O you who believe, respond to the call of Allah and His Messenger when He calls you to that which would give you life...

THE STRUGGLE FOR ISLAM AND CALL FOR KHILAFAH - OBAMA’S ‘HEARTS AND MINDS’ CONQUEST - INTERVIEW WITH NAVEED BUTT ON THE SWAT OFFENSIVE AND THE AMERICAN PLAN FOR PAKISTAN - CARRY ON WESTMINSTER - STRUGGLE - ISLAM AND ECONOMIC GROWTH - FORCED MARRIAGES ACT
CHLAMYDIA LEAPS IN UNDER 16S

Reported in the Times on 19th May 2009, sexually transmitted infection cases (STIs), especially Chlamydia, are on the rise amongst under 16s. More than 2,000 15 year olds were infected with Chlamydia after having un-protected sex. Lisa Power, head of policy at the Terrence Higgins Trust summed up Western philosophy on the issue saying “We need to accept that having a legal age of consent will not stop some young people from having sex; what we can do is make sure that those who do are equipped with all the information they need to protect themselves and their partners from STIs and unwanted pregnancy.”

Boots Pharmacies discovered in a recent poll that even if men were aware of having symptoms of chlamydia, about a quarter say they would continue to have sexual relations with their partner despite the risk of passing the infection on to their ‘loved’ ones.

Promiscuous behaviour can never be curbed in British society as long as people are convinced they are free to satisfy their sensual desires in anyway they like. But that is thought to be a fundamental right afforded by Western values. Currently, the Muslim world is a region of the world that is relatively STIs free! But with the efforts being made to promote these same values through western inspired education programmes and media, that may not last forever.

OBAMA’S SELECTIVE MEMORY

During Barack Obama’s recent tour of the Middle East he delivered a speech in Egypt which was ostensibly designed to reach out to the Muslim world. This was a stillborn effort, as the US had resumed bombing Muslims in Pakistan a mere three days after Obama came to power. Whilst waxing lyrical about Islam’s contribution to the world over the centuries which saw Europe burning people at the stake for witchcraft and praying to the bones of saints for medical cures, he rather conveniently failed to mention the political order that Islam had established during this period, under which all these successes occurred - the Caliphate. This Caliphate produced the necessary legal stability, economic comfort and societal harmony which allowed the creativity and ingenuity of its citizens to flourish; something which is sorely lacking in the Muslim world. Something which is certainly not aided by the continued murder of Muslims by US wars and sanctions against Muslim lands.

Could it be that the US is in such terror of an ideological rival that it would end its imperialistic hegemony over the world in the form of the Caliphate that it dare not even whisper its name?

US GOVERNMENT BAIL-OUT FAILS, AS GENERAL MOTORS FILES FOR BANKRUPTCY

Such is the scale of the economic disaster hitting the world, that people were no longer shocked by the most recent mega collapse. A 100 year strong legacy, almost 250,000 employees and over 16 million cars sold in 140 countries. All of which came to a grinding halt on June 1, 2009 as the world’s largest automaker American giant, General Motors (GM) filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in a New York court.

GM’s collapse constitutes the world’s third largest bankruptcy filing after Lehman last year and Worldcom in 2002. GM’s is the largest such filing in the manufacturing sector ever.

All this after billions of dollars were thrown at GM by the US government to prop up the flagging company. So much money was given to General Motors that it was being called “Government Motors”. This was despite the knowledge that GM was underperforming for many years with dated designs, outmoded thinking and inefficient practices. GM once symbolic of the strength of the US and Capitalism – is now a sign of the obsolescence of both.

TERRORIST CONVICTION RATE 13%

Just 13% of people arrested under Britain’s terrorism laws since the 9/11 attacks were convicted of terror offences, Home Office figures show. At 31 March 2008, there were some 125 terrorist prisoners in England and Wales. Of these, 62% were UK nationals and 91% classed themselves as Muslim. The home office also uses control orders against terror suspects who cannot be tried because of secret information which even the accused do not know about. These figures are startling to anyone who has been deluded with the misconception that the West is the beacon of human rights. Newly promoted Home Secretary Alan Johnson said protecting the public was his “top priority”.

When a society gives itself the absolute power to keep innocents locked up or under control orders, how does anyone feel safe from the long arm of the law? In contrast, Islam has proven to guarantee security and the basic human rights of food, shelter and clothing to every one of its population unlike the West that can only waffle on about their freedoms and rights whilst not even recognizing the right to live with peace of mind for any of its citizens!
Editorial

The Struggle for Islam and Call for Khilafah

Assalamu alaikum

For years now we have seen an almost constant attack on Islam by politicians and the media in the west. There has been very little respite since we saw the desecration of the Quran in Guantanamo Bay, the calls for it to be banned in Holland, the banning of Hijab in France, the attack on Niqab by a British government minister, and the slandering of RasulAllah (Sallallahu alaihi wasallam) in pictorial and written form, to name but a few examples. Most recently we have seen a call by France's President Sarkosy to ban the ‘burkha’.

Alongside the slaughter and occupation we see in Muslim lands, there can be nothing more alarming to the Muslim than seeing this ferocious misrepresentation of Islam.

At the same time, Muslims see – with distress and alarm – the twin evils of bombs in market places in Pakistan and bombs in the Swat and FATA regions of Pakistan. The town centre bombings are attributed to ‘Islamic militants’ – with a deliberate emphasis on the word ‘Islamic’. Muslims who believe in Shariah, Khilafah and decent Islamic family values are branded extremists and those who support the defence of Muslim lands like Palestine and Iraq are called ‘terrorist’ supporters.

The aim of such a campaign that alternates propaganda attacks on Islam with constant linking of Islam to violence is to westernize Muslims; to drive us from holding Islamic values to adopting western secular ones, and become westernised, secular, liberal-minded supporters of colonial foreign policy.

Imam Ahmad narrated in his Musnad that the Prophet (saw) said: “The knots of Islam will be undone one by one until when every one of them is undone, and the first one to be undone is the ruling and the last one is the prayer.” Also, the Prophet (saw) said: “There will come a time when holding on to your Iman will be like holding on to hot coal”.

That time is now. But simultaneously the west is in crisis. Indeed, the world is in crisis.

With no assistance from media or political attacks, we can see a collapse of confidence in the western way of life leaving ordinary people feeling insecure. The collapse of the capitalist financial system and the following economic hardship has burst the bubble of confidence in this way of life. The promise that wealth would trickle down, to make poverty history, has proved a lie. The myth of human rights, freedom and democracy has been exploded by the ‘war on terror’.

From broken families to the collapse of the finance system, from disrespect and antisocial behaviour to the corruption in Westminster, example after example have sapped people’s confidence in the system. Some citizens in the west are even looking at their colonial foreign policy with increasing distaste. In the Muslim world people, who once looked with expectation and intellectual mission despite the hardships. For the first generation of Muslims there was no withdrawing into obscurity, there was no compromise in the message. There was simply strengthening their link to Allah, and carrying the message in ever more effective ways till Allah decided between haq and batil.

Islam is a way of life that enshrines and upholds noble values: the worship of Allah (swt); the protection of life, honour, belief, mind and property of all its citizens; the security and stability so needed in the world; the justice and tranquillity of an economic system that does not make the rich richer and poor poorer.

Now is the time to Stand for Islam! To struggle for our communities in the west to live by Islam and carry the Dawah, and to call for the re-establishment of the Islamic Khilafah State in the Muslim world to implement Islam and unify the Muslim Ummah.

We invite all to join us in this campaign and ask Allah (SWT) to accept it from us, strengthen it and make it successful in this world and the next.

“O you who believe! If you help [the cause of] Allah, He will help you, and will make your foothold firm” [Surah Muhammad 47:7]
On 4 June, Barak Hussein Obama stood at the podium at the University of Cairo and gave his much anticipated speech to the people of the Islamic world. An exhilarating orator at the best of times, a man whose speeches have electrified audiences from Istanbul to Iowa from Berlin to Baltimore from the deserts of Nevada to the coast of North Carolina was ready to deliver another blockbuster, this time in the heart of the Muslim world.

