

CURRENT TRENDS IN ISLAMIST IDEOLOGY

Volume 1

Edited by
Hillel Fradkin
Husain Haqqani
Eric Brown

Volume 1

*Center on Islam, Democracy, and
The Future of the Muslim World*

HUDSON
INSTITUTE

Current Trends in Islamist Ideology

Hudson Institute

CURRENT TRENDS IN ISLAMIST IDEOLOGY

Edited by
Hillel Fradkin
Husain Haqqani
Eric Brown

Volume 1

*Center on Islam, Democracy, and
The Future of the Muslim World*

HUDSON
INSTITUTE

Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 2005 by Hudson Institute, Inc.

All rights reserved.

Printed in Washington, D.C. by Kirby Lithographic Company, Inc.

About the Hudson Institute

Hudson Institute is a non-partisan policy research organization dedicated to innovative research and analysis that promotes global security, prosperity, and freedom. We challenge conventional thinking and help manage strategic transitions to the future through interdisciplinary and collaborative studies in defense, international relations, economics, culture, science, technology, and law. Through publications, conferences and policy recommendations, we seek to guide global leaders in government and business.

Since our founding in 1961 by the brilliant futurist Herman Kahn, Hudson's perspective has been uniquely future-oriented and optimistic. Our research has stood the test of time in a world dramatically transformed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, the rise of China, and the advent of radicalism within Islam. Because Hudson sees the complexities within societies, we focus on the often-overlooked interplay among culture, demography, technology, markets, and political leadership. Our broad-based approach has, for decades, allowed us to present well-timed recommendations to leaders in government and business.

For more information, visit www.hudson.org.

Contents

Introduction	<i>1</i>
Recent Statements of Islamist Ideology: Bin Laden and Zarqawi Speak HILLEL FRADKIN	<i>5</i>
The Ideologies of South Asian Jihadi Groups HUSAIN HAQQANI	<i>12</i>
Radical Islamist Ideologies in Southeast Asia ANGEL RABASA	<i>27</i>
The Impact of the War in Iraq on the Global Jihad REUVEN PAZ	<i>39</i>
The Penetration of Islamist Ideology in Britain MICHAEL WHINE	<i>50</i>
Al Qaeda's Ideology ROHAN GUNARATNA	<i>59</i>
The Ideology of Al-Jama'ah Al-Islamiya ROHAN GUNARATNA	<i>68</i>
Contributors and Editors	<i>83</i>

INTRODUCTION

Islamism and Terrorism: The Ideological Dimension

THIS IS THE FIRST IN WHAT WILL BE A SERIES of reports on the ideological dimension of America's current struggle with its terrorist adversaries and its potential implications for the successful prosecution of that struggle.

As the 9/11 Commission said in its final report, the war that was inaugurated by the attacks of September 11, 2001 on New York and Washington is not best described as a "War on Terror." Rather, it is a war with terrorists who have a specific origin and agenda. They derive from "a radical ideological movement (commonly known as Islamism or radical Islam) in the Islamic world ... which has spawned terrorist groups and violence across the globe." As a result of this, it has become commonplace to say that the war on terror is also a war of ideas. This is a war that is being fought among Muslims themselves, as well as a war between the radicals and the non-Muslims upon whom they have declared war. This understanding conforms to that of the Islamist terrorists themselves. For as they frequently declare, they regard their enemies as both Muslims and non-Muslims, the "near enemy" and the "far enemy"—with the former often seen as the corrupt agents of the latter. This understanding of the two-fold character of the "enemy" was recently underscored by the leading terrorist authority Osama bin Laden. According to bin Laden, the current struggle is essentially a worldwide struggle between the ideas and principles of "heresy" and those of "the Islamic Nation."

If the struggle with Islamist terrorism is in part a war of ideas, it follows that a proper understanding of Islamist ideology must play an important role in our prosecution of the war. In part this is because the objectives and tactics of the terrorists derive to some extent from their ideological orientation. In part it is because ideology plays a very large role in the recruitment and training of new members of terrorist organizations. This is true whether or not their initial exposure to this ideology comes through contact with terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda, or with the much wider universe of

organizations that espouse a radical vision but do not directly engage in terrorist activities, such as the Muslim Brotherhood. This is so for at least two reasons.

First, existing radical Islamist organizations have historically often been offshoots of other radical organizations that were sometimes more violent in the past. Second, such organizations that today may espouse an agenda defined by educational or political concerns often prove to be the entry point for young people who go on to join terrorist groups. Their ideological training in these organizations is what first points them towards this path. As Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has observed, our current operations to defeat terrorist groups, which have enjoyed some considerable success, may well prove to be Sisyphean if the recruitment of new generations cannot be impeded. An understanding of the ideological dimension of Islamic terrorism is therefore crucial to any strategy that seeks to contain and defeat it.

There is an additional consideration which recommends a focus on ideology. The threat posed by Islamism or radical Islam to American interests is not solely embodied in the phenomenon of terrorism. Islamism or radical Islam poses to America a political threat as well. This problem has both a foreign and a domestic aspect.

The foreign aspect involves the potential radicalization of existing Muslim states as occurred in the case of Iran and obtained for a period in Sudan and Afghanistan. Such potential continues to exist in a variety of places in the Muslim world—for example, in Pakistan. There are a number of reasons for this, but among them is the fact that many existing regimes lack popular support and legitimacy whereas radical Islamist ideologies enjoy substantial sympathy. Within the Muslim world, the so-called war of ideas, an ideological war, is to date decidedly one-sided.

This is also the case for minority Muslim communities in Western countries, including in the United States. The potential radicalization of these communities would pose important political problems to the future of Western democracies.

Just how this war of ideas might issue in an outcome favorable to the United States and its interests remains an open question. However, any serious consideration of the issues and stakes involved in this war of ideas requires as thorough an understanding of contemporary radical Islamist ideology as possible. In general, this necessity has come to be acknowledged and has found some expression in studies and accounts of Islamist ideologies. What is still lacking, however, is a concerted and consistent focus on the ideological component akin to that which other recent ideological struggles solicited in

their time—for example, the struggles with Communism and Fascism.

This and future reports are intended to contribute to the remedy of these deficiencies. In particular, these reports will aim to provide an up-to-date accounting of the present state of radical Islamist ideology. For as in all politically-oriented ideological movements, Islamist ideology has a dynamic character. While certain premises of Islamist ideology do not change, certain conclusions have and may be altered in response to various events.

Of particular interest is the balance between the global and more local conceptions of Islamist ideology and the requirements of jihad. As a matter of necessity, all radical groups have had their origin in particular places and their concerns and conceptions could be limited by the character of their origins and their field of activity. On the other hand, it is also true that there is a certain “universalism” that is necessarily implicit in all forms of radical Islam. Thus there is always the possibility that groups will come to seek a more global perspective either on their own or in conjunction with other groups through coordination and even mergers. This has been especially true of the story of Al Qaeda over the past few years. In such cases, ideological changes and adaptations may be first the effect of various events—whether they be successes or failures—and then the cause of new events.

Accordingly, this report has attempted to cast a very wide net. It is comprised of contributions from distinguished students of radical Islam from its most eastern reaches in Southeast Asia through South Asia and the greater Middle East to Muslim communities in the West. We have asked our contributors both to describe the state of affairs in their region as well as its interrelationship with the wider world of radical Islam. For this inaugural issue, we have also asked our contributors to pay special attention to the history of current radical ideological trends in their respective geographical regions. Future issues of the report will address additional regions—such as continental Europe and Central Asia—as well as several critical thematic areas of contemporary importance, such as the Islamist discourse on WMD.

In this particular report, the editors provide a somewhat greater emphasis than is typical on the radical movements of South Asia and Southeast Asia. In the past, concern with radical Islam tended to focus on the greater Middle East, and especially on the Arab Muslim world. This was in accord with the fact that radical organizations and terrorist groups have enjoyed the greatest following and support in these areas. Moreover, it has been argued, with considerable merit, that the radical leadership even in non-Arab areas has often been of Middle Eastern origin with ongoing ties to the area—for example, Yemenis in Indonesia. In contrast, the Muslim communities of South

Asia and especially Southeast Asia have well-deserved reputations for greater moderation.

However, it has always been the objective of the radical movement to radicalize these communities. As our report indicates, this effort has had some success and has even accelerated over the past three plus years due to the impact of events, including both the 9/11 attacks and the Global War on Terrorism. To some degree, it may be said that the success of the latter in weakening Al Qaeda has even contributed to the growth of radicalism, as Al Qaeda has sought and found cooperative arrangements with radical groups in Southeast Asia.

More generally, and as has been sometimes noted, recent events have contributed to a transformation of Al Qaeda from a discrete terrorist organization, and only one among many, into a “movement.” This is as true today in Southeast Asia as it is in the Arab Muslim world, where certain originally independent organizations like that of Abu Musab al Zarqawi’s in Iraq have pledged their loyalty to the leadership of Osama bin Laden. It is also the case in Britain, where the al-Muhajiroun have affirmed his preeminence for them. Because of this, we have introduced our geographical reports with a discussion of the most recent pronouncements of Osama bin Laden and his newly acquired lieutenant, Abu Musab al Zarqawi.

*–Hillel Fradkin and Husain Haqqani
Washington, D.C.
February 2005*

Recent Statements of Islamist Ideology: Bin Laden and Zarqawi Speak

HILLEL FRADKIN

THE CONTEMPORARY ISLAMIST MOVEMENT comprises a great variety of organizations and institutions. The history of the Islamist movement presents us with a similar variety as well as some diversity of ideological perspectives and formulations. Nevertheless, at the present time, Al Qaeda and its leadership occupy a central place in the Islamist ideology due to their public prominence.

Recently, Osama bin Laden, the worldwide leader of Al Qaeda, and Abu Musab al Zarqawi, the head of an Islamist terrorist group in Iraq originally called “Tawhid and Jihad,” but which recently adopted the position of Al Qaeda, both issued lengthy statements of importance. The pronouncements of these two terrorist leaders concerned not only operational matters—(terrorist activities in Saudi Arabia and Iraq, respectively)—but also fulsome statements or restatements of Islamist ideology.

Because of Al Qaeda’s prominence, as well as the political context in which they were offered—the then prospective Iraqi elections—these statements by bin Laden and Zarqawi are probably destined to play an important role in defining the framework of discussion for Islamist ideology in the near term. The following pages are therefore devoted to an analysis of these two statements.

American Policy and American Principles

Since September 11, 2001, Western analysts have posed and debated a crucial question: Is it American (or modern and Western) principles that have caused radical Islamic hostility to America or is it our policies—support for Israel, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, etc.—that are responsible?

The statements by bin Laden and Zarqawi seem to answer that question definitively. These terrorist leaders have declared that it is America’s principles, not our policies, that have made inevitable their war upon us and any Muslim allies that we might prove to have. Although both statements are

concerned with and tied to recent events in Saudi Arabia and Iraq, both are at pains to insist that these local events must be seen as expressions of a truly global struggle defined by fundamental differences of principle.

Bin Laden chooses to put the matter in terms of what he calls the worldwide struggle between “heresy” and the “Islamic nation.” The forces of heresy are led by the United States and include America’s allies, including Muslim allies who are “apostates” as a result of this alliance. The forces of the “Islamic Nation” are led by the mujahideen who serve as its vanguard. For bin Laden, nothing less than the fate of Islam and even of humanity is at stake in this titanic struggle.

For Zarqawi, the most important theme is democracy and what he asserts to be its fundamental incompatibility with the true foundations and principles of Islam. The forces of heresy are thus principally though not exclusively constituted by democratic principles and the American-led attempt to introduce them into the Muslim world.

Zarqawi’s argument requires one qualification, since many existing non-democratic Muslim regimes are also incompatible with proper and true Islamic political doctrine and practice. Because of his focus on the Iraqi elections, Zarqawi does not develop this aspect at length. Bin Laden, however, does, and he focuses his political critique on the monarchies or quasi-monarchies of the Arab Muslim world, beginning with an ideological assault on the Saudi monarchy that eventually embraces other Arab governments.

Because the two statements while compatible at their foundations have different foci, it will be useful to treat them separately in the following discussion.

Bin Laden: The Global Heresy and Muslim Apostasy

The immediate occasion for bin Laden’s statement was the terrorist attacks that had been carried out in Saudi Arabia in the name of Al Qaeda. These attacks naturally drew the response of the Saudi government, which in addition to carrying out raids and arrests, sought and received the support of at least some Saudi clerics. The latter condemned the attacks as violations of Islamic principles and law. Bin Laden’s statement is in the first instance aimed at rebutting this charge and indeed hurls it back at the Saudi regime and its clerical defenders. Although the bin Laden statement is particularly concerned with Saudi events and the Saudi regime—notably, its illegitimacy on Islamic grounds—it is at the same time and by bin Laden’s lights necessarily an elaboration of the general character of his ideology. For as he puts it, “this (Saudi) conflict is partly a local conflict but in other respects it is a conflict

between world heresy and with it today's apostates—under the leadership of America on the one hand, and on the other, the Islamic nation with brigades of the mujahideen in its vanguard.”

In bin Laden's view, the connection between the global Islamic struggle against heresy and Al Qaeda's local struggle against the Saudi leaders is that the Saudi regime “allied itself with Infidel America and helped it (in its war) against Muslims.” The sins of the Saudi government are many, but it is through its alliance with America that the Saudi government has finally rendered itself absolutely illegitimate, Islamically speaking. This, for bin Laden, now justifies and even requires according to Islamic law rebellion against and the overthrow of the Saudi government through attacks like the ones Al Qaeda has just recently carried out.

Bin Laden traces the reason for the Saudi embrace of its “unholy” alliance with America to the present dysfunctional character of the Saudi regime, headed as it is nominally by a ruler totally incapacitated by stroke. Both Islamic principles and other considerations render him unfit for rule and he should and would be replaced but for the rivalries within the ruling family. America, he alleges, is able to manipulate this situation and thus secure Saudi acquiescence to its nefarious purposes.

But bin Laden does not stop with the Saudi monarchy. He argues that even though circumstances in other Arab monarchies and also Arab quasi-monarchies like Egypt differ, in all of them America has found the means to manipulate their policies in its favor and against the well-being of the Islamic Nation and governance by true Islamic principles. In effect, bin Laden proposes uprisings against most if not all Arab regimes. The justification for this call of “internal Jihad” is that the Arab Muslim world is rapidly being drawn ever further into heresy and apostasy by America. “Therefore it is obligatory for all Muslims to take action for reform, taking into consideration the dimension of the conflict and the fact these regimes are nothing but a part of the system of global heresy.” One might say, though bin Laden does not use these terms, that the consequence of his analysis is to redefine the *Dar al Islam*—the Muslim world—as the *Dar al Harb*—the realm of war, or the realm of the Infidels.

Apart from bin Laden's discussion of Arab politics and his claim to represent the true teaching of Islam, he focuses on one other matter as important—education. According to bin Laden, America's or the “Crusader control over our country” now goes well beyond the control of Saudi Arabian politics and aims at changing “our school curricula—with the intention of disfiguring the identity of the Islamic Nation and westernizing its children.”

Bin Laden asserts that this is already an old American policy vis-à-vis Saudi Arabia, dating from the time of the first Gulf War, and even older elsewhere, as in Yemen and in Egypt. For bin Laden, “this Crusader intervention in the changing of the curricula is absolutely the most dangerous intervention in our affairs, because it is, in short, a change in religion.” “It is evident that the outcome of changing the religious curricula is damaging both to religion and to material interests. As for the damage to religion, you already know that it is blatant apostasy, and as for material interests, the (altered curricula) will eventually produce educated slaves in our country, who will be loyal to America, sell the interests of the country and smile in the face of the Americans, while they conquer the land and defile the (Muslim’s) honor, under the pretext of liberty, equality and the laws of the United Nations.”

Zarqawi: The Heresy of Liberal Democracy

Bin Laden cites no specific examples of American intervention in education so it is not exactly clear what he has in mind. Nor does he give specific information about the substance of the changes in education to which he objects except to refer generally to the process of westernization, secularism and western principles such as liberty and equality. Zarqawi seems to begin where bin Laden leaves off, offering a remarkably specific discussion of the vices of democracy. For Zarqawi asserts that “Americans have been playing with the *minds* of many peoples with the lie of ‘civilized democracy’” (*emphasis added*) and that democracy is as such “heresy.” Moreover, he understands the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq to have been primarily motivated by this heresy: “The Infidel American administration declared war on Iraq and Afghanistan because it is the primary protector and guardian of democracy in the world.” Hence, for Zarqawi as for bin Laden, Islamist hostility toward America derives from principles rather than policies—or at least from the policies that flow directly and necessarily from American principles.

Zarqawi’s statement presents both general reasons why democracy is heretical as well as objections to specific aspects of a certain kind of democracy, which we would call “liberal democracy.” Although Zarqawi’s denunciation of democracy was much noted in the papers and referred to by President Bush, the thoroughgoing character of his attack and the fact that the object of his attack is not merely the democratic principle but liberal democracy in particular has received little attention. It thus deserves some brief elaboration.

For Zarqawi, the fundamental problem with liberal democracy is that it makes the will of the people sacred rather than the “divine law given by the Lord of the world” that alone deserves that distinction. In this way, liberal

democracy is not merely a political system but a “religion”—a religion, one might say, “of the people”—and it is thus heretical in at least two senses of the word. First, democracy is heretical because within a democracy, the legislator is man rather than Allah. This is the “very essence of heresy,” explains Zarqawi, for it is man, not God, who is “worshipped, obeyed and deified.” Second, liberal democracy in particular is that form of heresy known as “polytheism”—the very form of heresy which the Qur’an was revealed to combat. Liberal democracy is polytheism since it associates man as a “partner” with God. From this heretical democratic root grow many heretical branches—the variety of democratic freedoms that constitute what we call liberal democracy.

Zarqawi enumerates several of these liberal heresies, but the first and clearly the most important from his point of view is freedom of religion. Although he does not make his argument against freedom of religion altogether clear, it would seem that he thinks of it as the necessary corollary of democracy. For without freedom of religion, freedom could not enjoy sovereign legislative authority. Freedom of religion is then “patently false and perverse,” and bound to lead some to apostasy—a crime that, as Zarqawi hastens to remind his audience, is a capital offense in the Muslim context.

Zarqawi is aware of the possibility that one might maintain one’s religious ritual practice and worship in a democracy through the principle of separation of religion and politics, a principle upon which he claims democracy is based. But this principle, in Zarqawi’s view, amounts to telling Allah what is and what is not His prerogative. To the extent that this is not simply a democratic principle, Zarqawi implies that it is a Christian principle for it “renders to Allah what is Allah’s.”

Other democratic and civil liberties—such as freedom of expression, or freedom of association, and in particular the freedom to form political parties—are also if not quite equally as abhorrent as common democratic institutions like civil courts. Such courts, which owe their appointment to democratically elected legislatures, amount to making man the arbiter of governmental disputes, whereas by Zarqawi’s lights, it is Allah alone who has the right of arbitration.

Thus Zarqawi rejects liberal democracy, root and branch. In fact, the heretical character of liberal democracy demands resistance, although at the present time that resistance will be difficult and necessarily violent. For Zarqawi observes, with considerable lamentation, that the problem facing Islam is not only or no longer only Infidel adversaries. Many Muslims, he explains, “continue to admire democracy and defend it as though they were its owners and creators; their hearts are imbued with the love of democracy as the Chil-

dren of Israel were imbued with the love of the (golden) calf.” This is so even though “democratic experiments have had damaging consequences for the Muslims, causing weakness, controversy, division, and conflict.” In keeping with this view, Al Qaeda operatives in Iraq subsequently announced to Iraqi citizens before the elections: “Take care not to go near the centers of heresy and abomination, that is the election (stations). He who has warned has carried out his duty; (if something happens) do not blame us, but yourselves.”

Democracy vs. the Islamic Nation

Though the themes of both bin Laden and Zarqawi are not simply new, they place a particularly heavy stress on the actual or potential inner corruption of Muslim society—whether specifically in the case of Saudi Arabia and Iraq, or more generally in the wider Muslim world, especially the Arab Muslim world. It is this perceived potential for internal corruption that justifies the perpetration of violence against other Muslims. The crossing of this sometime red line requires concerted argument on its behalf, for as both bin Laden and Zarqawi know, the perpetration of this kind of violence, in contrast to violence directed solely against Infidel targets, is suspect by many Muslims and has recently been debated by Islamic legal authorities, including by those sympathetic to the Islamist cause.

In both cases, the strategy of their argument is to tie the necessity of this violence to a global struggle with democratic heresy. In bin Laden’s treatment, the “near enemy”—Muslim rulers—has now practically merged with the “far enemy”—America. In Zarqawi’s treatment, the very souls of Muslims are now merging with those of the Infidels.

In both cases, this strategy has the effect of breaking down the distinction between principles and policies—the theme of Western analysis and even Muslim analysis in times past. Though their statements are in the beginning and end obviously related to very specific countries and events, the link to the global seems first and foremost to be a reaction to the prospect of some real reform in the Arab Muslim world. Though Western analysts are still uncertain and much divided over the real prospects of such reform, bin Laden and especially Zarqawi seem to be persuaded that it is a genuine and serious threat. The Iraqi elections appear to have reinforced that belief.

Inasmuch as that requires Islamist discourse to put a particular stress on the issue of democracy, we are likely to see the idea of democracy as heresy play an even more prominent role in Islamist discourse than heretofore. While the most immediate bearing of this will be on the political life of mostly Muslim countries around the world, it also directly affects the minority Mus-

lim communities living within Western democracies. If it is determined to be illegitimate for Muslims to govern themselves democratically, the question will arise whether Muslims living in democratic countries can participate in democratic practice at all.

