

DANGEROUS CONCEPTS TO STRIKE ISLAM AND CONSOLIDATE THE WESTERN CULTURE

**This booklet has been published by Hizb ut-Tahrir
First Edition
1419 AH
1997**

Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim

'They (the disbelievers) want to extinguish Allah's Light (Islam) with their mouths, but Allah will not allow except that His Light should be perfected even though the Kafirun may hate it. It is He Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad [saw]) with guidance and the Deen of truth, to make it superior to every other way of life even though the Mushrikun may hate it'. [9:32-33]

Contents

Opening Ayah.....

Contents.....

Introduction.....

Terrorism.....

Interfaith Dialogue.....

Wasatiyyah.....

Fundamentalism.....

Globalisation.....

Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim

Introduction

The struggle between good (*khair*) and bad (*sharr*), between truth (*haqq*) and falsehood (*batil*) is one of the universal laws of life. Since the Wisdom (*Hikma*) of Allah necessitates that the struggle and contest between the people be a factor in the prevailing of truth and good and the defeat of falsehood and evil. He (swt) said: *'And if Allah did not check one set of people by means of another, the earth would indeed be full of mischief'. [2:251]* And He (swt) said: *'For had it not been that Allah checks one set of people by means of another, the monasteries, churches, synagogues and mosques, wherein the Name of Allah is mentioned much would surely have been pulled down'. [22:40]*

So after the Messenger (saw) and his noble Sahabah had plunged into an intellectual and political struggle with the Mushrikeen and the Kuffar to establish the Islamic State. And a bloody struggle (afterwards) in addition to the intellectual struggle after the establishment of the state, carrying Islam as the Message of good and guidance (*huda*) to the whole of mankind. The *kuffar* throughout the ages used to plot against this state. Sometimes by material actions of war such as the Mongols, Crusaders, the *kuffar* of Spain; and sometimes by cultural and intellectual actions like the heretics (*zindeeq*), missionaries and the orientalists, in order to destroy the *Khilafah* state as an executive body at the head of which is the *Khaleefah*.

In the 1st world war that was achieved. They destroyed the *Khilafah* state, expelled the *Khaleefah* and tore up the Muslims' land into weak statelets in which they applied the rules of *kufr*, thinking that by such actions they have banished Islam from the hearts of the Muslims.

However the sensations of revival have flowed back into the Islamic *Ummah* at the hands of her believing, sincere and aware sons. Thus, the *kufr* states realised that the strength of Islam is not solely confined to its executive body, and that winning over certain weak Muslim souls by polluting their thoughts with the Western culture would not realise what they had hoped.

After research and study they came to the conclusion that the power of Islam (and that of the Muslims) lies in its *Aqeedah* and the thoughts that emanate from it. This has led them to review their plans and to develop them so that the *Kafir* nations, with their formal apparatus and the agents of their rulers and thinkers, can take up the task of finishing off Islam by destroying its *Aqeedah* as a political *Aqeedah* so that the creed of separating religion (*deen*) from life can take its place. Thus, they began putting forward and adopting thoughts leading to what they believe, such as nationalism, socialism, democracy, pluralism, human rights, liberties and market policies, whose fallacy and danger we have already explained. (See; 'The American Campaign to Destroy Islam').

Then they put forward other thoughts accompanied by actions like the inter-faith and inter-cultural dialogue and the saying (that the Arabs and Jews) are the sons of Abraham. They started to tarnish Islam with terrorism, fundamentalism and extremism. Therefore we have to clarify the nature of these opinions and their danger to the Islamic *Ummah* so that she may be aware of them and she can take the legitimate stance towards them. Especially when the return of Islam to life as a world ideology

and political system, conveyed to mankind by the *Khilafah* state, became a definite matter not only for the Muslim activists, but also for the Islamic *Ummah* and the enemies of Islam who have not stopped conspiring against this *Deen* and against this *Ummah*.

We will discuss these thoughts in order to demonstrate their danger and fallacy, not as thoughts for understanding or as doubts that have to be repelled, but as actions of the *Kafir* West, at the head of which is America, Britain and France, by which they aim to strike Islam and strike those working for the re-establishment of the *Khilafah*, and even to strike the *Khilafah* state when Allah permits it to be established.

Therefore we must expose these thoughts and actions, so that Muslims realise what is intended for them and what is planned against their *Deen* so as to hold tight to their *Deen* and to work earnestly to re-establish the *Khilafah* on the way of the Prophethood by emulating the Messenger of Allah (saw), so that the re-establishment of the *Khilafah* and the rule by what Allah has revealed is realised at their hands. He (swt) said: *It is He Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad [saw]) with guidance and the Deen of truth, to make it superior over every other way of life even though the Mushrikun may hate it'. [9:32-33]*

If we carried out what Allah (swt) has obliged upon us, then we are sure that the hopes of the *Kuffar* who plot against Islam and the Muslims will be dashed, they will lose their money and their fire shall be put out. He (swt) said: *'Verily, those who disbelieve spend their wealth to hinder (men) from the Path of Allah, so they will continue to spend it; but in the end it will become an anguish for them. Then they will be defeated. [8:36]*

Terrorism (*Al-Irhab*)

Linguistically, terrorism is a noun derived from the verb *Arhaba*, 'to terrify', with the meaning to frighten or scare. He (swt) said: "*(Liturhibo) to threaten the enemy of Allah and your enemy*" [8:60] i.e. you should frighten the enemy.

However, this meaning has been changed to a new terminological meaning. Both American and British intelligence services agreed in a seminar held for this purpose in 1979 that terrorism is: "the use of violence against civil interest to achieve political objectives".

Afterwards, many international conferences and seminars were held and legislation and cannons were passed to define the actions which can be described as terrorism; and to clarify the types of movements, organisations and parties which practise terrorism; and to earmark those states supporting terrorism. That - according to their contention - is in order to adopt the necessary measures for fighting against terrorism and restricting it.

It is clear from the totality of cannons and legislations relating to terrorism that they are not accurate. They are subject to the political approaches of the states which have laid down these canons and legislations. For example, we see that America considered the assassination of Indira Ghandi as a terrorist act but the assassination of King Faysal and the murder of Kennedy not terrorism. It described the blowing up of the FBI building in Oklahoma in the beginning as a terrorist act but when it became clear that those behind the explosion were American militias they changed the act from terrorist to merely a criminal act.

America specifically describes certain movements as popular opposition movements like the rebels of Nicaragua and the IRA and others. She considers the fighters of these movements, when they are arrested, as prisoners of war according to protocol (1) of 1977 added to the Geneva convention. While she describes every movement opposing American interests or the interests of America's agents as being a terrorist movement and places its name on the list of terrorist organisations, a list which is periodically issued by the American foreign ministry, like most of the Islamic movements in Egypt, Pakistan, Palestine, Algeria etc.

