

Jihad

In

Islam

First Edition

1429h – 2008

Hizb ut-Tahrir Publications

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	3
<i>Jihad</i>	7
<i>The Obligation of Jihad</i>	9
<i>Jihad is a Collective Duty</i>	11
<i>How to Perform Jihad</i>	12
<i>Jihad Is Ongoing Until the Day of Judgement</i>	14
<i>Jihad and the Reality of the Muslims Today</i>	15
<i>The Falsehood of Defensive Jihad</i>	19
<i>The Duty of the Muslims Today</i>	35

Bismillah al-Rahman al-Raheem

Preface

Allah (swt) says

قَاتِلُوا الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَلَا بِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَلَا يُحَرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ
وَلَا يَدِينُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ حَتَّى يُعْطُوا الْجِزْيَةَ عَنْ يَدٍ
وَهُمْ صَٰغِرُونَ

“Fight against those who believe not In Allah, nor in the Last day, nor forbid that which has been forbidden by Allah and his Messenger and those who accept not the Deen of Truth from among the people of the book, until they pay the Jizyah with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.”(T.M.Q. 9.29)

A quick glimpse at the reality of the Muslims today reveals how other nations have contended for them and how the weakest of those nations have plucked up the courage to plunder their resources, sully their honour, shed their blood and desecrate everything sacred in their lives, until they had no sanctity left, despite their great number which exceeds 1.25 billion and a fifth of the world population and despite the abundance of their faculties and material resources. However, they are as the Messenger of Allah (saw) foretold, like **“the foam of the water on the surface of the river”** compared with the days when the Islamic Ummah was an Ummah of Jihad, basing her relationship with other nations and her foreign policy upon it, protecting her authority domestically and carrying her idea to the world to illuminate its path after she herself had been illuminated with the radiance of Islam, its Aqeedah and its system. This is despite the fact that it came into being in one single city amid the mightiest powers, with the least of resources and the smallest of numbers; yet 3000 of them would face 200,000 and would send shivers down their spines. Then they would succeed in single-handedly rocking the two superpowers at that time and subsequently vanquishing them. This went on until the Jihad of the Muslims imprinted in the minds of the Europeans the notion that the army of Islam is invincible.

Indeed a single quick glimpse will reveal the extent of the Muslims’ loss when they kept silent over the alienation of Islam from life by toppling its state, and when they

relinquished Jihad for the sake of Allah to carry the message of Islam to the other nations.

However, the Islamic Ummah started to aspire to Islam, after she had incurred the calamity of forsaking its system and conducting her affairs according to the rules and systems of Kufr, and allowing the traitors appointed by the Kuffar to dominate Islam's interests. This Ummah is now yearning for the radiance of Islam to illuminate her path anew and to shape her future on its basis. Vitality has started to stream into her and the sincere sensation of her Deen has been nurtured by her aspiration to build her life anew on its basis, realising that she has no place among other nations unless Islam became the source of her legislations, the basis of her life and her message to other peoples and nations, thus achieving happiness in this life and in the hereafter. This transformation has prompted the Kafir West to lie in wait for the Ummah, monitoring her evolvment, scrutinising the changes and gauging the extent of her response to Islam and the extent of its impact on her children. As the Kafir West pursued its monitoring of the Ummah's activity and its scrutinising the changes shaping her, it never relented its military, bloody, intellectual and cultural crusade on Islam and the Islamic Ummah.. The objective of these campaigns against Islam and the Islamic Ummah is to uproot Islam from the hearts of the Muslims and destroy their aspiration of establishing it in the realm of life.

Although this onslaught began several centuries ago, it is nevertheless ongoing and intensifying. Every time the Western Kuffar perceive the Ummah's tangible aspiration to be ruled by Islam, they persist with their onslaught and intensify their campaign, because they dread Islam and its influence on the Ummah, groups and individuals alike.

The Ummah's elevation from the desolate situation she is currently experiencing to a revived position depends on the presence of the Islamic thoughts in the minds of the Muslims, because man's concepts about life emanate from the basic thoughts he possesses and because man is influenced by the extrinsic thoughts. The presence of the Islamic thoughts depends on generating the basic Islamic thoughts and removing the extrinsic thoughts that have crept in, and on ensuring that people's basic thoughts are the Islamic thoughts to the exclusion of all others. This is why the Western Kuffar, who have been working assiduously to subvert the basic thoughts of the Muslims after they had started to grow and expand, have intensified their onslaught on the Ummah to prevent these basic thoughts from settling in the hearts and minds of the Muslims. The onslaught is powerful and persistent, with the aim of shattering all that the

Muslims have adopted in terms of thoughts related to life, i.e. to the entity of the state and societal transactions. This onslaught is also targeting all those who work towards generating these thoughts, especially now that they have started to settle and concentrate in the psyche of the Ummah. The Kafir West is once again working towards confining Islam to issues of worship by emphasising the idea of separating religion from life.

The basic thoughts that the Kafir West is relentlessly working towards destroying in the minds of the Muslims are those that concentrate Islam in life and to which all the other thoughts are linked, namely the Islamic Aqeedah, Khilafah and Jihad.

The onslaught on the Islamic Aqeedah has never ceased and the fierce intellectual struggle that the Muslims have been engaged in is in fact a struggle between the Islamic Aqeedah and other doctrines. The Islamic Aqeedah was never susceptible to destruction despite the ferocity of the onslaught because it is the only sound Aqeedah. It has been conclusively proven through rational evidence that this Aqeedah is from Allah (swt), brought to us by the Messenger of Allah (saw). However, it would not have been distorted in the minds of the Muslims had it not been for the acute weakness in perceiving Islam, which in turn weakened their envisagement of their Aqeedah and their confidence in the rules that emanate from it.

As for the attack on the Khilafah, it was an attack on the state itself, i.e. an attack on the Islamic state to destroy it. This also had been relentless and when the Islamic Ummah became weak and lost her international standing, the status of the Khilafah and the Khalifah became weak as a result, and the thoughts upon which the ruling system in Islam are founded were subjected to an attack by the Kuffar and doubts were fabricated about their soundness and their ability to govern life's affairs within the state.

The attack on Jihad as a concept and as a reality only became conspicuous during the period of the intellectual invasion that the Islamic Ummah was subjected to in recent centuries, especially after the direct military occupation that Western powers had coordinated to seize the legacy of the Ottoman state in its quality as the Islamic Khilafah State. The Muslims rose to face this invasion spurred by the tremendous influence of the thoughts of Aqeedah and Jihad. Hence, the West resorted to distorting the concept of Jihad and started to spread among the Muslims, through some of the scholars who had been beguiled, that Jihad was merely a struggle against the soul and to repel aggression rather than initiate fighting against the Kuffar so that they may embrace Islam, because there is no compulsion in religion. As a result of the

intellectual invasion and the onslaught on Islam, coupled with the weakness of the Muslims, several Muslim scholars set about defending Islam, the “accused”, by refuting the accusations lodged against it on the basis that it did not contradict the thoughts that the Kuffar had propagated and led the Muslims into thinking that those thoughts were the cause of their revival. Those defeated Muslims resorted to interpreting some of the thoughts of Islam, including Jihad, so that they may agree with what the West propagated and led them to believe it. They denied the fact that initiating the fight against the Kuffar was part of the concept of Jihad in Islam, since initiating a fight was aggression and “Allah does not like the aggressors”, and since Jihad was merely confined to defensive fighting, not offensive and not a method to carry the Da’awah.

This is how the Kuffar have been distorting this idea. This study aims to clarify the concept of Jihad so that it becomes crystal-clear and an impetus for the Ummah to perform it according to the Shari’ah rules.

Jihad

Jihad is exhausting the effort in fighting for the sake of Allah either directly, or by way of financial assistance, or by giving opinion or bolstering the number of troops and the like. Hence, fighting to make the word of Allah reign supreme is Jihad. As for the Jihad by way of opinion for the sake of Allah, the opinion has to be directly related to fighting for the sake of Allah; otherwise, it would not be considered Jihad according to Shari'ah, even if it involved hardship and even if it yielded an advantage in making the word of Allah supreme, because Jihad is specific to fighting and anything directly linked to fighting. If giving opinion, advice, writing and delivering a speech were directly related to fighting, such as delivering a sermon to the armed forces to motivate them, or writing an article that exhorts fighting the enemies, it would be considered Jihad. Other than that, it would not. Hence, fighting the renegades who rebel against the Khalifah of the Muslims or undertaking political struggle, or earning a living or struggling against one's own desires i.e. "Jihad ul Nafs", or standing up to the tyrant Muslims' rulers and accounting them, all this is not considered Jihad in Shari'ah terminology, even if it is called Jihad in the linguistic sense and even if it yielded great rewards and significant benefits for the Muslims. The issue is not one of hardship or advantage, but of the Shari'ah meaning in which the term has been mentioned; the Shari'ah meaning of jihad is fighting and anything related to it in terms of opinion, exhorting through speech and writing and the like.

