

The Post Khilafah Discourse of Islamic State of Rumiyyah
Magazine

© Daurius Figueira

October 2016

The Post Khilafah Discourse of the Islamic State

In September 2016 the Islamic State (IS) released its new online English publication Rumiyaah which presents a new post Khilafah discourse to Muslims of the Western English speaking countries. In a previous article: "Islamic State: 'Why we hate you and why we fight you' The Post Khilafah discourse for Muslims of the West" I analysed this new discourse as it began to appear in Dabiq magazine making analysis of the discourse of Rumiyaah vitally necessary to understand the strategic position of Islamic State at this juncture in the assault on the Khilafah.

The most potent statement of IS in Rumiyaah is the quotation from the Hadith of the Prophet (uwbp) that defines the worldview, discourse and strategy of IS for this era revealed in Rumiyaah. The section of Hadith quoted is as follows: "Allah's Messenger was asked, 'Which of the two cities will be conquered first? Constantinople or Rumiyaah? He replied, 'The city of Heraclius will be conquered first' meaning Constantinople." (Reported by Ahmad and ad-Darimi from Abdullah Ibn'Amir). Commentators in the West have interpreted this quoted selection of Hadith by IS as an indication of its continuing war on the West as Rumiyaah is Rome. But the Hadith states that Heraclius/Constantinople will fall first then Rome but is Constantinople today in the hands of Muslims? IS emphatically states that Turkey is in the hands of the apostates with their supplicant scholars of Islam which means for IS Constantinople is yet to fall and it will fall first then Rome and Rome will never fall until Constantinople falls to IS first. The prime target then is not Rome/Rumiyaah and cannot be in order to conquer Rome. To conquer the West subjugating it to the hegemony of IS demands then that the hegemony of the apostates over the Muslim lands especially Constantinople/Turkey be smashed. The post Khilafah discourse is not proposing the triggering of the apocalypse by the vanguard at Dabiq but the intra Islamic war to purge the Muslim world of the hegemony of the apostates that stands in the way of realising the compulsory obligation of all Muslims to ensure the hegemony of Islam over all of mankind. The failure to conquer Turkey restoring Islamic hegemony over Constantinople results in the failure to conquer Rumiyaah/Rome and in the punishment of Muslims by Almighty Allah (swt) for this catastrophic failure to be steadfast, patient and obedient slaves of Almighty Allah (swt). Having failed in this obligatory task Muslims have then by their own failure to act embraced shirk. This discourse is focused on obligatory Muslim action without

reference to Islamic apocalyptic scenarios as it links obligatory Muslim action to the realisation of a world order that is the strategic order of Almighty Allah (swt). Obligatory Muslim action is joined at the hips with the reward promised to those who undertake said action no action, no reward only punishment. In this discourse IS has gone to mainstream Sunni Salafi Jihadi discourse veering closer to the worldview of Anwar Al Awlaki and Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi and this is deliberate. (See my book: "Salafi Jihadi Discourse of Sunni Islam in the 21st Century"). Whilst the commentators of the West focus on Rumiya which is the hand that distracts the strategy to purge Islam will be revealed as the Khilafah shrinks and then collapses especially in Iraq where the sectarian war serves the agenda to purge Islam and Syria sucks Turkey into the quagmire largely due to its fixation with the Kurds never fail to learn from the Afghanistan adventures and the fact that Sunni Islam is the majority sect in Syria but doesn't wield state power.

There are two articles in Rumiya 1 that are of interest for this study: "Stand and Die upon that for which your brothers died" and "The Kafir's BLOOD is halal for you so shed it". In Stand and Die Islamic State is dealing with the death of fighters of IS but is spelling out the discourse that is meant to spin the impact of the assault on the IS and the demise of the Khilafah. The article states: "The people of falsehood constantly attempt to make the deaths of righteous men and their slayings by the enemies of Islam-the mushrikin and the apostates-into a sign foretelling the breaking of the muwahiddin. But those fools do not realise that Allah (swt) has ordained for each soul its set term before He created the heavens and the earth." The death of the members, the fighters and the leaders of IS at the hands of the enemies of Islam, the idolaters/unbelievers and the apostates of Islam will not destroy the fighters of Islam. Why? Two reasons: Almighty Allah (swt) has set the time limit on each soul and no human is exempted so when a fighter/leader of Islamic State is killed at the hands of the idolaters and apostates the primary reason for this death is not resistance to the enemies of Islam but simply the time allotted to the soul by Almighty Allah (swt) had expired. The manner of death, the action and its justification driving the environment of death didn't hasten death as the time allotted by Almighty Allah (swt) cannot be abrogated by the actions of humans. When the time allotted has run out regardless of your actions you simply die. The question then that arises is: What

