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The Meaning of Civilisation
(Handhara)

Bismillah ir-Rahman ir-Rahim

A civilisation (handhara) is a collection of concepts about life. Civilisation could be a spiritual divine one (deeniyah ilaahiyah) or man-made (wadhiyyah bashariyyah). The spiritual divine civilisation emanates from a doctrine (‘‘aqeedah); like the Islamic civilisation that emanates from the Islamic ‘‘aqeedah. As for the man-made civilisation, either it emanates from a doctrine like the Capitalist Western civilisation that is a collection of concepts about life emanating from the doctrine of separating religion from life. Or it does not emanate from a doctrine like the Shinto, Greek, Babylonian and Assyrian civilisations. This civilisation is a collection of concepts that a people or a group of peoples agreed upon so it is a national (shabiiyyah) or man-made civilisation.

In addition, a people or peoples could have a religion (deen) and a doctrine whatsoever, but this religion has no concepts about life like Christianity and Buddhism. So people agree on concepts about life specific to them, where these concepts form their civilisation without this having any relationship with their religion, because it does not emanate from it. So their civilisation is not divine despite the fact that they have a religion. Hence, it is possible for various peoples to associate in one civilisation, despite the difference of their religions like the Japanese, Hindus and Sikhs and French; their religions are different but their civilisation is one, namely Capitalism.
Material objects that are used in life's affairs are not part of civilisation even though they sometimes result from it. There is no objection to give the technical term of 'madaniyya' for these tangible material objects so as to distinguish them from the collection of concepts for which we used the term 'hadhara' (civilisation). If these material objects resulted from a specific civilisation like statues then they are part of specific madaniyya. However, if they resulted from science and industry, then they are of universal madaniyya, like the television, rockets, planes, penicillin etc. Thus madaniyya can be specific and it can be universal. This is contrary to civilisation that cannot be specific. The meaning of specificity (khubsu'iyah) is related to our adoption. So what is specific is not permitted for us to adopt from others, whereas what is universal is permitted for us to adopt.

The distinction between civilisation (hadhara) and madaniyya must be observed at all times, just as it is imperative to observe the distinction between the material objects derived from civilisation and the material objects derived from science and industry. That is in order to observe, when adopting madaniyya, the distinction between its objects, and the distinction between it and civilisation. There is no objection to adopting Western madaniyya derived from science and industry. As for Western madaniyya derived from Western civilisation, it is not permitted to adopt it in any case whatsoever due to its contradiction with the Islamic civilisation in the basis upon which it is built namely the doctrine ('aqeedah). Our 'aqeedah is different from their doctrine that is built upon the compromise solution and separating religion from life; in the depiction of worldly life or the criterion for actions; which is the halal and haram for us, and benefit for them; and in the meaning of happiness which is permanent tranquillity, which is - for us - attaining the pleasure of Allah, and for them the bodily pleasures.

In order that we become fully aware of what we adopt from others and what we leave, it is necessary to distinguish between civilisation and madaniyya, and it is necessary to distinguish between madaniyya resulting from civilisational concepts and madaniyya resulting from pure sciences and industry.

If it is said: Why did you adopt the technical term 'hadhara' for concepts and the term 'madaniyya' for material forms instead of the reverse? Hadhara in language, is residence in a civilised region (like towns), while 'al-hadhir' is the one who is of towns and villages. Al-Qatami said: "Whoever is pleased with residing in towns. Which Bedouinmen will see us?" While 'madana' in the place means to reside therein, and 'madina' means to arrive to the town (madinah), so the two meanings are close to each other. It is said in response to this (self-directed) question: hadhara is used in the language for meanings related to thoughts, so it is closer to use it for concepts. It was said in 'Al-Qamus': "Hadhura is like nadusa which is the man of eloquence. (bayan) and understanding (fiqh)." In Al-Lisan, it is said: "a man 'hadhr' to mean eloquent, and a man 'hadhir' if he brought something good." It also came in 'Al-Lisan': "And in the hadith: 'Say that which yahdhurukum' i.e. that which is present and existing in you, and do not burden yourselves with something else." So hadhara is closer, more consistent and appropriate to use for the collection of concepts than using madaniyya, and madaniyya is closer to be used in material objects. It has been said that there is no contest in technical terminology (istilah), and what is important is distinguishing between concepts and material objects derived thereof, and material objects derived from them and material objects derived from pure sciences, inventions and industry. The first is rejected and it is not permitted to take them, while it is permitted to take the second.

We have said that the civilisation (hadhara) is a collection of concepts about life, and that either it is a spiritual divine one (deeniyah) or man-made. An example of the spiritual divine civilisation is the Islamic civilisation, and an example of the man-made are the Indian civilisation and Western civilisation. The existence of these civilisations is a definite matter and an incontestable established fact. Likewise is the difference between them, such that none but the liar can deny it. The source of the divine civilisation, according to its people, is revelation; the source of the man-made civilisation is the people who agreed on it. This alone suffices is enough for distinction and difference. Even if there appears a type of meeting in some of the concepts, this is not an agreement or a common matter: This is because civilisation, when it is adopted, must be adopted together with the basis from which it emanated or the basis it is built upon. So if the basis between two civilisations is different, the agreement between some of their concepts, or the existence of similarity between them is rejected and not permitted. The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation (hatmiyyat sira'a Ul-hadharat)
between some of their concepts about life, is worth no attention. This is because the concept is a branch from its basis (asl), and it cannot be adopted except with its basis. Both the Islamic civilisation and the Western civilisation allow eating fish, wearing wool, private property, delegating the woman, accounting the ruler and taking medicine. However, these and their like are not considered of the Islamic civilisation unless they are adopted based upon being revelation from Allah to Muhammad ﷺ i.e. upon their being Shar’a, whereas they are adopted in the Capitalist civilisation based upon their being of interest (maslaha) or their being ameliorated by their minds. If the Muslim adopts them based upon their interest (maslaha) or the rational amelioration, it is not considered adopting from Islam.

The difference between civilisations is a matter of fact without any possibility to deny it. What concerns us is the difference between the Islamic civilisation and others, in particular the Western civilisation, and what results from this difference or is built upon it, such as the issues of dialogue (al-hiwar), the clash (as-sira’a), the possibility of founding one universal civilisation, the forms and types of clash and will the clash cease, hide or will there be a victory for one civilisation over others? What is meant by religious dialogue between religions in view of those who call for it, and what is the correct position regarding it? What is the difference between religions and civilisations etc?

Religions are of two types: A deen (religion) from which a civilisation emerges i.e. it has a collection of concepts about life, like the Islamic deen, and a religion from which no civilisation emerges - and there is no collection of concepts therein - like the Christian religion. Though it has ideals like ‘Do not steal and do not commit zina’, however, it has no collection of concepts covering all aspects of life. Hence, the Christian religion is an appropriate example of a religion from which no civilisation emanates.

The Capitalist civilisation does not emanate from the Christian religion; even if it came about in countries where the majority of their populations are Christians. So the dialogue or clash or partnership between Islam and Christianity differs from the dialogue or clash between it and the Capitalist civilisation.
when the Islamic civilization interacted with other civilizations in the world, and when Islam spread in the world, took from and had a room for all the legacies and other human civilizations and gave them from its legacy and civilization. This was the golden age of the Islamic State." (Dr. Qasim Jafar spoke, in a study circle on 'The First War of the Century', on Al-Jazeera channel, under the heading: 'Are the American explosions an incentive for dialogue or the clash of civilizations?' on 29/9/2001). He said: "It is upon us as Arabs and Muslims to abstain from this problem... it is upon us to possess sufficient confidence in ourselves, in our civilization, and in our history and legacy, so as to burst forth in the world from the position of equality, and not the position of the follower (tabi')..." (The above-mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera channel).

Another said: "The Islamic civilization was based upon the common denominator between world civilizations so it accepted the other and interacted with it in taking and giving (Amru Abdalkarim, a political scientist - IslamOnline.net). Another person attempted to use as evidence for the dialogue of civilizations the ayyat of the Noble Qur'an so he said: "And our Book, the Glorious Qur'an, emphasises upon the manner of dialogue with the others, dialogue with polytheists (mushriken):

وإذ أخذ من المشركين استجواب فأجراه حتى يسمع كلمة الله النبوية 6

1 'If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah' [TMQ al-Taubah: 6], dialogue with disbelievers (kafirun):

قال يا أهل الكفرون الكافرون 1

'Say: O you disbelievers!' [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 1], dialogue with the current and official religions in the world:

يا أهل الكتاب تعالوا إلى كلمة سوهة بيتنا وتبكرون إلا نعم الله ولا شريك به تابئين ولا تجدون بعضاً أرباباً 64

Al 'Imran: 64

'O People of the Book, come to a just word between us and you: That we worship none but Allah, that we associate nothing with Him, nor some of us take others as lords' [TMQ Al-Imran: 64], dialogue from a position of equivalence... I view that it is not possible to say of eternal struggle because we are

Muslims. I point to the Qur'anic ayyah:

