

Dangerous Concepts

to Attack Islam and Consolidate
the Western Culture



Al-Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB

e-mail: info@khilafah.com
website: <http://www.khilafah.com>

Al-Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB

e-mail: info@khilafah.com
website: http://www.khilafah.com

This booklet has been published by Hizb ut-Ta h r i r
First Edition
1419 AH/1997

Dhul -Qa'adah 1421/1422 AH / 2001 CE

ISBN: 1899 574 174

Translation of the Qur'an

It should be perfectly clear that the Qur'an is only authentic in its original language, Arabic. Since perfect translation of the Qur'an is impossible, we have used the translation of the meaning of the Qur'an' throughout the book, as the result is only a crude meaning of the Arabic text.

Qur'anic *Ayat* and transliterated words have been *italicised* in main part of the book.

Saying of the Messenger ﷺ appear in **bold**

ﷻ - subhanahu wa ta'ala
ﷺ - sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam
RA - radhi allaho anha/anho
AH - After Hijrah
CE - Common Era



هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ
يُظهِرُهُ عَلَىٰ الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ

Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim

“They (the disbelievers) want to extinguish Allah's Light (Islam) with their mouths, but Allah will not allow except that His Light should be perfected even though the Kafirun may hate it. It is He Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad) with guidance and the Deen of truth, to make it superior to every other way of life even though the Mushrikun may hate it.”

[At-Tauba: 32-33]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Content

Opening Ayah	3
Introduction	5
Terrorism (Al-Irhab)	8
Interfaith Dialogue	13
Compromise (Wasatiyyah)	28
Fundamentalism	33
Globalisation	38

Introduction



Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim

The struggle between good (*Khair*) and bad (*Sharr*), and truth (*Haqq*) and falsehood (*Batil*) is one of the universal laws of life. The Wisdom (*Hikma*) of Allah ﷻ dictates that the struggle and contest between the people should be a factor in the victory of truth and good and the defeat of falsehood and evil. Allah ﷻ says:

وَلَوْلَا دَفَعُ اللَّهُ النَّاسَ بَعْضَهُمْ بِبَعْضٍ لَفَسَدَتِ الْأَرْضُ

"And if Allah did not check one set of people by means of another, the earth would indeed be full of mischief." [Al-Baqarah: 251]

Allah ﷻ also says:

وَلَوْلَا دَفَعُ اللَّهُ النَّاسَ بَعْضَهُمْ بِبَعْضٍ لَهَدَّمتْ صَوَامِعُ
وَبِيَعٌ وَصَلَوَاتٌ وَمَسَاجِدٌ يُذَكَّرُ فِيهَا اسْمُ اللَّهِ

"For had it not been that Allah checks one set of people by means of another, the monasteries, churches, synagogues and mosques, wherein the Name of Allah is mentioned much would surely have been pulled down." [Al-Hajj: 40]

Thus the Messenger ﷺ and his noble *Sahabah* embarked on an intellectual and political struggle against the *Mushrikeen* and the other *Kuffar* to establish the Islamic State. In addition to the intellectual struggle, a bloody struggle followed the establishment of the State, so Islam could be carried as the Message of good and guidance (*Huda*) to the whole of mankind. Throughout the ages the *Kuffar* have plotted against the Islamic State. They did this through material actions of war

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

such as the Mongols, Crusaders, and the *Kuffar* of Spain; and sometimes through cultural and intellectual actions as the heretics (*Zanadiqa*), missionaries and orientalists did, in order to destroy the Khilafah State as an executive body, at the head of which is the *Khaleefah*.

After the First World War the *Kuffar* achieved their objective. They destroyed the Khilafah, expelled the *Khaleefah* and broke up the Islamic lands into weak statelets in which the rules of *Kufr* were applied, thinking that by such actions Islam would be banished from the hearts of the Muslims.

However the sensations of revival are now flowing back into the Islamic *Ummah* at the hands of her believing, sincere and aware sons. The *Kufr* states now realise that the strength of Islam is not solely confined to its executive body, and that seducing certain weak Muslim souls with the lure and temptation of Western culture will not achieve their objectives.

After research and study they came to the conclusion that the power of Islam (and that of the Muslims) lies with the Islamic *Aqeedah* and the thoughts that emanate from it. This has led them to review and re-develop their plans so that the *Kufr* nations, with their official institutions and their agents, i.e. the rulers and thinkers in the Muslim lands, can attempt to finish off Islam by destroying its *Aqeedah* as a political *Aqeedah* to ensure the creed of separating religion (*Deen*) from life can take its place. They began adopting certain thoughts and promoting concepts, such as nationalism, socialism, democracy, pluralism, human rights, freedom and free-market policies, whose fallacy and danger have already been explained. (See book *The American Campaign to Destroy Islam*)

The *Kuffar* then put forward other thoughts accompanied by actions such as inter-faith and inter-cultural dialogues, and the viewpoint that both the Arab and Jewish races are the sons of Abraham. They started to tarnish Islam with the ideas of terrorism, fundamentalism and extremism. Therefore it is vital that we clarify the nature of these opinions and their danger to the Islamic *Ummah* so she may be aware of them and so she adopts the correct stance towards them. This is especially so since the return of Islam to life as a global ideology and political system, conveyed to mankind by the Khilafah state, has become

obvious, not only for the Muslim activists, but also for the Islamic *Ummah* and the enemies of Islam who continue to conspire against this *Deen* and its *Ummah*.

We discuss these thoughts to demonstrate their danger and fallacy, not as thoughts that need to be understood or doubts that need to be dispelled, but as part of the work of the *Kuffar*, led by the United States and Great Britain. Through these thoughts the *Kuffar* aim to attack Islam and those who work for the re-establishment of the Khilafah, and even to attack the Khilafah when Allah ﷻ permits it to be established.

Therefore we must expose these thoughts and actions, so that Muslims realise what the *Kuffar* have planned for them, and what is planned against Islam. This will ensure that the Muslims hold tight to their *Deen* and work earnestly to re-establish the Khilafah on the way of the Prophethood by emulating the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, so the re-establishment of the Khilafah and the rule by what Allah has revealed can be realised at their hands. Allah ﷻ said:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ
لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ

"It is He Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad) with guidance and the *Deen* of truth, to make it superior over every other way of life even though the *Mushrikun* may hate it." [At-Tauba: 32-33]

If we carry out what Allah ﷻ has obliged upon us, we can be sure that the hopes of the *Kuffar* who plot against Islam and the Muslims will be dashed, they will lose their wealth and their fire will be extinguished. Allah ﷻ says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا يُنْفِقُونَ أَمْوَالَهُمْ لِيَصُدُّوا عَنْ سَبِيلِ
اللَّهِ فَسَيَنْفِقُونَهَا ثُمَّ تَكُونُ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسْرَةً ثُمَّ يُغْلَبُونَ

"Verily, those who disbelieve spend their wealth to hinder (men) from the Path of Allah, so they will continue to spend it; but in the end it will become an anguish for them. Then they will be defeated." [Al-Anfal: 36]

2 Terrorism

(Al-Irhab)

Linguistically, *Al-Irhab* (terrorism) is a noun derived from the verb *Arhaba* (to terrify) with the meaning to frighten or scare. Allah ﷻ said:

تُرْهِبُونَ بِهِ عَدُوَّ اللَّهِ وَعَدُوَّكُمْ

"(Liturhibo) to threaten the enemy of Allah and your enemy." [Al-Anfal: 60]

i.e. you should frighten the enemy.

However, this has been altered to give a new meaning to the word. In a seminar in 1979 both the American and British intelligence services agreed to redefine terrorism as 'the use of violence against civil interests to achieve political objectives.'

Thereafter, many international conferences and seminars have been held and legislation and canons passed to define those actions which can be described as terrorism, clarifying the types of movements, organisations and parties which practise terrorism and highlighting those states supporting terrorism. The *Kufr* states contend that this was done to adopt the necessary measures to fight terrorism and to control its spread.

It is clear from the legislation and laws relating to terrorism that they are not accurate. These anti-terrorist laws are subject to the political bias of the states that enacted them. For example, we see that the United States considered the assassination of Indira Ghandi as a terrorist act, but not the assassination of King Faisal nor the murder of Kennedy. At first, she described the blowing up of the FBI building in Oklahoma city as a terrorist act, but when it became clear that those behind the

explosion were American militias they changed their portrayal of it from being an act of terrorism to a simple criminal act.

