outside the Millah of Islām. So *fiṣq* is sometimes considered as a sin that does not make one a kāfir and sometimes it is an action that makes one leave the Millah.

In the issue of the dead animal, in the ayah we have talked about, a man, for example, comes and ate from the dead animal and says, “I know that Allāh forbids that,” his *fiṣq* is *fiṣq asghar* and he has committed a major sin. Why? Because he admits and acknowledges it is forbidden but he disobeys the command of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) and ate it, this is *fiṣq asghar*. Another man comes and did not eat from the dead animal but says, “It is *halāl*,” this person leaves the *Millah*. Why? Because he considers what Allāh (‘azza wa jal) made *harām* as *halāl*, and the principle among *Ahluṣ-Sunnah wal-Jamā’ah*, as *imām at-Tahāwī* (*rahimahullāh ta’ālā*) mentioned in his book on ‘*aqīdah*, “And we do not make *takfīr* on anyone from the people of the *Qiblah* by a sin unless he considers it *halāl*.” Thus, the Muslim who does these sins stays in the fold of *Islām* but there is *fiṣq* in him. However, if was to call the *halāl harām* or the *harām halāl*, he leaves the *Millah* because he opposes the legislation of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) and came up with an opposing legislation that clashes with the legislation of Allāh (‘azza wa jall). *Abū Muhammad al-Maqdisī* added a condition to this general rule and said, “We do not make *takfīr* on anyone from the people of the *Qiblah* by a sin that is not *mukaffir* (i.e., does not constitute *kufr*), unless he considers it *halāl*.” When we come across some of these details, we will talk about the benefit of this condition, if Allāh (*ta’ālā*) wills.

"And indeed, it is *fiṣq*."

Now, those who accept and approve to rule and judge by man-made laws and constitutions, is this *fiṣq asghar* or *fiṣq akbar*? This is *fiṣq akbar*, and the evidence for that is the saying of Allāh (ta'ālā) at the end of the ayah, "And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be *mushrikīn*." Allāh (subhānahū wa ta'ālā) judged them with *shirk* and whomever Allāh judges with *shirk*, his *shirk* is not *asghar*. This is the first evidence, and as for the second evidence it is that the one who consents to those man-made laws has made those who legislate partners to Allāh ('azza wa jall). How? Putting down rulings is the exclusive right of His ('azza wa jall) and no one is allowed to make a legislation except Allāh ('azza wa jall). The evidence for that is in sūrah Yūsuf where Allāh (ta'ālā) says, "Legislation is for none except Allāh. He has commanded that you worship nothing except Him. That is the correct Dīn, but most of the people do not know." When we come to this ayah we will elaborate on it, with the permission of Allāh (ta'ālā).

So this ayah establishes that laying down rulings is the exclusive right of Allāh (tabāraka wa ta'ālā), and it is not allowed for anyone other than Allāh to make a legislation. If a committee of drafting a constitution comes and lays down a constitution and an individual concurs and approves the

constitution, he has then taken as an object of worship the one who put down the constitution because the one who establishes legislations and laws is an ilāh. So either he is our lord or he gave himself one of the attributes exclusive to Allāh ('azza wa jall). And whoever consents to the legislation of Allāh and also consents to the man-made laws has taken Allāh ('azza wa jall) and His legislation, and those with their man-made laws and constitutions as two objects of worship! Their fisq here is fisq akbar which takes them out of the Millah, "and indeed it is fisq."

Then He said, "and indeed the shayātīn," what is intended by shayātīn here? Ibn Kathīr (rahimahullāh) mentioned from 'Ikrimah (rahimahullāh ta'ālā) that he said, "The intended shayātīn here are people from the Persian Majūs." And he mentioned another narration from ibn 'Abbās (radiyallāhu 'anhu) that he said, "Shayātīn here means the jinn." Why the variance of interpreting the shāyatīn here to be those from the jinn or from the men? Because Allāh ('azza wa jal) mentioned two types when He said, "Shayātīn from men and jinn, inspiring to one another decorative speech in delusion." So there are shayātīn of men and shayātīn of jinn.

Imām at-Tabarī (rahimahullāh rahmatu wāsi'ah) said in his tafsīr, "The shayātīn of men inspire to their allies from mankind, and it could be possible that the shayātīn of the jinn

inspire to mankind." And he said, "The matter could be both, meaning, the shayātīn from jinn and shayātīn from men inspire to their allies'." Now we know what is meant by this noble ayah.

