The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation

(Hatmiyyat sira'a U-hadharat)
Translation of the Qur'an

It should be perfectly clear that the Qur'an is only authentic in its original language, Arabic. Since perfect translation of the Qur'an is impossible, we have used the translation of the meaning of the Qur'an throughout the book, as the result is only a crude meaning of the Arabic text.

Qur'anic Ayat and transliterated words have been italicised in main part of the book.

Saying of the Messenger(s) appear in bold:

- subhanahu wa ta‘ala
- sallallahu ‘alaihi wa sallam
- RA - radhi allahu anha/anho
- AH - After Hijrah
- CE - Common Era

Contents

The Meaning of Civilisation (Hadhara) .................5
The Meaning of Dialogue (al-hiwar) between Civilisations .................9
The Idea of Accepting the Other ..................19
The Idea of the Alternative Civilisation ..............27
The Clash between Civilisations
The History of the Clash between Islam and other Civilisations .............28
Forms of the Clash of Civilisations
Intellectual Struggle (as-sira’ a ul-fikri) ..............40
Economic Struggle ..................................42
Political struggle ..................................44
Military Conflict .................................47
The Probable Evidences of those who deny Civilisation Struggle in Islam .................50
Rebutting the Probable Evidences of those Denying the Offensive Jihad (jihad ut-talab) .................57
Conclusion ........................................62
A civilisation (hadhara) is a collection of concepts about life. Civilisation could be a spiritual divine one (deeniyat ilahiyyat) or man-made (wadh'iyya bashariyya). The spiritual divine civilisation emanates from a doctrine (‘'aqeedah); like the Islamic civilisation that emanates from the Islamic ‘'aqeedah. As for the man-made civilisation, either it emanates from a doctrine like the Capitalist Western civilisation that is a collection of concepts about life emanating from the doctrine of separating religion from life. Or it does not emanate from a doctrine like the Shinto, Greek, Babylonian and Assyrian civilisations. This civilisation is a collection of concepts that a people or a group of peoples agreed upon so it is a national (shabiyya) or man-made civilisation.

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

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

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

If it is said: Why did you adopt the technical term 'hadhara' for concepts and the term 'madaniyya' for material forms instead of the reverse? Hadhara in language, is residence in a civilised region (like towns), while 'al-hadhir' is the one who is of towns and villages. Al-Qatami said: "Whoever is pleased with residing in towns. Which Bedouin men will see us?"

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

We have said that the civilisation (hadhara) is a collection of concepts about life, and that either it is a spiritual divine one (deeniiyya) or man-made. An example of the spiritual divine civilisation is the Islamic civilisation, and an example of the man-made are the Indian civilisation and Western civilisation. The existence of these civilisations is a definite matter and an incontestable established fact. Likewise is the difference between them, such that none but the liar can deny it. The source of the divine civilisation, according to its people, is revelation; the source of the man-made civilisation is the people who agreed on it. This alone suffices is enough for distinction and difference. Even if there appears a type of meeting in some of the concepts, this is not an agreement or a common matter. This is because civilisation, when it is adopted, must be adopted together with the basis from which it emanated or the basis it is built upon. So if the basis between two civilisations is different, the agreement between some of their concepts, or the existence of similarity...
The Meaning of Dialogue (al-hiwar) between Civilizations

When we say dialogue or clash, we mean Muslims, their deen and their civilisation on one side; and Christians and their religion and the Capitalists and their civilisation, on the other side. It is a malicious attempt that the leaders and intellectuals of the Capitalist civilisation differentiate between Islam and its followers i.e. between Islam and Muslims. So they claim that Islam is great but Muslims are backward and some of them are terrorists. They are liars in their view for if Islam was really great in their view, then they would have embraced it. However they attempt to delude the naïve from amongst Muslims, attempting to reduce the rancour against them when they strike a Muslim people, or when they attempt to spread the concepts of their civilisation among Muslims. They know that the Islamic ‘aqeedah still remains in the souls of Muslims and it is strong in the majority of them. So if they openly declare their enmity to Islam, they will stir up Muslims and provoke them. Thus they use these deceptive sentences as a weapon to anaesthetise Muslims and to deceive them. Some Muslims would swallow this bait and accept dialogue by the manner presented by Christians and Capitalists or by their agent intellectuals. They concentrate in the definition of this dialogue upon three matters: The first is equality between religions and civilisations in the dialogue without superiority or preference of a religion or civilisation over another. The second is that the limit of the dialogue is restricted to mere knowledge of the other’s opinions without addressing its refutation or invalidation. The third is creating an alternative civilisation through the method of arriving at the common denominators between the two religions and two civilisations.

This is the meaning of dialogue in their view, and its benefit as they claim is: “Productive interaction between cultural peculiarities, to form an alternative superior civilisation, that invites to accept the other on the same footing” (Dr. Milad Hana in a cultural debate held in Cairo on Monday, 2/4/2001). And: “Every time civilisations seek to find what is common between them and what is human, they advance, flourish and peace would spread” (Dr. Jafar Abdussalam, the Secretary-General of the Conference of Islamic Universities). One of them went to the extent of saying that: “Islam is a deen of interaction and a deen of development, and not like what is said that it is a deen of obscurity and a deen of isolation. On the contrary, the golden age of Islam and Muslims was...
when the Islamic civilisation interacted with other civilisations in the world, and when Islam spread in the world, took from and had a room for all the legacies and other human civilisations and gave them from its legacy and civilisation. This was the golden age of the Islamic State." (Dr. Qasim Jafar spoke, in a study circle on 'The First War of the Century', on Al-Jazeera channel, under the heading: 'Are the American explosives an incentive for dialogue or the clash of civilisations?' on 29/9/2001). He said: "It is upon us as Arabs and Muslims to abstain from this problem... it is upon us to possess sufficient confidence in ourselves, in our civilisation, and in our history and legacy, so as to burst forth in the world from the position of equality, and not the position of the follower (tabi'ī)..." (The above-mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera channel). Another said: "The Islamic civilisation was based upon the common denominator between world civilisations so it accepted the other and interacted with it in taking and giving (Amr Abdulkarim, a political scientist - IslamOnline.net). Another person attempted to use as evidence for the dialogue of civilisations the ayaat of the Noble Qur'an so he said: "And our Book, the Glorious Qur'an, emphasises upon the manner of dialogue with the others, dialogue with polytheists (mushrikeen):

> وإن أخذ من المسلمين استجارك فأجره حتى يؤمن كلام الله الوارثة

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

> فلَيْ أُهِبِهَا الكَفَارُونَ الكافرون

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

> يا أهل الكتاب تعالوا إلى كلمة سواء بيننا ويحكم الال تنبيه ولا نشرك به شيئاً ولا يتح مم تنبيه ابتدأ أرباباً

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

> فما وجدنا فيها غير بيت من المسلمين الداريات

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

> واعثوا فألاء المسلمين آل عمران

(And bear witness that we are Muslims) [TMQ Al-Imran: 52]. Perhaps

Muslims. I point to the Qur'anic ayaat:

> تعلموا إلى كلمة سواء بيننا ويحكم الال

(And bear witness that we are Muslims) [TMQ Al-Imran: 52]. Perhaps
And:

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

And:

"Surely they disbelieve who say: 'Allah is the third of three'" [TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 76].