The United States in particular describes certain movements as popular opposition movements like the rebels of Nicaragua and the IRA and others. She considers the fighters of these movements, when arrested, as prisoners of war according to Protocol (1) of the 1977 Geneva Convention. On the other hand, every movement opposing American interests or the interests of its agents is considered a terrorist movement and is placed on the list of terrorist organisations. This list, periodically issued by the US State Department, regularly includes most of the Islamic movements in Egypt, Pakistan, Palestine, Algeria etc.

Since the 1970s, America has generated national and international public opinion according to her viewpoint of what constitutes terrorism. She has consistently exploited actions aimed at civil targets for her own ends, whether these actions came from political or military movements not linked to America, or from movements connected to the intelligence services of America. For example, many reports have indicated that some actions described as terrorist were backed by personnel from the CIA, like the hijacking of the TWA aeroplane at Beirut at the beginning of the 1980s. The United States also exploited the explosion that occurred at the American al-Khobar base in Saudi Arabia. In 1996, at the G7 Conference in Paris she made forty recommendations regarding the fight against terrorism. Even before knowing the identity of the bombers, she used the incidents of the World Trade Centre bombing in New York and the bombing of the FBI offices in Oklahoma to promote anti-terrorism legislation approved by the US Senate in 1997.

The G7 recommendations and the anti-terrorism legislation gave the United States the authority to pursue any suspected terrorists worldwide. The United States believes she has the right to arrest and kidnap any person she considers guilty of any terrorist act and implement any punishment she deems appropriate, for example, prison, exile, withdrawal of residential and/or national rights and so on. All this can be done without giving the accused the right to defend himself or to be represented before a civil court or jury.

In addition, the United States regularly stereotypes those countries

opposing US interests as terrorist states, for example North Korea, China, Iraq and Libya. She has accused many Islamic movements of terrorism; movements like Islamic Jihad, Hamas, Jama'ah Islamiyyah in Egypt and FIS in Algeria. In this manner, she has also exploited bombings against the Jews in Palestine and the acts that took place in Algeria on the eve of the military's abolition of the parliamentary elections.

According to these laws, resolutions and recommendations, the United States can pursue and attack anyone she considers to be a terrorist, whether individual, organisation, party or state, by using her military forces or political influence to impose economic sanctions, as was seen in Iraq and Libya. This viewpoint was expressed by her former Secretary of State George Schultz when he said: 'However much terrorists may try to escape they will not be able to hide.'

Thus, the anti-terrorism law adopted by the United States is one of the strategic weapons she uses to tighten her hold on the world, especially with respect to those countries which have the capacity to rebel against US policy.

Since the United States has identified Islam as her greatest enemy after the fall of communism, the Islamic countries are now seen as strategic areas in which she will use the anti-terrorism law in order to increase her influence and keep them under control. This is because Muslims are now seeking the path of revival to re-establish the Khilafah, which the United States and other *Kufr* nations know to be the only State capable of destroying the capitalist ideology, which America heads.

This is why we will find no Islamic movements that have not been labelled as terrorist by the United States. Even political parties and movements that do not use material actions to realise their objectives are not exempt from this label. Thus the United States considers the activity of any movement, party or state calling for the return of Islam as a terrorist action breaching international law. With this justification, and by compelling those nations who have adopted the anti-terrorism legislation, she is able to mobilise the forces of these nations under her leadership to strike these movements, parties or states.

Therefore it has become incumbent on those Muslims working for the re-establishment of the Khilafah, being a direct target of the so-called policy of anti-terrorism, to expose the reality of this law to Islamic and global public opinion. They must also expose the reality of US policy which works to dominate the world through this law, and that she is the real perpetrator of many of the bombings and explosions worldwide that have been attributed to Muslim individuals, groups or states.

It is also incumbent on the Muslims to be Islamic in their actions and behaviour. Islam has a specific way of realising its aims and objectives. This is manifested in carrying the call to resume the Islamic way of life by re-establishing the Khilafah. Adherence to this method, which relies on intellectual and political struggle to the exclusion of material actions, is adherence to the *Shara'i* method ordered by Islam, and not out of fear or desiring to escape from the label of terrorism.

It is incumbent on Muslims to be clear that the task of the Islamic State after its establishment is restricted to *Shar'a*. Whether it is internal such as looking after the affairs of the people and implementing the *Hudood* (penal code), or external such as conveying Islam through *Jihad* to the all mankind and destroying the material obstacles that are a barrier to the implementation of Islam.

The Muslims must be clear that the comprehensive implementation of Islam by Muslims on themselves and others does not originate from the whims of Muslims nor does it aim at realising certain specific interests. Rather it is in compliance with the orders of Allah ﷻ who created man, life and the universe and ordered man to organise his life in accordance with the rules of Islam, which He ﷻ revealed to Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.

Thus the description of Islam and the Muslims as terrorist by the United States and other countries is a biased description. It is contrary to the reality and contradicts what Allah ﷻ wishes from Islam. He ﷻ said:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً لِّلْعَالَمِينَ

"And We have sent you (O Muhammad) not but as a mercy for the 'Alameen (worlds)." [Al-Anbiya: 107]

Allah ﷻ also said:

وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ تَبْيَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ
وَهُدًى وَرَحْمَةً وَبُشْرَىٰ لِلْمُسْلِمِينَ

"And We have sent down to you the Book (the Qur'an) as an exposition of everything, a guidance, a mercy, and glad tidings for those who have submitted themselves to Allah." [Al-Nahl: 89]

This mercy is clearly shown by the implementation of the rules of Islam. There is no difference between prayer (*Salah*) and *Jihad*, between *Du'a* and frightening the enemy. There is no difference between *Zakah* and cutting the hand of the thief, nor is there a difference between helping the grieved and killing those who commit aggression against the sanctities of the Muslims. All of them are *Shara'i* rules which the Muslims or the State will implement in practice and when its time comes.

Interfaith Dialogue

Inviting non-Muslims to Islam is a matter that Allah ﷻ has made obligatory on the Muslims. The Muslims have been doing this for fourteen centuries, and continue call others to Islam whether they are from the People of the Book or not. Allah ﷻ said:

ادْعُ إِلَى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحُكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ
الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُمْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ

"Invite (O Muhammad) to the Way of your Lord with Hikma (clear proof) and fair preaching, and argue with them in a way that is better." [Al-Nahl: 125]

And he ﷺ said in his letter to Heraclius, the Roman Emperor: **"Verily, I invite you with the call of Islam. Embrace Islam and you shall be safe and Allah will grant you the reward twice. If you turn away then upon you will bear the sin of the people under your rule."**

Thus, our call to the non-Muslims is an invitation to have conviction in Islam and to abandon *Kufr*.

As for the idea of interfaith dialogue that is being circulated nowadays, it is a foreign, evil and Western idea that has no basis in Islam. This is because it calls for mutual relationships between different religions. It calls for a new fabricated religion which the *Kuffar* want the Muslims to embrace instead of Islam, because the advocates and followers of this idea are the *Kuffar* themselves.

Internationally, this idea started in 1932 when France sent

representatives to confer with the scholars of al-Azhar University about the idea of uniting the three religions: Islam, Christianity and Judaism. This was then followed by the Paris Conference of 1933 attended by orientalist and missionaries from every university in France, England, Switzerland, America, Italy, Poland, Spain, Turkey and others. The Conference of world religions in 1936 was the last conference of religions before the Second World War, which distracted the Europeans from these conferences.

In 1964 Pope Paolo VI sent a letter in which he called for dialogue between the religions. The Vatican then published a book in 1969 with the title: 'Guide to dialogue between the Muslims and Christians.'

During the 1970's and 1980's more than thirteen interfaith and intercultural meetings and conferences were held, the most prominent of which was the Second World Conference of Religion and Peace held in Belgium attended by 400 delegates from various world religions. Another conference was held in Cordoba in Spain attended by Muslim and Christian representatives from 23 countries. These two conferences were held in 1974 followed by the Christian-Muslim assembly in Qurtaj, Tunis in 1979.

It was in the 1990s that those calling for interfaith dialogue became most active. Thus they held the Arab-European Conference in 1993 in Jordan, followed in 1994 by the Khartoum Conference for interfaith dialogue. In 1995 two dialogue conferences were held, one in Stockholm and the other in Amman, both of which were followed by the Conference "Islam and Europe" at the University of Ahl al-Bayt in Jordan in 1996.

Justifications for dialogue:

One of the most significant justifications presented by delegates at the interfaith conferences is standing firm in the face of the disbelief and atheism represented by the Soviet Union before its collapse. Communism was depicted as a danger to the divine religions, which would threaten their cultural achievements. Then they pretended to weep for humanity and to fight for the defence of all believers in the world. They sought to define truth in relative terms, emphasising that no individual and no religion could claim sole ownership of the truth, but

it should be subject to the democratic process where the majority opinion is closest to the truth.

