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Hizb ut-Tahrir

Ideology and Strategy
Executive Summary

Hizb ut-Tahrir (HT) is a revolutionary Islamist party that works to establish an expansionist super-state in Muslim-majority countries, unifying Muslims worldwide as one political bloc, or “ummah”.

PART I: IDEOLOGY

All states are regarded as ‘lands of war’ because the party’s specific type of governance is presently not implemented. HT’s state, on the other hand, would be considered the ‘land of Islam’. HT’s conception of jihad, or warfare, is based on these classifications. The party believes that its state can wage war in order to annex all Muslim-majority countries and colonise all non-Muslim majority countries. HT believes that Muslims should engage in this war to convert all ‘lands of war’ into the ‘land of Islam’, and killing civilians to achieve this is permitted. HT’s state would be governed by autocratic rule and enforce an intolerant strand of shariah as state law. The party’s draft constitution discriminates against minorities and women.

In the absence of HT’s state, Muslims are sanctioned to engage in jihad in ‘occupied Islamic lands’, defined as any country that is Muslim-majority or was once ‘ruled by Muslims under the authority of Islam’. HT believes that “terrorising” the “enemy” is a religious duty against those committing ‘aggression against the sanctities of the Muslims.’ HT defines Israel as an “enemy” state: killing Israeli Jews is sanctioned through tactics such as suicide bombings as well as hijacking and bombing Israeli planes.

Inherent to HT’s worldview is a clash between “Western” and “Islamic” civilisations. The party believes the United Kingdom and United States of America are leading a campaign against Islam and Muslims worldwide. HT considers the influence of Western thought and physical presence in Muslim-majority countries as a threat to Islam, which it wishes to “uproot”. Liberal values – secularism, human rights and pluralism – are rejected as “un-Islamic” because they differ from HT’s Islamist doctrine. Promoting democracy, for example, is seen as part of a Western conspiracy to weaken Islam. Communism and socialism are also rejected despite HT’s founder and ideologue heavily borrowing from socialist concepts to formulate party ideology.

While HT is not a terrorist organisation, its revolutionary Islamism belongs to the same political spectrum as entry-level Islamists (the Muslim Brotherhood) and militant Islamists (al-Qaeda). While they differ in methodology, the end goal of all three organisations is to create an “Islamic state”. A number of militant Islamist groups emerged in the Middle East as a result of being radicalised by HT’s sectarian ideology, and former members have since participated in terrorism.
PART II: ACTIVITY IN MUSLIM-MAJORITY COUNTRIES

Operating in over 40 countries worldwide, HT is widely banned in the Middle East, Central Asia and South Asia. The party’s method for gaining power is to infiltrate military factions in Muslim-majority countries in order to facilitate a coup. The party has already staged failed coups in the Middle East in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and is currently attempting to do so in Pakistan because the country possesses nuclear weapons.

PART III: STRATEGY IN THE WEST

HT actively seeks mass support for its Islamist revolution among Western Muslims. Party ideology commands them to oppose Western civilisation and to subvert their societies. All Western states are considered “enemies” of Islam and potential land for HT’s expansionist Islamist state via jihad.

HT targets Muslim communities in an attempt to create a monolithic bloc sympathetic to its brand of Islamism and to promote sole identification with HT’s “ummah”. To unite Western Muslims to its cause, HT encourages a victim mentality by presenting Muslims as the target of a perceived Western ‘War on Islam’. Furthermore, the party denounces Muslim integration, forbids Muslims from voting in democratic elections and describes Muslims who call for human rights and democracy as apostates.

HT Britain’s (HTB) activities demonstrate the party’s ‘keep your ideology in your heart’ strategy. Since the 7/7 London bombings the party has increasingly adopted measures to disguise its intolerant ideology. HTB emphasises “political” struggle and uses euphemistic language to hide its support for jihad, antisemitic beliefs and totalitarian system of governance.

HTB has adopted front groups – youth groups, student and community organisations – to disseminate its ideology. Designed to circumnavigate the party’s possible proscription, HTB uses front groups to embed its ideology within British Muslim communities. For example, HTB’s Brick Lane Islamic Circle holds weekly study sessions in a local-government owned community centre in Tower Hamlets, London.

HTB encourages young Muslims to spread HT’s ideology and work towards the party’s revolution. The party focuses on university campuses, youth organisations and mosques. In some cases, HTB members have targeted school children. For example, party members run the Islamic Shakhsiyah Foundation – a charity that manages two primary schools – and write the schools’ curriculum based on HT’s version of Islam. The government regulatory body Ofsted has praised the schools’ “Islamic” ethos and the foundation has received £113,411 in government grants.

Within wider society, HT works to mainstream its worldview as “Islamic” and present its totalitarian ideology as a non-threatening – and viable – alternative to current political thinking.
HTB presents itself as an “Islamic” voice and engages with politicians, local authorities and mainstream media. HTB’s grassroots activities have gained the support of local politicians and the party has been given a platform in the Houses of Parliament. In 2008, the party’s Chairman, Abdul Wahid, spoke at a debate funded by the government’s Preventing Violent Extremism programme.

**PART IV: POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

In the UK, the Conservative Party has recently voiced its commitment to proscribe HT should they form the next government. The current Labour government has stated that any decision to proscribe HT would have to be justified under the UK’s Terrorism Act 2000, and that the party is currently under review.

HT ideologically legitimises acts of terrorism. However, there is no evidence that HTB, or party chapters worldwide, have direct links to terrorism. Since the Terrorism Act 2006, HTB does not appear to have explicitly and publicly supported suicide bombings or terrorist organisations. Any government wishing to proscribe HT in the UK would therefore have to amend current terrorism legislation.

Whilst proscription would send a strong message, it would likely prove impractical and ineffective. Furthermore, it could engender strong opposition and possibly give unnecessary legitimacy to HT’s worldview. Instead, the government could reduce HT’s public legitimacy by encouraging greater civic intolerance of the party. Some of the recommendations for government highlighted in this report include:

**HT and its front groups:** The government’s Research, Information and Communications Unit should circulate centralised criteria to all Prevent partners for identifying HT ideology.

**Civic institutions:** A ‘No Platform’ policy for HT should be established across publically-funded institutions. Local authorities should also establish mechanisms to limit civic institutions inadvertently funding or hosting HTB front groups.

**Community groups:** Government should establish centralised criteria for funding and engagement with stakeholders in Muslim communities. Funding and engagement should be conditional on the group and its members not sharing a platform with HT members or publicly supporting HT ideology.

**Schools:** HT members should be restricted from working in primary and secondary schools. HT’s antisemitism is incompatible with schools’ duty to promote racial equality. The Charity Commission and local authorities should withdraw charitable status and public funding for registered charities whose schools consistently engage in political activity by hosting HT members or publicly supporting HT ideology.
**Universities:** Further and Higher Education services should provide greater institutionalised support for the National Union of Students’ ‘No Platform’ policy. University authorities should review teaching and pastoral responsibilities given to HT members.

**Registered mosques and Islamic charities:** The Charity Commission’s Faith and Social Cohesion Unit (FSCU) should support mosques combating HT influence. Charitable status and public funding should be withdrawn for registered mosques and other Islamic charities which either host HT members, allow them to become trustees, or publicly support HT ideology.

**Mosques and Imams National Advisory Board (MINAB):** Since MINAB is heavily influenced by entry-level political Islamists, the government must consider if it is appropriate for MINAB to advise the FSCU, particularly in relation to identifying and combating HTB activism in British mosques.

**Effects within civil society:** The government should focus on promoting the shared values of a liberal democracy as effective opposition to extremism because HT undermines these values and encourages hatred and separatism towards those who do not share the party’s interpretation of Islam. It is hoped that this would empower civil society and British Muslim communities to develop greater resilience to the extremism espoused by groups like HT.
Introduction

At the 2009 Conservative Party conference, Shadow Home Secretary Chris Grayling said that the revolutionary Islamist party Hizb ut-Tahrir (HT), or the Party of Liberation, would be proscribed should the Conservatives win the next election. In the immediate aftermath of the 7/7 2005 London bombings, the then Prime Minister Tony Blair also proposed proscription. However, this decision is still under review.

Operating in over 40 countries worldwide, HT aims to establish an aggressively expansionist Islamist state. While it claims to be non-violent, HT sanctions military coups in Muslim-majority countries. The party’s state would then engage in offensive warfare – committing the mass murder of civilians if necessary – in order to colonise all Muslim and non-Muslim-majority countries.

Like all violent and non-violent Islamist groups, HT interprets Islam as a holistic socio-political system. Its ideology has helped inspire jihadist terrorism and bears crucial similarities to the doctrines of al-Qaeda and its affiliates. In common with Islamist terrorists, HT believes Muslims have a “religious” duty to liberate perceived ‘occupied Islamic lands’. To achieve this, HT prescribes violence, which includes suicide bombings as well as hijacking and bombing planes.

In the West, HT’s current strategy is one of grassroots activism and engagement with wider society. The party aims to create a monolithic political Muslim bloc in the West to aid its Islamist revolution and subvert Western societies for future annexation by HT’s state. In order to mainstream HT ideology amongst Western Muslim communities and avoid rejection by wider society, the party has downplayed its more intolerant beliefs and presents itself as defending “true” Islam in the face of a perceived Western ‘War on Islam’.

However, HT remains legal in the UK and operates openly in many countries in the West. This report highlights HT’s inherently violent ideology and presents a case study of party activities in the UK as an example of its strategy in the West. This report also includes a detailed analysis of policy measures – and potential repercussions – that could be taken by any future British government towards HT.
Methodology

This report examines HT’s ideology and influences on Islamist terrorism as well as its policy of military coups in Muslim-majority countries. The report demonstrates the party’s perspective on the West by investigating its strategy and activities in the UK. The report concludes with a detailed analysis of possible policy measures that could be taken towards HT in the UK.

The report’s authors have used a number of external publications that analyse party ideology and activities as well as primary sources which include: a previously unpublished internal strategy communiqué issued by HT’s global leadership for party branches in the West; interviews with and public testimonies from former leading members of HT Britain (HTB); published HT books, pamphlets and leaflets; and HT media statements and online material. The report’s authors also attended HTB’s national and local events between 2008 and 2009. As HT members have a duty to internalise, adopt and propagate party concepts, a variety of HT literature has been used to examine party ideology.
PART I

IDEOLOGY
Aim

The aim of Hizb ut-Tahrir is to resume the Islamic way of life and to convey the Islamic da’wah [message] to the world. This objective means bringing the Muslims back to living an Islamic way of life in Dar al-Islam [land of Islam] and in an Islamic society such that all of life’s affairs in society are administered according to the Shari’ah [Islamic] rules, and the viewpoint in it is halal [permitted] and the haram [forbidden] under the shade of the Islamic State, which is the Khilafah [Caliphate] State. […] It also aims to bring back the Islamic guidance for mankind and to lead the Ummah [community] into a struggle with Kufr [disbelief], its systems and its thoughts so that Islam encapsulates the world.¹

HT is a revolutionary Islamist party. It aims to:

1. Establish an expansionist Islamist state, the Caliphate, and implement the party’s constitution based on a medieval interpretation of shariah, or Islamic, law;²

2. Unify Muslims worldwide into a single political bloc, the “ummah”;

3. Annex all states to the Caliphate.

The party claims that its methods are non-violent.³ HT plans, however, to stage a military coup in a Muslim-majority country – regardless of whether the government is democratically elected or not – in order to establish its Islamist state. The party then aims to overthrow all governments in Muslim-majority countries, through warfare if necessary, to create an Islamist super-state. HT would then move to colonise all other states either by diplomatic means – “inviting” other states to join its Caliphate – or “offensive” jihad: expansionist state warfare.⁴

¹ Hizb ut-Tahrir, Hizb ut-Tahrir (London: Al-Khilafah Publications, 2000), p.12. This booklet was bought by the report’s authors at HTB’s annual 2009 conference in London. Some Arabic words have been spelt and formatted differently in quotes and in the authors’ work. This is because the majority of quotes are taken and kept in their original format.
² For the purposes of this report, “Islamist” as opposed to “Islamic” will be used to best describe HT’s state.
⁴ For the purposes of this report HT’s interpretation of jihad will be used. See glossary.
Early Ideological Influences

Mohammed Taqiuddin an-Nabhani [1909 – 1977], the founder of HT and its ideology, was born in the village of Ijzim in British mandated Palestine. The grandson of Sheikh Yusuf an-Nabhani, a famous Islamic scholar and judge of the Ottoman Empire, Nabhani is revered by members of HT for his heritage, Islamic education and professional background.5

Nabhani spent four years studying at al-Azhar University and Dar-ul-‘Ulum College in Cairo, Egypt, graduating in 1932.6 He returned to Palestine and worked as a religious teacher in a high school, but left teaching in 1938 because he felt the curriculum belonged to ‘Western colonialist nations’ that were ‘prone to corruption’.7 Nabhani then worked in Islamic courts and became a judge in Ramleh, Palestine in 1945 before fleeing to Syria when Israel was created in 1948.8 Returning to Jordanian-controlled Jerusalem soon after, Nabhani worked as a judge in the Islamic Court of Appeals, a position of prestige that he held until his resignation in 1950.9

Nabhani’s strong antisemitism is the likely result of his association with known antisemites of the time. For example, Nabhani was closely associated with Sheikh Muhammad Hajj al-Amin Hosseini between 1945 and 1948.10 Hajj Hosseini, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, had previously allied himself with Adolf Hitler and the Nazis during World War II in return for Hitler’s promised assistance in destroying the nascent Jewish state in Palestine.11 HTB’s online biography of Nabhani claims he also spent time with Sheikh Izz al-Din al-Qassam, whom the party describes as a ‘famous mujahid’, or warrior.12 Al-Qassam is known to have formed the ‘Black Hand’, or al-kaff al-aswad, group – one of the first modern Arab terrorist groups – in 1930 in British mandated Palestine in order to “terrorise” and “kill” the Jewish population.13 In common with HT and other modern Islamist groups, al-Qassam ‘often quoted verses from the Qur’an referring to jihad, linking them with topical matters and his own political ideas.14

Whilst working as a judge in Jerusalem, Nabhani associated with a group of Palestinian Arab nationalists, many of whom were former associates of Hajj Hosseini. Members of the group were western-educated and modern in their political outlook; politically the group resem-

---

5 Nabhani later criticised his grandfather for being a mystic Sufi.
7 Ibid
10 Ibid, p.2
12 ‘Sheikh Muhammad Taqiuddin al-Nabhani’, Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain website
14 Ibid, p.62
bled the Syrian Ba’th party, which Nabhani may have also been in contact with during his time in Syria.15 Nabhani’s association with Arab nationalists inspired to a great extent the emphasis on state-based politics and institutions found in his intellectual formulation and vision of HT. Propagating Ba’thist ideology, which is socialist and secular, Nabhani and his associates called for the unification of all Arab states through revolutionary change. Resenting the then Jordanian King Abdullah, whom they saw as obstructing Palestinian liberation by keeping it under Jordanian authority, the men befriended a sympathetic Jordanian Colonel, Abdullah al-Tall. Al-Tall encouraged them to ‘attack the regime and prepare Palestinians to accept a coup’ through writings in their daily newspaper *al Ba’th*. When al-Tall’s coup attempt failed, however, Nabhani started to move away from his Ba’thist associates.16

Nabhani’s *Inqadh Filastin*, or *Saving Palestine*, first published in January 1950, is an introduction to the Ba’thist nationalist concepts that he was later to introduce in HT. For example, Nabhani categorises Arabs as a single nation and calls for a revolutionary vanguard to regenerate Arab unity.17 In order to have such a transformation, Nabhani writes that a group of Arab intellectuals should be formed to define a course of action and to spread their ideas across all spectrums of society.18 He differs from Ba’thism by calling for Arab unification based on Islam as opposed to pan-Arabism. Nabhani does not, however, call for the establishment of an Islamic state in this early writing.

The destruction of the Ottoman Empire in 1924, the creation of Israel in 1948 (viewed by Nabhani as catastrophic for Muslims in Palestine and worldwide), al-Tall’s failed coup in Jordan, and the influences of Ba’thist anti-colonialism, all served to convince Nabhani that radical change was needed to remove Western influence from Arab nations. In August 1950, Nabhani sent a letter, published as *Risalat al-Arab*, or *The Message of the Arabs*, to members of the Cultural Summit of the Arab League in Egypt, in which he stressed that the real message of the Arabs was Islam and that political revival of the “*ummah*” was needed.19 Since none of the members reacted, Nabhani was persuaded that the establishment of his own political party was necessary for such a revival. In 1952 Nabhani formed HT as a political party in Jordanian-controlled Jerusalem.

Nabhani’s brand of Islamism was revolutionary compared to other Islamist movements formed in opposition to colonialism, such as the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in Egypt in 1928 and Jamaat-e-Islami (JI) in India in 1941. Nabhani, the only leader of the three groups to possess Islamic qualifications,20 considered the others failures because their ideas and strategies for establishing an Islamist state were not clarified, and their aims were cultural rather

---

15 Taji-Farouki, *A Fundamental Quest*, p.3
16 Taji-Farouki, ‘Islamic Discourse and Modern Political Methods’, pp.368-369
17 Ibid, p.370; see also Taji-Farouki, *A Fundamental Quest*, p.4
19 Ibid, p.195
20 Hasan al-Banna, founder of the MB, was a school teacher. Sayyid Abul A’la Mawdudi, the founder of JI, was a journalist. Several authors state that Nabhani was a member of the MB. However, Taji-Farouki points out that HT sources deny that he was ever a member. See Taji-Farouki, *A Fundamental Quest*, p.6
than political.\textsuperscript{21} The MB, for example, advocates the gradual Islamisation of societies through grassroots activism, where Islamic order under \textit{shariah} would emerge, and then an Islamist state. Nabhani, however, believed that no such order could be created without establishing an Islamist state first.\textsuperscript{22} Instead, Nabhani’s ideology developed the revivalist principles of the MB within a socialist framework borrowed from Ba’thism: he envisaged an expansionist state run by Islamist principles under which all Muslims could be united as a single political bloc, and that advocacy for change should be conducted outside of the political framework. This sets HT apart from the MB and JI as the latter Islamist groups use entry-level tactics – political participation – as a means to advocate social and political reform.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{21} Commins, ‘Taqi al-din al-Nabhani and the Islamic Liberation Party’, p.202; see also Taji-Farouki, \textit{A Fundamental Quest}, p.189
\textsuperscript{22} Taji-Farouki, \textit{A Fundamental Quest}, p.191
\textsuperscript{23} Entry-level Islamist groups include the MB and JI, which participate in state institutions to Islamise society from within. For the purposes of this report, Islamists are defined as those who seek to unify Muslims within a single political bloc; seek to implement \textit{shariah} law; and seek to create an Islamist state, the Caliphate. They do not usually employ violent tactics to achieve their aims, although some MB groups do accept the use of violence when necessary before coming into power.
Islamist Ideology

HT’s Islamism is a twentieth century ideology. HT believes Islam is not only a religion but a holistic political ideology, within which sovereignty belongs to God, not mankind. Its vision of a Caliphate is shaped by modern conceptions of statehood incorporating, for example, a standing army, constitution and governing body. HT’s draft constitution implements *shariah* law at state level. According to article 1:

The Islamic *‘Aqeeda* [doctrine] constitutes the foundation of the State. Therefore, nothing is permitted to exist in the State’s structure, system, accountability, or any other aspect connected with the State that does not take the Islamic *‘Aqeeda* as its source. The Islamic *‘Aqeeda* is also the source of the State’s constitution and laws. Consequently, nothing related to them is permitted to exist unless it emanates from the Islamic *‘Aqeeda*.25

In HT’s state, public and private spheres are regulated by the party’s radical mindset and interpretation of *shariah* law, which it claims is based on Islamic sources, such as the *Quran* and *Hadith*.

Since its inception in 1952, the party has continuously aspired to create an expansionist Islamist state uniting what it calls ‘Islamic lands’ under one leader, the Caliph.

The unity of Islamic lands is Fard [obligatory] on the Muslims, because Islam has forbidden more than one Islamic state. So it is forbidden to have more than one Khilafah.27

In reality, HT’s state is a theocratic dictatorship. Article 35 of HT’s draft constitution stipulates:

The *Khalifah* [Caliph] is the State. He possesses all of the authority of the State….28

Hizb ut-Tahrir’s Methodology for Political Change

HT calls for intellectual debate as a precursor to revolutionary change. HT seeks to build mass support for the party’s vision at a grassroots level.29 HT also aims to infiltrate and seek sup-

24 Islamist groups, such as the MB and JI also believe the same. HT believes that both de jure and de facto sovereignty belongs to God.
26 For HT, ‘Islamic lands’ include Muslim-majority countries, ‘even if it had not been ruled by Muslims’, and non-Muslim majority countries that were once ‘ruled by Muslims under the authority of Islam’. See pp.19-20 for HT’s definition of ‘Islamic lands’. See also Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Ummah’s Charter (Meethaq ul-Ummah)* (London: Khilafah Publications, November 1989), p.19
27 Ibid, p.19
port from military factions to facilitate what it calls a “bloodless” coup, an HT concept known as nussrah.\textsuperscript{30} HT states:

> But if the land was a land of Kufr and the rules of Islam were not put in implementation, then removing the ruler who governs over the Muslims would be through using the method of Nusrah, i.e. seeking the help.\textsuperscript{31}

HT does not advocate jihadist terrorism as a method for achieving its state; the party believes it would be counter-productive to its aims. HTB states:

> We consider that Islamic law forbids violence or armed struggle against the regime as a method to re-establish the Islamic State.\textsuperscript{32}

HT’s vision prescribes three strategic stages:

- Stage one: instilling a number of individuals with the party’s aims and method to form a group which is intellectually capable of propagating HT’s message.
- Stage two: interacting intellectually with society, encouraging it to embrace HT’s version of Islam and work towards the establishment of its Islamist state.
- Stage three: establishing an Islamist government and expanding to unite all Muslim-majority countries as one state.\textsuperscript{33}

At present, the party is in its second stage; intellectual political struggle.

**Economic Policy**

Nabhani’s *The Economic System of Islam* (1953) outlines HT’s state-based economic policy. Presented as an alternative to the failings of capitalism, the policy includes a return to the gold standard and the introduction of jizya (non-Muslim poll tax) and kharaj (tax on colonised non-Muslim land):

> Jizya is a right that Allah enabled the Muslims to take from the Kuffar [disbelievers] as a submission from their part to the rule of Islam. […] The Jizya is taken from the Kuffar as long as they remain in Kufr; if they embrace Islam it will be waived from them.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{30} The reference to “bloodless” is taken from a quote given by an HT member cited in ‘British Islamists plot against Pakistan’, *Sunday Times*, 4 July 2009


\textsuperscript{33} Hizb ut-Tahrir, *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, pp.21-22

It [Kharaj] is a right imposed on the neck of the land that has been conquered from the Kuffar by way of war or by way of peaceful agreement, provided that the peace agreement stipulates that the land is ours (ie belonging to the Muslims) […] Each land conquered from the Kuffar after declaring war against them is considered Kharaji [land subject to Kharaj] land, and even if they embraced Islam after the conquest, the land remains Kharaji.\(^{35}\)

HT’s financial dependence on revenue gained via occupation and the subsequent subjugation of non-Muslims reveals the colonialist mindset inherent in its ideology. In general, however, HT’s economic policies are incoherent and it is unclear how the party intends to finance the wide-ranging responsibilities it sets itself towards its citizens.\(^{36}\)

**Dar al-Islam and Dar al-Harb: an Ideological Conflict**

Ideological conflict is inherent to HT’s worldview. HT regards its vision of an Islamist state as *Dar al-Islam*, the land of Islam. States that do not meet the party’s ideological criteria – even Islamist states such as Iran – are labelled by HT as *Dar al-Kufr*, the land of disbelief, or *Dar al-Harb*, the land of war.\(^{37}\) For HT, the two situations are both absolute and oppositional:

*The whole world, whether it is the Islamic countries or the non-Islamic countries, are either Dar al-Islam or Dar al-Kufr/Kufr and there is no third.*\(^{38}\)

HT has a politicised understanding of *Dar al-Islam*, which it defines as state implementation of *shariah* law ‘in all matters of life and ruling […] even if its citizens are non-Muslims.’\(^{39}\) HT’s understanding of *shariah* law and its rigid ideological framework informs all aspects of economic, social and political governance. All current governments – including those in Muslim-majority countries – are considered un-Islamic, and therefore *Dar al-Kufr*, by the party because its version of *shariah* law is not implemented:

*Out of the Muslim countries of today, there is not a single country or state where Islamic laws are exclusively implemented in ruling and life’s affairs; therefore all of them are considered Dar al-Kufr although their citizens are Muslims.*\(^{40}\)

\(^{35}\) Ibid, p.230
\(^{36}\) International Crisis Group, *Radical Islam in Central Asia*, p.5
\(^{38}\) Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Ummah’s Charter*, p.18
\(^{39}\) Hizb ut-Tahrir, *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, p.66
\(^{40}\) Ibid, p.67
According to HT, *Dar al-Islam* does not exist at present because all forms of governance are products of Western-based ideologies, primarily democracy, capitalism and secularism. Despite its ideology heavily borrowing from socialism and communism,\(^{41}\) HT disregards both because they are Western constructs:

The Communist ideology is a *Kufr* ideology and its ideas and systems are *Kufr* ideas and systems. It is in conflict with Islam totally and basically, both in its principles and details.\(^{42}\)

**Jihadist Philosophy of Expansionism**

Should HT achieve its expansionist state, its relationship with other states would be dictated by its doctrine of *jihad* based on its *Dar al-Islam/Harb* paradigm. The party defines *jihad* as:

\[
\text{Jihad is the war undertaken for the sake of Allah (swt) to raise high His (swt) word. The undertaking of jihad requires an army...}^{43}\]

Muslim-majority countries would be forcibly united into one state as part of its perceived ‘global ummah’.\(^{44}\) HT’s relationship with these countries would be based, therefore, on domestic policy.

All countries of the Islamic world are to be considered as if they are one, because Muslims are an Ummah apart, and they should be one unit as one state and one being. Therefore, the relationship with them is not considered within foreign relations […] rather it should be a part of home policy. Therefore the Islamic state does not establish any diplomatic relations or enter into any treaties with them. It is necessary to work to unite them in one state, the State of the Khilafah.\(^{45}\)

\[\text{If a Muslim-majority country does not accept HT’s rule, or refuses to unite with its state, or wishes to separate from it, then warfare would be used.}^{46}\]

Sanctioning such a war, Abdul Qa-deem Zallum, HT’s second global leader who took over after Nabhani’s death in 1977, says:

\[\text{Hence, it is imperative to restore this issue to its rightful place and to consider it as a vital issue, thus preventing the dismemberment of any country from the body of the Khilafah, even if this led to several years of fighting and even if it led to the killing of millions of Muslims.}^{47}\]

---

\(^{41}\) For more details on HT’s ideological affinity with communism and socialism see Angel M. Rabesa *et al.*, *The Muslim World after 9/11* (United States of America: Rand Corporation, 2004), pp. 345-351

\(^{42}\) *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, p.41

\(^{43}\) *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, *The Institutions of State in the Khilafah: In Ruling and Administration* (London: Hizb ut-Tahrir, 2005), p.78. (Swt) is the abbreviation of *Subhanahu wa ta’ala*, which means glorified is Allah. It is an expression of honour written after the name Allah. It has been included from here on as part of the original quote.

\(^{44}\) *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, p.68

\(^{45}\) Ibid

\(^{46}\) Abdul Qadeem Zallum, *How the Khilafah was Destroyed* (London: Al Khilafah Publications, 2000), p.193

\(^{47}\) Ibid, p.197
Once HT’s Islamist state has been consolidated, non Muslim-majority countries would be “invited” to join “Islam”.

…[T]he Muslims should work with the Khilafah to combine the rest of the Islamic countries with it, hence the countries will become Dar al-Islam and they will then carry Islam to the world through invitation and jihad.48

Should non-Muslim-majority countries refuse HT’s invitation, jihad would then be waged against them.

Indeed, Allah (swt) has ordered the Muslims to carry the Da’wah to all mankind and to bring them into the Khilafah state. He (swt) has legislated Jihad as a method to carry the Da’wah. So the state must rise to declare Jihad against the Kuffar without any lenience or hesitation.49

HT’s state is not motivated by material acquisition. HT’s expansionism is ideological – the state would fight anyone who rejects its Islamist rule:

…[I]f they accepted to pay the jizyah but refused to be ruled by Islam, it is not allowed to accept this from them because the cause of fighting – which is that they are disbelievers who have refused to accept the da’wah – remains standing so fighting them remains obligatory…50

The evidence gathered from HT literature renders HTB’s claim obsolete when it says:

The suggestion that Hizb ut-Tahrir will be permitted to engage in an armed struggle when the Caliphate re-emerges, is absolutely false […] The party is not waiting for any order to begin an “armed struggle” […] it will continue on its path of non-violent political struggle until the Caliphate is established, and post its re-establishment.51

**Sanctioning Non-State Actors’ Engagement in Jihadism**

HT has categorically claimed that jihad is an “offensive” war to spread Islam:

Those saying Islam is a *deen [religion]* of peace deny offensive jihad i.e. initiating fighting with the disbelievers.52

A booklet entitled the *Concepts of Hizb ut-Tahrir* (1953), written by Nabhani and adopted within HT ideology, stipulates that the concept of “defensive” jihad does not exist. Instead

---

48 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, p.67
49 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Ummah’s Charter*, p.85
51 Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, Media Information Pack, p.15
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**HIZB UT-TAHRIR: IDEOLOGY AND STRATEGY**

*jihad* is an “offensive” duty that must be waged by Muslims to remove any obstacle towards Islam:

…[T]hey [the West and “weak” Muslims] interpreted *jihad* as a defensive rather than offensive war. They contradicted the reality of *jihad*, for *jihad* is a war against anyone who stands in the face of the Islamic Da’wah whether he is an aggressor or not. In other words it is the removal of any obstacle standing in the face of the Da’wah…53

Similarly, in a booklet entitled *Hizb ut-Tahrir* (2000), the party states:

Jihad is not a defensive war; it is in fact a war to raise the Word of Allah (swt) and it is compulsory originally in order to spread Islam and to carry its message even if the disbelievers did not attack us. [Emphasis added]54

Despite stating that “defensive” *jihad* does not exist, the same booklet, *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, states that HT members are required to participate in what would commonly be perceived as “defensive” *jihad* in the face of apparent aggression:

The fact that the party does not use material power to defend itself or as a weapon against the rulers is of no relevance to the subject of jihad, because jihad has to continue till the Day of Judgement. So whenever the disbelieving enemies attack an Islamic country it becomes compulsory on its Muslim citizens to repel the enemy. The members of Hizb ut-Tahrir in that country are a part of the Muslims and it is obligatory upon them as it is upon other Muslims, in their capacity as Muslims, to fight the enemy and repel them.55

In another booklet, *The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisations* (2002), HT states:

… *Jihad* encompasses defensive and offensive war i.e. the fighting of defence and offence.56

Such examples only show how HT has blurred the line between “offensive” and “defensive” *jihad* in order to ideologically legitimise violence and attacks against what it sees as “enemy” nation. The party states that members of HT would join in what seems to be “offensive” *jihad* when an *Amir* (a Muslim leader) calls them to fight:

Whenever there is a Muslim amir who declares jihad to enhance the Word of Allah (swt) and mobilises the people to do that, the members of Hizb ut-Tahrir will respond in their capacity as Muslims in the country where the general call to arms was proclaimed.57

---

54 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *Hizb ut-Tahrir*, p.68
55 Ibid, p.26
56 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisations*, p.59
This party position is different to the one presented by Jalaluddin Patel, whilst he was the leader of HTB, in a 2004 interview. Patel stated that “defensive” jihad could be undertaken at any time with or without an Amir, however, “offensive” jihad could only be undertaken by the Caliphate, where the enemy state is not required to have attacked first:

Jihad as a defensive enterprise can be undertaken with or without an Amir and with or without an Islamic state. This is because it is the duty of every Muslim to defend his land and property. Therefore defensive Jihad requires no authority to sanction it. [...] In an offensive situation, where there is an Islamic state that possesses the appropriate political and military capabilities, it is the only authority that can sanction and undertake offensive jihad.58

Al-Qaeda ideologue Abu Qatada, on the other hand, has also echoed the position that jihad is an absolute duty that must be waged in an absence of the Caliphate, but does not differentiate between the “defensive” and “offensive”.59 Currently imprisoned in the UK awaiting deportation to Jordan, Abu Qatada ran religious circles from London during the 1990s and issued edicts sanctioning Muslims to participate in jihad. According to one former HTB member, Abu Qatada stated this position in a 1995 debate with Omar Bakri Mohammed, the then leader of HTB who left the party a year later to found the radical Islamist group al-Muhajiroun (AM).60 Abu Qatada is said to have used HT’s position quoted below to demonstrate that Omar Bakri’s position on the notion that a Caliph was needed to wage jihad was wrong:

Jihad is an absolute [...] obligation, and it is not restricted or conditional upon anything. The ayah [a Quranic verse] upon it is absolute: “Fighting is prescribed upon you” [...] The presence of the Khaleefah [Caliph] has no [effect] upon the obligation of jihad; rather jihad is obligatory whether there is a Khaleefah or not.61 [Emphasis in original text]

Despite sanctioning jihad in perceived defensive situations, the party has not clearly defined the difference between what constitutes the “defensive” and “offensive”. With such a blurred distinction, HT appears to encourage Muslims to participate in jihad whenever the party feels it necessary.

Following the terrorist attacks in the United States of America (US) on 9/11, HT stated in an October 2001 leaflet that all Muslims are in ‘a state of war’ with the UK and the US as these countries ‘declare[d] war against Islam and Muslims.’62 Such a proclamation is similar to the

---

60 AM is a radical Islamist group. Its ideology is akin to that of HT’s. See Appendix A of this report for a full analysis on Omar Bakri’s founding of AM and its similarities to HT ideology.
62 ‘Communiqué from Hizb ut-Tahrir – America and Britain declare war against Islam and the Muslims,’ 9 October 2001, Hizb ut-Tahrir Leaflet. An internet archive search reveals this leaflet was previously posted on Khilafah.com – HTB’s former official website. See http://web.archive.org/web/20050301161600/www.khilafah.com/home/category.php?DocumentID=2428&TagID=3 [accessed 30.08.2009]. According to this leaflet, the US is seen by HT to have openly declared war on Islam and Muslims post 9/11 because they have attacked ‘Islamic lands’. The UK and the US are also seen by HT to have declared war against Muslims during the Gulf War.
one made by al-Qaeda. Osama bin Laden, founder and leader of al-Qaeda, has declared himself as *Amir* and has called upon Muslims worldwide to fight against perceived aggressive states, such as the UK and the US. HT, as evidenced above, states that its members should wage *jihad* when an *Amir* calls them to fight. However, the fact that HT has not responded to bin Laden’s calls highlights that the party chooses which *Amir* they will respond to.63

**Clash of Civilisations Worldview**

Inherent to HT’s ideology is a perpetual conflict between good and evil, or Muslims and their non-Muslim enemies, defined as an inevitable clash of civilisations.64 HT defines civilisation as ‘a collection of concepts about life.’65 In HT’s worldview, ‘Islamic civilisation’, based on Islamic ‘*’aqeedah* is divinely inspired whereas all other civilisations – regardless of religion – are man-made and founded on the Western concept of capitalism.66 HT defines ‘Western civilisation’ as an “enemy” of Islam because it sees it as dominating economic and political systems worldwide, as well as occupying or having a military presence in ‘Islamic lands’.67 HT literature states:

O Muslims […] the Capitalist Western civilisation has knocked you down militarily, politically and economically, however they will never defeat you intellectually.68

HT believes that the US leads the world’s capitalist system, which it sees as a deliberate policy to suppress Islam because it fears the return of an ‘Islamic ummah’:

…[T]he West fears that the Islamic Ummah would make a return again and destroy its influence and interests not over land but over the whole globe. Upon America and the West realizing this fact, the American campaign is directed primarily against the Islamic Ummah despite the fact that the campaign is on a world wide scale.69

HT deems it acceptable to borrow from Western material culture, *madaniyya*, but not its civilisation, *hadhara*, which contains concepts that the party despises. Objects derived from Western science and industry, such as ‘television, rockets, planes, penicillin,’ and nuclear
weapons,\textsuperscript{70} are seen as universal and, therefore, acceptable to use.\textsuperscript{71} However, Western civilisation – its concepts and values – are forbidden and, according to HT, must be “uprooted” from all Muslim-majority countries:

As for the political struggle, it is manifested in the struggle against the disbelieving imperialists [the West], to deliver the Ummah from their domination and to liberate her from their influence by uprooting their intellectual, cultural, political, economic and military roots from all of the Muslim countries.\textsuperscript{72}

The clash of “\textit{Kufr}” and Islamic civilisations is presented as a factual reality that exists ‘now and will remain until the clash ends shortly before the Hour [day of judgement]…’\textsuperscript{73} Zallum wrote that Muslims should always remember that there is a perpetual struggle – both intellectual and physical – between Islam and “\textit{Kufr}”:

The fierce struggle between the Islamic thoughts and the \textit{Kufr} thoughts, and between the Muslims and the \textit{Kuffar}, has been intense ever since the dawn of Islam. When the Messenger of Allah (saw) was sent, the struggle was only an intellectual one, and was not associated with any material struggle. This status quo continued until the Islamic State was established in Madinah, whereupon the army and the authority were established and since then, the Messenger of Allah (saw) combined the material struggle with the intellectual struggle. The verses of \textit{Jihad} were revealed and the struggle went on. It will continue in this way – a bloody struggle alongside the intellectual struggle – until the Hour comes and Allah (swt) inherits the Earth and those on it. This is why \textit{Kufr} is an enemy of Islam, and this is why the \textit{Kuffar} will be the enemies of the Muslims as long as there is Islam and \textit{Kufr} in this world, Muslims and \textit{Kuffar}, until all are resurrected […] and it should be taken as a criterion to judge the relationships between Islam and \textit{Kufr} and between the Muslims and the \textit{Kuffar}.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{70} HT Pakistan issued a press statement calling on the Pakistani military to use nuclear weapons against America: ‘… a Pakistan, possessing nuclear weapons, missiles technology and half a million brave soldiers who are ready to attain martyrdom for Islam, is in a good position to injure and bruise an already battered America to an extent which she cannot afford to stomach right now.’ See ‘It’s America, not Pakistan, that is not in a position to fight another open war,’ Hizb ut-Tahrir Pakistan Press Statement, 13 September 2008, uploaded on Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain website, available at http://www.hizb.org.uk/hizb/press-centre/press-release/it-s-america-not-pakistan-who-is-not-in-a-position-to-fight-an-open-war-with-pakistan.html [accessed 26.08.2009]

\textsuperscript{71} Hizb ut-Tahrir, \textit{The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation}, p.6

\textsuperscript{72} Hizb ut-Tahrir, \textit{Hizb ut-Tahrir}, p.15

\textsuperscript{73} Hizb ut-Tahrir, \textit{The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation}, p.62

\textsuperscript{74} Zallum, \textit{How the Khilafah was Destroyed}, p.1. (Saw) is an abbreviation of \textit{Salla’allahu ‘alayhi wa-sallam}, which means ‘May Allah bless him and grant him peace’, the formula spoken after mentioning Islam’s Prophet Mohammed. It has been included from here on as part of the original quote.
Problematic Ideological Positions

HT claims that it is a non-violent organisation that works peacefully to install its Islamist state. This section highlights, however, that the party’s underlying ideology is inherently violent as evidenced in the stances it has adopted.

