Dangerous Concepts to Strike at Islam and Consolidate Western Culture

(Translated from Arabic)

Dangerous Concepts to Strike at Islam

and Consolidate Western Culture

(Translated from Arabic)

Published by Hizb ut Tahrir

First Edition

1419 AH / 1997 CE

Second Edition

Rajab 1439 AH / April 2018 CE

Reviewed

Rabi' al-Akhar 1448 AH / September 2026 CE

﴿ يُرِيدُونَ أَن يُطْفِـُٔوا۟ نُورَ ٱللَّهِ بِأَفْوَٰهِهِمْ وَيَأْبَى
ٱللَّهُ إِلَّآ أَن يُتِمَّ نُورَهُۥ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ ٱلْكَٰفِرُونَ ﴿٣٢﴾ هُوَ
ٱلَّذِىٓ أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُۥ بِٱلْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ ٱلْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُۥ
عَلَى ٱلدِّينِ كُلِّهِۦ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ ٱلْمُشْرِكُونَ ﴾

“The disbelievers want to extinguish Allah’s Light with their mouths. However, Allah will only permit that His Light is perfected, even though the disbelievers may hate that. It is He Who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the Deen of truth, to make it superior over all other ways of life even though those who associate partners with Allah hate that.”

[TMQ Surah At-Tawbah 9:32-33]

Contents

Introduction 1
Terrorism 6
Interfaith Dialogue 14
Compromise 39
Fundamentalism 47
Globalisation 56

Introduction

The struggle between good and evil, between truth and falsehood, is one of the laws amongst the laws that Allah ﷻ determined for creation. The Wisdom of Allah ﷻ mandates that struggle and conflict are a factor within the prevailing of truth and good, over falsehood and evil. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَلَوۡلَا دَفۡعُ ٱللَّهِ ٱلنَّاسَ بَعۡضَهُم بِبَعۡضٖ لَّفَسَدَتِ ٱلۡأَرۡضُ﴾

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

And He ,dias ﷻ

﴿وَلَوۡلَا دَفۡعُ ٱللَّهِ ٱلنَّاسَ بَعۡضَهُم بِبَعۡضٖ لَّهُدِّمَتۡ صَوَٰمِعُ وَبِيَعٞ وَصَلَوَٰتٞ وَمَسَٰجِدُ يُذۡكَرُ فِيهَا ٱسۡمُ ٱللَّهِ﴾

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

So, the Messenger ﷺ and his noble Companions (ra) plunged into an intellectual conflict and political

struggle with the mushrikeen and the Kuffar to establish the Islamic state. Then, there was a bloody conflict, in addition to the intellectual struggle, after the establishment of the state, carrying Islam as the Risaalah message of good and guidance, to the whole of humankind. The kuffar throughout the ages used to plot against this state, sometimes by material actions of war, such as the Mongols, the Crusaders, the kafirs of Spain, and sometimes by cultural and intellectual actions like those of heretics, missionaries and the orientalists in order to destroy the Khilafah (Caliphate) State, as an executive body, at the head of which is the Khaleefah (Caliph).

By the First World War that was achieved. The kuffar (disbelievers) destroyed the Khilafah state, expelled the Khaleefah, and tore up the Muslim lands into weak, tiny states, in which they applied the rules of kufr (disbelief), thinking that, by this action of theirs, they had banished Islam from the hearts of the Muslims.

However, at the hands of its believing, sincere, and aware, sons and daughters, the Islamic Ummah now manifests the portents of revival, which have streamed back within the Muslims. Thus, the kufr states realised that the strength of Islam is not confined to its executive body alone. They realize

that winning over certain weak Muslim souls, by polluting their thoughts with the Western culture, will not achieve what they had hoped for.

After research and study, they came to the conclusion that the power of Islam, and the Muslims, lies in the Islamic ‘aqeedah (creed) and the thoughts that emanate from it. This led them to review their plans, and to develop them, so that the people of kufr, with their established systemic order, and their agents from amongst the rulers and thinkers within Muslims, can take up the task of striking at Islam by destroying its ‘aqeedah as a political ‘aqeedah. This is so that the ‘aqeedah of separating religion from life can take its place. Thus, they began by presenting, for adoption, thoughts that lead on to what they believe, such as nationalism, socialism, democracy, pluralism, human rights, freedoms and free market policies, whose fallacy and danger we have already explained. (Refer to the booklet, “The American Campaign to Suppress Islam”).

Then, they presented other thoughts, accompanied by actions, like those of interfaith and intercultural dialogue, and the stance that the Arabs and Jews are all the progeny of Ibraheem (as). Then, they tarnished Islam with terrorism, fundamentalism and extremism. Therefore, we have to clarify these

opinions, and their danger for the Islamic Ummah, so that the Muslims may be aware of them and take the legitimate Shariah stance towards them. This is especially when the return of Islam to life as a global ideology and political system, conveyed to humanity by the Khilafah state, is an inevitable matter, not just for the Muslims working for Islam alone, but also for the Islamic Ummah, and also for the enemies of Islam, who have not stopped conspiring against this Deen and this Ummah.

We will discuss these thoughts in order to demonstrate their danger and fallacy, not as thoughts that are intended to be understood, or doubts that have to be repelled, but as actions of the disbelieving West, at the head of which are America, Britain and France, which are intended to strike Islam, and strike those working for the re-establishment of the Khilafah, and even to strike the Khilafah State, when Allah ﷻ permits it to be established.

Therefore, we must expose these thoughts and actions, so that Muslims are clear as to what is intended by them. This is so that they work earnestly to re-establish the Khilafah (Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood by, emulating the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, so that the re-establishment of the Khilafah and the ruling by all that Allah ﷻ has revealed is realised, at their hands. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿يُرِيدُونَ أَن يُطْفِـُٔوا۟ نُورَ ٱللَّهِ بِأَفْوَٰهِهِمْ وَيَأْبَى ٱللَّهُ إِلَّآ أَن يُتِمَّ نُورَهُۥ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ ٱلْكَٰفِرُونَ ﴿٣٢﴾ هُوَ ٱلَّذِىٓ أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُۥ بِٱلْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ ٱلْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُۥ عَلَى ٱلدِّينِ كُلِّهِۦ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ ٱلْمُشْرِكُونَ﴾

"The disbelievers want to extinguish Allah's Light with their mouths. However, Allah ﷻ will only permit that His Light is perfected, even though the disbelievers may hate that. It is He ﷻ Who has sent His Messenger ﷺ with guidance and the Deen of truth, to make it superior over all other ways of life even though those who associate partners with Allah ﷻ hate that." [TMQ Surah At-Tawbah 9:32-33].

If we were to do what Allah ﷻ has obligated upon us, then we are certain that the hopes of the Kuffar, who plot against Islam and the Muslims, will be dashed. They will waste their wealth, and their fires will be put out. He ﷻ said,

﴿إِنَّ ٱلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا۟ يُنفِقُونَ أَمْوَٰلَهُمْ لِيَصُدُّوا۟ عَن سَبِيلِ ٱللَّهِ ۚ فَسَيُنفِقُونَهَا ثُمَّ تَكُونُ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسْرَةً ثُمَّ يُغْلَبُونَ﴾

"Certainly, those who disbelieve spend their wealth to hinder men from the Path of Allah .ﷻ So they will continue to spend it. However, in the end it will become an anguish for them. Then they will be overcome." [TMQ Surah Al-Anfal:36].

Terrorism

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

﴿تُرْهِبُونَ بِهِۦ عَدُوَّ ٱللَّهِ وَعَدُوَّكُمْ﴾

"to terrify the enemy of Allah ﷻ and your enemy." [TMQ Surah Al-Anfal:60]. This means you must strike fear the enemy.

However, this meaning has been changed to a new terminological meaning. Both American and British intelligence services agreed upon this term in a seminar held for this purpose in 1979. Terrorism, now, is, "the unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims."

Subsequent to 1979, many international conferences and seminars were held. Legislation and laws were passed to define the actions which can be described as terrorism, and to clarify the types of movements, organisations and parties which practise terrorism, as well as to highlight those states that support terrorism. All this, according to their claims, is in order to adopt the necessary measures to fight terrorism and restrain it.

It is clear from reviewing the laws and legislations, relating to terrorism, that they are not accurate. These anti-terrorism laws are subject to the political bias of the states, which have enacted these laws and legislations. For example, we see that America considers the assassination of Indira Ghandi as terrorism, but not the assassination of King Faysal and the murder of John F. Kennedy. America described the blowing up of an FBI building in Oklahoma, in the beginning, as a terrorist act. However, when it became clear that those behind the explosions were American militias, it changed from describing the act as terrorist to merely a criminal act.

America specifically described certain movements as popular resistances, like the rebels of Nicaragua and the Irish Republican Army (IRA), amongst others. It considered the fighters of these movements, when they are arrested, as prisoners of war, according to Protocol I, a 1977 amendment protocol to the Geneva Conventions. On the other hand, America considers every movement opposing American interests, or the interests of America's agents, as being a terrorist movement. America places the names of these movements on the list of terrorist organisations, which is periodically issued

by the US State Department, and includes many Islamic movements in Egypt, Pakistan, Palestine and Algeria, amongst other places.