Recommendations of conference participants:

The following were the most important recommendations of the conferences held in the name of interfaith and intercultural dialogue and between Islam and Europe:

1. Devising and adopting new meanings and provisions for words such as disbelief, atheism, polytheism, belief, Islam, moderation, extremism and fundamentalism to ensure that these words would not become factors of division between people of different religions.
2. Identifying shared elements in the three religions, which would include creed, morals and culture, and to place emphasis on positive co-operation between the religions and cultures, since all the people of the Book were accepted as believers, and worshippers of Allah ﷻ.
3. The formation of a joint document on human rights to permit peace and co-existence between the followers of different religions. This would be achieved by eliminating the feeling of barriers of blood between the religions and by removing the concept of the cultures of different peoples and policies of different states.
4. A comprehensive review of the history and education curricula, so that they become free of any incitement or hatred. Religious education would be considered part of basic humanitarian studies that aim to create personalities open to human cultures and with mutual understanding of others. Therefore, the study of certain beliefs and worships had to be disqualified.
5. Raising interest in studying the following subjects and formulating unified concepts for them: justice, peace, women rights, human rights, democracy, work morals, pluralism, freedom, world peace, peaceful co-existence, cultural openness, civil society etc.

The means and styles of interfaith dialogue:

After the failure of the Western *Kuffar* in distancing the Muslims from their *Aqeedah* via the missionaries, orientalist, cultural works, the media, intellectual and political deception, they resorted to government authorities in their countries and in the countries of their agents. They began to hold conferences and seminars, formed joint work teams and established centres of study in their countries and in the Muslim lands, such as the Oxford Centre for Islamic studies, the Centre for Middle Eastern Studies at Durham University, the American college of the Holy Cross, the Muslim League, the Royal Academy for the study of Islamic Culture, the University of Ahl al-Bayt and the World Council of Churches etc.

They deliberately used terminologies and pretentious general expressions with undefined meanings to create deception and delusion. For example, terms such as renovation, openness to the world, human civilisation, universal sciences, the need for peaceful co-existence, renunciation of partisanship and extremism, globalisation etc., were all examples of this.

They mixed the concepts of science and culture, and the concepts of *Hadharah* (civilisation) and *Madaniyya* (material progression) to justify attacking those who hold to their specific way of life. They claimed that such people opposed science and technology and the civilisation arising from them, and accused them of being reactionary and backward, even though this is not the case in Islam. Islam opens its gates to science and to the technology that is derived from this science, but closes them in the face of any *Thaqafa* (culture) or *Madaniyya* from other than the *Thaqafa* and *Hadharah* of Islam. This is because these thoughts and concepts are related to the behaviour of the human being, which has to be controlled by the Islamic concepts about life.

They painted certain capitalist thoughts in glowing tones to the Muslims and promoted them by claiming that they do not contradict Islam to such an extent that some Muslims considered them as part of Islam, such as democracy, freedom, pluralism, socialism and others. On the other hand, they denounced certain Islamic thoughts and described them as uncivilised and out of date, such as *Jihad*, the *Hudood*, polygyny and other *Shara'i* rules.

They subjected the study of the Islamic texts to the Capitalist way of thinking, which makes the reality the source of the rule and not the subject of the thought. It makes benefit the criterion in adopting or leaving the rule rather than the *Halal* and the *Haram*. This incited some Muslims to invent certain principles, which did not rely on the *Shara'i* texts to understand Islam. This is like the *Fiqh* of reality, the *Fiqh* of balances, necessity permits the prohibited things and others. This resulted in the dilution of certain rules of Islam and non-differentiation of the foreign rule from the original rule, and even between what constitutes *Kufr* and what constitutes Islam. For example, *Riba* (usury) has become acceptable and martyrdom is now portrayed as suicide.

The *Kuffar* who initiated this dialogue are now generalising and widening its scope. It will no longer remain restricted to the few who participate in conferences and seminars. Rather it will include all sections of society from men, women, the educated and labourers. This is done via the universities, institutes of study, parties and associations. It is, as some conference delegates have described, joining the western *Hadharah* in economics, social relations, politics, education etc. Thus, Capitalism - according to their claim - is humanity, rationalism, freedom and democracy. It is the new and successful *Hadharah*. As for Islam, it is seen as blind faith, despotism and heritage and depicted as the sovereignty of religion, slavery and polygyny. It is thus an uncivilised religion!

One of the styles used to blind the Muslims to the real objective of these conferences is to invite those belonging to certain beliefs such as Hinduism, Buddhism and Sikhism to attend alongside the Muslims, Christians and Jews. This happened at the World Conference for Religion and Peace in Japan and in a seminar in Beirut in 1970, to ensure that Muslims would not suspect they were the only targets of the dialogue. How could so-called Muslim scholars allow Islam to be placed on an equal stage with Buddhism and other religions?!

The true viewpoint of the West towards Islam:

The West, which calls for dialogue with the Muslims and heads conferences of dialogue, views Islam as the enemy. This viewpoint is the motive for such dialogue and governs and directs this dialogue. For example, the encyclopaedia of French culture, which is a renowned point of reference, states that the Messenger Muhammad ﷺ is: 'a killer, the

Antichrist, kidnaps women and the greatest enemy to the human mind.' Likewise most of the textbooks in Western Europe describe the Messenger Muhammad ﷺ, Islam and the Muslims with the most ugliest of descriptions. Recently, the following has been mentioned in the book 'The End of History' written by the American thinker Fukuyama: "The Capitalist system is the eternal salvation for man on earth. Islam, despite its weakness and disintegration, threatens this new victorious way of life (i.e. capitalism)." The former General Secretary of NATO, Javier Solana, said: 'Fundamentalist Islam is the danger which threatens the geopolitics of the future.' The orientalist Barnard Lewis said about Islam and Capitalism: 'They are contradictory. There is no scope for dialogue.' And Samuel Huntington, professor of political science at Harvard University and the Director of the Institute of Strategic Studies said: "The clash between civilisations (*Hadharah*) will dominate foreign policy. The dividing lines between the civilisations (*Hadharah*) will be the battle lines in the future." Then he says: "Religion vehemently distinguishes itself and it is clear to the people. A person can be half French and half Arab...but it is difficult for a man to be half Catholic and half Muslim..."

Where is the dialogue they call us for from this enmity?

When these statements are compared with the hostile actions which have come from the West against Islam and the Muslims, such as the Crusades, the extermination of Muslims in Spain, the destruction of the Khilafah State and afterwards the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine, and the portrayal of Islam and the Islamic movements as terrorist and extremist. When we compare these statements, we realise the meaning and the aims of the dialogue that the *Kafir* West is conducting with the Muslims.

The aims of the Dialogue:

The primary aim that the capitalists are working to achieve from the dialogue between religions and *Hadharah* is to prevent the return of Islam to life's affairs as a comprehensive system. This is because it threatens the survival of their ideology and *Hadharah* and will destroy their interests and influence.

As for other partial aims that serve their primary aim, these are various. Thus the West aims to paint the world according to the colour of the Capitalist civilisation, especially in the Muslim lands, in order to replace

the Islamic *Hadharah*. This will make it easy for them to remove the Islamic *Thaqafa* (culture) from the minds of the people. They aim to achieve that by shaking the confidence of Muslims in the Islamic *Thaqafa* (culture) and in its sources and principles. They aim to neutralise Islam in the clash of civilisations by stripping it of its most important characteristics which distinguish it from other religions, namely the political aspect with which the Khilafah would be established to look after the affairs of the people according to the rules of Islam and carry it to the whole of mankind.

The Capitalists also aim to reshape the personality of the Muslim anew such that he finds no shame in leaving the duty (*Wajib*) and doing the prohibited (*Haram*). Then they aim to corrupt the Islamic desires and values and destroy in the Muslim the zeal for Islam such that he no longer hates *Kufr* and the *Kafireen*, and he no longer enjoins good and forbids evil. With this they will remove the cultural immunity of the Islamic *Ummah* with which she resisted all external elements, and will remove the emotional and intellectual barriers that threatened the presence of Capitalist civilisation in Muslim lands. Thus, preserving their influence and interests becomes easier and they guarantee their survival and continuance.