Permissibility of Killing Civilians in Dar al-Harb

HT’s state is sanctioned to wage war with countries it defines as Dar al-Harb. States that the Caliphate has a treaty with are considered belligerent if they do not accept to be ruled by "Islam", as in HT’s state. Governments that do not have treaties with the Caliphate are also considered belligerent, even if ‘no actual hostilities’ exist:

In the view of Islam there is dar al-Islam and dar al-Harb and there is no third. Except that the people of warfare (ahl ul-harb), whom we have a treaty with (Muahideen) are considered belligerent in governing solely (muharibeen hukman). Similarly when there is no actual hostilities (qital) though there is not a treaty, they are also considered belligerent in government (muharibeen hukman). As for Muahideen, because they are infidels (kuffar) and they do not submit to the authority of “Islam”, they are considered belligerent (muharibeen lit. warring people) because of [sic] the messenger said: “I have been ordered to fight the people” and this is general [generally applicable] (aam). 75

HT explicitly states that killing civilians, except the ‘Muslims amongst them’, through offensive wars in any country that has not submitted to HT’s rule, is lawful:

As for those who are actually in a state of war (harb fi’liyah) between us and them, no peace treaty is contracted, they are considered in all states, in a state of war, a combatant in the battlefield (muharibeen fi’il-marika), their blood is Halal (lawful), as is their property except that of the Muslims amongst them.76

This highlights that HT’s wars are ideological and that the pseudo-religious justifications provided by the party lend legitimacy to militant Islamists who currently target civilians in countries seen as Dar al-Harb.77

75 Hizb ut-Tahrir, Muqadimmat ul-Dustur aw asbab ul-Muwajjabbat lah (The Introduction to the Constitution or the Causes of its Obligation) (Beirut, Lebanon: Dar ul-Ummah, 1963), p.450. Translation taken from http://www.quilliamfoundation.org/MissedQuotations.htm [accessed 27.08.2009]. See also Hizb ut-Tahrir, Hizb ut-Tahrir, pp.68-69
76 Muqadimmat ul-Dustur aw asbab ul-Muwajjabbat lah, p.450
77 HT’s view of killing only non-Muslim civilians and not Muslims in ‘lands of war’ has similarly been echoed by Anjem Choudary (current UK head of AM) in an August 2005 BBC Hardtalk interview. When asked by the presenter whether he would condemn the killing of innocent people on 7/7, Choudary responded by saying: ‘When we say innocent people we mean Muslims. As far as non-Muslims are concerned they have not accepted Islam, as far as we are concerned that is a crime against God.’ Video available at ‘Justifying acts of terror?’, 10 August 2005, BBC Hardtalk, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/hardtalk/4135160.stm [accessed 2.09.2009]
Occupation of Islamic Lands

HT defines ‘Islamic lands’ as:

… [L]ands that were ruled by Muslims under the authority of Islam and the rules of Islam were applied on them. […] This means the rules regarding the lands of such countries remain as they were when they were under the authority of Islam. […] Also any land, in which there is a Muslim majority, even if it had not been ruled by Muslims, it will be considered as Islamic land because its people have embraced Islam over it.78

According to HT, ‘occupied Islamic lands’ include: the Palestinian Territories (by Israel); East Timor (by Australia); southern Central Asia (by China); the Caucasus, Crimea and Khazan (by Russia); Delhi, Kashmir and the whole of northern India (by India); Andalusia, Sabta and Maleela (by Spain); Sicily (by Italy); Serbia, Croatia, Greece, Romania, Bulgaria, Burma and the islands in the Mediterranean Sea; and Burma and the Philippines are seen to be ‘occupying Islamic lands’.79 The fact that the above-mentioned countries are mainly populated by non-Muslims makes no difference to HT:

… [S]pain is populated by non-Muslims, and every country whose population is of non-Muslims is not an Islamic country; the conclusion is that Spain is not an Islamic country. This conclusion is false. Its falsehood come [sic] from the falsehood of the second premise: the statement that every country whose population is of non-Muslims is not an Islamic country is false because a country is deemed Islamic if it was once ruled by Islam or if the majority of its population is of Muslims. This is why the conclusion is false. Spain is indeed an Islamic country.80

Since many of these lands are seen as occupied, HT states that there is an ‘inevitability of military conflict’, where there is an obligation to wage “offensive” jihad.81 Militant Islamist groups such as al-Qaeda have also echoed HT’s classification of ‘occupied Islamic lands’, and many of the above-mentioned countries have had problems with Islamist terrorism.

Permissibility of Killing Israeli Jews

In the lead up to the 1994 Cairo Agreement,82 Ata Abu Rishta, HT’s current global leader and former spokesman,83 stated that Israel is a warring nation because it is ‘occupying Islamic

78 Hizb ut-Tahrir, The Ummah’s Charter, p.19
79 Hizb ut-Tahrir, The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation, p.47
81 Hizb ut-Tahrir, The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisation, p.47
82 Also known as the Gaza-Jericho Agreement signed by Israel and the Palestinians that led to the establishment of the Palestinian Authority. Israel committed to give territory over to the Authority, and the Palestinians committed to combat terrorism and prevent violence. See Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, available at http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Peace%20Process/Guide%20to%20the%20Peace%20Process/Main%20Points%20of%20Gaza-Jericho%20Agreement [accessed 25.08.2009]
lands’, and made it permissible to kill Israeli Jews:

There can be no peaceful relations with the Jews: this is prohibited by Islamic Law. It is also prohibited to settle for only part of Palestine. There can be neither negotiations, co-existence nor normalization of relations with the Jews in Palestine. None of the Jews in Palestine who arrived after the destruction of the Ottoman Empire have the right to remain there. The Islamic legal rule requires that those of whom are capable of fighting be killed until none survive. Any others should be forced to leave. Individual Jews who lived in Palestine (as part of a dhimma [non-Muslim – report’s authors’ insertion] community) before the end of the [Ottoman – original insertion] empire and are not guilty of any violent act against the Muslims can be allowed to stay… however, it is anticipated that none belong in this category. It is impossible to solve the problem of Palestine by peaceful means: what is required is actual war, in the form of Jihad.84

HT is here legitimising killing Israeli Jews ‘capable of fighting’ through what the party would define as “defensive” jihad until the whole of Israel is eradicated and Palestine liberated. HT aims to reverse the creation of Israel’s borders because it is ‘occupying Islamic lands’.85 In an article entitled ‘Martyrdom Operations’ in a June 2001 HT magazine, Al-Waie, the party sanctions killing civilians as collateral damage because it sees the “enemy” as doing the same:

…I[If the enemy is using destructive weapons, such as bombs, planes, rockets, etc. to kill our fighters, children, women, and elderly, then we’re allowed to use destructive weapons as well, including bombs, whether with it we kill the enemy fighters or with them their women, children and elderly.86

Antisemitic sentiments are often compounded in HT’s justification in eradicating Israel. In fact, HTB’s former official website, Khilafah.com, hosted leaflets issued by HT international and its chapters in Lebanon and Jordan that included antisemitic comments and statements threatening Israel’s right to exist:

…[T]he Jews have increased in their arrogance, superiority and corruption in the land […] In origin, no one likes the Jews except the Jews […] The American people do not like the Jews nor do the Europeans […] The Jews themselves are known for their cowardice.87

…[R]estore […] Palestine from the claws of the Jews…88

ht/prominent-members/profile-of-sheikh-ata-abu-rashta.html [accessed 25.08.2009]
84 Taji-Farouki, A Fundamental Quest, p.162
85 Taji-Farouki notes: ‘Hizb al-Tahrir also points out that, while jihad is originally a collective duty (fard al-kifaya), it becomes a personal duty (fard ‘ayn) for those Muslims whose land has actually been occupied by Israel. If all these people together are not sufficient to the task, however, this personal duty then devolves in addition upon people in lands adjacent to those that have been occupied, until an adequate force is assembled. It insists that if it takes all Muslims together to destroy Israel, then this jihad becomes a personal duty of each and every one of them.’ See Suha Taji-Farouki, ‘Islamists and the Threat of Jihad: Hizb al-Tahrir and al-Muhajiroun on Israel and the Jews’, Middle Eastern Studies (London: Frank Cass), Vol. 36, No. 4, October 2000, pp.21-46, p.30
The Muslims and their armies have the ability to uproot the cowardly Jewish entity…\(^8^9\)

...Allah has obliged upon you, the Jihaad and the eradication of the Jews.\(^9^0\)

The relationship that must be between the Muslims and Jews today is a relationship of fighting and killing, not a relationship of normalisation and peace treaties, until we uproot their entity from the land of the Muslim.\(^9^1\)

Although these leaflets are unavailable on HTB's current website, such rhetoric contradicts the claims made by HTB against charges that it promotes antisemitic views:

... [O]ur opposition to the Israeli State and our rejection of Zionism. We defend the right of people living under military occupation to defend their land with the proviso that they do not kill innocent civilians.\(^9^2\)

However, as evidenced above, HT sanctions killing Jewish ‘women, children and elderly’ – innocent civilians – as collateral damage.

**Support for Suicide Bombings**

Since HT officially views Israel as an “enemy” state, the party has stated that whilst suicide itself is forbidden in Islam, suicide bombings in Israel are not. In the 'Martyrdom Operations' article, HT makes it permissible to bomb planes and carry out suicide bomb attacks, or any other means necessary, to kill the ‘enemy unbeliever’:

All ways and means which a Muslim uses to kill unbelievers is permitted as long as the enemy unbeliever is killed – whether they are killed by weapons from afar or if their ranks are penetrated; whether their stronghold is captured and penetrated before their eyes, or whether you blow up their planes or shoot them down; or whether you blow yourself up amongst their military encampments or blow yourself and them up with a belt of explosives. All of these are permissible means of fighting unbelievers.\(^9^3\)

The bombers, HT describes, are not actually committing suicide but are instead performing 'martyrdom operations', which does not make them terrorists.\(^9^4\)


\(^9^0\) Ibid


\(^9^2\) Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, Media Information Pack, p.14. See p.110 of this report for Abdul Wahid’s, HTB’s Executive Chairman, statement regarding the removal of content from HTB’s current website.


\(^9^4\) HT states: 'Suicide is killing oneself out of hopelessness with regard to one’s life and not out of an aspiration to go to Paradise;
HTB members have been on record echoing the sentiment that suicide bombings are praise-worthy. For example, in 1994 HTB member Faisal Muhammad paid tribute to a Hamas suicide bomber who had attacked Tel Aviv on 19 October 1994, killing 22 people and injuring 40. Muhammad was a chairman of the ‘1924 Society’, an HTB front group at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). Sajjad Khan, HTB’s current Chief Political Advisor and former leader, has also praised suicide bomb attacks. Whilst on the leadership committee, Khan stated in 2003:

We would not call it a suicide bombing but legitimate force to resist occupation, like the French resistance.96

Imran Wahid, HTB’s current chief media advisor, said in a 2003 BBC Hardtalk interview:

The legitimate force is the Islamic army of the Islamic Caliphate. Muslims have the right to resist occupation and if that means that they have to undertake such actions [suicide attacks – original insertion], then we will never condemn that. I condemn terrorism if by terrorism you mean the attacks on innocent civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq and actions of the tyrant rulers of the Muslim world in rounding up the Muslims who call for establishment of Islamic Caliphate… [D]efending the land from foreign occupation is not terrorism… Britain and the U.S. are occupying Muslim land. We support the right of the people to resist their occupation. I care for the laws of Islam only…97 [Original edits]

Wahid’s statement of ‘I condemn terrorism if by terrorism you mean the attacks on innocent civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq’ is a reference to Western military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq, rather than the suicide attacks that deliberately target innocent civilians by the Taliban and/or al Qaeda, which HT defines as ‘defending the land from foreign occupation.’

By contrast, after the 7/7 London suicide bomb attacks, HTB issued a statement saying:

With respect to the London bombings, we once again state in explicit terms that Islam forbids the killing of innocent civilians – we again express our denunciation of the London bombings of 7th July 2005.98

From an ideological perspective, HTB is able to denounce 7/7 because the UK is not considered to be an ‘Islamic land’. Moreover, the attacks were seen to be against civilians and

---

This is killing oneself as opposed to killing unbelievers. This is for the sole purpose of causing oneself to suffer, not of causing the enemy to suffer by killing him. . . . The difference between blowing oneself up while killing the enemy and committing suicide to kill oneself should be clear: The former leads to Paradise whereas one who commits suicide goes to hell. . . . When he blows himself up in these military operations against the enemy, he becomes a martyr (God willing) as long as his intentions are righteous and sincere towards Allah. Al-Waie, June 2001. Quote taken from an English translation found in Baran, Hizb ut-Tahrir: Islam’s Political Insurgency, p.51. HTB former member A attests that HT’s al-Fajr magazine, distributed in London, issued a statement in the 1990s saying that whilst suicide itself was forbidden in Islam, suicide bombings are not.

95 Islamic student group faces ban after unrest; Independent, 29 October 1994

96 ‘Storm over bomb jibe’, The Sun, 26 August 2003


not perceived military targets. The denunciation could have also been a tactical move in response to increased public scrutiny. However, if HT’s rationalisation of suicide bombings against “enemy” states were to be used, then this could lend justification to suicide attacks against British and American forces in ‘occupied Islamic lands’, such as Iraq and Afghanistan. The party, as echoed by Imran Wahid, believes these countries to be at war with Muslims because they are ‘occupying Islamic lands’. What remains ambiguous is whether HTB’s position would stay the same if HT ever achieves its Caliphate, as the party sanctions killing civilians in countries that are seen as Dar al-Harb.

**Hijacking Planes**

HT issued an edict on 8 April 1988 entitled ‘The Islamic Rule on Hijacking Aeroplanes’. The edict encourages the hijacking of planes belonging to “enemy” states:

> If the plane belongs to a country at war with the Muslims, like Israel, it is allowed to hijack it, for there is no sanctity for Israel nor for the Jews in it and their property and we should treat them as being at war with us.

However, the same edict emphasis that it is a terrorist act to hijack planes belonging to a non-Muslim country that is not at war with Muslims. HT also forbids hijacking state-owned Arab planes and killing those on board as it believes that the planes belong to Muslims as a trust:

> If the aeroplane is from an Islamic country, including the Arab countries, it is not allowed to hijack it, nor attack it, and it should not be damaged, because it is Muslim property, even though it may belong to the state, because if it belongs to the state it does not mean it belongs to the ruler, but it belongs to Muslims, and it is held as a trust for the Muslims and it should not be violated; it is haram (sinful) to attack or damage such a trust. Hijacking aeroplanes means to attack the people in the aeroplanes without a just cause, for those people on board the plane are innocent bystanders, even if their ruler is an evil oppressor…

This edict is yet to be retracted in its entirety by the party. After US planes were hijacked on 9/11, a September 2001 HT leaflet claimed that it is forbidden to hijack ‘civilian aeroplanes’ carrying ‘innocent civilians’. The leaflet states:

> They [a Quranic message] forbid the hijacking of civilian aeroplanes carrying innocent civilians and for-

---

99 HTB former member A says that HTB saw 7/7 as an illegitimate attack because of HT’s technical difference between military and civilian targets. In Israel civilians can be seen as military targets as rationalised in Al-Waie magazine, June 2001.

100 See Appendix B of this report for the full edict. HTB former member A was handed this leaflet by an HTB member pre-9/11. See also Michael Whine, ‘Hizb ut-Tahrir in Open Societies’, p.91, pp.87-95 in The Challenge of Hizb ut-Tabiin: Deciphering and Combating Radical Islamist Ideology, ed. by Baran. Whine states that this edict was inserted as a leaflet in HT’s magazine al-Fajr, issue 12, April 1988, and the magazine was distributed freely at the time outside London Central Mosque, commonly known as Regent’s Park Mosque.

101 To the knowledge of the report’s authors, the party has not retracted this edict, in part or in its entirety, to date.
HT’s description of the planes hijacked on 9/11, ‘civilian aeroplanes’, is a technical definition for the party as the planes were privately and not state-owned. Making this a point of technical interpretation suggests that the act of hijacking planes is acceptable in HT’s interpretation of Islam.

Omar Bakri, who borrowed heavily from HT’s ideology, did not share such a technical distinction. He praised the hijackings of US planes and the death of civilians whilst being leader of AM. His stance stemmed from HT’s position of seeing the whole world as Dar al-Harb, therefore viewing non-Muslim civilians as legitimate targets. The position of Omar Bakri and AM was stated in one of the group’s articles:

The Muslims living in the west are living under a covenant of security, it is not allowed for them to fight anyone with whom they have a covenant of security […] However for those Muslims living abroad, they are not under any covenant with the kuffar in the west, so it is acceptable for them to attack the non-Muslims in the west whether in retaliation for constant bombing and murder taking place all over the Muslim world at the hands of the non-Muslims, or if it [is] an offensive attack in order to release the Muslims from the captivity of the kuffar. For them, attacks such as September 11th Hijackings is a viable option in jihād, even though for the Muslims living in America who are under covenant, it is not allowed to do operations similar to those done by the magnificent 19 on the 9/11.103

Support for Terrorism and Terrorist Organisations

Citing supposed Quranic justification, HT literature approves the use of terrorism as a means to ‘frighten your enemy’.104 To legitimise its point of view, HT translates from Arabic the word “al-Irhab”, or terrorism, as “frighten”, and states that it is a Muslim’s religious duty to “frighten”, just as it is a religious duty to pray or fight jihād, or ‘helping the grieved and killing those who commit aggression against the sanctities of the Muslims’. HT states that these are shariah rules (i.e. obligatory) that would be implemented in practice ‘when its time comes’.105 Military factories would be established in HT’s Caliphate in order to instil “terror” in the enemy and to wage offensive wars:

105 Ibid, p.12
This terror cannot take place without preparation, and preparation requires the presence of factories. Thus the verse [a Quranic verse] indicates obligation of establishing the military factories through the meaning of necessity...

What the party is in fact doing is providing justification for the instigation of terrorism and inspiration for the creation of terrorist training camps, as in HT’s view jihad is a necessary obligation to be carried out by any Amir.

HT explicitly categorises Islamist movements that undertake violence and terrorist acts as being legitimate ‘Islamic movements’. Groups that HT sees as legitimate include: Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Jama’ah Islamiyyah in Egypt. The party claims that when the West uses the label of terrorism, it is a propaganda tool.

According to HT, the UK and the US have defined terrorism to mean ‘the use of violence against civil interests to achieve political objectives’ because they wish to maintain their national interests. The party believes that Western governments have exploited the bombings of Jewish civilians, for example, in order to launch attacks against ‘Islamic movements’ by designating them as terrorist organisations. It states:

This is why we will find no Islamic movements that have not been labelled as terrorist by the United States. Even political parties and movements that do not use material actions [violence] to realise their objectives are not exempt from this label.

HT, which views itself as an ‘Islamic movement’ that does not use ‘material actions’, has not been labelled as a terrorist organisation either by the UK or the US.

Western Conspiracy against Islam and Muslims

HT often claims in its rhetoric that the ‘Western world’ is full of Jewish and Christian disbelievers that form a ‘united front against Muslims, and are engaged in a permanent effort to destroy Islam.’ According to HT, the West promotes democracy in the ‘Muslim world’ as part of a campaign to curb the “spread” of Islam, as it supposedly fears the return of a great Islamic civilisation:

Therefore the West fears that the Islamic Ummah would make a return again and destroy its influence and interests not over its land but over the whole globe. Upon America and the West realizing this fact, the American campaign is directed primarily against the Islamic Ummah despite the fact that the campaign is on a world wide scale.

106 Hizb ut-Tahrir, The Institutions of State in the Khilafah in Ruling and Administration (A translation of Ajhiza Dawlat-al-Khilafah), 1st edn. in Arabic (Lebanon: Hizb ut-Tahrir, 2005), p.82
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The party sees the promotion of democracy as part of an ideological conflict between capitalism and Islam, the West and the ‘Muslim world’. That the West spreads supposed “Kufr” ideas, such as democracy, in Muslim-majority countries is a manifestation of this struggle according to HT. In one HT pamphlet, *The American Campaign to Suppress Islam*, it is stated that the US promotes capitalism in order to suppress Muslims and Islam:

…”The American campaign by turning the Muslims away from their *deen* [faith] to Capitalism by all ways and means including media misinformation, distortion of the concepts and rules of Islam, the implementation of *Kufr* laws, as well as setting up legislation necessary for this implementation. They also serve it by subjugating the states in the Islamic world with various treaties, pacts and constraints to keep them under the influence of the *Kuffar* to impoverish the Ummah to do away with the Islamic values in her besides the attack against the sincere aware sons of the Ummah to silence them, thereby spreading an atmosphere of submission and intimidation over the people, so that no one dares to voice the truth. All for the purpose of humiliating the Ummah and forcing her to submit to Kufr and the *Kuffar.*”

Further entrenching such a conspiratorial mindset, HT has stated that the terrorist atrocities committed by militant Islamists, such as 9/11, 7/7 and the Mumbai 2008 bombings, are actually a Western conspiracy. It was claimed by HT in one October 2001 leaflet that the US were complicit in the 9/11 attacks by not acting upon it despite having prior knowledge:

…”The American secret service has infiltrated the Taliban through Pakistan and consequently it has infiltrated the al- Qa’idah organisation led by Bin Ladin. If Bin Ladin was responsible for this attack America would have known about it, especially as such an attack requires a great number of people to execute it and a long period of time to prepare for it. We are used to Americas’ lies and wilful deception in such situations.”

One former member of HTB says that the current leader of HT in India told him that the 7/7 London bombings were a conspiracy by the British government. Similarly, in a question and answer session found on one of HT’s websites, the party conspiratorially claims that the US was directly, or by proxy, behind the Mumbai 2008 terrorist attacks:

The conclusion from all these facts is that it is likely that it is the US and its agents that are behind these attacks, either directly or proxy, which means that either the US and its men have planned and executed the incidents or they have exploited one of the several organisations who have been severely wronged and hence harbour revenge.

According to former members of HTB, such conspiracies are genuinely believed to be true by
members of the party, and highlights that HT members will very often place the blame on Western countries instead of condemning outright the atrocities committed by terrorists.

**Encouraging Armies of Muslim-majority Countries to Revolt**

HT has issued statements encouraging the armies of Muslim-majority countries to defy their governments and fight against “Kufr” states. For example, HT has called on armies to engage in *jihad* against the UK and the US, and to help establish HT’s Islamist state by means of a coup:

**O Armies of the Islamic Ummah:** The time has come for you to defend the domains of the Muslims [...] Have you not heard and seen with your own eyes the head of Kufr America and her cunning ally Britain destroying the homes of the Muslims in Afghanistan? Do you not hear or see what the ruling clans are doing in your lands in terms of allying with the Kuffar against the Muslims [...] The time has come for you to liberate the Ummah from the evil of these renegade clans that have permitted loyalty to *Kufr* at the expense of supporting the Muslims. It is forbidden for you to obey them in fighting the Muslims. Rather it is obligatory on you to work to liberate the *Ummah* from them, and to support your Muslim brothers in Afghanistan and elsewhere by standing on their side in confronting America, Britain and their allies in their brutal war against Islam and the Muslims. [Emphasis in original text]

A September 2008 leaflet issued by HT Pakistan, posted on HTB’s current website, called on Pakistan’s army to use its military capabilities, including nuclear weapons, ‘to injure and bruise an already battered America to an extent which she cannot afford to stomach right now.’ A July 2009 leaflet calls on Pakistan’s army to help HT establish its Caliphate; part of HT’s strategy of seeking *nussrah*. When the US removed Saddam Hussein from power during its invasion of Iraq in 2003, the party criticised the US government on the basis that the invasion was viewed as an ‘occupation of Islamic lands’ by the “Kuffar”. One March 2003 HT leaflet calls on armies of Muslim-majority countries to destroy the US:

Should you not proceed [...] and thus destroy the new crusaders [...]? Let the armies move to help the Muslims in Iraq for they seek your help.

---

116 According to former members A and B.
117 See Appendix C of this report, ‘Communiqué from Hizb ut-Tahrir – America and Britain declare war against Islam and the Muslims’, Hizb ut-Tahrir Leaflet
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However, when Saddam invaded Kuwait in 1990, the party supported the annexation because it was seen as an act of unifying 'Islamic lands'. Farid Kassim, HTB's first deputy leader and spokesperson, stated in light of the first Gulf War:

From the Islam point of view [sic], it is correct that any border should be removed, we are described in the Koran as one nation. The borders were not put there by Muslims, but by Europeans.121

HTB members even gathered outside London Central Mosque in Regent's Park in an attempt to persuade others to join what they termed as Saddam’s jihad. Party representatives also went to the Iraqi Embassy in London to ask Saddam to announce himself as Caliph.122 This is despite the fact that Saddam was repressing HT members in Iraq in 1990.123

Rejection of Modernity and Man-made Institutions

HT rejects all established political conventions and norms, including international and national laws and institutions, as they are considered invalid and “Kufr”:

…[I]t is not permitted for Muslims to enter into international organisations like the United Nations, the World Bank, or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, because these organisations are based on foundations contradictory to the laws of Islam and because they are a tool in the hands of the superpowers, particularly the US, which uses them to achieve special interests and as a means to create foreign influence upon Muslims and their lands.124

Though HT requires its members to refrain from participating in democratic institutions from an ideological perspective, HTB have showed a willingness to exhaust legal avenues when the party faced possible proscription in the UK in August 2005.125 Similarly, HTB announced its intention to fight the German ban of HT’s public activities by submitting an appeal to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR).126 Noman Hanif, a former member of HTB and an apologist for HT ideology, has questioned the validity of HTB’s appeal.127 Hanif states that HTB made no effort to justify its actions under supposed Islamic jurisprudence, as every action by the party is justified by its interpretation of Islamic sources.128

As part of a process of indoctrination, HT members are required to reject mainstream schol-
ars who accept democratic principles and/or advocate living in secular states, abiding by their laws. Instead, HT only permits its understanding of Islam in the adoption of shariah law in its Caliphate. Article 36 of HT’s draft constitution states:

…Thus, the Khalifah is forbidden to adopt any rule that is not correctly deduced from the Shar’iyah [Islamic] sources. He is confined to the rules he adopts and to the methodology of deduction he chooses.

Ironically, however, the party recognises that the Caliph can accept mainstream interpretations of Islam, by Islamic scholars, that HT would not normally be seen as being part of shariah law. As long as the Caliph does not actually believe in it – for he would then be committing “Kufr” – then the adoption is acceptable:

Hence, if he believed in the rule that he had adopted, he would then commit Kufr and become an apostate from Islam; if he did not believe in it but he nevertheless took this rule on the basis that it does not contradict Islam, as was the case with the Khulafa’ of Bani Uthman [Caliphs of the Ottoman State] in their last days, he would in this case be sinful but he would not become a Kafr. If he also were to have a shade of an evidence, such as the one who legislates a rule with no evidence but deems it beneficial according to his opinion, and if he were to base his argument upon the principle of “Public Interests” […] or anything similar, in this case, if he deems that these are Shari’ah principles and Shari’ah evidences, he would not be sinful and he would not be a Kafr, but he would be wrong. What he deduces in terms of rules would be considered as Shari’ah rule in the view of all the Muslims and it should be obeyed if the Khalifah adopted it…

HT believes that Ottoman rulers were “sinful” because they not only implemented secular law but they also found it acceptable. The rejection of modern state institutions and modes of governance illustrates that the party’s specific form of ruling system is based on its narrow interpretation of Islamic scripture, history and laws. HT’s rejection of man-made institutions and its vision of applying its own “divine” state system is in actuality based on a twentieth century ideological phenomenon that is devoid of historical nuances.

129 HTB former member A states that this is part of HT’s indoctrination process.
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Rejection of Democratic Values

HT describes democracy as:

… [T]he political framework of the Capitalist thought…

Democracy is the rule of the people, for the people, by the people. The basis of the democratic system is that people possess the right of sovereignty, choice and implementation. […] They are therefore the lawmakers.

The party believes that Muslims who adopt democracy reject Allah as the sole legislator:

For Muslims to adopt democracy means to disbelieve in all – may Allah forbid – the decisive evidences and conclusive evidences, […] which oblige them to follow Allah and to reject any other law.

Rejecting all other laws, institutions and governments that are not “Islamic” could create a radicalised outlook, as well as a political and religious hostility, to anything other than the Islamist ideal. For example, HT’s perspective encompasses the assumption that democracy encourages moral laxity and extreme forms of sexual deviancy:

Such abnormal and strange sexual practices have come to fill these low democratic countries. So homosexuality has increased between men, and lesbianism has increased between women, as well as sex with all animals. Also on the increase is the practice of group sex between males and females who all have sex together at the same time, the likes of which is not to be found even in the domain of beasts and animals.

HT sees universal human rights as concepts antithetical to Islam, defining them as a Western construction and therefore “Kufr”. HT argues that Muslims who call for freedoms and human rights are ‘trumpets of the Kufr’.

Freedom of opinion also allows the calls for Kufr ideas that encourage immorality among women, vice, profanity, and corruption, and undermines the high values of honour.

… He [a Muslim in HT’s state] is not allowed to call for the “liberation of women”, or Nationalism, or Patriotism, or Regionalism, or a Kufr principle like Capitalism or Socialism, or indeed any idea that contradicts Islam.

---
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In the totalitarian system envisaged by HT, there would be no place for many of the freedoms codified in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (1948) or in subsequent human rights treaties.

HT believes that it is prohibited for Muslims to accept the principle of pluralism, as it is deemed a Western concept:

… [T]he permissibility of multiple parties in Islam does not mean that Islam permits pluralism based upon the Capitalist understanding as called for by America and the West. The Capitalist pluralism emanates from the Capitalist doctrine of detachment of religion from worldly life. So, according to the Capitalist pluralism, it is allowed to establish parties and movements to call for a Kufr doctrine or idea, such as the doctrine of detachment of religion from life, or to be established on a basis prohibited by Islam, such as patriotic and nationalist parties. Likewise, it is allowed to establish movements that call for things which Allah (swt) prohibits, such as sexual perversion, adultery, to establish groups defending gambling, drinking alcohol, abortion, and the use of women as sexual objects. Therefore, a Muslim cannot accept both the pluralism which America propagates and the unrestricted pluralism which means accepting the existence of calls for Kufr and anything which Allah has prohibited.141

HT’s constitution states that multiple parties would be permitted to function as long as these parties adhered to “Islamic” principles laid down by its Islamist state, and did not contradict the foundations upon which the state would be based. Jalaluddin Patel confirmed this position in a 2004 interview:

These groups will have to be formed upon the tenets of Islam and parties that are not based upon Islam will not be allowed. However this does not mean that if they held a valid Islamic opinion that was premised on a legitimate interpretation of the Islamic texts they would be persecuted in the event of this opinion conflicting with the opinion of the Caliph.142

Apostasy for Believing in Democratic Values

HT sees any Muslim who believes in democracy as an apostate from Islam. According to HT:

Thus, whoever does not rule whatever Allah has revealed, denying Allah’s right to legislate, as is the case with those who believe in democracy, is a Kafir …143

Any Muslim who believes, adopts and lives by human rights standards would also be considered an apostate from Islam:

Despite this, many call for human rights including [sic] the rulers presiding over the Muslims as well as
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their supporters and advocates… [who are] enchanted by the Western culture and the misguided and naive who are either ignorant, transgressors or Kafir. A person who does not realise the contradiction between “human rights” and Islam, and calls for it is fajir [sinner], however the person who believes in it as an idea emanating from the detachment of deen from life, which is a Kufr creed, and calls for it upon this basis is undoubtedly a Kafir because in this case he does not embrace the creed of Islam.144

This takfir, or excommunication, is a prelude to declaring jihad against democratic authorities and governments composed of Muslim believers, as they would all be considered apostates. Even entry-level Islamists who participate in secular democratic politics are not exempt from the label of apostate. For example, a 1996 HT leaflet describes Najmuddine Arbakan, then president of the Islamic Welfare (Rafah) party – an Islamist party – who was appointed as Prime Minister of Turkey, as being an apostate:

As for the loss of Arbakan in this life, it will occur when he executes all what the seculars demand of him, and then they will throw him in the middle of the road, without any regret or sympathy for him. This will not take long. As for his loss in the hereafter, this will occur when he is thrown in hell fire for his apostasy and deviation from the Deen of Allah.146

The same leaflet describes Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, founder of the modern Turkish state, as being of Jewish origin.146 Labelling Muslims who do not adhere to HT politics as Jewish is not uncommon, and is meant to diminish their credibility. This antisemitic tactic is used with others, such as Islam Karimov, the authoritarian ruler of Uzbekistan.147

HT therefore sees anyone who supports liberal values as working against the interests of Muslims. Despite this, HTB responded to the threat of proscription in 2005 by stating:

Placing a ban on a political party with a 50 year history of non-violence will lead many to question the talk of freedom of speech, tolerance, people power, human rights and democracy.148

Imposing Medieval Interpretations of Shariah

HT’s understanding of shariah law is based on picking selective aspects of Islamic jurisprudence from medieval interpretations, which when implemented would contravene universal human rights standards and values. The laws that HT would impose regulate the lives of citizens in the private and public domain based on religious constraints. Citizens breaking the
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Caliphate’s laws would face medieval *hudud* punishments.\(^{149}\)

On issues of adultery and pre-marital sex, HT believes that the appropriate punishment is death by stoning and lashing respectively,\(^{150}\) and apostasy from Islam would be punishable by death:\(^{151}\)

Muslims […] have no option after embracing Islam to disbelieve in it and to renounce it. The rule regarding the Muslim who becomes apostate is to require his repentance. If he insists on his disbelief, the capital punishment is applied on him because the Prophet (saw) said: *“Whoever changes his deen, kill him.”* [Emphasis in original text]\(^{152}\)

On the crime of brigandage and murder, HT’s punishment is to kill, crucify or amputate:

Whoever killed and took property, he is killed and crucified; and whoever killed and did not take property, he is killed but not crucified; and whoever took property without killing, his hand and leg will be amputated from opposite sides without killing…\(^{153}\)

Tayyib Muqeem, a member of HTB currently in Pakistan, confirmed this position in a 2009 interview. He said that in HT’s state medieval punishments, such as the ‘chopping off’ of hands for theft and stoning to death for adultery, would become law. He also said that ‘every woman would have to cover up.’\(^{154}\)

Though *dhimmis* would not be compelled to change their beliefs and religious practices in HT’s state, they would, however, be forced to abide by HT’s version of *shariah* law, and would be subject to *hudud* punishments:

… [T]hey are commanded with certain orders and prohibitions […]. They are addressed with rules of Islam and commanded with the branches […] though they are not compelled to change their beliefs or change the rules, which are part of their beliefs. […] So they are left to believe, worship and undertake any action, which the Messenger allowed such as drinking alcohol or marriage. In these matters we do not oppose them. However, any other matters, such as the ‘Uqubaat (punishments) [*hudud* penal code] and Mu’amalaat (transactions) are applied on them just as they are applied on the Muslims, in exactly the same manner.\(^{155}\)

Citizens wishing to appeal a judge’s decision on any matter would find it futile as ‘there are no courts of appeal and there are no courts of cessation.’\(^{156}\) HT states that: ‘If the judge pronounced a sentence, it would become binding, and the sentence of another judge would not

---
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under any circumstances reverse it.\textsuperscript{157} However, should the circumstantial evidence change, then in such cases the verdict of the judge can be reversed.\textsuperscript{158}

HT also regulates gender roles, rendering a woman’s right as unequal to a man’s. Since these roles would be legalised, any actions deemed contrary would be punishable. For example, article 109 of HT’s draft constitution stipulates that men and women are to be segregated in public and private and are only allowed to meet when absolutely necessary, such as when trading and making the Islamic pilgrimage to Mecca.\textsuperscript{159}

Furthermore, article 112 states that women are not allowed to hold the position of a Caliph, chief judge, or the \textit{Amir of jihad}.\textsuperscript{160} Similarly, \textit{dhimmis} are not allowed to hold any position of authority within HT’s state. The Caliph and his executive assistants must be Muslim and it is categorically prohibited for Muslims to accept a ‘\textit{Kafir}’ to rule over them.\textsuperscript{161}

Article 113 states that women have to cover up – with only their hands and face uncovered – and that they can only live with a \textit{mahrem} male (a husband or men they cannot marry).

