

The West's Fear of the Khilafah Pushes it to Harness its Energies to Obstruct It

(Translated)

The Muslims know that the West does not want Islam alive in an executive entity. They also know that its colonial states and their media, intelligence and political machine are working around the clock to prevent the return of the Khilafah (Caliphate) State. The West knows well the meaning of its return as a political entity and a global intellectual leadership. It deals with the idea of its return as an imminent reality.

Any observer does not need to go through trouble to follow up what is readily published by the media of the enemies on the return of the Khilafah State in the world to manipulate minds and spread lies and misleading frauds, such as articles, conferences and seminars of Western thinkers to influence the positions of Muslims towards the Khilafah State and to distance them intellectually and politically from it, and to facilitate everything that would create a public opinion against the idea of the return of the Khilafah State globally. This is not limited to the media controlled by Western countries, but their political and intelligence services and the so-called national security departments work around the clock away from the media and in secret, monitoring and escalating everything that would prevent the realization or the approaching return of the Khilafah State. These activities are known by their results, which leave clear fingerprints and traces, clearly indicating this direction to the deep observers and political followers.

To prove this, we will present **some examples of the political and media actions** of the colonial and kaffir West's great interest in its war on the idea of the Khilafah State, its attempt to exclude it from its natural popular support, its implantation of the idea of the impossibility of the return of the Khilafah and the possibility of Muslims regaining their position in the vanguard of nations through the Khilafah state as a political intellectual leadership of the world, its challenge of the literature of Hizb ut Tahrir, the pioneer and leader in the political struggle, the serious party working to establish the Khilafah, with its awareness that understands its idea, perceiving of its organs, the visionary that follows international politics, and its draft constitution and its readiness to lead the up-coming Khilafah State soon, Allah willing, in all matters related to the state's policy internally and externally.

First: When Patrick Buchanan, the former advisor to Presidents Nixon, Ford and Reagan, published his article entitled "An Idea Whose Time Has Come" on 23/6/2006, this was not to confirm that the idea of the return of the Khilafah from Morocco to Pakistan was imminent, but rather to warn against its return, by saying: **"If Islamic rule is an idea taking hold among the Islamic masses, how does even the best army on earth stop it? Do we not need a new policy?"**

Speaking with a close look at the reality witnessed at the time, he warned the Western colonial countries to prepare for the danger of the upcoming Khilafah State before it is too late. He reviewed the reality and the expectations, including the following:

"The idea for which our many of our adversaries fight is a compelling one. They believe there is but one God, Allah; that Muhammad is his prophet; that Islam, or submission to the Koran, is the only path to paradise; and that a Godly society should be governed according to the Shariah, the law of Islam. Having tried other ways and failed, they are coming home to Islam".

He asked, in objection:

"What idea do we have to offer? Americans believe that freedom comports with human dignity, that only a democratic and free-market system can ensure the good life for all, as it has done in the West and is doing in Asia. From Ataturk on, millions of Islamic peoples have embraced this Western alternative. But today, tens of millions of Muslims appear to be

rejecting it, returning to their roots in a more pure Islam. Indeed, the endurance of the Islamic faith is astonishing.

Islam survived two centuries of defeats and humiliations of the Ottoman Empire and Ataturk's abolition of the caliphate. It endured generations of Western rule. It outlasted the pro-Western monarchs in Egypt, Iraq, Libya, Ethiopia and Iran. Islam easily fended off communism, survived the rout of Nasserism in 1967, and has proven more enduring than the nationalism of Arafat or Saddam. Now, it is resisting the world's last superpower."

Perhaps the warning cry made by dozens of poles of Western political thought centers, including Buchanan, on behalf of the colonial West, for its need for a new policy to stop the idea of Islamic rule and the Khilafah, which has become entrenched among the Islamic masses, is what created new political maneuvers and long-term plans in an attempt to extract the concept and confuse the idea of the Khilafah in the minds of Muslims, intimidating them of calling for it by describing it as backward, brutal and terrorist.