Since the 1970s, America decided to create a global and domestic American public opinion against terrorism as America saw it, and against those who are characterised by terrorism. America exploited actions which opposed civil order, whether these actions came from political or military movements not linked to America, or whether they come from movements connected to American intelligence. Hence, many reports have indicated that within the actions described as terrorism, those responsible were assets of the CIA, such as the hijacking of the TWA airplane in Beirut, in the beginning of the 1980s. America also exploited the bombing of the American al-Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1996 for this purpose.

Thus, America imposed forty recommendations relating to fighting terrorism at the G7 Summit that was held in France in 1996. Then, America exploited the incident of the World Trade Centre bombing in New York in 1993, whose perpetrators the FBI knew of beforehand, by passing a law for countering terrorism, which was approved by the US Senate in 1996.

In accordance with these recommendations, and this legislation, America was able to pursue any person accused of terrorism in any place. America has the right to arrest, abduct and inflict punishments which America deems appropriate, such as imprisonment, exile and withdrawing residence or nationality. All that would be done without giving the accused person the right to defend himself, or be legally represented before the civil courts or jury.

In addition, America has deliberately resorted to sweeping generalisations, by describing certain countries which went against American interests as terrorist, such as North Korea, China, Iraq and Libya. America has accused many Islamic movements of terrorism, such as Al-Jihad, Hamas, Al-Gama'a Al-Islamiyya in Egypt and FIS in Algeria. In this manner, America also exploited bombings against the Jews in Palestine, and the events that took place in Algeria on the eve of the military's nullification of parliamentary elections.

According to these laws, resolutions and recommendations, America is able to pursue and strike anyone America describes as terrorist, whether it is an individual, organisation, party or state, either by deploying American military forces, or by using political influence to impose

economic sanctions, as America did in Iraq and Libya. This aggressive stance was expressed by the former US Secretary of State, George P. Schultz, when he said, "that our responses [to terrorism] should go beyond passive defense to ... active prevention, preemption, and retaliation."

Thus, the anti-terrorism legislation adopted by America is one of the strategic weapons used by Washington to preserve its control over the world, especially the part of the world which has the potential to rebel against American policy.

Moreover, America has designated Islam as its enemy after the end of communism. The Muslim countries are the most important areas in which America uses anti-terrorism legislation to increase its influence and keep them under American control. This is because the Muslims are beginning to seek the path of revival to re-establish the Khilafah State, which America and other disbelieving states know to be the only state which can destroy the capitalist order which America leads.

That is why you will hardly find an Islamic movement today which is not liable to be designated by America as terrorist. Not even political movements and parties, which absolutely do not use material actions to realise their objectives, are safe

from this classification. Thus, America considers the action of every movement, party or state which calls for the return of Islam as a terrorist action, which goes against international law. Consequently, America is able, through this justification, and by compelling nations to pass anti-terrorism legislation to mobilise the forces of these states under American leadership to strike at this movement, party or state.

Therefore, it has become necessary for those Muslims working for the establishment of the Khilafah (Caliphate) state, who are a direct target of the policy known as counter-terrorism, to expose, before global and Islamic public opinion, the reality of what the Americans call anti-terrorism legislation. They must expose the reality of the policy of America, which works to dominate the world through this legislation. They must also expose that America is itself behind many terrorist acts in the world, as false flag attacks, though they have been attributed to the names of Muslims.

It is incumbent on the Muslims to be Islamic in their actions and behaviour. Islam has a specific method of realising its aims and objectives. Part of this method is the carrying of the Dawah to resume the Islamic way of life by re-establishing the Khilafah state. Adherence to the method, which

depends on intellectual conflict and political struggle alone, whilst completely abstaining from material actions, is adherence to the Shariah method which Islam has commanded. The Shariah method is not adhered to out of fear, or out of desiring to escape from the classification of terrorism.

It is incumbent on the Muslims to clarify that the work of the Islamic state, after its establishment, is also restricted to the Shariah. This is whether the work is domestic, such as looking after the affairs of people and implementing the Hudood, or the work is external, like conveying Islam though Dawah and Jihad to all of humanity, and removing the material obstacles that obstruct the implementation of Islam.

It is incumbent on Muslims to clarify that the implementation of Islam by the Muslims, both on themselves and others, is neither based on the whims and desires of Muslims, nor to realise a certain material interest for them. Instead, the implementation is in compliance with the orders of Allah ﷻ Who has created man, life and the universe and Who ﷻ has ordered the human being to organise his life according to the Shariah rulings of Islam, which He ﷻ has revealed to Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.

Thus, America and other countries describing Islam as terrorism, and the Muslims as terrorists, have a biased description. It is contrary to the reality, and contradicts what Allah ﷻ bestows through Islam. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَآ أَرۡسَلۡنَٰكَ إِلَّا رَحۡمَةٗ لِّلۡعَٰلَمِينَ﴾

"And We have sent you, Muhammad ﷺ, only as a mercy for all humanity." [TMQ Surah Al-Anbiya:107]. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَنَزَّلۡنَا عَلَيۡكَ ٱلۡكِتَٰبَ تِبۡيَٰنٗا لِّكُلِّ شَيۡءٖ وَهُدٗى وَرَحۡمَةٗ وَبُشۡرَىٰ لِلۡمُسۡلِمِينَ﴾

"And We have sent down to you the Noble Quran as a clarification for all matters, a guidance, a mercy, and glad tidings for those who submit to Allah (Muslims)." [TMQ Surah An-Nahl:89]. This mercy is manifested by the implementation of the Shariah rulings of Islam. There is no difference between Salah (prayer) and Jihad, or between Dua and striking fear in the enemy. There is no difference between Zakah and cutting the hand of the thief, or between helping the oppressed, and killing those committing aggression against the sanctities of the Muslims. All of these are Shariah rulings, which either the Muslims or the state implements, according to their stipulations and their causes.

Interfaith Dialogue

Indeed, inviting non-Muslims to Islam is a matter Allah ﷻ has made a Shariah obligation on the Muslims. The Muslims have been doing so for fourteen centuries, and still call others to Islam, whether they are from the People of the Book or not. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿ٱدۡعُ إِلَىٰ سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِٱلۡحِكۡمَةِ وَٱلۡمَوۡعِظَةِ ٱلۡحَسَنَةِۖ وَجَٰدِلۡهُم بِٱلَّتِي هِيَ أَحۡسَنُۚ﴾

"Invite to the Way of your Lord with evidences and inspiring speech, and debate with them, with that which is better." [TMQ Surah Al-Nahl:125]. And the Messenger ﷺ said in his letter to Heraclius, the emperor of Rome, «**إِنِّي أدعوكَ بدِعايةِ الإسلامِ ، أَسلِمْ تَسلَمْ ، يُؤْتِكَ اللهُ أجرَك مرَّتينِ، فإن تولَّيْتَ فإنَّ عليكَ إثمَ الأريسيِّينَ**» **"Verily, I invite you with the call of Islam. Embrace Islam and you shall be safe. Then Allah ﷻ will grant you the twofold reward. However, if you turn away, then the sin of your people is upon you."** [Al-Adab al-Mufrad]. Thus, our Dawah to the non-Muslims is a Dawah to have conviction in Islam and abandon disbelief (kufr).

As for the idea of interfaith dialogue, which is being heavily circulated nowadays, it is a foreign,

evil and Western idea that has no basis in Islam. This is because it calls for mutual commonality amongst religions. Moreover, it calls for a new fabricated religion, which the Muslims are to profess instead of Islam, because the advocates, and those who call for this idea, are the Western disbelievers (kuffar) themselves.

This idea started internationally in 1932, when France sent representatives to negotiate with the ulema of al-Azhar about the idea of unifying the three religions, Islam, Christianity and Judaism. This was followed by a conference in Paris, in 1933, which was attended by orientalists and missionaries from major universities in France, England, Switzerland, America, Italy, Poland, Spain and Turkey, amongst others. Then, the 1936 Conference of World Religions, also known as the World Congress of Faiths, was the last conference of religions before the Second World War, which distracted the Europeans from those conferences.

In 1964, Pope Paul VI issued a communication in which he called for dialogue between the religions. Then the Vatican published a document in 1969 with the title, “Guidelines for a Dialogue between Muslims and Christians.”

During the 1970s and 1980s, more than thirteen interfaith and intercultural meetings, and conferences were held. The most prominent of them was the Second World Conference on Religion and Peace which was held in Louvain, Belgium. It was attended by four hundred delegates from various world religions. There was also a conference of Cordova in Spain, which was attended by Muslim and Christian representatives from twenty-three countries. These two conferences were held in 1974. Then, there was a Christian-Muslim assembly in Carthage, Tunisia, in 1979.

In the 1990s, those calling for interfaith dialogue were very active indeed. Thus, they held an Arab-European conference in 1993 in Jordan. It was followed, in 1994, by the Khartoum conference for interfaith dialogue. Then in 1995, two interfaith dialogue conferences were held, one of them in Stockholm, and the other in Amman, both of which were followed by a conference about Islam and Europe in the University of Aal al-Bayt in Jordan in the year 1996.