Article 114 states that a woman cannot dress provocatively in front of a non-\textit{mahrem} man.\textsuperscript{162}

HT even goes as far as regulating the relationships between husband and wife. According to article 116:

\begin{quote}
The marriage is a life of tranquillity and companionship. Therefore, the responsibility of the husband towards his wife is one of care taking, and not ruling. She is to obey and he is to provide.\textsuperscript{163}
\end{quote}

Enshrining social conservatism as perceived religious duty in law, the wife is to “obey” her husband and her primary duty is in the home. Article 117 states that:

\begin{quote}
Husband and wife must cooperate with each other in performing household duties. The husband performs all work undertaken outside of the house. The woman performs actions normally undertaken
\end{quote}
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\item \textsuperscript{160} Ibid, p.262. Allowing women to vote, article 111 stipulates: ‘Women can participate in the election process and in the giving of the \textit{Ba’yah} \textsc{[allegiance]} to the \textit{Khalifah}. They can be members of \textit{Majlis al-Ummah} \textsc{[Assembly of Muslims]}. She can also be employed by the State.’ Article 112 stipulates: ‘It is not permitted for a woman to assume responsibility for government. Consequently, women cannot hold the positions of the Khalifah, \textit{Wali} \textsc{[governor of a province appointed by the Caliph]}, \textit{Amel} \textsc{[mayor of a city appointed by either the governor or Caliph]} and she cannot undertake any task that is considered to be an aspect of government.’
\item \textsuperscript{161} Hizb ut-Tahrir, \textit{The Institutions of State in the Khilafah}, p.23, p.64
\item \textsuperscript{162} ‘The Social System’ in ‘A Draft Constitution of the Islamic State’, in an-Nabhani, \textit{The Islamic State}, p.262. Article 113 stipulates: ‘Women [sic] functions in both the public and private lives. In public life, women are allowed to be with other women, \textit{Mahrem} males and other males, provided that nothing of the women’s body is revealed, apart from her face and hands. Seductive manners and clothing are not allowed. In private life, women are allowed to dwell with other women and \textit{Mahrem} males. In both lives, all \textit{Shar’iyah} laws should be complied with.’ Article 114 stipulates: ‘\textit{Khulwa} a man and a woman are not allowed to be alone without a \textit{Mahrem}. \textsc{[Tabaru]} Make up and dress that normally catches attention and/or exposes the body are not allowed in front of non-\textit{Mahrem}.’
\item \textsuperscript{163} Ibid, p.262
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
inside the house to the best of her ability. The husband should hire a maid as required to assist her with the household tasks she cannot perform herself.164

**Forceful Imposition of Hizb ut-Tahrir’s Ideology**

HT defines Islam based on its politicised understanding of the faith. HT therefore forbids Muslims from believing in any other ideology, religion or interpretation of Islam other than its own, because the party sees its ideology as Islam in its truest form. HT states:

Therefore the freedom of belief does not exist for Muslims because they are obliged to embrace the Islamic ‘*Aqeedah*. It is not allowed for a Muslim to embrace any other creed, whether it is based on an originally revealed religion, such as Judaism and Christianity, or another ideology’s creed, such as Capitalism or Socialism, or any creed from any way of life, or any thought other than the creed of Islam.165

HT’s Caliphate would force its citizens to abide by its version of Islam by punishing those who differ:

The ruling structure will oblige the people to follow the thoughts and rules of Islam and oblige Muslims to organise their actions according to the orders and prohibitions of Allah… It proceeds in generating this change through direction and implementing punishments.166

Muslims who differ from HT’s ideology would be regarded as a “*Kafir*” and an apostate of Islam, who would be fought and killed by HT’s state even if this meant genocide:

Therefore, it is imperative to put back this issue in its rightful place and consider it to be a vital issue, by killing every apostate even if they numbered millions.167

Thus the rule by a *Kufr* system would be prevented even if this led to several years of fighting and even if it led to the killing of millions of Muslims and to the martyrdom of millions of believers.168

HT states that in its Caliphate the “usurpation” of HT authority ‘would be considered a crime for which there will be the severest punishment.’169 HT only legitimises rebellion and disobedience to the Caliph if he rules with “*Kufr*” laws or is ‘silent over the domination of kufr in the country.’

…Fighting the ruler when he shows kufr buwaah i.e. when the ruler rules with kufr laws or if he is silent over the domination of kufr in the country. In this situation he must be fought.170

---

164 Ibid, pp.262-263
165 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The American Campaign to Suppress Islam*, p.21
166 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Ummah’s Charter*, p.51
167 Zallum, *How the Khilafah was Destroyed*, p.193
168 Ibid, p.199
169 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Ummah’s Charter*, p.64
170 Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Ummah’s Charter*, p.66
However, if citizens of HT’s state were to suffer human rights abuses, obedience to the Caliph’s authority would still be required:

...The sharee’ah [shariah law] has urged obedience to those who assume authority over the Muslims, whatever injustice they committed and however much they violated the people's rights.171

This illustrates HT’s contempt for the internationally recognised legal obligation and responsibility it would have as a state in guaranteeing the protection of its citizens.

171 Ibid
Ideological Influence: al-Qaeda

Zeyno Baran, an expert on HT, writes that whilst al-Qaeda defines itself as ‘the “pioneering vanguard” of Islamic movements, HT declares itself to be the “ideological vanguard” of the Islamist movements.’\(^{172}\) Baran also states that whilst HT is not a terrorist organisation, it is a ‘conveyor belt’ for producing ‘thousands of manipulated brains, which then “graduate” from HT and become members of groups like al Qaeda.’\(^{173}\)

Whilst it is difficult to quantitatively prove Baran’s statement, ideologically, al-Qaeda and HT are of the same political spectrum. To wage war, militant Islamists have cited the same philosophical justifications provided by HT and have built upon both Sayyid Qutb’s and Nabhan’s ideological bases to legitimise terrorism as a tactic. Qutb is often referred to as the father of modern jihadism and whose writings are said to have heavily influenced bin Laden.\(^{174}\) In fact, Nabhan’s Islamism served as a precursor to the more ‘mature radicalism’ developed by Qutb in the 1960s and exemplified in his 1964 book *Milestones*.\(^{175}\) Militant Islamists merge Nabhan’s call to implement an expansionist Islamist state with Qutb’s classification of all Muslim and non-Muslim societies as *jahaliya*, or ignorance.\(^{176}\) Mass casualty attacks against civilians are justified on these two foundations.\(^{177}\)

Ideological affinities between HT and al-Qaeda are demonstrated in the fact that both view current rulers as apostates because the Islamist project is not implemented in its totality, and Islam as an all-encompassing socio-political system that has been in absence since the Ottoman state’s demise. The following excerpt is from the al-Qaeda training manual:

> After the fall of our orthodox caliphates on March 3, 1924 and after expelling the colonialists, our Islamic nation was afflicted with apostate rulers who took over in the Moslem nation. These rulers turned out to be more infidel and criminal than the colonialists themselves. […] They [the rulers] started to fragment the essence of the Islamic nation by trying to eradicate its Moslem identity […] Islam is not just performing rituals but a complete system: Religion and government, worship and Jihad […], ethics and dealing with people, and the Koran and sword.\(^{178}\)

Differing tactically from HT, however, al-Qaeda and other militant Islamists believe in creating their own armies as opposed to recruiting from existing ones. Instead of instigating
terrorist acts, which is seen as counter-productive,\textsuperscript{179} HT prioritises influencing the military to overthrow governments to create a state that then wages the \textit{jihad} that is currently being conducted by militant Islamists.\textsuperscript{180} As Maajid Nawaz, a former member of HTB’s national executive committee, who has renounced Islamism, states: ‘It just so happens that Nabhani’s methodology in fighting this war was to use pre-existing militaries rather than creating his own army.’\textsuperscript{181}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
179 In reference to Islamist terrorism, HTB states: ‘We reject the notion that an Islamic political party can use violence to establish an Islamic government.’ See Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, Media Information Pack, p.14
180 HT states that the current violent tactics used by militant Islamists only apply once HT has a state: ‘But the duty to raise arms against the ruler and to fight against him if he showed clear Kufr, this applies only if the Dar (land) is Dar ul-Islam, and the rules of Islam were implemented and the ruler subsequently showed open Kufr.’ See Hizb ut-Tahrir, \textit{The Methodology of Hizb ut-Tahrir for Change}, p.22
181 Nawaz, \textit{The Roots of Violent Islamist Extremism and Efforts to Counter it}, p.9
\end{flushright}
PART II

ACTIVITY IN MUSLIM-MAJORITY COUNTRIES
Nussrah

After forming HT in 1952, Nabhani applied for an official permit to establish the party, a request the Jordanian government denied. The government believed the party intended to overthrow the monarchy and argued that HT ideology was incompatible with the Jordanian constitution: it promoted Islam, not nationalism, as the basis for social unity. It was feared this would create divisions amongst society along religious lines that could potentially lead to civil unrest. 182

However, by 1954 HT started to publicly interact with Jordanian society in order to build mass popular support for party ideology and its Islamist revolution. 183 The party intended to assume power within 13 years – the time it took Islam’s Prophet Mohammed to establish a state in Medina – despite having no clear strategy. 184 By 1958, HT activists were facing increasing pressure from the Jordanian police. Party meetings and study circles were regularly broken up and the police harassed anyone discovered leafleting on behalf of HT. 185 In the same year, one of HT’s founding members Asad Baoud al-Tamimi left the party. 186 The party’s leadership felt society was not responding to its message.

By 1962, HT decided that the best way to achieve power was through the method of influencing the army to conduct a coup (nussrah). The party sought to gain sympathy and protection from within the army to improve the chances of HT’s success in achieving its state. At this time, the party leadership sent experienced members to seek such support in Syria and Iraq. However, HT failed to gain any positive response from the army and in 1964 decided to abandon this new strategy. 187

In the same year, HT started to see its activities in Jordan as being effective amongst the public. Interpreted by the party as evidence of its success was its ability to rally opposition to the Pope’s visit to Jerusalem at the time. HT therefore expected that their first Caliph would be installed in Jordan. In 1965, HT decided to again adopt the strategy of seeking nussrah in order to achieve immediate power. 188

182 Taji-Farouki, A Fundamental Quest, pp.6-8
184 ‘Caesarean Section’, Hizb ut-Tahrir Leaflet, 27 January 1972. According to this leaflet, the party’s line in the mid-1950s was: “This is a style to be determined by the nature of the action, and when the Ummah responds to the party then at that time the action shall be scrutinised and the style shall be decided at that time. It may be via a campaign of civil disobedience, or a massive demonstration, or an overwhelming revolution, or a military coup, or it could be other than that.” Quote translated from Arabic original.
185 Taji-Farouki, A Fundamental Quest, pp.22-23
186 Ibid, p.19
187 Ibid, p.25
188 Ibid, pp.25-26
Global Activity

Middle East

Despite great optimism concerning its activities in Jordan, HT’s coup attempts in 1968, 1969 and 1971 all failed. Internal party sources claimed that army officials were making simultaneous arrangements for coups in Iraq and Syria during 1968 and 1969. HT sources admitted that a further coup was attempted in southern Iraq in 1972 and conceded that the attempts may have involved Salih Sirriyya, who was an HT member at the time in Iraq and Jordan.\(^\text{189}\)

Despite these early failures, the party reiterated in 1970 that it had secured a popular response and all that was needed was the presence of a sufficient physical force capable of taking power – the party should continue seeking \textit{nussrah} and nothing else.\(^\text{190}\) Overall HT activity, however, came to a standstill between the 1970s and the 1980s, and coup attempts were no longer staged directly by the party.\(^\text{191}\) Instead, HT offered the post of Caliph to Ayatollah Khomeini, twice, in 1979. Khomeini ignored HT’s request and the party later denounced him as an American agent and current members, such as Jalaluddin Patel, view the Islamic Republic of Iran as “un-Islamic”.\(^\text{192}\) In 1980 the party leadership stated that though seeking \textit{nussrah} was vital, members should remember that the attainment of power also depended on gaining popular support.\(^\text{193}\)

It was in this period that one of HT’s founding members, al-Tamimi, set up the militant organisation Islamic Jihad-Bayt al-Maqdis in 1982 in Jordan.\(^\text{194}\) A faction of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ), al-Tamimi’s organisation aimed to destroy Israel and received assistance from Fatah and the Iranian regime. Al-Tamimi coordinated terrorist attacks in Israel and inspired other factions of PIJ to do the same.\(^\text{195}\) In 1983, his organisation was responsible for the murder of an Israeli citizen in Hebron.\(^\text{196}\)

As a result of its staged coup attempts, HT faced significant restrictions from governments in the Middle East. Though liberalisation policies in Jordan in the 1990s gave the party more freedom to operate, members were regularly arrested for membership of an illegal organi-

---

\(^{189}\) ‘\textit{Uslub li-Kasb al-Umma wa Akhhd Qiyadatiha’}, Hizb ut-Tahrir Leaflet, 14 January 1980, cited in Taji-Farouki, \textit{A Fundamental Quest}, p.167; see also pp.27-28 of \textit{A Fundamental Quest}


\(^{191}\) Taji-Farouki, \textit{A Fundamental Quest}, p.30, p.191

\(^{192}\) Ibid, p.31; see also Mahan Abedin, ‘Inside Hizb ut-Tahrir: An interview with Jalaluddin Patel’

\(^{193}\) Ibid, p.31

\(^{194}\) Taji-Farouki, \textit{A Fundamental Quest}, p.19; see also ‘Kyrgyzstan: Political Shockwaves Fracture an Islamist Group’, Stratfor Global Intelligence, 20 April 2005


sation that breached the country’s constitution. In 1993, for example, members were arrested after authorities said they had discovered armed HT cells. This was later ruled to be untrue in a court hearing.

In Syria, where the party is currently banned, security forces conducted extensive arrests of party members between 1999 and 2002. In 2003, it was reported that 59 HT members remained in Syrian jails. HT, however, claims in a 2000 publication that this number was actually over 800. In 1996 it was reported that HT had claimed that one of its leading members in Saudi Arabia had been in prison since his arrival in Syria in 1979.

In Iraq, 11 HT members were executed in 1990 for calling on Saddam to forego Ba’thism and to adopt an Islamist state. After Saddam’s removal in 2003, HT announced it would be opening an Iraqi branch. One HT member in Iraq, Abu Abdullah Al-Kurdi, claimed in a 2008 interview that the party has two offices in Baghdad, which American forces allegedly bombed, killing one HT activist.

HT members have been frequently arrested in Turkey, where HT is also banned. As early as 1967, leaders of HT Turkey were arrested. In 2003, 93 HT members, including the then head of the party’s Turkish branch, Amir Yilmaz, were arrested. In July 2009, 200 suspected HT members were arrested and detained. Some are allegedly linked to the neo-nationalist group Ergenekon, declared a terrorist organization by the Istanbul Chief Prosecutor’s Office, some of whose members are currently facing charges of plotting a coup against the government.

In the Palestinian Territories, HT has found it hard to gain significant prominence. It faced competition with the rise of the nationalist Palestinian Liberation Organisation and later with Islamist groups such as Hamas. Recently, however, the party has resumed political activity in the Territories, though it is facing pressure from the Palestinian Authority. In 2008, some of the party’s branch leaders were allegedly arrested. In July 2009, HT claimed that “100s”...
of its activists were arrested.\textsuperscript{209} The party was also stopped from holding its 2009 annual conference.\textsuperscript{210}

In Lebanon, where HT’s current global leader, Ata Abu Rishta, is suspected of being based, it is reported that the party has joined forces with other Islamist groups in the region to oppose US President Barack Obama’s attempts to solve the Arab-Israeli conflict.\textsuperscript{211} A private meeting took place in September 2009 between the leaders of HT, al-Jama’a al-Islamiyya (the Lebanese branch of the MB), Hizbollah and Hamas. The leaders concluded that Obama’s plan ‘poses one of the most dangerous American plans in the region.’ They also said that the plan: ‘… needs to be opposed in all possible forms, in particular by increasing acts of resistance […] and opposing Israeli efforts towards a normalisation of their relations with Arab countries….’ The leaders further added that the “monopolisation” of Palestinian leadership by President Abbas must be challenged, and the choice of resistance against US plans should be encouraged. The Islamist groups agreed to keep in touch to discuss further issues of mutual interest.\textsuperscript{212}

In February 2007, HT’s Media Office in Lebanon reported that the party sent “high-delegation” members to express similar sentiments to Abu Ahmad al-Rifa’ee, a representative of the Palestinian militant group Islamic Jihad.\textsuperscript{213} The meeting was supposedly ‘well received’. HT also claims to have visited a Hizbollah representative, Abdul Majeed ‘Ammar, and the former Prime Minister of Lebanon, Omar Karami, in order to ‘quell the growing disunity and sectarianism emerging in Lebanon as a result of the manipulation of foreign powers.’\textsuperscript{214} HT engagement with different Islamist factions and high profile personalities is an attempt to create a united front against perceived Western influences. This highlights HT’s ability to operate relatively freely in the country.

\textbf{North Africa}

Having expanded to Egypt in the mid-1950s, HT was banned after Sirriyah initiated a pre-coup attack in 1974. As the first step in overthrowing Egypt’s secular regime under the former President Anwar el-Sadat, Sirriyah led a group of assassins to capture Egypt’s Military Tech-
technical Academy to help HT establish its state. Sirriyah believed that sudden political revolt was necessary for HT to establish its state, differing with the party’s strategy of engendering popular support and seeking *nussrah*.\(^{215}\) The assassins, who were taught and radicalised by Salim al-Rahhal, a member of HT, believed that they were seeking *nussrah* for HT to assume power.\(^{216}\) The assassins were later responsible for the murder of el-Sadat in 1981.\(^{217}\)

The Egyptian government has since arrested suspected party members. In 1983, the government arrested and charged 60 HT members with ‘working to overthrow the regime with the aim of establishing the Caliphate.’\(^{218}\) In 2002, 26 men including three British nationals were arrested and convicted in 2004 for being members of HT and for ‘attempting to revive’ the party in Egypt.\(^{219}\) In general, however, party support in Egypt remains weak when compared to competing Islamist groups, such as the MB.\(^{220}\)

In Tunisia, where the party was established in the 1970s, 30 men, including the head of the Tunisian HT branch, were arrested in 1983. They were charged with membership of an illegal organisation and attempting to overthrow the government in order to replace it with a Caliphate. Of the men arrested, 19 were military personnel, and the remaining 11 were said to have incited army officers to join the party.\(^{221}\) Recently, a press statement issued by HT’s media office in North Africa reports that 20 activists were imprisoned in May 2008 on charges of ‘participating in reestablishing an “illegitimate” organisation (Hizb ut-Tahrir), holding unauthorised meetings, preparing a place for holding un-authorised meetings and in possession of leaflets deemed as disturbing public order.’\(^{222}\)

In 1983, HT members in the armed forces in Libya were arrested and a leaflet issued by HT condemned the execution of ten of its members on charges of plotting to overthrow the government.\(^{223}\) One external 1987 publication claims that HT staged coup attempts in Algeria and Sudan, though the events were not reported in the media at the time.\(^{224}\)

\(^{215}\) Sirriyah and al-Tamimi were not the only HT members to have moved on to terrorist movements. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the former leader of al-Qaeda in Iraq, was also a former member of HT in Jordan. This has been verified by both The Nixon Center and Quilliam Foundation. See ‘Islamic Supremacist Group Holds First U.S. Conference’, *Fox News*, 17 July 2009; see also Rohan Gunaratna, ‘Links with Islamic Groups’, p.112, pp.112-114 in *The Challenge of Hizb ut-Tahrir: Deciphering and Combating Radical Islamist Ideology*, ed. by Baran; see also Steven Brooke, *Jihadist Strategic Debates before 9/11*, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 2008, Vol. 31, No.3, pp.201-226, p.204
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\(^{220}\) A 2007 analysis says that the MB receives mass support from especially young and student activists in Egypt. A 1996 analysis states that HT’s influence in Egypt has been overshadowed by the wider support the MB receives. See Chris Zambelis, ‘Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood: Political Islam Without al-Qaeda’, *Jamestown Foundation, Terrorism Monitor*, Vol. 5, Issue 22, 26 November 2007; see also Taji-Farouki, *A Fundamental Quest*, p.169
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Central Asia

HT activity grew after Soviet controls on religion and politics eased in the late 1980s. It is reported that HT grew rapidly in Uzbekistan in the mid-1990s, after a Jordanian disseminated HT literature in Ferghana Valley. Following the suppression of HT Uzbek members in 1997, the party spread into southern Kyrgyzstan. In Tajikistan, HT Uzbek members supported the establishment of the party in 1998. There have been claims that approximately 100,000 HT members operate in the region. Though difficult to quantify, a 2003 report estimated the number to be no more than 20,000, with the majority being in Uzbekistan, whereas a 2004 report puts the highest estimate at 65,000.

According to a former member of HTB, HT offered the Taliban the state of Uzbekistan, because the party believed that its membership base in the country was a reflection of its strength. The former member further stated that an audio tape of a talk given by a member of HT’s global leadership was circulated amongst selected HTB members in 1999. The speaker stated that the party’s leadership sent a delegation headed by ‘Abu Mahmood’ to the Taliban to offer the allegiance of Uzbekistan, and implied to the Taliban that it had the ability to deliver Uzbekistan to them. However, the Taliban allegedly refused because they described themselves as only an emirate for Afghanistan and not a Caliphate, and said that HT’s state was an outdated and unrealistic idea in the modern world. This claim is corroborated by Naveed Butt, HT’s spokesman in Pakistan, who said: ‘[W]e went to Mulla Omar to enquire whether he had declared Khilafah the goal of the Taliban. We have given all these movements assistance in following the road back to the Khilafah’.

Despite being able to attract a substantial membership base, HT activities in the Central Asian region remain underground due to large-scale repression and abuses that members face from governments and police services. The treatment of HT members by the Uzbek government, for example, is oppressive. In 2002, two men accused of belonging to HT died as a result of being submerged in boiling water. In 2007, it was estimated that at least 4,500 suspected HT members and loose associates were serving prison sentences for up to 20 years for distributing leaflets and other minor activities.

There is no evidence that HT has resorted to violence, despite its members being persecuted. However, there have been examples of unsatisfied members leaving HT to join milit-
tant groups. A former HT member, for example, joined the militant Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan after disagreeing with HT’s ‘political struggle’. The former member claimed that the party was ‘throwing in the fire many worthy young Muslims’ that could have been ‘loyal and worthy fighter[s] for Islam.’\textsuperscript{233} The political persecution of HT members in the Central Asian region by government authorities has increased sympathy towards HT’s cause in the region.\textsuperscript{234} Furthermore, party chapters worldwide use criticisms of these governments to legitimise HT’s message.

South/Southeast Asia

In the Southeast Asian region, Indonesia is one of HT’s strongholds. The party was introduced to the country in 1983 by Abdurrahman al-Baghdadi, an Australian of Jordanian-Lebanese descent. Though the party first operated underground on university campuses, it became more public after political controls eased in 1998. For example, the party claims that it has been able to recruit ‘tens of thousands’ of members in Indonesia.\textsuperscript{235} Though difficult to quantify, media sources report that HT’s summer 2007 conference in Indonesia attracted an estimated 80,000–100,000 members and supporters worldwide.\textsuperscript{236}

The popularity of the party is largely due to the successful implementation of its strategy: grassroots infiltration of madrassahs, or religious seminaries, in order to mainstream HT ideology.\textsuperscript{237} The party has also gained increasing support on campuses and has engaged with other Islamist organisations.\textsuperscript{238} The party was represented in the founding congress of the Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia (MMI) where members of Jemaah Islamiyah were included, the group responsible for the 2002 Bali bombings. HT and MMI were prominent in their support for the leader of Jemaah Islamiyah, Abu Bakar Ba’asyir, during his trial in 2003.\textsuperscript{239}

HT was officially launched in Pakistan in 2000. However, it is said that the party actually set up in the late 1990s under Imtiaz Malik, a British-born Pakistani who is believed to operate covertly in the country as the branch leader.\textsuperscript{240} HT is publicly active and holds regular protests and demonstrations. The party is, however, banned and members are often arrested.\textsuperscript{241} On 17 October 2009, for example, 35 HT members and supporters, including key leaders and a nuclear scientist, were arrested in Islamabad under anti-terrorism legislation.\textsuperscript{242}
Members of HT Pakistan claim that the party is targeting the country as a base for HT’s Islamist state, and that part of the party’s strategy to gain power is to influence military officers to instigate coups. Shahzad Sheikh, HT Pakistan’s Deputy Spokesman, openly stated that the party was persuading the army to instigate a ‘bloodless coup’ against the present Pakistani government. He said: ‘It is the military who hold the power (in Pakistan) and we are asking them to give their allegiance to Hizb ut-Tahrir.’

Maajid Nawaz, a former member of HTB who was sent to Pakistan in 1999 to help set the party up, states that HT’s former global leader, Zallum, targeted Pakistan because it has nuclear weapons. Nawaz further attests that in 1999 HTB members were called upon by the party’s leadership to move to Pakistan, where at least ten HTB members were planted in each of Pakistan’s main cities, and HT Pakistan’s leadership committee still contains British Pakistanis. Nawaz also claims that HT recruited members in the Pakistani armed forces during their training at Sandhurst, the UK’s top military academy: at the behest of the party, the army officers then returned to Pakistan to instigate a military coup. According to Nawaz the same army officers were arrested in 2003 on suspicion of being linked to extremist groups. However, it is unlikely that HT would gain substantial support from military officers in Pakistan as it remains a fringe movement faced with competition from popular Islamist groups, such as JI.

HT was officially launched in Bangladesh in November 2001 and founded chapters at public and private universities, such as Dhaka University and North South University, in order to target students and young professionals. However, the party has been operating at a grassroots level in the country since 1992. HT Bangladesh has also been publicly active by organising protests and demonstrations. The party was particularly vocal over the February 2009 murder of approximately 70 army officers by mutineer security guards of the Bangladesh
Though the level of popular support HT receives is unclear, HT’s presence at universities points to a deliberate strategy of targeting students.

The current leader of HT’s branch in Bangladesh is suspected to be British national Zituozzaman Hoque, who HT admits to be a member of the party. Hoque lectures at an independent university in Bangladesh. The party’s Media and Promotions Secretary, Mustafa Minhaz, is also a lecturer at the University of Asia Pacific, according to a 2005 report. One former British member attests that the party was set up by HTB members, and the current leader of HTB, Nasim Ghani, was sent to Bangladesh in August 2000 to help the party’s structure before being ordered back to the UK to look after the leadership there.

In September 2009, 30 HT members and activists were arrested in Bangladesh. A month later, HT became the first Islamist group with no proven involvement in terrorism to be banned there. In proscribing the party, the Bangladeshi government said they feared HT posed a ‘threat to peaceful life’. One analyst states that the government may have been worried about HT’s increasing activity and influence amongst university students. The Bangladeshi government stated that intelligence agencies in the country would continue surveillance of HT to make sure it did not re-emerge under a different name. HTB’s Bangladesh Committee said that ‘the party will continue to build support’ for its revolution in Bangladesh despite the ban.

---

249 ‘Bangladeshi army officers blame prime minister for mutiny’, Daily Telegraph, 13 March 2009
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253 HTB former member A attests that HTB members set up HT in Bangladesh in the 1990s. Ed Husain, a former HTB activist, claims in an interview that Nasim Ghani was sent to Bangladesh to set up HT. Husain’s claim is disputable, as HT is known to have been in operation before Ghani was sent. See Husain’s interview reported in James Brandon, ‘UK Charity Funding Arms and Training for Bangladeshi Terrorists’, Jamestown Foundation, Terrorism Monitor, Vol. 7, Issue 9, 10 April 2009
PART III

STRATEGY IN THE WEST
HT has been active in the West for nearly 50 years. The first national branch in a non Muslim-majority country was established in West Germany in the 1960s. Branches followed in the UK in 1986 and later, as a result of activism by British members of HT, in Denmark in 2000. Outside of Europe, HT held an inaugural conference in Australia in January 2007 and there appears to be a resurgence of HT activism in the US and Canada, with national conferences in both countries in July 2009.

Committed to establishing an expansionist Islamist state in Muslim-majority countries, HT works in the West to further this agenda by creating mass support amongst Western Muslims for the party’s Islamist revolution. HT unequivocally states that Western governments will never be accepted by the Caliphate. Further to this, HT ideology commands that Western Muslims oppose Western civilisation; disengage from mainstream political systems; and identify solely with the “ummah”.

Non-acceptance of Western States

All Western countries are defined as Dar al-Kufr or Dar al-Harb. In the event of the establishment of HT’s state, all relations with them would be dictated by ‘the demands of jihad’. Accordingly, HT’s state would sign temporary trade treaties with some Western states providing that they are in accordance with “divine” law. Other Western ‘colonialist/imperialist’ states, notably the US, UK, France and Russia, are defined as potentially “warring” nations, which precludes all diplomatic relations. All Western states are considered “enemies” of Islam and potential land for HT’s Islamist state. By constructing a framework for foreign relations based on a state of war, HT provides pseudo-religious justifications for perpetrating acts of terror against Western states and their civilian populations.
Opposing Western Civilisation

HT ideology mandates Western Muslims to actively work to subvert their societies. HT insists that Muslims – individually and as a collective – must develop what it calls an ‘Islamic personality’, taking Islam as the ‘only criterion’ for ‘concepts about life, practical and actual’.

Central to HT’s worldview is the existence of an ideological struggle and, in respect of Western Muslims, of the need to transform “Western” mindsets into “Islamic” mindsets. HT literature insists that Muslims who are capable of initiating revolution in their society are obliged to do so:

For the one able to manifest his deen and perform the requested Shar’a rules where he is able to change Dar al-Kufr wherein he resided to Dar al-Islam; it is forbidden for him in this situation to emigrate from Dar al-Kufr to Dar al-Islam.

For Western Muslims this obligation takes on the form of opposing the established political order until the entire population converts to HT’s Islam or accepts HT’s authority by annexing itself to the Caliphate:

If there resides disbelievers in the land within which he live [sic] and is ruled by kufr, it is obliged upon Muslims to fight its people until they become Muslims or pay the jizyah and be ruled by Islam.

HT’s mandate for Western Muslims to “fight” their country’s “people” is a clear exposition of jihadist philosophy and reveals the internal contradiction in HT’s worldview between its “non-violent” political ideology and its jihadist conception of how to disseminate that ideology. HT believes that Western Muslims must infiltrate their societies and institutions with a view not of “Islamising” them, but rather to develop a bloc that would aid a revolution or “offensive jihad” in these states:

This is also obliged upon him in his attribute as a Muslim and in his consideration as one whom the disbelievers are next to and of those who are closer to the enemy.

According to HT, this support can be provided by individuals or a group and, ideally, with the support of the Caliphate:

This is the same whether he possesses the ability by himself or his group structure (takattul) with the Muslims in his land or by seeking assistance of Muslims outside his land or by cooperation with the Islamic State or any (other) means.

---
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In Muslim-majority countries HT believes the primary role of Muslims is to ‘fight their rulers’ by challenging the existing government and fomenting a revolution. For HT, it is a sin for Muslims to renege on either obligation:

In these two situations, it is considered that his leaving the Dar al-Kufr which rules by other than Islam i.e. by kufr as fleeing from the jihad from a place wherein it is obliged upon him or fleeing from fighting the one who rules by kufr, both of which are great sins before Allah.

Disengagement from Mainstream Politics

Whilst mainstream Islamic edicts advocate that Muslims living in non Muslim-majority countries should engage with the societies in which they live, abiding by those countries’ legal systems and governances, HT explicitly rejects integration. An HT central strategy communiqué to HTB’s national executive in February 2005 reveals the party’s views on political participation:

The party will not work to establish the Khilafa in the West but in Muslim countries. The members of the party in the West must not take part in anything related to governance in those countries, i.e. they should not take part in elections or participate in civil disobedience, etc.

HTB members and activists, for example, do not participate in elections in the UK.

Sole Identification with the “Ummah”

For HT, a community or society is characterised by a ‘unity of thought, emotions and system [and] it is according to the identity of these elements that society will be defined.’ HT works to create a ‘model Islamic’ community within – interacting with but not integrating into – wider Western societies. The creation of an “Islamic” community is a political act, achieved by ‘changing non-Islamic thoughts which exist into Islamic thoughts’ and removing any alternative thoughts or lifestyles:

What appears in all of these political actions that the party conducts is the culturing of the Ummah with the Islamic culture in order to mould it with Islam and to purify it from the corrupted creeds, er-

---
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roneous thoughts, and wrong concepts, and also to purify it from the effect of the *kufr* thoughts and opinions.\textsuperscript{276}

HT rejects the doctrine of *al-Wasatiyyah*, most commonly translated as centrism or middle ground, which sees Islam as a religion of tolerance – a middle way between extremes. HT translates *al-Wasatiyyah* as “compromise”. In HT ideology “compromise” is a foreign and capitalist idea which, rooted in the Western separation of church and state, is a covert attempt to secularise Islam.\textsuperscript{277} HT considers Muslims showing loyalty to the government and society to which they belong as a dilution of their faith and an example of compromise. The pluralistic notions of multiple overlapping identities – the notion of a ‘British Muslim’ for example – and integration are an anathema to HT, which views them as deliberate “*kufr*” policies through which the state oppresses Muslims and restricts their identification with Muslims globally. HT literature states:

The middle position or compromise solution is an idea that is alien to Islam. The Western nations and those Muslims loyal to them have attached this idea to Islam to sell it to the Muslims in the name of moderation and tolerance, intending to deviate the sincere Muslims from the clearly defined rules and limits of Islam.\textsuperscript{278}

HT forbids integration within Western states and encourages sole identification with the “*ummah*”. HT’s ideal Muslim community in the West is, therefore, defined by its adherence to HT’s totalitarian ideology and its opposition to all other – especially Western – ideologies and ways of living.

\textsuperscript{276} Hizb ut-Tahrir, *The Methodology of Hizb ut-Tahrir for Change*, p.25
\textsuperscript{277} HT literature states: “[*Al-Wasatiyya*] is a foreign term whose source is in the West and the capitalist ideology, that ideology whose creed is based on the compromise solution. […] They then took the idea of separating religion from life as a creed for their ideology, from which the capitalist system arose, and on whose basis the Western nations revived and then began carrying this ideology to others via colonialism.” See Hizb ut-Tahrir, *Dangerous Concepts*, p.28
\textsuperscript{278} Hizb ut-Tahrir, *Dangerous Concepts*, p.32
A UK Case Study [1986 – 2009]

Therefore, when the discerning and sincere people say that the British are the head of Kufr among all the other Kufr states, they mean exactly that, for they are indeed the head of Kufr and they are the arch enemies of Islam. The Muslims should indeed harbour hatred for the British and a yearning for revenge over them...279

Established in the UK in 1986, HTB adheres to the party’s rigid ideology. HTB’s strategy, however, and the tactics the party use to further its agenda, have evolved significantly over the last 25 years. HTB activism between 1986 and 2009 can be categorised loosely into four stages:

- Foundation (1986 – 1996);
- Retreat (1996 – 2001);
- Post 9/11 (2001 – 2005);
- Post 7/7 (2005 – present).

**Foundation (1986 – 1996):** During the late 1980s and early 1990s the party followed HT protocol for any new national branch, namely ‘culturing to produce people who believe in the idea and the method of the Party.’280 HTB worked to develop a core base of loyal members, establishing halaqaat (sing. halaqat), or study circles, across the UK and imbuing its followers with the party’s ideology. Whilst the party engaged in regular activity, including fortnightly public forums and magazines,281 HTB had not developed a coherent strategy for the UK. The party’s tactics and rhetoric were sporadic and decentralised.

Initially, HTB focused on Muslims who were living in the UK temporarily – international students or business people from countries where HT activism is prohibited, for example – so that they would disseminate HT ideology when they returned to their home countries.282 Similarly, protests organised by HTB were primarily aimed at foreign regimes, targeting Middle Eastern or Central Asian embassies in London.283 The police investigated HTB activists a number of times during the early 1990s; senior party members, however, were generally elusive and HTB activism was virtually unknown outside of British Muslim communities.284
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Between late 1993 and early 1996, however, the party developed an increasingly public – and negative – profile as HTB’s aggressive activism was reported in the mainstream British press. Following the signing of the Israel-Palestine Liberation Organisation Accord in September 1993, the party began openly targeting young second generation British Muslims on UK campuses and at mosques. HTB leaflets and meetings on campuses were increasingly reported to students’ unions, many of which instigated a localised ‘No Platform’ policy in response to HTB’s public antisemitism, anti-Hinduism and homophobia. In 1994 the Guardian reported that many mosque officials felt “besieged” by the party’s increased activism, which included issuing leaflets condemning local imams who advocated tolerance and integration. One Muslim journalist, Ehsan Massoud, of Q-news, said that many young British Muslims felt that their communities and mosques were dominated by the “biraderi”, or clan affiliations of older immigrant generations. In opposition, HTB deliberately marketed their totalitarian form of Islam as a comprehensive political alternative.

The party’s rising profile resulted in the first efforts to ban HTB. In 1994, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Jewish student leaders and a number of MPs petitioned the Home Secretary about the party’s propaganda. In March of that year John Marshall, MP for Hendon South, told the House of Commons that HTB were ‘homophobic, anti-Semitic and anti-Hindu’ and called on the party to be prosecuted ‘by the forces of law and order.’ The party was not banned, but did go on to publicly self-censure.

**Retreat (1996 – 2001):** Following increased scrutiny of the party, HT’s former global leader Zallum ordered the then leader of HTB, Omar Bakri, to end controversial public rallies and combative debates on campuses. In response, Bakri resigned from HT in early 1996 after 18 years of membership. He formed a new group, AM, in which he was joined by many of his supporters in HTB. Bakri still shared HT’s fundamental aims, ideology and strategy; he disagreed, however, with party tactics in the West. Whilst HTB focused on creating Western support for HT’s revolution in Muslim-majority countries, Bakri argued that Nabhani’s revolutionary methodology should be applied in full in the West, and that an Islamist state could be established in the UK. AM became more aggressive than HTB, characterising itself as the ‘party of action’ to HTB’s ‘party of words’. AM activism was fuelled by HT ideology and Bakri’s embracement of Wahhabism. AM began publically supporting acts of terrorism
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abroad, holding public rallies with terrorist sympathisers and continued to organise combative university events. HTB’s “retreat” was tactical: according to Bakri, leading HT members wanted the UK branch to work “underground”. Concerned that Bakri’s previous public activity had distracted from the primary goal of re-establishing the Caliphate, HTB maintained a low public profile and worked on developing a coherent and practical strategy for activism in the West. In 1998, HT central leadership issued a strategy document, referred to by the party as a communiqué, to HTB’s national executive. The strategy included rhetorically streamlining localised international incidents, specifically the Middle East peace process, the Balkans conflict and continued US presence in the Gulf, into a narrative of the West’s “oppression” of Muslims and a ‘War on Islam’.