And:

"O People of the Book, why do you  disbelieve in the saiyet of Allah while you hear witness?" [TMQ Al-Imran: 70].

And:

"And because of their disbelief and uttering a grave falsehood (buhtan) against Mary" [TMQ An-Nisa: 156].

And:

"O People of the Book, why do you disbelieve in the aayaat of Allah while you bear witness?" [TMQ Al-Imran: 98].

And:

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

And:

"And because of their disbelief and uttering a grave falsehood (buhtan) against the Prophet they say: 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others' and wish to adopt a way in between. Those are in truth disbelievers, and We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating punishment." [TMQ An-Nisa: 150-1].

And:

"Those who disbelieve among the People of the Book do not like that there should descend upon you any good from your Lord. But Allah chooses for His mercy whoever He wills. And Allah is the Owner of great bounty." [TMQ Al-Imran: 105].
The Messenger of Allah ﷺ: ‘I am a Muslim’ and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said when he read the letter:

کذب عدو الله ليس مسلم، وهو على النصرانية

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

Amr Musa, Secretary-General of the Arab League, made clear that he does not believe that there is a civilisation better than (another) civilisation, and from the meaning of his words is that the Islamic civilisation is not preferable to the Capitalist, Hindu or Jewish civilisation for he says: “We do not believe that there is a better civilisation” in the exposition of his refutation of the Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi.

One of them attempted to use as evidence for accepting the other as they are without restriction or condition, and without attempting to pronounce judgments against him, the ayaat of Surat Al-Kahf that say:

"Religious dialogue is the attempt of the individual encumbered with the values, conventions, beliefs and previous creeds to discover the other... The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation..."

he ta’ala said:

وَقَلْ لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَوْلُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِالْأَمْرِ أَسْلَمُواْ إِنْ أَسْلَمُواْ فَإِنَّمَا أَهْلُ الْحَيَاةِ الْأُخْرَىٰ أُوْلُواْ الْمَلَكَةَ وَالْجَهَâلَةَ" [TMQ Al-Imran: 20]. And he said:

"By the One in whose hand is Muhammad’s soul, none hears of me of this Ummah, Jew or Christian, then dies without believing in what I was sent with except he is of the denizens of the Fire.”

And ibn Hibban extracted from the hadith of Anas that Caesar wrote to
meaning study of a religion in comparison with others upon the level of the creed ("aqeedah), legislation and ritual worships, and its views about man, the universe and life and the like, of assuming objectivity and the possibility of eliminating prejudice. Whereas religious competition is a process aiming to prove the superiority and distinction of one religion over the other; a matter which is not of course aimed by religious dialogue which a process of understanding only" (Husam Tamamm, researcher and journalist, Egypt: IslamOnline.net, under the title: 'Religious Dialogue: A Human Necessity or world Conspiracy').

These quotations are necessary to know what the advocates of the idea of religious dialogue intend of this expression, which is their technical terminology. The best of what guides us to the meaning of this technical terminology is what they themselves say or write, since the linguistic meaning does not benefit here. From all of these quotations, it is possible to crystallize the meaning of this technical terminology in the following:

Firstly: Equality and equivalence between religions and civilisations, and non-preference between a religion and another or a civilisation and another.

Secondly: Accepting the other as it is and discovering it without pronouncing judgments against it, but rather understanding and recognizing its views without restriction or condition.

Thirdly: The objective of dialogue between civilisations is interaction to create an alternative superior civilisation through the means of seeking to find out what is common and human; a matter that leads to the advance and flourishing of civilisations, and spreading of peace. The objective of dialogue between religions is to prevent Islam from entering the arena of the struggle.

All these concepts completely contradict Islam. There is not a single concept from these that has evidence or probable evidence. They are not from Islam; rather they are all distortion (tamweeh) and deception, and their danger against Islam is sure.

**The Idea of Equality between Civilisations**

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

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

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

And He said:

![What is there after the truth except misguidance?](TMQ Yunus: 32).

And He said:

![They wish to arbitrate to At-Taghut while they have been commanded to deny it. And Satan wishes to mislead them far astray!](TMQ An-Nisa: 60).
The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation (hatmiyyat sirār al-Ul-hadharat)

"He is the One who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the deen of truth so that it prevails over all other deens, even if the polytheists detest it." [TMQ At-Taubah: 33].

And He said:

وَمَن يَبْعَثْ عَلَى الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَن يَفْلِحَ مَنْ وَهَوْنَ فِي الْأُخْرَى مِنَ الْخَلاَسِرِينَ ٣٨٩

"And whoever seeks other than Islam as a deen, never will it be accepted from him. And in the Hereafter he will be among the losers." [TMQ Al-Imran: 85].

And He said:

وَأَنزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدَّقًا لَّا بِنَيَّةٍ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَمَهْمَا عَلَىٰهُ ٤٨٢

"And We revealed to you the Book in truth confirming the Scripture that came before it and dominating over it." [TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 48].

And He said:

كَذَٰلِكُ الْبَرَّ يَضُرِّبُ اللَّهُ الْحَرَّمَ وَالْبَاطِلَ فَأُمَرَّ الَّذِينَ يَشْرَبُونَ جُفَاءٍ وَأَمَامَا يَبْعَثُ الناسُ فِي مَكْتُوبٍ فِي الأَرْضِ كَذَٰلِكَ يَضُرُّبُ اللَّهُ الْأُمَلَىّ ١٣:١٧

"Thus does Allah show forth truth from falsehood (by parables). Then as for the foam, it passes away as scum while that, which benefits mankind remains in the earth. Thus Allah sets forth parables." [TMQ Ar-Rad: 17].