Then He said, "...they inspire..." meaning, the shayātīn inspire their awliyā (the awliyā are their supporters and beloved). What is the meaning of inspiration from the shayātīn to their awliyā here? It comes in "Mukhtār as-Sihāh" (a dictionary by ar-Rāzī): "Wahī is to inspire or what is delivered as hidden words is called wahī." This wahī is divided into two: wahī rabbānī from Allāh ('azza wa jall) to whomever He wills from His creation, and wahī shaytānī from the Shaytān to his awliyā. The evidence for wahī rabbānī is the wahī from Allāh ('azza wa jall) to His prophets and messengers as mentioned in His saying (tabāraka wa ta'ālā), "Indeed, We have revealed to you, [O Muhammad], as We revealed to Nūh and the prophets after him. And we revealed to Ibrāhīm, Ismā'īl, Ishāq, Ya'qūb, the Descendants, 'Īsā, Ayyūb, Yahyā, Hārūn, and Sulaymān, and to Dāwūd We gave the book [of Psalms]." What is this called? [It is] wahī rabbānī from Allāh to His messengers.

However, sometimes Allāh ('azza wa jall) sends wahī to other than His prophets as He (tabāraka wa ta'ālā) said, "And when I inspired the disciples to believe in Me and in My

messengers." The disciples were those men who were close to the prophet of Allāh 'Isā ('alayhis-salāh was-salām). What is the meaning of wahī here? Those words that were cast into their chests.

There is a third wahī from Allāh ('azza wa jall) to some of His creation, as He mentioned in the ayah in sūrah an-Nahl, "And your Lord inspired the bee: build homes in the mountains and trees, and in (the hives) they build for you." This teaching of Allāh ('azza wa jall) to this creation Allāh ('azza wa jall) called wahī, so the wahī rabbānī from Allāh ('azza wa jall) goes to whomever He wills from His slaves.

The second type of wahī is Shaytān to his awliyā, and it's evidenced by the saying of Allāh (ta'ālā), "And indeed, the shayātīn do inspire their allies." And also His (ta'ālā) saying, "...shāyatīn from mankind and jinn, inspiring to one another decorative speech in delusion."

A man once came to ibn 'Abbās (radiyallāhu 'anhu) and said, "Mukhtār ath-Thaqafī claims that wahī comes to him." He is the son of Abū 'Ubaydāh ath-Thaqafī, his father was the leader of the battle of Jisr in al-Qadisiyyah, but after that he went out to seek revenge for al-Husayn and then he claimed prophethood and used to claim that wahī comes to him. So, ibn 'Abbās said, "Yes." Meaning, it is true that wahī comes to

Mukhtār, then he recited, "And indeed do the shayātīn inspire their allies."

How does this alliance between the Shaytān and those take place? Because when the Shaytān takes over some people or they ally with him, the Shaytān takes power and authority over them. What are some entry points the Shaytān takes until some people become allies to him?

There are four doors which allow Shaytān to enter through to the point where he takes some people as allies.

The first door: if there was a defect in īmān. This is a wide door that Shaytān could enter from to those with a defect and takes them as his allies.

The second door: a defect in relying on Allāh ('azza wa jall).

The third door: a defect in both īmān and reliance. Through these doors Shaytān could enter.

The other or fourth: if shirk is found with someone, then this is a door for the Shaytān, a wide door through which he could enter and take them as his allies.

[And there is also a] fifth: sins and disobedience is a door for the Shaytān to make them his allies.

What is the evidence for what I have just said?

Allāh (tabāraka wa ta'ālā) says, "Verily, he (Shaytān) has no power over those who believe and put their trust only in their Lord. His power is only over those obey and follow him, and those who commit shirk."

So if īmān is present it would then preventive factor preventing man from becoming the ally of Shaytān, and if the correct reliance is found it would be a preventive factor from becoming an ally of Shaytān. If these two matters are established it would be impossible for man to become an ally of Shaytān. As well, if shirk is negated from man he cannot become an ally of Shaytān.