The Ideologies of South Asian Jihadi Groups

HUSAIN HAQQANI

ALTHOUGH AN OVERWHELMING majority of South Asian Muslims has practiced several variations of Sufi Islam over history, the region has been home to minority puritanical movements resisting “un-Islamic influences” or non-Muslim rule. Most jihadi movements in South Asia have grown out of these Islamic revivalist movements. In recent years, jihad has been used by the fragile Pakistani state to bolster its national identity against India. Pakistan’s crucial role as the staging ground for the anti-Soviet Jihad in Afghanistan created a nexus between Pakistan’s military and secret services, which was heightened by the state sponsorship of jihad against India in the disputed territory of Jammu and Kashmir. Several jihadi groups have emerged over the last two decades in Pakistan and Kashmir, occasionally spreading operations into parts of India. Some offshoots of radical Islamist movements in Bangladesh have also embraced jihadi ideology and rhetoric in recent years, increasing the prospect of militancy and terrorism in Bangladesh.

Sources of Islamism in South Asia

Until the decline of the Mughal Empire in the eighteenth century, Muslim rulers presided over South Asian kingdoms in which the majority of their subjects were Hindus. The exigencies of Muslim ascendancy in a non-Muslim environment demanded religious tolerance by the rulers and resulted in syncretism in the religion as practiced by local Muslims. Unlike in the Middle East, enforcement of Shariah in historic India was never complete. But Muslim ulema, muftis and qadis as well as laymen enjoyed a position of relative prestige as co-religionists of the rulers.

The rise of British rule, culminating in the formal addition of India to the British Empire after 1857, marked the end of the privileged position of Muslims. The Muslim community’s response to the gradual decline in Muslim political power came in the form of revivalist movements seeking to sharpen an Islamic identity. South Asia’s Islamist political movements trace their in-

spiration back to Sheikh Ahmed Sirhandi's challenge in the sixteenth century to the ecumenism of Mughal emperor Akbar.

In the nineteenth century, the first jihadi group emerged in India and operated in the country's northwest frontier, including parts of present-day Pakistan and Afghanistan. This puritanical militant movement fought the region's Sikh rulers. The rise of British power simply changed the militants' target. The movement's founder, Sayyid Ahmed of Bareili, organized cells throughout India to supply the frontier movement with men and money. Calling themselves "mujahideen," the movement's followers interpreted the Islamic concept of jihad in its literal sense of holy war. Sayyid Ahmed of Bareili (not to be confused with Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan, the reformer) had been influenced by the ideas of Muhammad ibn-Abdul Wahhab, to which he had been exposed during his pilgrimage to Mecca. He called for a return to early Islamic purity and the re-establishment of Muslim political power. Sayyid Ahmed's revival of the ideology of jihad became the prototype for subsequent Islamic militant movements in South and Central Asia and is also the main influence over the jihad network of Al Qaeda and its associated groups in the region.

The influence of Sayyid Ahmed's ideas and practices on South Asian Islamists is visible in recent jihad literature in Pakistan, which invariably draws parallels between British colonial rule in the nineteenth century and U.S. domination since the end of the twentieth. Unlike in Sayyid Ahmed's time, today's jihad battlefield is not limited to a single geographic area. Nor are the various mujahid cells dependent on handwritten messages delivered by couriers riding (and hiding) for thousands of miles. Modern communications facilitate jihad without frontiers. After all, the enemy is also global in reach. And despite the differences in technology, the nineteenth-century mujahideen remain the role model for today's jihadis, who make up an international network aimed at waging holy war at a time when the majority of Muslims seek to synthesize their faith with modern living.

But the revivalist ideas of Sheikh Ahmed Sirhandi and the jihadi ideology of Sayyid Ahmed of Bareili alone do not explain the rise of modern jihadis. Even the large number of South Asian Muslims who embraced western learning under British rule were influenced by revivalist ideas to the extent of seeking a separate identity from South Asia's Muslims, a process that was somewhat accelerated by the demand for and creation of Pakistan.

The emergence of Pakistan as an independent state in 1947 was the culmination of decades of debate and divisions among Muslims in British India about their collective future. The concept of a Muslim-majority Pakistan

rested on the notion that India's Muslims constituted a separate nation from non-Muslim Indians. Although the Islamists did not like the westernized leadership that sought Pakistan, and in some cases actively opposed the campaign for Pakistan, the lack of religious orthodoxy among Pakistan's founders did not prevent them from seeking the revival of Islam's lost glory in South Asia. In fact, the creation of a Muslim-majority state provided them with a better environment to pursue their ideas.

Soon after independence, Pakistan's Constituent Assembly declared in 1949 that South Asian Muslims had created Pakistan for the principal objective of "ordering their lives in accordance with the teachings and requirements of Islam." Prominent individuals within the government mooted proposals for adopting Arabic as the national language, and of changing the script of the Bengali language from its Sanskrit base to an Arabic-Persian one. The president of the ruling Muslim League announced that Pakistan would bring all Muslim countries together into "Islamistan"—a pan-Islamic entity. In 1949, the Pakistani government also sponsored the World Muslim Conference presided over by the Grand Mufti of Palestine, Amin al-Husseini, to promote Pan-Islamism. This conference led to the formation of the Motamar al-Alam al-Islami (Muslim World Congress), which has since played a crucial role in building up the feeling of Muslim victimization that has subsequently fed the global Islamist movement.

Since the creation of Pakistan, Islamist groups have been sponsored and supported by Pakistan's state machinery at different times to influence domestic politics and shore up Pakistani national identity, which is periodically threatened by sub-national ethnic challenges. The Islamists have also helped support the Pakistani military's political dominance. Islamists have been allies in the Pakistan military's efforts to seek "strategic depth" in Afghanistan—a euphemism for Pakistan's efforts to make Afghanistan a client state of Pakistan—and to put pressure on India for negotiations over the future of Kashmir, the Muslim majority Himalayan region that has been disputed by India and Pakistan since their partition.

Pakistan's state institutions, notably national security institutions such as the military and the intelligence services, have played a leading role in building Pakistani national identity on the basis of religion since Pakistan's emergence. This political commitment to an "ideological state" gradually evolved into a strategic commitment to the jihadi ideology, especially during and after the Bangladesh war of 1971. Then, the Pakistani military used the Islamist's idiom and the help of Islamist groups to keep elected secular leaders supported by the majority Bengali-speaking population out of power. A

Bengali rebellion and brutal suppression of the Bengalis by the military followed. In the 1971 war the country was bifurcated, leading to the birth of an independent Bangladesh.

In the original country's western wing, the effort to create national cohesion between Pakistan's disparate ethnic and linguistic groups through religion took on greater significance and its manifestations became more militant. Religious groups, both armed and unarmed, have become gradually more powerful as a result of this alliance between the mosque and the military. Radical and violent manifestations of Islamist ideology, which sometimes appear to threaten Pakistan's stability, are in some ways a state project gone wrong.

Given Pakistan's status as an ideological state, Islamic political groups of all kinds have proliferated in the country and several of them have received state patronage at one time or another. Others have operated independently or with the support of fellow Islamist groups outside the country. The organized jihadi movements that have been militarily active since the anti-Soviet Afghan Jihad can be classified into three groups. The first of these groups is centered on the *Jamaat-e-Islami* (Islamic Society) founded by Islamist scholar Maulana Abul Ala Maududi in 1941. The second group includes the *Deobandi* movements that arose from the austere interpretations of Islam emanating from the Deoband madrasa of Northern India, which was founded in 1867 to protect Muslims from being seduced by Western materialism. The third group of South Asian jihadis is *Wahhabi*, which is influenced by the doctrine of Muhammad ibn-Abdul Wahhab and almost invariably funded by Saudi Arabia.

Jamaat-e-Islami and its Jihadi Offshoots

The *Jamaat-e-Islami* is an Islamist party similar to the Arab Muslim Brotherhood, with which it has both ideological and organizational links. It has operated over the decades as a political party, a social welfare organization, a pan-Islamic network and the sponsor of militant groups fighting in Afghanistan and Kashmir. For years, *Jamaat-e-Islami* was the major recipient of Saudi assistance in Pakistan, until its current leadership failed to support the Kingdom in the 1991 Gulf War. Although relations between the Saudi government and *Jamaat-e-Islami* have since been repaired, the disagreement between them in the early 1990s led the Saudis to divert support from *Jamaat-e-Islami* to *Deobandi* and *Wahhabi* groups for a period, somewhat diminishing *Jamaat-e-Islami's* status as the dominant Islamist group in South Asia.

The founder of *Jamaat-e-Islami*, Abul Ala Maududi (1903-1979), was a

prolific writer. In his books and pamphlets, running into over one hundred in number including a six-volume commentary on the Quran, Maududi laid out an elaborate ideological vision. He argued that Islam was as much a political ideology as it is a religion and that the basic division in the world was between “Islam and un-Islam.” Maududi critiqued all un-Islamic ideologies, including socialism, communism, secularism and capitalism. He described the political system of Islam as “theo-democracy”—a system in which officials would be elected but would be subject to divine laws interpreted by the theologically learned.

The Islamic ideology, according to Maududi, carried forward the mission of the Prophets, which he described as follows:

1. To revolutionize the intellectual and mental outlook of humanity and to instill the Islamic attitude towards life and morality to such an extent that their way of thinking, ideal of life, and standards of values and behavior become Islamic;
2. To regiment all such people who have accepted Islamic ideals and molded their lives after the Islamic pattern with a view to struggling for power and seizing it by the use of all available means and equipment;
3. To establish Islamic rule and organize the various aspect of social life on Islamic bases, to adopt such means as will widen the sphere of Islamic influence in the world, and to arrange for the moral and intellectual training, by contact and example, of all those people who enter the fold of Islam from time to time.¹

Maududi also laid out a stage-by-stage strategy for Islamic revolution in his many speeches and writings. His first major book, *Al-Jihad fil-Islam (Jihad in Islam)*, defined the various ways and means of struggle for the perfect Islamic state. In other books, Maududi described the social, economic and political principles of Islam.

The Jamaat-e-Islami adopted a cadre-based structure similar to that of communist parties. It built alliances with Islamist parties in other countries, recruited members through a network of schools and hoped to serve as the vanguard of a gradual Islamic revolution. Though the party’s call for Islamic revolution did not have mass appeal, its social service infrastructure helped create a well-knit, nation-wide organization within a few years of partition in 1947. After the creation of Pakistan, Jamaat-e-Islami divided its organization into two entities—one based in India, the other in Pakistan. The Indian branch refrained from directly participating in electoral politics, and focused instead on developing pious cadres for the eventual transformation

of the region into an Islamic state. In Pakistan, Jamaat-e-Islami participated in elections with poor results until 2002, when it formed an alliance with other Islamist groups and won a significant share of seats in parliament and two provincial legislatures.

The Jamaat-e-Islami's real opportunity in Pakistan lay in working with the new state's elite, gradually expanding the Islamic agenda while providing the theological rationale for the Pakistani elite's plans for nation building on the basis of religion. Jamaat-e-Islami's cadres among students, trade unions and professional organizations, as well as its focus on building its own media, made it a natural ally for those within the government who thought that Pakistan's survival as a state required a religious anchor.

The Jamaat-e-Islami's first foray into military jihad came in 1971, when its cadres sided with the Pakistan army in opposing independence for Bangladesh. Jamaat-e-Islami members were organized in two militant groups, *Al-Badr* and *Al-Shams*, and were trained by the Pakistani army to carry out operations against Bangladesh nationalists seeking separation from Pakistan. In the initial years after Bangladesh's independence, this role of the Jamaat-e-Islami prevented the movement from assuming an overt political role in Bangladesh, but the organization has since revived and is now part of the ruling coalition in Bangladesh. Although the Bangladesh Jamaat-e-Islami is occasionally accused of using its muscle against political opponents, it operates within the country's political system and appears to have opted against direct participation in military jihad. Other Bangladeshi Islamist groups including some offshoots of the Jamaat-e-Islami have been alleged to have developed links with global terrorist networks such as al-Qaeda.

The collaboration with the Pakistan army in what turned out to be a lost battle in what was then Eastern Pakistan helped Jamaat-e-Islami forge closer links with the Pakistani military and intelligence services. These links led to the organization's close identification with the Islamizing military regime of General Ziaul Haq (1977-1988). Jamaat-e-Islami Pakistan was directly involved in supporting the Afghan mujahideen operating out of Pakistan, maintaining close ties with Gulbeddin Hikmatyar's Hizbe Islami (Islamic Party) and Burhanuddin Rabbani's Jamiat-e-Islami (Islamic Society). Both of these Afghan Jihadi groups adopted the ideological precepts of Pakistan's Jamaat-e-Islami, which influenced Hikmatyar's anti-Western bent during and after the anti-Soviet struggle.

During the period of the war against the Soviets, Jamaat-e-Islami was able to build a significant infrastructure, including madrasas, businesses and charities with the help of generous financial contributions from the gov-

ernments and private individuals in the Gulf States. Jamaat-e-Islami played host to many of the foreign, mainly Arab, mujahideen that came to Pakistan to participate in Afghanistan's jihad. Jamaat-e-Islami's own cadres also received training alongside the foreign and Afghan fighters and several Pakistani young men fought the Soviets inside Afghanistan. By the time of the Soviet withdrawal, Jamaat-e-Islami had developed ties with Islamist groups throughout the world. Islamist liberation movements seeking redress of perceived and real grievances in places remote from Pakistan, such as Chechnya, Bosnia and Southern Philippines congregated in Pakistan. The Jamaat-e-Islami raised funds for these groups and provided military training for their members, in addition to allowing its own younger members to participate in Jihad around the world.

From 1989, Jamaat-e-Islami has actively participated in the militancy in Jammu and Kashmir with the full backing of Pakistan's inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) and the Pakistan military. To maintain a distinction between Jamaat-e-Islami, the ideological-political group, and militant or terrorist outfits, several jihad-specific organizations were created. The most prominent of these is the Hizbul Mujahideen (The Party of Holy Warriors). For years, Hizbul Mujahideen avoided the terrorist label by taking care that its target in Kashmir could be identified as military, as opposed to civilian, targets. Even the United States acknowledged this distinction and spared Hizbul Mujahideen from designation as a terrorist group. Post 9/11 developments have diminished such distinctions. Under pressure from the United States, the Pakistan government has restricted Hizbul Mujahideen's freedom of operation in planning and executing attacks against India. There is no doubt, however, that Hizbul Mujahideen retains the capacity to attack targets in Indian-controlled Kashmir and Jamaat-e-Islami's trained militant cadre remains intact.

Although Jamaat-e-Islami can be described as being sympathetic to the aims of various Jihadi movements, it has taken care not to cross the line from being primarily an ideological-political movement—"the vanguard of the Islamic revolution," in Maududi's words. The party's ideological journal, *Tarjuman al-Quran*, explained the need for caution in approaching the issue of military jihad, implying that there was no sense in attracting massive military retaliation when political options were available. According to one editorial in the journal:

Muslim rulers sheepishly follow the steps of their Western masters. They fulfill their political and economic interests. In retaliation if some people resort to force, they are branded as terrorists. These rulers are promoting non-Islamic culture and crushing Islamic forces

in their own as well as their masters' interests. How to work for the supremacy of [faith] is then a problem of universal extent. There has been an element of disunity in some movements on this issue, due to which some extremist-armed groups have sprung up in small niches. Excesses by such groups have sometimes been reported from some places. Using the excuse of these groups' violations, the hostile rulers are crushing Islamic movements. At places where these movements are cautious and not providing any such opportunity, the antagonists are trying to create [an] atmosphere so as to crush them, e.g. in Pakistan....Confused thinking, particularly when it is based on despair instead of reasoning and thinking, diffuses strength for action. This can lead to disastrous consequences... for so long as doors are open for peaceful preaching of Islam's message and the required result to bring change is satisfactory, and for so long as the public opinion for an Islamic revolution is not mobilized, one [does] not qualify to pick up arms for *Jihad*.²

Aside from its involvement in the conflicts in Afghanistan and Kashmir, Jamaat-e-Islami appears unwilling to acknowledge any direct involvement in jihadi activities. But like the Muslim Brotherhood in the Arab world, the movement serves as an ideological inspiration for polarizing Muslims between "true believers" and "camp followers of the West." The Jamaat-e-Islami has built a coherent ideological case for global Islamic revivalism—a revivalism that includes the defense of violent jihad, but without identifying Jamaat-e-Islami clearly with militant struggle.

The Jamaat-e-Islami's leading ideologue, Professor Khurshid Ahmad, recently published a collection of essays in Urdu, *Amrika: Muslim Dunya ki Bey-Itminani (America and the Unrest in the Muslim World)*.³ In this book, Ahmad argues that the United States "dreams of world domination, resolves to control the resources of other nations, wants to shape the world according to its ideas, and seeks to impose its values and ideology on others by force." Only the Islamists, he says, offer a political force capable of resisting this Pax Americana.

Ahmad's book comprises nine essays, four written before September 11, and five after the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. In the book, he condemns the attacks but argues that the perpetrators are still unknown. "A glance at the history of Israel and [the] Zionist movement," he suggests, "gives credence to the suspicion of Mossad's role in the terrorist acts." Like all Islamists, however, Ahmad was suspicious of Western intentions long before September 11. Two of his essays on the "new world order" that emerged following the end of the Cold War, originally published in 1991 and 1993, exten-

sively cite influential U.S. conservatives such as Samuel Huntington, Francis Fukuyama, and Eliot Cohen as proof of an insidious plan to create a century of U.S. dominance at the expense of other nations.

The framework of this U.S.-led new world order, according to Ahmad, rests on “four pillars”: globalization, Western democracy, technological supremacy, and political alliances. Ahmad’s suspicions of U.S. intentions during the 1990s, even as the United States was leading a military campaign on behalf of Bosnia’s Muslims, can best be understood in the context of the U.S. abandonment of Afghanistan and Pakistan after the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan. Ahmad saw the end of U.S. support for the Afghan Mujahideen as a betrayal motivated by the United States’ need for a new enemy—an Islamic green menace to replace the defunct Soviet red threat. The U.S. ruling elite, he argues, in collusion with Zionist Israel and Hindu India (the Islamist “axis of evil”) is bent on plundering the Islamic world of its oil and denying Muslims their rightful place in the contemporary world.

Ahmad’s prescription for resisting U.S. subjugation is similar to such prescriptions from other Islamist groups: The Muslim *Ummah*—(the global community of believers)—must purify its ranks and become a homogenous community that can mobilize against the American-Zionist-Hindu plot. Ahmad also emphasizes Pakistan’s special role in this Islamic revival. As the only Muslim country with a nuclear capability, Pakistan must expand cooperation with Iran, China, and other nations that wish to oppose the U.S. hegemon. The Americans have let Pakistan down before, he says, because their interests converge with those of India. The Chinese, however, have been among Pakistan’s most reliable allies.

In effect, Ahmad advises the Islamists to reverse the mistake they made during the Cold War, when they sided with the West against godless communism in Afghanistan. The arrogance and triumphalism of the “American imperialists” require a closing of ranks among all those who oppose them. Ironically, Ahmad’s arguments for a proposed alliance between the Islamic world and China parallel Huntington’s prediction in his clash of civilizations thesis of an eventual “Sino-Islamic alliance” against the West.

The Deobandis

Unlike the Jamaat-e-Islami, South Asia’s Deobandi groups did not originate as a political movement. The movement takes its name from a traditional madrasa established in 1867 in the North Indian town of Deoband. The school’s founder, Maulana Qasim Nanotvi, was concerned with the prospect of India’s Muslims adopting and accepting western ways. His

madrasa, therefore, marked the beginning of a movement to adhere to a traditional religious way of life. The Deobandis explain the decline of Islamic societies in terms of their having been seduced by the amoral and materialist accoutrements of Westernization. According to them, Muslims have lost Allah's blessings because they have deviated from the original teachings of Prophet Muhammad and the pristine ways of his earliest followers.

The tradition of Deoband was extremely hostile to British rule and committed to a literal and austere interpretation of Islam. Instead of organizing for political action, the Deobandis originally focused on establishing madrasas. During the struggle for independence from British rule, Deobandis were divided between those who supported Gandhi's Indian National Congress because of their hostility to the British and those supporting the creation of an independent Pakistan.

After Pakistan's creation, the Deobandis expanded control over the traditional religious education system and argued that a Muslim's first loyalty is to his religion and only then to the country of which he is a citizen or a resident. Over the years, Pakistan's Deobandis have insisted that Muslims must recognize only the religious frontiers of their Ummah and not the national frontiers. Jihad has always been central to Deobandi thinking and Deobandi scholars inspired and participated in militant campaigns against British rule throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In recent years, Deobandi Ulema have articulated jihad as a sacred right and obligation, encouraging their followers to go to any country to wage jihad to protect the Muslims of that country.

The Deobandis gained considerable strength during the anti-Soviet Afghan Jihad, especially because General Ziaul Haq encouraged the establishment of madrasas for Afghan refugees as well as Pakistanis. Most of the new madrasas followed the Deoband model and had Deobandi teachers. The movement's influence reached its peak when the Taliban, themselves students of Deobandi madrasas in Pakistan, assumed power in Afghanistan. The Afghan Jihad ended the previous isolation of Deobandi traditionalists, linking them with global Islamist movements. Groups such as the Harkat-ul-Jihad-al-Islami (Movement for Islamic Jihad) that were born during the Afghan war to assist in the recruitment and ideological motivation of Afghan peasant refugees created a wider presence in Pakistan, and later in Kashmir. Once jihad was expanded to Kashmir, several Deobandi militant groups appeared on the scene with initial assistance from Pakistani intelligence.

In addition to Harkat-ul-Jihad-al-Islami, prominent Deobandi groups include Harkat-ul-Ansar (Movements of Supporters of the Faith), which

changed its name to Harkat-ul-Mujahideen (Movement of Holy Warriors) after being a declared terrorist group by the United States for its involvement in kidnapping of western tourists in Kashmir. The founder of Harkat-ul-Ansar and Harkat-ul-Mujahideen, Fazlur Rehman Khalil, was one of the signatories of Osama bin Laden's fatwa declaring war against the United States. Khalil worked closely with Pakistani intelligence, and until recently continued to lead jihadi groups after changing their names once the previous name appeared on the list of global terrorist organizations. He announced his 'retirement' in January 2005, passing the baton of leadership to less well-known followers.