تعالوا إلى كلمة سوهة بيتنا وتبكرون

Al 'Imran: 64

'Come to a just word between us and you' [TMQ Al-Imran: 64]. This ayyah means that it is possible for us to dialogue with Christians, we dialogue with Jews, and we dialogue with others. Why? Meaning there is a common word between us; we do not say that we dialogue to our word" (Ata-Allah Muhyi' ar-Ra'di, Iranian President adviser for the dialogue of civilizations in the above mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera). There are those who call to dialogue between religions to create common denominators between them, and stay silent about the points of difference, in order to anaesthetise Muslims from the clash. They call to the saying of 'the sons of Abraham' to strengthen dialogue between the three religions on the basis that those who came with them descend from one father namely Ibrahim (as). Some Muslims use as proof the ayyat of Noble Qur'an that say the Prophets were Muslims, like His saying at the tongue of Nuh:

وأمرت أن أكون أول المسلمين النور 12

"And I was commanded to be the first of the Muslims" [TMQ 39:12] at the tongue of Ibrahim and Ismail:

رُبْتُوا واجعلنا مسلمينَّا لَكَ وَمِن ذَرِّيتِنَا أَهْمَهَا مُسْلِمَةَ لَكَ (128:2)

"Our Lord! Make us Muslims to you and of our descendants Muslims to you" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 128] and about the people of Lut:

فَمَا وَجَدْنَا فِيهِمْ غَيْرَ بَيْتٍ مِّنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ الدَّارِيَاتِ 36

"But We did not find therein but one house of the Muslims" [TMQ Az-Zariyat: 36] and at the tongue of the disciples (hawariyyin):

واعثهِنَا بِنَا مِسْلَمٌ آل عمران 52

"And bear witness that we are Muslims" [TMQ Al-Imran: 52]. Perhaps
there will come those who say that Christians and Jews are Muslims, and we hear those who say that the followers of the three religions are believers even though the Qur’anic texts, definitely proved and of definite meaning, are decisive in charging Jews and Christians with disbelief (kufr) such as His saying:

“Verily those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messenger and wish to distinguish between Allah and His Messenger and say, ‘We believe in some and disbelieve in others’ and wish to adopt a way in between. Those are in truth disbelievers, and We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating punishment’ [TMQ Al-An-Nisa: 150-1].

And:

“O People of the Book, why do you disbelieve in the ayaat of Allah while you are witnesses?” [TMQ Al-Imran: 70].

And:

Those who disbelieve among the People of the Book and the polytheists were not going to leave (their disbelief) until there came to them clear evidence. A Messenger from Allah reciting pure pages” [TMQ Al-Baiyinah: 1-2].

And:

“Those who disbelieve among the People of the Book and the polytheists were not going to leave (their disbelief) until there came to them clear evidence. A Messenger from Allah reciting pure pages” [TMQ Al-Baiyinah: 1-2].

And:

“Verily those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messenger and wish to distinguish between Allah and His Messenger and say, ‘We believe in some and disbelieve in others’ and wish to adopt a way in between. Those are in truth disbelievers, and We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating punishment’ [TMQ Al-An-Nisa: 150-1].

And:

“Say: O People of the Book, why do you disbelieve in the ayaat of Allah while Allah is witness over what you are doing?” [TMQ Al-Imran: 98].
the Messenger of Allah ﷺ: ‘I am a Muslim’ and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said when he read the letter:

کذب عدو الله ليس مسلم و هو على النصرانية

"The enemy of Allah lied. He is not a Muslim while he is upon Christianity."

Amr Musa, Secretary-General of the Arab League, made clear that he does not believe that there is a civilisation better than (another) civilisation, and from the meaning of his words is that the Islamic civilisation is not preferable to the Capitalist, Hindu or Jewish civilisation for he says: "We do not believe that there is a better civilisation" in the exposition of his refutation of the Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi. One of them attempted to use as evidence for accepting the other as they are without restriction or condition, and without attempting to pronounce judgments against him, the ayaat of Surat Al-Kahf that say:

"Religious dialogue is the attempt of the individual encumbered with the values, conventions, beliefs and previous creeds to discover the other (of a different religion) - as he is - and understand him and crystallize a philosophical formal view towards him without resorting to pronouncing prejudiced value judgments against him...the supporters of religious dialogue raised the motto of sincere intention. So he assumes the divestment of conditions and goals except the desire to understand the other and view him intellectually...The content of dialogue does not, in principle, differ with the tale with which the Noble Qur'an brought in Surat Al-Kahf (ayaat 32-42) about the dialogue between two men. Allah gave one of them two gardens of grapes surrounded by palm trees and with crops in the middle, rivers flowing therein; and Allah increased its owner over the other two property in garden and children. The tale reveals that the dialogue took place between the two men without condition or restriction, and the Qur'an brought it with its complete details; and despite it's including the kufr of one of them in Allah, the other did not interrupt the dialogue because of it. Likewise the Qur'an did not refrain from mentioning the sayings of kufr; because in their totality they are able to build and formulate the intellectual examination of the personality disbeliefing in Allah 'azza wa jalla...Religious dialogue differs from comparative religion and religious competition even if these concepts commingle in the literature. Comparative religion is a science.
The Idea of Equality between Civilisations

The meaning of equality between religions and between civilisations is a kufr, concept since it is an invitation to equality between the truth (haqq) and falsehood (batil), between the deen of truth and distorted religions, between kufr and iman, between misguidance (dhalaala) and guidance, between the abrogating deen and the abrogated (deen), between civilisational concepts whose source is revelation and civilisational concepts laid down by man i.e. between the mind and text (naql), between arbitrating to At-Taghut and arbitrating to the Book and Sunnah and what they both guide to, between the confirmed (thaalat) that benefits mankind and remains in the earth and the vanishing foam that is scum.

The evidences for that are difficult to limit. He ta’ala said:

\[\text{"Nay We fling the truth (haqq) against the falsehood (batil) so it destroys it. And, behold, it is vanished!" [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 18].}\]

And He said:

\[\text{"What is there after the truth except misguidance?" [TMQ Yunus: 32].}\]

And He said:

\[\text{"They wish to arbitrate to At-Taghut while they have been commanded to deny it. And Satan wishes to mislead them far astray!" [TMQ An-Nisa: 60].}\]
pleases you.' Fear Allah, O men of understanding, so that you may be successful” [TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 100].

And He said:

"The likeness of the two parties is as the blind and deaf, and the seer and hearer. Are the two equal when compared? Will you not then take heed?" [TMQ Hud: 24].

And He said:

"They wish you disbelieve as they disbelieved so that you become equal" [TMQ An-Nisa: 89].

How strange for the one claiming Islam, then he equalises between Islam and kufr, between atheism (ilhad) and trinity and tawheed, between the denier of the Prophethood of Muhammad /salla2 and the believer in it, between permitting riba and forbidding it, between the worship of Allah /handhalt and worshipping creatures, between fornication and marriage, between permitting homosexuality and forbidding lesbianism and homosexuality, between the pig and dates. It is even more strange; the one who remains silent and says nothing about preference and does not prefer tawheed to polytheism, halal to haram, the Shar'a to At-Taghut, the believer to the kafir, revelation to man-made, Islam to the remaining deen, the Qur'an to the distorted Books, worshipping the Creator to worshipping the sun, the cow and the stars. May Allah save us from fitnah! Subordination (tab'iyya) is rejected, equality is rejected, and remaining about the preference of Islam and its civilisation over the remaining religions and civilisations is rejected.

The Idea of Accepting the Other

As for accepting the other, in order to merely know his opinions, without pronouncing judgments against him, and without refuting what he says, is not of the Islamic method whatsoever. Rather, what the Book indicates is completely contradictory to that. When the Noble Qur'an
mentions the thoughts and statements of kufr; it always follows them with what is the truth, thus refuting them. Examples of this are:

"And when it was said to them: 'Believe in what Allah revealed', they said: 'We believe in what was revealed to us' and they disbelieve in what is after it while it is the truth confirming that which is with them. Say: 'Why then did you kill the Prophets of Allah aforetime if you were (indeed) believers?'" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 91].

"And they say: 'Allah has begotten a child.' Glory be to Him! Nay, to Him belongs all that is in the heavens and the earth. All surrender to Him with obedience" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 116].

"And they say: 'Ar-Rahmaan has begotten a child.' Indeed you have brought forth a terrible evil thing! Whereby the heavens are almost torn down, the earth split asunder and the mountains fall in ruin. That they ascribe a child to Ar-Rahmaan. And it is not suitable for Ar-Rahmaan to beget a child" [TMQ Maryam: 88-92].

"And when you said: 'O Musa, we shall never believe in you until we see Allah plainly.' And you were seized with a thunder bolt while you were looking" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 55].

"And they say: 'None shall enter Paradise except he be a Jew or Christian.' Those are their desires. Say: 'Produce your proof if you are truthful.' Rather whoever submits his face to Allah and is a doer of good, his reward is with Allah. Such will not fear nor will they grieve" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 111-112].

"And they say: 'When will this promise (come to pass), if you are truthful?' If only those who disbelieved knew when they will not be able to ward off the Fire from their faces nor their backs. Nor will they be helped. Nay, it will come upon them suddenly and perplex them. And they will have no power to avert it nor will they get respite" [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 38-40].

"And when it was said to them: 'Believe in what Allah revealed', they said: 'We believe in what was revealed to us' and they disbelieve in what is after it while it is the truth confirming that which is with them. Say: 'Why then did you kill the Prophets of Allah aforetime if you were (indeed) believers?'" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 91].

"And they say: 'We shall never believe in you until we see Allah plainly.' And you were seized with a thunder bolt while you were looking" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 55].
And:

"And they say: 'Be Jews or Christians (then) you will be guided.' Say: 'Nay, the creed of Ibrahim and he was not of the polytheists'" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 135].