The intention behind this dialogue, which the *Kuffar* and their agent rulers guard in the Muslim countries with an entourage of scholars and thinkers, is to create a new religion for the Muslims. It is based upon the creed of separating religion from life, and in which man is the Legislator instead of Allah ﷻ, the Creator of mankind. They are as Allah ﷻ describes them:

وَلَا يَزَالُونَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ حَتَّى يَرُدُّوكُمْ عَنْ دِينِكُمْ إِنِ اسْتَطَاعُوا

"And they will never cease fighting you until they turn you back from your Deen."
[Al-Baqarah: 217]

And as Allah ﷻ says:

وَلَنْ تَرْضَىٰ عَنْكَ الْيَهُودُ وَلَا النَّصَارَىٰ حَتَّىٰ تَتَّبِعَ مِلَّتَهُمْ

"Never will the Jews nor the Christians be pleased with you (O Muhammad) till you follow their religion." [Al-Baqarah: 120]

Since the basis of the Islamic civilisation is the Islamic *'Aqeedah* and the basis of Western civilisation is the Capitalist *'Aqeedah*, then merging them is impossible. So the intention behind the dialogue led by the *Kafir* West is to make the Muslims abandon their Islamic concepts to the advantage of the Capitalist concepts. This is because they realise that the combination of two contradictory beliefs is impossible.

Thus the dialogue between religions and civilisations for establishing common factors and manufacturing a new human civilisation is unrealistic. There must be an intellectual struggle between religions and civilisations to know truth from falsehood, ugly from pretty, and good from evil. Allah ﷻ says:

فَأَمَّا الزَّبَدُ فَيَذْهَبُ جُفَاءً وَأَمَّا مَا يَنْفَعُ النَّاسَ فَيَمْكُثُ فِي الْأَرْضِ

"Then, as for the foam it passes away as scum upon the banks, while that which is good for mankind remains in the earth." [Ar-Rad: 17]

As for the dialogue they call to, it is a dialogue represented by the enemies of Islam with the aim of destroying Islam, the Islamic civilisation and the Islamic *Ummah*. Therefore the Muslims must adopt and perfect the necessary tools of struggle, which are manifested in the re-establishment of the Khilafah State that will embark on an intellectual and material struggle to spread the sublime Islamic *Hadharah* and remove the false and corrupt *Hadharahs*.

The statement regarding the sons of Abraham:

This viewpoint has come to strengthen the dialogue between the three religions because these three divine religions were brought by the Prophets Muhammad, Jesus and Moses (peace be upon them). They all derive their ancestry to one father and he is Abraham (peace be upon

him). Therefore, it is incumbent on the followers of these religions to live together in peace because they are descendants from one origin in lineage and religion.

This is from one angle. From the other angle this viewpoint supports the so-called peace process in the Middle East and the normalisation of relations with the Jews. This is to accept one part of the Jewish and Western conspiracy against Islam and the Muslims by usurping Palestine and al-Masjid al-Aqsa; and by implanting a poisoned dagger in the heart of the Islamic *Ummah*. This also justifies the participation of the Jews, Christians and Muslims in their guardianship over Jerusalem (Al-Quds), which contains the holy sites, in their capacity as Muslims who all belong to one religion - the religion of Abraham (peace be upon him), the father of the Prophets.

To highlight the error of this viewpoint and to refute it we need to clarify three issues:

(1) The linguistic issue

The word '*Aslama*' in its linguistic meaning means '*Inqaada*' (i.e. to submit). The Noble Qur'an has used it with this meaning in the stories of the Prophets and in describing their followers who submitted to the Order of Allah ﷻ. He ﷻ said on the tongue of Nuh (peace be upon him and he came before Ibraheem):

إِن أُجْرِيَ إِلَّا عَلَى اللَّهِ وَأُمِرْتُ أَنْ أَكُونَ مِنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ

"My reward is only from Allah, and I have been commanded to be one of those who submit (Muslimeen)." [Yunus: 72]

And He ﷻ said on the tongue of Ibraheem and Isma'eel (peace be upon them):

رَبَّنَا وَاجْعَلْنَا مُسْلِمِينَ لَكَ وَمِنْ ذُرِّيَّتِنَا أُمَّةً مُسْلِمَةً لَكَ

"Our Lord! And make us submissive (two Muslims) unto You and of our offspring a nation submissive (Muslimatan) unto You." [Al-Baqarah: 128]

And He ﷻ said regarding the people of Lut (peace be upon him):

فَمَا وَجَدْنَا فِيهَا غَيْرَ بَيْتٍ مِنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ

"But We found not there any household of those who submitted (muslimeen) except one (i.e. of Lut and his two daughters)." [Az-Zariyat: 36]

And on the tongue of Musa (peace be upon him):

فَعَلَيْهِ تَوَكَّلُوا إِن كُنْتُمْ مُسْلِمِينَ

"Then in Him put your trust if you are those who have submitted (to Allah's will [Muslimoon])." [Yunus: 84]

And on the tongue of the Hawariyyoon, the followers of 'Isa (peace be upon him):

آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَاشْهَدُوا بِأَنَّا مُسْلِمُونَ

"We believe in Allah, and bear witness that we are those who have submitted (muslimoon)." [Al-Imran: 52]

So the word 'Muslimoon' found in the *Ayats* means 'those who have submitted' (*Munqaadoon*). It does not mean that they professed one *Deen*, which is Islam as revealed to Muhammad ﷺ. Islam was not known to them and they were not addressed with it. Rather, each people had a particular Messenger who called them to a specific *Shari'ah*. Allah ﷻ said:

لِكُلِّ جَعَلْنَا مِنْكُمْ شِرْعَةً وَمِنْهَاجًا

"To each (Ummah) among you, We have prescribed a law (*Shari'ah*) and a clear way (*Minhaaj*)." [Al-Ma'ida: 48]

After the revelation (*Wahy*) came down to Muhammad ﷺ, the revelation took up certain Arabic words and transferred them from their conventional linguistic meanings to *Shara'i* meanings. The *Shari'ah* texts from the Qur'an and *Sunnah* have clarified this. One of these transferred expressions is the word 'Islam' which linguistically used to mean

'*submission*' (*Inqiyaad*), and became a *Shara'i* meaning - the *Deen* revealed by Allah ﷻ to His Messenger Muhammad ﷺ. Allah ﷻ said, addressing the whole of mankind until the Day of Judgement:

وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمْ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

"I have chosen for you Islam as your *Deen*." [Al-Ma'ida: 3]

And Allah ﷻ said:

وَمَنْ يَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ

"And whosoever seeks a *Deen* other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him." [Al-Imran: 85]

And the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: "**Islam has been built on five.**" Other religions are not based on these five.

After the divine transference of the meaning of the word 'Islam', the words derived from it, such as the verb and active participle (*Aslama* and *Muslim*), if used without a *Qareena* (context), indicate the *Shara'i* meaning only. If the conventional linguistic meaning is intended this would then require a *Qareena* to change it from the *Shara'i* meaning. Allah ﷻ for example says:

مَا كَانَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ يَهُودِيًّا وَلَا نَصْرَانِيًّا وَلَكِنْ كَانَ حَنِيفًا مُسْلِمًا

"Ibraheem was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but he was one who truly submitted (*Musliman*) (to Allah's will)." [Al-Imran: 67]

This does not mean that Ibraheem (peace be upon him) was on the *Deen* that Allah ﷻ revealed to Muhammad ﷺ. Rather it means that Ibraheem (peace be upon him) had submitted to Allah ﷻ regarding that which Allah ﷻ revealed to him, unlike the Jews and Christians who fabricated the *Deen* of their Prophets.

As for the statement that Muhammad ﷺ, 'Isa and Musa (peace be upon them) were on the *Deen* of Ibraheem (peace be upon him), it means that they believed in the same *Aqeedah*, which is the foundation of every

Deen revealed from Allah ﷻ.

This is what is meant from His ﷻ saying:

شَرَعَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا وَصَّى بِهِ نُوحًا وَالَّذِي أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ وَمَا
وَصَّيْنَا بِهِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَمُوسَى وَعِيسَى أَنْ أَقِيمُوا الدِّينَ وَلَا تَتَفَرَّقُوا فِيهِ

"He (Allah) has ordained for you the same Deen which He ordained for Nuh, and that which We have inspired to you (O Muhammad), and that which We ordained for Ibraheem, Musa and 'Isa saying you should establish the Deen and do not become divided over it." [Ash-Shura: 13]

So the word 'Deen' in the *Ayah* means the foundation of the Deen, which is the *Aqeedah*. Allah ﷻ specified this when He ﷻ said:

لِكُلِّ جَعَلْنَا مِنْكُمْ شِرْعَةً وَمِنْهَا جَا

"To each (Ummah) among you, We have prescribed a law (Shari'ah) and a clear way (Minhaaj)." [Al-Ma'ida: 48]

(2) The Shar'i issue

Allah ﷻ sent Muhammad ﷺ as the seal of the Prophets and the Messengers to the whole of mankind. He ordered them to leave whatever religion they were following, whether divine or not, and called on them to embrace Islam as a *Deen*. Whoever responded to the call became a Muslim and whoever rejected committed *Kufr*. Allah ﷻ said:

وَقُلْ لِلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ ءَأَسْلَمْتُمْ فَإِنْ أَسْلَمُوا فَقَدِ
اهْتَدَوْا وَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ وَاللَّهُ بَصِيرٌ بِالْعِبَادِ

"And say to those who were given the Book (the Jews and Christians) and to those who are illiterates (Arab pagans): 'Do you (also) submit yourselves (to Allah in Islam)?' If they do, they are rightly guided; but if they turn away, your duty is only to convey the Message; and Allah is All-Seer of (His) slaves."