Harkat-ul-Mujahideen was involved in hijacking an Indian Airlines aircraft in 1999 and secured the release of one its principal ideologues and organizers, Maulana Masood Azhar, from an Indian prison. Upon his release Azhar formed the Jaish-e-Muhammad (Army of Muhammad), which was involved in the killing of *Wall Street Journal* reporter Daniel Pearl and high profile suicide attacks on the Kashmir legislative assembly and the Indian parliament in 2001—a few days after the 9/11 attacks in the United States. Jaish-e-Muhammad was involved in several attacks on churches in Pakistan as well as in assassination attempts on Pakistan's military ruler, General Pervez Musharraf. Although temporarily detained by Pakistani authorities under U.S. pressure, Azhar was subsequently released and is now at large, surfacing occasionally to make speeches exhorting global jihad.

The ideology of the various Deobandi jihadi groups is explained, among others, by Masood Azhar in three books: *Ma'arka (The Struggle)*, *Faza'il Jihad (The Virtue of Jihad)* and *Tuhfa-e-Saadat (The Gift of Virtue)*.⁴ *Faza'il Jihad* is Azhar's translation of the thirteenth century classical text on jihad by Ibn Nahhas, believed to be a disciple of Ibn Taimiyah. The book romanticizes jihad and paints a somewhat sensuous portrait of the worldly and other-worldly benefits that await the Mujahid. The fact that different versions of the Ibn Nahhas book have been found in circulation among jihadi groups—from Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan to Jemaah Islamiyah in Indonesia—seems to indicate that this is the favored text of Al-Qaeda-related jihadi movements.

Most contemporary Deobandi literature on jihad traces the history of Muslim grievances. According to this view, the world as shaped over the last two centuries is unfavorable to Muslims. Palestine has been taken over by the Zionists, Kashmir occupied by India, Chechnya devoured by Russia, and the Muslim sultanates in southern Philippines subjugated by Catholic Manila. The battle in each case, irrespective of the political issues involved, is one of Muslim against non-Muslim. And the Muslims' disadvantage comes from their lack of effective military power vested in the hands of the righteous.

“Every Muslim must just turn to God” is the remedy for this imbalance, according to Maulana Masood Azhar, in the foreword of his third book, *The Gift of Virtue*. As a tribute to the nineteenth-century Wahhabis and Sayyid Ahmed of Bareili, Azhar penned the preface of *The Struggle* in the mountainous redoubt where Ahmed died in battle. The fundamental argument of each one of Azhar’s books, and many published speeches, appears to be that puritanical Islam faces extinction at the hands of an ascendant secular culture, just as the fledgling religion was challenged by unbelievers in its earliest days during the seventh century A.D. *The Struggle* is written as an invitation to young Muslims to join Jaish-e-Muhammad, complete with motivational anecdotes from the early history of Islam. For example, Azhar reminds readers of how the Battle of Badr, in A.D. 623, was won by the earliest Muslims with an ill-equipped army of 313 fighters facing Arabia’s pagan tribes numbering in the thousands.

The Prophet Mohammed was forced to fight those who sought to eliminate Islam, as were his early companions. To follow their example, the Deobandi jihadis argue that Muslims must define the contemporary detractors of Islam in similar terms and fight them in a similar manner. Azhar’s argument for fighting India in Kashmir is rooted in the same theological arguments that Osama bin Laden has cited in his declarations of war against the United States. The Indian military’s presence in Kashmir compromises the sovereignty of Muslims in a territory over which they should actually rule, Azhar argues. Bin Laden resents the United States because its troops defile the holy land of Saudi Arabia. Azhar expresses respect for bin Laden partly because of shared beliefs and partly because bin Laden has financed jihad with his inherited wealth. For Azhar, the struggle for sovereignty is also an existential struggle for Muslims. “Submission and slavery damage our faith and religion,” he writes in *The Struggle*. In his view, Islam risks being diluted as a system of belief unless it is politically ascendant. “The decline of Muslims,” one of his colleagues argues, “started with the fading of the spirit of jihad and sacrifice.”

The Wahhabis or Ahle-Hadith

Although Sayyid Ahmed’s nineteenth century efforts influenced the jihadi thinking of Deobandis and the Jamaat-e-Islami, his own Wahhabi movement did not gain a large following in South Asia until recently. The Wahhabis in South Asia described themselves as “Ahle-Hadith” (People of the Prophet’s Tradition). Their adoption of Hanbali religious rites and their strict condemnation of many rituals widely practiced by South Asian Muslims did not sit well with the vast Hanafi Sunni population.

In recent years, especially during and after the Afghan Jihad, the existing Ahle-Hadith groups were able to better organize themselves, increasing their numbers as well as their influence. A large number of Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi Muslims worked in Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries and subsequently returned home with Wahhabi views. Wahhabi funding from the Gulf Arab region has also enabled Wahhabi missionaries to convert Sunni Muslims to their interpretation of Islam. More significantly, Sunni Muslims have cast aside their aversion to Wahhabi groups, creating a large number of traditional Sunnis who embrace Wahhabi political and jihadi ideas without necessarily giving up their rites and rituals.

The most significant jihadi group of Wahhabi persuasion is Lashkar-e-Taiba (The Army of the Pure) founded in 1989 by Hafiz Muhammad Saeed. Backed by Saudi money and protected by Pakistani intelligence services, Lashkar-e-Taiba became the military wing of Markaz al-Dawa wal-Irshad (Center for the Call to Righteousness). Saeed created a large campus and training facility at Muridke, outside the Pakistani metropolis of Lahore. After the U.S. froze Lashkar-e-Taiba's assets and called for it to be banned, Saeed changed his organization's name in Pakistan to Jamaat-ul-Dawa (the Society for Preaching). Pakistani authorities have been reluctant to move against either Lashkar, which continues to operate in Kashmir, or Jamaat-ul-Dawa, which operates freely in Pakistan. Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jamaat-ul-Dawa scaled down their military operations against India to help Pakistan honor its commitments to the U.S. and India. But Saeed remains free and continues to expand membership of his organization despite divisions in its leadership.

Under U.S. pressure, General Musharraf placed Jamaat-ul-Dawa on a watch list in November 2003.

Lashkar-e-Taiba has adopted a maximalist agenda for global jihad though its operations so far have been limited to Kashmir. The group justifies its ideology on the basis of the Quranic verse that says, "You are obligated to fight even though it is something you do not like" (2:216). Extrapolating from this verse, the group asserts that military jihad is a religious obligation for all Muslims. The group then defines the many circumstances in which that obligation must be carried out.

For example, a Markaz al-Dawa wal-Irshad publication titled *Hum Jihad kyun Kar rahe hain? (Why Are We Waging Jihad?)*, declares the United States, Israel and India as existential enemies of Islam. It lists eight reasons for Jihad: 1) to eliminate evil and facilitate conversion to and practice of Islam; 2) to ensure the ascendancy of Islam; 3) to force non-Muslims to pay *jizya* (poll tax, paid by non-Muslims for protection from a Muslim ruler); 4) to assist

the weak and powerless; 5) to avenge the blood of Muslims killed by unbelievers; 6) to punish enemies for breaking promises and treaties; 7) to defend a Muslim state; and 8) to liberate Muslim territories under non-Muslim occupation.

This list of itself is sufficient to justify a virtual state of permanent jihad. "Have all the obstacles to observing the faith in the world been removed?" the unnamed author asks rhetorically, adding that non-Muslim dominance of the global system makes jihad necessary. "Is the current world order that of *kafirs* (unbelievers) or of Muslims? Is the global economic system according to the wishes of Allah, which requires the end of interest and usury?" Jihad is described as essential to ensure ascendancy of Islam and to create circumstances whereby non-Muslims would either convert to Islam or pay *jizya*. Furthermore, all major powers have broken their pledges to Muslims made at one time or another, for which they must be punished, runs the argument. "Are Muslims not being mistreated all over the world? Are not weak Muslim men, women and children calling for help against oppression from India, Kashmir, Philippines, Chechnya, Russia, China, Bosnia and several other parts of the world?...Burma's Muslims are under attack from Buddhists, who expel them from their homes... Israel has pierced the dagger of its existence in the heart of the Arabs."

The Markaz/Lashkar/Jamaat-ul-Dawa movement construes Muslim territories under non-Muslim occupation in the broadest sense. "Muslims ruled Andalusia (Spain) for 800 years but they were finished to the last man. Christians now rule (Spain) and we must wrest it back from them. All of India, including Kashmir, Hyderabad, Assam, Nepal, Burma, Bihar and Junagadh were part of the Muslim empire that was lost because Muslims gave up jihad. Palestine is occupied by the Jews. The Holy Qibla-e-Awwal (First Center of Prayer) in Jerusalem is under Jewish control. Several countries such as Bulgaria, Hungary, Cyprus, Sicily, Ethiopia, Russian Turkistan and Chinese Turkistan...were Muslim lands and it is our duty to get these back from unbelievers. Even parts of France reaching 90 kilometers outside Paris and some of the forests and mountains of Switzerland were home to Muslim mujahideen but are now under the occupation of unbelievers."

Some of the arguments and claims might appear historically incorrect or practically impossible but this does and will not deter a closely-knit jihadi group from raising funds, organizing cadres and fielding militants or terrorists in pursuit of a broadly defined global jihad aimed at the revival of Islam's global ascendancy and eventual domination.

NOTES

¹ S. Abul A'la Maududi, *A Short History of the Revivalist Movement in Islam*, (Lahore: Islamic Publications, 1963), p. 26.

² Khurram Jah Murad, "Revolution Through Bullet or Ballot," *Tarjuman-al-Quran*, January 1996. <http://jamaat.org/Isharat/archive/0196.html>

³ Khurshid Ahmad, *Amrika: Muslim Dunya ki Bey-Itminani (America and Unrest in the Muslim World)*, (Islamabad: Institute of Policy Studies, 2002), 308 pages (in Urdu).

⁴ Maulana Masood Azhar, *Ma'arka (The Struggle)*; *Faza'il Jihad (The Virtue of Jihad)*; *Tuhfa-e-Saadat (The Gift of Virtue)*, (Karachi: Idara AI-Khair, 2001) (in Urdu).

⁵ 'Hum Jihad kyun Kar rahe hain?' (*Why Are We Waging Jihad?*), (Muridke: Markaz al-dawa wal-Irshad, undated), (in Urdu).

Radical Islamist Ideologies in Southeast Asia

ANGEL M. RABASA

ADHERENTS OF RADICAL ISLAMIC IDEOLOGIES are a small minority in Southeast Asia. Islam spread in Southeast Asia largely through the conversion of elites and therefore developed under different conditions from other regions of the Muslim world, where the religion was established through military conquest. The ethnic and linguistic diversity of the region; the persistence of strong pre-Islamic cultural traditions; the absence of a common language and discourse (such as Arabic, which reinforces ideological and cultural trends in the Arab world); and the presence of substantial non-Muslim communities throughout the region accustomed Muslims in Southeast Asia to co-exist with other religious and cultural traditions and produced a famously tolerant version of the religion.

There always were, of course, tendencies toward more orthodox and Shariah-based forms of Islam and periodic attempts to introduce more radical interpretations of the religion. The Padri movement in Sumatra in the 1820s and 1830s involved an effort to introduce Wahhabism by clerics returning from Mecca who had been influenced by Wahhabi teachings during the al-Sauds' first occupation of the city at the beginning of the nineteenth century. There were bursts of Muslim radicalism throughout Southeast Asia during the European colonial period—armed jihads to liberate Muslim lands from the occupation of infidels. Indonesia faced a major uprising against the secular republic, the Darul Islam rebellion (1949-1962). The Darul Islam worldview combined the goal of the Islamic state with the Javanese ideal of the Just King who would bring in a reign of justice. The way to the just society was through violence. In 1961, the Darul Islam leader Kartosuwirjo had a vision in which he saw the road to the Islamic state covered with mounds of corpses.¹ Although the rebellion spread from its original base in West Java to other parts of the Indonesian archipelago in the 1950s, it failed to gain broad support among Indonesian Muslims. Kartosuwirjo was captured and executed by Sukarno's government in September 1962.

In more recent years, the growth of Islamic radicalism in Southeast Asia has been catalyzed by the worldwide Islamic revival and the influx of funds and ideologies from the Middle East. Saudi money has come in two forms: Above-board funds for religious and educational purposes, and funds quietly disbursed for militant Islamic groups. The funding has had a profound effect. It has allowed extremist groups to expand their activities and to make inroads into the largely moderate system of Indonesian religious education.² This inflow has, in turn, accelerated a process of *Arabization*—the displacement of indigenous culture by Arab religious and social practices—and the growth of international Islamist networks reaching from the Middle East and South Asia into Southeast Asia.

The spread of radical ideologies in Southeast Asia is associated with groups that made their appearance in the region in recent decades, such as the Hizb ut-Tahrir and Jamaah Tarbiyah, that support the establishment of a pan-Islamic caliphate, and the Muslim Brotherhood. Other extremist groups surfaced in Indonesia in the immediate post-Suharto period. The most notorious of these, but by no means the most dangerous, was the Forum Komunikasi Ahlu Sunnah Wal Jamaah and its paramilitary wing, the Laskar Jihad, which were inspired by Saudi-style Wahhabi teachings.

Laskar Jihad achieved notoriety by recruiting fighters for armed jihad in the Moluccas. In the summer of 2000, Laskar Jihad dispatched several hundred fighters from their training camp in Bogor, in West Java to Ambon, the epicenter of the communal violence, and were unhindered by the authorities, despite President Wahid's orders to stop them. In Ambon and later in Poso, Central Sulawesi, the Laskar Jihad militiamen participated in conflicts that pitted Muslims against Christians.³ In addition to the Laskar Jihad, there were even more sinister groups operating in the areas of conflict in eastern Indonesia, such as the Laskar Jundullah and the Laskar Mujahideen, both of which have been linked to terrorist organizations. These irregulars sometimes clashed with the Laskar Jihad militiamen.⁴

Of course all of these groups had agendas that were broader than, as they put it, the defense of beleaguered Muslims. At the heart of the Laskar Jihad's agenda was the imposition of Shariah law in Indonesia. Laskar Jihad leader Ja'afar Umar Thalib presided over an illegal Islamic court in Ambon that condemned an adulterer to death by stoning—the first recorded application of Islamic criminal law (*hudud*) in modern Indonesian history. Ja'afar was arrested for his role in the execution, but released after protests by some sectors of the Muslim community. Unlike other Indonesian radical groups, however, the Laskar Jihad did not question the legitimacy of the Indonesian govern-

ment and, in fact, insisted that its involvement in fighting in the Moluccas was intended to protect Indonesia's unity from alleged Christian secessionists.

There is evidence of early contacts between the Laskar Jihad leader Ja'afar Umar Thalib and Osama bin Laden, whom Ja'afar met in Peshawar, Pakistan in 1987. However, the Laskar Jihad refrained from joining bin Laden's movement and after the September 11 terrorist attacks, Ja'afar took pains to distance his group from al-Qaeda. He criticized bin Laden for lacking proper understanding of Islam and characterized al-Qaeda as *Khawarij* ("Seceders" who in the orthodox Sunni view have defected from religion and unsheathed the sword against the rightful ruler).⁵ Laskar Jihad's leaders disbanded the militia after the Bali bombings of October 12, 2002, although the group was not linked to the attack.⁶

Some Indonesian scholars have noted that Islamic extremism in their country has been associated with clerics of Arab and more specifically Hadrami (Yemeni) origin—such as Laskar Jihad leader Ja'afar, *Jama'ah Islamiyah* founders Abu Bakar Ba'asyir and Abdullah Sungkar (see below) and the Islam Defenders Front chief Muhammad Habib Rizieq, among others. This is not to suggest that individuals of Arab origin are more prone to Islamic radicalism than other Muslims. The majority of Arab-Indonesians are politically and religiously moderate and the Arab-Indonesian community includes such luminaries as former foreign ministers Ali Alatas and Alwi Shihab. Nevertheless, the Arab diaspora, particularly its newer elements, may serve as either a liaison or camouflage for missionaries or terrorists arriving from the Middle East. There is considerable evidence that Middle Eastern influences have shaped the ideology of most, if not all, of the Indonesian militant movements. Some Indonesian Muslim scholars attribute the moderate character of Indonesian Islam to their perception that Indonesia is the least "Arabized" of the major Muslim countries.⁷

Origins and Development of *Jama'ah Islamiyah*

The closest nexus between radical Islamism in Southeast Asia and the global jihadist movement is the *Jama'ah Islamiyah* (JI), a regional terrorist network closely associated with al-Qaeda. *Jama'ah Islamiyah* was established in the early 1990s by two radical Islamic clerics living in Malaysia, the late Abdullah Sungkar and Abu Bakar Ba'asyir. In 1971 Sungkar and Ba'asyir established an Islamic boarding school or *pesantren*, *Pondok al-Mukmin*, which two years later moved to the village of Ngruki, Central Java. The *al-Mukmin pesantren* became one of the fountainheads of radical Islam in Southeast Asia—the locus of the so-called "Ngruki network," the original core of the *Jama'ah Islamiyah* organization. The network's goal was to revive

the Darul Islam's agenda of an Islamic state by establishing vanguard "Islamic communities" (*jama'ah islamiyah*) as a necessary precursor of the Islamic state.⁸ (The Darul Islam-JI connection remains strong today; as Australian analyst Greg Fealy points out, the DI areas have proven a rich source of new members for the JI and are likely to remain so in the future.)⁹

Sungkar and Ba'asyir were imprisoned in 1978 by the Suharto government for subversion. (Among other things, they were accused of rejecting the non-denominational state philosophy of *Pancasila* and refusing to fly the Indonesian flag at their pesantren.)¹⁰ The two were released on appeal in 1982, but to avoid re-arrest they fled to Malaysia—an event they represented as a *hijrah*, an emigration imbued with religious significance in imitation of the Prophet Mohammed's flight from Mecca to Medina.

In Malaysia, a then more welcoming environment for Islamic militants than Suharto's Indonesia, they were met by an Indonesian Afghan war veteran known as Abu Jibril (alias Fikiruddin, alias Mohamed Iqbal), with whom they established a clone of the al-Mukmin pesantren, the Luqmanul Hakiem in Ulu Tiram, Johor state, as a base for indoctrination and operations. In Malaysia, Sungkar and Ba'asyir linked up with another Indonesian veteran of the Afghan war and al-Qaeda operative, Riduan Isamuddin, alias Hambali. Hambali, the only non-Arab member of the *shura* or central council of al-Qaeda, provided a critical link between the indigenous Indonesian radicals of the Ngruki network and bin Laden and the al-Qaeda organization. Hambali was also the operational chief and conduit for funds from al-Qaeda to Jama'ah Islamiyah.

In this formative period of the organization, Sungkar met with bin Laden and personally recruited Southeast Asian fighters from the camp of the radical Afghan mujahideen commander Abdul Rasul Sayyaf.¹¹ In 1996 JI shifted the training of recruits to Camp Hubaidiyah, a camp for foreign fighters located within Camp Abubakar, headquarters of the Moro Islamic Liberation Front in Mindanao. When Camp Abubakar was overrun by the Philippine Army in the summer of 2000, JI moved its training to a facility near Poso, Central Sulawesi.¹² Access to training camps is critical to the transmission of operational tradecraft to the next generation of jihadists, but the camps also have an equally important role in facilitating the diffusion of ideology and the indoctrination of recruits.

Sources of Jama'ah Islamiyah's Ideology

As with all jihadist organization, religious study is an integral part of the training and indoctrination process in Jama'ah Islamiyah. The Singapore Government's White Paper describes this process in the case of JI re-

cruitment: the first stage involves religious classes organized for a general audience. JI teachers would employ the tactic of inserting into their lectures quotations from the Quran and hadith discussing jihad and the plight of Muslims. The second stage involved identifying those who wanted to find out more about the plight of Muslims in other areas, such as Bosnia, the Moluccas, and Mindanao. Those would be engaged in more intense and focused discussion circles and those who were deemed suitable were invited to join the organization. Esoteric language and code names were used in the indoctrination process, which helped to create a strong sense of group identity and commitment.¹³

It was during the Malaysian period that the organization and ideology of the Jama'ah Islamiyah coalesced. According to the JI manual *Pedoman Umum Perjuangan Jama'ah Islamiyah* (General Guidelines of the Struggle of Jama'ah Islamiyah), the group's objective is the creation of a transnational Islamic state (*Daulah Islamiyah*) comprising Indonesia, Malaysia, and the southern Philippines.¹⁴ The sources of the Jama'ah Islamiyah's ideology were both local and international. The first source was the Darul Islam's vision of an Islamic state in Indonesia and of armed struggle as the means of attaining that end—in contraposition to the mainstream Salafi method of gradually Islamizing the society through *dakwah* (Arabic *da'wa*, meaning “call” or “Islamic propagation”). Sungkar had served as an officer in Darul Islam leader Sekarmadji Maridjan Kartosuwirjo's Islamic Army of Indonesia (*Tentara Islam Indonesia*) and Ba'asyir, although he did not participate in the rebellion, accepted the Darul Islam's agenda.

In 1976 Sungkar and Ba'asyir affiliated their earlier network of Islamic communities with the existing Darul Islam structure in Central Java. Both men swore allegiance to the Darul Islam regional leader, Haji Ismail Pranoto, alias Hispran. However, in 1992 Sungkar had a falling out with a Darul Islam associate, Ajengan Masduki. Sungkar accused Masduki of Shi'ia and Sufi tendencies and asked the recruits in Sayyaf's Afghan training camp to choose between him and Masduki. This rift marked the emergence of JI as a distinct organization from Darul Islam.¹⁵

A second source of ideology was Middle Eastern Islamic radicalism. Contacts with al-Gama'a al-Islamiyya, a terrorist splinter group of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood could have influenced the Indonesian radicals to move beyond the goal of an Islamic state in Indonesia to the concept of a pan-Islamic caliphate.¹⁶ The third and most decisive source of ideology was the Afghan Jihad and the influence of Afghan war veterans, of whom Hambali was the most prominent, but by no means the only one.¹⁷ The Afghan connection

infused the organization with the al-Qaeda concept of the global jihad and its method of terrorist attacks against U.S. and Western targets.