According to most commentators Obama did not disappoint, carefully navigating between different issues and sensitivities while not shying away from blunt speech on occasions, he seemed to have something for everyone. Some commentators went as far as saying the address was one of the best speeches given by a US President abroad in living memory. Others compared it to Kennedy’s famous Berlin speech, while a few saw parallels between Nixon’s outreach to China and Obama’s outreach to the Islamic world. Yet while the speech received on the whole a favourable reaction, very few commentators grasped the overall context of the speech, why did Obama want to give the speech, what did he leave out, who was the audience. And what was he trying to achieve?

In analysing the speech, a number of points emerge:

1. Obama’s Cairo speech should not be seen in isolation. This is a part of a deliberate diplomatic strategy of repairing America’s reputation in the Islamic world after the debacle of the Bush years. Obama in conjunction with large sections of the US national security establishment realise that America cannot achieve her objectives using military means alone. Following the failures in Iraq, Afghanistan and the scandals of Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo, America’s military is not only exhausted but her standing in the world has suffered to depths not seen in recent times. When America polls single digit favourable ratings in Turkey, a country with the most aggressive secular system in the Muslim world, you know you are in trouble. Therefore a new strategy had to be formulated which though commenced during Bush’s second term, had to present a completely different messenger to have any credibility. Obama began this new strategy in his inaugural address on January 20th, in which he called for a new beginning with the Muslim world and relations based on mutual respect. That was followed up by giving an interview with al-Arabiya, his first interview with a foreign news organisation since coming into power;
he then produced a warm address to the people of Iran on the occasion of the Persian New Year, which preceded his address in Istanbul to the Turkish parliament. Cairo was the latest instalment of this process.

2. The significance of Obama having to come to Cairo to address the entire Islamic world, not the people of Egypt, Saudi Arabia or Turkey should not be underestimated. Reaching out to the global Ummah is unprecedented in global diplomacy, as international relations from the time of Westphalia have been focused on bilateral or multilateral relationships between governments of nation-states. This is a major strategic step, in that it accepts the premise of an Ummah as a powerful monolithic entity with a shared vision and a unifying creed, something the west has hitherto refused to acknowledge. The President of the United States acceptance that the Muslim world is a viable entity in itself, rather than the sum of 57 nation states is an explicit acknowledgement that those Islamic groups who have long campaigned for the establishment of a unified Islamic Khilafah have won this specific argument. After Cairo, no longer can a pan national entity in the Islamic world be dismissed as a medieval fantasy cooked up by a small fringe.

3. Obama’s praise of Islamic history, its religious tolerance, racial equality and the scientific, medical and other technological advances were extensively discussed in the post speech analysis. Most commentators focused on the obvious point that Obama in this section of the speech was trying to gain empathy by praising the Muslim world’s achievements. However what most commentators missed was that by making such statements, Obama was actually praising the track record of the Khilafah, not the track record of the modern Muslim states. It is not the modern state of Egypt or Saudi Arabia that have delivered great navigational tools or gained religious tolerance, it wasn’t the modern state of Morocco or Algeria that developed algebra or medical advances, it wasn’t Pakistan or Turkey who developed mastery of pens and printing and who deliver racial equality. These were all done by the Khilafah, the same Khilafah which Obama together with his agents in the Muslim world are actively trying to prevent its return.

4. Obama made a great deal about his intention to close Guantanamo Bay, yet there are other Guantanamo being the tip of an ugly iceberg.

There are many facilities in dark corners of the world where the US is holding thousands of prisoners with Guantanamo being the tip of an ugly iceberg.

5. Obama criticised the settlements of the Israelis in Palestine and condemned occupation, yet America is permanently occupying two Muslim countries. He argues that the United States seeks no permanent bases in the Muslim world but is that believable, when the US has had bases in Korea and Germany for over 50 years and retains bases in Qatar, Bahrain and Kuwait despite no conflict being present there.

6. Obama states he opposes violent extremists and cites this as the sole reason the US is in Afghanistan, yet he cites an unbreakable friendship with Israel a country that has implemented extreme violence on the people of Lebanon and Gaza in the last few years. His own country has also killed innocents deliberately on multiple occasions especially in Japan, Vietnam and lately in Iraq and Afghanistan, arguing that this was necessary in the context of wider objectives. Also every country in the world has his so called “violent extremists” in them. US authorities are already arguing that some people are migrating from Pakistan and Afghanistan to Yemen and Somalia. Is the US going to invade them as well?
7. Obama criticised the people of Palestine for using force in response to Israeli occupation in his speech. Yet ironically in another part of his speech, he quoted two of the US founding fathers Thomas Jefferson and John Adams praising the United States as being born out of revolution against an empire. Yet it was Jefferson, Adams and the other founding fathers that had no qualms about using force to overthrow the British Empire’s occupation of America.

8. Obama argued for democracy and human rights, but had nothing but praise for the ruler of Saudi Arabia and Egypt on his trip. Is this the new beginning Obama promised, by saying the ruler of Egypt was not an authoritarian and praising him as being a force for good? This is a man who has ruled Egypt with a tight fist (to use a term Obama is familiar with) and who routinely locks his opponents in Egypt up and whose idea of elections is to take a poll of his own living room. Obama also said democracy shouldn’t be imposed but that it’s tenets are universal, echoing the neoconservative line that western values are the values of mankind. However what is clear is that values are distinct from aspirations, everyone aspires to have their basic needs met, an accountable government, justice for all, but values can be distinct originating from a nation’s ideology. In the case of the west they have selected a capitalist ideology which generates a number of questionable values such as individualism, materialism and a secular construct that has culminated in bringing us the worst economic crisis since the 1930’s, a political system that is so bankrupt that it has lost all credibility and a dysfunctional social model where broken families, crime and drugs are escalating. Are these the values the US President wants to export to the Muslim world?

9. Obama has also argued about preventing an arms race in the Middle East in the context of Iran. Yet if you want a weapons free Middle East, why don’t we send home the 150,000 US troops in Iraq or the 70,000 in Afghanistan, why don’t we close the US bases in Qatar and Kuwait or send the US Navy’s 5th fleet in Bahrain back to the United States. Or why don’t we reverse Israel’s occupation of Palestine, curtail her aggressive wars in the region and dismantle her nuclear submarine capability. Why don’t we stop US support for dictators in the Muslim world who rule by force and ruthlessly protect US interests. If we really want a stable Middle East these are the real sources of instability not the red herring of an Iranian nuclear programme which even western experts acknowledge maybe some five years away.

It is clear that most Muslims like most Americans would like us to end the cycle of conflict that has generated so much bloodshed. The west has no monopoly on caring about the affairs of humanity, nor does one speech by a US President erase a bloody track record that he and his predecessors have presided over. Islam obliges Muslims to care about the affairs of all people, to be concerned about poverty, deprivation and disease, to give power to those who have no voice, to provide strength to those who are weak, to give opportunities to those who have no hope. It is not that Muslims believe they are perfect, or that there is no room to resolve these issues without using violence. Islam’s timeless beliefs oblige that we strictly adhere to Islam’s principles of justice and fair treatment but also to expose those that seek to oppress and colonise. To therefore truly end this cycle of bloodshed in a sustainable manner, we must first understand why we have got to this point and address the real causes of conflict and not just the symptoms. For we have a collective responsibility to solve this problem for everyone, not just for the current generation but those that are still to come. This would constitute a true new beginning, as the Quran directs: “O you who believe! Stand out firmly for Allah, as witnesses to fair dealing and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just: that is next to piety: and fear Allah for Allah is well acquainted with all that you do.” [Sura Nisa 4:135]

---

Why don’t we stop US support for dictators in the Muslim world who rule by force and ruthlessly protect US interests.
Interview with Naveed Butt on the SWAT offensive and the American Plan for Pakistan

This is part of an interview with Naveed Butt – Spokesman for Hizb ut-Tahrir in Pakistan. The full transcript of the interview can be read at www.hizb.org.uk and www.khilafah.eu

Interviewer:
First of all could you shed some light on exactly what is going on in SWAT and the operations in tribal areas and perhaps on the military operation conducted by the government?

Naveed Butt:
Bismillah ir-Rahman ir-Raheem. This operation was formally announced on the 7th May 2009 by none other than the prime minister himself and since then this is the sixth week into the operation. Roughly four million people have been made homeless from SWAT, Buner and other districts and thousands of people, which the government claims are militants, have been killed. Scores of casualties have occurred to our military people, to our army, Muslim brothers in the army, and above all there is a miserable situation of the people, who are being forced out of their homes. They call them IDP (Internally Displaced People) and they are forced to live in tents. And these tents are like ovens… it’s a misery to even go to the wash room. There’s no proper sanitation, there’s no proper food arrangements… it’s impossible!