[Al-Imran: 20]

And He ﷻ said:

لَمْ يَكُنِ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَالْمُشْرِكِينَ
مُنْفَكِينَ حَتَّى تَأْتِيَهُمُ الْبَيِّنَةُ رَسُولٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ

"Those who disbelieve from among the people of the Book (Jews and Christians) and among the Mushrikeen (polytheists), were not going to leave (their disbelief) until there came to them clear evidence, a Messenger (Muhammad) from Allah." [Al-Baiyinah:1-2]

They are not separated from the *Kufr* except by their embracing of Islam. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: **"By the one in whose Hand lies Muhammad's soul! No one from this Ummah, whether Jew or Christian, who hears about me and then dies without believing in what I have been sent with, except that he will be from the inhabitants of the Fire."** So the people are all called to gain conviction in Islam, and whoever does not profess Islam after the matter has been proven to him, then he is definitely a *Kafir*. After Muhammad ﷺ was charged with prophethood, if the Jews and Christians continued to hold to their religion, they are considered *Kafir* according to the Quranic text. It is forbidden to describe them as Muslims, and whosoever believes that they or others are Muslims, he is a *Kafir*. This is because with this belief of his he has rejected clear *Shara'i* texts that are definite in meaning and authenticity. If they die on this belief then they will be from among the inhabitants of the Fire.

(3) The issue concerning the sons of Ibraheem (Peace be upon them)

This is a call to the bond of nationalism. It is a bond arising from the survival instinct and is shallow and emotional in nature. It is not suitable for man because it cannot bind one human being with another if they differ in lineage.

The bond of the sons of Ibraheem (peace be upon him) has been negated by time. It does not exist today because the descendants of Ibraheem (peace be upon him) and his offspring have mixed with other peoples through marriage, social intercourse, migration and wars. Today

it is impossible to separate them from other peoples. Since the followers of the three religions can be found among all peoples and tribes of the world, they have mixed on the basis of religion and not on the basis of ethnicity. Therefore, applying the claim regarding the sons of Ibraheem (peace be upon him) on the Muslims, Jews and Christians and on those who live around al-Masjid al-Aqsa or any others is a pointless exercise and is incorrect. The intention is to fight Islam, justify the peace process and normalise relations with the Jewish entity of Israel that exists on the usurped land of the Muslims; all of this to give legitimacy to the terrible crimes committed by the treacherous rulers of the Islamic lands under the orders of their masters, the *Kuffar* of the West.

The family or nationalist bond is like the bond of the sons of Ibraheem (peace be upon him). It is rejected by the *Shari'ah* as a basis to organise the relationships of the people. Allah ﷻ said:

قُلْ إِنْ كَانَ آبَاؤُكُمْ وَأَبْنَاؤُكُمْ وَإِخْوَانُكُمْ وَأَزْوَاجُكُمْ وَعَشِيرَتُكُمْ
وَأَمْوَالٌ اقْتَرَفْتُمُوهَا وَتِجَارَةٌ تَخْشَوْنَ كَسَادَهَا وَمَسَاكِينُ تُرَضُّونَهَا
أَحَبُّ إِلَيْكُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَجِهَادٍ فِي سَبِيلِهِ فَتَرَبَّصُوا حَتَّى يَأْتِيَ
اللَّهُ بِأَمْرِهِ وَاللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الْفَاسِقِينَ

"Say: If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your kindred, the wealth that you have gained, the commerce in which you fear decline, and the dwellings in which you delight...are dearer to you than Allah and His Messenger, and striving hard and fighting in His Path, then wait until Allah brings about His Decision (torment). And Allah guides not the people who are Fasiqoon (disobedient)."

[At-Tauba: 24]

Thus, the order of Allah is above every nationalistic, family or benefit bond. Allah ﷻ clarified the shallowness of this bond to the previous Messengers. He ﷻ said:

وَنَادَى نُوحٌ رَبَّهُ فَقَالَ رَبِّ إِنَّ ابْنِي مِنْ أَهْلِي وَإِنَّ وَعْدَكَ الْحَقُّ وَأَنْتَ
أَحْكَمُ الْحَاكِمِينَ. قَالَ يَا نُوحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ إِنَّهُ عَمَلٌ غَيْرُ صَالِحٍ

"And Nuh called upon his Lord and said: 'O my Lord! Verily, my son is of my

family! And certainly your promise is true, and You are the most just of the judges'. And He ﷻ said: 'O Nuh! Surely, he is not of your family, indeed his work is unrighteous.'" [Hud: 45-46]

And He ﷻ said about Ibraheem:

قَالَ إِنِّي جَاعِلُكَ لِلنَّاسِ إِمَامًا قَالَ وَمِنْ
ذُرِّيَّتِي قَالَ لَا يَنَالُ عَهْدِي الظَّالِمِينَ

"He ﷻ said to him: 'Verily, I am going to make you a leader of mankind', (Ibraheem) said: 'And of my offspring (to make leaders).' (Allah) said: 'My covenant includes not the Zalimeen (wrongdoers).'" [Al-Baqarah: 124]

Thus, the son of Nuh (peace be upon him) according to the *Shara'i* criterion is not from his family, because he did not believe in what Allah ﷻ revealed to his father. And the *Zalimeen* (wrongdoers) from the offspring of Ibraheem (peace be upon him) are exempt from the covenant of leadership made by Allah ﷻ since they did not follow what Allah ﷻ revealed to their father Ibraheem (peace be upon him). So the call to the sons of Ibraheem (peace be upon him) today is *Jahil* (ignorant) and a politically motivated call. It is forbidden to call for it and invite people to it. This is because the intention is to fight Islam, divert the Muslims from their *Deen*, justify the treacherous peace treaty with the Jews and concede to them what they usurped from the blessed land of Palestine, so that relations with them may be normalised and Israel can be accepted as a state in the Middle East.

4 Compromise

(Wasatiyyah)

This term did not appear amongst the Muslims until the modern age. It is a foreign term whose source is the West and the Capitalist ideology, that ideology whose creed is based on the compromise solution. This solution arose as a result of the bloody conflict between the Church and its subordinate kings on one side, and the new breed of Western thinkers and philosophers on the other side. The former group viewed Christianity as capable of solving all of life's affairs. The second group took the view that Christianity was incapable of doing this, and considered it the cause of much humiliation and backwardness. They saw the human mind as the only entity that could produce a system capable of organising life's affairs and dealing with any problems that could arise.

After a bitter conflict between the two groups they agreed on a compromise solution. Religion was recognised as the relationship between a person and his Creator, on the condition that it would have no say in life, leaving the organisation of life's affairs to man. They then took the idea of separating religion from life as a creed for their ideology, from which the Capitalist system arose, and on whose basis the Western nations revived and then began carrying this ideology to others via colonialism.

The effect of this compromise solution, on which they built their creed, became prominent in every aspect of legislation and behaviour of the followers of the Capitalist ideology, not least in political issues. The issue of Palestine is a relevant example. Muslims see Palestine as belonging to them; at the same time the Jews say Palestine is the Holy Land promised to them by God, so all of it belongs to them. In 1947 the Capitalist Western nations proposed a solution of partition, calling for

the establishment of two states in Palestine - one state for the Jews and one state for the Muslims. This idea of partition has since been used to resolve many international problems orchestrated by the Capitalist nations, for example, in Kashmir, Bosnia and Cyprus among others.

Consequently politics for the Capitalist nations is based on lies and deception, not necessarily to obtain the whole truth but to achieve a something, whether greater or less than the truth. Not every party will achieve their objectives, but will arrive at a compromise solution, approved by both parties. Not because it is the correct solution but due to the circumstances of each party in terms of their strengths or weaknesses. So the strong takes everything he desires if he can, and the weak concedes anything that he cannot obtain.