America decided, since the 70's, to create a world and local American public opinion against terrorism as it viewed it and against those who are characterised by terrorism. She exploited the actions that targeted civil aims, whether these actions ensued from political or military movements not linked to America or they came from movements connected to the intelligence services of America. This is because many reports have indicated that some of the actions described as terrorist, were backed by some people from the CIA, like the hijacking of TWA plane in Beirut in the beginning of the eighties. America exploited the explosion at the American al-Khubar base in Saudi Arabia. Thus she imposed 40 recommendations relating to fighting terrorism on the G7 conference that was held in France 1996. Then she exploited the incident of the world trade centre bombing in New York and the FBI offices, before they knew who had done it by

passing the law of fighting against terrorism which was approved by the American senate in 1997.

In accordance with these recommendations and this law, America was able to pursue any person accused of terrorism in any place. She has the right to arrest, abduct and inflict the punishment which she deems he deserves such as prison, exile, withdrawing residence or nationality. All that would be done without giving the accused person the right to defend himself or to be presented before a civil court or jury.

As well, America has deliberately resorted to generalisation by describing certain countries which go against American interests as terrorist, countries such as Korea, China, Iraq and Libya. She has accused many Islamic movements of terrorism, movements like Jihad, Hamas, Jama'ah Islamiyyah in Egypt and FIS in Algeria. Thus she exploited the bombings against the Jews in Palestine and the acts that took place in Algeria on the eve of the military's abolition of the parliamentary elections.

According to these laws, resolutions and recommendations, America is able to pursue and strike anyone she describes as terrorist. Whether it is an individual, organisation, party or state by using her military forces or political influence to impose economic sanctions as she did in Iraq and Libya. This was expressed by her former foreign secretary Schultz when he said: 'However much terrorists may try to escape they will not be able to hide'.

Thus, the terrorism law adopted by America is one of the strategic weapons used by her to tighten her hold on the world, especially the part which has the propensity to rebel against American policy.

Since America has nominated Islam and taken it as her enemy after the end of communism. The Islamic countries are the most important areas in which America will use the terrorism law, to increase her influence and keep them under her control. This is because the Muslims started to seek the path of revival to re-establish the Khilafah State which America and other Kafir nations know it to be the only state capable of destroying the capitalist ideology which America heads.

That is why you will hardly find an Islamic movement today which is not liable to be described by America as terrorist. No movement or political party which does not use material actions to realise their objectives is safe from this description. Thus, America

considers the activity of every movement, party or state which calls for the return of Islam as a terrorist action which goes against international law. Consequently, she is able, with this justification and by compelling the nations which signed on the law of terrorism, to mobilise the forces of these nations under her leadership to strike such movement, party or state.

Therefore, while Muslims are working for the establishment of the Khilafah and are being a direct target of the policy known as fighting terrorism, it has become necessary upon them to expose to the Islamic and world public opinion the reality of what they call the terrorism law. They have also to reveal the reality of the policy of America which works to dominate the world through this law, and that she is the one which was behind many terrorist acts in the world though they have been attributed to Muslims names.

It is also incumbent on the Muslims to be Islamic in their actions and behaviour. Islam has a specific way of realising its aims and objectives. It is the carrying of the Call to resume the Islamic way of life by re-establishing the Khilafah State. Adherence to this method, which relies on the intellectual and political struggle to the exclusion of the material actions, is adherence to the Shara'i method which Islam has ordered, not out of fear or desiring to escape from the description of terrorism.

It is incumbent on the Muslims to clarify that the task of the Islamic State after its establishment is restricted to the Shar'a. Whether internally such as looking after the affairs of people and implementing the Hudood (penal code) or externally like conveying Islam through Jihad to the all mankind and destroying the material obstacles which come in the path of Islam's implementation.

They have to clarify that the implementation of Islam by the Muslims on themselves and others is not based on the whims of Muslims or to realise a certain interest for them. It is rather in compliance with the orders of Allah (swt) Who has created man, life and the universe and ordered the human being to organise his life with the rules of Islam which He has revealed to Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (saw).

Thus, America and others countries describing Islam as terrorism and the Muslims as terrorist is a biased description. It is contrary to the reality and contradicts what Allah wishes from Islam. He (swt) said: *'And We have sent you (O Muhammad [saw]) not but as a mercy for the 'Alameen (worlds).'*[21:107] He (swt) said: *'And We have sent down*

to you the Book (the Qur'an) as an exposition of everything, a guidance, a mercy, and glad tidings for those who have submitted themselves to Allah'.[16:89]

This mercy is exemplified by the implementation of the rules of Islam. There is no difference between prayer (Salah) and Jihad, between Du'a and frightening the enemy. There is no difference between Zakah and cutting the hand of the thief, nor is there a difference between helping the grieved and killing those committing aggression against the sanctities of the Muslims. All of them are Shara'i rules which the Muslims or the state will implement each on its reality and at its time.

Interfaith Dialogue

Indeed, inviting non-Muslims to Islam is a matter Allah (swt) has made obligatory on the Muslims. The Muslims have been doing this for 14 centuries and still call others to Islam whether they are from the People of the Book or not. He (swt) said: *'Invite (O Muhammad [saw]) to the Way of your Lord with Hikma (clear proof) and fair preaching, and argue with them in a way that is better'.[16:125]* And he (saw) said in his letter to Heraclious, the emperor of Rome: *Verily, I invite you with the call of Islam. Embrace Islam and you shall be safe and Allah will grant you the reward twice. If you turn away then upon you will be the sin of the people under your rule'*

Thus, our call to the non-Muslims is an invitation to have conviction in Islam and abandon Kufr.

As for the idea of interfaith dialogue which is being circulated nowadays, it is a foreign, evil and western idea which has no basis in Islam. This is because it calls for mutual partnership between religions. It rather calls for a new fabricated religion which the Muslims will profess instead of Islam, because the advocates and those who call for this idea are the western kuffar themselves.

This idea started internationally in 1932 when France sent representatives to negotiate with the scholars of al-Azhar about the idea of uniting the three religions: Islam, Christianity and Judaism. Afterwards that was followed by the Paris conference of 1933 which was attended by orientalist and missionaries from every university in France, England, Switzerland, America, Italy, Poland, Spain, Turkey and others. The conference of world religions in 1936 was the last conference of religions before the second world war which distracted the Europeans from those conferences.

In 1964 the Pope Paolo VI sent a letter in which he called for dialogue between the religions. Then the Vatican published a book in 1969 with the title: 'Guide of dialogue between the Muslims and Christians'.

During the seventh and eighth decade of the 20th century more than thirteen interfaith and inter cultural meetings and conferences were held the most prominent of which was the 2nd world conference of religion and peace held in Belgium which was attended by 400 delegates from various world religions. Another conference was held in Cordoba in Spain which was attended by Muslim and Christian representatives from 23 countries. The two previous conferences were held in 1974 and then the Christian-Muslim assembly in Qurtaj, Tunis in 1979.

In the last decade of the 20th century those calling for inter faith dialogue were active. Thus, they held the Arab-European conference in 1993 in Jordan, followed in 1994 by the Khartoum conference for interfaith dialogue. In 1995 two dialogue conferences were held, one of them in Stockholm and the other in Amman, both of which were followed by the conference "Islam and Europe" in the university of Aal al-Bayt in Jordan in 1996.