Among these cunning policies is its avoidance of imposing its so-called democratic values on Muslims directly, which it saw its clear failure and Muslims' dissatisfaction of it, during the military occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. They assigned this task to their Muslim men such as the scholars of the sultans, Islamic organizations and some Islamic parties, and providing platforms for secularists and liberals and perpetuating oppression and mouths gagging by puppet rulers.

They tried to strike the idea of the return of the Khilafah State by calling it a dream, and being impossible to exist at times, keeping it away from the Shariah classification and its obligation which the scholars unanimously agreed on. They claim that Islam did not make it an obligation, but rather that it was valid for a certain time but no longer valid for today, and that the form of government in Islam does not need to be the Khilafah State. Many of the Islamic parties that came to power or participated in secular rule abandoned the concept of implementing Shariah in the Khilafah State in order to dilute it and keep it away from the Muslims' concern that it is obligatory.

As for the cunning Kaffir, colonial West, it extended its arms in secret and militarized the advocates of material actions in Islamic groups, which became associated with scenes of killing and beheading, the brand that it published in the media for those who claimed the establishment of the Khilafah while they did not establish it. However, the West has benefited from linking the name of the Khilafah to these groups, who in turn have distorted its image to the people and some Muslims in a dirty mission, which increases the difficulty of the task of the sincere party that works for its return and whose name is associated with it, for Hizb ut Tahrir means the Khilafah and the Khilafah means Hizb ut Tahrir, but the colonial Western media and its electronic search machines are now linking the name of the Khilafah and the Islamic State with ISIS and other distorted images in a miserable attempt to obscure its purity, strength, and obligation in Islam, and imposing a blackout on the party that is working for it.

Second: The Center for Strategic Studies of the Center for Marine Analytics in Virginia, America, in cooperation with the Wilton Park Center in England of the Office of Foreign Affairs in the United Kingdom, which serves as a global forum for strategic discussion, held a conference at its headquarters in England on 3/5/2007 for a period of 3 days, titled **The Struggle for Unity and Authority in Islam: Reviving the Caliphate?**

Each of the two centers issued a report that concluded with 81 points revolving around the main topics discussed, which revolve around: Unity and Governance in the Era of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, Caliphate and Authority in Islamic Political Systems between Theory and Practice, Reviving the Call to Caliphate in the Twentieth Century, Obstacles to the Unity of the Islamic Ummah, Regional perspectives on the Caliphate, An Overview of the Groups that Promote the Concept of the Caliphate, Thinking Through Implementation and the Model of Hizb ut Tahrir, Da'wa, Media and the Message, and finally on Other Islamic Perspectives.

This conference decided from the onset that the parties calling for the Khilafah are extremists.

The following are the main points of the report:

-This conference brought together experts, scholars, practitioners, and leaders in the Muslim community to discuss **unity and authority** in the Muslim world today. Specifically, participants considered these issues within the context of the “**current caliphate debate**” – an ongoing discussion among some members of the Muslim community over the establishment of a modern-day caliphate.

- It appears that only a small, and mostly extremist, minority is promoting the caliphate as a viable institution for the 21st century. In bringing perspectives from across the Islamic world – from Africa to the Middle East to Indonesia - to the table, we were able to more accurately situate extremist views within the very broad spectrum of Islamic thinking on these matters.

- However, when considering the institution of the caliphate today, the past must be borne in mind because no aspect of the Islamic faith can be thoroughly understood without considering history.

- Today’s struggle for unity and authority in Islam is playing out, to some extent, in a modern caliphate debate

- Even modern-day groups that advocate a caliphate model – most notably Hizb ut-Tahrir – tend not to examine the assumptions implicit in their vision. Some of these assumptions include aspects of the modern, state-centric system that currently exists.

- The search for unity and authority is a defining struggle in the historical evolution of any state or nation. Since the death of the Prophet, two central politico-religious questions for Muslims have been: Who can stand in for the Prophet after his death? What authority should this person have?

