

Hizb ut Tahrir: A Call for Unity or Division?!

(Translated)

<https://www.al-waie.org/archives/article/20115>

Ustadh Yusuf Arsalan

Member of the Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir / Wilayah Afghanistan

Al Waie Magazine Issue No. 473

Thirty-Ninth Year, Jumada II 1447 AH corresponding to December 2025 CE

A short while ago, Ustadh Ahmad Bakr, may Allah have mercy on him, a member of the office of the Ameer of Hizb ut Tahrir, passed away. After reading some memoirs about his Dawah journey, I was deeply moved, especially by his steadfastness on the path of Dawah and his painful memories of imprisonment and torture in Sednaya Prison, Syria. In one of these short memoirs, the writer mentioned the lessons he learned from the Ustadh; among them was that Sheikh Taqi al-Din al-Nabhani, may Allah (swt) have mercy on him, advised him, in the event of problems and trials, whether related to the Ummah or to Dawah carriers, to read the book "Defence Against Disaster in Accurately Determining the Positions of the Companions (ra) after the Death of the Prophet (saw)" العواصم من القواصم في تحقيق مواقف الصحابة بعد وفاة النبي، because it grants steadfastness, insight, and strength of faith.

Based upon this, I looked into the book. It was authored by Al-Qadi Abu Bakr ibn al-'Arabi al-Maliki in the Sixth Century AH, and its main theme revolves around the steadfastness of the Companions and their crucial stances in the face of trials and tribulations and the events of their time. Through reading it, the concerns of Sheikh al-Nabhani, the founder of Hizb ut Tahrir, regarding the unity of the Ummah and the danger of division become clearer. He believed that, under all circumstances, the correct Islamic stance must be demonstrated, and that steadfastness is an unchanging principle.

The book begins with prominent examples, including the actions of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq (may Allah be pleased with him) after the death of the Prophet (saw), when he saved the Islamic Ummah from division through his wisdom and adherence to Islamic Shariah Law. Similarly, in the incident at Saqifa Bani Sa'ida, when some of the Ansar proposed that there be "an amir from the Ansar and an Amir from the Muhajirun, he prevented division with a decisive statement and a strong argument, saying, «نحن الأمراء وأنتم الوزراء» **"We are the amirs, and you are the wazirs."**

Other examples include the decision of Abu Bakr (ra) to fight those who refused to pay zakat, Umar's (ra) setting a three-day deadline for choosing a Khaleefah (Caliph), Uthman's (ra) sacrifice until his martyrdom, and Ali's (ra) patience with the Kharijites until they drew their swords. All of this demonstrates that the unity of the Ummah is a fundamental principle in Islam, a core tenet of Islamic governance, as vital as blood flows through the body. This same principle was a primary concern of Hizb ut Tahrir, just as it was for the Companions (ra) and the Khulafaa Rashidoon (Rightly Guided Caliphs) (ra).

From the Call for Secularism to the Nation-State

Every society is a product of its history, and Muslims are no exception. Today, as a result of certain historical events and decisions, "political affiliation and difference of opinion" are considered synonymous with "division." The notion that true unity is impossible has become ingrained in awareness, while the Ummah of Islam is more fragmented and divided than ever before. In this context, some raise the question of Hizb ut Tahrir: Is it a Dawah for division or unity? These concerns stem from the fact that Hizb ut Tahrir operates in a coordinated manner, places particular emphasis on enjoining good and forbidding evil politically, and presents an understanding of Islam that may not be easily accepted by those enamored with certain ideas or schools of thought. To answer this question, it is necessary to clarify the concept of "division" and then examine its causes and manifestations to determine Hizb ut Tahrir's stance within it.