Justifications for dialogue:

One of the most significant justifications presented by conferees in the inter faith conferences is to stand in the face of the disbelief and atheism represented by the Soviet Union before its collapse. Thus, communism is an atheism which threatens the divine religions and threatens their cultural achievements. Then they pretended to weep for humanity and for the defence of believers in earth. Then they sought the truth in relative terms, thus allowing nobody to claim that he alone has it, rather it should be subject to democracy where the majority opinion is the closest to the truth.

Recommendations of conference participants:

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

- coining new meanings and provisions for words such as disbelief, atheism, polytheism, belief, Islam, moderation, extremism and fundamentalism so that these words do not become factors of division between people of religions.

- establishment of joint elements in the three religions which would include creed, morals and culture and the emphasis on positive co-operation between the religions and cultures, since all the people of the Book are believers and they worship Allah.
- the crystallisation of a joint document on human rights in order to permit peace and co-existence between the followers of religions. This is achieved by eliminating the feeling of barriers of blood between the religions and by removing the concept of the 'enemy' in the peoples' cultures and the states' policies.
- review of the wording of history and the education curricula, so that they become free of any incitement or hatred. The religious education has to be considered part of the basic humanitarian studies which aim to create personalities who are open to human cultures and have mutual understanding of others. Therefore, certain beliefs and worships must not be studied.
- interest in studying the following subjects and putting down a unified concepts for them: justice, peace, woman, human rights, democracy, work morals, pluralism, freedom, world peace, peaceful co-existence, cultural openness, civil society etc.

The means and styles of interfaith dialogue:

After the failure of Kafir westerners in distancing the Muslims from their 'Aqeedah via the missionaries, orientalist, cultural works, the media intellectual and political deception, they resorted to the official authorities in their countries and in the countries of their agents. They began to hold conferences and seminars and forming joint work teams and establishing centres of study in their countries and in the Muslim lands like the Oxford centre for Islamic studies, the Centre for Middle Eastern studies in the British university of Durham, the American college of the Holy Cross, the Muslim League, the Royal Academy for the study of Islamic culture, university of Aal al-Bayt and the World Council of Churches etc.

They deliberately used terminologies and glittering general expressions which indicate undefined meanings in order to mislead and deceive. For example: the terms of renovation, openness to the world, human civilisation, universal sciences, the need to have peaceful coexistence, discarding partisanship and extremism, globalism etc.

They mixed the concepts of science and culture, and the concepts of *Hadharah* and civilisation in order to take this confusion as justification to attack those holding onto

their specific way of life by saying that they are against science and against the civilisation arising from it and accused them of being reactionary and backward. Though the issue in Islam is not as they claim. Islam, opens its gates to science and the civilisation that arises from this science but it closes them in the face of any culture or *hadhara* that is other than the culture and *hadhara* of Islam because they constitute thoughts and concepts related to the behaviour of the human being which has to be controlled by the Islamic concepts about life.

They painted certain capitalist thoughts in glowing tones to the Muslims and they sell them by saying that they do not contradict Islam to the point that some Muslims considered them as being from Islam, like Democracy, freedom, pluralism, socialism and others. While they denounce certain Islamic thoughts and describe them as uncivilised and not fit for this age, such as Jihaad, the Hudood, polygamy and other shara'i rules.

They subjected the study of the Islamic texts to the capitalist way of thinking which makes the reality the source of the rule and not the subject of the thought. It makes benefit the criterion in adopting or leaving the rule and not the Halaal and the Haraam. This incited some Muslims to invent certain principles which do not rely on the *Shara'i* texts to understand Islam. This is like the *Fiqh* of the reality, the *Fiqh* of balances, necessity permits the prohibited things and others. This resulted in the dilution of certain rules of Islam and the non-differentiation between the foreign rule from the original rule, not between what constitutes *Kufr* and what constitutes Islam. Thus *Riba* (usury) has become permitted and martyrdom has become suicide.

The *Kuffar* who are supervising the dialogue are embarking on the generalisation and widening of the scope of the dialogue. So it will not remain restricted to the few participating in the conferences and seminars. Rather it must include all sections of society from the men, women, educated and labourers. This is done via the universities, institutes of study, parties and associations. It is, as some participants of the conferences described, joining the western *hadhara* in economy, social sphere, politics, education etc. Thus, capitalism - according to their claim- is humanity, rationalism, freedom and democracy. It is the new and successful *hadharah*. As for Islam, it is blind faith, despotism, heritage. It is the sovereignty of religion, the slavery and polygamy. It is thus an uncivilised religion!

One of the styles with which they are blinding the Muslims in the conferences of dialogue is the participation of those belonging to certain beliefs such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism etc with Muslims, Christians and Jews. This happened in the world conference for religion and peace in Japan and in a seminar in Beirut in Lebanon in 1970, so that Muslims do not think they are the only targets of the dialogue. How can those called the scholars of the Muslims accept to make Islam equal to Buddhism and other religions!

The true viewpoint of the West towards Islam:

Indeed the West, which calls for dialogue with the Muslims and heads conferences of dialogue, views Islam as an enemy. This viewpoint is the motive for the dialogue and this viewpoint governs and directs the dialogue. Thus the encyclopaedia of French culture which is the reference for every researcher states that the Messenger Muhammad (saw) is: "a killer, antichrist, kidnaps women and the greatest enemy to the human mind". Likewise most of the text books in Western Europe describe the Messenger Muhammad (saw), Islam and the Muslims with the most ugliest of descriptions. Recently, the following has been mentioned in the book 'The End of History' of the American thinker Fukiyama: 'the Capitalist system is the eternal salvation for man on earth. Islam despite its weakness and disintegration, threatens this new victorious way of life (i.e. capitalism)'. The general secretary of NATO said: 'Fundamentalist Islam is the danger which threatens the geopolitics of the future'. The orientalist Barnard Lewis said about Islam and Capitalism: They are contradictory. There is no scope for dialogue. And Samuel Huntington, professor of political science in the American Harvard University and the director of the institute of strategic studies said: 'The clash between cultures (*hadharah*) will dominate the foreign policy. The dividing lines between the cultures (*hadharah*) will be the battle lines in the future'. Then he says: 'Religion vehemently distinguishes itself and it is clear to the people. A person can be half French and half Arab...but it is difficult for a man to be half catholic and half Muslim...'

Where is the dialogue they call us for from this enmity?

When these statements are compared with the hostile actions which have come from the West against Islam and the Muslims like the Crusades, extermination of Muslims in Spain, destruction of the Khilafah state and afterwards the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine and portraying Islam and the Islamic movements as terrorist and

extremist. When we compare these statements, we realise the meaning and the aims of the dialogue that the Kafir West is conducting with the Muslims.

The Aims of the Dialogue:

The primary aim which the capitalists are working to achieve from the dialogue between religions and *hadharas* is to prevent the return of Islam to life as a system. This is because it threatens the survival of their ideology and *hadhara* and will destroy their interests and influence.