Justifications for dialogue:

One of the most significant justifications, presented by conference attendees in the interfaith conferences is to oppose disbelief and atheism

represented by the Soviet Union before its collapse. Thus, communism is an atheism, which threatens the divine religions and threatens their cultural achievements. Then they pretended to weep for humanity and for the defence of believers in earth. Then, they discussed the truth in relative terms, and that it is not allowed for anyone to claim hatred against it. They also said truth should be subject to democracy, so the majority opinion is what is closest to the truth.

Recommendations of conference participants:

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

- The coining of new meanings and provisions for words such as disbelief, atheism, polytheism, belief, Islam, moderate, extremism and fundamentalism, so that these words are not a factor of division between people of religions.

- The establishment of joint universities for the three religions which would include creed, morals and culture, and the emphasis on positive collaboration between the religions and cultures upon the claim that all the People of the Book are believers and they worship God.

- The crystallisation of a joint document on human rights in order to permit peace and co-existence between the followers of religion. That is to be achieved by removing the feeling of barriers between the religions, and by removing the concept of "the enemy" within popular culture and the policies of states.

- The review of the wording of history, and the education curriculums, so that they are free of any incitement, or hatred, and so that religious education is considered part of basic humanitarian studies, which aims to create personalities that are open to human cultures, and have mutual understanding of others. Therefore, certain beliefs and worships must not be studied.

- The rousing of interest in studying the following subjects, and putting down a uniform concept for them, which are justice, peace, women's rights, human rights, democracy, work morals, pluralism, freedom, world peace, peaceful co-existence, and civil society, amongst others.

The means and styles of interfaith dialogue:

After the failure of disbelieving Westerners in distancing the Muslims from their 'aqeedah (doctrine) via the missionaries, orientalists, cultural

operations, and the intellectual and political deception of the media, they resorted to the state apparatus in their countries and in the countries of their agents. They began to hold conferences and seminars, formed collaborative teams and established centres of study in their countries and in the Muslim lands, like the Oxford Centre for Islamic studies, the Institute for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies, Durham (IMEIS), the American College of the Holy Cross, Muslim World League (MWL), the Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought and the World Council of Churches, amongst others.

They deliberately used terminologies and sweeping generalizations, which indicate meanings that are not clearly defined in order to mislead and deceive, such as reformation, cultural open-mindedness, human civilisation, universal sciences, peaceful coexistence, eschewing bigotry and extremism and globalism amongst others.

They mixed the concept of "science and culture" with the concept of "culture and civilisation" in order to use this confusion as a justification to attack those holding onto their specific way of life by saying that they are against science, and against the civilisation arising from it, whilst accusing them of being regressive and

backwards. Though the issue in Islam is not as they claim. Islam opens its gates to science and the civilisation that arises from this science. However, Islam closes its gates in the face of any culture or civilisation that is other than the culture and civilisation of Islam. This is because they constitute thoughts and concepts related to the behaviour of the human being, which must be controlled by the Islamic concepts about life alone.

They paint certain capitalist thoughts in bright colours for the Muslims. They market them to the Muslims by saying that they do not contradict Islam, until some Muslims considered these capitalist thoughts as being from Islam, such as democracy, freedom, pluralism, socialism and others. They also denounce certain Islamic thoughts and describe them as uncivilised and not fit for this age, such as Jihad, the Hudood punishments, polygyny, amongst other Shariah rulings.

They subjected the study of the Islamic texts to the capitalist way of thinking which makes the reality the source of the rule and not the subject of the thought. It makes utilitarian benefit the criterion in adopting, or leaving the ruling, and not the Halal and the Haram. This pushed some Muslims to invent certain principles, which are not supported by the

Shariah texts to interpret Islam, such as “the fiqh of the reality,” “the fiqh of balance,” and “necessity permits the prohibited” amongst others. This has resulted in the dilution of certain Shariah rulings of Islam, and the inability to differentiate between the alien ruling, from the original ruling, as well as between what constitutes kufr and what constitutes Islam. Thus Riba (interest) has become permitted, whilst seeking martyrdom has become suicide.

The disbelievers who are supervising the dialogue are embarking on the generalisation and widening of the scope of the dialogue. So, it will not remain restricted to a few in conferences and seminars. Instead, it must include all sections of society from men and women to the educated and working class. This is done via the universities, institutes of study, parties and associations. It is done, as some participants of the conferences expressed, by attaching the Western civilisation to the economy, social and familial domains, politics, education and so on. Thus, capitalism, according to their claim, is humanist, rational, freedom and democracy; it is the new and successful culture. As for Islam, it is blind faith, despotism and ancient heritage. It is a theocracy which accepts slavery and polygyny. It is an uncivilised and barbaric religion!

One of the styles with which they are blinding the Muslims in the conferences of dialogue is the participation of those belonging to certain beliefs, such as Hinduism, Buddhism and Sikhism, amongst others, with Muslims, Christians and Jews. This is what happened in the first World Conference on Religion and Peace that was held in Kyoto, Japan, in 1970, and also in a seminar in Beirut in Lebanon in the same year. This is so the Muslims do not think they are the only targets of the dialogue. How can those so-called ulema of Muslims accept to make Islam equal to Buddhism and other religions!

The true view of the West regarding Islam:

Indeed, the West, which calls for dialogue with the Muslims and heads conferences of dialogue, views Islam as an enemy. This viewpoint is the motive for the dialogue and this viewpoint governs and directs the dialogue. Thus, the cultural Encyclopédie Française (French encyclopaedia) of 1936, which is a reference for researchers, states that the Messenger Muhammad ﷺ is a murderer, the antichrist, abductor of women and the greatest enemy to human reason. Many text books in Western Europe describe the Messenger of Allah, Muhammad ﷺ, Islam and the Muslims with the ugliest of descriptions.

In addition, in the book “The End of History and the Last Man,” the American thinker Francis Fukuyama stated, “Islam has indeed defeated liberal democracy in many parts of the Islamic world, posing a grave threat to liberal practices even in countries where it has not achieved political power directly.” “Islamic fundamentalism is at least as dangerous as communism was,” said Willy Claes in 1995, the then secretary general of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, adding “Please do not underestimate it.” The orientalist Barnard Lewis asserted that there is no scope for dialogue with Islam as it contradicts Western thought. As for Samuel P. Huntington, former director of Harvard's Center for International Affairs and the Albert J. Weatherhead III University Professor, who explained in his book, “The Clash of Civilizations,” that, “The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future… Even more than ethnicity, religion discriminates sharply and exclusively among people. A person can be half-French and half-Arab and simultaneously even a citizen of two countries. It is more difficult to be half-Catholic and half-Muslim.”

So, what is the dialogue they call us for amidst this enmity?

These statements need to be compared with the hostile actions which have come from the West against Islam and the Muslims, such as the Crusades, the extermination of Muslims in Spain, the destruction of the Khilafah state and the subsequent establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine, and the depiction of Islam and the Islamic movements as terrorist and extremist. When we compare these statements, we realise the meaning and aims of the dialogue the Kafir (disbelieving) West is establishing with the Muslims.

The aims of the dialogue:

The primary aim which the capitalists are working to achieve, from the dialogue between religions and cultures, is to prevent the return of Islam to life as a system. This is because Islam threatens the continuation of their ideology and culture and will destroy their interests and influence.

As for other partial aims, which serve the primary aim, these are varied. Thus, they aim to paint the world according to the colour of the capitalist civilisation, especially in the regions within which the Muslims live, to take the place of the Islamic civilisation. This is so that it will be easy for them to obliterate the Islamic culture from the minds of the people. They intend to do so by shaking

the confidence of Muslims in the Islamic culture and its Shariah sources and foundations in order to neutralise Islam in the battle of the clash of civilisations by depriving it of its most important characteristics which distinguish Islam from the rest of the religions; namely, the Islamic politics upon which the Khilafah state would be established to look after the affairs of the people by the Shariah governance of Islam, and to carry Islam to the whole of humankind.

The Capitalists also aim to shape the personality of the Muslim anew, such that he finds no shame in leaving the Shariah obligation and indulging in the Shariah prohibition (Haram). Then, they aim to corrupt the Islamic desires and values, and destroy within the Muslim the zeal for Islam, such that he does not hate disbelief (kufr) and the disbelievers, and he does not enjoin the ma'ruf (goodness) and forbid the munkar (evil). With this, they undermined the cultural immunity of the Islamic Ummah due to which Muslims resisted any foreign corruption. The Capitalists want to undermine the emotional and intellectual barriers which threaten the capitalist cultural existence in the Muslim countries. Thus, preserving their influence and interests becomes easier and they ensure the survival and continuance of their influence and interests.

The intention behind this dialogue, which the Kuffar (disbelievers) and the agent rulers guard in the Muslim countries, and with them an entourage of so-called ulema and thinkers, is to create a new religion for the Muslims. It is based on the creed of separating religion from life. It contains legislation by humankind instead of legislation from Allah ﷻ, the Creator of humankind and the Legislator. They are as Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَلَا يَزَالُونَ يُقَٰتِلُونَكُمۡ حَتَّىٰ يَرُدُّوكُمۡ عَن دِينِكُمۡ إِنِ ٱسۡتَطَٰعُواْ﴾

"And they will never cease fighting you, until they turn you back from your Deen, if they are able." [TMQ Surah Al-Baqara:217]

And as He ﷻ says,

﴿وَلَن تَرۡضَىٰ عَنكَ ٱلۡيَهُودُ وَلَا ٱلنَّصَٰرَىٰ حَتَّىٰ تَتَّبِعَ مِلَّتَهُمۡ﴾

"Never will the Jews nor the Christians be pleased with you until you follow their religion." [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah:120].

