

لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُوْلُهُ



DOES SAUDI ARABIA PREACH INTOLERANCE AND HATRED IN
THE UK AND THE US?

SALAFIMANHJ.COM
RESEARCH DIVISION

هل تدعو المملكة العربية السعودية إلى
عدم التسامح و الحقد في الغرب؟

**DOES SAUDI ARABIA
PREACH
INTOLERANCE AND
HATRED IN THE UK
AND THE US?**

**AN INDEPENDENT STUDY INTO THE AGENDA OF
THE NEO-CON AND SUFI PARTNERSHIP**

© Copyright **SalafiManhaj** 2007

URL: **www.SalafiManhaj.com**

E-mail: admin@salafimanhaj.com

Important Note:

The following document is an on-line book publishing of www.SalafiManhaj.com. This book was formatted and designed specifically for being placed on the Web and for its easy and convenient distribution. At the time of this e-book publishing, we are not aware of any other book similar to it, in terms of its translation from its original Arabic source. Since this book was prepared for free on-line distribution we grant permission for it to be printed, disbursed, photocopied, reproduced and/or distributed by electronic means for the purpose of spreading its content and not for the purpose of gaining a profit, unless a specific request is sent to the publishers and permission is granted.

CONTENTS

4 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

55 WHAT DO SAUDI RELIGIOUS SCHOLARS REALLY BELIEVE ABOUT NON-MUSLIMS? DO THEY PREACH HATRED AGAINST ALL NON-MUSLIMS?

81 SAUDI ARABIA ALSO SUFFERS FROM EXTREMISM AND TERRORISM

94 WHAT IS THE MEANING OF 'KAAFIR' AND 'KUFFAAR'?

100 IS THE 'INFLUENCE' OF SAUDI ARABIA A HINDRANCE TO 'COMMUNITY-COHESION' AND TOLERANCE IN THE UK? AN ASSESSMENT OF THE STATEMENTS OF ABDAL HAKIM MURAD (TJ WINTER) AND OTHERS

118 DID IMAAM MUHAMMAD IBN 'ABDULWAHHAAB CONSIDER THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO BE AN APOSTATE STATE AND DID HE REVOLT AGAINST IT?

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Indeed, all praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, we seek His aid, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evil of our actions and from the evil consequences of our actions. Whomever Allaah guides, there is none to misguide and whoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is no god worthy of worship except Allaah and I bear witness that Muhammad is the servant and messenger of Allaah.

To proceed:

In the atmosphere of the so-called ‘war on terror’, which the people of *sunna* have been waging long before 9/11, there has risen to the fore the suggestion that Muslim countries themselves are responsible due to their ‘intolerance’ as opposed to the ‘tolerance’ of other ‘developed’ nations. Muslim countries, particular those which adhere to Islaam the strongest have been seen as being crazy havens of repression, extremism, hatred, violence and intolerance by many quarters in the US and Europe, yet the same is not applied whatsoever to their own nations. Indeed, those who argue that Muslim countries are havens for intolerance and extremism also need to seriously question their own selves first, as we shall see in this study, and this is all the more the case if they deliver and pronounce such statements such as **“You are either with us or against us”** and **“they hate our way of life”**, and the likes of such simplistic statements that are spoon-feed to simple-minded followers and are not taken seriously by those with any trace of intellect and awareness of the foreign policy dynamics at play.¹

¹ Former bureau chief of the *Jerusalem Post* and adjunct scholar of the *Cato Institute*, Leon T. Hadar, documented in the early 1990s the move of the US towards the demonisation of Islam, among other appropriate “threats”:

Now that the Cold War is becoming a memory, America’s foreign policy establishment has begun searching for new enemies. Possible new villains include ‘instability’ in Europe - ranging from German resurgence to new Russian imperialism - the ‘vanishing’ ozone layer, nuclear proliferation, and narcoterrorism. Topping the list of potential new global bogeymen, however, are the Yellow Peril, the alleged threat to American economic security emanating from East Asia, and the so-called Green Peril

As a result, the whole infrastructure of Muslim countries has been called into question, whether be its media, education system or Islamic institutions and at the same time such Muslim countries are accused of being devoid of freedom?! A number of TV programmes and ‘reports’ from allegedly ‘impartial and unbiased researchers’ have put forward a variety of highly simplistic claims wherein specific Muslim countries have been impugned of fostering intolerance, hatred and extremism. So for example, some of the Islamic publications which emanate from Saudi have even been compared to the propaganda of the likes of Goebbels and Goering!!¹ On the other hand however, the nations which have been responsible for:

(green is the color of Islam). That peril is symbolized by the Middle Eastern Moslem fundamentalist - the ‘Fundie’, to use a term coined by The Economist.

See Leon T. Hadar, *“The ‘Green Peril’: Creating the Islamic Fundamentalist Threat’*, *Policy Analysis*, Cato Institute, no. 177, 27 August 1992.

Madeline Albright, the former US Ambassador to the UN, stated, while Secretary of State, that **“the Islamic terrorism threat will lead to a war of the future”** as recorded in *The Observer* (of London), 23 October 1998, p.14

Chomsky stated in 1994 **“With secular nationalism in utter disarray, having largely failed or been destroyed, the current threats are seen to be Islamic fundamentalism...”** Noam Chomsky, *World Orders: Old and New* (London: Pluto Press, 1994), p.227

1 Let’s list some of the hysterical neo-con scare-mongering authors and Islamophobes who have some very questionable stances in regards to “community cohesion” and ‘promoting tolerance’ to say the least:

1. *Freedom House*, headed by Nina Shea, in a document on “Saudi publications on hate ideology fill American mosques” when only about fifteen mosques were mentioned within the ‘study’, which constitute less than 1% of all mosques in America! ‘Freedom House’ did not consult or liaise with any mosques or Muslim organizations whatsoever. They neither asked the members of the Islâmîc centres their views nor did they enquire into their activities and how the publications are used. In the Freedom House ‘studies’ they also make the huge error, which we see committed by others, of claiming that the Muslims only view the world in terms of *Dâr ul-Islâm* (the abode of Islâm) and *Dâr ul-Harb* (the abode of war) **“and that when Muslims are in the latter, they must behave as if on a mission behind enemy lines”!!!** This is mentioned on page 13 of the document *‘Saudi Publications on Hate Ideology Fill American Mosques’* (Washington: Center for Religious Freedom, 2005). This is an absolutely ignorant statement as Shaykh Khaalid al-Anbaree has stated within his lectures on *Siyasah ash-Shar’iyyah* (Politics in Light of Islâm) that the domains are split into three: *Dâr ul-Islâm*, *Dâr ul-Kufr* (which is split into two) and *Dâr ul-Harb*, so not just two abodes! And even when Muslims are in an abode of warfare they are not instructed to **“behave as if on a mission behind enemy lines” (!!?)** rather scholars have even noted that when Muslims are in an abode of war they have to tolerate the laws, obey the laws of that land and treachery, killing, stealing et al. are not permitted within it for Muslims who enter that country with

- a contract of agreement and safety. So we can see here then that *'Freedom House'* and Nina Shea have a totally incorrect approach to begin with! There were a number of *Sufis* who contributed to her reports and within the intros and acknowledgements there is much reference to Hishâm Kabbânî!
2. Mark Silverberg's *The Quatermasters of Terror: Saudi Arabia and the Global Islamic Jihad* (Wyndham Hill Press, 2005) and Dore Gold's *Hatred's Kingdom: How Saudi Arabia Supports the New Global Terrorism* (Washington D.C: Regnery, 2003). Taking Silverberg first here he is a US attorney and a listed author of the *'Ariel Center for Policy Research'* in Israel. In his book *The Quatermasters of Terror: Saudi Arabia and the Global Islâmic Jihad* (Wyndham Hill Press, 2005) he claims Saudi Arabia has **"spent 87 billion dollars over the past twenty-five years to finance the propagation of Islâmic extremism"**!! In his introduction, he also makes the same blunder as Nina Shea, Robert Spencer and Bernard Lewis, that the **"...Muslim world is divided into two spheres, the House of Islâm (Dar al-Islâm) and the House of War (Dar al-Harb), which is non-Islâmic. In his view, world peace, according to Islâm, is achieved only when the world is subjected to Dar al-Islâm. "The presumption", says Lewis, "is that the duty of jihad will continue, interrupted only by truces, until all the world either adopts the Muslim faith or submits to Muslim rule."** Silverburg also demonstrates that he has been influenced by the likes of Hishâm Kabbânî as he states in the introduction, **"In the estimated 80% of mosques that the Wahhabists control in America..."** and Silverburg reached this figure based on al-Kabbaanee's claim in 1998 that "80% of mosques in America are controlled by Wahhabis"!! Therefore, the solution for all of this according to Silverburg is for Islâm to be modernized and moderated, he claims, **"in the same way that Christian and Jewish scholars have (over the centuries) moderated the more strident aspects of their scriptures and promoted those verses that spoke of the brotherhood of man, tolerance and understanding over those portions that speak of exclusivity"** (!!!) Has he heard of Jack Chick, Franklin Graham, Rabbi Yitzak Ginsburg, Rabbi Meir Kahane and others? But then Silverburg states, in a clear demonstration ignorance of the topic: **"To this day, no major Muslim cleric or religious body has ever issued a fatwa condemning Osama bin Laden."** Even though Imaam 'Abdul'Azeez Bin Baaz (*raheemahullaah*) issued one in the 1990s!
 3. Robert Spencer, a Catholic neo-con ideologue who rose to fame after 9/11 as a self-proclaimed 'Islamic specialist'!? He is the editor of *The Myth of Islamic Tolerance: How Islamic Law Treats Non-Muslims* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2005) which despite its impressive size is actually totally devoid of serious source referencing which the biased and questionable contributors really thought they could do justice to! He, along with Hugh Fitzgerald, is also behind the websites *'Jihad Watch'* and *'Dhimmi Watch'*, and the hysterical documentary film entitled *'Islam: What the West Needs to Know'* which also features Bat Ye'or, Serge Tifkovic and others. The documentary also depends on the words and footage of extremists and discredited preachers such as Omar Bakri Muhammad. The documentary film also claims on its website that **"Virtually every major Western leader has over the past several years expressed the view that Islam is a peaceful religion and that those who commit violence in its name are fanatics who**

- misinterpret its tenets”** and this is also totally false as the likes of Berlesconi, Putin and General Boykin have been clear in their statements against Islaam. One of the main mistakes, or rather blatant lies, fabrications and distortions, of the likes of Spencer is that they claim that Islaam only views the world as *only* being ‘*Daar ul-Islaam*’ (an abode of Islaam) or ‘*Daar ul-Harb*’ (an abode of war which is at war with a *Muslim country*, not unofficial individuals and bandits within a Muslim country who are on the run) and as a result, according to Spencer and his ilk, Muslims view the whole non-Muslim world as *Daar ul-Harb* and this claim is totally false and a blatant fabrication. So here then we can see how the likes of Spencer are either utterly ignorant of this or blatant liars, some would opt for the latter as being their actual condition! Here they have fallen into exactly the same mistake as Nina Shea et al. of ‘*Freedom House*.’ Spencer on his ‘*Jihad Watch*’ website implicated Muslims as being responsible for the Armanious Murders in New Jersey wherein a Coptic family was murdered. The ‘*Jihad Watch*’ website argued that Muslims pretended to convert to Christianity in order to win the family’s trust, it later turned out that this was not the case, but the website issued no retraction or apology. What is also unfortunate is that the likes of Yusuf Smith (a *sufi* follower of Nooh Keller who runs the ‘*Blogistan*’ website), who have tried to ‘debate’ Spencer end up falling into a quagmire. As on one occasion Smith accepted Spencer’s use of the term “Wahhabis” and then proceeded to guide Spencer to another *sufi* site which referred to Keller’s *Reliance of the Traveller*. Spencer’s response “**the book contains a chapter on jihaad**” (!!) so even when some of the *Sufis* try to agree with his simplistic use of terms such as “Wahhabi”, the likes of Spencer just throw it back into their faces! This also happens with the case of Dr Khaled Abou El-Fadl who regularly attacks simplistically “Wahhabism” and promotes himself as a “moderate” yet the likes of Dan Pipes still throw this back in his face and accuse El Fadl of being a “neo-Islamist” and of spouting “reformist apologetics”! So much for foolishly trying to publicly slander Muslim countries in order to gain acceptance from the enemies of Islaam. In other blatant lies, Spencer claimed on his site on August 10 2004 that Ahmad Deedaat (*raheemahullaah*) had been sponsored by the Saudi Bin Laden group and that Bin Laadin did this on purpose as a “precursor to jihad”!?! For some reason Spencer is referred to in the US media!?
4. Craig Winn, author of *Prophet of Doom* who has been totally refuted by Jalal Abualrub on a number of occasions, refer to the radio debate at **www.islamlife.com**
 5. Oriana Fallaci, known for her *fallacies* against Islaam and the Muslims and equating the Qur’aan with Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*!?! She authored *Anger and Pride* wherein she erroneously claimed that “**millions and millions of Muslims marched in support of Bin Laden**”!?! and other clear lies and distortions that she took with her to her deathbed, 500,000 copies of this book sold within hours in Italy. From her many *fallacies*, is that she claims that there is a systematic plan by Muslims to take over Europe and destroy Western civilization as we know it and that there is a Muslim conspiracy for this end with all Muslims complicit, either via giving tacit approval to this “conspiracy” or with actual people power, with Muslim countries serving as bases for this “plot”!!! Her views are exactly the same as the *BNP*’s in the UK regarding Muslim communities and Fallaci claims that Islamic schools and Muslim entrepreneurs are all in the act!! She exaggerates the figures by suggesting that there are already 25 million Muslims in the United States and that the process by which Muslims Islamicize Western countries is by setting up halaal meat shops, kebab

restaurants, mosques and other “ugly sites” as she describes. Their women wear the hijab which, according to Fallaci, is designed to terrorize Western women. Muslim men “grow bushy beards and wear clothes that resemble pyjamas or nightgowns in public. Muslims cut the throats of sheep on the balconies of their apartments and practice other habits in the most beautiful parts of Western cities”. Unless something is done, Fallaci warns, “Muslims will turn beautiful European and American cities into areas of “lies, calumnies and hypocrisy”!! As part of their secret plan to destroy Western civilization, Muslims are also bringing a variety of diseases, including syphilis and AIDS, to Europe. Fallacy also stated that Muslims have instructions to produce large numbers of children at a time when most Western nations are in demographic decline, Fallaci states that, “Muslims have orders to multiply like rats.” Fallaci says another *fallacy* which is that all Muslims are Arabs, even when they belong to other nationalities. So for her, being Muslim means abandoning one’s true identity and adopting that of the Arabs. She then accuses, based on this, all Arabs of being potential Bin Ladens!!! In her view, Islaam can produce only Bin Ladens, she even ridicules suggestions that Muslims ever contributed anything to science, art and philosophy. Addressing the West, she cries out: **“You do not understand or do not want to understand that if we remain passive, if we do not fight back, the jihad will triumph.”** She was no doubt affected by the events of 9/11 and that led her to her extremist stances, however she was unchallenged by other people in the West and was allowed to travel the whole world spouting her nonsense up until her death. She has been refuted here: <http://www.swans.com/library/art12/pbyrne16.html>

6. Bat Ye’or - the concept of ‘*dhimmitude*’ was formulated by Bat Ye’or in her book *Islam and Dhimmitude: Where Civilisations Collide* (Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 2002). The name ‘Bat Ye’or’ is not a real name and is rather a false Hebrew pseudonym that she uses, her real name is Giselle Littman and she is an Egyptian born British Jewish author who claims to specialise in the Middle-East and Islaam. It is worth highlighting some aspects of her background as it helps us to understand some of the main reasons as to why she has formulated her ideas. Littman was born in Cairo, but her Egyptian nationality was revoked in 1955 because she was Jewish so her family had to leave Egypt for England in 1957 wherein they became stateless refugees. Littman herself has described how her life experiences influenced her research interests when she said: “I had witnessed the destruction, in a few short years, of a vibrant Jewish community living in Egypt for over 2600 years and which had existed from the time of Jeremiah the prophet. I saw the disintegration and flight of families, dispossessed and humiliated, the destruction of their synagogues, the bombing of the Jewish quarters and the terrorizing of a peaceful population. I have personally experienced the hardships of exile, the misery of statelessness and I wanted to get to the root cause of all this. I wanted to understand why the Jews from Arab countries, nearly a million shared my experience.” She authored a book entitled *The Jews in Egypt* in 1971 and then a study on Copts in Egypt under another false pseudonym, ‘*Yahudiya Masriya*’ (Egyptian Jew) in Arabic. Claiming to focus on the status of non-Muslims under Muslim rule she attempts to recruit Christians and other non-Muslims into supporting the Zionist project by explaining away Christian expressions of appreciation of Muslim tolerance as a false consciousness inspired by an inferiority complex and self-hating hang-up due to the aftermath of *jihad*, which she terms as “*dhimmitude*.” Littman (Bat Ye’or) claims that any injustices against Muslims are mere figments of the

imagination and are only referred to in order to cover up an Islamic master plan for subjugating the non-Muslim world?! In the second half of the book *Dhimmitude* she vilifies anti-Zionist Christians as being 'dhimmi pawns.' However, she does not seek to attempt to dismiss Jewish critics of Israel in the same manner, such as Israel Shahak for example. Littman (Bat Ye'or) in her simplistic assessment of Islamic history dismisses any accusations of treachery on the part of Jews during the time of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) and she also resorts to cut-and-paste quotations, context dropping and selective quotes from scholars and historians, as a result, she omits and glosses over any other positions that refute her claims. She claims that European persecution of Jews came about after Europeans learned these "new techniques" from the Muslims!! She also argues a similar line in her book *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* (Cranbury, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005). Littman does not admit that Palestinian Christians and Muslims have shared a common cause as victims of Israeli persecution, oppression, tyranny and injustice merely claiming that Arab Christian anti-Zionists have **"dhimmi submission to Muslim masters"!!** Even the Israeli murder of Christians is blamed on the Muslims (on pages 278 and 386 of *Dhimmitude*). She therefore claims that Muslims are intolerant due to their ideas on *jihad* and that the Divine Legislation (*Sharee'ah*) **"wages a perpetual war against non-Muslims who refuse to submit."** However, academics and professors in the field have raised questions concerning Littman's arguments. Esther Benbassa, director of *Religious Studies in Modern Judaism* at the *Sorbonne University* in France said in an interview for the French weekly *Le Point* that Littman (Bat Ye'or) **"is not a professional historian and that, though restrictions on Jews in Arab countries existed, they were more symbolic than practical, with non-Muslim minorities enjoying protection, autonomy and freedom."** Sidney H. Griffith in the *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 30, no. 4. (November 1998), pp. 619-621 writes in regards to the book *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam: "They [the documents used as sources] are presented out of context with no analysis or explanation. The trouble with The Decline of Eastern Christianity is that in spite of the gathering of an enormous amount of historical material, and in spite of the fact that she has raised an issue that well deserves study, Bat Ye'or has written a polemical tract, not responsible historical analysis." He also states: **"The problems one has with the book are basically twofold: the theoretical inadequacy of the interpretive concepts jihad and dhimmitude as they are employed here; and the want of historical method in the deployment of the documents which serve as evidence for the conclusions reached in the study. There is also an unfortunate polemical tone in the work."** In assessing these claims is noteworthy to mention that Henry Stubbs, a contemporary of Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), who was an expert in Ottoman policies of tolerance highlighted that if the Europeans adopted Ottoman policies of tolerance it would solve the problems of religious hatred and communal violence. Interestingly, after Hobbes, Locke (1632-1704) wrote a famous treatise on tolerance which became the basis for American freedom of religion acts and policies, based on the Ottoman model. Even 'Voltaire' praised the Ottomans and had admiration for Ottoman tolerance, he said: **"[They are] invincibly attached to their religion, they hate, they disdain the Christians, they regard them as idolaters; yet they suffer their***

- presence and protect them in their empire and in the capital they inhabit a vast quarter where they are permitted to hold processions, which are preceded by four Janissaries who march in front.**” ‘Voltaire’ also commented favourably on the fact that the Turks had no aristocracy and did not permit duelling. Littman’s work and idea of ‘*dhimmitude*’ is utilised and referred to by the likes of the far-right *BNP* in Britain and others who we have mentioned within this footnote.
7. Patrick Sookhdeo, an alleged former Muslim originally from Guyana, who is now a British Anglican Canon and director of the obscure ‘*Institute for the Study of Islam and Christianity*’ in London. He was recently challenged over his views in a radio discussion by Hamza Bajwa of the *The Muslim Weekly* newspaper, the discussion can be heard here: <http://www.premier.org.uk/engine.cfm?i=1266&PageNum=1&ItemID=1610> Also known for his context-dropping, cut and paste quotations and wild claims about Islaam and Muslims, Sookhdeo is the author of *Islam: The Challenge to the Church* (Pewsey: Issac Publishing, 2006); *Islam in Britain: The British Muslim Community in February 2005* (Pewsey: Isaac Publishing, 2005); *Understanding Islamic Terrorism: The Islamic Doctrine of War* (Pewsey: Isaac Publishing, 2004); *A People Betrayed: The Impact of Islamisation on the Christian Community in Pakistan*, Fearn, Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications, 2002 and Pewsey, Wiltshire : Isaac Publishing, 2002) and other works. In the London *Spectator* magazine in July 2005 Sookhdeo wrote an article entitled “*The Myth of a Moderate Islam*” wherein he claimed that as the likes of the terrorists and extremists merely say that they are doing their actions in the name of Islaam they are therefore to be seen as representing Islaam!? Sookhdeo also states within the article that “Muslims must with honesty, recognise the violence that has existed in their history” as if Muslims do not recognise or comment on it!?! Muslims recognise moreso than much of Bani Aadam, not to mention that it is rather the case that many British people deny the atrocities of colonialism and imperialism, or are at least totally ignorant of the history; many Americans deny the impact of slavery on the African-American and of the destruction of the Native-American; in Germany, the people try to play down the importance of the Holocaust to the extent that Germany has even asked some EU countries to remove any mention of Germany’s role in the Holocaust and the Second World War from school and college textbooks!?! Even Bernard Lewis noted that “**the Christian attitude towards Islam was far more bigoted and intolerant than that of the Muslims towards Christianity.**” (Bernard Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (London: Phoenix, 1982), p.297) The fact of the matter for Sookhdeo to admit himself is that Christian civilisation has given rise to more atrocities than the Muslim world has. Saint Augustine stated “**lead them in**”—i.e. “force them to convert” and the Qur’aan says the exact opposite: “**There is no compulsion in religion**” {Baqarah (2): 256}. Most of the wars in the 20th century have had little to do with Muslims and the vast majority of the estimated 250 million deaths out of warfare during the 20th century have mostly come from the Western ‘Christian’ world, with the Muslims accounting for about 10 million of these deaths. The greatest death totals come from World War 1, about 20 million, at least 90 % of which were inflicted by “Christians”, and World War 2, 90 million, at least 50% of which were inflicted by “Christians,” the majority of the rest occurring in the Far East. There was also the slaughter of 900,000 Rwandans in 1994 in a population that was over 90 % Christian,

this in fact led to Rwandans embracing Islaam! See: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/3561365.stm> Also the genocide of over 300,000 Muslims and systematic rape of over 100,000 Muslim women by Christian Serbs in Bosnia between 1992 and 1995. So statistically, Christian Civilization is the bloodiest and most violent of all civilizations in all of history, and is responsible for hundreds of millions of deaths. Here is a quotation from Pope Nicholas the fifth, who gave Alfonso the fifth of Portugal in Romanus Pontifex 1454 CE the right to: **“...invade, search out, capture, vanquish, and subdue all Saracens and pagans whatsoever, and other enemies of Christ wherever they live, along with their kingdoms, dukedoms, principalities, lordships and goods, both chattels and real estate, that they hold and possess ... to reduce their persons to perpetual slavery and to take for himself and his heirs their kingdoms...”** (Quoted in Muldoon, *Popes, Lawyers and Infidels: The Church and the Non-Christian World 1250-1550*, Liverpool University Press, 1979, p.134) At its outset, the Anglican church had no better a record of toleration in regard to non-Anglican communions. Of course, time-bound references cannot be taken as our criterion. Here is another time-bound reference; the Charter which the Muslim ruler, Umar, agreed with the Christians of Jerusalem: **“In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful. This charter is granted by 'Umar, Servant of Allah and Prince of the Believers, to the people of Aelia. He grants them security for their persons and their properties, for their churches and their crosses, the little and the great, and for the adherents of the Christian religion. Neither shall their churches be destroyed, nor their substances or areas, nor their crosses or any of their properties, be reduced in any manner. They shall not be coerced in any matter pertaining to their religion, and they shall not be harmed. Nor will any Jews be permitted to live with them in Aelia. Upon the people of Aelia falls the obligation to pay the jizyah; just as the people of Mada'in (Persia) do, as well as to evict from their midst the Byzantine army and the thieves. Whoever of these leaves Aelia will be granted security of person and property until he reaches his destination. Whoever decides to stay in Aelia will also be granted the same and share with the people of Aelia, in their rights and the jizyah. The same applies to the people of Aelia as well as to any other person. Anyone can march with the Byzantines, stay in Aelia or return to his home country, and has until the harvesting of crops to decided. Allah attests to the contents of this treaty, and so do His Prophet, his successors and the believers. Signed: 'Umar ibn al-Khattab Witnessed by: Khalid ibn al-Walid, 'Amr ibn al-'As, 'Abd al-Rahman ibn 'Awf and Mu'awiyah ibn Abi Sufyan. Executed in the year 15 AH.”** (Quoted in Alistair Duncan, 1972, *The Noble Sanctuary*, London: Longman Group Ltd, p.22)

8. 'Ayaan Hirsi Ali', it was just a matter of time before she would be exposed, we will put her name in inverted commas as this is the name that she calls herself and is not her full real name, as we do not know what her real name is, we will put it in inverted commas. 'Ayaan Hirsi Ali' is a Somaalee apostate pseudo-feminist, a former right-wing Dutch MP for the Dutch VVD party and self-confessed immigration cheat!! Yet chosen by *Time* magazine as being **“one of the most influential people of 2005”**?! Influential for whom and for what we ask? For being a self-

confessed immigration cheat? After many Muslims were initially concerned about some of her wild claims and her false propaganda, the country to where she 'fled' has now exposed her deception and has stripped her of her beloved Dutch passport and citizenship! (This was a documentary on a program entitled *Zembla* that is aired in Holland) 'Hirsi 'Ali' rose to notoriety in the West after her extremist claims about Islaam and by calling upon non-Muslim governments to do more to stand up for western values in order to fight against Islaam. Her extremist opinions, which were not justified with any evidence, and her open *kufir* regarding Islaam was given much media focus. A few years ago, on TV, 'Ayaan Hirsi 'Ali' exclaimed that she had **"not been Muslim for five years"**, she reiterates this in her interviews. Yet in her recent book *The Caged Virgin: An Emancipation Proclamation for Women and Islam*, she regularly and dishonestly says **"we Muslims"!**? On *BBC2's Newsnight* (aired in the UK) in June 2006 she also made herself look utterly pathetic by claiming that she is arguing as a Muslim, but then the interviewer asked her how on earth she could have a Muslim audience when she was an atheist!? In *The Caged Virgin* she demonstrates not only utter ignorance of Islaam and poor research, but also presents a meagre understanding of history. She states for example: **"Every Muslim, from the beginnings of Islam to the present day, is raised in the belief that all knowledge can be found in the Koran."** **"For Muslim children the study of biology and history can be very confusing."** So here she is either absolutely ignorant of Islaam or being deceptive, as the Muslim scholars note that knowledge of the mundane affairs can be sought, the only distinction that they make is that it is not as praiseworthy, but it can still be sought based on the hadeeth of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), found in the 'Book of Knowledge' in *Saheeh al-Bukhaaree*, where he said to the people who were artificially inseminating the date-palms *"you know better about your dunya affairs."* Furthermore, many of the bona-fide Islamic scholars have noted that worldly knowledge and sciences for human endeavour is a collective responsibility to acquire For more on this see Imaam 'Uthaymeen's (*raheemahullaah*) words about knowledge: **<http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/Knowledge.pdf>** So her claim that history and biology can be "confusing for Muslim children" (!!!) is again totally false, as the Muslims have studied these subjects for centuries with no difficulties whatsoever, in fact in Muslim Spain for example it was part of the curriculum to study these subjects, and if it was so "confusing for Muslim children" why are the subjects studied today in Muslim countries and within Islamic schools in Europe and the US?! So 'Ayaan Hirsi Ali' hasn't got a clue what she is talking about. She also argues that Islaam has obstructed individual freedoms and that the individual is not valued in Islaam?! Another clear indication of her deceptive methods is in discussing the issue of female genital mutilation, she states that the practice was "spread by Islam" when anyone who has even an atom's weight of knowledge of this issue knows that it goes back to the Pharoanic period and even according to the *United Nations Population Fund*, FGM is practiced in sub-Saharan Africa by Animists, Christians (Coptic and other), Muslims and Ethiopian Jews. However, only Islaam is impugned within the simplistic, biased and poorly researched writing of the one called 'Ayaan Hirsi Ali', yet what can be expected from a self-confessed immigration cheat? She also states in *The Caged Virgin* that Muslim women are in some way incapable of speaking up for themselves and need Western women to do that for them, or Westernised/Naturalised Euro or US women at least to speak up for them?! This

in itself indicates the extent to which 'Ayaan Hirsi Ali' has internalized Orientalist thinking, she states, in an example wherein she puts herself forward as some sort of reference point for Muslim women, **"The [reason] I am determined to make my voice heard is that Muslim women are scarcely listened to, and they need a woman to speak out on their behalf."** Women during the epoch of the *salaf* were referred to by men for Islamic knowledge and asked to settle disputes over issues related to *'ilm*, this was during the epoch of early Islaam, which 'Hirsi Ali' is obviously ignorant about. The book, *Caged Virgin*, is rather an insult to Muslim women, if indeed it is even directed to them, how such a poorly researched and factually inaccurate piece of work can somehow be taken as rallying cry for Muslim women in the West is beyond many Muslim women. 'Ayaan Hirsi Ali' was the one who kicked off a *fitnah* in Holland/the Netherlands and increased the oppression of the Muslims there as she initiated a 'play' in Holland wherein verses of the Qur'aan were used in a despicable manner and Muslim women were in fact mocked. This is what many non-Muslims do not realise, is that 'Ayaan Hirsi 'Ali' claims to represent Islaam, yet the majority of Muslim women were utterly appalled by her disgusting play! This resulted in the assassination of the director of the play, Theo Van Gogh in 2004 the grandson of the world famous artist and ironically was vocally opposed to feminism! After this, the Muslims in that country were subject to a variety of draconian legislations all in order to suppress and restrict the development of Islaam and the Muslims there. In any case, the Dutch have a history of turning the tables on its 'minority communities' and during World War 2, 80% of Dutch Jews were deported to concentration camps and subsequently gassed or massacred by the Nazis. The Dutch Jews were often escorted to the Nazis by the Dutch themselves as the Dutch wanted to free themselves from the Jews and avoid being conquered by the Nazis. Subsequently, 'Hirsi Ali' fled to America for three months and then was under 24 hour guard and police protection in *The Hague*. Her similitude therefore, was of one who held the West to be intrinsically liberated and as a result the West was obviously her desire and ambition whilst she was in East Africa. Initially 'Hirsi 'Ali' had claimed that she came to Europe as a refugee in 1992, fleeing from a forced marriage in war-torn Somalia, however a recent exposè of 'Hirsi 'Ali' uncovered that she was actually living in a middle-class area in Nairobi, Kenya with her rich family, and the so-called 'forced marriage' was actually an *arranged* marriage with a Somaalee man from Canada and they divorced normally, as her own brother and other (female) family members informed! Indeed, Professor Jytte Klausen, a just female Danish researcher of comparative politics at Brandeis University and author of *The Islamic Challenge: Politics and Religion in Western Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005) noted recently that: **"She wasn't forced into a marriage. She had an amicable relationship with her husband, as well as with the rest of her family. It was not true that she had to hide from her family for years."** She did not arrive from war-torn Somalia, but had rather spent substantial periods of time in Kenya (where she spent most of her life), Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia and Germany! Furthermore, her name 'Ayaan Hirsi 'Ali' is false and is not her real name, rather her real name was something else! She therefore fabricated her refugee story in order to seek asylum and residence in Europe, and then later get a passport, which she did get in 1997! This is the kind of lying individual that some people in the West were propping up as an 'Islamic specialist' and some *kuffaar* in England were even claiming that she should be supported as an 'Islamic moderate'!!! *Time*

Magazine even listed her as one of the most influential thinkers of 2005 CE!! ‘Ayaan Hirsi ‘Ali’ attended the *American Jewish Committee* centennial meeting in Washington!? (“A woman of valour” in *The Jewish Chronicle*, May 12 2006) After the cartoons controversy, the fraud ‘Hirsi ‘Ali’ supported the printing of the cartoons. Crying on Dutch TV in disgrace, she admitted that she lied (Dutch: “Ik heb gelogen”), and that her birth date and name on her Dutch passport were all false, going against Holland’s immigration laws! At the same time, ‘Hirsi ‘Ali’ supported Holland’s anti-refugee policies!! She has said that she will join the *American Enterprise Institute*, one of the hardcore right-wing neocon think-tanks and spin-labs in the USA! So it looks as if she will get another nationality soon, as long as she panders enough to her pay-masters and fabricates more *baatil* against Islaam. In any case the US right wingers are against homosexuality, abortion and euthanasia, all the things that ‘Hirsi Ali’ calls to, so it looks as if she may not be there long!! Her political party began to view her as more and more of a liability and one of her former colleagues from her political party declared that ‘Ayaan Hirsi ‘Ali’ “**is not a Dutch national**”!! So much for pledging allegiance to the enemies of Islaam and blindly following them in everything for name and fame, and so much for European right-wing politicians finding token black mascots to attack Muslims. Condemned by even some non-Muslim journalists who branded her extreme, she is in tears, in disgrace, humiliated with no home (except in Kenya, but she despised Africa in any case and would not return there), her political reputation in tatters, her credibility called into question by her own people, stripped of her beloved nationality, ‘Ayaan Hirsi ‘Ali’ has been exposed by her own hands, indeed as the Qur’aan says,

كَذَلِكَ الْعَذَابُ وَالْعَذَابُ الْآخِرَةُ أَكْبَرُ لَوْ كَانُوا يَعْلَمُونَ

“Such is the punishment (of this world). And the punishment of the Hereafter is greater, if only they knew.”

{*al-Qalam* (68): 33}

Others who are also known for their use of the technique of claiming a past background of Islaam are the likes of Walid Shoebat, Wafa Sultan, Ibn Warraq et al. all of whom claim a connection to Islaam yet as their backgrounds are unknown their claims to Islaam cannot be totally verified at all, they have only gained infamy in the West. And as we have seen with the case of ‘Ayaan Hirsi Ali’ honesty, integrity and reliability are not hallmarks of the so-called “former Muslims”! Furthermore, they are all distinctly characterized by crediting the West solely for “emancipating their minds”, along with providing them with citizenship out of their “third world” countries of origin. As a result, they are the most vehement in their opposition to Islaam along with their blind praise of all things European or American. Indeed, they are also known for sharing podiums with known Zionists and being propped up by their media, a damning indication of their aims if there ever was one! So for example, ‘Ayaan Hirsi Ali’ and Irshad Manji have exonerated any blame from Israel, yet have strongly criticized the Palestinians. Hirsi Ali retained her Dutch citizenship however after being supported by the neo-cons, Zionists and right-wing Dutch governmental sympathizers who all launched a worldwide campaign to defend her.