The word "division" (تَفَرُّقٌ tafarruq) comes from the root "faraqa," meaning separation and distancing. In the Quran, the term "separation" is used to denote both physical and spiritual separation, as in the verse, (وَإِذْ فَرَقْنَا بِكُمُ الْبَحْرَ) **"And when We separated the sea in partition for**

“Separate us from the disobedient people” [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah 50], and the verse, **«أَفَرُّقْ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَ الْفَاسِقِينَ»** [TMQ Surah Al-Ma'idah 25]. In Islamic Shariah Law, separation is often used to refer to disagreement on Usools (fundamentals) of Deen and Aqeedah (doctrine), which is forbidden and can reach the level of disbelief (kufr). However, differences of opinion regarding the faroo' (branches) are not considered separation. The Messenger of Allah (saw) said, **«إِنَّ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ افْتَرَقَتْ عَلَى إِحْدَى وَسَبْعِينَ فِرْقَةً، وَإِنْ أُمَّتِي سَفَّتْ رُقَى عَلَى اثْنَتَيْنِ وَسَبْعِينَ فِرْقَةً، كُلُّهَا فِي النَّارِ إِلَّا وَاحِدَةً، وَهِيَ الْجَمَاعَةُ»** **“Bani Israeel were split into seventy-one sects, and my Ummah will split into seventy-three sects, all of them in Hell except one, and that is the Jama'ah (Community of Muslims)”** [Ibn Majah].

Dr. Hakim Al-Mutairi, Professor of Tafsir and Hadith at the College of Sharia at Kuwait University, studied this hadith. In his study, he stated, **«تفترق»** (فهذه دراسة حديثة نقدية إسنادية لحديث الافتراق) **«تفترق»** فإنه مع شهرته وكثرة طرقة، إلا أن الشيخين البخاري ومسلماً تنكبا عنه ولم يخرجاه، وحكم بعدم صحته ابن حزم فقال **«لا يصح أصلاً من طريق الإسناد، وما كان هكذا فليس حجة عند من يقول بخبر الواحد»** **“This is a modern, critical, and chain-of-narration study of the hadith of the division of the Ummah, ‘My Ummah will be divided into seventy-three sects, all of them in Hellfire except one.’ Despite its widespread circulation and numerous chains of transmission, the two Sheikhs, Al-Bukhari and Muslim, refrained from including it in their collections. Ibn Hazm ruled it unsound, saying, ‘It is not authentic at all according to its chain of transmission, and what is like this is not considered proof by those who accept the hadith of a single narrator.’”**

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, while considering it authentic, questioned its strength of authenticity, saying, **«فمن كَفَر الثنتين والسبعين فرقة كلهم فقد خالف الكتاب والسنة وإجماع الصحابة والتابعين لهم بإحسان، مع أن حديث «الثنتين والسبعين فرقة» ليس في الصحيحين، وقد ضَعَفَهُ ابن حزم وغيره، لكن حسَنَهُ غيره أو صَحَّحَهُ، كما صَحَّحَهُ الحاكم وغيره»** **“Whoever declares all seventy-two sects to be disbelievers has contradicted the Quran, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Companions and their righteous followers. Furthermore, the hadith of the seventy-two sects is not found in the two Sahihs (Bukhari and Muslim), and Ibn Hazm and others have deemed it weak, while others have considered it sound or authentic, as did Al-Hakim and others.”**

Al-Shawkani stated, **«زيادة «كلها في النار» لا تصح مرفوعة ولا موقوفة»** **“The addition ‘all of them in Hellfire’ is not authentic, either as marfoo' (attributed to the Prophet (saw)) or as mawqoof ((attributed to a Companion).”** Al-Shawkani included it in his book, **“Al-Fawa'id al-Majmu'ah.”** In contrast, the hadith of “division” was authenticated by al-Tirmidhi, Ibn Hibban, al-Hakim, and a group of later ulema. The meaning of “community” in this hadith is the Islamic Ummah unified under one Khaleefah (Caliph). The Companions (ra) called the year of their unification under Mu'awiyah the Year of Jama'ah (Community of Muslims), after their previous division. Similarly, any group based on Islamic aqeedah is considered part of the Jama'ah (Community of Muslims), even if they differ on subsidiary matters. However, calling for non-Islamic ideologies, such as secularism, is a call to division.