"And the said: 'Verily Allah has taken our promise not to believe in any Messenger unless he brings to us an offering which fire devours.' Say: 'There came to you Messengers before me with clear proofs and with what you speak of. Why did you kill them if you are truthful?'

And:

"And they say: 'Be Jews or Christians (then) you will be guided.' Say: 'Nay, the creed of Ibrahim and he was not of the polytheists'" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 135].

"And the Jews say: 'Allah's hand is tied up!' Be their hands tied up and be they accursed for what they say! Nay, both His hands are widely outstretched. He spends as He wishes" [TMQ Al-Mai'dah: 64].

And:

"Have you not considered about he who disputed with Ibrahim about his Lord because Allah had given him the kingdom? When Ibrahim said to him: 'My Lord is He who gives life and causes death.' He said: 'I give life and cause death.' Ibrahim said: 'Verily Allah causes the sun to rise in the east thus you cause it to rise in the west.' Thus the disbeliever was utterly defeated. And Allah guides not the unjust folk'" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 258]. Even though this ayah was of the Shari'a of those before us, however it commenced with His saying subhanahu:

"And they say: 'Surely Allah would have guided us if we had been guided.'" [TMQ Al-An'am: 148].

"Those who associate (with Allah) will say: 'If Allah had willed, we would not have associated, nor would we have forbidden anything.' Likewise held those before them until they tested Our wrath. Say: 'Have you any knowledge so that you produce it for us? Verily you follow nothing but conjecture (dhann) and you do nothing but lie'" [TMQ Al-An'am: 148].
And they say: 'There is nothing but our life of this world, we die and we live and nothing destroys us except time. They have no knowledge of it, they only conjecture. And when Our clear ayaat are recited to them, those who expect not meeting Us say: 'Bring us a Qur'an other than this or change it.' Say: 'It is not for me to change it of my own accord. I only follow that which was revealed to me. Verily I fear if I disobey my Lord, the punishment of a Great Day. Say: If Allah had so willed, I would not have recited to you that which I recite to you nor would I have made it known to you, if I had stayed among you a lifetime before this. Have you then no sense?" [TMQ Al-Isra': 16].

And the Jews say: 'Uzayr is the son of Allah.' And the Christians say: 'The Messiah is the son of Allah.' That is their saying from their mouths. They imitate the saying of those who disbelieved of old, of those who knew not the manifest about Allah. Not till - as to the Messiah, We shall bring him to you in a clear sight. And as to theFeeh, see the case of Al-Kahf, which one of them used as evidence. The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation (hatmiyyat sira'a Ul-hadharat)
As for His saying:

\[\text{وَإِنَّ أُحَدَّ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ إِسْتَجَارَةً فَأَجْزَأَهُ حَتَّى يَسْمَعَ كَلَامَ الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللهِ مَوْضِعَةً مَّأُونَةً (6:9)}\]

“If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah then escort him to a place of safety” [TMQ At-Taubah: 6]. There is no evidence in this 

\[\text{ayah} \] for what they claim about dialogue between equals. There is no indication therein for dialogue; rather therein is a command to make the polytheist hear the word of Allah, and either he believes or he is escorted to his place of safety. So the 

\[\text{ayah} \] is about giving protection to the polytheist who wishes to ask about Islam, so Islam is explained to him in a way that is hoped he will embrace it. There is no evidence in the 

\[\text{ayah} \] for dialogue in order to know his opinions in the way of equality and equivalence without pronouncing judgement against him. The 

\[\text{ayah} \] determines that he is a polytheist, so it pronounced judgement of polytheism. It does not seek a dialogue with him to know his opinions; rather it seeks making him listen to the Qur'an. So there is no sense in using it as evidence.

The Idea of the Alternative Civilisation

What caps the matter is their saying that the objective of dialogue between civilisations is interaction to create an alternative superior civilisation through the method of seeking to find ... in turn, leads to progress, flourishing and spreading peace. How bad is the deduction of this concept by someone using His saying:

\[\text{فَلِيَأْتُوا الْأَبْرَارُ أَنْ يَأْتُوا بِحَقٍّ إِلَى الْأَبْرَارِ وَيَتَّخِذُوا الْأَحْسَنَ عَلَى النَّاسِ} (3:62)\]

“Say: ‘O People of the Book. Come to a just word between us: That we worship none but Allah nor associate anything with Him nor some of us taking each other as lords’. [TMQ Al-Imran: 62]. So he says: ‘This is a dialogue with others from a position of equality.’ Then he interprets His saying: ‘To a just word’ into the word ‘common (mushtarak) between us’ (and) ‘we do not
say we dialogue to (reach) to our word.” This understanding of the ayah is slandering upon Allah, as the meaning of ‘sawaa’ is just (‘adl), i.e. a just word which what the ayah explains subsequently. There is nothing in the ayah, whether in its wording or its meaning, that indicates we invite them to a common word. He definitely did not intend that we associate in a just word by the evidence of his saying: “We do not say that we dialogue to our word” so nothing remains except that he wants the common civilisation. The call to interaction and seeking to find what is common between the civilisations is mixing the truth with falsehood; Allah prohibited the People of the Book from this, and also Muslims by greater reason. He ta’ala said:

"O People of the Book, why do you mix the truth with falsehood while you know?" [TMQ Al-Imran: 71].

After we have clarified their intention from the dialogue between religions and dialogue between civilisations, and their objective of this dialogue, we move onto the issue of clash in its various types, economic, intellectual, military and political.

The Clash between Civilisations
The History of the Clash between Islam and other Civilisations

The clash/struggle (sira’a) between religions and civilisations is ancient, and what concerns us is the clash between Islam and other religions and civilisations. The truth is that Islam is a deen of struggle from the time when Muhammad /sallalahu ‘alaihi wa sallam/ was commanded to come out openly with the truth until the Hour is established. When he /sallalahu ‘alaihi wa sallam/ was ordered to speak out openly what he was commanded, the intellectual struggle commenced between the concepts of Islam and the concepts of kufr. This intellectual struggle has continued until our time. It has not stopped nor is it allowed to stop, despite what was added to it of other types of struggle. The intellectual struggle is refuting thoughts with sharp styles, and with intensity and harshness. The Messenger /sallalahu ‘alaihi wa sallam/ performed it in execution of the command of Allah. So he would say:

"Verily you and what you worship besides Allah are fuel for the Hellfire! Surely you will enter it."

[TMQ Al-Anbiya: 98].

And:

"A slanderer, going about with calumnies. A hinderer of good, transgressor, sinful. Cruel, after all that, base-born"

[TMQ Al-Qalam: 11-3].

And:

"Then, verily, you misguided, deniers. You will surely eat of the tree of Zaqqum. Then you will fill bellies therewith. Drink boiling water on top of it. So you will drink the drinking of thirsty camels. That will be their entertainment on the Day of Recompense! We created you, so why do you not believe?"

[TMQ Al-Waqi‘a: 51-7].

And:

"Verily, we pray and invoke the curse of Allah upon the deniers"

[TMQ Al-Imran: 61].

And:

"Perish the hands of Abu Lahab and he has perished"

[TMQ Al-Masad: 1].
those who do wrong through fighting or refusing the enforcement of the rule upon them and the paying of jizyah, arguing with them is by the sword. As an example of intellectual struggle narrated regarding Him(salla2) is what ibn Abi Sheeba and Abdurrazaq reported in their Musnads, as well as the writers of the Seerah and others, from Qatadah that "the Messenger of Allah(salla2) said to a man:

"Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.' The Christian said: 'I have embraced Islam.' So he said: 'Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.' The Christian said: 'I have embraced Islam before you.' So he became angry and said: 'you lie. Three matters barred between you and Islam: Your purchasing of wine (he did not say: 'Your drinking wine'), your eating the pig and your invoking a child for Allah.'"

And As-Sana'ni reported in his 'Tafseer' from Abdurrazaq from Qatadah that Ubayy bin Khalaf came with a decaying tooth while scattering it in the wind and said: Will Allah give life to this, O Muhammad? The Prophet(salla2) said: "Yes, Allah will give life to it and cause you to die and enter you into the Fire!" And Al-Hakim reported in 'Al-Mustadrak' and authenticated it from Jabir bin Abdullah (ra) who said:

"The argument with what is better is avoiding the harm of the one arguing with you i.e. that you turn away from his insult to you. That is to say, you ignore him. Likewise there is no contradiction between the intellectual struggle and His(salla2) saying:

"Verily Hell is a place of ambush. A dwelling place for the transgressors. Abiding therein for ages. No cool shall they taste therein nor any drink. Except boiling water and dirty wound discharges. An exact recompense!" [TMQ An-Naba: 21-6]. The argument with what is better is to turn away from their harm to you in the argument. As for
the people if they have evil designs upon him. He said: Leave me. Allah will protect me. He said: On the morrow, bin Mas’oud came to the mawqif (of Ibrahim at the Ka’aba) in the forenoon and recited:

\[ \text{Al-Rahman 2:1} \]

then he faced them reciting it. He said: They contemplated it then began asking: What is ibn Umm ‘Abd saying? He said: Then they said: He is reciting some of what Muhammad came with. So they stood and began striking upon his face and he maintained reciting what Allah willed that he reaches. Then he left to his companions, and he had been affected in the face. They said to him: This is what we feared for you. He said: The enemies of Allah were no more contemptible to me than now and if you wish I will awake for the like tomorrow. They said: No, it is enough for you, what you said. You have made them hear what they detest."