9. Serge Trifkovic, a Serbo-Croatian ‘academic’ who also compares Islaam to fascism and questions the massacres of Muslims in Bosnia!? He is the author of *Sword of the Prophet* (Boston: Regina Orthodox Press, 2002) and *Defeating Jihad*. He testified for the defense team of a Serb politician

- who was later found guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity at the *International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia*!!!?
10. Joe Kaufman, a Southern Florida hardcore Jewish extremist who promoted Rabbi Meir Kahane, who encouraged Baruch Goldstein the Israeli who killed 30 Palestinian Muslims while they were praying in a cold-blooded attack. On 1/1/2001, seven years after Goldstein's terror act Kaufman praised the founder of the *Kahane* terror movement in a column titled "A *Kahane Legacy Lost*." In the column Kaufman praised the violent terrorist Rabbi Meir Kahane and said: **"It was perfectly understandable, if he were to have hated Arabs. Just like, during the Holocaust, it was perfectly understandable for a Jew to hate Germans...If the Kahanes' memory serves us any purpose, it's to show that trust (and peace) is ultimately between only ourselves."** Immediately after the tragic acts of 9/11, Kaufman advocated the use of Nuclear Weapons to achieve "peace"! In a commentary on 11/18/01 titled *'Making Friends with the enemy...The Nuclear Way.'* Kaufman said: **"Question: If the decimation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was the right thing to do, in response to Pearl Harbor, then why the heck are we saving our nuclear weapons now? And furthermore, if we're not using them, why do we have the nukes in the first place? After all, there is no more Soviet Union to compete with. If the attacks are not a good enough reason to use them, then what are we holding on to them for?!!! Now, at this point, you may think of me as being no less than a madman, but hear me out, for I have a method to my madness."** Kaufman has spewed hatred against Muslim youth events, like falsely accusing a Muslim youth last year (January 16 2006) retreat in a the Tampa area, as a 'Jihad camp.' Kaufman circulated the wrong information encouraging other radicals to threaten both the youth and the venue owners. It turns out that Kaufman lied and made up the stories which he pitched to local media. A *St. Petersburg Times* reporter discussed the issue in an article earlier this year titled "Are bloggers against hate, or feeding it?" Source: http://www.sptimes.com/2006/01/16/State/Are_bloggers_against_.shtml A constitutional rights organization, *Americans United*, gave Kaufman the 'Onion Award' for **"his consistent record of trashing everything Muslim with a broad brush of innuendo, association and excessive rhetoric."** Kaufman's website had links to the extremist anti-Muslim websites of '*Kahane.org*' and '*HinduUnity.org*'! Yet when this was exposed in America, he removed them! The '*Kahane.org*' website for example had links to '*Kach*' an extremist Jewish Zionist terrorist group which has performed terror operations on Arabs and even according to the U.S. Department of State, '*Kahane Chai*' and '*Kach*' are known terrorist organizations banned in the United States! Kaufman writes for '*Front Page Mag*', the same magazine that Stephen Schwartz also writes for!? He has been refuted in-depth by Jalal Abualrub here: http://www.islamlife.com/readarticle.php?article_id=22
11. Melanie Philips, author of *Londonistan: How Britain is Creating a Terror state Within* (London: Gibson Square, 2006) – It has been suggested that she had trouble finding a publisher, yet in being just, it is important to note that *Londonistan* does mention some things which are correct. Such as how the authorities allowed London to become a haven for extremists; how some Muslims over emphasize the role of Jews and thus go to extremes with regards to simplistic conspiracy theories

regarding Jews and laying the blame always at their feet; Muslims not realizing that there is a religious basis to suicide bombings. The book however is quite simplistic in many other matters, as we shall see. *Londonistan* is not really an academic or meticulous enterprise. It refers largely to sources from the print media or from other media agencies, it therefore lacks a serious precise study or assessment of the very serious issues which the book attempts to delve into. On p.33, regarding female Islamic dress: **“...one wonders whether such attire really is a religious requirement commanding respect, or a political statement of antagonism against the British state.”** This is the impression we get even after the opening pages of *Londonistan*, all actions by Muslims must have some kind of sinister political underlying aim, however authors such as Na’ima B. Robert in her book *From My Sister’s Lips* (London: Bantam Press, 2005) have superbly emphasized the deeply faith-based aspects of female Islamic dress, which the book totally ignores. On p. 35 she claims that some Islamic bookstores within London are even selling Adolf Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*! Yet for such a serious claim she brings no evidence whatsoever of this or within which bookstores this book is being sold and this is not acceptable. On p.77 she demonstrates that she has no real understanding of the religious basis of terrorist groups, as she notes that their aim is to **“defeat Western democracy and reinstitute a seventh century Islamic empire that stretched halfway across the globe...”** But this is not their aim at all, rather their aim, as they themselves actually claim, no matter how erroneous to us, is to retaliate against perceived injustices in the name of a distorted concept *jihad*, not to topple democracy and set up an Islamic state, so Philips again is tripping over her toes in trying to understand the matter. She makes this error further on, on page 102 with regards to Muslims who do not agree with the term ‘Islamic terrorism’: **“True, the IRA were Catholics and their adversaries were Protestants. But their cause was not Catholicism. It was a united Ireland. They did not want to impose the authority of the Pope upon Britain...the Islamists who want to defeat the West in the name of Islam, impose Sharia law and re-establish the medieval caliphate throughout the world.”** So here for example she lumps all ‘Islamists’ into one homogenous group without thoroughly distinguishing between the ideas at hand, as not all ‘Islamists’ utilise terror like the IRA used to do or as *al-Qaa’idah* does currently. With regards to the police she states on page 101: **“But since Muslims tend to be alienated by any action that suggests there is anything wrong with their community or religion, this meant the police had to deny the nature of Islamist terrorism altogether.”** This is absolute nonsense, it is as if she is totally oblivious to what took place in Forest Gate, the shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes and a variety of other signs of “police denial of Islamic terrorism” which Philips refers to. On p.103, she says: **“The New Testament does not advocate the killing of the unfaithful. The Koran does.”** Does it? Philips brings no quote from the Qur’aan whatsoever and thus deceptively mentions this with no reflection on what the Qur’aan actually states, such as: **“But if they incline towards peace, you too incline to it. And trust in Allah. Verily, He is the All-Hearer, the All-Knower.”** {*al-Anfaal* (8): 61-2} Even during open war, the Believers are ordered with compassion and to continue the greater *jihad* of calling to the Truth: **“And if any of the pagan (enemy) seeks your protection then grant it - in order that he may hear the Word of Allah – and escort him to where he can be secure. That is because they are**

men who know not.” {*at-Tawbah (9): 6*} As for non-combatants or civilians, we read: **“Allah does not forbid you to deal justly and kindly with those who fought not against you on account of religion, nor drove you out of your homes. Verily Allah loves those who deal with equity.”**{*al-Mumtahanah (60):8*} She also condemns multiculturalism and equal opportunities (!?), saying on p.111: **“Institutions have been instructed to teach themselves that they are intrinsically racist and to reprogramme their minds in nonjudgmentalism.”** Hereby seeming to condone discrimination? This is the logical outcome of Philips’ agenda, as she rarely refers to incidents of discrimination and prejudice at all within her petit work, unless of course it is against Jews as we shall see later. Melanie Philips, like Bat Ye’or, also constantly refers to the **“Judeo-Christian heritage”** thereby including the Jews within that which she holds to be the dominant British culture that all others have to fall in line with. As a logical result of this, she redefines British nationalism to innately include Jews and she does this by making constant reference to notions of a ‘Judeo-Christian’ British nation. By doing this it seeks to deny other minority communities their cultures, as they do not ‘fit-in’ with the pre-set ‘Judeo-Christian’ British way of life. This is even all the more applicable when it comes to dealing with Muslims who have an all-encompassing way of life. The reality however, which the author made no reference to whatsoever within her petit work, was the fact that after the Jews had been expelled from England for 350 years after the 1290 CE edict against their presence in England, Oliver Cromwell was the one who allowed their return to England and practice their religion, in what came to be known as the ‘*Cromwellian Protectorate*’ in 1695 CE. Cromwell’s main reason for this was for trade and economic reasons as opposed to any notions of sharing a ‘Judeo-Christian heritage.’ In fact, around this time in Europe Christians did not want the term ‘Judeo’ appended to their religion in any way, shape or form! Therefore, the term ‘Judeo-Christian’ which the author of *Londonistan* makes constant referral to is rather flawed, not to mention the fact that the term is a modern term developed out of American political developments in the 1940s as mentioned by Arthur A. Cohen in his book *The Myth of the Judeo-Christian Tradition* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970). Maybe Melanie Philips should propose her concept of British nationhood to the likes of the Christian far-right, to see if they would accept her notion of a ‘Judeo-Christian’ British heritage?! With regards to the book lacking any academic basis, this is further evident in the author’s lack of awareness of trends in academia. So for example, on page 161-62 we find: **“In other words, British universities are teaching the Koran not as an objective and detached analysis of a religion, as would be the case with teaching any other religion...So British universities, the supposed stewards of rationality, have been pushed into becoming instead tools of religious indoctrination. And any backsliding into the realm of objective scholarship is punished.”** This quote is enough to indicate the author’s detachment from academia and her disconnection from Western research, criticism and enquiry. If aware, one would immediately know that *SOAS (University of London)* has a special ‘origins of Islam’ course, which is far from being an example of that which “panders to Muslim sensitivities”! On p. 155 the author states: **“In many areas, old churches, public houses or other buildings are being bought by Muslims and converted into mosques, along with brand new mosques that are springing up, backed by the kind of international funds that no other faith groups**

can command...” This is one of the most absurd statements mentioned in *Londonistan*, it is well known that funds are generated *within* Muslim communities and by attendees of mosques, examples of external donors helping to build *masajid* are few compared to their efforts of Muslim communities themselves. However, according to the *Londonistan*’s tirade against the Muslim community in the UK, everything in Britain is in favour of the Muslims. A further example of this is on p.154: **“British Muslims, however, are increasingly pushing for their culture to be highly visible and given parity in the public sphere.”** This is the problem with her simplistic analysis, nowhere in her book is there mention of the fact that Jewish schools for example have been state-funded for faith schooling and it took Muslims ages to achieve this! Even now, wherein the Muslim population is quite large, there are still only six state funded Islamic schools while there are thirty-six state-funded Jewish schools! Also quite surprising is her simplistic assessment of Shaykh ‘AbdurRahmaan as-Sudays on pages 155-56 of *Londonistan*, it was also an issue with which she totally surprised and bedazzled Anas Tikriti (of the MAB) on the *Radio 4* show *Moral Maze* with in early July 2005 CE. Yet quite simply, Philips has not mentioned a shred of evidence from where Shaykh Sudays was supposed to have made the statements, this is the first issue. Where did Shaykh Sudays make these statements? In which Masjid did he make the statements? When did he make the statements? All of this is unbeknown to the author, so what is her source for her vitriol against Shaykh Sudays, an online article by one Tom Gross?! Further, some of the statements which are mentioned are in the Qur’aan! But they obviously need to be understood in light of the scholars of *tafseer*, not in light of anti-Islamic elements. Throughout *Londonistan*, we are told that Muslims are transgressing against ‘the British’ state and people, refusing to fit in and implementing their ways onto ‘the British.’ Yet the author herself launches her own tirade against ‘the British’ saying: **“As soon as the issue of Israel enters the picture, the British reaction to terror becomes ‘quite positive.’ Far from springing to Israel’s defence as a fellow target, the British become passive, mute and even sympathetic to the murderous sentiments being screamed by the marching jihadists.”** Who then needs to be taught about British values? After Muslims have been accused of not being British enough, she herself condemns, criticises and splits off from the feelings of ‘the British’ (purely on the basis of alliance with Israel) thus demonstrating that her own ideas have no connection to ‘the British.’ The issue of Israel is also briefly dealt with in *Londonistan*, however the book equates those who criticize Israel as being hardcore anti-Semites and this is simplistic. On page 164 she states, in very simplistic terms that: **“Muslim hostility to Israel is rooted in Muslim hostility to Jews.”** Regarding Israel we find: **“...it has been demonised in a way that goes way beyond legitimate criticism, because the attacks are based on distortions and outrageous double standards.”** (!! Only Israel is demonized according to *Londonistan* and nothing else! However, what is neatly absent from *Londonistan* is any mention of Jewish opposition to Israel: **“Israel’s attempt to defend itself is represented as a desire for vengeance and punishment-tapping into the ancient prejudice that the Jews are motivated by the doctrine of ‘an eye for an eye’...”** (p.196) Yet Philips makes no mention of the fact that a number of Jews, including some orthodox Jews, have been vehemently opposed to Israel and its policies, so is this “prejudice against Jews”? Israel Shahak, a victim of anti-Semitism and the Jewish

holocaust, author of *Jewish History, Jewish Religion – The Weight of Three Thousand Years* (London: Pluto Press, 1994) wherein he holds that there are entrenched supremacist notions within Jewish society and law. Also there are other Hasidic orthodox Jews who are all vehemently anti-Israel claiming that the very idea of a Jewish state is a Zionist plan which opposes the teachings of the Torah, the latter face particular intimidation by pro-Israeli Zionists. There are many other humanist Jews who totally oppose Israel, but have been conveniently omitted from the pages of *Londonistan*. She mentions some correct and true statements in regards to the UK government Home Office Muslim taskforce and how it became a mere excuse to make Muslims out to be in need of a whole range of demands without looking at all the religious basis of extremism, and this is true. However, she states on p.264 that: **“No other minority in Britain had ever presented the state with a shopping list of demands for special treatment...”** *Londonistan* represents but the rantings of a highly opinionated columnist and is not really of the caliber of detailed studies into the issue. Furthermore, *Londonistan* with its heavy reliance on journalism and the author coming from this angle indicates that in all honesty *Londonistan* has no real serious or meticulous grasp of issues such as Islam, Muslims and religious issues as the author has no real scholarly or academic background in such matters.

12. Daniel Pipes, an American Zionist and Islamophobic columnist. He is director of the so-called *'Middle East Forum'*. He is 'endorsed' by groups such as the *'Christian Coalition'*, the *'American Israel Public Affairs Committee'*, the *'American Jewish Congress'*, and the *'Zionist Organization of America.'* He is behind the website *'Campus Watch'*. As for his father, Richard Pipes, then he was one of the architects of the neo-con methodology, who taught at *Harvard University* for 46 years, retiring in 1996. Richard Pipes was born in Poland to a wealthy Jewish family and specializes in Russian history, he was a leading advisor to the Reagan administration. Richard Pipes was head of the 1976 Team B which undermined the CIA and claimed that the Soviets had weapons even though there were none to actually be found and there was no proof whatsoever that they had certain capabilities. Team B claimed that the Soviets had a nuclear-armed submarine fleet that used a sonar system that was not based on sound and as a result of this could not be detected?! Do such false insinuations sound familiar?? Much of this was based on Pipes' view of the Soviets as being a highly expansionist and totalitarian state which was bent upon world domination. As for Daniel Pipes then he has authored a variety of articles wherein he has called for all Muslims to be monitored! As mentioned in an article entitled *The War's Most Agonizing Issue* for the *Jerusalem Post* on 1/22/03. He was selected by the US government to be on the US 'Institute of Peace' (!!!) a post that he served until January 2005.
13. First and least (!) 'Jack Chick' and his 'publications', not exactly the best example of Western toleration! As they were the first to utilize the method of cartoons and comics to get over their messages of hate after getting the idea for this in the 1950s from the communists in China according to his own admission. Along with its simplistic and futile publications of the likes of Robert Morey such as *Islamic Invasion* and other discredited and feeble works.
14. Websites who are responsible for such simplistic analysis, false reasoning and biased fanatical partisanship are the *'Militant Islam Monitor'*, *'Jihad Watch'*, *'Front Page Mag'*, *'Campus Watch'*, *'Little Green Footballs'*, *'Western Resistance'* and others. *'LGF'* started out as a web-design

company which used to discuss cycling and computer programming but then after the events of 9/11 the site became a fanatically Islamophobic neo-con Zionist propaganda machine, demonstrating how events can affect the rationality. R.J. Smith in an article for the *Los Angeles Magazine* in February 2006 stated that the site “...believes all Muslims are terrorists until proven innocent...the site is a dysfunctional mix of beautiful photos Johnson takes on coastal bike rides and constitutionally protected hate speech.” Indeed, in 2005 the *Jerusalem Post* (on 2/2/06) gave the website the ‘Best Israel Advocacy Award’ for “promoting Israel and Zionism” and “presenting Israel’s side of the conflict”, enough said! There is a blog entitled ‘LGF Watch’ which refutes ‘LGF’. As for the ‘Middle-East Media Research Institute (MEMRI)’ then it is a non-profit organisation established by Colonel Yigal Carmon, a twenty-two-year veteran of military intelligence in Israel with the goal of exploring the Middle East “through the region’s media.” MEMRI focuses on the following areas: Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Palestine, Persian Gulf, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon and Turkey. Laila Lalami has highlighted that there are three general observations that can be made about MEMRI’s work. One is that it consistently picks the most violent, hateful rubbish it can find, translates it and distributes it in e-mail newsletters to media and members of Congress in Washington. The second is that MEMRI does not translate comparable articles published in Israel, although the country is not only a part of the Middle East but an active party to some of its most main conflicts, indeed if not the main conflict! For instance, when the right-wing Israeli politician Effi Eitam referred to Israel’s Palestinian citizens as a “cancer,” MEMRI did not pick up this story. The third is that this organization is now the main source of media articles on the region of Islaam, a far greater and far more diverse whole than the individual countries it lists.

Most of the above name-check each other and compliment each others work. What is for sure is that it is odd how can fanatical Jewish Zionists, who describe Jesus, peace be upon him, as being a bastard, a false prophet who blasphemed against God and a magician, can be allies to fanatical Evangelicals who yearn for the second coming of Jesus wherein all Jews will be converted to evangelical Christianity!?! Furthermore, Justin Vaisse (Adjunct Professor at the *Institut d’études Politiques de Paris*) speaking at the *Brookings Institution* on September 13 2006 highlighted some of the causes of this scare-mongering:

I arrived in the U.S. about 10 days ago, and going from Boston to Washington and other cities I toured the bookshops and I was looking for books on Islam in Europe. And the only titles I could find, the only books I could find, bore titles like *While Europe Slept: How Radical Islam is Destroying the West from Within*, by Bruce Bauer; *The West's Last Chance: Will We Win the Clash of Civilizations*, by Tony Blankley; *Eurabia, The Euro-Arab Axis* by Bat Ye'or; or *Menace in Europe: Why the Continent's Crisis is America's, Too*, by Claire Berlinski. Again and again these books would show up in different bookshops, ours would not, but I think with some time it will, hopefully. And more generally, even more serious authors like Bernard Lewis or Neil Ferguson write things or give interviews speaking of the Islamization of Europe, the reverse colonization, the demographic time bomb that is threatening Europe, et cetera, with the suggestion that the sky is falling. In this literature that we call the alarmist school, you would generally find four inaccurate premises. The first one is about demography.

1. Using weapons of mass destruction upon Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Cambodia¹, Afghaanistaan and 'Iraaq;
2. Wiping out entire peoples;
3. Kindling war without evidence;
4. The transatlantic slave-trade, and has not compensated the descendents of it and it is still in living memory, and has rather increased oppression of its descendents by abandoning them during natural disasters for example;
5. Colonising whole countries and forcibly implementing their cultures on others for years;
6. Destabilising whole nations and countries;

Myth number one, if you want, is about demography. It is the idea that Muslims taken as a demographic bloc are gaining against the native population. The second myth is about sociology and culture. It is the idea that Muslims form "a distinct, cohesive, and bitter group" in the words of a 2005 *Foreign Affairs* article. Myth number three is about political attitudes. The alarmist view has it that Muslims seek to undermine the rule of law and the separation of church and state in order to create a society apart from the mainstream whether by imposing head scarves on young girls, campaigning for gender segregation in public institutions, defending domestic abuse as a cultural prerogative, or even supporting terrorism. The fourth and last myth is about domestic and foreign policy. Because they supposedly form a bloc, Muslims are supposed to influence more and more heavily the political process whether in domestic issues or, more importantly, in foreign policy issues. The idea is that France, Europe in general, but France more precisely, is kind of held hostage by its growing Muslim population and that it is tilting towards a more anti-Israeli and anti-American position.

See full study by Justin Vaisse here, which refutes much of this scare-mongering and critically assess its claims: <http://www.brookings.edu/comm/events/20060913islam.pdf>

This mass hysteria, scare-mongering and propaganda against Islam and Muslims in Europe has led to much discrimination and prejudice as a recent study (2006) conducted by the *European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia* entitled '*Perceptions of Discrimination and Islamophobia: Voices From Members of Muslim Communities in the European Union*' which can be downloaded here: http://eumc.europa.eu/eumc/material/pub/muslim/Perceptions_EN.pdf

¹ Noam Chomsky noted that in 1969 when Nixon and his Secretary of State Kissenger launched their secret and illegal bombing of Cambodia, the logs of US pilots were falsified to conceal the crime. Between 1969 and 1973, US bombers killed three quarters of a million Cambodian peasants in an attempt to destroy Northern Vietnamese supply bases, many of which did not even exist. During one sixth-month period in 1973, B-52 aircraft dropped more bombs on Cambodians, living mostly in straw huts, than were dropped on Japan during all of the World War 2, the equivalent of five Hiroshimas. See Noam Chomsky, *World Orders: Old and New* (London: Pluto Press, 1994), p.33

7. Propping up oppressive rulers, only to conspire their overthrow when the time suits;
8. Promoting disrespect of Islaam via a variety of means in the name of ‘defending an open media’;
9. Holding minorities within minorities to account and forcing them to change...¹

...have got away with not even a footnote within these ‘reports into global intolerance and hatred’!?

The Muslim country which has faced the most hostility in this regard is Saudi Arabia, which has even been accused by some as being a silent “axis of evil”! Yet none of the terrorists in the UK for example, whether those who committed 7/7 and most of the terror suspects in the UK, have any link whatsoever to Saudi Arabia and in fact make *takefeer* of Saudi Arabia! In fact such terrorists are either themselves British or those who the UK themselves allowed in under asylum or employment. So how on earth can the Islamic system in Saudi Arabia be held responsible for extremism, intolerance and radicalisation in the UK and US?! The whole idea is not only incredulous but also demonstrates acute ignorance of the whole situation and a distinct lack of adequate research into the matter. Indeed, many terrorists who are intolerant are more likely to have been made hateful after their regular viewing of the western media and listening to preachers who have been allowed to preach their extremism within the UK as opposed to the texts of classical scholars and contemporary bona fide senior scholars of Saudi Arabia.

An example of this can be seen with references to the stance of the *Salaf* against the people of innovation, in some of the quotes used just because it may refer to the “*armies of the people of sunnah*” translated from the Arabic words used in the originally such as *juyyosb*’ for example, one of the claims has been that this therefore teaches to be violent towards ‘the other’ (!) and this is a gross misunderstanding of the statements of the *Salaf*.

This claim of impugning Saudi Arabia with all things intolerant in the world cannot be correct from the angle that Saudi Arabia is home to the annual Hajj pilgrimage wherein peoples from all backgrounds, nationalities, colours and races, male and female are all present. Syed Faisal Ali reporting for the *Arab News* on 11 Dhu’l-Hijjah 1427 AH corresponding to Sunday 31 December 2006 CE:

“Haj Highlights Islamic Tolerance and Equality

¹ This development is but a modern day re-hash of the colonial heritages of that such countries have in any case.

MINA, 31 December 2006 — The face of true Islam and its worldwide diaspora was evident during the Standing on the plains of Arafat, the climax of Haj, on Friday. The pilgrims that converged here represented a living testimony of the sincere hospitality and overwhelming spirit of true brotherhood. “There are hundreds and thousands of pilgrims, from all over the world,” said Ibrahim Abu-Nasser, a pilgrim who came from the United States. “They are of all colors, from blue-eyed blonds to black-skinned Africans ... Islam is the only religion which not only preaches but follows the principle of equality. It embodies compassion, charity and self-righteousness.” Qassim Najeeb, a British haji, agrees. “The whole world, particularly the modern West, needs to understand Islam better because this is the one religion that erases from society racism and disparity. Everyone here is considered guests of Allah and hence equal in everyway,” he said. “The West, which is suffering from a resurgence of racism, is trying to create awareness about casteless and colorless society. But this message was given 1,400 years ago by our Prophet,” Najeeb said. Essamuudin Abdul Razik, a North American pilgrim, said he believed that Islam was the answer to all social ills. “I wish those who spit venom get to see this concept in practice here so that they get a feel for Islam,” he said. Indian-American pilgrim Asad Alam said all Muslims could feel at home equally on the plains of Arafat. “Going to Haj shows how universal Islam is. People of all colours and ethnic groups speaking different languages felt at home in Arafat, greeting and helping each other like brothers,” Alam said. “There is a mindset in the West that Muslims are intolerant and rigid in their behaviour, beliefs and thoughts. But on the contrary, they are very tolerant and accommodating in all walks of life.” Ekram Saleh, an Egyptian-born British national, said he believes that Islam created the concept of social security through Zakah, the compulsory tax Muslims must pay to help the needy. “It entails that every Muslim has certain obligations toward society,” said Saleh. “Have you ever seen people giving away food and drink in any other religious congregation? I was spellbound to see the way food and beverages are being distributed free of cost in Arafat. It is a sight worth seeing,” Saleh said. All of the Western pilgrims agreed that there exists a profound misunderstanding of Islam in the West.”

In fact if anything, the West has become more intolerant due to certain developments and this has led them to impugn Muslims of being non-active in fighting terror or as even those who condone extremism and terror. An example of this can be seen with one of the neo-con journalists, Charles Moore noted in an article in the *Daily Telegraph* (dated: 9/7/2005 CE):

It is only when you start thinking about what we are not getting from the leaders of British Muslims, and indeed Muslim religious leadership throughout the world, that you start to see how much needs doing...when did you last hear criticisms of named extremist groups and organisations by Muslim leaders, or support for their expulsion, imprisonment and extradition? How often do you see fatwas issued against suicide bombers and other terrorists, or statements by learned people declaring that people who commit such deeds will go to hell? When do Muslim leaders and congregations insist that a particular imam leaves his mosque because of the poison that he disseminates every Friday? When did a British Muslim last go after a Muslim who advocates or practices violence with anything like the zeal with which so many went after Salman Rusdie?

This is an excellent example of such ignorance, Moore states these things “when did you last ever hear...”, yet when did Moore last ever go to a Masjid in the first place? Furthermore, Moore cannot read Arabic and is thus totally unaware of the refutations that Muslim scholars have been making on such extremists way before 9/11. So for Moore to state all of this in such a pompous way is not only unfair but also demonstrates an acute lack of news-verification, not to mention precise substantiation. So Moore states all of this, yet seems to forget the fact that it was not the Muslims who allowed London to become a crazy haven for the likes of ‘Umar Bakri¹, Sa’d al-Faqeeh, Muhammad al-Mas’ari², Aboo Qataadah al-Filisteene³, Aboo Baseer at-Tartoose⁴, al-Fawwaaz, Aboo ‘Umar, Aboo Ithaar¹, Aboo

¹ A Syrian of dubious background, for an in-depth analysis of his ideas, beliefs and methodology refer to: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_BakriAppeal

² Another Saudi dissident and pseudo-scholar who resides in London and calls to political agitation along with supporting anyone who calls for ‘jihad’

³ For a detailed refutation of him refer to Shaykh ‘AbdulMaalik ar-Ramadaanee al-Jazaa’iree, *The Savage Barbarism of Aboo Qataadah* translated at <http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhajQataadah.pdf>

Also see Shaykh AbdulMaalik bin Ahmad Ramadaanee al-Jazaa’iree, *Talkhees al-Tbaad min Wahshiyati Abi'l-Qataad* (Jeddah: Maktabah al-Asalah al-Athaariyyah, 1422 AH). It has been alleged that he was supported, protected and sheltered by UK security and intelligence services after the events of 9/11 with even the French security and intelligence services accusing their British counterparts of sheltering him. Indeed, before all of this the *salafees* of Jordan also indicated towards Aboo Qataadah’s co-operation with the security services.

⁴ Aboo Baseer ‘AbdulMun’im Mustaphaa Haleemah at-Tartoosee, a Syrian *takfeeree* propagator who is now based in Lewisham, south-east London. For more on him refer to Aboo Noor al-Kurdee’s refutation of him that has been translated here: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Tartoosee.pdf

Hamza al-Misree², Abdullaah Faysal al-Jamaykee al-Khaarijee³ et al!!!! Or do these arm-chair experts from the neo-cons, along with their *Sufi* poodles, really expect us to blame Saudi Arabia for this development in the UK aswell?! Well they do in fact!! Abdal-Hakim Murad

¹ He is Aboo Ithaar Muhammad bin Mustaphaa al-Muqree' al-Misree, another Egyptian *takfeeree* based in London who associates with the likes of Aboo Baseer, Aboo Qataadah et al. One of the trustworthy Moroccan *salafee* brothers in London noted to me that in Ramadaan 2005 CE, Aboo Ithaar and his henchmen were distributing free copies of his book on 'Tawheed ul-Haakimiyah' at *al-Muntada Islamee*!! In the book Aboo Ithaar concocts his own principles of *takfeer* and *irjaa'* and noting that whoever does not agree with such and such a principle, has fallen into *irjaa'*!?

² Aboo Hamza Mustaphaa ibn Kamaal ibn Mustaphaa al-Misree, born in Alexandria in 1958 CE he arrived in the UK in 1979 CE and began practicing Islaam in London in the mid 1980s after being a nightclub bouncer in the city of London. He assumed British citizenship in the mid 1980s and after divorcing his British wife. He later was to assume a heroic status after having both of his arms blown off, some claim in Afghaanistaan, while others say during an industrial accident. Aboo Hamza is not known to have studied at all with the people of knowledge and he did/does not have any teachers and did not study at any Islamic centre of learning or institution. He rose to notoriety in London, and the world in fact, due to featuring regularly on *al-Jazeera* and other Arabic TV channels (!) and gained a band of followers after taking over a *masjid* in Finsbury Park by force with his blind-followers. This *masjid* then became one of the many bases of *takfeeree da'wah* in London along with the followings of the likes of Aboo Qataadah, 'Abdullaah Faysal, Aboo Ithaar, Aboo Baseer, Aboo 'Umar and al-Maghrawaan. His ignorance is demonstrated on the audio entitled '*Debate with the Jihaadis in Luton*' wherein his gross ignorance is refuted by Shaykh Saleem al-Hilaalee along with the brothers Aboo Usaamah Khaleefah and Aboo Sayfillaah 'AbdulQaadir (*hafidhahumullaah*). Aboo Hamza was implicated in the Yemen hostage takings which involved some *jihaadee* youth of London and Birmingham including Aboo Hamza's own son (!) and was arrested by British authorities later after the US wanted him for extradition on charges of terrorism. Earlier this year Aboo Hamza was sentenced to seven years for inciting racial hatred (against Jews) and possessing a document which may be useful to terrorists. In 2003 CE the *masjid* that he used to use was closed down and he was forced to pray outside with his cronies. His frustration against the *salafi da'wah* led him to compile a pathetic audio entitled '*The Running Lying Hilaalee*' wherein he tries to refute Shaykh Saleem?! Indeed, the ignorant audio lectures of Aboo Hamza eventually were proofs against him as *kuffaar* researchers from all over the world have obtained them and extracted the more bizarre of Aboo Hamza's statements. After the death of Imaam Bin Baaz (*raheemahullaah*), Aboo Hamza posted on his '*Supporters of Shari'ah*' website '*The Death of an Evil Scholar*' and poured scorn upon Imaam Bin Baaz (*raheemahullaah*). He is likely to be extradited to the US after he has completed his prison term.

³ Born 'William Forrest', this Jamaican *khaarijee* was responsible for issuing a number of erroneous and extreme rulings to the youth in London, the wider UK and in other English-speaking countries. For more on him refer to *The Devil's Deception of Abdullah Faysal ("Sheikh Faisal")*: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Deception.pdf

(aka Tim J. Winter), who is largely out of touch with the Muslim youth in the UK in any case, stated:

...it's also the case that the great majority of people who do believe in the legitimacy of terrorism to secure purportedly Islamic ends, do tend to subscribe to the rather literalist, dry, intense Wahabi theology.¹

This statement of Murad (Winter) is a common feature of his writings, he makes sweeping generalisations such as this and resembles here the likes of Stephen Schwartz, who has even described the likes of the *Shee'ab* 'Hezbollah' as being "Wahhabis"?!² Demonstrating that they have no idea how they are applying the term. In fact, Schwartz actually quotes from Murad (Winter) when Murad (Winter) writes under the pseudonym 'Karim Fenari'.³

Aftab Ahmad Malik stated in a reply to Stephen Schwartz, which just discretely passes the buck and agrees with the crude views of the neo-con Schwartz:

Yes, published books subsidised by certain Middle Eastern countries have nurtured this hate crime that Schwartz is so apt at repudiating...⁴

Contemplate on these words! Malik does little to challenge Schwartz's contentions and in fact holds it to be correct! Also notice, and this is a common feature, that Malik makes reference to "**certain Middle Eastern countries**" yet does not have the courage to merely state who he feels is contributing to spreading "**hate crime**" in the UK?! As for "subsidising publications" then this has to be justified with evidence and mere claims are to be rejected and this is all the more the case when not a shred of evidence for such "subsidies" can be presented.⁵ Abdal Hakim Murad also makes this absurd contention on the Channel 4 (UK) documentary '*Undercover Mosques*' on the programme *Dispatches*,⁶ dated 15 January 2007, that:

¹ *Feature Interview with Tim Winter (aka Abdal Hakim Murad)*, ABC news (Australia), 18/4/2004

² Schwartz wrote an article after 9/11 entitled '*Liberation, not Containment*' for the *National Review* wherein he said that "**Hezbollah are Wahhabis**".

³ Murad (Winter) has written a number of articles under this pseudonym, such as '*The Wahhabi who Loved Beauty*', '*The Jihad of Imam Shamil*' and '*Puncturing the Devil's Dream regarding the Hadiths of Najd and Tamim*'.

⁴ Aftab Ahmad Malik, "*As a British Muslim, I advise you: Don't be alarmed by Stephen Schwartz*" from the '*Amal Press*' website.

⁵ The *Salafees* in the West are also accused of being in receipt of such "Saudi funding" when the reality is that the bona fide *Salafees* in the West are largely self-financed and self-funded UK based efforts, with no "subsidies" from any "Middle Eastern countries" whatsoever!

⁶ This documentary was produced and directed by Andrew Smith of '*Hardcash Productions*' which has a fascination in making Saudi Arabia out to be a kind of secret, hidden and suspicious country; as a result, they

“A number of bookshops known to me have actually gone out of business because they have been undercut by the more fundamentalist literature being supplied for free by Saudi Arabia.”

This is an absolutely incredulous statement from Murad and merely demonstrates a rather petty grievance as opposed to an objective argument. The books that Saudi Arabia provide for free are small booklets for Islamic propagation or sets for new Muslims, they are not meant for business purposes whatsoever! Secondly, what is the intent in saying that the literature is **“more fundamentalist”**? It is but mere scaremongering as many of the books given for free are merely accounts of how people became Muslims and their stories! The salafimanhaj.com research team find this claim of Murad (Winter) as particularly erroneous as some of the team have worked in the arena of handling such materials on the grassroots in Muslim communities, which Murad (Winter) does not have equal experience within in order to comment, being a Cambridge University lecturer. Furthermore, no evidence is presented of such literature as an example which also throws this claim into even further question. Then Aftab Ahmad Malik continues with:

...however most mosques in the UK have fallen victim to their literalist, ahistorical reading of Islam and Muslims are warned to look for tell-tale signs of damnation. As such, both Barelwi and Deobandi Mosques are labelled as places of “evil innovation” and Muslims are warned to avoid them.

So it's clear as to the main aim of such a statement, to impugn Saudi Arabia of funding hatred. Here there is little difference between Schwartz's teacher Hishaam al-Kabbaanee and Aftab Malik, as they have both impugned **“most mosques”** of coming under sway of the spectre of overseas, Saudi, influence which spreads **“hate crime”** as Malik has stated. This is in fact the starting point for the types of 'investigative journalism' as seen in the

have conducted several documentaries in the past six years on similar topics. This particular documentary was also rather shoddy as has even been stated by non-Muslim producers and directors in the UK who have informed the salafimanhaj.com team of this! Therefore, we advise them to be more precise in future, indeed an example of their 'desire to portray the truth' can be seen in the fact that they rejected a suggestion by Aboo Usaamah to actually come on the show live! This they rejected, as it would have totally undermined the whole 'thesis' of the programme which was to portray a sinister, suspicious, underhand realm of 'Saudi-influenced' teachings. Indeed, some of the people that they 'exposed' on the show were *takfeerees* who hate Saudi! Just goes to show the type of 'research' and 'investigation' that *Hardcash Productions* undertook! Indeed, it is also evident that certain 'Sufic' elements had a hand in the *'Undercover Mosques'* documentary and may have even suggested the idea and plans to *Hardcash Productions*.

documentary *'Undercover Mosques'* which was aired on January 15 2007 on Channel 4's (UK) *Dispatches* programme. Moreover, the *Salafees*, who Aftab Malik is insinuating here, do not say that Muslims cannot pray behind Muslims, as from the hallmarks of *Ahl us-Sunnah* and the *Salaf* is that they pray behind the people of innovation, as long as the innovation is not of a major level which includes *shirk*.

Going back to Charles Moore's ludicrous article, then one mosque in London, *The Brixton Mosque and Islamic Cultural Centre (Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah)*, was vocal in denouncing extreme acts with their chairman Abdul-Haqq Baker making the mosque's position quite clear in 2001 and 2002, see:

<http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,193661,00.html>

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/september11/story/0,,624775,00.html>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2001/12/27/wreid127.xml>

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1730523.stm>

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1729022.stm>

<http://archives.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/UK/12/26/baker.cnn/index.html>

With regards to *fatwas* condemning terrorism, hijackings and suicide bombings then obviously the likes of Charles Moore have not even bothered to conduct any research on this matter. A cursory look at the website: www.fatwa-online.com demonstrates just out of touch and ill-informed the likes of Charles Moore are, who are only interested in Islaam when it and the Muslims are blamed for the contemporary manifestations of global terror and intolerance.

There is also the excellent book *According to Which Intellect and Religion is Bombing and Wreaking Havoc Considered Jibaad?!* By one of the elder *hadeeth* scholars of Madeenah, Saudi Arabia, Shaykh 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Abbaad.¹ There is also the superb *Islamic Condemnation of Terrorism, Hijacking and Suicide Bombing* compiled by Salafi Publications.² And the outstanding leaflet, which was actually originally written in the mid-1990s by a Muslim from the north of England, entitled *'Islamic Terrorism – Exploded!'*³ The dates of these publications demonstrate

¹ London: Daar ul-'Itisaam Publishers, 2004 CE

² Birmingham: 2nd Edition, 2003 CE

³ Available via www.Quran.nu

just how uninformed Charles Moore is, along with other foolish neo-con journalists and their ‘British Sufi’ and so-called ‘moderate’ poodles.¹

Now if we look at the situation of Saudi Arabia and its alleged role in spreading intolerance and hatred, which was an accusation that only arose after 9/11, Delinda C. Hanley² noted in the *Arab News*:

Public criticism of Saudi Arabia in the mainstream American media has escalated to new heights in recent months. When newscasters and columnists have exhausted their accusations that Iraq’s Saddam Hussein has amassed weapons of mass destruction that could be used to harm Israel or supported terror, they revert to tirades against the Saudi monarchy. Why the relentless attacks? And who benefits from a US media campaign vilifying Saudi Arabia along with Iraq? In addition to the media’s anti-Saudi

¹ Such as the likes of the neo-con ‘*British Muslim Forum*’, the *Muslim Educational Centre of Oxford (MECO)* and also the ‘*Sufi Muslim Council*’ the latter in particular claim that Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab (*raheemahullaah*) made *takfeer* of the Ottomans, they state this here: <http://www.sufimuslimcouncil.org/ex1.html> they also oddly state that the Imaam pronounced “**ah le kitab (people of the book – Jewish and Christian)...as “non-believers” – kafir**” (!) yet this is in the Qur’aan, not the words of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab! Allaah says,

ä ä ä ä ä ä

“Indeed, those who disbelieve from the People of the Book...”

{*al-Bayyinah* (98): 6}

So Allaah in the Qur’aan calls them non-believers and there is no way that they can be believers, due to them simply not believing in Islaam! What are the likes of the *SMC* and *MECO* trying to achieve?! This is the danger with the likes of these as they end up in denying the verse of the Qur’an instead of giving qualified scholarly explanations. With regards to the *Sufi Muslim Council*’s claim that Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab made *takfeer* of the Ottoman state, this again is a false claim and we have set aside a section at the end of this treatise to assess the credibility of this assertion. The *Sufi Muslim Council* also oddly claims to represent “**the silent majority of British Muslims**” and this use of “the silent majority” is what the neo-cons claimed about the Middle-East, that there was “a silent majority” who blindly supported US policies in the Middle-East!? First of all, how are *SMC* able to quantify all of this? There have no stats, figures or indicators by which anyone can assess if they truly represent “the silent majority of Muslims in the UK”. In any case, Islaam is not about adhering to what “the majority of Muslims” may adhere to in any given place as it could be the case that this includes practices such as forced marriages, weird national customs, blind following of cultural beliefs and other erroneous traditions which have no basis whatsoever in the *deen* of Islaam.

² News editor of the *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* magazine

diatribes, both Democratic and Republican legislators are goading the Bush administration into a public confrontation. Nor are the names of those pushing the buttons unfamiliar ones: Sen. John McCain (R-AZ), former House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA), Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY) and Joseph Lieberman, (D-CT), and Representatives Tom Lantos (D-CA) and Frank R. Wolf (R-VA) are among those on both sides of the aisle waging a campaign to discredit Saudi Arabia. Charging religious intolerance, they are demanding that the Bush administration place Saudi Arabia on a list of countries of “particular concern” — thereby opening the door to possible diplomatic or economic sanctions.¹ Since 1990, Saudi Arabia has purchased —

¹ The out of touch *Sufis* and so-called ‘moderates’ who also insinuate that this should be the process in dealing with Saudi are the likes of Dr Abdal Hakim Murad (aka TJ Winter) the lecturer of ‘divinity theology’ at *Cambridge University* and Dr Khaled Abou El Fadl (see fn. No.73), the naturalized American of Egyptian origin. Both of whom have claimed vehemently that Saudi Arabia is a haven of intolerance, Abou El Fadl for example stated in an article entitled *The Crusader: Why we must take Bin Laden seriously* written for the March/April 2006 edition of the *Boston Review* that: **“Like other Wahhabis, bin Laden is intolerant of differences. He brands Muslims who do not agree with his views either hypocrites or apostates.”** So he stated this as if Bin Laden has the same belief system as the main *salafee* scholars of Saudi such as Imaam Bin Baaz and Imaam Ibn ‘Uthaymeen (*raheemahullaah*). El Fadl also insinuates that it is the method of the bona-fide scholars of Saudi Arabia to thus brand Muslims who do not agree with them as being **“either hypocrites or apostates”** after he had already erroneously claimed that Bin Ladin has the same creed and *manhaj* as them! Abou El Fadl then states: **“In bin Laden’s view, the only true Islamic government of the modern age was the government of the Taliban, which was the only one able to claim the honor of being more Wahhabi than Saudi Arabia.”** So here then we can see that even Abou El Fadl has no idea how he is applying the simplistic term “Wahhabi” as he uses it to describe the Taalibaan who were *Hanafee-Deobandee Sufis*! This is assuming El Fadl is serious in this statement, if not then there is not much need in mentioning it unless one wishes for confusion over such important issues. Then Abou El Fadl states: **“The most pertinent indicator of bin Laden’s loyalty to Wahhabi principles is his adherence to a doctrine known as *al-wala’ wa al-bara’*— association and disassociation. According to this doctrine, Muslims are not to ally themselves with or even befriend Jews and Christians. Wahhabi doctrines have in fact long maintained that Jews and Christians should not be allowed to live in any part of Arabia.”** Here there are a number of issues:

1. The issues of *al-walaa’ wa’l-bara’* is something which is found within classical texts, indeed is mentioned by the *salaf*. Therefore, Abou Fadl’s strange assertion that it is a “Wahhabi doctrine” (??!) is erroneous to say the least.
2. The issue of not allying with non-Muslims is mentioned clearly in the Qur’aan
3. The issue of allying with non-Muslims has been sanctioned by classical scholars if there is a worldly benefit for Muslims in that and there is no harm in this, in any case this would not be defined as ‘allegiance’ in the prohibited sense. This has been stated who Abou Fadl would describe as

paying cash — \$39.6 billion worth of military equipment from the United States — hardly hostile behavior. Israel, however, is infuriated by Riyadh’s financial, spiritual and political support of the Palestinian cause and its ability to rally international support. America’s Israel-first journalists and politicians thus work diligently to transform the public’s perception of Saudi Arabia from that of a vital longtime partner and ally into an American enemy. For example, Israel and its American supporters were quick to criticize and downplay Crown Prince Abdullah’s Arab-Israeli peace plan. In mid-January, when Saudi diplomats proposed a way to defuse the crisis in Iraq, their country’s motives were analyzed more than their proposed solution. Long before 9/11, the US media and film industry has engaged in Arab- and Muslim-bashing.¹ Fair-minded Americans who attended school, worked or lived with Saudi Arabians and other Arabs soon became friends with them, and ignored the media’s slant. After 9/11, individual Americans across the country reached out time and again to their Muslim and Arab neighbors - even to strangers — to show they cared. Like people around the

“Wahhabi”! However, the intent of Abou Fadl is to try and show that the scholars of Saudi Arabia are against all types of interaction, dealings and good neighbourliness with non-Muslims and this is false and dangerous.

4. Jews and Christians not being allowed in the Arabian Peninsula, then this accusation alone indicates that Abou Fadl is totally unfamiliar with the statements of the classical scholars. Firstly, with regards to the definition of the ‘*Jazeeart ul-’Arab*’ (Arabian Peninsula) then some scholars defined as being Makkah and Madeenah, some said Makkah, Madeenah and al-Yamaamah, some said Makkah, Madeenah, al-Yamaamah, other surrounding area and Yemen. Secondly, the issue of not letting them reside in the Arabian Peninsula is from the speech of Imaams Maalik, ash-Shaafi’ee, Ahmad and others (*raheemahumullaah*), so it is not something “invented in Wahhabi doctrine”! For more on this see Shaykh’Abdul’Azeez bin Ra’ees ar-Ra’ees, *The Clear Proofs for Refuting the Doubts of the People of Takfeer and Bombing*, pp.79-89: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf
5. In any case there are non-Muslim workers presently residing in parts of Saudi Arabia, such as Riyadh for example and within the Eastern provinces!