does a Muslim do with the time allotted since no one knows when it will expire and what is the obligation Islam places on Muslims in light of this overarching reality? The idolaters and apostates can only kill those at the end of the time allotted to them no one else therefore as long as Muslims accept and act on their duty to engage the enemies of Islam there will always be fighters/leaders who survive the assaults. The second reason bolsters the first as follows: "Those fools do not realise that Allah (swt) preserves His religion however He wills, and this religion will remain established and will not be damaged by the death of any person. He preserved it and employed His righteous slaves in its service." The religion of Almighty Allah (swt), Islam, will never disappear from the face of the Earth until its mission as determined by Almighty Allah (swt) is accomplished and until such time the successful attainment of its mission is dependent on no human whether Muslim/slave of Allah (swt) or the enemies of Islam the idolaters and apostates. Mankind is then assured of one single reality the continuity of Islam in spite of the resistance and failures of humanity as the power that preserves the agenda of Islam is the absolute, universal power that is only possessed by Almighty Allah (swt). Muslims/slaves of Allah are called then by Allah (swt) to be obediently used in this agenda being played out on Earth rendering death under whatever conditions to be irrelevant as the prime issue is the existential condition of the person at the moment the allotted time expired: were you a slave of Allah (swt) or an enemy of Allah (swt)? This is the only question of relevance to all humans at the point of death.

The mujahidin of Allah (swt) are then slaves/Muslims of a special category and calling as the time and manner of their death is irrelevant what is of prime importance is total immersion in the agenda of Islam as revealed in that era. The article states: "As for the mujahidin in Allah's cause-and they are the elite of His creation, those of His slaves whom He has chosen to be martyrs and whom He subjects to favourable tests-then the death of their leaders and commanders who stormed ahead of them into battle, running headfirst into hardships for their religion, only increases their firmness and determination in fighting the enemies of Allah." The mujahidin constitute an elite amongst Muslims a demarcation created by Allah (swt) as the mujahidin are chosen to be martyrs and subject to tests that ordinary Muslims are not subjected to thereby constituting the mujahidin as the vanguard of the agenda of Islam. The agenda of Islam will then

always constitute the mujahid as the agenda cannot realise its designed end without the mujahid. Islamic State in its present incarnation has reacted to the military collapse of the Khilafah as a geographic expression by formulating and releasing its most astute and discursively tight discourse of the cult of death which is now lynch pinned on the concept of human fatalism that is vital to the attainment of an end determined by the All Powerful (swt). A concept that is shirk as it posits the All Powerful (swt) as being limited by an agenda formulated and unleashed by the All Powerful (swt). But Islamic State must enter the domain of shirk for in its quest to cobble together a discourse that insists that Muslims are called to terminate their lives to further the agenda of the All Powerful (swt) they must then limit the All Powerful (swt) to justify the supposed need the All Powerful (swt) has for the cult of death. Islamic State is now plumbing depths last seen in the history of Islam with the diverse discourse of the Mutazila and the nihilism of the Kharijites where IS has now combined both streams. The operationalisation of this cult of death that insists it is pristine Islam is now being revealed to the Muslim world on a daily basis in the battle for Mosul, Iraq.

The article continues with the discursive position of the flow of succeeding generations of the mujahidin as follows: "This is the way of the muwahiddin in every time and place. Whenever a generation of them passes, another generation follows, holding the banner of tawhid overhead while plunging anew into the battle for Islam, which continues to be waged against shirk and its people." It is a sustainable process of continuity and regeneration as it is the will of The Almighty (swt) according to the discourse of IS. The Mujahidun must then be killed to further the process to its culmination and can then in no way destroy the agenda of Islam. IS states: "The killing of our persevering brothers who preceded us will not harm Islam at all, as it is preserved by Allah (swt), just as it will never harm our brothers. We consider them to be those who emerged as fighters for Allah's cause, seeking shahadah without turning back." If the death of the mujahids will not harm Islam nor the Muslims why the need for it, why the need for Shahids? Does Almighty Allah (swt) need the blood of the Shahids to realise the agenda of Islam? The discourse states: "By Allah's permission their slayings will not harm the Islamic State as long as it proceeds upon Tawhid and the Sunnah." In this epoch the Islamic State is the personification of the agenda of Islam which nullifies the assaults upon it and the impact of the death of its leaders and fighters as Allah

(swt) will ensure its continuity as the agenda of Islam is not yet accomplished. As: “Men shall continue to be employed by Allah to frustrate the kuffir, thereby healing the hearts of a believing people, just as Allah established those who established its foundations and raised its bases, until it reached, by Allah’s grace, what it has reached today of dignity and empowerment.” The discourse is insisting that Almighty Allah (swt) in the agenda of Islam can only treat with human action via counter human action. The All Powerful (swt) is limited by an agenda created by The All Powerful (swt) which leaves The All Powerful (swt) dependent and beholding to human action but most of all to war and blood lust by humans. This is shirk. The gravity of the strategic situation Islamic State is now addressing is apparent but what is most important is the apocalypse it is desirous of unleashing by any means necessary in response to this strategic reality. Islamic State is positing an agenda of Islam that can only advance through the shedding of human blood and the discourse is insisting that The Almighty (swt) is not only desirous of this, commands this but is also trapped by a dependence on human agency. This is the discourse of shirk that situates Islamic State way outside the pale of Islam as a cult transfixed on blood-letting. The IS discourse must compromise the central concept of Tawhid in Islam as it must relentlessly attempt to place limits on the power of The Powerful (swt) in its attempt to manufacture a rationale for the centrality of human action. This centrality that must relentlessly seek to limit the power of Almighty Allah (swt) to the agenda of Islam as it seeks to justify wars of conquest as the only human action necessary to the agenda of Islam. In its quest IS must formulate a discourse that presents Allah (swt) dependent on a finite, imperfect creation of Allah (swt) to realise an agenda that is the product of Allah (swt). In this IS discourse Almighty Allah (swt) is beholding to what was created in imperfection by Almighty Allah (swt). This discursive concept does not follow from the opening concept of the discourse presented in the said article which it must as the discourse is seeking to justify global wars of conquest.