The government is claiming they are going to expand this operation. On the other side in cities there have been bombings. Lahore has experienced two brutal bombings during this operation so is the case of Peshawar. So all of Pakistan has been plunged into chaos just for the sake of the Americans and there’s a complete disregard for human casualties and suffering.

Interviewer:
Isn’t it ironic that we are not fighting this war against the American occupying forces in Afghanistan or the arch enemy of Pakistan, India. This is the war within. This is a war against our own people. How did the Pakistani military or the people of Pakistan ever allow this brutal occupation? Also, is the Pakistani army united in its offensive in SWAT or are there elements within the Pakistani army who are against these operations?

Naveed Butt:
Actually this is a very good question. The very first operation which the Pakistani army undertook… was on the 2nd October 2003 and when that operation started the whole public were up in arms there was a huge backlash, and everybody said that this is an American war and why is the Pakistan army fighting an American war? From there the government has learnt from this… this time around the government...
has played very cautiously and they have undertaken a huge campaign.

I would like to give you a little background. Each time the government wanted to do something they first allow the militants to expand, they allowed the writ to be absent they allowed the militants to put up barricades or even have chowkiya we call it here so that on the ground people should feel that the militants are the ones who are in control. Now this was again highlighted by the media and then used and they made a big deal out of it: look Pakistan’s writ is being depleted and the government of Pakistan is not doing enough and as a result the government showed that the government is under huge pressure from the media and from the civil society and the government does not have the option but to go ahead with a certain military operation and then via that military operation the government is using a sledge hammer approach. In other words overwhelming force is used which results in a lot of collateral damage many people dying, civilians dying, which would again feed off this militancy… so this cycle of violence is used to spiral up… this is exactly what happened during the ‘Red Mosque’ attacks… So this approach was done to win the public.

The second thing which was very prominent to see, was that there had been certain personalities who were very close to the militants in the case of the ‘Red Mosque’ as well who are also in this case of the SWAT operations. So there are facts on the ground which show that very high officials from within the government had been very closely in touch with the militants and they almost led them into doing things which afterwards would be used by the media and by the government against the militants.

These are the blunders which the government used afterwards against the militants. For example it was well-known in SWAT that militants put up banners and placards in the market places that women are not allowed to visit the markets, over two hundred

schools were destroyed by bombing them, then obviously that famous incident of lashing a girl just because she went out along with her father-in-law. Similarly there were senseless bombings of mosques, public places, and factories. Then there were leaflets distributed signed by the militants stating that Shias are not Muslims, that they are kuffar and they should either give jizya or they should evacuate and they should leave otherwise they will be killed and their women will be made into concubines. I mean things which people or Muslims can not accept. Similarly there has been the slaughter of army people. Army people were captured, they were slaughtered and video films were then used by the army to produce anger within the army. There were reports regarding shrines being bombed so all of these blunders added to the anger within the Ummah against the militants.

So these type of issue were taken out by the media and the media did a huge campaign before the SWAT operation. There was at least a week of a complete media campaign warning how we should move quickly otherwise the militants are going to take over Islamabad. Even though it may seem absurd to a lot of people but these types of arguments were actually given by the media to build public opinion for this operation.

**Interviewer:**
By the way some say re this alliance with the Americans; that this is economically beneficial for the country. What are your views on that?

**Naveed Butt:**
Pakistan basically has, according to the government stats, incurred roughly 35 billion dollars of losses since they have joined this ‘War on Terror’ and we are given peanuts of about $7 billion extended over a few years, I think $1.5 billion dollars per year.

This shows that Pakistan’s economy was strong enough, that it still survived after absorbing a shock of about $35 billion, and by the way, $35 billion was the total external debt of Pakistan a couple of years ago so this shows what a huge amount of economic loss Pakistan has to bear because of joining this so called ‘War on Terror’. So in other words monetarily this is a disaster. Pakistan’s GDP has reached a record low this past year, from a record over 38 years, this has been the lowest GDP. All sectors have recorded negative growth except for agriculture, so this shows that Pakistan’s economy is in a shambles due to the joining of this ‘War on Terror’.

**Interviewer:**
Let’s move on to talk about the campaign that was launched by Hizb ut-Tahrir in the second week of May called ‘Stop the American war which makes Muslims fight Muslims’. Please enlighten us on this campaign.

**Naveed Butt:**
Alhamdulillah this was a very successful campaign and in this campaign Hizb ut-Tahrir distributed hundreds of thousands of leaflets in major cities like Karachi, Lahore, Islamabad, Peshawar, and some other smaller cities and there were thousands of stickers and posters that were put up – there were banners put up in all major cities and in some cities there were billboards. Additionally there were bayanaat, many public addresses, that numbered in the hundreds or probably thousands.

**Interviewer:**
So if the war is not the solution, what solution do you propose to rid Pakistan from this ongoing chaos that has gripped the entire country?

**Naveed Butt:**
The solution is very simple, and that is to get America out of this region because America’s presence is the root cause of
all this chaos and instability and for all this terrorism. Getting rid of America is not a problem because America is a parasite. It’s feeding off our bodies.

So the only viable solution for Pakistan’s problems is to get rid of America and kick America out of this region. Once that’s done, whatever problems which are in the form of either Indian involvement or Mossad involvement or certain factions, which are being supported by the embassies of the United States here in Pakistan, will automatically evaporate.

Interviewer:
But some say you can’t do that. This is not something favourable to Pakistan, say, if America attacks Pakistan?

Naveed Butt:
America! Everybody knows its economy is in a shambles, there’s a huge recession even after pumping trillions of dollars into the economy they have not been able to resuscitate their economy. America’s arms and troops are stressed, they can’t rotate their army personnel let alone fight a third war with Pakistan, an all out war with a nuclear state who has air power as well, who has the seventh largest army, who’s missiles can easily reach their sat-coms, and their Bagram base and also their seventh fleet and sixth fleets.

So this is a mistake, America can never do and they know this but it’s the Pakistan government and their agent rulers who are actually scaring people away and they’re building an atmosphere that if you say no to America, America is going to obliterate us.

Interviewer:
So it seems that it is a myth. Once you’ve kicked America out of this region then what?

Naveed Butt:
Once America is out, we have to kick America’s system out as well, which is this capitalist rotten system along with America’s agent rulers and then establish the Khilafah in Pakistan. Because it is Islam alone which can provide tranquility and which can organise people’s affairs in a way where people are happy (contended).

Once the Khilafah is established in Pakistan, we will inshallah expand… this re-unification is the only solution for the Muslims alongside the implementation of Islam, and in this situation no power can stand up against Muslims or even try to hurt Muslims anywhere in the world.

Interviewer:
There is an opinion in certain cross-sections of society; they say if you are against these operations it means you are in favour of these militants. Does Hizb ut-Tahrir propagate a violent means to achieve its objectives?

Naveed Butt:
This is well-known of Hizb ut-Tahrir that for more than fifty years Hizb ut-Tahrir has followed the methodology of Rasool Allah (saw) which he followed in Mecca for thirteen years and in this methodology there is no room for militancy. Hizb ut-Tahrir is following the intellectual and political struggle and convincing those within the ahlul-nusrah (people who have the power) that they should support us so that we should implement Islam as a system, as a deen and we have not swayed away from this methodology for the last 60 years.

So we are very clear that people know that Hizb ut-Tahrir does not condone civilian killings in the form of bomb blasts or by otherwise violent means. So being against this brutal operation does not necessarily mean that we condone whatever the militants have been doing in the Fatah or in Pakistan at large. We are only concerned that America is achieving its objectives by making Muslims fight Muslims.

Interviewer:
Any final message that you have for our viewers worldwide?

Naveed Butt:
I call upon the billions of Muslims around the world to recognise your responsibility and join the ranks of Hizb ut-Tahrir to fulfil your Fardh. This is the greatest obligation which establishes all other obligations. I call upon the intellectuals and the influencers of the Ummah to step forward and use your intellect and influence for establishing this Deen, not the strength of the kuffar and their kufr systems.

I call upon the ‘Ulema of this great Ummah and I would like to remind them of the responsibility which Allah’s Messenger (saw) has bestowed upon their shoulders.