The legitimacy and obligation of armed jihad against the West and “apostate” Muslim rulers—a central theme of the teachings of Said Qutb and Mohammed Faraj, and taken by al-Zawahiri and other ideologues of modern radical Islam and assimilated by al-Qaeda—is the ideological intersection of Jama’ah Islamiyah with the global jihadist movement.¹⁸ According to the Singaporean investigation of JI terrorist cells broken up in 2001 and 2002, JI members were taught that Muslims who did not subscribe to the group’s ideology were to be considered infidels, as was anyone who left the group. Those who remained enjoyed a sense of exclusivity and commitment and believed that they were closer to Allah and in possession of the truth. Militants were promised martyrdom if they died while engaged in jihad.¹⁹ In adopting this worldview, JI members departed not only from the teachings of mainstream Southeast Asian Islam, but from the mainstream Sunni view that Muslims are not permitted to rebel against a Muslim ruler, and that armed jihad (except when strictly defensive) is not lawful in the absence of a caliph to legitimize it.

The JI’s commitment to the global jihad is tied with intense feelings of hatred for the United States and the West. Bali bombing mastermind Imam Samudra, defended the Bali terrorist attack as “a manifestation of Islamic solidarity between Muslims not limited by geographic boundaries.” He said that he wanted to carry out God’s order to defend the weak so that “American terrorists and their allies understand that the blood of Moslems is expensive and valuable.” Another Bali defendant, JI operations chief Mukhlas, stated during his trial that all Westerners were “dirty animals and insects that need to be wiped out.”²⁰ A violent Islamist website provides a justification for the Bali bombing, purportedly from files recovered from Samudra’s computer. Entitled “Why Was Bali Our Target?,” it lists the following arguments:

It is a gathering place for all the nations of imperialists, terrorists, oppressors, and destroyers of the virtue of Indonesian women—who, it should be noted, are Moslems. Are there Moslems who do not know that Bali is a centre for dealing in narcotics? Bali is one of the world’s largest and most popular places for sex outside marriage, in a country where the majority of the population are Moslems, in a country with many Religious Scholars, Preachers, Proselytisers, and Islamic *harakah* activists. This is an irony which shames us in the presence of Allah, the Almighty and most worthy of praise. Particularly in Jalan Legian Kuta, there are substantial gangs of Jews (May Allah curse

them), who use Bali as an intelligence conduit and a place to rendezvous, [in their efforts] to destroy the Islamic community.

It was a relatively soft target for striking against citizens of countries who proudly, arrogantly and grandiosely trample on the honour of Moslems by involving themselves in the crusade under the leadership of America (cursed by Allah alaihim), especially by raining thousands of tonnes of bombs on weak men, Moslem women, and innocent babies in Afghanistan.²¹

It is striking that the reasons alleged for the atrocity are of a moral and social order—Westerners bringing corruption to a Muslim country, with U.S. foreign policy (the “crusade under the leadership of America”) almost as an afterthought, after some tactical considerations (“a relatively soft target”). It could be that from the jihadist standpoint, violence is its own justification. According to JI expert Zachary Abuza, the concept of purifying violence is central to the JI ideology. Religious violence is seen as an act of cleansing of sins, particularly important in the case of JI members who were formerly criminals and are seeking redemption.²²

The militants’ commitment was strengthened by having them take an oath of allegiance (*bayat*) to their emir or spiritual leader (also an al-Qaeda practice). Although as the group’s emir, Ba’asyir is not believed to have been directly involved in operations, the interrogation of captured JI terrorists reveals that they took care to seek religious sanction for operations from Ba’asyir.²³ (Senior al-Qaeda operative Omar al-Faruq, captured in Indonesia in 2002, reportedly alleged that Ba’asyir approved the Christmas 2000 church bombings in Indonesia, in which 18 persons were killed and over 100 injured.)²⁴

According to the International Crisis Group’s Indonesia analyst Sidney Jones, a rift developed within the Jama’ah Islamiyah between two factions. One faction—the terrorists—was associated with former JI operations chief Hambali (captured in Thailand in 2003 and now in U.S. custody), and included most of the people involved in the Bali and J.W. Marriott bombings. This faction had been most influenced by bin Laden’s 1998 fatwa declaring war on Jews and Crusaders. The second faction, according to Jones, favored a longer-term strategy of building a mass base through religious work (*dakwah*) to carry out an Islamic revolution when the time was right.²⁵ The role of Ba’asyir in this internal debate is disputed. In one view, he is said to have sided with the latter faction and to have opposed the Bali bombing for tactical reasons. On the other hand, a regional intelligence source places Ba’asyir with the more violent faction.²⁶

Jama'ah Islamiyah introduced into Southeast Asia the hitherto unknown practice of suicide bombing and mass-casualty terrorist attacks. In the bombings in Bali on October 12, 2002, one of the bombs was carried in a backpack into a club by a suicide bomber named Iqbal. The Bali bombing, comprising three separate bombings in the tourist area of Kuta, was the first mass-casualty terrorist attack in Southeast Asia, as well as the worst terrorist incident in Indonesia's history. It left over 180 dead and 300 injured, the majority Australian tourists. It was also the first suicide bomb attack in modern Indonesian history and represented another step in the introduction of Middle Eastern terrorist techniques into Southeast Asia.²⁷ Two other major recent terrorist attacks in Indonesia, the August 2003 vehicle bombing of the J.W. Marriott Hotel in Jakarta and the September 2004 car or truck explosion outside the Australian embassy both involved suicide bombers (although there are indications that the bomb at the J.W. Marriott hotel might have been triggered remotely).²⁸

Current Trends

After the fall of Suharto and Ba'asyir's return to Indonesia, Ba'asyir concluded that the more open political environment in Indonesia offered opportunities to pursue the JI's objectives through overt as well as clandestine means. Consequently, together with other Muslim activists, in August 2000 Ba'asyir convened the founding congress of an above-ground front organization, the Indonesian Mujahideen Council (Majlis Mujahideen Indonesia —MMI), composed of people who hold dual membership in JI and MMI, as well as members of other radical Indonesian Islamist groups. The founding meeting was attended by representatives of virtually every group committed to the implementation of Islamic law in Indonesia, as well as of international groups such as the Hizb ut-Tahrir. Ba'asyir was chosen as emir of the governing council, with a mandate to lay the foundations of a new international caliphate.²⁹

Since the Jama'ah Islamiyah came to the attention of the outside world in 2001, about 250 militants, including much of the leadership, have been arrested across Southeast Asia. The arrests have damaged, but not destroyed the ability of the organization to conduct terrorist operations. As noted earlier, a faction associated with Hambali is committed to continuing terrorist attacks against Western targets, but a second faction—one that was closer to the JI's original Darul Islam roots—gives priority to re-involvement in armed jihad in eastern Indonesia. Some regional authorities believe that the two tracks are not incompatible, and that the JI is in fact pursuing simultaneously

both a strategy of mass-casualty attacks against Western targets and participation in local jihads against indigenous Christians.³⁰ In any case, as Southeast Asia terrorism expert Zachary Abuza points out, all JI members have the same ultimate goal and view sectarian violence as the means to achieve it.³¹

Participation in these jihads is an important element in the group's ideological consolidation. It provides new members with a "rite of passage" which is the functional equivalent of the founding generation's experience in Afghanistan. Moreover, as Sidney Jones points out, many in JI saw Poso as fertile ground for the kind of intensive proselytizing that could expand the community prepared to live in accordance with the group's religious and political ideas. Given the history of communal strife in the area, the Indonesian government's tenuous control, and the receptivity of some local Muslim community leaders to the JI's strict Salafi message, JI leaders apparently believed that Poso could be transformed into an Islamic community—a place where Islamic law could be applied—as well as a secure base for the organization, much as Medina after the Prophet Muhammad's flight from Mecca.³²

The consensus of analysts is that JI is now in the process of consolidation and rebuilding that involves greater emphasis on religious training and on political activity through its political arm, the MMI. Religious training is critical to the organization's rebuilding activities. The JI seeks not only fighters, but also people steeped in religious understanding. Thirteen younger JI members (known as "al-Ghuraba," Arabic for "the foreigners") were sent to study at a Laskar-e-Toiba madrassa in Pakistan. The group was reportedly formed on Hambali's orders and many of its members were related to JI leaders—they were, in effect, the next generation of leadership. The group itself was set up by Ba'asyir's son Abdul Rahim. One of the members of the group, an Indonesian named Muhammad Saifudin, said senior JI leaders "saw the urgency of regeneration in the movement" and sent their sons and their students to Pakistan to study to become ulama.³³ The implication of this is that ideologized religion is central to the persistence of Islamic extremism and violence. This phenomenon is difficult to understand, much less address effectively, by the post-religious societies of Western Europe or one such as the United States, that insists on the separation of religion and state. But it is a phenomenon that must nonetheless be confronted squarely if radical and violent Islamism is to be effectively countered.

NOTES

¹ Karl D. Jackson, *Traditional Authority, Islam and Rebellion: A Study of Indonesian Political Behavior*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980, pp. 4-7, 17.

² "Saudis Quietly Promote Strict Islam in Indonesia," *The New York Times*, July 5, 2003.

³ The causes of the communal conflict in eastern Indonesia are complex, but at least at the beginning, the conflict in the Moluccas could not be ascribed solely to religious factors. See Angel Rabasa and Peter Chalk, *Indonesia's Transformation and the Stability of Southeast Asia*, Santa Monica: RAND, 2001, pp. 41-44.

⁴ The Laskar Jundullah and Laskar Mujahideen have been linked to the regional terrorist organization Jama'ah Islamiyah through their parent organizations, the Sulawesi-based Komite Persiapan Pemberlakuan Syariat Islam (KPPSI) and the Majelis Mujahideen Indonesia (MMI), respectively. See Angel Rabasa et al., *The Muslim World After 9/11* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2004), Chapter 8; and Zachary Abuza, "Muslims, Politics, and Violence in Indonesia: An Emerging Jihadist-Islamist Nexus?" NBR Analysis, Vol. 15, No. 3, September 2004, pp. 21-22.

⁵ "Waiting for Osama's Blessing," *Tempo* (Jakarta), September 27, 2001. For the definition of the Khawarij see, <http://www.hamline.edu/apakabar/basisdata/2001/09/27/0031.html>
http://www.sunnah.org/aqida/ghunya/khawarij_fifteen_sects

⁶ Laskar Jihad's trajectory and agenda is reviewed in Michael Davis, "Laskar Jihad and the Political Position of Conservative Islam in Indonesia," *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, Vol. 24, No. 1, April 2002.

⁷ Discussion with Dr. Azyumardi Azra, Rector, State Islamic University, Jakarta, June 2002. See Rabasa, *Political Islam in Southeast Asia*, p. 16.

⁸ International Crisis Group (ICG), "Al-Qaeda in Southeast Asia: The Case of the 'Ngruki Network' in Indonesia," Asia Briefing, August 8, 2002 (corrected January 10, 2003).

⁹ Greg Fealy, "Islamic Radicalism in Indonesia: The Faltering Revival?" *Southeast Asian Affairs* 2004, Singapore: ISEAS, 2004, pp. 111-112.

¹⁰ After 1982 all political and educational institutions were required to accept Pancasila ("Five Principles") as their sole ideology. One of the principles was "belief in One God," but otherwise the state philosophy made no distinctions among religions.

¹¹ Information from a Southeast Asian intelligence service, June 2004.

¹² The existence of the camp was revealed in the trial in Madrid of eight alleged members of an al-Qaeda cell in Spain. "Looking for SE Asia's Own Carlos the Jackal," *Jakarta Post*, January 30, 2002. The activities of the Spanish al-Qaeda cell members to recruit volunteers for training in the Indonesian camp are described in the Court's summary of the case against the cell members, Juzgado Central de Instrucción No. 005 Madrid, Sumario (Proc. Ordinario) 0000035/2001E.

¹³ Government of Singapore, White Paper: "The Jama'ah Islamiyah Arrests and the Threat of Terrorism," Singapore, January 7, 2003, p. 15. The International Crisis Group describes the same process in JI recruitment in Central Sulawesi, ICG, "Jihad in Central Sulawesi," ICG Asia Report No. 74, Jakarta/Brussels. February 3, 2004, p. 18.

¹⁴ Government of Singapore White Paper, p. 6. The Singaporean authorities believe that this putative regional Islamic state logically includes Singapore and Brunei.

¹⁵ Blontank Poer, "Tracking the roots of Jamaah Islamiyah," *The Jakarta Post*, March 8, 2003; ICG,

“Jama’ah Islamiyah in Southeast Asia: Damaged but Still Dangerous,” ICG Asia Report No. 63, Jakarta/Brussels: August 26, 2003, p. 6.

¹⁶ ICG, “Al-Qaeda in Southeast Asia,” op.cit., p. 16.

¹⁷ Most JI leaders are Afghan war veterans: Hambali, Umar Baraja (al-Qaeda’s liaison with Ba’asyir), Muchliansyah alias Solihin, Arqam, Usztad Syawal alias Yasin alias Abu Seta, Agung Abdul Hamid, Aris Munandar, and Abdullah Sungkar’s son Said.

¹⁸ All of them Egyptian ideologues. Qutb was executed in 1966 by Nasser’s government and Faraj in 1982 for his role in President Sadat’s assassination. Al-Zawahiri headed the Egyptian Islamic Jihad until he merged his organization with al-Qaeda.

¹⁹ Government of Singapore, White Paper, pp. 15-17.

²⁰ Quoted in Kumar Ramakrishna, “Constructing’ the Jama’ah Islamiyah Terrorist: A Preliminary Inquiry,” Working Paper No. 71, Singapore: Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, October 2004, pp. 40-41, 45.

²¹ The website of the International Death Battalion, <http://istimata.cjb.net>. The Samudra citation can be found in http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2003/20030210_bali_confessions/samudra_site.htm.

²² Zachary Abuza, “Muslims, Politics, and Violence in Indonesia,” p. 31.

²³ Ramakrishna, op.cit., p. 44.

²⁴ “Hand of terror: key suspects prepare to face the music,” *Straits Times* (Singapore), Sept. 20, 2002. The same allegation was made by captured former JI official Abu Bakar Bafana in his testimony, via teleconference from Singapore, in Ba’asyir’s 2003 trial in Jakarta. Bafana said that he had visited the Indonesian city of Solo “to seek the approval of Ustadz (teacher) Abu Bakar Bashir to attack churches in Indonesia.” Bafana added that Ba’asyir gave his blessing. He also testified that Bali bombing mastermind Imam Samudra had given him a computer disk listing priests to be targeted in the attacks. “Bashir leads JI, behind bombings, says witness,” *Agence France-Presse*, June 26, 2003.

²⁵ International Crisis Group (ICG), “Indonesia Backgrounder: How the Jama’ah Islamiyah Terrorist Network Operates,” ICG Asia Report No. 43, Jakarta/Brussels, December 11, 2002, p 5; and “Jihad Central Sulawesi,” p. 24.

²⁶ Information from a senior Southeast Asian intelligence official, June 2003. One could suspect that the information provided to the ICG by JI sources that Ba’asyir was an advocate of the more moderate line was designed to exculpate Ba’asyir, who was then under detention by Indonesian authorities.

²⁷ “Suicide Bomber Blew Up Paddy’s Club in Kuta,” *Tempo Interactive* (Jakarta), November 22, 2002. Several individuals implicated in the Bali bombings, including Imam Samudra and Mukhlis, the JI’s reputed operational chief, were arrested and went on trial in Jakarta in June 2003. Samudra, Mukhlis and another terrorist were sentenced to death, four accomplices to life in prison and 27 others to sentences of varying lengths. The group’s reputed emir, Ba’asyir, was not named as a suspect in the Bali bombing but was arrested on separate charges of rebellion and forgery of immigration documents. Ba’asyir was set free in April 2004 after the Supreme Court reduced his sentence on the immigration charges and sustained a higher court decision to dismiss the rebellion charges, but was re-arrested almost immediately on charges of planning and inciting acts of terrorism, withholding information on acts of terrorism, and conspiracy.

²⁸ *CNN Late Edition*, August 10, 2003, at <http://edition.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0308/10/le.00.html>.

²⁹ ICG, "Al-Qaeda in Southeast Asia," pp. 17-18; documents of the MMI founding congress in 2000 are available at <http://www.geocities.com/kongresmujahidin>.

³⁰ Information from a senior Asian intelligence official, June 2004.

³¹ Zachary Abuza, "Muslims, Politics, and Violence in Indonesia," p. 24.

³² ICG, "Jihad in Central Sulawesi," p. 14.

³³ "Indonesian Militants Keep Regenerating," *The Washington Post*, March 25, 2004.

The Impact of the War in Iraq On the Global Jihad

REUVEN PAZ

THE UNEXPECTEDLY QUICK FALL OF SADDAM HUSSEIN and the collapse of his government created a vacuum in Iraq that has attracted a steady flow of terrorist volunteers to the country. Furthermore, the dismantling of Iraq's military forces and the subsequent deterioration of the security situation there has triggered the emergence of fundamental conflicts and disputes along ethnic, tribal, and religious lines. Various jihadist groups—some old, some new, and comprised predominantly of Sunni Arabs—have since rapidly turned post-Saddam Iraq into a new battleground.

For Islamist and terrorist ideologues in the Middle East and elsewhere, the insurgency in Iraq has presented a golden opportunity. They have sought to consolidate, direct, and reinforce the insurgency and to reinvigorate militant and radical Islam around the Muslim world by elaborating a new set of ideas about the meaning and purpose of jihad. This new ideology potently combines several elements, including:

- Anti-Americanism and anti-Westernism. These sentiments are shared across a broad range of Arab publics and have been inflamed by the War in Iraq. The new ideologists of jihad have sought to exploit this outrage to rally popular support for both the insurgency and for militant activities elsewhere.
- Radical interpretations of the Islamic doctrine of apostasy and religious excommunication or *takfir*. In this ideology, Muslims that are perceived to collaborate with America and other “infidel” powers—for example, by enlisting in Iraqi security services, or by participating in elections—are declared to be the same as enemy combatants, and are to be treated as such. Recently, this ideology has focused Islamist and terrorist animosity on a “core triangle” of “apostate” Arab regimes deemed to have forsaken Islam—Iraq, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

- Viewing the struggle in Iraq as a “return home” to the heart of the Arab world for Muslim fighters after years of struggle in “exile” in places such as Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Central Asia. In this view, Iraq is seen as a staging point in which Muslim holy warriors could consolidate their power, and ultimately mount a larger offensive in the hopes of one day purifying all Islamic lands of “infidel” and “satanic” influence (*jahilyya*).
- Promoting the idea of the “ummah” not simply as the worldwide community of faithful Muslims, but as a political and strategic unit. This idea is promoted by Islamist ideologues to enforce ideological and organizational solidarity and uniformity among large Muslim publics that are otherwise disconnected linguistically, culturally, and nationally. This has been facilitated in particular by the Islamist’s increased use of the Internet, which they have employed quite effectively to recruit sympathy and new fighters for the insurgency throughout the Arab and Muslim world, including from Muslim communities in Europe.

Taken together, this new ideological matrix has enabled Islamist leaders to amass a significant level of support and sympathy for the Iraqi insurgency—and especially among Muslim youth, who have increasingly voiced their approval not only for the insurgency, but also for the Islamist’s overall political aspirations in the region and throughout the Muslim world. In turn, this new ideology of jihad has had a significant impact on the organization, activities, and mindset of Islamist terrorist groups in the Middle East and on the political culture of the Global Jihad in general.

The Ideological Development of Global Jihad

Since the outset of the War in Iraq, Islamist scholars, clerics, and intellectuals have led a massive campaign to reinterpret the meaning and purpose of jihad. This ideological movement represents a shift toward what we might call the “second” and even “third generation” of Al-Qaeda and Islamist terrorism. It also marks a shift away from the Egyptians and toward the Saudis as the leading ideologues of the Global Jihad. If we were to map these ideological developments, we would point to four influential figures, each representing four successive stages:

- Dr. Abdallah Azzam—a Palestinian who introduced the doctrine of jihad to the Afghan Mujahideen and their Arab supporters, and who created, along with Osama bin Laden, the original strategy for Al-Qaeda.

- Dr. Ayman Zawahiri—an Egyptian who contributed to the development of Al Qaeda’s ideology in Afghanistan by introducing the principles of the jihadi experience in Egypt. Zawahiri was a key ideologue behind the consolidation of the doctrines of the Taliban and the attempt to create the only true and purified or Salafi Islamic state in modern times in Afghanistan.
- Sheikh Abu Muhammad al-Maqdesi—a Palestinian who combined the doctrines of the *Jihadi Salafiyah* with the most severe principles of Saudi Wahhabism, thus creating the *Tawhid wal-Jihad* that operates in Jordan and nowadays in Iraq, and has inspired several Islamist movements elsewhere. One of al-Maqdesi’s most loyal disciples, Abu Anas al-Shami, a Jordanian of Palestinian origin, was the leading inspiration of Abu Mus’ab al-Zarqawi in Iraq, until his death in Fallujah in October 2004. Another Palestinian partner of al-Maqdesi, Omar Abu Omar (alias Abu Qutadah), who is presently imprisoned in the United Kingdom, was the leading ideological figure of Al-Qaeda in Europe.
- Sheikh Yousef al-Ayiri—the Saudi scholar and commander of Al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia, who was killed in June 2003 by the Saudi police. Al-Ayiri’s ascendance as the major theorist of jihad in Iraq represents a distinct shift in the global jihadi ideology to Saudi hands. Two of his Saudi associates are trying to fill his place—Sheikh Fares Bin Ahmad al-Zahrani (alias Abu Jandal al-Azdi) in Saudi Arabia, and Sheikh Abu Omar Seyf in Chechnya. The latter is the leading Islamist ideologue of the Arab battalion of volunteers in Chechnya. Another figure that should be noted is Sheikh Hamed al-Ali, a Saudi who lives in Kuwait.

Even though he was killed over a year ago, Sheikh Yousef al-Ayiri should be regarded as the leading architect of the jihad in Iraq and in other regions as well. Between 2000 and 2003, al-Ayiri authored about 40 books and many long articles in Arabic on the strategy and purpose of jihad. These publications appeared only on the Internet and were not signed. Al-Ayiri himself remained anonymous to most of the world until his death, and only in the past year have the holy warriors and other participants in Global Jihad come to recognize his writings. Unfortunately, the significance of his work for the insurgency in Iraq and elsewhere remains largely underappreciated in the West and by Western intelligence communities.