From a political perspective, the word Jama'ah is also the opposite of “division.” It has been narrated in hadiths that the term Jama'ah, in addition to its meaning in aqeedah, refers to the unified Islamic political system, namely the Khilafah (Caliphate), and that obedience to its Imam is obligatory for Muslims. The Messenger of Allah (saw) said, **«مَنْ خَرَجَ مِنَ الطَّاعَةِ، وَفَارَقَ الْجَمَاعَةَ، فَمَاتَ؛»** **«مَاتَ مِيتَةً جَاهِلِيَّةً»** **“Whoever abandons obedience and separates from the Jama'ah (Community of Muslims), and then dies, dies a death of ignorance”** [Muslim]. He (saw) also said, **«تَلَزُمُ»** **«جَمَاعَةَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَإِمَامَهُمْ»** **“Adhere to the Jama'ah of Muslims and their Imam”** [Muslim]. Therefore, separating from the Jama'ah and rebelling against it are forbidden. Today, since the Jama'ah lacks a unified body, and since nation-states and nationalist parties have prevented its unity, establishing a single Islamic Jama'ah has become a Shariah obligation. Every Hizb that pursues this path is making a Dawah for unity. Conversely, the nationalist parties and nation-states that have fragmented the Jama'ah into nationalistic borders and identities are the greatest factor in this division and the greatest obstacle to achieving Islamic unity.

The Struggle for Authority (Sultah) and Division

The ideology of Hizb ut Tahrir is Islamic, and its goal is to establish a unified Jama'ah of Muslims. Therefore, its Dawah is a Dawah for unity, while the Dawah for secularism, nationalism, and the nation-state is a call for division. However, when society today mentions unity and

division, it often refers to the common understanding of the two words: nationalism, tribalism, partisanship, or intellectual and Fiqhi differences.

When the Islamic Ummah was at the height of its intellectual, fiqhi, and civilizational flourishing, this prosperity was truly the fruit of the intellectual and political awakening it experienced. It was the result of reasoned reflection and contemplation of the Shariah texts and a correct understanding of reality. However, when intellectual and fiqhi differences turned into division and conflict, political factors played a major role.

This historical reality led the Sunnis, as a new identity, to adopt positions of authority. This situation took shape during the Abbasid Khilafah (Caliphate) of al-Mutawakkil, following the Khilafah of al-Ma'mun, al-Mu'tasim, and al-Wathiq, who had adopted the Mu'tazilite school of thought. Ulema and rulers, both since al-Mutawakkil's reign, collaborated to make decisions that served their shared interests in the face of intellectual disagreements, even though Sunni ulema were sincere in their opposition.

Ulema viewed narrowing the scope of fiqhi difference as a means to prevent the infiltration of dissenting groups, such as the Mu'tazilites, Shiah, and Kharijites, while those in power saw it as a way to maintain order and political strength. When both sides agreed on this view, steps were taken under the guise of "preventing fitnah and division." The door of ijtiḥad (juristic derivation) was closed, critical thinking was suppressed, accountability of rulers was curtailed, and even restrictions were placed on understanding and referring to the Quran.

Even today, whenever someone speaks of ijtiḥad, critical thinking, political affiliation, or holding rulers accountable, some people view it through the lens of division. Although the suppression of reason and political activity has no basis in Islamic texts, it arose from historical experiences from which some ulema drew erroneous lessons, imposing restrictions upon them. Those in power then inclined towards these restrictions to preserve their authority. All of this led to the stagnation and paralysis of the Jama'ah of Muslims, a paralysis from which it has not yet recovered. The true lesson from history is not to repeat its mistakes.

Differences of opinion are acceptable in Islam, as they are inherent in human nature. People differ in many matters, and Islam — the Deen for innate human nature — has acknowledged this fact. Therefore, differing interpretations of Islamic Shariah Law are acceptable, but this is not sufficient, as the fiqhi differences can become a cause of division. Herein lies the question: how can we determine that a Hizb, despite holding differing interpretations, is not actively working towards division?

Herein lies a fundamental principle: whenever an individual or group is absorbed by the allure of power, instead of adhering to Islamic Shariah obligations and the strength of Shariah evidence, they are inevitably heading towards fragmentation. The sheer pursuit of power negates any possibility of accepting differing fiqhi opinions. History is replete with clear examples: from the Kharijites to the Mu'tazilites and the Wahhabis, they all lost in the struggle for power, sacrificing their Shariah obligations in favor of competing for power. In contrast, the proponents of unity under Shariah Law consider Shariah obligations and the strength of Shariah evidence as fundamental principles, viewing authority as a means to establish Islamic Shariah Law, not exploiting Islamic Shariah Law as a means to attain authority.