Post 9/11 (2001 – 2005): HTB used the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks to build on their ‘clash of civilisations’ narrative of Western “oppression” of Muslims. The party presented military operations and security measures taken in response to the attacks as a pretence for Western governments to weaken the global “ummah” by severing ties between Muslims in the West and the ‘Muslim world’. During this time, HTB increased its activity within British Muslim communities, once more targeting mosques, local communities and campuses. At the same time the party increased its engagement with non-Muslim audiences: HTB attempted to mainstream Islamism by using the 9/11 attacks and its aftermath to expose the perceived weaknesses of Western capitalist societies and present Islamism as an alternative ideology. HTB’s coherent strategy towards both Muslims and non-Muslims proved successful: independent sources confirm that HT conferences in London in 2002 and in Birmingham in 2003, for example, attracted 6,500 and 7,000 people respectively.

Post 7/7 (2005 – present): In the immediate aftermath of the 7/7 London attacks HTB was propelled into the public consciousness when, in August 2005 Blair pledged to investigate and if necessary ban the party. In 2007, the party was further scrutinised following the high profile departure of senior members and the popular publication of one former activist’s memoir of his time in the organisation. HTB used this situation to present itself as the “vice...
tim” of Western oppression and to highlight the perceived hypocrisy of Western ideology, particularly in relation to civil liberties. Since 7/7, HTB strategy has increasingly focused on challenging wider public thinking by presenting its ideology as a non-violent mainstream political alternative – one that ought to be accepted within the UK’s multi-cultural paradigm.

‘Strategies for Action in the West’, Hizb ut-Tahrir Strategy Communiqué, 16 February 2005

HT’s ideology and strategy are centralised. HT global leadership issues strategy communiqués to the executive committees of national branches, which then interpret them into a localised strategic action plan. This accounts for the differences in style between national branches in the West. Whilst HT core ideology stresses the indivisibility of the Muslim “um-mah” and rejects national identity, national strategies often reflect the ethnic origins of the various Muslim communities within Western states. National executives are encouraged to interpret strategy to best suit their localised needs. HT tells its national executives:

The tools to implement the strategy may change from place to place, and from time and time. Use what is best for that time and place.300

For example, HT’s Danish and British branches differ in their emphasis on international situations with the former focusing on the Arab-Israeli issue and the latter focusing on South Asian politics, reflecting the fact that in Denmark the Muslim population is primarily of Arab descent whereas in the UK it is primarily of South Asian descent.301

An HT central strategy communiqué to HTB’s national executive in February 2005 reveals the focus of HTB’s recent activity.302 The communiqué updates previous Western strategy (from 1998) in light of the 9/11 attacks, the American-led invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, and Western efforts to support democracy in the Middle East. The communiqué refers to these events as:

Then 9/11 happened and was used by the West to attack Muslims in Afghanistan and Iraq. This created an atmosphere of targeting Muslims in the West. All this was done under the pretext of the War on Terror. In addition to the economic and political attacks on Islam, the West tried to spread their corrupt culture under the guise of democracy.303

HT central leadership’s strategic response to 9/11 develops a two-sided approach: one for Muslims and one for non-Muslims. Regarding Muslims in the West, HT states:
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PART III: STRATEGY IN THE WEST

After September 2001, the West launched major attacks on the Muslim world with crusader tendencies, targeting the political Islam of al-Khilafa and setting up specialised centres and conferences to study what they thought was an imminent establishment of the al-Khilafa. They worked on cutting the links from Muslim communities living in the West so that they do not take part in establishing the Khilafa, using the ‘War on Terror’ to put pressure on them. This was happening before 9/11, but it was a good opportunity to increase this process. This requires that the party in the West fights assimilation of Muslims and make Muslims realise that they are part of the great Umma. 304 [Emphasis added]

Regarding wider Western society, HT states:

9/11 exposed the weakness of Western capitalist regimes, especially in relation to democracy and human rights which they have infringed upon with impunity. This requires the party to highlight that the principles of Western culture do not solve the problems of society and are drowning in crime and corruption. 305

In all HTB activism, therefore, there are two messages and two complementary aims: one for the UK’s Muslim communities and one for the wider public – specifically intellectuals and opinion-formers such as journalists and politicians. Presenting itself as the vanguard of Islam, HTB works within British Muslim communities to promote political identification with Muslims globally and discourage any other sense of personal loyalty. Within wider society, HTB works to mainstream HT ideology, presenting Islamism, the Caliphate and their interpretation of shariah law as a non-threatening – and viable – alternative to current political thinking.

The full strategy contained in the 2005 communiqué develops this approach, providing tactics for each of the two primary aims. It states:

Part I: Carry the message to Muslims in the West

Regarding the Muslim community:

- Interact with them, gaining their trust, educating them about their religion
- Highlight that they are part of the Ummah
- Mobilise them if the freedom of religious practice is threatened i.e. the veil
- Give importance to the ‘Ulama’, i.e. scholars, as aides to the Khilafa in their knowledge and professional experience
- Prepare the community for the establishment of the Khilafa in Muslim countries

304 Ibid
305 Ibid
Regarding Muslims in the West for temporary reasons:

- Students, tourists, businessmen: encourage them to carry the message of the mission to the West and then ensure that they return to their countries.
- Pro-Western collaborators: try to hold protests to highlight how these collaborators have betrayed their Ummah.
- Political parties (in power or opposition), independent politicians and thinkers: try to connect with those influential people to relay the opinion of the party, highlight hot topics related to Muslims and highlight the greatness of Islam
- People of power visiting: give them information

Part II: Carry the message to non-Muslims

Promote the doctrinal call:

- Show that Islam is the religion of intuition and intellect where people can find comfort in this life and after – show that Islam is the true and right religion
- Educate those who convert to Islam
- Encourage those who convert so that they can carry the strong message

Interact with Western thinkers and politicians:

- Shake up the capitalist system and start debates about it
- Show the inability of the capitalist system to solve social problems
- Expose the collapse of the Western tenets of democracy and freedom, especially after 9/11
- Show the inequality of Western society
- Present Islam though its history and civilisation
- Provide examples from Western society and its discrimination against Muslims
- Provide examples from Muslim society and its equal treatment of everyone
- Monitor what is published by institutes, think-thanks, etc about Muslims and relay the information to those in power.306

Over the last four years HTB has interpreted and implemented this strategy document in the UK with varying degrees of success. Regarding the UK’s Muslim communities, HTB has:

- Followed a centralised recruitment strategy;
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- Presented itself as the vanguard of Islam;
- Promoted disengagement from the UK’s societal systems i.e. elections;
- Established forums to promote HT ideology within local communities and used front organisations and individuals to disseminate its ideas on UK campuses;
- Gained the tacit support of other UK-based Muslim and Islamist organisations.

Regarding the wider public, HTB has attempted to mainstream HT ideology and party representatives by engaging with politicians, civic institutions, local councils and the media as well as adopting measures to disguise the party’s intolerant ideology. The following UK case study highlights how localised HTB activism exemplifies HT’s wider strategy in the West.
The Vanguard of Islam – Activism within the UK’s Muslim Communities

Recruitment, Study Circles, and Membership

Since its inception in 1986, HTB has followed HT’s centralised recruitment protocol of localised *halaqaat*. By the early 1990s, HTB had established a number of groups across the UK.\(^{307}\) Designed to mimic the Muslim tradition of reciting the *Quran* in small groups, HTB’s *halaqaat* instead provide new recruits with a structured indoctrination of HT ideology in advance of party membership. Every HTB member attends a *halaqa*, regardless of their experience and position in the party. Typically the circles consist of five individuals and take place at HTB members’ houses once a week and last for two hours. Gender segregation is strictly maintained – men and women do not attend the same *halaqa* and the two sexes have developed entirely separate organisational structures at a localised level.\(^{308}\)

New recruits must demonstrate their commitment to the party before they are invited to join a *halaqa*, to become *daris*, or students. Typically they will then spend one to two years under the guidance of a local *mushrif*, or instructor, discussing HT’s ideology and listening to readings from books by the party’s founder, Nabhani. Most commonly read is *Nidham al-Islam*, or the *System of Islam*, which lays out Nabhani’s vision of an “Islamic” state and is a presentation of HT ideology as well as refutation of other Arab political ideologies.\(^{309}\) Once involved in a *halaqa*, an aspiring HT member must internalise the party’s ideology before they are invited to take an oath of loyalty to the party. One former HTB member has spoken publicly about her recruitment. She said:

> I became affiliated with the group, distributed its literature and, over the next few years, worked my way towards becoming a full member. In the strict hierarchy of the organisation, this was not a simple task. The new recruits aspired to become *daris*, or “students”, who in turn aimed to take an oath of loyalty to Hizb ut-Tahrir and become full members. All the women were expected to use any social contact they had to recruit new members—mother-and-baby groups, student unions, even a chat with the neighbours. After proving their commitment to the party, they were assessed by a committee and allowed to attend the weekly “culturing circle”. At 20, I joined them. […] Later, however, I realised that the *halaqa* and the party philosophy made [Nabhani’s] writings synonymous with the *Quran*. In Hizb ut-Tahrir, religion and politics were truly confused. But the cult-like structure of the organisation made this difficult to see.\(^{310}\)

HTB is currently funded by private donations and membership revenue – members typically donate ten percent of their earnings to the party.\(^{311}\)
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\(^{307}\) Taji-Farouki, *A Fundamental Quest*, p.172

\(^{308}\) Umm Mustafa (pseudonym), ‘Why I left Hizb ut-Tahrir’, *New Statesman*, 28 February 2008. See also Husain, *The Islamist*

\(^{309}\) Husain, *The Islamist*, p.97

\(^{310}\) Umm Mustafa (pseudonym), ‘Why I left Hizb ut-Tahrir’

\(^{311}\) According to HTB former member A.
The War on Terror/‘War on Islam’ Paradigm

HTB has campaigned on a variety of international issues, consistently presenting the party’s call for an Islamist state as the only solution to problems in Muslim-majority countries, all of which, the party claims, stem from “Kufr” policies. Since the 9/11 attacks and the subsequent US-led War on Terror, a core HTB tactic is to co-opt grievances within British Muslim communities as well as wider British society. The repression of political dissent by autocratic regimes in Central Asia, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and Israel’s military action in Gaza, for example, are all presented as part of what HT calls ‘the war America is waging against the Muslims’.

HTB promotes the belief that the War on Terror is a guise for the West’s ‘War on Islam’. A 2002 HTB statement reads:

Dear Brothers and Sisters, since the events of September 11th 2001, we have continuously warned that the Western governments have been conducting a ruthless campaign against Islam and Muslims under the disguise of a “war on terrorism”. We have witnessed with immense sadness the events that have taken place in the name of the “war on terror” such as the killing of the Muslims of Afghanistan, the boycott of the Muslims of Iraq and the butchering of the Muslims of Palestine. In addition we have all seen the execution of Muslims in China, the arrest and torture of Da’wa carriers in Uzbekistan aimed at shattering their resolve, and the onslaught against the Muslims of India at the hands of Hindu mobs. All of this was orchestrated and sanctioned by the head of Kufr, America, and supported slavishly by Britain and the Western governments.

Furthermore, HTB argues that post 9/11 counter-terrorism measures in Muslim-majority countries are deliberate attempts by Western governments to strengthen Western hegemony and weaken the global “ummah”:

… [T]he real motive for waging “War Against Terrorism” is not to counter terrorism. The real motive is clearly to establish and strengthen US hegemony and influence over the Islamic lands, their people, and their resources in order to repress any semblance of Islamic political resurgence.

For example, in July 2002, HTB organised a conference entitled ‘Muslim Women and America’s War on Terror’, advertising that: ‘There will be three speeches in English outlining the “War on Terrorism” in Central Asia, the plight of Islamic activists in Uzbekistan and the responsibility of Muslim women in Britain’. The party organised a number of conferences
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and protests against the Uzbek Embassy in London – two, for example in July 2002 – following repeated detentions of HT members in Uzbekistan.316 Whilst the Uzbek government has been criticised for its repressive policies towards HT members and sympathisers by human rights organisations,317 HTB’s motive in highlighting these abuses appears to be to further its claim that the West, and in particular the US, has launched a ‘War on Islam’. The press release advertising the July conference further stated that:

The conference is part of an international campaign to put the spotlight upon the West’s unscrupulous allies in the “War Against Terrorism”, including the states of Central Asia, and in particular Uzbekistan […] Uzbekistan is a prime example of the war America is waging against the Muslims.318

HTB’s ‘War on Terror’/’War on Islam’ paradigm enables the party to present itself as the true guardian of Islam, advocating all HTB activism as the only defence. An internal email briefing between female speakers at a 2005 HTB conference reveals the party’s strategy:

Conference Aims:

1. Establish the correct political understanding of the reality confronting the Muslim community in the west [sic] and globally.
2. Establish our political vision for Muslims in the west [sic] as the correct vision.
3. Establish understanding of the key role of women in the West in aiding the Khilafah and her role in shaping society in the West.319

The briefing further outlines three key responses the HTB speakers should stress to their audience:

First we must in the face of such fear and coercion, stand firm upon Islam, this means to practice Islam and maintain strong Islamic identities […] Secondly we must challenge the Western way of life, meaning highlight its failure, hypocrisy, for eg Muslims living in the West are the ones who can expose to the world what the war on terror is in order to hinder it’s [sic] aims […] Muslims in the West are in the best position to show the true face of Islam to the West, its superiority and its ability to be the alternative for the whole of humanity.320

This strategy is most evident in HTB’s anti-integration rhetoric. The party believes that integration is a deliberate Western strategy to “weaken” Islam and encourages British Muslims to
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resist. In 2002, HTB released an ‘Open Letter to the Muslims in Britain regarding the Dangerous Call of Integration’, which states:

You should be at the forefront of safeguarding this noble Ummah from the plans and conspiracies of the Kuffar that seek to contaminate the pure Aqeedah of the Muslims. [...] Those who seek solace in the Western way of life in the name of integration should fear disgrace at the hands of the West and their stooges in the Islamic world in this life, and the punishment of Allah (swt) in the hereafter.

O Muslims! Today’s Crusade launched against Islam and the Muslims aims to subvert Islam by making Muslims reject their creed and embrace the creed of secularism which calls for the separation of Deen from life, which means to keep Islam completely away from their lives such that nothing remains of it but spiritualistic rituals conducted in the places of worship and a few pages in books of history. These are indeed dark days that the Muslim Ummah endures in the Khilafah’s absence. We ask you not to deviate from the path of the Haq [obligation] even a hairbreadth until you see the Victory of Allah (swt) and the glory and power of Islam and the Muslims, or you meet Allah (swt) while He (swt) is pleased with you.321

HTB deliberately manipulates local grievances, such as opposition to the reprinting of the Danish Mohammed cartoons, government counter-terrorism measures and counter-radicalisation programmes, in order to further the party’s anti-integration agenda. In April 2007 the party launched its ‘Stand for Islam’ campaign322 in response to what it called ‘relentless attacks on the Islamic laws, values and beliefs.’323 At the campaign launch press conference Taji Mustafa said:

Over the last few years there has been relentless attacks [sic] on the Islamic laws values and beliefs. […] It appears as if there is a competition among the secular fundamentalists in Europe. So a few months ago we saw the republication of the disgusting cartoons mocking the Prophet. And recently we saw the Dutch MP Wilders release his film and call for a ban on the Quran, a book believed in by over one billion people. Here in the UK when the archbishop of Canterbury made some comments about the shariah, the floodgates were opened, politicians, commentators, people in the media found it acceptable to launch a vicious racist xenophobic attack on the idea of shariah, that its [sic] barbaric, oppressive etc. It’s very clear now that Europe’s intolerance is clear for all to see. And there is no longer any doubt that this really is a war on Islam whether or not they call it a war on terror.324

Mustafa said that this perceived ‘War on Islam’ is designed to “intimidate” Muslims. He then

---

conflated ‘[Islamic] belief and values’ and ‘Islamic identity’ with HT’s political vision for an Islamist state:

What are the aims of this unrelenting and vicious campaign? It seems designed to intimidate, to preach hatred, to vilify Islam and Muslims, to say to the Muslim community in Europe, if you want to live here, there are aspects of your belief and values which are unacceptable, beyond the pale. So you need to give them up, to stop calling for the khilafah of the Muslim world, you need to stop supporting the shariah and wanting to live by Islam in your day to day lives, in the way women deal with men and the way you raise your children. […] This intellectual onslaught must not go unchallenged […] Because our very Islam and Islamic identity in the west is threatened.325

Mustafa also said that this domestic repression is part of a wider attempt by the West to legitimise military operations in Muslim-majority countries:

And the wider picture is that in the wider world there is a huge propaganda and physical campaign against Muslims in the name of the war on terror. So really these two mimic each other, in the Muslim world there is physical invasion and occupation as they see Muslim [sic] call for unity, shariah and the khilafah.326

For HTB, ‘Stand for Islam’ is the domestic front in the face of the perceived ‘War on Islam’. According to Mustafa, HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ campaign has two aims: to demonstrate the ‘greatness of Islam’; and to challenge the dominance of Western liberal values. HTB’s intention, Mustafa states, is to present HT’s vision of a Caliphate as a legitimate alternative:

The second aspect of this campaign is that Muslims, we want to empower them to put western civilisation under a microscope. Today when the secular fundamentalists attack Islam and Muslims, they paint a very simple picture for the common man in the west. That picture goes something like this, they say, Islam is in their words, backward, barbaric and oppressive to its women. And they claim that western liberal capitalism is tolerant, progressive and it empowers women. And so they claim therefore that it is their right to export their beliefs and values to the Muslim world, indeed to the whole world. They want to impose their system, capitalism, their values, liberal values on the whole world. Even at the barrel of the gun whether people like it or not in Iraq of Afghanistan or elsewhere. Whereas we as Muslims we want our system, the khilafah, we want our values, the noble values from Islam and the shariah, to be that which controls our lives. So if they have framed the arguments like this, it is time that we, the Muslim community put under the microscope these claims of the liberal way of life. We need to put these claims under the microscope, put them on trial.327

HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ campaign has proven successful in mainstreaming the party’s brand of Islamism and has provided HTB with public platforms it was previously denied – primarily due to campaigns by other Muslim groups – during the 1990s. For example, a ‘Stand for
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Islam’ event in Ilford, Essex, in May 2008, was hosted by the Ilford Community Centre. HTB reported that 250 people met ‘to discuss ways of responding to attacks on [their] religion’ and that speakers Akmal Asghar and Nasim Ghani ‘urged Muslims not to stay silent in the face of criticism and ridicule of Islam.’328 HTB spokesman Mobeen Anway told a local paper, the Ilford Recorder, that ‘in the face of negative publicity about Islam, we want to create a more positive impression of our faith.’ Bashir Chaudhry, founder of Ilford Community Centre, confirmed that in the past the Centre has refused to host HTB, adding that:

If they are planning to discuss controversial issues which we don’t agree with, or which could be damaging to the wider Muslim community, then we won’t allow it. But if they are just wishing to hold a meeting to discuss non-controversial issues like this, then who are we to stop them?329

HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ is a national campaign. HTB member Majed Iqbal details the campaign’s work in Rochdale on his blog:

[L]iterature available to mobilise people in putting forward the intellectual responses back to arguments [sic] thrown by politicians and Media has been warmly welcomed by everyone attending on the busy afternoon and evening Stall held on the Milkstone Rd Area. [...] Discussions have been flowing week in week out with many asking how they can play a role in this campaign as well as having further discussions on the topics of Shariah, Role of Muslims living in Europe, interacting with Media, understanding the political context of Islamic Activism and having key responses for arguments about Islamic Rule in the Muslim world, hudood (punishments) and the greatly talked about “Reformation of Islam” alluded to by European Politicians and Media.330

Other ‘Stand for Islam’ events nationwide include: ‘Is Islam oppressive to Women?’, 11 May 2008,331 and ‘The role of Muslim women in Islam’, 12 June 2008,332 both held at Birmingham City Council’s Small Heath Community Centre; ‘Attacks on the Shariah’, 21 June 2008, at the Noshahi Civic Centre, Small Heath, Birmingham,333 and ‘Stand for Islam against the call to ban the Quran’, 8 July 2008, in Coventry.334

‘Stand for Islam’ has been particularly active in London over the last two years, organising a number of public events in municipal spaces. One lecture, ‘Is the Shariah just about punish-
ments’, was organised for 12 June 2008 in three separate locations: Toynbee Hall which is supported by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets in Whitechapel; the Shalom Centre in East London; and the Angel Community Centre in Edmonton. The ‘Stand for Islam’ poster advertising these events echoes HTB’s three-fold strategy of presenting the situation as part of HT’s ‘War on Islam’ narrative; establishing HT’s ideology as the correct alternative; and offering HTB activism as the solution. The poster states:

Politicians and media commentators constantly associate Shariah law with extremism and even terrorism. Muslims have to stand up for the truth of the Shariah. Our community must convey its real message in the face of such myths and slander. [...] Come and find out: How the Shariah really controls crime in society? What are the values that the Shariah ensures in society? And how should Muslims present the true meaning of the Shariah in the current climate?

‘Stand for Islam’ has also organised a number of community events across London, including in Tooting, South London; Walthamstow, North London and Whitechapel, East London. According to HTB, the Tooting event ended with a Q&A which featured ‘active participation from [the] audience as to the practical actions individuals can undertake to ‘Stand for Islam’ and portray Islam’s message to the wider society.’

‘Stand for Islam’ has also actively campaigned against the government’s counter-extremism programme, particularly focusing on the perceived inaccuracy of the description “extremism”. For example, ‘Stand for Islam’ organised an event in Central London, ‘Palestine – 60 years of occupation and oppression’, to mark the 60th anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel. HTB reports that:

Muslims were asked to stand with the people of Palestine in their time of need, stand for the Islamic solution for the region and to stand against pressures from politicians and media in the west, who quite hypocritically see the non-recognition of Israel as part of their definition of extremism, frequently throwing accusations of anti-Semitism against anti-Zionists.

HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ has been particularly successful in Camden, where the campaign has gained the support of local councillors and police representatives. The authors of this report believe that the Muslim Community Representatives Camden & Islington Association (MRCIA) is effectively a front group for ‘Stand for Islam’ and thereby HTB. A spokesman for MRCIA, however, denied that it is a ‘front organisation’ for HTB, but said that had ‘links’ with
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the party. In 2008, the MCRCIA launched a ‘Stand for Islam’ campaign newsletter, which stated:

If we stand for Islam, we stand for the return of the Khilafah Rashida in the Muslim world, and will do all we can to aid this effort.

The newsletter further advertised:

Over the coming weeks we will be clarifying what Islam is, its beliefs, teachings and practices as well as tackling very controversial issues such as ‘Women in Islam,’ ‘Shari’ah Law’ and ‘The Caliphate’ to name but a few.

The MCRCIA leaflet states that the campaign is ‘supported by Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir in Camden,’ and advertises ‘Weekly Islamic Circles at Regents Park Mosque […] given by a member of Hizb-ut Tahrir.’ The MCRCIA also runs a blog – featuring HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ logo as its blogger profile picture – in order to advertise its events. The blog has been operating since May 2009. Before then, MCRCIA events were advertised on another blog, ‘Stand for Islam’, advertised in the 2008 newsletter. Although neither blog links to HTB’s website, they both use HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ logo and their rhetoric echoes HTB’s. Furthermore, MCRCIA regularly gives a platform to HTB speakers.

The MCRCIA organised and/or participated in a variety of events in 2008. Amongst them was, ‘Don’t ban the Quran: How should Muslims respond?’, a lecture at Kings Cross Centre, 23 May 2008, featuring Taji Mustafa and a ‘Stand for Islam’ stall at the ‘Camden Bangladeshi Mela’, or festival, on Cromer Street on 17 August 2008. The MCRCIA/’Stand for Islam’ also ran a ‘Borrow a Muslim’campaign, where non-Muslims were invited to question Muslims – most likely HTB members – about their faith and common misconceptions, at the Camden County Fair, 19 July 2008, at Coram Fields, Bloomsbury, a community fair sponsored by Camden council. MCRCIA’s stated aim for this campaign echoes the language used by Mustafa during HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ press launch:

Our purpose at the County Show was in light of the intellectual attack on the beliefs of Islam and the ongoing attack [sic] on our community we went there to clarify issues in regards to Islam to the Muslim Community and the wider Non-Muslim Community.
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345 The Camden County Fair and the Bangladeshi Mela 2008 was attended by one of the report’s authors, who witnessed campaigners distributing literature which supports HT’s worldview. Further details of all these events can be found in the MCRCIA newsletter on community events 2008, available at mcrclia.blogspot.com/2009/08/islamic-mela-2009-video_30.html [accessed 28.08.2009]
The MCRCIA/’Stand for Islam’ participated in the 2009 Camden Bangladeshi Mela, a video of which is available on MCRCIA’s YouTube page. The video explains the aims of the Mela and features footage of the event and interviews with prominent local figures. The video appears, however, to have been made by HTB or its supporters. The interviews were conducted in front of HTB – and its various affiliates’ – stalls. The video starts by describing the theme of the event, one which echoes HT’s vision of Islam as a complete legal, political, economic and social system:

The Islamic Mela’s theme this year was ‘The Systems of Islam’ to educate the masses a marquee was erected which housed exhibitions on the Islamic ruling, Judicial, Social, Education and Economic systems, tour guides were on hand to bring the exhibits to life. Four different system stalls were dotted around the Islamic Mela where leaflets were given out and discussions took place on the four Islamic systems.348

At one point in the video the camera zooms in on a sign titled ‘Islam Judicial System’. The sign, however, repeats article 68 of HT’s draft constitution for its Islamist state, stating:

There are three types of Judge in Islam: Responsible for settling disputes among the people. Responsible for resolving disputes that arises between the Ummah and any people who harm the society at large. Who deals with disputes between the people and the leadership, He can dismiss any ruler or government official, including the Khalifah.350

Janine Griffis, identified as a representative from the Camden Community and Police Consultative Group, is then interviewed as follows:

_Interviewer:_ Is there any aspect of the systems of Islam that will just stay with you?

_Jane Griffis:_ Well you know I think when I came last year, I did rent a Muslim, it was really borrow a Muslim and it was very interesting because what we talked about with this young woman was the woman’s place in Islam and society and I have to admit that’s the point I don’t know very well and I don’t understand and sometimes in the past there have been some areas of confusion. So she was wonderful actually. She was a very very articulate and ambitious young woman who was going to go far.351

This is followed by footage of a large HTB sign and an interview with a Liberal Democrat spokesperson, who says:
It’s a great event, I was here last year and really enjoyed it then and it’s another great day, hopefully the weather will hold off and I think it’s really a fantastic event because you get people from the community, people coming in here, you get information about Islam, different forms of Islam, the work that Islam and Muslims groups do in the community here in Kings Cross and Camden more widely and I think it’s a really positive event. 352

Labour Councillor Abdul Hai, of Kings Cross ward, is also interviewed. He says:

Really pleased to say that a really large turnout and I think in some ways this gives a positive side to Islam and the problems of Islam and presents Islam in a positive way and fundamentally I think what we see is young leaders from the community are taking a leadership role promoting Islam in a positive way. I’d like to see similar stuff maybe across the country and across the borough itself.

HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ campaign has been very successful, therefore, at presenting – and mainstreaming – core tenets of HT ideology. The campaign has consistently emphasised the need for Muslim unity, the view of Islam as a complete socio-political project, and the emphasis on a strong Islamic identity in the face of a perceived ‘War on Islam’.

Defending Women’s Rights

HTB’s ongoing activism with regards to women’s rights has two strategic purposes: to denigrate the liberal Western model of individual human rights and to promote HT’s narrow interpretation of a religious lifestyle as the only “Islamic” alternative for British Muslim women. HTB presents the promotion of women’s rights as a deliberate Western policy to dilute Islam and sever ties between Western Muslims and Muslims worldwide. HTB further stresses that British Muslim women have been poisoned by Western individualism, which the party argues is at odds with their Islamist interpretation of Islamic tradition.

An internal 2005 HTB conference briefing outlines the party’s “vision” for British Muslims and the role Muslim women should play in bringing this about:

To establish a model Islamic community where the Muslim woman is the backbone and symbol of Islamic identity by thought and deed.

[…]

Muslim women in the West support Khilafah, have allegiance to it when it returns and become one of the key voices of Muslim women in the Global struggle. 353

To further this aim, HTB encourages “Islamic” dress for women. One former HTB member said that the party demands uniformity within its female ranks:
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We even had a very specific dress code that was chosen by the emir of HT. He had made it mandatory for all members to wear the jilbab (a loose dress), Khimar (headscarf) and socks. Many Muslim women wear the jilbab and scarf, but for some reason I could always identify a fellow HT member; perhaps it was the uniform-like style.354

HTB argues that wearing the headscarf is obligatory for all Muslim women – as a religious duty to be honoured.355 For HTB the discussion of religious dress within a framework of women's rights is wrong: the hijab, or headscarf, is divinely mandated, the party argues, and to justify wearing it or not as a matter of “choice” is “unIslamic”. During HTB's 2003 annual conference, 'What does it mean to be a British Muslim?'; in Birmingham, one HTB member told the audience:

Inevitably western attitudes are beginning to affect Muslim thinking. Sometimes Muslim women will say that they wear a headscarf as a matter of choice. They will say it is their freedom to do so, but this is a justification of an Islamic practice by western concepts. A truly Islamic woman would say she wore her headscarf in obedience to the Creator whether the Creator gave reasons or not.356

HTB strategy also concentrates on publicly defending British Muslim women from perceived attacks against displays of religiosity. HTB organises public protests, community initiatives and workshops in order to present the party as the vanguard of Islam and as the defenders of Muslims. In January 2004, for example, HTB organised a protest rally against the French ban on wearing religious symbols in schools. Media reports suggest that 300 women were urged by HTB to fight for their right to wear the hijab.357 It is important to note, however, that HTB does not campaign for women's freedom of dress; in HT's Islamist state women would be permitted to show only their face and hands in public.358

In June 2004 it was reported that HTB had influenced 13-year-old Shabina Begum, a British Muslim from Luton, encouraging her to take her school to court for refusing to allow her to wear the jilbab, clothing which reveals the hands and face only. Begum's brother, who helped her bring the case to court, is an HTB member. Party activists admitted that Begum had been in contact with HTB since 2002 and that they had been encouraging and advising her. HTB Media Spokesperson Imran Wahid told the Sunday Times newspaper:

Our members in Luton have consistently advised Shabina and her family to stand up for her right to an education and her right to observe the Islamic ordinances, including the wearing of the jilbab359

354 Umm Mustafa, ‘Why I left Hizb ut-Tahrir’, New Statesman
355 ‘The Struggle for Islam and the Call for the Khilafah’, HTB 2009 Conference
356 ‘Muslims vow to Honour and Obey’, The Birmingham Post, 21 August 2003. Interestingly, this contradicts a later joint statement signed by Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain in response to the then Leader of the Commons Jack Straw’s comments about the niqab, or face veil, in 2006. The ten point statement signed by a number of Muslim organisations stated: ‘We urge people to be supportive for a woman's right to wear the veil as on one hand, this complies with the values upon which western civilization was founded – the protection of human and religious rights.’ See Joint statement about the veil from Muslim groups, scholars and leaders, Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain website, 22 October 2006, available at www.hizb.org.uk/hizb/in-the-community/working-together/joint-statement-about-the-veil-from-muslim-groups-scholars-and-leaders.html [accessed 28.08.2009]
357 ‘Has the headscarf got a chequered future?’, The Times, 26 January 2004
359 HTB Media Spokesperson Imran Wahid quoted in the Sunday Times, available at www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/
In 2005 Begum was invited to speak at an HTB conference. An internal HTB email was circulated to all women speakers before the event outlining the conference programme. The email outlined the party’s aim in relation to Begum’s contribution, entitled ‘My struggle to maintain my identity with the Jilbab ban’.

In the briefing Begum is told to ‘highlight your struggle in a personal tone’ and ‘illustrate the significance of Islamic dress code to maintaining Islamic identity of Muslim women’. The briefing further reveals that Begum’s talk is designed to convince her audience that ‘Muslims must combat integration agenda and maintain identity’. HTB strategy is therefore to bolster a ‘clash of civilisations’ narrative which equates “integration” with a loss of “Islamic” identity in order to encourage both segregation within the UK and loyalty to a perceived political trans-national Muslim bloc.

Championing “Islamic” Education and Identity

As part of its anti-integration agenda, HTB has portrayed the British education system as un-Islamic in order to create a desire for alternative education within British Muslims. The party was actively pursuing this strategy as early as 1990. For example, in May of that year HTB campaigned successfully to have a humanities project withdrawn from an East London secondary school. Part of the project analysed quotations from members of the terrorist group Islamic Jihad and asked questions such as, ‘Should any system political or religious say that it is willing to kill or be killed in order to put across their way of life?’ HTB activist Shezad Manzoor complained to the school and distributed HTB leaflets demanding that the project’s author be sacked and blaming Western “capitalist” society for criticising Islam. Manzoor told the Guardian that he had acted in lieu of the parents of Muslim pupils, explaining that they had not complained before because many spoke little English.

HTB has consistently emphasised the importance of Muslim youth in its community, college and university activism. Most recently HTB members founded a group, known as SREIslamic, in 2009 to campaign against elements of sex and relationship education (SRE) in the UK’s primary schools. SREIslamic was founded by Yusuf Patel, a member of HTB and brother of Jalaluddin Patel, the former leader of HTB, and Farhad Khodabaksh, also an HTB member. Whilst the campaign is responding to concerns raised by some parents of a variety of religious backgrounds, SREIslamic/HTB is manipulating such concerns in order to further entrench its narrow Islamist mindset and encourage self-segregation amongst British Muslims.

A July 2009 HTB booklet, A positive agenda for Muslims in Britain, details the party’s involvement in the SREIslamic campaign:
Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir have also started raising awareness around the country on government plans to promote compulsory Sex and Relationship Education to children aged 5 years old and above, and encouraged parents to question the implementation of this policy in their children’s schools.364

One Rochdale SREIslamic activist, Majed Iqbal, also a member of HTB, has used his position as a local journalist to mainstream the views of SREIslamic. Writing for the local Asian Leader, Iqbal, who does not disclose his affiliation with HTB, reports on SREIslamic under the headline, ‘Muslim community says NO to sex education for 5 year olds’365 Some British Muslims have expressed concern that HTB’s involvement in the project could lead to further increased Islamist demands designed to segregate Muslim pupils. Dr Shaaz Mahboob, vice-chairman of British Muslims for Secular Democracy says:

Even if parents are not interested in this [HT’s] agenda, they will listen to their thoughts on sex education. [HT] will use this consultation to build sympathy with Muslim parents and then, perhaps, move onto religious classes or separating girls and boys. If the government starts listening to these things, it is difficult to see how it will end.366

HTB’s SREIslamic campaign is already providing greater legitimacy to the party’s views. In December 2009, Patel will speak at the Muslim Education Conference in Birmingham, organised by the al-Hijrah Trust, a Muslim educational charity.367 Patel’s affiliation to HTB is not made clear in the promotional material for the event. Instead, Patel is described as an education “campaigner”:

Yusuf Patel: College lecturer by profession and campaigner on Sex and Relationship Education in schools. He has been conducting presentations, workshops and leading a national campaign, evidencing the deep opposition within the Muslim community against the government’s proposals to make sex education statutory from the age of five.368

Other speakers include representatives from the al-Hijrah Training Academy, the Association of Muslim Governors and the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB)369 Education Committee. However, also speaking is Conservative Councillor Les Laurence, Birmingham Council Cabinet

368 Upcoming events, al-Hijrah website
369 The MCB is an umbrella group claiming 500 affiliates within Britain’s Muslim communities. Founded in 1997 with the support of the Conservative Home Secretary Michael Howard (1993-1997), the MCB was seen as a significant interlocutor between the government and British Muslim communities, though its influence has decreased in recent years. The MCB is inspired by a narrow interpretation of Islam: many of the group’s leaders and founders were formerly affiliated with Islamist parties in Pakistan and Bangladesh such as JI. See ‘Radical Links of UK’s ‘Moderate’ Muslim Group’, Observer, 14 August 2005
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Member for Children, Young People and Families.\textsuperscript{370} The SREIslamic campaign has therefore facilitated an influential and public platform for HTB.

\textit{A positive agenda for Muslims in Britain} confirms the party’s belief in segregated schooling as a means to instil its interpretation of ‘Islamic values’ in young children. Furthermore, the booklet encourages British Muslims join Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) and become school governors in order to promote HTB’s values within schools:

\begin{quote}
We should aim for our institutions to be self reliant. State funding comes with strings attached and creates a dependency that gives the government control. This colonial agenda has been used countless times elsewhere. There is a great need to have more independent schools, madrassahs and mosques for our community.

[…]

We should invest time in our families trying to promote the noble Islamic values. We should be actively involved in our children’s schools at PTA or Governor Levels to promote good values within our community. We need to mobilise our community and raise awareness when necessary.\textsuperscript{371}
\end{quote}

HTB calls for young British Muslims to maintain their ‘Islamic identities’ in the face of the West’s “crusade” against Islam. For example, during his ‘Address to the Muslim Youth’ at the HTB 2009 conference, Taji Mustafa emphasised the importance of young British Muslims spreading HT’s message of the West’s global ‘War on Islam’ and retaining their ‘Islamic identity’ in response:

\begin{quote}
We need to understand our situation and understand what to do […] we need to understand why there are attacks on Islam and what to do […] People are frightened of the call for Khilafah. They see people wearing the hijab. They attack us because of our success. […] The Government wants to sell the Muslims a moderate Islam – a secular, hijab-free, do-what-you-want Islam. […] If we are silent what are they going to believe?\textsuperscript{372}
\end{quote}

Mustafa told his Muslim audience that they needed to join HTB:

\begin{quote}
Number one: Learn arguments so you are capable of defending Islam. Number two: Take that knowledge, those arguments, to your community, to your friends, to your brothers and sisters, to your uncles and aunties, to your parents, so that the community stand and show people the true message of Islam.