And He said:

فَنَّ كَفَانَةَ مَوْئِمًا كَفَانَ فَأْسِقًا لَا يُبْطَنُ ٣٢:١٨

"Is then he who is a believer like he who is a transgressor (fasiq)? They are not equal." [TMQ As-Sajdah: 18].

And He said:

قَلْ لَا يُبْطَنَ الْخَيْرُ وَالْطَّيِّبُ وَلَوْ أَضْحَكَ كُلُّ أَعْجَابُ كَوْرَةَ الْخَيْرِ فَأَقْتُلُوا اللَّهُ بِأَوْلِي الْأَلْبَابِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُونَ ١٠٠

"Say: ‘Not equal are the evil and the good, even though the abundance of evil pleases you.’ Fear Allah, O men of understanding, so that you may be successful" [TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 100].

And He said:

مِثلُ الْفَرْقَيْنِ كُلُّ أَعْجَابٍ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالْبَصَىٰ وَالْسَّيِّئُ هُلُ الْبَكْرَىٰ مِنْ أَفْلَا تَذَكَّرُونَ ١١:٢٤

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

And He said:

وَذَٰلِكَ لَوْ تَذَكَّرُونَ كَمَا كَفَّرُوا فَتَكَبَّرُونَ سَوَاءٌ السَّبَأُ ٨٩

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

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

The Idea of Accepting the Other

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

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

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

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

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

"Those who said: 'Verily Allah has taken our promise not to believe in any Messenger unless he brings to us an offering which fire devours.' Say: 'There came to you Messengers before me with clear proofs and with what you speak of. Why did you kill them if you are truthful?'' [TMQ Al-Imran: 183].

And:

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

And:

"Those who associate (with Allah) will say: 'If Allah had willed, we would not have associated nor would we have forbidden anything.' Likewise belied those before them until they tasted Our wrath. Say: 'Have you any knowledge so that you produce it for us? Verily you follow nothing but conjecture (dhann) and you do nothing but lie.' [TMQ Al-An'am: 148].

And:

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

And they say: 'There is nothing but our life of this world, we die and we live and nothing destroys us except time. They have no knowledge of it, they only conjecture. And when Our clear ayaat are recited to them, those who expect not meeting Us say: "Bring us a Qur'an other than this or change it." Say: "It is not for me to change it of my own accord. I only follow that which was revealed unto Me. Verily I fear, if I disobey my Lord, the punishment of a Great Day." Say: "If Allah had so willed, I should not have reitated it to you nor would He have made it known to you. I had stayed among you a lifetime before this. Have you then no sense?"' [TMQ Yunus: 15-16].

And:

And when Our dear ayaat are recited to them, those who expect not meeting Us say: ‘Bring us a Qur’an other than this or change it.’ Say: ‘It is not for me to change it of my own accord. I only follow that which was revealed unto Me. Verily I fear if I disobey my Lord, the punishment of a Great Day.’ Say: ‘If Allah had so willed, I should not have reiterated it to you nor would He have made it known to you. I had stayed among you a lifetime before this. Have you then no sense?’” [TMQ Yunus: 15-16].

And:

And the Jews say: ‘Uzayr is the son of Allah’ and the Christians say: ‘The Messiah is the son of Allah.’ That is their saying from their mouths. They imitate the saying of those who disbelieved of old. Allah’s curse is upon them, how they lie! They took their rabbis and monks as lords besides Allah and the Messiah son of Mary while they were not commanded save to worship one Lord. There is no god but He. Glorified be He beyond what they associate!” [TMQ At-Taubah: 30-1].

And:

And when Our clear ayaat are recited to them, those who expect not meeting Us say: “Bring us a Qur’an other than this or change it.” Say: “It is not for me to change it of my own accord. I only follow that which was revealed unto Me. Verily I fear if I disobey my Lord, the punishment of a Great Day.” Say: “If Allah had so willed, I should not have reiterated it to you nor would He have made it known to you. I had stayed among you a lifetime before this. Have you then no sense?” [TMQ Yunus: 15-16].
As for His saying:

وَإِنَّ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ اسْتَجَارَكَ فَاجْعَلْهُ يَسْمَعَ

كلام الله ﷺ في أوله مأمتة (6:9)

“As for one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah then escort him to a place of safety” [TMQ At-Taubah: 6]. There is no evidence in this āyah for what they claim about dialogue between equals. There is no indication therein for dialogue; rather therein is a command to make the polytheist hear the word of Allah, and either he believes or he is escorted to his place of safety. So the āyah is about giving protection to the polytheist who wishes to ask about Islam, so Islam is explained to him in a way that is hoped he will embrace it. There is no evidence in the āyah for dialogue in order to know his opinions in the way of equality and equivalence without pronouncing judgement against him. The āyah determines that he is a polytheist, so it pronounced judgement of polytheism. It does not seek a dialogue with him to know his opinions; rather it seeks making him listen to the Qur’an. So there is no sense in using it as evidence.

The Idea of the Alternative Civilisation

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

قَلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ لَا أُعْبُدُ مَا تُعْبُدُونَ وَلَا أَنْتُمْ غَاتِبُونَ مَا أُعْبُدُ

{109:1-3}

“Say: ‘O you disbelievers! I do not worship that which you worship. And you do not worship what I worship’” [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 1-3] for dialogue with disbelievers (kaffar) and His saying:

وَإِنَّ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ اسْتَجَارَكَ فَاجْعَلْهُ يَسْمَعَ

كلام الله ﷺ في أوله مأمتة (6:9)

“If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah then escort him to a place of safety” [TMQ At-Taubah: 6] for dialogue with polytheists; this is an incorrect deduction and outside its context. Surat Al-Kafirun has pronounced a judgment against them, which is that they are kuffar and will remain upon their kufur without ever believing. Allah subhanahu knew that they would never believe ever and He informed the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about that. He commanded him to convey it to them and to reject their offer of mutual exchange of deities yearly. So there remains no place for dialogue whatsoever after Allah subhanahu informed that they would remain disbelievers until death. This Surah descended regarding specific people. Allah spoke the truth. Some of them died and some of them were killed; and none of them believed.