As for other partial aims which serve the primary aim they are various. Thus, they aim to paint the world according to the colour of the capitalist *hadhara* especially the regions in which the Muslims live, to take the place of the Islamic *hadhara*. So that it will be easy for them to obliterate the Islamic *hadhara* from the minds of the people. They aim to achieve that by shaking the confidence of Muslims in the Islamic *hadhara* and its sources and principles in order to neutralise Islam in the battle of the struggle of *hadharas* by stripping it off from its most important characteristics which distinguish it from the rest of the religions. That is politics with which the Khilafah state would be established to look after the affairs of the people by the rules of Islam and carry it to the whole of mankind.

They also aim to shape the personality of the Muslim anew such that he finds no shame in leaving the *Wajib* and doing the *Haram*. Then they aim to corrupt the Islamic taste and kill in him the zeal to Islam such that he does not hate Kufr and the Kafir, and he does not enjoin the Good and forbid the Evil. With this they remove the cultural immunity of the Islamic Ummah with which they resisted any intruding element and remove the emotional and intellectual barriers which threaten the capitalist *hadhara* existence in the Muslim countries. Thus, preserving their influence and interests becomes easier and they insure their survival and continuance.

The intention behind this dialogue, which the Kuffar and the agent rulers guard in the Muslims' countries, and with them an entourage of scholars and thinkers, is to create a new religion for the Muslims. It is based on the creed of separating religion from life, and in which legislation is for man instead of Allah (swt), the Creator of mankind, being the legislator. They are as Allah (swt) describes them: *'And they will never cease fighting you until they turn you back from your Deen*[2:217]. And as He (swt) says: *'Never will the Jews nor the Christians be pleased with you (O Muhammad [saw]) till you follow their religion'*. [2:120]

Since the basis of the Islamic *hadhara* is the Islamic 'Aqeeda and the basis of the western *hadhara* is the capitalist 'Aqeeda then merging them is impossible. So the intention behind the dialogue led by the Kafir West is the work to make the Muslims abandon their Islamic concepts to the advantage of the capitalist thoughts. This is because they realise that the combination of two contradictory beliefs is impossible.

Thus the dialogue between religions and *hadharas* for establishing joint elements and to manufacture a new human *hadhara* is unrealistic. There must be an intellectual struggle between religions and *hadharas* to know the truth from falsehood, the ugly from the pretty, and the good from the evil: *'Then, as for the foam it passes away as scum upon the banks, while that which is good for mankind remains in the earth'*. [13:17]

As for the dialogue to which they call, it is a dialogue from one direction represented by the enemies of Islam with the aim of destroying Islam, the Islamic *hadhara* and the Islamic Ummah. Therefore, the Muslims must perfect the necessary tools of struggle, which is represented in the re-establishment of the Khilafah state, that will plunge in the intellectual and material struggle to spread the sublime Islamic *hadhara* and take the place of the false and corrupt *hadharas*.

The saying regarding the sons of Abraham

This saying has come to strengthen the dialogue between the three religions for the three divine religions have been brought by the Prophets: Muhammad, Jesus, Moses (peace be upon them). They all derive their ancestry to one father and he is Ibraheem (peace be upon him). Therefore, it is incumbent on the followers of these religions to live together in peace because they are descendants from one origin in lineage and religion.

This is from one angle. From the other angle this saying supports the so-called peace process and the normalisation with the Jews. This is to pass one chapter of the Jewish and western conspiracy against Islam and the Muslims to usurp Palestine and al-Masjid al-Aqsa and to implant a poisoned dagger in the heart of the Islamic Ummah. To justify also the participating of the Jews, Christians and Muslims in the religious custodianship over Jerusalem (al-Quds) which contains their holy sites in their capacity

as Muslims who all belong to one religion which is the religion of Abraham, the father of the Prophets.

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

The first is a linguistic issue:

The word 'aslama' in its linguistic meaning means 'inqaada' (i.e. to submit). The Noble Qur'an has used it with this meaning in the stories of the Prophets and when describing their followers who submitted to the Order of Allah (swt). He (swt) said on the tongue of Nuh (and he came before Ibraheem): *'My reward is only from Allah, and I have been commanded to be one of those who submit (muslimeen).'* [10:72] And He (swt) said on the tongue of Ibraheem and Isma'eel: *'Our Lord! And make us submissive (two Muslims) unto You and of our offspring a nation submissive (Muslimatan) unto You.'*[2:128] And He (swt) said regarding the people of Lut: *'But We found not there any household of those who submitted (muslimeen) except one (i.e. of Lut and his two daughters).'*[51:36] And on the tongue of Musa: *'Then in Him put your trust if you are those who have submitted (to Allah's will [Muslimeen]).'*[10:84] And on the tongue of the Hawariyyoon, the followers of 'Isa: *'We believe in Allah, and bear witness that we are those who have submitted (muslimoon).'*[3:52]

So the word 'muslimoon' found in the ayats means 'those who have submitted' (munqaadoon). It does not mean that they professed one Deen, which is Islam as revealed to Muhammad (saw). This is because Islam was not known to them. They were not addressed with it. Rather, each people had a particular Messenger who called them to a specific Shari'a. He (swt) said: *'To each (Ummah) among you, We have prescribed a law (Shari'ah) and a clear way (minhaaj).'*[5:48]

After the revelation (Wahy) came down to Muhammad (saw), the revelation took up certain Arabic words and transferred them from their linguistic conventional meanings to shari'a meanings. The Shari'a texts from the Qur'an and Sunnah have clarified this. One of these transferred expressions is the word 'Islam' which linguistically used to mean 'submission (inqiyaad), and became a shara'i meaning which is the Deen revealed by Allah to His Messenger Muhammad (saw). He (swt) said addressing the whole of mankind until the Day of Judgement: *'I have chosen for you Islam as your Deen.'*[5:3] And He (swt) said: *'And whosoever seeks a Deen other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him.'*[3:85] And he (saw) said: **Islam has been built on five**'. Other religions are not based on these five.

After the divine transference of the meaning of the word 'Islam', the words derived from it, such as the verb and the active participle (*aslama* and *Muslim*), if used without a Qareena (indication) it indicates the Shara'i meaning only. If the conventional linguistic meaning is intended then this would require a Qareena to change it to the Shara'i meaning. So His (swt) saying: *'Ibraheem was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but he was one who truly submitted (Musliman) (to Allah's will)'* [3:67] does not mean that Ibraheem was on the Deen which Allah revealed to Muhammad (saw), rather it means that Ibraheem had submitted to Allah regarding that which Allah revealed to him, unlike the Jews and Christians who fabricated the Deen of their Prophets.