Number three: Join us. Work with us. Work with Hizb ut-Tahrir. The work we are engaged in is the work of all Muslims […] When this deen [religion] is being attacked, vilified, demonised […] It is time for the youth of today to stand for Islam.\textsuperscript{373}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{371} Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, \textit{A positive agenda for Muslims in Britain}, p.16

\textsuperscript{372} ‘The Struggle for Islam and the Call for the Khilafah’, HTB 2009 Conference, London, 26 July 2009. Attended and recorded by the report’s authors; see also ‘An address to the Muslim Youth’, Taji Mustafa, video available at www.youtube.com/watch?v=E4dFFX7Bu2U&feature=channel_page [accessed 25.08.2009]
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Promoting Disengagement with the UK’s Social Systems

British Muslims are encouraged to reject mainstream political participation in favour of grassroots “Islamic”, i.e. HTB, activism. HTB’s strategy is three-fold: to reveal the perceived inadequacy of democracy as a system of governance; to oppose integration; and to foster support for HT ideology.

HTB strategy was evident in the party’s campaign during the London Mayoral elections in May 2008, which deliberately set HTB apart from less radical Islamist as well as Muslim organisations in the UK. In the run-up to the elections Muslim organisations and individuals affiliated with the MCB and the Muslim Association of Britain (MAB) ran a campaign encouraging London’s Muslim communities to vote for the Labour candidate Ken Livingstone because they felt he would best serve the interests of the Muslim communities in London.

In April 2008 HTB issued a press release, ‘Hizb ut-Tahrir’s view on the upcoming elections’, which expressly forbade London’s Muslims from voting, countering the MCB/MAB position and encouraging HT activism as an alternative. HTB rejects voting in the London elections primarily from its purist ideological perspective. HTB stated that whilst the concept of elections is not haram, voting in an election for a non-Islamic position, i.e. one that would administer a system other than HT’s interpretation of shariah, is prohibited:

The positions of mayor and councillor have an executive ruling function, as well as some strategic and administrative functions. The ruling function is according to the secular non Islamic law, and hence would be prohibited for any Muslim.

As with any HT position, the party selectively quotes scripture to support its position:

In the Quran Allah (SWT) tells us “And those who do not rule by that which Allah has revealed, they are the disbelievers.” [Translated meaning Surah al-Maidah: 44] As a result it would be prohibited to vote for someone (be they Muslim or non Muslim) to represent them in this function.

Furthermore, HTB continues to assert its proscriptive interpretation of what is acceptably “Islamic” by outlining unacceptable aspects of the position of elected officials:

There are many things which openly contradict Islam which are expected from councillors or mayors

374 The MAB was founded in 1997 by Kamal Helbawy, a senior member of the MB. Commonly considered the British franchise of the MB (with links to Hamas), the MAB stated in a 2002 newsletter that its aim was ‘the widespread implementation of Islam as a way of life; no longer to be sidelined as merely a religion’. See Mahan Abedin ‘How to Deal with Britain’s Muslim Extremists? An interview with Kamal Helbawy’, Jamestown Foundation, Spotlight on Terror, Vol. 3, Issue 7, 5 August 2005; see also ‘A briefing on the Muslim Association of Britain’, Workers Liberty Party, available at www.workersliberty.org/node/6805 [accessed 30.08.2009]
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elected as representatives: licensing the sale of alcohol, gambling, sex shops, as well as sponsoring a variety of festivals where drunkenness and lewdness occur.379

In the press release, HTB rejects the MCB/MAB position arguing that ‘benefit should not be our criteria’. Furthermore, HTB questions the effectiveness of such perceived “benefit”:

Does anyone believe that a vote on May 1st will affect Britain’s belligerent foreign policy or draconian security laws, which all occurred under the current mayor who is seen as the least hostile candidate, and could not prevent these things?380

After presenting political participation as both *haram* and ineffective, HTB then presents its activism as the only viable alternative to British Muslims:

Dear Muslims! These are some of the positive steps we can take for serving the priorities of Islam. For if we Stand for Islam, stand with our Ummah, engage positively with non-Muslims, and see our whole lives as an example for Dawah, only then truly we will be worthy of Allah’s good pleasure, and at the same time achieve something realistic and positive in society, more than a simple vote could ever do.381

**Establishing Forums to Propagate Hizb ut-Tahrir Ideology in Local Communities**

HTB works to facilitate forums in local communities through which the party can propagate HT ideology. Since 2000 the party has further established schools and youth groups in order to target young British Muslims. HTB also uses pre-existing networks within British Muslim communities to further disseminate its message.

In 2005, HTB members set up the Islamic Shakhsiyah Foundation (ISF), a registered charity which runs two primary schools; one in Slough, Berkshire and one in Haringey, North London. Two of the ISF’s four trustees are HTB members: Yusra Hamilton is a member of HTB and the wife of Taji Mustafa; Farah Ahmed, an ISF trustee and author of the ISF religious curriculum, is also a member of HTB.382 A 2009 inspection by the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted) of the ISF Slough school lists Yusra Hamilton as the school’s proprietor and Farah Ahmed the Head teacher.383

A 2007 *Sunday Times* investigation into the schools revealed that the ISF curriculum propagates HT ideology: children aged seven and eight are asked to compare HT’s Islamic system,
where laws are divine, to other belief systems, where laws are man-made and therefore inferior; and children aged nine and ten are taught that HT’s Caliphate must be re-established.\footnote{88 ‘Schools are run by Islamic group Blair pledged to ban’, \textit{Sunday Times}, 5 August 2007} 

It was further alleged that the author of the ISF history curriculum wrote in HT’s \textit{Khilafah} magazine:

\begin{quote}
The world will, insha-Allah (God willing), witness the death of the criminal capitalist nation of America and all other (infidel) states when the army of jihad is unleashed upon them.\footnote{89 Hizb ut-Tahrir, \textit{Hizb ut-Tahrir}, pp.72-73}
\end{quote}

On the ISF website, the Foundation says their ‘ultimate goal’ and ‘foremost work’ is the creation of an ‘Islamic personality’ in children:

\begin{quote}
Our intention is that this model is able to produce persevering Islamic personalities for the challenges facing us living here in Britain in the 21st century.\footnote{90 Shaksiyah is Arabic for ‘personality’ and the Foundation’s name echoes HT founder and ideologue Nabhani’s three volume treatise, \textit{al-Shakhsiyyah al-Islāmiyyah}, or \textit{The Islamic Personality}. Accordingly, the creation of an ‘Islamic personality’ is a key tenet of HT ideology. Instilling Islamic personalities is part of HT’s ‘purification process’, the aim of which the party describes as:}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
…[T]he establishment of the Khilafah that implements Islam and carries its message to the rest of the world.\footnote{91 ISF Trustees’ report and financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2008, available at www.charity-commission.gov.uk/registeredcharities/ScannedAccounts/Ends76%5C0001112376_ac_20080331_e_c.pdf [accessed 30.08.2009]}
\end{quote}

All independent schools must register with the Department for Children, Families and Schools (DCSF) and are subject to Ofsted inspections. Whilst the ISF website provides a DCSF registration number for the school in Slough there is no listing for the school in Haringey.\footnote{92 Teacher Training programmes, ISF website, available at http://www.isfnet.org.uk/ [accessed 23.10.2009]. For more details, see the ISF course handbook, available at http://home.btconnect.com/ISF/form/ITEC%20-%20Course%20Handbook%20of%202009.pdf [accessed 23.10.2009]}

A 2005 Ofsted inspection of the Slough school praised the schools \textit{halaqa} system and its “Islamic” ethos.\footnote{93 ‘Islamists who want to destroy the state get £100,000 funding’, \textit{Sunday Telegraph}} Furthermore, ISF has managed to secure public funding for their schools: the ISF Trustees’ Report and Financial Statements (2007/08) revealed that the organisation received £113,411 in government grants that year.\footnote{94 ISF Trustees' report and financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2008, available at www.charity-commission.gov.uk/registeredcharities/ScannedAccounts/Ends76%5C0001112376_ac_20080331_e_c.pdf [accessed 30.08.2009]}

ISF confirmed that the money came from the government’s ‘Free Entitlement’ and ‘Pathfinder’ programmes.\footnote{95 ‘Islamists who want to destroy the state get £100,000 funding’, \textit{Sunday Telegraph}} The Foundation also runs teacher training programmes at London Central Mosque.\footnote{96 ISF Trustees’ report and financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2008, available at www.charity-commission.gov.uk/registeredcharities/ScannedAccounts/Ends76%5C0001112376_ac_20080331_e_c.pdf [accessed 30.08.2009]}

\begin{quote}
Our intention is that this model is able to produce persevering Islamic personalities for the challenges facing us living here in Britain in the 21st century.\footnote{97 Shaksiyah is Arabic for ‘personality’ and the Foundation’s name echoes HT founder and ideologue Nabhani’s three volume treatise, \textit{al-Shakhsiyyah al-Islāmiyyah}, or \textit{The Islamic Personality}. Accordingly, the creation of an ‘Islamic personality’ is a key tenet of HT ideology. Instilling Islamic personalities is part of HT’s ‘purification process’, the aim of which the party describes as:} ...[T]he establishment of the Khilafah that implements Islam and carries its message to the rest of the world.\footnote{98 ISF home page, available at http://home.btconnect.com/ISF/index.html [accessed 23.10.2009]}
\end{quote}
HTB is also active at a grassroots level within British Muslim communities. A party tactic is to set up small front organisations in local areas in order to anonymously propagate HT ideology. Former HTB activists attest that the party set up a range of youth organisations in different areas of Tower Hamlets between 2004 and 2008. This was a centralised HTB policy – the men were members of a dedicated HTB Youth Team – aimed at influencing young British Muslims and spreading HT ideology. One former activist, who set up the (now defunct) Newgen Community Forum, said:

The main purpose of all the organisations in Tower Hamlets including Newgen [was to be a] front for HT, to promote HT and its ideas and to have influence over youths in Tower Hamlets.

The former Newgen secretary stated that this tactic was a pre-emptive measure designed to circumnavigate the party’s possible proscription by embedding HT ideology in the community:

Also if HT gets banned in Britain then they still remain in the community.

HTB deliberately targeted young British Muslims:

[The] target age group [was] between 15 and 18 mainly. Means and styles used were from football to work shops, residential after school home work club and trips. We were given targets to recruit at least five youth so HT can start Halaqa [study circle] with them.

HTB used a variety of tactics to promote its ideology and legitimise party activists:

While doing activities like football we would use every opportunity to promote HT and pass on HT ideas. We would invite a local role model from the community like the councillor and amongst them we would include a member of HT. Just to make it look like HT members are role models.

The former secretary of Newgen left HTB in 2007. He said that at that time the party was trying to secure funding from local businesses, Tower Hamlets Council and various affiliated bodies such as the Tower Hamlets Youth Opportunity Funding for All scheme and the Tower Hamlets Community Empowerment Network. Moreover, he said that HTB had been planning residential trips for young Muslims:

We planned in future when we get funding from the government to select youths and to take them to residential holiday where we will have more of a chance to make them listen to us.

---

393 An archived copy of the Newgen website, dated 22 October 2007, lists Ruhul Ahmed as the organisation’s chairman. Former members were unable to confirm whether Ahmed is still with the party. See http://web.archive.org/web/20071022144545/http://newgencommunityforum.org/ [accessed 29.10.2009]
394 Written testimony from HTB former activists C & D (anonymous: 8 February 2008).
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The former Newgen secretary revealed that HTB would deliberately target young British Muslims who they felt would be vulnerable to the party’s rhetoric:

    We would select who we believe will be suitable and easy to recruit. 399

Another HTB front group, set up after the Newgen secretary left the party in 2007, is the Brick Lane Islamic Circle (BLIC). According to the group’s website, BLIC was ‘founded by local youth and community professionals’ in order to ‘provide a motivating atmosphere through talks, discussions and outdoor activities that help create a positive image of young muslims [sic] and contribute to improve their own communities’. 400 Former HTB activists, however, claim it was created by HTB ‘to directly promote HT ideas’. 401 BLIC runs weekly ‘Friday Circles’ at the Montefiore Centre, an educational community centre owned by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. 402 The group’s website details events between March 2008 and July 2009, including movie nights, rap competitions, lectures and community BBQs. 403

While some BLIC events appear innocuous, the promotional material for many others echoes HTB rhetoric. For example, on 16 May 2008 BLIC hosted a lecture entitled ‘Freedom of Speech’, claiming:

    From behind the cloak of freedom of speech we have seen our beloved prophet and our way of life (Islam) ridiculed, cursed, insulted and degraded by Western thinkers and newspapers. Come and find out how to defend our beloved Holy Prophet and the Quran. 404

Similarly, an advert for a lecture, ‘The Struggle for Islam’, on 17 July 2009 says:

    We are living in a time where Islam is constantly attacked. The enemies of Islam are working day and night to change our Deen; they are also working to turn Muslim youth away from Islam. The struggle is real – THIS IS IT! JOIN THE CAMPAIGN. 405

BLIC also advertised two BBQs for HTB’s ‘Stand for Islam’ campaign in May and June 2008. None of BLIC’s events or its website, however, directly links the organisation to HTB.

Another current HTB front group, the Inspire Youth Association (IYA), was advertised in the

---

399 Ibid
400 See www.bricklanecircle.blogspot.com [accessed 30.08.2009]
401 Written testimony from HTB former activists C & D.
402 See bricklanecircle.blogspot.com/2008/04/brick-lane-islamic-circle.html [accessed 31.08.2009]. The Montefiore Centre, formerly the Bethnal Green Training Centre, has been managed by the Spitalfields Small Business Association on behalf of Tower Hamlets council since 2001. See www.ssba.info/Workspace/montefiore.html [accessed 31.08.2009]
403 Interestingly, contestants for the ‘Stop putting pressure on me’ rap competition were told their rap had to include the words “Islam,” “struggle,” “parents” and ‘boiling point’. HT uses water as a metaphor for society: Nabhani wrote that ‘society is similar to water in a large kettle [...] and if the correct ideology was introduced into the society it would be a flame whose heat would transform the society to boiling point and then to a dynamic force’ [emphasis added]. Similarly, senior party members told the audience at the HTB 2009 conference in London that the “Khilafah” was imminent because ‘the ummah is reaching boiling point’. See an-Nabhani, Concepts of Hizb ut-Tahrir, p.5
404 See bricklanecircle.blogspot.com/2008/05/freedom-of-speech.html [accessed 31.08.2009]
405 See www.bricklanecircle.blogspot.com
women’s section at HTB’s 2009 annual conference. HTB members were distributing leaflets to young Muslim women, encouraging them to join one of IYA’s four Summer Youth Project talks, ‘covering problems we face as young Muslim sisters’, in Walthamstow, London. The IYA leaflets appear to have been designed to appeal to young girls: white and pink with a flower motif, they detail each event using “street” language. One talk is titled ‘Wha Guan with Ramadhan?’ and another, ‘Wifey or wife?’ states ‘films portray a glamorous side to hookin up, but is this the reality?’ Whilst the leaflets do not mention HTB, party members told the report’s authors that the project was being run by female members. Parents who encourage their daughters to attend these circles, however, could easily be unaware of the party’s radical mindset, which includes the rigid regulation of gender relations. Female members of HTB further confirmed that there were many similar projects across London and that IYA was planning to hold iftars, or events to break the Muslim fast, during Ramadan 2009.

HTB also uses pre-existing networks within British Muslim communities to propagate its ideology, including the Islam Channel and Press TV. Islam Channel is one of the largest satellite channels aimed specifically at British as well as other European Muslims. Whilst many of the programmes are apolitical, HTB members also present some programmes. Sajid Varda, the former host of Islam Channel’s ‘Saturday Night Live’ programme and Basharat Ali, one of the hosts on the Muslim current affairs programme Ummah Talk, are both members of HTB. The hosts of the Islam Channel’s women’s issues programme Muslimmah Dilemma, Ibthilal Ismail Bsis and Aamna Durrani are also members of HTB and regularly invite HTB Women’s Media Representative Nazreen Nawaz to appear on their programme. Former HTB activists who appeared on the Islam Channel warn that ‘many of these speakers regularly use their shows to promote Hizb ut-Tahrir’s ideology’. Other HTB members also feature as guests on the Islam Channel. For example, in September 2006 Jameel Rahmaan, a representative of HTB, featured as a guest on the popular Islamist talk show, The Hassan and Habibah Show, discussing sexual intimacy in Islam. In November of that year, Taji Mustafa debated the then editor of BBC Two’s current affairs programme Newsnight, Peter Barron, on Ummah Talk.

In October 2009, Dalia Mogahed, an advisor to the Obama administration on faith-based issues, appeared alongside an HTB representative on an Islam Channel programme hosted

---

406 A scanned copy of the leaflet is available at www.socialcohesion.co.uk/uploads/1251729988iya_leaflet.pdf
407 HT’s draft constitution, for example, imposes medieval interpretations of shariah within the Caliphate’s social system, mandating segregation and prescribing strict gender roles within a marriage and household. See articles 108-118, ‘The Societal System’, in an-Nabhani, The Islamic State, pp.262-263
408 ‘Islam Channel and the promotion of extremism’, Quilliam Foundation Press Release, 30 April 2009, available at www.quilliamfoundation.org/index.php/component/content/article/498 [accessed 31.08.2009]. The details of HTB membership referenced here are not affected by Quilliam Foundation’s later corrections to the press release, and are corroborated by former HTB members. Durrani also ran a literature stall at HTB’s 2009 conference in London witnessed by the report’s authors.
409 Co-hosts Hassan Saleemi and Habibah Ellahee are known Islamist sympathisers. For example, in response to Blair’s speech about Islamist terrorism at the Labour Party national conference on 16 July 2005, Hassan Saleemi wrote in the Muslim Weekly: ‘The desire for a Khilafah, is not the monopoly of a few groups, not the monopoly of a few ‘young radicals’, but is fundamental to Islam.’ (Date of article publication in the Muslim Weekly is unknown, but appeared on Hassan and Habibah’s blog on 20 August 2005). See ‘Islam is the “evil ideology”’, Hassan and Habibah’s Blog, available at hassanandhabibah.blog.co.uk/2005/08/20/islam_is_the_evil_ideology~1144455/ [accessed 31.08.2009]. Also see ‘Sexual intimacy in Islam’, Hassan and Habibah’s Blog, 5 September 2007, available at hassanandhabibah.blog.co.uk/2007/09/05/sexual_intimacy_in_islam~3655473/ [accessed 31.08.2009]
by HTB members. Mogahed appeared on the Muslima Dilemma programme, discussing the subject, ‘Why Muslim Women want Shariah?’, based on findings from her recent survey of Muslim women. The show, presented by members of HTB, also featured Nasreen Nawaz, who was introduced in her capacity as the party’s Women’s Media Spokesperson. Nawaz and Mogahed discussed the implementation of shariah law. Mogahed said that her findings show that women in Muslim-majority countries want democracy, equal gender rights and political suffrage, which many believe are congruent with shariah. In accordance with HT ideology, Nawaz supported the call for the Caliphate as a single state for the “Muslim world” and advocated HT’s version of shariah, as ‘the source of legislation’ and for the ‘strict regulation in terms of social laws’. Mogahed failed to challenge Nawaz’s ideas and often supported her assertions with research findings. She failed to challenge the party’s presentation of itself as a representative political movement. HTB see the interview as a PR success and have posted it on their website.

The Iranian government-funded news channel, Press TV, regularly interviews HTB members for news and current affairs programmes. In some cases, however, Press TV fails to disclose members’ affiliation to the party, presenting them as independent analysts. In February 2009, for example, Jamal Harwood, HTB’s Head of Legal Affairs, was described as an ‘economic analyst’; in July 2009 Nazreen Nawaz was described as a ‘women’s rights activist’. Press TV is not unaware of HTB, and other members are named as representatives: Sajjad Khan was described as HT’s ‘Chief Political Advisor’ in an October 2008 interview and in May and August 2009 Taji Mustafa was described as an HT member.

Similarly, in 2002 HTB appeared to make use of an information website and exchange network for Muslim teachers. Set up by Hasna Saber, Asif Tufal and Zara Bokhari, the now inactive muslimteachers.net was criticised for providing links to HTB and AM. After the links were made public, a spokesperson for the Board of Deputies of British Jews called for the site to be closed down and the Home Office and Metropolitan police said that they planned to monitor it. In response Tufal, a sixth form teacher and the website’s creator, said:

---

411 In April 2009, Mogahed, Senior Analyst of Muslim Studies at Gallup, was appointed by President Obama to a new interfaith advisory board designed to strengthen inter-faith dialogue and report to the president on the role religion can play in resolving social problems and addressing civil rights issues. See ‘Obama appoints The first Muslim American woman head of Gallup as advisor’, Watan Arab American National Newspaper, 21 April 2009, available at www.watan.com/en/the-community/486-obama-appoints-the-first-muslim-american-woman-head-of-galup-as-advisor.html [accessed 20.10.2009]


416 ‘Links to Islamic militants probed’, The Times Education Supplement, 1 February 2002; see also ‘Muslim teachers website storm;
Khilafah and Al Muhajiroun have been banned in the Middle East, not for inciting racial hatred but for calling for the establishment of a true Islamic State in place of the current dictatorial Muslim regimes.417

Establishing Forums to Propagate Hizb ut-Tahrir Ideology on UK Campuses

HTB’s student activism is perhaps the best documented of HT’s activities in the UK. HTB targets British Muslims at further education colleges and institutions of higher education, capitalising on students’ freedom and openness to new political and social ideas. HTB’s early – and openly discriminatory – activism in the 1990s under Bakri was well documented in mainstream media and academic circles.418 Similarly, the National Union of Students (NUS) and the National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education actively campaigned against the group.419 In response to attempts by student unions to censure HTB, the party began operating through front organisations including the ‘1924 Committee’ at SOAS and the ‘Muslim Education Society’ at University College London.420

Former HTB members attest that in the late 1990s and early 2000s party activists worked on some campuses to control Islamic societies (ISOCs); by getting HTB members elected to university Islamic Society (ISOC) committees, the party sought to impose its agenda and ideologies on other Muslim students.421 Similarly, Maajid Nawaz has spoken about how, as a young HTB activist at Newham VI Form College, he campaigned to get fellow HTB activists elected to the student union. Once under the party’s control, the union then began, he said, ‘[its] mission to recruit everyone in this college to Islamism’.422

HTB was banned entirely by the NUS in 2004. Since then, the party has still tried to influence ISOCs: Bradford University ISOC, for example, was allegedly run by HTB until recently.423 However, the party appears to be implementing HT’s strategy directives to ‘shake up the capitalist system and start debates about it’ and ‘show the inability of the capitalist system to solve so-

---

417 Ibid
419 ‘Campus fears over “anti-Semitic” lecturer’, Observer, 17 March 1996; see also ‘Islamic extremist threat to gays’, The Times Higher Education Supplement, 16 August 1996
420 President of the University of London Union, which ejected HTB from freshers’ events, said: ‘The group were parading under the name of the Muslim Education Society. They were displaying leaflets which are normally distributed by Hizb ut-Tahrir and we found leaflets with the Hizb ut-Tahrir logo on being delivered to the stand in boxes.’ See ‘Extremists disrupt freshers fairs’, The Times Higher Education Supplement, 13 October 1995
421 Rashad Ali, former HTB national executive committee member, states that the party targeted ISOCs and that he ‘regularly visited and spoke at least a dozen universities promoting Islamist thought’. However, it should be noted that just as HT ideology is regarded as a deviancy from Islam by the majority of British Muslims, many ISOCs shun HTB and its activists, and in some instances have actively campaigned against the group. After an HTB event on its campus in 1994 the SOAS ISOC published the following disclaimer: ‘We in no way condone any racist remarks alleged to have been made at this event, nor support the inflammatory pre-publicity.’ See ‘Don’t deny campus radicalisation’, Guardian: Comment is Free, 6 December 2008, available at www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/dec/06/islam-religion-edmunds [accessed 28.08.2009]; see also Hitler’s heirs incite Islamic students; Observer, 13 March 1994
422 See ‘In and out of Islamism’, a talk by Maajid Nawaz to City Circle 3 November 2007, video (part 2 of 4), available at www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Wh9m8dE5_A&feature=related [accessed 28.08.2009]
423 Rashad Ali, ‘Don’t deny campus radicalisation’, Guardian: Comment is Free
cial problems’ on UK campuses. In contrast to their early aggressively titled events, the party now organises more mainstream-sounding debates designed to present HT’s Islamism as an “intellectual” alternative to liberalism, secularism and capitalism.

In May 2008, for example, HTB organised a debate, ‘Is secularism right?’, featuring Birmingham University Professor of Sociology John Holmwood and HTB member Shareef Hafezi. Although the event was not held on the Birmingham University campus, it was widely advertised to the student body by Yasmin Patel, the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Students’ Officer for Birmingham University’s Guild of Students 2008/09. Patel allegedly emailed students in her capacity as BME officer encouraging them to attend, including a poster which stated that the debate was organised and hosted by HTB.424 This is despite HTB being subject to both the NUS ‘No Platform’ policy which Birmingham University’s Guild of Students had ratified that year.425 HTB tactics enabled the party to engage with Birmingham students despite the NUS ban, legitimise HTB by sharing a platform with a respected member of Birmingham’s academic community, and present “Islam” – i.e. HT ideology – in opposition to secularism.

In recent years HTB’s tactics on UK campuses have become more sophisticated and the party continues to operate covertly through front groups. One apparent group, the Ideological Society (IS), was recently established at Queen Mary university (QM). The group has adopted HT’s “intellectual” approach, by presenting the perceived failings of current societal systems and presenting HT’s Islamist worldview as ‘alternative values’. The group, which has a website and a Facebook page,426 held its inaugural event, ‘Broken Britain’, in October 2009 in a QM building.427 In its promotional material for the event, IS said:

Our aim is to provoke thought and debate about the issues that face society today in what has become known as ‘Broken Britain’. […] In our first event, we will discuss how these problems can be related to the prevailing values in society, and what alternative values can overcome these issues.428

Such problems and others are symptoms of a liberal value based society. We offer the chance to examine the flaws of these liberal values.429

424 ‘Birmingham professor speaks at extremist Islamic group debate’, Birmingham Post, 13 May 2008
425 The Birmingham University Guild of Students 2008 agenda reiterated the NUS ‘No Platform policy’, stating:
   ‘Annual Conference 2004 voted to include Hizb ut-tahrir to the NUS No Platform Policy.
   1. Racism in all its manifestations is unacceptable.
   2. Islam should not be defined by Conference as it is the property of Muslim students.
   3. Hizb ut-tahrir and Al-Muhajiroun are two of the largest Islamist extremist groups in the United Kingdom.
   4. Hizb ut-tahrir (HUT), Al-Muhajiroun (AM) and the Muslim Public Affairs Committee (MPAC) are responsible for supporting
terrorism and publishing material that incites racial hatred.
   5. MPAC are holocaust deniers, are constantly publishing anti-Semitic conspiracy theories, inciteful racist material and
   material inciting activists to break the law through their website.’
Available at guildofstudents.com/files/Draft_agenda_Dec.doc [accessed 29.08.2009]
426 QM Ideological Society website, available at www.ideologicalqmu.wordpress.com/ [accessed 13.10.2009]; see also
d=559255467.2357718205.1
428 The Ideological Society – Fresher’s Invitation Event; QM Ideological Society website, 22 September 2009, available at
[accessed 13.10.2009]
429 ‘Broken British ideology; QM Ideological Society website, 5 October 2009 www.ideologicalqmu.wordpress.com/2009/10/05/
britains-broken-ideology/ [accessed 13.10.2009]
There is no contact information, other than a generic email address, on the IS website. However, the group also uses the social networking site Facebook, which lists Mohammad Abdul Basir as the group’s “creator”. Basir’s personal Facebook profile picture is HTB’s logo. Basir has also started the Facebook group ‘We BELIEVE in ONE UMMAH – Not Nationalism’, which uses a logo titled “al-Khilafah” as its profile picture, and states:

We are One Ummah with One Book and One Aqeedah which needs One State AL KHILAFAH. A State with Islamic Law that emanates from the Islamic Aqeedah. […] All we need now is a sincere Islamic leadership that that will implement Islam, unite the Muslims countries, protect the Muslim lands and carry Islam to the rest of Mankind and then truly will the Muslims rejoice.430

The IS facebook page was created at the beginning of the academic year 09/10; at the time of writing this report Basir had only posted information about the ‘Broken Britain’ event.431 On his other group, ‘We BELIEVE in ONE UMMAH – Not Nationalism’, which appears to have been created in May 2009, Basir has posted a number of links to HTB’s website, uploaded HTB videos and advertised HTB’s 2009 Khilafah Conference in London. On 1 June 2009 Bashir wrote on the group’s comments section, known as the “wall”:432

Muslims should not want our brothers in Pak [Pakistan] army to leave, rather what we should want is for them to change their ways, repent and establish Khilafah so that they can then fight and remove the American soldiers from Pakistan, Afganistan and the wider region. If we have sincere Muslims leaving the army, then u will just have the ones who disobey Allah (swt) in power and they will continue in their aggression towards the Muslims of Pakistan. O sincere soldiers in the Pakistan army! Is there not one Sa’ad ibn Mu’adh among you, who will give the Nusrah to Hizb ut Tahrir so that we may establish Khilafah.433

As well as creating front organisations, the party appears to be adopting a policy of using “front” individuals to propagate its brand of Islamism.434 The authors believe that one such individual is Hamza Andreas Tzortzis from the Hittin Institute, which describes itself as:

A research-based initiative that seeks to present Islam, Islamic history and heritage and shed indispensable light on the mechanisms of the Islamic system in its history and in both current and future applicability.435

Whilst Tzortzis obfuscates the issue of his association with HTB, one former party member at-
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430 ‘We BELIEVE in ONE UMMAH – Not Nationalism’ facebook group [accessed 13.10.2009]
431 At the time of writing the group had 119 members, one wall post and one link to the IS website.
432 The Facebook ‘wall’ is the primary means of public communication between friends and within groups over Facebook. Members of Facebook may pass on messages, videos, images and links to friends or other group members by posting them on the Facebook ‘wall’.
434 ‘Islamic group in secret plan to recruit UK students’, Independent, 4 September 2005
435 Whilst the Hittin Institute is not affiliated with HTB, the content of its website echoes the separatist worldview of HT, specifically its advocacy of Islam’s incompatibility with liberal democracy and the need for an Islamist state based on divine law to solve domestic social problems. See www.hittininstitute.com/ [accessed 1.09.2009]
tests to his previous involvement in the organisation and suggest that he may have distanced himself from the party in order to give him and his organisation plausible deniability. 436 In April 2008 Tzortzis wrote to the Centre for Social Cohesion to invite a representative to participate in a panel discussion on community cohesion in East London. The email, signed from Tzortzis, was sent from info@hizb-towerhamlets.org. In 2006 Tzortzis was Deputy Chairman of the Hackney Muslim Organisation (HMO), a now inactive community group. HMO organised a fundraising dinner in August of that year for Interpal, where Tzortzis gave a platform to and spoke alongside Taji Mustafa. 437

Tzortzis speaks regularly at events organised by HTB, advocating the Islamist belief that Islam is a divinely-inspired political system and therefore superior to liberal democracy which is man-made. For example, in a video posted on the party’s website of an HTB event in Central London in April 2008, Tzortzis is recorded saying:

It’s a very real, very rational argument that the Quran can only be from the creator. And these are arguments that we need to develop, that we need to research, in order to discuss, ideologically, with the non-Muslims, to show to them that Islam does not have to be defended. And I am not here today to defend Islam in any shape or form. When they mention democracy and secularism, they say why these are enlightened values? They don’t justify their belief and nor should we in some cases, why should we justify what Allah (SWT) says when we must cut the hand of the thief with all these conditions, why would we justify the social system?

[…]

Our deen, our aqeedah is based on something that is real that is rational and that is proven. Whereas their aqeedah and their manifestations of their aqeedah is based on something weak, based on the compromise, and something that can be easily refuted. 438

At a February 2008 HTB event in Whitechapel, HTB reports that Tzortzis urged his Muslim-majority audience to:

Embark on an intellectual path of dawah to the non-Muslims in the UK, thus enable them to understand why Muslims are trying so hard to end the chaos in the Muslim lands and establish the Islamic Khilafah State there. 439

436 According to HTB former member A, who further attests that members of HT are not allowed to deny their membership.
Tzortzis also speaks regularly on UK campuses, presenting the failings of “Western” ideologies, specifically liberalism, and positing an Islamist state and shariah law as a diametrically opposed and legitimate alternative. Tzortzis’ blog details recent university debates which reflect this oppositional paradigm: ‘This House Believes Islam is the Only Intellectual and Political Challenge to Secular Liberalism’ (QM university, 10 July 2008); ‘Islam & Secular Liberalism: Which One Makes More Sense?’ (University of East London (UEL), 13 September 2008); ‘Has Freedom of Speech Gone Too Far?’ (UEL, 8 November 2008; ‘Islam & Democracy’ (University of Bristol International Affairs Society, 18 November 2008); ‘Islam or Liberalism: Which is the Way Forward?’ (London School of Economics, 23 January 2009).

In March 2009, for example, Tzortzis spoke at an event, ‘Islamic Law – Barbaric or Misunderstood?’, hosted by the Birmingham University Guild of Students. Tzortzis was given an unopposed platform by Yasmin Patel, the BME officer who had advertised an HTB event the year before. Echoing HT’s 2005 strategy directives – ‘show the inability of the capitalist system to solve social problems’ – Patel advertised the event on her blog:

The event considered the term Shariah (and its partner-term ‘extremism’) and considered some key questions: do we really know what Shariah stands for or what role it has to play? Is it a system of barbaric harsh punishments that suppresses people and oppresses women? Or is Shariah far from that and rather a solution to social breakdown?

The event included discussions about ‘Terrorism (Crossing the Limits)’, whether religion does more harm than good and whether multiculturalism has failed. Based on his recent work, Hamza Andreas Tzortzis contrasted the ability of liberal and Islamic models in solving social problems.

Patel’s blog also links to a video of the event on YouTube, hosted by “Fazzamin”, a user who claims to represent Nahda Productions, which is described as ‘a unit that monitors international media on matters to do with the Revival of the Muslim masses’. The domain name given for Nahda Productions (1ummah1state.com) belongs to HT Pakistan and the website (www.1ummah1state.com) hosts press releases and videos of HT Pakistan’s March 2009 conference.

Gaining the Support of Islamist Groups and Muslim Organisations in the UK

HTB has successfully gained the tacit support of less radical Islamist organisations as well as Muslim groups in the UK which normally would not engage with or support HTB. The party has created the impression that HT’s ideology is synonymous with Islam, that criticism of HTB...
is symptomatic of the West’s ‘War on Islam’, and that therefore it is incumbent upon Muslims in the UK to defend HTB. The statements of support for the party from other organisations following criticism of HTB echo the party’s strategic narrative that places HT as the vanguard of Islam in the face of Western “oppression” and increased Islamophobia. The extent to which HTB has been successful is evident in the responses of Muslim organisations to the government’s decision to investigate the party for possible proscription in August 2005, and the Federation of Student Islamic Societies’ (FOSIS) – an umbrella group for ISOCs – condemnation of the NUS ‘No Platform’ policy in 2004.

In August 2005, Blair announced a raft of anti-terrorism measures in the wake of the 7/7 London bombings, which included the possible proscription of HTB. In response, 38 Muslim groups and individuals signed a six point statement, entitled ‘Unprecedented Muslim Community Response to Proposed Anti-Terrorism Measure’. Amongst the six points was a defence of HTB:

The proposal to ban the non-violent organisation Hizb ut-Tahrir is, in our view, unwarranted, unjust and unwise, and runs counter to all the principles which Western democracies are currently trying to promote abroad. Any disagreement with a political organisation must be expressed through debate not censorship. Whatever objections one may have to someone else’s point of view, we must uphold their right to hold and articulate those views. If it is suggested that any laws have been broken by any individuals or groups then this must be proven by due legal process. Criminalising the mere possession of certain opinions is the hallmark of dictatorships, not democracies.

The full list of Muslim groups and individuals who signed the statement shows that HTB had managed to engender widespread defence, if not support, from within British Muslim communities across social, political and cultural affiliations. It is important to note that the ban was opposed by members of the police force as well as a number of human rights campaigners primarily on the grounds that proscription would contravene civil liberties, drive extremism underground and damage community relations. However, the six point statement presents HTB as an unequivocally ‘non-violent […] political organisation’, giving the party further legitimacy within both British Muslim communities and wider British society.

The then MCB Secretary-General, Iqbal Sacranie, also opposed the ban, saying:

---

444 The six points were: ‘The term extremism has no tangible legal meaning or definition and is therefore unhelpful and emotive; The right of people anywhere in the world to resist invasion and occupation is legitimate; Questioning the legitimacy of the State of Israel is legitimate political expression; The proposal to ban the non-violent organisation Hizb ut-Tahrir is unwarranted, unjust and unwise; Arbitrary closure of mosques may prevent legitimate political discourse in mosques fuelling a radical sub-culture; Deporting foreign nationals to countries known for gross human rights abuses is abhorrent.’ See ‘Full text: Joint statement from Muslim groups’, Guardian, 16 August 2005, available at www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/aug/16/uksecurity.terrorism1 [accessed 2.09.2009]
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446 Mainstream Muslim organisations and progressive individuals (Q-News and Dr Usama Hasan), socially conservative Wahabbis (Haitham Haddad) and the MB and JI-inspired Islamists (MAB and Islamic Forum Europe) were all signatories to the six point statement.