And ibn Kathir reported in ‘Jami’ Al-Masaneed wa As-Sunan’: “From Hatib whom the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had sent to Juraij bin Mina who was the Muqawqis of Alexandria who said to him: Why does your Prophet not invoke against those who expelled him from his land? He said to him: Just as your Prophet did not invoke against those who intended to kill him until Allah raised him to Him. He said to him: You have acted well. You are a wise man coming from a wise man." And Al-Hakim reported in ‘Al-Mustadhab’ and said (it) saheeh upon the conditions of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim): “From Abu Musa (ra) who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded us to depart to the land of An-Najashi. That reached Quraysh and they sent Amr bin Al-As and ‘Amara bin Al-Waleed, and they collected gifts for An-Najashi. They came to us and advanced to An-Najashi, arrived to him with gifts, kissed him and prostrated to him. Then Amr bin Al-As said: Verily a folk from us disliked our religion and they are in your land. Am-Najashi said to him: In my land? He said: Yes? He said: Send them to me. Jaffar said to us: Let none of you speak. I am your speaker today. So we reached An-Najashi while he was sitting in his assembly. Amr at his right and ‘Amara at his left, and the priests and monks seated (samatin). Amr and Amara said to him: They do not prostrate to you. When we reached him, the priests and monks with him chided us: Prostrate to your king. Jaffar said: We do not prostrate except to Allah. An-Najashi said to him: And who is that? He said: Verily Allah sent among us His
colloquial languages as Arabic. It is known that it is impossible for the one who does not know Arabic to understand Islam, not to mention performing $ijtihad$ with it. They want the Arabic to become like Latin and Syriac such that none understands Islam except experts in this unused language. In reality, they want it to become a dead language. How would the one who does not understand Arabic be able to understand the news ($khabar$), composition ($insha'a$), command ($'amr$), prohibition ($nahy$), the literal ($haqeeqa$) and metaphoric ($majaz$), the reason ($'illah$), cause ($sabab$), condition ($sharT$), preventive ($maan'i$), general ($a'amm$), specific ($khaas$), absolute ($mutlaq$), restricted ($muqayyad$), the indications of the explicit wording ($mantooq$) and the understood ($mfhoom$) and necessity ($iltizam$), the meanings of the letters, conjugation, grammar etc? All of these are necessary to understand the $Shari'ah$ texts. Whoever calls to this is an enemy of Islam, and whoever among the Muslims is fooled by these falsehoods is stupid.

However, the embracing of the $deen$ of Allah was not general in a complete perfected way, even among the Arabs themselves. The defeated religions and civilisations remained present. They were weak at the beginning due to the disappearance of the environment that allowed their growth. Thus the movement of heretics ($zanadiqa$) failed and was suppressed. However, the negligence of the Arabic language afterwards led to the closure of the gates of $ijtihad$ and confusion in understanding the rules, which weakened the State until it became petty states. Some thoughts of the ancient civilisations intruded to Muslims like the idea of asceticism and punishing the body from Hindu philosophy, tribalism among some, the ideas of hidden secret meanings ($batiniyya$) in others, and the inclination to separate from the centre of the Khilafah, weakened the State and stopped the conquests. Rather the first conquests. It is possible to perceive the difference between the Uzbek, Tajik, Pushtun, Turkish, Berber, Indian, (Ad-Deelam), Turkmen and Kurdish peoples, their love for Islam and adherence to it, and the peoples conquered in the period of the Ottomans like the Serbs, Greeks, Hungarians, Croats, Romanians and others. These quickly conspired
with the West against Islam and their State, and they never abstained whenever offered an opportunity for vengeance. Then the cultural and missionary invasions against Islam started until the Western civilisation achieved the destruction of the Islamic State, fragmented it, and divided the community (jama'ah) of Muslims. Nor did Western Capitalism stop at that limit; rather it worked to spread its concepts of nationalism, patriotism, democracy, freedom, man-made canons, and imaginary borders among Muslims. It appointed over these petty states corrupt rulers allied to them who consolidate its influence and concepts, protect its interests, preserve the division, deviate from the way of Allah and oppose every sincere person who attempts to free himself from their noose. They were assisted upon that by agent intellectuals who invite to Western thoughts with passion, defend them, and struggle against the Islamic civilisation, standing with blind sincerity to the side of the Ummah's enemy. The Crusader enemies and their agents among the influential people in the Muslim countries, put under their control the media means and education, thus they became misguided and misleading. This intellectual assault did not stop the call to the concepts of Western civilisation of what they call freedom, democracy, pluralism, civil society, the state of institutions, human rights, women's rights, the patriotic bond, religious dialogue etc., is in full swing. Thus it is truly considered a violent intellectual struggle between the two civilisations; Islamic and Capitalist. This clash is so clear such that it requires no evidence, for we are living it daily, no matter how much some intellectuals and the influential Capitalists attempt to hide it, through distortion and deception. For example, we find the former American president Nixon say in 'The Favourable Opportunity (al-fursa as-saniha)': "Our isolation contradicts our values and religious beliefs, which call to spread virtue throughout the world." He also says in his book 'Victory without War': "The revolutionary Islamic ideology is a reaction against modernisation. Communism promises to rotate the hour of history forwards and Islamic fundamentalism returns it backwards... Communist and Islamic revolutionaries are ideological enemies adopting a common aim: Desire to achieve power by any necessary means with the aim of imposing a dominant dictatorship based upon their ideals which are unbeamable." We find Bertusconi, the current Italian prime minister, say: "We must be aware of the superiority of our civilisation. The East will remain oriented towards the civilisation of the West and this orientation will increase. This occurred once in the communist world and, also occurred in parts of the Islamic world." Teri Larson, the coordinator of the Oslo process, welcomed the inclination of Muslims of Palestine towards normalization with the West. One member of the Jewish delegation in Oslo and Wye River, Ori Speer, mentioned in his book 'The Course (Al-Maseera)': "The scarves started to disappear from the heads of women, and the dresses started to be shortened from the lower part, a matter that Larson welcomed, considering it inclined towards normalization with the West." In fact, women would not dare do that during the first Intifada before Oslo. We find also Phyllis Oakley, former Under-Secretary of State say: "We agree with those who say that the clash of civilisations cannot be avoided." Madeleine Albright, former US foreign secretary, said: "We were attacked because of our identity. We adhere to globalisation and defend democracy, freedom and open society. This is the essence of America from which we cannot retreat" (Al-Quds magazine quoting from the translated words of Nathan Charles-Washington). Paul Kennedy, History professor at the American Yale University says: "It is difficult to avoid deducing that the danger of terrorist attacks will not cease. We have not as well realized great success in preventing the occurrence of these attacks. The genie got out of the bottle's neck and it carries the spirit of vengeance, and the car bomb has now become the airplane bomb" (Al-Quds magazine in translated words of 22/9/2001). The former Jewish president, Herzog, said before the Polish parliament in 1992. "The epidemic of Islamic fundamentalism spreads quickly. Nor does it pose a danger to the Jewish people only; rather upon all of humanity" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Shimon Peres said: "Fundamentalism has become the greatest danger of the age after the collapse of communism" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Cyrus Vance, former American foreign secretary, said: "We must be careful and resolved in dealing with these fanatics whose actions are impossible to predict" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). The French cultural encyclopaedia states that Muhammad is: "Anti-Christ, kidnapper of women, and the greatest enemy to the human intellect."

These and their like explicitly state their enmity to Islam, and their statements are a clear indication that they practice with their Capitalist civilisation violent intellectual struggle against the Islamic civilisation. However, there is another group that attempts to blow ashes in the eyes and delude Muslims, in order to perpetuate their anaesthetization and make them desist from generating change, while they are not less hostile to Islam and its people. So we find the former American president...
Clinton says: "Our enemy in the Middle East is extremism, and he rejected the idea of the clash of civilisations. Similarly he said that the current struggle has no relationship with Islam; it is however a struggle against extremist forces that hide with religion and nationalism. He added saying: that it conflicts with Islamic teachings and emphasized that Islam is a powerful force for tolerance and moderation in the world" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Louis Mitchell, Belgian foreign secretary, says in comment upon the above-mentioned statements of Berlusconi: "When a prime minister of a member state of the European Union speaks with this logic, this is completely rejected. The view that any civilization is better or of more advanced position than other civilisations is considered as contradicting European values in which we all believe" (above mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera). Even Bush Jr. who declared openly the 'Crusade' and announced it, this did not prevent him from visiting the Islamic Centre in Washington and describing Islam as a deen of peace. Similar to him is his partner in this campaign, the British Prime Minister Blair, who described Islam as being a deen of peace, and he used as evidence the meaning of the noble aayah:

من قتل نفساً غاب نفساً أو قتله في الأرض غاب الناس جمعاً

{5:32}

"Whoever kills a soul for other than a soul or (to spread) mischief in the earth, it is as if he killed all of mankind" [TMQ Al-Mai'dah: 32]. It is imperative that Muslims are not beguiled by deceptive words said by the like of these, for their deeds reveal their deep rooted feelings, not their false words, which do not fool a Muslim.