Since the basis of the Islamic culture is the Islamic creed and the basis of Western culture is the capitalist creed, merging them is impossible. So, the intention behind the dialogue led by the disbelieving West is the work to make the Muslims abandon their

Islamic concepts for capitalist thoughts. This is because they realise that the combination of two contradictory beliefs is impossible.

Thus, the dialogue between religions and civilisations for establishing common factors, and manufacturing a new human civilisation, is impractical. There must be an intellectual conflict between religions and cultures to know the truth from falsehood, the weak from the strong, and the good from the evil. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿فَأَمَّا ٱلزَّبَدُ فَيَذۡهَبُ جُفَآءٗۖ وَأَمَّا مَا يَنفَعُ ٱلنَّاسَ فَيَمۡكُثُ فِي ٱلۡأَرۡضِ﴾

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

As for the dialogue to which they call, it is actually one-way, represented by the enemies of Islam with the aim of destroying Islam, the Islamic culture and the Islamic Ummah. Therefore, Muslims must master the necessary tools for conflict, represented by the reestablishment of the Khilafah state, which will plunge into intellectual and material conflict to spread the sublime Islamic culture and replace false and corrupt cultures.

Talk of the Progeny of Abraham (Ibraheem (as)):

This talk has come to strengthen the dialogue between the three religions as three divine religions which were brought by the Prophets Muhammad ﷺ, Esa (as) and Musa (as). They all derive their ancestry from one father and he is Ibraheem (as). Therefore, the disbelievers (kuffar) say it is incumbent on the followers of these three religions to live together in peace, because they descend from one origin, both in lineage and religion.

This is from one angle. From the other angle, this talk supports the so-called peace process, and the normalisation with the Jews. This is to facilitate the Jewish and Western conspiracy against Islam and the Muslims, so as to occupy Palestine and Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa and to implant a poisoned dagger in the heart of the Islamic Ummah. It is to justify the participating of the Jews, Christians and Muslims in the religious custodianship over Jerusalem (al-Quds), which contains their holy sites, based upon the claim that the Muslims belong to one religion, which is the religion of Ibraheem (as), the father of the Prophets.

To demonstrate the error of this stance and to refute it, we need to clarify three issues:

Firstly, the linguistic issue: The word ‘Aslama’ in its linguistic meaning means ‘inqaada’ (to submit). The Noble Quran has used it with this meaning in the Stories of the Prophets and when describing their followers who submitted to the order of Allah ﷻ. Allah ﷻ said of the speech of Nuh (as), who came before Ibraheem (as),

﴿إِنۡ أَجۡرِيَ إِلَّا عَلَى ٱللَّهِ وَأُمِرۡتُ أَنۡ أَكُونَ مِنَ ٱلۡمُسۡلِمِينَ﴾

“My reward is only from Allah. I have been ordered to be one of the Muslims, who submit” [TMQ Surah Yunus:72].

And He ﷻ said of the speech of Ibraheem (as) and Isma’eel (as),

﴿رَبَّنَا وَٱجۡعَلۡنَا مُسۡلِمَيۡنِ لَكَ وَمِن ذُرِّيَّتِنَآ أُمَّةٗ مُّسۡلِمَةٗ﴾

“Our Lord! Make us the Muslims who submit before You and of our offspring a submitting Muslim Ummah before You.” [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah:128].

And Allah ﷻ said regarding the People of Lut (as),

﴿فَمَا وَجَدۡنَا فِيهَا غَيۡرَ بَيۡتٖ مِّنَ ٱلۡمُسۡلِمِينَ﴾

“We found not there any household of the Muslims who submit, except one household.” [TMQ Surah Az-Zariyat:36].

And about the speech of the Prophet Musa (as), Allah ﷻ said,

﴿فَعَلَيۡهِ تَوَكَّلُوٓاْ إِن كُنتُم مُّسۡلِمِينَ﴾

"Then in Him put your trust, if you are Muslims who submit." [TMQ Surah Yunus:84]. And about the speech of the Hawariyyoon, the followers of 'Isa (as), Allah ﷻ said,

﴿ءَامَنَّا بِٱللَّهِ وَٱشۡهَدۡ بِأَنَّا مُسۡلِمُونَ﴾

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

So, the word 'Muslims; (muslimoon) found in the ayaat mean "those who have submitted" (munqaadoon). It does not mean that they professed one Deen, which is Islam as revealed to Muhammad ﷺ. This is because Islam was not known to them, and they were not addressed by the Deen of Muhammad ﷺ. Instead, each people had a particular Messenger, who called them to a specific Shariah. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿لِكُلّٖ جَعَلۡنَا مِنكُمۡ شِرۡعَةٗ وَمِنۡهَاجٗا﴾

"To each Ummah among you, We have made a Shariah Law and a clear method." [TMQ Surah Al-Ma'ida:48].

After the Revelation was sent down to Muhammad ﷺ, the Revelation took up certain Arabic words, transferring them from their linguistic conventional meaning to a Shariah meaning. The Shariah texts from the Noble Quran and Prophetic Sunnah have clarified these meanings. One of these transferred expressions is the word 'Islam' which linguistically used to mean "submission (inqiyaad)," but then came to have a Shariah meaning, which is the Deen revealed by Allah ﷻ to His Messenger Muhammad ﷺ. Allah ﷻ said addressing the whole of humankind until the Day of Judgement,

﴿وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ ٱلْإِسْلَٰمَ دِينًا﴾

"I have chosen for you Islam as your Deen." [TMQ Surah Al-Maa'idah:3]. And He ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَن يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ ٱلْإِسْلَٰمِ دِينًا فَلَن يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ﴾

"And whosoever seeks a Deen other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him." [TMQ Surah Aal-i Imran:85]. And the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, «بُنِيَ الإِسْلامُ عَلَى خَمْس» **"Islam has been built on five**," whilst the previous Shariahs are not built upon these five.

After the Shariah transference (naql) of the meaning of the word 'Islam,' the words derived from it, such as the verb 'aslama' and the subject of

the verb, ‘Muslim,” when found without a contextualization (qareenah), came to evidence the Shariah meaning alone. If the conventional linguistic meaning is implied, then this would require a contextualization (qareenah) to change it from the Shariah meaning.

As for His ﷻ saying,

﴿مَا كَانَ إِبۡرَٰهِيمُ يَهُودِيّٗا وَلَا نَصۡرَانِيّٗا وَلَٰكِن كَانَ حَنِيفٗا مُّسۡلِمٗا﴾

“Ibraheem was neither a Jew nor a Christian. He was Muslim.” [TMQ Surah Aal-i‘Imran: 67]; this does not mean that Ibraheem (as) was on the Deen which Allah ﷻ revealed to Muhammad ﷺ. Instead, it means that Ibraheem (as) had submitted to Allah ﷻ regarding what Allah ﷻ revealed to him, unlike the Jews and Christians who had corrupted the Deen of their Prophets.

As for the statement that Muhammad, ‘Isa and Musa were on the Deen of Ibraheem, it means that they believed in the same ‘aqeedah, which is the foundation of every Deen from Allah ﷻ. This is what is meant by His ﷻ saying,

﴿شَرَعَ لَكُم مِّنَ ٱلدِّينِ مَا وَصَّىٰ بِهِۦ نُوحٗا وَٱلَّذِيٓ أَوۡحَيۡنَآ إِلَيۡكَ وَمَا وَصَّيۡنَا بِهِۦٓ إِبۡرَٰهِيمَ وَمُوسَىٰ وَعِيسَىٰٓۖ أَنۡ أَقِيمُواْ ٱلدِّينَ وَلَا تَتَفَرَّقُواْ فِيهِ﴾

"Allah ﷻ has legislated for you the same Deen which He ordained for Nuh (as) and that which We have inspired in you, O Muhammad ﷺ, and that which We ordained for Ibraheem (as), Musa (as) and Esa (as) saying you should establish the Deen, and do not become divided over it." [TMQ Surah Ash-Shura:13]. So, the word Deen in this ayah means the foundation of the Deen, which is the Aqeeda. Allah ﷻ specified this when He ﷻ said,

﴿لِكُلٍّ جَعَلْنَا مِنكُمْ شِرْعَةً وَمِنْهَاجًا﴾

"To each Ummah among you, We have made a Shariah Law and a clear method." [TMQ Surah Al-Ma'ida:48]

Secondly, the Shariah issue: It is that Allah ﷻ sent Muhammad ﷺ as the Final of the Prophets and the Messengers (as) to the whole of humankind. Allah ﷻ ordered all peoples to leave whatever religion they were following, whether divine or not, and called them to adopt Islam as a Deen. Whoever responded to the Dawah became a Muslim, and whoever rejected committed Kufr. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿ وَقُل لِّلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ ءَأَسْلَمْتُمْ ۚ فَإِنْ أَسْلَمُوا فَقَدِ اهْتَدَوا ۖ
وَّإِن تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ ۗ وَاللَّهُ بَصِيرٌ بِالْعِبَادِ ﴾

“And say to those who were given the Book and to those who are illiterate pagans, “Do you submit yourselves in Islam?” If they do, they are rightly guided. However, if they turn away, your duty is only to convey the Message. Allah is All-Seer of His servants.” [TMQ Surah Aal-i ‘Imran:20].