Some Muslims, instead of criticising this idea of compromise, the compromise solution and clarifying its mistakes and fallacies, have instead adopted it and claimed it as a part of Islam. They even say that Islam is established on it. So Islam is placed between spiritualism and materialism, individualism and collectivism, realism and idealism, and between continuity and change. There is no excess or deficiency, nor exaggeration or negligence.

To prove the opinion they have adopted these Muslims studied all aspects and found that everything has two extremes and a middle point. The middle is the safe area while both extremes are subject to danger and corruption. The middle is the centre of power, and the area of balance and equilibrium between the two extremes. Since the middle point and compromise share these merits, it is no surprise that compromise should emerge in every aspect of Islam. Thus Islam lies in the middle in belief and worship, in legislation and morals and so on.

After they rationally measured the rules of Islam with the reality of things, these Muslims studied certain *Shara'i* texts, twisted their meanings and subjected them to their new understanding to fit with this newly adopted opinion. So they said regarding the saying of Allah ﷻ:

وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا لِتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ
عَلَى النَّاسِ وَيَكُونَ الرَّسُولُ عَلَيْكُمْ شَهِيدًا

"Thus We have made you a just nation, that you be witnesses over mankind and the Messenger ﷺ be a witness over you," [Al-Baqarah: 143]
 the middle position of the *Ummah* is derived from the moderation in their *Minhaj* and system. There is nothing in it of the excesses of the Jews and the negligence of the Christians. They also said that the word 'middle' (*Wasaf*) meant justice, and justice -according to their claim- was the middle of two conflicting sides. So they gave justice the meaning of reconciliation in order to serve the idea of compromise. The correct meaning of the *Ayah* is the Islamic *Ummah* is an *Ummah* of justice, and justice is one of the conditions of a witness in Islam. This *Ummah* will be a just witness over other nations by conveying Islam to them. The *Ayah*, even though it came in the form of a notification (*Seeghatul Ikhbaar*), is an order from Allah ﷻ to the Islamic *Ummah* that she should convey Islam to the other nations. If she does not do so she will be sinful. She is a proof against the other nations just as the Messenger ﷺ is a proof against her: "so that the Messenger be a witness upon you" in his conveyance of Islam to the *Ummah* and in his request that the *Ummah* convey it to others: **"Let the one present convey it to the one absent."**

These Muslims also used the following saying of Allah ﷻ as evidence:

وَالَّذِينَ إِذَا أَنْفَقُوا لَمْ يُسْرِفُوا وَلَمْ يَقْتُرُوا وَكَانَ بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ قَوَامًا

"And those who, when they spend, are neither extravagant nor stingy, but hold a medium (way) between those." [Al-Furqan: 67]

So they gave spending two extremes, extravagance and stinginess, and they gave it a middle position, the medium (way). This is, in their view, an evidence for moderation in spending money. They did not understand that the meaning of the *Ayah* is that there are three types of spending: extravagance, stinginess and moderation. Thus extravagance is spending in the *Haram*, whether in small or large amounts. If a person spends a *Dirham* in buying alcohol, gambling or bribery, this is extravagance, which is *Haram*. As for stinginess, it is abstention from spending in the *Wajib*. If a person did not pay a single *Dirham* due on him as *Zakat* on his money, or if he does not spend on those to whom he is obliged to give maintenance, that would be considered stinginess and therefore *Haram*. As for moderation (*Qawwaam*) it is spending according to the *Shara'i*

rules, whether it is a vast amount or very little. So honouring a single guest by slaughtering a sheep, chicken or camel is moderate spending. It is *Halal* because Allah ﷻ said:

بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ

"between those," [Al-Furqan: 67]

to indicate there are three types of spending: extravagance, stinginess and moderation. One of those three types is required by *Shar'a*, which is the moderation. He did not say: "between those two" to indicate the middle position between two different things.

There is no middle position or compromise solution in Islam. Thus, Allah ﷻ created man and He knows his reality, a knowledge that no human being can be aware of. Allah ﷻ is the only one able to organise man's life accurately, no one else can do this. The rules have already been defined, there is no middle position or compromise solution in them or in the texts of Islam. Rather there is accuracy, clarity and distinction, which Allah ﷻ labelled as *Hudood* (limits) due to their accuracy and correctness. He ﷻ said:

وَتِلْكَ حُدُودُ اللَّهِ يُبَيِّنُهَا لِقَوْمٍ يَعْلَمُونَ

"These are the limits of Allah, which He makes plain for those people who have knowledge." [Al-Baqarah: 230]

And Allah ﷻ said:

وَمَنْ يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَيَتَعَدَّ حُدُودَهُ يُدْخِلْهُ نَارًا خَالِدًا فِيهَا

"And whosoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, and transgresses His limits, He will cast him into the Fire, to abide therein forever." [An-Nisa: 14]

Where is the middle position and compromise solution in the saying of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to his uncle Abu Talib when his people offered him position, money and rank to leave Islam: **"By Allah! O uncle, if they put the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left, that I should abandon this matter, I shall not leave it until Allah makes it victorious or I perish."** And where is the compromise in his

statement to the tribe of Bani 'Aamir b. Sa'sa'ah when they demanded that they should have the rule after him ﷺ in return for their *Nusrah* (support): **“The matter belongs to Allah, He ﷻ places it where He wills.”**

Thus the middle position or compromise solution is an idea that is alien to Islam. The Western nations and those Muslims loyal to them have attached this idea to Islam to sell it to the Muslims in the name of moderation and tolerance, intending to deviate the sincere Muslims from the clearly defined rules and limits of Islam.

Fundamentalism

The first time the term fundamentalism appeared was in Europe towards the end of the 19th Century. It was used to indicate the position of the Church regarding the new sciences and philosophies and the strict adherence to the Christian faith.

The Protestant movement is considered the basis of fundamentalism. It set out its fundamental principles in the Conference of Niagara in 1878, and in the General Presbyterian Conference of 1910, where the basic principles of fundamentalism were crystallised. They were established on principles of Christian beliefs that contradicted the scientific progress being made by the Capitalist ideology, established on the creed of separating religion from life.

Though this movement disappeared with the Second World War, it was implanted in the minds of Europeans that fundamentalism was an enemy to progress and science. It was considered intellectual backwardness not compatible with the age of awakening, and it had to be fought until its effects were removed from society and life.

Thus, fundamentalism emerged in Europe as a reaction to scientific and industrial progress that came after the separation of Christianity from life's affairs. It emerged because of the inability of Christianity to respond to the new systems of life, which are derived from the Capitalist creed, the creed of separating religion from life. This pushed the believers in the Christian faith to adopt a stance rejecting the various forms of material progress and Capitalist culture. However this movement, fundamentalism, failed and disappeared due to its inability to present practical solutions for life's problems, and because of the reason for its establishment, i.e. the resistance to scientific progress, and those

disciplines and thoughts which the Christians did not agree with or believe in.

Hence the source of describing certain Christian and Jewish movements as fundamentalist is the West. It is a reference to religious movements that oppose the technological, industrial and scientific progress that occurred after the application of the Capitalist ideology.

Thus the description of many Islamic movements and of those Muslims affiliated to these movements by Western thinkers and politicians, then by some Muslims who agree with them, aims at attacking and opposing these movements by creating international public opinion against anyone described as such. This is because in their view fundamentalism means backwardness and reactionism, and it means opposing scientific and industrial advancement.

Simply describing a specific group as fundamentalist is sufficient to consider such a movement a danger to the modern materialist *Hadharah* and to people's lives. This justifies taking necessary measures, however harsh, to oppose it. When a state, like Egypt or Algeria, executes Muslims for being fundamentalists, this action is greeted with the support of the Western public opinion. No human rights organisations rise against that because those executed people -according to their claim- are fundamentalists. They are seen as enemies of humanity, especially when all of the ugliest acts are attributed to them, such as the mass slaughter of innocent people in Algeria and the killing of tourists and Copts in Egypt.

The description of fundamentalism exceeded its original term to include every movement and party that works to change the current terrible lives of the Muslims to an Islamic life by re-establishing the Khilafah and ruling by Islam. It also includes every movement that opposes the aggressors and usurpers of Islamic land and their rights such as the Jews, Serbs, Americans and others. So the Muslim *Mujahids* who fight their enemies who usurp their land are fundamentalists and terrorists. Those who also die as martyrs by striking the aggressor foreign forces are suicidal and criminals!