Yet what can be expected from one who throws doubt upon the authenticity of Aboo Hurayrah (*radi Allaahu ’anhu*)?! As Abou El Fadl does.

As for Murad (Winter), then within his article *The Poverty of Fanaticism*, which is itself a rather pedantic tirade against Saudi Arabia replete with petty insinuations, he stated: **“The neo-Kharijite nature of Wahhabism makes it intolerant of all other forms of Islamic expression.”** So they seek to present *Salafiyah*, or as they erroneously and crudely refer to it “Wahhabism”, as being “intolerant” along with a whole host of other simplistic and unfounded assertions and actually end up being more ‘intolerant’ of those they impugn with it in the first instance!

¹ So was the UK! As we shall soon come across

world, Salah Obeid of the Saudi Arabian Public Relations and Information Office was devastated by the attacks, and mourns friends lost in both the Pentagon and the World Trade Towers. The Saudi diplomat remembers his neighbor's concern for him as he offered Obeid a ride into his Washington, DC office the following day. Obeid's friend said he, for one, could not punish his neighbor for someone else's crime. While most individual Americans still do not blame a nation or religion for the crimes of a few, that may not remain the case. Among the media and US legislators are those working overtime to point fingers and whip up American anger and generate calls for revenge. They promote the un-American concept of guilt by association. Hence the media's relentless attack on both Saudi Arabia and Iraq as the US is dragged closer to war in the region. "The evil done by a few Muslims has been expanded in the American media to include all Muslims," explained Khaled Al-Maeena, editor-in-chief of the Arab News. "The anti-Islamic hysteria and the defamation of Muslims and their leaders has been a well-planned, well-orchestrated effort." Most front-page stories in the mainstream US press describe the Saudi response to the anti-terrorism campaign as "grudging." Allegations that money given by the Saudi ambassador's wife for medical aid may have been diverted to two of the 9/11 attackers received much excited media attention. Media outlets are fed by various "think tanks" working together to spew out anti-Arab and pro-Israel propaganda. Among those is the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA) in Washington, DC, which, in addition to its briefings, arranges free trips to Israel for journalists and public officials. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, also based in the national capital, boasts a bevy of Middle East terrorism experts, including Matthew Levitt and Patrick Clawson, who can be counted on for sound bites calling Saudi Arabia a "state facilitator" of terrorism. Rarely if ever is the institute identified as a spin-off of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), Israel's Washington lobby. The Washington Center for Peace and Justice, Inc., a charitable organization based in Arlington, VA, has an elegant Web site that focuses on "victims of Saudi kidnapping" and calls for a boycott of Saudi oil import. Featured on the Web site are the gripping June 2002 testimonies before the US House of Representatives by Monica Stowers, Pat Roush and Ria Davis. Also to be found on the Web site is a statement by discredited terrorist expert Daniel Pipes, who wages a vicious personal crusade against Islam in the press. Thanks to this organization, Saudi Arabia, whose nationals are involved in 46 child custody cases, receives more adverse publicity and public scrutiny, than, for example, Germany, with 116 similar "kidnapping" cases. Saudi Arabia also is a favorite target of

the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), which, in addition to spreading disinformation about the Middle East conflict, censors, criticizes, reviews, and protests any activities, articles or speeches it perceives as being anti-Israel (as being, by definition, “anti-Semitic”). In October 2002 the Council on Foreign Relations released a report blaming Saudi Arabian charities and individuals for funding Al-Qaeda. The council, which is chaired by Maurice Greenberg, chief executive of American International Group (AIG), and whose members include former CIA and FBI Director William Webster, and Stuart Eizenstat, deputy Treasury secretary under President Bill Clinton, called for a tough campaign to denounce countries such as Saudi Arabia for not cooperating in curbing terrorist financing, threatening them with sanctions if they fail to improve. A Rand Corporation study presented on the Hill at a Defense Policy Board briefing on July 10 raised a ruckus when it accused the Saudis of complicity “at every level of the terror chain.”¹ The study recommended that the US threaten Saudi Arabia with

¹ Allaahu Musta'aan! That then, is an unjust division! It is not strange for the RAND corporation to issue odd reports, the report into '*Civil Democratic Islam: Partners, Resources and Strategies*' (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2003) by Cheryl Benard, which attempted to basically find a form of Islaam which nurtures, panders, promotes and caves in to the policies of the West, is an example of this. She calls for 'moderates' to be utilized by non-Muslim governments and the 'traditionalists' and 'scripturalists' to only be used in so far as they oppose violent extremists. Within her report, Benard also claims that women who do not wear the *hijab* or *niqaab* should be made into 'civil rights heroes' (!!) and that their views, which are based largely on Western feminism, should also have an equal footing within the 'Islamic discourse' (pp.58-59 & p.61)!? Even though they have no evidences, reject clear verses of the Qur'aan, deny the *sunnah* of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), oppose the *manhaj* of the *salaf* and have concocted their own version of Islaam which suits their desires! Benard also promoted Sufism within her report due to the emphasis on music, mysticism and 'spirituality' which she feels fits well into promoting peace and reducing terror!? Benard displays a particular disdain for Saudi saying, as if talking directly to her non-Muslim colleagues "Clearly, our strategy toward Saudi is based on geopolitical, tactical and economic considerations and does not represent an endorsement of that regime or its lifestyle and ideology." (p. 27) She also makes a number of massive errors in her biased report and this can be seen on page 29 wherein she claims that the traditionalists do not really consist of young men!? Benard's promotion of the modernist school of thought is very dangerous arguing, "Instead, we allow our vision of Judaism's or Christianity's true message to dominate over the literal text, which we regard as history and legend. That is exactly the approach of the Islamic modernists..."(p.37) She does however note the limitations of the modernists, such as: **their distance from the average Muslim on the street; no connection to Muslim youth; no publications available; no monies; no media; no institutions; no educational centres; too isolated; too integrated with their kuffaar surroundings to tap into the Muslim communities; too academic; not attractive to journalists etc; not found in Islamic schools etc.** (pp. 39-40), basically they're totally out of touch with the Muslim youth! Benard contradicts herself in her report as she

military and financial measures, including seizing Saudi oil fields and Saudi assets in the US, unless the Kingdom ends its support for “Islamic insurgency groups.”¹ The deviously misnamed Saudi Institute for Development and Studies, a think tank in McLean, VA, produces aggressive hate-filled media releases to discredit the Kingdom. It recently initiated a joint project with Foundation for the Defense of Democracies to track and study “the spread of hate against Americans” by Saudi Arabians. The institute also urges the American people and their leaders to respond “appropriately” by expelling Saudi diplomats. These are but a few of the organizations working night and day to promote hatred and distrust between two old friends. One has to wonder at the extent of this “interest” in a long-time US ally. Nevertheless, at the prodding of Israel-firsters from these and other think tanks whose goal is to isolate and neutralize Saudi Arabia, Washington appears willing to toss aside decades of friendship - not to mention a key ally in a vital region. Domestically, the American media and government are creating a climate of hysteria and fear in which distrust of Muslims and Arabs can flourish. A recent FBI bulletin stated: “In selecting its next targets, sources suggest Al-Qaeda may favor spectacular attacks that meet several criteria: High symbolic value, mass casualties, severe damage to the US economy, and maximum psychological trauma.” The press leaks periodic warnings of impending attacks and hypes nationwide searches of “foreign-born men” that turn out to be bogus. In this highly charged climate, the INS and FBI have inflicted humiliating interrogations on Saudi businessmen, students and their associates. Males aged 16 and older from Arab and Muslim countries now are required to register with the

argues that the modernists, such as Khaled Abou el-Fadl (who is vocal in his hatred of Saudi as well as being completely out of touch with Muslim youth), Bassam Tibi et al, should be the Muslims who define Islam, not the others, as they represent minority opinions. Yet these modernists themselves, she even states, represent an even smaller minority and are totally out of touch with Muslim youth so where is the democracy here that she is so fanatical in bolstering!? Page 47 is the chapter on the ‘*Proposed Strategy*’ to be implemented and here she notes that modernists should be supported first amongst the Muslims, not the traditionalists, as those who present the face of contemporary Islam. What is very dangerous is her recommendation to financially help and support modernist Islamic thought through **encouraging new websites; modernist textbook authors for curriculum; usage of media wherein modernists can express their baatil views; affordable and cheap books that expose modernist Islamic thought to Muslim youth** (p.48) Page 50-53 sees a rather pathetic attempt to dissect *hadeeth* science and this in itself needs a separate refutation. On page 62, she asserts that the “**causal relationship between traditionalism and underdevelopment**” should be shown! So beware!

¹ La hawla wa la quwwata ila billaahi!

Immigration and Naturalization Service and many of those who have voluntarily complied have been arrested and/or deported. Since 9/11, the government also has shut down Islamic- and Saudi-funded charities and businesses, frozen their bank accounts and detained their officers without charges. Not surprisingly, in the past year Arab business and tourist travel to the US has plummeted, according to a Nov. 26 Washington Post article, “costing American businesses hundreds of millions of dollars. US exports have dropped by 25 percent from last year, costing the United States at least \$1.5 billion.” The impact of scaring off Saudi Arabian business “is more substantial than people realize or want to recognize,” noted Charles Kestenbaum, a former US Embassy commercial officer in Saudi Arabia. “We’re treating all Saudis as if they’re terrorists. Our inability to distinguish between who is a friend and an enemy turns everyone into an enemy. It’s a self-fulfilling prophecy.” The Nov. 26 Post article quoted Mohamed Al-Ghamdi, a Saudi journalist who studied in the US, as saying: “We are hurt. We don’t go to America anymore. We are afraid of you. America is engaged in war and thinks we’re responsible.” “It hurts my feelings when I open up the newspaper and read something bad about my country,” Abdul Mohsen Al-Yas, Saudi Arabia’s director of information, told the Washington Report. At the Dec. 3 news conference cited at the beginning of this article, Al-Jubair announced both new and existing counter-terrorism measures, denying press claims that his government had dragged its feet in fighting terrorism. The press conference was an attempt to explain to the press what Riyadh had been doing quietly, out of the limelight. After 9/11, Al-Jubair said, the Kingdom froze 33 suspicious bank accounts worth \$5.6 million, questioned more than 2,000 people, ordered financial audits of Saudi charities, and established new rules for sending humanitarian donations outside the country. While the media reiterate that 15 of the 19 hijackers were Saudi Arabian nationals, rarely is it mentioned that Al-Qaeda has been as determined to damage Saudi Arabia as it is to attack the US. In fact, Al-Jubair charged, “We believe Al-Qaeda chose Saudis to give the operation a Saudi face and drive a wedge between the two countries. “What we need to do, as we have done,” he told the assembled American reporters, “is join hands, wrack our brains together, and find ways to fight the scourge of terrorism.” After all, the only beneficiaries of an end to the longtime friendship between the United States and Saudi Arabia are Israel and Osama Bin Laden.¹

¹ Delinda C. Hanley, “Saudi Bashing: Who’s Responsible for it and Why?” in *Arab News*, Sunday 2 February 2003 CE

Martin Jacques, senior visiting research fellow at the *Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore* in *The Guardian* of London superbly noted with regards to the growing intolerance that is being expressed in the world today:

I have just read Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. It is a classic. Published in 1947, it analyses the nature of Japanese culture. Almost 60 years and many books later, it remains a seminal work. Like all great works of scholarship, the book manages to transcend the time and era in which it was written, ageing in certain obvious respects, but retaining much of its insight and relevance. If you want to make sense of Japan, Benedict's book is as good a place to start as any. Here, though, I am interested in the origins and purpose of the book. In June 1944, as the American offensive against Japan began to bear fruit, Benedict, a cultural anthropologist, was assigned by the US Office of War¹ Administration to work on a project to try and understand Japan as the US began to contemplate the challenge that would be posed by its defeat, occupation and subsequent administration. Her book is written with a complete absence of judgmental attitude or sense of superiority, which one might expect; she treats Japan's culture as of equal merit, virtue and logic to that of the US. In other words, its tone and approach could not be more different from the present US attitude toward Iraq or that country's arrogant and condescending manner toward the rest of the world. This prompts a deeper question: Has the world, since then, gone backward? Has the effect of globalization been to promote a less respectful and more intolerant attitude in the West, and certainly on the part of the US, toward other cultures, religions and societies? This contradicts the widely held view that globalization has made the world smaller and everyone more knowing. The answer, at least in some respects, is in the affirmative — with untold consequences lying in wait for us. But more of that later; first, why and how has globalization had this effect? Of course, it can rightly be argued that European colonialism embodied a fundamental intolerance, a belief that the role of European nations was to bring "civilized values" to the natives, wherever they might be.² It made no pretence, however, at seeking to make their countries like ours: Their enlightenment, as the colonial attitude would have it, depended on our physical presence. In no instance, for example, were they regarded as suitable for democracy, except where there was racial affinity, with white

¹ This was the former name of the US *Ministry of Defence* until the 1950s.

² It is exactly this intolerance which conveniently gets forgotten by many of those who drone on about it with regards to Islaam and Muslims.

settler majorities, as in Australia and Canada. In contrast, the underlying assumption with globalization is that the whole world is moving in the same direction, toward the same destination: it is becoming, and should become, more and more like the West. Where once democracy was not suitable for anyone else, now everyone is required to adopt it, with all its Western-style accoutrements. In short, globalization has brought with it a new kind of Western hubris — present in Europe in a relatively benign form, manifest in the US in the belligerent manner befitting a superpower: that Western values and arrangements should be those of the world; that they are of universal application and merit. At the heart of globalization is a new kind of intolerance in the West toward other cultures, traditions and values, less brutal than in the era of colonialism, but more comprehensive and totalitarian. The idea that each culture is possessed of its own specific wisdom and characteristics, its own novelty and uniqueness, born of its own individual struggle over thousands of years to cope with nature and circumstance, has been drowned out by the hue and cry that the world is now one, that the Western model — neoliberal markets, democracy and the rest — is the template for all...After three decades of headlong globalization, the world finds itself in dangerous and uncharted waters. Globalization has fostered the illusion of intimacy while intolerance remains as powerful and unyielding as ever — or rather, has intensified, because the Western expectation is now that everyone should be like us. And when they palpably are not, as in the case of the Islamic world, then a militant intolerance rapidly rises to the surface. The wave of Islamophobia in the West — among the people and the intelligentsia alike — is a classic example of this new intolerance. When I wrote a recent article on the Danish cartoons, arguing that Europe had to learn a new way of relating to the world, I got nearly 400 e-mails in response. Over half of these were negative and many were frightening in their intolerance, especially those from the US, which were often reminiscent in their tone to the worst days of the 1930s.¹ We live in a world that we are much more intimate with and yet, at the same time, also much more intolerant of — unless, that is, it conforms to our way of thinking. It is the Western condition of globalization, and its paradox of intimacy and intolerance suggests that the Western reaction to the remorseless rise of the non-West will be far from benign.²

¹ So it turns out that it's only not Muslims spreading 'intolerance'!

² Martin Jacques, "Globalization Making the West More Intolerant" in *The Guardian* (of London), 18 April 2006 CE

Madeline Bunting also noted in *The Guardian* (of London) in an article entitled “UK Muslims: A Community Left to Talk Only to Itself”, on 28 February 2006 CE, that:

February 2006 has proved a *mensis horribilis* for British Muslims. Cast your mind back over the past few weeks and virtually all the major news stories were guaranteed to provoke Muslim outrage: from the publication of the Danish cartoons across Europe to the leaked full report of Abu Ghraib abuse, the video of British troops abusing Iraqi teenagers, the glorification-of-terrorism legislation, and the UN report on Guantanamo Bay. The uncanny coincidence of three trials involving free speech — Nick Griffin, David Irving and Abu Hamza — has only thrust into sharper contrast for British Muslims the double standard of which they believe they are so often victims... Tolerance is clearly better than intolerance, but that has blinded us to its inadequacies. It is no accident that two of the most liberal countries in Europe, which prided themselves on their tolerance, have hatched a deep hostility to Islam — Denmark and the Netherlands (the latter is even considering banning the burqa in all public spaces). The indifference is incubating a sense of impotent rage within many sections of the British Muslim community that believe they have no traction on the established mainstream; neither on the political system nor on that other bugbear, the media (the fury directed at the latter is daunting). The old alliance with the center-left is fraying to breaking point; old allies in the battles against racism have jumped sides, and now routinely present arguments more Islamophobic than the center-right.¹ So there is an odd mismatch as February 2006 draws to a bitter end. On the one hand, the British establishment is quietly congratulating itself on being an oasis of good sense in the cartoon storm. Glossing over July 2005, there has been a remarkable revival of faith in British multiculturalism as Brits look with smug horror at the Islamophobia of Denmark and the Netherlands or the violence in France last autumn. Meanwhile, among British Muslims it is commonplace to draw analogies with the rise of anti-Semitism in Germany in the 1930s: how cultural racism legitimizes persecution and, ultimately, violence. Even the idea that there is no community with a more vested interest in promoting Holocaust education than Muslims is spreading — what happened in Europe in the 1940s could happen again, and they will be the victims this time. This kind of apocalyptic gloom is interspersed with fantasies of flight — where shall we move to? This could be the panic of a ghetto community that is too often left to talk only to itself. And if it is, then who should be talking with them — and why

¹ Like Melanie Philips for example in the UK

aren't they? When did you last have a conversation with a Muslim in which you enjoyed each other's company enough for you both to change, even if only a small part, your minds?

Yet even before the events of 9/11 and 7/7, hostility and intolerance was manifest against Muslims. James Meikle, then Community Affairs Editor for *The Guardian* of London, reported on Friday 28 February 1997 that:

Race relations think tank urges media curbs and religious discrimination law to fight growing anti-Islam bias: Britain's turning into a nation of Muslim-haters –

Britain is in danger of turning into a nation of Muslim-haters, according to the race relations think tank, the Runnymede Trust. In a consultation paper published yesterday, it called for radical changes in attitudes and behaviour from the media, politicians and community leaders to help fight discrimination, harassment and violence against the million, or more, British Muslims. The report entitled *Islamophobia: Its Features and Dangers*, suggests making discrimination unlawful on religious grounds...Gordon Conway, Vice-Chairman of Sussex University, who chairs the commission, said this hostility was forcing Muslims out of the mainstream of British society, and preventing them from playing a proper part in national debates. "Their voices, their fears, and their concerns are not heard". Nasreen Rahman, Runnymede trustee, said Muslims were represented "...either as Salman Rusdie-type libertarians or as extreme fundamentalists, and any reasonable attitudes lying between these two extremes are seen as those of individuals being Westernised and 'sensible'".¹

This was before 9/11 and 7/7, as a result can the accusations against Muslims be fair if there was already intolerance against Muslims, let alone Muslims, and Muslim countries such as Saudi Arabia, themselves being carriers of intolerance against the UK and US.

Indeed, currently, the state of affairs has degenerated to the extent that extremist Sikh and Hindu community leaders have joined forces with the far right in the UK in order to oppose Muslims! One far-right organisation in the UK, the *BNP*, state on their website that they aim to **"...bring together white Britons, Sikhs and Hindus, in a common effort to expose and resist the innate aggression of the imperialistic ideology of Islam..."**! A tape was produced at the end of 2001 CE entitled *Islam – A Threat to Us All* by the *BNP* and features speech from a Hindu and a Sikh!! The Sikh speaker on the tape states:

¹ James Meikle, "Race relations think tank urges media curbs and religious discrimination law to fight growing anti-Islam bias: Britain's turning into a nation of Muslim-haters" in *The Guardian*, Friday 28 February 1997

“Who will stop them and save the rest of us? Ironically, the party labelled by the media as ‘the Nazis’. Therefore, let us join to salute the British National Party.” !!?

The tape contains much nonsense such as British Muslims secretly planning to drug, kidnap and seduce non-Muslim women and then get them involved in prostitution overseas!¹ One extremist Sikh by the name of “Ammo Singh” met the leader of the far-right organisation and the *BNP* have attempted to write a joint anti-Muslim statement with Hasmukh Shah, a Hindu businessman whose property reportedly suffered more than half a million pounds worth of damage during the Bradford riots.² The *Washington Post* reported on Saturday November 25 2006:

Intolerance in Europe:

Prostitutes and drug dealers are welcome in the Netherlands. Just don’t wear a veil
EUROPE’S MUSLIM communities increasingly are portrayed - especially by European media - as havens for religious intolerance that flourish thanks to the overly tolerant policies of liberal governments. It’s true that until relatively recently, some Western European governments shrank from confronting clerics or others who promoted extremist ideology or encouraged terrorism. It’s also true that some European artists and politicians have been threatened or even killed for criticizing or mocking Islam. But another important part of the dangerous increase in tensions between Europeans and Muslims is the blatant bigotry of many mainstream political leaders, journalists and other elites against Islam and its followers. Sometimes the bigots portray their crude attacks on Muslim beliefs and culture as a defense of freedom of speech - as when a Danish newspaper last year chose to publish gratuitously offensive cartoons about the prophet Muhammad. Sometimes they claim to be promoting better communication, as when British parliamentarian Jack Straw recently asked Muslim women to remove their veils when visiting his office. Luckily for the enemies of cynicism and disingenuousness, there is also the Dutch government - which no longer bothers to disguise its ugly prejudice. On Nov. 17, just five days before Wednesday’s hard-fought general election in the Netherlands, the incumbent center-right government promised that, if reelected, it would introduce legislation to

¹ The *Naqshabandee Soofee* of Beverly Hills, Hishaam al-Kabbaanee, also claimed that Muslims, so-called “*Wahhabis*”, were doing this in the US!!

² Nick Lowles, “*Sleeping with the Enemy – Griffin Ponders Black Membership*”, February 2002 CE in *Searchlight Magazine*.

<http://www.searchlightmagazine.com/index.php?link=template&story=61>

ban the wearing of burqas and other facial coverings in most public places, including courts, schools, trains and even streets. The ruling Christian Democratic Appeal party finished first in the voting, but the makeup of the next government remains unclear. If enacted, the prohibition would affect no more than a few dozen of the country's 1 million Muslims, who make up some 6 percent of the population. But the point is symbolic: A country famous for tolerating prostitution, drug use, euthanasia and public nudity considers Muslim veiling beyond the pale. Rita Verdonk, the immigration minister who is rapidly becoming the face of the new Dutch intolerance, claimed that the measure was needed for "reasons of public order, security and protection of citizens." Nothing subtle in that connection: As far as Ms. Verdonk is concerned, burqas and terrorism are synonymous. Like other Europeans, the Dutch have reason to worry about terrorism; the country has been traumatized by the assassinations of a prominent right-wing politician and a right-wing filmmaker in the past few years. But attacking Muslim culture - as opposed to those who practice or promote violent acts - is no way to diminish the threat. It won't be surprising if more Dutch Muslims respond to their government by putting on burqas - or by answering intolerance with intolerance.

As for the state of affairs within America, then there have been a whole host of incidents which indicate the rising intolerance that is sweeping the nation.¹ On April 17 2006, nationally syndicated radio host Michael Savage called for "kill 100 million" Muslims. On his radio show, Savage² told listeners that "intelligent people, wealthy people ... are very depressed by the weakness that America is showing to these psychotics in the Muslim world. They say, "Oh, there's a billion of them." Savage continued: **"I said, 'So, kill 100 million of them, then there'd be 900 million of them.' I mean ... would you rather us die than them?"** Savage added: "Would you rather we disappear or we die? Or would you rather they disappear and they die? Because you're going to have to make that choice sooner rather than later." On the Christian Broadcasting Corp.'s 700 Club, host Pat Robertson expressed concern that Americans, "especially the American left," need to "wake up" to the "danger". Robertson continued: **"Who ever heard of such a bloody, bloody, brutal type of religion? But that's what it is. It is not a religion of peace."** On the April 28 edition of the Christian Broadcasting Corp.'s (CBN) 700 Club, host Pat Robertson referred to Islam

¹ See for example: <http://www.careerjournal.com/myc/diversity/20040108-sappal.html>

² An appropriate and befitting name indeed!

as a “bloody, brutal type of religion.” Maybe the likes of these need to open up the Bible and read the following verses, lest we forget:

“And the Lord said, “Go through the city, and smite; let not your eye spare, neither have you pity. Slay utterly the old and young, both maids and little children, and women”.” {Ezekiel 9: 5}

“And the Lord said unto Moses, “Avenge the children of the Midianites,” They warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses, and they killed the males. And they took all of the women as captives, and their children, and took the spoil of their cattle, and took all of their flocks, and all of their goods. And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles with fire. Moses said, “Have you kept all of the women alive? Now kill every male among the children, and kill every woman that has known a man by lying with him, but keep all of the young girls for yourselves”.” {Numbers 31: 1}

“When you draw near to a city fight against it, offer terms of peace to it, and if its answer to you is peace and it opens to you, then all of the people that are found within it shall do forced labour for you and shall serve you. But if the city does not make peace with you, then you shall besiege it...you shall put all its males to the sword, but the women and the children, the cattle and everything else in the city, all its spoil, you shall take as booty for yourselves; and you shall enjoy the spoil of your enemies.”
{Deuteronomy 20: 10-17}

Herein, the Bible, which some hold to be the words of the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth, orders the killing of women, children and livestock in a certain context and such is not found at all in the Qur’aan, the opposite in fact is found in the Qur’aan and the example of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)! Not to mention the suicide mission of Samson also being praised in the Bible!

A spoof of Anti-Muslim bigotry on a Washington, D.C., radio station drew support for treating American Muslims in a manner similar to how the Jewish community was targeted in Nazi Germany!? In his 630 *WMAL* program on Sunday, November 26, talk show host Jerry Klein seemed to advocate a government program to force all Muslims to wear “identifying markers.” He stated: **“I’m thinking either it should be an arm band, a crescent moon arm band, or it should be a crescent moon tattoo.”** (4:00) Klein said: **“If it means that we have to round them up and do a tattoo in a place where everybody**

knows where to find it, then that's what we'll have to do.” (11:38) The program focused on public reaction to the removal of six Imams, or Islamic religious leaders, from a US Airways flight in Minnesota last week. Some callers to the program rejected discriminatory treatment of Muslims, but others supported Klein's statements and even suggested that even more severe measures be taken against American Muslims. “Richard” in Gaithersburg, Md., said: **“Not only do you tattoo them in the middle of their foreheads; you round them up and then ship them out of this country, period.”** (15:58) “Heath” in Upper Marlboro, Md., said: **“I don't think you go far enough. . .you have to set up encampments like they did during World War II like with the Japanese and Germans.”** Later in the program, Klein revealed that his call for discriminatory actions against Muslims was “baloney.” Klein said: “I can't believe any of you, any of you, are sick enough to have agreed for one second with anything that I have said in the last half hour.”¹ Kerry Burke and Nancie L. Katz (along with Alison Gendar) in an article for the *New York Daily News* entitled *“Muslim Beating: Five Orthodox teens charged in attack”*:

Five Orthodox Jewish teens have been slammed with hate-crime charges in the brutal beating of a Pakistani immigrant in Brooklyn. “They hit me in the face with brass knuckles four or five times while somebody held my hands,” said the victim, Shahid Amber, 24, a gas station attendant. “Then they all beat and kicked me. They were screaming ‘Muslim m-f-r. You m-f-g Muslim terrorists. Go back to your country.’ “Amber, who was eating ice cream outside a Midwood Dunkin’ Donuts when the gang attacked on Sunday, needed 15 stitches on his broken nose and reconstructive surgery. Witnesses who called 911 said that 10-12 youths jumped him, a source said. Amber said the attack began after one of the group asked if he were Muslim and he answered yes. Amber’s father, Umbar Islam, 56, described a brutal assault by boys in long black jackets, black pants and black hats. “They punched and broke his nose. They ripped his jacket. He was covered in blood. They said, ‘Jews rule this country!’” Islam said. “These people are crazy. In his life, he’s never fought. He doesn't know how to fight.” Yitzi Horowitz, 15, David Brach, 15, Yossi Friedman, 17, Shulomi Bitton, 16, and Benjamin Wasserman, 16, all of Borough Park, were charged with assault as a hate crime, gang assault, menacing, harassment and criminal possession of a weapon. Horowitz and Brach were freed on their own recognizance. The other

¹ From *American Muslim Perspective*, Online Magazine, “Radio Spoof Draws Support from Nazi-like treatment of US Muslims”, Washington, D.C., Nov. 27, 2006

three were ordered to pay \$5,000 cash bond and are due back in court today. Bitton's mother, Irit Bitton, said last night that her son was innocent. "My son was just standing over there and he did not touch anybody," she said. "He's a sensitive boy. He wouldn't even kill a fly.¹ I believe my son 100%." She also denied he was biased. "We have clean hearts," she said.

Alongside of all of this hate crimes against Muslims within Europe and the US have increased, there have been a variety of tests into one's 'patriotism', inspection of charities and other forms of draconian legislation which are not at all taken into consideration by those who claim that Muslims are the prime causes for 'intolerance in the West'. In a poll conducted by *YouGov* and mentioned by Philip Johnson in the *Daily Telegraph* of London on 25 August 2006, 53% of those surveyed believed that Islaam posed an intrinsic threat to the West:

The alleged plot to blow up transatlantic airliners and last year's terrorist attacks on London have made more people fear Islam as a religion, not merely its extremist elements, a poll for The Daily Telegraph has found. A growing number of people fear that the country faces "a Muslim problem"² and more than half of the respondents to the YouGov survey said that Islam posed a threat to Western liberal democracy. That compares with less than a third after the September 11 terrorist attacks on America five years ago. The findings were revealed as Ruth Kelly, the Communities Secretary, conceded that the multi-culturalist approach encouraged by the Left for two decades had probably been a mistake and could have contributed to the alienation that many young Muslims said they felt and experienced. Figures published yesterday by the Office for National Statistics also showed that immigration was now the driving force behind population growth. Last year the number of people living in Britain rose by 375,000 on the previous year to more than 60 million. That was the biggest annual rise since 1962 at the height of the post-war baby boom. Most of the rise was the result of record levels of immigration, which also produced the highest birth rate for 30 years. The YouGov survey confirms ministers' fears that the country is becoming polarised between Muslims and the rest of the population, which is suspicious of them, and that a belief in "a clash of civilizations" has taken root. Since a similar poll was conducted after the July 7 bombings in London last year, there has been a significant increase in the number of people worried about some of their Muslim compatriots. The

¹ Well, according to some of the so-called ultra-orthodox Zionists "the goy is worse than an animal"!

² Does this sound ominously familiar????!!

sense of loyalty to this country and are prepared to condone or even carry out acts of terrorism”¹ has nearly doubled from 10 per cent a year ago to 18 per cent now. The number who believe that “practically all British Muslims are peaceful, law-abiding citizens who deplore terrorist acts as much as any- one else” has fallen from 23 per cent in July last year to 16 per cent. However, there remains strong opposition to the security profiling of airline passengers based on their ethnicity or religion. A higher proportion than last year now feels that the police and MI5 should focus their counter-terrorism efforts on Muslims and far fewer people are worried that such an approach risks dividing the country or offending law-abiding Muslims. Most strikingly, there has been a substantial increase over the past five years in the numbers who appear to subscribe to a belief in a clash of civilisations. When YouGov asked in 2001 whether people felt threatened by Islam, as distinct from fundamentalist Islamists, only 32 per cent said they did. That figure has risen to 53 per cent. Five years ago, a majority of two to one thought that Islam posed no threat, or only a negligible one, to democracy. Now, by a similar ratio, people think it is a serious threat. The findings illustrate the huge task facing the Government’s new ”cohesion and integration commission” which was formally launched yesterday, charged with finding out whether the multi-cultural experiment has failed and, if so, why. Miss Kelly said that “difficult questions” had to be posed and answered by the commission, which was promised by the Government more than 12 months ago in its response to the July 7 atrocities on the London transport system that killed 52 passengers and four Muslim suicide bombers. “In our attempt to avoid imposing a single British identity and culture, have we ended up with some communities living in isolation from each other with no common bonds between them?” she asked. Miss Kelly said that diversity had been “a huge asset” but she acknowledged that the wave of immigration, the highest in British history, had brought fresh challenges. These included the importation of “global tensions”² and the growing alienation of white Britons worried by the pace of social and cultural change. After years when many on the Left have either shut down the debate on cultural diversity or sought to avoid it, Miss Kelly said: “We must not be censored by

¹ Allaahu Musta’aan! A “**large proportion of British Muslims...are prepared to condone or even carry out acts of terrorism**” this demonstrates that there is a degree of scare-mongering taking place aswell that has made common people think that the majority of Muslims are involved in this.

² Some of these “global tensions” have actually in some cases, been exacerbated and initiated by certain governments themselves and not merely “imported” by Muslims!!?

political correctness and we cannot tiptoe around the issues.” She said: “Our ideas and policies should not be based on special treatment for minority ethnic faith communities. That would only exacerbate division rather than help build cohesion.” The commission will be chaired by Darra Singh, the head of Ealing council, in west London. He called for “a vigorous and open debate about diversity based on facts, not scaremongering”. He said: “The commission is a real opportunity to get to grips with this challenge.” Nick Clegg, the Liberal Democrat home affairs spokesman, said: “To be truly effective, any attempt to reach out to disaffected members of Muslim communities must incorporate honest debate about Government foreign policy and some counter-terrorism measures.”

In Germany a 2006 survey by the *Allensbach Institute* showed that 56% of those surveyed wanted the government to ban the building of mosques, 91% linked Islaam to the “oppression of women” and 71% believed Islaam was “intolerant”. 40% of the participants believed that “tough limits should be imposed on the practice of Islam in Germany”. In Spain, a 2006 *Instituto Elcano* poll showed that 68% consider Muslim societies as “violent”, and 79% as “non-tolerant”.

Before we look at what Saudi religious leaders and scholars really believe about non-Muslims in the West and how they advise Muslims living in the west to interact with non-Muslims, let’s refer to an interview which took place in the Winter of 2002 CE with the Saudi Minister of Higher Education and the former chair of the *Islamic Board of Higher Education*, Dr Khaalid al-Ankary. In an interview in Rabat, Morocco with Nathan Gardels, editor of *New Perspectives Quarterly*:

“NPQ: The Wahhabi sect of Saudi Arabia has come under increasing attack for spreading intolerant Islam around the world and fostering the likes of Osama bin Laden and most of his suicide hijackers. Recently, Francis Fukuyama has said “the present conflict is not simply a fight against terrorism, nor against Islam as a religion or civilization, but rather with Islamofascism—the radically intolerant and anti-modern doctrine” that has arisen in the Muslim world. **“A strong finger of blame points at Saudi Arabia,” Fukuyama contends.** “Wahhabi ideology easily qualifies as Islamofascism: a textbook mandated for use in Saudi 10th-grade classes explains that **“it is compulsory for Muslims to be loyal to each other and to consider the infidels their enemies.”**”¹ As a leading member of the Saudi government in

¹ It would be odd if any Islamic text book did state this, as it opposes the Qur’aan wherein Allaah does not lump all disbelievers in Islaam (*kuffaar*) into one rubric of being “enemies.” The Qur’aan says,

each passage in order to fully comprehend its context and meaning. The Koran has to be taken as a whole and not by selective reading which serves one's interest and argument.

I will give you one simple example. There is a passage that starts with "do not pray." One can claim the Koran forbids praying. But this passage continues to say "while you are under the influence of alcohol." Again, one can claim the Koran permits drinking alcohol, just not while praying. However, if this passage is read within its context and its historical circumstances, as an Islamic scholar usually does, one would know this passage entered the Koran at a time before alcohol was forbidden, and later understood as a step in a gradual program toward forbidding alcohol totally. Muhammad bin Abdulwahhab's movement (whose followers you call "Wahhabis") is a reformation call that started in the 18th century to go back to the purest, simplest roots of Islam as contained in the Koran and the direct sayings and traditions of the Prophet. And nothing more. Abdulwahhab believed there should be no intermediary between the faithful and their Maker. He opposed all *bida'h*, or unwarranted innovations, in the faith after the early era of Islam. Religion for him was supposed to create simplicity in a Muslim's life, not difficulties. Most of the stigma given to "Wahhabism" is probably due to historical ideological divisions rather than the actual teachings of Muhammad bin Abdulwahhab himself. Like other Saudis, I do not agree with using the term "Wahhabism" because I think this may lead people to believe it is a new version of Islam, which is definitely not the case.

NPQ: Yet, Abdulwahhab thought all innovation was tantamount to polytheism and against the unity of God.¹ Isn't that the source of the charge that infidels-those not believing in the one God of Allah- must be fought?

AL-ANKARY: The teaching of Abdulwahhab's reform movement is to believe in the unity of God, yes. But the Koran is very clear there can be no compulsion in religion. One can judge the so-called "Wahhabism" by the history of Saudi Arabia over the past two centuries and see the country (which is supposed to be embracing Wahhabism) as a peaceful, moderate source of stability in the region. This is the best proof of the invalidity of the argument that so-called "Wahhabism" is subversive to others.

NPQ: So "Wahhabism" doesn't sanction intolerance and violence?

AL-ANKARY: **If someone in Saudi Arabia doesn't agree with the government, following the Wahhabi teachings, they are not called upon to be violent or aggressive,**

¹ So here Nathan Gardels, the interviewer, has erroneously put innovation on the same level as *shirk*!?! And this is *baatil*! As *shirk* nullifies all actions and innovation does not nullify all actions but are rejected and false actions, yet *takfeer* is not made for innovations, unless of course they are those innovations which are major ones which necessitate *takfeer* but not generally.

but to engage in peaceful consultation and advice-shura-to solve disputes and seek consensus-ijma. Any other way is against the Book. One can also judge this by studying Saudi Arabia in the pre- and post-Wahhab era. Before this reform movement there was hatred and animosity. This movement was successful in making people more respectful of others and peaceful toward them. It has managed to transfer loyalty from warring tribes to statehood. Saudi society is now composed of people from different tribes who live together in harmony.

NPQ: Another charge, this time from the *Wall Street Journal* op-ed page by a retired US military officer. He writes: “The obvious source of fundamentalist terrorism, subversion and hatred is Saudi Arabia...the Saudis themselves have engaged in a decades-long campaign to destabilize secular and relatively tolerant regimes throughout the Muslim world...the syncretic, easygoing version of Islam that prevailed in Indonesia is anathema to the Wahhabi vision of religion....” Your response?

AL-ANKARY: I totally disagree with this. On the contrary, Saudi Arabia has taken a moderate position in its relations with the international community, winning the respect of moderate Muslim states and the West. Through institutions from the Gulf Cooperation Council to the World Bank we have assisted Islamic and non-Islamic countries alike in development.

If anything, Saudi Arabia has been subject to criticism from some Arab and Muslim countries for being too moderate and too close to the West, mainly the US.¹ In everything written or said about Saudi Arabia over the past 30 years, I have never seen or heard until now about efforts to destabilize any Muslim country. I end up wondering what the Arab and Islamic world would look like today without the balanced and moderate leadership role played by Saudi Arabia.

NPQ: What about the charge that the Saudis are financing extremists by supporting radical mosques and “madrassas” (religious schools) across the world?

AL-ANKARY: Let me be more specific and comment on institutes and schools that are the responsibility of my ministry. First, these schools have been opened in response to requests from both the people and the governments of the countries in which they are established. Second, they have been providing quality education (not just Koranic studies) for people who otherwise would not be educated. Third, they are in close coordination with the government as well as other schools and institutes in these countries. If they were accused of inspiring

¹ Indeed, some have even made *takfeer* of Saudi Arabia due to their incorrect ideas and notions surrounding relations with non-Muslim countries.

extremism, these countries would close them down since they operate with licenses from education authorities in the host country. **Finally, I have never seen evidence of extremist instigation in schools we sponsor. And if there is any, I would, in my official capacity, be the first to know.**

NPQ: Critics say that since so many suicide hijackers came from Saudi Arabia, there must be something in the school system that lays the groundwork for them becoming terrorists. As a minister in charge of education, how do you respond to that?

AL-ANKARY: This year, 200,000 students have graduated from high school in Saudi Arabia; 175,000 students graduated the year before. If a handful of these students are accused of being terrorists, then does that mean one can over generalize and label the whole education system as fostering extremism? Is there any logical or statistical validity to this argument? If so, the education system in the US also needs an overhaul due to the shootings at Columbine or the events in Waco, Texas. If so, then the United Kingdom system needs to be changed because of the IRA.

NPQ: The post 9-11 reaction against Saudi Arabia could be coming from within the broader values of American society. Saudi Arabia is seen not only as a country that supported the Taliban's oppression of women but oppresses women at home. The women's constituency in the West, and in the US in particular, is far more influential than the Israeli lobby.

AL-ANKARY: First of all, it is unfair and incomprehensible to compare woman's rights in Saudi Arabia with the Taliban. Saudi women have equal rights to men in education, jobs and social welfare. The status of women in Saudi Arabia has been under scrutiny in recent years. Still, there are many facts that people in the West are not aware of. The growth rate of female students is faster than the rate of male students. More than half (55 percent) of higher education students in Saudi Arabia are female. There are a significant number of females in Saudi higher education institutions who were educated in the West through government scholarships. And this is for a country much younger than others where women have far fewer opportunities. **Another point: There are pillars of the Islamic faith that Muslims are bound to abide by because they are direct teaching of the Koran and the Prophet-the oneness of God, praying, charity, fasting, Haj and so on. But there are many other areas subject to varying interpretations by scholars.** It is in these areas where social traditions are confused with religious teachings. For example, there is no statement in the Koran or the Prophet's teaching that forbids women from driving cars. Whatever one may think of that, it is not an Islamic issue. **Finally, I believe the women's rights issue is exaggerated because people in the West try to overextend their value system to other societies which have their own way of defining a fair system of human rights."**

In relation to this issue about women, then we come across a very informative even that was noted in the *New York Times* on Thursday 29 September 2005 entitled '*Saudi Women Have Message for US Envoy*':

The audience - 500 women covered in black at a Saudi university - seemed an ideal place for Karen P. Hughes, a senior Bush administration official charged with spreading the American message in the Muslim world, to make her pitch.