As for the statement that Muhammad, 'Isa and Musa were on the Deen of Ibraheem, it means that they believed in the same 'Aqeeda, which is the foundation of every Deen revealed from Allah. This is what is meant from His (swt) saying: *'He (Allah) has ordained for you the same Deen which He ordained for Nuh, and that which We have inspired to you (O Muhammad [saw]), and that which We ordained for Ibraheem, Musa and 'Isa saying you should establish the Deen and do not become divided over it'*. [42:13] So, the word 'Deen' in the ayah means the foundation of the Deen, which is the 'Aqeeda. He (swt) specified this when He (swt) said: *'To each (Ummah) among you, We have prescribed a law (Shari'ah) and a clear way (minhaaj)'*. [5:48]

Secondly, Shara'i Matter:

Which is that Allah (swt) sent Muhammad (saw) as the seal of the Prophets and the Messengers to the whole of mankind. He ordered them to leave whatever religion they were following, whether divine or not, and called them to adopt Islam as a Deen. Whoever responded to the call became a Muslim and whoever rejected committed Kufr. He (swt) said: *'And say to those who were given the Book (the Jews and Christians) and to those who are illiterates (Arab pagans): 'Do you (also) submit yourselves (to Allah in Islam)?' If they do, they are rightly guided; but if they turn away, your duty is only to convey the Message; and Allah is All-Seer of (His) slaves'*. [3:20] And He (swt) said: *'Those who disbelieve from among the people of the Book (Jews and Christians) and among the Mushrikeen (polytheists), were not going to leave (their disbelief) until there came to them the clear evidence, a Messenger (Muhammad [saw]) from Allah...'* [98:1-2] They are not separated from the Kufr except by their embracing of Islam. He (saw) said: **'By the one in whose Hand lies Muhammad's soul! No one from this Ummah whether Jew or Christian who hears about me and then dies without believing in what I have been sent with, except**

that he will be from the inhabitants of the Fire'. So the people are all called to gain conviction in Islam and whoever does not profess Islam after the matter has been proven to him, then he is definitely a Kafir. The Jews and Christians, after Muhammad (saw) was charged with prophethood, if they remain on their religion they are Kuffar according to the Quranic text. It is forbidden to describe them as Muslims, and whosoever believes that they or others are Muslims, he is a Kafir. This is because with this belief of his he has rejected definite Shara'i texts which are definite in meaning and authenticity. If they die on this belief then they will be from the inhabitants of the Fire.

Third: The call regarding the sons of Ibraheem is a call to the bond of nationalism. It is a bond whose reality indicates that it is a shallow emotional bond arising from the survival instinct. It is not fit for humans because it cannot bind one human being with another if we differed in lineage.

The bond of the sons of Ibraheem has been wiped out by time. It does not exist in the reality of life because those who descend from Ibraheem and his offspring have mixed with other peoples due to marriage, social intercourse, migration and wars. So it is difficult or rather it is impossible today to separate them from the rest of the people. Since the followers of the three religions are themselves from all peoples and tribes of the world, they have been mixed on the basis of religion and not on the basis of ethnicity. Therefore, applying the claim regarding the sons of Ibraheem on the Muslims, Jews and Christians and on those who live around the al-Masjid al-Aqsa or any other masjid, is a pointless application which is not correct. The intention is to fight Islam and then justify the claimed peace process and to normalise relations with the Jewish entity which exists on the usurped land of the Muslims; all that to give legitimacy to the terrible crime which committed by the traitorous rulers under orders from their masters, the Kuffar.

The family or nationalist bond is like the bond of the sons of Ibraheem. It is rejected by the Shar'a as basis to organise the relationships of the people. He (swt) said: *"Say: If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your kindred, the wealth that you have gained, the commerce in which you fear decline, and the dwellings in which you delight...are dearer to you than Allah and His Messenger, and striving hard and fighting in His Path, then wait until Allah brings about His Decision (torment). And Allah guides not the people who are fasiqoon (disobedient)".* [9:24] Thus, the order of Allah is above every nationalistic, family or benefit bond. Allah (swt) clarified the shallowness of this bond to the previous Messengers. He (swt) said: *And Nuh called upon his Lord and*

said: 'O my Lord! Verily, my son is of my family! And certainly your promise is true, and You are the most just of the judges'. And He (swt) said: 'O Nuh! Surely, he is not of your family, verily his work is unrighteous'.[11:45]. And He (swt) said about Ibraheem: 'He (swt) said to him: 'Verily, I am going to make you a leader of mankind', (Ibraheem) said: 'And of my offspring (to make leaders).' (Allah) said: 'My covenant includes not the Zalimeen (wrongdoers)[2:124] Thus, the son of Nuh according to the Shara'i criterion is not from his family, because he does not believe what Allah has revealed to his father. And the zalimeen (wrongdoers) from the offspring of Ibraheem are exempt from the covenant of Allah of leadership since they did not follow what Allah has revealed to their father Ibraheem. So the call to the 'sons of Ibraheem' today is a jahil and politically motivated call. It is forbidden to call to it and invite people to it. This is because the intention is to fight Islam and divert the Muslims from their Deen and justify the treacherous peace treaty with the Jews, concede to them of what they usurped from the blessed land of Palestine, to normalise relations with them and accept them as a state in the Middle East.

Compromise

The terminology of compromise did not appear amongst Muslims except in the modern age. It is a foreign terminology and its source is the West and the capitalist ideology. That ideology whose creed is based on the compromise solution. A solution which arose as a result of the bloody conflict between the church and the Kings subordinate to it on the one hand, and between the western thinkers and philosophers on the other hand. The first group used to view the Christian religion as fit to solve all issues of life. The second group used to take the view that this religion was not suitable for that, and considered it the cause of the humiliation and backwardness. They viewed the mind as the one able to come up with a system which is suitable to organise the affairs of life.

After a bitter conflict between the two groups they agreed on a compromise solution. Which is the recognition of religion as the relationship between a person and the creator, on condition that it does not have any say in life, leaving the organisation of life's affairs to man. Then they took the idea of separating religion from life as a creed for their ideology from which the capitalist system emanated. On whose basis they revived and then they carried it to others via colonialism.

The effect of this compromise solution on which they built their creed, became prominent in every legislation and behaviour of the followers of the capitalist ideology, not least in the political issues. Thus, regarding the issue of Palestine - for example- all of which the Muslims demand as being their lands and at the same time the Jews claim that it is the promised land which God promised all of it to them. So in 1947 the western capitalist states put forward a solution, which is the plan of partition, that called for the establishment of two entities in Palestine. One for the Arabs and the other for the Jews. This compromise solution appears in many international problems which are controlled by the capitalist nations, like the problems of Kashmir, Cyprus, Bosnia and others.

As a consequence politics for them depends on lies and deviousness. Not to obtain all of the truth but to obtain something, whether it is greater or less than the truth. Not that everyone can achieve his right, but to arrive at a compromise solution approved by both parties. Not because it is correct but due to circumstances of each group in terms of their strength or weakness. So the strong takes everything he desires if he can and the weak concedes everything that he cannot obtain.

Some Muslims, instead of criticising the idea of compromise and the compromise solution and clarifying its error and fallacy, they have adopted it and claimed that it exists in Islam. Rather Islam is established on it. So Islam is between spiritualism and materialism, between individualism and collectivism, between realism and idealism, between constancy and change. So there is no excess or deficiency, nor exaggeration or negligence.

To prove the opinion they have adopted they examined things and found that everything has two extremes and a middle point. The middle is the safe area while the extremes are subject to danger and corruption. The middle is the centre of power, and the area of balance and equilibrium between two poles, since the middle and compromise has all these merits, so it is no surprise that compromise should emerge in every aspect of Islam. Thus Islam is the in the middle in belief and worship, and the middle in legislation and morals...