The answers have not been given in the Qu’ran or left by the Prophet. As a result, the skeleton theory of the political system in Islam that has emerged provides nothing more than a partisan reading of early Islamic history, reflecting divergent interpretations of its various episodes over time.

There is no unique, prescribed system that provides step-by-step instructions for Islamic governance.

History will not repeat itself: It is not possible to bring back a system that existed for just a few decades 15 centuries ago. Very few Muslims actively seek a return to the ancient, pre-modern political system that existed in the 7th century.

There are significant obstacles to global Muslim unity, or a modern-day caliphate. Most of these hindrances stem from the existing nation-state system.

It is difficult to imagine how one would successfully impose this type of system on the expansive modern-day nation state system, made up of thousands of ethnic groups, tribes, sects, etc. Muslim unity has not existed for a very long time, if it ever did exist.

Even if Muslims agreed on the need for a caliph or some other formal leader of the umma, it would likely introduce disputes over such practical issues such as where the caliph would sit, where the “capital” would be, what form the caliph succession would take, and how far caliph authority would extend.

- Hizb ut-Tahrir is perhaps the group that is best known for its advocacy partly due to its very effective media and outreach activities.

The group is not monolithic. Today Hizb ut Tahrir is fairly autonomous in each country. There is no centralised entity that approves the activities of each branch.

-Hizb ut Tahrir lays out a clearer vision of how the caliphate would be structured if it were implemented. According to the group, they aspire to have an Islamic state led by a caliph

who implements Islam. He does not reign but rules. There are only three other ruling positions in the state: the authorised aides (who have the same power as the caliph, but by delegation), and provincial and district governors.

-Additionally, the Caliph would take the following measures once he was installed: adopt Arabic as the language of the state; treat all Muslim states as a de facto part of his realm; end diplomatic relations with colonial countries and with those with which there are no treaties; maintain a state of war with hostile countries; withdraw from all international organizations not based on Islam (e.g., the UN, IMF); and convey the call to Islam worldwide.

- The Internet has greatly extended the space in which the call for the caliphate can be propagated.

The Hizb ut Tahrir website Khalifa.com is also very sophisticated, complete with an organisational chart. There is considerable traffic on this site, and it is often quoted in the media.

- Groups advocating the caliphate today exist on the fringes; their views are not the mainstream. Accordingly, Hizb ut Tahrir is often thought of as dysfunctional and the members of Al-Qaeda are simply seen as aberrations. In contrast to these fringe elements, there currently are a number of very influential Islamic leaders whose views on politics, leadership, and authority in the faith resonate with significant segments of the Muslim world.

Neither the Qur'an nor the Sunnah gives a name to a form of government but contemporary influential Muslim thinkers are articulating bases for modern forms of Islamic governance.

The first is Rashid Ghannouchi; he argues that Muslims should participate in non-Muslim governments, and the second is Tariq Ramadan; his basic argument goes beyond Ghannouchi's. He argues that "[Muslims] need to separate Islamic principles from their cultures of origin and anchor them in the cultural reality of Western Europe."

It is noteworthy that neither of these scholars supports the notion of bringing back the caliphate, nor did any of the scholars present at this conference.

Although there is clearly a lively debate over unity and authority in the Islamic world - with a broad range of perspectives and views - the vast majority of people do not seriously entertain the notion of bringing back the caliphate.

Rather, it seems to be primarily extremist groups that are advocating the re-establishment of the caliphate.

Hizb ut Tahrir, on the other hand, advocating nonviolent organisation, has as its main driver to overthrow existing governments establish a caliphate. Although they seem to have a clearly articulated plan for how to operationalise this caliphate, there is little evidence that they are making any progress doing so. Many think that the notion of bringing back the caliphate is a rhetorical device used to recruit, gain sympathy, mobilise followers, irk enemies, and to gain legitimacy. (End of the report)

The observer and follower does not need to spend much effort to understand the messages of this conference from its discussions on what it calls the struggle for unity and governance in Islam, specifically (The Revival of the Caliphate State) in which it is trying to lend credibility to its proposals through the presence of a group of what it calls experts, scholars, activists and leaders in Islamic countries. They were selected to reflect the point of view that excludes the call for the establishment of the rightly-guided Khilafah State. The truth in the report, through them, is to mislead and distort and attempt to invade the Islamic country intellectually and politically to separate the mass support for the idea of establishing the Khilafah and working for it.