As for His saying:

وَإِنَّ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ المُشْرِكِينَ استَجَارَكَ فَاجْعَلْهُ يَسْمَعَ

كلام الله ﷺ في أوله مأمتة (6:9)

“Say, ‘O People of the Book. Come to a just word between us: That we worship none but Allah nor associate anything with Him nor some of us taking each other as lords’. [TMQ Al-Imran: 64]. So he says: ‘This is a dialogue with others from a position of equality.’ Then he interprets His saying: ‘To a just word’ into the word ‘common (mushtarak) between us’ (and) ‘we do not
say we dialogue to (reach) to our word." This understanding of the āyah is slandering upon Allah, as the meaning of 'sawā' is just (biad), i.e. a just word which what the āyah explains subsequently. There is nothing in the āyah, whether in its wording or its meaning, that indicates we invite them to a common word. He definitely did not intend that we associate in a just word by the evidence of his saying: "We do not say that we dialogue to our word" so nothing remains except that he wants the common civilisation. The call to interaction and seeking to find what is common between the civilisations is mixing the truth with falsehood; Allah prohibited the People of the Book from this, and also Muslims by greater reason. He ta'ala said:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَمْ تَلْبِسْنِينَ الْحَقَّ بِالِبَاطِلِ وَتَكْتَمَلْنُ الْحَقَّ وَتَعْلَمُونَ

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

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

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

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

"Verily you and what you worship besides Allah are fuel for the Hellfire! Surely you will enter it" [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 98].

And:

"A slanderer, going about with calumnies. A hinderer of good, transgressor, sinful. Cruel, after all that, base-born" [TMQ Al-Qalam: 11-3].

And:

"Then, verily you misguided, deniers. You will surely eat of the tree of Zaqqum. Then you will fill bellies therewith. Drink boiling water on top of it. So you will drink the drinking of thirsty camels. That will be their entertainment on the Day of Recompense! We created you, so why do you not believe?" [TMQ Al-Waqi'a: 51-7].

And:

"Then, verily, you misguided, deniers. You will surely eat of the tree of Zaqqum. Then you will fill bellies therewith. Drink boiling water on top of it. So you will drink the drinking of thirsty camels. That will be their entertainment on the Day of Recompense! We created you, so why do you not believe?" [TMQ Al-Waqi'a: 51-7].

And:

"Verily the criminals are in misguidance and will burn!" [TMQ Al-Qamar: 47]

And:

"We pray and invoke the curse of Allah upon the deniers" [TMQ Al-Imran: 61].

And:

"Perish the hands of Abu Lahab and he has perished" [TMQ Al-Masad: 1].
And:

إِنْ شَاءَتْكُمْ هُوَ الْأَثَرُ [3:108]

"Verily the one who makes you angry will be cut off" [TMQ Al-Kauthar: 3].

This intellectual struggle does not contradict with His saying:

اِذْ أَلْقَا إِلَى سَبِيلٍ يَتَزَاكَمُونَ عَلَى الْحَكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ السَّمِيعَةِ وَأَحْسَنَ الْكَنَّاسَةِ مَنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ مِنْهُمْ وَأَحْسَنَ إِنَّ رَبَّكُ هُوَ الْأَعْلَمُ بِمَا يَفْتَرِنَّ عَلَيْهِمْ وَهُوَ الْأَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ [16:125]

"Invite to the way of your Lord with (hikma) and fair preaching. And argue with them with what is better. Verily your Lord knows best who has gone astray from His way and He knows best those who are guided" [TMQ Al-Nahl: 125]. This is because the (hikma) here is the intellectual proof (burhan 'aqli) and the irrefutable evidence (hujjat damigha); and the fair preaching is the beautiful reminder. The beautiful reminder is by impressing the thoughts and emotions collectively like His saying:

إِنَّ جَهَّالَتَكُمْ كَانَتُ مُرَاضَدَةً لِلْأَعْمَالِ لَا طَاعَةً لِلْيَدِ وَلَا بَعْضًا لَا هَيْثَ مَعَ هَٰذَا أَحْقَاقًا لَا يُذَوْقُونَ فِيهَ {٢٦-٢١١}

"Verily Hell is a place of ambush. A dwelling place for the transgressors. A biding therein for ages. No cool shall they taste therein nor any drink. Except boiling water and dirty wound discharges. An exact recompense" [TMQ An-Naba: 21-6]. The argument with what is better is avoiding the harm of the one arguing with you i.e. that you turn away from his insult to you. That is to say; you ignore him. Likewise there is no contradiction between the intellectual struggle and His saying:

وَلَا تَجَادَلُوا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ إِلَّا بِمَا يَذْهَبُ رَأِيَ الْأَحْسَنُ إِلَّا إِلَى الْأَهْلِ الْمُتَّقِينَ {٢٩:٤٦}

"Argue not with the People of the Book except with that which is better except those who do wrong among them" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 46]. That which is better is to turn away from their harm to you in the argument. As for those who do wrong through fighting or refusing the enforcement of the rule upon them and the paying of jizyah, arguing with them is by the sword. As an example of intellectual struggle narrated regarding Him is what ibn Abi Sheeba and Abdurrazaq reported in their Musnads, as well as the writers of the Seerah and others, from Qatadah that "the Messenger of Allah said to a man:"

(أَسَلَمُ أَبَا الْحَارِثَ فَقَالَ النَّصَارَىُّ قَدْ أَسَلَمْتُ فَقَالَ فِي اَلْثَلَّاثِ أَسَلَمْتُ فَقَالَ قَدْ أَسَلَكْتُ فِي اَلْثَلَّاثِ فَعَلَتْ وَقَالَ كَذَّبْتُ حَالَي بَيْنَيْنِ وَبَيْنِ الإِسْلَامَ إِلَى ثَلَاثِ شَرِيكِ الْخَمْرِ وَيَقُولُ شَرِيكُ وَأَكْلُ الخَيْرِ وَدَعَاكُمْ لِلَّهِ وَلِدَاءً)."

