



The Attacks In Europe: Causes and Consequences.

DR Tariq Abdelhaleem

All praise is due to Allah, and may Allah's peace and blessings be upon His Prophet.

Part 1

a. Introduction

The subject of the attacks in Europe is a prickly, controversial issue that requires much thought and contemplation. Any discussion thereof should take into account basic Islamic principles and their resulting implications and secondary issues. It must also take into account the plans and plots outlined in global agendas and the conspiracies of global powers.

This is an issue that is particularly engaging to political analysts concerned with the welfare and the affairs of their own people. Indeed, it is not acceptable for such individuals to remain silent in the face of such events, regardless of the controversy and complexity that they present.

International conflicts are classified differently based on many different criteria and factors that are all taken into consideration with a great deal of precision by those involved in these conflicts. These factions must also delicately balance different elements and consider endless variables in the face of such conflicts and struggles.

Let us, for instance, consider two different types of conflict based on the variable of locality. The first is local (or localized) conflict that takes place in a specific part of the world, such as the Vietnam or Iraq wars – which were, in essence, American invasions and that were far removed from any conventional meaning of conflict. The second kind of conflict based on this criterion is global conflict. While the two world wars are obvious examples of this, the war between North and South Korea and the wars between the Ottoman Empire and Tsarist Russia also fall under this category.

Each of these two types of conflict exhibits differences in, for instance, such things as military approach and the rules of engagement.

Another basis upon which different conflicts might be classified is the nature of the conflict. In other words, is the conflict carried out for purely material reasons where the objective is merely control and

rulership? Or is civilization a factor that needs to be taken into consideration?

Another factor is the balance of strength between the different warring factions with regards to numbers and technology and other points of strength and weakness. Faith, or the strength thereof, is another such factor that needs to be taken into consideration alongside the more material factors that Allah has decreed as means by which life on earth may persist.

Other variables include the different layers within a single conflict and the different dimensions to it. It also includes the different degrees of conflict with regards to escalation or de-escalation whenever either of these two options becomes prudent at different stages of a conflict.

The presumed consequences of specific tactics and maneuvers with regards to gains and losses are another factor that needs to be considered when assessing both sides of a conflict. Indeed, one faction might make a move that ultimately works against them, and that can be used against them by the adversary without any significant response on the adversary's part.

These are all but a few of the many considerations that need to be taken into account when studying such conflicts. When such aspects are taken into consideration, many questions begin to present themselves, including:

- What is the nature of the conflict currently raging in the Middle East?
- What is the nature of the warring factions?
- Who are the primary and secondary enemies in this confrontation?
- What are the boundaries of this conflict and what are the factors causing it to escalate?
- What type of confrontation is required in the individual scenarios?
- What are the motives for expanding the battleground?
- To what extent can the capacity or ability to confront be increased?¹

¹ To be added later

Answers to these questions can only be a matter of informed and educated opinion. It is not possible to come to any clear cut, decisive all encompassing answers or solutions. Some answers, however, will be more correct than others, and this depends on whether or not the solutions upon which these answers are based bring us closer to or take us farther away from accomplishing our objectives. Still, *ijtihaad*, or the process of making a legal decision through interpreting the Qur'an and the Sunnah, is a mandatory obligation for those who are capable of doing so. It is unacceptable to come to opinions based on personal inclinations or upon face value, unverifiable information that has become accepted as true due to the cumulative effect of being repeated and reiterated by general sources. Such pitfalls commonly mislead individuals into thinking that they are capable of coming to conclusions that pertain to such affairs.

Rather, it is necessary for any such *ijtihaad* to be based on observation – not just opinion – against a broad background of Islamic principles internalized through experience and the study of different Islamic sciences and applied jurisprudence.

Hence, we do not claim that our research, observations or conclusions regarding this issue are in any way conclusive. However, we do believe that the recommendations outlined and discussed in this paper will bring us closer to meeting necessary objectives, and that they are hence more realistic and more correct than other recommendations for the same issue have proven or may prove to be.

b. What is the nature of the conflict currently flaring in the Middle East?

The conflict or struggle in the Middle East is neither regional nor is it a recent development. This is something well known to any academic or even to a student with basic knowledge of the region and its history. Indeed, the conflict began when Islam rose to prominence at the time of the Roman and Persian Empires. Fierce battles then ensued between the Islamic East, that sought to spread tranquility and prosperity, and the invading West that sought to bring destruction and carnage. Islam became part of the fabric of the countries that it spread to, and the Muslims were neither invaders, nor colonizers nor imperialists. The Crusades then followed – eleven Crusades in total – and these were in turn followed by the French *Crusades* and, eventually the American *Crusades* playing out today. All of these are

military campaigns that, for two centuries, have inflicted the worst kind of cultural, creedal, social and economic destruction in Muslim lands and elsewhere.