And Allah ﷻ said,

﴿ لَمۡ يَكُنِ ٱلَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ مِنۡ أَهۡلِ ٱلۡكِتَٰبِ وَٱلۡمُشۡرِكِينَ مُنفَكِّينَ حَتَّىٰ تَأۡتِيَهُمُ ٱلۡبَيِّنَةُ ۝١ رَسُولٞ مِّنَ ٱللَّهِ يَتۡلُواْ صُحُفٗا مُّطَهَّرَةٗ ۝٢﴾

“Those who disbelieve from among the people of the Book and among the Mushrikeen, were not going to leave their kufr, until there came to them clear evidences. A Messenger ﷺ from Allah.” [TMQ Surah Al-Baiyinah:1-2].

They are not separated from Kufr, except by their embracing of Islam. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, **«وَالَّذِي نَفْسُ مُحَمَّدٍ بِيَدِهِ لاَ يَسْمَعُ بِي أَحَدٌ مِنْ هَذِهِ الأُمَّةِ يَهُودِيٌّ وَلاَ نَصْرَانِيٌّ ثُمَّ يَمُوتُ وَلَمْ يُؤْمِنْ بِالَّذِي أُرْسِلْتُ بِهِ إِلاَّ كَانَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ النَّارِ»** **“By Him in Whose hand is the life of Muhammad, he who amongst the community of Jews or Christians hears about me, but does not affirm his belief in that with which I have been sent, and dies in this state of kufr, he shall be but one of the inhabitants of Hell-Fire.”** [Muslim].

So, the people are all called to gain conviction in Islam. Whoever does not profess Islam, after the matter has been confirmed for him, then he is definitely a disbeliever (kafir). As for the Jews and Christians after Muhammad ﷺ was charged with Prophethood, if they remain on their religion, they are disbelievers according to the Quranic text. It is forbidden to describe them as Muslims. Whosoever believes that they, or others, are Muslims, he is a Kafir. This because with this belief of his, he has rejected definite Shariah texts, which are definite in meaning and textual authenticity. If they die on this belief, then they will be from the inhabitants of the Fire.

Thirdly, the issue concerning the Progeny of Ibraheem (as): This is a call to the bond of partisanship. It is a bond whose reality indicates that it is a shallow, emotional bond, arising from the survival instinct. It is not fit for humans because it cannot bind one human being with an another if they differed in lineage.

The bond of the progeny of Ibraheem (as) has been wiped out by time. It does not exist in the reality of life because those who descend from Ibraheem (as), and his offspring, have mixed with other people due to marriage, social interaction, migration and wars. So, it is difficult, or rather it is

impossible, today to separate them from the rest of the people. The followers of the three religions are themselves from all peoples and tribes of the world. They have been integrated on the basis of religion, and not on the basis of ethnicity. Therefore, applying the claim concerning the progeny of Ibraheem (as) on Muslims, Jews and Christians, and on those who live around Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa or any other masjid, is a pointless application and incorrect. The intention is to fight Islam and then justify the supposed peace process and to normalise relations with the Jewish entity, which exists in its entirety on the occupied land of the Muslims, and to give legitimacy to the terrible crime which was committed by the traitorous rulers under the orders from their masters amongst the disbelievers.

The familial, partisan or nationalistic bond is like the bond of the progeny of Ibraheem (as). It is rejected by the Shariah as a basis to organise the relationships of the people. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿قُلۡ إِن كَانَ ءَابَآؤُكُمۡ وَأَبۡنَآؤُكُمۡ وَإِخۡوَٰنُكُمۡ وَأَزۡوَٰجُكُمۡ وَعَشِيرَتُكُمۡ وَأَمۡوَٰلٌ ٱقۡتَرَفۡتُمُوهَا وَتِجَٰرَةٌ تَخۡشَوۡنَ كَسَادَهَا وَمَسَٰكِنُ تَرۡضَوۡنَهَآ أَحَبَّ إِلَيۡكُم مِّنَ ٱللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِۦ وَجِهَادٖ فِي سَبِيلِهِۦ فَتَرَبَّصُواْ حَتَّىٰ يَأۡتِيَ ٱللَّهُ بِأَمۡرِهِۦۗ وَٱللَّهُ لَا يَهۡدِي ٱلۡقَوۡمَ ٱلۡفَٰسِقِينَ﴾

"Say: If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your kindred, the wealth that you have gained, the commerce in which you fear decline, and the dwellings in which you delight, are dearer to you than Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ, and Jihad in His Path, then wait until Allah ﷻbrings about His Decision. Allah does not guide the people who are fasiqoon (disobedient)." [TMQ Surah At-Tauba: 24].

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

﴿وَنَادَىٰ نُوحٌ رَّبَّهُۥ فَقَالَ رَبِّ إِنَّ ٱبۡنِي مِنۡ أَهۡلِي وَإِنَّ وَعۡدَكَ ٱلۡحَقُّ وَأَنتَ أَحۡكَمُ ٱلۡحَٰكِمِينَ ۝ قَالَ يَٰنُوحُ إِنَّهُۥ لَيۡسَ مِنۡ أَهۡلِكَۖ إِنَّهُۥ عَمَلٌ غَيۡرُ صَٰلِحٖ﴾

"And Nuh (as) called upon his Lord ﷻ and said, 'O my Lord! Verily, my son is of my family! Certainly, your promise is true, and You are the Most Just of the judges.' Allah ﷻ said, 'O Nuh! Surely, he is not of your people. Verily his work is not righteous.'" [TMQ Surah Hud:45-46]. And He ﷻ said about Ibraheem (as),

﴿قَالَ إِنِّي جَاعِلُكَ لِلنَّاسِ إِمَامٗاۖ قَالَ وَمِن ذُرِّيَّتِيۖ قَالَ لَا يَنَالُ عَهۡدِي ٱلظَّٰلِمِينَ﴾

"Allah ﷻ said to him. "Verily, I am going to make you a leader of mankind." Then Ibraheem (as) said, "And from my offspring too." Allah ﷻ replied, 'My covenant does not include the Zalimeen (wrongdoers).'" [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah:124].

Thus, the son of Nuh (as), according to the Shariah criterion, was not from the people of Nuh (as), because he did not believe what Allah ﷻ has revealed to his father (as). The zalimeen (wrongdoers) from the offspring of Ibraheem (as) are exempt from the covenant of Allah ﷻ for leadership, since they did not follow what Allah ﷻ has revealed to their father, Ibraheem (as). So, the call to the "progeny of Abraham" today is an ignorant and politically motivated call. It is Haram to call towards it and invite people to it. This is because the intention is to fight Islam, to divert the Muslims from their Deen and to justify the treacherous peace treaty with the Jews. It is in order to surrender what they usurped from the Blessed Land of Palestine. It is in order to normalise relations with the Jewish occupiers, and accept them as a state in the Middle East.

Compromise

The terminology of compromise did not appear amongst Muslims except in the modern age. It is a foreign terminology. Its source is the West and capitalist ideology, whose creed is based on compromise. This compromise emerged as a result of the bloody conflict between the Church and the kings who came under its authority, on the one hand, and Western thinkers and philosophers, on the other. The first faction used to view the Christian religion as suitable to solve all issues of life, whilst the second faction adopted the view that this religion was not suitable, and was the cause of humiliation and misery. The second faction adopted the view that human reasoning is able to formulate a system, which is suitable for organizing the affairs of life.

After a bitter conflict between the two factions, they agreed upon a compromise solution: the recognition of religion as an individual relationship between a person and his Creator, while denying religion any role in life or the state and leaving the organization of life's affairs to humans. They then adopted the idea of separating religion from life as the creed of their ideology, from which the capitalist system emanated. On this basis, they achieved their

revival and subsequently carried this ideology to others through colonialism. The effect of this compromise solution, upon which they built their creed, became prominent in every legislation and behaviour of the followers of the capitalist ideology, not least in the political issues. Thus, regarding the issue of Palestine, for example, the Muslims demand all of Palestine as their land, whilst at the same time the Jews claim that all of Palestine is the promised land which God promised to the Jews. Thus, in 1947, the Western capitalist states put forward a compromise solution: the partition plan, which called for the establishment of two entities in Palestine, one for the Arabs and the other for the Jews. This compromise solution has appeared in many international issues that are controlled by the capitalist powers.

As a consequence, politics for them is based on lies and deception, not on obtaining all of one's rights, but on obtaining whatever is possible, whether it is more or less than what is right. Politics is not about ensuring that everyone obtains their rights; rather, it is about reaching a compromise solution acceptable to both parties, not because it is necessarily correct, but because of the circumstances of each group in terms of its relative strength or

weakness. So, the strong takes everything he desires if he can, whilst the weak surrenders everything he cannot hang on to.