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

And As-Sana'ni reported in his 'Tafseer' from Abdurrazaq from Qatadah that Ubayy bin Khalaf came with a decaying tooth while scattering it in the wind and said: Will Allah give life to this, O Muhammad? The Prophet said:

"Yes, Allah will give life to it and cause you to die and enter you into the Fire!" And Al-Hakim reported in 'Al-Mustadrak' and authenticated it from Jabir bin Abdullah (ra) who said:

إِنَّ حُكْمَ الْقَرْنِ يوُقَّعُ عَلَى رَبِّ النَّاسِ يَا مَهْدُ، أَنْ تَحْرَجَ عَلَى اَلْحَرِّمَ . . . فَكَفَّرْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى الله عليه وسلم. فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى الله عليه وسلم: "يَا أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ رَكَّبْنَا رَجُلَيْنَ مِنِ الْأَحْسَنِ رَجُلَيْنَ حَمْرَاءُ مِنْ الْرَّجُحَمِ الرَّجُحَمٍ حَنَيْنَ فَقَلُوا إِنَّا أَفْرَضْنَآ فِي الْرَّجُحَمِ الرَّجُحَمِ". لَمَّا بَلَغَ [٣٠:٥]
"Quraysh convened one day and Utbah bin Rabi'ah came to him and said: O Muhammad, are you better or Abdullah?... The Messenger of Allah said: Have you finished? He said: Yes. So the Messenger of Allah recited: 'Bismillah ir-Rahmaan ir-Raheem. Ha Meem. A revelation from Allah, ir-Rahmaan, ir-Raheem' until he reached: ‘But if they turn away, then say: ‘I have warned you of a lightning bold like the lightning bolt of ‘Ad and Thamud’ [TMQ Fussilat: 1-13] Utbah said to him: It is enough, it is enough. Have you anything other than this? He said: No. So he returned to Quraysh and they said: What is behind you? He said: I did not leave anything that I thought you would say to him except that I said to him. They said: Did he answer you? He said: Yes. By the One who set upright the structure, I understood nothing of what he said except that he warned you of a lightning bolt of ‘Aad and Thamud. They said: Woe unto you, a man spoke to you in Arabic and you do not know what he said? He said: No, by Allah, I understood nothing except mentioning the lightning bolt." This is some of what was narrated from him of intellectual struggle.

Likewise, some of the Sahabah would do this. Of this is what ibn Ishaq narrated with his chain from Az-Zubair who said: 'The first to loudly recite the Qur'an in Makkah after the Messenger of Allah was 'Abdullah bin Mas'oud (ra). He said: The companions of the Messenger of Allah assembled one day and said: By Allah, the Quraysh have not heard the Qur'an being loudly recited yet, so which man will make them hear it? 'Abdullah bin Mas'oud said: Me. They said: Verily we fear them against you. We intend a person who has kinsfolk who protect him from the people if they have evil designs upon him. He said: Leave me. Allah will protect me. He said: On the morrow, bin Mas'oud came to the maqam (of Ibrahim at the Ka'aba) in the forenoon and recited:

الرحمن عَلَّمَ الْقُرآنَ (2–1:55)

"Ar-Rahman. Has taught the Qur'an" [TMQ Ar-Rahman: 1-2]. Then he faced them reciting it. He said: They contemplated it then began asking: What is ibn Umm 'Abd saying? He said: Then they said: He is reciting some of what Muhammad came with. So they stood and began striking upon his face and he maintained reciting what Allah willed that he reaches. Then he left to his companions, and he had been affected in the face. They said to him: This is what we feared for you. He said: The enemies of Allah were no more contemptible to me than now and if you wish I will awake for the like tomorrow. They said: No, it is enough for you, what you said. You have made them hear what they detest." And ibn Kathir reported in 'Jami' Al-Masaneed wa As-Sunan': "From Hatib whom the Messenger of Allah had sent to Juraij bin Mina who was the Muqawqis of Alexandria who said to him: Why does your Prophet not invoke against those who expelled him from his land? He said to him: Just as your Prophet did not invoke against those who intended to kill him until Allah raised him to Him. He said to him: You have acted well. You are a wise man coming from a wise man." And Al-Hakim reported in 'Al-Mustadhak' and said (it) saheeh upon the conditions of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim): "From Abu Musa (ra) who said: The Messenger of Allah commanded us to depart to the land of An-Najashi. That reached Quraysh and they sent Amru bin Al-As and 'Amara bin Al-Waleed, and they collected gifts for An-Najashi. They came to us and advanced to An-Najashi, arrived to him with gifts, kissed him and prostrated to him. Then Amru bin Al-As said: Verily a folk from us disliked our religion and they are in your land. An-Najashi said to him: In my land? He said: Yes? He said: Send them to me. Jaffar said to us: Let none of you speak. I am your speaker today. So we reached An-Najashi while he was sitting in his assembly. Amru at his right and 'Amara at his left, and the priests and monks seated (samatin). Amru and Amara said to him: They do not prostrate to you. When we reached him, the priests and monks with him chided us: Prostrate to your king Jaffar said: We do not prostrate except to Allah. An-Najashi said to him: And who is that? He said: Verily Allah sent among us His
Message, and he is the Messenger that Isa prophesied (to come) after him whose name is Ahmad. He commanded us to worship Allah without associating anything with Him, to establish the prayer, pay the zakat, and he commanded us the good and forbade us from the evil. He said: His words amazed the people. When Amru saw that, he said to him: Allah prosper the king. They oppose you in Isa bin Maryam. So An-Najashi said to Jaffar: What does your companion say about the son of Mary? He said: He says about him the saying of Allah: He is the spirit of Allah and His word that He brought forth from the maiden virgin whom no man had approached. He said: Then An-Najashi picked a stick from the ground, then raised it and said: O priests and monks, these do no exceed the width of this, what you say about Isa bin Maryam. Welcome to you and to the one whom you come from. Verily I bear witness that he is the Messenger of Allah, and that he is the one Isa bin Maryam prophesied of. Were it not for what I am of kingship, I would go to him until I carry his shoes. Dwell in my land as long as you wish, and he commanded food and clothing for them. And he said: Return to these two their gifts." And Ahmad reported this hadith in greater length from Umm Salamah (ra), and it is more detailed than the hadith of Abu Musa (ra). Al-Haithami reported it in ‘Al-Majma’a“ and said: Its men are the men of the saheeh (ahadith) apart from ibn Ishaq, and he explicitly stated that he heard it. Muslims remained struggling with the religions and civilisations of kuff after his death in an intellectual and military struggle - as will follow - until Islam spread across the regions of the ancient world save a little thereof. People entered into Islam in crowds, and they shed their previous religions and civilisations and became a single new Ummah, its ‘aqeedah one, its thoughts one, its viewpoint in life one, its system one, its interest one, and its highest ideal one namely raising high the word of Allah. It assumed the position of the leading state in the world, and its towns became the centres of radiance for the enlightened thought, the ‘aqeedah of tawheed and the just Shari’ah. They carried the Book and Sunnah, and the Arabic language, to the world so Islam became the ideology of all, and the interest in the Arabic language became great, until there emerged among them mujtahidoon and scholars of language, without difference between Arab and non-Arab, until they became brothers by the favour of Allah. Today, we see a vicious campaign against the Arabic language to detach it from Islam through wicked styles such as the call to colloquialism, writing the other languages of Muslims in the Latin alphabet, and considering local colloquial languages as Arabic. It is known that it is impossible for the one who does not know Arabic to understand Islam, not to mention performing ijtihad with it. They want the Arabic to become like Latin and Syriac such that none understands Islam except experts in this unused language. In reality, they want it to become a dead language. How would the one who does not understand Arabic be able to understand the news (khabar), composition (insha’a), command (’amr), prohibition (nahy), the literal (haqeeqa) and metaphoric (majaz), the reason (’illah), cause (sabab), condition (sharat), preventive (maani), general (a’amm), specific (khaas), absolute (mutlaq), restricted (muqayyad), the indications of the explicit wording (mantooq) and the understood (mfhoom), the meanings of the letters, conjugation, grammar etc? All of these are necessary to understand the Shari’ah texts. Whoever calls to this is an enemy of Islam, and whoever among the Muslims is fooled by these falsehoods is stupid.