I call upon the sincere Muslims, in the Muslim armies to recognise their responsibility. For how long are you going to wait and sit on the sidelines while the Ummah is being butchered and killed left, right and centre?

I call upon you to help and give nussrah to Hizb ut-Tahrir so that this Khilafah state is established.

Wa akhir adaawana walhamdulillahi rabbil ‘alameen.
The events that have recently consumed Britain’s political class would be laughable if they weren’t quite so serious. Governance has an impact on people’s lives. Political systems and the politicians therein set a standard for society. So, a corrupt government, a flawed system and dishonest politicians eventually set the standards for the rest of society.

THE DEPTHS OF THE CRISIS IN BRITAIN’S POLITICAL SYSTEM

The impact cannot be overstated. When pious politicians lecture people who wrongly claim benefits, “hoodies”, parents and greedy bankers from their pulpit dripping with sleaze, tax dodging and corruption – who will listen to them seriously?

When tax payers facing the greatest economic crisis in almost a century face home repossessions and job losses, how does it sit with the ‘ruled’ that the rulers and rule makers have serviced second homes (moats, duck houses and toilet seats included), dodged taxed and taken bribes for amending legislation… and hardly anyone of them loses their job.

If Cromwell or Lenin were alive today the scene would be set for regime change in Westminster.

But, in the absence of any viable alternative, what will happen is that the current players will simply reshuffle the deck. Most likely the current ‘joker’ in the pack - Prime Minister Gordon Brown
They will all hope that pressure building up from public anger will be released by an angry ‘X’ marked on the ballot paper. Then a new democratic political cycle will begin: massive egos jostling for promotion; image makeovers to make them more media friendly; lobbying, lobbying and more lobbying; cash for political parties and policies; retirements into lucrative directorships etc.

The truth is that this expenses crisis is just the tip of an iceberg. Outside of this recent problem there have been:

• Two members of the House of Lords caught by a newspaper accepting cash for amending legislation. These two have been caught, but their initial complacent reaction would suggest that the practice is common, and they felt they weren’t doing anything extraordinary.
• The cases involving the now famous Oleg Deripaska, Nathanial Rothschild, Lakshmi Mittal, Bernie Ecclestone, Michael Ashcroft… to name but a few.
• The ‘loans for peerages’ scandal that saw Lord Levy lose his influential position as fundraiser for the Labour government.
• The ‘cash for questions’ scandal that brought down John Major’s government.
• The vote rigging of postal votes in local elections.
• The private finance initiatives have brought big business unbelievably generous contracts at the state’s expense.

But, this problem is not confined to the United Kingdom. Italy, France and other countries face frequent political scandals. In the United States the former Governor of Chicago was caught trying to sell the Senate seat that Barack Obama vacated; not to mention the shenanigans that surrounded the election of George W Bush in 2000 with the suspicious ‘hanging chads’ on ballot papers.

As one writer wrote in 2009:

“In Kenya – two party politicians claim the Presidency. In order to win it they both let their own people slaughter each other by tens of thousands. It is still unresolved.

“In Zimbabwe – a half-crazed President (“Zimbabwe is mine”) embodying socialist politics in pure form, battles the opponent, he in turn, the appointee of American investment. Their refusal to collaborate has produced million dollar inflation and a cholera epidemic with over 1000 dead.

“In Bangladesh – two militant Begums battle for power, their policies identical – they have paralysed the country for a decade.” [1]

If the financial crisis proved the myth of the free market as an ideal economic model and reveals the greedy, selfish values that drive Capitalist business, then this political crisis proves that politicians are driven by similar greedy, selfish values and money politics simply don’t mix.

The only difference is there the defenders of the system blamed the greedy individuals. Here the greedy individuals blame the system.

THE MELTDOWN OF THE BROWN GOVERNMENT

Initially public anger was directed at the political class. But calls for a general election, fancy footwork and smooth talking from David Cameron, and a desire to punish someone all led to a disastrous result for Labour in Local and European elections.

Ministers resigned like rats leaving a sinking ship, seeming to put their own survival shamelessly above party loyalty or principle. It was an ugly spectacle.

Anger towards Brown, credited for leading the desperate response to the financial crisis, turned to ridicule and, eventually, pity.

Fears were stoked about gains for the Far Right. Undoubtedly, this ugly nationalist political message has found some sympathisers in the current climate. It is, sadly, unsurprising given the economy is in recession, plus a loss of trust in the main parties and the shameless way all politicians play the immigration card these days. But their chances of gaining any real power or influence is, thankfully small, and most politicians use the BNP card to rally their own support base.

POLITICS REDUCED TO LITTLE MORE THAN A GLORIFIED BEAUTY CONTEST

In truth, the lack of debate on policies, in particular the almost total absence of scrutiny by the media on the Tory party’s policies, means that politics is now reduced to who impresses most on TV.
IN CAPITALIST STATES MONEY PUSHES CONSCIOUSNESS OF GOD INTO THE MARGINS OF SOCIETY

It is the near total separation of God from collective life that has left society to be dominated by material values. ‘WIFM’ - ‘what’s in it for me’ is the fundamental question people ask themselves, and not how will I be judged on my behaviour. Western society has virtually confined all values bar material ones to the home and the private space. When such values are relegated to the periphery of society, when success and failure is judged purely by the wealth that you have, the value of your house and what you materially own, is there any wonder that politicians behave like they do, no matter where in the world one lives.

The Islamic ethos ensures that society is more evenly balanced between material, moral, humanitarian and spiritual values. Politicians must have a strong foundation rooted in values which are strongly correlated with helping the needs of their citizens. It is, in the end, only an atmosphere of God-consciousness that can ensure that every penny they earn should be made transparent, so as to ensure that even the appearance of corruption is questioned.

If the financial crisis proved the myth of the free market as an ideal economic model and reveals the greedy, selfish values that drive Capitalist business, then this political crisis proves that politicians are driven by similar greedy, selfish values and money politics simply don’t mix.

MONEY AND POLITICS DON’T MIX WELL

People always say never mix religion and politics. But the western cocktail of money and politics has caused huge problems in personal behaviour, in society’s values and in global peace and security. The Islamic system would take the money out of modern politics. The electoral circus every four or five years in the west (every two years in the United States) positively encourages the growth of money in politics forcing politicians to either raise vulgar amounts of money for re-election or maximise their own wealth before they get booted out.

THE ISLAMIC ALTERNATIVE

When looking to the alternative for the Muslim world, we should work for Islam’s system of governance.

The Islamic system though not immune from the temptations on offer, seeks to actively detach both finance and the interests of corporations from politics. Whereas capitalism and democracies are fused at the hip in the west, so creating a class of politicians who are either personally corrupt or beholden to a corporate class, no such influence is permitted in an Islamic political model where strong restrictions surrounding relationships and influence are in force. The Islamic economic system is also the complete antithesis to the capitalist economy, putting the problems of the ordinary man over big business. A Khilafah state is the only vehicle to establish this Islamic political system and today provides a unique opportunity to show that there is a better way to manage politics. When it implemented Islam in its politics the Muslim world was a giant in global affairs leading in science, prosperity, healthcare and helping Europe to emerge from its dark ages.

TRIED AND TRUSTED IN THE MUSLIM WORLD

The Islamic political model is tried and trusted, it balances the material instincts of individuals with strong spiritual values, it makes accountability the key
tenet of its political system and obliges every citizen to participate actively, it promotes political service while not forgetting that society's greatest wealth is its values and beliefs and that politicians without values are like ships without water. The Shariah political rules are fixed and cannot be so easily manipulated. They build a culture of accounting the ruler by the ordinary citizen, political parties, elected assemblies and by the judiciary itself. It puts no one above the law and does not exempt politicians from paying taxes or from prosecution.

The Umayyad Caliph Umar bin Abdul Aziz (717-730) once said “Rulers usually appoint people to watch over their subjects. I appoint you a watcher over me and my behaviour. If you find me at fault in word or action guide me and stop me from doing it”. This was an institutionalised mechanism of accountability, but his personal God-consciousness was such that it is said that he would put out a candle which was fuelled by money from the treasury even if someone busied him asking about his personal well-being.

The combination of values and rules in Islam made for a political culture where the first Caliph Abu Bakr once said: “after my death hand over to Umar (his successor) this milk-camel and dish which were given to me on account of my Khilafah (Caliphate)”. They were not to be inherited as part of his personal estate.