Instead of criticising the idea of compromise and the compromise solution, while clarifying its error and fallacy, some Muslims have adopted it and come to claim that it is present in Islam. They even claim that Islam is established on compromise. So, they say that Islam is in between spiritualism and materialism, in between individualism and collectivism, in between realism and idealism and in between constancy and change. So, they claim there is neither excess or deficiency, nor exaggeration and exceeding the bounds.

To prove their opinion, they claim that they examined objects, and found that everything has two extremes with a middle point. The middle is the safe area, while the extremes are subject to danger and corruption. The middle is the centre of power, the area of balance and equilibrium between two extremes. They say that since the middle point and compromise share these attributes, it is no surprise that compromise should emerge in every aspect of Islam. Thus, Islam lies in the middle in the realms of creeds, worships, legislation and morals and so on.

After they made a rational analogy between the Shariah rulings of Islam, and the reality of objects, they studied certain Shariah texts and twisted their meanings, subjugating them to their new understanding so that they confirm with the opinion that they have adopted. So, they said regarding His ﷻ saying,

﴿وَكَذَٰلِكَ جَعَلۡنَٰكُمۡ أُمَّةٗ وَسَطٗا لِّتَكُونُواْ شُهَدَآءَ عَلَى ٱلنَّاسِ وَيَكُونَ ٱلرَّسُولُ عَلَيۡكُمۡ شَهِيدٗا﴾

"Thus, We have made you an Ummah of wasat (a just and balanced nation), so that you be witnesses over mankind and the Messenger be a witness over you." [TMQ Al-Baqarah:143], that the Ummah of *wasat* is that of being in the middle, derived from the moderation in its way and system, so there is nothing in it of the excessiveness of the Jews, or the abstinence of the Christians. They said that the word 'wasat' also means justice, whilst justice, according to their claim, is the middle of two conflicting sides. So, they gave justice ('adl) the meaning of reconciliation (sulh) to serve the idea of compromise.

However, the correct meaning of the ayah is that the Islamic Ummah is an Ummah of justice, where justice (adl) is from the conditions of a testimonial witness in Islam. This Ummah is a just witness over

the other nations in that it has to convey Islam to them. Although the ayah came in the informational form (seeghatul ikhbaar), here it denotes an order (amr) from Allah ﷻ to the Islamic Ummah, such that the Muslims are obligated to convey Islam to the other nations. If the Ummah does not do that, Muslims will be sinful. The Ummah is a testimony (hujjah) against the other nations, just as the Messenger ﷺ is a testimony (hujjah) against the Ummah, as Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَيَكُونَ ٱلرَّسُولُ عَلَيۡكُمۡ شَهِيدٗا﴾

"and the Messenger be a witness over you." [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah:143]. This is in the sense of his ﷺ conveyance of Islam to the Ummah and his command to us that we must convey Islam to others. The Prophet ﷺ said, «اللَّهُمَّ اشْهَدْ، فَلْيُبَلِّغِ الشَّاهِدُ الْغَائِبَ» **"O Allah! Be witness. The present witness must convey to the one who is not present."** [Muslim]

The advocates of compromise also used the following Saying of Allah ﷻ as evidence,

﴿وَٱلَّذِينَ إِذَآ أَنفَقُواْ لَمۡ يُسۡرِفُواْ وَلَمۡ يَقۡتُرُواْ وَكَانَ بَيۡنَ ذَٰلِكَ قَوَامٗا﴾

"And those, who, when they spend, are neither excessive nor miserly, but proper spending between those." [TMQ Surah Al-Furqan: 67]. So, they gave

spending two extremes, excess (israaf) and miserliness (taqteer), and they gave spending a middle position which is the middle way. This is, in their view, an evidence for moderation in spending money.

However, they did not understand that the meaning of the ayah is that there are three types of spending, excess (israaf), miserliness (taqteer) and proper spending (qawwaam). Thus, extravagance is the spending upon Haram whether it is a little or a lot. If a person spends a single dirham in buying alcohol, gambling or bribery, it is excess and haram. As for miserliness, it is the abstention in spending on the Shariah obligation. If a person did not pay a single dirham which is owing from him from the Zakat on his money, or if he does not spend on those upon whom Shariah has obligated him to give financial maintenance, that is miserliness and is haram. As for the proper spending (qawwaam), it is the spending according to the Shariah rulings of Islam whether spending a lot or a little. So, honouring a single guest by slaughtering an entire sheep, chicken or even camel is proper spending. It is Halal because Allah ﷻ said in the ayah,

﴿بَيْنَ ذَٰلِكَ﴾

"between those" [TMQ Al-Furqan:67] to show that there are three types of spending, excess,

miserliness and proper spending (qawwaam). One of those three types is demanded by the Shariah, which is the proper spending.

There is no middle position or compromise solution in Islam. Thus, Allah ﷻ created man and He knows his reality, a knowledge that no human being can know. He ﷻ Alone is Able to organise his life accurately, and no one else can attain this level. So, the Shariah rulings have come defined. They have no trace of the middle position, or of the compromise solution. There is no middle position or compromise solution in the Shariah texts and Shariah rulings of Islam. Instead, they are accurate, clear and distinct such that Allah ﷻ Himself called them Hudood (limits) due to their accuracy and directness. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَتِلْكَ حُدُودُ ٱللَّهِ يُبَيِّنُهَا لِقَوْمٍ يَعْلَمُونَ﴾

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

And He ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَن يَعْصِ ٱللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُۥ وَيَتَعَدَّ حُدُودَهُۥ يُدْخِلْهُ نَارًا خَٰلِدًا فِيهَا﴾

"And whosoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, and transgresses His limits, He will

cast him into the Fire, to abide therein." [TMQ Surah An-Nisa:14].

Where is the middle position and the compromise solution in the saying of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to his uncle Abu Talib, when his people offered him position, wealth and rank to leave Islam, «وَاللهِ لَوْ وَضَعُوا الشَّمْسَ فِي يَمِينِي ، وَالْقَمَرَ فِي يَسَارِي عَلَى أَنْ أَتْرُكَ هَذَا الْأَمْرَ حَتَّى يُظْهِرَهُ اللهُ أَوْ أَهْلِكَ فِيهِ مَا تَرَكْتُهُ» **"By Allah! O uncle, if they put the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left, that I must abandon this matter, until Allah makes it victorious or I perish, I shall not leave it**." [Ibn Hisham]? Where is the compromise in his statement to the tribe of Bani 'Aamir b. Sa'sa'ah when they demanded that they should have authority after him ﷺ in return for their nussrah (military support), he ﷺ replied, «الْأَمْرُ إِلَى اللَّهِ يَضَعُهُ حَيْثُ يَشَاءُ» **"The authority belongs to Allah ﷻ and He ﷻ grants it where he wills."**?

Thus, the middle position or the compromise solution is an idea foreign to Islam. The Westerners, and those Muslims who are loyal to them, have attached compromise to Islam in order to market it to the Muslims in the name of moderation and tolerance, intending to distort for us the limits of Allah ﷻ and the clear, distinct Shariah rulings.

Fundamentalism

The first time the term ‘fundamentalism’ appeared was in Europe towards the end of the nineteenth century to indicate the stance of the Church towards the sciences and new philosophies and their strict adherence to the Christian faith.

The Protestant movement is considered the foundation of fundamentalism. Its fundamental principles were articulated at the Niagara Bible Conference of 1878 and later at the 1910 World Missionary Conference, where the core ideas upon which fundamentalism is based were crystallised. They were established on principles of Christian beliefs which contradicted the scientific progress, arising from the capitalist ideology which is itself established on the secular creed of separating religion from life.

Though this movement disappeared with the Second World War, it settled in the minds of the Europeans that fundamentalism was an enemy to progress and science. It is intellectual backwardness which does not befit the age of renaissance and enlightenment. It must be fought until all its traces are removed from society and life.

Thus, fundamentalism emerged in Europe against the effect of the scientific and industrial advancement, which came after the separation of Christianity from life and state. This separation was a reaction to the inability of Christianity to respond to the new systems of life which emanate from the creed of the capitalist ideology, the creed of separating religion from life. It pushed the believers in the Christian faith to adopt a stance refusing the various forms of material progress and the capitalist culture. However, this movement, described as fundamentalist, failed and disappeared due to its inability to present practical solutions to life's problems. It failed due to the aim for which it was established, which is the resistance to science, disciplines and thoughts which the Christians did not agree with or believe in.

So, the source of describing certain Christian and Jewish movements as fundamentalist is the West itself. It is a reference to the religious movements which oppose technical, industrial and scientific progress which took place due to the application of the capitalist ideology.

Today, this description is applied to many Islamic movements, to those who are affiliated to these movements, by the Western thinkers and

politicians, then by some Muslims who conform to this stance. The aim is to fight and oppose these movements by creating an international public opinion against anyone described as such because fundamentalism for them means backwardness and regression. It means opposing scientific and industrial advancement.