Jihad is an obligation according to the text of the Qur'an and the Hadith. Allah (swt) says: T.M.Q **"And fight them until persecution is no more, and the Deen is all for Allah."** [8-39]

Allah (swt) also says: T.M.Q **"Fight against those who believe not In Allah, nor in the Last day, nor forbid that which has been forbidden by Allah and his Messenger and those who accept not the Deen of Truth from among the people of the book, until they pay the Jizyah with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued."** [9-29]. He (swt) also says: T.M.Q **"Fighting has been prescribed for you."** [2-216]. Allah (swt) says: T.M.Q. **"Unless you go forth, He will punish you with a grievous penalty"** [9-39] **"O you who believe, fight the unbelievers who gird you about, and let them find firmness in you."** [9-123]

Anas (ra) said: **"The Messenger of Allah (saw) said: "Perform Jihad against the polytheists with your wealth, your hands and your tongues."**

Anas also reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **A raid for the sake of Allah or an expedition is better than life and anything in it.** He also reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **“I have been ordered to fight people until they profess that there is no god but Allah.”** Imam Ahmed and Abu Dawood reported on the authority of Anas that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **“Jihad has been ongoing since Allah sent me and will continue until the last generation of my Ummah fight al-Dajjal; it is not to be nullified by the tyranny of the despot or the fairness of the just ruler.”** The Messenger of Allah (saw) also said on the authority of Zayd Ibnu Khaled: **“Whoever equips a raider for the sake of Allah, it is as if he performed the raid himself; and he who looks benevolently after a raider’s family, it is as if he performed the raid himself.”**

Ataa Ibnu Yazid al-Laythi reported that Abu Saeed al-Khudri (ra) said: **“...They asked: O Messenger of Allah! Who are the best people? Upon this the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: “A believer who performs Jihad for the sake of Allah with his body and his wealth.”** He (saw) also said: **“Whoever dies not having contemplated raiding, he would die on a path of hypocrisy.”** Abu Awfa reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **“Let it be known that paradise is under the shades of swords.”** Abu Hurayra (ra) reported: **“A man from among the companions of the Messenger of Allah (saw) passed by a glen that had a spring, so he liked it and said: I wish I could keep away from all people and settle here, but I will not do so until I seek permission from the Messenger of Allah (saw). So he mentioned this to the Messenger of Allah; upon this he (saw) said: Do not do it, because to be engaged in fighting for the sake of Allah is better than praying at home for seventy years.”**

The Obligation of Jihad

Jihad is initially a duty of sufficiency; it becomes an individual duty upon the Muslims who are attacked by the enemy and a duty of sufficiency upon the others. The obligation does not fall until the enemy is repelled and the land of Islam is purified of his squalor. The meaning of Jihad being a duty of sufficiency (Fardh Kifaya) is that we initiate the fighting of the enemy even if he did not attack us. If the Muslims failed to initiate the fighting at any given time, they would all be sinful. For instance, if the Muslims in Egypt initiated the fighting, in their quality as a part of the Islamic State, the Muslims in Indonesia would be absolved of blame, because the fighting of the belligerent Kuffar by the Muslims would effectively be undertaken, thus the duty of Jihad would be fulfilled.

However, if fighting broke out between the Muslims and the Kuffar, but the sufficiency was not fulfilled by the Muslims of Egypt alone, the obligation remains in force upon the Muslims of India and Indonesia; the obligation would fall upon the nearest to them until the sufficiency is fulfilled. If the sufficiency was not fulfilled until all the Muslims were involved, Jihad becomes obligatory upon every single Muslim until the enemy is defeated. Jihad remains a duty of sufficiency upon the Muslims generally, except for those called up by the Khalifah. Jihad becomes obligatory upon everyone called up by the Khalifah because Allah (swt) says: **“O you who believe! What is the matter with you, that, when you are asked to go forth in the cause of Allah, you cling heavily to the earth? Do you prefer the life of this world to the Hereafter? But little is the comfort of this life, as compared with the Hereafter”**; and because the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **“If you are asked to go forth then do so.”** The Kifaya in Jihad within the Islamic State means that a sufficient number of Muslims must undertake the task of fighting; they could either be conscripts i.e. regular soldiers as was the case in the times of Omar, or volunteers who have voluntarily prepared themselves for Jihad as was the case in the days of Abu Bakr.

The initiation of Jihad does not mean that we straightaway fight the enemies; we must rather call them to Islam. The Muslims are forbidden from fighting those the Islamic Da'wah is yet to reach. It is imperative to call the Kuffar to Islam and if they reject, the Jizya will be imposed on them and if they refuse to comply, we will fight them. Muslim reported on the authority of Suleiman Ibnu Burayda on that of his father who said: **“When the Messenger of Allah (saw) appointed anyone as leader of an army or detachment he would especially exhort him to fear Allah and to be good to the**

Muslims who were with him. He would say: Declare war; do not embezzle the spoils; do not break your pledge; do not mutilate (the dead) bodies; and do not kill the children. When you meet your enemies who are polytheists, invite them to three courses of action. If they respond to any one of these, you also accept it and withhold yourself from doing them any harm. Invite them to Islam; if they respond to you, accept it from them and desist from fighting against them. Then invite them to migrate from their lands to the land of the Muhajireen (immigrants) and inform them that, if they do so, they shall have all the privileges and obligations of the Muhajireen. If they refuse to migrate, tell them that they will have the status of Bedouin Muslims and will be subjected to the commands of Allah like other Muslims, but they will not get any share from the spoils of war or alms except when they actually perform Jihad with the Muslims. If they refuse to accept Islam, demand from them the Jizya. If they agree to pay, accept it from them and hold off your hands. If they refuse to pay the tax, seek Allah's help and fight them.” Ibnu Abbas reported: “The Messenger of Allah (saw) never fought any folk before inviting them.” Farwah Ibnu Musayk reported: “I said: “O Messenger of Allah, shall I fight with my consenting folk those who reject?” He said: “Yes.” Then after I left, he called me back and said: “Do not fight them until you call them to Islam.”

Jihad is a Collective Duty

The reality of Jihad is that it is part of the duties related to the Islamic Ummah as a whole. It is not a rule related to individuals, as in the case of an individual defending himself against an assailant. Assaulting a person or a property unlawfully must be repelled, regardless of whether the assaulter is Muslim or Kafir. There is no argument over the right to defend oneself against an assault on his person, property or honour. However, this matter is looked into on a personal level, not on the level of the Ummah; whereas Jihad is related to the Islamic Ummah as a whole, because it is a collective duty.

How to Perform Jihad

Allah (swt) has decreed a number of rules demonstrating the manner of performing Jihad and has not left it to people's own opinion. This manner, which is reflected in the actions and the sayings of the Messenger of Allah (saw), is the one we are commanded to follow and it is that manner that explains how we should perform Jihad. The Messenger of Allah (saw) - in his quality as the Emir of the Muslims – used to dispatch the expeditions of Jihad and appoint for every expedition an Emir and he used to also assume the leadership of the army himself and perform Jihad. He (saw) said: **“The Imam is but a shield behind which one fights and protects himself.”** He (saw) also said: **“Jihad is obligatory upon you with every Emir, be it righteous or dissolute.”** The actions and the sayings of the Messenger of Allah (saw) demonstrate that the Muslims must appoint an Emir from amongst them and it is this Emir who organises the matter of Jihad. The reality of Jihad is that Allah (swt) has decreed it upon the Muslims as whole while they had an Emir; thus Jihad is a collective duty and with the Emir. This means that it is imperative for the Ummah to appoint an Emir. What is meant by Emir in this context is the general Emir who has the competency of running people's affairs. If he did not have this competency, he would not be the Emir to whom the Shari'ah rule applies. Hence, Jihad is a collective duty and not an individual one; it has to be performed with a group because it is a collective duty.

Another condition of Jihad is that the ruler must be Muslim, be he righteous or dissolute (Fajir); the term Fajir does not include the Kafir because the Kafir cannot be Emir over the Muslim and the Muslim is not obliged to obey him. Allah (swt) says: **“And never will Allah grant to the unbelievers a way over the believers.”** [4-141].

