

Press Release

Loyalty Cannot Be Enforced!

The debate on loyalty, reignited by the football match between Morocco and The Netherlands, is merely the latest manifestation of a recurring societal discussion that rests upon a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of loyalty.

Loyalty is not a legal status. It is not an administrative fact, such as the possession of a passport, nor is it a declaration that can be signed under pressure. Loyalty is an inner conviction that arises from a worldview. It develops when a person is intellectually and emotionally connected to a particular idea, community, or civilization. For this reason, loyalty cannot be imposed; it can only emerge through conviction and be earned through just conduct.

It is precisely for this reason that loyalty can never be a prerequisite for people with different convictions to live together. Coexistence requires that people recognize one another's rights and abide by the rules that safeguard public order; it does not require them to share the same deepest convictions, identities, or loyalties. A society that demands its citizens first internalize a particular ideological or national loyalty before they are regarded as full members ultimately asks not for compliance with the law, but for inner conviction. In doing so, it leaves the realm of the rule of law and enters the realm of ideological assimilation.

No one expects a Christian to abandon his faith in order to become a subject of an Islamic state. Nor does anyone expect a socialist to become a liberal in order to live peacefully alongside liberals. Convictions cannot be coerced because they belong to the realm of intellectual belief. The moment a conviction is adopted under compulsion, it ceases to be a conviction and is reduced to nothing more than hollow outward conformity.

It is precisely for this reason that the question of loyalty posed to Muslims is so remarkable. They are often expected not only to obey the law but also to identify themselves with the secular national identity and its underlying principles. The implicit message is this: not only must the law be accepted, but also the philosophy upon which the state is founded.

At this point, the condition for peaceful coexistence gradually shifts from adherence to the rule of law to ideological assimilation. The requirement is no longer to live together despite differences, but to internalize one dominant worldview. The standard is no longer: "Do you abide by the rule of law?" but rather: "Do you think as we do?"

It is precisely here that the paradox of liberal discourse reveals itself. A society that proclaims "diversity," "freedom," and "pluralism" often struggles with fundamentally different worldviews once they become organized, visible, and assert an independent intellectual identity.

For the Muslim community, this contains an important lesson. The solution is neither to try even harder to prove that one is "truly Dutch," nor to retreat into ethnic nationalism. Both responses accept the same premise: that one's highest loyalty is owed to the nation-state.

Islam proceeds from a different premise. The Muslim's primary loyalty is not to a geographical or ethnic category, but to a creed. The bond of the Ummah is not founded upon blood, language, or the nation-state, but upon a shared worldview and way of life. It is precisely for this reason that the identity of a Muslim cannot be reduced to a choice between two flags. The question is not whether he is Dutch or Moroccan. The essential question is which worldview shapes and directs his loyalty.

Okay Pala

**Media Representative of Hizb ut Tahrir
in The Netherlands**