By merely classifying a specific group as fundamentalist, it is sufficient to consider it a danger to the modern materialist culture and to the lives of people. This justifies taking necessary measures, however harsh, to struggle and fight against it. When a state like Egypt or Algeria execute Muslims for being fundamentalists, this action is greeted with support by Western public opinion. No human rights organisation is moved by it because those people, according to their claim, are fundamentalists. They are against humanity, especially when all of the ugliest acts are attributed to them, such as the mass slaughter of innocent people in Algeria and the killing of tourists and Copts in Egypt.

The description of fundamentalism crossed over to include every movement and party which worked to change the terrible life which the Muslims live in, to an Islamic way of life by re-establishing the Khilafah and ruling by Islam. It has come to include

every movement which opposes aggressors, violators and occupiers of the land of Muslims and their rights, such as the Jews, the Serbs and the Americans and others. So, the Muslim mujahideen who fight their enemies, who are occupying their land, are fundamentalist and terrorists. Those who die as martyrs by striking the aggressor foreign forces are suicidal criminals!

The description of fundamentalism is dangerous for every Muslim, and every movement fighting injustice and occupation. It is dangerous for every party striving according to the Shariah methodology to resume the Islamic way of life. This is because the objective of this description is to create legal justifications to strike at anyone calling for the reestablishment of Islam in life. This is under the pretext that Islam is a fundamentalist movement, like the Jewish and Christian fundamentalist movements, which fought industrial and scientific progress in the age of the capitalist revival. The selection of this term, to brand the Islamic movements with, is because of its historical relevance to Western public opinion. This is so that the people of the West stand with their rulers in the face of the return of political Islam, as a state and system of life.

It should not occur to the mind of any Muslim that the description of Islamic movements as fundamentalist is taken due to their connection with the foundation of the Deen or the foundations of jurisprudence (usool fiqh). The foundation of the Islamic ‘aqeedah is the belief in Allah, His angels, Books, Messengers, Day of Judgement and al-Qadar. The foundations of jurisprudence are the usool (principles) on which jurisprudence is based, which the mujtahid uses to deduce practical Shariah rulings from the detailed Shariah evidences.

Fundamentalism, according to its Western terminological meaning, and which the Christian Protestant movement has brought, with the aim for which the movement was founded, cannot be further from the Islamic concepts and the Islamic movements whether they are contemporary or historical. In Muslim history, political movements, intellectual schools and legal schools of thoughts have appeared. However, they do not resemble the Christian fundamentalist movements in any way whatsoever. Even those who called for the closing of the door of Ijtihad (Shariah deduction) in the seventh century Hijri did so not to preserve the old and oppose the new. Instead, they thought that the Islamic fiqh initiated by the predecessors (salaf) already covered all the issues that the later ulema (khalaf) could possibly face.

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

﴿إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا ٱلذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُۥ لَحَٰفِظُونَ﴾

"Indeed, It is We Who have sent down the Zikr (Quran). Indeed, We will preserve it." [TMQ Surah Al-Hijr: 9].

Islam is a complete and comprehensive ideology founded on a creed based on reason, from which emanates a comprehensive system that addresses all aspects of human life until the Day of Judgment. It cannot be imagined that the ideology of Islam is unable to give a Shariah ruling for any problem faced by man. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْكَ ٱلْكِتَٰبَ تِبْيَٰنًا لِّكُلِّ شَىْءٍ﴾

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

The scientific and industrial progress which the Islamic world witnessed in the past was a result of the implementation of Islam, and not a result of separating Islam from life. The scientific and

industrial advancement which the world is witnessing today is indebted to the Muslim scientists who set out many of its theories and basic laws in the shade of the Islamic life and the Islamic State.

Therefore, describing Islam and the Islamic movements as fundamentalist, in the way that the Christian movements were described, is an erroneous and biased description. It does not apply to the reality of Islam and nor on anyone who works for the return of Islam to life. This is because he is striving to change the bleak reality in which Muslims are living. That reality results from the rule of man-made systems in life. This is the opposite to the work of the Christian fundamentalist movements, which came to preserve the reality in which the Christians lived before capitalism in form and content.

So, America's and Europe’s depiction of the Islamic movements as being fundamentalist is nothing but a war against Islam’s return to life. It is a strategic issue, even a vital issue for the West. They are intent on keeping the Third World, especially the Muslim World, backward and far from any true revival. This is so as to stand as an obstacle to the re-establishment of the Khilafah state which will uproot their system and put an end to their ambitions and their greed.

Consider the testimony of one of these people working as visiting faculty at the Center for Middle Eastern Studies (CMES) at Harvard. He submitted a report to the US Congress in which he asserted that fundamentalists take the view that the Shariah should be applied in all its details, and that the orders and prohibitions of God must be implemented completely and that is binding on all Muslims. He added that Islam is considered the basic source of their strength and the Shariah is suitable for application today as it was suitable for application in the past. He also asserted that fundamentalists deeply hate the Western civilisation and that they see it as the greatest obstacle which stand in the face of the application of the Islamic Shariah Law.

As for John Louis Esposito, the American academic professor of Middle Eastern and Religious Studies and scholar of Islamic studies, he wrote in his essay, "Political Islam: Beyond the Green Menace" of January 1994, that, "The United States should demonstrate by word and action its belief that the right to self-determination and representative government extends to an **Islamically oriented state and society**, if these reflect the popular will and **do not directly threaten United States interests**."

So, the fundamentalism which they attack is the reimplementation of the Shariah in life. If this is fundamentalism, then Muslims, in their view, are all fundamentalists. This is because they wait with yearning and zeal for the implementation of all the Shariah rulings of their Deen under the shade of the Khilafah state to save them and the world from the misery of capitalism and to take them to the goodness of Islam. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ افْتَرَىٰ عَلَى اللَّهِ الْكَذِبَ وَهُوَ يُدْعَىٰ إِلَى الْإِسْلَامِ ۚ وَاللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ ۝ يُرِيدُونَ لِيُطْفِئُوا نُورَ اللَّهِ بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَاللَّهُ مُتِمُّ نُورِهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

"And who does more wrong than the one who invents a lie against Allah, while he is being invited to Islam? Allah guides not the people who are oppressors (zalimoon) * They intend to put out the Light of Allah with their mouths. However, Allah completes His Light even though the disbelievers hate it." [TMQ Surah As-Saf: 7-8].

Globalisation

The example of the term globalisation, in modern terminology, is that of the example of the Jilbab in garments (as a veil to conceal the truth), or the example of Trojan Horse in military strategy. It hides that which it contains in order to conceal it from the people. Indeed, globalisation conceals a great deal.

There is nothing more indicative of that than what took place in Beirut towards the end of 1997, when the Center for Arab Unity Studies, one of the remnants of Arab nationalism, held a conference to look into globalism and to determine what stance of Arabs should be with regards it. It was as they saw in globalism a contradiction and threat to the idea of nationalism and the Arab nation state. It was mentioned in the invitation to the conference that the subject of the conference was, 'Globalism and the manner of Arabs dealings with its understanding and its manifestation, within the economic, cultural and political fronts. This is in addition to its history, future and current role. It includes the United States' approach to globalization, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. It includes globalisation's effect on economy

and growth in the Arab countries in addition to their cultural environment and identity.'

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

Globalisation is a term coined in English, rendered in French as Mondialisation, that gained striking prominence in the 1990s. It is used not to describe a matter as international due to its presence or realisation in most parts of the world, but to specify that an actor or actors, wish to make a matter international. An example would be a company that would adopt a policy of production, which looks at the whole world as being suitable for producing its goods. Then, in actual fact, the company pursues its production in any state or states where production costs are lower than anywhere else. It will then be

said that the company has globalised its production. Similar things can be said about other activities of this company or others, such as when it adopts a policy of globalisation and pursues it in marketing its goods, advertising them, searching for and developing new products, employing workers, professionals, or managers, attracting investors who would provide loans to finance its operations, or engaging in any other activity. The first time the word globalization was applied was in describing the activities of the large American multinational companies, starting in the 1980s. That is because when Reagan became the president of America in 1981, he employed bold policies in international relations, economic and political, and won the strong support of American financial circles. Part of this was the use of the policy of the strong dollar to attract financiers outside the country to invest their money in US treasury bonds and within the American financial markets in order to finance his program of arming America and ruining the Soviet Union at that time in an arms race. This is what actually led to the economic collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989.

This policy led to consecutive sharp rises in the value of the dollar during Reagan's first term of

office, reflected in the U.S. Dollar Index (USDX, DXY, DX, or, informally, the "Dixie"). It rose to the extent that the marker of the dollar's exchange rate, measured by a basket of foreign currencies of major trade partners, and weighted towards the United States' balance of trade with them, reached 159 points in February 1985. This compares to 91 points in the first month of his term in January 1981. It represents a surge of 75%. It was one of the signs of Reagan's political gamble that he ignored the negative peripheral consequences of the strong dollar policy. This is because he focused on winning the battle of Capitalism over Communism.