Banning Hizb ut-Tahrir is certainly not the solution and may well prove to be counterproductive. We understand that Hizb ut-Tahrir in the United Kingdom are an avowedly non-violent group.

The statement then reveals the extent to which HTB had successfully presented the party as a legitimate Islamic organisation. HTB was under investigation for support for terrorism and violence. Sacranie, however, politicises the issue by misrepresenting the grounds for a possible ban, alluding instead to HT’s activities in autocratic countries:

In addition, we are seeking clarification from the government to ensure that expressions of support for people who are living under brutal military occupation is not to be outlawed. That would be completely unacceptable […] To prohibit support for oppressed peoples would make us complicit in the injustice.

By presenting HTB as acting in defence of the rights of Muslims globally, the MCB statement equates HTB activism with support for the rights of oppressed people, ignoring the inherent violence in HT ideology and the group’s support for terrorist movements. Such support from a then influential British Muslim organisation like the MCB in 2005 lends legitimacy to HT’s ‘War on Islam’ mindset, which is now openly propagated by senior members of the MCB.

FOsis has also supported HTB on a number of occasions. Signatory to the six point statement in response to the 2005 proposed anti-terrorism measures, FOSIS responded, like the MCB, with whom they are affiliated, by portraying HTB as a legitimate political party. The FOSIS statement further bolstered HTB’s vision of itself as the party defending Muslims worldwide:

Mr. Blair needs to clarify whether he aims to silence the voices that support Palestinians’ struggle for freedom and other peoples’ struggles against brutality and occupation around the world.

FOsis has been consistently vocal in its support for HTB against the NUS’s ‘No Platform’ policy. FOsis condemned the motion passed at the NUS 2004 annual conference extending its ‘No platform’ policy to HTB as well as AM and the Muslim Public Affairs Committee UK (MPAC), an antisemitic fringe pressure group. Whilst FOSIS was not alone in its concern, its press

449 ‘Blair extremism measures: reaction’, BBC News
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451 In 2005 the MCB was seen as a significant interlocutor between the government and British Muslim communities. Since then, however, the MCB’s prominence decreased as the government increasingly engaged with a wider variety of Muslim organisations. The MCB lost government support in January 2009 after it was revealed that its Deputy Secretary-General, Daud Abdullah, signed a statement supporting attacks on British navy forces in the event of deployment off the coast of Gaza during the Israel-Gaza conflict. However, it appears that the MCB have started to regain the government’s ear following the Labour government’s Cabinet reshuffle in June 2009.
454 Some NUS delegates raised legitimate concerns about widening the ‘No Platform’ policy (originally introduced to combat
release feeds off HTB’s alarmist narrative of an institutional ‘War on Islam’, bolstering the impression created by HTB that all Muslims are being targeted. The statement said:

Today the NUS has chosen to condemn the Muslim Public Affairs Committee, Al-Muhajiroun and Hizb ut-Tahrir: will tomorrow be the Muslim Council of Britain? The Muslim Association of Britain? Or even FOSIS?

FOSIS would like to take this opportunity to remind Muslim students that should they ever face instances of Islamophobia, they should contact us and let us know so that together we can address what is becoming an increasing problem.

Furthermore, at the 2006 annual NUS conference, FOSIS supported a motion to revert the ‘No Platform’ policy on HTB. The motion, proposed by SOAS and Middlesex University student unions, stated:

1. A motion passed at 2004’s NUS annual conference falsely accused the Islamic political party Hizb ut-Tahrir (HT) of being racist and extremist. During the debate at conference, HT was wrongly accused of organising an event to celebrate the attacks in New York.

2. HT rejects all forms of racism and discrimination.

3. HT is an intellectual and political entity that seeks to change people’s thoughts through intelligent discussion and debate.

4. Contrary to allegations of sexism and racism, HT has members from both sexes and different races and who came from Christian, Hindu, Sikh, Jewish and Atheist backgrounds.


6. This motion led to a noticeable rise in Islamophobia on campus.

7. The NEC [National Executive Committee] rightly opposed the state ban of non-violent groups such as HT.

8. Government proposals to ban non-violent Islamist organisations such as Hibz ut-Tahrir (HT), combined with the failure to address the fascist BNP [British National Party] reveal the hypocrisy and Islamophobia behind the ‘anti-terror’ measures.

9. There is a mass support from a wide range of organisations against the possible state ban on HT, including FOSIS, The Muslim Association of Britain, The Muslim Council of Britain, Respect, Stop the War Coalitions, Yvonne Ridley and others.

far-right rhetoric) on the basis of the right to freedom of speech and community relations.

455 AM disbanded later that year to avoid proscription and its two successor groups, al-Ghurabaa and Saved Sect were banned under the 2006 Terrorism Act for glorification of terrorism. See Appendix A of this report.


457 It is likely Yvonne Ridley was seen as representing the Islam Channel. See motion 714, Motions Annual Conference, NUS, 28-
A key strand of HTB’s post-2005 strategy is to mainstream political Islam whilst downplaying HT’s intolerant ideology. The success of this strategy, exemplified by the HTB slogan 'keep your ideology in your heart', is borne out in this 2006 ‘No Platform’ motion. It is important to note that the points regarding HT (2-5) misrepresent its ideology and can be refuted using the party’s constitution, literature and statements. The motion presents HTB as a non-violent and inclusive political party. Furthermore, the motion legitimises HTB as the vanguard of Islam in the UK. By equating criticism or censorship of HTB with “Islamophobia”, the motion conflates HT’s Islamism and members with Islam and Muslims. This is most apparent in the proposed resolutions:

1. To work actively with FOSIS against Islamophobia on campus and seek to reduce the fear element of Muslims seeking to promote Islam on campus.
2. To remove Hizb ut-Tahrir from NUS’s no platform policy.
3. To criticise the publications of the Islamophobic cartoons and the racist media coverage that followed.

Whilst the motion to revert the ‘No Platform’ decision was rejected, the party was actively supported by FOSIS, who had 120 candidates elected to the NUS conference making it the single biggest faction that year. It was reported that many of the students protesting at the conference – wearing T-shirts in support of HTB and handing out HTB literature – were FOSIS delegates. The 2006 FOSIS president Wakkas Khan told the Guardian newspaper that whilst not supporting the party in principle, FOSIS supported their right to be heard:

I’m not going to say I’d prefer it if Hizb ut-Tahrir didn’t get on to our executive. Isn’t that democracy in action? If Hizb ut-Tahrir became the most well-oiled political group on campus, and persuaded our 90,000 members – well, that’s democracy in action. What we’re saying is not that we agree with Hizb ut-Tahrir. We’re saying we support their right to exist and have their voice heard. The view that Fosis has been infiltrated by Hizb ut-Tahrir is an ignorant one. The simple fact is that all Muslim students have got a lot more organised.

The party’s 2005 ‘keep your ideology in your heart’ strategy was successful: HTB was able to downplay its intolerant ideology, present itself as a political Muslim organisation and, as a
result, gain legitimacy through its support from British Muslim organisations, many of whom would not normally have engaged with the party.
Mainstreaming Islamism – Activism within wider British Society

HTB has worked actively to reform its negative image within wider British society. Public reaction to HTB in the first half of this decade is in stark contrast to how the party was received in the mid-1990s. For example, in 1995 the NUS published a survey based on calls received by Campus Watch, a 24-hour hotline set up in conjunction with the anti-fascist organisation Searchlight. Reporting that over 70% of the calls received concerned HTB activism against Jews, Hindus and homosexuals, the NUS and the Association of University Teachers called on the Department for Education and Employment and the Home Office to ban HTB. The then-President of the NUS, referred to HTB as ‘the single biggest extremism threat in the UK at the moment’. Mainstream media reporting incidents of HTB activity on campuses habitually referred to the group as ‘Muslim fundamentalist’ or ‘Islamic extremists’.461

By contrast, in 2002 press coverage of the revived HTB annual conference referred to HTB as a ‘Muslim political party’.462 By 2003 the Birmingham Post reported an HTB conference on shariah-based economics as though it were a mainstream financial conference. The paper reported:

Thousands of Muslim professionals will debate financial systems, values and ethics at a national conference in Birmingham. [...] Organised by Hizb ut-Tahrir, an Islamic political party, the conference will outline the major dilemma millions of Muslims face dealing with economic and financial transactions in the context of a Western capitalist system.463

Furthermore, after quoting one of the conference speakers as saying ‘Muslims in Britain no longer should feel compelled to enter into prohibited economic transactions motivated by Western liberal values of materialism and individualism’, the paper then went on to “objectively” report that:

Muslims in Britain and throughout the world aspire to carry out their financial affairs in accordance with the principles of Islamic law. Muslims are forbidden from obtaining the various conventional mortgage and insurance products and services in the forms currently offered due to their incompatibility with the principles of Islamic law.464

Such disparity shows how HTB successfully managed to portray the party as representative of British Muslim communities to the media. Since then, the party has continued to mainstream

464 ‘Muslims are set for conference’, The Birmingham Post.
its ideology and prescriptions for British Muslims, targeting politicians, civic institutions, local councils as well as mainstream broadcast and print media. HTB has also deliberately downplayed its intolerant Islamist ideology, by using euphemistic language in mainstream media as well as party literature and leaflets, and working in conjunction with other Muslim groups on wider issues.

Engaging with Politicians, Civic Institutions, Local Councils and the Media

Following the 9/11 attacks, HTB began mainstreaming its political ideology by engaging with influential political figures and commentators. HTB follows the party’s 2005 strategy communiqué directive – ‘show the inability of the capitalist system to solve social problems’ – by presenting its “Islamic” system as a credible solution. A 2009 HTB booklet claims:

Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain has interacted and continues to interact with many non-Muslim intellectuals, politicians and media personalities to explain the work for Khilafah and how Islam can address many of the global problems facing humanity today.465

The party relied on this strategy to defend itself against later calls to proscribe the party. In response to the 2005 proposed anti-terrorism measures which included a ban on HTB, the party issued a statement which included:

In Britain the party has attracted to its ranks men and women, young and old, from different walks of life and from different ethnicities. Its activities including conferences, seminars and roundtable discussions, have been attended by thousands of people. Annual conferences have been attended by in excess of 10,000 people. In recent times we have held panel discussions with non-Muslim politicians, thinkers and personalities including Roger Mosey, Edwina Currie, Peter Hitchens, Clive Crook and Michael Gove, amongst others.466

HTB is referring to debates hosted by the ‘Dialogue with Islam’ forum, an organisation founded in 2004 which describes itself as a ‘dedicated platform whose sole aim is to provide a bridge of understanding and discussion between the Western Intellectuals [sic] and the Muslim community in Britain.’467 The forum attracts senior political figures, including cabinet and shadow cabinet ministers, as well as leading commentators and opinion formers from across the mainstream media. Whilst the authors of this report do not believe that Dialogue for Islam is a front group for HTB, the forum has, however, invited senior HTB members to participate, including UK Executive Chairman Abdul Wahid, Taji Mustafa and Head of Legal

465 Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, A positive agenda for Muslims in Britain, p.21
466 ‘Press Statement from Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain’, 6 August 2005
467 See www.dialoguewithislam.org/about_us.htm [accessed on 3.09.2009]
Affairs Jamal Harwood. The forum appears to be sympathetic to Islamist or conservative interpretations of Islam:

For the Muslim panel we tend to go for Islamists [sic] Thinkers or Orthodox Traditionalists. As we believe that there is very little discussion in this space and it is most likely to bear the most fruit, as this is making a conversation between those of often differing viewpoints rather than simply facilitating a conversation between like-minded people.

Dialogue for Islam has defended giving a platform to HTB members, stating:

We believe in constructive debate and engagement between Western society and some of the viewpoints carried by the afore-mentioned groups and others. Our conditions are that there be no breach of the law, and that there is a minimal level of civilised debate [...] In any case Groups such as those mentioned above are already given ample of [sic] publicity by global Media outlets such BBC, CNN, Al-Jazeera.

HTB is given legitimacy through Dialogue for Islam's public platforms as the forum states that it tries ‘to get speakers who have substantial following [sic] and have expertise on the topic at hand’. This lends credibility to HT’s revolutionary Islamist ideology.

In the aftermath of the 7/7 London bombings the party further attempted to mainstream its ideology by engaging with Members of Parliament (MPs). For example, following the potential ban on HTB, party representatives petitioned the then Cabinet Minister Clare Short, MP for Ladywood in Birmingham, and secured a platform in the House of Commons in 2006 at an event hosted by Short. In a letter inviting MPs to meet HTB representatives, Short claimed that the organisation ‘explicitly rejects the use of violence’. However, when members of the public protested and asked about the party’s views on Jews and homosexuals, on the strength of which the NUS banned HTB, Short said: ‘I must admit I haven’t done a lot of research. [...] I understand they regret that’. Her spokeswoman released a statement saying:

She has simply facilitated this meeting, so that parliamentarians can decide for themselves whether or not this organisation should be banned. She holds no brief for them at all. But she believes it is only right that parliamentarians are able to discuss such a serious decision and decide together.

It was later revealed that HTB had also engaged in dialogue with the Conservative party that year. Jamal Harwood had written to the leader of the opposition David Cameron in August 2006 thanking him for his criticism of the Israeli bombardment of Lebanon. A member of

468 Harwood, for example, spoke alongside Lord Norman Lamont, former Chancellor of the Exchequer 1990-1993, Sheikh Hassan Ali Imam and founder of Ebrahim College in East London; and Mathew D’Ancona, Deputy Editor of Sunday Telegraph, at an event at QM university in 2005. See ‘Previous events’, Dialogue for Islam website, see www.dialoguewithislam.org/previous_events.htm [accessed 3.09.2009]
469 See www.dialoguewithislam.org/about_us.htm
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Cameron’s office responded, writing:

David is most grateful to you for your comments on relationships between western governments and the Muslim world. He fully takes on board the points put across to him. Your comments are noted and appreciated.473

The letter came to light after Cameron questioned the current Prime Minister Gordon Brown in July 2007 over why the government had not proscribed HTB. In response Imran Wahid relied on Cameron’s communication with Harwood to criticise the Opposition’s inconsistent policy:

Many will find it remarkably hypocritical and opportunistic that less than a year ago, Cameron was expressing his gratitude for our comments on Israel’s bombardment of Lebanon, yet now he calls for our banning.474

HTB also sought to mainstream its ideology by participating in local council-sponsored events. For example, in February 2008 Abdul Wahid was given a platform at a London Borough of Tower Hamlets-funded debate organised by the Cordoba Foundation on whether political participation has failed British Muslims.475 Following HT’s 2005 strategy communiqué directives, namely to ‘show the inability of the capitalist system to solve social problems’ and ‘expose the collapse of the Western tenets of democracy and freedom, especially after 9/11’, Wahid argued in favour of rejecting democracy, advocating:

- Muslims should work outside the political system and concentrate on grassroots initiatives;
- Muslim MPs involved in mainstream politics are ‘selling out’ their morals and principles by not defending shariah law;
- The UK’s moral crisis, exemplified by phenomena such as binge-drinking, can only be solved by the institution of ‘Islamic values’;
- Religious obedience is more important than the right to freedom of speech.476

473 ‘Hypocrite: Wednesday Cam blasts Brown for not banning extremists Yesterday revealed: He wrote them a polite thank you letter’, The Mirror, 6 July 2007
474 ‘Hypocrite: Wednesday Cam blasts Brown for not banning extremists Yesterday revealed: He wrote them a polite thank you letter’, The Mirror
475 The Cordoba Foundation (CF), an Islamist pressure group founded by Anas al-Tikriti, had received a grant of £19,000 from Tower Hamlets Council Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Fund to organise a series of debates, of which this was one. However, following CF’s unwillingness to disinvite Abdul Wahid Tower Hamlets Council withdrew its support and funding of the event. CF received a total of £38,000 from the Tower Hamlets Prevent scheme. In March 2009, the then Communities and Local Government Minister Sadiq Khan confirmed in the House of Commons that Tower Hamlets Council has since withdrawn all funding for CF and that this is the only example to date of Prevent funding contracts ‘being withdrawn or terminated’. See ‘Controversial Hizb ut-Tahrir debate to go ahead after all’, East London Advertiser, 22 February 2008; see also House of Commons Hansard written answers for 18 March 2009, available at www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmhansrd/cm090318/text/90318w0009.htm [accessed 4.09.2009]
476 ‘Muslim pressure group wins anti-democracy vote’, East London Advertiser, 27 February 2008
PART III: STRATEGY IN THE WEST

Wahid secured further legitimacy for HTB by speaking at the London Muslim Centre (LMC), one of the largest Islamist institutions in the UK, attached to the East London Mosque.\(^{477}\) The LMC has also received substantial public funding, including from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, London Development Agency, the Department for Communities and Local Government’s Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder fund and the European Union.\(^{478}\)

An earlier HTB community event also typifies the HT strategy of presenting HT’s totalitarian Islamist state as the answer to social problems in the UK. In October 2003, HTB organised a panel discussion on the effects of drugs in the local community. Among the panellists was Amir Kabal, Director of the East Staffordshire Racial Equality Council and local magistrate. The event was part of HTB’s ‘national anti-drug programme’. According to an HTB press release advertising the event:

> The motivation for the consumption of drugs emanates from the Capitalist viewpoint on life that makes maximum sensual gratification the object in life.\(^{479}\)

HTB’s invitation to Kabal mirrors the tactic used by the HTB youth team when they invited a local councillor to an event to ‘make it look like HT members are role models’.\(^{480}\) A 2009 HTB booklet reveals that this tactic is part of a wider long term strategy for engaging with young British Muslims:

> On a practical level Hizb ut-Tahrir has been working amongst the younger generations for many years. Through our youth projects, circles and talks many young people have been led away from lives of drugs and lewdness to the beauty of Islam.\(^{481}\)

Recent HTB media tactics echo the party’s engagement with MPs and political institutions. Between 1996 and the early 2000s, HTB members were reluctant to talk to journalists about party membership or funding.\(^{482}\) More recently, however, HTB has sought platforms – both open and covert – within the mainstream British press. Post 7/7, HTB members have regularly been given a right to reply and been provided with public platforms on influential BBC current affairs programmes including Radio 4’s the Today Programme, BBC Two’s Newsnight.

---

\(^{477}\) The LMC is an Islamist-friendly venue which hosts many British Muslim organisations inspired by the Islamist group JI. During the 1990s LMC affiliated with groups such as the Young Muslim Organisation and actively campaigned against HTB’s influence in East London (see Husain, *The Islamist*). That the LMC is now giving HTB a platform therefore lends the party legitimacy within less radical Islamist circles in the UK.


\(^{479}\) Kabal, who did not stay for the duration of the event, was unaware of HTB’s political motives and only learnt of the group’s agenda when his presence was reported in the media. See ‘Raceboss duped’, *The Burton Mail*, 21 October 2003

\(^{480}\) Written testimony from HTB former activists C & D.

\(^{481}\) Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, *A positive agenda for Muslims in Britain*, p.14

\(^{482}\) A 2004 investigative piece for the *Guardian* reported that: ‘until recently, the leadership of Hizb was secretive and cautious, reluctant to release details of the scale of its membership, its leadership structure or its funding […] in a sign that the group is changing direction, it has given the *Guardian* unprecedented access to its leadership.’ See “The west needs to understand it is inevitable: Islam is coming back”: Faisal al Yafai talks to Britain’s most radical Islamic group, banned across the Middle East, about faith, defiance and the future’, *Guardian*, 11 November 2004
and BBC News 24. Taji Mustafa, for example, was interviewed in March 2009 by the BBC’s Today programme in response to the then Home Secretary Jacqui Smith’s revised counter-terrorism strategy, commonly known as CONTEST 2, where he claimed that Muslims were being demonised for their beliefs:

[...] labelling every Muslim who calls for, or believes in, or supports the idea of a Caliphate – a unifying authority for which the Muslim world…which we think will bring stability – these basic ideas of Islam which enjoy popular support, are now being labelled as beyond the pale – as terrorism.

Other HTB members have appeared on Sky News. Nazreen Nawaz was interviewed in October 2006 in response to comments made by the then Leader of the House of Commons, Jack Straw, on the *niqab*, or face veil. Party members have also been given a platform by mainstream newspapers and online journals. Taji Mustafa, for example, was given a platform by the *Guardian*’s online ‘Comment is Free’ and Abdul Wahid writes for the online journal Open Democracy.

In July 2005, the *Guardian* newspaper terminated its contract with Dilpazier Aslam, a member of its trainee journalist scheme, due to his refusal to withdraw his membership from HTB. A *Guardian* statement said: ‘continuing membership of the organisation [is] incompatible with his continued employment by the company’. The *Guardian* also stated that the paper should have explicitly mentioned Aslam’s affiliation to HTB at the end of his comment piece about British Muslims in the aftermath of the July 7/7 bombings, ‘We will rock the boat’. In the piece, Aslam called on his readers not to act “shocked” at the fact that the attacks were seemingly home-grown, telling them the attacks were an inevitable result of the UK’s US-led foreign policy:

Shocked would also be to suggest that the bombings happened through no responsibility of our own. OK, the streets of London were filled with anti-war marchers, so why punish the average Londoner? But the argument that this was an essentially US-led war does not pass muster. In the Muslim world, the pond that divides Britain and America is a shallow one. And the same cry – why punish us? – is often heard from Iraqi mothers as the “collateral damage” increases daily.

Shocked would be to say that we don't understand how, in the green hills of Yorkshire, a group of men given all the liberties they could have wished for could do this.
Aslam later sued the *Guardian* for unfair dismissal, and the paper paid out without admitting liability – despite the paper claiming to be unaware of Aslam’s membership, colleagues say he was open about it at work.489

In 2004, however, HTB had participated in the *Guardian*’s ‘Focus on Islam’ roundtables, which served as the qualitative basis for the paper’s special report, ‘Young, Muslim and British’. One HTB member, who participated in a discussion entitled ‘What is the impact of the “War on Terror” on British Muslims?’, said in response to a question about the obligation to report political or religious groups intent on violence:

We as the Muslim community need to be the voice of the Muslims abroad, we have failed to do so correctly so far … In my particular view, we have no responsibility to inform on some of the actions of our brothers here supporting what they regard as being just causes abroad.490

The HTB member then went on to disregard the concept of civic duty – ‘I would say to hell with your civic duty’ – and claimed that his party represented a mainstream Muslim view, a claim strongly denied by the other participants. These statements were seen as so potentially damaging by HTB that the party wrote to the *Guardian* claiming that the member’s comments may have been misconstrued and that the party in no way condoned violence or support for terrorism.491

### Downplaying Intolerant Hizb ut-Tahrir Ideology

After adopting the ‘keep your ideology in your heart’ policy in 2005, HTB has repeatedly downplayed its intolerant Islamist ideology. Between late 2005 and early 2006 the party removed the overwhelming majority of HT leaflets from its website. Archived versions of HTB’s former official website (Khilafah.com) shows that on 26 June 2005 and 30 September 2005 HTB hosted 256 leaflets, the oldest of which dates to 20 August 1999.492 Many of the leaflets hosted by HTB were openly antisemitic or anti-Western, with one alleging that the US government was complicit in the 9/11 attacks.493 On 16 March 2006, however, the Khilafah.com website hosted only 30 leaflets, the oldest of which was HTB’s press statement in response to

---

489 ‘Guardian trainee may sue over sacking’, *Independent*, 24 July 2005
491 The following correction was printed in the *Guardian*’s Corrections and Clarifications column, 20 December 2004, and is attached to the online article: ‘The Islamic political party, Hizb ut-Tahrir, has asked us to say that the views of one of its members expressed below may have been misrepresented because his comments were not specifically enough related to the questions to which they applied and may have given the impression that the organisation would turn a blind eye to violence in the UK. The party wants to make it absolutely clear that it does not advocate or engage in violence and that it seeks to change opinion through intelligent discussion and debate. The party strictly adheres to Islamic law in all aspects of its work.’ See www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2004/nov/30/islamandbritain13 [accessed 3.09.2009]
493 ‘Alliance with America is a great crime forbidden by Islam’, Hizb ut-Tahrir Leaflet
the proposed proscription of the party in August 2005. Abdul Wahid explained HTB’s decision to remove controversial material:

The decision to remove some of our overseas literature from our British website was a considered response to the legitimate proposition that people who read it out of its context might see it as offensive.

HTB, therefore, appear to have removed inflammatory material from their website in the aftermath of 7/7 and the government’s proposed proscription, and not because the party has reformed. Maajid Nawaz later confirmed that HTB had deliberately sought to downplay the most combative elements of the party’s foreign policy because it feared proscription.

By contrast, HT Denmark remained vocal and aggressive, yet by 2007 the branch appeared to be moderating its views. In a 2007 interview with a Danish newspaper, however, Nawaz suggested that the recent softening of its image, typified by HT Denmark’s announcement that it would work with Danish Imams on common issues, was no more than the party echoing the tactical shift of its British counterpart. Similarly, HT’s branch in Germany issued a statement in 2002 refuting charges of violence against the party. HT Germany also rejected charges of antisemitism, stating:

We reject decisively the charge of anti-Semitism […] Moreover, it is well known that there is a blood relation between Jews and Arabs; this alone is enough to consider the charge of anti-Semitism ludicrous. However, at the same time we decisively reject Zionism represented in the form of Israel.

HT’s three main European branches have therefore sought to soften their public image, not in response to an ideological shift, but as a defensive reaction to increased scrutiny from their respective governments.

Since 7/7, HTB has been careful to avoid or deflect accusations of extremism. In a 2006 interview on BBC Two’s Newsnight Taji Mustafa said of his party: ‘we don’t ask anybody to commit action of criminality, we do not, in anyway condone criminality’. However, since then leading HTB members have, including Mustafa, have revealed HT’s intolerance. In 2008, during the al-Quds Day rally in Central London, Mustafa indirectly called for the destruction of Israel:

When there is occupation, there is a need for liberation […] We don’t want 5% of Palestine, we don’t want 80% of Palestine, we don’t want 99% of Palestine, we want to liberate the whole of Palestine.
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In January 2009, Imran Wahid addressed a crowd in Marble Arch, Central London, where he rejected any possible peace with Israel and claimed jihad was the only way to solve the current Middle East crisis:

... [T]here is no need for summits, there is no need for conferences, no need for treaties, no need for negotiations, no need for meetings, no need for Doha or Oslo or Madrid or Washington or New York or London or any of these places [where peace meetings have been held in the past]. There will be no peace and no negotiations with the illegitimate entity of Israel which has usurped the Muslim lands... brothers and sisters, they have run out of places to go [for peace talks] ...only one solution to the occupation of Muslim lands, one solution to the cries of the widows and the orphans, one solution to avenge the death of the elderly and the children...fight in the way of Allah those who fight you! al-Jihad!501

Most recently, during the September 2009 al-Quds event, Mustafa shouted to the audience, ‘Must Palestine be liberated? Will Palestine be liberated?’ When the crowd replied positively, Mustafa asked, ‘Would we die for that?’502 Mustafa also said:

The Palestinians don’t need our food [...] what the people of Palestine need, to bring peace, to bring security, to bring justice to the land again, they need the army of the Muslim Ummah503

In general, however, HTB has avoided making extreme statements publically and have instead sought to appear more representative of British Muslims. For example, HTB attempted to engage with other Muslim groups, which it had previously not done. This strategy is exemplified in the party’s recent involvement with other Muslim-led events or initiatives. For example, HTB had a stall at the 2007 Global Peace and Unity conference, an annual two-day conference held at the London’s ExCeL Exhibition Centre organised by the pro-Islamist Islam Channel.504 More recently HTB worked with other Muslim organisations in Hounslow to set up the Hounslow Muslim Forum (HMF). The forum’s inaugural debate, a discussion of the government’s latest counter-extremism strategy, was hosted by a Hounslow state secondary school. The event was also backed by the Metropolitan police – Inspector Alan Murphy of Metropolitan Police Prevent and Engagement Team was due to speak. Panellists included Daud Abdullah, Deputy General of the MCB, and Moazzem Begg, a former Guantanamo Bay detainee who had previously spoken on an HT platform, ‘Muslim Armies Must Defend Gaza’.505 HTB’s engagement strategy failed after a local council leader intervened and asked the school to cancel the event.506 As a result, the HMF expelled HTB from the organisation

www.youtube.com/watch?v=QHeZrlztGKg&feature=player_embedded [accessed 22.10.2009]
503 Ibid
504 Observed by one of the report’s authors, 24-25 November 2007
505 ‘Protesters swamp Edgware Road in Gaza protest’, Hampstead and Highgate Express, 8 January 2009
506 Cllr. Peter Thompson told the local newspaper, Hounslow Chronicle: ‘The use of publicly-owned premises such as your school by groups holding extreme religious, ideological or political views, who aim to create or exploit grievances and community tensions to the detriment of the whole community, should not be permitted.’ See “Muslim Extremist” to speak at Lampton School, Hounslow Chronicle, 9 July 2009
and the event went ahead without Inspector Murphy.507

HTB has similarly attempted to downplay its ideology in the mainstream media as well as in articles published by New Civilisation, the party’s publishing house and online magazine.508 Since 2001 HTB has repeatedly written to newspapers asking for corrections to articles or complained to Ofcom, the national regulatory body for broadcast media. Whilst the party consistently disputes statements that HT is linked to violence or terrorism, HTB also uses euphemistic language to disguise its ideology. For example, in a 2003 letter to The Sun newspaper, Imran Wahid said:

In response to your article of September 15, 2003, headlined “Web call to kill Brits”, I would like to emphasise that Hizb ut-Tahrir is a political party attempting to resume the Islamic way of life by re-establishing the Islamic Caliphate. The work of the party is intellectual and political. The party considers violence or armed struggle against the regime a violation of the Islamic Shari’ah.509

Wahid’s two central claims can be refuted by some HT literature. Wahid states: ‘The work of the party is intellectual and political.’ HT literature, however, states that *jihad* is central to HT’s methodology of expanding the Caliphate.510 Wahid further states: ‘The party considers violence or armed struggle against the regime a violation of the Islamic Shari’ah’. However, HT methodology advocates the re-establishment of the Caliphate through military coups and has stated its willingness to kill “millions” of Muslims in order to then expand its Islamist state.511

HTB also presents the party as non-threatening to British society. For example, in October 2005 Wahid wrote to the Observer, stating:

Our members did not tell Harriet Harman: ‘We’re not part of British society. . . we stay here like guests in a hotel’ (‘When Harriet met Hizb’, Comment, last week), but, rather, explained that Muslims should be active citizens who participate in society while holding on to their Islamic beliefs. Hizb ut-Tahrir seeks the return of the Islamic caliphate in the Muslim world, not the UK, and we envision it to be an independent state with an elected and accountable ruler, an independent judiciary, political parties, the rule of law and equal rights for minority groups. It will be a state that serves the masses and not the corrupt clients of foreign powers.

Contrary to claims of misogyny, women in the caliphate will have full access to education, vote and be encouraged to perform an active role in society. Hizb ut-Tahrir works to direct the sentiments of Muslims about events in the Muslim world into non-violent politics. This channels the anger and frustration with

---

507 ‘Muslim debate goes ahead peacefully’ Hounslow Chronicle, 15 July 2009
508 HTB’s media pack describes Akmal Ashghar as ‘Head of New Civilisation Think Tank’ under the heading ‘Leading UK members of Hizb ut-Tahrir (Following elections in 2008)’. See Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, Media Information Pack, p.11
509 Letters, The Sun, 5 February 2005
510 HT literature states that: ‘The duty of the Islamic State is to implement Islam and execute its rules internally and carrying the *da’wah* for it externally, and that the method for this is *Jihad*, performed by the State.’ See an-Nabhani, *Concepts of Hizb ut-Tahrir*, p.5
511 See pp.20-21 of this report.
Again Wahid’s two further claims can be refuted by HT literature. Wahid states: ‘[The Caliphate is] an independent state with an elected and accountable ruler, an independent judiciary, political parties, the rule of law and equal rights for minority groups.’ HT’s draft constitution, however, confers singular power over the judiciary, foreign relations, the armed forces, and all other state institutions. Wahid states: ‘Women in the caliphate will have full access to education, vote and [are] encouraged to perform an active role in society.’ The draft constitution further imposes medieval interpretations of shariah law within the Caliphate’s social system and regulates gender relations.

Similar euphemistic language can be found in the summer 2005 edition of New Civilisation. HTB member Akmal Asghar’s article, ‘New Caliphate, New Era’, echoes Wahid’s presentation of HT’s Caliphate as a legitimate, non-discriminatory and accountable ruling system. Asghar describes the ruling system in HT’s Islamist state deliberately downplaying many of the intolerant aspects of HT’s draft constitution. For example, Asghar refutes claims that the Caliphate is a theological totalitarian dictatorship, claiming instead that the system is uniquely representative:

The Caliphate, and the legitimacy of the Caliph at its head is based on representation; the principle, “the authority lies with the Ummah”, is a cornerstone of the Islamic ruling system. The Shariah places the original authority of managing the affairs of the people in the hands of the people themselves, but requires them to appoint a head of state to do so on their behalf and so the head of state is legitimate only through popular consent.

Asghar defines popular consent as ‘the process of direct elections or an election by a representative assembly consisting of individuals elected to their respective positions’. The latter refers to the Majlis al-Ummah, or assembly, an elected consultative body within the state. Asghar specifies that all men and women over the age of 15 may vote in the assembly elections. Asghar fails to mention, however, that non-Muslims are only allowed in the assembly to ‘voice their complaints with respect of unjust acts performed by the rulers and/or the misapplication of the Islamic laws upon them’. Non-Muslims, therefore, have no rights in the election of the Caliph and no rights to call for his removal. Furthermore, they are prohibited from becoming the Caliph or taking any positions in government.

Asghar further states that the authority of the Caliph remains conditional upon support from the (Muslim) populace:

512 ‘Comment: Letters to the Editor: A free caliphate’, Observer, 30 October 2005
Once elected, the head of state is bound to an agreement with the people through the bayah contract [...] Authority is at no point transferred to the head of state through the bayah contract and remains permanently with the people. Thus, if the head of state violates any of the terms of the bayah contract, the people can demand, through the independent judiciary, he vacate his post, a point expanded on later.518

The draft constitution, however, stipulates that only judges in the Makhatat al-Mahdhalim, or Court of Unjust Acts, have the authority to dismiss or warn the head of State.519 Asghar states that this “independent” court ‘is presided over by only the most eminent and qualified judges in the state and granted extensive powers by the Shariah’. However, the judiciary is neither representative nor independent: judges must also be Muslim males and are appointed (and dismissed) solely by either the Caliph, or the Qadi al-Qudaa, or Supreme Judge, whom the Caliph appoints.520

Asghar writes that ‘the Caliphate bears no resemblance to a totalitarian state’. The draft constitution, however, states that ‘the Khilafah is the State’ and grants the Caliph command over the armed forces, the judiciary, foreign and diplomatic relations and all other state officials or institutions.521 Asghar writes that ‘the Caliph, as head of state with the responsibility for adopting law, will adopt one opinion to bind society to a set of common standards within a declared legal framework, but that does not prevent further debate and amendment’. The constitution affirms, however, that ‘the Khalifah issues Ahkam Shar’iyah [religious edicts]. When he adopts and implements them, they become laws to be obeyed. They are not to be transgressed’.522

Asghar and Wahid’s euphemistic description of HT’s ideology, methodology and vision for its Caliphate exemplifies the dual message inherent in HT’s activities in the UK. The party has not rescinded its neo-fundamentalist aims. The image it presents to British Muslim communities and wider British society, however, is one of a legitimate Islamic political party.

518 Akmal Asghar, ‘New Caliphate New Era’ New Civilisation
521 Ibid
522 Ibid
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Current Positions

There is no quick fix to the problem of home-grown terrorism, but banning Hizb ut-Tahrir would be an excellent first step, sending a strong signal to aspiring terrorists […] We no longer play that game.

Former HTB activist

My ideal scenario would be not to ban the party [Hizb ut-Tahrir] but it would be that through the power of discussion and persuasion and the strength of challenging thought with thought, that eventually the party would fizzle out in this country and hopefully generally throughout the world.

Former HTB member

HT is currently banned or restricted in 12 countries, primarily in Central Asia, the Middle East and South Asia. In Europe, the party was banned in Germany in January 2003 from engaging in public activity because of its promotion of antisemitism, though membership still remains legal. By contrast, a 2008 investigation in Denmark resulted in a senior state prosecutor advising the Danish government that there was no case to ban the party. Policy makers and commentators in the UK are divided on how to approach HT and whether the party should be proscribed. For some commentators, HT’s Islamism is a legitimate social alternative. For others, it is on the same ideological spectrum as militant Islamism, such as al-Qaeda, and can inspire Islamist terrorism.

In the wake of the 7/7 London bombings in 2005, Blair announced a 12 point security plan which included: ‘to proscribe Hizb-ut Tahrir and the successor organisation of Al Mujahiroun [sic].’ Both groups were already under investigation for links to terrorist activity. While AM successor groups al-Ghurabaa and Saved Sect were proscribed after the Terrorism Act 2006, widening the criteria for proscription to include glorification of terrorism, no action has been taken.

---

523 Ed Husain, May 2007. Husain’s position has, however, changed: as co-Director of the government backed Quilliam Foundation he said: ‘When as Muslim democrats we can defeat HT with arguments, why should we resort to a ban?’ See ‘I know how these terrorists are inspired’, Daily Telegraph, 2 May 2007; see also Ed Husain: You Ask The Questions’, Independent, 14 April 2008


525 As of February 2008, the following 12 countries have banned or placed restrictions on HT: Germany, Russia, Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. See House of Commons Hansard Written Answers, 19 February 2008, c588W, available at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmhansrd/cm070219/text/80219w0026.htm#080220116000816 [accessed 5.09.2009]

526 ‘Islamist group challenges Berlin’s five-year ban in European court’, Guardian, 24 June 2008; see also ‘No ban on Islamist party in Denmark: public prosecutor’, Agence France Presse, 19 June 2008

527 See Peter Mandaville, Transnational Muslim Politics: Reimagining the umma, (London: Routledge, 2001)

528 See Nawaz, The Roots of Violent Islamist Extremism and Efforts to Counter it, p.4

529 Tony McNulty, then Minister of State (Home Office) in House of Commons Written Answers, 22 November 2007, c1072W, available at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmhansrd/cm071122/text/71122w0013.htm#07112251001744 [accessed 5.09.2009]

530 Section 21 of the Terrorism Act 2006 widens the criteria for promotion or encouragement of terrorism contained in the Terrorism Act 2000 to include: ‘(a) the unlawful glorification of the commission or preparation (whether in the past, in the future or generally) of acts of terrorism; or (b) activities which are carried out in a manner that ensures that the organisation is associated with statements containing any such glorification.’ The Act defines glorification as: ‘any form of praise or celebration, and cognate expressions are to be construed accordingly; “statement” includes a communication without words consisting of sounds or images...’
been taken to proscribe HT.