THE RULES OF THE SYSTEM COMPLEMENT THE VALUES IN SOCIETY

The Islamic political model, as we said before, has a fixed source of legislation - that is the Shariah texts. Hence, manipulation is much diminished. It is difficult to buy influence as Ijtihad (legal reasoning), cannot go beyond the boundaries of its known legal principles.

The elected Khalifah must be accounted by an independent media, political parties and the people. Indeed, there should be a People's assembly, where the people's elected representatives can be consulted on various matters and, as well, formalise the accounting and scrutinising process. There is a court, known as the Mahkamat al Mathalim (the Court of the Unjust Ruler), whose sole remit is to judge between ruler and ruled, and to scrutinise the actions of the executive. It has the power to remove a Khalifah if he breeches the terms of his contract of ruling, and may not be dismissed once he has started an investigation until its conclusion.

CONCLUSION

After seeing this disgraceful mess in the ‘Mother of Parliaments’, Muslims would do well to learn from these errors and look to the system Allah has given, and work to see it implemented in the Muslim world, and thereafter illustrate to the world the best example of a society built on sound values, and a system that diminishes corruption.

Allah (swt) informs: “Verily we have revealed the book to you in truth for instructing mankind.” [Sura Az-Zumar 39:41]
INTRODUCTION:
Today Muslims witness their deen being attacked and vilified on a daily basis. These attacks come from governments, the media and intellectuals and are becoming harsher and more direct. These are the days when writers who insult our beloved Prophet (Sallalahu Alaihi Wassalam) are honoured and politicians see attacking Islam as a sure way of increasing their popularity. Muslims face emotional, intellectual and even physical attack with the Western nations invading Muslim countries in the name of the war on terror.

THIS IS NOTHING NEW:
Our beloved Prophet (saw) and his companions faced a very similar situation soon after the Prophet (saw) first received revelation. The attacks on the Prophet (saw) and his companions started when the call for Islam became public and addressed the problems of the Makkah society and the corruption of its leadership. The early Muslims endured horrific abuse at the hands of the Quraysh.

PERSECUTION:
The companions faced terrible persecution at the hands of the Quraysh. The family of Yasir suffered especially, with Sumaya (May Allah be pleased with her) having the honour of being the first martyr of Islam. She was killed simply because she refused to renounce her belief in Islam.

Many companions were persecuted and tortured because they held firm to their belief. Bilal is another example. Whilst being tortured he defied his oppressor by repeatedly saying “ahad” even though this only led to his torture being intensified.

When Abu Dharr al Ghifari accepted Islam he went to the Ka’bah and pronounced his declaration of faith in front of all the enemies of Islam which almost brought him death from the beating he received. However this did not stop him as the very next day when he saw people worshiping idols he began to curse the idols which again resulted in him receiving yet another beating.

Khabbab ibn Al-Aratt was tortured with pieces of heated iron from his shop being placed all over his body when he announced his Islam publicly. This resulted in the flesh and skin of his back and waist being burnt off.

Khubaib ibn Adyy was the first man to be crucified in the name of Islam and while he was being crucified his body was being stabbed by spears and swords. His tormentors were saying “wouldn’t you rather the Prophet (saw) was here in your place while you were safe with your family” he said “I wouldn’t want to be with my family and have the joys of the whole world if it meant the Prophet (saw) had the pain of even a prick of a thorn.” Uthman ibn Affan was tied with rope, thrashed severely and made to endure many other physical hardships for proclaiming his conversion. Abdullah ibn Masud was beaten unconscious for reciting the Quran publicly.

RIDICULED:
Once the Prophet (saw) was reciting his prayers at the Ka’bah when Uqbah bin Abu Muait twisted his neck with a piece of cloth until he (saw) was nearly strangled. On being informed of this, Abu Bakr rushed to the spot and saved the Prophet (saw) and then said addressing...
the Quraish: “Would you kill a person simply because he claims that Allah is his lord?”

The Prophet (saw) was slandered in many ways, accused of being a madman, magician, possessed, or soothsayer.

Once the Prophet (saw) was performing prayers in the courtyard of the Ka’bah in the presence of the Quraish. Abu Jahl said to the people “A camel has been slaughtered at such and such place and its intestines are still lying there. One should fetch them and put it on the back of Muhammad.” Upon hearing this, Uqbah bin Abu Muait got up and fetched the intestines and put it on the back of the Prophet (saw) when he was prostrating. The disbelievers were overtaken by laughter. Fatimah (May Allah be pleased with her) who was only a child at the time removed the intestines from the back of her father. Many psychologists say that children who see their parents being humiliated can have severe and long lasting psychological effects.

**MUSLIMS WERE DISCREDITED BY AMR IBN AL AAS WHEN THEY MIGRATED TO ABYSINNIA**

The Prophet (saw) was stoned at Ta’if by the slaves and children.

During the treaty of Hudaybia the representative of the Quraish insulted the sahaba by saying to the Prophet (saw) “You are a noble man of Quraish so why have you chosen to side with these scum (the sahaba) against the nobility of Quraish”.

**BOYCOTT**

The Quraish imposed a complete social and material boycott on Banu Hashim and Banu Abdul-Muttalib who were lending their unrelenting support to the Muslims. No one was to meet the Muslims, talk to them, establish marital relations with them or trade with them. The Muslims were even forced to eat the leaves of trees. This agreement was put into writing and hung on the Ka’bah for added impact. The boycott lasted for three years during which time the Muslims could only buy food and other essentials during the months of peace. In this atmosphere they would continue to preach Islam among people from outside Makkah. This inhumane treatment stirred some Quraish from within.

**COALITIONS AND TREACHERY AGAINST ISLAM**

Mischief makers of Banu Asad had assembled in Qatan under the leadership of Talhah bin Khawilid and Salamah bin Huwailid with the intent of launching an attack on the Muslims.

In Safar, 4 AH the Quraish sent seven persons from the Adal and Qarah clans to the Prophet (saw) saying that their people have decided to enter Islam so they requested that some men be sent to teach these new converts. In response the Prophet (saw) sent 6 teachers headed by Marthad bin abu Marthad Ghanawi or Asim bin Thabit bin abu Aflah. When this party reached Raji, a water spot, they discovered the treachery of Quraish who had called in 200 men to kill the teachers.

The Prophet (saw) went to conduct discussions with Banu Nadir regarding some blood money owed due to a Muslim killing 2 members of that tribe. While the Prophet (saw) was there they tried to kill him by throwing a big rock from the citadel of the fortification. The Prophet (saw) realised the plot via revelation and left immediately before the plot could be executed. He confronted the Jews regarding their plot and they didn’t deny it.

During this period Banu Muharib and Banu Tha’labah of Ghatfan tribe were making large scale preparations to wage war against the Muslims. The Prophet (saw) along with 400 companions proceeded to meet them. The enemies who had collected at an oasis retreated when they heard the news of the Muslims coming and no fighting took place.

**LATER THE JEWS OF BANU NADIR WERE EXILED TO KHAIBAR OR SYRIA.**

The Jews and the Quraysh in the battle of Ahzab - Prominent chieftains from Banu Nadir alongside those of Banu Wa’il went to Makkah to incite support and raise funds for the battle. They then went to the Ghatfan clans and Banu Kinanah to play the same role. Next they made contact with Banu Quraizah of Al-Madinah who were still bound to help the Muslims according to a pact signed by both parties. Finally Banu Sulaim, Fazarah, Ashja, Banu Sa’d and Banu Murrah and the chieftains of the Quraish, Banu Nadir and Ghatfan went to the Kabah and vowed to fight against the Muslims as long as they lived. The total number of allied forces came to at least ten thousand or twenty-four thousand according to some narrations. It consisted of four thousand five hundred camels and three hundred horses.

There are many incidences regarding Abdullah ibn Ubai. One famous one involves the incident when Aisha (May Allah be pleased with) was left behind during a journey. Abdullah ibn Ubai spread rumours regarding her.
People who stood up to rulers

**IMAM MALIK**
He stood up to the Khalifah Abu Ja`far al-Mansur regarding the hadith “The divorce of the coerced does not take effect”. Imam Malik was told not to narrate this hadith but he did anyway and was flogged for it. Even after being flogged and while being paraded he still defied the Khalifah by narrating the hadith.

**SAID IBN JUBAIR**
Said ibn Jubair fought along side Abdullah ibn az-Zubair and was part of a group called the “Battalion of Quran reciters”. He was eventually captured and brought to Al Hajjaj.