Another condition of Jihad is that we fight the Kuffar in their quality as Kuffar, because for the fighting to be deemed as Jihad, it must be for the purpose of making the word of Allah supreme, carrying His Da'awah and in execution of His commands. Allah (swt) says: **“Fight against those who believe not In Allah, nor in the Last day, nor forbid that which has been forbidden by Allah and his Messenger and those who accept not the Deen of Truth from among the people of the book, until they pay the Jizyah with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.”** [9-29] He (swt) also says: **“O ye who believe! Fight the unbelievers who gird you about, and let them find firmness in you: and know that Allah is with those who fear Him.”** [9-123] – **“So fight against the friends of Satan: feeble indeed is the**

cunning of Satan.” [4-76] – “fight the chiefs of disbelief.” [9-12] – “And fight the Pagans all together as they fight you all together.” [9-36].

Hence, the Sabab (cause) of Jihad is that those we fight are Kuffar who rejected the Da’awah to Islam. So we fight them until they embrace Islam and become part of the Islamic household, or pay the Jizya and submit to the authority of Islam, and their household becomes also part of the Islamic household.

Another condition for Jihad is that the fighting must not carry a plot to strike the Muslims and inflict harm on them; in other words, the fighting must not be a means to Haram, because the means to Haram is prohibited.

Another condition for the duty of Jihad and in order to avoid defeat is that the force of the Muslims should be at least half of the enemy’s when initiating the fighting. Allah (swt) says: **“For the present, Allah has lightened your (task), for He knows that there is a weak spot in you: But (even so), if there are a hundred of you, patient and persevering, they will vanquish two hundred, and if a thousand, they will vanquish two thousand, with the leave of Allah, for Allah is with those who patiently persevere.”** [8-66] Hence, Allah (swt) has not allowed the Muslims, when initiating the fight, to contemplate defeat even if the enemy’s force were double their own. This is the Shari’ah rule pertaining to performing the duty of Jihad in terms of initiating the fight against the Kuffar and carrying the Da’awah to them.

These are the conditions that must be generated in order to achieve the Jihad that Shari’ah has ordered and in the manner that it has commanded; without these conditions, Jihad is not obligatory upon the Muslims. The obligation then would be to achieve these conditions by working towards generating them, because the Shari’ah principle that applies to this reality stipulates that “whatever is necessary to accomplish a Wajib (duty) is in itself a duty.”

Fighting according to the aforementioned manner and conditions cannot be achieved through organisations and fighting groups, or through individual fighting, even though the fighting yields a personal reward if the intention is for the sake of Allah, and it does not remove the obligation to work towards what fulfils the task within the Shari’ah manner that Allah (swt) has demonstrated.

Jihad Is Ongoing Until the Day of Judgement

The Hadith of the Messenger of Allah (saw) in which he said: **“Jihad is ongoing since Allah sent me until the last generation of my Ummah fight the Dajjal; it is not annulled by the tyranny of the despot or the fairness of the just”**, means the obligation is permanent, i.e. the Jihad against the polytheists is an obligation that continues until the Day of Judgement and is not dependent on the Imam being either a tyrant or fair. Hence, Jihad cannot be voided and cannot be relinquished under the pretext of the tyranny or the justness of the rulers. His (saw) saying **“the tyranny of the despot or the fairness of the just”** is in reference to the Imam. Hence, the terms tyrant and fair act as adjectives to an omitted noun that refers to the Emir or Imam. The duty of Jihad is not dependent on the fairness or the tyranny of the rulers and performing it is not restricted to their fairness. This is the understanding of the scholars from among the generation of Tabi’een and those who came after them; we do not know of any difference of opinion about this topic. The Hadith does not in any way mean that Jihad is devoid of rules or conditions or that it can be performed in any way. It rather has a set of fixed rules and conditions derived from the Shari’ah evidences. It is a duty just like any other and it must be performed according to the evidence and according to its manner. There is no difference between Jihad and the other Shari’ah rules such as Zakat, Salat, the Hudud (penal codes) and the like, all of which have their Shari’ah conditions and causes, which must be observed.

Jihad and the Reality of the Muslims Today

Here a question arises: since Jihad has a set of conditions that must be observed and fulfilled and since one of the conditions is that Jihad in the absence of an Emir is not compulsory, while we witness the reality of the Muslims today that they do not have a Muslim Emir ruling over them; the question is: what should the Muslims do in case their lands are attacked by an aggressor, as is the case today in Palestine, Iraq, Somalia, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Chechnya and other Muslims' lands? Would the Muslims let their lands be violated and their blood be shed?

The answer to this is that the Shari'ah rule related to the Muslims who live in these lands stipulates that they are obliged to repel the enemy in case he attacks their lands and everyone must go forth to fight him and expel him from their lands. If the Kifaya (sufficiency) to repel the enemy is not achieved, the obligation to repel shifts to the Muslims living nearest to these lands and so on, until sufficiency is achieved. If sufficiency is achieved and the Muslims succeed in repelling the enemy from their lands, the rest of the Muslims would be absolved of blame. However, if the enemy succeeded in defeating the Muslims and in dominating and occupying their lands, the obligation of repelling the enemy shifts to the Muslims nearest to them, because the the attacked people would be under coercion and subjugated, unable to repel the enemy; thus, it is obligatory upon the Muslims to work towards recapturing these lands from the Kuffar irrespective of the sacrifices they may have to make.

However, the recapture of these lands is achieved through the restoration of the Islamic State that will prepare the armies and mobilise the Muslims to liberate the occupied lands. The liberation of the occupied lands is not through the forming of groups that undertake some military actions against the occupying forces. Although this type of fighting is permitted, it does not however achieve the objective of liberating the occupied lands. This is so because the issue is not merely to fight, but to fight for an objective, namely to liberate the lands from the occupation and the dominion of the Kuffar. If the Muslims contended themselves with the fighting undertaken by those groups, they would be letting their brethren down and squandering the faculties of everyone; this may also lead to consolidating the occupying forces in the Muslims' lands instead of vanquishing them.

As for the fact that this type of fighting does not achieve the objective, this is clear from the fact that confronting the occupying states to repel them and to liberate the occupied lands requires a state; in other words it requires a state that will undertake the equipping, training and arming of the armed forces and directing these forces to

fight the forces of the occupying state, and organising the military operations that lead to weakening the enemy and expelling him from our lands. Despite of what has arisen in the Muslims lands in terms of liberation movements, be it to fight the old colonialism or the neo-colonialism, these groups never managed to liberate a land occupied by the Kuffar by relying solely on their own resources and capabilities; some of them have rather consolidated the occupation of the Muslims' lands by the Kufir states. Huge efforts were exhausted in order to undertake this endeavour instead of steering the energies of the Ummah towards establishing the entity that shoulders the responsibility of liberating the occupied Muslims' lands; thus, it would be a nation fighting another nation, state fighting a state and an army fighting an army, as opposed to individuals and groups facing huge armies, or as opposed to what is referred to nowadays as resistance. In addition to the multiplicity of its groups and the weakness of its armament and training, its survival and continuity requires in most cases the backing of other forces, be it from foreign states or from the existing regimes which are affiliated to Kufir states, in order to maintain continuity and influence. Foreign backing is one of the means used to buy the loyalty of these groups or to exploit them or exert pressure on them. This means the acts of resistance are subject to the volition of the powers that sponsor the liberation movements. This leads to the ruin of not only the Muslims but of their lands as well.

On the other hand, no one told the Muslims to keep silent over the occupation of their lands and over the shedding of their blood by their enemies while they remain idle. However, what is the way to salvation? The point at issue is to rally around Islam and to protect it. Defending Islam necessitates defending the lands where Islam is existent. When the Muslim defends and protects the lands, he does so because they are Muslims' lands, irrespective of whether they were a Dar al-Islam (Islamic household) or a Dar al-Kufr (Kufir household). Hence, wherever Islam is existent in any land, it is deemed a land for every Muslim. Islam calls for the defence of the Muslims' lands because they are the lands of Islam and it deems every stretch of the Islamic lands as a frontline of Islam – if the enemy were to transgress it, Jihad becomes obligatory upon every Muslim. This is a concept that forms part of the Islamic Da'wah and is not an instinctive concept. These lands of Islam have been torn apart by the colonial Kafir and the authority of Islam has been removed. The Kafir established his own system over these lands and placed his own watchdogs from among the traitors and agents when the international situation forced him to withdraw his own armies. Therefore, whoever addresses the Ummah with the obligation of Jihad, he must explain the method by which the Ummah engages in Jihad, and not address the Ummah with this collective duty while she is torn to shreds. Hence, the Muslims should nowadays

distinguish between what is permissible to do and what effectively fulfils the obligation and yields the desired result, in terms of vanquishing the enemy, expelling him from the occupied Muslims' lands and salvaging the lands from his claws. The Muslims should also distinguish between what achieves for them the might and the strength and achieves the desired deterrent from the preparation for Jihad: **“Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies, of Allah and your enemies”**, and what is a reaction to being invaded by the enemy and having their properties and their honour violated; in the case of the latter it would be easy for the plots and plans of the enemy to be passed without the Muslims realising it. Consequently, the Muslims should tread the only path that Islam has legislated to achieve unity and resist Kufr, namely establishing the Khilafah and undertaking the duty of Jihad. Nothing could unite the Muslims except the banner of Islam, and no one can gather the groupings of the Muslims except the Khalifah of the Muslims; nothing can protect Islam and defend the sanctity of the Muslims except the Jihad to make the word of Allah supreme. Hence, it is imperative to work towards establishing the Khilafah by destroying the existent entities in the lands of Islam and appointing a Khalifah to restore the authority of Islam and to hoist the banner of Islam and lead the Muslims to the battlefields of Jihad, fighting the Kuffar and the hypocrites to make the word of the Kuffar the lowest and the word of Allah the highest. The point at issue is not just a land usurped by the enemy; it is rather a war whose soldiers are the collaborating rulers and whose officers are the Western states as a whole, led by America. The one and only path to engage in this war would be by redressing the situation through the establishment of the Khilafah and then by declaring Jihad for the sake of Allah to make His word supreme. This is the one and only path.