The article: “The Kafir’s BLOOD is Halal for you so shed it” is the generic discourse of IS on the need for global wars of conquest but the difference lies in the attempt to place the discourse within the paradigm of mainstream Salafi Jihadi discourse. This indicates that in its hour of peril Islamic State is now reaching out to Salafi Jihadi groups it attacked as being apostate as the strategic

realities of Syria, Iraq and a number of theatres of operations the world over now demand this embrace.

The article commences with the position that one of the meanings in English of the Arabic root word *Din* was obedience along with religion, authority, judgment and rule. Therefore, in the religion of Islam/*Din* obedience to Almighty Allah (swt) is a religious duty incumbent on all Muslims. The article states: "So the command of Allah-to which obedience is due is a religious duty is to fight until there is no *fitnah* i.e. evident shirk in the obedience of Allah, and until no manifest authority is given to any rule except to that of the True King." It is the religious duty of all Muslims in obedience to Allah (swt) to wage war on the unbelievers until all are subdued because shirk is tyranny against the hegemony of Allah (swt).

The discourse insists that it is mainstream discourse as follows: "Lest someone think this is a strange, new opinion, it should be known that that this is the stance of the Sahabah and the greatest scholars of the Ummah." The text that follows list a number of mainstream sources that indicate that this IS discourse is in fact mainstream Islamic discourse and what is noteworthy in this article is the absence of the discourse of Takfir used by IS as the mechanism to judge and execute Muslims viewed as apostates. The discourse of Takfir was the basis of the rejection of IS by mainstream Salafi Jihadi discourse and al-Maqdisi was vocal in his rejection of this discourse starting with his rejection of the methodology of Zarqawi in Iraq. The article states: "None of this should be surprising to any Muslim who has studied his religion, as this matter of a kafir's blood being halal to shed is something upon which scholars have recorded consensus." What is surprising to those who regularly deconstruct the discourse of Islamic State is the absence of the discourse of Takfir in this article in an attempt to now move within the ambit of Sunni Salafi Jihadi mainstream discourse of the 21st century maybe the prodigal has returned. I have my grave doubts.

In the final paragraph of the article the graphic message to Muslims of the West is unleashed as follows: "Muslims currently living in Dar al-Kufr must be reminded that the blood of the disbelievers is halal, and killing them is a form of worship to Allah, the Lord, King, and God of mankind. There is no shar'i requirement to target soldiers and policemen nor judges and politicians, but all kuffir who are not under the covenant of dhimmah are fair game." The Islamic

State now has limits placed on its actions in the West in keeping with mainstream Salafi Jihadi discourse as the blood of Muslims and unbelievers who are under the covenant of dhimmah is Haraam/prohibited whilst all other persons it is open season on them as the shedding of their blood is halal/permitted, compulsory as it is a religious duty. In the post Khilafah era the Islamic State is now moving to immerse itself in the mainstream Salafi Jihadi global movement towards ending the futile internecine warfare that has cost IS position on global battlefields through alliances and truces. The end to the internecine warfare is now strategically necessary to survival and the pursuit of the post Khilafah agenda seen in the willingness of IS discursive agents to drop the discourse of Takfir thereby going mainstream. The threat has then evolved further as it attempts to evolve a new strategic order.

Discourse invokes and provokes mental imagery and impact and it is only a Muslim can relate the experience of the impact this discourse evokes. In Islam the consumption of blood is Haraam/prohibited the statement that the blood of the unbeliever/Kaffir is Halal evokes and provokes a stream of mental imagery and thoughts. This impact can and will have impact on a specific individual or individuals the question is amongst these individuals who will act upon the images? Let radicalisation and de-radicalisation discourse figure that out where the adherents of this discourse are impacted entirely different by the discourse if at all. This is a discourse formulated by Muslims for Muslims therefore if you are not Muslim and you want insight you either become a Muslim or trust Muslims to interpret for you. Maybe the problem is trusting Muslims as the US Cavalry never trusted the Native Scouts they employed in the "Indian" Wars. The problem is Islam is driven by a discourse, worldview, paradigm, epistemology that is alien to the Enlightenment Project there are then no commonalities to enable communication all there is a power relation. Specific Muslims of the West are now offering themselves as communication assets by attempting to combine elements of the Enlightenment Project with a jurisprudence determined version of Islam rather than Quranic Islam which results in a new Western creation the 21st century version of Gunga Din ever seeking her/his Lawrence of Arabia.