However, the embracing of the deen of Allah was not general in a complete perfected way, even among the Arabs themselves. The defeated religions and civilisations remained present. They were weak at the beginning due to the disappearance of the environment that allowed their growth. Thus the movement of heretics (zanadiqa) failed and was suppressed. However, the negligence of the Arabic language afterwards led to the closure of the gates of ijtihad and confusion in understanding the rules, which weakened the State until it became petty states. Some thoughts of the ancient civilisations intruded to Muslims like the idea of asceticism and punishing the body from Hindu philosophy, tribalism among some, the ideas of hidden secret meanings (batiniyya) in others, and the inclination to separate from the centre of the Khilafah weakened the State and stopped the conquests. Rather the Crusaders and Tatars coveted it until the Ottomans came and unified most of the regions of the State under their authority and resumed the conquests. However, the military character dominated it without carrying the ideology in the correct manner, so the peoples of the conquered lands were not melted into the crucible of Islam as occurred in the first conquests. It is possible to perceive the difference between the Uzbeks, Tajiks, Turkmens and Turkmen and the peoples conquered in the period of the Ottomans like the Serbs, Greeks, Hungarians, Croats, Romanians and others. These quickly conspired...
with the West against Islam and their State, and they never abstained whenever offered an opportunity for vengeance. Then the cultural and missionary invasions against Islam started until the Western civilisation achieved the destruction of the Islamic State, fragmented it, and divided the community (jamah) of Muslims. Nor did Western Capitalism stop at that limit; rather it worked to spread its concepts of nationalism, patriotism, democracy, freedom, man-made canons, and imaginary borders among Muslims. It appointed over these petty states corrupt rulers allied to them who consolidate its influence and concepts, protect its interests, preserve the division, deviate from the way of Allah and oppose every sincere person who attempts to free himself from their nose. They were assisted upon that by agent intellectuals who invite to Western thoughts with passion, defend them, and struggle against the Islamic civilisation, standing with blind sincerity to the side of the Ummah’s enemy. The Crusader enemies and their agents among the influential people in the Muslim countries, put under their control the media means and education, thus they became misguided and misleading. This intellectual assault did not stop so the call to the concepts of Western civilisation of what they call freedoms, democracy, pluralism, civil society, the state of institutions, human rights, women’s rights, the patriotic bond, religious dialogue etc. is in full swing. Thus it is truly considered a violent intellectual struggle between the two civilisations; Islamic and Capitalist. This clash is so clear such that it requires no evidence, for we are living it daily, no matter how much some intellectuals and the influential Capitalists attempt to hide it, through distortion and deception. For example, we find the former American president Nixon say in The Favourable Opportunity (al-fursa as-saniha): “Our isolation contradicts our values and religious beliefs, which call to spread virtue throughout the world.” He also says in his book ‘Victory without War’: “The revolutionary Islamic ideology is a reaction against modernisation. Communism promises to rotate the hour of history forwards and Islamic fundamentalism returns it backwards…Communist and Islamic revolutionaries are ideological enemies adopting a common aim: Desire to achieve power by any necessary means with the aim of imposing a dominant dictatorship based upon their ideals which are unbecame.” We find Berlusconi, the current Italian prime minister, say: “We must be aware of the superiority of our civilisation. The East will remain oriented towards the civilisation of the West and this orientation will increase. This occurred once in the communist world and, also

occurred in parts of the Islamic world.” Teri Larson, the coordinator of the Oslo process, welcomed the inclination of Muslims of Palestine towards normalization with the West. One member of the Jewish delegation in Oslo and Wye River, Ori Speer, mentioned in his book ‘The Course (Al-Maseera)’: “The scarves started to disappear from the heads of women, and the dresses started to be shortened from the lower part, a matter that Larson welcomed, considering it inclined towards normalization with the West.” In fact women would not dare to do that during the first Intifada before Oslo. We find also Phyllis Oakley, former Under-Secretary of State say: “We agree with those who say that the clash of civilisations cannot be avoided.” Madeleine Albright, former US foreign secretary, said: “We were attacked because of our identity. We adhere to globalisation and defend democracy, freedom and open society. This is the essence of America from which we cannot retreat” (Al-Quds magazine quoting from the translated words of Nathan Charles-Washington). Paul Kennedy, History professor at the American Yale University says: “It is difficult to avoid deducing that the danger of terrorist attacks will not cease. We have not as well realized great success in preventing the occurrence of these attacks. The genie got out of the bottle’s neck and it carries the spirit of vengeance; and the car bomb has now become the airplane bomb” (Al-Quds magazine in translated words of 22.9.2001). The former Jewish president, Hertzog, said before the Polish parliament in 1992: “The epidemic of Islamic fundamentalism spreads quickly. Nor does it pose a danger to the Jewish people only; rather upon all of humanity” (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Shimon Peres said: “Fundamentalism has become the greatest danger of the age after the collapse of communism” (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Cyrus Vance, former American foreign secretary, said: “We must be careful and resolved in dealing with these fanatics whose actions are impossible to predict” (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). The French cultural encyclopedia states that Muhammad is: “Anti-Christ, kidnapper of women, and the greatest enemy to the human intellect.”