He is renowned for his conversation with Al Hajjaj and consequent death. All throughout the conversation he remained steadfast to the truth even though this infuriated Al Hajjaj even more. What makes him even more special is that you can lie when your life is at risk. When he was finally killed his blood gushed out in a way that Al Hajjaj had never seen before, the explanation for this was that Said ibn Jubair was so relaxed at the time of his murder that his blood was kept in its original form, but usually if one is scared or afraid their blood curdles and does not flow profusely.

Abdullah ibn az-Zubair (ibn Asma)
He stood up to Yazid and had to fight the army of Al Hajjaj.

While under siege Abdullah ibn Zubair went to his mother, Asma. She asked him, “what brings you at such an hour when the war is on?” He said “I came to consult with you.” “Consult with me on what?” asked Asma. He said, “Most of my supporters have betrayed me, either out of greed or out of fear. Only a few remain with me, and they will not be able to resist for long. Messengers have been sent from the Umayyads proposing that I stop the fight, and they would give me whatever I ask for.” She answered “its up to you. You know yourself best. If you believe that you are right and fighting for a right cause, be persevering in the fight as were your supporters who died for it. But if you are after worldly gains, then wretched are you and you have destroyed yourself and those with you”. He later died in battle.

**IMAM ABU HANIFA**
In 763, al-Mansur, the Abbasid Khalifah offered Abu Hanifa the post of Chief Judge of the State, but he declined to accept the offer, choosing to remain independent. His student, Abu Yusuf, was appointed Qadi Al-Qadat (Chief Judge of the State) instead of himself.

In his reply to al-Mansur, Abu Hanifa excused himself by saying that he did not regard himself fit for the post. Al-Mansur, who had his own ideas and reasons for offering the post, lost his temper and accused Abu Hanifa of lying. “If I am lying”, Abu Hanifa said, “then my statement is doubly correct. How can you appoint a liar to the exalted post of a Chief Qadi (Judge)?” Incensed by this reply, the ruler had Abu Hanifa arrested and locked in prison and tortured.

**IMAM BUKHARI**
Even here, there were envious people who did not leave him alone. They met the governor of Bukhara, who was a representative of the Khalif, Khâlid ibn Ahmad. They told him to call Imâm Bukhârî to his house and busy him with teaching his son. When the governor put this suggestion to Imâm Bukhârî, he was told, “I do not want to abuse knowledge and carry it to the footstep of the rulers. If anybody wants to learn, they should come to my school”. The governor replied, by stating, “If my son was to attend your school, he should not sit with ordinary people. You would have to teach him separately”. Imâm Bukhârî answered, “I cannot stop any person from hearing Ahâdîth”. Upon hearing this, the governor of Bukhara became angry with him and manufactured a fatwa (verdict) against Imâm Bukhârî to banish him from the city.

**OTHER EXAMPLES**
Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 751/1350) and Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), both tortured and imprisoned. Ibn Taymiyya died in prison.

Ibn Rushd (d. 595/1198), imprisoned and exiled.

Al-Nisa’î (d. 309/915), beaten and died from his injuries in jail

Al-Tabari (d. 310/923), Muslim historian, was persecuted by fanatic Hanbalis; his books were eventually burned, and grave desecrated by enemies.

Al-Nawawi (d. 676/1277), fired from his teaching post and banned to Damascus, then to Egypt, fired again, arrested and imprisoned, died poor and lonely in his father’s home.

The common characteristic of all of the above is that despite obstacles including in some instance the worse of oppression and torture they all remained firm in their belief and constant in their struggles to make the word of Allah highest. May Allah (swt) accept their actions and may we all be inspired to strive in their footsteps. Ameen.
Ever since the industrial revolution economic growth has been the key measure of prosperity in all economies. Every year nations around the world prepare national accounts from which the growth of their economies is measured and compared to the rest of the world. Organisations such as the IMF and World Bank produce annual reports and development indicators looking at the effects of economic growth which is the increase in the production of goods and services from the previous year. It was President Harry Truman of the US, in his inaugural speech in 1949 that encapsulated development: “Greater
production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge.” He reiterated a concept that had at the time formed the very basis of national economies for over 200 years.

Economic growth has ever since its become synonymous with success. This is because if an economy produces more than the previous year many different aspects in an economy are also stimulated. Companies are producing more hence they will need to employ more, thus creating jobs in the economy.

The profit motive that companies pursue will force them to develop technologies that will produce goods at a fraction of the cost. Entrepreneurs will enter the market place due to the potential opportunities. Disposable incomes will rise as companies produce more to generate greater profits, hence wages and salaries should also rise. National incomes will rise giving citizens the ability to purchase more thus further stimulating the wider economy.

Today the world economy churns out $54 trillion annually. The world economy has seen spectacular growth since the industrial revolution, with many liberals contending that the number of people in the world who live in comfort and no longer reside in abject poverty has all been a result of the free market drive to continually grow.

**DISASTER CAPITALISM**

Capitalist notions of economic growth have dominated the global economic scene, however the free market has been unable to deliver sustainable and stable economic growth and this continues to be its biggest failure. Economic growth has been punctuated with regular recessions, crashes, slumps and depression. Whilst Capitalist nations have achieved phenomenal economic growth their economies continue to self destruct at regular intervals.

Capitalism may have driven wealth creation like never before; however there are a number of developments that it should also be certified with. The world economy may be generating record wealth with liberal democracies driving this, but half of the world’s population will not have had enough food today as they earn less than $2 a day - 80% of the world lives on less than $10 a day (World Bank Development indicators 2008). World poverty has in fact accelerated under Capitalism.

Capitalism’s next success has been the creation of histories greatest ever wealth fault line. Whilst the majority of the world barely survives on a few dollars, the US has most of the world’s billionaires, in what is mankind’s greatest
lopesided world economy. In 2006 the World Institute for Development Economics Research of the United Nations released the culmination of a global study; a number of its findings are staggering. By gathering research from countries all over the world the study concluded that the richest 1% of the world own 40% of the planet’s wealth and that only 10% of the world’s population owned 85% of the world’s assets.

(www.iariw.org/papers/2006/davies.pdf)

Richard Robbins in his award winning book ‘Global Problems and the Culture of Capitalism’ confirmed this when he said “The emergence of Capitalism represents a culture that is in many ways the most successful that has ever been deployed in terms of accommodating large numbers of individuals in relative and absolute comfort and luxury. It has not been as successful, however, in integrating all in equal measure, and its failure here remains one of its major problems.”

The US generated nearly $14 trillion in 2007, however the national debt - the money the central and federal governments owe to the US public and the world through the bonds they have sold - stands at $9.7 trillion. The US citizenry have a huge appetite for imports and consumption and as a result consumer debt stands at $11.4 trillion. The debts of US companies amount to $18.4 trillion. This makes the US indebted to the tune of just under $40 trillion - nearly 75% of what the world produces. Yet, 37 million Americans live below the poverty line. Capitalism's continued endeavour of perpetual economic growth has drowned the world in money it does not have, which all makes the prosperity liberals insistence on reminding us, rather irrelevant.

PERPETUAL ECONOMIC GROWTH = MISSION IMPOSSIBLE

Whilst it is undeniable that Capitalism has pumped out more wealth than any other period in history, in this apparent success lays its failure. The need for perpetual economic growth is what causes the regular crash. Capitalist notions of economic growth require the national economy to continually grow; this in turn needs consumers to continually spend, the availability of debt allows this on a massive scale. Once consumers have spent beyond their means a cut in spending becomes inevitable - so the boom is followed by the inevitable crash.

The UK’s current economic crisis is a classic example of this. The UK witnessed a boom for nearly a decade that was driven entirely by financial services and the real estate bubble. Britain like most western economies was driven by a handful of sectors which was used to stimulate the remainder of the economy. Once the real estate bubble ran out of steam, the UK’s engine packed up and unless another engine can replace the broken economy the UK economy will cease to move. The bubble was aided in its expansion by the ability to print money at will, the desire of consumers to spend beyond their means, and the availability of debt, which all contributed towards the expansion of the bubble. In fact one aspect of the Capitalist economy that will always make economic growth unsustainable is the fact that money can be printed at will and will always exceed what is produced by the economy.