It provides a ruling arbitrarily and without evidence that the groups calling for the Khilafah are a minority and does not discuss the validity and strength of the idea. Therefore, it describes these groups as extremist, although it presents their views, especially the view of

Hizb ut Tahrir, which affirms that it is non-violent, meaning that it is an Islamic political party with a clearly defined program on how to establish the Islamic state and it has a draft constitution and clear programs to implement Islam upon its establishment, so where is extremism that is described in the report?

The distortions that were mentioned in the points of this report can only be explained in the context of their relentless pursuit, as joint intellectual research institutions between America and Britain as the two heads of kufr and colonialism, to try to put obstacles towards what they see as the inevitability of the return of the Khilafah State and the implementations of Islam with its lofty human values that defeated and excluded the ideas of brutal, corrupt capitalist and secular values, as the world sees it today. Their political defeat is looming on the horizon; they continue in lying, forgery and misleading for decades. This campaign intensifies whenever they realize the imminence of the establishment of the Khilafah, using various media and political means and intellectual seminars in addition to their repressive tools; the puppet Muslim rulers, and Muslim scholars as a closer means for intellectual and political confusion about the system of government in Islam. It reached the point of their exploitation and pushing groups that carry out material activities such as killing and displacement under the name of the Khilafah by rhetoric, distortion and alienation.

The West was not more articulate about its ill intentions for the Islamic Ummah in general and for the return of the Khilafah State in particular. While it is aware and trembling of the inevitability of its return when it asks, and warning, at the end of the report: **“Can a deep understanding of extremist groups’ calls for a modern caliphate be used to inform policy makers regarding combating extremism and terrorism?”**

Third: The article (The Islamic Caliphate or the National State?) dated 11/9/2020, on Al-Hurra website by journalist Imran Salman, a Bahraini-American, who worked on several projects with American research institutions, including the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, where he was the managing editor of “Democracy Papers” on Iraq.

We bring to you excerpts from this article, which is full of hostility, distortion and hatred for the project of restoring the Khilafah State:

The Islamic Khilafah belongs to the past, like the ancient empires, and its chronological life has come to an end, sweet and sour, and it must be clearly stated in the school curricula that it is not suitable for the modern era and that it contradicts the reality of current countries. Teaching it is purely a historical presentation, and has nothing to do with the present or the future of these people.

There is another wrong assumption, which is that in order for the Arab countries to progress, they must unite. Arab countries do not need unity to revive. First, it needs to build modern national states based on civil state, the rule of law, and serving the interests of their people.

The calls for unity that were issued over the past hundred years were nothing more than a sentimental idea, appealing to many and tantalizing their imaginations, but they missed the realization of the interest, and therefore they ended up being just an attempt to bring down an imagined idea on the ground.

The dream of a single Arab state may be a demand (albeit not realistic) for those who believe in the possibility of such unity, although modern and ancient history has not praised it in any way. As for the dream of an Islamic Caliphate, it is a catastrophe and a disturbing nightmare, and we do not wish anyone to go through it.

Of course, the call for Arab unity, despite its naivety and tragedy, is much less bearable than the story of the Islamic Caliphate. The latter sends us many years back in the past; an imaginary past, each Islamic sect imagines it however it wants or in line with its political desire, while other groups reject it and sees as an adverse evil.

In other words, we should not look at the Islamic Caliphate any more than the Westerners today look at the Greek or Roman civilization... we benefit from their positives regarding our present, not that we go back to it, God forbid!

It is clear from this article the extent of his hostility to the return of the Khilafah through intellectual and political distortion, which is evident through the positions he occupied and was employed in by Western democratic institutions.

