Calhoun

Institutional Archive of the Naval Postgraduate School

Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Faculty and Researcher Publications · Faculty and Researcher Publications Collection

2010

Fighting the Jihad of the Pen: Countering Al Qaeda's Ideology

Gregg, Heather S.

Taylor and Francis

"Fighting the Jihad of the Pen: Countering Al Qaeda's Ideology," Terrorism and Political Violence, 22, no. 2 (2010): 294-314

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Fighting the Jihad of the Pen: Countering Revolutionary Islam's Ideology

HEATHER S. GREGG

Defense Analysis Department, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, USA

Al Qaeda's ideology is not new; their critique of the existing political and social order and vision for how to redeem the Muslim world builds on preexisting arguments of several 20th century predecessors who called for an Islamic revolution that would create a new order based on Islam. The persistence of revolutionary Islam suggests that these ideas need to be countered in order to strike at the root of the problem driving Islamically motivated terrorism and insurgency. U.S. efforts to defeat Al Qaeda, however, continue to focus primarily on killing or capturing the leadership, interdicting operations, and defensively bolstering the homeland and U.S. assets against various types of attacks. In order to confront Al Qaeda's ideology, U.S. efforts should focus on indirectly fostering "a market place of ideas"—the space and culture of questioning and debating—in order to challenge the grievances and solutions proposed by revolutionary Islam.

"The life of the Muslim Ummah is solely dependent on the ink of its scholars and the blood of its martyrs."

—Sheikh Abdullah Azzam[1]

Following September 11th, the United States launched a Global War on Terror that aimed to eradicate terrorist threats to the United States and its interests. The principal target has been Al Qaeda. U.S. efforts to defeat Al Qaeda have focused on killing or capturing the leadership, interdicting operations, and defensively bolstering the homeland and U.S. assets against various types of attacks. Comparatively little effort—in money, manpower, and strategy—has been put into countering Al Qaeda's ideology, which is the inspiration for its actions.

Heather S. Gregg is an assistant professor in the Defense Analysis Department at the Naval Postgraduate School, which works primarily with U.S. and foreign special forces officers. She is a co-editor of *The Three Circles of War: Understanding the Dynamics of Conflict in Iraq* (Potomac, 2010).

The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewers of the article for their helpful comments.

Address correspondence to Heather S. Gregg, 589 Dyer Road, Room 210, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943, USA. E-mail: hsgregg@nps.edu

Al Qaeda's ideology, however, is not new. Its critique of the existing social and political order and vision for how to redeem the Muslim world builds on preexisting arguments of several 20th century predecessors who called for an Islamic revolution that would create a new order based on Islam. The persistence of revolutionary Islam suggests that these ideas need to be countered in order to strike at the root of the problem driving Islamically motivated terrorism and insurgency. The U.S. government has a limited but important role in fighting this ideology; directly confronting Al Qaeda's message is unlikely to work because the United States lacks credibility and is not trusted by large portions of the Muslim world. The best avenue for the U.S. to counter revolutionary Islam is to focus on indirectly fostering "a market place of ideas"—the space and culture of questioning and debating—in order to challenge the grievances and solutions proposed by revolutionary Islam.

The article is divided into three sections. The first section constructs a three-part definition of ideology—a critique on the current order, a set of beliefs for how the world ought to be, and a course of action for realizing that better world. The second section uses the definition of ideology to dissect Al Qaeda's vision. And the third section concludes with a discussion on the challenges of fighting each subcomponent of revolutionary Islam's ideology, arguing that creating the space and culture for debating ideas is a useful means for undermining Al Qaeda's vision for a better world and how to get there.

Ideology—Critique, Vision, and Action

Ideology has many meanings, some contradictory to one another. This section draws on literature from political philosophy to create a working definition of ideology, stressing three subparts: a set of beliefs for how the world ought to be, a critique of how the world currently is, and a course of action for realizing that world. From this definition, the article then investigates the set of beliefs embodied in Al Qaeda's ideology.

Despite the disagreement over defining ideology, most scholars agree on the term's origins. Eighteenth century scholar Atoine Detutt de Tracy first used ideology during the French Revolution to describe a new science of ideas that promised to justly and rightly govern the new republic.[2] Since coining the term, the study of ideology has taken several trajectories. One direction focuses on the philosophical aspects of ideology—such as its normative claims to truth and its epistemological properties. Within this camp, ideologues such as Hegel and Marx, and de Tracy before that, argue that human history is ever progressing towards perfection and that it is only a matter of time and effort before false ideologies are discredited, truth prevails, and ideological struggle ends. For Marx, the end of class struggle and false ideologies means the end of ideology altogether. More recently, scholars have argued that the discrediting of communist ideology and the persistence of liberal democracy has brought about the "end of history," meaning the end of ideological struggle.[3]

Another approach to studying ideology looks more at its functional aspects as a set of ideas that mobilizes and shapes human behavior. Political philosopher Iain MacKenzie describes this as the study of "ideology as doing rather than as knowing."[4] Studying ideology from this perspective focuses more on its utility than its truthfulness of source or knowledge. For example, Louis Althusser argues that ideology has a "practico-social function" that bonds societies together.[5] Another

practical function of ideology is that it makes sense out of the world; it tells individuals and societies who they are and who they ought to be.[6]

Iain MacKenzie argues that ideologies are particularly powerful because they combine critiques of the current order and a vision for a better system: "Along with a map of reality comes a picture of an ideal society. An ideology, then, provides both an account of existing social and political relations and a blueprint of how these relations ought to be organized."[7] Political theorist Andrew Heywood notes, "Ideologies are embraced less because they stand up to scrutiny and logical analysis, and more because they help individuals, groups and societies to make sense of the world in which they live."[8] Ideology, therefore, contains valuable insights into the mental landscape of its creators and those who embrace them; it offers a glimpse into the dreams and aspirations of how they believe the world ought to be and their paths for realizing that new world.

Finally, Heywood suggests that ideology is particularly powerful and important to study because it fuses together the two worlds of thought and action: "[ideology] straddles the conventional boundaries between descriptive and normative thought, and between political theory and political practice . . . ideology therefore has a powerful emotional or effective character: it is a means of expressing hopes and fears, sympathies and hatreds, as well as articulating belief and understanding."[9]

With this discussion in mind, this article uses Heywood's definition of ideology:

> A more or less coherent set of ideas that provides the basis for organized political action, whether this is intended to preserve, modify or overthrow the existing system of power. All ideologies therefore, have the following features:
>   (a) They offer an account of the existing order, usually in the form of a 'world view.'
>   (b) They advance a model of a desired future, a vision of the 'good society.'
>   (c) They explain how political change can and should be brought about—how to get from (a) to (b).[10]

Ideologies, in other words, attempt to make sense of the world around us; they tell us who we are and who we ought to be. They explain current misery and assign blame for that misery, blaming false ideas and the leaders that uphold these ideas. Ideologues provide a vision for (in their eyes) a better world and directions for how to get there; they describe the elusive path to utopia. Finally, ideologues wrap their message and their call for action in an air of authenticity, claiming their path to be true, and therefore infallible.