Hence, the conflict is essentially global¹, in spite of the fact that it plays itself out in the Middle East. There are no soldiers or munitions at war on Western soil, nor are there war planes circling Western skies. The invasion was instigated purely by the West – and this is an irrefutable fact. This conflict (because the word conflict at least alludes to a relative balance between the conflicting powers, it is debatable whether or not the term is appropriate in this context) has different characteristics, and it is not possible to describe it in a way that is unidimensional.

One of the many dimensions, for instance, is that it is a civilizational conflict. On one side of the conflict there lies an Islamic system upon which an entire civilization was once built and went on to lead the world for centuries before it was afflicted with the patterns and the calamities that bring about the downfall and collapse of civilizations. This civilization has today been reduced to a mere general culture through which its adherents identify themselves, and a language that they speak among themselves. On the other side of this conflict there exists a modern civilization that itself was born of different civilizations including the Islamic, Roman and Greek civilizations and that bears Christian overtones from the traces of Jesus's religion after its falsification. This falsified religion was then rejected and abandoned at all practical levels by Western societies, but adopted only at a sentimental level.

- At the civilizational level that partly characterizes this conflict, there evolved a cultural/ philosophical conflict. This form of invasion began towards the end of the eighteenth century with the French campaigns in the Middle East, and continued under the pretext of 'modernizing the Islamic world' through such means as dispatching orientalist to the Islamic world or receiving delegates from the Islamic world in the West.

Some academics have misinterpreted the global nature of this conflict, and one of example of ¹ this can be found on the following link:
<http://www.aljazeera.net/knowledgegate/opinions/2016/3/23/%D8%AA%D9%81%D8%AC%D9%8A%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D8%A8%D8%B1%D9%88%D9%83%D8%B3%D9%84-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AE%D8%B7%D8%A7%D8%A1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AE%D9%85%D8%B3%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%82%D8%A7%D8%AA%D9%84%D8%A9>

The pace and prevalence of such efforts increased with the British, French and Spanish colonization of the Islamic world, extending from the Atlantic to the Gulf. Indeed, even rulers in Muslim lands participated in the proliferation and entrenchment of colonial endeavors – and this is something we will discuss shortly.

- The conflict is also characterized by a need for natural resources, such as the oil and the endless mineral reserves with which Allah has blessed the Middle East. All such resources are a necessary means for the progress of the modern, material Western world. This is one of the most important reasons behind the fierce, destructive conflicts raging today, and the colonialist efforts that have taken the form of American, British and more recently, Russian¹ military bases in the region. Indeed, perhaps the largest American base in the region today is the malicious Zionist entity we refer to as Israel.

- Another dimension characterizing this conflict is the attempt by global powers to politically subjugate and colonize the region due to its geographical importance. Indeed, the Middle East connects the East and West, and is the only region that brings together three continents – Africa, Europe and Asia. No other region is characterized by such geographical importance, and Egypt and Syria are particularly important in this regard.

Such is the nature of the conflict. It is a cultural, economic, social and military conflict by means of which the West is attempting to change the Islamic culture of Muslim populations and manipulate education systems and curricula, and media systems in particular in its attempt to achieve the objectives outlined above.

c. What is the nature of the warring factions?

There is an enormous difference between the premises and principles upon which Western societies are based on the one hand, and the Islamic principles and Shari'ah upon which the Islamic nation was built, on the other hand. Still, it is important to point out that the Islamic system as defined came to an end with the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the events of World War I. The system of governance in place in the West is almost an exact opposite of an Islamic system –

¹ A Russian military base now exists on the Syrian coast.

especially when it comes to the source of legislation. There might be similarities with regards to some of the more general laws that deal with interactions and public affairs, or in issues of property rights and other related matters. Such similarities become apparent with any comparative study between the two systems. However, when it comes to matters pertaining to criminal law, *hadd* punishments or legal retribution and compensation, the two systems differ greatly.

The source of legislation in Islam is Allah's infallible revelation that takes the form of preserved religious texts (the Quran and the Sunnah), and then independent interpretation that is based on the principles derived from these texts – either individually or collectively – ijtihaad. Ijtihaad needs to take into account three different disciplines involving jurisprudence: principles underlying jurisprudence, principles of jurisprudence, and theories of jurisprudence.

The Western system of governance, on the other hand, depends solely on human assumptions and conclusions. It does not derive legislation or rulings from revelation, since there is no revelation with regards to Christian rulings to begin with. A small number of laws and legislation are derived from Judaism. The West, therefore, depends wholly on the human intellect, as opposed to deriving its laws from scriptural evidence or religious texts. This applies to underlying basic principles, legal principles and legal theories. Based on this difference and regardless of similarities between secular laws and Islamic rulings, there will always be a difference first and foremost with regards to the sources of such rulings and, secondly, with regards to the objectives sought in applying them.

The social/cultural structures that result from each of these two governance systems also differ greatly. The Islamic system bases itself on the principle of *Shurah* or consultation between those qualified to issue rulings and recommendations on account of their knowledge, experience and reputation. Economically, the Islamic system is based on the principle of individual or private ownership and takes into account everything that relates to this concept with respect to conditions, regulations and prohibitions. An obvious prohibition, for instance, is interest. Socially, Islam lays its foundations with the family, which in turn is built on the relationship between a man and his wife or wives. There are clear and specific rulings that pertain to all aspects of the Islamic system of governance.