Fourth: As for the fourth picture about shedding light on the Khilafah, it is from the book "The Sects and Islamic Movements" issued in 2021, the seventeenth chapter of the book talks about: "Hizb ut Tahrir: The Dream of the Caliphate" by its Kazakh author Miriam Aitkulova. In this book, Hizb ut Tahrir is classified in the third part under the title "Fundamentalists and Extremists," and according to the book's claim, it describes the extremists as those who use violence to achieve their goals. However, it included Hizb ut Tahrir under this section to put it in the spotlight of fighting terrorism, falsely and slanderously. It describes the party as political and not violent.

We review the most important comments made in it:

Against the backdrop of turmoil in Muslim-majority countries, decolonization processes and internal clashes between Arab states, the emergence of an Islamist movement such as Hizb ut Tahrir, which struggles with its own view of justice, was not unexpected; however, in a world where the association of religion and politics has been rejected for some time, and seen as backward, the ideas of a new movement have been claiming to be a political party, but fighting stubbornly for an Islamic Caliphate on the method of the Prophet Muhammad steadfastly.

It is under the spotlight and the center of special attention by the security services and social and political institutions in Central Asia, where Hizb ut Tahrir has gained wide popularity since the collapse of the Soviet regime. However, Hizb ut Tahrir has gained less international attention than other fundamentalist Islamist movements, and research on this party is often controversial, oscillating between being described as a "terrorist" or a "peaceful" group. In this regard, this chapter attempts to provide more insights into the history and ideology of Hizb ut Tahrir and the position it takes on violence.

Hizb ut Tahrir is well organized and its ideology is clearly defined. This ideology encourages the revival of the Islamic Ummah through the establishment of the Khilafah, similar to that of the era of the Prophet Muhammad and his first four caliphs (the Four Rightly Guided Caliphs). The party sees the shortcomings of other Islamic movements in their lack of a strong political program and their cooperation with secularists, and it declares itself not as a purely religious organization, but as a political movement inspired by Islam. Therefore, it opposes any other ideologies - be it communism, capitalism or anything else - as alien to Islam.

For Hizb ut Tahrir, Islam is an idea and a method and it is self-sufficient, revealed by Allah (swt) and cannot be compatible with any man-made ideologies. The fundamental principles of Hizb ut Tahrir have not changed since the day it was founded, and despite frequent changes in leadership and changing conditions in the contemporary world, Nabhani's initial ideas form the bedrock of Hizb ut Tahrir and continue to inspire many Muslims today. The party's name reflects its primary goal of liberating Islamic countries from the influence of kuffr regimes.

Muhammad Iqbal and Zulkifl Zulkifl regard Hizb ut Tahrir as a group with all the characteristics of a fundamentalist movement, although it is often confused with a "terrorist" group inaccurately.

Today, Hizb ut Tahrir is considered one of the largest Islamic movements in the world. From its humble beginnings in Palestine, Hizb ut Tahrir's ideas spread rapidly in many countries, thanks in large part to Nabhani's strategy that encouraged his followers to travel

extensively, his charismatic personality and his welcoming approach to all Muslims regardless of race, gender or sect they belong to (Othman 2012: 90)

Hizb ut Tahrir actively disseminates its ideas through pamphlets, brochures, lectures and regular meetings. Today, its media branch is perhaps the most organized and modern, when compared to the media of other Islamic organizations. During its first decade of activity, Hizb ut Tahrir achieved relative success in many Arab countries.

It is currently present, either officially or secretly, in more than forty countries. One of the hallmarks of the movement is the effective use of media capabilities; it is adapted to the latest communication methods, through professionally composed print and informational brochures, official and unofficial social media pages, and websites in the countries in which they are located. For example, for a long time, the office of Hizb ut Tahrir in Central Asia had pages on online social media, until they were blocked by the security institutions. However, the flexibility of social media allows them to continue their own activity.

