

Islamic State: “why we hate you and why we fight you” The post Khilafah Discourse for Muslims of the West

© Daurius Figueira

August 2016

Islamic State: “why we hate you and why we fight you” The post Khilafah discourse for Muslims of the West

In Dabiq 15 in an article titled: “Why we hate you & why we fight you” IS has begun the process of articulating a post Khilafah discourse of engagement with the West. The discourse is rooted in a concept of hatred for the West that motivates to kill where the reality of salient importance is the act of killing by a perpetrator who proclaims adherence to Islam. The moral praxis of the perpetrator is irrelevant as the act of killing trumps the qualities of the perpetrator creating a discourse where moral relativism pervades and all those who kill in the name of Islam are elevated to a special category as they have killed the enemies of Islam as defined and named by IS. The article states: “Shortly following the blessed attack on a sodomite, Crusader nightclub by the mujahid Omar Mateen,”. Mateen is described as a mujahid and receives the salutation for a deceased mujahid but his lifestyle would have earned him a graphic public execution in the spaces dominated by the IS as is the case with the Nice, France attacker. A Muslim living in the West who is in the closet or has declared publicly her/his sexual preference can purchase redemption and exoneration by killing those the IS has declared enemies of Islam but this condition does not apply to the spaces of the IS clearly expressed by the brutal hunt for persons of the LGBT community within the spaces of the IS which amounts to genocide. The article states: “A hate crime? Yes. Muslims undoubtedly hate liberalist sodomites, as does anyone else with any shred of their fitrah (inborn human nature) still intact.” Lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender persons are threats to a natural order and must be dealt with more so when they constitute threats to Islam other than their threat to the natural order then genocide is the final solution. The binary mutual exclusiveness of the IS’s worldview is the product of Western discourse not Quranic discourse as Quranic discourse is much more complex. The Quran speaks of believers and unbelievers but within the body of Muslims there are the munafiqun who pose a graver threat to Islam than the unbelievers and within the body of unbelievers are the people of the Book who are differentiated from the mass of unbelievers. There is then a deliberate attempt by Salafi Jihadi discourse

to create a Quranic discourse in its own image and likeness. The discourse of the Salafi Jihadi is then of western colonial, imperialist origin hence its western extremist pedigree making the engagement of the IS with the west an instance of parricide and a brazen attempt to conquer and re-create in a western extremist mould Quranic discourse.

The article speaks of the responses of US politicians and the media to the attack in Orlando, Florida. The responses are classified into a hate crime, an act of terrorism and an act of senseless violence. IS states that yes it's a hate crime as it's the duty of Muslims to execute hate crimes on members of the LGBT community. Yes, it's a terrorist act as Muslims are beholding, compelled to terrorise the disbelieving enemies of Islam. On describing the attack as senseless violence the article states: "One would think that the average Westerner, by now, would by now have abandoned the tired claim that the actions of the mujahidin-who have repeatedly stated their goals, intentions, and motivations-don't make sense." The actions of the mujahidin are rational to the mujahidin but the west refuses to accept the rationality of the attacks. The attacks are rational because they are the result of western attacks on Islam therefore Islam is the victim and the west the aggressor. The article states: "Unless you truly-and naively- believe that the crimes of the West against Islam and the Muslims, ...won't prompt brutal retaliation from the mujahidin, you know full well that the likes of the attacks carried out by Omar Mateen, Larossi Aballa, and many others before and after them in revenge for Islam and the Muslims make complete sense." Islam and Muslims are the victims of western aggression making the attacks of Mateen and Aballa acts of retaliation of self-defence therefore within the Quranic stipulation. These attacks are not then actions in a quest for Islamic domination of the west but self-defence made necessary and compulsory by the anti-Islamic aggression of the west. The shift in discursive content and emphasis illustrates the launch of the offensive strategy for operations post collapse of the Khilafah. The listed crimes of the west that merit violent attacks are: insulting the Prophet, burning the Quran and waging war on the Caliphate which means that the collapse of the Khilafah is the result of western aggression and demands Muslim attacks on the west in the aftermath of its collapse. Those assets trapped in the west unable to undertake hijrah and those returned to the west are then the vanguard to operationalise these attacks. The new discursive construct formulated and unleashed is part of

the arsenal of new recruiting/motivational triggers for the post Khilafah operational terrain in the west. It is then noteworthy that the two model attackers from the west chosen for the article are Omar Mateen and more important for the strategy Larossi Aballa who via a knife attack killed a French police commander and his partner.

The article under study states that there is a hegemonic “false narrative” in the west presently that must constantly insist that the attacks of the mujahidin are senseless acts as the politicians of the west believe this false narrative will win them votes in the next election as there is a majority of the masses that have embraced the false narrative. The analysts and journalists in their striving for appeal to the mainstream or political correctness will also propagate the false narrative as will the apostate Muslim leaders of the west. The article states: “The point is, people know that it’s foolish, but they keep repeating it regardless because they’re afraid of the consequences of deviating from the script.” This false narrative is an obstacle to the west understanding the position of IS and those in the west who do understand this position are enveloped in silence. The article states: “As such, it became important for us to clarify to the West in unequivocal terms-yet again-why we hate you and why we fight you.” All attacks on the west for IS are then hate crimes.