Politically, the West functions on democratic principles – where the privilege to vote is granted through citizenship. Economically, the West is based on the idea of absolute or unlimited ownership that bears no restrictions except with regards to such things as fraud or the unlawful taking of another person’s wealth or property. Socially, it is founded on individualism, along with the right to start ‘families’ by individuals of the opposite or the same sex.

Each of these systems has given birth to a set of ideological, creedal and social references and literature; just as they have each led to radically different or even opposing methods and protocols for interactions, customs and traditions. This tremendous difference or dichotomy between the two systems stems, in part, from a Muslim understanding (whether correct or incorrect) of the concept of friendship and enmity for the sake of Allah. It is also due to a mutual lack of knowledge on the part of both the non-Muslim West and the Muslim East, and the principles upon which they live their lives.

It is important for anyone analyzing the current social and political situations in the world today to consider the tight relationship between both social and political factors in existence. In this age, there is a very strong association between the civil organizations representing the people of a country and that country’s political organizations. Western governments monitor and keep a close eye on the behavior of these civil organizations, and tend to expose them whenever they feel they are doing something that, in one way or another, does not serve political interests. Civil organizations in Muslim lands, however, serve Western governments and Western agendas without any governmental monitoring at all.

This leads us to the issue of how governments in general, whether Western or Eastern, differ from their populations. Without exception, all governments today are enemies of their own people; but it is the nature of this enmity or the way that it manifests itself that differs from one country to another. Conversely, all governments work to secure the interests of their own members and officials to the detriment of the interests of their own people.

Common tactics through which this enmity manifests itself include deception, manipulation and the pursuit of personal interests and agendas. However, due to the nature of Western populations, as

described with a great deal of precision by the Prophet (PBUH)¹, Western governments have had to find means other than violence and oppression. Hence, they resort to such tactics as lying, deception, disinformation, distortion and media propaganda.

Governments in the Muslim East, however, do not need to resort to such means. And so while they make use of deception and disinformation in the Gulf States for instance, they also employ violence, murder and imprisonment throughout other Muslim lands. This difference is important to understanding other points that will be discussed, Allah willing.

Part 2

d. Who are the primary and secondary enemies in this confrontation?

We've already mentioned that the colonial West had, and continues to have, many interests in Muslim lands. Such interests have caused the West to be a particularly ruthless enemy from both an Islamic and a nationalistic perspective.

But the question I would like to answer here is: Is the West the only enemy in this conflict, or is it the main enemy? The fact is there is indeed another enemy, who may even be more dangerous to Muslims than the West. That enemy can be identified as the rulers or the governments that have a stranglehold on Muslim lands. It is not possible for the West to wage a military, cultural, economic or social war on Muslim lands without inside help. It would not be possible without the aid of leaders who employ deceit, cunning and who themselves are power hungry and have a hatred for Islam. Such leaders are not just tools in the hands of the main enemy; indeed, they have surpassed the West in their destruction of everything Islamic, the murder of those who call to Islam, their terrorizing Muslims and the confiscation of their wealth. They have shown every form of enmity to those who uphold Islam, just have they have shown every form of loyalty of those who show animosity to Islam. They have done everything possible to undermine the Shari'ah and attack Islam in every way imaginable.

¹ In an authentic hadith narrated by Amr Ibn Al 'Aas and collected by Muslim, the Prophet (PBUH) describes Western population as having no tolerance for the injustice of their rulers.

This is the nature of those who rule Muslim lands today. This is something that started with Mohammed Ali Basha in Egypt at the time when he began to adopt French orientalism, and with the Saud Family in Saudi Arabia with their relationship with British colonialists. This is a trend that continues even today with the likes of Al-Sisi in Egypt and his unwavering loyalty towards Jews, and every other ruler in the Muslim world without exception.

This is a reality that cannot be contested.

Hence, the main enemy is not necessarily Western populations. Indeed, these populations need to be called to Islam. People like Amr Ibn Al'Aas, Qutaybah Bin Muslim and Moosa Ibn Nusair never considered the populations of the countries to which they led their expeditions to be enemies. Instead, they saw them as Unbelievers who did not believe in Allah and that it was, hence, necessary to convey the message of Islam to them either by fighting anyone who stood in the way of the message of truth, or by whatever peaceful means may have been appropriate to the time and place.

We believe that these populations today (i.e. Western and non-Muslim in general), require that enormous effort be undertaken to call them to Islam. This is a task that can only be undertaken by a centralized Islamic government. Such a government would then be able to expose the lies and fabrications being concocted against Islam, whether such false notions revolve around terrorism or backwardness, the oppression of women, etc. Individual efforts to convey the message of Islam and expose such falsities are also an option to an extent, but that is not the topic of this paper.