This understanding of ideology is particularly useful for discerning the message of Al Qaeda. Al Qaeda's vision, which builds on several Muslim ideologues of the 20th century, contains a critique of the existing political order in the Muslim world. It cites weak and corrupt Muslim leadership, its adherents to the false ideologies of the West, and its support from the West as the malady of the Muslim world. In order for the Muslim world to be restored, it must return to its true path, which is laid out in the Qur'an and the Sunnah (the sayings and actions of the Prophet Muhammad). For Al Qaeda, this return to the right path can only be achieved through a physical struggle, jihad, against Muslim leadership and the Western powers that support it.

Al Qaeda's Ideology—Critiques, Vision, and Means for Change

While some of its tactics and strategies are new—such as attacking the continental United States with the aim of compelling its withdrawal from the Muslim world— Al Qaeda's ideology is not new; it has its roots in several Muslim thinkers from the 20th century who developed the vision for an Islamic revolution. Building on the three-part definition of ideology—a critique of the existing order, a vision for a better world, and the means for achieving that better world—this section outlines Al Qaeda's ideology and its historic antecedents. It argues that its critique of the existing order is not new, its vision for a better world order is vague, and perhaps its greatest contribution to the evolving ideology is that the United States is directly attacking the Muslim world—through occupation, war, and support of corrupt Muslim leadership—and that fighting the United States is an individual obligation for all Muslims to defend the faith against this imminent threat. Each of these points will be elaborated on below.

The Critique—The Muslim World is in a State of Crisis

Al Qaeda's ideology is grounded on the assertion that weak and corrupt Muslim leadership is to blame for the decline of the Muslim community and that leadership is weak because it has embraced the West and strayed from the true path of Islam. Al Qaeda points to events such as the 1967 Six Day War, Israeli occupation of Palestine, and the presence of foreign troops on Saudi soil and other Muslim lands, as evidence that Muslim leadership has failed to protect the *dar al Islam*, the territory of Islam. Reform is not an option; overthrowing Muslim leadership throughout the *dar al Islam* and instilling pious leaders who defend the faith is necessary to counter this crisis. In other words, an Islamic revolution is the only solution.

Al Qaeda formed in the wake of the Soviet Afghan war of the 1980s with the goal of spreading jihad throughout the world as a means of toppling secular Muslim regimes and establishing pious governments in their place. Bin Laden's primary target was the Saudi royal family, which he denounced for allowing U.S. troops to base on Saudi soil in 1991 and for imprisoning several *ulama*, Muslim scholars, who disagreed with this decision.[11] Bin Laden's first public statement, "An Open Letter to King Fahd," argues that the Saudi government has violated *tawhid*, the oneness of God, by creating laws that diverge from God's laws (Shariah) and joining forces with human enterprises such as the Gulf Cooperation Council and the United States. The letter argues: "You have put the Islamic law only at the very end of the above mentioned list of legislative sources even after the garbage of human thoughts, norms and traditions of the disbelieving nations and the laws of the disbelieving regimes."[12] Bin Laden's letter draws on the historical precedents of Ibn Taymiyah,[13] Ibn Katheer, Sheikh Mohammad bin Ibrahim, and Ibn Hazm, among others, to argue that the Saudi royal family no longer has authority over the country because of its breach of *tawhid*. In 1994, bin Laden founded the Advice and Reconciliation Committee, which focused almost entirely on criticizing the Saudi regime for failing to uphold the tenets of the faith.[14]

Al Qaeda also blames Western ideas and values as corrupting the Muslim world. Democracy, in particular, is a Western idea that Al Qaeda names as a source of threat to Islam. Zawahiri, bin Laden's deputy, goes so far as to call democracy "a new religion." He states: "In Islam, legislation comes from God; in a democracy, this

capacity is given to the people. Therefore, this is a new religion, based on making the people into gods and giving them God's rights and attributes."[15] Democracy, in other words, compromises the sovereignty and oneness of God; it places humans in a position of authority that should only be held by God.

The critique of corrupt Muslim leaderships and their embrace of Western ideas is a grievance that stretches back almost a century. Hassan al Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, began his Islamic revival as a critique against Muslim leadership and its failure to lead the community in the right path of the faith. Banna argued that Egypt—and Muslim society more broadly—was in a state of crisis; Egyptian society had strayed away from the path of God by investing in Western, secular ideologies—including both capitalism and socialism—and materialistic pursuits. Only by retuning Egyptian society to its true faith and identity—Islam—could it flourish and shake off Western influence.[16]

Around the same time as Banna, South Asian Islamic ideologue Sayyid Abul a'la Mawdudi was equally critical of Muslim leadership and the educated elite, which he believed had been seduced by the ideas of the West. Mawdudi argued that Western culture and ideas were inherently bankrupt and corrupt. Mawdudi reinterpreted the term *jahiliyyah*—a word used to describe the ignorance of the world prior to the revelation of the Qur'an—to mean the ignorance and deception of Western culture and ideological thought.[17] In the article "Self-Destructiveness of Western Civilization," written in the 1930s, Mawdudi contends that, while Western accomplishments and political power are "awe inspiring," the West is destined to fail because of its arrogance and rebellion against God: "The miseries of the First World War, financial breakdowns, ever increasing unemployment, a spectacular rise in sexual diseases, disintegration of the family system, all of these are very clear indications for those who have insights to conclude the repercussions of tyranny, disobedience, lustfulness and dishonesty."[18] Mawdudi concludes that mimicking the West will only cause "backwards and licentious nations" to suffer the same fate as the powers they emulate.[19]

Sayyid Qutb, perhaps one of the most important 20th century Islamic ideologues, also blamed the perceived decline of Islam on Muslim leadership, including religious leaders. Qutb accused these leaders of aping Western ideology, bending to the will of political authority, and compromising the teachings of Islam. Qutb also used the term *jahiliyyah* to describe not only the West but the Muslim world, which had become lost and corrupted by the ideas of the West and weak Muslim leaders. Specifically, Qutb called governments that embrace secularism and that give humans the right to govern over other humans (a role reserved only for the sovereignty of God) as *jahilil*.[20]

It is important not to lose sight of the long-standing critique against Muslim leadership, both political and religious, as the principal cause of the crisis in Islam today. Despite Al Qaeda's focus on the United States as a threat to the Muslim world, which will be discussed below, corrupt Muslim leadership still remains the principal problem in Al Qaeda's ideological critique of the existing order.