ISLAM PRODUCES SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH

Free market economies will always have booms and busts as the need to achieve permanent economic growth is unsustainable. Any variation of the free market will have the same outcome. Islamic economics on the other hand has a different viewpoint on the economy and has at its core some fundamental concepts that create a stable and sustainable economy. This allows for a much more stable economy with sustainable growth and not miracle growth which eventually runs out of steam.

Sustainable economic growth is achieved in an Islamic economy through a number of ways:

1. The Islamic economy is built upon the real economy with agriculture and manufacturing the key sectors in the economy that generate wealth. Islam does not recognise the interest-based financial markets in their current form as witnessed in the west. The Islamic economy creates wealth through the manufacturing of real goods and the value added at each stage of production. This in no way means Islam is against a service sector, rather the emphasis in an Islamic economy is upon the real economy.

2. By removing the role of dubious financial asset markets in an economy, there remains the real economy where trade, investment, salaries and wealth is generated and circulated. This creates the much needed stability absent in free market economies as speculation has been effectively removed. The $1,000 trillion derivatives market allows speculation upon events in the real economy on a huge scale, the ability to make money in such a manner means it ceases to be in the real economy creating a duel economy. The Islamic economy in effect only has the real economy, hence all participants engage in the same sphere.

3. The Islamic prohibition of interest frees up idle wealth. Allah (swt) said: “That is because they say: Trade is just like riba, whereas Allah permitted trade and forbade riba.” [Al-Baqarah 2:275]

The existence of interest causes wealth to remain in banks in order to accrue interest rather than remain circulating in the economy. In free market economies all banks use most of their customer deposits to speculate on the financial markets which is effectively a double whammy as money again is not circulating in the real economy. The removal of interest removes the incentive to deposit excess wealth in banks for long periods. The only way to increase wealth is through investing it across the economy in projects or entering into business. In this way an Islamic economy will grow and it will be real growth built upon wealth which is
invested in the economy rather than debt, unhindered wealth circulation is what primarily will lead to economic growth in the Islamic economy.

4. The removal of direct and indirect forms of taxation leads to economic growth. The level of taxation in any nation will affect people’s behaviour, including their choices with regards to working patterns, saving and investing. Taxation in the west has created a number of problems in wealth distribution where the burden falls heavily upon the poor with the rich utilising tax loopholes and tax havens. In most developed countries, individuals pay income taxes when they earn money, consumption taxes when they spend it, property taxes when they own a home or land, and in some cases estate taxes when they die. Consumption taxes symbolise the west, such taxes are levied on the sale of goods or services. The most important kinds of consumption taxes are general sales taxes, excise taxes, value-added taxes, and tariffs.

Those who pay taxes based on such a framework generally lose 50%-60% of their salary to taxation, on top of this if one was to spend they would be liable to a general sales tax. Such a taxation regime actually affects spending patterns and forces people to not invest across the economy but actually save their earned wealth. The Islamic economy removes such forms of taxation and as a result citizens will have much more wealth to invest and spend. In comparison Allah (swt) ordained Zakat, a wealth ‘tax’, “Give the Zakat” [Al-Muzzamamil 73:20].

Zakat is liable on citizens at the end of the Islamic tax year. Hence the removal of direct and indirect taxation and the implementation of a wealth based taxation system aids wealth circulation.

5. The Islamic ruling on a multi-metallic currency creates a stable economy allowing long term decisions to be made. In Islam when it comes to exchanging a commodity with a specific monetary unit, Islam has guided us to the monetary unit by which the exchange is to take place. It has restricted the Islamic economy to a specific type of money, which is gold and silver. The Islamic evidences have designated gold and silver as the primary measuring unit for prices and labour. This is understood from the actions of Muhammad (saw) when he collected Zakat, levied taxes and imposed fines, all were measured according to gold and silver. Having a gold and silver backed currency will bring the much needed stability to the economy by containing inflation. Currently the world is plagued by the spectre of inflation as governments across the world continue to print money at will. Islam solved this problem by pegging the currency to metal; this essentially restricts the State as any increase in money supply requires more gold and silver. As a result the state will need to very carefully plan increases in money supply as it will need more metal each time, plus it will have to monitor the production level in the country to ensure it doesn’t create a scenario where there is more money than the amount of goods circulating in the economy. In this way Inflation will be rare in an Islamic economy, this allows for stable purchasing power which causes certainty in the economy.

CONCLUSIONS

The Islamic economy fundamentally creates growth through unrestricted wealth circulation. Allah (swt) even mandated a system via the prohibition of interest and wealth oriented tax which ensured better distribution of wealth in the economy: “Lest it (wealth) circulates solely among the wealthy from amongst you.” [Al-Hasr 59:7]

Islam allowed society to increase its wealth and is in no way prescriptive in the methods in which this is acheived. However Islam regulated and has not set society completely free in accumulating wealth, as this inevitably leads to corruption and the creation of the poor. The Islamic economy has ordered via a number of Quranic verses that citizens in an Islamic economy live within their means, at the same time Allah (swt) despised extravagance. Allah (swt) through many verses praised those who seek and work with their own skills and wealth, praising those who benefit from their accumulated wealth. All of this shows that Islam has promoted making money and enjoying life’s pleasures. Islam at the same time has the necessary tools to achieve sustainable economic growth and a distributive wealth system where all can live in relative comfort and ease.
The new Forced Marriages Act which came into affect in November 2008 promises to deliver protection to the ‘many’ who have been forced into marriage by their parents. Foreign Secretary David Milliband said in a newspaper article on Sunday 14th December 2008 that “the UK’s Forced Marriage Unit (FMU) had handled more than 1,500 reports so far this year. According to the FMU, 65% of all known cases of the practice in the UK involve people of Pakistani origin”. The practice is also present in Hindu and Sikh communities. The Forced Marriage Act grants the UK courts (not foreign courts) powers to prevent UK forced marriages and grant protection for those who are victim of this. Anyone found guilty of trying to force an individual into marriage could face up to 2 years imprisonment. It also raises the marriage visa age from age 18 to 21. This legislation is the first to specifically target the issue of forced marriage.

In August 2008, a high profile case of Dr Humayra Abedin, a 33 year old GP became a perfect public relations exercise for the government to launch the new Forced Marriages Act. A statement issued to the court revealed claims that Humayra Abedin was tricked by her parents into leaving the UK to visit her mother in Dhaka, Bangladesh. On arrival she was manhandled by her...
family into the property and locked in a room and kept hostage for 4 months. The courts in the UK heard of her 4 month ordeal, where her parents forced her to marry without free consent and Dr Abedin agreed to the marriage contract under duress. She later managed to email a friend in the UK seeking help, and the UK high court under the new Forced Marriages Act 2007, was able to pressure the Bangladeshi courts to secure her release and her safe return. Injunctions were issued against Dr Abedin's parents, a paternal uncle and the man she was allegedly forced to marry, by UK courts in December 2008.

This is not the first time that the topic of forced marriages has dominated domestic news. The remarks of David Blunkett, the then Home secretary in 2002, infuriated the Muslim community. Mr Blunkett was accused of attempting to create a debate on the issue in order to control immigration from South Asia, and labelling the Muslim community yet again.

Therefore the FMA (forced Marriage Act) has raised many questions in the minds of Muslims which must be addressed. The main issues have been to understand the motives behind the FMA and secondly what impact the FMA will have on Muslims or the issue of forced marriage.

WHY THE ACT?

When legislation is made targeting Muslims (stick approach), it comes with a carefully planned programme of re-culturing and redefining of Islam. Take the example of the anti-terror legislation introduced throughout the 2000's; this was coupled with visits by a variety of MP's and Muslim religious figures to Muslim areas, to discuss and ‘re-educate’ Muslims about who is a terrorist, why supporting resistance to occupation is encouraging terrorism, what is the supposed Shariah meaning of Jihad and the like. The visit by John Reid to Walthamstow in 2006 to address the Muslim community about how to monitor ‘future tell tale signs of terrorism’ in their own children certainly did not receive a ‘champagne reception’. It seems the lesson politicians learnt is never to repeat this kind of nonsense again. However the means by which the agenda of redefining Islam has become much more sinister.