In September 2007, Parmjit Dhanda, Labour MP and the then Parliamentary Undersecretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government, said the government was worried that a ban on HT would end in a propaganda coup for the party if it won a legal challenge in courts. In February 2009, the then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Hazel Blears, stated that HT, ‘falls short of openly advocating violence or terrorism.’ She further said that it would be a mistake to equate groups which share ideology but not violent tactics, such as HT with al-Qaeda, ‘just as it would be intellectually lazy to lump the BNP with Combat 18, or the Socialist Workers’ Party with the Red Army Faction.’ In March 2009, the government confirmed that HT remains under close review.

The Conservative Party, however, maintains that HT is an ‘extremist’ organisation and a ‘conveyor belt to terrorism,’ and it is anticipated that a future Conservative government would ban the party. In March 2008, David Cameron, Conservative Party leader, said:

Hizb-ut-Tahrir is an extremist organisation that poisons the minds of young Muslims against Jews, Christians and other unbelievers. Some of those who have been through its ranks have ended up in Al Qaeda. In short, it is a conveyor belt to terrorism. […] There’s only one responsible course of action. It’s time to close down Hizb-ut-Tahrir.

In October 2008, Pauline Neville-Jones, Shadow Security Minister, said: ‘We will ban Hizb-ut-Tahrir – which has just called for American soldiers in the Gulf to be killed.’ At the October 2009 Conservative Party conference, Shadow Home Secretary Chris Grayling stated: ‘… I will immediately ban Hizb’ut-Tahrir [sic], and any other group that actively incites hatred and violence.’

HTB is a fringe group with little influence within British Muslim communities whose support base is arguably declining. Since operating in the UK over the last 25 years, however, key aspects of HT ideology – specifically the belief that the West has an ‘anti-Islam’ agenda – have...
been adopted by less radical British Islamist groups, though the party itself is often publically condemned. If the government fails to tackle HT, the party will continue to aggressively promote non-integration within British Muslim communities and present its intolerant Islamist ideology as a non-threatening alternative to current political thinking. Furthermore, since its inception HT has influenced numerous terrorist movements across the Middle East. In the UK, HT members formed al-Muhajiroun, whose successor groups are the only two British-based Islamist groups currently proscribed. Other than taking no action on HT, there are two policy options for the government: proscribe HT or encourage civic and civil intolerance of the party.
**Scenario One: Proscription of Hizb ut-Tahrir**

In reference to Hizb ut-Tahrir, the Home Office maintains that: ‘any decision to proscribe must be based on evidence that a group is concerned in terrorism as defined in the Terrorism Act 2000, and must be proportionate.’\(^{538}\) In this scenario the Secretary of State would designate HT – including all country chapters – as a terrorist organisation in accordance with Part II of the Act. The party would be added to the list of proscribed organisations contained in Schedule 2 of the Act.

**Legislation**

**International impact – a policy of deterrence**

The Act made it illegal for a number of terrorist groups to operate in the UK. It was intended to counter the view that the UK is a 'safe haven' for international terrorists, where they can fundraise, recruit and organise campaigns.\(^{539}\) The effect of proscribing HT would be to restrict the party’s ability to use the UK as a logistical nerve centre for international operations, specifically the aggressive promotion of HT in South Asia.\(^{540}\)

**Domestic impact – criminal offences under the Terrorism Act 2000**

Proscription has the effect of outlawing previously lawful activity.\(^{541}\)

**Membership – section 11 (1)**

- It is an offence to belong or profess to belong to a proscribed organisation.
- Membership of HT would become a prosecutable offence.
- Offence carries a maximum punishment of imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years, or on summary conviction (without a full trial) to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or a fine.

---


540 HTB, for example, has sent members from the UK to promote HT in Pakistan and it is claimed that HTB recruited Pakistani military officers in the UK to instigate a military coup there. For more information on HTB’s international promotion of HT see pp.55-56 of this report.

541 Offences and sentences detailed in this sub-section are taken from the Terrorism Act 2000.
Support – section 12 (1-2)

- It is an offence to invite support for a proscribed organisation; this is not restricted to the provision of money or other property.

- It is an offence to arrange or attend a private meeting with the intention to support a proscribed organisation; to further the activities of a proscribed organisation; or to be addressed by a person who belongs or professes to belong to a proscribed organisation.

- Private HT meetings, including hosting or attending HT study circles in members’ homes would be illegal and the individuals involved liable for prosecution.

- Offence carries a maximum sentence of ten years, or six months on summary conviction or a fine.

Public activity – section 12 (3)

- It is an offence to address a public meeting with the intention of encouraging support for a proscribed organisation or to further its activities.

- All HT public meetings, including annual conferences, rallies and public events, would be illegal and the organisers liable for prosecution.

- Offence carries a maximum sentence of ten years, or six months on summary conviction or a fine.

Support – section 13

- It is an offence to wear an item of clothing, or wear, carry or display an article in a public place that demonstrates s/he is a member or supporter of a proscribed organisation.

- The distribution of HT literature or public banners containing the party’s insignia would be illegal and the individuals involved liable for prosecution.

- Offence carries a maximum sentence of 6 months imprisonment or a fine.

Fundraising – sections 15-18

- Section 1(5) widens the definition of actions undertaken for the purposes of terrorism to include those done for the benefit of a proscribed organisation.
• Offences contained under sections 15-18, which include fundraising, money laundering, providing property and entering into funding arrangements, are applicable if undertaken in the name of a proscribed organisation.

• The Act allows police to seize all finances and property of a proscribed organisation.

• An individual who funds or enters into an agreement to fund HT would be liable for prosecution. Providing property for HT’s use – hosting a study circle or providing a platform for an HT event – would also become a criminal offence.

• Offences carry a maximum sentence of imprisonment for a term not exceeding 14 years.

**Anticipated Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain Response**

It is likely that HTB would continue to operate covertly and respond to proscription in a variety of ways.

**Protest proscription**

HTB would immediately protest against proscription, through the media as well as in the courts. Following the government’s inquiry into HT in August 2005, the party released a statement disputing allegations of involvement with terrorism and protested against the proposed policy of proscription. HTB is likely to find support from other Islamist groups in the UK, as well as from some Muslim organisations, human rights groups, politicians and commentators. After Blair proposed proscription, the party received almost unanimous support from a variety of Muslim organisations in the UK.\(^{542}\) It is likely that HTB would re-iterate its condemnation of the 9/11, 2004 Madrid and the 7/7 2005 London bomb attacks and assert their commitment to engaging in ‘political struggle’ only in Muslim-majority countries. HTB would present proscription as an attack not just against Islam but also against the tenets of liberal democracy. On the issue of proscription, HTB states in its media pack:

> Banning a non-violent Islamic political movement with a history of non-violence exceeding fifty years would be descending a very slippery slope. It would lead many to further question and debate the strength of values of freedom of speech, tolerance, the empowerment of people, human rights and democracy […] It will prove that society cannot tolerate the peaceful expression of Islamic political thought.\(^{543}\)

---

\(^{542}\) 38 Muslim groups and individuals signed a six point statement, entitled ‘Unprecedented Muslim Community Response to Proposed Anti-Terrorism Measure’, which contained a defence of HTB. The MCB and the MAB also spoke out against the proposed proscription, as did Liberty (National Council for Civil Liberties) and International Crisis Group. See pp.97-100 of this report for more details. See also ‘Full text: Joint statement from Muslim groups’, *Guardian*, 16 August 2005

\(^{543}\) Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, Media Information Pack, p.7
HTB is likely to challenge proscription legally. Under the Act, organisations and individuals have the right to apply to the Secretary of State for de-proscription and, if their application is refused, to appeal to the Proscribed Organisations Appeal Commission, which the Act set up. The Act further allows an organisation or individual affected by proscription to take the case to the Court of Appeal. HTB confirmed in August 2005 that it would exhaust all legal avenues to combat proscription, so it is likely the party would pursue the case.

Membership, public activity and fundraising
HTB is not a registered political party, company or charity and is under no legal obligation to disclose this information. The party is open about its leadership – details of all senior figures are available in HTB’s media pack, which is available on the party’s website. Similarly, HTB senior figures have made themselves increasingly available to the media since 2001 and the party’s response to domestic and international incidents can be found in press releases and statements available on HTB’s website. Proscription would not eliminate HT membership or activity in the UK: in fact, there is evidence that HT is, or has been, active in all 12 countries where the party is restricted or proscribed. In the event of proscription all membership would be hidden, public events directly in the name of the party stopped and its UK-based website taken down. It is likely that membership, study circles and fundraising would continue in private. According to one former member of HTB, should the party’s national executive members be arrested for membership, the party’s ‘Shadow Wilayah’, or new national executive committee, would take over. Similarly, international HT websites, which can be accessed by members in the UK, would continue and are likely to host material specifically aimed at UK members. Currently, HTB membership lists and funding arrangements are not public.

Ideological dissemination
As demonstrated in this report, HTB has already established a variety of local networks and forums through which party ideology can be disseminated in the event of proscription. This would most likely continue as a deliberate policy designed to give the impression of a strong base of support for HT ideology across British Muslim communities. Localised community groups, such as the Brick Lane Islamic Circle, would continue to target young British Muslims, propagating a politicised interpretation of Islam – specifically HT’s Islamism – as a legitimate defence against a perceived state-sponsored war against Islam. It is likely that party members or sympathisers would continue to set up a variety of groups, including youth organisations, single issue pressure groups and community forums, under a variety of names. It is likely that HTB would utilise the rapidly expanding world of social media to

---

544 Schedule 3, Terrorism Act 2000
545 ‘Press Statement from Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain’, 6 August 2005
546 It must be noted that there are difficulties in accurately assessing the popularity of HT under repressive regimes, particularly those where members are tried in State Security Courts. However, analysts and commentators have observed HT activity in all 12 countries between 1996 and the present. See Taji-Farouki, A Fundamental Quest; see also Baran, Hizb ut-Tahrir: Islam’s Political Insurgency
547 According to HTB former member F (anonymous: interview 1 September 2009), the ‘Shadow Wilayah’ would take over if the current national executive committee members were arrested. Members of the ‘Shadow Wilayah’ are already chosen and its details are kept secret from most members of HTB.
548 See pp.87-91 of this report.
spread its ideology, specifically within British Muslim youth. For example, it is likely that more front group blogs would be set up to target either local communities or students.\textsuperscript{549}

**Issues for Government**

The responsibility for investigating and prosecuting individuals for crimes pertaining to involvement with the party would lie with the police, the Security Service and the Crown Prosecution Service.

**Investigating HT activity**

Monitoring suspicious activity is a lengthy and labour intensive exercise for the UK’s police and Security Service. In the event of proscription, devoting police and Security Service resources to monitor suspected HT activity would inevitably divert attention away from groups that are explicitly linked to terrorism. Al-Qaeda inspired terrorism poses one of the biggest threats towards the UK and the investigation of suspected HT activity could be viewed as a drain on resources. For example, after the 7/7 London bombings, extra resources were allocated to the Security Service to increase capability and enable further investigation of potential terrorists.\textsuperscript{550} Despite the three fold increase in the Security Service’s budget between 9/11 to 2009, it is assessed that not enough potential terrorist targets are covered adequately.\textsuperscript{551}

**Prosecution for HT membership**

Convicting an individual in the UK for membership of a proscribed organisation is a difficult process. In the last decade a number of individuals convicted of terror-related offences had known connections to al-Qaeda.\textsuperscript{552} However, only two men have been convicted of al-Qaeda membership.\textsuperscript{553} Police have blamed the “wording” of the 2000 Act for the difficulty in convicting individuals for membership of al-Qaeda. In 2003, Leicestershire police were forced to drop al-Qaeda membership charges against two individuals who, in the same trial, were convicted for terrorist offences including fundraising for al-Qaeda.\textsuperscript{554} It is therefore unlikely that suspected HT members would be convicted for membership.

\textsuperscript{549} See pp.78-81, 90 & 94-95 of this report for current examples of HTB front groups using social media.


\textsuperscript{551} Ibid

\textsuperscript{552} Centre for Social Cohesion research has shown that between 1999 and 2009 at least 14 individuals with known links to al-Qaeda were convicted in the UK of terrorism offences, but not charged with membership of the group. This includes senior al-Qaeda operative Kamel Bourgass, member of a cell which planned a coordinated biological attack across Europe known as the ‘ricin plot’; and Salahuddin Amin, convicted in 2007 for his role in the fertiliser bomb plot and described as the ‘pivot’ between UK extremists and al-Qaeda.

\textsuperscript{553} Rangzieb Ahmed and his co-accused Habib Ahmed were convicted in October and December 2008 respectively of terror-related offences, including membership of al-Qaeda and Harakat ul-Mujahideen (HuM), a Pakistan-based terrorist organisation. Both men were sentenced to nine years for membership of al-Qaeda and six and two years respectively for HuM. See ‘British guilty of directing terror’, BBC News, 18 December 2008, available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7789773.stm [accessed 13.09.2009]

\textsuperscript{554} Brahim Benmerzouga and Baghdad Meziane were convicted in April 2003 of entering into a funding arrangement for the purposes of terrorism contrary to section 17 of the Terrorism Act 2000. See “Terror-link pair jailed”, BBC News, 1 April 2003, available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/2907427.stm [accessed 12.09.2009]
Combating negative public perception
If the government is not able to articulate the process behind its decision effectively, it would face accusations of thought crime. The primary criticism the government would face, specifically from UK-based Islamist organisations and some Muslim groups, is that it is curbing civil liberties and criminalising political dissent by banning what is seen as a non-violent organisation. For example, in response to a proposed proscription of HT, a joint statement in August 2005 from 38 Muslim groups and individuals in the UK stated: ‘Criminalising the mere possession of certain opinions is the hallmark of dictatorships, not democracies.’

Islamist groups, as well as Muslim and human rights organisations sympathetic to Islamism, are likely to echo HT’s rhetoric that proscription is evidence of the government’s desire to quell political Islam in an authoritarian manner not dissimilar to repressive Middle Eastern and Central Asian regimes. HTB members would be presented as acting in defence of the rights of Muslims globally: by presenting their activism as support for the rights of oppressed people living under despotic regimes, HT could be romanticised as a legitimate resistance movement. Some groups and individuals are also likely to further HT’s rhetoric that the government is ‘at war with Islam’ using scaremongering tactics to frighten British Muslims by arguing that if HT can be proscribed any Muslim group could be targeted next. For example, in response to the August 2005 proposed proscription, FOSIS stated: ‘Today the NUS has chosen to condemn the Muslim Public Affairs Committee, Al-Muhajiroun and Hizb ut-Tahrir: will tomorrow be the Muslim Council of Britain? The Muslim Association of Britain? Or even FOSIS?’

The government would also have to consider that by proscribing HT, those vulnerable to extremism could develop a negative perception of government, and counter-radicalisation stakeholders could also be adversely affected. The government would need to effectively communicate its decision to proscribe HT to the whole population, and particularly to British Muslim communities and government stakeholders working in counter-radicalisation. (See Scenario Two: Communicating policy effectively, pp.138-139).

Tackling the continued propagation of Hizb ut-Tahrir ideology
The government would need to be aware that HT may propagate its ideology through the use of front groups. The government needs to tackle this through its counter-terrorism programmes. (See Scenario Two: Identifying front groups, p.139).

---
555 In August 2005, for example, Shami Chakrabarti, Director of Liberty said: ‘Hizb ut-Tahrir is to be proscribed. If necessary, powers to proscribe terrorist organisations are to be extended – presumably into the realms of non-terrorist extreme political parties. I certainly have very little in common with this organisation. But it is anathema to democracy to ban non-violent political organisations, however extreme. Surely it is unwise to emulate the banning tendencies of Middle Eastern regimes that radicalised generations of dissenters by similar policies. In months and years to come, will we see the banning of extreme rightwing or leftwing political parties?’ See Shami Chakrabarti ‘The price of a chilling and counterproductive recipe,’ Guardian, 8 August 2005
556 See ‘Full text: Joint statement from Muslim groups,’ Guardian
557 ‘FOSIS condemns motion to ban Islamic groups,’ FOSIS press release
The Viability of Proscription

HT provides ideological legitimacy for committing acts of terrorism in the absence of its Islamist state.558 The party asks and permits Muslims, including HT members, to participate in jihad as a perceived “defensive” measure in territories it regards as ‘occupied Islamic lands’. This jihad can take the form of suicide bombings, hijacking and bombing planes, and any other physical means necessary.559 HTB national executive members Imran Wahid and Sajjad Khan have both stated in 2003 that they support suicide bombings as a ‘legitimate force’ because ‘Muslims have the right to resist occupation’.560 HTB previously disseminated literature that labelled designated terrorist organisations, such as Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Jama’ah Islamiyyah in Egypt as legitimate ‘Islamic movements’.561

However, there is no evidence that HTB, or HT chapters worldwide, have direct links to terrorism: HTB has not committed, participated in or prepared for terrorist activity.562 Past statements made by HTB national executive members in support of suicide bombings and the distribution of literature in support of terrorist organisations could be considered as glorification of terrorism.563 However, these statements were made before the criteria for proscription were widened by the Terrorism Act 2006. Since then HTB does not appear to have explicitly and publicly expressed sentiments in support either of suicide bombing or terrorist organisations.564

The only two UK-based Islamist organisations to be banned under the 2006 Act are Al-Ghurabaa and Saved Sect, which were proscribed not only because both groups produced and disseminated literature contrary to section 21 of the 2006 Act, but went further than HTB by publicly praising Osama bin Laden and refusing to condemn the 7/7 London bombings.565 HTB, on the other hand, denounced 9/11, the 2004 Madrid bombings and 7/7 based on the fact that it does not consider these countries to be ‘Islamic lands’. However, it is possible that

558 See pp.21-24 (Sanctioning Non-state Actors’ Engaging in Jihadism) of this report for an analysis on HT’s definition and permissibility of offensive and defensive jihad and how the lines between the two types of warfare are blurred.
559 See pp.151-152 (Appendix B, The Killing of Israeli Jews; ‘Support for Suicide Bombings’ and ‘Hijacking Planes’; Sanctioning Non-state Actor’s Engagement in Jihadism) of this report.
560 See p.30 of this report.
561 See pp.32-33 of this report. The literature in question is The American Campaign to Suppress Islam. HTB former member A attests that the book was distributed and published in the UK. An archive search of HTB’s former website, Khilafah.com, reveals that a pdf of this booklet was available to download. The British and US government have proscribed Hamas, Jama’ah Islamiyyah (or Al-Gama’at al-Islamiya), and the Islamic Jihad group (the UK has proscribed Egyptian Islamic Jihad and Palestinian Islamic Jihad), as terrorist organisations. See ‘Proscribed Terrorist Groups’, Office for Security and Counter Terrorism, available at http://security.homeoffice.gov.uk/legislation/current-legislation/terrorism-act-2000/proscribed-groups [accessed 5.09.2009]; and ‘United States Identifies 42 Foreign Terrorist Organizations’ , 30 April 2008, available at http://www.america.gov/st/peace/sec-english/2008/April/20080429115651dmslahreleko0.9584772.html [accessed 5.09.2008].
562 Robert Tinline, then head of the multilateral and terrorist financing section of the counter-terrorism department in the FCO, stated that ‘A number of governments cite HuT [Hizb ut-Tahrir] involvement in violence and links to terrorist organisations (with little supporting evidence). […] [T]here is no apparent case to proscribe HuT because its activities abroad include involvement in terrorism’. See Martin Bright, When Progressives Treat with Reactionaries: The British State’s flirtation with radical Islamism, Policy Exchange, July 2006, p.72
563 Contrary to section 21 of the Terrorism Act 2006, which amends the Terrorism Act 2000.
564 In R v Rahman; R v Mohammed [2008] EWCQ Crim 1465 the Court of Appeal stated in its decision that whilst Bilal Mohammed was guilty of several offences under the Terrorism Act 2000, his distribution of material fell outside the scope of section 2 of the 2006 Act because the Act was not in force at the time of his conduct, and therefore he was doing nothing illegal.
the denunciations could have been a tactical move in response to greater public scrutiny of extreme Islamist groups.

**Alternative Arguments for Proscription – Propagation of Antisemitism**

HT’s ideology is inherently antisemitic. The party’s desire to destroy the state of Israel has led to the justification of killing Israeli Jews. Contrary to HTB’s claims that the party is against Zionism, the evidence gathered in this report strongly indicates that HT is hostile to Israel primarily because it is seen as Jewish.

Proscribing an organisation for antisemitism would be unprecedented in the UK. In Germany, HT’s antisemitism was seen as contradicting articles in the German constitution and the ban on the party’s public activities was made possible under anti-terrorism legislation adopted after 9/11, which lifted legal protections for religious associations and allowed the outlawing of foreign-based organisations. Current UK legislation does not allow for similar restrictions. Moreover, when the German government acted against HT, the party had a small membership base of approximately 300 activists, which made proscription of its public activities tenable. In the UK, however, HT has approximately 2000 activists – with the most active numbering approximately 100-200.

The Home Office could issue temporary restrictions on HTB public protests or processions if advised by the police that they might disrupt public order. Such restrictions can be implemented under sections 12-13 of the Public Order Act 1986, but only in local councils for a period not exceeding three months. Furthermore, such restrictions can only be put in place if the police find strong evidence to indicate that HTB are intending or are likely to stir up racial hatred. A precedent for such activity was seen in the action taken by UK Home Secretary Alan Johnson against the English Defence League’s protests in August 2009.

Furthermore, the UK’s Jewish communities are already protected by racial hatred laws. Under current legislation, prosecuting individuals who disseminate and publish antisemitic literature, ‘which is threatening, abusive or insulting’, to intentionally ‘stir up racial hatred’ may be possible under the Public Order Act 1986. For example, Iftikhar Ali, a member of AM, was convicted in October 2000 for stirring up racial hatred by distributing leaflets that called for a holy war against Jews.

---

566 For examples of HTB’s antisemitic statements, see pp.27-29 of this report.
567 Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, Media Information Pack, p.14
568 In placing such a ban on HT’s public activities, the then German Interior Minister Otto Schily stated: ‘I will not tolerate organizations here engaging in anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli hate propaganda’. See ‘Germany bans Islamic organization accused of spreading anti-Semitic propaganda’, Associated Press, 15 January 2003
569 HTB former members A, B and E confirm this is the approximate figure.
570 ‘Rightwing march ban over fear of violence’, Guardian, 21 August 2009
572 With similar laws to the UK, prosecutors in Denmark achieved the successful conviction of HT member Fadi Abdelatif in October 2002 for distributing leaflets that were racist against Jewish people. Conversely, Denmark’s state prosecutors decided that
Overall Effectiveness

Whilst a proscription of HT would send a strong message, its effectiveness is questionable. Since al-Ghurabaa and Saved Sect were proscribed in 2006 under section 21 of the 2006 Act, there have been no membership convictions to date, though individual members have been convicted for offences relating to racial hatred and terrorism. Instead, members of these groups currently propagate openly the same message and ideology that they did before by re-grouping under new names. After the proscription of al-Ghurabaa and Saved Sect, members re-grouped under Ahl us-Sunnah Wal Jamma’ah (ASWJ), or literally ‘Adherents to the Sunnah Community’. Re-naming themselves after the largest denomination of Muslims, the Sunnis, may be an attempt to avoid further proscription.

The 2006 Act specifies that if a group listed in Schedule 2 of the 2000 Act is operating wholly or partly under a new name, then that would be considered as the same group listed in Schedule 2. The Secretary of State could then provide an order making the new name illegal. However, when leading members of ASWJ were imprisoned in 2008 for fundraising and inciting murder for terrorist purposes overseas, the group’s activities were markedly lower. Yet immediately after their release, AM announced in May 2009 that it was re-launching under the leadership of UK-based hate preacher Anjem Choudary. The Secretary of State is yet to announce an order banning AM’s activities. It could therefore be argued that the answer to tackling HT – and AM – ideology may not lie in proscription, but in government assessing how the dissemination of extremist ideologies can be challenged effectively.
Scenario Two: Encourage Civic & Civil Intolerance of Hizb ut-Tahrir

Proscribing HT would likely prove impractical and ineffective. Furthermore, it could engender strong opposition and possibly give unnecessary legitimacy to HT’s worldview. Government policy towards the party should aim to reduce HT’s ability to recruit without criminalising its ideology. Actions to limit HT activism should therefore be civic measures to reduce its access to public funding, platforms and the subsequent legitimacy.

The wider public, rather than the government, is best placed to expose and reject HT ideology. The government should not sponsor so-called ‘credible voices’ within British Muslim communities and should prevent Islamist groups acting as arbitrators of what they believe Muslims in the UK want and need. Instead, the government should combat extremism on its own terms by promoting the values of liberal democracy.

By implementing the following civic intolerance of HT the government would send a strong message to the public regarding the incompatibility of the party’s ideology and shared British values. The policy would hopefully engender a public opinion and civil intolerance of HT in the same way that there is intolerance of the BNP.

Background: Current Counter-Terrorism Strategy

The government’s current counter-terrorism strategy, known as CONTEST, was developed in 2003 in response to the threat faced by the UK from al-Qaeda-influenced terrorism. The revised strategy, published in March 2009 and commonly known as CONTEST 2, is co-ordinated by the Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism (OSCT), a part of the Home Office, and is divided into four strands:

- **Pursue:** stopping terrorist attacks;
- **Prevent:** stopping people becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism;
- **Protect:** strengthening our protection against attack;
- **Prepare:** mitigating the impact of attacks.577

Policies designed to restrict HTB could be incorporated into Prevent, primarily the responsibility of the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG), which has five primary objectives:

---

Challenging the violent extremist ideology and supporting mainstream voices;
Disrupting those who promote violent extremism and supporting the institutions where they may be active;
Supporting vulnerable individuals;
Increasing the capacity of communities to resist violent extremism;
Addressing grievances.\textsuperscript{578}

**Recommendations**

**Central government**
To challenge HT ideology and activity effectively, the government could make the following revisions to the Prevent agenda:

**Department:** OSCT  
**Recommendation:** Widen the Prevent agenda

Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE), the Prevent delivery mechanism, focuses on challenging violent ideology. HT’s revolutionary Islamism, however, legitimises violent extremism and for some the party has served as a ‘conveyor belt for terrorism’.\textsuperscript{579}

- There needs to be greater recognition of the role that “non-violent” extremist ideology plays in radicalising individuals and fuelling segregation within British Muslim communities. The Prevent agenda should counter all groups espousing extremist ideology, and not only groups perpetrating violence.

**Department:** CLG  
**Recommendation:** Establish criteria for funding and engagement with community groups

Local councils and affiliated bodies are responsible for decisions relating to PVE funding and engagement. However, funding – and thereby legitimacy – has been given to organisations that are institutionally ill-equipped or unwilling to counter extremist narratives, and has been used to give a platform to HTB representatives.\textsuperscript{580}

- Criteria for funding and engagement with community groups should be centralised, applicable to all groups, not just those within British Muslim communities, and based on a commitment to shared British values.


\textsuperscript{579} Baran, ‘The Road from Tashkent to the Taliban’, *National Review Online*

\textsuperscript{580} For example, in February 2008 the Cordoba Foundation used PVE funds to organise a debate featuring HTB’s Abdul Wahid. See pp.106-107 for more details.
The government should adopt the criteria recommended in a 2009 Policy Exchange report on the effectiveness of the Prevent agenda.\textsuperscript{581} Accordingly, the government and local authorities should not engage or fund any organisation if it or individual members fulfil any of the following criteria:

- Support the deliberate targeting of civilians anywhere in the world;
- Call for attacks on British soldiers or allies;
- Call for the destruction of a UN member state;
- Support terrorism;
- Threaten rights laid out in the ECHR;
- Advocate discrimination on the basis of religious sect, race, sexual orientation or gender in any aspect of public life or public policy.

The funding and engagement criteria should be used by all lead officers in local authorities who have responsibility for Prevent, known as Prevent ‘leads’, when considering PVE funding applications.

Funding and engagement with stakeholders in Muslim communities should be conditional on the group and its members not sharing a platform with HT members or publicly supporting HT ideology.

**Department:** CLG  
**Recommendation:** Refrain from promoting some interpretations of Islam over others

The Prevent strategy acknowledges the importance of reaching beyond self-appointed “gatekeeper” organisations to the wider community to support “mainstream” voices.\textsuperscript{582} The government currently funds a number of initiatives designed to encourage moderate voices within British Muslim communities. In some cases, however, funding has gone to groups who support or give platform to political extremists.\textsuperscript{583}

It is not the government’s role to define what Islam is and what it is not. The government should not promote some particular interpretations of Islam as counterweights to extremism.

\textsuperscript{582} HM Government, *The Prevent Strategy: A guide for local partners in England stopping people becoming or supporting terrorists and violent extremists*, June 2008
\textsuperscript{583} The Foreign Office has given a Muslim group, the Radical Middle Way, £670,000 (2007-2009), to promote a tolerant, democratic and British form of Islam. However, scholars and speakers invited by the group have included Kemal Helbawy, a senior member of the Muslim Brotherhood who in 2005 refused to condemn suicide bombings in Chechnya, Israel, Iraq and the Palestinian territories. See Abedin, ‘How to Deal with Britain’s Muslim Extremists? An Interview with Kamal Helbawy’, Jamestown Foundation, *Global Terrorism Analysis*, Vol. 3, Issue 7, 8 August 2005. The Radical Middle Way’s decision to invite Helbawy was discussed on BBC Two’s *Newsnight* on 17 January 2008. See ‘The Centre on Newsnight’, Centre for Social Cohesion, 19 January 2009, available at http://www.socialcohesion.co.uk/blog/2008/01/the-centre-on-newsnight.html; For funding information see House of Commons Hansard debates, 16 July 2009, c650W, available at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmhansard/cm090716/text/90716w0025.htm#0907172006626 [links accessed 20.10.2009]
The government should acknowledge the disproportionate influence of political Islamist voices within prominent British Muslim organisations, which are given legitimacy by their position as interlocutors between the government and British Muslim communities.

The government should focus on promoting the values of our liberal democracy, which allows individuals to practise their religion freely, as an effective opposition to extremism. It is hoped that this would empower civil society and British Muslim communities to debate the various interpretations of Islam freely, generating greater resilience to the political extremism espoused by groups like HT.

**Department:** CLG

**Recommendation:** Institute an HTB ‘No Platform’ policy across publicly-funded institutions

HTB currently gain a public platform, and subsequent legitimacy, through holding events and study circles in civic institutions. Central government could take the following steps to help local authorities and their Prevent partners restrict HTB’s activity and limit the party’s influence in their local area.

- CLG should instruct local authorities to adopt a ‘No-Platform’ policy towards HTB in all civic institutions. No local authority owned or managed building, public school, Further Education (FE) college, public university or community venue should host an HTB event or give platform to HT members or supporters.

- OSCT should provide centralised support for local authority Prevent ‘leads’ when identifying HT front groups. Prevent ‘leads’ should be fully briefed with a centralised criteria for HT’s ideology and should liaise with civic institutions to identify HT front groups. (See Identifying HTB members and HTB front groups, p.139).

- Local authorities should also establish mechanisms to limit civic institutions inadvertently funding or hosting HT front groups. Prevent ‘leads’ should share best practice with other local authorities to limit HT front groups being replicated in different areas. The ‘Communities of Practice’ website, a government-sponsored knowledge-sharing forum for local government and the public sector, could be used.

---

584 For example, the Brick Lane Islamic Circle uses a government-owned building in Tower Hamlets. See p.90 of this report.

585 CONTEST partners include government departments, the police, the security and intelligence agencies, the UK Border Agency, emergency services and the Armed Forces as well as international partners. The Prevent agenda, in particular, involves the DCSF, CLG, the Department for Innovation, Universities and Schools (DIUS), regional government, local councils, community safety partnerships and local community organisations.

Public sector bodies
The question of how far to accept HT members working in the public sector is complex. The government should accurately assess and mitigate the threat from HT while upholding civil liberties, freedom of expression and a commitment to liberal democracy.

Sector: The Security Service, the UK Police & the National Probation Service
Recommendation: Establish a zero-tolerance policy towards HTB members

Currently, all government posts with high level security clearance require what is called Developed Vetting (DV), the most comprehensive form of security vetting in the UK. DV protects against anyone seeking ‘to overthrow or undermine parliamentary democracy by political, industrial or violent means; and is applicable to those working in the Security Service. Regarding the police and probation services, grounds for dismissal include membership of an organisation whose ideology is incompatible with the duty to promote equality under the Race Relations Act.

- Include membership or support for HT in the DV procedure.
- Refuse clearance to any member or supporter of HT.
- Acknowledge that HT’s antisemitism is incompatible with the duty to promote equality under the Race Relations Act.
- Refuse employment in either the UK Police Service or the National Probation Service to HT members.

Sector: Primary and secondary Education services
Recommendation: Restrict HTB members working in schools

DCFS: In September 2009, the DCSF announced a review of the current provisions to prevent the promotion of racism in schools, to investigate ‘whether there is a case for affiliation to an organisation that promotes racism being grounds for barring from the profession’. Existing safeguards to protect young people from discrimination and prevent the teaching of partisan political activities include: a requirement for schools to have equal opportunities policies; a duty to promote racial equality under the Race Relations Act; a statutory duty to promote community cohesion; a duty on governing bodies, head teachers and local authori-

588 In March 2009, for example, a member of Merseyside Police was dismissed after BNP membership details were leaked to the media, because he had ‘knowingly been a member of the BNP’. See ‘BNP membership officer sacked’, BBC News, 21 March 2009, available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/merseyside/7956824.stm [accessed 6.10.2009]
ties to forbid the teaching of partisan political activities; and disciplinary powers of the General Teaching Council (GTC).\footnote{590}{All teachers working in teaching posts in maintained schools, non-maintained special schools and pupil referral units in England must register with the GTC. See ‘Safeguarding Children and Safer Recruitment in Education’, Department for Education and Skills, November 2006, available at http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/everychildmatters/_download/?id=801 [accessed 20.10.2009]}

- DCSF should acknowledge that HTB’s antisemitism is incompatible with schools’ duty to promote racial equality under the Race Relations Act.

- DCSF should widen the proposed review with a view to excluding HT members from teaching positions in schools.

GTC and teaching unions: In 2008 the GTC stated that ‘there is no restriction on teachers being members of the BNP’.\footnote{591}{‘No teacher will be sacked over BNP membership’, Daily Telegraph, 20 November 2008} The UK’s two largest teachers’ unions, NASUWT and the National Union of Teachers, however, disagreed: both condemned teachers’ membership of the BNP on the basis that it is ‘inconsistent with the values a teacher should have’.\footnote{592}{Ibid}

- The GTC and teaching unions should issue statements clarifying their position regarding HTB members working as teachers.

Ofsted: Ofsted is currently inadequately equipped to identify HT ideology in schools.\footnote{593}{For example, a 2005 Ofsted report praised the Islamic Shakhsiyah Foundation Slough school’s halaqa system and Islamic ethos despite the fact that the curriculum was based on HT ideology and HTB members set up the Foundation. See pp.87-88 of this report for more details.}

- OSCT should brief Ofsted on how to identify HT members and ideology in schools. (See Identifying HT members and HT front groups, p.139).

- DCSF should review its policy of allowing voluntary-aided faith schools their own separate inspection arrangements.

The Charity Commission: A number of schools in the UK are – or have connections to – registered charities. Voluntary-aided or controlled schools, which are generally state-maintained faith schools, are normally linked to charitable foundations, often religious organisations, which own the school’s buildings and land. Similarly, half of the UK’s independent schools have charitable status.\footnote{594}{‘Types of Schools’, DirectGov website, available at http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/Parents/Schoolslearninganddevelopment/ChoosingASchool/DG_3016312 [accessed 20.10.2009]}

- Ofsted should refer voluntary and independent schools with charity status suspected of employing HT members or propagating HT ideology to the DCSF and the Charity Commission. (See Identifying HT members and HT front groups, p.139).

- The Charity Commission and local authorities should withdraw charitable status
and public funding for registered charities whose schools consistently engage in political activity by either hosting HT members or publicly supporting HT ideology.

### Sector: Further and Higher Education services

### Recommendations:
- Provide greater institutionalised support for NUS ‘No Platform’ policy;
- Review teaching and pastoral responsibilities given to HT members

HT is subject to a ‘No-Platform’ policy by the NUS (banning public activity on UK campuses), which is upheld by individual students’ unions. HTB, however, have taken steps to circumvent NUS policy and continue to operate covertly on UK campuses. Furthermore there are no limits on the political affiliations of university teaching staff. The promotion of free speech and enquiry retains special legal status within the higher education sector: under the Education (No.2) Act 1986, and in accordance with article 10 of the Human Rights Act 1998, universities are legally obliged to ensure that ‘freedom of speech within the law is secured for members, students and employees of the establishment and for visiting speakers’.595

- **University authorities and local authorities should give greater support to the NUS ‘No Platform’ policy:** Prevent ‘leads’ should liaise with students’ unions and facilities managers, responsible for booking university premises, to identify all HTB front groups on campuses. (See Identifying HT members and HT front groups, p.139).

- **FE college students’ unions should vote on a proposed ‘No Platform’ for HT.**

- **University authorities should review the compatibility of HT membership with the duty to promote race relations and community cohesion.** Accordingly, for members of staff affiliated to HT, they should institute a policy outlining the level of teaching time, pastoral care responsibilities and other direct contact with students.