These people know Islam in its reality, rather even better than some Muslims. Nixon, the former American president, whose sayings we have already mentioned his sayings: "Their ideals which cannot be afforded...Fundamentalism turns it backwards...Islamists are ideological enemies", we find him say in his book 'The Favourable Opportunity': "Islam is not merely a religion; rather it is a basis for a great civilization." So he distinguishes between Islam from Christianity, and he says in the same book in his discussion about fundamentalists: "They are determined to return the previous Islamic civilization through reviving the past, and they aim to implement the Islamic Shari'ah and announce that Islam is a deen and a State." Furthermore he says: "However, our civilisation is not more advanced than their civilisation. The Islamic world fought communism with more strength than the Western world fought it, and their rejection of material things and the widespread immoral excesses in the Western world is a credit for them and not against them." Just as you see that he is sincere in such words; they, however, did not prevent him from announcing that we are ideological enemies. They also did not prevent him from conspiring against Muslims and assisting Jews against them. So he says in his book 'Victory without War': "Our commitment to the survival of Israel is a profound commitment. We are not official allies. Rather what binds us together is something greater than any paper scraps. It is a moral commitment, a commitment that no president in the past ever abandoned; and every future president will fulfill it with sincerity. America will never permit Israel's enemies who swore to inflict grievous damage upon her to realise their goal in destroying her." He also says in his book 'The Favourable Opportunity': "In order to protect the threatened democratic governments such as Israel and South Korea, we are prepared to use military power if necessary." He also says: "No American president or Congress will ever be able to permit the destruction of Israel." These people understand the reality of Islam and its civilization; however they insist upon their kufr, enmity and tricks. This is not strange. The Muslim might understand the Western civilization more than some of its sons, yet still he remains sincere to his deen and civilization, just as the contrary can occur: So it is imperative that Muslims are not fooled by these types of statements.

The existence of the rightly guided Khilafah upon the way of Prophethood is the fundamental cornerstone in the clash between Islam and kufr. It is naivety and poor understanding to confine the struggle with its various forms to mere da'wah in the various types of media, writing books and individual contacts, at the time wherein Islam is not implemented and the situation of Muslims is deplorable in weakness, disgrace, backwardness and division. Once the State existed, then justice, dignity, happiness, humanity and every type of goodness will be manifested in it; and the near and distant, Muslim and kafir will notice that. Its existence will replace the millions of books and contacts, and thousands of types of media. If what was mentioned before is added to its existence, you will see people entering the deen of Allah in crowds.
8. Fighting the Arabic language and reviving non-Arabic languages, and inciting nationalistic and patriotic agitations.

Even what is called struggle for interests (sīrah al-masālih) is originally founded upon intellectual differences, and then it is followed by intellectual struggle. This struggle over interests could reach military conflict. The weak one who is not able to engage in military conflict does not embark on a struggle for interests, except as much as the hyena or fox can do to the lion's prey. This struggle for interests could be between two different civilisations, just as it is possible to be between two countries or peoples of one civilisation. When America invaded the Gulf, occupied it and extended its influence upon it, settled, established (itself) and gained ground, its goal definitely was not the liberation of Kuwait; rather it was a struggle over the petrol interests and spreading the influence. As one of them said: "We came to correct the mistake of the Lord" i.e. in His subhanahu wa ta'ala creating petrol in the Gulf instead of the West. And Schultz said in a television programme on 16/12/90: "It is necessary to demolish Iraq militarily, even if it withdrew from Kuwait." And Dick Cheney said before Congress on 3/12/90: "It is necessary to guarantee that this type of invasion is not repeated irrespective of the manner of settling this, and even if Saddam withdrew from Kuwait." It is known that Iraq, Kuwait and the rest of the Gulf were until that time a region of British influence, so America was struggling with Britain politically and economically, even though both of them belong to one civilisation namely Capitalism. At the same time, it was struggling with Muslims politically, economically and militarily, and it adopts Capitalism and struggles with Muslims who abandoned their Islamic civilisation or most of its concepts. America's struggle with Muslims in the previous styles is built upon a civilisation concept for them, namely colonizing weaker nations and allowing the domination of their capabilities. Look at it is now repeating the attack in Central Asia. Likewise its struggle with Britain is built upon a civilisation concept different to that upon which its struggle with Arabs is built. It struggles with Britain in the Gulf because it must be alone in its leadership of the New World, and in plundering the resources of the weak, America, as Bush says, must be the vanguard so there is no scope for two poles in the world leadership; rather it is only one leader, which must be America, the heir of ancient colonialism, without rival. Among examples of the struggle between two civilisations is the struggle that was between the...
Capitalist America and the communist Soviet Union. It however, did not reach the point of military conflict, and was restricted to the political, intellectual and economic struggle that ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union. Of the examples of struggle between the sons of one civilisation is the struggle between the Nazis and others among the Capitalists; it was a struggle between those who view the superiority of the German race over other races and those who deny racial distinction between the races of the European and American peoples that adopt Capitalism. However, the struggle remained within the domain of one civilisation. It was based upon a specific concept which was a part of the Nazis' civilisation opposite to the concept of the Allies.

The intellectual struggle is the basis for every struggle on the face of the earth from the difference of the two sons of Adam until our time; and it will continue until when Allah wills. Accordingly, we began with the intellectual struggle.

**Economic Struggle**

Economic struggle existed from ancient times, however, today it has become organized, comprehensive destructive and dreadful, such that the followers of the powerful civilisation started to devour the slaves of Allah, among the followers of other civilisations, without mercy, sympathy or humanity. The world has thus become a large jungle where the strong devour the weak. It is true that the world is a small village in relation to communication and transport; however it is a jungle in relation to the supremacy of the strong over the weak. This is evident in what the Capitalism practices - particularly its leader America - of styles including:

First: Domination over raw materials whenever a way to achieve that is found.

Second: Making the dollar an alternative to gold as the world's currency. Europe tries to struggle against its hegemony by its currency called the 'Euro', and some states try to return to the gold and silver standard. However, America fights any attempt to return to the gold standard.

Third: Continuing to make the developing countries mere markets for consumption by preventing them from developing heavy industry and even many of the light industries.

Fourth: Drowning the developing countries with compound interest loans through the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. The danger of these loans is obvious.

Fifth: Attracting the emigrant professionals and intellectuals who do not find any place for themselves in their original countries, and so are forced to emigrate to the West.

Sixth: Formulating policies predominantly imposed by the IMF leading to the absence of food security in these countries, such that they fall under the mercy of aid, grants and loans after they have been self-sufficient.

Seventh: Igniting regional wars to push states to purchase weapons, which quickly transform into mere outdated, insignificant, rusting scrap metal, unless they are used in their regional wars.

Eighth: Working for the absence of security in various countries, such that their capital migrates to more secure countries like Europe and America, which they then freeze under various pretenses whenever they wish. If we know that the Arab countries alone have capital in the West amounting to 800 billion dollars at the lowest estimate, we are able to imagine even approximately what has been plundered from the Islamic lands, all of them under-developed countries, without mentioning other developing countries.

Ninth: Dominating economic interests in various countries through what they call globalisation, privatisation and capital investments owned by giant Capitalist corporations.

Tenth: Designating rulers who are their agents together with armies and intelligence services whose function is to protect their interests.

Eleventh: Landing forces in some sensitive global regions and settling therein, to perpetuate the extension of influence, as America did in the...
Gulf, Sinai, Central Asia, Turkey and elsewhere. This is in addition to the fleets that cruise the oceans to secure the plunder of riches.

Twelfth: Working to fragment the world into many countries in the name of independence to perpetuate their weakness and facilitate dominance over them.

Thirteenth: Spreading their culture and civilisational concepts to perpetuate dominance over defeated countries and to distance them from thinking about change and liberation from their claws.

Fourteenth: Imposing sanctions upon some countries, like the sanctions America imposed upon Iraq. It issued resolutions through the Security Council under Number 665 to boycott Iraq and grant the American navies the right to use force to prevent trade with Iraq. Bob Woodward commented in his book 'Leaders' upon this resolution saying: "This was the first time in United Nations history spanning forty five years that it granted countries outside its umbrella the right to impose economic sanctions. This was a magnificent diplomatic victory for the American administration."

Political struggle

As for political struggle between the Western civilisation and Muslims, it was evident in the following:

First: Their destruction of the Khilafah in 1924.

Second: Their establishing of the Jewish state in Palestine, and preserving it and its characteristic military supremacy.

Third: They're dividing of the Muslims' community (jama'ah) and encouraging this division under the name of independence, until they became about sixty entities and they still work for fragmentation and division. The danger of destructive fragmentation is not hidden from the intelligent. Muslims are strongly inclined to this idea of independence and fighting for its sake even though it completely clashes with their civilisation and concepts. Allah commanded them to be one body (jami'an) and not divided, but they proceed with division and consecrating division even though they recite day and night His saying:

واعتنصموا بِحَيْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا وَلَا تَفَرَّقُواۖ آمِنَةٌ ۱۰۳

"Hold fast, all together; to the rope of Allah and do not divide" [TMQ Al-Imran: 103]. All together (jami'an) is the condition of those holding fast to the rope of Allah; its meaning is the community (jama'ah); rather it is the community itself due to his saying:

من أتاكهم و أمركم جميع على رجل واحد يردان يشق عصاكم أو يفرق جماعكم فأقلاوه.

"Whoever comes to you and your affair is united under one man aiming to break your power or divide your community (jama'ah), kill him!" So all together (jami'an) and community (jama'ah) under one man, have the same meaning.

Fourth: Implementing their political systems, republican and monarchical, formally in the Islamic regions, together with separating the authorities formally into three authorities as is the situation with them.