Our enemy, the Western Kafir occupies our lands, some politically, some militarily and some by displacing the Muslim people and placing his own people, providing them with all the means to act as an arsenal and a bridgehead for him. So how can such a force be fought through organisations and individuals? It is impossible to expel these enemies – as is the case in Palestine – except through armies that are organised, trained and equipped with what deters the enemy of Allah. This can only be achieved from outside the location that falls under the occupation of the enemy, from lands that are not militarily occupied, even if they were under the political dominion of the enemy. The method to achieve this is to engage in a relentless political struggle with the rulers, because they are the agents of the Kafir West in addition to ruling by other than what Allah has revealed. This political struggle should be coupled with the intellectual struggle against the thoughts of Kufr such as nationalism and capitalism

and against those who carry such thoughts from among the aberrant and those who seek to deceive the masses. The method to achieve this is to carry the Islamic Da'wah and to work towards resuming the Islamic way of life. Hence, the situations must be changed by removing the rulers and then engage in a fierce war of liberation.

When the armies of the major powers descended on our lands as is the case today in Iraq and Afghanistan, it was the Muslims' rulers who assisted them willingly and out of choice in occupying our lands, to prevent us from getting ourselves rid of their dominion. The issue today is not simply the issue of "Israel" or Palestine, nor is it the issue of a foreign influence controlling our lands, but rather the issue of the major powers' armies occupying our lands in a "legitimate" manner through the United Nations; the Muslims have only one path, namely to reject this occupation and resist these plans before they are implemented. There is no other way to achieve this but by seizing the reins of power from those who wish to drive us towards the abyss. The hope still has its omens and the chance is not lost yet; averting the calamity is still possible. It lies in the removal of the rulers and seizing the leadership of the lands from the collaborators, then declaring the rejection of occupation and the presence of "Israel" as well as all the other plots; this would be part of the implementation of the suspended Islam once the Islamic State is established.

This is Islam and this is the clarity of vision, not the fabricated fatwas of the regimes' scholars that conform to the general mood that had been generated and spread by the rulers, and for which some of the groups calling sincerely for Jihad had fallen. Such fatwas do not salvage the lands and do not fulfil the obligation of Jihad, but often leads the Ummah towards executing the plans of the enemy represented today by the head of Kufr, America, and contributing to her unilateral dominion, thus bringing ruin and devastation rather than salvation and liberation. It is baffling to witness this pattern of events recurring ever since the Khilafah was destroyed up until today and yet the Muslims fail to learn the lesson and realise the unfruitfulness of this individualist approach and do not turn towards the collective sacrifice reflected in an Ummah that has her state, her authority and her will.

The Falsehood of Defensive Jihad

The enemies of Islam are attempting to generate among the Muslims the idea that Jihad is a defensive war and not offensive and that initiating war against the enemies contradicts the meaning of Jihad in Islam. They justify their allegation by referring to Allah's (swt) saying: **“But if the enemy incline towards peace, do also incline towards peace”** [8-61] and also His saying: **“Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah loves not transgressors.”** [2.190]

They also refer to Allah's (swt) saying: **“To those against whom war is made, permission is given to fight, because they are wronged; and verily, Allah is most powerful for their aid.”** [22-39].

They argue that these verses denote defensive fighting and that the verse of initiating war does not abrogate the verses denoting that Jihad is for defensive situations.

The whole of this allegation is refuted from three aspects:

First: The evidences of Jihad are general and unrestricted; they encompass defensive war and initiation of war against the enemy; they also encompass limited war, unlimited war, and preventive war and so on. These evidences include all types of fighting against the enemy because they are general and unrestricted. To specify them or restrict them to being in reference to defensive war requires a text to either specify or restrict them; and there are no texts as such either from the Book or from the Sunnah; hence they remain general in their evidential aspect and they include all types of wars and all types of fighting against the enemy. Let us review the verses of Jihad in Surat al-Tawbah because this Surah is the last of what was revealed on fighting, thus ruling out any claim of specification or restriction or abrogation. Allah (swt) says: **“Fight against those who believe not In Allah, nor in the Last day, nor forbid that which has been forbidden by Allah and his Messenger and those who accept not the Deen of Truth from among the people of the book, until they pay the Jizyah with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.”** [9-29]

Allah (swt) also says: **“And fight the polytheists altogether as they fight you altogether and know that Allah is with the pious.”** [9- 36]

Allah (swt) also says: **“O Prophet! Make Jihad against the unbelievers and the Hypocrites, and be firm against them. Their abode is Hell, an evil refuge indeed.”** [9-73]

Allah (swt) also says: **“Allah has indeed purchased of the believers their persons and their goods; for theirs (in return) is the garden (of Paradise): they fight in His cause, and slay and are slain: a promise binding on Him in truth, through the Law, the Gospel, and the Qur'an: and who is more faithful to his covenant than Allah. Then rejoice in the bargain which ye have concluded: that is the achievement supreme.”** [9-111]

Allah (swt) also says: **“O you who believe, fight the unbelievers who gird you about, and let them find firmness in you: and know that Allah is with those who fear Him.”** [9-123]

The order to fight has come in these five verses in a general and unrestricted manner: **“fight those who do not believe in Allah...”**, **“fight the polytheists all together...”** and so on. The denotation of the order is included and from the five verses, the generality and unrestrictive denotation can be clearly deduced; hence, they are proof that Jihad is fighting the Kuffar, be it initiating the fight, or defending the Muslims or the lands of Islam. They include defensive war, offensive war and all types of war, without any specification or restriction due to the non-existence of any specification of the general rule or any restriction of the unrestricted rule.

As for the verses: **“But if the enemy incline towards peace, do also incline towards peace”**, **“Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah loves not transgressors”**, **“To those against whom war is made, permission is given to fight, because they are wronged; and verily, Allah is most powerful for their aid”** and other similar verses, these cannot indicate specification of the verses in Surat al-Tawbah, nor can they restrict them, because they had all been revealed before Surat al-Tawbah; it is well known that the former does not specify nor does it restrict the latter. This is so because specification amounts to an abrogation of a section from the general rule, since it moves the rule away from its generality by nullifying it in some part and placing another rule instead. Hence, since specification of a rule amounts to abrogation, and since abrogation stipulates that the abrogating rule must come later than the abrogated, these verses cannot specify the verses of Jihad because they had been revealed earlier. The verses in Surat al-Tawbah were the last of what was revealed on Jihad, thus specification cannot be established. Likewise, the same applies to restriction. The restricting text must come after or accompany the unrestricted in order to act as a restriction for it or for the referral of the unrestricted text to a restricting rule to be sound. In this context, the aforementioned verses and their like had been revealed before the verses of Surat al-Tawbah, thus they are

invalid in terms of restriction and the unrestricted text cannot be attributed to a restricting rule because the unrestricted was revealed later. Therefore, these verses can neither specify nor restrict the rules of Jihad and consequently, their use as a proof that Jihad is a defensive war becomes redundant and non-applicable. The general rule maintains its evidential aspect due to the absence of any text that may specify it and the unrestricted rule maintains also its evidential aspect due to the absence of any text may either restrict it or make reference to it possible. Therefore, Jihad is fighting the enemies in an unrestricted manner and in a general manner: it includes offensive, defensive, preventive, limited, unlimited and all types of wars.