And so the real enemies are the governments, whether in the East or West that manipulate their youth, prepare their forces, orchestrate conspiracies and employ every form of cunning and falsehood with the objective of destroying Islam and its followers and turning them into nothing but slaves to the Western capitalist puppet masters. Western governments only seek to turn their own populations into a submissive herd of sheep who are content with the materialist way of life created for them, just as they seek that Eastern Muslim populations live under continued oppression and in constant humiliation.

And so with regards to geography, there are two enemies: The distant enemy who orchestrates and operates his war machine from afar, and a nearby enemy who facilitates and implements the orders and directives of the distant enemy. In our view, it is more prudent and makes more sense to uproot the nearby enemy first. It is reasonable to assume that being rid of the Eastern *hand* that carries out the orders of the plotting Western *mind* will bring more effective results. Hence, it is the governments, leaders, kings, heads of state and the security systems of the regimes present in Muslim countries that need to be dealt with first.

These are the factions most worthy of being removed, as it is they who allow the external enemy to make advances into Muslim lands and cause the corruption and devastation that they cause. These are the agents who allow the external enemy to use Muslim airspace for their warplanes, and Muslim soil for their military bases. The entire Gulf region is testimony to this. Perhaps the most obvious example of this is the Emirates, the most exemplary of all Jewish colonies and a country that can only be described as a Zion-Arab state. A nation that is home to widespread prostitution and every form of moral corruption; not to mention a sanctuary for those escaping justice for such crimes as the murder of their own people, corruption and enmity towards Islam.

e. What are the boundaries of this conflict and what are the factors causing it to escalate?

The confrontation between the East and West, or between Islam as an existing civilizational force and the West as an oppressive civilization and force is playing out in the Middle East and Afghanistan. This is largely a deliberate choice and also the result of the fact that there is no centralized Islamic force to defend Islam and combat the Western onslaught. Indeed, armies in Muslim lands are tool for oppressing and even slaughtering Muslim populations for the purpose of safeguarding Western interests.

History has demonstrated that the confrontation went from being military during the Napoleonic era, to being cultural towards the end of the 19th century, to being military again until the Middle of the 20th century, then to cultural towards the end of the 20th century, and then most lately to being military again with the beginning of the 21st century.

There are different reasons for this change in tactics. These reasons include the strength of regional governments that act as agents for the West, or the weakness of such governments. The need to protect specific interests against the communist bloc at one point in history was another factor, and the need to protect oil resources is a more recent factor.

Hence, we saw the immediate US intervention in the Gulf's affairs at the end of the 20th century and during the first Gulf War – under the pretext of fighting Saddam's terrorism – as a means of combating Saddam (and protecting their oil and other interests) when it was clear that the Gulf countries would not be able to do so. We saw the same thing again at the beginning of this century when Afghanistan fell into the hands of the Taliban. The second Gulf War was saw an even greater escalation of Western intervention; and the so called 'Arab Spring' saw a continuation of this escalation when it became obvious that Arab governments were far weaker than once thought.

Ultimately, the arena for this conflict has not changed, as it has always been Muslim lands. The agents and facilitators for Western intervention and invasion are and have always been treacherous Arab presidents, kings, Emirs, etc. These agents, then, are the real enemies, in every sense of the word, both currently and practically.

f. What type of confrontation is required in the individual scenarios?

Based on the above, it is better and more practical to deter the enemy by destroying the hands that carry out the orders. This is an absolute priority. But this will not be possible through sterile and futile negotiations where conditions that prevent any kind of meaningful change are stipulated before the different parties even come to the negotiating table. Nor will it be possible by adopting such philosophies as "Our peaceful protests are stronger than bullets," or such slogans as, "participation not confrontation" or any other form of nonsense adopted by the Muslim Brotherhood or their offshoot group the Suroories, who are themselves a product of the Brotherhood's creedal deviance. Force is the means that has always been used by the internal enemy – Arab governments – to impose themselves and oppress their people.

Destroying these oppressive systems requires, first, that Muslim populations are educated about and made more aware of Islam's core principles. The type of confrontation will differ from one country to another and depend on the kind of government in power.

In some countries, such as Egypt for instance, an armed confrontation is not possible on account of the nature of its people. Rather, a popular uprising that is aided by some sort of supporting force would be more effective. Other countries, such as Libya and Syria have adopted means that are entirely militant. Other nations, still, might make use of both types of confrontation, such as Algeria and Tunisia, if their people are granted the opportunity to make a change.

Different jihadist groups have adopted different confrontation strategies. These groups and strategies might be divided as follows:

Talibaan have decided to confine the confrontation to its own borders in an effort to end occupation, whether Russian or American. This is indeed an intelligent tactic, and we will not dwell on it.

Al Qaeda diverted from this tactic with the end of Russian occupation and the beginning of American occupation by attacking Western targets in different parts of the world. I am of the opinion that Al Qaeda has changed its methodology and that the globalization of jihad has caused its leaders to change their outlook.

There are two different approaches that relate to the globalization of jihad.

The first is that a given jihadist group carries out armed attacks against different targets. I will not call these military attacks, since military attacks are different in their nature to armed attacks carried out by such groups.