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

من قتل نفساً بغير نفس أو فساد في الأرض فكأنما قتل الناس جمعاً

{5:32}

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

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

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

Intellectual Struggle (as-sira'a ul-fikri)

The intellectual struggle between Islam and the remaining kufri civilisations is a factual reality, and it is obligatory upon Muslims, even when the kuffar did not initiate the struggle against them. The Messenger of Allah peace be upon him initiated it in Makkah before the State and after the secret stage. The situation remained thus until our time and it will remain until when Allah wills. It is quite apparent even if it is obscured to some people. Whoever studied the books of ‘Creeds and Sects’ (Al-Millal wan-Nihal) will find intellectual struggle therein with all the thoughts that Muslims knew.

This struggle between the Western civilisation and Islamic civilisation is manifested in many styles including:

1. Dominance over the media apparatus and directing them for the benefit of the Capitalist civilisation.

2. Dominance over the education syllabi at all its levels in order to spread the Western concepts, distort and fight some of the concepts of Islamic civilisation and forge the history of Muslims.

3. Establishing schools and universities directly supervised by Westerners.

4. Setting up parties that adopt Western civilisation and call for it, and which are protected by the West and its moderate progressive friends.

5. Sponsoring those whom they call the elite, educated and intellectuals, focusing light upon them and promoting them, so that they become the leaders of thought in the countries of the Islamic world.

6. Funding the educational scholarships and courses in their various types, to choose those suitable to become their intellectual or political agents, or agents i.e. spies.

7. Founding institutions, clubs and centres specialised in spreading their poison, and spending generously upon them.

8. Fighting the Arabic language and reviving non-Arabic languages, and inciting nationalistic and patriotic agitations.

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

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

**Economic Struggle**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Political struggle

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

First: Their destruction of the Khilafah in 1924.

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

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

واختصموا بِحِبْلِ اللهِ جَمِيعًا وَلَا تَفَرَّقوَا آلِ مُسَرَّرٍ

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

من أتاكمو وأمركم جميع على رجل واحد يرد ان يشق عصاكم أو يفرق جائعكم فأقفلوه.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Military Conflict:

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

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

بوشك ان تداعي عليكم الأمم كما تداعي الأكلة إلى قفصها فقال قالن: ومن قلة من يومئذ؟ قال بل أيمن يومئذ كثير ولكنكم غلبتكم خفاء السيل:
the threat to its interests... In order to protect the threatened democratic governments, like in Israel and South Korea, we are prepared to use military force if necessary.

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

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

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

--The former Secretary (General) of the NATO alliance, Claus, formally announced that the alliance endorsed Islam in the place of the former Soviet Union, as a target for its enmity. BBCOnline.net quoted from President Bush on 17/9/2001 his saying: "This crusade, this war
 upon terror will be for a long period."

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

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

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

'The Probable Evidences of those who deny Civilisation Struggle in Islam

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

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

"To you is your deen" [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 6] for Allah subhanahu addressed the disbelievers with the language of plurality and said:
then the Jizyah, and if they reject, then the sword. It is deception to deduce with His saying:

وَلَا تَجَادَلُوا أُهُلَّ الْكِتَابِ إِلاْ بِأَلْبَيْنِي هُمَّ أَحْسَنُ

29: 46

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

أَمِنُّ أَنْ تُرْبَدُوا أُولَئِكَ الْمُجَاهِدُونَ وَأَنْتُمُ الْمُفْتَسِرُونَ وَأَنْتُمُ الْمُطَّلِبُونَ

MUSLIMON almu'kot 46

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

It is also erroneous to deduce His saying:

وَقُولُ لِلَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ إِلَّا عَلَى مِثَالِكُمْ إِنَّ عَامِلِيْنَ وَالَّذِينَ مُتَّبَعُونَ

11: 122-121

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

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَالَّذِينَ هَآذَوْا وَالضَّادِينَ وَالخَلاَقِينَ وَالَّذِينَ أَشْرَكُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُفْصِلُ بَيْنَهُمْ يُؤْمِنُونَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى كُلِّ ضَيْفٍ شَهِيدٍ

22: 17

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

فَأَتَهُمْ وَأَتَأْتُوا إِلَىِّ السَّلَّمِ وَأَتَأْتُوا إِلَىِّ اللهِ كَلَا تَكُونُ عَلَيْهِمْ عِطْرَةً

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

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

ياَ أَيَّامِ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَذْحَلُوا فِي السَّلَّمِ كَأَفَّةٍ وَلَا تَبَيَّنُوا خَطُورَاتِ الشَّيْطَانِ إِلَّا لِّكُلِّ عَدُوٍّ مَّجِينٍ

"O you who believe, enter into submission (as-silm) completely and do not follow the footsteps of Satan. Verily he is an open enemy to you." [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 208] It is said that it is necessary to know those being addressed with this ayah then know the meaning of 'as-silm'. 'Those who believe' could mean the Muslims as being addressed, and it could be the believers in Prophets before Muhammad, and 'as-silm' could here be Islam or it could mean peace (sulh). If those addressed are the believers in Muhammad, there is no meaning in saying to them: 'Enter into peace with believers', because they are not warriors but are rather believers like them; it is only said to them: 'Enter completely into Islam, meaning the obeying of all His Shari'ah and establishing His limits and rules, without trying to choose some and leaving some.' If those addressed are the believers in the previous Prophets, there is no meaning in requesting them to enter into peace; rather this meaning does not exist in the Qur'an. At-Tabari said: "As for calling them initially to peace, this does not exist in the Qur'an." So the meaning is calling them to Islam and to enter therein. Thus whoever was the one addressed, there is no call therein for Muslims to enter into treaty of peace with disbelievers i.e. mutual peace (muwada'). And if they use as evidence His saying:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ فَلَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ الَّذِينَ أُعْلِنَ عَلَيْهِمْ

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

أَذَنْ لِلْذِينَ يَقَاتِلُونَكُمْ بِذِيَالْعُلُوْيَةِ إِلَّا لِّيُقَاتِلُوكُمْ وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ نَصْرِهِمْ تَقْدِيرٍ

"Permission (to fight) is given to those who were fought, because they were oppressed. Verily Allah likes not any treacherous disbeliever" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 38]. When he emigrated, it was revealed:

وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحَبِّبُ كَلِلْ حَوْاَنَّ كَفُورٍ (22:38)
...a secure sanctuary" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 67] and His saying:

وَهَذَا الْبُيُوتُ الْأَمِينُ (95:3)

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

وُلِدَتْ هَذَا الْمَهْدُ مِنْ نَفْعٍ فَوْقِهِمْ (24:55)

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

من أصيح منكم آمنًا في سره

"Whoever of you awakes safe in his flock (sirb)." This, indeed, is scorning of the Shar'a and the minds of people!