The basing of U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia, following Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait in 1991, produced a new argument against the West—that it was directly attacking the Muslim world and seeking to occupy Islam's holiest cities, Mecca and Medina. Bin Laden spearheaded this argument, first through a series of open letters to the Muslim world, followed by his 1996 declaration of war against the United States and Israel. In 1998, the Qatari-based satellite news station *Al Jazeera*

interviewed bin Laden after the African embassy bombings and U.S. attacks on Afghanistan and Sudan. Bin Laden asserted:

> Our duty—which we have undertaken—is to motivate our *ummah* to *jihad* for the sake of God against America and Israel and their allies. And we are still doing this, motivating people; the popular mobilization that happened in these last months is moving in the right direction to remove the Americans from Muslim countries.[21]

In his 1998 fatwah, bin Laden goes even further to declare that fighting U.S. troops and civilians is *fard ayn*, an individual obligation of all Muslims:

> The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies—civilians and military— is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque [Jerusalem] and the holy mosque [Mecca] from their grip, and in order for their armies to move out of all the lands of Islam, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim. This is in accordance with the words of Almighty Allah: "And fight the pagans all together as they fight you all together," and "fight them until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah [Qur'anic passage]."[22]

Al Qaeda's call for all Muslims to kill Americans, and their allies, is a new addition to the ideology of the Islamic revolution. Prior arguments—such as Qutb's—focused on local Muslim leadership and their corruption by Western ideas. Bin Laden and Al Qaeda take that argument further, arguing for the need to attack the United States directly. Their imperative, however, is based not only on the encroachment of Western thoughts and culture, but more specifically on acts that they perceive to be direct attacks against the Muslim world, including the presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, U.S. military operations in Somalia and Bosnia and, more recently, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Al Qaeda's statements and communiqués call for the Muslim world to rise up, *en masse*, in order to establish a unified and free *ummah* that can defeat its enemies, and that the obligation for Muslims to defend the faith is binding on all. It is a call for a total Islamic revolution of society, governance, and the faith. Most aspects of this message are not new but have built on the critiques of previous scholars and that the ideas of former ideologues have persisted beyond the lives of their creators.

The Solution—Islam is a Total Way of Life, Return to the Foundation of the Faith

Al Qaeda's ideology is rooted in the argument of several 20th century scholars that Islam provides a total way of life and offers complete direction for governance, economics, and society. Islam's totality transcends time and space and provides solutions to modern questions for individual and collective life as it has done throughout the ages. The worldwide Muslim community, the *ummah*, needs to unify and return to the foundations of the faith, laid out in the Qur'an and the Sunnah—the sayings and ways of the Prophet Muhammad—and of his companions.

Bin Laden described the totality of Islam for modern life in a 1997 interview with CNN reporter Peter Arnett:

> We are an *ummah* [unified Muslim community], and have a long history with the grace of God. We are now in the 15th century of this great religion, whose complete and comprehensive methodology has clarified the dealing between one individual and another, the duties of the believer toward God, and the relationship between the Muslim community and other countries in times of peace and war.[23]

Bin Laden's argument for the totality of Islam for modern life has its roots in the ideas of Mawdudi and Qutb. Mawdudi asserted that Muslim society could only be restored to its strength and totality by returning to Islam, which offers a complete template for spiritual, social, political, and economic life. He further argued that it is the government's responsibility to direct society on the right path of the faith. Westernized Muslim elites had led the community astray and pious Muslims need to provide an alternative to their leadership.[24] Mawdudi envisioned a state governed by an "Islamic system" that upheld Shariah law in its totality and managed spiritual, familial, social, economic, and political relations. The model for the Islamic system is the first Muslim community, the Prophet and the first four Caliphs, which governed the unified *ummah* and propagated the faith.[25] Ultimately, the Islamic system would recognize *hakimiyah* and *tawhid*, the sovereignty and oneness of God, undivided by human innovation and ambition.

Sayyid Qutb built on the arguments of Banna and Mawdudi, further stressing the authenticity of Islam's message for life. Qutb wrote extensively on an authentic Islamic ideology that would not only replace the secular ideologies of capitalism, communism, and nationalism, but would surpass their moral bankruptcy and provide a true and complete way of life.[26] Qutb also argued that it was the government's role to provide the moral framework and instruction that would lead Muslim societies out of *jahiliyyah* and into the right path of Islam. Qutb devised a four-stage process for realizing a pious government, based on the early experiences of the Prophet: the creation of a *jamaah*, or group of individuals committed to a true Islamic society and polity; the necessary persecution of the *jamaah* by the unfaithful; the *hijrah*, or separation of the *jammahi* from society; and then victory and consolidation of power.[27] Ultimately, Qutb asserted that the goal of humanity is to submit to the sovereignty of God; the detailed workings and bureaucracy of the state were not a concern to Qutb.[28]

In addition to returning to the true path of Islam, Al Qaeda's ideology also dismisses the concept of the state as unauthentic and calls for the unification of the *ummah*, the worldwide Muslim community to overcome the threats it faces. Bin Laden's declaration of war most clearly demonstrates the call for reunification. Bin Laden argues that fighting to liberate Saudi Arabia and Jerusalem from non-Muslim hands is a necessary first step, but that the ultimate goal is the reunification of the *ummah*: "This is the time to be firm, so be firm and know that your unity and cooperation for the liberation of the Islamic holy places is a sound step toward the unification of the nation's ranks under the banner of one God."[29]

Zawahiri also argues for the need to unify the *ummah*, adding the return of the *Khalifa*, one pious leader who can defend the *dar al Islam*, to his argument:

> Liberating the Muslim nation, confronting the enemies of Islam, and launching jihad against them require a Muslim authority, established on a Muslim land that raises the banner of jihad and rallies the Muslims around it. Without achieving this goal our actions will mean nothing more than mere and repeated disturbances that will not lead to the aspired goal, which is the restoration of the caliphate and the dismissal of the invaders from the land of Islam. This goal must remain the basic objective of the Islamic jihad movement, regardless of the sacrifices and the time involved.[30]

Similar to his argument against democracy, Zawahiri's critique of the state system stems from its Western origins and the way that states artificially divide the *ummah*. Zawahiri's imperative for reunification is more pragmatic than bin Laden's statements, calling for the Muslim masses to wake up, return to the true path of Islam, and band together as necessary conditions for expelling enemies from the territory of Islam, both domestic and foreign.[31] Taken together, Al Qaeda's call for reunification fills both a spiritual and a pragmatic purpose.

The desire to reunify the *ummah* is also stressed in Al Qaeda's predecessors and other contemporaries, but perhaps on a more mystical than a pragmatic level. Qutb, for example, describes the goal of Islam as worldwide unity:

> This religion is not a declaration for the liberation of the Arab man! It is not a message restricted to the Arabs... Its object is "man," the "human" genus—its scope is the "world"... the whole world. God is not the Lord of the Arabs alone not even those who believe in the Islamic doctrine alone... God is the "Lord of the worlds" and this religion seeks to *restore* "the world" to its lord and extricate people from bondage to anyone save Him. The greatest bondage—in the view of Islam—is subservience to human laws legislated by humans.[32]

Whereas Qutb described the universally salvific power of God's message for all of humanity, bin Laden and Zawahiri appear to be calling for a more literal unification of the *ummah* as a means of consolidating power to defend the *dar al Islam*. Moreover, Al Qaeda asserts the need for transnational unity that transcends the state system and creates a defensive barrier against Western influence. Qutb calls for a new government but still appears to work within the state system. Nevertheless, the goal of transnational unity of the *ummah* is a theme that is not new to the Muslim world or to the Islamic revival more specifically.