These are four reasons, but the fifth reason, sinning and disobedience, as a door for the Shaytān like what I mentioned to you earlier, "...but Shaytān made their deeds fair seeming to them. So he is their helper today (in this world), and theirs will be a painful torment." He commits this sin then he sees this sin he brought forth to be acceptable and that he will be praised for it; such are these from the allies of the Shaytān.

Anyone who comes forth with munkar that opposes the legislation and sees this violation of the legislation to be acceptable and beautiful, then he is from the allies of Shaytān. Now you know that the Shaytān inspires, and you came to know that he has allies, and you came to know how Shaytān makes them his allies.

After that Allāh (tabāraka wa ta'ālā) mentioned: why do the shayātīn inspire their allies? What is the goal from that inspiration? He says, "...in order to dispute with you." The "lam" (in the Arabic) here is for purposes and intent.

The meaning of dispute in "Mukhtār as-Sihāh" is: "dispute with strong animosity." The definition imām al-Qurtubī (rahimahullāh ta'ālā) said with regards to "dispute": "the strike of speech by proof or strength." What does this mean?

A person is either someone upon the truth or someone upon falsehood, so if one of them wanted to strike the other person, for instance the one upon the truth wanted to strike the one on falsehood, he would strike him with proofs, and then after that with force, this is called dispute. Like that, when one upon falsehood wanted to strike the one on the truth, he would strike him with proofs or with force, this is called dispute. Dispute also carries two meanings between "good dispute" and "indecent dispute." It can be generally

referred to as either. What is the evidence for this categorization?

Allāh (‘azza wa jall) says, “Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good instruction, and argue with them in a way that is best.” So there is the good dispute in when you defend your truth with proof, but if the matter needed after that to be defended with force then so be it. Allāh (‘azza wa jall) also said, “And do not argue with the people of the Scripture except in a way that is best.”

Did the Prophet (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam) defend the truth he possessed with proof and strength against the falsehood of the mushrik? Yes. For thirteen years he was calling the mushrik of Makkah with proof and after migration he was granted permission to fight, so he began to strike falsehood with force. For us, the Muslim, we don’t just strike falsehood with proof only, if the matter calls for force then it is permissible for us to strike falsehood by force, and that is the guidance of our Prophet (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam).

The indecent and obscene dispute is when the individual of falsehood tries to strike the person of truth with his falsehood. The evidence for that in the book of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) is in sūrah al-Kahf, “And those who disbelieve dispute by [using] falsehood to [attempt to] invalidate thereby

the truth.” And in another ayah Allāh (tabāraka wa ta’ālā) says, “And every nation intended [a plot] for their messenger to seize him, and they disputed by [using] falsehood to [attempt to] invalidate thereby the truth. So I seized them, and how [terrible] was My penalty.”

This is happening now in reality on the ground, for the mujāhidīn in the cause of Allāh have established the proofs that what we are upon is the truth. We want to rule by the Sharī’ah of Allāh (‘azza wa jall), and for His word to be the highest, and they have established the proof for that. They have combined it with the establishment of the proof by strength and tried to strike falsehood with all their might, and they have disputed in the manner which is best.

Likewise, opposite to that, the people of falsehood tried defending their falsehood with “proof” and also with the use of force. For “proof” they attempted to establish it through the scholars of the rulers and the satellites. We had in our city two of them: one of them was Abū Hārith and the other Abū Safwah, if you can remember them. They tried to strike the truth with falsehood, how? They attempted to make obedience to the tawāghīt leaders obligatory. And at that time is was Iyād ‘Allāwī, and what will make you know about Iyād ‘Allāwī?

They said its obligatory to obey them, and they added to that and said: those who are recruited by the defense ministry and the interior ministry are considered “mujāhidīn,” but as for those who go against those rulers and tried to fight them they are “Khawārij.” Then they said: whoever is killed from the army and police are martyrs. And that those killed from the “Khawārij” then: those are Khawārij dogs of Hell-fire, and they brought forward all the hadīth that the Messenger (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wa sallam) said in regard to the Khawārij.

So they tried with that falsehood to strike the truth with “proof,” and they combined it with force. They brought the Ministry of Defense, America, the police, the spies, and other agencies to help them, and they tried with force to strike the truth. “And indeed do the shayātīn inspire their allies [among men] to dispute with you. And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be mushrikūn.”