### CLG & the Charity Commission – mosques in the UK

Traditionally HTB has targeted mosques for recruitment and organised alternative circles within mosque grounds to propagate HT ideology.596 Currently, there is no effective centralised regulatory body responsible for the UK’s 1500 mosques, or the local services they provide.597 However, the Mosques and Imams National Advisory Board (MINAB) and the Charity Commission – both government-funded bodies – are becoming increasingly influential. Established in June 2006, MINAB – an alliance of four Muslim groups, the MCB, MAB, British

---


Muslim Forum and al-Khoei Foundation – received £249,600 from CLG, to ‘set standards and establish a system of self-regulation for mosques’. MINAB also works with the Charity Commission, the regulator and registrar of charities in England and Wales. The commission’s new Faith and Social Cohesion Unit (FSCU), part-funded by CLG ‘to encourage more mosques to fulfil their legal obligation to register as charities [and] to support better governance in existing mosques’, is advised and evaluated by MINAB representatives. Increasing numbers of mosques in England and Wales are registering for charity status and two thirds are in contact with the Charity Commission. Government departments should consider the following recommendations to help limit HTB influence in mosques in the UK.

Department: CLG
Recommendation: Rebalance relationship with MINAB

Two of MINAB’s founding groups, the MCB and MAB, are inspired by a narrow form of political Islam, inspired by the Islamist parties JI and the MB, and members have refused to unequivocally condemn suicide bombings in Israel. Furthermore, the founding groups exert a disproportionate influence and have directly appointed 16 of the 50 members of MINAB’s Executive Board.

- Since MINAB is heavily influenced by entry-level political Islamists, the government must consider if it is appropriate for MINAB to advise the FSCU, particularly in relation to identifying and combating HTB activism in British mosques.

- CLG should retract funding and support for MINAB unless the four founding organisations – particularly their members on MINAB’s Executive Board – clarify their position on key issues pertaining to Islamist extremism and terrorism. Specifically, they must:
  - Condemn acts of terrorism anywhere in the world;
  - Retract support for proscribed terrorist organisations;
  - Condemn suicide bombing anywhere in the world;

---


600 In 2007, 331 mosques were registered with the Charity Commission; by April 2009 the figure had risen by 37% to 455. See ‘Commission runs satellite TV campaign to reach mosques and Muslim groups’, the Charity Commission, 24 August 2009, available at http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk/news/pramadhan082009.asp; see also ‘Survey of Mosques in England and Wales’, [accessed 20.10.2009]

601 MAB was founded in 1997 by Kamal Helbawy, a senior member of the Muslim Brotherhood, who helped found the MCB in the same year. For details on the MCB’s connections to Jamaat-e-Islami, see ‘Radical links of UK’s ‘moderate’ Muslim group’, Observer, 14 August 2005; see also comments made by leading MAB member Azzam Tamimi during a BBC Hardtalk interview, 5 November 2004, available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/hardtalk/3985403.stm [accessed 20.10.2009]

PART IV: POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- Condemn attacks on British forces anywhere in the world.

- Any MINAB member who fails to meet the criteria should also be relieved of their advisory role with the Charity Commission.

Department: The FSCU
Recommendation: Restrict HT influence at registered mosques and Islamic charities

Under the Charities Act 2006, a charity in England and Wales must be constituted for at least one of thirteen prescribed purposes for the public benefit. Any mosque with an annual turnover of more than £5,000 must legally register as a charity for religious (and, if applicable, educational) advancement. By law, charities cannot engage in political activity unless it is undertaken to further the main charitable purpose. Political activities are defined as ‘[any] activity by a charity which is aimed at securing, or opposing, any change in the law or in the policy or decisions of central government, local authorities or other public bodies, whether in this country or abroad’. Furthermore, a charity must not support or fund a political party, candidate or politician and the charity cannot ‘be used as a vehicle for the expression of the political views of any individual trustee or staff member’.

- The FCSU should acknowledge that HT’s ideology and global activity constitutes political activity because it aims to secure change in the law and central government of Muslim-majority countries.

- The FSCU’s criteria for good governance in mosques should include a ‘No Platform’ policy for HT.

- The FSCU’s criteria for good governance should be mandatory for all registered Islamic charities.

- OSCT should brief the FSCU on how to identify HT ideology, members and front groups. (See Identifying HT members and HT front groups, p.139).

- The main sources of advice and support for mosques are local authorities and other mosques. The FSCU should therefore liaise with local authority Prevent ‘leads’ and local Councils of Mosques to identify and support ‘at risk’ locations.

- 15% of mosques receive grants from the public sector. The FCSU and local author-

---

605 In the 2009 Charity Commission survey, 68% of mosques reported seeking advice from local authorities and 58% said from other mosques. See ‘Survey of Mosques in England and Wales’, Charity Commission, p.9
606 Ibid, p.1
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ities should withdraw charitable status and public funding for registered mosques and other Islamic charities which repeatedly engage in political activity by hosting HT members, allowing HT members to become trustees or publicly supporting HT ideology.

- The FSCU needs to better communicate the law regulating political activity to all registered mosques and Islamic charities. The FSCU should liaise with local authorities and local Councils of Mosques in order to convey the commission’s guidance more widely and effectively.

- The FSCU should liaise with local authorities and local Councils of Mosques to establish forums for sharing knowledge and best practice relating to challenging HT. Forums should be open to all local mosques, not just those represented by the Council of Mosques.

Issues for Government

Communicating policy effectively

Recognising the need to communicate its Prevent-related policies more effectively, OSCT established a strategic communications agency, the Research, Information and Communications Unit (RICU) in 2007. RICU does not have a website as a visible point of contact and its statements and research are not publicly available. Islamist groups, by contrast, have been more successful in promoting their own agenda. For example, a recurring grievance HTB encourages is the impression that the government has an anti-Muslim agenda. Following the publication of a leaked draft of CONTEST 2 in February 2009, Islamist groups – including HTB – capitalised on the government’s alleged definition of extremism. HTB argued that ‘Muslims would be considered as “extremists” if they believe in some of Islam’s core ideas [emphasis added]’. RICU did not clarify the government’s aims or criteria for extremism, nor did it correct inaccurate reporting. Instead, RICU allowed the accusations that the government has an anti-Muslim agenda to go unchallenged. RICU should respond publicly to inaccurate reporting.

607 For example, 16 prominent registered Islamic charities were unaware of the law when their trustees signed a letter in support of the Labour incumbent Ken Livingstone in the 2008 London Mayoral elections. The Charity Commission later wrote to the trustees, reporting that ‘[they] are now aware of the importance of distinguishing between acting as an individual and acting as a charity trustee.’ The commission’s actions were also covered by a London paper. See ‘Report to the Chief Executive’, Charity Commission meeting, 20 March 2008, Board Paper No: (08) OBM 10, p6, available at http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk/Library/tcc/pdfs/paper08obm10.pdf; see also ‘Charity Commission slams Muslim letter backing Ken’, Evening Standard, 22 January 2008

608 RICU advises CONTEST partners on how ‘to characterise the threat we face and describe the response that we are making’. Sir Charles Farr, OBE, Director General OSCT, testimony to the Home Affairs Committee on CONTEST, February 2009, available at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmhaff/212/09022601.htm [accessed 20.10.2009]

609 It was wrongly claimed the proposed criteria for a Muslim extremist included one or more of the following traits: desire for a Caliphate; support for shariah law; support for jihad; argue that Islam bans homosexuality and that it is a sin against Allah; and failure to condemn the killing of British troops. See ‘Anti-terror code would alienate most Muslims’, Guardian, 17 February 2009

Identifying HT members and HT front groups

It is likely that HTB would continue to operate covertly despite the proposed policy of civic intolerance. In order to effectively institute a ‘No Platform’ policy, local authorities and all Prevent partners as well as the DCSF, Ofsted and the Charity Commission’s FSCU need to be able to accurately identify HT front groups. RICU ought to provide the following centralised criteria for identifying HT front groups to be circulated to all Prevent partners. For a group or individual to be identified as HT, or an HT front group they would have to advocate all of the following:

- Belief in a global political Muslim bloc – the “ummah”;
- Advocacy of an “Islamic” state – the Caliphate;
- Politicised understanding of Islam as a divinely inspired socio-economic political system;
- Belief that this system is the only ideology that can solve ‘social problems’;
- Advocacy of “shariah” as divine state law;
- Rejection of democracy.

Furthermore, RICU would need to communicate the suggested criteria to all local stakeholders, including: schools, colleges and universities as well as all registered mosques and Islamic charities in the UK. Local authority Prevent ‘leads’ should also provide particular support for education institutions. It would be useful for all institutions to nominate a dedicated member of staff: for schools and colleges this could be the Head of Pastoral Care; for universities the responsibility could be shared between the chaplain and a member of the facilities team, as this is the department responsible for allocating university buildings for events.

Accusations of a police state

The government is likely to face accusations of instigating a police state; of punishing people for their thoughts rather than any criminal activity. In response, the government needs to demonstrate that the means by which it sustains British liberal democracy will never compromise the civil liberties that underpin it.
The government should affirm its commitment to freedom of speech: all opinions which fall short of inciting violence and hatred, however offensive, are legal. Therefore, individuals as well as community organisations and their representatives are free to hold any opinion they wish so long as they do not break the law. The sign of a healthy democratic society is its ability to tolerate unrepresentative, offensive and dissenting voices – organisations will not face legal repercussions for having such opinions.

However, the government should acknowledge that the right to freedom of speech does not guarantee the right to a public platform or the right to public engagement and funding. The government should make clear that it is not obligated to engage with extremists in the name of representation. It is the prerogative of the government to decide who it supports: deciding to engage with or fund individuals and institutions who positively articulate shared British values within a liberal democratic framework, is not the equivalent to criminalising those who do not.

Similarly, the government should acknowledge the inherent ethical difficulties in restricting HTB members from working in schools. However, while British citizens have equal rights to employment, this does not apply to working with children under the age of 16, who are defined as a ‘vulnerable group’ under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006.611 The government should communicate to the public the legal responsibility of local authorities and public schools to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people. Further to acknowledging that HT’s antisemitism is incompatible with schools’ duty to promote racial equality under the Race Relations Act, the government should clearly explain that the views held by HT members compromise their ability to teach children under the age of 16 impartially.

Repercussions within wider Civil Society

It is not the right of the state to generate civil intolerance towards HT and its ideology. Citizens – both individually and as collectives – in a liberal democracy have the right to hold and express any beliefs, however offensive, within the law. By the government improving its strategic communications and liaising with civil society partners, it is possible that the following areas within British civil society would recognise the threat HT’s ideology poses, most acutely towards British Muslim communities. Accordingly, we would expect HTB and its members to be critically challenged in or ostracised from these areas.

Mainstream British media

Arguably one of the best ways to tackle radical influences in society is for the media to deny unrepresentative fringe organisations the oxygen of publicity. However, HTB is a grassroots organisation that depends on support from within local communities for its radical agenda. Negative publicity, therefore, makes it harder for HT to establish itself as a legitimate repre-

sentative of British Muslims. It would be hoped that the mainstream media would not provide unchallenged platforms for HT members or present HT members as representative of British Muslims. It would be helpful for the National Union of Journalists to issue a statement clarifying its position regarding HT members working as journalists. Furthermore, mainstream papers and broadcast media could establish working protocols relating to employing HTB members as staff reporters – for example disclosing their affiliations in all related articles.

Mosques in the UK
During the 1990s, mosque officials reportedly felt “besieged” by HTB’s activism. It would be hoped, therefore, that cooperation between CLG, the FSCU and mosques in the UK would provide centralised support and expertise in tackling HTB ideology and activism. Combating HT effectively requires support from and co-ordination between all mosque employees. For example, mosques should be encouraged to develop a dedicated strategy to protect children and young people from HT influence in the mosques’ educational facilities. Similarly, potential employees and volunteers could be vetted by the mosque management for membership or support for HT. Since the party has traditionally targeted young British Muslims, it could be argued that they are more likely to spot potential HT recruitment drives in their mosques. Mosques should consider developing management positions for young people or establish dedicated Youth Boards; by feeling invested in, the young people in the congregation may be likelier to engage in and to encourage resistance to HT.

Human rights/civil liberties organisations, community groups, academics and Muslim scholars
The UK has a strong heritage of natural justice, enshrined in its citizens’ civil rights and its opposition to totalitarianism. Recognising the threat posed by HT, it is possible that human rights/civil liberties organisations, community groups and academics would draw on their collective expertise to refute HT’s ideological legitimacy. Academics and Muslim scholars could undertake independent and objective research into HT ideology, critiquing HT’s political, social and economic rationale as well as its religious authority. Human rights/civil liberties organisations and community groups could generate greater resilience to HT’s political extremism within British Muslim communities and wider society. The party’s claims that it is representative of British Muslims, the defender of Islam and the victim of a perceived Western-led ‘War on Islam’ should be robustly challenged.

613 Mosques in the UK employ a variety of individuals, often in a voluntary capacity: 97% of mosques employ Imams; 83% teachers; 42% dedicated youth workers; 38% community workers; and 43% women’s project co-ordinators. A third of mosques (31%) run Imam training programmes, almost all (94%) run educational programmes for young people, and half (52%) have people aged between 18 and 30 with management responsibility. ‘Survey of Mosques in England and Wales’, Charity Commission, February 2009, p.11; see also ‘Commission runs satellite TV campaign to reach mosques and Muslim groups’, 24 August 2009
Conclusion

HT is a revolutionary Islamist party which actively works to establish an expansionist state in Muslim-majority countries and create a new world order based on Islamist principles. HT sanctions military coups in Muslim-majority countries and the mass killings of civilians in order to unite all Muslim-majority countries into one Islamist super-state and colonise all others. In the West, the party seeks support for this Islamist revolution.

The party’s public condemnation of violence and terrorism is inconsistent with its fundamentalist ideology, which echoes that of al-Qaeda and its affiliates. HT advocates the killing of Israeli Jews and the destruction of Israel and supports designated terrorist groups in the Middle East and North Africa. Furthermore, the party’s jihadist philosophy approves suicide bombings and hijacking aeroplanes as legitimate tactics to fight perceived oppression of Islam and Muslims.

In the West, HT presents itself as the victim of Western liberal “hypocrisy” to further its ‘War on Islam’ mindset. While Western governments have tolerated the party more than those in Muslim-majority countries, branches of HT have been investigated for links to terrorism and, in some cases, its activities limited. HT makes strategic use of the relative freedoms afforded to the party in the West, co-ordinating campaigns in countries where it is proscribed from the UK.

In the UK, the party preaches that the government policy of integrating Muslim communities is a deliberate attempt to weaken Islam. HTB aims to create a monolithic Muslim bloc sympathetic to its trans-national brand of Islamism and has adopted front groups and single issue campaigns to propagate its ideology. In order to mainstream its ideology within wider society, the party now downplays its intolerant beliefs and presents itself as a legitimate political party. The party remains a fringe organisation. HT ideology, however, is increasingly accepted as a non-violent political alternative. By implementing the recommended policy of civic intolerance of HT, the British government would send a strong message to the public regarding the incompatibility of the party’s ideology and shared British values.
APPENDICES
Omar Bakri resigned as leader of HTB in February 1996 and immediately formed AM.\(^{614}\) Many of his supporters were ex-members of HTB. Echoing HT’s aims and ideology, AM calls for the re-establishment of an Islamist state under the rule of a single Caliph within a legislative framework based on shariah.\(^{615}\) However, Bakri disagreed with HT’s central leadership’s strategy towards British Muslim communities. He believed that Nabhani’s methodology should be applied in full in the UK to turn it into an Islamist state whereas HT believed it more important to disseminate party ideology to generate support for its Islamist revolution in a Muslim-majority country first.\(^{616}\)

**Active Support for “Defensive” Jihad**

In the absence of an Islamist state, both AM and HT believe it necessary to wage “defensive” jihad for the protection of Muslims against perceived “aggression”.\(^{617}\) AM, for example, has said:

> We do support the defensive *jihad* (which is obligatory upon Muslims) against aggressors and occupiers in the Balkans, Africa, Palestine, Kashmir, the Philippines, etc […] We do not believe in any armed struggle to establish *al-Khilafa*.\(^{618}\)

The International Islamic Front, an AM front group for which Bakri was a spokesperson, issued a statement calling American forces legitimate targets and praising the 1998 US embassy attacks in Nairobi and Tanzania.\(^{619}\) In December 2000, Bakri claimed that approximately 1,800 British Muslims were recruited at mosques and universities to take part in ‘military service’ every year.\(^{620}\) In that same year AM claimed to have recruited young British Muslims to fight “defensive” *jihad* in Kashmir, Chechnya and Afghanistan.\(^{621}\) After 9/11, AM labelled the hijackers the ‘Magnificent 19’,\(^{622}\) and claimed in November 2001 that they had recruited ‘up to 600’ British Muslims to fight in Afghanistan against US-led forces.\(^{623}\) Whilst AM’s figures
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615 Taji-Farouki, ‘Islamists and the Threat of Jihad’, p.30. Taji-Farouki states that Bakri took HT ideology and ‘transformed [it] more or less in toto to the new group’.
616 Ibid, pp.31–32
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have not been verified by the Security Service, there are a number of instances of British Muslims fighting *jihad* who were either members of AM or who had regularly attended its meetings.\(^{624}\) Similarly, one former member of HTB reports that a number of HT followers left from Birmingham for Afghanistan to fight against perceived “occupying” forces during the early years of the US-led campaign.\(^{625}\)

### Public Rallies

AM held a number of subversive events in the late 1990s.\(^{626}\) AM’s first public event, scheduled for 8 September 1996 in London, was cancelled at the last minute due to increased security costs. Amongst those invited to speak were Osama bin Laden, Muhammad Fadhlallah, the spiritual leader of Hizbollah, and Omar Abdel-Rahman, convicted in 1995 for conspiracy to bomb the World Trade Centre in New York in 1993. All were excluded from the UK by the Home Office as their presence would ‘not be conducive to national security’. Other scheduled participants included Mohammad Al-Massari, Saudi dissident and founder of the Committee for the Defence of Legitimate Rights, who praised bin Laden and ideologically supported HT\(^{627}\) and Abdul Karim Obeid, a senior Lebanese Hizbollah member detained in Israel between 1989 and 2004. A variety of imprisoned members of the Islamic Salvation Front in Algeria were also due to speak.\(^{628}\)

### Campus Activism

The NUS banned AM from students’ union buildings in 2000 because of its offensive and discriminatory leaflets, particularly towards Jews, Hindus and homosexuals. In March 2004, the NUS extended its ‘No Platform’ policy to AM.\(^{629}\) Despite this, the group claimed that it increased its recruitment drive following 9/11, targeting prominent UK universities and mosques and distributing leaflets promoting the idea of a clash of civilisations between Islam and the West. In a 2006 interview with *al-Sharq al-Awsat* newspaper, Bakri claimed that AM had targeted over 48 universities and campuses – including Oxford, Cambridge, the London School of Economics and King’s College London – concluding public events with a call to embrace Islam and martyrdom.\(^{630}\)
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\(^{624}\) ‘One in Seven UK Terror-related Convictions Linked to Islamist Group Now Threatening to Relaunch’, Centre for Social Cohesion Press Briefing

\(^{625}\) According to HTB former member A.


\(^{628}\) British Muslims Monthly Survey, August 1996


\(^{630}\) ‘The [Islamist] Groups and the Universities’, *Asharq Alawsat*, 15 December 2006; see also ‘Radical Islamist activities in UK campuses’, *International Institute for Counter-terrorism*, 22 December 2006
Proscription – Al-Muhajiroun and Successor Groups

To avoid proscription, AM disbanded in October 2004. In the aftermath of the 7/7 London bombings Bakri fled the UK for Lebanon. Leading members of AM reformed under successor groups, al-Ghurabaa, the Saved Sect and ASWJ. Al-Ghurabaa and Saved Sect were both proscribed in July 2006 under the Terrorism Act of that year for glorifying terrorism. Leading members or ASWJ were convicted of terrorism-related offences in April 2008. Following their release in May 2009, AM announced it was re-launching under the leadership of Anjem Choudary.

Al-Muhajiroun linked Convictions for Terror-related Offences

A significant number of all those convicted in the UK of Islamist terrorism-related offences between 1999 and 2009 were either members of, or have known links to, AM.631

Bomb attacks:
Omar Khyam, Waheed Mahmood [aka Abdul Waheed] and Jawad Akbar (April 2007) – convicted for their roles in the ‘fertiliser bomb’ plot targeting London nightclubs and other public buildings.632

Membership of al-Qaeda:
Habib Ahmed (December 2008) – convicted for membership of al-Qaeda and possessing documents containing details of al-Qaeda operatives.633

Terrorist fundraising:

Murder offences:
Umran Javed (January 2007), Abdul Muhid (March 2007) and Mizanur Rahman (July 2007) – convicted of soliciting murder during the Danish Embassy anti-cartoon protests.635

631 ‘One in Seven UK Terror-related Convictions Linked to Islamist Group Now Threatening to Relaunch’, Centre for Social Cohesion Press Briefing

**Arson:**
Amer Mirza (March 1999) – convicted for petrol-bombing a Territorial Army base in West London in protest against an American bombing campaign in Iraq.\(^{637}\)

Ali Beheshti (April 2009) – convicted for conspiracy to firebomb the home of Martin Rynja, the publisher planning to release a book about Islam’s Prophet Mohammed’s wife Aisha.\(^{638}\)

**Racial hatred:**
Iftikhar Ali (October 2000) – convicted for distributing leaflets advertising an AM event in Whitechapel – which called for a holy war against Jews – with the intention of stirring up racial hatred.\(^{639}\)

Mizanur Rahman (November 2006), Umran Javed (January 2007) and Abdul Rahman Saleem (February 2007) – convicted for inciting racial hatred during the Danish Embassy anti-cartoon protests against the republication of the Danish Mohammed cartoons in London in February 2006.\(^{640}\)
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636 ‘Six men convicted of terrorism offences’, Metropolitan Police
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APPENDIX B: Hizb ut-Tahrir’s Edict on Hijacking Planes

THE ISLAMIC RULE ON HIJACKING AEROPLANES

“Every Muslim’s blood, property and honour are sacred to a Muslim.”

The subject is hijacking aeroplanes belonging to the Muslim world, including the Arab countries; or the Kafir (disbelieving) countries with whom we are at war, like Israel; and those Kafir countries with whom we are not at war with.

If the aeroplane is from an Islamic country, including the Arab countries, it is not allowed to hijack it, nor to attack it, and it should not be damaged, because it is Muslim property, even though it may belong to the state, because if it belongs to the state it does not mean it belongs to the ruler, but it belongs to the Muslims, and it is held as a trust for the Muslims and it should not be violated; it is haram (sinful) to attack or damage such a trust. Hijacking aeroplanes means to attack the people in the aeroplanes without a just cause, for those people on board the plane are innocent bystanders, even if their ruler is an evil oppressor, ruling by something different to what Allah revealed - for this does not mean you can attack those on board, or hurt them. Whilst hijacking the aeroplane those on board have nothing to do with the injustice of the ruler, for they cannot be held responsible for the injustice of their ruler. Allah says “Each one carries the responsibility for his own actions.” And hijacking aeroplanes, and imprisoning those on board and terrorizing them and threatening to kill them, all this comes under the heading of ‘corruption on the earth’ and within the subject of terrorism, which are both haram. Allah says, “The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and His Apostle and strive to make corruption on the earth is only this, that they should be slaughtered or crucified or their hands and their feet should be cut off on opposite sides or they should be imprisoned; this shall be as a disgrace for them in this world, and in the hereafter they shall have a grievous punishment.” (5:33) Omar said be heard the Prophet (saw) say, “Don’t punish the people, whosoever does that in this life Allah will punish him in the hereafter.”

And attacking the people on board the aeroplane and terrorizing them means violating their honour and sacredness, and this is haram under the Shari’a (divine law) because the sanctity of Muslims, and the sacredness of their property, honour and persons should be respected and secure, and they should never under any circumstances be violated. The Prophet (saw) said, “Every Muslim’s blood, property and honour are sacred to a Muslim.” And the Messenger Muhammad (saw) said as he was going around the Ka’ba, “By Him whose hands hold Muhammad’s soul the greatest sanctity of a Believer to another in the eyes of Allah is the sanctity of his property and blood and that he should think good of him.”

And the killing of all or some on board is a great crime which Allah prohibited, and it is haram. Allah says, “And slay not the life which Allah has forbidden except with a just cause.” (17:33) And He says, “Whosoever
kills someone without reason makes corruption on this earth as if he were killing everyone." And Allah put a rule that whoever deliberately kills an innocent Believer Allah will put him in the hell forever and they will have the wrath and curse of Allah and Allah has prepared for him a painful punishment. Allah says, "Who deliberately kills a Believer, his is hell forever. Allah is wrath against him and He has cursed him and prepared for a painful punishment." (4:93)

If the plane belongs to a country at war with the Muslims, like Israel, it is allowed to hijack it, for there is no sanctity for Israel nor for the Jews in it and their property and we should treat them as being at war with us.

If the plane belongs to a Kafir state with whom their is no direct war with Muslims it is not allowed to hijack it nor to attack those on board because it is terrorism and Allah prohibited Muslims to be terrorists and He says, "Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you but begin not hostilities. Lo! Allah loves not aggressors." (2:190)

This is the rule in Islam on hijacking aeroplanes, which Muslims must hold to, and any political aim, whatever it may be, even if Islam orders us to do it, must be done according to the Shari'a. It is not allowed for Muslims to hijack aeroplanes or to terrorize, attack or kill people on board, whether Muslims or Kafir, except if they are Kafir at war with Muslims. So all the deeds of some of the groups or some organisers of hijackings or destruction of planes or terrorizing or killing those on board, all is this haram from the Islamic viewpoint, except if the aeroplane's passengers belong to a Kafir state at war with Muslims.

"This is Allah's limits and don't transgress them and whoever transgresses Allah's limits are of the oppressors."

21 Sha'ban 1408
8 April 1988

حزب التحرير
APPENDIX C: ‘Communiqué from Hizb ut-Tahrir – America and Britain declare war against Islam and the Muslims’

“Fight against them so that Allah will punish them by your hands and disgrace them and give you victory over them and heal the breasts of a believing people” [TMQ At-Taubah: 14].

On Sunday 7/10/2001, America, the head of Kufr and her ally Britain declared a brutal war against the Muslims. They began to bomb Afghan cities – Kabul, Kandahar, Jalalabad, and other cities – with deadly Tomahawk missiles and with bombers, which carry tens of tonnes of destructive bombs. These were launched from battleships, aircraft carriers and submarines that she has amassed in the Indian Ocean over the last three weeks. They were also launched from airports and military bases of some neighbouring states with the collusion and treachery of the criminal rulers in the Muslim lands.

The two enemies of Islam and the Muslims, America and Britain, waged an unjust war against the poor and defenceless Afghan people who had been afflicted by destructive wars for more than a quarter of a century. They declared the war against it even though their government had not declared a war against them and nor did it commit aggression against them.

It is one of the strange and astonishing discrepancies, and more so an insult to people’s intelligence when they say that they are not fighting Islam or the Muslims, at a time when they are unleashing all their lethal weapons against the defenceless Muslims in Afghanistan visible to the whole world to see and when they fight Islam in the name of terrorism.

The war criminal Bush is waging an unjust war on the Muslims to regain the tattered prestige of America and to eliminate the effects of the blow, which had shaken her on the eleventh of September, carried away by the desire of the American people for revenge. Polls have stated that more than eighty per cent of the American people wish to see military action as a response to what happened on that date. In addition to this, one of the aims of this oppressive war is to uproot the aspiration of the Muslims for the re-establishment of the rule by Islam, and to remove the Taliban government after it freed itself from the American subjugation and from the Western subjugation in general. This represents a dangerous precedent, in the view of the Americans, to her influence and to the influence of the West in that region and what may result in terms of the liberation of the other Islamic peoples like Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Iran and others.
As for what the war criminal Blair is undertaking by squeezing himself into the hostility against Islam and the Muslims – he has truly drawn people's attention by surpassing his partner in crime Bush in inflaming the war. Blair's undertaking of this action is indeed a clear aggression against Islam and the Muslims. By doing that he is showing enmity to the Islamic Ummah without any regard for this Ummah, all of which is seen and heard by her traitorous agent rulers, as if it is not their duty to protect her sanctities and territories!

Indeed the reality of the war waged by America, the head of Kafir, and Britain and their allies from the Kafir states on Afghanistan is a crusade. They are waging it under the banner of what they call fighting terrorism, through deliberate lies and deception, to strike Islam and the Muslims, and to protect their treacherous agents – the rulers of the Muslims who are colluding with them in this war – those rulers who have opened up the airports and territories of the Muslims to their military operations throughout the length and breadth of the Islamic world.

This is not the first time in which America and Britain have waged a war against the Muslims. They waged a war, with other nations, against Iraq in 1990 to facilitate the continuous plundering of the oil resources of the Gulf under the pretext of protecting Kuwait and its people. Even until now they are still, almost daily, launching attacks on the north of Iraq and the south of Iraq. They established the Jewish entity in Palestine in 1948 and they still support it with money, weapons and influence, eager to fight Islam and humiliate the Muslims. Over the necks of the Muslims they established agent rulers who inflict on them a horrible torment to facilitate for the West the looting of the Muslims' resources and to oppose any movement working for liberation from the noose of Kafir and working to restore the rule of Islam in the land. What America and Britain are doing is displaying their enmity for the Islamic Ummah. They are enemies; a state of war exists between them and all the Muslims that necessitates adopting an actual state of war as a basis for dealing with them according to the dictates of the Shari'ah rules. That position should be adopted with them and all those who ally themselves with them in their war against the Muslims:

“And fight in the Way of Allah those who fight you” [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 190].

The last few days have shown the extent the ruling clans in the Islamic world, including the Arab world, have reached, in serving the Kafir and being faithful to him, and the extent of the hatred of these clans for the sons of the Islamic Ummah. They colluded with the Kafir in killing the Muslims of Afghanistan and they provided him with the necessary military facilities and gave him the right to use the bases and airports. They revealed to them the secrets of the state relating to intelligence and all the information, which would enable the Kafir to fight the Muslims. They vied with each other in providing lists which contain the names of those
they call ‘suspects’ in order to chase them, and they collaborated with them in paying for the costs of the war against the Muslims.

**O Armies of the Islamic Ummah:**

The time has come for you to defend the domains of the Muslims:

“O you who believe! What is the matter with you, that when you are asked to march forth in the cause of Allah (Jihad) you cling heavily to the earth? Are you pleased with the life of this world rather than the Hereafter? But little is the enjoyment of the life of this world as compared with the Hereafter” [TMQ At-Taubah: 38].

Have you not heard and seen with your own eyes the head of Kufr America and her cunning ally Britain destroying the homes of the Muslims in Afghanistan? Do you not hear or see what the ruling clans are doing in your lands in terms of allying with the Kuffar against the Muslims:

“O you who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians as Awliya (friends, protectors), they are but Awliya to one another. And if any amongst you takes them as Awliya: then surely he is one of them” [TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 51]

“O you who believe! Take not My enemies and your enemies (i.e. disbelievers) as friends” [TMQ Al-Mumtahana: 1].

The time has come for you to liberate the Ummah from the evil of these renegade clans that have permitted loyalty to Kufr at the expense of supporting the Muslims. It is forbidden for you to obey them in fighting the Muslims. Rather it is obligatory on you to work to liberate
the *Ummah* from them, and to support your Muslim brothers in Afghanistan and elsewhere by standing on their side in confronting America, Britain and their allies in their brutal war against Islam and the Muslims.

**O Noble Ummah:**

Indeed, the declaration of war on Muslims in Afghanistan or in any other nation is a declaration of war on all Muslims in the world. There is no difference between Kabul, Damascus, Cairo, Makkah, Jakarta and other capital cities of the Muslims. The political borders placed amongst the Muslims by the Kuffar are of no value. The war of the Muslims is one and their peace is one. The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) wrote in the treaty of Madinah the description of the Muslims: “They are one *Ummah* to the exclusion of all other people…the believers are helpers of each other to the exclusion of others… the peace of the believers is one and the believer does not make peace except with another believer in fighting in the path of Allah.”

22 Rajab 1422 Hijri

9/10/2001

*Hizb ut-Tahrir*

**Source:** *Hizb ut-Tahrir*
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Glossary

‘Aqeeda: Islamic doctrine
Amir: Muslim leader
Da’wah or dawah: proselytising the message of Islam
Dar al-Harb: lit. land of war. Used by Islamists to mean any land where shariah law is not imposed.
Dar al-Islam: lit. land of Islam. Used by Islamists to mean any land where shariah law is imposed.
Dar al-Kufr: lit. land of disbelief, synonymous to Dar al-Harb
Dar: land
Deen: faith
Dhimmi: a medieval conception of a non-Muslim under protection in a Muslim polity
Hadith: reported saying of Islam’s Prophet Mohammed
Halal: permitted / lawful
Halaqa (pl. halaqaat): study circle, usually used for Quranic recitation or Islamic studies. HT uses it to discuss party ideas.
Haram: forbidden / sinful
Hijab: lit. barrier. Used to refer to the female headscarf in the report.
Hudud: medieval Islamic penal code. Usually refers to a set of punishments for theft, adultery, pre-marital sex and apostasy.
Inshaallah or Insha-Allah: God willing
Jihad: lit. means struggle. Interpretations range from a personal effort to live according to Islam or inner struggle against the self to physically defending Islam by means of an armed struggle. Primarily used by HT to mean offensive – expansionist state warfare.
Jilbab: a loose dress
Jizya or jizyah: tax paid by dhimmis (see dhimmi)
Khaleefah or Khalifah: Caliph, head of state in the Caliphate
Kharaj: tax on colonised land
Khilafah, al-Khilafa or Khilafa: Caliphate. HT uses it to mean an expansionist Islamist state.
Kufr (pl. Kuffar; s. Kafir): disbelief (pl. disbelievers; s. disbeliever)
Nussrah or nusrah: seeking support. HT uses the term to mean seeking support from powerful groups, i.e. HT’s policy of infiltrating military factions to conduct coups.
Quran: Islam’s holy book
Shariah, Shar’iyah, Shari’ah or Sharee’ah: lit. road. It is a range of diverse traditions and interpretations of strict rules to broad principles and objectives. HT presents its own version of shariah as strict laws that include medieval forms of punishment.
Takfir: the practice of declaring a Muslim a non-Muslim, similar to excommunication.
Ummah or Umma: community, religious fraternity. HT defines ummah as a global Muslim political bloc.
Abbreviations

AM: Al-Muhajiroun
BLIC: Brick Lane Islamic Circle
BME: Black and Minority Ethnic
BNP: British National Party
CLG: Department for Communities and Local Government
DCSF: Department for Children, Families and Schools
DV: Developed Vetting
ECHR: European Court of Human Rights
FE: Further Education
FOSIS: Federation of Student Islamic Societies
FSCU: Charity Commission Faith and Social Cohesion Unit
GTC: General Teaching Council
HMF: Hounslow Muslim Forum
HMO: Hackney Muslim Organisation
HT: Hizb ut-Tahrir
HTB: Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain
IS: Ideological Society
ISF: Islamic Shakhsiyah Foundation
ISOC [pl. ISOCs]: Islamic Society
IYA: Inspire Youth Association
Ji: Jamaat-e-Islami
LMC: London Muslim Centre
MAB: Muslim Association of Britain
MB: Muslim Brotherhood
MCB: Muslim Council of Britain
MCRCIA: Muslim Community Representatives Camden & Islington Association
MINAB: Mosques and Imams National Advisory Board
MMI: Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia (the Indonesian Mujahidin Council)
MP [pl. MPs]: Member of Parliament
MPAC: Muslim Public affairs Committee UK
NUS: National Union of Students
OFSTED: Office for Standards in Education Children’s Services and Skills
OSCT: Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism
PIJ: Palestinian Islamic Jihad
PVE: Preventing Violent Extremism
QM: Queen Mary, University of London
RICU: Research, Information and Communications Unit
SOAS: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
SRE: Sex and Relationship Education
UEL: University of East London
Hizb ut-Tahrir Members Mentioned

Abdul Qadeem Zallum: HT’s global leader [1977-2003]
Abdul Wahid: HTB Executive Chairman [current]
Abdurrahman al-Baghdadi: HT member who introduced the party in Indonesia in 1983
Abu Abdullah al-Kurdi: HT member in Iraq
Akmal Ashgar: HTB member, head of New Civilisation think tank
Amir Yilmaz: Leader of HT Turkey [in 2003]
Ata Abu Rishta: HT’s global leader [2003 – present]
Asad Baoud al-Tamimi: One of HT’s founding members [1952-1958], founder of Islamic Jihad-Bayt al-Maqdis [1982, Jordan]
Dilpazier Aslam: HTB member and former Guardian newspaper journalist
Farhad Khodabaksh: HTB member
Farid Kassim: HTB’s first Deputy Leader and Spokesperson
Imran Wahid: HTB Chief Media Advisor, and former Media Representative
Imtiaz Malik: Leader of HT Pakistan [suspected]
Jalaluddin Patel: HTB member and former leader
Jamal Harwood: HTB Head of Legal Affairs
Majed Iqbal: HTB member
Mobeen Anway: HTB Spokesman
Mohammed Taqiuddin an-Nabhani: HT’s founder, ideologue and global leader [1952-1977]
Mustafa Minhaz: HT Bangladesh Media and Promotions Secretary
Nasim Ghani: HTB Chairman [current leader]
Naveed Butt: HT Pakistan Spokesman
Nazreen Nawaz: HTB Women’s Media Representative
Sajjad Khan: HTB Chief Political Advisor, former leader
Salih Sirriyya: An HT member in Iraq and Jordan during the 1970s. He was the initiator of a pre-coup attack in 1974 in Egypt to help establish HT’s state.
Salim al-Rahhal: HT member. Radicalised the murderers of former Egyptian President Anwar el-Sadat in 1981.
Shahzad Sheikh: HTB Pakistan Deputy Spokesman
Shareef Hafez: HTB member
Taji Mustafa: HTB Media Representative
Tayyib Muqeem: HTB member
Zituzzaman Hoque: Leader of HT Bangladesh [suspected]
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