Undoubtedly, the inclination towards authority is an innate human trait. On the one hand, acquiring authority to establish and empower Islam is a Shariah obligation, for Deen cannot be established or manifested except through authority. On the other hand, power is a great arena for testing humanity, as Suleiman (as) said, **﴿هَذَا مِنْ فَضْلِ رَبِّي لِيَبْلُوَنِي أَأَشْكُرُ أَمْ أَكْفُرُ﴾** **“This is from the favor of my Lord to test me whether I will be grateful or ungrateful”** [TMQ Surah An-Naml 40]. However, what is meant by the struggle for power here is the mere pursuit of authority, in which Shariah obligation and the strength of Shariah evidence are sacrificed.

Islam has shown that authority is not an end in itself. Imam Ali (ra) did not fight the Kharijites until they drew their swords, because his concern was fulfilling his Shariah obligation, not merely preserving power. Similarly, Uthman (ra) surrendered himself to prevent the Ummah from descending into discord and division. Instead of defending his authority, he prioritized God's pleasure. It is mentioned in "Al-Awasim min al-Qawasim" that Uthman (ra) forbade the Companions from fighting alongside him against the rebels, saying that he would not allow

anyone to be killed because of him. He submitted to the decree of Allah (swt) until he was martyred.

From this, ulema today pose the question: If the ruler of the Muslims were placed in a situation similar to that of Uthman (ra), should he sacrifice himself to prevent discord?

Therefore, it can be said that the mere pursuit of power is a characteristic of those who seek division, while adherence to Shariah obligation and the strength of Shariah evidence is a characteristic of those who seek unity.

Here are some manifestations of the mere pursuit of power:

1. Takfir (Accusing of Kufr) Based on Mutashaabahaat (Ambiguous متشابهات) Texts

Although Takfir is fundamentally a Shariah ruling, it has also been used throughout history as a tool. Groups and states have resorted to Takfir, immorality, and heresy to justify oppression or suppress fiqhi difference. This is why Takfir has often extended into the political arena.

In this context, Hizb ut-Tahrir is considered one of the most cautious movements regarding Takfir and the application of such labels. Based on the Quran, Sunnah, and the biographies of the Companions (ra), it believes that the foundation of the religion lies in the clear Muhkamaat (محکّمات unambiguous) texts, while the Mutashaabahaat are open to interpretation and debate amongst ulema. Islamic history is replete with examples of Takfir based on Mutashaabahaat, from the Kharijites to the Mutakalimoon and even followers of the schools of Islamic Fiqh. A little reflection reveals that the roots of many of these acts of Takfir lay in the pursuit of power.

In contrast, Hizb ut-Tahrir focuses on the clear Muhkamaat (محکّمات unambiguous). Unity does not mean that everyone agrees on a single opinion, but rather that they adhere to the established principles, unify under one leader, and strive to uphold the Deen, even if they differ in the branches. Therefore, takfir in the address of Hizb ut-Tahrir is generally directed at the systems of disbelief and their governing structures, not at individuals or groups.

As for those who make power an end in itself, they often resort to takfir to justify their actions. They consider themselves the sole possessors of truth, level accusations against others, and are incapable of accepting other Muslims. Hizb ut Tahrir categorically rejects this approach and considers it one of the greatest causes of division.

2. Absence of Consistency

The school of political realism, also called the “school of power school,” is based on the premise that everything in politics revolves around power, and that all values and elements, including culture and moral values, are sacrificed for the sake of power and self-interest. This school considers this approach not only realistic but also correct.

Those whose approach resembles this school are characterized by inconsistency. They change their stances according to circumstances and interests. Sometimes they raise the banner of the Khilafah (Caliphate), and at other times they become democrats; they make jihad the solution one day, then abandon it the next to appear “enlightened.”

In contrast, the Islamic idea and method are constant, and their Shariah evidence is definitive and unchanging. So, what makes the same matter permissible for these people at one time and forbidden at another? The answer is clear: self-interest and power-seeking which justify the means by the ends.

In contrast, Hizb ut Tahrir has, for over seventy years, made the establishment of the Khilafah Rashidah (Rightly Guided Caliphate) its goal, adopting the path of intellectual and political action based on the Prophetic methodology, and has not deviated from it, for any interest or authority not founded on Islam. It believes that divine nasr (victory) is extended only to those who act in accordance with Islamic Shariah Law and remain steadfast despite the temptations of power and self-interest. If Hizb ut Tahrir sought power for itself, changing its direction and methods would have been easy for it.