After they rationally measured the rules of Islam with the reality of things they studied certain Shara'i texts and twisted their necks and subjected them to their new understanding so that they fit with the opinion they have adopted. So they said regarding His (swt) saying: *'Thus We have made you a just nation, that you be*

witnesses over mankind and the Messenger (saw) be a witness over you'.[2:143]. The middle position of the Ummah is derived from the moderation in their minhaj and system. There is nothing in it of the excessiveness of the Jews and the negligence of the Christians. They also said that the word 'middle' (wasat) means justice and that justice -according to their claim- the middle of two conflicting sides. So they gave justice the meaning of reconciliation, to serve the idea of compromise. The correct meaning of the ayah is the Islamic Ummah is an Ummah of justice. And justice is from the conditions of a witness in Islam. This Ummah will be a just witness over the other nations that she has to convey Islam to them. The ayah, even though it came in the form of a notification (seeghatul ikhbaar), however it is an order from Allah to the Islamic Ummah that she should convey Islam to the other nations. If she does not do that she will be sinful. She is a proof against the other nations just as the Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him) is a proof against her: "so that the Messenger be a witness upon you" in his conveyance of Islam to you and his request from you that you should convey it to others: **'Let the one present convey it to the one absent'**.

They, as well, used the saying of Allah (swt) as evidence: *And those who, when they spend, are neither extravagant nor niggardly, but hold a medium (way) between those*'.[25:67] So they gave spending two extremes, extravagance and stinginess. And they gave it a middle position which is the medium (way). This is, in their view, an evidence for moderation in spending money. They did not understand that the meaning of the ayah is that there are three types of spending: extravagance, niggardliness and moderation. Thus, extravagance is the spending in haram, whether less or more. If a person spends a dirham in buying alcohol, gambling or bribery, this is extravagance which is haram. As for niggardliness, it is the abstention from spending in the wajib. If a person did not pay a single dirham which is due on him as Zakat of his money, or if he does not spend on those he is obligated to give maintenance, that will be niggardliness, and it will be haram. As for the moderation (qawwaam) it is the spending which is according to rules of the Shari'a whether spending is much or few. So honouring a single guest by slaughtering a sheep, chicken or camel is moderate spending. It is halal because Allah (swt) said in the ayah: *'between those*'.[25:67] to show that there are three types of spending: extravagance, niggardliness and moderation. One of those three types is required by the Shar'a which is the moderation. He did not say: (between those two) to show the middle position between two different things.

There is no middle position or compromise solution in Islam. Thus, Allah (swt) created man and He knows his reality, a knowledge that no human being can know. He (swt) is

the only one able to organise his life accurately, no one can attain this level. So the rules have come defined, they have no trace of the middle position or of the compromise solution. There is no middle position or compromise solution in the texts and rules of Islam. Rather there is accuracy, clarity and distinction, so Allah Himself called them Hudood (limits) due to their accuracy and correctness. He (swt) said: *'These are the limits of Allah, which He makes plain for the people which have knowledge'*. [2:230] And He (swt) said: *'And whosoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, and transgresses His limits, He will cast him into the Fire, to abide therein'*. [4:14] Where is the middle position and the compromise solution in the saying of the Messenger of Allah (saw) to his uncle Abu Talib when his people offered him position, money and rank to leave Islam: **'By Allah! O uncle, if they put the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left, that I should abandon this matter, until Allah makes it victorious or I perish, I shall not leave it'**? And where is the compromise in his statement to the tribe of Bani 'Aamir b. Sa'sa'ah when they demanded that they should have the rule after him (saw) in return for their nusra (support): **The matter belongs to Allah, He (swt) places it where He wills'**?

Thus the middle position or the compromise solution is an idea alien to Islam. The westerners and those Muslims who are loyal to them have attached it to Islam in order to sell it to the Muslims in the name of moderation and tolerance, intending to deviate us from the distinct rules and limits of Islam.

Fundamentalism

The first time the term fundamentalism appeared was in Europe towards the end of the 19th century. That was to indicate the position of the church regarding the sciences and new philosophies and the strict adherence to the Christian faith.

The protestant movement is considered the basis of fundamentalism. It set out its fundamental principles in the conference of Niagara in 1878, and in the general presbyterian conference of 1910, where the basic thoughts on which fundamentalism is established were crystallised. They were established on principles of Christian beliefs which contradicted the scientific progress arising from the capitalist ideology, that is established on the creed of separating religion from life.

Though this movement disappeared with the second world war, however it settled in the minds of the Europeans that fundamentalism was an enemy to progress and science. It is intellectual backwardness which does not befit the age of awakening, it must be fought until all its effects are removed from society and life.

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

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

Thus the description of many Islamic movements and of those who are affiliated to these movements, by the western thinkers and politicians, then by some Muslims who concur with them, aims at attacking and opposing these movements, by creating a international public opinion against anyone described as such. This is because fundamentalism in their view means backwardness and reactionism, and it means opposing scientific and industrial advancement.

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

The description of fundamentalism exceeded the limit to include every movement and party which work to change the terrible life which the Muslims live in to an Islamic life by re-establishing the Khilafah and ruling by Islam. It also included every movement which opposes aggressors and usurpers of Muslims' land and their rights such as the Jews, Serbs and Americans and others. So the Muslim Mujahids who fight their enemies who are usurping their land are fundamentalist and terrorists. And those also die as martyrs by striking the aggressor foreign forces are suicidal and criminals!

The description of fundamentalism is dangerous to every Muslim and every movement fighting injustice and occupation. It is dangerous to every party working according to the Shari'ah methodology to resume the Islamic way of life. This is because the objective of this description is to create legal justifications to attack anyone calling for the re-establishment of Islam in life, under the pretext that Islam is a fundamentalist movement, like Jewish and Christian fundamentalist movements which fought industrial and scientific progress in the age of the capitalist revival. The selection of this term itself is just to brand the Islamic movements with it is because of what it has of historical relevance to the western public opinion, so that the western peoples stand behind their rulers in the face of the return of political Islam as a state and system of life.

It should not occur to the mind of any Muslim that the description of Islamic movements as fundamentalist is taken from their connection with the foundation of the Deen or the foundations of jurisprudence (Fiqh). The foundation of the Islamic 'Aqeeda is the belief in Allah, His angels, Books, Messengers, Day of Judgement and al-Qadar. The foundations of jurisprudence are the principles on which jurisprudence is based, which the Mujtahid uses to derive practical Shara'i rules from their detailed evidences.

Fundamentalism, according to its western terminological meaning, and which the Christian protestant movement has brought together with the aim for which the movement was founded, is far from being related to the Islamic concepts and the Islamic movements whether they are contemporary or historical. In the Muslims' history, political movements, intellectual schools and jurisprudence schools have appeared. However they do not resemble the Christian fundamentalist movements in any way whatsoever. Even those who called for the closing of the door of Ijtihad in the seventh century did so not to preserve the old and oppose the new. It was rather because they thought that the Islamic Fiqh generated by the predecessors (salaf) contained all the issues that the later scholars (khalaf) could possibly face.