It is important to note that Al Qaeda's priority of reunifying the *ummah* and transcending all earthly barriers—national, ethnic, sect, and class—is not shared by all jihadi groups today. Palestinian Islamic jihadi groups, such as Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, continue to have specific nationalists objectives—the creation of a Palestinian state—in addition to Islamic goals. Likewise, the Lebanese Shia Hizbollah has both sectarian goals as well as more general Islamic pursuits. Therefore, Al Qaeda's vision for one monolithic *ummah*, while appealing as a spiritual goal, is not universally held by all jihadis today.[33]

The Means for Realizing the New World

Al Qaeda's goals are consistent with a growing movement in the Muslim world called *Salafi*.[34] *Salafi* advocate a strict adherence to *tawhid* (the oneness of God), reject interpretations of the scripture, and call for literally following the Qur'an and Sunna, as they believe the companions of the Prophet Mohammad (*al salaf al salahiya*) did. Although united in their goals of the oneness of God and the literal word of scripture, *Salafi* are divided over strategies for realizing this interpretation of the faith. Political scientist Quintan Wictorowicz argues that three sub-sets of Salafi exist based on differing views of how to achieve a pure, Islamic society: jihadis, who contend that violence is necessary; politicos, who believe that working through the political system can affect change; and purists, who stress the need for transforming society apart from violence and politics, which are divisive and distract from the true goals of the faith.[35]

Al Qaeda clearly falls in the jihadi's camp; their message contends that the necessary path for change requires physical struggle, or the "lesser jihad," and that jihad becomes a pillar of Islam.[36] For Al Qaeda, jihad is more than just a tactic or strategy; it is a theological imperative, binding on all Muslims. Zawahiri, in particular, argues for the necessity of jihad to restore Islam to its proper place. In his memoirs, *Knights Under the Prophet's Banner*, Zawahiri contends that "no solution is possible without jihad," and "jihad is the only solution."[37] Zawahiri further writes in *Knights Under the Prophet's Banner* that not only is jihad "the only solution," but that, tactically, the focus must "concentrate on martyrdom operations as the most successful way of inflicting damage on the opponent and the least costly to the mujahedeen in terms of casualties."[38] Zawahiri stresses: "Be sure to inflict maximum casualties on the enemy, kill the greatest number of people, for this is the language understood by the West, no matter how much time and effort such operations take."[39] As both a strategy and a tactic, suicide bombing has the multi-prong objective of striking fear into the hearts of its opponents, and waking up the *ummah* to the urgency of the crisis at hand.

Zawahiri asserts the necessity of jihad by pointing to historic examples of Islamic movements that have tried non-violent means of changing the status quo, but have failed, such as the FIS in Algeria: "It wanted to use the ballot boxes in a bid to reach the presidential palaces and ministries, but at the gates tanks were waiting, loaded with French ammunition, their barrels pointing at those who had forgotten the rules of the battle between justice and falsehood."[40] He also devotes an entire essay, "Bitter Harvest," to condemning the methods of the Muslim Brotherhood, which has tried to work with Muslim governments to bring people back to the faith.[41]

Bin Laden also asserts the necessity of jihad. In a 1997 CNN interview with Peter Arnett, he states:

> ... the effect of *jihad* has been great not only at the level of the Islamic movement but also at the level of the Muslim nation in the whole world. The spirit of power, dignity, and confidence has grown in our sons and brothers for this religion and the power of God. And it has become apparent even to the Islamic movement that there is no choice but to return to the original source, to this religion, to God's Book, and to the *sunna* of His Prophet, as understood by our predecessors, may God

be pleased with them. Of this, the peak of this religion is *jihad*. The nation has had a strong conviction that there is no way to obtain faithful strength but by returning to this *jihad*.[42]

Despite the attention paid to Al Qaeda's use of suicide bombings and emphasis on jihad, its argument for the necessity of jihad has its antecedents in previous Muslim thinkers. Qutb is often cited as the ideological father of modern day jihad and of Al Qaeda.[43] In *Milestones*, Qutb attacks the notion of defensive jihad undertaken to defend the territory of Islam, stressing instead the need for jihad to free Muslims and all men from the bonds of ignorance:

> The reasons for jihad...are these: to establish God's authority in the earth; to arrange human affairs according to the true guidance provided by God; to abolish all the Satanic forces and Satanic systems of life; to end the lordship of one man over others, since all men are creatures of God and no one has the authority to make them his servants or to make arbitrary laws for them. These are the reasons sufficient for proclaiming jihad.[44]

Qutb goes on to claim that these conditions are ongoing on the earth, and therefore require perpetual jihad.[45]

Building on the writings of Qutb, Egyptian activist Abd al-Salaman al Faraj called for Muslims to violently defend the faith against the Sadat regime in his booklet *The Neglected Duty*, circulated in the late 1970s.[46] Faraj argues that jihad was the forgotten duty of Muslims and that force is not only necessary but also required for all Muslims to defend and purify the faith from the threat of corrupt Muslim leadership and secularism. Faraj states:

> With regard to the lands of Islam the enemy lives right in the middle of them. The enemy even has got hold of the reins of power, for this enemy is (none other than) these rulers who have (illegally) seized the Leadership of the Muslims. Therefore, waging jihad against them is an individual duty, in addition to the fact that Islamic jihad today requires a drop of sweat from every Muslim. Know that when jihad is an individual duty, there is no (need to) ask permission of (your) parents to leave to wage jihad, as the jurists have said; it is similar to prayer and fasting.[47]

Bin Laden's mentor, Sheikh Abdullah Azzam, also argued for the necessity of physical jihad against the adversary. In "Martyrs: The Building Blocks of Nations," Azzam elevates jihad and martyrdom to a new level, contending that: "The life of the Muslim *ummah* is solely dependent on the ink of its scholars and the blood of its martyrs." Azzam goes on to argue that: "Indeed those who think that they can change reality, or change societies, without blood, sacrifices and invalids [sic], without pure, innocent souls, then they do not understand the essence of this *deen* (religion)."[48]

Bin Laden and Zawahiri also argue that a top-down revolution that seizes the power of the state is necessary in order to successfully bring Muslims back to the right path.[49] Zawahiri, in particular, has articulated a strategy that involves gathering a small force, what he calls the "jihad vanguard,"[50] which would drive

out Western influence and overthrow Muslim governments through jihad: "Small groups can spread fear among the Americans . . . It is always possible to track an American or a Jew, to kill him with a bullet or a knife, a simple explosive device, or a blow with an iron rod . . . With the means available, small groups can spread terror among Americans and Jews."[51] Zawahiri goes on to argue: "The jihad movement must follow a plan aimed at establishing an Islamic state it can defend on a territory in the Muslim world; from there, it will lead the struggle to restore the rightly guided caliphate after the Prophet's model."[52] Zawahiri also notes that, ultimately, transforming the population is the jihad movement's goal: "In short, the jihad movement must enter the battle in midst of the community and lead it to the battle field. It must guard against isolating itself from its community in an elitist battle against the authorities."[53] Seizing the government is thus a means to the ultimate goal of bringing everyone back to the right interpretation of the faith. This process requires a trained, committed, focused core that can drive the transformation in the right direction.