In August 2003, al-Ayiri published a book titled *The Future of Iraq and the Peninsula After the Fall of Baghdad*. In that book, al-Ayiri explains that the collapse of the Ba’ath regime in Iraq is a “blessing for Islam and Muslims.” Had the

Ba'ath been able to resist the Infidel invasion, al-Ayiri argues, then the secular Ba'ath ideology would have been strengthened in the hearts and minds of Muslims overall, with devastating consequences for Islam and the future of Islamist ideology in the region. But since the American victory over the Ba'ath, al-Ayiri explains that the most dangerous enemy of Islam in the region is the heretical and corrupting ideology of democracy. "One of the most wicked aspects of secularism is democracy," he writes, "which cancels the authority of the Shariah on the society and which is in total conflict with it in form and substance. God Almighty has stated that there is no governing but by God. Democracy, however, says that governing is done by the majority of the people."

In al-Ayiri's view, the ideology of democracy is on the ascendant in Muslim lands because the majority of Muslims have forsaken the Islamic duty of holy war. He therefore enjoins all true Muslims to heed the Islamic obligation of jihad, and to wage a total and violent holy war against the forces of democracy. In a later publication, "The Crusader War Against Iraq," al-Ayiri elaborated his view of the struggle in Iraq and its significance for Islam's larger global conflict with democracy. He says "the importance of the war in Iraq is not because a brother Arab country is attacked by the United States, but because Iraq is just one link in the chain of attacks to follow." Therefore, he says, "if the Mujahideen do not resist in Iraq, they are going to fail in the future aggressions" and, ultimately, in the overall ideological conflict between democracy and Islam.

The New Strategy of the Global Jihad

On July 1, 2004, the Foreign Broadcast Information Service translated a document titled "The Mujahideen's Roadmap." Signed by the Abu-Hafs al-Masri Brigades, an Islamist group affiliated with Al-Qaeda, the roadmap asserted that:

the Americans, Jews, and the Crusader West are our enemies and are combatants. They must be killed wherever they are caught.... Combat is today the individual duty of every Muslim man and woman, as the ancestor *ulema* agreed. If the enemy enters a single inch of the Muslims' land, then it becomes the Muslims' duty to fight until they get the enemy out. Let a million or more die in the battlefield and let those remaining live in dignity and freedom, as this is better than having them die in the dialogue and humiliation field and the remaining ones live in humiliation and be the slaves of the Christians and Jews.

The declaration "let a million [Muslims] or more die in the battlefield"

should remind us of the Algerian uprising in the 1950s against the French. The expressions of outrage in the Arab world following the invasion of Iraq seems to feed off of these “old demons” and deep-rooted feelings of dishonor and humiliation. Islamist ideologues will continue to appeal to these sentiments, and it is reasonable to assume that they will continue to work to unify the Arab world’s diverse Islamist and terrorist groups at both the doctrinal and organizational levels.

Uniting these disparate groups is clearly one of the principal strategic objectives for the new ideologists of Global Jihad. The roadmap calls on all mujahideen “to enlarge the circle of the (Islamic) struggle by distributing the operations all over the world.” This entails ramping up Islamist indoctrination and recruitment efforts not only in support of the Iraqi insurgency but also to incite militant Islamist activity in other countries. The roadmap calls on the mujahideen to employ new tactics to achieve their goal of expanding the global jihad—in particular, to “form small organizations under different names” so as to “make it difficult for the enemy to discover and hunt them down” and to “scatter the security organs’ efforts.” It also calls on holy warriors to learn how to use computers and the Internet, and to employ such technologies to “ignite a psychological war against the enemy.” This is intended not merely to repel foreign forces from Iraq, but to “drag the United States into a third quagmire after Iraq and Afghanistan.” (The document singles out Yemen as a possible arena for future conflict.) All of these efforts are undertaken in hopeful anticipation of a larger strike against the United States homeland, possibly with weapons of mass destruction—a strike that will “make the United States yield or break its will and leave its agents so that we can settle accounts with them.”

Central to this strategy of proliferating new Islamist fronts is the promotion of radical doctrines of *takfir*—or religious excommunication of Muslims deemed to have departed from Islamic belief. In the new jihadi ideology, this applies to all those who have adopted beliefs deemed antithetical to the Islamist cause. As the roadmap states, “Arabs and Muslims who support [the Crusader West] are considered to be like them and must be killed because they are apostates.” This view was recently expressed by Abu Musab Zarqawi, who called for “an all-out war on this evil principle of democracy and all those who follow this wrong ideology.”

This new ideology of Global Jihad has significantly altered the so-called “red lines” of what constitutes legitimate forms of jihad. For one, it has led to widespread violence against all Muslims who willingly accept or collaborate with pro-democratic forces (e.g., the Shi’a) in Iraq. The beheadings of both

Muslim and non-Muslim civilians, for example, have also become a widespread phenomenon in Iraq. These barbaric acts were carried out by various Islamist groups, all of which operated under different names. Each execution was videotaped and, within hours, circulated around the Internet by Islamist websites and other forums. In September 2004, for example, propagandists for Al-Qaeda and Jamaat al-Tawhid wal-Jihad in Iraq posted a “movie” containing footage of several executions on various websites that sympathize with the jihad. Thousands of Muslim youngsters, mainly in the Arab world, have publicly stated their support for the beheadings of innocent Turks, Egyptians, and Nepalese, not to mention hundreds of Iraqis, whose only “sin” was looking for employment.

Such tactics as beheadings and suicide-bombings in Iraq have gained increasing support from a growing number of Islamist clerics in the region. Prior to the war in Iraq, Islamic clerics debated the legitimacy of suicide or “martyrdom” operations, but the battleground in Iraq has escalated this debate and given it a new pitch. Today, many Islamist clerics sanction suicide operations, and if there is debate over what constitutes legitimate tactics, it is largely over the legality of beheading, kidnapping, the killing of Muslims, or of committing such terrorist acts outside of Iraq.

Assessing the Regional and Global Impact

The new ideology of jihad has had a dramatic impact on the security situation in the Middle East and elsewhere. Following the American siege of Fallujah in November 2004 and the occupation of most of the city in early December 2004, it became increasingly difficult for Arab governments to silence the growing anti-Americanism and popular support for the mujahideen in Iraq. Groups and individuals that had previously voiced their opposition to the September 11 attacks, such as the Muslim Brotherhood or various Wahhabi clerics from within the Saudi religious establishment, have recently begun to voice their support for war against the American forces. In November 2004, for example, a group of 26 senior clerics in Saudi Arabia formally declared that the struggle against America in Iraq was a jihad. The Saudi government gave their silent approval to the declaration, which has the binding authority of a fatwa. Moreover, Sheikh Yousef al-Qaradhawi, the leading authority of the international Muslim Brotherhood, gave his sanction to the jihad against the United States and its allies in a press conference in Cairo, without any reaction from the Egyptian government. More recently, in February 2005, Qaradhawi published a poem on his website that calls on all Muslims to recognize that the forces of apostasy and hypocrisy are gathering,

and that the “struggle [against them] has become obligatory” for all members of the Islamic Nation.¹

These developments signal a doctrinal and organizational rapprochement between the Saudi government and mainstream Wahhabism on the one hand, and the mainstream Muslim Brotherhood on the other. This has created two big blocks of Islamists in the Sunni Arab world—the violent Jihadi Salafiyyah, and the mainstream (*Wasatiyyah*) Ikhwani-Wahhabi. While the latter was composed largely of groups that did not officially practice terrorism, they have made an exception in their ideology for issues concerning Israel and the Jews, where all forms of terrorism, including suicide bombings, have been explicitly sanctioned.

At the same time, the new theory of jihad has also led to considerable friction within Saudi Arabia, and especially among the Saudi religious establishment. Al-Ayiri’s takfiri-influenced ideology splits significantly from the present generation of radical Islamist scholars and their Saudi mentors of the Wahhabi reform movement, led by Dr. Safar al-Hawali and Sheikh Salman al-Awdah. Hawali and al-Awdah, who were once mentors of Osama bin Laden, were recruited in the past year by the Saudi government to defend the Kingdom against the extremists who used the war in Iraq to start a terrorist campaign on Saudi soil. As a result, a tremendous crisis among the Saudi Islamists has emerged. So far, it appears that a significant portion of them have sided with al-Ayiri’s strategy of fomenting jihad in Iraq, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

In addition to Saudi Arabia, new ideological conflicts and fronts in the Global Jihad have emerged in Arab and Middle Eastern countries—for example, in Jordan, Morocco, and Turkey. Outside of the Middle East, the War in Iraq has also broadened opportunities for ideological indoctrination and recruitment, especially in Central Asia, the Caucasus, in Southeast Asia, and among Muslim communities living in the West.

Surprisingly or not, the Islamist militants have failed to gain much influence in Egypt, perhaps as a result of the “iron fist” that the Egyptian authorities have employed in handling the Islamist phenomenon during the past 20 years. Another important example where the war and the radical Islamists have had little influence is Algeria. While there is improved cooperation and heightened mutual influence between Algerian and Saudi radical groups, this has not yet seriously affected the struggle within Algeria. According to some reports, there are indications that traditional Islamic scholars in Yemen have had some surprising successes in refuting the new ideology of jihad and dissuading many would-be Islamists from taking up arms in Iraq and elsewhere in the region.²

The Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza have been largely unaffected by the War in Iraq and the new ideology of Global Jihad. This is due in part to the death of Yasser Arafat in November 2004, which opened new prospects for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. For many there is renewed hope that this could lead to progress toward a political solution to the conflict. There has also been a constant decrease in Saudi support for Hamas, especially in the financial realm, as a result of American pressure and legislation against terrorist financing. Furthermore, the killing of Hamas leaders Sheikh Yasin and Dr. Rantisi in Gaza decreased the influence of the Jordanian and international Muslim Brotherhood on Hamas. Hamas's new leadership, including Khaled Mish'al and Mousa Abu Marzouq, are influenced more by secular, not Sunni-Islamist, ideologies. Finally, and most importantly, the anarchy in the Palestinian Authority has enabled Hizballah and its backers in Iran to exercise increased influence in the region. Since neither of these Shi'ite elements is part of the Sunni-led Global Jihad, and since they pursue very different Islamist agendas, the radical Sunni ideology of al-Ayiri and others has had up until now minimal impact in Gaza and the West Bank.

Throughout the Sunni world, it seems that the Iraq insurgency has inherited the role of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as the primary concern of Islamist militants and as the major factor contributing to Muslim anti-Westernism. In a way, Iraq has become the most important criterion for carrying out terrorist operations even outside Iraq. Examples include the attacks in Madrid in March 2004 and in Jakarta in early September 2004. In a declaration published on Islamist websites in Arabic on September 10, Indonesia's Jama'ah Islamiyyah stated clearly that the bombing nearby the Australian embassy in Jakarta was meant as a lesson for the Australian government, which participates in the "war against our brothers in Iraq." Other terrorist strikes that were thwarted in Europe, as well as threats made against such countries as Italy, Denmark, and Honduras, were all made against the background of the War in Iraq.

Possible future developments that we should keep in mind are the emergence of other Islamist fronts in Turkey, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. Thus far, there has been limited support for the Global Jihad among Turks, but Turkey is not invulnerable to ideological penetration. The gruesome terrorist attacks in Beslan and against two airplanes in Southern Russia by Chechen terrorists and their Arab supporters were not explicitly linked to the War in Iraq and the new ideology of Global Jihad. Yet, it should be noted that the leading Islamist authority of the Arab volunteers in Chechnya has published several articles in support of the jihad in Iraq, and has attempted to link both

the Chechen and Iraqi struggles together within an overarching, global Islamist framework. Moreover, the increased influence of Wahhabi radical groups in Central Asia should be a paramount concern, and may well add further fuel to the fire.

Madrid: The New Ideology of Global Jihad in Action

The most significant terrorist attack that took place on the background of the War in Iraq was the horrifying bombings in Madrid on March 11, 2004, which resulted in 190 persons killed and over 1400 wounded. For the ideologues and strategists of the Global Jihad, Europe has become one of the most important fronts.

On December 8, 2003, following a deadly attack against the Spanish troops in Iraq in which seven intelligence officers were killed, the jihadi “news agency” Global Islamic Media (GIM) published a more explicit threat, which hinted at the possibility of an attack within Spain. Titled “A Message to the Spanish People,” the message attempted to play on the humanitarian sympathies of the Spanish people, arguing that while the Iraqi people suffered greatly under Saddam’s rule, they continue to suffer under American “liberation” and occupation. Therefore, any country that assists the United States in occupying Iraq was guilty, and should be fought. The message severely attacked the then Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar as a “war criminal.”

The most detailed and explicit statement against Spain’s involvement in Iraq was authored by elements of *Qa`idat al-Jihad*, and appeared in December 2003. The analysis is found in a 50-page booklet, titled *The Iraqi Jihad, Hopes and Risks: An Analysis of the Reality and Visions for the Future, and Actual Steps in the Path of the Blessed Jihad*. The book was published on Islamist websites under the name, “The information institution in support for the Iraqi people—the center of services for the Mujahideen.” The booklet’s introduction presents its argument as a follow-up to a book written in the beginning of 2003 by the above-mentioned Sheikh Yousef al-Ayiri.

About eight pages of *The Iraqi Jihad* are dedicated to Spain. They include a detailed analysis of Spanish politics, including the personal ambitions of then Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar, and of the political struggle between the right and left wing parties in the upcoming parliamentary elections on March 14, 2004. The book attempted to show how the Spanish government could be forced to withdraw its forces from Iraq; how the Spanish government’s support for the United States could be decreased through popular pressures; how to ignite opposition in Italy and Poland to the presence of their troops in Iraq; and how to create pressures within the United

Kingdom against the alliance of their government with the Americans. The book advanced the theory that each of these European governments would withdraw its support of the War in Iraq in a kind of domino effect after an attack on Spain.

The subsequent bombings in Madrid should teach us the lesson that we are dealing with people and groups that mean everything they write or say. Even though they are capable of using deception and disinformation, knowing how each new audiocassette affects Western intelligence services, the West should listen more carefully to their hinted threats and not neglect any piece of writing. The Madrid bombings proved the sophistication of European Islamist groups, the amount of weapons they can obtain, and their access to chemical materials. It is increasingly likely that these groups will attempt to obtain and use weapons of mass destruction.

The Madrid bombings were unique in the framework of jihadi terrorism, and not only because of the written threats that preceded them. The Moroccans that carried out the Madrid attacks were linked to The Moroccan Group for Da`wah and Combat—a sister group of an Algerian faction by a similar name. In the past year, it appears that a common takfiri doctrinal approach has emerged between these radical North African groups and the Iraqi and Saudi Jihad groups. In Iraq and Saudi Arabia, the adoption of these takfiri doctrines has led to a violent and non-compromising Islamist fight against government and elements of civil society. The ability of the new jihad ideologists to recruit among takfiri Moroccan networks in Europe, using the Iraqi issue, should be of central concern for Western policymakers dealing not only with Iraq, but also with homeland security.

Muslim Resistance to the Global Jihad

The answer to the new ideology of Global Jihad that has emerged from the War in Iraq lies primarily within the Muslim world itself. The process of radicalization creates a larger distinction between, on the one hand, the radical Islamists, and on the other, those Islamic doctrines and trends that do not advocate the violent radical jihadi line. Though this larger process has now only begun, it might as it unfolds produce a moderate Islamic answer to the problem of radicalism.

The United States and its Western allies should pay more attention to these moderate Islamic elements and seek to promote them, either in their own countries, or through their policy vis-à-vis the Muslim world. The role that ideology plays in radical and terrorist groups is immense, and must not be neglected by the West. Ultimately, however, curtailing this phenomenon

must come from within the Arab and Muslim world. The final answer to Islamist radicalism will come not through democracy simply, for this could probably, as it has in the past, lead to Islamist states, as occurred in 1989 in Algeria. Rather, the answer will come from moderate Muslim elements who challenge these radical phenomena from within the Muslim world.

Dr. Sa'd Bin Tefla, a journalist and the former Minister of Information in Kuwait, recently wrote an excellent article in which he posed the question: "Where are the Fatwas Against bin Laden?" In his article he compared the lack of a fatwa against bin Laden to the fatwa that called for the killing of Salman Rushdie. He concluded his article by saying:

But let us put aside the [subject of the] fatwa. Have any protests been held condemning bin Laden's actions in any of the Islamic capital cities? Perhaps there were some that demonstrated in his favor. The [Muslim] satellite stations competed amongst themselves in broadcasting his sermons and fatwas, instead of preventing their dissemination as they did in the case of Rushdie's book. Have we earmarked a reward for anyone who kills bin Laden as we did for anyone who kills Rushdie on account of his book? With our equivocal stance on bin Laden we from the very start left the world with the impression that we are all bin Laden.

Only when such self-critical voices are heard more often in the Arab world will the problem of radical Islamism and terrorism be seriously confronted. Until then, the insurgency in Iraq will continue to serve the Islamists, who unfortunately benefit from increasing support from Arab Muslim youngsters who are attracted to the apocalyptic nature of the radical Islamist discourse that preaches Global Jihad.

NOTES

¹ See <http://www.qaradawi.net>, translated by MEMRI, special dispatch series No. 858, February 4, 2005.

² See for example, "Koranic duels ease terror" by James Brandon, *Christian Science Monitor*, February 4, 2005.

The Penetration of Islamist Ideology in Britain

MICHAEL WHINE

PUBLIC ISLAMIST ACTIVITY IN BRITAIN can be dated to the publication of Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* in January, 1989. Its appearance was marked by public burnings of the book and wide demonstrations in Britain's northern urban centers, starting in Bradford, a city to which large numbers of Pakistanis had migrated during the 1960s to man the cotton industry located there. Muslim community leaders subsequently sought a religious ruling on the book from Ayatollah Khomeini, and his fatwa, issued one month later, led to death threats against Rushdie that contributed to severely strained diplomatic relations between the European Union and Iran.

The effect of this episode on the British Muslim community was profound. Up until that point, British Muslims had largely been politically and religiously quiescent. But the common outrage toward what was perceived as an attack on Islam led over the course of the following months to the establishment of several Muslim advocacy groups. Out of these emerged the U.K. Action Committee on Islamic Affairs and several prominent leaders, some of whom went on to establish the Muslim Council of Britain, which is today regarded as the U.K.'s primary Muslim representative body.

Following the Rushdie Affair, foreign countries and organizations increased their investment in the British Muslim community, aiming to capitalize on new opportunities for Muslim political and communal organization, as well as to provide new financial support for religious services and mosques. As a result, new ideological influences from abroad began to have significant impact on the political and religious life of the British Muslim community.

British Islam

To analyze the nature and extent of Islamist ideological penetration in Britain, it is important to understand the demographic features of British Islam. Britain did not measure religion until the 2001 Census, and even then one's religious affiliation was only a voluntary question. Britain did

however measure migrants' countries of origin and from these figures it is thought that the 1991 Muslim population was around 1.25 million. The 2001 Census indicated that 1.6 million people in England and Wales and just over 42,000 in Scotland identified themselves as Muslim. The voluntary nature of the question is likely to have led to a low figure and it is now thought that there are around 2 million.

The sudden rise in Muslim migration to Britain in the 1960s was caused by the prospect of legislation that would restrict entry. The Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962 was a response to growing concern over large-scale immigration. The fear that Britain would close its doors resulted in a massive increase in immigration, and especially from the Indian subcontinent. Over two-thirds of Britain's estimated two million Muslims are from the Indian subcontinent. Importantly, the settlers came only from a limited number of areas: Indian Muslims primarily from Gujarat; Pakistanis from the Mirpur district of southern Kashmir and the Cambellpur district of northeast Punjab; and Bangladeshis from Sylhet and Chittagong.

Successive waves of migrants have come from Pakistan, India, and Bangladesh after the Pakistani invasion of East Bengal. Other smaller waves of Indian subcontinent nationals came as refugees in the 1970s from Uganda and Kenya. Political disruption in East Africa in turn led to yet another wave of migrants from Somalia in the 1980s and 1990s, and again from North Africa, fleeing political tensions in the 1990s.¹

Britain's Arab communities are small and often transient, composed of students and businessmen who temporarily locate to Britain during the summer to escape the intense heat of the Middle East. However, the Lebanese civil war and political turmoil in some Arab states has led to the relocation of many Arab media outlets to London, which now serves as a major Arab-language news publishing center.

Another discreet group of Muslim migrants were the Turkish Cypriots, who fled the civil war in Cyprus in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Finally, a small number of Muslims fleeing civil war in the former Yugoslavia came to Britain in the late 1990s.

The nature of Muslim migration, with young men coming to work and then women joining them later, has ensured that the Muslim population is both more youthful and growing faster than the norm. The 2001 Census showed that almost 55% of Pakistanis and over 46% of Bangladeshis were born in the U.K. Overall, the Muslim population is among the youngest in the country, with one-third aged 50 and under, and a further 20% aged between 16 and 24.

Settlement has been geographically uneven: almost half live in the London area and the West Midlands. Yorkshire and the greater Manchester area account for almost two-thirds of the rest. Within the West Midlands, three-quarters live in the greater Birmingham area. Turkish Cypriot Muslims live almost exclusively in northeast and east London, where more than half the Bangladeshis are also concentrated. The Arab community also lives almost exclusively in the London area.

Conversion to Islam in Britain is almost negligible in comparison with other countries. One commentator suggests 10,000 persons as the upper limit with the majority of these coming from the Afro-Caribbean community.²

Save for the established Church of England, there is no legal framework for religious communities. The other traditional Christian communities and the Jewish community are recognized in law and have historical privileges but the status of legal recognition common in continental Europe does not exist in Britain. Technically therefore, a religious community can establish itself without any form of registration or legal recognition. If however it desires a not-for-profit status it must register as a charity, which provides tax exemption and reduced local property taxation. As a consequence, virtually all mosques and Muslim organizations in Britain are registered charities and this provides a measure of their growth. In 1963, 13 mosques were registered in Britain; from 1966 they began to register at an annual rate of nearly 7; this increased to 18 from the mid-1970s. The last published list, for 1999, gives a total of 584 mosques in England and Wales.