Fifth: They are fighting the serious movements that are working for change through establishing the Islamic State, the rightly guided Khilafah State. At times they call them extremists and at other times they call them fundamentalists. This fight is mostly through the use of their agents and rarely directly. "Martin Indyk, the official responsible for Middle Eastern affairs stood in the White House to say that the challenge facing America in the East is assisting friendly countries to contain extremism" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). If they were unable to contain it, they suppressed it with harshness and malice through their 'progressive moderate friends', those about whom Nixon said in 'The Favourable Opportunity': "The relationship of many politicians in the Islamic countries with Islam does not exceed their relationship with its ideals, customs and norms...Progressives: This is a group whose activity is noticeable... and it strives to tie the Muslims with the civilized world in the political and economic spheres. This group is distinguished with flexibility, and they do not describe the West as being atheist. Rather they call them the People of the Book, Some of the countries ruled by the progressives are democratic like Turkey and Pakistan... We must
assist the progressives in the Muslim world... The key of the American policy is represented in the strategic cooperation with the progressive Muslims only. Since we associate with progressives in our goals, our cooperation must cover all economic and security areas... It is imperative that the relationship between America and partner states does not reach the level of guardianship, and we must not treat the leaders in the progressive states as if they are our correspondents between us and their peoples, rather we must treat them as equal partners, because the quickest way to bury them is treating them as mouthpieces for Western propaganda... We must accept at time the rejection of our friends in the Islamic world of some of our actions that cause them political difficulties in their countries. The Ummah knows well these 'progressive moderate friends', and there is nothing wrong in reminding her of what the rulers of Iraq, Egypt, Turkey, Uzbekistan, Algeria, Syria, Libya and Tunisia did to the sincere among the sons of this Ummah.

Sixth: Founding the United Nations and Security Council to grant legitimacy to intervene in the affairs of weak countries, among them the states existing in the Islamic world. If America could not intervene through the Security Council due to the wrangling of some super powers, it bypasses the Security Council and United Nations and acts independently in a solitary manner, such as the case now in what it called the 'Crusade War against Terrorism' so it goes out wherever it likes and strikes whoever it likes, Nixon stated explicitly in his book 'The Favourable Opportunity' about this policy saying: "When the interests of the United States are exposed to harm, it will act in coordination with the UN whenever possible. However, if the matter was not possible, it will act alone without assistance from it." Collard Power, political science professor at Massachusetts University, said in his article: "It is clear that international law does not apply to the Western hemisphere... It seems that breach of human rights is accepted as long as it serves American interests."

Seventh: Assembling a number of profiteers and tyrants whom they call parties, where they hand over the power to one of them and classify the remainder as opposition. This is if they did not impose what they call the single party system.

These are some of the forms of the political struggle that the followers of the Capitalist civilisation wage upon Muslims and others. They succeeded in all these forms, due to the absence of the good guardian and good system, represented by the Khilafah State.

Military Conflict:

Then we move onto the last type of conflict between civilisations; that is the military conflict, which among Muslims is called jihad and it is a wide subject. What concerns us here is proving the inevitability of military conflict particularly in the Islamic civilisation; the attempt by some to negate the obligation of offensive fighting (qital ut-talab), then rebutting those who say that Islam is the deen of tolerance and peace; then is Islam a deen of terror?

We begin with the actions of the followers of the kafir civilisations with Muslims; they are more eloquent in indication than words because they are tangible and sensed. Australia, whom we never fought once, occupied East Timor. China occupies an entire region (wilayah) of southern Central Asia; Russia occupies several Islamic regions like the Caucasus region, Crimea, Khazan etc. India occupies Delhi, Kashmir and the whole of northern India. The Americans dominate the entire Gulf and extend their political and military influence across Central Asia, from Uzbekistan to the Gulf and go into the Sina, beside they have a large military base in Incirlik in Turkey. Moreover, they struggle with both France and Britain over their influence in Africa. The British have a remainder of influence in both Asia and Africa, and a military presence in the Gulf and Gibraltar. The Serbs, Croats, Greeks, Romanians and Bulgarians occupy Islamic lands. Spain occupies Andalusia, Saba and Melela. The Italians occupy Sicily, the land of Al-Aghaliba. The islands of the Mediterranean sea are all occupied and they are Islamic lands. The Philippines occupies Islamic lands and Burma does likewise. The Jewish state occupies Palestine which is part of the frontiers of Bilad Ash-Sham. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said the truth when he said:

بوشك أن تداعي عليكم الأمم كما تداعى الأكلة إلى قفصها فقال فقال:

ومن قلة نحن يومئذ؟ قال بل أتتم يومئذ كبير ولكنكم غناء كفنا السيل
"The nations are on the verge of summoning each other over you, as the eaters summon each other over their large bowl. So a speaker said: Is it due to our small number on that day? He said: No, rather that day you will be many, but you will be foam like the foam of the torrent. Allah will remove from the chests of your enemies the fear from you and Allah will cast ‘al-waham’ in your hearts. A speaker said: O Messenger of Allah, what is ‘al-waham’? He said: Loving the world and the fear of death” (narrated by Abu Dawud from Thawban).

Despite this painful reality that suffices to prove the struggles of the followers of kafir civilisations with Muslims, it does not however hinder corroborating this idea with the sayings of some of their politicians and thinkers i.e. from the followers of the civilisations of kafir:

--Nixon says in his book 'Victor without War': "Real glory does not come from avoiding conflict, but rather from our being in its tumult fighting for our principles, interests and friends... We must discard our delusions about how the world runs. Americans incline to believe that conflict is unnatural, that the peoples of every nation are fundamentally similar, while differences are due to misunderstanding, and that permanent and comprehensive peace is an attainable goal. History however refutes these views, because each nation differs from another in fundamental aspects, the political conventions, historical experience and ideological motivation. These are aspects that normally give birth to conflicts. Conflicting interests and the fact that we understand each other lead to disputes and eventually wars... However, comprehensive peace i.e. the existence of a world without conflicts is mere delusion. The like of this peace has not existed and nor will it ever exist." Nixon also says in 'The Favourable Opportunity': "The interest is vital when its loss threatens the security of the United States. Thus the continuous independence of western Europe, Japan, Canada, Mexico and the Gulf states is a vital issue for our country's security. Likewise, we have a vital interest in that the under-developed countries do not obtain nuclear weapons. The US has no choice except using the armed forces to prevent the threat to its interests... In order to protect the threatened democratic governments, like in Israel and South Korea, we are prepared to use military force if necessary."

--On 23/1/1980 Carter delivered a 'State of the Union' address to the American Congress, and of what he said: "However, our position is completely clear. Any attempt from any external power to dominate the Gulf region will be considered an attack on the vital interests of the United States. Such aggression will be repelled by the use of any necessary means including military."

--On 2/11/1990 Henry Kissinger published an article in Yedioth Ahronot under the heading 'Soon, America, You Will Lose Deterrent Force', and of what he said therein: "The military option is without doubt painful and difficult. It can incite demonstrations in Islamic countries and release the spark of new waves of terrorism. However, these dangers must be compared against the dangers of a more difficult conflict: at a later time if the signs of American weakness lead to the collapse of moderate governments in the region, escalating the tension and the end of all systems."

--On 18/9/2001, it was published in the (Amerikatan) newspaper, on the internet an interview with the French newspaper Le Figaro conducted with James Schlesinger, Nixon's advisor and former American Defense Secretary who currently works in the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, and of what he said: "Uprooting these networks requires many years because they enjoy a strong determination resulting from their strong belief in their position."

--On the programme 'First War of the Century' on Al-Jazeera the presenter of the programme quoted from the Washington Post that Henry Kissinger said under the title 'Revenge is not Sufficient Response': "It is necessary to face what happened with an attack against the system that produced this threat."

--The former Secretary (General) of the NATO alliance, Claus, formally announced that the alliance endorsed Islam in the place of the former Soviet Union, as a target for its enmity. BBCOnline.net quoted from President Bush on 17/9/2001 his saying: "This crusade, this war..."
The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation (hatmiyyat sira’a Ul-hadharat) u 51

upon terror will be for a long period.”

--Samuel Huntington says in his article in the American magazine 'Foreign Affairs': "There is little possibility this continuous military confrontation between the West and Islam since many centuries will weaken. Rather it is possible that it will increase in viciousness and severity…"

--Shimon Peres said in his book 'The New Middle East': "…We are a determined people and there is no power on the face of the earth able to induce us to abandon this land after fifty generations of living in the Diaspora, fifty generations of suppression, torment and annihilation. We will never move from the only place in this world, in which we are able to renew our independence, guarantee our safety and live with dignity and honour:…"

--Steve Dunleavy said in the New York Post journal after the incident of Tuesday: “Kill the bastards, train assassins, make contract with mercenaries and earmark millions of dollars to hunt the heads and bring them dead or alive, preferably dead. In relation to the cities who host these worms, bomb them with bombs in basketball playgrounds.”