The other approach is that a given group has different branches in different places that operate like independent or centralized groups. The actions of these branches are still, however, attributed to the main umbrella group. This second approach isn't really a globalized jihad approach, but can give the impression of being one in its method of antagonizing the internal enemy.

Consider, for instance, Al Qaeda's attack on the French paper, Charlie Hebdo, as compared to their attacks on the USS Cole Warship in 2000 and the US Council in Karachi in 2002 or any of the other attacks carried out in the early 2000s. The attack on the paper was an attack that carried the

very specific objective of upholding the honor of Prophet Mohammed (peace be upon him) and hence, unlike the other attacks, had nothing to do with American ties or meddling. The attack on the paper, therefore, cannot be seen to belong to the first approach.

In a previous article discussing the change in methodology adopted by Al Qaeda, I had mentioned that, in spite of holding onto the concept of globalized jihad, they had began adopting a more localized approach to retaliating against the aggression of governments in different parts of the world. This is something that has been witnessed in the group's activities on the Arabian Peninsula and the Maghreb. These groups are more local than global, whether in terms of their centralization, make-up, or their objectives.

I think that this change in approach is a result of the founder's (Sheikh Osama Bin Ladin) grasping the role that these local governments played in destroying the hopes of their own people. Both he and Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahri saw that it was necessary to, first, deal with governments who are agents of the West and secondly, try to create popular support for their movement.

Finally comes ISIS. This is a Harouri¹ organization that has adopted ideas that fall outside of the realm of Ahl ul Sunnah. This group does not have a specific strategy. Indeed, whenever afflicted with a defeat or a drawback in its own territories, it carries out attacks in Europe in order to reinforce support for its champions or as a show of strength. This group does not have a strategy that is based on any Sunni Islamic principles. Rather, it operates in order to fulfill the interests of its Baathist and deviant leaders.

Part 3

The Globalization of Jihad

It is important that we discuss the issue of the globalization of jihad in more detail, as I believe it is at the heart of this paper. I had previously mentioned that a researcher can see the globalization of jihad as manifesting itself in two different approaches with regards to how it is applied.

¹ Having a tendency to accuse masses of Muslims of apostasy without sufficient evidence or any evidence at all (also takfeeri)

The first approach is that a given group or organization adopt a strategy of attacking general Western interests throughout the planet. This would then be the cornerstone in the ideology of that group. Indeed, this was Al Qaeda's strategy until the 2001 attacks, and it was a direction they took as a response to the first Iraqi invasion in the early 90s. This approach then continued until the fall of the Taliban in early 2002 after the American invasion of Afghanistan.

This strategy then changed in 2011 when Sheikh Osama Bin Laden saw that it was more important to focus on the internal enemy. The first manifestation of this was Abu Mus'ab Al Zarqawi's allegiance to Al Qaeda when the former announced the establishment of the Tawheed and Jihad organization in Iraq. This organization was founded on the principle of resisting Shi'ite aggression and resistance against the Western invasion of Iraq. Most of this organization's attacks targeted the internal establishment.

Sheikh Osama then began to address the different popular uprisings throughout the Arab world, and even suggested that a Shura Council be established to help them meet their objectives.

The second approach is that local groups undertake attacks against the ruling governments in an effort to weaken an oppressive government's grip or weaken the presence of those who support this government, such as Western organizations or establishments that are present for military or consultation purposes. This is a different kind of globalization that does not stipulate that jihad be taken to Western lands. Rather, it is about establishing branches in different Muslim lands - to the extent that this is possible. It is important to mention two points mentioned in a document released by Sheikh Ayman Al Zawahri. Points 9 and 10 state that it organization must not launch any attacks against Mosques or Islamic gatherings. It is safe to assume that Western forces will not be present in these places, and so the warnings are clearly directed at those targeting local governments.

One might respond by saying that this analysis goes against the third directive stated in the same document which states that any clash with local governments needs to be avoided. It is true that this is Al Qaeda's official and historical stance, but the reality of the organization's actions appears to contradict this stance. This is apparent in Al Qaeda's support or adoption of popular uprisings and their using such

uprisings as a kind of fuel for their cause and a means of recruiting fighters.

I believe that since 2006, Al Qaeda has gradually shifted from the first strategy in the globalization of jihad to the second strategy. It did this by affiliating itself with Al Zarqawi and making him its representative in Iraq. I say this because there were no attacks in Europe after the 2004 attack in Madrid and the 2005 London Underground attack. Any other attacks carried out afterwards were isolated incidents that cannot be attributed to the organization.

The third approach is a frivolous and futile approach adopted by the Harouri group, ISIS. It is not a genuine form of globalization intended to oust the US from the West or to force Europe to change its politics. Rather, their attacks are carried out with only two real objectives. The first is to enhance their own image in the eyes of their followers; while the second objective is to compete with Al Qaeda – nothing more than that. An example of this is their attack on a jewelry shop in Paris immediately following the Charlie Hebdo attacks. And so their attacks are not a form of globalization at all, but rather attempts to secure personal interests and seek influence throughout the planet.

g. What are the motives for expanding the Jihad battleground?