Foreign Influences

Among the most active foreign ideological influences on British Islam is the Jamaat-e-Islami, the main Islamist opposition movement in Pakistan. In 1963 it established the U.K. Islamic Mission, in 1990 the Islamic Foundation in Leicester, and in 2000 the Markfield Institute as a seat of higher learning. These institutions have provided the basis for one of the ideological streams that have now emerged in British Islam. A second stream of Islamist ideology now in Britain originates within the Ikhwan al Islami or Muslim Brotherhood founded by Hasan Al Banna in 1928 in Egypt. In alliance with the Jamaat-e-Islami, the Muslim Brotherhood now provides a major influence on the Muslim community.

These streams of Islamist ideology have deeply penetrated the traditionalist and heretofore moderate Muslim communities of Britain, and are expressed in recruitment and fundraising activities for foreign Islamist projects. The major traditions within Britain's Muslim communities are the Deobandi and Barelwi, which both originated in the Indian subcontinent.

The revivalist Tablighi Jimaat, which originated in India in 1927, serves both communities. The Ahl-I-Hadith also spans the Indian and Pakistani communities and propagates a policy of separation from non-Muslim society.

The Pakistani invasion of East Bengal exacerbated tensions between Britain's two main Muslim communities, and in 1976 the Bangladeshi community established the Da'watul-Islam which, like the (Pakistani-centered) U.K. Islamic Mission, provides teaching facilities within state schools and links mosques. These two organizations exercise the most influence within British Islam at a religious level and are traditional rather than political or Islamist.

The Saudi-funded, and therefore Wahhabi-influenced, Muslim World League was also established in London during the 1970s and although its influence has grown since, it is still limited. The Muslim World League assisted in the establishment of the Council of Mosques U.K. and Eire in 1984, and Egyptian influence is reflected in the Council of Imams and Mosques, likewise established in 1984.

Arab Muslim influences are seen most strongly among a range of overlapping organizations. The Federation of Student Islamic Societies (FOSIS) has a close association with the Muslim Brotherhood, and tends to be active among foreign national Arab students studying in Britain. Its penetration within British Muslim student circles has waxed and waned over the years, but its members have been active at recent National Union of Students annual conferences.

The Muslim Institute was established during the 1980s and reflected Iranian influence. It was out of this Institute that the Muslim Parliament, under the leadership of the late Kalim Siddiqui, grew. This more than any other entity represented Iranian interests in Britain. Although it gave the appearance of a democratically elected body, it was no such thing. Its leadership was bedeviled by accusations of financial impropriety, and in the end it ceased to function after Siddiqui died while on a visit to South Africa. Although it achieved considerable publicity and some notoriety it nevertheless failed to make much of an impression on the British Muslim community.

Sufi tradition is also strongly represented in Britain, and is seen as antipathetic to the Islamist groups. Sufism is particularly strong in the Indian sub-continent and therefore has been one of the important countervailing forces against Arab, and particularly Saudi, influences.

Islamist Campaigning Issues

A range of issues has confronted the British Muslim community since large-scale migration began in the 1960s. Some of these are national and internal and concern the nature, practices and development of the commu-

nity; others concern Muslims abroad. Initially, among the early migrant communities, there was severe strife between the Bangladeshi community and the Pakistani community, which in some senses could be described as running counter to the present-day Islamist ethos of the unity of Islam. Thereafter, Kashmir, which has also been regarded as an India-Pakistan territorial issue, as well as a Muslim-Hindu religious one, has provided a major platform for Islamist campaigning that has worked to unify the nationally and ethnically disparate Muslim communities of Britain. Since many of the migrants come from the northwest provinces of India which abut the southeastern provinces of Pakistan, the situation in Kashmir provides a focus for campaigning along sectarian lines. Indeed, Britain has become a center for fundraising for Kashmiri Islamist groups.

The foreign jihadi-centered campaigns in Afghanistan, Bosnia, and Chechnya have also provided a focus for Islamist recruitment in Britain and indeed it is around these issues that the most visible and highly publicized campaigning has been centered. Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Iraq have also provided the focus for Islamist campaigning and recruitment and are among those which have provided the most media coverage. Palestine provides another focal point for political agitation in Britain and although much of this campaigning has been by and on behalf of Palestinian secular groups, the Palestinian Islamist groups have a growing presence, which is evident through growing fundraising, propaganda activity and political agitation.

While foreign policy issues have attracted the most media attention, they are not necessarily the most important ones facilitating Islamist penetration. The most important of the internal issues concerns the nature of education for children within the Muslim community. This has assumed a paramount importance given that it is a comparatively youthful community.

Before the twentieth century the majority of Britain's schools were Church-funded, and taught Christianity as a core value. Post-Second World War developments led to a national educational system which was multi-cultural, non-denominational and taught appreciation of all religions, but from a generally secular standpoint. Secondary schools, the majority of which were single-sex, also became co-educational.

These trends clashed with the views of traditionalist Muslim parents who wanted Islam taught within the school system, rather than as an after school add-on. Their growing political influence, particularly in northern cities, led to increasing demands for state provision of religious education. The private Muslim schools that had been established were seen as underperforming in comparison to state schools, and this gave added impetus to these demands.

Through the 1980s and 1990s Muslim educationalists campaigned for state funding for Muslim schools and this goal was only achieved when the Islamia Schools achieved this status. These schools were founded by Yusuf Islam, the former pop singer Cat Stevens, and have become noteworthy in recent years for the high academic achievements of their pupils.

An interesting by-product of this campaign has been that increasing numbers of Muslim parents send their children to the Jewish King David Schools in Birmingham and Liverpool, which had falling rolls as those cities' Jewish communities declined.

However, separate education for Muslim children has now given rise to growing concern over Muslim separatism, a development that is encouraged by various Islamist ideological forces. As Britain enters the twenty-first century there are important voices calling for the return of a system which teaches British civic core-values. These include Trevor Philips, the chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, the government agency dedicated to improving race relations, but due shortly to expand its remit to become the unitary human rights agency.

A linked issue concerning Muslim separatism is the recent demand by Muslim parents for their daughters to wear the *hijab* at school. Unlike France or Germany, where secularism is state policy, this has not previously been much of an issue in the U.K. However, a Muslim pupil lost her case to wear the full-length jilbab when she took it to the High Court in July 2004. Moreover, the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, which has Britain's largest concentration of Muslims, has recently ordered an exclusion policy in its schools for girls seeking to wear the *jilbab*.

A second major campaigning issue has been that of religious discrimination. The race relations legislation of 1964 and 1976 outlawed discrimination on racial grounds, and the Public Order Act of 1986 allowed for the prosecution of incitement to racial hatred. An Appeal Court case (*Mandla v. Dowell-Lee*, 1983) recognized that the Sikh and Jewish communities were to be regarded as racial groups, and therefore were protected by this legislation. However, Muslims, Hindus and others were unprotected by primary legislation, although cases settled by the courts had afforded them a measure of protection. The Muslim community has spearheaded demands for primary legislation that would ban discrimination on religious grounds as well as incitement. The current Labour government has sought to enact such legislation but failed, initially, to do so on the back of the anti-terrorism legislation in 2001. The government, however, has recognized the imbalance in its anti-discrimination policies and has reintroduced legislation, again within the framework of new police powers.

Islamist Influences

It is among the most overtly political organizations that one sees Islamist influences most clearly, for obvious reasons. Hizb ut-Tahrir (Islamic Liberation Party—HT), established in Britain around 1990, was the first of the groups to publicly adopt a confrontational and anti-Western perspective. Sheikh Taqi Uddin Al Nabahani, a Shariah court judge from what was then East Jerusalem, founded HT in the 1950s. He had been a devotee of Said Qutb, the post-war Muslim Brotherhood leader, and of the late Haj Amin al Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem. The founder of HT in Britain was Omar Bakri Mohammed, a Syrian émigré and former Muslim Brotherhood member who had fled his native Syria. In Britain, Bakri Mohammed tirelessly preached and recruited members in the manner of the Brotherhood by establishing small discussion groups under the leadership of an experienced member. HT originated in the colleges of London University, primarily at Imperial College and Queen Mary College, and fairly rapidly gained notoriety for its anti-Jewish, anti-Hindu, anti-Sikh and homophobic views.

The group's confrontational style and Bakri Mohammed's self-seeking publicity stunts rapidly led to the group being banned by the National Union of Students and by several universities. In 1996, Bakri Mohammed was removed from office by the Middle East-based HT leadership, who appeared to have preferred the traditional, rather more covert approach adopted in Arab societies. In turn, Bakri Mohammed founded Al-Muhajiroun (The Emigrants—AM). In establishing AM, Bakri Mohammed teamed up with Mohammed Al Mas'ari, a Saudi exile who had been a co-founder of the Committee for Defence of Legitimate Rights, a Saudi Islamist opposition group, and the translator into English of Osama bin Laden's first declaration of war against the United States. A year before, Mas'ari had been the subject of an extradition attempt by the government, which failed to get him deported from Britain.

The ideology of AM differs little from that of HT. The ideology of both groups is extremely anti-Semitic, anti-Western, and separatist; and both focus on recruiting students and young people. Bakri Mohammed has, however, failed to move beyond a small group of devotees partly because the ideology of recreating the Caliphate has little appeal for British Muslims. However, AM has managed to radicalize numbers of disaffected Muslim youth who have gone on to jihadi terrorism in Afghanistan, Pakistan and elsewhere. The suicide bombers of the Mike's Place Bar in Tel Aviv in 2002 are known to have attended both HT and AM meetings in Britain, although the extent of their involvement with the groups is unlikely now to be revealed. Omar Ahmed

Shaikh, the British Muslim behind the murder of Daniel Pearl, is also thought to have been radicalized by HT before embarking on a humanitarian mission to Bosnia, from where he went on to Afghanistan and ultimately Pakistan.

In recent years, however, HT has reverted to traditional modes of activity by recruiting in a quieter manner. It has also changed its target audience to middle-class professionals and its current promotional literature and the nature of its meetings reflect this clearly. However, HT members in other countries almost certainly have a close involvement with terrorism, particularly in the central Asian republics of the former Soviet Union.

Iranian influences are now most clearly reflected in the Islamic Human Rights Commission led by Massoud Shadjareh, whose high profile campaigning on a range of issues has achieved much publicity. Again, this organization has failed to grow beyond the small founding group, despite its attractive title. Among its public activities is the organization of the annual Quds Day Parade in London, initiated internationally by the late Ayatollah Khomeini to mark Muslim claims on Al Quds (Jerusalem).

In opposition to AM and HT stands the Muslim Public Affairs Committee (MPAC), a small group with a more public profile than its actual size would warrant. Like AM and HT, MPAC promotes anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial. But unlike them, MPAC campaigns for inclusion within the general political process, rather than separation from it. Its most active campaigns are focused on attacking Members of Parliament who they deem to be pro-Israel and/or anti-Muslim.

The emerging dominant Islamist ideological influence in Britain now is that of the Muslim Brotherhood, through the Muslim Association of Britain (MAB). Although founded and led by former Hamas and Brotherhood leaders from Jordan, Egypt and Iraq, it promotes itself as a mainstream body.

MAB's involvement with anti-Iraq war campaigning, defense of the right to wear the hijab, Palestine, and its close association with the revolutionary leftist Respect political party founded by former Labour MP George Galloway, provide it with opportunities to influence discourse within the Muslim community, particularly among the young. It has used this influence to exert a malign influence on what had been growing Muslim-Jewish contacts in Britain prior to 9/11.

Looking forward, it seems likely that Islamist ideological influences will grow as a consequence of, and a reaction to, growing anti-Muslim sympathies within the population as a whole. The violence that followed the Islamist murder of Theo Van Gogh in Holland and a reaction to Muslim demands for separatism on the one hand, and campaigns for greater inclusion on the

other, has worried governments of those countries with large Muslim minorities. Similar concerns are also growing in Britain. While Britain has always pursued inclusionary social policies and is now doing much to ensure that legislation provides equal protection to all religious minorities, there are additional factors which may mitigate these moves and further alienate the Muslim community.

Political scientist Shamit Saggarr recently noted that there were three factors causing isolation and potential radicalism amongst British Muslims. First, the Muslim communities are characterized by patterns of social and economic exclusion; earnings are lower among Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities, and their children achieve less in school. Second, these communities experience high levels of social isolation, particularly in the northern industrial towns. These contribute to an inward-looking posture that is reluctant to promote interaction with the outside community. Third, British Muslims have begun to embrace the ideology of victimhood, and a clear oppositional culture can be discerned.

Professor Saggarr notes that there is a lack of certainty about which levers can be pulled to counter these trends, and with what results. The government has backed initiatives to increase the training of British-born Imams, thereby promoting a home-grown version of Islam, but he notes that there is no evidence that younger religious leaders are likely to be less influenced by radical ideology than their older foreign-born peers. One option employed by the government has been to pressure Muslim leaders, and particularly the Muslim Council of Britain, to write to individual mosques reminding them of their responsibility to counter the teaching of violence or violent conspiracy. He suggests that centrally-directed efforts should lead to reducing intolerance and that combined with tackling the three sets of obstacles to achievement, should provide the pragmatic answer to dealing with a potential “clash of civilizations” in Britain.³

NOTES

¹ Philip Lewis, *Islamic Britain*, London: I.B. Tauris, 1994, p. 14.

² Jorgen Nielsen, *Muslims in Western Europe*, The New Edinburgh Islamic Surveys, Edinburgh University Press, 2003, p. 44.

³ Shamit Saggarr, “Left Outside”, *The Guardian*, November 9, 2004.

Al Qaeda's Ideology

ROHAN GUNARATNA

Unlike other terrorist groups, Al Qaeda presents an unprecedented threat to America, its allies, and to global security in general. In addition to training its own members—(4000 was the October 2001 estimate, according to the Western intelligence community)—Al Qaeda and the Taliban regime trained 70,000 members in its camps in Afghanistan. While Al Qaeda conducted one major attack every year prior to 9/11, Al Qaeda and its associated groups have conducted one attack every three months since 9/11. Although it is the most hunted terrorist group in history, the campaign of holy war unleashed by Al Qaeda is likely to outlive the group itself and the current generation of Islamists.

This is because Al Qaeda's real strength lies not in its global infrastructure and membership *per se* but in its overarching and highly appealing ideology. In keeping with its original mandate, Al Qaeda's principal aim today is to inspire and incite Islamist movements and the Muslim masses worldwide to attack those perceived to be the enemies of Islam. Although the majority of Muslims worldwide do not support Al Qaeda, Al Qaeda is constantly seeking to reinvigorate the global jihad movement by exploiting the widespread suffering, resentment, and anger in the Muslim world and turning it against the United States and its allies. Considering the sympathy and new recruits it has gathered from Islamist groups in Asia, Africa, Middle East, and elsewhere, the ideological campaign unleashed by Al Qaeda has been a partial success.

Although bin Laden and his associates have been scattered, arrested and killed, the organization has survived and the ideology is intact. With the diffusion of Al Qaeda's ideology around the globe, especially after 9/11, the threat it poses has moved beyond the group and individual figures like bin Laden. Israeli intelligence services now prefer to describe Al Qaeda as the "Jihadi International" and the British Special Branch refers to Al Qaeda and its associated groups as "international terrorism."¹ Al Qaeda's radical ideology—sustained internationally by anti-Western and anti-Semitic rhetoric—has adherents

among many individuals and groups, few of whom are currently linked in any substantial way to bin Laden or those around him. They merely follow his precepts, models and methods, acting in the style of Al Qaeda. Therefore, the Al Qaeda ideology, and how it impacts Islamist terrorism's strategies and tactics, must be thoroughly studied and understood. An effective strategy to weaken and destroy the group will have to focus on its ideology.

The Afghan Crucible

Osama bin Laden (alias Osama Mohammad al Wahad, or Abu Abdallah, or Al Aaqa) was born in 1957. Attending university in Saudi Arabia, bin Laden became deeply influenced by Wahhabi religious teachings, and later assisted the Islamist movement against the communists in Yemen. After the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in December 1979, he arrived in Pakistan and subsequently in Afghanistan to assist the Afghan groups in their campaign against the Soviets. In 1984, Dr Abdullah Azzam, a Palestinian Jordanian, who also came to oppose the Soviet occupation in Afghanistan, founded the Maktab al Khidmat lil Mujahideen al-Arab (MAK), known commonly as the Afghan Service Bureau. MAK provided significant assistance to the Arab mujahideen and to their families. Bin Laden joined with Azzam, who became his mentor. At the height of the foreign Arab and Muslim influx into Pakistan and Afghanistan from 1984-1986, bin Laden spent time traveling widely and raising funds in the Arab world. As Azzam recruited several thousands of Arab and Muslim youths to fight the Soviet presence, bin Laden channeled several millions of dollars and other material resources into the Afghan jihad.

MAK operated independently of the Western and Pakistani governments that assisted in the fight. MAK rarely interacted with the Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) of Pakistan or with the Egyptian government, but it tapped into the vast Muslim Brotherhood network and into the resources of the Saudi government.² Both the fighting and relief efforts were assisted by two banks—Dar al Mal al Islami, founded by Prince Mohammad Faisal in 1981 and Dalla al Baraka, established by King Fahd's brother-in-law in 1982. The banks channeled funds to Afghanistan through 20 NGOs, the most famous of which was the International Islamic Relief Organisation (IIRO). Both IIRO and the Islamic Relief Agency functioned under the umbrella of the World Islamic League, led by Mufti Abdul Aziz bin Baz.

Shortly before the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan, Azzam and bin Laden decided to form a new vanguard group—*Al Qaeda Al-Sulbah* (The Solid Base). This concept is commonly attributed to the Egyptian theorist Said Qutb. He envisaged a revolutionary Muslim vanguard that would over-

turn un-Islamic regimes in the Middle East and establish Islamic rule. The concept draws on the stories told about the early Muslim generation who received education and guidance from the Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) in the house of Arqam Bin Abi Arqam. They were companions of the Prophet Muhammad whose devotions and commitments to the Islamic struggle against Arab pagans during their time were unparalleled by later generations. It was precisely because of their success as well as the testimony of their excellence by the Prophet that they were revered. For Al Qaeda, they became a source of inspiration and model for Muslims to emulate.

When Azzam formulated the founding charter of Al Qaeda (probably in 1987 and in early 1988), he envisaged Al Qaeda as an organization that would channel the energies of the Afghan mujahideen into fighting on behalf of oppressed Muslims worldwide—an Islamic “rapid reaction force” ready to spring to the defense of their fellow believers and to advance the principles of Islam on short notice. In April 1988, Azzam described his original concept of Al Qaeda thus:

Every principle needs a vanguard to carry it forward and, while focusing its way into society, puts up with heavy tasks and enormous sacrifices. There is no ideology, neither earthly nor heavenly, that does not require such a vanguard that gives everything it possesses in order to achieve victory for this ideology. It carries the flag all along the sheer, endless and difficult path until it reaches its destination in the reality of life, since Allah has destined that it should make it and manifests itself. Al-Qa'idah al-Sulbah constitutes this vanguard for the expected society.³

When conceiving of Al Qaeda, a principal concern of Azzam was the future of the Islamist movement after its victory over the Soviet military. While the concept of Al Qaeda was transformed to meet the changing geopolitical landscapes, Azzam did not originally intend it to be a global terrorist organization.⁴ He was, according to many analysts, a firm believer that “the end does not justify the means.” During the Afghan-Soviet War, for example, Azzam rejected a proposal by MAK's Egyptian members to utilize jihadi funds to train the mujahideen in terrorist techniques and tactics. He went so far as to issue a fatwa ruling this a violation of Islamic law. Azzam was against the killing of non-combatants and would never endorse Al Qaeda's current spate of terrorist tactics.⁵ In his view, jihad was invoked as a religious obligation in defense of Islam and Muslims against a defined enemy, and not a speculative one.

Though Azzam was the ideological father of Al Qaeda, bin Laden gradually assumed leadership of the group.⁶ Toward the end of the anti-Soviet

Afghan campaign, however, bin Laden's relationship with Azzam deteriorated. The dispute over Azzam's support for Ahmad Shah Massoud, who later became the leader of the Northern Alliance, caused tension. Bin Laden preferred Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, former Prime Minister and leader of the Islamic Party (Hizb-i-Islami), who was both anti-communist and anti-western. Furthermore, together with the Egyptian members of Al Qaeda, bin Laden wished to support terrorist action against Egypt and other Muslim secular regimes. Having lived in Egypt, Azzam knew the price of such actions and opposed it vehemently. Azzam and bin Laden went their separate ways. Later, Azzam was assassinated by the Egyptian members of Al Qaeda in Peshawar, Pakistan.

After the Afghan victory, bin Laden was lionized in the eyes of those who fought with him in the war as a brave warrior and selfless Muslim ruler.

He not only gave us his money, but he also gave himself. He came down from his palace to live with the Afghan peasants and the Arab fighters. He cooked with them, ate with them, dug trenches with them. This is bin Laden's way. His credentials include fighting in the famous battles of the whole Afghan war. In these battles the mujahideen came out victorious convincing them how the Soviet's huge military machine could be defeated by unconventional methods.

Bin Laden's followers personally believe that it was the actions of the mujahideen, primarily supported by the Muslim world, that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the ending of the Cold War. They also believe that the U.S. had achieved its goal of becoming the sole global superpower through what bin Laden and his fellow mujahideen had achieved in Afghanistan. Bin Laden later justified his actions by stating that MAK and its Islamist allies were being persecuted by "an ungrateful U.S." who had also taken credit for the defeat of the Soviets. Al Qaeda ideologues often interpret the Afghan victory as the will of men—the Infidel armies—being single handedly defeated by the Will of God. The internalization of the victory brought about a belief in the power of armed jihad—a belief that their efforts had received divine legitimacy and that their future path was guided by God.