It is also wrong to claim that the Ayat of al-Tawbah have abrogated the other Ayat that preceded them, simply because they do not denote any abrogation whatsoever. The mere materialisation of a contradiction between two texts is an insufficient pretext to claim that an abrogation has occurred; rather, Shari'ah evidence must be established to indicate that such and such text abrogates a given text; otherwise, it cannot be considered as an abrogating text. It is imperative to have a *Qarinah* (conjunction) that denotes abrogation. Hence, the mere materialisation of a contradiction between the two evidences does not necessarily mean that one abrogates the other because it is possible to reconcile the two and dispel the alleged contradiction. This is in fact the case with most of the evidences which some individuals claimed that they had abrogating attributes, only to discover later the error of their claim when the evidences are reconciled. Certain texts may share the same topic but their circumstances, conditions and the like may differ. The Ayat they claimed that had been abrogated are in fact different either in respect of circumstances or conditions or themes. It was alleged that the ayah of **“But if the enemy incline towards peace, do also incline towards peace”** had been abrogated by the ayah of **“the sword”**, namely Allah (swt)'s saying: **“Fight those who believe neither in Allah nor the Last Day”**. In fact, there is no abrogation between them because each one of them describes a different reality to the other; the first is related to a peace situation and the second is related to a war situation. Peace and war are permanent situations, thus the rules of each one of them are also permanent and none of them has been abrogated. Al-Zamakhshari wrote in al-Kishaf, interpreting the saying of Allah (swt) **“But if the enemy incline towards peace, do also incline towards peace”**: “What is sound is that the matter depends on what the Imam deems as beneficial to Islam and its people, in terms of war or peace; surely it does not mean that they should fight forever or that they should incline towards a truce forever.” Al-Sadi and Ibnu Zayd said: “The meaning of the ayah: If they invite you to peace, then respond; there is no abrogation in it.” Ibnul Arabi said: “Hence, the answer to this is different;

besides, Allah (swt) says: **“Be not weary and faint-hearted, crying for peace, when you have the upper hand: for Allah is with you, and will never put you in loss for your (good) deeds.”** [47-35]. Therefore, if the Muslims are mighty, redoubtable and well protected with a huge army, there shall then be no truce.”

The Muslims are allowed to initiate a truce if they deemed that it would bring them a benefit or repel harm. Hence, the ayah does not explain the situation of Jihad but rather the situation of truce, for it tackles the issue of truce. Allah (swt) is saying if they invite to a truce then do respond to their request and do not worry about their treachery; the verse that follows it confirms this. The sequence of the verses is as follows: **“But if the enemy incline towards peace, do also incline towards peace, and trust in Allah. For He is the one who hears and knows all things. Should they intend to deceive you - verily Allah suffices you: He it is who has strengthened you with His aid and with the company of the Believers; And He has put affection between their hearts.”** Therefore, there is no contradiction between this ayah and the ayat of the sword because their topics are different.

As for the ayah **“Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah loves not transgressors.”** [2-190], it deals with the issue of not extending the fight beyond those who fight the Muslims, namely the women and children who do not fight; thus this ayah has not been abrogated by Allah’s saying: **“Fight the pagans all together”** because the ayah ordering the Muslims to fight the polytheists is specifically related to that topic; it is a command to perform Jihad, whereas this ayah denotes a command to restrict the fighting against those who fight the Muslims and to refrain from fighting those who are not involved in the fighting - the Muslims should fight those who are effectively involved in fighting them, to the exclusion of the elderly, women, children and monks. Allah’s saying **“but do not transgress limits”** denotes the prohibition of fighting those who do not fight us from among the women, children and elderly. However, if they fought the Muslims, they would be fought back even if they were monks, women and children. The prohibition of fighting them is because they do not usually fight. Hence, the prohibition of transgressing in this ayah is related to those who do not fight from among the aforementioned, and the prohibition of transgressing in other ayat is related to those we have been forbidden from fighting through other evidences, such as the killing of women, children, the elderly and the covenanters, as well as mutilating or killing by surprise before inviting people to Islam first and the like. The Qur’an has prohibited transgression in several ayat; this denotes an order to refrain from the actions that the Legislator has prohibited during the battle and does not prohibit the

initiation of war, because the ayat of al-Tawbah are conspicuous in requesting the initiation of war. As for the Ayah in which Allah (swt) says: **“To those against whom war is made, permission is given (to fight), because they are wronged;- and verily, Allah is most powerful for their aid”**, it also denotes an unrestricted command to fight and not only when the Muslims are wronged because His saying **“because they are wronged”** is not an Illah (Shari’ah reason) for fighting but rather a description of reality - the polytheists of Quraysh used to inflict grievous harm on the Muslims, who used to come to the Messenger of Allah (saw), some of them beaten and others with head injuries, and complain to him; he would say: **“Be patient; I have not been ordered to fight”**. This went on until he (saw) migrated to Medina and this ayah was revealed ordering the Muslims to fight after they had been forbidden from doing so. Al-Dahhak wrote: “The companions of the Messenger of Allah (saw) sought permission to fight the Kuffar as they harmed them in Makkah, thus Allah revealed “Surely Allah will defend those who believe; surely Allah does not love any one who is unfaithful, ungrateful.” [22-38], and when the Messenger of Allah (saw) migrated, Allah revealed **“To those against whom war is made, permission is given (to fight), because they are wronged.”** Hence, the ayah was revealed to remove the restriction imposed on the Muslims, allowing them to repel the harm inflicted on them by resorting to force and fighting, and ordering them to fight those who had been harming them, namely the Kuffar of Quraysh; it also denotes a command to fight. In other words, the Muslims had been prohibited from repelling the harm of Quraysh by way of fighting, thus when the ayah was revealed the restriction was lifted. This is the topic of the ayah; it denotes therefore a specific situation and not the situation of war in general. It deals with repelling the harm of Quraysh by fighting Quraysh. However, the ayah denotes also the command to fight by way of suggestive indication, whereby the speech is patterned to explain a rule or to indicate a rule, yet a rule other than the one for which the speech is patterned is perceived. The speech in this context is patterned to indicate the lifting of the restriction imposed on repelling the harm by fighting and to grant the Muslims a permission to repel harm by fighting; however, another rule is deduced from the speech, namely the order to fight. Hence, there is no contradiction between this ayah and the ayat of **“the sword”** because the topics are different and this ayah does not necessarily serve as evidence for fighting; it was rather legislated to repel harm – it is not a command to fight but a permission to respond to the harm of the polytheists by force. This becomes clear when all the ayat are conjunctionally discerned: **“Verily Allah will defend (from ill) those who believe: verily, Allah loves not any that is a traitor to faith, or show ingratitude * To those against whom war is made, permission is given (to fight),**

because they are wronged;- and verily, Allah is most powerful for their aid * (They are) those who have been expelled from their homes in defiance of right,- (for no cause) except that they say, "Our Lord is Allah.. Did not Allah check one set of people by means of another, there would surely have been pulled down monasteries, churches, synagogues, and mosques, in which the name of Allah is commemorated in abundant measure". Hence, the ayah indicates a specific situation that was existent, namely repelling harm by fighting i.e. meeting force with force. The ayah does not indicate the legitimacy of fighting for the sake of Allah to make the word of Allah supreme; it rather indicates the legitimacy of fighting to repel harm, whereas the ayat of **"the sword"** indicate the legitimacy of fighting for the sake of Allah, i.e. Jihad to make the word of Allah reign supreme. Hence, they are two different topics and there is no contradiction between them; thus it is wrong to claim that the ayah has been abrogated by the ayat of the sword. Also, it is not an ayah that denotes Jihad for the sake of Allah so as to claim that Jihad is a defensive war. It is rather an ayah on a specific topic, namely the permission to repel harm by fighting after the Muslims had been forbidden from doing so. Consequently, it becomes evident that there is no abrogation whatsoever in any of the ayat of Jihad and that the ayat of Jihad are general and unrestricted; there are no texts that either specify or restrict the ayat of Jihad and there are no instances where the unrestricted is overridden by a restrictive text; thus the ayat maintain their general and their unrestrictive attributes: Jihad therefore is fighting the enemies and it includes all types of warfare, be it defensive, offensive or other, according to what the Khalifah deems favourable to the Da'awah and to the Muslims.