However, not all within the Al Qaeda movement agree on a top-down approach; there are advocates who argue for a bottom-up approach for realizing the global jihad, which is an important innovation in Al Qaeda thinking. Brynjar Lia's biography on Abu Mus'ab al-Suri—a purported new generation of thinkers in Al Qaeda— sheds light on a strategist with a different approach for realizing Al Qaeda's vision. According to Lia, al-Suri concurs with Al Qaeda's broad goal of freeing the Muslim world from foreign occupation, overturning corrupt Muslim leaders, and unifying the *ummah*.[54] Al-Suri argues, however, that Al Qaeda is only one part of a greater Muslim uprising and that its most important contribution to the Muslim world is its ideology, which provides solidarity and encouragement.[55] In order to realize a unified *ummah* free of corrupt leadership, Muslims should take a much more rational approach to achieving this goal and develop a long-term strategy that builds on the lessons learned from jihadis and other, non-Muslim insurgents.[56] Al-Suri further argues that the global Muslim uprising should not be driven by organizations, but rather by "systems," or independent groups and individuals inspired by Al Qaeda's ideology and loyal to its vision.[57] In other words, the top-down vanguard is unnecessary; the approach should be bottom-up and united only by the vision to establish a new Muslim order through jihad.

Another important difference with Al Qaeda and its associates is the debate on what to attack first and why. Zawahiri and bin Laden proposed a strategy that requires Muslims to attack the "far enemy"—namely the United States, as a necessary first step for toppling the "near enemy," U.S.-backed local Muslim regimes.[58] Their strategy asserts that, once the far enemy has withdrawn its support, the near enemy will be easier to conquer, paving the way for pious Muslim leadership. In his 1998 *Al Jazeera* interview, bin Laden responds to questions about U.S. and British air strikes against Iraq in Operation Desert Fox:

> . . . the time has come for Muslim people to realize after these attacks [Desert Fox] that the states of the region do not have their own sovereignty. For our enemies disporting themselves in our seas and on our lands and in our airspace, striking without anyone's permission . . . but these other regimes, they no longer have any real power. They are either colluding with America and Britain or have lost the power to do anything against this barefaced occupation.[59]

Bin Laden's statement suggests that Western powers, specifically the United States, Britain, and Israel are preventing jihadis from toppling Muslim regimes; no change can come without attacking this enemy first and compelling its withdrawal.[60]

In *Knights Under the Prophet's Banner*, Zawahiri argues that a global conspiracy consisting of "the United Nations; the servile rulers of the Muslim peoples; multinational corporations; international news agencies and satellite media channels; international relief agencies and nongovernmental organizations, which are used as a cover for espionage, conspiracies, proselytizing and arms smuggling," is attacking Islam.[61] Zawahiri repeatedly stresses that the international conspiracy needs to be attacked first and that it is important to "reemphasize that at this stage focusing on the domestic enemy alone would be pointless."[62] Zawahiri goes on to argue that, in the face of this multi-pronged threat against Islam, a counter-coalition is forming that will drive this threat out of the *dar al Islam*. "It is a growing force that is rallying under the banner of jihad, against the scope of the new world order. This force is free of the servitude to the dominant Western imperialism and promises destruction and ruin to the new crusades against the land of Islam."[63]

In order to compel the retreat of the far enemy, Al Qaeda has made three broad arguments for what to target—the economy, the military, and average citizens—these are new contributions to the evolving ideology of revolutionary Islam. Bin Laden's first target was the U.S. economy. The logic behind this target appears to be that economic might not only translates into military power, but is a coercive force in and of itself; hitting economic targets is thus a necessary means of weakening a force that is preventing the Muslim world from realizing social and political change.

At the beginning of the 1991 Gulf War, bin Laden called for all Muslims to boycott U.S. goods and products as a symbol of resistance to U.S. power.[64] The zenith of this strategy was Al Qaeda's efforts to target the U.S. economy through attacking the World Trade Center. Following the attacks, bin Laden defended his actions:

> As for the World Trade Towers, the ones who were attacked and who died in it were part of a financial power. It wasn't a children's school! Neither was it a residence. And the general consensus is that most of the people who were in the towers were men that backed the biggest financial force in the world, which spreads mischief throughout the world.[65]

The *Terrorism Perspectives Project* reports that strategists, such as Al-Qurashi and Al-Hilali, have continued to identify the economy as the United States' "center of gravity," meaning its source of strength and thus the principal object of attack.[66]

Along with economic targets, bin Laden's earliest writing argued for attacking the U.S. military as a means of compelling their withdrawal from the Muslim world. Bin Laden draws from several historic examples to argue the effectiveness of this strategy, including the mujahidin's victory over the Soviets in Afghanistan, the withdrawal of U.S. forces after the Marine barracks bombing in Lebanon, and particularly the removal of U.S. forces in Somalia after 19 soldiers were killed. Bin Laden states:

> The U.S. government went [to Somalia] with great pride and stayed there for some time, wanting to frighten them [and show] that they are the

greatest power on earth. It went there with pride and with over 28,000 soldiers, to fight a poor unarmed people ... Resistance started against the U.S. invasion because Muslims do not believe U.S allegations that they came to save the Somalis ... With God's grace, Muslims over there cooperated with some Arab *mujahidin* who were in Afghanistan. They participated with their brothers in Somalia against the American occupation troops and killed large numbers of them ... After a little resistance, the American troops left after achieving nothing. They left after claiming that they were the largest power on earth. They left after some resistance from powerless, poor, unarmed people whose only weapon is the belief in God Almighty, and who do not fear the fabricated American lives.[67]

Again, bin Laden states:

We believe that America is much weaker than Russia, and we have learned from our brothers who fought in the jihad in Somalia of the incredible weakness and cowardice of the American solider. Not even eighty of them had been killed and they fled in total darkness in the middle of the night, unable to see a thing.[68]

Some of Al Qaeda's earliest attacks were directed against U.S. military targets, such as the *USS Cole* in Yemen.