The Probable Evidences of those who deny Civilisation Struggle in Islam

These are their actions and sayings and they are both in harmony, yet the deluded, and some naïve Muslims, insist upon dialogue and deny the clash and struggle between civilisations. Some of this Ummah persist upon dialogue between religions, specifying Christianity with this dialogue, thus look for points of reunion between Islam and Christianity such as fighting against atheism, forgetting or pretending to forget that kufr is one creed:

"To you is your deen" [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 6] for Allah subhanahu addressed the disbelievers with the language of plurality and said:

فَلَيْ يَا الَّذِينَ كَفَارُونَ الكافرون

"Say: O you disbelievers." [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 1] Then He mentioned the deen in singular form and said:

لكم دينكم ولي دين [6:69]

"To you is your deen" [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 6]. Or like meetings to solve the Palestinian problem. Yet who created the Jewish state, protected it and assisted it with money, weapons and support, other than the kafir states founded upon the Capitalist civilisation? The deluded have a duty to discharge, because they are intellectual agents. As for the naïve, they are joking and occupy themselves with something futile, and they share in deluding the masses. They enter into meetings, dialogues and sessions invited by Jews and Christians. They are dubious calls, whose callers intend to detach us from our deen and mix the truth with falsehood, without sparing any effort for that: “Never will the Jews and Christians be pleased with you until you follow their creed. Say:

إِنَّ هُدًى اللَّهِ هُوَ الْهَادِئَ وَلَنِّ يَغْفَرَ أَهْلِهِمْ بَعْدُ الَّذِي جَاءَهُمْ مِنَ الْعَلَمِ مَا لَكُمْ مِنِ اللَّهِ وَلَا تَنْصِرُوا الْفَرْقَةِ 120

‘Verily the guidance of Allah is the (only) guidance’. And if you were to follow their desires after what came to you of knowledge, then you would have against Allah no protector or helper” [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 120].

(And):

وَذَلِكَ لِنَخْلُطَنَّكُمْ فِي الْأَمْرِ ۙ ۗ ۗ ۗ ٩:٦٨

"They wish that you compromise (with them) so that they compromise (with you)" [TMQ Al-Qalam: 9] i.e. incline to them. This ayah, even though it was revealed about the Makkah polytheists, however it applies upon every disbeliever (kafir) and polytheist (mushrik). The definite ayah prove, and the Sahabah have had a consensus (ijmaa), and the Islamic Ummah knows, that the People of the Book are disbelievers; hence it is not possible to compromise with them and or incline towards them. Rather, it is obligatory to demonstrate the fallacy of their deen, their disbelief and lies, and invite them to enter the true deen of Islam. After establishing the Khilafah State, they are invited to Islam; if they reject,
then the Jizyah, and if they reject, then the sword. It is deception to deduce with His saying:

وَلَا تَجَادَلُوا أُمَلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِي هُوَ أَحْسَنُ

29: 46

"Argue not with the People of the Book except with what is better" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 46] and remain silent about the ayah's conclusion: "except those who do wrong among them. And say:

آتِي بَالْذِي أَنزَلَ إِلَيْنا وَأَنزَلَ إِلَيْكُمْ وَأُلْهِيْتَا وَإِلَيْكُمْ وَاحِدَةٌ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسَلِّمُونَ

We believe in that which was revealed to us and revealed to you, our God and your God is one, and we submit (in Islam) to Him" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 46]. So those who among them made wrong are excluded from the arguing with that which is better; they are the one who fight and do not pay the jizyah, so what is required is the triumph over them and not arguing with them.

It is also erroneous to deduce His saying:

وَقَالُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ أُمَلِ اللَّهِ إِنَّ مَتَّى الْمَعَارِضُونَ

11: 22-121

"And say to those who do not believe, 'Act according to your ability, situation and way. We are acting likewise. And wait! We (too) are waiting'" [TMQ Hud: 121-2] as 'peaceful co-existence between us and them'. This command indicates intimidation and threat. Rather, we are commanded, beyond intimidating and threatening them, to fight them until they embrace Islam or pay the jizyah as will follow. So where is the peaceful coexistence?! As for the deduction with His saying:

إِنَّ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَمَّنَوْا وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتِ هَدُوُوا وَالصابِرُونَ وَالحَمَّضُ وَالْمُتَّقِيٰنَ أَشْرَكُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَفْصِلُ بَيْنَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى كُلٍّ شَهِيدٌ

22: 17

"Verily those who believe and the Jews and Sabians and Christians and Zoroastrians, and those who associate (with Allah), verily Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection. Verily Allah is witness over all things" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 17] for leaving "the differences in beliefs and conduct between us and them to Allah to judge between us on the Day of Resurrection." If this means not compelling them to enter Islam, then it is correct. If it means that Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection, then that is also correct. If it means not inviting them to the deen of truth, it is false, because we are commanded to carry the da'wah to them until they embrace Islam or pay jizyah or they are fought. If it means not fighting them, this is also wrong, because the offensive war (qital ut-talab) is fard as will follow.

As for deducing from His saying:

لَا تُبْنِئَكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْذِّينَ لَمْ يُقِلُوْا كُلَّمَةَ مَنْ قَالَ: يَعْبُدُونَ مُنْتَزِهَةً

60: 8

"Allah does not prohibit you to deal kindly and justly with regard to those who did not fight you over the deen nor drove you from your houses. Verily Allah loves those are just" [TMQ Al-Mumtahinah: 8] upon kindness, justice and treating these people well. It is said that what is meant by this ayah is those who believed in Makkah and did not emigrate, so the deduction with it is outside the subject. If the meaning is every one of the people of (other) religions, the deduction is correct regarding those who did not fight us or drive us out from our houses. Definitely this does not include those who fight the Muslims of Palestine, expelling them and assisting in their expulsion. Also it does not include everyone who fights the Afghans now, expelling them and assisting in their expulsion. Likewise, it does not include any people fighting us in Iraq since the Second Gulf War; neither does it includes those fighting us in Kashmir, Chechnya and their like.

If they use as evidence His saying:

وَإِنَّ جَنَحَوْا لِلسَّلَّمِ فَاجْهَلْ لَهُمَا

61: 8

"And if they incline to peace, then you incline to it" [TMQ Al-Anfal: 61] (to
say) that Islam is a deen of peace and that peace is the origin, then this ayah has to be understood together with this ayah:

فَلَا تَهْزَوُوا وَتَخْفُوا إِلَى الْسَّلَمِ وَأَنْثُمُ النَّاَزِلُونَ [35:35]

"Be not weak and call to peace while you have the upper hand." [TMQ Muhammad: 35].

So if Muslims are living with dignity, strength, power and (as one) group (jam'ah), then no peace. The evaluation of the benefit, or otherwise, of peace is left to the Khaleefah, and there is no importance to the evaluation of anyone else unless he is delegated by him. If they use as evidence His saying:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَذْكُرُوا فِي الْسَّلَمِ كَافِهَةً وَلَا تَقِنِيعُ حُكْمِ السَّيِّدَانِ إِلَّا لَكُمْ عَلَى مَعِينٍ [28:80]

"O you who believe, enter into submission (as-silm) completely and do not follow the footsteps of Satan. Verily he is an open enemy to you." [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 280] It is said that it is necessary to know those being addressed with this ayah then know the meaning of as-silm. 'Those who believe' could mean the Muslims as being addressed, and it could be the believers in Prophets before Muhammad, and as-silm could here be Islam or it could mean peace. If those addressed are the believers in Muhammad, there is no meaning in saying to them: 'Enter into peace with believers', because they are not warriors but are rather believers like them; it is only said to them: 'Enter completely into Islam, meaning the obeying of all His Shari'ah and establishing His limits and rules, without trying to choose some and leaving some.' If those addressed are the believers in the previous Prophets, there is no meaning in requesting them to enter into peace; rather this meaning does not exist in the Qur'an. At-Tabari said: "As for calling them initially to peace, this does not exist in the Qur'an." So the meaning is calling them to Islam and to enter therein. Thus whoever was the one addressed, there is no call therein for Muslims to enter into treaty of peace with disbelievers i.e. mutual peace (muwada'ah). And if they use as evidence His saying:

"And if they withdraw from you, fight not against you and offer you peace, then Allah has opened no way for you against them" [TMQ An-Nisa: 90] (to say) that it is haram for Muslims to initiate fighting against peaceful disbelievers who withdraw from fighting Muslims. It is said that this ayah relates to hypocrites who befriend and reach a people with whom we have a covenant i.e. they follow their rule in the treaty (muwada'ah). It might mean those who go out with them under compulsion to fight us and then they withdraw from the fighting, like those who came out on the day of Badr with the polytheists; then there is no way for us against them. If they use as evidence His saying:

أَذَنْ لِلَّذِينَ يَقَالُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ عَلِيمُونَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقِيدٍ [22:39]

"Permission (to fight) is given to those who were fought, because they were oppressed. And verily Allah is A He to support them!" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 39] (to say) that the permission to fight is for the oppressed against whoever initiated fighting against him. It is said that the command to fight is absolute (mutlaq) without restriction to the situation of oppression. This is because His saying: "because they were oppressed" is not a divine reason (illah) for fighting, but rather a descriptive reality (wasf waqi'). This is because the Quraysh used to severely harm the Muslims who would come to Rasool Allah sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam, beaten and wounded in the head, complaining to him and he said to them: "Be patient for I have not been commanded with fighting" until they emigrated. Then this ayah was revealed wherein Allah commanded them with fighting after He prevented them from it. Ad-Dhahak said: "The companions of the Messenger of Allah sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam sought permission to fight the disbelievers when they harmed them, and Allah revealed:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ نَا يَبْحَبُ كُلَّ حَوْاَنٍ كَفُوْرٍ [22:38]

"Verily Allah likes not any treacherous disbeliever" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 38]. When he emigrated, it was revealed:
...a secure sanctuary" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 67] and His saying:

"And by this city of security" [TMQ At-Tin: 3] and His saying:

"And We will exchange for them security after their fear" [TMQ An-Nur: 55].