Besides, the sayings and the actions of the Messenger of Allah (saw), as well as what the Sahaba unanimously agreed upon and practiced, indicates conspicuously that Jihad is initiating war against the Kuffar to make the word of Allah supreme and to spread Islam; it includes defensive as well as offensive war. Hence, fighting is to spread Islam. This is what the sayings and the actions of the Messenger of Allah (saw) as well as the Ijmaa (general consensus) of the Sahaba indicates. As for the saying of the Messenger of Allah (saw), the two Sheikhs extracted from the Hadith of Abdullah Ibnu Omar who said: **"the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: "I have been ordered to fight against people until they testify that there is no god but Allah and that Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah and until they perform the prayers and pay the Zakat, and if they did so they would gain protection from me for their lives, unless [they do acts that are punishable] in accordance with Islam, and their reckoning will be with Allah."** In another narration, the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **"I have been ordered to fight against people until they profess that**

there is no god but Allah and that Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah. If they did, their lives and property would be inviolable to me except by that which is right and their reckoning will be with Allah.” It has also been reported from Sulaiman Ibnu Buraidah through his father that when the Messenger of Allah (saw) appointed anyone as leader of an army or detachment he would especially exhort him to fear Allah and to be good to the Muslims who were with him. He would say: **“Fight in the name of Allah and for the sake of Allah. Fight against those who disbelieve in Allah. Declare war, do not embezzle the spoils; do not break your pledge; and do not mutilate (the dead) bodies; do not kill the children. When you meet your enemies who are polytheists, invite them to three courses of action. If they respond to any one of these, you also accept it and withhold yourself from doing them any harm. Invite them to (accept) Islam; if they respond to you, accept it from them and desist from fighting against them. Then invite them to migrate from their lands to the land of the Muhajireen (emigrants) and inform them that, if they do so, they shall have all the privileges and obligations of the Muhajireen. If they refuse to migrate, tell them that they will have the status of Bedouin Muslims and will be subjected to the Commands of Allah like other Muslims, but they will not get any share from the spoils of war or Fai' except when they actually fight with the Muslims (against the disbelievers). If they refuse to accept Islam, demand from them the Jizya. If they agree to pay, accept it from them and hold off your hands. If they refuse to pay the tax, seek Allah's help and fight them.”**

It is clear from these two Hadiths that Jihad is to initiate war against the enemy and not just a defensive war. He (saw) said: **“I have been ordered to fight against people...”** i.e. initiate war. He also ordered the commander of the army to invite the Kuffar to three courses of action starting with a call to Islam; if they rejected the call and refused to pay the Jizyah, he should then fight them. Hence, the two Hadiths clearly indicate that Jihad is initiating war and the Messenger of Allah (saw) stated also that Jihad was ongoing until the day of Judgement. Anas reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **“Three things are from the essence of Iman: to refrain from fighting he who professes that there is no god but Allah, not to deem him Kafir because of a sin he commits and not to exclude him from Islam because of a deed he performed; and Jihad will remain from the time Allah sent me until the time which the last of my Ummah fights the Dajjal. It will not be invalidated by the corruption of the corrupt one nor by the justice of the just one.”** This means that Jihad will continue until the Hour comes. The Messenger of Allah (saw) also said: **“I was sent before the coming of the Hour with the sword.”**

Jihad could not be unremitting until the Hour comes if it were merely defensive fighting. The sayings of the Messenger of Allah (saw) are clear in indicating that Jihad is fighting to spread Islam. The actions of the Messenger of Allah (saw) also indicate amply that jihad is initiating war. The sortie of the Messenger of Allah (saw) to Badr to seize the caravan of Quraysh was to initiate war: he wanted to seize the goods and to fight those who protected the caravan. Then the Battle of Badr took place, which meant that the sortie was not merely for the caravan but also to initiate a battle; Allah (swt) says: **“Behold! Allah promised you one of the two (enemy) parties, that it should be yours: Ye wished that the one unarmed should be yours, but Allah willed to justify the Truth according to His words and to cut off the roots of the Unbelievers.”** [8-7]. The two parties were the cattle and the soldiers, which proves that the outing was for commercial and military purposes. This amounted to an initiation of war; Quraysh was a state at the time and it was yet to attack the Messenger of Allah (saw) or Medina. It was rather the Messenger of Allah (saw) who initiated the fight - he dispatched a host of expeditions including that of Abdullah Ibnu Jah’sh; then he attacked their caravan. This constitutes ample proof from the actions of the Messenger of Allah (saw). Even if we assumed that the Messenger of Allah’s (saw) battle with Quraysh had been for defensive reasons, although there was nothing defensive about it since it was the Messenger of Allah (saw) who intercepted the caravan, his raid on Hawazin in the Battle of Hunayn and his besieging of Taif indicate clearly that he had initiated war. The task force that the Messenger of Allah (saw) dispatched to fight the Romans in the Battle of Mu’tah and the Battle of Tabuk, in which he led a huge army to fight them, indicate conspicuously that he had initiated war. Hence, although the actions of the Messenger of Allah (saw) included defensive war, such as the Battle of Uhud and the Battle of al-Ahzab, most of them were however offensive; this proves that Jihad is fighting to spread Islam. Jihad may sometimes be defensive but it is in essence an offensive war.

As for the Ijmaa of the Sahaba, the conquests of Iraq, Persia, al-Sham, Egypt and North Africa were all achieved during their time and on the basis of their general consensus. The fact that those conquests were an initiation of war is axiomatic. Hence, all this is an irrefutable proof that Jihad is not merely a defensive war but rather fighting against the Kuffar to make the word of Allah reign supreme; it may be a defensive war and it may be an offensive war. It is in essence however an initiation of war to spread Islam.

Second: A nation who carries the Da’awah (call) to a comprehensive idea about the universe, man and life and to a specific way of life can’t be but a fighting nation; i.e. a

nation who initiates the Da'awah to her Aqeedah and who fights for its sake. This is because the Da'awah to the comprehensive idea, coupled with a way of life, necessitates inherently that she initiates war against people for its sake, because it is an intellectual leadership that leads its embracer to convey it to others and it leads its conveyer and its receiver to the thought and to thinking, thus generating the inevitable intellectual struggle between the two. Its association with a specific way of life makes seeing it vivacious in society's relationships compelling. The implementation of the intellectual leadership, either by way of choice or enforcement, is what warrants fighting if implementation is not occasioned by choice. Hence, the initiation of war by the nation who carries a Da'awah would be inevitable if those invited failed to embrace it or submit to its authority. This is so because fighting for its sake falls under believing in it, for it is a belief in existent realities and not just a belief in abstract thoughts, thus it is imperative to witness these realities, i.e. to witness the implementation.

The Islamic Ummah carries a Da'awah to a comprehensive idea about the universe, man and life, coupled with a specific way of life; hence, she is a nation of Jihad, i.e. an Ummah who initiates people with carrying the Da'awah and fighting for its sake. This is why scholars described Jihad as being the Da'awah to Islam and the fighting for the sake of Allah. Several conclusive and clear ayat were revealed denoting the obligation to convey the Da'awah to people and to initiate war against them if they fail to respond. The evidences of carrying the Da'awah point adequately to the notion of fighting, though the indication is based on the denotation of exigency. This is because the instruction to carry the comprehensive idea, from which a way of life emanates, is an instruction to fight for the sake of this idea and the way of life that emanates from it. Hence, it is only natural and obvious for Jihad to be an initiation of war against people if they fail to respond to the Da'awah and to also include defending the Muslims and the lands of Islam as part of defending the Da'awah. Hence, it is strange for Islam and contradictory to the nature of the Islamic Ummah, in her quality as a Da'awah carrier, to claim that Jihad is a defensive war and not an initiation of war against people because if it were merely a defensive war, it would not be deemed as Jihad; in other words, it would not be the fighting undertaken by a nation who carries a Da'awah, but merely the fighting of any nation or people, i.e. an ordinary fighting to defend oneself, in which case it would be wrong to call it Jihad, because Jihad is the Da'awah to Islam and the fighting for its sake. If it were a fighting that has no connection to the Da'awah, it would be stripped of the concept of Jihad and it would no longer be Jihad. The meaning of Jihad is to initiate war against people for the sake of the Da'awah and not just sheer fighting.