This description is dangerous to every Muslim and every movement

fighting injustice and occupation. It is dangerous to every party working according to the *Shari'ah* methodology to resume the Islamic way of life. This is because the aim of this description is to create legal justifications to attack anyone calling for the re-establishment of Islam in life's affairs, under the pretext that Islam is a fundamentalist movement, like Jewish and Christian fundamentalist movements who fought industrial and scientific progress in the age of the Capitalist revival. The selection of this term to brand the Islamic movements with is because of its historical relevance to Western public opinion, so that the people of the West stand behind their rulers in the face of the return of political Islam as a state and system of life.

It should not occur to the mind of any Muslim that the description of Islamic movements as fundamentalist is taken from their connection with the foundation of the *Deen* or the foundations of jurisprudence (*Fiqh*). The foundation of the Islamic *'Aqeedah* is belief in Allah, His Angels, Books, Messengers, the Day of Judgement and *al-Qadar*. The foundations of jurisprudence are the principles on which jurisprudence is based, which the *Mujtahid* uses to derive practical *Shara'i* rules from their detailed evidences.

Fundamentalism, according to Western terminology, which the Christian Protestant movement brought together with the aim for which the movement was founded, has no connection with Islamic concepts and Islamic movements whether contemporary or historical. In Islamic history, political movements, intellectual schools and jurisprudence schools have appeared. However they do not resemble the Christian fundamentalist movements in any way whatsoever. Even those who called for the closing of the door of *Ijtihad* in the seventh Century *Hijrah* did so not because they wanted to preserve the old and oppose the new. Rather because they thought that the Islamic *Fiqh* generated by the predecessors (*Salaḥ*) contained all the issues that the later scholars (*Khalaḥ*) might possibly face.

Islam is a unique *Deen* that differs from other divine religions, in that it is the final message and abrogates the ones that came before. Allah ﷻ has taken the responsibility of preserving it as it was revealed until the Day of Judgement.

He ﷺ said:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

"Verily It is We Who have sent down the Zikr (Qur'an) and surely, We will guard it." [Al-Hijr: 9]

It is a complete and comprehensive ideology established on a creed based on the human mind, from which emanates a comprehensive system that solves all man's affairs until the Day of Judgement. It cannot be imagined this ideology is unable to give a *Shara'i* rule to any problem faced by man. Allah ﷻ said:

وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ تَبْيَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ

"And We have sent down to you this Book (the Qur'an) as an exposition of everything." [An-Nahl: 89]

The scientific and industrial progress experienced by the Islamic world in the past was a result of the total application of Islam and not of separating Islam from life. Much of the scientific and industrial progress being experienced by the world today is due to those Muslim scholars who set out many of its theories and basic laws in the shade of Islamic life and the Islamic State.

Therefore, to describe Islam and Islamic movements as fundamentalist, in the manner in which Christian movements were described, is erroneous and a biased description. It does not apply to the reality of Islam, or on anyone who works for the return of Islam to life. This is because he is striving to change the miserable reality in which the Muslims live, which has come about from the rule of man-made systems in life's affairs. This is contrary to the work of Christian fundamentalist movements, which came to preserve the reality in which the Christians lived before Capitalism, in form and content.

So the West's description of Islamic movements as being fundamentalist is nothing but a war against the return of Islam as a

comprehensive system. It is a strategic, even a vital issue for the West. They are intent on keeping the Third World, especially the Islamic world, backward and distant from any true revival. This is to prevent the re-establishment of the Khilafah that will uproot their system and put an end to their ambitions and greed.

Listen to the testimony of one of these people; he is a visiting scholar at the Harvard University for Middle Eastern studies. He submitted a report to the US Congress in which he said: 'Fundamentalists take the view that the *Shari'ah* should be applied in all its details and that the orders and prohibitions of God must be implemented completely, and that it is binding on all Muslims. Islam is the basic source of their strength and the *Shari'ah* is suitable for application today as it was suitable for application in the past.' He also said: 'Fundamentalists deeply hate Western civilisation, they see it as the greatest obstacle in the face of the application of Islamic Law.' The American scholar John Esposito, in a report submitted also to the American Congress stated: 'Those who most threaten American interests are the Muslim fundamentalists.'

So the fundamentalism attacked by the *Kuffar* is the reapplication of Islamic Shari'ah in life. If this is fundamentalism then the Muslims, in their view, are all fundamentalists. This is because with yearning and zeal, the Muslims wait for the total application of all the Islamic rules under the shadow of the Khilafah, to save them and the world from the misery of Capitalism and take them to the glory of Islam. Allah ﷻ said:

وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ افْتَرَى عَلَى اللَّهِ الْكَذِبَ وَهُوَ يُدْعَى إِلَى الْإِسْلَامِ
وَاللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ. يُرِيدُونَ لِيُطْفِئُوا نُورَ اللَّهِ بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ
وَاللَّهُ مُتِمُّ نُورِهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُونَ

"And who does more wrong than the one who invents a lie against Allah, while he is being invited to Islam? And Allah guides not the people who are unjust (Zalimoon). They wish to put out the Light of Allah (Islam) with their mouths. But Allah will complete His Light even though the disbelievers hate it." [As-Saf: 7-8]

6 Globalisation

The example of the term 'Globalisation', in new terminology, is like the example of the *Jilbab* in garments or the example of the "Trojan Horse" in military technology. It hides that which it contains in order to conceal it from the people. Indeed globalisation conceals a great deal.

There is nothing more indicative of this than what took place in Beirut towards the end of 1997 when the Centre for the Study of Arab Unity, one of the leftovers of Arab nationalists, held a conference to study globalisation and determine what stance should be adopted regarding it. It seems that they saw in globalisation a contradiction and threat to the idea of nationalism. It was mentioned in the viewpoint of the call to the conference that the subject matter under discussion was:

Globalisation and the way for the Arab to deal with its understanding and manifestation in the areas of economics, culture and politics. Its historical, current and future role. Of particular interest is how the United States would deal with globalisation, especially after the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War; its effect on the economy and investment in the Arab countries in addition to their cultural environment and identity.

Many scholars and university professors were invited to the Conference and they contributed their understanding of globalisation and the stance that should be adopted regarding it. The local papers published briefs of the dissertation put forward by the delegates in the conference, which lasted three days. Huge differences appeared in these studies until the Conference became like a dialogue between deaf people rather than an intellectual conference. Those supervising the Conference decided to conclude it without issuing any resolutions or recommendations.

Globalisation, as a term, was coined in English and French about ten years ago. It is used, not to describe a thing as international due to its presence or manifestation in most parts of the world, but to specify that a doer or doers of an action wish to make this thing international. For example, a company would adopt a policy of production that looks at the whole world as suitable for producing its goods. Then it will carry out production in any state or states where production costs are cheaper than anywhere else. It is said the company has 'globalised' its production. Similar things are said about the other activities this company pursues when it adopts the policy of 'globalisation' in marketing and advertising its goods, searching for new commodities and developing them, employing workers, professionals or managers, or in attracting investors and financiers who would provide loans to finance the company's operations.

The first time the word "globalisation" was applied was in describing the activities of the large American companies in the mid-1980s. When Ronald Reagan became the president of the United States in 1981 he employed bold policies in international relations, both economic and political, and won the strong support of American financial circles. Part of this was using the strong dollar to attract financiers from abroad to invest their money in the debt bonds of the American budget and the money markets that trade with them to finance his program of arming the United States and exhausting the Soviet Union, at that time, in a counter arms race. This is what led to the economic collapse of Communism in 1989.

This policy led to consecutive sharp rises in the value of the dollar during Reagan's first term of office, to the extent that the marker of its exchange rate, measured by the currencies of the other countries and weighted by the United States' economic (trade) exchange with them, reached 159 points in February 1985. This compares to 91 points in the first month of his term in January 1981, an increase of 75%. It was one of the signs of Reagan's political gamble that he ignored the negative and marginal consequences of the strong dollar policy. This is because he was focused on winning the battle of Capitalism over Communism. One of the negative effects was that the strong dollar weakened the ability of American goods to compete with foreign goods produced outside the United States. So the level of American exports declined

and its imports increased. Consequently, the deficit in the balance of US foreign trade during Reagan's presidency rose sharply, until its total at the end of Reagan's presidency reached \$723 billion, compared to the total of only \$4 billion during the eight years that preceded him.

Another side effect of the strong dollar was that profits of many US companies declined due to fierce competition between foreign goods and American goods priced in dollars. These companies were compelled to reduce the price of their commodities and then seriously look at ways to cut costs, especially the cost of American manual labour. At that time a group of American professors suggested these companies should be restructured by a fundamental review of their activities in all fields - production, marketing and so on. This idea became widespread amongst American financiers and businessmen. Its implementation led to the closure of several factories and branches of US companies. It also led to great numbers of their employees and workers being dismissed from work. An example of that were the job losses announced by General Motors, one of the biggest car companies in the United States, when it dismissed 74,000 employees in one go. IBM, one of the biggest computer firms, dismissed 60,000 employees in three waves within a short period of time.