Al Qaeda's Worldview

Following Azzam's assassination, the ideological vacuum in Al Qaeda was filled by Dr. Ayman al-Zawahiri. A well-known hardliner, Zawahiri became the principal strategist of the jihad movement, transforming bin Laden and Al Qaeda significantly. Before joining Al Qaeda, Zawahiri was already a

practical terrorist, the mastermind of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad, one of the most deadly organizations in the Middle East. His experience fighting against the “iron-fist” government policies of Egypt had made him battle-hardened to the core. He was compelled to continue the Islamic struggle across the world at all cost.⁷

Under Zawahiri's leadership, the new ideology of Al Qaeda became marked by a willingness to carry out armed struggle against all who they perceived to be the enemies of Islam. This new ideology of jihadism is conventionally traced to the work of two modern Sunni Islamic thinkers: Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab and Said Qutb. Wahhab, the eighteenth-century reformer, claimed that Islam had been corrupted a generation or so after the death of the Prophet Mohammad. He denounced all theology and customs that developed after that period as “un-Islamic,” and in doing so, tried to reject more than 1,000 years of religious scholarship. He and his supporters took over what is now Saudi Arabia, where today, Wahhabism remains the dominant school of religious thought. Qutb was an Egyptian ideologue of the mid-twentieth century. Following his experience traveling in the United States, he declared Western civilization an enemy of Islam, and denounced leaders of Muslim nations as “apostates” for not following the tenets of Islam closely enough. He preached that “defensive jihad” should be undertaken not just to defend Islam, but also to purify Islam of all un-Islamic belief.

In Al Qaeda's view, the U.S. and Israel were the leaders of a global conspiracy against Islam and the Muslim Nation. Al Qaeda was especially incensed by America's military, political, and economic presence in the Arabian Peninsula, especially in Saudi Arabia; U.S. support for the state of Israel; U.S. assistance to pro-Western dictatorships around the Middle East; and since the first Intifada in 1987, the neglected future of the Palestinians. Such perceptions generated support for Al Qaeda's new mission, propelling it forward and helping to transform it into its present state.

With his infamous 1988 fatwa declaring war on Infidels and Muslim apostates, bin Laden underlined his resentment towards the U.S and the “alliance of Jews, Christians, and their agents.”⁸ Though he did not possess Islamic religious credentials or authority, bin Laden said the U.S. had made “a clear declaration of war on God, His messenger, and Muslims” through its policies in the Islamic world.⁹

Although the U.S. troops established a presence in Saudi Arabia at the invitation of the Saudi royal family, bin Laden justified and framed his fatwa with a renewed commitment to “defensive jihad.” Bin Laden publicly criticized the Saudi royal family and alleged that their invitation of foreign troops

to the Arabian Peninsula constituted an affront to the sanctity of the birthplace of Islam and a betrayal to the global Islamic community.¹⁰ Bin Laden advocated violence against the Saudi government and the United States—the “near enemy” and the “far enemy.”

Al Qaeda began a massive ideological campaign to rally support for the cause of jihad against Islam’s enemies. The arguments articulated in support of their ideology provide momentum for it to travel far and wide. Theologically, they legitimize their struggle against fellow Muslims as a struggle between “true Islam” or “pure Islam” and heresy. The former can only be implemented if a true Islamic society and the rule of Shariah can be established. Of course, to achieve this end, Islam will need a militant Islamic movement to provide leadership and spiritual guidance, and to check the threat posed by the global conspiracy that is trying to eradicate Islam by spreading godless and atheistic views among the Muslim masses.¹¹

To appeal to the grievances shared by many in the Arab Muslim world, Al Qaeda began couching its agenda in the “Third Worldist” terms familiar to any contemporary anti-globalization activist. Though presented in divine and religious terms, their jihad was in the service of social justice. Jihad in the name of God, they proclaimed, was the means to rid the Muslim Nation of injustice and to attain freedom. It was also a way to avenge and to punish those who inflicted punishment upon the ummah.¹²

Al Qaeda employed several practices to reinforce its struggle. The *bai'ah*, or the pledge of allegiance, serves as an assurance that those affiliating themselves with the jihad will remain committed to the organization’s ideology. By instituting it, Al Qaeda has generally been able to buffer itself against internal differences and the organizational divisions that they lead to. Through it, a level of uniformity is maintained that has contributed to the organization’s stability and ease of management and administration.

Al Qaeda has also firmly intertwined its jihadi ideology with the theology of martyrdom. Al Qaeda operatives firmly believe that Allah guides and rewards those who sacrifice themselves for a noble and holy cause. Looking into the 9/11 hijackers psyche before the suicide attack revealed that they were willing to sacrifice their lives without hesitation. None of them had second thoughts; they viewed their acts as a sacrifice necessary to achieve the goal of establishing the religion of majestic Allah on earth. Their struggle yields either one of two things—victory or martyrdom.

What actually motivates Al Qaeda is not power, wealth or fame, but rather the ideological belief in the purification of Islam through violent struggle.¹³ When the many mujahideen factions joined together to face the Soviets, a

common enemy, they put aside their differences. The Afghan Jihad showed that Muslims could, regardless of their individual affluence, education, or nationality, pursue a common objective and fight side by side in defense of Islam and Muslims everywhere. After the mujahideen repelled the Soviets, the Al Qaeda ideology required them to target a new enemy, and sought to mobilize them on new battlefields in defense of the Muslim Nation—especially against the U.S. The battle concept became total war, to be waged on many fronts, “by pen and gun, by word and bullet, by tongue and teeth.”¹⁴

The Driving Force

Momentous events such as the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979, the defeat of the Soviet Army in Afghanistan, the collapse of communism, the breakup of the Soviet Union, and the end of the Cold War precipitated the creation of over one hundred contemporary Islamist movements in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, the Caucasus, and the Balkans. Since 9/11, the U.S.-led intervention in Afghanistan has scattered Al Qaeda's members across the globe. Though Al Qaeda's command and control and organizational infrastructure has been dealt some heavy blows, its ideology has inspired and incited the formation of new terrorist groups, bringing many of them, both old and new, into the service of the global jihad.

Three years after 9/11, the West has had very limited success containing and rolling back the Al Qaeda ideology as it spreads across the world. Al Qaeda remains a capable organization, frequently packing surprises. Support for Al Qaeda is often spawned and sustained in regional conflict zones. To reduce the appeal of Al Qaeda ideology, it is essential that the international community develop the capability and structures to end regional conflicts through political negotiation. Regional conflict zones—Palestine, Chechnya, Kashmir, Mindanao (Philippines), Maluku (Indonesia), Poso (Indonesia), Algeria, Afghanistan, and Iraq—are the biggest producers of human rights violations, internal displacement, refugee flows and terrorists. International neglect of such conflicts, thinking that the warring parties will fight among each other and exhaust themselves, has proven to be misguided.

The key to strategically defeating the new international terrorism is to counter the extremist ideology that triggers, drives, and justifies it. Because one of the methods by which terrorist ideologues recruit members is the subversion of madrasahs, it is necessary to institute measures preventing the spread of extremism through the educational institutions. Similarly, it is important for governments to work with media outlets—especially on television and the Internet—to present alternatives to the rhetoric and false ideas that

inflame political extremism and make the Al Qaeda ideology so appealing. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, moderate Muslims must expose the deviant teachings of Al Qaeda and its associated groups, and assume responsibility for the future direction of Islam and their political communities.

Defeating Al Qaeda requires unconventional methods. Only by using military force in conjunction with a concerted effort to offer an ideological alternative to extremism can a wedge be driven between actual terrorists and potential terrorists and supporters. It is essential that the counter-terrorism community understand that without marrying hard power with soft power, the Al Qaeda-led jihad movement will not be defeated.

NOTES

¹ See for example, Jason Burke, "Think Again: Al Qaeda," *Foreign Policy* (May/June 2004), p. 1. Available: <http://www.foreignpolicy.com> (October 11, 2004). And also, interview, Keith Weston, Director, Police International Counter Terrorism Unit, Thames House, London, November 2004.

² "Al-Qaeda," *Jane's World Insurgency and Terrorism*, January 9, 2004, p. 1. Available: <http://jtic.janes.com>.

³ Abdullah Azzam, "Al-Qa'idah al-Sulbah," *Al-Jihad*, 41, April 1988, p. 46. The original text in Arabic was translated into English by Reuven Paz, Academic Director, International Policy Institute for Counter Terrorism, Israel.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵ Abdullah Azzam, *Iklan al-Jihad* (Peshawar: Maktab Khidmat al-Mujahideen), pp. 95–131.

⁶ Rohan Gunaratna, *Inside Al Qaeda Global Network of Terror* (London: Hurst & Company, 2002), p. 2.

⁷ See published extracts from Ayman al-Zawahiri's book, *Knights Under the Prophet's Banner*. Al-Sharq al-Awsat, December 2, 2001, London.

⁸ "Declaration of Jihad Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Mosques," *Al-Islah* (London), September 2, 1996.

⁹ "Text of Fatwa Urging Jihad Against Americans," *Al Quds Al Arabi* (London), Feb. 23, 1998. The fatwa argued that defensive jihad was necessary "in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque (Jerusalem) and the holy mosque (Mecca) from their grip (the U.S. and Israel).

¹⁰ Robert Fisk, "Interview With Saudi Dissident Bin Ladin," *Independent* (London), July 10, 1996.

¹¹ "Al-Qa'idah al-Sulbah." Translated by Reuven Paz from *Al-Jihad*; No. 41, April 1988, p. 46.

¹² Translation of Osama bin Laden videotape, Al Jazeera TV, October 30, 2004.

¹³ Bouchaib Silm, "Osama and Azzarqawi: Rivals or Allies," *IDSS Commentaries*, 55/2004, p. 2. The trap to be avoided by Western scholars is the common assumption that Al Qaeda and other

jihad groups are driven by publicity in pursuit of their broader goal.

¹⁴ Al Qaeda Training manual recovered by the British Police in Manchester, n.d. n.p. p. 2. See also Gunaratna, p. 21.

The Ideology of Al-Jama'ah Al-Islamiya

ROHAN GUNARATNA

IDEOLOGY—NOT POVERTY OR ILLITERACY—IS THE KEY DRIVER of Islamist terrorism. Ideology frames a terrorist group's organizational structure, leadership and membership motivation, recruitment and support, and strategies and tactics. To counter the threat posed by a terrorist group, its operational infrastructure must be dismantled and its ideological appeal must be reduced. Failure to do so will result in the group replenishing its human losses and material resources and rising again only to continue the fight.

One example of this is Al-Jama'ah Al-Islamiyah (Jama'ah Islamiyah—JI), the Southeast Asian associate of Al Qaeda. JI has evolved through three phases. In the first phase, the predecessor of JI, Darul Islam (DI), campaigned for an Islamic state in Indonesia, and attacked several local Indonesian targets. After the DI leadership was forced to relocate from Indonesia to Malaysia, it came into contact with other foreign jihad groups. In the second phase, JI was transformed into a regional jihad group, and carried out attacks throughout Southeast Asia to advance its original mission. Later, after participating in the multinational anti-Soviet jihad in Afghanistan, JI came into contact with Al Qaeda. In the third phase of development, JI came to share Al Qaeda's global vision of jihad, and began to directly target the U.S., its allies and its friends either in partnership with Al Qaeda or by acting alone.

During each of these phases, JI ideology exhibited a remarkable ability to adapt itself to changing circumstances, to incorporate new ideas, and to apply itself to new strategic and political ends. At the same time, JI ideology remained firmly rooted in its founding precepts and extremist political vision of the world. This, in turn, provided JI with a surprising level of ideological and organizational cohesion, even as it evolved from a local to a global jihad group.

The Birth of JI

J I's roots can be traced back to the Indonesian rebellion in the 1950s led by Darul Islam (DI). At its founding, the DI movement opposed the secular nature of the Sukarno regime, and from 1948 to 1962, fought the regime to establish an Islamic state in its place. Motivated primarily by politics, the DI rebellion in West Java was led by Sekarmadji Maridjan Kartosuwirjo. Before the Second World War, Kartosuwirjo was active in Muslim nationalist politics in the then Dutch East Indies. He eventually grew unhappy with the political maneuvering and slow-pace of nationalist leaders like Masyumi, and in 1947 began assembling a militia in West Java.

In 1948, Kartosuwirjo announced the establishment of the Islamic Army of Indonesia (Tentera Islam Indonesia—TII) and proceeded to fight the newly formed Indonesian republic. For the next thirteen years he continued his struggle to establish an Islamic state. When Kartosuwirjo was arrested in 1962, the rebellion was finally crushed. However, when Suharto came to power in 1966, General Ali Moertopo reactivated DI to protect Indonesia against the danger of Communist infiltration across the Indonesian-Malaysian border in Borneo. In order to discredit the Islamists before the 1977 elections, some 185 people believed to be members of Komando Jihad, a group sharing Kartosuwirjo's ideals, were arrested by the government in mid-1977.

The founders of JI, Abdullah Sungkar and Abu Bakar Ba'asyir, were among those detained by the government. Both of them were deeply involved in Islamic proselytizing (*dakwah*) activities. Although they were never a part of the original Darul Islam, they fully endorsed DI's political agenda. Due to their meetings with Haji Ismail Pranoto (Hispran for short), who was accused of leading the Komando Jihad, they were both charged with having been inducted into DI by Hispran. Whatever the truth of the charges was, it is no secret that both of them were known for making statements urging disobedience to secular authorities and questioning the validity of the Indonesian constitution. Sungkar and Ba'asyir rejected the state ideology of Pancasila, and dared to criticize the Suharto government. They were tried in 1982 and sentenced to nine years in prison for subversion. Subsequently, their sentences were reduced on appeal to three years and ten months. Facing imminent re-arrest, they fled to Malaysia. In exile, Sungkar became the Suharto regime's number one enemy.

In Malaysia, Sungkar identified a number of sympathetic Malaysian businessmen who supported the establishment of an Islamic state in Indonesia. In an effort to seek additional funding for their cause, Sungkar and Ba'asyir went to Saudi Arabia. They also established contacts with the mujahideen in Afghani-

stan, who were then waging war against the Soviet Union. This opened the gateway for JI members to become ever more politicized and radicalized, and they received military training and were exposed to the ideology of armed jihad.

With Malaysian financial backing, Sungkar and Ba'asyir were able to form their own organization. After a dispute with the Indonesian-based DI leader named Ajengan Masduki, Sungkar formed JI in 1993. Sungkar's new group did not initially have a name but by 1995 Sungkar's followers were formed into small groups consisting of 8 to 10 members, and they were known as Al Jemaah Al Islamiyah.¹ Members of his first small group or cell included Riduan Isamuddin alias Hambali, Abdul Ghani, Jamsari, Suhauime, Matsah, and Adnan and Faiz Bafana.² The weekly meetings of the JI cells included highly selective readings of the Quran as well as other studies to prepare members for jihad. Compared to DI, JI was a more tightly structured organization, but it retained DI's vision of establishing an Islamic state in Indonesia. Only later did their ambition grow into creating a pan-Islamic state in Southeast Asia.

Jama'ah Islamiyah's Worldview

In general, JI ideology refers to the comprehensive set of ideas by which the group makes sense of itself and the world. It is an attempt by them to provide some explanation of how things have come to be as they are and to provide some indication of where they are heading as a basis to guide their action. It also provides criteria for rigorously distinguishing between what, in their perspective, are to be considered valid and invalid ways of thinking. Finally, JI ideology provides an overriding justification for their violent actions to which they may make a final appeal when challenged by outsiders.

Although much of JI ideology relies on concepts from the Quran, the Sunnah and the interpretation of the venerable forefathers (*Salafush-Sholih*), it must be stressed that it is by no means representative of the views held by all Muslim scholars.³ This is to say that JI ideology has its limits, that it is just one set of interpretation among others, and that in reality it can be quite inconsistent with the general principles of Islam.⁴

In their understanding of Islam, JI preaches the need to practice Islam in its totality, which is referred to as "Islam Kaffah."⁵ Within this all-encompassing framework, they hope to achieve peace in the worship of God in the widest sense of the word by accepting the Quranic guidance not only towards the spiritual good of the hereafter but also towards the good life—spiritual, physical and social—attainable in this world.

Al-Jama'ah Al-Islamiyah's founding charter—*The Pedoman Umum Perjuangan Al-Jama'ah Al-Islamiyah*, translated as "The General Guide for

Islamic Groups,” and commonly known as the “PUPJI”—offers insights into the basic concepts of JI ideology.⁶ In the introduction of the PUPJI, the Central Leadership Council of JI wrote that God has outlined a number of set principles by which men should lead their lives.

Firstly, the aim of man’s creation is to worship God alone.⁷ Consequently, all worldly possessions, time, energy and thought must be channeled toward this end.

Secondly, human beings are to serve as God’s vicegerent on earth.⁸ In this view, man is responsible for ensuring that the earth is managed and developed in accordance with God’s laws. He thus is required to prevent, eliminate and fight all acts of earthly corruption, which is seen as the product of a way of life which falls outside the domain of the Shariah.

Thirdly, life on earth is a contest between good and evil, and a person will be judged by his good deeds. Good deeds are measured by the fulfillment of two fundamental requirements—namely, sincerity toward God and emulating the Prophet in all of life’s endeavors.

Fourthly, the apostles of God were sent by Him to establish the *dien*. The meaning of “establishing the *dien*” or “*Iqomatid Dien*,” according to the exegetes (*Mufassirun*), is to establish a way of life based on the unity of God (*Tawhid*). This means to establish Islam in all its aspects as revealed by Abdullah bin Umar, the companion of the Prophet Muhammad, in his commentary of the *Surah Al-Fatehah*. This includes following *aqidah* (the Islamic creed), *ibadah* (performing acts of worship) and accepting Islam as a total *manhajul-hayah* (way of life).

The Prophet Muhammad, in discharging his duties as the messenger of God, had successfully shown all of this, integrating both the physical and spiritual duties of life in total submission to the worship of God. His example was then emulated by the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, the other companions of the Prophet, and also by later generations with varying degrees of success.

In JI’s view, however, Muslims gradually began to lose their way, and forsake their duties to God. After the fall of the Ottoman Caliphate in 1924, the Muslim Nation grew increasingly weak, and was exposed to the secularist ideologies of the modern world that wrought further moral decadence and decay. Since the Muslim Nation was no longer a world leader in the religious, political, and military realms, the JI proposed setting up a new state based on the holistic teachings of Islam. The establishment of such a state would restore the unity of religion and politics, thereby counterbalance the secular forces that had caused the enervation and decline of the Islamic Nation.⁹

What Motivated Them?

Religion is perhaps the most important motivating factor for JI operatives. According to psychological reports, many JI members joined the group because they wanted a “no fuss” path to heaven; others were altruistic and wanted sincerely to help the Muslim Nation.¹⁰ In JI, they wanted to be convinced that they had discovered “true Islam,” and that they could be freed from endless searching, as they found it too stressful to be critical, evaluative and rational. They believed they could not do wrong in the eyes of God, as JI’s leaders legitimated the group’s agenda and actions through their readings of holy scripture. The psychological profile of the JI’s members (e.g. high compliance, low assertiveness, low in the questioning of religious values, and high level of guilt and loneliness) suggested that they were predisposed to indoctrination and control and needed a sense of belonging without close attachments.

Religious texts were quoted selectively to educate and motivate JI’s members. In the hands of JI ideologues, Islam became a weapon. It incited many to the call of jihad. It also ensured a measure of solidarity over the course of JI’s development, even as JI came into contact with other ideas and groups. The PUPJI, though its written in the Indonesian language, makes extensive use of Arabic words and religious concepts, leaving little room for doubt that distinctively Arab ideas and theology lay at its core. The ideology is, in short, drawn primarily from various religious sources.¹¹

Fear of divine retribution and hope for the rewards of the hereafter were instilled by charismatic lecturers causing members to view JI’s struggle as synonymous with Islam’s.¹² The end result was a group driven by the belief that its actions were legitimized by God, hence the need to support it with undivided loyalty and uncompromising devotion. This is evident in Abu Bakar Ba’asyir’s address during the Mujahideen II Congress, held in Surakarta, Jawa Tengah on August 10–12, 2003. In speaking about Indonesia’s struggle for independence from the Netherlands, he underscored that the underlying intention of that struggle is to practice Shariah so that the obligation to worship God is fully realized. He reasoned that the freedom to practice Shariah in its totality was inhibited during Dutch, English and Japanese rule.¹³ This same line of reasoning can also be traced to Said Qutb or to Egypt’s *Gamaa Islamia*, who believed that it is an Islamic obligation to fight against political regimes that limit the implementation of Shariah.¹⁴ Having different parties speaking about the same thing, all quoting from Islam’s rich sources certainly gave JI the extra religious mileage and superficial correctness to fuel their struggle.

To reinforce their struggle in pursuit of the caliphate, the JI adopted the concept of *Al Wala' Wal Bara*. It believed that his concept, which specifies how to distinguish between friends and enemies, was woven into the fabric of the Islamic creed (*Aqidah*). This in turn served as a constant reminder of the divine justification and legitimacy for their actions.¹⁵ In pursuing their aim, JI stressed the need for individual Muslims to be in a group (*Al-Jamaah*)—a necessary precursor to the establishment of an Islamic state. The individual Muslim is required to pledge allegiance (*Al-Baiah*) in order to become a member of JI. Through their loyalty, JI members felt the obligation to God to rid the world of polytheism, falsehood and oppression.¹⁶ With this pledge, JI members become obligated to listen (*Al-Sa'mu*) and obey (*Al-Ta'ah*) to the best of their ability the *Amir*, the leader of the group, and other appointed leaders (*Ma'sul*). When these conditions are not satisfied, the person is charged with having committed a sin against God.¹⁷

Those that fulfilled their pledge walked a divine path. JI ideology supplied for its recruits various milestones on the road toward the Islamic state—*Iman* (belief), *Hijrah* (emigration in the way of God), *Idad* (preparation for the struggle in the way of God) and *Jihad* (struggle in the way of God). These were all stages that the Prophet Muhammad himself was reported to have led the early Muslim generation through. By appealing to jihad, JI constantly urged Muslims to go to war against the enemies of Islam who resisted the application of Islamic law. Initially, their target was the Indonesian government, but JI later came to include Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines. A key figure in promoting this ideology was Abu Jibril, who, in his lectures, called for the setting up of a “Nusantara Islamic State” (*Daulah Islamiah Nusantara*), together with preaching *jihad* and the desirability of dying as martyr.¹⁸

Strategic Flexibility

The *Al-Manhaj Al-Harakiy Li Iqomatid Dien (The Progressive Methodology In Establishing The Religion)* reveals that JI conceived of their struggle in three stages—namely, the preparation to establish the *Daulah* (Islamic State), the setting up of the *Daulah* itself, and finally, the establishment of the caliphate. To ensure the overall cohesion and long-term survivability of JI in this struggle, the PUPJI laid out a broad set of operational guidelines for all JI operatives to follow during each successive stage of the revolutionary struggle.