One of the negative effects of the policy of the strong dollar is that the profits of many American companies decreased due to foreign goods competing with American goods which are priced in dollars. These American companies were compelled first to decrease the price of their commodities and then to seriously look at ways to cut costs, especially the cost of American labour. A team of university professors, at that time, suggested the idea of restructuring these companies through a fundamental review of their work whether in production or marketing. This idea became widespread amongst the wealthy employers. Its implementation led to the

practical closure of a number of factories and branches of American companies at home. It led to a number of their employees and workers being laid off work at the same time, such as the job losses announced by General Motors in 1991. GM was one of the largest car companies in America when it fired 74,000 employees, representing 19% of its work force, closing 21 automobile plants in one go. The IBM company, which was at the time one of the largest computer companies, discharged 60,000 employees in three waves within a short period of time in 1993.

These companies recovered, after restructuring, the production of the factories they had closed down, or parts of which they had sold off in America, by shifting production to new, smaller companies that paid low wages to their workers, especially those who had lost their jobs due to restructuring. They also established alternative factories and branches outside America. One of the side effects of the strong dollar policy is that prices and wages become meagre abroad. So, the companies concentrated on poor and heavily-populated countries like Pakistan, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and India where the monthly wages of a worker hardly reached the wage of one or two hours of the American factory worker.

This was not confined to just the manual workers, but included the educated and people of expertise, like engineers and computer programmers, wherever they may be as long as their wages were lower than what they are in America, and they needed both work and wages.

The companies caused a political outcry in America over the restructuring process and the collective dismissal of workers in startling numbers. Many Americans viewed the outsourcing of jobs and the resulting loss of employment as an attack on their livelihoods, believing that the companies' motives were driven by nothing more than capitalist greed. The companies responded that they were forced to do so because of fierce international competition, and that they had no choice but to compete on the international level and globalise their operations. A committee of senators held meetings, open to the public, to investigate the globalisation of American companies, and the first of which was held in 1987 and the last of which was held in 1992. This investigation led to the term 'globalisation' becoming publicised. Then, the committee embedded its usage when it placed the term 'globalisation' in the headings of its reports, which

were first issued in 1987, and then in subsequent years. This was the first time the expression ‘globalisation’ was used in the title of any book or report published in English. Then followed the publication of books on the subject of globalisation until the published material in English reached 260 books, most of which were published in the 1990s during Clinton’s term in office.

However, the effect of these investigations just gave vent to the political outcry against lay-offs by the companies and their outsourcing of work out of America (off-shoring). They were a justification of what they did, and thus suppressed the negative press. The investigations ended in 1992. Then after Clinton came to office, the US Congress agreed to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which Bush signed with Canada and Mexico, even though the agreement enabled American and Canadian companies to manufacture whatever commodity they wanted in Mexico, where the labour wages are extremely cheap. Then, that commodity would be sold in American and Canadian markets. This confirmed the fears of the trade unions, and other American political factions, that opposed the multinationals, accusing them of exporting labour.

The ensuing political outcry and the domestic political conflict within America itself, which accompanied the mass lay-offs and the export of jobs outside America, were what publicised the term "globalisation". The outcry effectively came to an end in 1992. It was brought to an end for the benefit of the financial sector and the companies under American control.

All of this led to the formation of a public opinion that high-skilled and highly experienced work, for which high wages are paid, should not leave America. It maintained that what should be exported was work involving mainly physical labour, which is exhausting and monotonous and requires low wages—work that Americans did not want for themselves anyway.

When these expectations are realised, the benefits will return to all Americans because they will be free to specialise in advanced industries and in highly skilled, experienced, and highly paid work. Moreover, the export of such work will mean that commodities produced and manufactured by cheap foreign labour outside the country will return to American markets at low prices. The political resolution of this issue in 1992, followed by

Clinton's assumption of the presidency in 1993, shifted American foreign and economic policy. Clinton's predecessor Bush used to adopt the policy of promotion of exporting goods and sponsoring the establishment of the World Trade Organisation, instead of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to open the doors wide before these exported goods. However, the American business and financial sectors took the view that, more important than promoting exported goods, was the need to complete what they had begun in the early 1980s: a comprehensive restructuring of companies to strengthen them and make them more capable of generating profits. In their view, restructuring should result in the outsourcing of labor, not merely the export of physical goods, while simultaneously exposing them to aggressive international competition. Businessmen put forward other ideas which they wanted Clinton to adopt. They said that for many years America has been bearing the burdens of the Cold War, and other international obligations, on account of which Europe and Japan were becoming stronger economically. They had now become a danger to the vital interests of America. Now that the Cold War is over, America must regain its ability to compete with Europe and

Japan. It must resume competing with them in a strong manner, and not be bound to any compliance with their interests, as America used to do in the past according to their stances. They even called for the American intelligence to be used in economic spying on Europe and Japan and their companies after its preoccupation with the political issue of the Cold War had decreased.

In response to these ideas and opinions, Clinton and his US Treasury Secretary, who held one of the highest-ranking positions in relation to Wall Street, adopted the call for the opening up of world markets, not only to sell American goods, but also to enable American companies to produce goods wherever cheap labour was available. This also enabled American companies to market their services and goods made in America, or in any other country where they wished, within global markets.

Most importantly, America facilitated the expansion of US financial companies—banks, insurance companies, and brokerage houses operating in American financial markets—into financial markets outside America. This was a new development, since these companies had not previously operated extensively abroad and, consequently, were not welcomed in many countries

because of concerns about the dangers posed by the activities of the American companies.

This is because financial companies, by their very nature, attract money in the form of trusts, insurance premiums, shares, and bonds. Thus, huge amounts of money become concentrated in their hands, enabling them to manage these funds in accordance with their wishes.

The businessmen were concerned about the idea put forward immediately after the end of the Cold War, which is that the world is inevitably divided into three large economic zones. The first zone includes the whole of Europe, and it is controlled by Western Europe. The second zone contains most of Asia, and it is dominated by Japan. The third zone includes the two American continents, which are reserved for the United States. They feared that this idea may become a reality. Thus, they opposed it vehemently and denounced it as regionalism. They alluded to the fact that Europe and Japan are behind promoting the idea. They offered an alternative to this idea, which is that the world should become one. No one should have a monopoly over any one part, but it is for everyone to compete in any place. The Clinton administration actively promoted this concept through targeted media campaigns and a

surge of supporting literature. Within this, there were books that talked of the globalization of the activities of companies.

That media campaign came to an end in America after the Clinton administration adopted the idea at the beginning of its term and launched movements abroad, sponsored by the US administration and its state apparatus. It moved abroad especially in what are known as the developing countries, where the media campaigns were focussed. It preoccupied the people of those countries with shallow and deceptive thoughts, weak and borrowed expressions and cheap and strange sophistry. Many were completely bewildered by them. Despite the imbecilic nature of the thoughts to which the media campaigns called, they were planned and focussed to produce specific results. They aimed to generate, and gain, public opinion for opening the doors wide before the activities of American companies in a comprehensive assault to harvest the fruits of winning the Cold War and to establish a monopoly to the exclusion of European and Japanese companies.

Unfortunately, it seems that these campaigns have achieved their aims and enabled rulers smitten by the West to anaesthetise their populations before

the new American onslaught and attack on their countries. They opened their markets wide to American goods, employed their cheap labour in American factories, and attracted their people's savings to American financial companies, enabling these companies to use their financial markets for speculation. The following are some of the thoughts hidden in the bowels of globalisation, which America has directed abroad, especially in the countries of the Third World:

- Immediately after the fall of the Soviet Union, there remained in the world only the Western economic order, which they called the free market, instead of its true name which is Capitalism, a name which reminds us of its greed and ugliness. All the countries in the world are either implementing this order or desiring and striving to implement it.

- The financial world has become one because its proponents can now transfer funds to any country and invest it in any investment whose returns are greater than other investments. The transfer of funds is done at exceptional speed, made easy by fast means of communication. These funds are not to be invested in a country which places obstacles before the investment.

- The business world has also become one. Thus, the companies known as multinationals, despite the fact that they are not truly multinational because the parent company belongs to only one country and holds only one nationality, now have the ability to manufacture and market products on a global scale. This compels any country that wishes to develop to welcome these American companies, allowing them to employ its population or sell American products with ease. Otherwise, the American multinationals will simply move on to yet another country.

- The means of mass communication between all corners of the world has become comprehensive and interlinked to the extent that it prevents any one actor from completely controlling it. This interlinking has led to the information of populations becoming shared. It has led to views, and even tastes, that are almost in complete harmony with each other.

These are some of the thoughts about globalisation that are being promoted in the countries of the Third World. What is meant by promoting it is that, on this basis, each country must welcome foreign capital, make its labour available, and adopt the advice of its advocates regarding

changes to the country's laws, including the privatisation of state institutions to enable foreigners to purchase them.

It is claimed that there is no alternative to this if we want to join the global march of progress in a world that has come together through the globalisation of finance and labour; otherwise, we will remain backward and regressive.

No one will be spared the effects of these false claims, propagandist sophistry, and the veneer of globalisation, which hides itself away in any country where there are a few well-informed officials, while the targeted population depends on the media apparatus specifically directed at them to shape their views. That is why it is not strange that we compare the campaigns for globalisation with the missionary invasion of the nineteenth century. This onslaught may be even more dangerous than the one that came before because, this time, it does not carry the cover of religion, although it is more detestable.