But the response on Tuesday was not what she and her aides expected. When Ms. Hughes expressed the hope here that Saudi women would be able to drive and "fully participate in society" much as they do in her country, many challenged her. "The general image of the Arab woman is that she isn't happy," one audience member said. "Well, we are all pretty happy." The room, full of students, faculty members and some professionals, resounded with applause. The administration's efforts to publicize American ideals in the Muslim world have often run into such resistance. For that reason, Ms. Hughes, who is considered one of the administration's most scripted and careful members, was hired specifically for the task. Many in this region say they resent the American assumption that, given the chance, everyone would live like Americans. The group of women on Tuesday, picked by the university, represented the privileged elite of this Red Sea coastal city, known as one of the more liberal areas in the country. And while they were certainly friendly toward Ms. Hughes, half a dozen who spoke up took issue with what she said. Ms. Hughes, the under secretary of state for public diplomacy, is on her first trip to the Middle East. She seemed clearly taken aback as the women told her that just because they were not allowed to vote or drive that did not mean they were treated unfairly or imprisoned in their own homes. "We are not in any way barred from talking to the other sex," said Dr. Nada Jambi, a public health professor. "It's not an absolute wall."¹ The session at Dar Al-Hekma College provided an unusual departure from the carefully staged events in a tour that began on Sunday in Egypt. As it was ending Ms. Hughes, a longtime communications aide to President Bush, assured the women that she was impressed with what they had said and that she would take their message home. "I would be glad to go back to the United States and talk about the Arab women I've met," she said. Ms. Hughes, on this

¹ One of the stereotypes is that in Muslim countries, such as Saudi Arabia for example, there is no interaction whatsoever between males and females and this is absolutely false if anyone who has ever lived there will know! There obviously has to be communication in things that are a necessity in Islam and as long as such communication does not lead to any licentiousness.

first foray, has churned through meetings in which she has tirelessly introduced herself as “a mom,” explained that Americans are people of faith and called for more cultural and educational exchanges. Her efforts to explain policies in Iraq and the Middle East have been polite and cautious. At the meeting with the Saudi women, television crews were barred and reporters were segregated according to sex. American officials said it was highly unusual for men to be allowed in the hall at all. A meeting with leading editors, all men, featured more familiar complaints about what several said were American biases against the Palestinians, the incarceration of Muslims at Guantanamo Bay and the alleged American stereotype of Saudis as religious fanatics and extremists after Sept. 11. Ms. Hughes responded by reminding listeners that President Bush had supported the establishment of a Palestinian state and asserting that Guantanamo prisoners had been visited by the International Red Cross and retained the right to worship with their own Korans.¹ Americans, she said at one point, were beginning to understand Islam better but had been disappointed that some Muslim leaders had been “reticent” at first in criticizing the Sept. 11 attacks. “Now, several years later, we’re beginning to hear other voices,” she said.² But it was the meeting with the women that was the most unpredictable, as Ms. Hughes found herself on the defensive simply by saying that she hoped women would be able to vote in future elections.³ In June, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice talked of democracy and freedom in the Middle East but declined to address the question of driving. By contrast, Ms. Hughes spoke personally, saying that driving a car was “an important part of my freedom.” A woman in the audience then charged that under President Bush the United States had become “a right wing country” and that criticism by the press was “not allowed.” “I have to say I sometimes wish that were the case, but it’s not,” Ms. Hughes said with a laugh. Several women said later that Americans failed to understand that their traditional society was embraced by men and women alike. “There is more male

¹ That’s as long as if these *masaahif* are not thrown into lavatories by US army soldiers!

² This is erroneous because it will be demonstrated within this treatise that the scholars were warning, refuting, condemning and criticizing terrorism, hijackings and suicide bombings from the 1980s and 1990s! so for it to be said that “we’re just beginning to hear other voices” is a mere demonstration of ignorance.

³ This is a cultural issue, as those who adhere to Islaam strictly do not believe in ‘democratic elections’ as have developed in Europe and they are not from Islaam. Islaam has its own way of selecting its leaders which have been outlined in the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), see:

chauvinism in my profession in Europe and America than in my country,”¹ said Dr. Siddiqa Kamal, an obstetrician and gynecologist who runs her own hospital. “I don’t

¹ Indeed, and the cases of sexual harassment within the workplace in Europe and America is well-known, if only the people knew! For example Clare Dyer, legal correspondent for *The Guardian* noted in an article entitled “£180,00 for Sexual Bullying” dated Saturday June 28 2003:

“A 22-year-old former trainee car sales executive has won nearly £180,000 for sexual harassment after only one week in a new job left her suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. An employment tribunal at Maidstone, Kent, made the near-record award for sexual harassment to Angelica Graham, then 21, who started work at the Beadles Group in Sevenoaks in June last year. **In her first day at work, her line manager, Ralph Marriott, pulled her towards him, said “Come here, lovely”, hugged her, and slipped his hand on to her buttocks, the tribunal found. He asked to see her pubic hair to find out whether her hair was its original colour. He pinched her bottom very hard, and when she screamed in pain, he said: “Never mind, sweetheart, I will rub it better for you.” At various times during the week, he told Ms Graham: “You have a nice bum, I want to bite your bum.” He tugged at the zip in the side of her skirt, pulled her towards his groin, grabbed her buttocks, lifted her off the ground and tried to feel around her crotch, the tribunal found. He made remarks to colleagues such as “She’s a fit one, I wouldn’t mind giving her one.”** Ms Graham’s barrister, Schona Jolly, and solicitor, Krishna Santra, said the harassment was designed to intimidate a young, vulnerable employee in her first week of work. The tribunal accepted medical evidence that Ms Graham, from Maidstone, suffered post traumatic stress disorder as a result. Ms Jolly told the tribunal: “A return to sales work seems almost impossible. She has lost the bubbly confidence with which she was able to perform a successful ambitious sales role.” The compensation award covers injury to feelings, injury to health, costs of care, loss of earnings and aggravated damages because of the seriousness of the sexual harassment. Mr Marriott was ordered to pay £7,000 personally, and the company £171,000. Lawyers say the award is one of the highest for sexual harassment. **As a result of the trauma, Ms Graham left the job after a week. Her lawyers told the tribunal that she still experienced frequent and distressing flashbacks, her relationship with her boyfriend had broken down and she had lost social contact with her friends. Her confidence was dented and doctors estimated it would take two-and-a-half years before she could work again.** The Beadles Group had no written policy on sex discrimination or harassment, or equal opportunities in general, the tribunal said. Nor did it provide training or advice to ordinary employees about sexual harassment, or warn them against it. It failed to take the reasonable steps it could have taken to prevent Mr Marriott from acting as he did. Ms Santra said: “**The case is a sobering reminder that sexual harassment does occur in the workplace, despite the fact that employers are increasingly aware of the legislation and the need for training.**” “**The decision is a reminder to employers to make sure they have the relevant policies in place, that line managers and supervisors are trained to deal with situations like this, and they deal with the matter promptly and sensitively.**”

According to an *ABC news* report on June 10 2005 entitled “*Japan Tries Women-Only Train Cars to Stop Groping*”, it is mentioned:

“**Tokyo Subway Experiment Attempts to Slow Epidemic of Subway Fondling**

want to drive a car,”¹ she said. “I worked hard for my medical degree. Why do I need a driver’s license?” “Women have more than equal rights,” added her daughter, Dr. Fouzia Pasha, also an obstetrician and gynecologist, asserting that men have obligations accompanying their rights, and that women can go to court to hold them accountable. Ms. Hughes appeared to have left a favorable impression. “She’s open to people’s opinions,” said Nour al-Sabbagh, a 21-year-old student in special education. “She’s trying to understand.” Like some of her friends, Ms. Sabbagh said Westerners failed to appreciate the advantages of wearing the traditional black head-to-foot covering known as an abaya. “I love my abaya,” she explained. “It’s convenient...”

June 10, 2005 — Japan’s capital is facing an epidemic of men who can’t keep their hands to themselves, and it’s happening inside one of its most famous symbols — the trains. Whether above the crowded streets or below ground, Tokyo’s trains are renowned for their efficiency and cleanliness. **But according to a survey conducted in Tokyo last year, nearly 64 percent of Japanese women in their 20s and 30s said they’ve been groped on trains, subways or at transit stations in the city.**

Women Often Ashamed to Speak Out

These subway gropers — who lean, rub and pinch during the remarkably crowded rush hours — are known in Japanese as “chikan.” Victims are often ashamed to show their faces. They say the experience is degrading, humiliating and frightening, but most are too embarrassed to react when it’s happening. “They think it’s a kind of shame to say something or to cry, ‘Help, help,’” said Mihoko Ejiri, a professor at Tsuda College of Women.

Women-Only Train Cars

But now, there is some temporary relief for Japanese women — a train car of their own. It’s just an experiment now, and only during rush hour, but for those who have been harassed, it has made a huge difference. One woman passenger told ABC News, “Because it’s just only girls, females, and we don’t touch, you know, so ... [it’s] very safe!” Even most men seem to think the women-only cars are fair. Many men worry about being falsely accused of groping if they accidentally brush up against a woman in a packed train. Gropers can be imprisoned for up to seven years or fined up to \$485. But there’s also some grumbling, especially in overcrowded adjacent cars, where the men are packed like sardines, while the ladies ride in comfort. However, as one newspaper editorial in Tokyo suggested, the victims did not bring about the women-only experiment, but the “chikan.”

¹ Note that this is a woman saying this herself!

WHAT DO SAUDI RELIGIOUS SCHOLARS REALLY BELIEVE ABOUT NON-MUSLIMS? DO THEY PREACH HATRED AGAINST ALL NON-MUSLIMS?

Abdal Hakim Murad (TJ Winter) a lecturer of ‘divinity theology’ at *Cambridge University* stated that **“This is one of the most important items I think on the Saudi radical agenda, to push out the more hospitable types of religious leadership and replace them with firebrands, trained and programmed in the major Saudi universities.”**¹

As a result, we have to look at what senior scholars who have studied and taught within major Saudi universities teach.

First of all it is important for us to look at the efforts of the bona-fide Saudi Islamic scholars in opposing extremist ideologies which have been responsible for the misconceptions about Islaam today. The scholars in Saudi Arabia were the most vocal in their condemnations from the mid-1990s when many people had not even heard of the likes of Bin Laadin!² The former *Muftee* of Saudi Arabia, Imaam ‘Abdul’Azeez ibn ‘Abdullaah ibn Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) stated in the late 1990s in regards to Usaamah Bin Laadin, Muhammad al-Mas’ari and Sa’d al-Faqeeh:

These publications from al-Faqeeh, al-Mas’ari or other callers to evil, baatil (falsehood) and division must be totally destroyed and no lenience should be shown to them. It is incumbent to advise and guide them to the truth and warn them from this baatil. It is not permissible for anyone to co-operate with them in this evil, they must be advised and referred back to (true) guidance. And leave this baatil. And my advice to al-Mas’ari, al-Faqeeh, Ibn Laadin and all who traverse their way is that they leave off this dangerous path, to fear Allaah and be warned of His Wrath and Anger, to return back to (true) guidance, to repent to Allaah from they have done before.³

¹ This was boldly stated by Murad (Winter) on the *Channel 4* (UK) documentary entitled ‘*Undercover Mosques*’ for the programme *Dispatches* on 15 January 2007.

² This is important to highlight as there is no doubt that the increased Western interest, attacks, accusations, investigations, reports etc into Islaam of late has been due to the horrific 9/11 attack which Bin Laadin has been accused of sanctioning and authorising, along with other attacks that have taken place in Europe or against Europeans abroad.

³ ‘Abdul’Azeez bin ‘Abdullaah bin ‘AbdurRahmaan bin Baaz, *Majmoo’ Fataawaa wa Maaqaalaat Mutanawwi’ah* (Buraydah, Saudi: Daar Asdaa’ al-Mujtama’, 1421 AH/2000 CE, Third Edition), vol.9, p.100

Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) also stated this in the Arabic newspaper *al-Muslimoon* and also reported in *ash-Sharq al-Awsat*, on 9 Jumadaa al-Ulaa 1417 AH corresponding to 21 September 1996 CE. It can be heard in audio here where Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) further emphasises that no co-operation should be made with the likes of Usaamah Bin Ladin due to their harms for safety and security, this was way before any foolish 'investigative report' or 'think tank into global tolerance' even cared about the likes of Bin Ladin: <http://www.al-mobile.org/File/1163762664.ram>

Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) also stated:

From that which is known to anyone who has the slightest bit of common sense, is that hijacking airplanes and kidnapping children and the like are extremely great crimes, the world over. Their evil effects are far and wide, as is the great harm and inconvenience caused to the innocent; the total effect of which none can comprehend except Allaah. Likewise, from that which is known is that these crimes are not specific to any particular country over and above another country, nor any specific group over and above another group; rather, it encompasses the whole world. There is no doubt about the effect of these crimes; so it is obligatory upon the governments and those responsible from amongst the scholars and others to afford these issues great concern, and to exert themselves as much as possible in ending this evil.¹

Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) also stated with regards to the terror attack in Riyadh in 1416 AH that:

There is no doubt that this incident is great evil which is based upon causing major corruption, major evil and serious transgression. And there is no doubt that this incident can only be done by one who does not believe in Allaah or in the Last Day, with correct and sound faith, performing such a criminal and filthy act which has brought about great harms and corruption. Only those with filthy souls filled with hatred, envy, evil and corruption, and devoid of (sound and correct) faith, would do the likes of such actions. We ask Allaah for well-being and safety and to help the people in authority in all that will affect those people because their crime is severe and their corruption is huge. There is no power or movement except with Allaah! How can a believer or a Muslim perform such a serious crime which is based upon such huge transgression, corruption and destroying lives and injuring others without due right?

He further stated:

¹ *Kayfa Nu'aaliy Waaqi'unal-Aleem* pp. 113, 114

I exhort all who know anything about these (terrorists) to convey that info to the relevant people. It is upon all who know about their condition and about them should convey that about them, because this is from the avenue of co-operation in order to prevent sin and transgression and in order to secure safety of the people from evil, sin and transgression; and to establish justice from the transgressions of those oppressors... There is no doubt that this is from the greatest of crimes and corruptions on the earth and those who commit such actions are more deserving to be killed and restrained due to the heinous crime that they have committed. We ask Allaah that He makes them fail and that He shackles them and their likes and that He saves us from their evil and the evil of those like them and that He totally destroys their plots, indeed He is Lofty and Majestic, Generous and Kind.¹

Dr Natana DeLong-Bas superbly states in chapter six of her book *Wahhabi Islam: From Revival and Reform to Global Jihad*:

The global jihad espoused by Osama bin Laden and other contemporary extremists is clearly rooted in contemporary issues and interpretations of Islam. It owes little to the Wahhabi tradition, outside of the nineteenth-century incorporation of the teachings of Ibn Taymiyya and the Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah into the Wahhabi worldview as Wahhabism moved beyond the confines of Najd and into the broader Muslim world. The differences between the worldviews of bin Laden and Ibn Abd al-Wahhab are numerous. Bin Laden preaches jihad; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab preached monotheism. Bin Laden preaches a global jihad of cosmic importance that recognizes no compromise; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab's jihad was narrow in geographic focus, of localized importance, and had engagement in a treaty relationship between the fighting parties as a goal. Bin Laden preaches war against Christians and Jews; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab called for treaty relationships with them. Bin Laden's jihad proclaims an ideology of the necessity of war in the face of unbelief; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab preached the benefits of peaceful coexistence, social order, and business relationships. Bin Laden calls for the killing of all infidels and the destruction of their money and property; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab restricted killing and the destruction of property. Bin Laden calls for jihad as a broad universal prescription for Muslims of every time and place; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab confined jihad to specific and limited circumstances and contexts. Bin Laden

¹ 'Abdul'Azeez bin 'Abdullaah bin 'AbdurRahmaan bin Baaz, *Majmoo' Fataawaa wa Maaqaalaat Mutanawwi'ah* (Buraydah, Saudi: Daar Asdaa' al-Mujtama', 1421 AH/2000 CE, Third Edition), vol.9, pp.253-255

issues calls to violence and fighting; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab sought to curtail violence and fighting. Bin Laden provides an ideological worldview based on jihad; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab provided legal justifications for the mechanics of jihad. Bin Laden calls for jihad as an individual duty; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab upheld jihad as a collective duty. Bin Laden requires no justification for jihad outside of the declaration of another as an infidel; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab limited justifications for jihad and restricted the use of the label infidel. Bin Laden's vision of jihad clearly belongs to the category of contemporary fundamentalists; Ibn Abd al-Wahhab's vision of jihad contains elements of both classical and modernist interpretations of Islam. Wahhabi Islam is neither monolithic nor stagnant. Changes in thought, topics addressed, and emphases on different themes have clearly occurred over the past 250 years. The militant Islam of Osama bin Laden does not have its origins in the teachings of Ibn Abd al-Wahhab and is not representative of Wahhabi Islam as it is practiced in contemporary Saudi Arabia, yet for the media it has come to define Wahhabi Islam in the contemporary era. However, "unrepresentative" bin Laden's global jihad of Islam in general and Wahhabi Islam in particular, its prominence in headline news has taken Wahhabi Islam across the spectrum from revival and reform to global jihad.¹

In an interview with Mshari al-Zaydi of *Sharq al-Awsat* newspaper Shaykh 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Ubaykaan (*hafidhabullaab*) of Riyadh shed some light on Islaam's war against terror:

One of the few Islamic scholars who continue to oppose al Qaeda and confront the organization using Fiqh (Islamic jurisprudence, literally: understanding and acquisition knowledge) is Sheikh Abdul Mohsen Bin Nasser Al Obeikan, born and raised in Saudi Arabia? A writer, a lecturer, and a speaker, he is a prominent figure who actively defends Islam against the fundamental and militant ideologies of groups such as al Qaeda who have been gaining popularity in Saudi Arabia in the last few years. Going against many others, Sheikh Al Obeikan rejects Al Qaeda's claims of engaging in Jihad (struggle for Islam) in Iraq, against Coalition troops and civilians. Interestingly, Al Obeikan describes himself as a Salafi, a traditionalist who advocates a return to a Sharia (The body of Islamic law based on the Quran and the sunna, the body of customs and practices based on Prophet Mohammed's words and deeds found in the Quran and the Hadiths) minded orthodox, using the Quran and the Hadiths (the sayings and deeds of the Prophet as recorded by his followers), or even a Wahabi (a puritanical Saudi Islamic sect founded by Muhammad ibn-Abd-al-Wahab in the 18th century) who opposed,

¹ Natana DeLong Bas, *Wahhabi Islam: From Revival and Reform to Global Jihad* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp.278-279

during the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990, Saudi Arabia's reliance on foreign troops to drive Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, for religious and political reasons. He is the first to admit his position, at the time, was a mistake and is quick to blame others who realize they were not for not publicly admitting the erroneous beliefs. In a lengthy conversation with Asharq Al Awsat, Sheikh Al Obeikan candidly discusses the much-needed reforms to the Saudi judiciary, his readiness to confront Bin Laden and traces the rise of radical political Islam in the Gulf Kingdom...

Q: You have been known for your direct criticism, or even attack, of the thoughts of Al Qaeda and similar groups, whereas other religious figures have not been so vocal. Some might even argue that this silence is a direct result of tacitly approving Bin Laden's discourse, or, the consequence of a lack of religious arguments to disprove these beliefs. What is your reaction?

A: I say to those who believe in Al Qaeda and its ideology of Takfir that they are being superficial and simplistic. I have challenged such people on many occasions through the media and by other means. I've even sat and debated with such sympathizers at my home and in the mosque. None was ever able to convince me. I, Sheikh Al Obeikan, am even ready to debate with Bin Laden himself!

Q: Why is the religious establishment not engaged in debates with those belonging to al Qaeda and their followers? Wouldn't Saudi Arabia benefit from a debate on complex religious issues such as Al Walaa wa Al Baraa (loyalty to Islam and disloyalty to its opponents), the role of Islamic law in everyday life, the Kingdom's membership in international organizations such as the UN? Why, when such a debate has already occurred in Egypt, is it absent from Saudi Arabia? Do you believe that a comprehensive debate is needed to replace the diversity of opinions currently publicized after each terrorist incident?

A: Indeed, what you propose is very much needed. I have discussed such a scheme with many sheikhs and scholars and we all agree that a national debate is a must. I have also invited followers of Al Qaeda to engage in a debate with me, but so far, I have received no replies.

Q: If were to be invited to a public debate with Bin Laden, would you accept?

A: Yes! I am ready to engage in a debate with Bin Laden and others such as Abu Mohammed Al Makdissi¹ in public. I have already said so on air, on the "Al Hewan Al Ghaib" television program. During the program, I received a phone call from Hamed

¹ Usually spelt 'al-Maqdisi' or 'al-Maqdisee'

Al Aaly a religious scholar in Kuwait who is now imprisoned for supporting terrorism. We had a debate, which was written about in Kuwaiti newspapers.

Q: Sheikh Faris Al Showeil, one of the members of al Qaeda's religious committee, asked, before his arrest, to discuss with Sheikh Safar Al Hewaly, whether the Saudi Arabia really has a Muslim government. The latter declined. If you were invited to discuss such matters, would you accept?

A: I am ready to debate at any time with anyone who defends Al Qaeda or justifies its actions.

Q: Nowadays, Sheikh Al Obeikan, you are mostly known as a prominent advocate for judicial reform as well a leading Sheikh confronting militant Muslim ideologies and groups. However, if we were to go back a decade, to the aftermath of the liberation of Kuwait, some might argue that you were not the same person. Then, for example, you were known for your activities in the "Jama' Al Jawhara" mosque in Riyadh, which served as a meeting point for those condemning the government's policies. What has changed since then?

A: I do not think I have changed at all. What has happened is that I have changed my style and how I deal with different situations. Whereas, in the past, I expressed my opinion in public, I now believe that public denunciations are a mistake, both on a religious and a rational level. I continue, however, to give advice to and discuss matters with those in power, in private.

Q: What are, if any, the mistakes that have accompanied the Sahwa (religious revival) across Saudi Arabia, in your opinion?

A: This religious revival started before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the second Gulf war that ensued. At the time, it was still a harmless phenomenon that was non-political and confined to individual acts such as listening to tapes of the Quran at home or in the car. The figures we tend to associate with this revival were, I believe, its product.

Q: Has religious sentiment been, therefore, politicized in Saudi Arabia?

A: Yes, that is what's happened! If the increase in religiosity had remained private, our society nowadays would be much more balanced.

Q: If you are saying that the true revival has been hijacked by politics, what do you say to the leaders of this Sahwa?

A: I would like to repeat that I do not believe in those self-styled leaders or symbols of the revival. I believe that the initial Sahwa created them. Let me add, however, that these figures you ask me about are the ones to blame for corrupting society's desire to do the right thing and transforming it into an attack on the Kingdom's rulers, convincing them that those in power should be fought, confronted, and eliminated. They are the ones who have been giving lectures and making speeches in the last few years, many influenced by the Kharijite thought (The Khawarij are a Muslim sect who rejected the authority of the fourth caliph, Ali Bin Abi

Talib. In modern times, Islamic thinkers have sometimes branded terrorist organizations which emphasis Takfir as neo Kharijites).

Q: Could you explain your last statement a bit further?

A: These figures took pieces of the old Khawarij sect, perfectly summed up in the thoughts and behavior of the Muslim Brotherhood, which has been a great influence on the latest militant Islamic groups. Some of these groups derive their thoughts from the Khawarij who advocated the belief of challenging their rulers because they abused their wealth and power and did not rule according to the Quran. These contemporary groups make the same claims under what they consider is “Hakimiyyah” or the rule of Allah.

Q: How can one call for reform in Saudi Arabia but avoid falling into the trap you have described, namely denouncing the rulers and rebelling against those in power?

A: It is necessary for wealth and power to be justly distributed in our society.

One can achieve this by making demands in a peaceful way, as the Prophet Mohammed taught us. Those who govern Saudi Arabia are now, more than ever, paying close attention to the interest of the country and the needs of its citizens. The decision to forge ahead with reform has already been taken at the highest levels and much implemented since the liberation of Kuwait, for example, the establishment of a Shura Council and the announcement of the Basic Laws.

Q: How is one to reconcile your enthusiasm for reform with your image as a traditionalist, Sheikh Al Obeikan?

A: Some might even tell you that I am a Wahabi! To all these people, I have one important thing to say and that is that political and administrative reform is possible without having to resort to the ways of the Muslim Brotherhood. Some might even think that Salafis (traditionalist) are not reform minded. In fact, traditionalists have, in the past, called for reform. Figures of this latest religious revival are, in reality, calling for corruption, strife, destruction, and killing, as the Khawarij did many centuries ago.

Q: Why, in your opinion, did Sheikh Mohammed Bin Othaymin denounce the Islamist figures that wrote the “Memorandum of Advice”, if he is not against the principle of reform?

A: I am also against this memorandum. I adopted the earlier “Letter of Demands” because it was concerned with religious matters of public interest. There is, however, a huge difference between the two. For example, the Memorandum calls for the Kingdom to open its borders to all Muslims. But how can such a situation be contemplated? Each country has its own economy and its own regulations. There are, evidently, considerable differences between the various Muslim countries in

educational, cultural, and social matters. If, in the situation we find ourselves in, the limited number of foreigners has had a great impact on Saudi society, how can we possibly ask to open our doors to everyone? Many Muslims would like to settle in the Kingdom, whether to be close to the holy mosques in Mecca and Medina, or to benefit from the economic riches of the country. If we were to open our doors to every Muslim, Saudi Arabia will be destroyed and its resources plundered. If Muslims want to come and use our resources, why don't we use theirs as well? We shouldn't compare both documents. Many religious scholars and sheikhs approved the first "Letter of Demands" across Saudi Arabia, in addition to Sheikh Bin Baz. Assembly of Senior Ulemas, however, rejected "The Memorandum of Advice". While the latter represents the Salafi tradition and its demands for reform, the Memorandum embodies the politically active religious current.

Q: Does all this criticism indicate that you reject the outcome of the current Islamic revival in Saudi Arabia?

A: Perhaps it is best, in order to answer your question, to look at the results of this revival. Are Saudi Arabians in a better condition as a result of the tapes in circulation inciting political hostility? I believe we were in a better situation before the emergence of such tapes.

Q: How can you condemn the usage of tape cassettes when some sheikh uses them as well?

A: I did not mean to condemn all usage of such tapes. **I do, however, condemn all the tapes that call for political incitement and hostility, such as the one entitled "a message to the security officer" or the tape entitled "You will remember in the future what I am now telling you", which featured speculation on the developments of the war in Kuwait, none of which turned out to be true. I believe this tape, which wanted to challenge the edicts of Sheikh Abdul Aziz bin Baz has been harmful. Its makers should admit their mistakes, like I have done in the past when I stopped voicing my opposition in public.**

Q: Many of the theoretical advocates of Al Qaeda, such as Yousef Al Airy¹ and Faris Al Showail, have been quoting the religious edicts and opinions of prominent sheikhs on

¹ One of his works has been 'explained' by 'Imam' Anwar al-Awlaki, a *takfeeree* propagator who makes *takfeer* of the scholars who do not agree that Muslims should wage armed *jihad* during times of weakness, referring to them as being "hypocrites"! Yoosuf bin Saalih al-'Uyayree, also known as Aboo Qutaybah al-Makkee was a represent of the group which called themselves '*al-Qaa'idah in the Arabian Peninsula*' which was headed by 'Abdul'Azeez al-Muqrin. Both died after shoot-outs with the Saudi police and al-'Uyayree was killed on 31 May 3003 CE. He fought in Afghanistan against the Soviets and then returned to Saudi Arabia in the early nineties and set himself up as a *takfeeree* ideologue. He has authored many books some of which

issues of Takfir and Jihad, implying that they are merely repeating the beliefs of Saudi religious leaders. What is your opinion on such practices?

A: These new militant leaders are the product of a revival that calls for political incitement and discord. They are willing to do anything that will serve their cause.

Q: How then, can Saudi Arabia protect its younger generation from succumbing to such ideology?

A: I would like to see the creation of a Supreme Committee to confront this Takfiri ideology, which will undertake a comprehensive and in depth study on how to combat revivalist ideology. We can no longer shy away from confronting this problem. Can you believe that some sheikhs, instead of delivering lectures on terrorism, speak about the importance of obeying parental obedience as a religious duty?

Q: Are you implying that some sheikhs might be encouraging revivalist ideology that incites violence?

A: Indeed. We need to address them and find out the reasons they are shying away from confrontation. They should fear for the future of their country, its safety, and security, in addition to the future of Islam. I would, at this point, commend the national media for its efforts to rid us of militant ideologies.

Q: There are some who accuse a sizeable segment of schoolteachers of being sympathetic to the ideology of Al Qaeda. Do you agree?

A: Not only does this segment populate our schools, but it also exists in our universities with some who believe in the ideology of Takfir even lecturing on the subject and publicizing it.¹

Shaykh Muhammad bin Haadee al-Madkhalee (*hafidhabullaah*), a professor at the *Islamic University of Madeenah* in Saudi Arabia stated:

Those who set off the explosions in the Kingdom admitted with their own mouths, that they were affected by the Jamaa'atut-Takfeer (one of the Egyptian Qutbist groups) and that they were from the group of Osama Bin Laden and al-Masari, and they were spreading their literature. Osama Bin Laden - who taught this man? Who educated him about the Shariah (Islamic laws)? He is a businessman, this is his field of specialization... they admitted, as we said, with their own mouths, we saw it and read it in the newspapers, and I have it here with me recorded with their own voices,

have been translated into English by the *takfeerees* of the *Tibyan (Tughyaan!)* Publications and are available from the 'Muwahhideen' website and others of their affiliates.

¹ Mshari al-Zaydi, "Interview with Sheikh Abdul- Mohsen Bin Nasser Al- Obeikan" in *Sharq al-Awsat*, 24 May 2005 CE see: <http://www.asharq-e.com/news.asp?section=3&id=85>

that they were affected by some of the people of takfeer (from the Qutbist groups) of Afghanistan. The majority of our youth that returned from the jihad in Afghanistan to our country were affected, either by the ideology of the Ikhwaan (the group al-Ikhwaan al-Muslimoon) in general, or by the revolutionary, takfeeree ideology. So they left us believing that we were Muslims, and they returned to us believing that we were disbelievers. So with that, they saw us as being disbelievers, the rulers, and the scholars, not to mention the common folk. They labelled the (Saudi) state apostate, and they rendered the major scholars apostate. They admitted this with their own mouths. They declared the scholars to be disbelievers, and mentioned specifically the two Shaykhs, Shaykh Abdul-Aziz Bin Baaz and Shaykh Muhammad Bin al-'Uthaymin, may Allaah preserve them. They mentioned their connection with al-Masari and Osama Bin Laden. Did they get this from the scholars of Salafiyah? No! Rather they got it from the people of takfeer.¹

After the London bombings, Mushtak Parker and P.K. Abdul Ghafour report in an article in the *Arab News* dated: Saturday 9 July 2005 that:

Grand Mufti and Others Denounce London Bombings

The Kingdom's grand mufti yesterday strongly denounced the deadly blasts that rocked London, saying Islam strictly prohibits the killing of innocent people. He also censured the terrorists for tarnishing the image of Islam by attaching their heinous crimes to the religion. The explosions that ripped through central London's transport system on Thursday, "targeting peaceful people, are not condoned by Islam, and are indeed prohibited by our religion," Sheikh Abdul Aziz Al-Asheikh said in a statement carried by the Saudi Press Agency. "Attributing to Islam acts of individual or collective killings, bombings, destruction of properties and the terrorizing of peaceful people is unfair, because they are alien to the divine religion," said the mufti, who also heads the Council of Senior Islamic Scholars, Saudi Arabia's highest religious authority. "Islam is a religion of reforms and righteousness. It envisages the progress of humanity and takes it from darkness to light. It also calls for respecting agreements and prohibits their violation," the mufti said referring to accords binding governments. "Causing corruption on earth is one of the biggest crimes in Islam," he explained. Sheikh Abdul Mohsen Al-Obaikan, a senior Saudi scholar and a Shoura member, said there was no justification, whatsoever, for the killing of innocent people. Speaking to

¹ From Abu Hasan Maalik, *In Defence of Islaam* (Toronto: Troid Publications, 2002 CE), p. 97

MBC television, he urged all members of the Muslim community in Britain to cooperate with British authorities in tracking down the criminals behind the attacks.

Imaam Muhammad Ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen (*rabeemabullaah*) of 'Unayza, Saudi Arabia, also affirms the Islamic belief of tolerance of non-Muslims. Prior to his passing away, he gave some advice to a *Salafi* community in the city of Birmingham (UK), via tele-link from Saudi Arabia. Speaking about several different topics, he had the following advice for the *Salafi* youth of Great Britain regarding interaction between Muslims and non-Muslims:

Likewise, I invite you to have respect for those people who have the right that they should be respected, from those between you and whom there is an agreement. For the land in which you are living is such that there is an agreement between you and them. If this were not the case, they would have killed you or expelled you. So preserve this agreement, and do not prove treacherous to it, since treachery is a sign of the hypocrites, and it is not from the way of the Believers. And know that it is authentically reported from the Prophet that he said, "Whoever kills one who is under an agreement of protection will not smell the fragrance of Paradise." Do not be deceived by the sayings of the foolish people who say, "Those people are not Muslims, so their wealth is lawful for us." For I swear by Allaah - this is a lie; a lie about Allaah's Religion, and a lie that Islamic societies (hold this to be true). So we may not say that it is lawful to be treacherous towards people whom we have an agreement with. O my brothers. O youth. O Muslims. Be truthful in your buying and selling, and renting, and leasing, and in all mutual transactions. Because truthfulness is from the characteristics of the Believers, and Allaah, the Most High, has commanded truthfulness,

ä ä

**"O you who believe - keep your duty to Allaah,
and be with the truthful."**

{*at-Tawba (9): 119*}

And the Prophet encouraged truthfulness and said, "Adhere to truthfulness, because truthfulness leads to goodness, and goodness leads to Paradise; and a person will continue to be truthful, and strive to be truthful, until he will be written down with Allaah as a truthful person." And he warned against falsehood, and said, "Beware of falsehood, because falsehood leads to wickedness, and wickedness leads to

¹ Al-Bukhaaree, *hadeeth* no.3166

the Fire. And a person will continue lying and striving to lie until he is written down with Allaah as a great liar."¹ **O my brother Muslims. O youth. Be true in your sayings with your brothers, and with those non-Muslims whom you live along with - so that by your actions, you will be inviters to the religion of Islam - in reality. And indeed, how many people first entered into Islam because of the behaviour and manners of the Muslims, and their truthfulness, and their being true in their dealings.**²

Shaykh Saalih Aal ush-Shaykh (*hafidhabullaah*), the head of the Saudi *Ministry of Islamic Affairs*, noted in his lecture on the subject of *Rights in the Sharee'ah (Human Rights)* that:

The non-Muslims of the earth can be divided into four categories, they can either be a dhimmi; a mu'aahid; a musta'min or a harbee. And the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) instructed given each one their due rights. Rather, Allaah instructed given non-Muslims rights in His Book, if they are not at war (with Muslims) and do not manifest enmity (against the Muslims). Allaah says,

أَأْمُرُ بِالْعَدْلِ وَالْإِيمَانِ وَالنَّهْيِ عَنِ الْفَحْشَاءِ وَالْمُنْكَرِ وَالْعَدْوِ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِ أَمْ يَكُنُ عَدُوًّا لِلْغَافِلِينَ

أَمْ يَكُنُ عَدُوًّا لِلْغَافِلِينَ

أَمْ يَكُنُ عَدُوًّا لِلْغَافِلِينَ

أَمْ يَكُنُ عَدُوًّا لِلْغَافِلِينَ

"Allaah does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes – from being righteous toward them³ and acting justly toward them.⁴ Indeed, Allaah loves those who act justly.⁵ Allaah only forbids you

¹ al-Albaanee, *Saheeh al-Jaami' as-Sagheer* (no. 4071)

² Shaykh al-'Uthaymeen on *'Interacting With non-Muslims in Western Countries'*, Tele-link (28th July 2000, Birmingham UK); Article ID: LSC010001 (www.spubs.com).

³ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) says about this: to be gentle with them.

⁴ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) says about this: to be fair with them.

⁵ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) transmits in regards to this in the ayah: Imaam Ahmad recorded that Asmaa' bint Abu Bakr said, "My mother, who was an idolatress at the time, came to me during the Treaty of

from those who fight you because of religion and expel you from your homes and aid in your expulsion – (forbids) that you make allies of them.¹ And whoever makes allies of them, then it is those who are the wrongdoers.”

{*al-Mumtabinah* (60): 8-9}

Therefore, the right of the dhimmi is well-established in the Divine Legislation. Not rights from people, but rights that Allaah has set for the dhimmi. The Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) stated “Whoever harms a dhimmi has harmed me”² or as is stated in the hadeeth. It is also authenticated from him (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) that he said “Whoever kills a mu’aahad will not smell the fragrance of

Peace, the Prophet conducted with the Quraysh. I came to the Prophet and said, “O Allaah’s Messenger! My mother came visiting, desiring something from me, should I treat her with good relations” The Prophet said,

« ä »

“Yes. Keep good relation with your mother.” The Two Saheehs recorded this *hadeeth*. Imaam Ahmad recorded that `Abdullah bin Zubayr said, “Qutaylah came visiting her daughter, Asmaa’ bint Abee Bakr, with some gifts, such as Dibab, cheese and clarified (cooking) butter, and she was an idolatress at that time. Asmaa’ refused to accept her mother’s gifts and did not let her enter her house. `Aa’ishah asked the Prophet about his verdict and Allaah sent down the ayah,

ä ä â ä ä Ô

“Allaah does not forbid you with those who fought not against you on account of religion”

...until the end of the ayah. Allaah’s Messenger ordered Asmaa’ to accept her mother’s gifts and to let her enter her house.” Allaah’s statement,

ää ä ä

“Indeed Allaah loves those who act justly.”

¹ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) states about this part of the verse:

“Allah forbids you from being kind and befriending with the disbelievers who are openly hostile to you, those who fought against you, expelled you and helped to expel you. Allah the Exalted forbids you from being their friends and orders you to be their enemy.”

² Saheeh Muslim

Paradise, the smell of which can be smelt for the distance of forty years.”¹ Why? Because the Muslims honour their lives as they came with an agreement, they came with a trust and is not to be transgressed against with regards to his life, blood, honour, money, rights are obligatory to them in the Divine Legislation. The texts regarding the rights of the enemies, the rights of the people of dhimma, the rights of the people of agreement (mu’aahadeen), the rights of the people with whom there is a trust, are various and the statements of the people of knowledge regarding the field is abundant. As for the harbee’oon, they are the ones whom between us and them is war and there are many regulations in regards to them and if we gain empowerment over them, they are respected if they are Christians and none of their children, women or elderly are killed. Whereas within other legislations everyone is to be killed! As is mentioned that within the Divine Legislation of Moosaa (alayhi salaam) that all are to be killed during war. As for the Divine Legislation of Islaam, Allaah allowed for only the fighter to be killed during battle, due to the benefits in the Divine Legislation for this. The dhimmi in an bode of Islaam has rights and within his home can do as he wills yet is not allowed to advertise what he does or anything from the prohibited actions. He can also not manifest his deen, this is for the mu’aahad and for the musta’miin, as for the dhimmi there is some explanation required for this speech in relation to those countries which were conquered yet there were already churches there like in Shaam, Egypt and ‘Iraq.

Indeed, this is from Islaam and the above quotes from these Saudi scholars can see that they implement to the letter Islaam how it should be practiced. This is in following the Islamic tradition of good treatment to non-Muslims. The Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) strictly warned against any maltreatment of people of other faiths, he said: *“Beware! Whoever is cruel and hard on a non-Muslim minority, curtails their rights, burdens them with more than they can bear, or takes anything from them against their free will; I (Prophet Mubammad) will complain against the person on the Day of Judgment.”*²

The scholarly work, *A History of the Jewish People*, edited by Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson an honest Israeli historian, notes:

The height of magnificence and luxury was reached by the wealthy Jews in the lands of Islam, particularly in Moslem Spain. We know that the court bankers of Baghdad in

¹ Saheeh Bukhaaree in *Kitaab ul-Jizyah* under the chapter *‘The sin of the one who kills a mu’aahad who has not committed any crime.’*

² Aboo Daawood

the tenth century kept open house for numerous guests and for the poor. Similarly, the ceremonies of the Jewish leaders in Babylonia [Iraq] and the patronage of the leading Jews in Moslem Spain, indicate conditions of ease and plenty. The attitude toward these non-Moslems in the Islamic territories was shaped in principle in accordance with the concept of dhimma, meaning protection granted to them by agreement or treaty... In return, their lives and property were protected and, in accordance with the general attitude of Islam to infidels, they were assured liberty of faith and worship. They were also permitted to organize themselves as they wished, and the Jews fully availed themselves of that permission....From the Jewish viewpoint, this conglomerate of Moslem attitudes to infidels was easier to live with than the one that had been established by Christianity, particularly in the Byzantine Empire. As we have noted above, for hundreds of years the overwhelming majority of Jews lived in the Islamic territories. Although it is possible to perceive some Christian impact on the Moslem attitude towards non-believers and even towards the Christians themselves, the moderation with which the Moslems applied this influence proved to be of great importance to the majority of Jewry over a long period. Unlike the masses of Christians and pagans who joined the Moslems over the first half century or so, the overwhelming majority of the Jews under Moslem rule held firmly to their own faith.¹

Among the favorable climates into which the Sephardim Jews immigrated was the city of Fez.