Bin Laden has further expanded his hit list to include all U.S. citizens, arguing that they pay taxes and elect the president of the United States and therefore are responsible for the president's policies:

Every American is our adversary, whether he fights directly or he pays taxes. Perhaps you have heard the recent news that three-quarters of the American people support Clinton in attacking Iraq. This is a people whose votes are won when innocents dies, whose leader commits adultery and great sins and then sees his popularity rise—a vile people who have never understood the meaning of values.[69]

More recently, the strategy of targeting civilians has come under attack from other Islamic revolutionaries. Following more than a decade in prison, members of the Egyptian Gaamat drafted a series of books critiquing jihadis' use of force to change the political and social status quo, including Al Qaeda's use of violence. The authors criticize, in particular, targeting U.S. civilians based on their democratic participation in governance. The authors conclude that this is an erroneous interpretation of the laws that govern jihad and they are not legitimate targets.[70] In 2007, Egyptian Islamic Jihad followed with a similar renunciation of violence and critique of Al Qaeda's theology and tactics.[71]

In addition to targeting the far enemy to compel its withdrawal, Al Qaeda and its affiliates have also proposed strategies for dealing with domestic leaders and wayward Muslims. Abu Bakr Naji has proposed that operations should not focus on toppling domestic governments—either by attacking them first or hitting the states that support them—but that the goal should be creating ungoverned spaces, what he calls "administrations of savagery" in which jihadis can organize, train, and

operate.[72] Jihadis can create these administrations of savagery by first attacking critical economic assets in a country, which will require a country's forces to double up protection on these sites. This, in turn, will create security vacuums in other areas from which jihadis can set up government-like structures, gain strength, and "manage savagery," which will win populations over. The ideological goal is still the same—to spread revolutionary Islam—but the strategy for reaching this ideological goal differs from bin Laden's and Zawahiri's focus on the far enemy. There is evidence that Naji's strategy is gaining ground in certain jihadi circles. In 2008, Saudi Arabia, for example, arrested hundreds of jihad, some of which were claiming to implement Naji's strategy.[73]

Perhaps the most controversial target for attack in revolutionary Islam has been fellow Muslims. Bin Laden cites the 14th century scholar Ibn Taymiyah as an example of legal justification for attacking corrupt Muslim leadership—in Taymiyah's case the Mongols and Muslim scholars who allowed for what Taymiyah deemed innovative practices—and, in so doing, targeting fellow Muslims.[74] Faraj also cites Taymiyah to make an argument for the permissibility of killing fellow Muslims, including corrupt Muslim leaders and individual Muslims who may be in an adversary's military.[75]

However, more recent attacks reveal that targeting and killing fellow Muslims, especially average citizens, is not winning people over to Al Qaeda's vision; in fact it is turning them against the movement. This is particularly true of the November 2005 series of suicide attacks in Amman, Jordan that killed over 60 people, mostly Muslim. The attack, coordinated by Jordanian-born Al Qaeda in Iraq leader Abu Musab Al Zarqawi, was meant to target foreign diplomats in Western hotels, but ended up killing mostly Muslims, including nearly 40 Muslims attending a wedding party. The attacks prompted protests in the streets condemning the acts.[76] The demise of Al Qaeda in Iraq is also attributed to its use of brutality against Iraqi Sunnis, including the movement's assassination of a prominent tribal Sheikh in 2007.[77] Recent U.S. intelligence forecasting suggests that Al Qaeda is on the decline, "having alienated Muslim supporters with indiscriminate killing and inattention to the practical problems of poverty, unemployment and education."[78]

There is also evidence to suggest that, among certain ranks identifying with the Al Qaeda movement, jihad is the ends, not the means, of the battle. The *Terrorist Perspectives Project* distinguishes between what they call the "strategists" and the "foot soldiers" in Al Qaeda. Communiqués between strategists reveal considerable frustration over foot soldiers' lack of strategic vision and their "thirst for martyrdom."[79] The tendency to think of jihad as the ends, not the means, to a greater struggle—the creation of a rightly guided Islamic state—has prompted foot soldiers to take actions that repel fellow Muslims from supporting the Al Qaeda movement. This is particularly true of attacks against other Muslims or attacks where Muslims become "collateral damage," such as the November 2005 Amman hotel bombings. Thus, while some foot soldiers treat jihad and suicide operations as the goal of their struggle, they do not reflect the ideological aspirations of the broader Al Qaeda movement.

The ideology of revolutionary Islam did not begin with Al Qaeda. The seeds of this vision began almost a century ago with ideas of Banna, and later Mawdudi, Qutb, Faraj, and Azzam. These ideas have persisted beyond the lives of their creators and have gone on to inspire new ideologues and different strategies and tactics for realizing a new social and political order based on a strict interpretation of the faith.

The resilience of revolutionary Islam, and the various tactics and strategies it inspires, suggests that targeting groups or even their leaders will not get at the root of the problem, which is the ideology itself. Countering Al Qaeda, therefore, needs to focus on eroding a narrative that is nearly a century in the making.

Fighting the Jihad of the Pen

The United States has focused primarily on dismantling Al Qaeda as an organization, capturing or killing its leaders, and taking defensive measures aimed at securing the homeland and U.S. interest abroad from terrorist attacks. The U.S. continues to fight Al Qaeda as a unique and discrete organization, proposing a new phase of counter-terrorism measures that target Al Qaeda's leadership in the tribal areas of Pakistan.[80] Comparatively, the U.S. government has committed only a fraction of time and treasure to specifically targeting the message of revolutionary Islam, attempting strategic communications programs, radio and television programs, and websites.[81]

Countering the message of revolutionary Islam requires, first, understanding the persisting themes of the message and why these messages resonate with at least some in the Muslim world: the vision for a better world and the means for achieving this new reality. Each of these subcomponents of ideology offers different opportunities for countermeasures. The article concludes by proposing different ways of countering revolutionary Islam, arguing that the best means for undermining ideology is to offer an alternative vision, one that is more appealing or more attainable than either the status quo or the vision of revolutionary Islam.

The previous discussion delineated several key points about the grievances of revolutionary Islam. First, despite the evolution of the ideology of revolutionary Islam from the 1920s, the problem that ideologues name with the current state of society and politics has remained surprisingly constant. Banna, Qutb, Mawdudi, and Faraj all describe a crisis in Muslim society caused by weak and corrupt leadership that has embraced false ideologies and strayed from the true path of the faith. Within this, Al Qaeda has also blamed the West, and particularly the United States, for supporting these regimes and meddling in the Muslim world. However, the critique of the existing order is not just about the United States. The ideology has a deeper critique about the crisis of the Muslim community and the need for pious Muslim leadership that upholds the tenets of Islam.

Revolutionary Islam's solution to these problems is simple and unspecific. Islam is the solution. Ideologues ranging from Banna to bin Laden call for placing Islam in the forefront of society and governance and reuniting the *ummah* into one body of the faithful. With the exception of Mawdudi, ideologues have committed very little ink to actually describing what the new political order would look like and how pious leadership would be cultivated and identified. Instead, most ideologues harkened back to the first four caliphs as the model of leadership and community, flattening the many disagreements and disunity during this time.