Islam is a unique Deen which differs from the divine religions, in that it is the last and it abrogates the ones that came before. Allah (swt) has taken the responsibility of preserving it as it was revealed until the Day of Judgement. He (swt) said: *'Verily It is We Who have sent down the Zikr (Qur'an) and surely, We will guard it'* [15:9]. It is also a complete and comprehensive ideology which is established on a creed that is based on the mind, from which emanates a comprehensive system which solves all the affairs of the human being until the Day of Judgement. It cannot be imagined that this ideology is unable to give a Shara'i rule to any problem faced by man. He (swt) said: *'And We have sent down to you the Book (the Qur'an) as an exposition of everything'*. [16:89]

The scientific and industrial progress which the Islamic world witnessed in the past was a result of the application of Islam and not a result of separating Islam from life. The scientific and industrial advancement which the world is witnessing today is indebted to the Muslim scholars who set out many of its theories and basic laws in the shadow of the Islamic life and the Islamic State.

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

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

Listen to the testimony of one of these people; he is a visiting scholar at the university of Harvard for middle eastern studies. He submitted a report to the American Congress in which he said: Fundamentalists take the view that the Shara'iah should be applied in all its details and that the orders and prohibitions of God must be implemented

completely, and that is binding on all Muslims. Islam is the basic source of their strength and the Shara'iah is suitable for application today as it was suitable for application in the past.' He also said: 'Fundamentalists deeply hate the Western civilisation, they see it as the greatest obstacle which stand in the face of the application of the Islamic Law'. Another says, and he is an American scholar called Esposito, in a report submitted by him also to the American Congress: Those who threaten American interests are the Muslim fundamentalists'.

So the fundamentalism which they attack is the reapplication of the Islamic Shara'iah in life. If this is fundamentalism then the Muslims - in their view- are all fundamentalists. This is because they wait with yearning and zeal, for the application of all the rules of their Deen, under the shadow of the Khilafah State, to save them and the world from the misery of capitalism and take them to the goodness of Islam. He (swt) said: *'And who does more wrong than the one who invents a lie against Allah, while he is being invited to Islam? And Allah guides not the people who are unjust (zalimoon). They intend to put out the Light of Allah (Islam) with their mouths. But Allah will complete His Light even though the disbelievers hate it'.*[61:7-8]

Globalisation

The example of the term "Globalisation", in the novel speech, is like the example of the *Jilbab* in the garments or the example of the "Trojan Horse" in the war tools. It hides that which it contains in order to cover up what it includes. Indeed Globalisation hides very much.

There is nothing more indicative of that than what took place in Beirut towards the end of 1997 when the centre for the study of Arab unity, which is one of the leftovers of Arab nationalists, held a conference to look into globalisation and to determine what stance Arabs should take regards it. As if in globalisation they saw a contradiction and threat to the idea of nationalism. It was mentioned in the viewpoint of the call to the conference that the subject of the conference was:

"Globalisation and the way the Arabs deals with its understanding and its manifestation on the economic, cultural and political side", in addition to its history, future and current role. And the US's dealing with it especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. And its effect on economy and growth in the Arab countries in addition to the cultural environment and identity.

Tens of scholars and university professors were invited to the conferences who contributed their understanding of globalisation and the stance that should be adopted regarding it. The local papers published briefs of the dissertation put forward by the participants in the conference which lasted 3 consecutive days. Huge disparities appeared in these studies until the conference became like a dialogue between deaf people rather than an intellectual conference. Those supervising the conference decided to conclude the conference without issuing any resolutions or recommendations.

Globalisation is a word coined in English and French about ten years ago. It is used not to describe a thing as international due to its presence or realisation in most parts of the world but to specify that a doer or doers wish to make the thing international. An example would be a company would adopt a policy of production which looks at the whole world as being suitable for producing its goods. Then in actual fact it pursues its production in any state or states whose production costs are less than anywhere else. Then it will be said that the company has 'globalised' its production. Similar things are said about other activities of this company or others such as when it adopts the policy of 'globalisation' and pursues it in marketing its goods, advertising them, searching for new commodities and developing them, in employing workers, experts and managers, or in attracting investors and financiers who would give loans to finance its operations or any other activity.

The first time the word "globalisation" was applied was in describing the activities of the large American companies starting in the mid-eighties. That is because when Reagan became the president of America in 1981 he employed bold policies in international relations, economic and political, and won the strong support of American financial circles. Part of this was the use of the policy of the strong dollar to attract the financiers from abroad to invest their money in the debt bonds of the American budget and the money markets which trade with them in order to finance his program of arming America and exhausting the Soviet Union at that time in a counter arms race. This is what actually led to the collapse of the Communism, economically, in 1989.

This policy of the strong dollar led to consecutive sharp rises in its value in the years of his first term in office to the extent that the pointer of its exchange rate, measured by the currencies of the other countries and weighted by America's economic (trade) exchange with them, reached 159 points in February 1985. This is in comparison with 91 points in the first month of his term in January 1981; making an increase of 75%. It

was of the signs of Reagan's political dare that he did not take notice of the negative and marginal results of the strong dollar policy. This is because he focussed on winning the struggle of Capitalism over Communism. One of the negative effects was that the strong dollar weakened the power of America in competing the foreign goods by the goods produced in America. So American exports declined and its imports increased. As a result of that, the deficit in the balance of its foreign trade at the time of Reagan accumulated greatly, till its total during the eight years of Reagan's rule reached \$723 billion, compared to its total of only \$4 billion during the eight years that came before him.

One of the negative effects of the policy of the strong dollar is that profits of many American companies declined due to the foreign goods' competition with American goods priced in dollars. These companies were compelled to reduce the price of their commodities then to seriously look at ways to cut their costs, especially the cost of American manual work. A group of university professors that time suggested the idea of 'restructuring' these companies by a fundamental review of their activities, whether in production or marketing etc. This idea became widespread amongst the financiers and businessmen. Its implementation led to the practical closure of a number of factories and branches of American companies. It also led to great numbers of their employees and workers being dismissed from work in different waves, like the job losses announced by General Motors, one of the biggest car companies in America when it dismissed 74,000 employees at one go. And IBM, which is one of the biggest computer companies, dismissed 60,000 employees in three waves within a short period of time.

These companies recovered, after restructuring, the production of the factories they closed down or parts of them which they sold in America by alternative production from new small companies which pays low wages to their workers, especially those hit by the job losses due to restructuring, and by establishing alternative factories and branches outside America. Another side effect of the strong dollar is that prices and wages have become very meagre abroad. The companies concentrated on poor and heavily populated countries like Pakistan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand and India, where the monthly wage of a worker hardly reaches the wage of one or two hours of the American factory worker. This was not confined to the manual workers but included the educated and the professionals like engineers and computer programmers, wherever they may be, as long as their wages are lower than what it is in America and they are in need to work and wages.