After restructuring, these companies managed to recover the production of the factories they had closed down or sold parts of them that they sold in America. This was done by alternative production from new small companies paying low wages to their workers, especially those hit by the job losses caused by restructuring, and by establishing alternative factories and branches outside the United States. This is because the strong dollar made the prices and wages become very meagre abroad. The American companies concentrated on poor and heavily populated countries like Pakistan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand and India, where the monthly wage of a worker barely matched the wages earned by one American factory worker in a few hours. This was not solely confined to manual workers but also included educated and professional workers like engineers and computer programmers, wherever they may be, as long as their wages were much lower than the American standard and they were in desperate need of work and wages.

A political outcry flared up in the United States regarding the process

of restructuring companies and discharging of workers in a collective manner and in startling numbers. Many Americans viewed the export of work abroad as depriving them of this work and as an attack on their livelihood, and viewed the motive of the companies as nothing but Capitalist greed. The companies replied that they did what they had to do because of intense international competition, and they had no choice but to compete at the international level and 'globalise' their operations. Committees appointed by Congress held meetings open to the public to investigate the globalisation of American companies, the first of which was held in 1987 and the last was in 1992. This investigation led to the idea of globalisation becoming publicised, when the committees consolidated its use by placing it in the headings of their reports that were issued in 1987 and in subsequent years. This was the first time the term 'globalisation' was used in the title of any book or report published in English. Then followed the publication of books on the subject of globalisation until the published material in English reached 260 books, many of which were published in the 1990s during President Clinton's term of office.

However, the effect of these investigations was to air political pressure against the job dismissals by these companies and their exporting of work outside of the United States, to justify of what they did and to eliminate of the hostile atmosphere generated by and within the media. The investigations ended in 1992, and they did not resume after that despite the fact that these issues were raised in the Presidential elections at the end on 1992. After Clinton came to power, Congress agreed to the NAFTA agreement that Bush signed with Canada and Mexico. The agreement enabled American and Canadian companies to manufacture whatever commodities they wanted to in Mexico, where the workers' wages are extremely low, and sell them in American and Canadian markets. This was exactly what American workers' unions and those American political factions opposing the companies were scared of.

Therefore the political outcry and what accompanied it of political conflict in the United States itself against the mass job dismissals and the export of work outside America, and which spread the term of globalisation, had practically come to an end in 1992. It was ended in favour of the US financial circles and companies under their control. All of this led to the formation of public opinion that determined that

work requiring high qualification and experience for which high wages should be paid should never leave American soil. If anything was to be exported, it would only be that work involving physical labour, exhaustingly monotonous and of very low wages. Once these expectations were realised then all Americans would benefit, because it would lead them to specialisation in advanced industries, highly qualified, highly experienced and highly paid work. Consequently the work exported would mean that the goods manufactured and assembled by cheap foreign hands outside the country would return to American markets at low prices.

The political resolution of this issue in 1992 and Clinton's accession to power in 1993 led to change in US foreign and economic policy. His predecessor Bush used to adopt the policy of promoting the export of goods and sponsoring the establishment of the World Trade Organisation instead of GATT, to open the doors wide to the export of goods. However, the American financiers and financial circles took the view that what was more important than the promotion of export goods was the need to complete what they had begun in the early 1980s with the comprehensive restructuring of the American companies, to strengthen them so that they would be more able to gain profit. They took the view that this restructuring would lead to the export of a lot of work and not only their goods and also lead to their involvement in fierce competition with non-American companies.

The American financiers put forward other ideas that they wanted Clinton to adopt. They claimed that for many years America had been bearing the burdens and costs of the Cold War and other international burdens. Consequently, Europe and Japan became stronger economically, to the extent they now threatened the vital interests of the United States. Now that the Cold War was over, they said that the United States must regain its ability to compete with Europe and Japan, and resume competing with them in a dominant manner. She should not commit herself to observe and adopt European and Japanese interests as she used to do in the past. Some American financiers even called for the American secret services to be used in economic spying on Europe and Japan and their companies after her preoccupation with the Cold War and other political issues had decreased.

In response to these thoughts and opinions, Clinton and his treasury secretary, Mr Rubin, who was one of the leading personalities on Wall Street, adopted the call for the opening of world markets. This was not only to sell American goods but also to enable US companies to produce goods wherever cheap labour was available, and to market their services and manufactured goods in the United States or any other country, wherever they wished in the world markets. The most important of these was the adoption of the activity of the US finance companies, which includes banks, insurance companies and brokerage houses of the money markets, in foreign money markets. This was a new matter since these companies had previously not worked extensively abroad and were not welcomed in many countries due to the danger of their actions. This was because financial companies by their very nature work to attract people's money in the form of deposits, insurance premiums, shares and bonds. Consequently, a huge amount of money would be concentrated in their hands that would enable them to deal with it in any way they wanted.

The American financiers were concerned about the idea put forward immediately after the end of the Cold War, that the world would inevitably be divided into three big economic regions. The first would include the whole of Europe and be controlled by Western Europe. The second would contain most of Asia and be dominated by Japan; and the third would include the two American continents restricted to the hegemony of the United States. They feared that this idea would become reality thus they opposed it vehemently and described it as regionalisation. They alluded to the fact that Europe and Japan were the keenest promoters of this idea. They offered an alternative to this idea, i.e. that the world should become one global market. No one country should have a monopoly over any one region, rather every country should have the right to compete in any place in the world. They promoted this idea through concentrated media campaigns; the Clinton administration adopted it and many books were published regarding it. From these came books which discussed the globalisation of company activities.

This media campaign ended in the United States after the Clinton administration adopted the idea at the beginning of its term of office. It then moved outside of the United States, sponsored by the US

administration and its state organisations. Abroad, especially in what are known as the developing countries, the media campaigns became concentrated, and preoccupied the people of those countries with shallow and deceptive thoughts, weak expressions and strange sophistry. Many people were completely bewildered by them. Despite the silly nature of these thoughts to which the campaigns called, they were planned and concentrated to produce specific results. Namely reshaping public opinion in these developing countries and utilising it for the benefit of the US companies to take the fruits of winning the Cold War, and to monopolise them to the exclusion of European and Japanese companies. Unfortunately, it is now clear that these campaigns have achieved their aims and they enabled rulers, smitten by the West and Western culture to stupefy their peoples before the new US onslaught and attack on their country. They are now opening their markets to US goods, employing their cheap labour in US factories attracting people's savings to US finance companies, and using US money markets for speculation.

The following are some of the thoughts concealed under the cover of globalisation that the United States is promoting abroad, especially to Third World countries:

1. After the fall of the Soviet Union there remained in the world only the Western economic system, which was branded the free market system instead of its true name, Capitalism. It is the system that reminds us of its greed and ugliness. All the countries in the world are either implementing it or are striving to implement it.
2. Global finance and the flow of money is now unitary, because its proponents can now transfer it to any country and utilise it in any form of investment whose returns will be greater than other investments. The transfer of money can be done at exceptional speed, made easy by fast means of communication, and this money will not be invested in a country that places obstacles and barriers to investment.
3. The world of business has become united as well. Hence the emergence of multinational companies, even though they are not truly multinational, because their mother company follows only one country and has only one nationality. These companies have the ability to

manufacture and market products on a global level; a matter which makes any country wishing to develop welcome these multinationals so that they will employ the people or sell their products, otherwise the multinationals will go to another country.

4. Global communication between all corners of the world has become comprehensive and inter-linked to the extent that it prevents any faction or entity from controlling it. This link has led the information of the people to become shared. Therefore, even people's opinions and tastes have become the same.

These are some concepts of globalisation being promoted in Third World Countries. The aim of promoting these concepts is to develop on their basis the necessity of bringing in foreign money and work. It is also intended to adopt the advice of the advocates of globalisation, in terms of changes to the country's laws and the privatisation of its state institutions to enable such advocates buy these institutions. In their view, there is no other option if the Muslims want to join the procession in a world that has agreed on the globalisation of money and work, otherwise we will remain backward.

No one should ignore the effect of these claims, propaganda and sophistry and the cover of globalisation that conceals them in a country where there are leaders and thinkers whose people are dominated by ignorance and who depend on the state media for their opinions. This is why it is not strange that we compare these claims of globalisation with the missionary invasion of the nineteenth century. This onslaught may be more dangerous than the one that came before because this time it does not carry the cover of religion, though this is more horrible.