The Muslims carry the Islamic Da'awah by inviting people to submit to Islam without coercing individuals to embrace it; they however oblige communities and nations to implement and to comply with its rules by breaking the barriers that prevent its implementation. The Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **“I have been ordered to fight people until they profess that there is no god but Allah and that Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah. If they did, their lives and property would be inviolable to me.”** He (saw) said people, which means in this context communities and nations, not individuals. The texts of the Qur'an and the Sunnah demonstrate clearly that individuals must not be coerced into embracing Islam. Allah (swt) says: **“There is no compulsion in religion.”** The Messenger of Allah (saw) said: **“He who adheres to his Judaism or his Christianity should not be forced away from it.”** i.e. he should be coerced to forsake his religion. Hence, Jihad does not mean coercing individuals to embrace Islam but rather subjugating communities and nations to the rule of Islam. They will be invited to Islam and the individuals who embrace it will have their lives and properties spared and fighting them will become prohibited because they will have responded to the Da'awah, even as individuals. Whoever does not embrace Islam will be compelled to submit to the rules of Islam. This is why the Messenger of Allah (saw) used to say to the emir of the army: **“Invite them to three courses of action... Invite them to (accept) Islam... If they refuse to accept Islam, demand from them the Jizya... If they refuse to pay the tax, seek Allah's help and fight them.”** Hence, Jihad does not in any way mean coercing individuals, communities or nations to embrace Islam. It rather means inviting them to Islam and if they refuse, they will be required to submit to the rules of Islam; this is what imposing the Jizya means. If they refuse to submit to the rules of Islam, they will be fought. The fighting will be to make them submit to the authority of Islam. This means the fighting will be to implement the Islamic way of life and not to force people to embrace Islam. This is why the whole of the world is regarded as being in either Dar al-Islam (Islamic household) or Dar al-Kufr (Kufr household) i.e. Dar al- Harb (a war household). The Dar al-Islam represents the lands where the rules of Islam are implemented even if their inhabitants were Kuffar, whereas the Dar al-Harb i.e. the Dar al-Kufr represents the lands where the rules of Islam are not implemented even if the inhabitants were Muslims. This is why the scholars say in the books of Jihad that the spoils of war should not be divided except in the Dar al-Islam i.e. in the lands where the rules of Islam are implemented. Al-Sirkhisi wrote in al-Mabsout: “As for Khaybar, the land was conquered and the rule was implemented, then came the dividing of the spoils before leaving, just like it was in Medina; this proves that the Imam is permitted to divide the spoils in the land that he conquers and turns into Dar al-Islam by

implementing the rules of Islam upon it. The stay of the Messenger of Allah (saw) in Khaybar, after the conquest, was long and he implemented the rules of Islam; hence, it became a Dar al-Islam where the share of the spoils was conducted like in any other part of the lands of Islam. He shared the spoils of Bani al-Mustalaq in Dar al-Islam, which he had already conquered and turned into Dar al-Islam. This is corroborated by the Hadith of Makhool who said: **“The Messenger of Allah (saw) never divided the spoils except in Dar al-Islam. This serves as evidence that spoils are not divided in Dar al-Harb.”**

Hence, Jihad is undertaken to transform Dar al-Kufr to Dar al-Islam, i.e. to establish the rules of Islam, and not to coerce people to become Muslims. It is in the nature of the Islamic Ummah to be a nation of Jihad, since she is a nation of Da’awah and a nation who carries the Da’awah. It is in her nature to initiate the Da’awah to Islam and to fight for its sake, because she does not carry an abstract idea as is the case with the Greek philosophy or with the preaching of Christianity. The Islamic Ummah carries the Da’awah to a comprehensive idea from which a specific way of life emanates. Hence, fighting for the sake of the idea is inevitable because the specific way of life from which it emanates and which necessitates its implementation, makes the subjugation of people to it inevitable, even if they did not embrace it. In other words, fighting for the sake of the idea is unavoidable. Hence, it is natural for the Islamic Ummah to be a nation of Jihad, i.e. it is natural for the Islamic Ummah to initiate war against people if they fail to respond to the Da’awah because this is what her nature necessitates in her quality as a nation that carries a comprehensive idea about the universe, man and life, from which a specific way of life emanates; thus the verses of Jihad were revealed ordering the initiation of war against the Kuffar.

Third: The idea that interprets Jihad as being merely a defensive war and that omits the initiation of war against people from the meaning of Jihad is not an Islamic idea, nor is it an Islamic opinion; this meaning of Jihad does not exist either linguistically nor in Shari’ah terminology. This idea was non-existent among the Muslims before the 19th century; in other words, it did not exist before Orientalism and the Orientalists, and the cultural crusade with which the West invaded us. Before then, nobody in the lands of Islam ever raised this issue. As for the difference of opinion among the scholars on whether the ‘ayat of the sword’ abrogated the ‘ayat of truce’, the argument was over accepting or rejecting the truce, not about the meaning of Jihad. Those who claim that the ayat of the sword abrogate the ayat of truce, they say that no truce or treaty should be accepted from the Kuffar, that the Muslims should continue to fight them until they submit to the authority of Islam; they also claim that

the ‘ayat of Bara’a’ have abrogated all the preceding ayat that make peace lawful and all that the Messenger of Allah (saw) had concluded in terms of the treaty of Hudaibiya and the pacts of good neighbourly relations with the tribes. Those who claim that the ayat of the sword are not abrogative say that the issue of peace is subject to the Imam’s opinion; if he deemed peace beneficial he would conclude it and if he deemed war beneficial he would reject peace and it would be within his competencies to declare war.

This is the meaning over which they differed, namely whether to accept or reject peace. They never differed over the meaning of Jihad. None of the Muslims then, be it scholars or otherwise, claimed that Jihad was a defensive war; it would be inconceivable for any of them to claim such a notion because to claim that Jihad is a defensive war would mean the suspension and the total annulment of Jihad. If it were merely a defensive war, this would mean the Da’awah to Islam could not be carried and no one could fight for its sake; it would mean that the Da’awah is carried in a missionary manner like the Christians. This would mean that no fighting for the sake of the Da’awah could ever take place and that fighting would only be allowed if the Islamic state was attacked; however, if there was no attack it would be wrong to fight because it would then be aggression and Allah has prohibited aggression. This is the meaning of the notion that Jihad is a defensive war and this would without a doubt amount to a categorical abolition of Jihad. There is no difference of opinion about Jihad being the Da’awah to Islam and the fighting for the sake of Allah. This is the true and sound meaning of Jihad. Hence, if fighting for the sake of Allah were prevented, i.e. if the fighting for the sake of the Da’awah were barred, it would mean the abolition of Jihad; it would be inconceivable for a Muslim who believes in the Qur’an to make such claims. The ayat of the Qur’an are clear-cut on this issue with no room for interpretation whatsoever and the Ahadith of the Messenger of Allah (saw) are explicit and denote one single meaning – namely fighting the Kuffar, shedding their blood and seizing their properties if they refuse to respond to the call of Islam. Is there anything more explicit than the saying of the Messenger of Allah (saw): **“I have been ordered to fight against people until they profess that there is no god but Allah and that Mohammed is the messenger of Allah. If they did, their lives and property would be inviolable to except by that which is right”**? Therefore, it would be implausible for a Muslim who believes in the Qur’an and in the Message of Mohammed (saw) to wittingly make such a claim about the meaning of Jihad. No one had ever made such a claim and it would be unthinkable for a Muslim to do so. No human being, Muslim or otherwise, has ever reported that such a meaning existed before the 19th century, be it through a sound or a weak report; not even through a

false report, like the ones Muslims have received throughout the years. This meaning surfaced in the 19th century during the Orientalist campaign that formed part of the cultural invasion. The Orientalists used to argue that the ayat of al-Tawbah, which are clear-cut about fighting the Kuffar, reflected a call to chauvinism that clashed with the tolerance championed by the virtuous civilisation, a call to fight the polytheists and kill them wherever they may be found mercilessly and relentlessly and a call to establish an authority on the basis of tyranny and oppression. This is what we read in many books written by Orientalists and it is designed to estrange non-Muslims from Islam and to alienate the children of the Muslims from Islam so that they disown their Deen since it advocates savagery according to the allegation of the Orientalists. They did not stop at that but went on to claim that Islam had been spread by the sword and that Islam had coerced people into embracing it; once the sword of the Muslims was lifted, people reverted back to their old religion. The Orientalist Washington Irving once wrote about the Muslims' surge for Jihad: "What doctrine could have been devised more calculated to hurry forward, in a wild career of conquest, a set of ignorant and predatory soldiers, than assurance of booty if they survived, and paradise if they fell? It rendered almost irresistible the Moslem arms." Then he wrote: "The crescent has waned before the cross, and exists in Europe, where it was once so mighty, only by the suffrage, or rather the jealousy of the great Christian powers, probably ere long to furnish another illustration that "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword"."