Fayez Taha once sat with Sheikh Taqi al-Din al-Nabhani and asked him: What is the difference between us and the other movements working to revive the Islamic way of life? The Sheikh returned the question to him to learn his opinion.

Fayez Taha said: We understand Islam better, we have stronger culturing, we are more politically aware, our opinions are stronger, and we are sincerer.

Sheikh al-Nabhani responded, explaining that this is not the distinguishing characteristic of the Hizb; there are other groups with political understanding and awareness, and many Muslims are people of sincerity and Iman. The distinguishing characteristic that sets Hizb ut Tahrir apart is its will, conviction, and self-confidence in achieving its goal. That is, its belief in Islam's idea, its hard work towards practical realization of Islam's idea, and its dedication of all its awareness, understanding, and energy to achieving this goal. This is an intellectual matter that stems from genuine feeling and profound thought, and leads to a firm conviction, not merely academic knowledge.

3. Power for Its Own Sake

One manifestation of the desire for power is when an individual or group believes that authority is their exclusive right, and that the legitimacy of any authority is contingent upon their presence, or the presence of their Hizb, at its helm. Although Hizb ut Tahrir considers itself prepared to lead the Khilafah (Caliphate), due to decades of work and preparation, it believes that whoever establishes the Khilafah on the Method of the Prophethood, even if not a member of the Hizb, is to be obeyed, even if the Hizb is not in power. This is a crucial principle in Hizb ut Tahrir's concept of "seeking military support (nussrah)."

The Hizb does not seek power for its own sake, but instead for Islam. Any authority that is not established for Islam, or is incapable of implementing it, has no value in the Hizb's eyes. This mindset has remained constant in the Hizb's culture and leadership since its founding. A clear example is Sheikh Taqi al-Din al-Nabhani (may Allah have mercy on him), who, despite his capabilities and resources, did not seek personal power, but always strived to make Islam the foundation of governance. He refused offers of absolute authority, including one from Adib ash-Shishakli in Syria, and support from certain factions within the Jordanian army before 1964. His reason for refusing, as he himself explained, was that Jordanian society had not yet accepted the Hizb or its ideas.

Sheikh al-Nabhani (rh) was capable of attaining positions of power and prestige, and of profiting from worldly possessions, but he lived a life of hardship and adversity, and died in poverty. Security considerations were so stringent that, after a lifetime of political activism under tight security restrictions, only about twenty people attended his funeral in Beirut, some of whom didn't even know who they were praying for. Muhammad Daoud Awad, a member of Fatah organization (PLO) who knew him in his youth and attended the funeral, said, "Al-Nabhani was one of the Ummah's most devoted men; he died in abject poverty, a frail and ailing old man, living in tattered clothes in a small apartment on the fifth floor of a modest building" (Al Jazeera Arabic).

4. Enjoining Maroof (Goodness) and Forbidding Munkar (Evil) in Politics and Division

Hizb ut Tahrir believes that one of the signs of a vibrant society is the continued presence of the concept of enjoining maroof and forbidding munkar, especially when applied to rulers. This constitutes half of politics; Muslims must monitor their rulers, advise them, and call them to what is right when they err. However, throughout history, this concept has been restricted, and sometimes even prohibited, under the pretext of "maintaining order" or "preventing sedition."

Hizb ut Tahrir has demonstrated steadfastness and courage in reviving this political Shariah obligation, even though this has often brought it repression and pressure. This is because the Hizb does not seek power for its own sake, nor does it approach those in power out of greed for worldly gains. On the contrary, the Hizb believes that sycophants and court loyalists are among the most prominent factors of division.

From the Hizb's perspective, division is not solely caused by material factors. A ruler who fears the advice and criticism of Islamic parties and prohibits it in the name of "public interest" or "preventing sedition" is, in fact, pushing society toward true sedition and divine punishment. The greatest of trials is disunity among Muslims. The Prophet (saw) warned, saying, «وَالَّذِي نَفْسِي بِيَدِهِ لَتَأْمُرُنَّ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَلَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ أَوْ لَيُوشِكَنَّ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَبْعَثَ عَلَيْكُمْ عِقَابًا مِنْهُ ثُمَّ تَدْعُوهُ فَلَا يُسْتَجَابُ لَكُمْ» **"By Him in Whose Hand is my soul, you must enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong, or Allah will soon send upon you a punishment from Him, then you will call upon Him, but He will not answer you."** [At-Tirmidhi].

