



STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD

HEARING ON

**“SHARIA-FREE AMERICA: WHY POLITICAL ISLAM & SHARIA LAW
ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, PART II”**

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PRESENTED

May 14, 2026

The Muslim Public Affairs Council (“MPAC”) respectfully submits this Statement for the Record concerning the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government hearing titled, “Sharia-Free America: Why Political Islam & Sharia Law are Incompatible with the U.S. Constitution: Part II.”

MPAC is a national public policy and civic engagement organization dedicated to advancing constitutional rights, religious liberty, and equal protection under the law. We submit this statement to express our profound concern that this Subcommittee, charged with defending constitutional liberties and the principles of limited government, is convening a second hearing in a single Congress premised on the idea that the faith of millions of Americans is inherently suspect under the Constitution.

The premise underlying this hearing lacks both factual and legal foundation. The Constitution is already the supreme law of the land, and no religious belief or tradition can supersede federal or state law. Existing constitutional safeguards already prohibit any attempt to override constitutional governance, yet no evidence has been presented demonstrating any effort by American Muslims to replace the Constitution or impose religious rule through governmental authority.

For American Muslims, “Sharia” commonly refers to a broad religious and ethical framework informing personal conduct and religious practice, including prayer, fasting, charitable giving, dietary observance, and family life. Muslims engage with these principles voluntarily and privately within the framework of American law, much like adherents of other faith traditions rely upon their own religious teachings in their daily lives. Against that backdrop, repeated congressional hearings focused specifically on whether Islam is compatible with the Constitution raise serious constitutional concerns regarding religious neutrality and equal treatment under the law. Congressional oversight authority should not be used in a manner that places institutional suspicion on a single faith community absent evidence of unlawful conduct or constitutional harm.



MUSLIM PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

The Establishment Clause prohibits government actions that endorse, disfavor, or target a particular religion. The Free Exercise Clause protects the ability of individuals and communities to practice their religion free from government hostility, discrimination, or unequal treatment. Hearings dedicated to examining whether Islam itself is compatible with constitutional governance risk undermining both principles. The constitutional concern is heightened by the selective nature of these proceedings. Congress is not convening hearings examining whether other religious or ideological movements are compatible with the Constitution, even amid ongoing public debate regarding government-affiliated religious rhetoric and the role of religion in public life. Instead, official scrutiny remains disproportionately directed toward American Muslims.

That disparity risks creating what many American Muslims increasingly perceive as a “Muslim exception” to constitutional neutrality, where Muslims are subjected to forms of political and institutional suspicion not applied equally to other religious communities. Additionally, we are deeply concerned about the broader policy and societal implications hearings of this nature can produce. Congressional proceedings carry institutional legitimacy and shape public discourse, media framing, and public perception. When unsupported narratives portraying Muslim communities as threats to constitutional governance are elevated through official proceedings, Congress risks legitimizing discriminatory rhetoric, reinforcing public suspicion toward an entire faith community, and contributing to a broader climate of anti-Muslim hostility.

The consequences of this climate are measurable. MPAC’s tracking documented an eleven-fold increase in violent attacks against American Muslims and Muslim institutions in March 2026 compared to prior monthly averages across our monitoring period. Independent organizations tracking hate activity and extremist rhetoric similarly documented significant increases in Islamophobic activity during the same period.

That increase did not emerge in isolation. It occurred during a period in which elected officials and public figures increasingly portrayed Muslims and Islam as politically dangerous, disloyal, or incompatible with American society. Government institutions cannot fully separate themselves from the foreseeable consequences of their rhetoric and actions. Hearings repeatedly framing a minority faith community as a constitutional concern risk contributing to an environment in which harassment, intimidation, discrimination, and violence become more likely.

The Constitution does not impose religious tests for citizenship, loyalty, or participation in public life. American Muslims are entitled to the same constitutional protections, presumption of equality, and religious liberty afforded to every other community in the United States. Congressional oversight must remain grounded in evidence, constitutional principles, and legitimate threats to public welfare and democratic institutions. It should not be used to elevate unsupported narratives targeting an entire faith community.

MPAC respectfully urges Members of the Subcommittee to reaffirm the constitutional principles of religious neutrality, equal protection, and religious liberty and to reject efforts that treat the faith of millions of Americans as inherently suspect under the Constitution.