Revolutionary Islam's simple solution has also produced a variety of means for realizing a new social and political world based on Islam. Strategies for seizing power and transforming the Muslim world range from a bottom-up, non-violent, gradual awakening of the *ummah*, such as the Muslim Brotherhood, to a top-down, violent overthrow of the state by an Islamic vanguard and the forced withdrawal of U.S. sponsorship through terrorist acts, typified by Al Qaeda.

The consistency of grievances in revolutionary Islam seems to suggest that this would be the best avenue for undercutting the ideology of revolutionary Islam. However, addressing these grievances is no small task and the United States has at best limited policy options. First, the grievances run the gamut from corrupt Muslim leadership to the erosion of Islam in public life to U.S. meddling in the Muslim world. The range and nature of these grievances does not suggest viable policy solutions. What does ''pious'' Muslim leadership look like and can everyone agree on a definition of pious leadership? Would it be enough to have the United States withdraw its troops from the Muslim world or would the end of U.S. influence also need to include separation from Israel, economic isolation, and the end of cultural influences such as movies, television, and music? What does the ''right'' application of Islam in public life look like and who determines that? Questions such as these imply that attacking grievances would be never-ending, for both the United States and various Muslim countries.

Similarly, the previous discussion demonstrates that Islamic revolutionaries have employed a variety of means for realizing the new social, political, and religious order. Groups that employ violence, especially terrorism, would seem the likely target for counter-ideology efforts. However, groups that use non-violent means, even the democratic process, still carry the same ideological goals—the return of Islam to the forefront of society and government and the consolidation of the *ummah*, a vision that threatens to flatten the diversity within Islam and to exclude non-Muslims from full participation in society and politics.[82] There is evidence to suggest that allowing groups to run in elections, properly managed, could create the conditions for these groups to learn debate, compromise, and modify their vision.[83] However, there is also evidence to suggest that participating in elections alone does not modify a group. Hamas and Hizbollah are examples of groups that have participated in elections, but have only partially modified their domestic goals and continue to maintain militant wings.

Of the three avenues mentioned above for fighting the ideology, challenging the vision for a better world promised by revolutionary Islam is the best means for fighting the ideology. Ultimately, ideologies are countered through competing worldviews that offer hope and a better vision for how to live. Communism as an ideology failed because, juxtaposed against the freedom and prosperity of liberalism, it did not live up to its utopian promises.[84] Similarly, the utopian promises of a radically egalitarian and free society based on a specific and unambiguous understanding of Islam will most likely not live up to its promises. There is already evidence of this in Iran, where different interest groups—including women's organizations—supported the Ayatollah and his vision of revolutionary Islam only to find that their rights had been marginalized by a restrictive interpretation of Islamic law. Following the revolution, women's groups have been some of the most outspoken critics of the Islamic republic and agitators for reform.[85] Revolutionary Islam cannot live up to its promises and this is an opportunity to undermine its message.

The U.S. government has a limited but important role in fighting this ideology. Directly confronting Al Qaeda's message is unlikely to work because the United States lacks credibility and is not trusted by large portions of the Muslim world; the message and the messenger need to come from a credible source in order to be believed.[86] Moreover, a new vision for how to understand Islam in the modern world and its role in society and politics will most likely need to come from within the *ummah*. However, the United States has at least two strategies it can pursue in

fighting revolutionary Islam's ideas: helping to magnify the divisions and inconsistencies within revolutionary Islam and helping to create the space and culture of debating ideas.

Exposing the inconsistencies in revolutionary Islam is an important first step for undercutting the vision. One possible means of doing this is to indirectly magnify the infighting between revolutionary Islamic groups, like the infighting between Al Qaeda and Gamaat, and Al Qaeda and EIJ. These squabbles reveal the vagueness of their vision for a better world. Any opportunity to expose the lack of unity within these movements opens the way for debate over their message and the path for realizing revolutionary Islam. Academics and think tanks in the United States have a role to play in perpetuating these divisions. The Combating Terrorism Center (CTC) at West Point, for example, has written extensively on the ideological and operational vulnerabilities of Al Qaeda, including infighting between leaders and groups. These reports are posted on CTC's website, along with primary documents generated by Al Qaeda itself, and are available to anyone. These reports are important for exposing critical debates within jihadi circles, and the Muslim world more broadly, over the right to kill fellow Muslims and the progress that Al Qaeda has actually made in achieving its goals. In 2008, Zawahiri denounced the works of CTC as fraudulent and erroneous, suggesting that he felt compelled to challenge their accusations.[87]

Another important step for challenging the vision of revolutionary Islam is to develop competing ideologies and create the space in which these ideas can be fostered and promoted, such as the "marketplace of ideas" that helped shape the ideology of liberal democracy and rule of law in the United States. A marketplace of ideas could serve the dual purpose of exposing the inconsistencies of revolutionary Islam's vision for a new world, and offering a place for competing visions to be heard.

Creating a marketplace of ideas requires at least two different components. First, a marketplace of ideas demands an intellectual culture of questioning and debate. Implicitly, a culture of questioning and debates rests on the assumption that ontological claims are not infallible nor are the authorities that purport them. Individuals need to be taught how to think, not what to think. Furthermore, this culture requires presenting an uncensored spectrum of opinions, ranging from the moderate to the extreme, and the right to agree and disagree with various opinions. This culture of debate comes from both formal education—schooling—and informal education, such as debates presented on television and in newspapers. This is a big undertaking that takes time and constant cultivation from individuals and governments in order to develop.

Second, a marketplace of ideas requires a forum in which ideas can be discussed and debated. Historically, civic space—town hall meetings, free associations, non-governmental universities, and other places where people could collect—served as a space where ideas could be exchanged. However, virtual spaces also act as important forums for sharing ideas, including newspapers, television and, more recently, the internet. Nineteenth century scholar Alexis de Tocqueville goes so far as to call newspapers a unique form of association, claiming that "nothing but a newspaper can drop the same thought into a thousand minds at the same moment."[88] Physical spaces may be limited or non-existent in the Muslim world, particularly in more authoritative regimes in which civic space and the freedom of assembly have been restricted. Virtual meeting spaces, however, provide a possible alternative. More recently, chat rooms and internet blog sites have become

important tools for countering extremists' messages. In Saudi Arabia, for example, the Al Sakinah program aims to draw extremists into dialogue and debate with religious scholars and former jihadis over extremist ideas. The very act of debating extremist ideas opens the possibility for alternative viewpoints and doubt. The program is credited with helping to promote a "middle way" between extremism and secularism.[89]

These two components of a marketplace of ideas—civic space and a culture of debate—are both necessary conditions for ideas to develop and prosper. Creating civic space alone is not sufficient for change; it could provide the forum for extremist groups to spread their ideology and propagate. Only can these groups be checked if there is also an intellectual culture in which all ideas are regarded as suspect and worthy of debate, and that truths—if they exist at all—are not fixed in time but must be constantly reevaluated, as well as the leaders that generate them.