The government has for the last 4 years (since 7/7) initiated a series of pilot initiatives, policies and research on the Muslim community in Britain under the guise of ‘rooting out extremism’ as evidenced by the reports published on CONTEST, PREVENT and PVE (Preventing Violent Extremism). They have identified that in order to integrate the Muslims in Britain, they will need Muslims who work at the grassroots level to work alongside them. The Community Cohesion Minister, Sadiq Khan wrote in a Fabien Society publication entitled ‘Fairness not Favours: How to reconnect with British Muslims’: “Over the last couple of years, the Labour Government has tried hard. We have shifted to more direct contact with grassroots organisations and established forums to engage with women and young people – two groups who are crucial in our ongoing debates”. The government is now targeting to entice Muslim personalities and in particular Muslim women and the youth who reside in our communities to vocalise and promote western values which in turn will dilute and label Islam in the process. By doing this they hope to create a lasting impact on our future generations.

In January 2008, Downing Street hosted the launch of NMWAG (National Muslim Women's Advisory Group). This consisted of 19 women (hijabis and non-hijabis) who the government hope will be the shining examples of ‘civic participation’ and ‘role models’ for Muslim women. Much funding has been made available for these women by the Women's National Commission (WNC) as well as to 100's of regional, local and national women's organisations who have pledged their support to ‘root out extremism’ and some organisations are actively focussed on the issues related to forced marriages.

WNC have hosted workshops and awareness building projects in Muslim...
The advisory group & supporting organisations have and wish to raise discussions within our community on a plethora of topics. Under Integration & Identity; discussions have been on multiple identities, integration, multiculturalism. Under Education and Gender roles; discussions have been on schools, universities and madrassahs, curriculum, cultural patriarchy Vs Islam, female imams and different interpretations of Islam!! Under Violence and Safety; discussions have been on the hijab/jilbab, terrorism, Islamophobia & Racism, domestic violence, honour killings AND FORCED MARRIAGE. Forced marriage is therefore just one topic amongst many that is directed at furthering the ‘rooting out terrorism’ agenda which is really aimed at diluting and redefining Islam.

**IMPACT OF THE FMA ON FAMILIES**

The impact of the publicity surrounding the FMA has been to wrongfully label Islam to be the cause of forced marriage rather than tradition and cultures alien to Islam. The government have gone from policing the Muslim community in public to meddling into relationships in the private life. The impact of the FMA could therefore result in the following for Muslims:

(a) Children using the FMA as a means to indulge in un Islamic practices such as dating, extra marital relationships and teenage pregnancies thinking the law will protect them. This will no doubt distance more youth from Islam and encourage them towards adopting secular values alien to Islam and strained parent-child relationships.

(b) Wrongfully label Islam as the cause, leaving cultural and secular values unquestioned which will allow the government to be successful in demonising Islam and Muslims but the practice will continue since causes are left unaddressed.

(c) Create division and mistrust in parent-child relationships.

In conclusion, the FMA will not irradiate the problem of forced marriage and will only generate a new set of obstacles for Muslims.

**CAUSES OF FORCED MARRIAGE**

It is true to say that forced marriages do take place in a minority of Muslim families. In some cases, girls have been taken abroad and emotionally blackmailed into marrying their cousins in order to secure visa’s or inheritance. Other cases have been due to parents noticing misconduct from their child, such as free mixing with the opposite sex or having boyfriends, which has driven parents in desperation to force their own child into marriage in order to avoid dishonour to the family. In the most severest of cases, it has resulted in honour killings in the UK and abroad. Such topics are taboo to discuss in the Muslim community, but it is necessary to distinguish between the practice of Islam and that of foreign cultures. Due to such cases being present in Muslim communities, Islam has become a prime target for attack. However what must be clear is that Islam does not condone forced marriages at all, and puts as the pivotal pillar in marriage the free consent of the two parties entering a marriage contract. Abu Hurayra reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: “A matron should not be given in marriage except after consulting her; and a virgin should not be given in marriage except after her permission is sought”. Ibn Abbas narrated that a young virgin came to the Messenger of Allah (saw) and mentioned that her father had given her in marriage against her wishes. So the Prophet (saw) gave her the choice of repudiating the marriage”.

Therefore any marriage contract conducted by force is considered void in Islam.

So if Islam is not the cause behind forced marriage, what is? The problems stems from two sources:

(i) Asian/Arab customs: The idea of ‘izza’, pride towards ones tribe or family background, wealth or nationality often has been the cause behind many parents rejecting decent marriage proposals and
resorting to forced marriage. Abu Hatim al-Muzani reported that the Messenger of Allah (saw) said: "When someone whose character and morals are agreeable to you approaches you for marriage give your daughter to him in marriage. If you do not then there will be tribulation and immense corruption in the earth".

(ii) Secular values: Secular values in society have generated a mirrored problem of dating and free mixing among the youth in the Muslim community. This has created a chasm within families where parents wish for the child to not indulge in the lifestyle of indecent and promiscuous behaviour and to maintain their Islamic values and identity and in some cases the child doesn’t. Through sheer desperation in many cases, parents resort to taking the child abroad and coercing them into a forced marriage to avoid the humiliation it would bring to the family if the child was allowed to continue in such behaviour. However this approach has led to youngsters running away from home rather than resolving the problem of the dating culture amongst youth. Furthermore, government initiatives have only sought to promote such attitudes amongst Muslim youth. The Borders and Immigration Minister Liam Byrne stated: “British citizens have the right to marry whoever they choose. But we want newcomers to succeed in our society and sign up to the standards we have in common. That means freedom, not being forced to marry someone, and it means newcomers quickly acquiring a command of English, with consequences for those who break the rules”. This means the law will also grant protection for Muslim girls to marry or cohabit with non-Muslim men which completely goes against Islam and promotes freedom for an individual to do as they wish without accountability to Allah (swt).

TACKLING FORCED MARRIAGE AS A MUSLIM COMMUNITY

The UK Government has a failed track record of solving Muslim community problems and an excellent track record of creating them. This legislation will not rid the problem of forced marriage from the community, any more than the anti-terror legislation will rid ‘terror’. Rather these legislations only serve to target further policing of the Muslim community and attempts to create division (a Muslim with another, a parent with child), increase Islamophobia in society and strip Muslims from the Islamic values and identity. The agenda to integrate Muslims and create a ‘British Islam’ has been propelled through curriculums for madrassahs, training of home grown imams, laws protecting the age of consent and sex before marriage, prostitution or immigration. The FMA is just another to add to the list of attempts by the government to show they are aiding the Muslim community but really are in the process of promoting secular values. The Muslim community must therefore deal with its own problems as a community from the Islamic basis.

IN RESPONSE THE MUSLIM COMMUNITY MUST:

a. Accept that such problems (though not a norm) happen in the Muslim community and needs to be tackled.

b. Understand that Islam does not condone forced marriages but rather puts the consent as the factor that makes the marriage legally binding in accordance to Shar’iah. The problem that exists in the community comes from eastern/Arab traditions and secular values and not Islam.

c. Encourage parents and children to use Islam as the basis to resolve parent-child disputes not culture and tradition or secular values.

d. Present the correct Islamic viewpoint on forced marriage to those who carry out this practice and raise our youth to refer to Islam in their actions as well as ourselves.

e. Solve its own issues as a community through a concerted effort to live by Islam and maintain our identity and not wait on the government to try to solve it for us. This will only lead the community into compromising on our values and principles and further the integrationist agenda.
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The Struggle for Islam and the Call for Khilafah

Obama’s recent Cairo speech laid out his vision for a ‘western-friendly’ Islam: accepting occupation and practicing Islam within western-secular limits – proof, if it were needed, that the USA is concerned by the rise of Islam throughout the Muslim world.

The call to remove the tyrants and dictators from Morocco to Indonesia who are backed by the West is getting louder and louder. Propaganda, oppressive anti-terror laws, torture and now Obama’s attempt to reinterpret the Qur’an are all part of the West’s desperation to stem this call.

In our global conferences this summer, Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain will highlight how we, as Muslims in the West, need to be at the forefront of the struggle that counters these policies: carrying the real message of Islam, showing its beauty and how the future Khilafah State will stand with the oppressed people of the world against the exploitation of global capitalism.

SUNDAY 26TH JULY 2009
VENUE: TROXY, 490 Commerical Road, London E1 0HX

SUNDAY 2nd AUGUST 2009
VENUE: BETHEL CONVENTION CENTRE, Kelvin Way, West Bromwich, B70 7JW

DOORS OPEN -11am
Tickets £8 | Telephone Hotline: 07984 233 911
website: www.hizb.org.uk | Email: conference@hizb.org.uk
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