“About 20,000 souls were absorbed in Fez, where the exiles rapidly began to succeed in their affairs and purchased property.”

The ruler of Fez was remembered with particular warmth. He was

...one of the Godfearing ones among the nations of the world, who admitted the Jews expelled from Spain and treated Israel well until his death in 1505. For God established him over the Kingdom of Fez to enable us to live.²

Israel Shahak further mentions that Jewish communities flourished in Muslim Spain wherein the real Jewish ‘Golden Age’ of Hebrew poetry, grammar and philosophy all began.³ Shahak also notes that Muslim rulers such as Salaahuddeen al-Ayyoobee who ruled over Egypt treated the Jewish communities well, and he also maintains that the Jews were in their best

¹ Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson (ed.), *A History of the Jewish People* (Harvard University Press, 1976), p.

² Ibid. p.631 quoting R. Abraham Terutiel, continuation of *Sefer Hakabbalah* in A. Neubauer, Oxford, 1887

³ Israel Shahak, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion – The Weight of Three Thousand Years* (London: Pluto Press, 1994), p.57.

social position under the Ottoman regime, whilst the rest of Eastern and Western Europe was expelling the Jews in the name of the Pogroms.

Jews were banished from France by Philip (Augustus) the second in 1182 CE; after having entered England with William the Conqueror in 1066 CE¹, Jews were expelled from England in 1290 CE²; expelled from France again in 1306; in 1349 CE many Christians

¹ William of Malmesbury, stated that William the Conqueror brought the Jews from Rouen to England as his policy was to get the feudal dues paid to the royal treasury in coin rather than in kind, and for this reason it was necessary to have a body of men scattered throughout the country that would supply quantities of coin. King Henry the first granted a charter to Rabbi Joseph, the chief Rabbi of London at the time, which allowed him and his followers to move about the country without paying tolls, to buy and sell, to be tried, to swear by the Torah etc. special weight was given to the Jew's oath which was valid against that of twelve Christians. After Henry the second, Jews were found in London, Oxford, Cambridge, Norwich, Thetford, Bungay, Canterbury, Winchester, Newport, Stafford, Windsor and Reading, yet they could only bury their dead in London which was not removed until 1177 CE. King Henry the second tried to impose a special tax in order to fund the crusade against Salaaahuddeen al-Ayyoobee in 1188 CE and the personal property of the Jews was regarded as one-fourth that of the whole country and the king imposed this on the English Jewry due to the windfall which came to his treasury. Towards the end of King Henry's reign, the Jews had incurred the hatred of the upper-classes in England and thus Henry began to spread anti-Jewish sentiment throughout England.

² The edict of expulsion was given by Edward the first of England, which exiled them from England for 350 years. He issued writs to sheriffs of all English counties ordering them to enforce a decree to the effect that all Jews should leave England before All Saints Day. Oliver Cromwell in 1656 CE allowed the Jews to enter England and practice their religion under what came to be known as the '*Cromwellian Protectorate*'. The commercial policy which led to the *Navigation Act in October 1651*, made Cromwell try to attract the rich Jews of Amsterdam to London so that they might transfer their important trade interests with the Spanish main to England. There were negotiations between the English and Menasseh Ben Israel of the Amsterdam community, which eventually led to Menasseh Ben Israel being allowed to enter England after the 1652-54 war between England and Holland. After the war, Menasseh Ben Israel sent his brother-in-law David Abravanel Dormido to London in order to present a petition for the readmission of the Jews. The petition was initially rejected and then Cromwell persuaded Menasseh Ben Israel to travel to London in person and present the case, which he did in 1655 CE. As a result, a national conference was summoned at Whitehall which included England's most prominent lawyers, merchants and other notables and the lawyers reached the conclusion that there was no opposition to the Jews residing in England, however the merchants and religious authorities of the day were opposed to it, thus Cromwell ended the national conference in order to prevent a decision which went against his own interests. Even after Cromwell's concessions to the Jews, in 1664 CE an attempt was made by the Earl of Berkshire to bring about the expulsion of the Jews and in 1684 CE it was claimed that the Jews were 'alien infidels' who were perpetual enemies to 'the British crown.' In 1723 CE a special act of Parliament was passed which allowed the Jews to hold land in England on the condition that they swear an oath. In 1740 they were allowed to become naturalised British citizens if they had lived in the British colonies. The history of the Jews in England therefore, is one of a people without any

regarded the Jews for being responsible for the ‘black death’ and thus many Jewish people migrated to Poland; in 1349 CE Jews were expelled from Saxony; expelled from Hungary in 1360 CE; expelled from Belgium in 1370 CE; expelled from Prague in 1380 CE; expelled from Austria in 1420 CE; expelled from the Netherlands in 1444 CE; expelled from Spain along with the Muslims in 1492; expelled from Portugal in 1498 CE; expelled from Prussia in 1510 CE; expelled from Naples and Sardinia in 1540 CE; expelled from Bavaria in 1551; made fearful of entering Denmark until the 1600s CE; expelled from Sweden and banned from there until 1782 CE; prohibited from seeking residence in Norway until 1815 CE.¹ During all of this, many Jews thus went to Muslim lands where they were tolerated and allowed freedom. Furthermore, the Catholic popes during the 1930s and 1940s supported Mussolini’s fascists and the Nazis.²

status, security or safety so it is strange how some authors, such as Bat Ye’or, Oriana Fallaci, Melanie Philips, Robert Spencer et al. mention nothing of this in their writing of anti-Semitism and blame every manifestation of hatred against the Jews that has taken place in history on the Muslims!?

¹Colin McEvedy (ed.), *The Century – World History Factfinder* (1984).

² It should also be noted that many Zionists in history actually supported Nazi and anti-Semitic ideals and the Austro-Hungarian Zionist Theodore Herzl is a prime example of this. Herzl was proud to receive the support of the notorious Count Von Plehve, the architect of the Jewish massacres for Tsar Nicholas the Second in Russia at the end of the nineteenth century. Herzl went to Russia to meet Von Plehve in August 1903, less than four months after the hideous *Kishinev* pogrom which Plehve had devised. Herzl thus composed an alliance based on their common wish to get the Jews out of Russia. Herzl admitted in his diaries: **“The anti-Semites are not the arch-enemies of the Jews, but rather will become our most dependable friends and the anti-Semitic countries, our allies.”** In his historic work, *The Jewish State* (1896), Herzl proclaims the Zionist conquest of Palestine as an extension of Europe’s imperial policy abroad: **“In Palestine, we should form a portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia; an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism...we have to maintain contact with all of Europe which will guarantee our existence.”** Other examples are:

1. The Zionist Ze’ev (Vladimir) Jabotinsky made a pact with Symon Petlyura, the reactionary Ukrainian leader whose forces massacred some 100,000 Jews from 1918 – 1921 CE
2. Ben Gurion’s allies amongst the French were extreme right wing anti-Semites who explained that they were only against the Jews in France, not in Israel, this was during the Algerian war for independence.
3. Perhaps the most shocking of these examples is with the Zionists in Germany who congratulated Hitler’s rise to power as they shared his belief in racial separation and his hostility to the assimilation of Jews into the society. Joachim Prinz, a Zionist Rabbi who had subsequently migrated to the US, wherein he rose to become the vice-chairman of the *World Jewish Congress*

With regards to the oppressive treatment that many workers receive in Saudi Arabia, the *mufti* of the country Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Aal ush-Shaykh noted in an article in the Saudi-based English language newspaper *Arab News* (dated: Tuesday 3 September 2002 CE/26 Jumada al-Thaane 1423 AH) entitled '*Grand mufti warns employers against flouting job contracts*' it is noted:

RIYADH, 3 September — The Kingdom's grand mufti has warned Saudi employers in remarks published yesterday against violating employment contracts with foreign workers. "Blackmailing and threatening (foreign) laborers with deportation if they refuse the employers' terms which breach the contract is not allowed" in Islam, Sheikh Abdul Aziz Al-Sheikh said in a religious ruling published in Al-Madinah daily.¹ He also warned employers against refusing to pay the agreed salaries in full or delaying payment under the threat of deportation, saying "this is illegal and a form of dishonesty" in Islam. Sheikh Abdul Aziz urged businessmen in the Kingdom to refrain from "exploiting and oppressing the weak workers" by violating contracts. "Islam does not permit oppressing workers regardless of religion. As we ask them to perform their duty, we must fulfill our duty and comply with the terms of the contract," the mufti said.² His remarks followed complaints by many foreign workers that their employers force them to pay expensive fees for residence permit renewal and the work license as well as their health insurance premium in violation of their contracts. There are about seven million foreigners working in Saudi Arabia, which has a total population of 22 million. The Kingdom, like other Gulf Arab countries, applies a

and a leading member in the *World Zionist Organisation*, published a book *Wir Juden (We Jews)* in 1934 CE (Berlin). The book praised and celebrated Hitler's policies and is replete of crude flatteries of Nazi ideology.

4. Moses Hess, a close acquaintance of Karl Marx, and widely known as one of the first socialists in Germany, subsequently revealed himself as an extreme Jewish racist whose views about the Jewish race were not unlike equivalent absurdities about the 'pure Aryan race.' But the German socialists, who struggled against German racism, remained silent about their Jewish racism. (Shahak, *op.cit*, p.30)

¹ One of the popular Saudi Arabic broadsheets

² So if the religious authorities in Saudi Arabia believed that Muslims and non-Muslims should not be tolerated or treated well then would the likes of such an edict been issued??! The answer is clear to those who are just.

sponsorship law which gives national employers the upper hand in dealing with expatriate workers. Expatriates contacted by Arab News in Riyadh and Jeddah welcomed the remarks made by the grand mufti and expressed hope that employers will heed his instructions. R. Anderson, a Western expatriate in Riyadh, said that it is not permissible for employers to recruit a foreign worker and then leave him to his way on condition that he pays the former a fixed amount every month. This practice is widespread in all cities and villages here.” This trend, he said, has led to several problems like forcing the worker to adopt illegal methods to earn more money by hook or crook to meet his and his sponsor’s obligations. Ataullah Khan, an Indian teacher, said there have been many cases where employers have failed to comply with provisions of the contract. Some companies alter the contract once the worker arrives in the Kingdom. The worker is often forced to sign the new contract under pressure. He called for eradicating the evil of contract substitutions. He applauded the grand mufti’s statement saying that there is an urgent need to impose tighter restrictions on employers who violate job contracts. Rehan Akhtar, an expatriate living in Jeddah, suggested that the grand mufti’s instructions must be followed by employers in letter and spirit. “Non-payment and delayed payment of salaries reflect badly on the employer and the country at large. Threat of repatriation is a Damocles’ sword hanging over the head of every worker, day in and day out. This fear psychosis must change in order to foster better working relations between the employer and employee. After all, a happy worker is a productive and loyal worker.” Abdul Rahim said he fully endorsed the grand mufti’s remarks. “It is high time wayward employers were made to follow the Shariah. People from the Subcontinent have already paid large sums of money back home to get jobs in the Kingdom. And they had pinned hopes on the meager wages to recover the amount they have already spent and also sustain their families. It is only fair that they are paid decent wages and on time.” “It is the lowly paid workers’ contracts that need to be honored more than those of the highly paid. Unless they are looked after well by the employers they are known to resort to crimes in an effort to make ends meet. I am happy the grand mufti spoke against exploiting the less fortunate among us,” said Jaleel-ur-Rahman, another expatriate living in Jeddah. “The fact that the grand mufti had to speak out on the issue goes to prove the gravity of the situation... It was assuming alarming proportions... I hope the grand

mufti's wise counsel will help curb this widespread and dangerous trend among the employers," he added."¹

Dr Natana DeLong-Bas states in her book *Wahhabi Islam – From Revival and Reform to Global Jihad*: **“The militant Islam of Osama bin Laden does not have its origins in the teachings of Ibn Abd al-Wahhab and is not representative of Wahhabi Islam...”**²

David Commins, a historian at *Dickinson College* who is writing a history of the so-called “Wahhabi movement” (and who contributed a blurb to DeLong-Bas’s book), shares DeLong-Bas’s belief that it’s simplistic to pin the current *takfeeree-jibaadee* movements on Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab (*rabeemabullaah*). According to Commins, Al Qaeda’s rhetorical goal of re-establishing a single, pan-national caliphate and their discourse against “Crusaders and Jews” are borrowed from the Muslim Brotherhood, the 20th-century Egyptian Islamist group that emerged in response to the rise of European colonialism.³ This is as opposed to the rhetoric of the likes of Khaled Abou El-Fadl⁴ who ridiculously claim,

¹ <http://www.arabnews.com/?page=1§ion=0&article=18300&d=3&m=9&y=2002>

² Natana DeLong Bas, *Wahhabi Islam: From Revival and Reform to Global Jihad* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004)

³ John Kearney, “*The Real Wahhab*” in *The Boston Globe*, 8 August 2004 CE

⁴ An Egyptian, now American, university lecturer of law at *UCLA* who is one of the most vociferous in his attacks against what he simplistically calls “Wahhabis” and impugning Saudi Arabia with all things evil without right. He holds degrees from the universities of Yale, Princeton and the Pennsylvania School of Law, yet his classical Islamic study is somewhat absent within his CV. Indeed, Abou El Fadl, in his departure from classical Islamic thought and methodology, has even thrown doubt upon the trustworthiness of the companion of the prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), Aboo Hurayrah (*radi Allaah ‘anhu*)! He was also appointed by President George W. Bush as a commissioner on the *US Commission on International Religious Freedom*. This was a ‘*think-tank*’ which recommended to the US government to fund a study to determine **“whether and how the Saudi government is propagating a religious ideology that explicitly promotes hate and violence toward members of other religious groups.”** It was Abou Fadl himself who suggested to the commission that the findings be “reported to Congress”!? So he deems Saudi Arabia, a Muslim country, as being untrustworthy yet the US congress as being trustworthy!? A rather odd *modus operandi* to say the least. On the website of his blind followers, entitled ‘scholar of the house, which should probably be titled ‘scholar of the white-house’ (!), they refer to him as being **“the most important and influential Islamic thinker of the modern age”** (!) and other pompous and self-righteous claims to ‘ilm. Yet the reality is that Abou El Fadl is largely out of touch with the Muslim youth in the West and seems to have some sort of grudge against Saudi Arabia which is clear within his statements about it, which impedes any balance or justice. He has also made statements arguing that madrassas **“provided ideological training for those who went to fight in Kashmir, Chechnya, and Afghanistan - and many still do.”** This is another example of the simplistic statements

without a shred of evidence, that Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab (*rabeemabullaab*) and the recognised Islamic scholars of Saudi Arabia by extension, taught murder! Therefore, it is rather mischievous for the *Sufi* stooges to the neo-cons to incite suspicion of Saudi Arabia, its Islamic scholars and the *da'wab salafyyab*, when one would be sure to find a whole array of odd and totally bizarre statements could be found within their centres and places of worship, much of which would also not be supported by any corroborated Islamic evidence!¹

of Abou Fadl, this he stated in the *Wall Street Journal* on November 10 2003. His books such as *The Great Theft: Wrestling Islam from the Extremists* (HarperSanFrancisco, 2005); *The Place of Tolerance in Islam* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2002); *And God Knows the Soldiers: The Authoritative and Authoritarian in Islamic Discourses* (UPA/Rowman and Littlefield, 2001); *Speaking in God's Name: Islamic law, Authority and Women* (Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2001). Abou Fadl states in his book *Place of Tolerance in Islam* (p.17):

“Although the Qur’an clearly claims that Islam is the divine truth, and demands belief in Muhammad as the final messenger in a long line of Abrahamic prophets, it does not completely exclude the possibility that there might be other paths to salvation. The Qur’an insists on God’s unfettered discretion to accept in His mercy whomever He wishes. In a rather remarkable set of passages that, again, have not been adequately theorized by Muslim theologians, the Qur’an recognizes the legitimate multiplicity of religious convictions and laws.” (!)

¹ Like the *Naqshabandee Sufi* Hishaam al-Kabbaanee, who is a reference point for the neo-cons and US Zionist Islamophobes. He is ‘Shaykh’ Hishaam Kabbaanee (or Kabbani) al-Lubnaanee, the main disciple and second in command of the *Naqshabandandee Soofee* cult organization led by Nazim al-Qubrusee “al-Haqaanee”. In fact other *Naqshabandandees* and *Sufis* have refuted Nazim and even made *takfeer* of him, such as the anti-Salafee Sameer al Kadi et al. Al-Kadi wrote a book entitled *The Irrefutable Proof that Nazim al-Qubrusee Denies Islaam.* Wherein he makes *takfeer* of Nazim and castigated Nazim et al as a new cult! Claiming that he is a *zindeeq* and “not a true representative of Naqshabandiyya”. But whatever the case, it is obvious that innovated ‘spiritual techniques’ and invented ‘exercises’ are no doubt going to led to strange understandings and individuals. Such a man could not emerge claiming passionately to be *Salafee*! Let’s look at some of Kabbaanee’s practices that have been recorded in order for us to assess the adherence to the sunnah of this individual, get ready:
<http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=618545744089582463&q=Kabbani+sufi+dhikr>

Al-Kabbaanee has recently been heavily criticized by the Muslim communities in America for his ‘wining and dining’ with various leading politicians of the United states government, and for claiming that the Muslim communities are intrinsically extreme. Kabbani reasons this, as being a *Naqshandee Soofee*, only his *Soofee* interpretations of Islaam are the peaceful way, whilst all the rest are extreme. Kabbaanee thus indirectly called for the United States of America to closely observe and monitor Muslim communities, to the US

benefit, and to Kabbani's benefit. So instead of talking to Muslims first and advising them, considering he stated that 80% of mosques in America are run by extremists, he rather went to the United States State Department, for advice!? Kabbani has caused difficulties due to his irresponsible remarks in a speech made at the State Department forum on January 7th 1999, which was made public by the United States Department of State after requests from Muslims in America. Amongst Kabbani's major statements of ignorance were that:- **80% of the mosques in the United States are run and controlled by extremists (!); the United States government should help Kabbani to stop this threat to US national security (!?); the national Muslim Student Association (MSA) is spreading extremism; the whole university system could be affected by this, and will bring the 'biggest danger'; Nuclear and Atomic warheads, and other weaponry are being given to Muslim students (!); Muslim extremists are planting opium and selling cocaine (!!); and even pimping Muslim women as prostitutes in order to spread "Wahhabism" and extremism!!!!** For a transcript of this speech see Kabbani's www.islamicsupremecouncil.org also see:www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Senate/8841/statedept.txt also see article by Richard H. Curtiss, www.washington-report.org/backissues/0499/9904071.html Amongst the Muslim signatories from organisations that have now protested against the foolish statements of al-Kabbaanee include the:-

1. *American Muslim Political Coordination Council (AMPCC)*
2. *American Muslim Alliance (AMA)*
3. *American Muslim Council (AMC)*
4. *Council on American Islamic Relations(CAIR)*
5. *Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC)*
6. *Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA)*
7. *Islamic Society of North America(ISNA)*
8. *Muslim Student Association (MSA)*
9. The Community of Warith Deen Muhammad
10. The staunch Maalikee and 'Ash'aree Sufi da'ee Hamza Yoosuf and his associated communities. Hamza Yoosuf has now protested against the foolery of Kabbaanee, after previously sitting with Kabbani and another *Soofee* shaykh of Mauritania and discussing Soofism in 1997!? The full details complete with photographs of this initial liaison of Hamza Yoosuf and al-Kabbani are available with all relevant documentation of their meeting: <http://www.naqshbandi.org/events/shKhatry/khatry.htm> It should come as no surprise that Hamza Yoosuf has no understanding of the Sunnah, especially when he makes statements such as "...I can go to Mauritania and learn Tawheed and 'aqeedah in five minutes...", then people wonder why we call to the *Salafi manhaj*!? In actual fact, most of the organisations that criticised Kabbaanee after his statements in 1998, were at one stage affiliated to him! This is what happens when Muslims 'collectively work' hand in hand with heretical ideas and innovators, condoning them without knowledge. But now, those Islamic groups and parties have realized the error of their alliance with al-Kabbani and his Soofic adherents.

Let's refer to another qualified Western scholar in the field, as opposed to the simplistic 'investigative' (!) journalism of the neo-cons and their Sufi poodles. On October 18, 2001, CNN interviewed Dr Ingrid Mattson, a professor of Islamic Studies and Christian-Muslim relations from *Hartford Seminary*. Exhibiting the unawareness that people are suffering regarding "Wahhabism" the questioner asked,

Then people want to accuse the *Salafees* for causing most of the *fitna* amongst the Muslim communities today!? As claimed the likes of Yamin Zakaria (an IT technician and former HT member who sets himself up as a *pseudo* analyst and writer, mimicking Abid Ullah Jan and Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed) in his unfounded and poorly researched article entitled '*Neo-Con Salafis*' in December 2006 CE on the website of the so-called '*International Institute of Peace*'. Kabbani's methodology, apart from his style of Soofism, is to brand any Muslim who does not agree with him (or follow him) as an 'extremist,' and to thus travel the whole world calling to this. Yet it has become clear to the Muslims as to whom the real 'extremists' are. Those who go to the extent of openly criticising Muslims and uncovering their mistakes, not to warn other Muslims, but to go directly and involve non-Muslim governments and their security services and agencies based on partisan and unfounded extreme claims, and this was in 1998, not after 9/11 when there was heightened concern amongst Muslims. Al-Kabbani's statements no doubt led to greater repression and surveillance of Muslims in America, and have added to the worsening lot of the Muslims in Europe and America. Whilst Kabbani and his followers are living it up in Beverly Hills 90210, watching Madonna's naked butt dancing all up in Kabbani's face!? (This is in reference to kabbani's statements that he enjoys watching Madonna on TV; like the *Soofees* of old, al-Kabbani is following them in his openly aired passion to 'justify his loves,' as it were) Al-Kabbani according to the *Naqshabandees* themselves on their own website note: **"...he graduated from the American University of Beirut in Chemistry...from there he went to Belgium to continue his Medical Degree in Louvain. Then he received his Islamic law degree from Damascus."** To be fair this alone shows the nature of such a man. There is no mention of any proper Islamic education or study of its sciences whatsoever, it is very obscure. Does he know Arabic? Has he written any books in Arabic? Or does he only rise to the occasion in attempting to refute *Salafees*? Or does he prefer to converse with Europeans and Americans, rushing to their educational establishments, rather than making *hijra* from them and studying the *deen*. This is very important, as al-Kabbani accuses *Salafees* (as do most of the modern 'Ash'aree *soofees* like Hamza Yoosuf, Keller et al.) of not being 'traditional in their learning.' About 25 years ago, Nazim decided to send his 'disciples' into Europe and America. Here, they would preach strange concepts and begin to call people to follow Nazim. Whom they called "*the greatest living saint*" and **"the world leader of Sufism."** In the United States, al-Kabbani became more and more nationalistically American. He set up his centre in Beverly Hills and began his *da'wah* amongst the rich and affluent influential people in the Beverly Hills area, of all the areas to reside in America! Then such people want to refute *Salafees*!? Al-Kabbani et al then began noting that Prince Charles and Hilary Clinton are secret members of their *sufi* cult. Moreover, they say this in order to condone the actions of their respective governments.

“What can you tell us about the Wahhabi sect of Islam? Is it true that this is an extremely right wing sect founded and funded by the Saudi royal family, and led by Osama bin Ladin? What is the purpose of the Wahhabi?”¹

Dr Mattson replied,

No it's not true to characterize Wahhabism that way. This is not a sect. It is the name of a reform movement that began 200 years ago to rid Islamic societies of cultural practices and rigid interpretation that had (been) acquired over the centuries. Because the Wahhabi scholars became integrated into the Saudi state, there has been some difficulty keeping that particular interpretation of religion from being enforced too broadly on the population as a whole. However, the Saudi scholars who are Wahhabi have denounced terrorism and denounced in particular the acts of September 11. Those statements are available publicly. This question has arisen because last week, there were a number of newspaper reports that were dealing with this. They raised the issue of the role of Saudi Arabia and the ideology there. Frankly, I think in a way it was a reaction to the attempts of many people to look for the roots of terrorism in misguided foreign policy. It's not helpful, I believe, to create another broad category that becomes the scapegoat for terrorism...²

Muslim students, from the UK and US, have verified the moderate teachings of the foremost scholars of Saudi Arabia which have emphasised how to interact with non-Muslims. An example of this can be seen in a report by Ismaeel Nakhuda for the *Arab News* on 10 Sha'baan 1427 AH corresponding to Sunday 3 September 2006 CE:

Westerners Attend Seminars Dispelling Myths About Islam:

MAKKAH, 3 September 2006 — A group of 82 Western Muslims participated in a set of seminars held in the holy cities of Makkah and Madinah with some of the Kingdom's leading sheikhs and imams to learn about the peaceful message of Islam. The students — male and female, who were mainly from the US and included people from Britain, Canada and the West Indies, were also given an opportunity to visit the holy cities, gain exclusive access to the Prophet's Mosque in Madinah, enter the Kaaba in Makkah and direct questions to Saudi scholars about the challenges faced by Muslim living in the West. According to the organizers, Al-Quraan Wa As-Sunnah Society of New York, the Saudi scholars were able to dispel many of the myths and

¹ The question itself demonstrates the prevalence of such stereotypes in the West and highlights the simplistic linkages that have been made due to certain global events.

² Ingrid Mattson, “*What is Islam?*” CNN interview, Oct 18, 2001

misconceptions surrounding Islam. Sheikh Zahid Rashid, an American student at the Umm Al-Qura University in Makkah and one of the main organizers of the tour said, “The group includes people who are active in dawa in their areas, imams of mosques in the US and the heads of MSAs at universities in the US. The whole purpose of the program is to make people active in the US to give dawa (propagation of Islam) and dispel myths about Islam and terrorism.” Participants spent one week in Madinah and two weeks in Makkah and were able to attend various seminars held by numerous sheikhs in both cities on subjects relating to creed, jurisprudence, hadith, the Qur’an and the methodology of dawa among non-Muslims in the West. Convert to Islam Mohammed Abdul Aziz, from Atlanta, US, said, “I have definitely learned about Islam and this trip has enabled me to dispel some myths there about Islam. There are those who say they are good Muslims but the scholars here are telling people that this is wrong. “As far as terrorism and stuff like that is concerned Saudi Arabia and the scholars here have categorically explained that they don’t support terrorism and that terrorism is against Islam.” Arab News joined the group on their final day of seminars in which members of the group directed questions to Sheikh Wasiullah Abbas, an Indian scholar who lectures in the Grand Mosque. The sheikh answered questions regarding Muslim unity, how to interact with non-Muslims in dawa work and how Muslims should work with student Muslim bodies at universities and colleges across the West. Speaking to the group the sheikh said, “You shouldn’t call them in a harsh way, nor should you put people down but you should call them with wisdom and try helping them.” Safwan Abu Kanaz, 35, came all the way from New York to participate in the seminars. Describing the trip to be very “historical” he said, “I’ve never seen the like of this trip and nor will I.” Safwan added, “The way the media are projecting Islam is in total contradiction of what is being portrayed about Saudi Arabia. The extremists are people without knowledge. The sheikhs have condemned all acts of extremism and have explained and clarified that which is Islam and that which is against the ethos of the religion.” Speaking about international terrorism he added, “They have explained in full detail that Islam is against terrorism. Those that are portrayed as leaders are not leaders and in fact don’t have any Islamic knowledge.” Among the highlights of the trip was an opportunity to visit the factory that builds covers for the Kaaba and a chance to have supper at the home of the Imam of Makkah Sheikh Muhammad Subayyil. Addressing the group Sheikh Subayyil advised against extremism and said, “People should behave with non-Muslims with softness, kindness and ease to attract them to Islam.” Wisaf Sharieff, 25, a radiology

student from New York, said, “We had a wonderful welcome in Madinah and one of the highlights of the Madinah stay was that within three days of reaching there we were given exclusive access to the haram and we had 35 minutes all to ourselves there. It was a special moment.” Commenting on the outcome of the visit Sheikh Zahid said, “We want people to see the peaceful message of Islam and to go back and be able to teach their communities the real message. We want people to know that Islam and Muslims are different from what the media show.” Organizers say this is the second time such a visit has been arranged and hope to organize similar visits in coming years.”

Therefore, when Murad (Winter) refers to **“firebrands, trained and programmed in the major Saudi universities”** this needs some inspection. Because some of the people who Murad (Winter) is accusing here, also studied within Western universities, so why not mention that aswell! If Murad et al. are making a big fuss over being **“trained in Saudi universities”** why stop there and not also mention the education within Western universities and institutions aswell?? Moreover, many indivuslas have studied in Saudi universities, but “trained” has very different connotations. And as for the term **“firebrands”** then some of Murad’s (Winter’s) own close associates, who he conducts talks with, are known for their lectures within the mid 1990s wherein they used to call the youth to awareness of a “Dajjal system”, waste time explaining “new world orders”, hype up the youth with socio-political discussion, make reference to “freemasonic plots” and all of this was only brought to an end after the events of 9/11 by some of the friends of Murad (Winter), such as Hamza Yoosuf! Yet these firebrand lectures are okay, as it is his friend and associate!?! Indeed, a cursory listen to the lectures of Hamza Yoosuf in the mid-90s can also reveal some highly **“firebrand”** rhetoric¹, yet will Murad (Winter) go on TV and expose this aswell? We think not.

¹ Refer to some at: <http://al-yaseen.tripod.com/id7.html> for an example of such “firebrand” rhetoric from Murad’s friend Hamza Yoosuf!! But we are not like Murad (Winter) who will actually go on national TV and expose this to people who are already concerned, worried, terrified and suspicious of anything to do with Islaam!

SAUDI ARABIA ALSO SUFFERS FROM EXTREMISM AND TERRORISM

One of the clearest indications which nullify the claims that Saudi Arabia in some way promotes intolerance and is pleased with it, is the fact that Saudi Arabia is one of the main victims of extremism and terrorism long before it graced the shores of the US and the UK. This is an area where the unjust refuse to offer any admittance. James Dao reporting for the *New York Times* on 13 June 2003 reported:

WASHINGTON, June 12 — The government of Saudi Arabia said today that it has fired several hundred Islamic clerics and suspended more than 1,000 others for preaching intolerance,¹ part of a broader campaign against terrorism. At a news conference held one month to the day after terrorist bombs killed more than 30 people in Riyadh, the Saudi government also announced that it has implemented new regulations intended to prevent the flow of Saudi money to terrorist groups overseas. Saying that last month's bombings had "galvanized" his government, Adel al-Jubeir, a senior foreign policy adviser to Crown Prince Abdullah, asserted that Saudi Arabia has done more than any other country to ensure that its money does not "get used for evil." "We will go after those who use religion to justify such behavior, which is alien to any faith, in particular our Islamic faith," Mr. Jubeir said at the Saudi Embassy here. For the Saudis, who spend millions of dollars annually on public relations in the United States, today's announcements were the latest effort to counter assertions that Saudi Arabia is a breeding ground for Islamic extremism and a major financier of terrorist groups like Al Qaeda and Hamas. Critics scoffed at the Saudi Embassy's assertions that they had "closed the door on terrorist financing and money laundering." William F. Wechsler, a National Security Council official in the Clinton administration who has studied terrorist financing, said the Saudis had revealed few details of their new regulations, making it difficult to evaluate their effectiveness. "Let's see the laws and regulations, and let others evaluate them, not take the Saudis word for it,"² he said in a telephone interview. "Let's see that they are meeting international standards. Let's see the enforcement." Richard A. Boucher, the State

¹ Note that this was in 2003 CE, not to mention what was taking place prior! So we have to be just

² This kind of attitude is also taken totally on board by the neo-con Sufis and those like them!? Yet in Islaam, the words of a Muslim have to be trusted.

Department spokesman, called pledges by the Saudis and other Arab nations to stop the flow of money to terrorist groups “a very important step forward.” But he said more needed to be done. According to documents released by the embassy, the Saudi government instituted new rules last month intended to make it easier for regulators to monitor charitable giving overseas. Those rules include requiring Saudi charities to keep their money in a single bank account, preventing cash withdrawals from those accounts and creating a new agency that will be the conduit for all Saudi charitable giving outside Saudi Arabia. But Mr. Jubeir acknowledged that there were significant loopholes in the rules. For example, the Saudi regulations will not apply to foreign-based charities that raise funds in the kingdom. The rules also will not prevent Saudi money from reaching schools, hospitals and other community institutions run by the political wing of Hamas, the Gaza-based group that has taken responsibility for a devastating suicide bombing in Jerusalem on Wednesday. But Mr. Wechsler and other terrorism experts said it was impossible to separate Hamas’ political wing from its military operations. “It’s a fantasy to think you can just give money to the charitable wing and somehow you are not helping a terrorist organization,” Mr. Wechsler said. The Israeli government also contends that Palestinian documents seized by its troops during raids in the West Bank last year provide evidence that organizations run by senior Saudi officials have contributed large sums of money to Hamas and to the families of suicide bombers. The Saudi government does contribute aid to the families of Palestinian suicide bombers, Mr. Jubeir said, but he argued that such assistance did not incite terrorist acts. “If the family’s in need, they will get the money,” he said. “We’re not saying, ‘Go blow yourself up and we’ll give you money.’”

So this in itself is clear in Saudi Arabia’s balanced stance, one of not supporting erroneous and extreme measures in the form of ‘martyrdom operations’ and of not leaving the Palestinians to suffer in poverty, hardship, squalor and difficulty. So at least Saudi Arabia is doing something like many other Muslim countries and charitable organisations, this is all a far-cry from the mere arm-chair polemics of the envious ones! Javid Hassan reporting for the *Arab News* on 7 Rajab 1427 AH corresponding to Tuesday 1 August 2006 CE notes:

Arabs Have No Monopoly on Terrorism, says Prince Saud:

RIYADH, 1 August 2006 — At least 53 percent of terrorist attacks that took place in 2004 happened outside the Middle East region, according to Foreign Minister Prince Saud Al-Faisal. In his foreword in the latest issue of “Diplomat” magazine, which is published on behalf of the Foreign Ministry’s Institute for Diplomatic Studies, Prince

Saud cites data provided by Rand Corporation, a nonprofit institution specialized in research and analysis, in support of his argument that “a stranger to the Middle East relying only on the media for information about the region would be led to believe that we have a monopoly on terrorists acts.” His article is relevant in the context of the current wave of terrorism sweeping across the Middle East that have been triggered by Israeli attacks on the people of Gaza and Lebanon. In the latest incident of Israeli state terrorism, 56 people, more than half of them children, were killed when it bombarded the southern Lebanese village of Qana on Sunday. It was the biggest single loss of life since Israel unleashed its firepower on Lebanon almost three weeks ago. However, going by the international media, one gets the impression that only Arabs are responsible for the acts of violence, of which Israel is the victim. Prince Saud said, “There is no single model or example that represents all acts of terrorism. Misguided people perform violent acts. Some do so in quest of glory and salvation based on religious fanaticism; others commit violent acts as a result of frustration and despair caused by circumstances and conditions beyond their control. There are also violent acts that are motivated by opportunistic politics — domestic and international.” The foreign minister stressed the need for preachers, not only in the Arab world but also in other countries, to promote understanding and tolerance among people. “The whole world must do so without overlooking the sensitivity of the moral issues and with full respect for the diversities of values and traditions of all cultures.” The mass media, Prince Saud said, needs to understand its role in fighting delinquent ideas. Educational institutions should also play their part in promoting sound human values and in insulating society against deviant thoughts. “Terrorism has no religion, ethnic origin, nationality, or geographic location. In this respect, it is pertinent to say that any attempt to associate terrorism with any given faith will in fact help legitimize the terrorists, and this we should reject completely,” he said. A survey conducted by the Pew Global Attitudes Project in 13 countries between March 31 and May 14 2006 found that positive opinion about Muslims has declined sharply in Spain over the past year (from 46 to 29 percent) and more modestly in Britain (from 72 to 63 percent). The survey was conducted in the wake of the Danish cartoon controversy that triggered global protests. It showed both hopeful and troubling signs with respect to Muslim support for terrorism and the viability of democracy in Muslim countries. The survey showed that there have been substantial decline in the percentages In countries like Jordan, Pakistan and Indonesia. It indicates that suicide bombings and other forms of

violence against civilian targets cannot be justified to defend Muslims against their enemies.”

P.K. Abdul-Ghafour reporting for the *Arab News* on Saturday 17 May 2003 CE corresponding to 16 Rabee' al-Awwal 1424 AH:

Sultan Vows Action Against Perpetrators of Riyadh Blasts:

JEDDAH, 17 May 2003 — Prince Sultan, second deputy premier and minister of defense and aviation, stated yesterday that the perpetrators of Monday's Riyadh bombings, which killed 34 people including seven Saudis and seven Americans, would receive severe punishment.

“Islam has nothing to do with these terrorist acts that claimed the lives of innocent people,” Prince Sultan told reporters after visiting the family of Fulaih ibn Shayez Al-Anazi, an air force officer who was killed in the incident while on official duty. Prince Sultan offered his condolences to Anazi's family and relatives. “The government will take care of the martyr's family,” he added. Chief of Staff Gen. Saleh Al-Mahya and Commander of the Air Force Lt. Gen. Abdul Aziz Al-Henaidi accompanied the prince. In Makkah, the imam of the Grand Mosque denounced Monday's terror attacks in Riyadh, which had also injured more than 190 people, and said terrorism would never achieve its goals. “It will only destroy its perpetrators and will not change any policies,” said Dr. Saleh ibn Abdullah Humaid, who is also chairman of the Shoura Council, told Muslims who packed the mosque complex. He emphasized the need for open and frank dialogue with the young generation to prevent them from being influenced by the ideologies of deviant groups. “Intellectual exchanges between Islamic scholars and educators and young men and women must be enhanced. We should not ignore the questions of youngsters seeking clarifications,” he said. Humaid urged the authorities to pay special attention to the needs and worries of youth. “Their needs are not limited to sports and recreation. But we should be keen to correct their beliefs and thoughts,” he explained. The imam described terrorism as a heinous crime involving as it did aggression, attack, murder and the terrorizing of peaceful and innocent people as well as destruction of property and bloodshed. “This is a disgraceful and cheap act in the eyes of all people who value their humanity,” he added. He refuted charges that the Kingdom's education curriculum and Islamic propagation methods were the main reasons for the deviation of certain people. “Our curriculum has been in place since the formation of the Kingdom,” he said. “It has produced several scholars, intellectuals, engineers and doctors. Why they say that a particular group is influenced by our curriculum. They should have asked why there is

a change in the attitude and thinking of this group although they studied the same curricula. That means they were influenced by something outside the curricula,” the imam pointed out. In his Friday sermon, Sheikh Ali ibn Abdul Rahman Al-Hodaifi, the imam of the Prophet’s Mosque in Madinah, said that killing innocent people was a great crime in Islam. Meanwhile, Saleh Al-Sheikh, the minister of Islamic affairs, endowments, call and guidance, condemned the Riyadh bombings. Addressing imams and khateebis attending a course in Dalam, he said the perpetrators of the attacks were influenced by wrong ideas. “The Shariah is there for the protection of a person’s self, religion, mind, wealth and honor,” he said.

Dr Sulaiman al-Juraid, a member of the *Shoora Council* in Saudi Arabia, writing in the *Arab News* on Sunday 10 August 2003 CE corresponding to 12 Jumadaa ath-Thaane 1424 AH:

Terrorism – Trial by Media Will Not Do

RIYADH, 10 August 2003 — While it is true that some Saudi nationals were among the terrorists of Sept. 11, it is a far cry from saying that the Saudi government or the Saudi people were somehow involved or condoned such a diabolical crime. If we accept this kind of logic, then we would conclude that the US government and the American people were somehow involved in terrorism because John Walker, an American citizen, was caught with the Taleban in Afghanistan. Another charge leveled at Saudi Arabia in connection with terrorism is that the country’s educational system breeds terrorism. But if this is true, then the US educational system breeds racism and bigotry as the Ku Klux Klan amply demonstrates in its hatred of non-whites.¹ The Israeli expert used by some influential American circles to buttress their arguments about Saudi Arabia’s connection to terrorism by pointing to our educational system should look closer at home.² In a recent survey, it was found that 31 percent of Israel’s elementary students attend religious schools — a number unparalleled by any other country in the world. In fact some terrorism experts described the Sept. 11 terrorists as “adults with education and skill, not hopeless young zealots...they mingled in secular society, even drinking forbidden alcohol, hardly typical of Islamic militants.” Terrorism expert, Ehud Sprinzak, went further by stating that these terrorists owed their allegiance, not to Islam or any religious belief, but to Osama bin Laden. As he

¹ This is an excellent argument, as if the UK, US or any other country within Europe wants to accuse a whole Muslim country and its educational system, whether that is Saudi Arabia or any other, then such a logic also has to be applied to their own non-Muslim countries then. As a result, the BNP, the National Front and other neo-Nazis within the UK can be traced to the UK educational system?! Is this fair?