Rebutting the Probable Evidences of those Denying the Offensive Jihad (Jihad ut-talab)

Those saying Islam is a deen of peace deny offensive jihad i.e. initiating fighting with the disbelievers. They confirm the defensive war and deny the offensive war (qital ut-talab) i.e. initiating the attack. Some of them believe there is no necessity for this matter since it is possible to overcome the material obstacles and convey the da'wah to disbelievers without colliding with these obstacles, by using the internet, media, books, leaflets, building mosques and Islamic centres in the heart of the countries of disbelievers, and live contacts with individuals to make them enter the deen of Allah. They claim that this takes the place of offensive war. This view collides with the texts of the Book, Sunnah and Ijmaa Us-Sahabah that all command that we initiate fighting against them, even if they do not initiate against us, if they do not accept Islam or pay the jizyah and submit to the rule of Islam. These texts are not reasoned with the reason (illah) that Jihad is only obliged in the situation of inability to convey verbally. As for the Book, it is His saying:

"Permission (to fight) is given to those who were fought because they were oppressed. And verily Allah is Able to support them." [TMQ Al-Hajj: 39]. Thus the ayaah was revealed to lift the ban from Muslims in repelling harm from them. So it is a specific situation, even if it avails the command to fight via the indicated meaning (dalalah al-ishara). So the ayaah does not explain the legitimacy of fighting in the way of Allah, but the legitimacy of fighting to repel harm. Thus there is no contradiction between this ayaah and the ayaah of At-Taubah. Moreover, the ayaah of At-Taubah were revealed later, so there is no abrogation, specification or restriction (to them).

If they deduce with the hadith of ibn Abi Awfa that is agreed upon: The Messenger of Allah said:

"O people, do not wish to meet the enemy and ask Allah for well-being. And if you meet them, be patient and know that Paradise is under the shadow of swords." This hadith has no relation with mutual peace, since what is therein is prohibition from wishing to meet them not prohibition from fighting them or the command for making peace with them. The scholars have said this prohibition is due to what there is in wishing to meet the enemy of pride ('ijab); so it is a deduction out of context. There are other attempts of deduction that do not deserve rebuttal, nay they do not (even) deserve mention. However we mention them to prove that some of these people do not refrain from gathering the evidences in any way. Their main concern is to prove Islam is a deen of peace and not a deen of struggle, conflict and jihad. Rather, in their view it is rather a deen of security, peace and tolerance. Some of what they claim to be evidence in the subject is His saying:

وَأَمَّمُهُمْ مِنْ خَوْفٍ (4:106)

"And made them safe from fear" [TMQ Quraish: 4] and His saying:

خَرَّمُ عَمَّا (67:29)

And His saying:

فَأَلْبَأْا لَكُمْ لَا لَكُمْ بِاللَّهِ وَلَا بِالَّذِينَ خَلَقَهُمَا وَلَا يَحْمِرُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ وَرِسُولُهُ وَلَا بَدِينُونَ دِينَ الَّذِينَ أَوْلُوهُمَا الكِتَابَ حَتَّى يَعْطُوُا الْجَرْحِيَّةَ عَن يَدٍ وَفِيمَ صَغَّارُونَ (29:9)
Taubah: 123. These are ayaat from At-Taubah which is among the last which was revealed without anything coming to specify, restrict or abrogate it, so it is evidence that Jihad encompasses defensive and offensive war i.e. the fighting of defence and offence. As for His  saying:

وَإِنَّ قَتَالَةَ لِلَّهِ الَّذِينَ يَقاَطِعُونَكُمْ وَلاَ يَعْتُدُّونَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لاَ يُحِبُّ الْمُتَّقِينَ (61)

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

"And remember that Allah is with the pious" [TMQ At-Taubah:36].

And His  saying:

ياَ إِيَّاهَا النَّبِيُّ مَا مَلَأْتَ قَلْبَكَ وَأَمَاتَهُمْ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَغْفِرُ لَهُمْ عِذَابَ الْأَخِرَةِ وَيَحْسَبُهُمْ مِنَ الصَّالِحِينَ (73)

"O Prophet, fight the polytheists collectively as they fight you collectively. And remember that Allah is with the pious" [TMQ At-Taubah:73].

And His  saying:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اعْتَرَفَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ آمَنَّاهُمْ وَأَمَاتَهُمْ أَنَّ لَهُمْ الحَجَّةَ يَقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ يَقَاتِلُونَ وَيُقَاتِلُونَ وَيَعْتَدُّونَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَيَقْتُلُونَهُمْ وَيَقْتُلُونَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَغْفِرُ لَهُمْ عِذَابَ الْأَخِرَةِ وَيَحْسَبُهُمْ مِنَ الصَّالِحِينَ (111)

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

And His  saying:

ياَ إِيَّاهَا النَّبِيُّ قَالُوا قَتَالَنا اللَّهَ الَّذِينَ يَقَاتِلُونَ مِنَ الْكَفَّارَ يَقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ وَيَقْتُلُونَ وَيَثَّبَتُونَ وَلَا تَهْزَمُونَ (123)

"O you who believe, fight those are closest to you among the disbelievers and let them find harshness in you. And know that Allah is with the pious" [TMQ At-
it; and the absolute remains upon its unrestricted nature due to the absence of any restricting text that the unrestricted can be restricted with or applied on it.

As for the Sunnah, this is due to what the two Sheikhs reported from the hadith of 'Abdullah bin 'Umar who said: The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.) said:

أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يشهدوا أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمدا رسول الله ويطيعوا الصلاة ويزدؤوا الزكاة فإن فعلوا ذلك عصموا من دماءهم إلا بخCHA and حسا美学 علي الله تعالى

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

أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يقولوا لا إله إلا الله فإذا قالوا فقد عصموا من دماءهم وأموالهم إلى بخCHA and حسا美学 علي الله

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

اغزوا باسم الله في سبيل الله، قاتلوا من كفر بالله، اغزوا ولا تعلموا، ولا تغلوا ولا تقلقوا ولا تفلحوا، وإذا قلت عدولكم من المشركين فادعوا إلى ثلاث خصال أو خلاف فابهين ما أجابوك فافعل منكم وكف عنهم، ثم إدعهم إلى الإسلام وإن أجابوك فافعل منهم وكس عنهم، ثم إجحهم إلى التحول من دار المهاجرين وخبرهم أمم إن

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

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

Conclusion

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

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