And his saying \\

فَأَمَّتَهُم مِّن خَوْفٍ (4:67) (And made them safe from fear) [TMQ Qur'aan: 4] and His saying:

"أَنَّ الدِّينَ يَقَالُونَ بِهِمْ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ "لَقَدْ (22:39) (A secure sanctuary)
"Fight those who do not believe in Allah nor the Last Day, nor forbid what Allah and His Messenger forbid nor follow the deen of the People of the Book until they pay jizyah readily and they are humbled" [TMQ At-Taubah: 29].

And His saying:

وَقَالُوا الَّذِينَ كُفَّارٌ كَافِرُونَ أَنَّ ابْنَيَّكُمَا وَابْنَيَّكُمَا أَنَّ اللَّهَ بِكُلِّ مَنْ يُبِينُ الْيَاهِدِينَ، أَنَّكُمْ كُفَّارٌ وَكَاذِبُونَ [9:36]

"Fight the polytheists collectively as they fight you collectively. And remember that Allah is with the pious" [TMQ At-Taubah:36].

And His saying:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ ٍ مَا هُدِيَتْ أُمَّتُكُمْ إِلَّا بِالْبُطُورِ ۛ وَأَمَّلَى عَلَيْهِمْ وَعَمَّتْهُمْ جَهَنَّمَ وَبَنَى الْمُصَدِّرَ [9:73]

"O Prophet, fight the disbelievers and hypocrites and be harsh against them. Their abode is Hellfire, a wretched destination!" [TMQ At-Taubah:73].

And His saying:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اشْتَرَى مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنْفُسَهُمْ وَأَمَوَالَهُمْ بِأَنْ يَعُدُّوا بَيْنَهُمْ يَقِيَّةً وَمَا يُقَابِلُونَ فِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ وَأَمَوَالِهِمْ. وَقَالُوا: "مَا نَعْمَ الْبُطُورِ؟" وَالْمُصَدِّرُ [9:111]

"Verily Allah purchased from the believers their souls and property so that Paradise is for them. They fight in the way of Allah, they kill and are killed. A promise binding upon Him in the Torah, Bible and Qur'an, and who is truer to his covenant than Allah? Then rejoice in the bargain that you have concluded. And that is the supreme success!" [TMQ At-Taubah:111].

And His saying:

بَيْنَ أَيُّهَا الْدُّعَا مَا أَتَاكُمْ وَلَا قَالُوا الَّذِينَ كُفَّارٌ بَيْنَكُمْ مِنَ الْكُفَّارِ وَلَا جَعَلُوا لَهُمْ غَلَظَةً وَأَعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ بِكُلِّ مَنْ يُبِينُ الْيَاهِدِينَ, أَنَّكُمْ كُفَّارٌ وَكَاذِبُونَ [9:123]

"O you who believe, fight those who are close to you among the disbelievers and let them find harshness in you. And know that Allah is with the pious" [TMQ At-Taubah: 123]. These are ayaat from At-Taubah which is among the last which was revealed without anything coming to specify, restrict or abrogate it, so it is evidence that Jihad encompasses defensive and offensive war i.e. the fighting of defence and offence. As for His saying:

 Waltu jannatul salem fa'ajjih u la yubhah al mu'minin [8:61]}


And His saying:

وَقَالُوا ۛ فِي سِيلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ يَقِيَّةً وَلَا تَعْقَدُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُعَذَّبَينَ [2:2]

"And if they incline to peace, then you incline to it" [TMQ Al-Anfal: 61] and His saying:

"Fight in the way of Allah those fighting you and do not transgress. Verily Allah loves not the transgressors" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 190].

And His saying:

أَنْ نَلْدِنَ يَقِيَّةً وَلَا جَعَلُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نُصُرَّةٍ مُّقَدِّرٍ [22:39]

"Permission (to fight) has been given to those who were fought because they were oppressed. Verily Allah is Able to support them" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 39]. These ayaat and their like are not suitable to specify the generality of the ayaat of At-Taubah, nor restrict those which are unrestricted (mutlaq) because they were all revealed before the ayaat of At-Taubah, and the precedent (text) does not specify the later (text) nor restrict it. This is because specification is equivalent to abrogation of a part of the general (text) as it diverts the rule from its generality, by invalidating it in a part of it and putting another rule in its place. As long as specification is equivalent to abrogation, and it is stipulated in abrogation that the abrogator (nasikh) is later than the abrogated (mansukh), then these ayaat are not suitable to specify the ayaat of At-Taubah because they are precedent to it in revelation. The ayaat of At-Taubah are among the last of what was revealed in jihād, so specification does not arise. What is said regarding specification is likewise said regarding restriction, as it is necessary for the restricting text to be later than the unrestricted text or accompanying it, so as to be a restriction for it, or so as to apply the unrestricted text upon the restricted one. Therefore the general remains upon its generality due to the absence of any specifying text to specify
it; and the absolute remains upon its unrestricted nature due to the absence of any restricting text that the unrestricted can be restricted with or applied on it.

As for the Sunnah, this is due to what the two Sheikhs reported from the hadith of 'Abdullah bin 'Umar who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يشهدوا أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمد رسول الله

ويمروا الصلاة ويدعوا الزكاة فإن فعلوا ذلك عصموا من دماءهم إلا

"I was commanded to fight the people until they bear witness that 'La ilaha illa Allah, Muhammad Rasul-Allah', establish the prayer and pay the zakat. If they do that, they safeguard their blood from me except with its due right, and their accounting is with Allah." And in another narration:

أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يقولوا لا إله إلا الله فإذا قالتا فقد عصموا من

"I was commanded to fight the people until they say 'La ilaha illa Allah.' If they say that, they safeguard their blood and property from me except with its due right, and their accounting is with Allah." And what Muslim reported from Sulayman bin Buraydah from his father: "When the Messenger ﷺ would command an Amir over an army or expedition, he advised him to fear Allah in himself and goodness for the Muslims with him. Then he would say:

اغزوا باسم الله في سبيل الله، قاتلو من كفر بالله

، اغزوا ولا تعلموا ولا تغفروا ولا تقتلوا ولا تعنوا، ولا تنبذوا، وإذا لقيت

عدول من المشركين فادعوه إلى ثلاث حسال أو خلق فابنهم ما أجابوك

فايكل منهم وكف عنهم، ثم ادعوه إلى الإسلام فإن أجابوك فاقلهم

وكف عنهم، ثم اجعوه إلى التحول من دار المهاجرين وخبرهم، أجمع

These two hadith are explicit that jihad is initiating the fighting. And the Messenger of Allah ﷺ initiated fighting Hawazin at Hunayn, Thaqif at Taif, and the Byzantine Romans in Mu'tah and Tabuk. And he went forth to fight twenty seven ghazwat (battles led by the Messenger) in nine years apart from the expeditions (led by companions).

As for Ijma' Us-Sahabah that jihad is fighting in the way of Allah to spread Islam, and that it is initiating the fighting, the conquests of Iraq, Persia, Ash-Sham, Egypt, North Africa, Khurasan, Kabul, Sijistan etc. suffice to prove it. The Copts of Egypt did not attack the Muslims, and the Berbers and Dalail did not attack them. All of these countries were conquered at the time of the Sahabah, and they initiated the fighting
against them and conquered these lands. After that, is there room for saying that Jihad is only defensive war and that there is no offensive war in Islam?

**Conclusion**

In brief, the clash of civilisations is an inevitable matter. It existed in the past, exists now and will remain until the clash ends shortly before the Hour; since it does not come except upon the worst of creation. Do not be deceived, O Muslims, by the callers to the dialogue who place their heads in the sand and condone humiliation and defeat. Make the preparations required for the conflict, since the Capitalist Western civilisation has knocked you down militarily, politically and economically; however they will never defeat you intellectually. Your 'aqeedah is hard to defeat; and it remains alive in the souls, except that some concepts of your civilisation coming out from your 'aqeedah have been afflicted with some contamination and some dust has struck them. So work to purify them and shake the dust away from it by returning to the Book and Sunnah. Beware of accepting a saying without evidence, or accepting a saying with evidence from a non-mujtahid or from the one reporting from him. This is the period of ignorant leaders, who give fatwas without knowledge. So beware of them, and search for sincere active scholars, and take your deen from them, for they are the lamps in the darkness, and they are few today. And know that the ultimate triumph and victory is for Islam and Muslims. This is what Allah and His Messenger promised us in definite reports (akhbar qat'iyya), so be confident in the good promise of Allah. Work to appoint your Khaleefah, and establish your community (jama'ah) over one man from among you so as he makes the preparations, unifies the Ummah, terrifies the enemy, protects the territories, deals with the citizens justly, distributes equally, and Allah makes at his hands this deen dominant over all other deens, even if the polytheists detest it.

O Allah, guide the Ummah of Muhammad to that which pleases You and make it deserve Your support. O Most Merciful, we are weak at Your door, appealing for Your help and seeking Your protection, dedicated in utter submission to You, desperate for Your help. Support Your deen, verify Your promise, and bring down Your Victory. For You is the praise in every situation.
The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation (hatmiyyat sirā' al-ḥadharat)