In the end of the ayah Allāh (tabāraka wa ta’ālā) said, “And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be mushrikūn.” That is: if you oppose My legislation and I said, “And do not eat of that upon which the name of Allāh has not been mentioned,” and you ate the dead meat in accordance with the legislation of those mushrikīn, you have with this action - obedience - become mushrikīn. Imām ash-Shanqīṭī (rahimahullāh ta’ālā) mentioned something beneficial here in

that in the first part of this ayah he said, “In the ayah there is a part missing.” What is it?

He said, “The conditional clause - if - needs a dependant clause that highlights the condition and it needs a main clause that highlights what happens if the condition is fulfilled. For example, we say: ‘If you study, you will pass,’ so if you do this action [of studying], you will achieve success, bi-ithnillāh. In the ayah, Allāh said, ‘And if you were to obey them,’ and the conditional clause here is ‘if,’ while, ‘you obey them’ is the dependant clause that expresses the condition. What consequence results from this obedience? He said, ‘Indeed, you would be mushrikūn,’” This is not the main clause that expresses the consequence and result. Why? He (ash-Shanqīti) said, “The main clause can not be a present tense verb, because if the main clause is a present tense verb, then it does not need a subject. On the other side, when the main clause is a verb in the past tense, or a verb of command, or dependent-sentence, then the main clause should start with a "ف" in the Arabic language. So if the Ayah was: ‘And if you obey them then you are mushrikūn,’ then it is permissible to say that ‘then you are mushrikūn’ is the main clause which expresses the consequence, nonetheless, since the "ف" is not mentioned here, then ‘you would be mushrikūn’ is not the

main clause that expresses the consequence and result.”
Therefore, where is the main clause?

He (ash-Shanqītī) said, “The main clause is an absent oath [that is omitted from the sentence], which would be: ‘So if you were to obey them, then, wallāh (fawallāh), you would become mushrikūn.’”²

Then, the ayah highlighted a collection of issues.

The first issue: without any doubt this ayah is addressed to the Muslimīn, speaking to the Muslimīn not the mushrikīn because it is not possible for me to say to a mushrik: if you obey the mushrikīn in their legislations, you will be a mushrik like them. That is a false statement, and the speech of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) is far from it, so this ayah is without a doubt directed to the Muslimīn. Allāh (tabāraka wa ta’ālā) says to the Muslimīn: do not obey legislations that are invented by others and leave My legislation, and if you were to obey these legislations, indeed you would be mushrikūn.

² All this has to do with the original Arabic and the scientific details regarding the grammar of the Arabic language, which is above many who speak Arabic let alone translating it and attempting to make sense of it in English.

Another benefit (i.e., the second issue) from this ayah is that we know, without a doubt, that every legislation other than the legislation of Allāh (‘azza wa jall), from whichever source it may come, is a shaytānic legislation because Allāh (subhānahu wa ta’ālā) said, “And indeed do the devils inspire their allies.”

The third issue: whoever approves and consents to a legislation other than the legislation of Allāh (‘azza wa jall), or accepts it or is content with it, then Allāh (‘azza wa jall) has judged him with shirk. This is plainly stated in the Qur’ān because at the end of the ayah He said, “And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be mushrikūn.” So the ruling of shirk here was revealed from Allāh (‘azza wa jall) in His Qur’ān. When I say: whoever obeys the man-made laws and constitutions are mushrikīn it is not my saying, this is the saying of Allāh (‘azza wa jall), and I am merely repeating what Allāh (‘azza wa jall) said. So the ruling is the ruling of Allāh, and we convey the ruling of Allāh (‘azza wa jall) by explaining and establishing the proof.

I point to the last matter and it is that whoever accepted in the past man-made laws he has committed shirk, and it is from the blessing of Allāh that he lengthened the life of the one who committed it so he can have the chance of repentance. So whoever said to the constitution “yes” he has

committed shirk with Allāh (‘azza wa jall), and the type of shirk is shirk of obedience.³ He needs to correct his affair and repent to Allāh (‘azza wa jall) from the shirk he fell in. I said what I said, and I ask Allāh for His forgiveness for me and you. May Allāh reward you all with goodness..⁴

³ Meaning, voted for the constitution in democratic elections.

⁴ This ends the first lesson, and all praise belongs to Allah. There are numerous others that the author (rahimahullah) goes through on the topic, that we hope Allah gives us the tawfiq to translate, edit, and publish.