The primary objective behind any Islamic movement is to benefit mankind as much as possible, and to protect against anything that might corrupt or bring harm. In any instance where the correct Islamic ruling is applied, the result will always bring benefit and reduce or eradicate harm. This is the correct viewpoint and it is the viewpoint that corroborates the Quran and Sunnah. It is not correct to state that wherever there is benefit, then that becomes the correct Islamic ruling. This is an incorrect viewpoint adopted from the words of some predecessors and the difference between the two standpoints can be both small and large. And so the first standpoint gives priority to the benefit – and while this might be correct with regards to the objective behind the Shari'ah, the second viewpoint is what outlined what is required of us as Muslims. This is because it is important that a Muslim adhere to the correct Islamic rulings based on evidence. It is then possible to identify the benefit as an effect and not as a cause.

It is important to understand the difference between these two standpoints as rights and victories have been lost on account of a failure to do so.

There are different rulings and principles that relate to the idea of expanding the jihad battleground. But before we delve into them, it is important that we mention two important things already pointed out:

1. The primary enemies are Arab rulers, their systems and their armies.
2. The confrontation is primarily taking place on Muslim lands.

Principles that relate to this matter include:

1. A person is only burdened with what he has the capacity to do. (Allah does not burden a person except with that it can bear)
2. Shari objectives differ greatly in their level. Some are mandatory, others are recommended and others are simply permissible. But even permissible objectives differ in that some are equal, without one objective being more favorable than another, while other permissible objectives are those that involve alleviating hardship. Objectives also differ based on whether we are talking about individuals or groups.
3. Preventing harm takes priority over bringing benefit. Furthermore, preventing imminent harm takes precedence over preventing harm that is less so; and preventing a greater harm is more important than preventing a lesser harm.
4. What is considered a 'general' objective may be general in an absolute sense or general in a more specific sense, or a general objective that includes that which is specific. All such objectives will differ with regards to individuals or groups.
5. The fiqhi principle that stipulates that "it is the general ruling that counts and not the specific situation under which a verse was revealed or a hadith reported" should not always be taken in an absolute sense. In other words, it is possible that a ruling applies only to a specific situation and cannot be generalized, or that there exists exceptions to the general ruling. However, the specific cause of the revelation of a verse can never be excluded from the application of that ruling and be overlooked when developing a generalized application of the ruling derived from the verse.

A Shar'i Perspective:

It is important for anyone who has studied *Shari'ah*, and more specifically Fiqh, to identify exactly what area of study is being researched. This is so that there is no confusion with regards to the different rulings. Based on this, it is necessary to point out that there is a significant difference between two different types of Quranic verses:

1. The first type that discuss Islam and Kufr – whether in terms of conditions, meanings, and the scope of different types of tawheed such as Ruboobiyah, Uloohiyah and Asmaa Wa sifaat; and issues that pertain to allegiance to Muslims and disavowing enemies of Allah.
2. The second type of Quranic verses that discuss waging jihad against those who have been identified as kufaar in accordance with the first type of verse, different forms of jihad, modes of applications and conditions.

Many misguided groups today, especially the Harouris, have confused these two types. In doing so, they have made general what is specific and made absolute what is conditional. To confuse areas of application is one of the most obvious signs heretical, innovator groups. Hence, they come to the false conclusion that every kafir is to be fought and killed no matter where they may be, if it is possible to do so – regardless of whether the situation is offensive or defensive. These groups are unable to distinguish between the kind of jihad outlined in the Quran that describe offensive jihad, and the kind that outlines defensive jihad, or repelling injustice or defending against aggression.

Verses that involve outlining the meaning of tawheed, Islam and Kufr are plentiful, and they specify the actions that take a person beyond the pale of Islam in their most severe form. Suratul Ma'idah, in particular, deals with this issue. Some of this chapter's verses that touch on this issue include, *{And whoever does not rule in accordance with what Allah has revealed, then it is they, they who are the Unbelievers.}*, and the verse, *{If they turn away from the Law of Allah) do they desire judgment according to the Law of Ignorance? But for those who have certainty of belief, whose judgment can be better than Allah's?}*, and the verse, *{And whoever takes them as allies is one of them}*, In surat-ul-Mumtahina, Allah says, *{You have a good example in Abraham and his companions: they said to their people: "We totally dissociate ourselves from you...}*, and in the same Surah He says, *{O You who believe, do not take as allies those against whom Allah is wrathful...}*.

As for Jihad, most of its rulings are found in the Al-Anfaal and Tawbah Chapters. Some rulings on Jihad were revealed slightly before then in Al Baqrah as well.