Statement 1: “We hate you, first and foremost, because you are disbelievers, you reject the oneness of Allah” It is for this reason we are commanded to openly declare our hatred for you and our enmity towards you.” Muslims living in the west must then openly declare their enmity and hatred for unbelievers by attacking them especially in the post Khilafah era where there is no Islamic space to undertake hijrah to. A state of war constantly exists between unbelievers and Muslims a condition of Dar al Harb as Islam and unbelief are mutually exclusive and a contradiction that must be resolved in Islam’s favour.

Statement 2: “We hate you because your secular, liberal societies permit the very things that Allah has prohibited while banning many of the things He has permitted ...thereby granting supreme authority to your whims and desires via the legislators you vote into power.” Western liberal secular democracies are an attempt by man to challenge and usurp the power of Allah to exercise suzerainty over the earth and Allah’s creation. Western societies are driven by and modelled on rebellion to the hegemony of Allah constituting a realm not of

ignorance/Jahiliyyah but of rebellion/shirk. How can a Muslim then be a Muslim living in this order? The article states: "As such, we wage war against you to stop you from spreading your disbelief and debauchery-your secularism and nationalism, your perverted liberal values, your Christianity and atheism-and all the depravity and corruption they entail." The Muslim must wage war on this zone of shirk as it threatens to infect the Ummah with its terminal diseases which threatens Islam's sustainability. The article continues: "You've made it your mission to 'liberate' Muslim societies, we've made it our mission to fight off your influence and protect mankind from your misguided concepts and your deviant way of life." The west is the aggressor and the Muslim's task is to save mankind from the assault of the west for surrender to the west is not an option for a Muslim with those willing to being apostates they must be cleansed to ensure success of Islam in this epic battle for hegemony. This discourse of IS clearly articulated for Muslims in the west for they are at the frontlines of the war. Statement 3: "In the case of the atheist fringe, we hate you and wage war against you because you disbelieve in the existence of your Lord and Creator." Atheists constitute a special category within the grouping "unbelievers" as there is no need to tolerate their existence within a world order in which IS and the Salafi Jihadi worldview is hegemonic for this "fringe" the final solution is mandatory as Auschwitz and the Gulag. Statement 4: The IS discourse of the Muslim as victim is as follows: "We hate you for your crimes against Islam and wage war against you to punish you for your transgressions against our religion." Aggression is given because of these crimes and the manner of response is "we will continue to retaliate, not with slogans and placards, but with bullets and knives." Slogans and placards are part of the methodology of democracy which is anathema to the methodology of IS. Statement 5: IS deals with crimes against Muslims in Muslim lands and its position as the liberator of Muslims in the clutches of the west and their proxies in the Muslim lands. The article states: "We hate you for your crimes against the Muslims" and "As such, we fight you to stop you from killing our men, women, and children, to liberate those of them you imprison and torture, and to take revenge for the countless Muslims who've have suffered as a result of your deeds." The collapse of the Khilafah at the hands of the west and its "usurpers" in the Muslim lands means that the acts of revenge are now paramount especially on those allies of the west in the Muslim lands. Statement 6: "We hate you for invading our lands and fight you to repel you and drive you out." This is the other

aspect of IS's role as liberator of Muslims and Muslim lands which insists on the strategic imperative to establish the Khilafah as Muslims lands are under occupation. IS's discourse presents the flashes of a post Khilafah strategic order which fits into the operational terrain that will obtain in Iraq and Syria with the collapse of the IS as Syria and Iraq are today geopolitical expressions without a social order that expresses their functionality as a state as conceived by the European discourse of Reason of State. IS by its daily methodology of governance in spaces under its hegemony have and continue to make sterling contributions to this fractured order in which they will thrive and blend into as an experienced asymmetrical fighting force.

The article ends with a most potent statement of IS's worldview for the post Khilafah stage of the engagement with the west as follows: "The gist of the matter is that there is indeed a rhyme to our terrorism, warfare, ruthlessness, and brutality." There is then a strategy that calls for the graphic violence which is "the fact is that we continue to wage-and escalate-a calculated war that the West thought it had ended several years ago. We continue dragging you further and further into a swamp you thought you'd already escaped only to realise that you're stuck even deeper within its murky waters." Iraq and Syria are the most recent episodes of the evolution of this "murky swamp" of the Muslim lands and the western engagement with IS driven by political imperatives ensures that rather than the swamp being drained it evolves in intensity and expanse. Faced with an apocalyptic movement well-grounded in the discourses of the west a sort of Al-Awlaki on steroids how can you engage militarily to drain the swamp by refusing to place warm bodies on the ground and insist the enemy will be vanquished primarily with air operations? Then you cobble together a discourse for public consumption that insists that the IS must be dismantled and will be defeated via this flawed strategy because as long as IS exists the terrorist attacks will escalate. Denial as political mobilisation as the talking heads cannot speak to a post Khilafah scenario and the threats emanating from this reality in public so the fall of Mosul is the great solution. But what is happening in the spaces liberated from IS must be focused on as it beckons to what is to come for it illustrates the grave sectarian divide and the legacy of IS in the swamp. This divide threatens to engulf Syria as the Assad clan and the hegemony of minorities as Alawites over a Sunni majority is literally engaged in a life and death struggle that

will knock on the sectarian doors of Lebanon. The swamp created and propped up by western colonial and neo-colonial imperialism was founded with the seeds of its own dysfunctionality sown in its social order. The swamp grows as a singularity as it continues to procreate its dysfunctional progeny the latest being the IS but not the last of a long line. Another product of the racist arrogance of North Atlantic humanism.