According to Nabhani's view, Islam is a complete and coherent intellectual system that can organize all aspects of life. According to the official website of Hizb ut Tahrir, its goal is to resume Islamic way of life and convey the Islamic call to the world. This goal means returning Muslims to live the Islamic way of life in Dar ul Islam (abode of Islam) and in an Islamic society so that all the affairs of life in the community are managed.

According to the rules of Shariah, and its point of view of Halal and Haram, under the Islamic state, which is the Khilafah State, that is the situation in which Muslims appoint a caliph and give him the pledge of allegiance to listen and obey, provided that he rules them according to the Book of Allah (swt) and the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (saw), provided that Islam is carried as a message to the world through Dawah and jihad.

An-Nabhani writes about the Islamic state that it "is neither a dream nor a figment of the imagination, as it has dominated and influenced history for more than thirteen centuries." An-Nabhani predicted that initially the Khilafah or Islamic state would be established in one of the Arabic-speaking countries and would eventually include all Muslim countries. However, his ideas later proved more popular elsewhere.

An-Nabhani combined classical Islam with modern politics, which resulted in a draft constitution (1953) for the future Caliphate that contains a set of laws for the political, economic and social system of the state and its foreign policy. According to the constitution, the head of the state, the caliph is elected; he must be just and accountable.

Aitkulova also addresses the view expressed by a number of counter- terrorism experts that the movement can be a first step on the path towards violent extremism.

Yes, Muslims dream of living in the Khilafah, but they do not dream of the possibility of its return, because its return is a promise from Allah (swt) and the Prophet (saw) gave its glad-tidings. The images of the state of justice and mercy, the implementation of the Islamic rulings, and the special style of living that characterizes the Khilafah state, pass before their eyes every day, and they see a caliph who was given the pledge of allegiance with acceptance and choice and gave him their authority to be governed by the law of Allah, and they see their public property distributed fairly among them, and they see their living rights guaranteed with the best possible care, and they see how they rush to jihad to eliminate the Jewish entity, and they do not see a Western embassy or the influence of a colonizer on their lands, and they move from one end of the country to the other without Passport or borders, and their unity is practically achieved in a state feared by nations, and they see the caliph addressing the nations and carries the call to Islam to them to bring them out of darkness into light and from the injustice of their beliefs and values to the justice and mercy of Islam.

For all this, the enemies of Islam are working to delay the return of the Khilafah through all the methods of the devils. They understand its reality well and visualize it as the people who work for it visualize it. So, are Muslims aware of the obligation to work for the establishment of the Khilafah state and sacrifice the most precious for it? It is based

on the promise of Allah and the glad tidings of His Prophet (saw), so that he is from the winners, Allah willing.

O Ummah of Islam: The implementation of Islam is an obligation upon you in an Islamic entity and state because Islam does not exist except in an executive entity that implements its rules. And the form of government in this entity is the Islamic Khilafah State, whose extensive evidence was provided by the Sunnah and the consensus of the Companions, as the obligation of the implementation of Islam and its rulings is mentioned in the book in His (swt) saying: **﴿فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ لَا يَجِدُوا فِي أَنفُسِهِمْ حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَيُسَلِّمُوا﴾** **“But no, by your Lord, they will not [truly] believe until they make you, [O Muhammad], judge concerning that over which they dispute among themselves and then find within themselves no discomfort from what you have judged and submit in [full, willing] submission”** [An-Nisa: 65].

How can the kaffir colonizer realize the importance of the Khilafah and study it and study those who work for it and describe them as terrorism and extremism and fight them directly and through their tools and plot against them at all levels, and you do not realize that it is your vital issue whose time has come? And take the vital measure regarding it, and do not make the disbelievers have a way or dominance over you?! Do not make the memory of its fall pass again next year, but let it be, Allah willing, the year of its establishment, so that the earth shakes under the feet of kaffir tyrants, and then humanity enjoys its long-awaited justice and mercy.

#YenidenHilafet

#ReturnTheKhilafah

#الخلافة_101

#أقيموا_الخلافة

Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by
Dr. Ahmad Hassouna