During the first, preparatory stage, founding a *jama'ah*, or party, supersedes all other activities for JI. All of this, however, is veiled in secrecy; all JI members operate on a need-to-know basis. An investigation by Singapore's

Internal Security Department (ISD) of JI members revealed that they operate as a clandestine organization, complete with code names and “JI-speak.”¹⁹ To date, most of the 2000 JI operatives that have been arrested have been more or less foot soldiers with no knowledge of JI’s overall operations or organization.²⁰ An integral part of founding the party is the formation of a core group or righteous leadership that lays the groundwork and designs the future course of development of the group as a whole. A rigid, military-style command and control structure is developed and enforced. Instilling discipline and obedience amongst new recruits is of paramount concern—a central part of the religious imperative to establish the faith. Listening and obeying the leadership is also inculcated through *Amar ma’ruf, nahi munkar* (the code of enjoining good and forbidding evil) and enforced by various internal review mechanisms such as *hisbah*, which serves more or less as a thermostat in controlling fluctuation in the members’ commitment. Members are obligated to collectively ensure the compliance of all and to refrain from any deviation from the directives of the leadership.

After the core group is established, the next step is the recruitment and education of new members. *Dakwah* or missionary work is an attempt by JI to reach out to the masses, to communicate their ideology and popularize their version of *Islam Kaffah*. The intent of this activity was to promote and exploit feelings of guilt within the Muslim community for failing to live up to JI’s version of “true Islam.” The effort was effective, and provided a platform not only for recruitment but also for neutralizing the public’s general animosity toward and distrust of JI’s radical agenda. Another emphasis of JI is on ideological education, which seeks to systematically instill, expand and change the worldview, emotion, desire and practice of all new recruits.²¹ *Tan-siq bainal jama’at* is another feature of JI ideology that allows it, and perhaps even compels it, to collaborate with other Islamic groups that share their world-view. Various studies on JI have shown that JI is willing to forge alliances domestically, regionally and globally to remain potent and able to achieve their aim.

All of these efforts to establish the party are veiled in secrecy; JI members all operate on a need-to-know basis. An investigation by Singapore’s Internal Security Department (ISD) of JI members revealed that they operate largely as a clandestine organization, complete with code names and “JI-speak.”²² To date, most of the 2000 JI operatives that have been arrested have been no more than foot soldiers with little knowledge of the group’s overall operations or organization.²³

JI and Al Qaeda Meet

As is well-known, the mujahideen's victory over the Soviet Union in Afghanistan was a watershed event for radical Islam. The Afghan Jihad increased JI's military capabilities, their access to new financial and other resource networks, and perhaps most significantly, their sense of belonging to an international Islamic brotherhood.²⁴ JI's desire for jihad became more concrete, their motivation grew stronger, and their strategies more refined. Unlike other Southeast Asian Islamist groups, JI at this stage was an ideological hybrid. Though its roots were in Southeast Asia, JI's ideological outlook became increasingly "Arabized," and developed a strong orientation toward the Middle East, most notably toward Saudi Arabia and Egypt. More specifically, JI began to incorporate the ideologies of *Al Gamaa Al Islamiyah al Masri* (The Islamic Group of Egypt) and, to a lesser extent, the *Al Islamiyah Al Jihad al Masri* (Egyptian Islamic Jihad) into its own thinking.

In the mid 1990s, Dr Ayman Al Zawahiri visited and spent time engaging the JI leadership in Malaysia. In the second half of the 1990s, Sungkar and Bashir visited Pakistan. Sungkar met with bin Laden on three occasions. The relationship was forged by Hambali, an Indonesian cleric, who as a child aspired to be an astronaut. During the early 1980s, while living in Malaysia, Hambali became a follower of Sungkar. Through his contact with Sungkar, Hambali was invited in 1986 to go to Afghanistan for training and to support the mujahideen in Afghanistan. While Hambali spent the next two months in Karachi awaiting further instructions, he met a number of individuals from Indonesia including Zulkarnaen who also became close to Al Qaeda.²⁵ In early 1987, Hambali and his colleagues underwent two months of military training with AK47s, MAC-1s, handguns, 60MM mortars and RPGs.²⁶ After Hambali returned to Malaysia in mid-1988, he traveled to the Philippines (Tawi-tawi) as a missionary and lived with a local Muslim family in 1991. During this time, he met Samsuddin, an Indonesian who subsequently brought him to the MILF Camp Abubakar. He also met the then MILF leader Salamat Hashim at the camp at that time. After 9 months in the Philippines, he returned to Malaysia via Sabah and proceeded to Selangor.

In 1994-1995, Hambali came into contact with Khalid Sheikh Mohamed, who later masterminded the 9/11 attack, and several other important Al Qaeda members, including Wali Amin Khan Shah, who worked with Ramzi Ahmed Yousef to destroy 12 U.S. airliners over the Pacific. As Hambali's involvement with Al Qaeda deepened, he rose through the ranks of JI's leadership. JI at the time was divided into several regional groups known as "Mantiqi."²⁷ Hambali was tapped to lead Mantiqi I, which covered Malaysia

and Singapore. Mantiqi II was led by Indonesian national Fati and covered Indonesia, Sabah and the Philippines. Nasir Abas headed Mantiqi III, which covered Kalimantan, Mindanao in the Southern Philippines and Sulawesi. There was also a Mantiqi IV in Australia; however, this Mantiqi consisted of only about 20 members, all of whom were Indonesian nationals residing in Australia.

The Mantiqis were all overseen by the Markaz, a central governing body that consisted of Sungkar, Ba'asyir, Zulkarnaen, Rushdan and Mukhlas. In addition to serving on the Markaz, these individuals served in JI's *Shura Majelis* (consultative council), which influenced the JI activities from a Koranic perspective. In the mid-1990s, JI primarily focused its activities on funneling money to the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) in the Philippines. But this changed in 1998 when the Markaz decided to start sending members and military equipment to Southern Philippines. From Mantiqi I, groups of Malaysians were sent to MILF camps for training and to support their Muslim brothers. Indonesian JI operative al-Ghozi was the JI's primary contact in the Philippines and Zulkarnaen was responsible for sending groups of Malaysian and Singapore members to the Philippines. Almost all of the key decision makers were Afghan trained.

After the fall of Suharto in 1998, Sungkar and Ba'asyir returned to Indonesia to continue their struggle. When Sungkar, the charismatic leader of JI, died in 1999, Ba'asyir succeeded him.²⁸ This caused some unhappiness within JI. Together with Irfan Awwas Suryahardi, Ba'asyir founded the Majelis Mujahideen Indonesia (MMI) in August 2000.²⁹ MMI was an umbrella group of Islamist groups campaigning for the enforcement of Shariah. The younger members of JI—Hambali, Abdul Aziz alias Imam Samudra, Ali Gufron alias Muchlas—saw Ba'asyir as too weak, too accommodating, and too easily influenced by others. These JI hardliners led by Hambali saw the formation of MMI as a betrayal of Abdullah Sungkar's original plan for JI to remain underground in its struggle to set up an Islamic state. In contrast to Ba'asyir, the Hambali-led group was of the opinion that accommodation with a non-Islamic political system could contaminate the faithful and was forbidden. As to Ba'asyir, he had relocated to the village of Ngruki, where he headed the Pondul Al Mukmeen pesantren in Solo, Central Java. While he had no objection to the conduct of terrorist operations, he also saw the merits of investing in the political struggle. While meeting prominent leaders of the Indonesian government, Ba'asyir continued to admire and follow bin Laden. He repeated his rhetoric, and offered his support to Al Qaeda operations in Southeast Asia.

What more or less emerged from this was three JI factions—the political faction (Yogyakarta-centric) that believed in political struggle, the radical faction led by Ba'asyir (Solo-centric) that combined political struggle with militant tactics, and the terrorist faction led by Hambali (Malaysia-centric). The bulk of the latter faction were Afghan trained and were the closest to Al Qaeda. Despite these differences in tactics and methodology, JI continued to function as a network of Islamic radicals extending across Southeast Asia. At times, the three factions cooperated and even collaborated with each other. In 2000, JI created Rabitat-ul-Mujahideen (Legion of Mujahideen), an umbrella organization of Southeast Asian Islamist and nationalist groups engaged in armed struggle. Its members included Moro Islamic Liberation Front, Free Aceh Movement (GAM), Rohingya Solidarity Organisation, Araken Rohingya Nationalist Organisation, and Jemmah Salafiya (Thailand). Like Al Qaeda, the vanguard of the global Islamic movement, JI aspired to be the vanguard group of the Southeast Asian Jihad.

What facilitated this solidarity among the factions was the extremist political ideology that they all shared in common. Most of the JI leaders who serve on the highest rung of the organizational ladder are protégés of Abdullah Sungkar and Abu Bakar Ba'asyir. Many of them were alumni of the Pondok Al Mukmeen in the village of Ngruki, one of the most famous pesantren (Islamic boarding schools) in Central Java. A trusted second tier of leaders appear to have been assigned as field coordinators, responsible for delivering money and explosives and for choosing a local subordinate who can effectively act as team leader of the foot soldiers. The bottom rung—the people who drive the cars, survey targets, deliver bombs, and most often risk arrest, physical injury, or death—are selected shortly before the attack is scheduled. They are mostly young men from pesantrens or Islamic boarding schools. Importantly, the schools that provide the recruits are often led by religious teachers with ties to the Darul Islam rebellions of the 1950's or to Ba'ayir's Pondok Al Mukmeen in the village of Ngruki.

Ideological Extremism and International Terrorism

During the period of a decade, a significant component of JI had become ideologically and organizationally linked with Al Qaeda. Today, a significant portion of JI members still believe in the Al Qaeda ideology and continue to actively participate in Al Qaeda's avowed mission of global jihad. As a direct result of Al Qaeda contact, many JI members began to think and act like Al Qaeda, directing their animosity toward "Crusader" and "Zionist" targets. For instance, the JI terrorist faction leader Hambali recruited Jack

Roche, an Australian convert, who was tasked by the Al Qaeda leadership to attack Jewish and Israeli targets in Melbourne, Sydney and Canberra. Similarly, JI hosted the Al Qaeda members that planned the *USS Cole* attack and two 9/11 pilots including its deputy operational commander Nawaf Al Hazmi in Kuala Lumpur in January 2000. Furthermore, JI hosted Zacariya Moussoui, an Al Qaeda suicide pilot in U.S. custody. Both the pre-and post 9/11 JI target selection included U.S., British, Australian and Israeli targets. Like it has done on several other occasions, Al Qaeda's overarching dominant ideology was successful in "hijacking" JI's parochial ideology.

Today, JI is driven more by its newly acquired ideology of global jihad than by its original, more local agenda. After Al Qaeda's attack on America's most iconic landmarks on September 11, 2001, JI is credited with having conducted the second worst terrorist attack. Emulating Al Qaeda, JI carried out simultaneous suicide bombings of the Sari Club and Paddy's café in Bali on October 12, 2002, killing 202 persons. The bombings were followed by several other attacks including suicide bombings of the JW Marriot hotel and the Australian Embassy both in Jakarta, Indonesia. As the JI training camp Jabal Kuba around Mount Kararo in Mindanao, Philippines is still active, JI still retains significant capabilities to conduct terrorist attacks in Southeast Asia.

And yet, despite its initial setbacks, its period in exile, its linking with Al Qaeda, and its eventual breaking apart into several factions, the JI ideology has remained generally coherent. This has allowed various JI factions to pool together both men and materiel. This would suggest that a military strike on JI's terrorist faction would be in itself an insufficient strategy to defeat terrorism in Southeast Asia. Instead, terrorism must be snuffed out at its ideological sources, one of the most significant of them being within the radical *pesantren*. This link between ideological extremism and terrorism must be understood. Without defeating ideological extremism, the threat of terrorism cannot be managed. Instead, the ideology will adapt, even as groups are dismantled, scattered, or as factions emerge in the leadership.

Until now, there has been no concerted effort to ideologically target JI and other comparable groups that employ religious justifications and arguments to legitimate terrorist activities.³⁰ An effective strategy to defeat JI includes, above all, mobilizing moderate Muslims and giving them the freedom to express themselves and to empower those who advocate cooperation and non-violent solutions to conflict. Moderate Muslims must be made to realize that they are strategic partners in this struggle with radical Islam and to recognize that they have more to lose than gain. The aim here must be to marginalize the militants and promote efforts to isolate and reduce the influence of extremist

ideology and its advocacy of intolerance and violence. To have a united voice against terrorism the moderate Muslim majority must remain well organized and single minded on this issue. The challenge here is to build and maintain political institutions for Muslims to resolve their differences democratically, and assume more responsibility for the future direction of their religion. Effective policies for engaging moderate Muslims and neutralizing extremism must be developed. Educating the public on extremist ideologies, organizations and tactics must be done both formally and informally so that the Muslim public is prepared to play its part in the collective struggle of civilization against terror.

NOTES

¹ Debriefing of Hambali, Central Intelligence Agency, August 2003.

² Debriefing of Hambali, Central Intelligence Agency, August 2003.

³ The phrase, '*Jama'atun minal-Muslimin*' which appears in the PUPJI, Chapter 1, Article 2, p. 14 is a clear admission of this.

⁴ Martin van Bruinessen, ISIM, Netherlands in his 'Traditionalist and Islamist pesantren in contemporary Indonesia' a paper presented at the ISIM workshop on 'The Madrasa in Asia', 23–24 May 2004.

⁵ PUPJI, p. 13 and 'Pidato Amanah Amirul Mujahideen Ust. Abu Bakar Ba'asyir' read during the Mujahideen II Congress, 10-12 August 2003, published by Wihdah Press, Jogjakarta.

⁶ 'Pedoman Umum Perjuangan Al-Jama'ah Al-Islamiyah' ('The General Guide For Al-Jama'ah Al-Islamiyah'), International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, Singapore, 2004. ICPVTR was the first institution to recover, fully translate, and analyze the JI guide.

⁷ The meaning of the Quranic verse in Arabic, "And (tell them that) I have not created the invisible beings (jinn) and men to any end other than that they may (know and) worship me", Q.S. 51: 56 in the PUPJI, Nidhom Asasi Muqaddimah, p. 13.

⁸ "And lo! Thy Sustainer said unto the angels: "Behold, I am about to establish upon earth one who shall inherit it (khalifah)", Q.S. 2:30.

⁹ PUPJI, Muqaddimah, pp. 3–4 and Chapter 2, Article 4 of the Nidhom Asasi, p.14.

¹⁰ White Paper, p. 17.

¹¹ PUPJI, pp. 5–6.

¹² "The Jemaah Islamiyah Arrests and The Threat of Terrorism," White Paper published by Ministry of Home Affairs, Republic of Singapore, 2003, pp. 15 -17.

¹³ 'Pidato Amanah Amirul Mujahideen Ust. Abu Bakar Ba'asyir', pp. 5–6.

¹⁴ Dr. Ahmad Mosuli. *Al-Ushuliah Al-Islamiah Dirasah Fi Al-Khitab Al-Ideoloji Wa Al-Siyasi 'Inda Sayyid Qutb*. Egypt: Al-Tiba'ah Wa Al-Nasyr Wa Al-Tauzee' Wa Al-Ilan, 1993, pp. 202–215. Ishom Darbalah and Ashim 'Abd al-Maajid. *Al-Qaul Al-Qathi Fi Man Imtana'a An Al-Syara'i*.

¹⁵ See Ushulul Manhaj Al-Harakiy Li Iqomatid Dien, seventh principle, PUPJI, p. 5 and Muhammad Saeed al-Qahtani, 'Al Wala' Wal Bara,' according to *The Aqeedah of the Salaf*, translated by Omar Johnstone available at www.islamworld.net/wal.html. Muhammad Nursalim's *Faksi Abdullah Sungkar Dalam Gerakan NII Era Orde Baru*, cites this book as one of the two books which shaped Abdullah Sungkar's Tauhid Paradigm. (Master's thesis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Solo, 2001, p. 22.)

¹⁶ PUPJI.

¹⁷ PUPJI, Chapter 10, Article 30–33, p.18.

¹⁸ *Al-Qaeda in Southeast Asia: The case of the "Ngruki Network" in Indonesia*, ICG Indonesia Briefing, 8 August 2002, p. 3.

¹⁹ White Paper, p. 15.

²⁰ Dr. Zachary Abuza, "The State of Jemaah Islamiya and U.S. Counter-Terror Efforts in Southeast," 2003. Available: http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/108/abuz1029.htm (October 12, 2004).

²¹ White Paper, p. 15.

²² White Paper, p. 15.

²³ Dr. Zachary Abuza, "The State of Jemaah Islamiya and U.S. Counter-Terror Efforts in Southeast," 2003. Available: http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/108/abuz1029.htm (October 12, 2004).

²⁴ White Paper, pp. 4–5 & 10.

²⁵ Debriefing of Hambali, Central Intelligence Agency, August 2003. Zulkarnaen is the current military commander of JI.

²⁶ Debriefing of Hambali, Central Intelligence Agency, August 2003.

²⁷ Indonesia Backgrounder, "How The Jemaah Islamiyah Terrorist Network Operates," ICG Asia Report No. 43 Jakarta/Brussels, December 11, 2002, p.1.

²⁸ Prior to his death, Sungkar sent Hambali to Karachi to meet with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the 9/11 operation. The purpose of the meeting was to deepen the already established ties with Al Qaeda and arrange for JI members to travel to Afghanistan to receive training. Hambali made two trips to Pakistan in 1999—the first trip alone and the second he was accompanied by JI senior operative Faiz Bafana. From 1998-2001, Hambali funneled some US\$12,000 to the MILF and some US\$18,000 to Muslim fighters in Ambon, Indonesia. JI operated a Malaysian government sanctioned/registered NGO called Jamah Al Ehsan, which raised money to be directly sent to Ambon. JI directly participated in the Christmas Eve Church bombings in Indonesia in 2000 and the attack against the Philippine Ambassador to Indonesia. JI also provided US\$4,000 to the MILF to carry out the bombing of a train in Manila in 2000. Although coordinated by Al Ghazi, the actual bombing was carried by Philippine JI member Mucklis, who later participated in the Bali bombing. The attack against the Philippine ambassador to Indonesia was also a JI operation. Al Ghazi was primarily responsible for this operation and JI provided some US\$4,000 for it.

Because of ongoing investigations in Indonesia and Malaysia, Hambali and his wife left Malaysia and traveled to Afghanistan via Bangkok using his true name Malaysian passport and with \$5,000 cash. After arriving in Karachi, they proceeded to Kandahar where they stayed for one month. While in Afghanistan, Hambali's primary contacts included Mohammed Atef alias Abu Hafs, the military commander of Al Qaeda (killed in November 2001) and Khalid Sheikh Mo-

hommed. Increasingly Al Qaeda relied on JI and specifically Hambali who held both Al Qaeda and JI appointments.

Hambali became a major link between Al Qaeda and JI. To assist Al Qaeda's Anthrax program, Hambali recruited Yazid Sufaat, a U.S.-trained biochemist and a former Army Captain from Malaysia, who came to Afghanistan in June 2001. Yazid participated in a one-month training course and then began working with Hambali supporting the anthrax program in Kandahar. When the U.S.-led bombing campaign started in Afghanistan in October 2001, Hambali briefly met with Yazid in Karachi before his return to Malaysia and they discussed the continuing anthrax program in Indonesia. While Yazid was arrested by the Malaysian Special Branch upon his return to visit with his wife in Malaysia, Hambali who was living with his wife was arrested in Thailand by the Thai Special Branch. During this period, Hambali had provided Al Qaeda funds to cells in Indonesia to bomb Bali and other targets. With Al Qaeda assistance, close interaction, and dual membership, JI had almost become an appendage of Al Qaeda.

²⁹ In his inaugural statement Amirul Mujahideen Ustadz Abu Bakar Ba'asyir called for complete application of Islamic law in Southeast Asia. He said: "We still believe that if the application of Islam law is not obstructed, there will be peaceful life in this nation. Everyone will get justice from Allah and get great benefit from the teachings of Muhammad. However, if the application of Islamic law is obstructed, and the aspiration of Muslims are unfairly blocked, Muslims have the right to fight. For MMI, there are only two alternatives: the application of Islamic law or death in the way of jihad."

³⁰ Most security measures—such as the ASEAN extradition treaty, the creation of financial intelligence units; the criminalization of terrorist financing; increased cooperation between intelligence services and law enforcement agencies; and the provision of incentives for job creation—emphasize targeting the organizational structures of terrorism. Seldom do they target the ideology of terrorism. Dr. Zachary Abuza, "The State of Jemaah Islamiya and U.S. Counter-Terror Efforts in Southeast Asia," p. 12–14.

Contributors and Editors

Hillel Fradkin is director of the Center on Islam, Democracy, and the Future of the Muslim World, and a Senior Fellow of the Hudson Institute.

Husain Haqqani is a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and co-chair of the Islam and Democracy Project, Hudson Institute.

Eric Brown is a research associate of the Center on Islam, Democracy, and the Future of the Muslim World and the Center for Future Security Strategies, Hudson Institute.

Angel Rabasa is Senior Policy Analyst at the Rand Corporation.

Reuven Paz is director of the Project for the Research of Islamist Movements (PRISM) in Herzliya, Israel.

Michael Whine is Communications Director for the Community Security Trust, and Defence and Group Relations Director of the Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Rohan Gunaratna is Head, International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research at the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies in Singapore and Senior Fellow, Combating Terrorism Center, United States Military Academy at West Point.

*Center on Islam, Democracy, and
The Future of the Muslim World*

**HUDSON
INSTITUTE**