² Not exactly an impartial choice to assess the educational literature of a Muslim country!?

put it, “Perhaps...loyalty to Osama bin Laden is even more powerful than the religious and nationalist fanaticism that has been behind other suicide attacks”. Timothy McVeigh who was responsible for the Oklahoma City bombing and the unabomber, responsible for many terrorist acts in the US, were American citizens but in neither case did anyone jump to the conclusion that the two represented the American people or the American government and none of their families or relatives were accused of the crimes the two had committed. This is a fair way of looking at things and no individual or nation should be tried and convicted by innuendo and guilt by association through selected leaks to the mass media by individuals who may have hidden agendas and who do not give the accused the chance to defend himself by facing his accusers. I lived for many years in the US and I know that the American people are fair-minded and, if they are presented with the facts, they will pass a fair judgment. This brings me to the recently published report by the US Congress on the causes of the 9/11 terrorist acts in the US, a heinous crime which Saudi Arabia and its people condemned in the strongest terms because Saudi Arabia itself had been the target of terrorism in the past. The latest example was the terrorist bombing in Riyadh on May 12, 2003. Yet the Congressional report left out 28 pages that pertained to the role of Saudi Arabia on the pretext that US national security demanded it. But as Prince Saud Al-Faisal, the Saudi foreign minister, stated publicly “Saudi Arabia has nothing to hide” and he demanded that the deleted portions concerning the role of Saudi Arabia be published so that the American people and the whole world would know the facts and so judge for themselves. Congress gets its information from the likes of Dore Gold, the former Israeli Likud ambassador, hardly an objective observer in this regard, and from Sen. Charles Schumer of New York, a well known supporter of Israel and a biased critic of Saudi Arabia. Innuendoes and trial by the mass media without presenting facts is a form of blackmail if not a form of terrorism.

Samar Fatany, a radio broadcaster in Jeddah, reporting for the *Arab News* on Tuesday 7 December 2004 CE corresponding to 25 Shawwaal 1425 AH, she notes:

Combating Terrorism and Extremism in Saudi Arabia:

The attack on the US Consulate in Jeddah yesterday must surely be deplored by all rational men and women — those who support American policies as well as those who do not. A small minority of militants and extremists must not be allowed to carry out barbarities while sheltering under the banner of Islam. The welfare of the Kingdom’s guests is a religious duty of the people and leaders of Saudi Arabia. In Islam, these people are known as Al-Mustamanun. The term refers to non-Muslims who are living

in Muslim lands or those who come to Muslim lands for work. Implicit in the term is the fact that Muslim leaders and people have guaranteed these people the security that is the right of each human being wherever he is and to whichever religious group he may belong. Saudi Arabia has undertaken drastic measures to counter the threat of terrorism and reject any extremist ideology that misrepresents either Islam or Saudi Arabia. There are those who doubt the Kingdom's resolve and fail to acknowledge the positive strides it has taken in the direction of reform and moderation. Regardless of what is said or not said, the people of Saudi Arabia are determined to fight extremism and reject terrorism in all its forms. An international conference on terrorism is scheduled for February 2005 and its objective is to send a strong message to radicals within and without that they and their extremist ideology will not be tolerated. In speaking to a weekly Cabinet meeting, Crown Prince Abdullah said the strong links between the Saudi leadership and people in addition to the efforts of the security and military forces will defeat those who seek to undermine the Kingdom's security and stability. In a speech to the Muslim World League, he called upon Muslim scholars to promote dialogue and critical debates. Both should aim at reaching a consensus on contemporary issues and working to improve the image of Islam. The crown prince has also urged Saudi journalists to inform young people of different ways and means of fighting extremists who are Al-Qaeda sympathizers.¹ Prince Sultan, second deputy premier and minister of defense and aviation, warned in a statement to reporters that terrorism and violence, on either the Islamic or social level, would never be acceptable. He made it clear that the people of the Kingdom would not accept the destruction of property that would damage the national economy and weaken relations with other countries. The Interior Ministry has seized huge amounts of explosives and ammunition in its continuing hunt for — and pursuit of — terror suspects all over the Kingdom. The security forces have been successful in preventing some terrorist attacks and have killed and captured many of the terrorists and their leaders. Even those who sympathize with them have been jailed. At a meeting of interior ministers from the Gulf states, Prince Naif said without ambiguity that the confrontation of terrorism was, and continues to be, fierce and strong. A Saudi crime specialist believes the government's pre-emptive strategies to dry up sources of terrorist funding, as well as the growing security awareness of Saudi citizens have led to the surrender of

¹ Does this indicate that Saudi Arabia preaches intolerance and hatred?! Only an unjust and perverted mind would still consider to do so after such actions!

militants. Security officials have released recorded statements made by members of terror cells to be used on prime time television broadcasts. The men all described how they had been convinced by preachers who issued edicts forbidding Muslims from working with the Saudi government, demanded that Muslims work to rid the Arabian Peninsula of non-Muslims, and declared that any Muslim who did not share these views was an infidel. One of the men said during his taped statement, "Thank God, I was jailed and God enlightened me." King Fahd in a statement to the Islamic Jurisprudence Academy's meeting at its 17th session in Makkah addressed the challenges facing the Muslim world today. In his address, he said: "Changes during this age have brought the Ummah face to face with a fierce campaign against its religious faith, morals and culture, making false accusations against Islam and exploiting the deviance of some young Muslims. Even the Holy Qur'an and the Prophet (peace be upon him) have not been spared from hostile attacks." The king went on to point out, "Terrorist organizations have built upon the ignorance of some Muslim youth about the correct rules of the Shariah and have turned those young people into willing tools for killing innocent people." The king also noted, "Such internal and external challenges were successfully overcome in the past. It is our hope that our distinguished scholars of jurisprudence and our theologians will overcome the challenges of the present day." The grand mufti of Saudi Arabia who is also the chairman of the senior ulema, Abdul Aziz Al-Asheikh, earlier called on terrorists to surrender and take advantage of the limited amnesty that was offered by the government. He said the amnesty was not a sign of weakness but that it aimed to correct mistakes and assist the militants to return to the right path. The grand mufti made it clear that any Muslim who is aware of the teachings of his religion and who adheres to the Holy Qur'an and the Sunnah will never involve himself in terrorist attacks or sympathize with the kidnapping and killing of innocent people. The danger, he said, is not only from the terrorists themselves but also from those who sympathize with them and make it possible for the terrorists to carry out their savage actions. The militant groups had declared war on religion and its values and they must be stopped, he asserted. At the same time, the imams at the Grand Mosque in Makkah and at the Prophet's Mosque in Madinah continue to preach tolerance and warn against terrorism and extremism in their Friday sermons. Sheikh Al-Talib, imam at the Grand Mosque, has emphasized that Muslims are against those who call themselves scholars, who advocate violence against innocent people and who encourage the targeting of peaceful Muslims. Such criminal acts, he stated, are contrary to the Shariah. Sheikh

Saleh Bin-Humaid, another imam, said: “Every act of sabotage targeting peaceful citizens and residents who are under Saudi Arabia’s protection is forbidden and is against the Shariah.”¹ Muslims should not accept any justification for such behavior, no matter where it came from, he added. Sheikh Ali ibn Abdul Rahman, imam at the Prophet’s Mosque, urged Muslims to be conscious of God and the teachings of Islam. He said: “Kidnapping non-Muslims and killing them is a heinous crime which amounts to treason against Islam and a betrayal of what it teaches.” The Saudi Committee for Studying Terrorism and its Causes says that the terrorists in the Kingdom are becoming increasingly isolated and do not enjoy the support of the overwhelming majority of Saudis. According to the committee, terrorist cells in Saudi Arabia are loosely connected and lack an ideological or methodical common denominator. This makes it more difficult to combat them but it does not mean that combating them is impossible. The committee is studying those individuals who, for whatever reason and from whatever motive, sympathize with the terrorists and those who justify the terrorists’ acts and so provide them with support, either moral or material. The committee recommends the creation of cultural, social and religious awareness among all levels and groups within the community. This is the responsibility of every single person. Imam Muhammad ibn Saud Islamic University in Riyadh has four researchers who are conducting studies into the causes of terrorism. Earlier, the university came under fire when the Ministry of Interior revealed that nine of the 26 terrorists on the Kingdom’s most wanted list were its graduates. The dean of the Faculty of Dawa and Mass Communications defended the university, saying that it was important to remember that students spend only a few hours a day on its premises. The rest of their time is spent as they wish, interacting with people off the campus.² Their behavior is thus shaped by their own perceptions of what they see, hear and think. He was equally defensive when it came to associating terrorism with a particular social group. He observed that highly educated people from many countries, including the US, had been involved in terrorist activities. Another group that has been the victim of much unfavorable publicity is the Commission for the Promotion of Virtue and Prevention of Vice — known as the *mutawwas* or the religious police. The religious police are seen as an integral part of the Saudi social fabric; their job is

¹ Therefore, how can Saudi preach something like intolerance when it is against the *sharee’ah*!?

² Therefore, what do people expect? For Muslims to follow other Muslims about all over the place in order to check on their activities? Well, it seems that for those who impugn the Muslims and their countries for being the problem this is their actual aim! Even though they scream freedom at other times?!

essentially to ensure that Islamic morals and behavior are followed in public and in private. Admittedly, their behavior has been overzealous at times and public resentment of their perceived intolerance has prompted the Commission to establish a program aimed at upgrading and improving the qualifications of its members. An Academy of Islamic Police at Umm Al-Qura University in Makkah has been established. Its aim is to qualify students to be better guardians and role models of Islamic virtues. The curriculum does not concentrate on Islamic studies alone but also teaches both psychology and English. The academy came about as a result of the disappointment of Saudi citizens concerning the behavior and performance of the mutawwas. Many Saudis questioned the need for such a group and in an effort to restore confidence and regain public esteem, the mutawwas have turned to higher education. In a message to students, teachers and parents, Education Minister Dr. Muhammad Al-Rasheed called for joint effort to expel deviant thoughts from young Saudi minds. He urged teachers not to act as religious scholars handing down rulings on various issues. The minister emphasized that the role of parents should be complementary to that of schools. At the beginning of the present academic year, Dr. Rasheed advised the five million students to be both wise and careful in making choices and to be aware of the consequences of their actions. He said that mercy should replace violence and that reason must prevail over recklessness. He noted that all citizens are partners in maintaining and protecting security and that it is the duty of every single citizen to work to strengthen national unity and to prevent evil from happening. The minister assured the public that his ministry would go forward with its reform program which would benefit the new generation as well as the country as a whole. The Saudi media is engaged in an aggressive campaign against extremists and Al-Qaeda sympathizers in the Kingdom. The local press regularly illustrates the public resentment of extremists and Saudi society's condemnation of targeting foreigners as well as all other terrorist acts. The media has further involved itself in the continuing debate between moderates and hardliners. The latter argue that Islam is under threat while the former believe that the intolerance advocated by a few is the real threat to Islam. The media continues to publicize and expose certain deviant interpretations of Islam that have led some Muslims to resort to violence. The heroism of the security forces is covered extensively with commentaries and editorials reflecting public support for them and condemnation of acts of terrorism and violence. Journalists continue to promote moderation and tolerance and well-known writers are highly critical of the extremist ideology espoused by some members of society. The President

of the Saudi Media and Communications Association, Dr. Ali Al-Garni, says that the association is committed to reaching out to the West in order to clarify misconceptions about Islam and present accurate information about Saudi Arabia's active role in combating terrorism. The possibility of an increase in terrorist attacks continues to be a primary concern of both Saudis and expatriates in the Kingdom. Confronting the extremists and combating terrorism has become the responsibility of the entire society. The Saudi leaders and Saudi citizens are working to create harmony and coordination among the country's cultural, educational and intellectual entities in order to spread awareness and truth and uproot every seed of terrorism.

May Allah protect this holy land and bless its people. Amen.

Therefore, actions of terrorism and extremism have harmed the Saudi public just as they have harmed the UK, Sa'eed Haider, Roger Harrison and Mahmoud Ahmad reporting for the *Arab News* on Monday 10 November 2003 CE corresponding to 16 Ramadaan 1424 AH note:

Saudis: Shocked and Angry –

JEDDAH, 10 November 2003 — Saudis and residents across the Kingdom reacted with shock and anger to Saturday's suicide bombings at a compound in Riyadh. In spite of the late hour, most residents in the capital were awake or outside their homes at the time of the explosion. "I heard one very loud explosion and our whole house was shaking," said Ibtihal Hassan, who was home at the time. "All the people in our neighborhood were out on the street trying to find out what happened," she said. Hassan said she quickly started calling her relatives to make sure they were safe. Her mother and sister, who were out shopping, said mobile phones soon started ringing all around as concerned family members frantically called their loved ones. Bombarded by brutal television and newspaper images of carnage caused by a midnight explosion at the housing compound of Al-Muhaya, on Riyadh's desert outskirts, many were united in condemning the second deadly attack in their capital in six months. "What Islam is this? They are terrorists," said Hamdan Youssef, a 39-year-old businessman. Sarah Hussain said she had heard about the closure of the US Embassy and possible bomb threats but did not take them seriously as there have been similar threats in the past. "They are Muslims and are killing their own Muslim brothers and sisters," she said "Even if the victims are not Muslim, they are still human beings. It doesn't matter if they are Westerners or not. "Saudi Arabia used to be a much safer place, said Hussain, but recently everything had changed. "No one is safe anywhere," she said.

“Not even in our homes.” Ahmad Al-Tayeb in Jeddah shared her confusion and anger. “I was shocked and I could not believe that there are people who are willing to kill and terrorize the innocent in this holy month,” he said. “For three hours I thought I was having a nightmare and this could not be true. I support all government actions against these terrorists. They targeted young children who were sleeping peacefully in their homes. What do these terrorists want from our children?” Fury that the attacks targeted innocent people during Ramadan was the single unifying factor across the Kingdom. “Whoever committed this terrible act is not a Muslim,” Ghazi Hadda said. “We all should condemn it and stand shoulder to shoulder with the government to crack down on these terrorists. If they send us the message that they are willing to kill us and threaten our children, then our message to them is we will not be afraid and we will fight against terrorism because terrorism has no place in our society.” Khaled Batarfi, managing editor of Al-Madinah newspaper, summed up saying the militants were losing the battle for the “hearts and minds” of ordinary Saudis. “This was their main battle. In the past they would pretend to be against Americans, Christians — whoever they perceive to be the enemy. Now their enemy is the same people whose approval they seek.” “It’s a pity to see something like this,” said Dr. Saleh Al-Tuwaijri, vice president of the Riyadh Red Crescent Society. “It’s very saddening, especially during the holy month of Ramadan.” “The terrorists who carried out these bombings have proved that they have no faith,” Al-Tuwaijri told Arab News. “No faith will ever condone this kind of aggression.” But some blamed those who spread religious intolerance in Saudi society. “Society will bear responsibility for this,” said Hussein Nasser, a 28-year-old bank employee. “We put the men of religion above fault, and made them unaccountable. We gave them special privilege — and this is the result.” Mubarak Musa, a 45-year-old businessman, also pointed an accusing finger at intolerance. “It’s the refusal of any other opinion at the expense of a single viewpoint. That’s the most dangerous thing,” he said. Anger was also the predominant emotion in the Eastern Province. The news of the explosion spread like a wildfire on Saturday night and people out shopping rushed back to their homes to watch the latest television bulletin. The markets in Dammam and Alkhobar, which otherwise hum with activity until 2 a.m. during Ramadan, looked deserted after midnight and many shopkeepers pulled their shutters down. Most Saudis and expatriates were angry over the explosion, with some calling the act both insane and inhuman. Abdullah Al-Amri, the imam of an Alkhobar mosque, said it was a sin to kill and hurt innocent people, and a greater sin to kill and hurt them in the holy month of Ramadan. “Such actions

contradict the basic teaching of Islam,” he said. Some people said they were surprised that the terrorists succeeded in executing their attack when the Americans had information that a terrorist attack was imminent. The US had closed its missions on Saturday to “review the security situation.” Western expatriates in the Kingdom were horrified at what appeared a senseless attack, but many too were moved to speculate about the motivation and circumstances behind it. “I’d be interested to know if the compound in Riyadh had the same level of protection as Western compounds,” said Andy Willox, a long time resident in Jeddah. “If it didn’t, then it could have been considered a soft target. If it was well protected and selected as a target, then I am shocked that a compound that housed mainly Arab and Muslim families was even considered as a target. Whose cause will the deliberate deaths of women and children serve?” Doug Vale, a South African teacher of English, offered a theory: “I am sure from previous experiences that this was chosen because of the extra security at Western compounds and because compounds per se are symbols of Western presence in the Kingdom,” he said. Tom Notestine, a US paramedic, said rumors had already begun to spread. “Muslim colleagues are devastated because innocent Muslim families seem to have been deliberately targeted. Many are in a state of denial that it could have been an Islamist organization like Al-Qaeda — they are saying that it was a CIA plot to destabilize the country. The reality is that many good people are dead and injured for no apparent reason.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF 'KAAFIR' AND 'KUFFAAR'?

With regards to the meaning of *'kufr'* (disbelief), the meaning of *'kufr'* linguistically means, originally, 'to cover' and 'to hide' and within the Arabic language the night is ascribed as being a *'kaafir'*, which does not mean here that it is expelled from the religion of Islaam, rather linguistically the *'kaafir'* here means 'that which covers'. For the night covers the day entirely like when someone walks during the night he does not see everything as there are many things that are covered by the darkness of the night. Thus, from this angle the night was called a *'kaafir'*. The *'kaafir'* was named so as he covers the truth and does not accept it, refusing the truth and covering it up and not answering the truth and for this reason was termed a *'kaafir'*. Some of the people of Islamic knowledge have said that such is known as a *'kaafir'* because he covers with his disbelief that which is incumbent upon him to have from *eemaan* (faith), however his *kufr* covers his *eemaan* and thus does not answer or respond to it (i.e. *eemaan*).

In regards to Muslims taking *kuffaar* as 'friends' then this relates to taking non-Muslims as close confides as whom to refer back to on issues related to Islaam. It also includes the fact that of course a Muslim should only take those as close friends those who share their beliefs as they will refer each other back to the sources for Islaam for guidance. Does a Sikh refer to a Jew in regards to issues about their religion or vice versa? The injunction in Islaam about not taking *kuffaar* as friends also does not negate the fact that Muslims have to be 'friendly', neighbourly, well-mannered, respectful, hospitable and helpful to non-Muslims in matters not related to having an adverse affect on the Muslims. In fact, the superb community relations, engagement and interaction that Muslims have had in many societies has been a reason for people to embrace Islaam! Therefore, the statements of the likes of Dr Taj Hargey of the obscure *Muslim Educational Centre of Oxford* (a Qur'aaniyoon organization!) that the term *'kuffaar'* is **"a very pejorative, negative, disparaging term and when you call someone a 'kaafir' they're not worthy to be associated with, this kind of intolerance gives rise to extremists"**¹ is absolutely incorrect, as one of the senior scholars of Saudi Arabia, Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan ibn 'Abdullaah al-Fawzaan (*hafidhabullaah*) stated:

¹ He stated this on the *Channel 4* (UK) documentary entitled '*Undercover Mosques*' for the programme *Dispatches* on 15 January 2007.

These are things like buying from and selling to the kuffaar, giving and receiving presents from the kuffaar and the like are all permissible and not allegiance to the kuffaar. Rather, these things are from worldly interaction and beneficial exchanges, such as also hiring a disbeliever for work. These are like the beneficial exchanges of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) when he hired ‘Abdullaah bin Urayqit al-Laythee to guide him on the way to hijra, while Abdullaah was a disbeliever, in order to help due to his experience on the tracks, so that is permissible. It is also permissible for a Muslim to hire out his services for kuffaar to use if necessary as this is from the door of beneficial exchanges and not from the door of love. To the extent that a disbelieving father must be righteous to him and this is not from the door of love. Allaah says,

 ä ä ä ä ä ä

 ä á ä ä ä ä ä ä

 ä ä ä ä ä ä ä ä á

 ä ä ä ä

“You will not find a people who believe in Allaah and the Last Day, having affection for those who oppose Allaah and His Messenger, even though they were their fathers or their sons or their brothers or their kindred. For such He has written eemaan in their hearts, and strengthened them with spirit¹ from Him. And He will admit them to Gardens under which rivers flow to dwell therein forever. Allaah is pleased with them, and they with Him. They are the Party of Allaah, indeed, it is the Party of Allaah that will be successful.”

{al-Mujaadilah (58): 22}

However, he (who has a disbelieving father) has to be righteous and good to him, this is from worldly goodness. There are aspects of interaction with the kuffaar such as peace treaties, covenants and trusts with the kuffaar which are all allowed and is not ‘allegiance’ (to the kuffaar). There are some things which some ignoramuses think are

¹ i.e. “that which gives life”, explained as the guidance of the Qur’aan or victory over their opponents.

allegiance when in reality, are not allegiance. There are situations when the Muslims are in danger and the kuffaar avert such a danger from the Muslims, then this is not *mudaahanah* (compromising) this is *mudaarah* (being amicable and harmonious).¹

¹ *Mudaarah* literally means to be amicable, affable and harmonious and in the context of the *Sharee'ah* the scholars have noted that it is given away some of your *dunya* for the preservation of the *deen*. As Shaykh Saalih is emphasizing here it is known by the scholars that *mudaarah* is different from *mudaahanah* (to compromise). Imaams Bukhaaree and Muslim (*raheemahumullaah*) in their *saheehs* within their sections on manners then include chapters on *mudaarah*. Al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar stated: “...the intent of it is to ward off via kindness.” In *al-Qaamoos al-Muheet* it is stated about the definition of *daraa'*: “To make something a deterrent, and to deter is to rebut, i.e. they rebutted each other in the argument.” Examples of *mudaarah* in the Qur'aan are in Soorah al-An'aam (6: 108) and in al-Qasas (28: 54).

Evidences from the *sunnah* for this are the *hadeeth* from Abi'l-Dardaa' that “We smile in the faces of people yet our hearts are cursing them.” (*Fath al-Baaree*, vol.10, p.527, *Kitaab al-Adab, Baab al-Mudaarah ma'a'n-Naas*). Also when 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr reported that 'Aa'ishah told him: “A man sought permission to enter upon the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), and he said, “Let him in, what a bad son of his tribe (or bad brother of his tribe) he is!” When the man came in, the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) spoke to him kindly and gently. I said: “O Messenger of Allaah, you said what you said, then you spoke to him kindly.” He said, “O 'Aa'ishah, the worst of the people in the sight of Allaah is the one who is shunned by others or whom people treat nicely because they fear his sharp tongue.” (*Fath al-Baaree*, vol.10, p.528, *Kitaab al-Adab, Baab al-Mudaarah ma'a'n-Naas*). Ibn Hajar said about these two *hadeeth*:

Ibn Battaal said: Mudaarah is from the good character of the believers, to be responsive to people, even with a word, without being coarse with them in speech, this is one of the strongest causes of harmony. Some people think that mudaarah is mudahaanah and this is an error, as mudaarah is regrettable and mudaahanah is prohibited. The difference is: mudaahanah is taken from the word ad-Dahhaan (the painter) who glosses over something and covers what is actually there. The scholars have explained it as lying with a sinner and openly displaying happiness with what he is doing without forbidding him at all. Mudaarah is being kind with the ignorant in order to teach him, being kind with the sinner in order to forbid him from what he is doing, without being harsh with him so that he does not expose what he does, and forbidding him with gentle speech and action, especially if his comradeship is needed and the likes of that.

Fath ul-Baaree (Daar ur-Rayyaan), vol.10, p.545.

Imaam al-Qurtubee stated:

The difference between mudaarah and mudaahanah is that mudaarah is to surrender the dunya for the benefit of the deen and it is permissible and even recommended. Mudaahanah is leaving the deen for the dunya.

Fath ul-Baaree (Daar ur-Rayyaan), vol.10, p.469.

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah (*raheemahullaah*):

So there is a difference between being amicable and harmonious (*mudaarah*) and compromising (*mudaahanah*), as compromising is not permissible however *mudaarah* is. So when the Muslims are in danger they obtain *mudaarah* (harmony) of the *kuffaar* in order to avert such danger and this is not allegiance. The matters need to be understood and understood yet as for explaining every act of interaction with the *kuffaar* to be allegiance to them then this is ignorance and error, or deceiving the people. So such a person should not enter into such issues except the *fuqhaa* and the people of knowledge. It is neither for the students nor for the school teachers to enter into such issues and analyse, prohibit and criticize the people saying “this is allegiance to the *kuffaar* and they (scholars) do not know the Divinely Legislated rulings” this is dangerous on the one who says such things as he is speaking about Allaah without knowledge.¹

Taj Hargey and the obscure *Muslim Educational Centre of Oxford* has some very interesting links on their website, such as linking to the ‘*Submitters*’ website, the followers of Rasheed Khaleefah who concocted the profane number nineteen theory! Furthermore, on their site are a number of Qur’aaniyoon sites, a veritable *mélange* of fringe beliefs! They also seem more concerned in wielding power and thus have a number of statements against the *MCB*, *MAB*, *MPAC* and other organizations as if to therefore set themselves up as viable alternatives?! On the website of the *Muslim Educational Centre of Oxford* there is even an article entitled ‘*Saudis cannot be trusted with Hajj*’ which is none other than the same views of the likes of the extremist *takefeeres*! And if the Saudis cannot be trusted then who else should?! So it demonstrates more of a petty slanderous grudge, in order cast aspersions against Saudi Arabia unjustly.

The other issue here is that all religions have terms by which they refer to others who do not share their belief and these words are verified within their religious books. In Judaism

Thus *mudaarah* is praiseworthy and *mudaahanah* is censured , so there is a difference between the two. The one who is *mudaaree* uses kindness with a person in order for the truth to manifest from the person or make him retract from falsehood. The *mudaahin* (compromiser) uses kindness in order for the person to remain established upon falsehood and leaves him upon his desires. *Mudaarah* is for the people of *eemaan* while *mudaahanah* is for the hypocrites.

ar-Rooh, p.231.

¹ Shaykh, Dr Saalih bin Fawzaan al-Fawzaan, Muhammad bin Fadh al-Husayn (editor and compiler), *al-Ajabaat ak-Muhimmah fi'l-Mashaakil al-Mumilah* (Riyadh: Mataabi' al-Humaydee, 1425 AH/2004 CE, Second Edition), pp.54-56

for example, non-Jews are referred to as *'the Goyim'*, yet this is rarely translated as 'infidels' or as 'expressing contempt and hatred' for non-Jews. It is only in Islaam that everything has been simplistically assessed as expressing 'hatred and intolerance' of non-Muslims. Another example of this in practice can be seen on a certain internet encyclopedia engine which has only a brief entry on what the term *'Goyim'* means yet has a huge section on *'kaafir'* and its meaning and usage!! This is not only unfair but is also simplistic to claim that the mere use of these terms in some way contributes to extremism and terrorism, let alone being damaging to community cohesion in the UK! If this is the case, then the other communities also have to be condemned for referral to terms of describing non-believers in their faiths. According to Jewish tradition, non-Jewish women are **"Niddah, Shifchah, Goyyah and Zonah (impure, slaves, heathens, whores)"**!! Along with also being **"Shiksah (unbridled whores)"** Even in the medieval period (for the West) Jewish Rabbis considered non-Jewish women as being **"b'hezkat zenat (prostitutes)"** as admitted by Rabbi Perry R. Rank, the 'cyber Rav'.¹

On Purim, February 25 1994, Israeli army officer Baruch Goldstein, an orthodox Jew from Brooklyn, massacred 40 Palestinian civilians, including children, while they knelt in prayer in a mosque. Goldstein was a disciple of the late Brooklyn Rabbi Meir Kahane, who told *CBS News* that his teaching that Arabs are "dogs" is merely **"derived from the Talmud"!!?**² *University of Jerusalem* Professor Ehud Sprinzak described Kahane and Goldstein's philosophy: **"They believe it's God's will that they commit violence against goyim, a Hebrew term for non-Jews."**³ An American Hassidic Rabbi, Yitzhak Ginsburg, a Jewish scholar ('Lubavitcher') from Kever Yossev Yeshiva (School of Talmud) in the West Bank city of Nablus declared, **"We have to recognize that Jewish blood and the blood of a goy are not the same thing."**⁴ Rabbi Yaacov Perrin said, **"One million Arabs are not worth a Jewish fingernail."**⁵ In the Talmud it states:

"All Israelites will have a part in the future world . . . The Goyim, at the end of the world will be handed over to the angel Duma and sent down to hell."⁶

¹ <http://www.jewishpost.com/jp1003/jpcy1003f.htm>

² *CBS 60 Minutes*, "Kahane"

³ *NY Daily News*, 26 February 1994 CE, p. 5

⁴ *NY Times*, 6 June 1989 CE, p.5

⁵ *NY Daily News*, 28 February 1994 CE, p.6

⁶ Zohar, Shemoth, Toldoth Noah, Lekh-Lekha

Also:

“Jehovah created the non-Jew in human form so that the Jew would not have to be served by beasts. The non-Jew is consequently an animal in human form, and condemned to serve the Jew day and night.”¹

Furthermore:

“Everything a Jew needs for his church ritual no goy is permitted to manufacture, but only a Jew, because this must be manufactured by human beings and the Jew is not permitted to consider the goyim as human beings.”²

In Hinduism, non-Hindus are referred to as **“mlechhas (unholy and uncivilised)”** due to not following the teachings of the Vedas! These views are held by Hindu groups such as the *VHP*, *Arya Samaj Movement*³, *the RSS*, *the Shiv Sena*, *the ABVP (Indian Universities Council)* and others. As for statements that Muslim scholars and graduates of Islamic universities may make about Islaam and related to Islaam and its regulations, then these can be broken down into two:

1. Is there evidence for it? If so, then there are bits and pieces in all religions that people like or don't like. If a person does apply it, what can you one do?
2. As for a person stating their own opinion based upon the texts of their religion, then if one says that it is not a valid opinion based on the texts, they have the right to say this. In the same way, we also have the right to say that it is not a valid opinion based upon the texts. For example, like the punishments in Islaam, no matter how abhorrent it may be for some, it is still a valid opinion in the *deen* for crimes against the Islamic state.

¹ Midrasch Talpioth, p. 225-L

² Schulchan Oruch, Orach Chaim 14, 20, 32, 33, 39

³ This group was founded in 1875 CE by Dayanand Sarasvati, a Hindu scholar and bigoted anti-Muslim. He was a leading figure in the 19th century Hindu revival that placed exclusive authority in the Vedas. The *Arya Samaj Movement* establishes Anglo Vaidic schools to raise Hindu militants. Ironically, given its present links with Ammo Singh and the *BNP*, the group has been violently hostile to Sikhs. Many of its members go on to become active in the hardcore *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS)* and the *ABVP*, the (Indian Universities Council). *ABVP* members have been involved in campus disturbances against Christians, Muslims, Sikhs, Buddhists and Jains.

**IS THE 'INFLUENCE' OF SAUDI ARABIA A HINDRANCE TO
'COMMUNITY-COHESION' AND TOLERANCE IN THE UK?
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE STATEMENTS OF ABDAL HAKIM MURAD
(TJ WINTER) AND OTHERS**

'Community cohesion' includes a number of different domains and a 'cohesive community' can be defined as one wherein all communities feel a sense of belonging, people's different values are respected and positively valued, there are similar opportunities for all and there are strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods. This is particularly for groups of people who live in a locality and getting together in order to defend or promote a common local interest. So if all of the above is included within the definition of 'community cohesion', then the individuals who claim that Muslims are spreading intolerance based upon some assumed connection to Saudi Arabia have them selves contradicted this very principle! Despite the futile assertion that the Muslims have! Indeed, a cursory glance at British colonial policy indicates that 'tolerance' was not from its salient features.

So we can see that only the Muslims are being implicated as being those who are eroding 'community cohesion' within the UK, and this is a transgressing statement. There is scant reference to the likes of the Christian child-molesters, far-right neo Nazi terrorists¹ (who are

¹ The *BBC* reported (Wednesday July 5 2006 CE) that: a man from East Sussex (in England) sent bomb-making instructions to a member of the far-right BNP. Allen Boyce, 74, of Farington Court, Old Orchard Road, Eastbourne, admitted incitement to possess explosives. He was sentenced by Lewes Crown Court on Wednesday, by Judge Anthony Niblett who described his actions as "evil". The judge suspended Boyce's sentence for two years and placed him under a two-year supervision order. The offence took place between 4 April and 15 November 2004. Boyce wrote to 27-year-old Terry Collins, also from Eastbourne, who was jailed for five years in 2005 for a campaign of attacks and abuse against Asian families. He sent Collins plans of a hotel in Eastbourne and instructions on how to mix two chemicals.

Also from the *Burnley Citizen* newspaper (4 October 2006 CE, 'Ex-BNP man faces explosives charge' by Andrew Hewitt):

FORMER British National Party member has been accused of possessing the largest amount of chemical explosives of its type ever found in the country. Robert Cottage, 49, of Talbot Street, Colne, appeared before Burnley magistrates charged with possession of an explosive substance. Cottage was charged under the Explosives Substances Act 1883 on Monday night after forensic experts searched his home, allegedly discovering

more numerous than all of the Muslims in the UK but are not asked to ‘integrate’), high crime rates, teenage pregnancy, binge-drinking and the likes! Only Muslims are mentioned in the context of the ‘erosion of community cohesion.’ In terms of understanding the reasons for radicalisation and extremism, these accusations against the Muslims are very simplistic indeed. Michael Meacher in an article in *The Guardian* noted:

Need to Consider Causes of Terror:

LONDON, 12 May 2004 — The West is losing the war on terror on a global scale. Despite the revelations of torture, the US-British policy is unchanged: See this historic struggle through to its conclusion for the sake of democracy and civilization; apply overwhelming force against terrorists and extremists; and show unremitting resolve to root out resistance wherever it is found. Whether it is Americans in Iraq, Israelis in Palestine or the West against Al-Qaeda, the approach is the same: A policy proclaimed in the name of freedom, tolerance and a decent world order that, ironically, could hardly be better calculated to produce the opposite. The policy is lethally flawed by its unwillingness to contemplate what lies behind the hatred: Why scores of young people are prepared to blow themselves up, why 19 highly educated young men were ready to destroy themselves and thousands of others in the Sept. 11 hijackings, and why resistance is growing despite the likelihood of insurgents being killed. To deal with this reality, we first have to understand it.

The reality of the matter is that in societies wherein there are people that have different norms and values, this does not necessarily mean that violence and terrorism will occur. So the issue of ‘intolerance’ is a moral and ethical issue based upon value judgements and within

chemical components which could be used to make explosives. Police sealed off Cottage’s home last Thursday and finished their search at the weekend. Officers claim that their find is the largest haul of chemicals of its kind discovered in someone’s home in the country. However, the exact nature of the chemicals has not been revealed.

Yet none of this made national front page news and has neither been analysed by the ‘investigative journalists’ who claim to produce pieces ‘for the public interest’ (!!), because the culprits were not Muslims even though they had the clear intent to bomb.

http://www.burnleycitizen.co.uk/display.var.951775.0.exbnp_man_faces_explosives_charge.php

the current climate of the ‘war on terror’ it is easy to push Islamic ideals as being incompatible with Western values and as therefore being ‘intolerant’. Hence, we have witnessed discussion regarding *niquaab*, Muslim families, “bombers in burkas”, Muslim women praying in mosques, Islamic charities, “chapati bomb plots”, social exclusion, marriages, Islamic beliefs and teachings etc. and in the name of ‘supporting tolerance’ *intolerance* has actually surfaced and has been supported, from those who claim to be opposed to it.

There is also a big difference between intolerance on the one hand and Islamic extremism on the other, ‘intolerance’ is subjective, as ‘intolerance’ for one person is another person’s norms and values, therefore it is difficult to extract the values of the UK as it does not have a defined set and if a thousand people were asked they would all have different values. Therefore, from this aspect one could say that any country is spreading or fostering ‘intolerance’, and it can be also said that Saudi Arabia is not spreading hatred and intolerance any more than the US, Pakistan, Indonesia, Syria or Nigeria is, not to mention within the UK. Moreover, many major cultures make universal claims concerning truth, but this should not be confused with the will to coerce others into these beliefs.

Another question that has to be asked, is Saudi Arabia deliberately spreading a form of Islaam which is capable of undermining the West? This is difficult to prove and unsubstantiated. Therefore, the statement of Murad (TJ Winter) that: **“I regard what the Saudis are doing in the ghettos of British Islam as potentially lethal for the future of the community...”**¹ is not only totally unfounded as we have noted in a previous section within this research regarding what Saudi scholars teach about non-Muslims, but also considering the fact that Murad (Winter) stated this in relation to cut and paste quotes from Aboo Usaamah ath-Thahabee (*hafidbabullaah*) and Green Lane Mosque, let’s see what non-Muslims in the community where Aboo Usamah preaches actually say. In an article entitled *‘Channel 4 accused of creating mischief over portrayal of Black Muslim in Dispatches documentary’* dated 15 January 2007 reported in the Online magazine *Black Britain*:

The Saltley Gate Peace Group (SGPG), a multi-faith community organisation based in Birmingham is made up of representatives from the Muslim and Christian community. It issued a press statement on Friday giving its **“undiminished support”** for the Green Lane

¹ This was stated by Murad (Winter) on the *Channel 4* (UK) documentary entitled *‘Undercover Mosques’* for the programme *Dispatches* on 15 January 2007.

Mosque. SGPG said that Imam Abu Usaamah: **“...is accepted by much of his congregation and the wider interfaith community to be a peaceful man and is known to promote peace to his congregation.”** It also said that Abu Usaamah has denounced terrorism on several occasions and encourages worshippers to avoid **“political Islam and radicalism.”**

With respect, Murad (Winter) who resides in Cambridge as a university lecturer has limited knowledge of **“the ghettos of British Islam”** to say the least! Therefore, how can one speak about **“the ghettos of British Islam”** when one never goes to them?! Or when one lives far from them?! He is not best placed to comment to say the least! So this is a nonsensical assertion and akin to a man in an ivory tower speaking about the vicinities of the populous, which he rarely frequents! Indeed, the *Barelwi* places of worship, which we understand Murad (Winter) does sometimes visit, have an utterly abysmal record in terms of their “tolerance and community relations” in the UK and are well-known for their virtual “no blacks, whites, Arabs or other Asians allowed” attitude, except for those who are from their own tribal village! Alongside blind following of ignorant cultural practices which clearly contradict Islaam. Furthermore, it was such *Barelwi* centres in the UK which were stocking and selling audios of the likes of Abdullaah Faysal and Aboo Hamza al-Misree during the 1990s! Murad (Winter) thus provides a stereotypical white academic’s portrayal of ghettos wherein cultural myths about Muslim ghetto culture are reinforced, as has been made about black culture in the West, as being havens for rebellion, violence and extremism.¹ Therefore,

¹ In any case this myth about minority communities is false and an evidence which attests to this is how white non-Muslims have participated in intolerant and terrorist activities. The *BBC* reported (Wednesday July 5 2006 CE) that: a man from East Sussex (in England) sent bomb-making instructions to a member of the far-right BNP. Allen Boyce, 74, of Farington Court, Old Orchard Road, Eastbourne, admitted incitement to possess explosives. He was sentenced by Lewes Crown Court on Wednesday, by Judge Anthony Niblett who described his actions as “evil”. The judge suspended Boyce’s sentence for two years and placed him under a two-year supervision order. The offence took place between 4 April and 15 November 2004. Boyce wrote to 27-year-old Terry Collins, also from Eastbourne, who was jailed for five years in 2005 for a campaign of attacks and abuse against Asian families. He sent Collins plans of a hotel in Eastbourne and instructions on how to mix two chemicals.

Also from the *Burnley Citizen* newspaper (4 October 2006 CE, ‘*Ex-BNP man faces explosives charge*’ by Andrew Hewitt): **“FORMER British National Party member has been accused of possessing the largest amount of chemical explosives of its type ever found in the country. Robert Cottage, 49, of Talbot Street, Colne, appeared before Burnley magistrates charged with possession of an explosive substance. Cottage was charged under the Explosives Substances Act 1883 on**

it is unfortunate that Murad (Winter) is contributing to a moral panic similar to the moral panic of the 1950s in the UK about “dark strangers”.