If we contemplate the verses that deal with jihad, especially in Surat-ul Tawbah (or Al Faadiha, as Ibn Abbass called it), which was revealed after the Conquest of Makkah and was the last of the Quran's chapters to be revealed, we find that it touches on many things that involve our area of study. For instance:

1. The declaration of jihad and the mobilization of troops, the end of any pacts with pagans who were not bound by a pact at the time the chapter was revealed; and the fulfillment of existing pacts with pagans to a predetermined time without renewal all took place after Islam had been completely established in both Makkah and Madinah and most of the tribes throughout the rest of the Peninsula. *{You may go about freely in the land, for four months, but know well that you will not be able to escape Allah...}* (9:2)

A closer look at such details is very important. As mentioned, all of these verses were revealed after the establishment of Islam and some after the conquest of Makkah. And so to apply their rulings to the state of Muslims today is to misplace these rulings in a way that is not befitting of a scholar. It is also important to remember that these verses deal with offensive Jihad and so the rulings derived do not deal with defensive Jihad.

2. Regarding the verse that includes, *{And fight all together against those who associate others with Allah in His Divinity in the manner that they fight against you all together...}* (9:36), Imam Tabari states that "all together" refers to the manner in which the believers should fight, and they should fight the Unbelievers as one body and not differ among themselves. In other words the verse does not (as some misguided people have misconstrued) mean fight them all, whether they fight you or not¹. Imam Qurtubi explains the verse in the same way, and explains that Muslims must not divide among themselves when fighting the Unbelievers.

This meaning is generally misunderstood among the common people and those who do not have sufficient knowledge. Instead, many people misunderstand the verse to mean "kill all unbelievers at any time and wherever they may be and in whatever state, and by whatever means

¹ The English translation of the verse makes the intended meaning clear, but the Arabic Quranic verse can be misunderstood by the unlearned.

possible”. It is very important that the correct interpretation of this verse be understood.

3. As for the verses in Surat-ul-Baqarah that begin with, *{And fight, in the path of Allah, those who fight you, but do not transgress}* (2:190) and end with the verse *{And spend for the sake of Allah and do not let your own hands be the cause of your ruin}* (2:195), these are verses that were revealed after the Hdaybiyah Treaty. These verses were preceded by rulings that pertain to Hajj: *{They ask you about the moon stages}*, and then followed by additional verses about Hajj *{And complete Hajj and Umrah in the cause of Allah}*.

4. Among these verses is the verse, *{And kill them wherever it is prudent for you to do so, and expel them whence they have expelled you}*.

And so the verse means that they should be killed whenever **it is prudent** to kill them and not, as many people understand, anywhere they are found. Nor does it mean to kill them at any time or by any means. Hence, it might be appropriate to fight against Unbelievers in some places and inappropriate in other places.

5. Regarding the verse, *{And fight them until the threat of paganism is abolished and all sovereignty is for Allah, alone (i.e. Allah’s religion)}* (2:193), Imam Qurtubi explains that this means to fight all Pagans in all places. Furthermore, the hadith, “I have been commanded to fight against the people (Unbelievers) until they declare that no deity is worth of worship but Allah.” And so both verse and hadith state that the reason for waging war is kufr. With this in mind, it is important to note the following:

The fact that kufr or Unbelief is the reason for waging war does not mean that all Unbelievers, no matter who they are or where they are should be fought or killed. This ruling existent in this verse is on condition that a clear call to Islam has already been made. Indeed, if this were not the case, it would mean that calling people to Islam – or da’wah – was needless to begin with. Additionally, the ruling in the verse addresses organized groups and not individuals. Hence, it is necessary that a group that has established itself call others to Islam before waging jihad.

6. The verse *{Fight the Unbelievers nearest (i.e. geographically) to you}* (9:123) is clear in that priority is to be given to fighting enemies who are closest first. Imam Qurtubi states that, “Allah teaches the Believers how to wage jihad and tells them to begin by fighting those who lie closest to them”. Al Tabary explains that the verse means, “Fight the Unbelievers

who lie closest to you, and not those who are positioned far away from you.”

As for the verse that states {And fight the Pagans wherever you find them, and take them and surround them, and lie in ambush for them...} (9:9), I believe that this is the only verse in the context of the chapter that refers to defensive jihad – along side other verses that command repelling injustice and aggression.

It is more likely that {wherever you find them} refers to within Muslim boundaries. This is further supported by the words {and surround them}. Imam Qurtubi states that the verse is a command to prevent the enemy from entering Muslim lands. Imam Tabari states that it means to prevent them from entering Muslim lands, and Makkah in particular. Hence, the general meaning is that any enemy posing a threat of entering a Muslim land must be prevented from doing so in every way possible. However, any means adopted for fighting the enemy must still not transgress the rules of jihad as mentioned in Suratul Baqarah. And so women, children, the elderly, workers, and priests, etc. must not be killed.

In addition to this, the Prophet’s (PBUH) actions and commands during the Battle of the Trench are a prime example of defensive Jihad. The Prophet (PBUH) did not send out small groups to infiltrate Pagan held areas, in spite of the fact that he knew of the conspiracies conducted between Quraish, and Ghitfaan and Banu An-Nudair after they had been expelled, in year 4 AH. The Quran records these occurrences in Surat-ul Hashr. At that point, the jihad was offensive, and the Prophet (PBUH) burned their date trees in order to weaken them. In spite of their residing with the Prophet (PBUH) in Al Madinah, it is not known that the Prophet (PBUH) killed any of them.