Therefore, enjoining all that is maroof (goodness) must be a political and collective action. The Quran made it the Shariah obligation of a "group" of Muslims, not merely an individual act. Hence, forming political parties is a Shariah means to achieve unity, vigilance, and accountability of rulers. Only those who fear for their interests and power will fear enjoining what is right in the political arena. The Messenger of Allah (saw) said, «أَلَا يَمْنَعُ أَحَدَكُمْ رَهْبَةُ النَّاسِ أَنْ يَقُولَ بِحَقِّ إِذَا رَأَاهُ أَوْ شَهِدَهُ، أَنْ يَقُولَ بِحَقِّ أَوْ يَذْكُرَ بِعَظِيمٍ» **“Let not the fear of people prevent any of you from speaking the truth when you see it or witness it, for speaking the truth or reminding others of something great neither hastens death nor delays sustenance”** [Ahmad].

An example of this is the story of Ibrahim as-Saigh. Al-Jassas, in his book “Ahkam al-Quran,” recounts the story of a man of devotion to Deen and abstention from material desires, diligent in his obedience to Allah (swt), who was bold in enjoining maruf and forbidding munkar. Ibrahim courageously confronted Abu Muslim al-Khorasani with harsh words. Although he possessed no military power and confined himself to verbal struggle, Abu Muslim repeatedly imprisoned and released him, until finally killing him for his outspoken objections. Imam Abu Hanifa, may Allah have mercy on him, was deeply saddened by this and wept. He explained that he had repeatedly warned Ibrahim: enjoining good and forbidding evil is a great Shariah obligation, but performing it individually, without collective support, exposes one to destruction and does not benefit the community. Instead, it must be carried out with other righteous men and under trustworthy leadership, not alone. The Imam thus indicated that this Shariah obligation, unlike many individual acts of worship, requires a group and organization to be effective and to minimize the potential harm to those who speak the truth.

5. Partisanship and Division

Hizb ut Tahrir considers itself one of the Islamic groups, not the only Islamic group. The Hizb's relationship with other Islamic movements is like that of one Muslim to another within the framework of Shariah guardianship; each calls the other to good and forbids them from evil. An example of this approach is the Hizb's efforts to unify the ranks of the mujahideen in Syria during the Arab Spring, when it warned against American conspiracies. Similarly, regarding the Gaza issue, it launched a wide campaign in Turkey, and the rest of the Muslim World, meeting with ulema and Islamic parties to present a unified voice in support of Palestine.

Hizb ut Tahrir does not believe that there is only one path, school of thought, or ijtihaad within the branches of Islam, that constitutes the path to salvation. The ijtihaads and opinions adopted by the Hizb are based on organizational necessity and the reality of ijtihaad, not on the premise that Paradise is confined to its understanding or that its opinions alone represent the truth.

An example of this is what Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi recounts about his meeting with the founder of Hizb ut Tahrir, Sheikh Taqi al-Din al-Nabhani. In one of his recordings, he spoke about his travels to Palestine and the illness that led to his hospitalization in Malhas Hospital. He said that Sheikh al-Nabhani came to visit him. He was a sheikh in a robe and turban, resembling the sheikhs of Egypt. He inquired about his travels, and a friendly conversation ensued between them about knowledge and travel. Then he introduced himself, saying, "The Daee, Taqi al-Din al-Nabhani." Al-Qaradawi thanked him, considering it a favor, as al-Qaradawi was then merely a student of Islamic knowledge, while al-Nabhani was the founder of a Hizb and a leader who had come to visit him.

From all these examples, it becomes clear that Hizb ut Tahrir is not a cause of division, but instead works to unify the Ummah on the basis of Islamic Aqeedah. The Hizb has built its path and methods on firm Shariah evidence and has remained steadfast upon it. Neither promises of power, nor threats, nor torture have been able to divert it from its course. The Hizb sees itself as part of the body of the Ummah, and its mission is to revive this body and establish a single Islamic state.

Therefore, it is the responsibility of Muslims to respond to this Dawah, to adopt its message of unity, to support it, and to abandon calls for division through nationalism, secularism and all other non-Islamic ideas, and to stand against them.