Therefore, reports, documentaries and ‘investigations’ into ‘Saudi Arabia spreading intolerance in the West’ are rather tirades against belief in, and the practice of, the fundamentals of Islaam which most Muslims hold. The aims of this is to then put forward an alternative, vetted form and expression of Islaam, that alternative being “acceptable forms of Islam” which support, buttress and never criticize, non-Muslim governments.¹ Certain organizations in the UK have fallen into this with the *Suffis* being the main culprits as we have seen so far as they are the ones who are ever ready to lay the blame at the feet of “Wahhabi clerics” without actually even beginning to define what that is! So for example, they will quote a bona-fide Islamic scholar from Saudi and say that “this is a Wahhabi opinion” yet then class the terrorists in Iraaq or the 7/7 bombers as also being “Wahhabis”! ‘Abdal Hakim Murad (TJ Winter) stated for example in an article entitled *Islam’s ‘heart of darkness’*:

Strict Wahhabis consider the theology and piety of mainline Sunnism to be kufr (disbelief).² Hence Wahhabi radicals have not hesitated to kill Muslims, including senior scholars; indeed, Muslims have always been al-Qaida’s principal victims.

Monday night after forensic experts searched his home, allegedly discovering chemical components which could be used to make explosives. Police sealed off Cottage’s home last Thursday and finished their search at the weekend. Officers claim that their find is the largest haul of chemicals of its kind discovered in someone’s home in the country. However, the exact nature of the chemicals has not been revealed.” Yet none of this made national front page news and has neither been analysed by the ‘investigative journalists’ who claim to produce pieces ‘for the public interest’ (!?!), because the culprits were not Muslims even though they had the clear intent to bomb.

http://www.burnleycitizen.co.uk/display.var.951775.0.exbnp_man_faces_explosives_charge.php

¹ An example of the move towards such “vetted Islam” can be witnessed in Murad’s (Winter’s) *‘Muslim Songs of the British Isles’* (!?!?) which is an attempt to formulate and innovate a type of expression which is not seen as subversive for the native white population of the UK. The site can be seen here: **<http://www.britishmuslimsong.co.uk/harmonia.htm>** along with Abdal Hakim Murad’s own vocal song contribution to this rather peculiar ballad of ‘Islamic expression’.

² This is a deceptive statement by Murad (Winter) which he is obliged to provide evidence for, or does he expect people to follow him blindly?

This is an example of such simplistic reasoning, as after the scholars have been defined as being “Wahhabi” the logical deduction is to then link them to terrorism, as seen within this quote. There are many other dynamics (economic, social and Islamic) that contribute to extremism and radicalization and to merely pass the buck to Saudi Arabia is foolhardy. Murad (Winter) has also stated, in an irresponsible statement wherein he also affirms the neo-con agenda, that: **“Some Wahhabis believe that this is how the West is to be brought down, by spreading Wahhabism in the heart of the West’s cities.”**¹

It is all the more strange that the *Sufis* of the era want to make themselves out to be those ones who the West should liaise with, even though the *Sufis* throughout the nineteenth century were the ones also revolting against British, French and Russian colonialism in Algeria, India, Senegal, Russia, Somalia, Syria, Sudan and other places!!² So statements from

¹ This was impudently stated by Murad (Winter) on the *Channel 4* (UK) documentary entitled ‘*Undercover Mosques*’ for the programme *Dispatches* on 15 January 2007.

² For example,

- AbdulQadir ibn Muhiydeen ibn Mustaphaa al-Hasanee al-Jazaa’iree, born in Qaytana, Algeria in 1222 AH/1807 CE. In 1246 AH/1830 CE when the French colonialists entered Algeria, he led a resistance against the French until 1263 AH/1847 CE when the ‘sultaan of the West’ ‘AbdurRahmaan ibn Hishaam made a peace deal with the French and then ‘AbdulQadir was taken to Toulon. In 1281 AH/1864 CE, he was allowed to move to Damascus where he died in 1300 AH/1883 CE.
- In Senegal, those who opposed French colonialism included Ahmadu Bamba, Imaam Samore Toure and Mahmadu al-Ameen. Mahmadu al-Ameen, a *Tijaanee soofee*, waged his war at a time when French colonial conquest was at its most vigorous phase during 1885 to 1887. Mahmadu al-Ameen began to be feared by the French as by 1885 he had an army numbering 5000 armed men with ammunition, thus the French, with support from Britain and other tribes and clans opposed to Mahmadu Ameen were cornered at Niani.
- Imaam Shamil Muhammad ad-Daghestanee fought against Czarist Russia for 35 years, his teacher was Mullah Muhammad al-Ghazzee al-Kamrawee, whose own military career began when Russia declared protection for Christians in Khurjistan and then formal annexation of the region from Safawid Persia in 1215 AH/1800 CE. Al-Ghazzee recruited thousands of soldiers and fought until his death in 1248 AH/1832 CE, when his successor al-Ameer al-Khanzajee took over but was killed the same year, after which the war’s leadership went to Imaam Shamil. He fought many pitched battles with the Russians in the 27 years of resistance that followed. In 1260 AH/1844 CE his forces captured 35 Russian canons, which provoked Russia to send an even larger army to finish off the *mujahideen*, who still fought on 15 years more until 1279 AH/1859 CE when Shamil Muhammad was captured. Shamil Muhammad was then banished to Turkey and then travelled to Madeenah and died there. We will speak about him further later.

the likes of 'Abdal Hakim Murad (TJ Winter) that Saudi Arabia **"...has also on occasion unwittingly nurtured revolutionary religious views"**¹ can equally be applied to the *Sufis* who ferociously fought against British, French and Russian colonialism! Indeed, Murad (Winter) himself stated in an article entitled *The Poverty of Fanaticism: Islamic Spirituality, the Forgotten Revolution*² in a rather odd attempt to present the *Sufis* as being 'militant' stated, prior to the events of 9/11 when many were not ashamed to mention the word *jibaad*:

-
- Muhammad ibn 'Abdullaah ibn Hasan as-Somaalee, born in 1864 CE near Bohotle in north-central Somalia. He was an important intellectual and scholar well versed in the Qur'aan, *hadeeth* and Islamic jurisprudence. He had resistance to the British and Italians in his country for more decades, 1899-1920 and highlighted that non-Muslims from remote lands entered Somalia enforcing Christianity, supported by their governments and their military superiority. Bradford Martin in his book *Muslim Brotherhoods in 19th Century Africa* (Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp.179-200, states that Muhammad ibn 'Abdullaah as-Somaalee mounted a military movement that was perhaps sustained longer and was more successful than any movement led by an African Muslim leader of the 19th century. For 20 years the hands of the Italians and the British were tied, forcing the imperial forces to spend huge sums of money, raising taxes in their home countries in order to fund these wars, and costing more lives purely on military operations. Muhammad ibn 'Abdullaah as-Somaalee died in 1920 at 56 years of age.
 - The *soofees* of Sudan joined the revolt of Muhammad Ahmad (the false claimant of being the Mahdi) against the Franco-British backed regime of the Turko-Egyptians during 1880-1898 CE!
 - Even al-Kabbaanee admitted this himself, despite his current frolics with the secularist rulers of Uzbekistaan! Kabbaanee had the nerve to say in his book, in the chapter entitled *Jihad and Sufi Mujahidin*, that the *Sufis* **"...far from encouraging escapism and quietism that impedes social progress, upheld the highest values of social consciousness as well as religious inquiry and science. In fact, they provide adequate testimony to an unremitting jihad and struggle against social injustice and social inaction that took place over the centuries."** See Muhammad Hisham Kabbani, GF Haddad (ed.), *Islamic Beliefs & Doctrine According to Ahl al-Sunna: A Repudiation of "Salafi" Innovations, vol.1* (Mountain View, CA: ASFA, 1996), p.230. What warped understanding of "social justice" leads al-Kabbaanee to impugn 80% of the *masaqid* in America to be run by "Wahhabi terrorists"?! What bizarre notion of "upholding high values of social consciousness" leads al-Kabbaanee to wine and dine with the enemies of Islaam?!

¹ Tim Winter, "Bin Laden's violence is a heresy against Islam" in *The Daily Telegraph* (London) 15 October 2001

² Written under the name of 'Abdal Hakim Murad' and not under his *Cambridge University* title of 'Tim J. Winter'?!

Likewise, the Islamic obligation of jihad has been borne with especial zeal by the Sufi orders. All the great nineteenth century jihadists: Uthman dan Fodio (Hausaland)¹, al-

¹ He wasn't a clear *sufi*. He is Aboo Muhammad 'Uthmaan ibn Muhammad ibn Foodee, born in Marratta in northern Nigeria in 1168 AH/ 1754 CE. The name 'Dan Fodio' is the Hausa rendition of Ibn Foodee. He was from a family of scholars that migrated to Hausaland from Futa Toro before the 15th century CE, bringing with it the Islamic tradition of Timbuktu. He waged a *jihad* in 1217 AH/1802 CE against clans that had violently opposed Islaam and strongly repressed the Muslims. He established the Sokoto Islamic state which ruled by *Sharee'ah* in West Africa. He is known for his *tajdeed* efforts and his stance against innovations. A number of folkloric legends and myths surrounded the personality of Dan Fodio as some people claimed that he could "walk on water" or appear in dreams. Some people even claimed that he was *the Mahdi*! All of these ideas were refuted by Dan Fodio himself during his time. In a book entitled *Tanbeeh al-Faheem*, Dan Fodio refuted the claims of a man named Hammaa who lived in Maganga, Nigeria and was claiming to be the *Mahdi*. The man was later executed for his heresy (MA al-Hajj, *The Mahdist Tradition in Northern Nigeria*, A.B.U. 1973). Dan Fodio however did make some comments in some of his works that were in line with the *Asharees*, but at times he clearly said things in line with the *Salaf* (pious predecessors) as have been mentioned. He therefore was akin to Imaam an-Nawawee and Ibn Hajar, who also had teachers that were of the *'Ash'aree 'aqeedah* but were not pure *'Asha'arees*.

Dan Fodio's chain of scholars however reveals interesting facts. One of teachers was Jibreel ibn 'Umar of the Tuareg tribe who had made Hajj and thus lived in Makkah for a while. In Madeenah, Jibreel Ibn 'Umar studied with Muhammad Murtada az-Zabeedee (1145-1205 AH/ 1732-1791 CE) who was originally from India but had travelled to az-Zabeed in Yemen where he lived for a while and studied before going on to teach in Madeenah himself. One of az-Zabeedee's teachers was Shaah Waliullaah ad-Dehlawee (1702 – 1762 CE) of Delhi in India. Dan Fodio's uncle who taught him *hadeeth* was Muhammad bin Raaj who had studied under Abu'l-Hasan as-Sindee also from India and a teacher of *hadeeth* in Madeenah. Abu'l-Hasan as-Sindee was a student of Muhammad Hayaat as-Sindee another great *hadeeth* scholar of India who was also teaching in Madeenah. One of Muhammad Hayaat as-Sindee's students was Muhammad ibn Abdul-Wahhaab (*raheemahumullaah*). Also see a recent study conducted in Nigeria and written in Arabic entitled *Asaaneed al-Faqeer ad-Da'eef al-Mutashaafee bi'l-Mushaffa' Ahmad as-Shareef* (Ms. University of Ibadan Library 82/137: Ibadan, Centre of Islamic Documentation (CAD)).

This *sanad* was also mentioned by an American Muslim researcher who had graduated from *Madeenah University*. Also see the research of a non-Muslim researcher Stefan Reichmuth in his "*Murtada al-Zabidi (d. 1791) in Biographical and Autobiographical Accounts – Glimpses of Islamic Scholarship in the 18th Century CE*" in the Islamic studies journal *Die Welt Des Islams – International Journal for the Study of Modern Islam* (Leiden, Boston and Koln: Brill, Vol. 39, No. 1, March 1999) p.70. With regards to fanatical blind following of Imaam Maalik, it is known that **"...the greatest contribution of Dan Fodio's reforming ideas, apart from his views on Sunnah and Bid'a, was in the field of madhaahib (schools of law)."** F.H. al-Misri (ed.), *Bayaan Wujoob ul-Hijrah 'ala'l-Ibaad* (Khartoum University Press and OUP, 1978 CE)

'Uthmaan ibn Foodee said in his book *Hidaayatut-Tullaab* (Zaria: Gaskiya Corporation, 1961), p.2:

Neither Allaah in His book, nor the Prophet in his Sunnah made it obligatory that one particular madhhab should be followed, nor did we hear any of the early scholars

enjoining a person to follow one way. If they had done that, they would have committed a sin by not allowing people to act in accordance with ahadeeth which that particular way did not give weight to.

Other statements from 'Uthmaan ibn Foodee can be found in his book *Hisn ul-Afhaam min Juyoosh il-Awhaam* [The Fortification of Understanding Against the Armies of Delusion], this book was translated into English as *Islam Against Illusions* (Quality Press, 1989) by Fazlur Rahman Siddiqi. In the book 'Uthmaan ibn Foodee says of many 'scholars,'

If such a person is not aware of the Sunnah it is not permissible to follow him...He is simply a lunatic lost in his special state. (ibid. p.105 (Arabic text), p. 157 (Eng. Text))

'Uthmaan ibn Foodee also says in the same book,

Some people are ignorant of the Sunnah, but they are anxious to emulate the practices of their Shaykh. If you speak to them about the Sunnah they will reply, "My Shaykh was doing this, my Shaykh was doing that," thus contradicting the clear and open Sunnah.

ibid. p. 90 (Arabic text), p. 99 (Eng. Text)

Under delusion number 35 Imaam 'Uthmaan states:

There are people in this country who venerate stones and trees...they sacrifice animals for them symbolizing that the stones and trees are great, and they even pour flour-paste on them.

He further stated:

The one who indulges in such activities is considered a kaafir according to consensus.

Dr Siddiqi stated (ibid. pp.34-36):

Since innovations and superstitions prevailed in all parts of the country, the common people as well as the Muslim scholars of that time were involved in un-Islamic practices and the whole society changed into a corrupt and demoralized society.

Hence, there was a situation which was exactly what was prevalent during the epoch of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab, Dr Siddiqi continues

At that time, Muslims were called Muslims only because they were born in the so-called 'Muslim families' while their characters and practices were against Islam and its education. Their belief was that some trees and stones deserved respect and worship and that these could provide them with the means of subsistence or bless them with a child...Muslims of that time had totally lost their Islamic identifications because of their pagan practices. Even for a Muslim, it was difficult to recognize his Muslim brother. Even the Ulama accused the Shaykh, but they were not sincere in their remarks against him. Their attitude to the Shaykh was not based on their sincerity, but it was the result of a conspiracy against the Shaykh by the Sultaan.

Dr Siddiqi also states on page 175 of *Islam Against Illusions*:

According to Muhammad Bello...the main purpose of his (Imaam 'Uthmaan's) sermons was to teach the people the fundamentals of Islam; preferably, the principles of tawheed, the other articles of faith and the essential duties of a Muslim towards Islam.

Muhammad Bello (*raheemahullaah*) was the son of Imaam 'Uthmaan. Therefore, here alone we can see a radical departure in the emphasis of Imaam 'Uthmaan and the *Sufis* of the era, who refrain from calling to

Sanousi (Libya), Abd al-Qadir al-Jaza'iri (Algeria), Imam Shamil (Daghestan)¹ and the leaders of the Padre Rebellion (Sumatra) were active practitioners of Sufism, writing extensively on it while on their campaigns. Nothing is further from reality, in fact, than the claim that Sufism represents a quietist and non-militant form of Islam.²

Before we breakdown Winter's, or Murad's, notions of Saudi Arabia and what we loosely brands as "Wahhabism", there are some issues to append to the above-mentioned statement from Murad and those who follow him from the *Sufis* and others, with regards the referral to 'Uthmaan Dan Fodio and Imaam Shamil. As we have already discussed Dan Fodio, we will look at Imaam Shamil.

Similar in many ways to Imaam 'Uthmaan Dan Fodio (*rabeemabullaah*), Imaam Shamil (*rabeemabullaah*) also was a far cry from the 'Sufism' that is being adhered to by the contemporary claimants such as Murad (Winter), Kabbani et al. What has to be understood is that after the dissemination of Sufism, it remained amongst most Muslims until some scholars became aware of the excessive and uncorroborated practices, but it is not correct for the contemporary claimants of a 'Sufi tradition' to jump on them as their role models, as the likes of Murad (TJ Winter) do when it suits and we shall mention herein some reasons as to why this is the case. Imaam Shamil was a *Sufi* of sorts, but his "Sufism" was in many ways

tawheed based on their claim that it causes division! Not to mention the fact that they are largely ignorant of it. 'Uthmaan ibn Foodee also made similar statements in his books *Irshaad al-Ummah ilaa Tayseer il-Milla* and *Tawqeef ul-Muslimeen*. See Ahmad Mohammad Khani, *The Intellectual Origin of the Sokoto Jihad* (Ibadan, Nigeria: Iman Publications, Muharram 1405 AH/1985 CE), pp.85-90

¹ He was born in the small village of Gimry which is in present-day Daghestan in 1797 CE. He studied Arabic, logic and other subjects. He was born at a time when the Russian Empire was expanding into the territories of the Ottoman and Persian empires. After the Russian invasion, the Caucasian tribes united against the oppressive Tsarist rule in what came to be known as the Caucasian War. Imam Shamil became the leader of the Caucasian resistance in 1834 CE and in June-August 1839 went to the mountains with some 4000 followers including women and children. They found themselves under siege in their mountain stronghold in Akhoulgo in a siege which lasted for eighty days and resulted in huge losses for Shamil and most of his followers were killed yet the Russians also had 3000 casualties. Amazingly, Imam Shamil and some of his closest followers were able to escape down the cliffs and cross Russian siege lines, then he re-grouped and resumed guerrilla tactics against the oppressive Tsarist Russian incursion. In 1859 however, Imam Shamil and his family surrendered and were imprisoned and then exiled to Kaluga, a small town near Moscow and then in 1869 was given permission to leave for Makkah via Istanbul. He died in Madeenah in 1871 CE and was buried at the Baqi'. Two of his sons served in the Russian army (Camaluddeen and Muhammad Sefi) while two other sons served in the Turkish army (Muhammad Ghazi and Muhammad Kamil).

² *The Poverty of Fanaticism: Islamic Spirituality, the Forgotten Revolution*, 2000, available Online

of the antithesis of the “Sufism” of those who hypocritically claim him as their own – especially the neocon *Sufis*. Shamil’s *Sufi* movement, known as Muridism, was essentially a 19th century *Naqshabandi Shafi’i* version of today’s *Deobandi Hanafi Taalibaan* or the Saudi *Hanbali mutawa*. That is, Shamil was concerned primarily with the implementation of the *sharee’ah* and by that we mean the external application of the *Sharee’ah* including the blessed *Sunnah* (*hijaab*, *hadd* punishments, beard, congregational prayer etc.) that classical and modern *Sufis* reject and mock. In fact, Shamil categorically stated that the only reason he waged *jihad* against the disbelieving Russians is because they prevented the Muslims from implementing the *Sharee’ah* and that had they left the Muslims to live by the laws of Islaam, he would not have declared war upon them.

Another matter of divergence with today’s *Sufis* is that Shamil saw his struggle as part of the wider anti-imperialist *jihad* of the Orthodox *Sunni ummah*. This is evidenced by his sending delegations to *Sunni* Muslims leaders, including the Ottoman Sultan, seeking military assistance and manpower. He would even encourage his followers with promises of Muslim armies coming to their support from as far as Yemen. All this is in stark contrast to the secretive, exclusive *Sufi* cults who see the wider *Sunni ummah* as *jaabil* heretics. The main reason that historians give for the ultimate defeat of Shamil’s east North Caucasus resistance is because they failed to win the support of the Kabardians (i.e. the Upper Circassians) of the central North Caucasus. Had the Kabardians joined in the fight against the Tsar, the Muslims would have presented a united and, most probably, unassailable front from the Caspian to the Black Sea - the Lower Circassians in the Western Caucasus were also at war with the Russians. And the reason Muridism failed to spread amongst the Kabardians and Circassians in general was because they thought it way too austere and excessive (incl. *farid dhiiker* sessions) compared to their own liberal application of Islaam. Again, the *Sufi* opportunist admirers of Shamil today themselves claim to champion liberalism against “Wahhabi” austerity.

In addition to the above, Shamil was famously opposed to those aspects of local cultural practice and tradition (known as the “*adaat*”) which opposed the *Sharee’ah*. In other words, as far as Shamil was concerned, he was fighting *bida’* (innovation). This is stark contrast to those *Sufis* who claim their pluralistic interpretation of Islaam defends traditional cultural Muslim practices. Finally, everyone in Russia today – Muslim and non-Muslim alike - see the “Wahhabis” as the inheritors of Shamil’s legacy and “Wahhabism” as the natural successor

or progression from Muridism. That is because the only popular leaders consistently calling for the freedom to implement *Sharee'ah* in Dagestan/Aluania in our time have been former "Wahhabi" graduates from the Islamic universities of Madeenah and Riyadh or those influenced by their *dawah*. That's not to say that Sufism has died out in Dagestan, on the contrary, it has flourished amongst the deviated 'clerics' who are patronized by the corrupted ones and whose Muridism is now confined to *dhiker* sessions and nothing else. In all likelihood, had Shamil lived today, he'd have declared the contemporary *Sufis* as being hypocritical or disbelieving apostates! See: <http://www.unc.edu/~aneurysm/pre.html>

In other writings related to Saudi Arabia, Murad (Winter), a *Cambridge University* lecturer, utilizes terms such as "mud huts", "Najdi wastelands", "shocking massacres", "dry", "neo-khawarij", "primitive" and a whole host of other disparaging and pejorative adjectives that TJ Winter draws upon when describing and 'discussing' Saudi Arabia and its Islamic understandings.¹ Many scholars have identified this process within Western academia in describing the teachings of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab, Samira Haj for example has noted:

Accordingly, ibn 'Abdul Wahhāb is mainly viewed as the legendary mastermind of a "pre-modern", "fundamentalist", "puritanical", "regressive", "violent" political movement and, concomitantly, the inspiration for present-day militant Muslim sects in struggling against modernity. Thus, the early Wahhabi movement is depicted as an "ultra-right-wing" reform movement given to violence and rebellion, fomenting disorder rather than promoting their avowed goal of Muslim unity. Reminiscent of the kharijite revolt in early Islam, Orientalists argue that the Wahhabis sought to impose reform through intolerance and fanatical methods that instilled in the minds of Muslims the conviction that change was only feasible through violent means.²

These Orientalist descriptions have unfortunately been preserved within the analyses of certain Muslims who have been entrenched within Orientalist academia. These are terms which if used to describe people of African origin or of Asian origin would be totally

¹ The neo-con Jewish convert to the Naqshabndee sufi order, Stephen Schwartz also does this within his book *The Two Faces of Islam: The House of Sa'ud from Tradition to Terror*. Schwartz says about Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab (*raheemahullaah*): "...an unsophisticated, narrow minded wanderer from Najd..."!! On pages 66-67

² Samira Haj, *Reordering Islamic Orthodoxy: Muhammad ibn 'Abdul Wahhāb* in the journal *The Muslim World* (Hartford, CT: Hartford Seminary, 2002) vol.92, nos. 3 and 4, pp.333-34

unacceptable in the UK or US. A further example of Murad (Winter) doing this can be observed within an interview with Dr Enes Karic, the former Minister of Education of Bosnia-Hezegovina which featured in the Bosnian newspaper *Ljiljan*:

Saudi Arabia, unfortunately, is a country where most people until recently lived in extremely simple conditions, and have not recognised the need to speak to the modern world in a sophisticated idiom. Literalism and anti-intellectualism may appeal to desert people, but will not survive long in the global academic and intellectual arena.¹

It may be due to being embedded within the Western academia and establishment which has led certain academics to speak in such ways about Muslims, and it also demonstrates a distinct elitist attitude which is utterly reprehensible. There is also a huge Eurocentric undertone to this type of speech from Murad (Winter) which looks down at other societies as being “extremely simple” indicating a paternalistic bias to his views on Saudi Arabia. Also to refer to Saudi Arabians as “a desert people” is a further example of Eurocentrism which holds the “modern world” (i.e. the West and Europe) as being a “sophisticated” superior culture.² The established image of “modernity” and the **“global academic and intellectual arena”** is based and centred within the urban European or Westernised metropolis and anything other than this deemed as “unsophisticated”. This is what is particularly distasteful within the diatribe of Winter as the above quote for example by extension pours scorn upon

¹ Also found here: <http://www.masud.co.uk/ISLAM/ahm/karic.htm>

² Eurocentrism is the conscious, and unconscious, emphasis on European or the Western values, culture and concerns over that of other cultures. It involves denying other cultures their own existence on the basis of them not being white or European. Western education involves a huge emphasis on Europe and largely ignores the histories of Africa, the Middle East and Asia which are only referred to in as much as they relate to Europe and its developments. There is slight mention of the achievements of other cultures and nations yet the main intellectual, academic and sophisticated developments are attributed to Europe and the West, degrading the cultures of others. Assumptions of European superiority arose during the period of European imperialism, which started slowly in the 16th century, and then accelerated in the 17th and 18th centuries and reached its peak in the 19th century. The progressive character of European culture was contrasted with traditional hunting, farming and herding societies in many of the areas of the world being newly explored by Europeans, such as the Americas, most of Africa, and later the Pacific and Australasia. Even the complex civilizations of the Islamic world, India, China and Japan were considered to be underdeveloped relative to Europe, and were often characterised as static. For many European writers of this time the history of Europe became the model for the rest of the world. Other cultures were identified as having reached a stage through which Europe itself had already passed – primitive hunter-gatherer; farming; early civilization; feudalism; modern liberal-capitalism. Only Europe had achieved the last stage. It was thus thought to be uniquely responsible for the scientific, technological and cultural achievements that constitute the modern world.

the environment of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*). Such stereotypes are the basis of an Orientalist outlook wherein “Orientals” are seen as being despotic, backward, warlike, treacherous and clannish, thus not to be trusted when in power, as Edward Said and other critics of Orientalism have highlighted. T.J. Winter maintains much of these Orientalist features particularly when talking about the Arabs of Saudi Arabia, as has been indicated. Winter’s statement above also fails to note the fact that Muslims scholars of the past that were from Saudi Arabia traveled in seeking knowledge, like Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab for example, so he was not merely stuck within an environment of **“anti-intellectualism which appeals to desert people”**. If we turn to some actual historians of the Arabia it is evident that ‘Uyaynah was a settlement wherein the Islamic sciences were studied. Gene Gurney states:

Islam was still strong in the Hejaz but weak or nonexistent elsewhere in Arabia. Animalistic practices had been resumed in the interior and integrated into Islamic rituals...Islam presumed a settled life or at least access to one. The Najd, although perforce inhabited mostly by tribes on the move, did possess some settlements where rudiments of Islam were taught. Uyaynah, not far from the main Saudi settlement of Dariyah, was one of these.¹

Indeed, the Qur’aan states,

آآ آ آ آ

“And We have certainly made the Qur’an easy for remembrance, so is there any who will remember?”

{*al-Qamar* (54): 17}

Imaam Bukhaaree in the *‘Book of Tawbeed’* in his *Sabeeh* reports that Matar al-Warraaq stated about this verse **“Is there anyone who seeks knowledge so that he can benefit from it?”** So Islaam can flourish within absolutely all settings and environments and currently Muslims live within a diverse range of geographical and cultural settings. Therefore, the statement of Murad (Winter) is again highly contentious if not downright false, as Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab (*rabeemabullaah*) not only studied in ‘Uyainah but also in Madeenah which was an academic environment that was different and much more diverse as

¹ Gene Gurney, *Kingdoms of Asia, the Middle East and Africa* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1986), p.105

there were scholars and students from all over the world present.¹ Different schools of fiqh along with many other branches of Islamic sciences were taught there. Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab for example studied under a number of scholars present in Madeenah at that time such as Ali ad-Daghestaanee, Ismaa'eel al-Ajaloonee, 'Abdullaah ibn Ibraaheem ibn Sayf² and Muhammad Hayaat as-Sindee (*rabeemabumullaab*)³; the last two scholars in particular were very close to Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab. 'Uthmaan Dan Fodio's uncle who taught him *hadeeth* was Muhammad bin Raaj who had studied under Abu'l-Hasan as-Sindee who was a student of Muhammad Hayaat as-Sindee (*rabeemabumullaab*). Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab also traveled and studied *fiqh*, *hadeeth* and Arabic language in Basra with scholars such as Shaykh Muhammad al-Majmoo'ee. Al-Majmoo'ee mentored, guided and supported Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab.⁴

As for the assertion that Saudi Arabia promoted “**anti-intellectualism**” then it is odd how the *Sufis* remain oddly silent with regards to the totally unsanctioned customs and bizarre practices which crept into Muslim practice and really did contribute to the stagnation of Muslim development. This is the real issue which Winter never ever addresses, the rampant dissemination of practices which are not based whatsoever on the Qur'aan, sunnah and the practices of the early Muslims (the *Salaf*). This however has been observed by some honest Western historians, Philip Hitti notes:

¹ In 'Uyaynah Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab studied *Hanbalee fiqh* with his father who was a scholar and a judge in al-'Uyaynah, and his family were known for scholarship and piety. His grandfather Sulaymaan ibn'Ali was said to be the greatest scholar in Najd during the 11th Islamic century (circa 16th - 17th century CE) and was the judge of 'Uyaynah.

² He was from the Shamaree tribe and his father had moved to Madeenah from al-Majma' wherein Abdullaah grew up and studied. 'Abdullaah also traveled to Damascus to study there and then retruned to teach in Madeenah. He had a huge library from which Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab benefited from. He died in Madeenah in 1140AH/1728CE. See 'Abdullaah al-Bassaam, *'Ulama Najd Khilaal Sitta Quroon* [The Scholars of Najd During the Last Six Centuries], (Makkah: Maktabah an-Nahdhah al-Hadeethah, 1398 AH), vol.2, p.505

³ Muhammad Hayaat ibn Ibraaheem as-Sindee was born in the province of as-Sind in the Indo-Pak subcontinent. After studying in Sind, he moved to Madeenah to continue his studies and later became teacher there. He was an erudite scholar of *hadeeth* and a *hanafee* jurist, he authored many works such as *Sharh at-Targheeb wa't-Tarheeb* and a commentary on the *Forty Hadeeth of Imaam an-Nawawee*. He died in Madeenah in 1163 AH/1750 CE. He had many students that went on to be great scholars and caller to Islaam.

⁴ 'Abdullaah ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen, *ash-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab Hayaatuhu wa Fikruhu* (Riyadh: Daar ul-'Uloom, 1412 AH) p.34

Besides introducing a form of monasticism and ritual, the Sufis made other contributions to Islam. They were evidently responsible for the diffusion of the rosary (subhah) among Moslems. Today only the puritanical Wahhabis eschew the rosary, regarding it as an innovation (bid'ah). Of Hindu origin, this instrument of devotion was probably borrowed by the Sufis from the Eastern Christian churches and not directly from India. During the Crusades, the rosary found its way into the Roman Catholic West...Moreover, Sufism founded and popularized the cult of sainthood. Veneration of saints finds no sanction in the Koran. It sprang up following Christian practice, in response to the mystic call and to meet the need of bridging the gap between man and God in Islamic theology.¹

Furthermore, regarding Winter's assertion about an **"anti-intellectualism which appeals to desert people"** then even if we are assuming that this is the case, the cause of this can be attributed to the decline of the Ottoman empire during the nineteenth century! The very ones who the *Sufis* erroneously claim were revolted against and this has actually been noted by some historians. Sarah Searight notes: **"Although the Arab provinces were left much to themselves, initiative was discouraged..."**² Philip Hitti also confirmed that: **"No intellectual work of high order could be expected under the political and concomitant social and economic conditions that prevailed in Arab states under Ottoman rule."**³ Indeed, Hitti goes on to accurately observe that the spread of *kalaam* (speculative theology) along with uncritical adherence to obscure mystical traditions led to hindering of scholarly investigation and productivity.

Therefore, such assertions by Winter are akin to myths which have been harboured within European thought about "the other" and indeed, while Saudi Arabia is accused of being intolerant of "the other" we find Eurocentric statements such as this. We have seen that Murad (Winter) wrote an article entitled *'Islam's heart of darkness'* strikingly similar in its title to the novella⁴ *Heart of Darkness* written in 1899 by Joseph Conrad (1857-1924). Within the book, Conrad tells the story of an Englishman, Marlow, and his experience in Congo and Conrad drew heavily on his own experiences in the Congo as a Captain of a Steamer. Firstly,

¹ Philip K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs: From the Earliest Times to the Present*, 9th edn. (New York: St Martin's Press, 1967), p.348

² Sarah Searight, *The British in the Middle East* (New York: Atheneum, 1970), p.6

³ Hitti, *op.cit.*, pp.741-42

⁴ A prose fiction narrative, longer than a short story yet shorter than a novel

the use of “darkness” to describe the African environment insinuates notions of the “unknown” and the “dark barbarous continent” in contrast with the “light of civilization and modernity”. Africans within Conrad’s novella are de-humanised, denied their own language, culture and merely reduced to the realm of the “dark and cannibalistic” jungle in which Europeans find themselves in. African professor Chinua Achebe, author of *Things Fall Apart* (1958), famously criticized Conrad in 1975 for having a racist bias throughout the novella. In his 1975 lecture entitled *An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s “Heart of Darkness”*, Achebe branded Conrad “A bloody racist,” and emphasized the implicit and explicit statements of the inferiority of African people to the white explorers. What is useful from Achebe’s observation about such Eurocentric ideals, that assist us in understanding the statements of Winter regarding Saudi Arabia for example, is that within the Western psyche is the tendency **“to set Africa up as a foil to Europe, as a place of negations at once remote and vaguely familiar, in comparison with Europe’s own state...”** Such a tendency can also be applied to the Arabian Peninsula as observed within the statements from Abdal Hakim Murad (TJ Winter). Conrad had earlier authored a novella entitled *The Nigger of Narcissus* which tells the story of the merchant ship the *Narcissus* and its voyage from Bombay to London with its only black crew member James Wait.

The reality then is that if the terror threat was not there, then such scare-mongering would not be present and it is quite difficult to progress community cohesion when both sides are fearful of the repercussions of violence, fear is not conducive to harmonious discussion. As if there was not a terror threat in the first place, there would not be such a vested interest into ‘Saudi intolerance spreading around the world’ and similar ‘investigations’ into Islamic belief and practice. The Irish communities of the UK for example, were vilified, feared and mistrusted and as a result were also subject to a variety of measures. To the extent that if an Irish person even stated that they agreed with *Sinn Fein* then this meant, to some people in England, that they were terrorists and intolerant. Irish people were stopped and detained at airports and ports, Irish homes were regularly raided and thousands were detained from anything from a few hours to a week. A study carried out in 1999 estimated that in 1993 60% of Irish people had been stopped and questioned over connections to terrorism.¹ In many large English cities Irish people would not go to work

¹ Bronwen Walter, *The Irish Community: Diversity, Disadvantage and Discrimination* (London: Runnymede Trust, 1999)

for a few days after an IRA bombing, out of fear of reprisals.¹ Within such an atmosphere of distrust it is very difficult to have community cohesion, and this is not helped by obscure ‘studies’, ‘reports’ and ‘investigative documentaries’ which cause more intolerance than they actually claim to be defeating in the first place.

Therefore in this atmosphere of fear, paranoia, misunderstanding and sensationalism for scoops and ratings, a Muslim speaking theoretically to a few other Muslims in a Birmingham Islamic centre, which supposedly has links to the Saudi government, about punishments to be exacted within a state which does not exist becomes worthy of informing the whole of the UK about!!? In any case, if there is an Islamic injunction which speaks about throwing people of mountains for example, there is absolutely no Muslim living in Britain who hears that who thinks that he will go to the nearest mountain in the UK (none in Birmingham incidentally and the closest highest thing to this probably being the *Bull Ring Shopping Centre!*) and throw a person off it!!? Therefore documentaries which claim “to be in the public interest” end up contributing to the climate of intolerance, which they claimed to be opposing at the outset.

¹ Paul Donovan, “*Muslims: The New Irish?*” Online and in the *Irish Post*, 2004

DID IMAAM MUHAMMAD IBN 'ABDULWAHHAAB CONSIDER THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE TO BE AN APOSTATE STATE AND DID HE REVOLT AGAINST IT?

The claim about the “**Wahhabis revolting against the Ottomans**”¹ is not a new claim and was mentioned by the enemies of Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhab during his time such as Dahlaan, az-Zahaawee and even Ibn ‘Aabideen. Yet Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab (*rabeemabullaab*) did not hold it to be Islamically correct to revolt against a Muslim ruler, religious or immoral, so long as they did not enjoin disobedience towards Allaah, because obedience is only with regard to what is right and proper. This further shows that the Ottomans did not rule over Najd during their epoch, this will be highlighted later. Just as the

¹ For example, Khaled Abou El Fadl stated in his article *The Crusader: Why we must take Bin Laden's writings seriously* in the March/April 2006 edition of the *Boston Review* that:

Wahhabis allied themselves with the Saudi family, which in turn relied on the British for military and logistical support, and it is British support that enabled Wahhabi fighters to wage war against the Ottomans. In doing so, the Wahhabis helped the British defeat and dismantle the Ottoman caliphate. Generations of Wahhabi scholars simply ignored this inconsistency; others denied that the British alliance ever existed; and still others masked the contradiction by greatly exaggerating the supposed heresy or apostasy of the Ottomans.

The real inconsistency is in the fact that the Ottomans themselves sought help from the British and French against the Russians during the Crimean war as well! So maybe a more detailed study of history needs to be undertaken by some!? Stephen Schwartz, the neo-con Jewish convert to the *Naqshabandee sufi* order states within his poorly researched book *The Two Faces of Islam: The House of Sa'ud from Tradition to Terror* that: “**Soon the itinerant Arab and the imperial British shared a goal: the liquidation of the Ottoman Empire.**” (p.67) It is not surprising that Schwartz would make such historical errors, as within the book there is scant reference to the Qur'aan and *hadeeth*, if there is any reference to them at all! Karen Armstrong also made a similar error in this regard by saying “**Abd al-Wahhab declared the Ottomans sultans to be apostates, unworthy of the obedience of the faithful and deserving of death.**” So within this excerpt there are two mistakes, naming Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab as “**Abd al-Wahhab**” which is the name of his father and the regurgitated claim about making *takfeer* and *khurooj* against the Ottomans. Karen Armstrong, *The Battle of God: A History of Fundamentalism* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2000), p.44

Some have tried to utilise the claim of the alleged “British spy”, yet even the Hamid Algar, an enemy of the *da'wah* of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab, admits that this is false and invented by the *shee'ah*!

Ottomans did not rule over West Africa and hence Imaam 'Uthmaan Ibn Foodee (Dan Fodio), *rabeemabullaah*, established the Sokoto Caliphate in West Africa; the Ottoman rule did not extend to West Africa.

Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated:

The Imaams from every Madhhab are agreed concerning the one the forcefully took over a region or regions that he has the ruling of "Imaam" in all matters. If this had not been so then the affairs of the world would never have been established. This is because for a very long time, before the era of Imaam Ahmad till this day of ours, the people have never gathered behind a single Imaam. And they do not know anyone from the Scholars who has mentioned that any of the Sharee'ah rulings cannot be correct (effected, implemented) except by the overall Imaam (the Khaleefah).¹

Thirdly, let's turn to what some Islamic historians have concurred, as opposed to the mere diatribes of the unqualified!² Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Aal-'AbdulLateef said:

Some opponents of the salafi da'wah claim that Imam Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab rebelled against the Ottoman Caliphate, thus splitting the jamaa'ah (main body of the Muslims) and refusing to hear and obey (the ruler).³

Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab said in his letter to the people of al-Qaseem:

وأرى وجوب السمع والطاعة لأئمة المسلمين برّهم وفاجرهم ما لم يأمرُوا بمعصية الله
ومن ولي الخلافة واجتمع عليه الناس ورضوا به وغلبهم بسيفه حتى صار خليفة وجبت طاعته
وحرّم الخروج عليه

I believe that it is obligatory to hear and obey the leaders of the Muslims, whether they are righteous or immoral, so long as they do not enjoin disobedience towards Allaah. Whoever has become Caliph and the people have given him their support and

¹ *ad-Durarus-Sunniyyah fil-Ajwibatun-Najdiyyah* vol.7,p.239

² Refer to the book by Professor Sulaiman Bin Abdurrahman al-Huqail (Professor of Education at Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University, Riyadh), *Muhammad Bin Abdulwahhâb – His Life and the Essence of his Call* (Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, Endowments, Dawah and Guidance, KSA, First Edition, 1421 AH/2001 CE), with an introduction by Sheikh Saleh Bin Abdulaziz Al-Sheikh.

³ Abdul'Azeez ibn Muhammad Aal 'AbdulLateef, *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een li Da'wat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahaab* (Riyadh: Daar ul-Watan, 1412 AH), p. 233

accepted him, even if he has gained the position of caliph by force, is to be obeyed and it is haraam to rebel against him.¹

And he also said:

الأصل الثالث : أن من تمام الاجتماع السمع والطاعة لمن تأمر علينا ولو كان عبداً حبشياً ..