If we contemplate the Quranic verses and Prophetic reports that concern Jihad we can deduce the following:

1. They were revealed after the Hudaibiya Treaty and the Conquest of Makkah – which means that the Islamic state was already well established throughout the Arabian Peninsula in general, and in Makkah and Madina in particular. There was no external threat.
2. These verse primarily concern offensive jihad, which is waged with the intention to spread Islam and call to it. They do not concern defensive jihad, which is mandatory even when an Islamic state has not been established – and must be carried out in whatever way possible to repel

Unbelievers from Muslim lands and prevent them from controlling these lands. Still, it is necessary that any jihad waged not transgress the red lines previously mentioned – and as referred to in Surat-ul-Baqarah.

3. That there is a difference between defensive and offensive jihad with regards to one's capacity to travel for the latter kind, or the capacity to repel with whatever means possible in the former kind. They are also different in that offensive jihad requires that an Islamic state already be established – in contrast to defensive jihad.

4. That it is important to rid the Islamic world, first and foremost, of its rulers, kings, presidents, Emirs and heads of state. This is especially true since they are ruled to be apostates and Unbelievers based on evidence from the Shari'ah to support this ruling. Fighting against these rulers is, hence, a priority.

Once the ruling regarding this issue has been made clear, we may then proceed to look at the pros and cons of applying this ruling. It is important not to come up with assumed pros and cons and then deduce a ruling based on these assumptions. Doing so would be to reverse the process of arriving at a sound ruling.

Today, there are several benefits to focusing on weakening the systems of Arab governments and not in carrying out attacks and explosions on Western soil. Such benefits include:

1. Conserving efforts and resources that are otherwise wasted on attacks that have no impact on Arab government systems.

2. Because attacks on Western soil bring no benefit, stopping such attacks will weaken the ability of Western governments to concoct pretexts for attacking Muslim lands. It is true that such governments do not usually require pretexts for their aggression, but carrying out attacks on Western soil will still make their job easier and bolster their popular/ electorate support – such support is something they fear and value more than their own deities. For instance, when George Bush Jr. invaded Iraq under the pretext of destroying Iraq's fictional weapons of mass destruction, his electorate was very much against the invasion and made their stance known. Indeed, they had only originally accepted the invasion as a result of the September 11th attacks. Contrary to this example, practically all populations stood behind their governments when they attacked the mujahedeen under the pretext of retaliating against ISIS. This was in spite of the fact that the governments involved in these attacks were really

targeting the Sunnis. This is the scenario today and will continue to be so, until ISIS' role in creating this false pretext ends. At that point, Western governments will then perhaps pursue ISIS. Western populations, of course, do not know the difference between the Nusra Front and ISIS, nor do they know the difference between Sunni groups and Harouri groups. Hence, the beheadings carried out by ISIS only provided a pretext and support for Western invasions of Muslim lands, just as it provided support for Al Sisi and Bashar Al Assad.

3. Attacks on Western soil will not destroy any of these countries, even if a thousand people are killed in a single attack. And so what could possibly be the point of such attacks? They are, at best, an attempt to transgression with transgression, and to avenge the blood of innocent men, women and children killed by the West with every passing moment. While such revenge might be legally justified, the Shari'ah was not revealed for the purpose of revenge. Rather, it was revealed so that specific objectives might be achieved. Such objectives include, foremost, the defense of Muslim lands, and secondly, offensive jihad for the sake of calling others to Islam, after Islamic rule has been established.

4. To win over Western populations, or at least a segment of them, and hence encourage them to stand against their governments will bring far greater benefit than killing tens or hundreds of men and women in airports, pubs or hotels.

5. Finally comes the issue of Iran, the Zoroastrian state that lies closest to Muslim lands. Why is it that such attacks and explosions have not been carried out on Iranian soil? Indeed, it is the closest enemy of its size and is more dangerous to Muslim lands than Russia and the West combined. In addition to this, it now controls parts of Muslim countries that include Lebanon, Syria and Iraq. Clearly, to fight against Iran, and contain them as much as possible is a primary form of repelling a primary aggressor.

Conclusion:

I'd like to conclude by stating that, if we take a close look and take into consideration all relevant legislative evidence, the attacks that have taken place in Europe or the US are not a result of any Quranic methodology. It is important not to take a biased look at the evidence, nor try to bend the evidence in order to make it point towards a predetermined conclusion. Rather, it is important to allow the evidence to lead to its own conclusion, after which we may determine the extent to which there is benefit in acting upon such a conclusion. I, therefore, advise all the groups that adopt such

actions or tactics to think about the consequences of their actions and to reconsider the rulings for such attacks in light of the Quran and Sunnah. What I have stated throughout this paper might be of help to such groups should they choose to re-evaluate their actions.