Hence, Jihad among the Muslims, as stipulated by the ayat of the Qur'an, the Ahadith and the actions of the Messenger of Allah (saw) was targeted by the Orientalists who had endeavoured to demonise it, libel Islam, gloat over the Muslims and insult them. With the intention of defending Islam, a group of Muslims set about responding to the Orientalists; thus they naïvely deemed the Orientalists' demonization of the rules of Jihad, as revealed in Surat al-Tawbah, as being justified, though they exonerated Islam from it and attributed it to the actions of the Muslims and to their misconstruction of Islam, but not down to the rules of Islam. They would for instance say: "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword is true; and although this may be a fitting description of the latter generation of Muslims who had gone to war in order to conquer various kingdoms and to colonise them rather than to defend themselves and their Aqeedah, it is however an accurate description of the West who goes to war to subjugate people and colonise their lands". They set about interpreting the rules of Jihad by claiming for instance that: "the Muslims' fighting does not mean that Islam used to proscribe self-defence and then it approved it, but rather that Islam then was the same as it has always been, it merely proscribes the belligerent type of

war: **“But do not transgress limits, truly Allah loves not the transgressors.”** [2-190]

When the Orientalists said: “You see this Mohammed? His religion calls to war and Jihad for the sake of Allah, i.e. to coerce people by the sword to embrace Islam. Is this not sheer chauvinism; this at a time when Christianity denounces fighting, abhors war and calls for peace and tolerance, and binds people with the bond of fraternity in god and our Lord Jesus?” When they raised their voices screeching this, the Muslims would respond in defence of Islam by saying for instance: “The Orientalists’ claim that Mohammed’s religion calls to fighting to coerce people by the sword to enter into Islam is a fabrication that the Qur’an rejects through the saying of Allah (swt) “...and do not transgress for Allah loves not the transgressors”, and in many other verses. Hence, they set about confusing the ayat related to prohibiting the coercing of individuals into embracing Islam with the ayat of Jihad and interpreting the ayat of Jihad as being related to defensive war rather than fighting to spread Islam. They also started to deny that Islam had spread through the sword. Many Muslims started to propagate the idea that Jihad was a defensive war and to deny that it was the initiation of war against people to spread Islam; this was under the pretext of defending Islam and to fend off the accusations of the Orientalists.

This is how the notion of Jihad being a defensive war started off: an onslaught by the Orientalists demonising the rule of Jihad, followed by a defence from certain Muslims in the shape of an allegation that Jihad was a defensive war; there is nothing to indicate that this defence from the Muslims had been in the first instance concocted by the West, but we cannot rule out the possibility that certain Orientalists might have sneaked it through under the pretence of being fair towards Islam, then the Muslims fell for it. This may be so because during their cultural invasion, the Orientalists used to split themselves into two camps, one attacking Islam and the other defending it under the pretence of being equitable; hence, some Orientalists may have said this and then they were mimicked by some Muslims. In any case, whether this meaning was sneaked through by the Orientalists or the Muslims said it themselves, it did not exist before the cultural crusade and it was instigated by the Western cultural invasion, especially the Orientalists’ campaign.

As for the reason behind this campaign against Jihad, it is because it was part of the attack on Islam that aimed at vilifying it and at demonising some of its rules. However, the motive behind this attack on Jihad specifically was due to the defeats that the West and Europe had suffered at the hands of the Muslims’ armies until the

widespread conviction that the Muslims' army was invincible became embedded among all Europeans. Therefore, the concept of Jihad had to be struck and the Orientalists launched their onslaught on Jihad to estrange the Muslims from it and to estrange the non-Muslims from the Muslims, since they were acting like savage beasts. Hence, instead of explaining the meaning of Jihad as it was revealed, it was interpreted in this manner to take it away from its real meaning and even to abolish it. This meaning was propagated through evil means until many educated Muslims started to echo it since the 19th century and up until today; and the intention was to abolish Jihad by distorting its meaning.

Britain for her part did not content herself with this but occasioned a campaign in India to abolish Jihad and allege that it was only valid during the days of the Messenger of Allah (saw), and that Jihad ended after his departure (saw). That was the preaching of the Qadiyanis in India; all this was designed to abolish Jihad, facilitate the onslaught on the Muslims and ensure they never regained the upper hand. This is because if a Da'awah-carrying Ummah relinquished Jihad, she would collapse and perish. Sayyeduna Ali (ra) also said: "The folk who relinquish Jihad will be humiliated."

Therefore, it is clear that the notion of Jihad being a defensive war was instigated as part of the Orientalists' campaign against Jihad, regardless of whether it was a botched attempt to defend Islam or a scheme concocted by the Orientalists themselves. It is a notion that denotes the suspension and the abolishment of Jihad; hence, it is forbidden for any Muslim to adopt such an opinion, especially if he perceives what it means. The response to the Orientalists should not be by demonising what they demonise and then defending it, because in this case it would be like spilling the honey because it is described as the bees' excrement. One should take the rule as it has been brought to us by the text and let the savour of the Qur'an decide what is repugnant and what is pleasant, not the saying of the West or the saying of the Orientalists. We need not draw attention to how the major powers mobilise their armies to seize the opportunity and initiate war to spread their message. We are merely calling to an unblemished perception of the ayat of the Qur'an as they have been revealed and with their Arabic and Shari'ah denotations intact, not as others want us to perceive them so that we may respond to the Orientalists.

This is a call to the Islamic Ummah to perceive the meaning of Jihad, specifically that it is an initiation of war against the Kuffar, so that she may be prepared to undertake it

once the Khilafah state is established and when the Khalifah of the Muslims summons her to the honour of performing it, Inshallah.

The Duty of the Muslims Today

The duty of the Muslims today is to work towards establishing the Khilafah, appointing one Khilafah over all the Muslims and removing all the collaborating rulers from power; this is the Shari'ah rule that would exonerate them. Shari'ah has commanded them to undertake their obligation and has not authorised them to wait until the Khilafah establishes itself – and this is never likely to happen – because waiting amounts to forsaking the obligation and depending on the unseen and what the circumstances may bring, and a capitulation to the corrupt reality. They must restore Islam back into their lives and perform Jihad. Neglecting the work to establish the Khilafah and then seeking solutions that are extraordinary to the laws of the universe, man and life does not form part of Islam.

The Muslims must not be distracted away from the duty of establishing the Khilafah and carrying the Islamic Da'awah to the world by engrossing themselves with attempting to liberate the lands of Islam from Western military occupation without generating the necessary tool to achieve this liberation, namely the armies equipped by their state, which represents their thoughts, implements their Deen upon them, erupts their powers and directs their faculties towards their enemies because the path towards liberation from Western occupation and influence starts with redressing the situation and establishing the Khilafah. In addition to this engrossment being usually concocted by the Kuffar to divert the Muslims away from their objective, the Legislator (swt) has ordered the Ummah to establish the Imam who will execute the rules of Islam and turn the lands of Islam into Dar al-Islam, just like they were before. Allah (swt) has only granted the Ummah a three-day respite to establish an Imam to succeed his predecessor and has commanded her to be a message conveyor to the world. Allah (swt) has made this task the Ummah's *raison d'être*. Hence, the only task the Muslims must be attending to today before any other is establishing the Islamic State, i.e. restoring the Islamic Khilafah.

One of the deceptive styles that has been adopted by the arch-enemy, the Kafir West, ever since the destruction of the Khilafah and up until today, is to engross the Ummah in liberating herself, even from itself, in order to distract her from carrying her message to the world and to embroil her in a whirlpool of thoughts and actions that would lead to tightening her fetters further instead of loosening them and to consolidating the Kafir's dominion over her rather than liberating her from its hegemony and influence. Hence, the Ummah's engrossment in herself and neglecting the conveying of the Da'awah to the world to salvage it is but a manoeuvre to divert

her away from leading the world and a means that consolidates and perpetuates this dominance over the lands of Islam. Therefore, it is wrong and detrimental for the Ummah to engross herself in anything other than carrying her Da'awah and to allow herself to be distracted from working towards salvaging mankind. Besides, liberation must be undertaken by the state through fighting; it will be a liberation linked to carrying the Da'awah because in order for fighting to be considered as Jihad, it must be for the sake of making the word of Allah reign supreme, and the word of Allah is carrying the Da'awah of Islam. Hence, even the Jihad of liberation must be to make the word of Allah dominant; when we fight to liberate Palestine, it is not for the orange trees of Yafa and we do not fight so that our homelands may return to us, we rather fight to make the word of Allah highest because Allah (swt) has ordered this so that the authority of the Kuffar is uprooted from the lands of the Muslims. This can only be achieved through liberation; thus, fighting must be to make the word of Allah highest not just to gain liberation, though the reality dictates this and makes it imperative. When we fight to liberate Senegal, Nigeria and Sudan and to turn them from Dar al-Kufr into Dar al-Islam, we must not stop at the Zambian borders until Algeria is liberated, nor at the Congolese borders until Indonesia is liberated; we will proceed with Jihad to carry the Da'awah according to the requirements of the circumstances and situations and according to what we possess in terms of power. We must fight to turn every Dar al-Kufr into Dar al-Islam, irrespective of whether its residents are Muslims, such as Pakistan, or Kuffar, such as Australia. Hence, the struggle against the enemies of the Muslims must be for the sake of carrying the Islamic Da'awah, not for sheer liberation. Although the issue of liberation has imposed itself upon the Muslims, the struggle must be for the sake of carrying the Islamic Da'awah, though this cannot be achieved except through liberation, as far as the Islamic lands are concerned; and even the work towards liberation must only be for the sake of making the word of Allah highest.

17 Ramadhan 1429h

17 September 2008