A political outcry flared up in America regarding the process of restructuring and discharging of workers in a collective manner and in startling numbers. Many Americans viewed the export of work abroad as depriving them of this work and an attack on their livelihood and that the motive of the companies was nothing but capitalist greed. The companies answered back that they were forced to do what they did because of intense 'international' competition, and that they had no choice but to compete on the international level and 'globalise' their operations. Committees in the Congress held meetings open to the public to investigate the globalisation of American companies, the first of which was held in 1987 and the last was in 1992. This investigation led to the term of globalisation to become publicised, then the committees concentrated its use when they placed it in the headings of their reports which were issued in 1987 and in the subsequent years. This was the first time the term 'globalisation' was used in the title of any book or report published in English. Then followed the publication of books on the subject of globalisation until the published material in English reached 260 books, most of which was published in the nineties during Clinton's term in office.

However, the effect of these investigations was ventilation to the political congestion against the job dismissals of the companies and their exporting of work outside of America, justification of what they did and elimination of the hostile media. The investigations ended in 1992, and they were not resumed after that despite the fact that the workers' dismissals were raised in the Presidential elections at the end on 1992. After Clinton came to power, Congress agreed to the NAFTA agreement which Bush signed with Canada and Mexico, even though the agreement enabled American and Canadian companies to manufacture whatever commodities they want in Mexico where the wages of workers is extremely cheap, and sell them in American and Canadian markets. This was exactly the thing which the workers unions and other American political factions which opposed the companies and accused them of exporting work were scared of.

Therefore, the political outcry and the political conflict in America itself that accompanied it regarding the mass job dismissals and the export of work outside of America, is what was publicly known its name afterwards as globalisation. It practically came to an end in 1992. It was ended for the favour of the financial circles and companies under their control. All of this led to the formation of public opinion which said that work requiring high qualification and experience for which high wages are

paid shall not leave America. The thing that is exported will be the work which only contained physical effort, exhaustingly monotonous and with low wages. It is something that they do not want for themselves anyway. When these expectations are realised then the benefits will return to all Americans, because it will lead them to specialise in advanced industries and highly qualified, experienced and paid work. Consequently the work that is exported will mean that the commodity collected and manufactured by cheap foreign hands outside the country will return to American markets at low prices.

The resolving of this issue politically in 1992 and the Clinton's assumption to power in 1993 led to the change in the American foreign and economic policy. His predecessor Bush used to adopt the policy of promoting the export of goods and sponsoring the establishment of the World Trade Organisation instead of GATT, to open the doors wide before the export of goods. However, the financiers and American financial circles took the view that what is more important than the promotion of export goods is the need to complete what they had begun in the early part of the eighties of the comprehensive restructuring of the companies to strengthen them so that they become more able to gain profit. They took the view that this restructuring of the companies should lead to the export of a lot of their work not just their goods only, and should lead to their involvement into a fierce competition with non-American companies.

The financiers put forward other ideas which they wanted Clinton to adopt. They said that for many years America has been bearing the burdens of the Cold War and other international burdens on account of which Europe and Japan were becoming stronger economically, so they had become a danger to the vital interests of America. Now that the Cold war is over, America must regain its ability to compete with Europe and Japan, and resume competing with them in a strong manner. She should not commit herself to observe their interests as she used to do in the past, according to her claim, until they even called for American secret service to be used in economic spying on Europe and Japan and their companies after her preoccupation with the Cold War and other political issues decreased.

In response to these thoughts and opinions, Clinton and his treasury secretary, Mr Rubin, who was one of the leading personalities on Wall Street, adopted the call to the opening of world markets, not only to sell American goods only but to enable American companies to produce goods wherever the cheap labour was available, and to market their services and manufactured goods in America or any other country, wherever she wished in the markets of the world. The most important of these was their adoption of

the activity of the American finance companies, which are the banks, insurance companies and brokerage houses of the money markets, in storming money markets outside America. This was a new matter since these companies did not work extensively outside before and hence was not welcomed in many countries due to the danger of their actions. This, is because financial companies by their very nature, work to attract the people's money in the form of deposits, insurance premiums, shares and bonds. Thus, a huge amount of money is concentrated in their hands which enables them to deal with it in the way they want.

The financiers were concerned about the idea put forward immediately after the end of the Cold War that the world is inevitably going to be divided into the three big economic regions. The first includes the whole of Europe and it is controlled by western Europe. The second contains most of Asia and it is dominated by Japan; and the third includes the two American continents which are restricted to the United States. They feared that this idea may become a reality, thus they opposed it vehemently and described it as regionalism. They alluded to the fact that Europe and Japan are behind promoting the idea. They offered an alternative to this idea which is that the world should become one. No one should have a monopoly over any one part, rather everyone has the right to compete in any place in the world. They promoted this idea through concentrated media campaigns and the Clinton administration adopted it and many books were published regarding it. From these were the books which talked about the globalisation of the activities of companies.

That media campaign ended in America after the Clinton administration adopted the idea at the beginning of his term and moved it outside of America sponsored by the American administration and its state organisations. Abroad, especially in what are known as the developing countries, the media campaigns were concentrated, and preoccupied the people of those countries with shallow and deceptive thoughts, weak and translated expressions, cheap and strange sophistry. Many people were completely bewildered by them. Despite the silly nature of these thoughts to which the campaigns called, they were planned and concentrated to produce specific results which is to reshape the public opinion and win it for opening the doors wide before the activities of the American companies in a comprehensive attack to pick the fruits of winning the Cold War, and to monopolise them to the exclusion of European and Japanese companies. Unfortunately, it seems that these campaigns have achieved their aims and enabled rulers smitten by the West to stupify their peoples before the new American onslaught and attack on their country, to open their markets to their

goods and employ their cheap labour in their factories and to attract people's savings to their finance companies and to use their money markets for speculation.

The following are some of the thoughts hidden under the cover of globalisation and which she has directed abroad, especially to the countries of the third world:

After the fall of the Soviet Union there remained in the world only the western economic system which they called the free market system instead of its true name which is Capitalism. It is the system which reminds us of its greed and ugliness. All the countries in the world are either implementing this system or desiring and striving to implement it.

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

The world of business has become one as well. So the companies which they called multinational, despite the fact they are not multinational, because their mother company follows only one country and has only one nationality. These companies have the ability to manufacture and market products on a world level; a matter which makes any country wishing to develop welcome these companies in order to employ the people or to sell its products, otherwise the companies will go to another country.

The means of communication between all corners of the world has become comprehensive and inter-linked to the extent that it prevents any party from controlling it. This link has led the information of the people to become one. It has led the views and even the tastes of the people to become the same.

These are some of thoughts of globalisation which are being promoted in the countries of the third world. What is intended from its promotion is to build on them the necessity of welcoming foreign money and work and to adopt the advice of their advocates in terms of changes to the laws of a country and privatisation of state institutions to enable them to buy them. There is no alternative, in their view, to this if we want to join the procession in a world which has consented on the globalisation of money and work, otherwise we will remain backward. No one should disregard the effect of these claims,

their propagandist sophistry and the cover of globalisation which conceals them in a country where there are few aware officials, and its people depended in the adoption of their views on the media apparatus and ignorance prevailed amongst them. That is why it is not strange that we compare these claims of globalisation with the missionary invasion of the last century. This onslaught may be more dangerous than the one that came before because this time it does not carry the cover of religion, though it is more horrible.