One of the main principles of unity is to hear and obey whoever is appointed over us even if he is an Abyssinian slave...²

And Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Aal-'AbdulLateef said:

وبعد هذا التقرير الموجز الذي أبان ما كان عليه الشيخ من وجوب السمع والطاعة لأنمة المسلمين برهم وفاجرهم ما لم يأمرؤا بمعصية الله : فإننا نشير إلى مسألة مهمة جوابا عن تلك الشبهة فهناك سؤال مهم هو: هل كانت " نجد " موطن هذه الدعوة ومحل نشأتها تحت سيطرة دولة الخلافة العثمانية ؟

After stating these facts which explain that the Shaykh believed it was obligatory to hear and obey the leaders of the Muslims, whether they are righteous or immoral, so long as they do not enjoin disobedience towards Allaah, we may refer to an important issue in response to that false accusation. There is an important question which is: was Najd, where this call originated and first developed, under the sovereignty of the Ottoman state?

Dr Saalih al-'Abood answered this by saying:

لم تشهد " نجد " على العموم نفوذا للدولة العثمانية فما امتد إليها سلطانها ولا أتى إليها ولاية عثمانيون ولا جابت خلال ديارها حامية تركية في الزمان الذي سبق ظهور دعوة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب رحمه الله ومما يدل على هذه الحقيقة التاريخية استقرار تقسيمات الدولة العثمانية الإدارية فمن خلال رسالة تركية عنوانها : " قوانين آل عثمان مضامين دفتر الديوان " يعني : " قوانين آل عثمان في ما يتضمنه دفتر الديوان " ، ألفها يمين علي أفندي الذي كان أميناً للدفتري الخاقاني سنة 1018 هجرية الموافقة لسنة 1609م من خلال هذه الرسالة يتبين أنه منذ أوائل القرن الحادي عشر الهجري كانت دولة آل عثمان تنقسم إلى اثنتين وثلاثين إيالة منها أربع عشرة إيالة عربية وبلاد نجد ليست منها ما عدا الإحساء إن اعتبرناه من نجد

Najd never came under Ottoman rule, because the rule of the Ottoman state never reached that far, no Ottoman governor was appointed over that region and the Turkish

¹ *Majmoo'at Mu'allafaat al-Shaykh*, vol.5, p.11

² *Majmoo'ah Mu'allafaat al-Shaykh*, vol.1, p.394; quoted in *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een*, pp.233-234

soldiers never marched through its land during the period that preceded the emergence of the call of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab (may Allaah have mercy on him). This fact is indicated by the fact that the Ottoman state was divided into administrative provinces. This is known from a Turkish document entitled Qawaaneen Aal ‘Uthmaan Mudaameen Daftar ad-Deewaan (Laws of the Ottomans concerning what is contained in the Legislation), which was written by Yameen ‘Ali Effendi who was in charge of the Constitution in 1018 AH/1609 CE. This document indicates that from the beginning of the eleventh century AH the Ottoman state was divided into 23 provinces, of which 14 were Arabic provinces, and the land of Najd was not one of them, with the exception of al-Ihsa’, if we count al-Ihsa’ as part of Najd.¹

And Dr ‘Abdullaah al-’Uthaymeen said:

ومهما يكن فإن " نجداً " لم تشهد نفوذاً مباشراً للعثمانيين عليها قبل ظهور دعوة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب كما أنها لم تشهد نفوذاً قوياً يفرض وجوده على سير الحوادث داخلها لأية جهة كانت فلا نفوذ بني جبر أو بني خالد في بعض جهاتها ولا نفوذ الأشراف في بعض جهاتها الأخرى أحدث نوعاً من الاستقرار السياسي فالحروب بين البلدان النجدية ظلت قائمة والصراع بين قبائلها المختلفة استمر حاداً عنيفاً

Whatever the case, Najd never experienced direct Ottoman rule before the call of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhaab emerged, just as it never experienced any strong influence that could have an impact on events inside Najd. No one had any such influence, and the influence of Bani Jabr or Bani Khaalid in some parts, or the Ashraaf in other parts, was limited. None of them were able to bring about political stability, so wars between the various regions of Najd continued and there were ongoing violent conflicts between its various tribes.²

Shaykh ‘Abdul’Azeez ibn ‘Abdullaah ibn Baaz (*may Allaah have mercy on him*) said in response to this false accusation:

لم يخرج الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب على دولة الخلافة العثمانية فيما أعلم وأعتقد فلم يكن في نجد رئاسة ولا إمارة للأتراك بل كانت نجد إمارات صغيرة وقرى متناثرة وعلى كل بلدة أو قرية -

¹ ‘Aqeedat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhaab wa atharuha fi’l-‘Aalam al-Islami (unpublished), vol.1, p.27

² ‘Abdullaah ibn Saalih al-’Uthaymeen, *ash-Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhaab Hayaatuhu wa Fikruhu* (Riyadh: Daar ul-’Uloom, 1412 AH) p.11; quoted in *Da’aawa al-Munaawi’een*, pp.234-235.

مهما صغرت - أمير مستقل... وهي إمارات بينها قتال وحروب ومشاجرات والشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب لم يخرج على دولة الخلافة وإنما خرج على أوضاع فاسدة في بلده فجاهد في الله حق جهاده وصابر وثابر حتى امتد نور هذه الدعوة إلى البلاد الأخرى...

Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab did not rebel against the Ottoman Caliphate as far as I know, because there was no area in Najd that was under Turkish rule. Rather Najd consisted of small emirates and scattered villages, and each town or village, no matter how small, was ruled by an independent emir. These were emirates between which there were fighting, wars and disputes. So Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhaab did not rebel against the Ottoman state, rather he rebelled against the corrupt situation in his own land, and he strove in jihad for the sake of Allaah and persisted until the light of this call spread to other lands...¹

Dr. ‘Ajeel al-Nashmee said:

..... لم تحرك دولة الخلافة ساكنا ولم تبدر منها أية مبادرة امتعاض أو خلاف يذكر رغم توالي أربعة من سلاطين آل عثمان في حياة الشيخ ..

The Caliphate did not react in any way and did not show any discontent or resentment during the life of the Shaykh, even though there were four Ottoman sultans during his lifetime...²

Dr. al-Nashmee said, answering this question:

لقد كانت صورة حركة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب لدى دولة الخلافة صورة قد بلغت من التشويه والتشويش مداه فلم تطلع دولة الخلافة إلا على الوجه المعادي لحركة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب سواء عن طريق التقارير التي يرسلها ولاتها في الحجاز أو بغداد أو غيرها.. أو عن طريق بعض الأفراد الذين يصلون إلى الأستانة يحملون الأخبار .

The view that the Caliphate had of the movement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhaab was very distorted and confused, because the Caliphate only listened to those who were hostile towards the movement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhaab, whether that was via reports sent by their governors in the Hijaaz, Baghdad and elsewhere, or via some individuals who reached Istanbul bearing news.³

¹ Conversation recorded on tape; quoted in *Da’aawa al-Munaawi’een*, p. 237

² *Majallat al-Mujtama’*, issue no. 510

³ *Al-Mujtama’*, issue no. 504; quoted in *Da’aawa al-Munaawi’een*, p. 238-239

With regard to Zalloum's claims that the Shaykh's call was one of the reasons for the fall of the Caliphate and that the English helped the Wahhaabis to topple it, Mahmood Mahdi al-Istanboolee says concerning this ridiculous claim:

This writer should be expected to produce proof and evidence for his opinion. Long ago the poet said:

If claims are not supported by proof, they are used only by the fools as evidence.

We should also note that history tells us that the English were opposed to this call from the outset, fearing that it might wake the Muslim world up.¹

And he says:

والغريب المضحك المبكي أن يتهم هذا الأستاذ حركة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب بأنها من عوامل
هدم الخلافة العثمانية مع العلم أن هذه الحركة قامت حوالي عام 1811 م وأن الخلافة هدمت
حوالي 1922 م

The ironic fact is that this professor accuses the movement of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab of being one of the factors that led to the destruction of the Ottoman Caliphate, even though this movement began in 1811 CE and the Caliphate was abolished in 1922 CE.²

What indicates that the British were opposed to the "Wahhabi movement" is the fact that they sent Captain George Foster Sadlier³ to **"congratulate Ibrahim Pasha on his success against the Wahhabis"** – during the war of Ibrahim Pasha in Dir'iyyah – and also to find out to what extent he was prepared to cooperate with the British authorities to reduce what they called "Wahhabi piracy in the Arabian Gulf." Indeed, this clearly expressed a desire to establish an agreement between the British government and Ibrahim Pasha with the aim of destroying the "Wahhabis" completely. Sadlier made an arduous journey from India to Riyadh to see the ruins in Dir'iyyah, which was razed to the ground by Ibraheem Pasha.⁴

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Manzoor al-Nu'maanee said:

¹ *Al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab fi Mar'aat al-Sharq wa'l-Gharb*, p. 240

² *Ibid.* p. 64

³ An officer of the 47th Regiment in the India British army at a time when securing sea routes to India was Britain's main interest. The British were concerned about the rise of the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab and branded any opposer to British colonial rule in India as being a "Wahhabi", this thus contributed to the scaremongering against the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab (*raheemahullaah*).

⁴ Jalal AbualRub, Alaa Mencke (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab* (Orlando, Florida: Madinah Publishers, 1424 AH/2003 CE), pp.224-231.

لقد استغل الإنجليز الوضع المعاكس في الهند للشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب ورموا كل من عارضهم ووقف في طريقهم وأوه خطرا على كيانهم بالوهابية ودعوهم وهابيين ... وكذلك دعا الإنجليز علماء ديوبند - في الهند - بالوهابيين من أجل معارضتهم السفارة للإنجليز وتضييقهم الخناق عليهم ...

The British made the most of the hostility that existed in India towards Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab and they accused everyone who opposed them and stood in their way, or whom they regarded as dangerous, of being Wahhabis...Similarly the British called the scholars of Deoband – in India – Wahhaabis, because of their blunt opposition to the English¹ and their putting pressure on them.²

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Aal-'AbdulLateef concludes:

¹ Hunter in his book *The Indian Musalmans* noted that during the Indian Mutiny of 1857 CE the British feared uprising from the “Wahhabi” Muslims who were revolting against the British. See W.W. Hunter, *The Indian Musalmans*, first published in London: Trübner and Co., 1871; Calcutta: Comrade Publishers, 1945, 2nd Edn.; Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, 1999, 2nd Edn.; New Delhi: Rupa & Co., 2002 Reprint.

In Bengal during this time many Muslims, including the old, the young and women, were all branded as being “Wahhabis” and revolters against the British empire and were hanged from 1863-1865 (Peter Hardy, *The Muslims of British India* (Cambridge University Press: 1972), pp.79-80. Hunter stated in his book that: **“There is no fear to the British in India except from the Wahhabis, for they are causing disturbances against them, and agitating the people under the name of jihad to throw away the yoke of disobedience to the British and their authority.”** Those who were imprisoned in the Andaman Islands and tortured were those intellectual scholars of the Salafi community such as Shaykh Ja'far Thanasary, Shaykh 'AbdurRahmaan, Shaykh'AbdulGhaffaar, Shaykh Yahyaa 'Alee (1828 – 1868 CE), Shaykh Ahmad 'Abdullaah (1808-1881 CE), Shaykh Nadheer Husayn ad-Dehlawee and many others. See: Mohamed Jafar, *Taareekh ul-'Aajeb and Taareekh-i-Aajeb – History of Port Blair* (Nawalkshore Press, 2nd Edition, 1892).

Ahmad Ridha al-Brailwee (born 14 June 1865 CE/10 Shawwaal 1272 AH) was assigned the job of dissension and opposed every plan to oppose the British, he rallied around himself a band of heretical supporters who were later known as the Brailwees. For further reading see:

- ✓ Muinuddin Ahmed Khan, *A History of the Fara'idi Movement in Bengal* (Karachi, 1965)
- ✓ Barbara Daly Metcalf, *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1982), pp.276-77
- ✓ Qeyamuddin Ahmad (Professor of History at Patna University), *The Wahhabi Movement in India* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1994, 2nd edition). Particularly chapter seven *“The British Campaigns Against the Wahhabis on the North-Western Frontier”* and chapter eight *“State Trials of Wahhabi Leaders, 1863-65.”*

² *Di'aaya Mukaththafah Didd al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhaab*, p. 105-106

From these various quotations we can see the falseness of these flawed arguments when compared to the clear academic proofs in the essays and books of the Shaykh; that falseness is also obvious when compared to the historical facts are recorded by fair-minded writers.¹

Other historians in this field who have also affirmed the above include Qeymuddin Ahmad, who noted:

In 1577, when the great Ottoman Sultan, Salim (1512-20), conquered Egypt, the Caliphate passed on to the Ottomans, and the Arabian peninsula too came under their control. On account of its distant position and inhospitable terrain, however, Arabia was not under effective Turkish control. Local chiefs held sway in its different, geographically well-defined zones such as the Hijaz and Najd areas and the southern coastal areas.²

Indeed, an honest and informed non-Muslim historian, Michael Field, noted:

The Nejd, which is culturally and politically the dominant part of the Kingdom, was never part of the Ottoman Empire, and no part of the Kingdom was ever ruled by a European colonial power.³

With regards to the claim that the followers of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab “considered everyone as an apostate unless they followed the Wahhabi school of thought”⁴ then we say, and this has been repeated so many times that it almost becomes

¹ *Da'aawa al-Munaawi'een*, pp.239, 240

² Qeyamuddin Ahmad (Professor of History at Patna University), *The Wahhabi Movement in India* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1994, 2nd edition), p.27

³ Michael Field, *Inside the Arab World* (Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995), p.181

⁴ This simplistic claim has been suggested by a range of pseudo political analyst to supposed ‘experts’, yet it is a claim that at times owes more to petty grudges or feelings of resentment towards Saudi Arabia, as opposed to an solid evidence. It is also a claim that is made yet with unsubstantial proof. Professor Madawi al-Rasheed (Professor of Anthropology of Religion at *Kings College, University of London*) for example she states in an article entitled ‘*Saudis in quest for a ‘Luther’ to bring tolerant Islam*’ (dated: 30/6/06):

The foundation narrative of the Saudi state assumed that all Muslims were blasphemous except those who subscribed to its own religious interpretations and become subservient to its political will...Today this religious discourse has backfired and began to haunt those who initially sponsored it. The same Saudi religious

repetitive, why cannot the words of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhab be transmitted by the claimants for us to see where he allegedly **“considered everyone as an apostate unless they followed the Wahhabi school of thought”**??

This claim is mentioned by the enemies of *tawheed* past and present, yet none of them has been able to do the simple thing of actually mentioning the words and statements of

discourse that accused all other Muslims of blasphemy is now turned against the Saudi regime itself, as this regime is labelled a regime of blasphemy by Bin Laden and many religious scholars. While previously state sponsored religious interpretations declared other Arab and Muslim leaders as blasphemous, for example Nasser, Qaddafi, Bourguiba, Khomeini and Saddam, today the Al-Saud themselves are considered blasphemous and unfit to rule. The establishment of the Saudi state was based on mass excommunication of other Muslims. Today the Al-Saud themselves and their ulama are declared blasphemous by people who had been brought up on Saudi religious interpretations.”

See <http://www.madawi.info/index.php/site/more/52/>

Well it hasn't **“backfired and began to haunt those who initially sponsored it”** as not only did the senior scholars of Saudi Arabia ever support extremists mavericks, but the *khawarij* of the era have always had an issue with Saudi Arabia as they want to place their own selves in authority. Also, it is surprising how any academic could make the error of thinking that the **“Saudi religious discourse”** has **“accused all other Muslims of blasphemy”**, considering all of the overwhelming evidence which will, and has been, presented within this study., which indicates the exact opposite. As for the contention that the Saudi state **“was based on mass excommunication of other Muslims”** this chapter clearly indicates that there was not the religious basis or teachings of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhab at any time whatsoever and in fact such mass excommunication was against his own position! Therefore, from whence are such commentators extracting these assertions from? We are still waiting for the sources! With regards to those people who declare Saudi Arabia to be **“blasphemous”** then most of them, if not all, have not been **“brought up on Saudi religious interpretations”** and if they were then they have stated that they reject it in favour of the views of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan al-Banna, Ayman adh-Dhawaahiree, Aboo Mus'ab az-Zarqaawee, Aboo Muhammad al-Maqdisee, Aboo Qataadah al-Filisteenee, Aboo Baseer at-Tartoosee and others who never had any knowledge-based link to Saudi Arabia whatsoever!

Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab?!! Those who wrote propaganda tracts against Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhab were the likes of Ibn Afaliq,¹ Ahmad bin ‘Ali ash-Shaafi’ee al-Qabbaanee,² Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Qadaree,³ Alawee al-Haddaad,⁴ Ibn Suhaym,⁵ Dahlaan,⁶ Zahaawee,⁷ Hasan ibn ‘Umar ash-Shatti, Ali Naqi al-Kanhooree,⁸ Muhammad Ibn

¹ Muhammad ibn ‘AbdurRahmaan ibn Afaliq (d.1163 AH), a contemporary of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab, the manuscript of the treatise wherein Ibn Afaliq states his lies against Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab is present in the *State Library* of Berlin, it was quoted by ‘Abdul’Azeez ibn Muhammad Aal ‘AbdulLateef in *Da’aawa al-Munaawi’een li Da’wat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahaab* (Riyadh: Daar ul-Watan, 1412 AH), p. 58. Ibn Afaliq wrote a letter to the ‘Ameer of ‘Uyaynah ‘Uthmaan ibn Mu’ammarr, trying to incite Ibn Mu’ammarr against Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab. Yet when Ibn Mu’ammarr did not agree with the claims of Ibn Afaliq, Ibn Afaliq then began writing against Ibn Mu’ammarr and accusing him of also making *takfeer* of Muslims! Refer to the book by Professor Sulaiman Bin Abdurrahman al-Huqail (Professor of Education at Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University, Riyadh), *Muhammad Bin Abdulwahhâb – His Life and the Essence of his Call* (Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, Endowments, Dawah and Guidance, KSA, First Edition, 1421 AH/2001 CE), with an introduction by Sheikh Saleh Bin Abdulaziz Al-Sheikh, p.163

² Another contemporary of Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhab but not much is known about his life, the treatise of al-Qabbaanee is mentioned by Ahmad ibn Ali al-Basaree in *Fasl al-Khitaab fee Rad id-Dalaalat Ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab*, p.65. A manuscript of the book is in the library of *Imaam Muhammad ibn Saud University* in Riyadh. This also demonstrates that the opposers claims have been preserved in order to refute them and it also refutes the claims that the followers of Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab totally destroyed, desecrated and ransacked the works, writings and books of their opposers! Qabbaanee had two writings against Muhammad ibn ‘Abdulwahhaab, the first was a copy in his handwriting of a book entitled *Kitaab Rad ad-Dalaalah wa Qama’ al-Jahaalah* by another scholar called Ahmad Barakat ash-Shaafi’ee al-Azharee at-Tandataawee. While the second is entitled *Kitaab Naqd Qawaa’id ad-Dalaal wa Rafd ‘Aqaa’id ud-Dullaal* which is a response to a letter sent by Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab to the ‘Ulama in Basra.

³ Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab wrote to him advising him during his time. Al-Qadaree authored *Risaalatun fi’r-Raddi ‘alaa’l-Wahhaabiyyah* which is extant in manuscript form in the library at *Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University*, Riyadh.

⁴ He authored *Misbahu’l-Anamee wa Jalaa’l-dh-Dhlaam fee Radi Shubuhaat Bida’i-n-Najd* (Cairo: Matba’atu’l-Aamirah, 1335 AH).

⁵ Sulaymaan ibn Muhammad ibn Suhaym (d.1181 AH) was one of the scholars of Riyadh, who left for al-Ahsa after Riyadh fell to the first Saudi state. He was also an arch-enemy to the *da’wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab and was one of the first to initiate falsehahod against the Imaam, sending such writings to other Muslim countries.

⁶ Ahmad ibn Zaynee Dahlaan (d.1304 AH), a partisan *soofee* judge who lived in Makkah and was a *Shaafi’ee muftiee* who spread much in the way of propaganda against Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab.

⁷ He authored *al-Fajru’s-Saadiq* (Cairo: Maktabah Maleejeje, 1323 AH).

⁸ A *raafidee* who authored *Kashf un-Niqaabee ‘an Aqaa’id Ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab* (Najaf: Matba’atu’l-Haydaraayah, 1345 AH).

Najib Suqiya,¹ Muhammad ibn Jawad Mugniya,² Bin Diyaf,³ Abu'l-Fidaa Ismaa'eel at-Tameeme, Umar bin Abi'l-Fadl Qaasim al-Mahjoob,⁴ 'AbdulWahhaab Ahmad Barakaat ash-Shaafi'ee al-Azharee at-Tandataawee⁵ and others, yet not one of them would actually quote the Imaam himself.⁶ As we can also observe little is known about their lives and their academic and scholarly pursuits in comparison to the abundant documentation related to Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab for example. Furthermore, there unsophisticated arguments were all refuted by the Imaam in his *Kashf ush-Shububaa*. When we turn to the actual writings of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab we find that he stated:

As for your assertion that we hold Muslims to be disbelievers and your question as to how we do this and how we do that, I would simply say that we never held the Muslims to be disbelievers. Rather, we never held anyone except polytheists to be disbelievers.⁷

¹ As noted by Muhammad Tawfeeq in his book *Tabyeen ul-Haqq wa's-Sawaab bi'r-Rad 'alaa 'Atbaa'I Ibn 'AbdulWahhaab* (Syria: Matba'atu'l-Fayhaa), p.8

² In his book *Hadhihi Hiya'l-Wahhaabiyyah* (1964 CE).

³ Ahmad ibn Abi'd-Diyaaf (d. 1291 AH/1874 CE) born in Tunis in 1219 AH/1804 CE. He served as secretary to an influential minister of the Husayni state in Tunis, Shakir Sahib at-Taabi', then took to writing from 1827 to the 1860s. In his *Ithaaf Ahl iz-Zamaan* within his summary of Hammuda Pasha's reign in Tunisia (1782-1814 CE) he discusses a so-called "Wahhabi proclamation". See Adel Sulaiman Gamal, Richard Mortel and A.H. Green (Trans.), *A Tunisian Reply to a Wahhabi Proclamation. In Quest of an Islamic Humanism*, vol.22.

⁴ Died 1222 AH/1807 CE, he was a student of Abu'l-Fidaa Ismaa'eel at-Tameeme at *Zaytuna University*. His father was an authority in *Maliki fiqh* who served as *Qadi* of Tunisia and also as the Chief *Mufti* of the *Sharee'ah Court*. Mahjoob was a famed *khateeb*, poet and eloquent writer yet his writings against the phenomena that he labelled "Wahhabiya" were rather polemical wherein he justifies *tawassul*, the building of shrines and other innovations. The writings of these Tunisian scholars demonstrated the support that Tunisia had for the Ottoman fight against the so-called "Wahhabis". See Adel Sulaiman Gamal, Richard Mortel and A.H. Green (Trans.), *A Tunisian Reply to a Wahhabi Proclamation. In Quest of an Islamic Humanism*, vol.22.

⁵ Not much is known about this individual's life except that he authored three books and moved to Makkaah towards the end of his life in the late 18th century CE. The historian of Najd, Ibn Turki considered him to be one of the four most prolific writers against Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab. See Samer Traboulsi, *An Early Refutation of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab's Reformist Views. Die Welts des Islams*, vol.42, no.3, 2002, pp.373-390.

⁶ They would only bring mere claims akin to the likes of Hamza Yoosuf, Keller, Winter, Zayd Shaakir, Moosaa Furber, GF Haddaad and Kabbaanee today!

⁷ Adapted from *Majmoo' Mu'allafaat is'-Shaykh*, vol.5, p.189

In a letter to Muhammad ibn 'Eid, one of the religious personalities of Tharmada, Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated:

As for the assertion of the enemies that I hold them to be disbelievers only by conjecture, or I hold an ignorant person against whom no argument has been established to be a disbeliever, it is a sheer lie and false accusation, leveled by those who intend to drive the people away from the deen of Allaah and His Messenger.¹

The Imaam also stated (*rabeemabullaab*) in a letter exonerating himself from fabrications concocted by Ibn Suhaym:

Allaah knows that the man ascribed to me what I never said and did not even occur to me. One such ascription is that “the people for the last six hundred years had not been on the right path” and that I hold anyone who seeks the intercession of pious people to be a disbeliever” and that I hold al-Busayree to be a disbeliever. My answer to all of these is: this is nothing more than false accusations!²

In a letter to the Shareef of Makkah at the time, Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated:

As for falsehoods and accusations, their example is the assertion that we hold the people to be disbelievers in general; that we hold migrating to us obligatory and that we affirm the disbelief of a person who does not hold to what we do and does not fight with us to be disbelievers. This and other such assertions are totally false leveled against us in order to drive the people away from the deen of Allaah and His Messenger.³

Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab stated to Ismaa'eel al-Jara'ee of Yemen:

As for the assertion that we hold the (Muslim) people in general to be disbelievers, it is a false allegation made public by the enemies to drive people away from this deen. We can only emphatically say that this is a naked lie!⁴

Rasheed Ridaa stated:

The books of the Shaykh contain what is contrary to the allegations. These books tell us that they do not pass the verdict of disbelief except against those who commit acts that are acts of disbelief according to the consensus of the Muslims.¹

¹ Ibid. vol.5, p.25

² Ibid. vol.5, pp.11-12, 62

³ Ibid. vol.3, p.11

⁴ Ibid. vol.5, p.100

Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab (*raheemabullaah*) also stated:

In regards to what has been said of me, that I make takfeer on the general body of Muslims then this a slander of the Enemies, as well as their saying that I say whoever adheres to the Religion of Allah and His Messenger while living in another land then it will not suffice him until he comes to me first then this also is a false accusation. Rather adherence to the Religion of Allah and His Messenger is done in any land however we do make takfeer of the one who affirms belief in the Religion of Allah and His Messenger then turns away from it and diverts the people from it, likewise whoever worships idols after knowing that it is the religion of the Polytheists and a form of beautification to the common people, then this is what we make takfeer of as does every scholar on the face of the earth, they make takfeer of these people, except for the stubborn or ignorant person and Allah knows best, Wa Salaam.²

Finally, the Ottoman state was already in a state of decline and stagnation by the eighteenth century, indeed by the seventeenth century, which the *da'wab* of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab cannot be held accountable for whatsoever. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the capitulations system circumvented the independence of the Ottoman state. It was a system which meant that European traders living in Ottoman territory were not required to observe the law of the land and thus had their own courts and laws by which they were ruled by, they were no longer subject to government control. Was the *da'wab* of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?

By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the gap between the technical skills of some western and northern European countries and those of the rest of the world grew wider and the Ottomans were left lagging. Was the *da'wab* of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?? In 1791 CE the Ottomans could not sufficiently defend their territories to the extent that the British Prime Minister of the day, William Pitt, contemplated sending British troops to help the Sultan against the Czar of Russia during the Ottoman-Russian war.³ Was the *da'wab* of Imaam Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhab responsible for

¹ Muhammad Basheer ash-Sahaswani, *Siyaanat ul-Insaan min Wasawis id-Dahlaan* (Riyadh: Najd Press, 1396 AH), p.485

² Taken from *ad-Durar-us-Saniyyah* (The Personal Letters of ash-Shaykh Muhammad bin ‘Abdil-Wahhaab (*raheemahullaah*)) letter no.19 page 57 and originally translated by Aboo ‘Imraan al-Mekseekee

³ Selim Deringil (*Boğaziçi University*, History Department), *The Turks and Europe: Uninvited Guests of Sharers of a Common Destiny?* Paper presented to the *Center for European Studies*, 24 February 2005

this?? During the Crimean War (1854-1856)¹ the Ottomans had to seek the help of Britain and France against the Russians, was the *da'wab* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?? The Ottoman state was in such a state in the nineteenth century that the European powers of France², Russia and Britain were occupying parts of its territory and various Ottoman provinces were semi-autonomous and under effective control of local rulers. Was the *da'wab* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?? The Ottomans had a state policy towards Arabic which was strong and institutionalized but then weakened, creating a barrier between most Muslims and the sources of Islaam. Due to this, a whole host of religious innovations, invented 'spiritual' exercises and odd customs flourished along with blind following of madhhabs. Was the *da'wab* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab responsible for this?? Allaah says,

ä ä

“And if you turn away (i.e. refuse), He will replace you with another people; then they will not be the likes of you.”

¹ The roots of this war go back to 1851 when the French forced the Ottomans to make them the “sovereign Christian authority” of the Holy Land which the Russians rejected due to two treaties which were previously made with the Ottomans in 1757 and 1774. the Ottomans thus reversed their decisions and made the Russians the official sovereign Christian authority of the Holy Land and then the French responded with a show of military force in the Black Sea forcing Sultaan 'AbdulMajeed 1 to change his mind. The newest treaty, between France and the Ottomans, confirmed France and the Catholic Church as the supreme Christian organization in the Holy Land, supreme control over the various Christian holy places, and gave the keys to the *Church of the Nativity*, previously in the hands of the Greek Orthodox Church, to the Catholic Church. Angry at this, the Russian tsar sent the 4th and 5th army corps deployed and mobilised along the Danube River. The Russians tried to negotiate another treaty wherein they would regain authority over the Christian communities within the Ottoman empire and the British Prime Minster of the day, Aberdeen encourage the Ottomans to reject this, which led to war. Benjamin Disraeli blamed Aberdeen and Stratford (who negotiated with the Ottomans on behalf of the British) for causing the war and this led to Aberdeen's resignation from office. After a diplomatic process the Sultan proceeded to war, his armies attacked the Russian army near the Danube and the Russian Tsar Nicholas responded by dispatching warships, which destroyed a squadron of Ottoman frigates in northern Turkey at the Battle of Sinop on 30 November 1853. The destruction of the Turkish fleet and heavy Ottoman casualties alarmed both Great Britain and France, which stepped forth in defence of the Ottoman Empire. In 1853, after Russia ignored an Anglo-French ultimatum to withdraw from the Danubian Principalities, Great Britain and France thus declared war.

² Who conquered much of the Algerian coast and announced they were rulers of it, as the British were 'masters' of India

{*Muhammad (47): 38*}

Allaah also says, in another beautiful verse which shows Allaah’s wisdom:

ä á ä ä ää ä ä
ä ää ä ä ää áä ää ää ä
ä ä ää ä ää

“O you who have believed, whoever of you should revert from his religion – Allaah will bring forth (in place of them) a people He will love and who will love Him (who are) humble toward the believers, powerful against the disbelievers; they strive in the cause of Allaah and do not fear the blame of a critic. That is the favor of Allaah; He bestows it upon whom He wills. And Allaah is all-Encompassing and Knowing.”

{*al-Maa'idah (5): 54*}

In the eighth volume of *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa fi't-Tarikh al-Maghib al-Aqsaa*, a history of north-west Africa in nine volumes by a Moroccan Muslim scholar and historian Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree (*rabeemahullaah*)¹, he discussed at length the *da'wah* of Imaam

¹ He is Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid bin Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Muhammad an-Naasiree and his lineage goes back to 'Abdullaah bin Ja'far bin Abee Taalib, husband of the sister of Hasan and Husayn (*radi Allaahu 'anhum*). An-Naasiree was from a family that was known for virtue and knowledge which had migrated to the city of Salaa (Salè), near Rabat in Morocco in 1220 AH/1805 CE. He was born on Saturday 22 Dhu'l-Hijjah 1250 AH/March 1835 CE in Salaa, which at that time was a city that was known for Islamic sciences, Arabic language and the study of Islamic texts. He studied the Qur'aan (Warsh 'an Naafi') with al-Hajj Muhammad 'Alawee as-Salaawee and Muhammad bin Jeelaanee al-Haamidee. He also studied the works of ash-Shaatibee, Ibn 'AbdulBarr, Ibn Maalik and Ibn Subkee with his cousin 'AbdusSalaam bin Talhah. An-Naasiree studied the sciences of the Arabic language with his teacher 'Allaamah Muhammad bin 'Abdul'Azeez as-Salaawee and studied a number of works on grammar, *balaaghaa* (rhetoric), logic, *fiqh* and *usool ud-deen*. He was pivotal in disseminating knowledge, conducting research and benefiting the general masses of people in Morocco, excelling in historical works. He was also concerned with socio-religious issues moreso that most scholars of the time. He was very eloquent and as a result his lessons would be full and would have an effect on those present. He was strongly influenced by the *sunnah* in all affairs and strongly opposed the people of innovation and refuted them, exhorting them to

Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab. An-Naasiree states that Sultaan Sulaymaan ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Abdullaah al-Alawee (who succeeded his father as king of Morocco) was given the pledge of allegiance in Fez in 1226 AH/1811 CE was thus a contemporary of the Imaam and scholar Sa’ud ibn ‘Abdul’Azeez ibn Muhammad ibn Saud. Sultaan Sulaymaan wanted to closely examine the *da’wah* in Saudi and thus sent his son Aboo Ishaq Ibraaheem (in 1226 AH/1811 CE) with a delegation of Moroccan scholars and notables with a letter from his father (Sulaymaan). An-Naasiree stated:

Many among those who accompanied Ibraaheem during that hajj trip told us that they did not witness any deviation in Islamic Law from Imaam ‘Abdullaah ibn Saud or his retinue. On the contrary, what they observed is steadfastness and care in performing the Islamic acts of worship, such as prayer, tahaarah, fasting, forbidding evil and cleansing the Two Holy Sanctuaries of impure and evil practices that used to be committed therein without objection from anyone. When ‘Abdullaah ibn Sa’ud met

refer back to the Qur’aan and *sunnah*. He opposed the leaders and sects of desires who had entered into the *deen* that which was not from it, **“He also strongly safeguarded waking the Muslims from their heedlessness to the clear manhaj”**, (Biography by Ja’far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, *Kitaab ul-Istihsaa’ li-Akhbaar Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqsa* (Daar ul-Baydaa [Casablanca]: Daar ul-Kitaab, 1954), vol.1, pp.14-15). From his most correct and authentic books in particular are his historical *magnum opus*, *Taarikh ul-Istihsaa’* and *Ta’dheem ul-Minnah bi’n-Nasrati’s-Sunnah* which according to Ja’far and Muhammad an-Naasiree in their biography of him in the first volume of *Kitaab ul-Istihsaa’*, **“are filled with warning against this disease and these (false) opinions by paying attention to spreading authentic Islamic knowledge amongst the ummah and referring people to study from the books of the Salaf.”** He advised a number of governors in Morocco during his era on issues related to governance, economics and the *deen*, he thus travelled to the cities of Tanger, al-‘A’raaish (Larache), Marraakush (Marrakech), Daar ul-Baydaa’ (Casablanca), Salaa (Sale), Tetwaan (Tetoun), Ghumaarah etc. initially he refused the posts as he thought that they would avert him from his scholastic efforts. He died on Thursday 16 Jumadaa Ulaa 1325 AH/12 October 1897 CE. He authored over thirty books (see *ibid.* pp.27-34) and his two main students were the jurist and author of Salaa, al-Hajj Tayyib ‘Awaad and the historian Aboo ‘Abdullaah Muhammad bin ‘Ali ad-Dakaalee as-Salaawee. From the titles of the works that he authored, there is nothing whatsoever that shows that he was *Soofee* and in fact the lengthy biography of him by Ja’far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, there is no reference made whatsoever to Sufism. Furthermore, from the thirty works that he authored, none of the books have anything to do with Sufism, the contrary in fact, in the form of his books *Ta’dheem ul-Minnah bi’n-Nasrati’s-Sunnah*. There may have been some members of his extended family and clan that were *soofees*, but as for Abu’l-‘Abbaas there is nothing to suggest that he was. Kurt S. Vikør in his book *Sufi and Scholar on the Desert Edge: Muhammad bin ‘Ali al-Sanusi and his Brotherhood* (London: Hurst & Co., 1995) refers to Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree as being an historian and no where mentions him as being a *soofee*, and refers to others from the Naasiree family as clearly being *soofees*. An-Naasiree died on 16 Jumadaa al-Ulaa 1315 AH/October 12 1897 CE, *raheemahullaah*.

with Ibraaheem he showed him the type of respect due to members of the Prophet's family. Ibn Saud sat next to Ibraaheem as an acquaintance, among other things that Ibn Saud spoke about was that he asked the Moroccan delegation about this "People claim that we commit deviation from the Prophet's sunnah. What part of the sunnah did you see us contradict and what did you hear about us from people before we met?" Judge Aboo Ishaaq Ibraaheem az-Zadaagaa, the (Moroccan) scholar who led the discussion with the Saudi Imaam said "We heard that you say Allaah has settled on His throne in a humanly tangible manner that indicates His having a body." Abdullaah Ibn Saud responded, "We seek refuge in Allaah from this statement, we only repeat the statement of Imaam Maalik (raheemahullaah) that "Istiwaah¹ is known,² the kayfiyyah (how) is unknown,³ asking about how it happened is an innovation and believing that istiwaah occurred is an obligation." Is anything wrong with this statement?" the judge said "No, this is also our belief." The judge then asked, "We were told that you deny that the Prophet and his brothers from the Prophets, peace be upon the, are alive in their graves." When Ibn Sa'ud heard the Prophet's name he raised his voice reciting the prayers and peace upon him, saying "We seek refuge in Allaah from this idea too. We believe that he, and the rest of the Prophets, are alive in their graves, in a type of life that is above the life enjoyed by the martyrs"...⁴

An-Naasiree then commented:

I believe that Sultaan Sulaymaan believed in this too and this is why he wrote his famous treatise in which he criticized the extreme austerity of the soofees who lived during his time and warned against abandoning the sunnah and excessive engagement in bida' (innovation). He also explained in his message the proper

¹ Allaah's rising above His Throne

² We know the linguistic meaning of 'istiwaah'

³ Because we do not comprehend Allaah's true essence of existence

⁴ Shaykh Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree, *tahqeeq* (verifying and checking) by Ja'far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa' li-Akhbaar Duwal al-Maghrrib al-'Aqsa* (Daar ul-Baydaa' [Casablanca]: Daar ul-Kitaab, 1954), Vol.8, pp.121-122.

There is also a new annotated edition by M. Hajji, B. Boutaleb & A. Tawfiq (Daar ul-Baydaa' [Casablanca]: Mansurat Wizarat al-Taqaafa wa-l-Ittisal, 2001-2005 CE) in 8 volumes. The oldest edition is the 1949 CE edition which is in nine volumes. A summarized edition was also published into three volumes in 1418 AH/1997 CE again by Daar ul-Kitaab in Casablanca and an-Naasiree himself published it himself in four volumes in Cairo in 1894 CE. It was translated into French by the Orientalists Grauille in 1906 CE, G.S. Colin in 1923-25 CE, Fumey in 1934-36 CE. This first edition mentioned in this footnote is available from the library at SOAS, University of London and the ninth volume discusses the 'Alawee dynasty in Morocco.

manner of visiting graves of righteous people and warned against excessive behaviour that commoners might commit at their vicinity as sincere advice to the Muslims, may Allaah increase him in goodness. Sultaan Sulaymaan also decided that a certain speech that emphasizes tawheed and rebukes bida' be recited in all masaajid where jumu'ah is held. He also instructed soofee zawiyas be closed down.¹

A balanced and fair non-Muslim historian, Gerald De Gaury, noted with regards to the how Islaam was being practiced throughout the Muslim world in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries:

Nowhere else in the Muslim world would this have been possible except in Arabia, and only in a country given to laxness could there have been such a sweeping and violent changeover in so short a period. Near to the heart of Arabia, Islam-or Muhammadanism-can be and is practiced as it was revealed, but farther afield, among Muhammadans of other races and less pure Arab stock, it has been changed to suit their different minds and other conditions of life.² The Persians are mostly of the Shiah sect, a more colourful version of Islam, spiced with self-inflicted cruelties at the annual Moharram passion play. The Afghans, Kurds, and the Algerians prefer the more secretive rites of the Derwish orders. Egyptian and Indian Muslims, the Turks and the Bokharans, the Muhammadans of the Far East, and West and Central Africa all have found or devised a sect to suit themselves. Thousands therefore look to shrines not often heard of in the West-to Abdul Qadir al Gilani, in Baghdad; to those at Nejeef and Kerbala, in Iraq; Meshad in Persia; and the holy sites of North Africa³-but ultimately Mecca is the holiest city of all, and the Wahhabis follow the creed nearest to that

¹ Shaykh Abu'l-'Abbaas Ahmad bin Khaalid an-Naasiree, *tahqeeq* (verifying and checking) by Ja'far and Muhammad an-Naasiree, *Kitaab ul-Istiqsaa' li-Akhbaar Duwal al-Maghrib al-'Aqsa* (Daar ul-Baydaa' [Casablanca]: Daar ul-Kitaab, 1954), Vol.8, p.123.

² Some may praise versions of Islaam which reflect peoples ethnic and cultural backgrounds, yet the problem with this is that a host of odd traditions and a vast array of obscure practices become integrated into Islaam to the extent that people then think that such customs are actually from the Qur'aan, *sunnah* and way of the early Muslims (*Salaf*). Yet the reality is that grave worshipping, pilgrimages to graves, dancing in mosques, forced marriages, female genital mutilation and other cultural habits that Muslims are engrossed in have nothing whatsoever to do with the authentic teachings of Islaam.

³ There are no Islamic "holy sites in North Africa" whatsoever!

revealed by the Prophet.¹ It was descendants of these men, leaders of the second Wahhabi revival, whom we had been seeing.²

¹ This should actually be “**revealed to the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wassallam)**”!

² Gerald De Gaury, *Arabia Phoenix: An Account of a Visit to Ibn Sa'ud* (London: George G. Harrap & Co., 1946), pp.95-6