The United States government has an important role to play in indirectly fostering a marketplace of ideas; specifically it should focus more on creating the space where competing ideologies can be debated and forced to compete with one another. The CTC is an example of a forum where ideas are being debated; their critique of Al Qaeda compelled Zawahiri to respond to the accusations being leveled against them. The CTC, in other words, drew Zawahiri into a debate that forced him to compete with other ideas. This should be the goal in countering Al Qaeda's message—creating competition with other visions for how to live a Muslim life.

One avenue for the United States government to create this space is to better leverage its academic institutions and centers as places where Islamic ideologies can be proposed and debated by providing resources such as space and money. The U.S government has already undertaken initiatives with this goal in mind. The Department of State runs the "Guidance for Tomorrow's Leaders Scholarships," which aims to identify and foster leadership in youth foreign countries, specifically the Middle East and North Africa, through education and volunteering.[90] The U.S. Department of State has also created the Middle East Partnership Initiative, which aims to provide funding and assistance to organizations that foster civil society, women's initiatives, economic development, and programs that educate youth.[91] These programs are important first steps for bolstering initiatives in the Muslim world that can foster a culture of debate and critical thinking. The goal of this approach should be to challenge and compel thinkers from different perspectives to debate ideas, to draw them in and force them to better articulate their vision for a new world. Compelling debate on this topic will further expose the inconsistencies of revolutionary Islam's ideology.

Along side U.S. government initiatives to foster civic space and debate, other countries have held conferences aimed at debating Islam's role in modernity and Islamic militancy. In particular, the country of Qatar has held a number of conferences aimed at discussing current day issues regarding Islam, including a conference on Islam and Cultural Heritage, a symposium on Islamic art, interfaith conferences, and a dialogue on Islamic sects. While these conferences are not specifically about violent extremism, they discuss various topics that emphasize the diversity in Islam, and the need for dialogue and intellectual investigation.[92]

The United States government should avoid directly confronting revolutionary Islam, directly sponsoring alternate visions, or trying to create their own competing ideologies. As previously stated, the United States lacks credibility in the Muslim world, which will hinder the chances of these ideologies prospering. But, perhaps

more importantly, this strategy reinforces a powerful stream of thought in revolutionary Islam's ideology—that Western ideas are trying to weaken and undermine Islam. Therefore, directly countering revolutionary Islam with a new ideology—apart from the United States' lack of credibility—is unlikely to work.

Countering an ideology that has persisted for nearly a decade will most likely take time and patience. While a new Islamic vision for the future needs to come from within Islam, the United States still has an important role to play in its unfolding, particularly in creating the space where these discussions can be debated and a new vision can emerge.

Notes

1. Sheikh Abdullah Azzam, "Martyrs: The Building Blocks of Nations," available at: ⟨http://www.religioscope.com/info/doc/jihad/azzam_martyrs.htm⟩, accessed April 28, 2009.

2. Andrew Heywood, *Political Ideologies: An Introduction, Fourth Edition* (London: Palgrave Macmillian, 2007), 5; Iain MacKenzie, "The Arena of Ideology," in Robert Eccleshall, Vincent Geoghegan, Richard Jay, Michael Kenny, Iain MacKenzie, and Rick Wilford, eds., *Political Ideologies: An Introduction, Second Edition* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 1–27, especially, 3.

3. MacKenzie (see note 2 above), 8–12.

4. MacKenzie (see note 2 above), 16.

5. Quoted in MacKenzie (see note 2 above), 16–17.

6. MacKenzie (see note 2 above), 18.

7. MacKenzie (see note 2 above), 1.

8. Heywood (see note 2 above), 15.

9. Heywood (see note 2 above), 12.

10. Heywood (see note 2 above), 11–12.

11. Lawrence Wright, *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9-11* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2006), 158–161; Peter L. Bergen, *The Osama Bin Laden I Know: An Oral History of Al Qaeda's Leader* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 149–150; Bruce Lawrence, ed., *Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden* (New York: Verso Books, 2005), 3–4.

12. Osama bin Laden, "Open Letter to bin Baz," *Messages to the World* (see note 11 above), 8.

13. For a compilation of Taymiyah's writings, translated into English, see: Yahya Michot, *Ibn Taymiyya: Muslims Under Non-Muslim Rule* (Oxford: Interface Publications, 2006).

14. Also called the Advice and Reformation Committee. For one of the ARC statements, see: Osama bin Laden, "Honorable Scholars of the Arabian Peninsula and Saudi Arabia in Particular," *Messages to the World* (see note 11 above), 15–19.

15. Ayman Al Zawahiri, "Advice to Reject the Fatwa of Bin Baz," in Gilles Kepel and Jean-Pierre Milelli, eds., translated by Pascale Ghazaleh, *Al Qaeda in its Own Words* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press Harvard University Press, 2008), 182–192, quote taken from 184. See also: Lawrence Wright, "Profiles: The Man Behind Bin Laden," *The New Yorker* (September 16, 2002).

16. Brynjar Lia, *The Society of Muslim Brothers in Egypt* (Ithaca, NY: Ithaca Press, 1998), especially, 54–60; John L. Esposito, *Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 121.

17. Charles J. Adams, "Mawdudi and the Islamic State," in John L. Esposito, ed., *Voices of Resurgent Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 101.

18. Sayyid Abul a'la Maududi, "Self-Destructiveness of Western Civilization," in Mansoor Moaddel and Kamran Talattof, eds., *Modernist and Fundamentalist Debates in Islam, a Reader* (New York: Palgrave, 2000), 325–331, quote taken from 328–329.

19. Ibid., 329.

20. William E. Shepard, "Sayyid Qutb's Doctrine of Jahiliyya," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 35 (2003): 521–545, especially, 527–528.

21. 1998 *Al Jazeera* Interview with Osama Bin Laden, *Messages to the World* (see note 11 above), 69.

22. Osama bin Laden, "Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders," *World Islamic Front Statement*, February 23, 1998, taken from the Federation of American Scientists' website: (http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/docs/980223-fatwa.htm), accessed June 27, 2002.

23. March 1997 Peter Arnett Interview with Osama bin Laden, *Messages to the World* (see note 11 above), 45.

24. To this end, he founded the political party Jamaat-i-Islami in 1941, which became active in Pakistani politics following Partition in 1947. Adams (see note 17 above), 101–102. See also: Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr, *Mawdudi and the Making of Islamic Revivalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

25. Adams (see note 17 above), 112–114.

26. Yvonne Y. Haddad, "Sayyid Qutb: Ideologue of Islamic Revival," in John L. Esposito, ed., *Voices of Resurgent Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 69–71. See also: Albert J. Bergesen, ed., *The Sayyid Qutb Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

27. Haddad (see note 26 above), 86–90.

28. Haddad (see note 26 above), 91.

29. "Declaration of War Against the Infidels Occupying the Two Holy Places," available at: (http://www.outpost-of-freedom.com/opf980830a.htm), accessed October 24, 2008.

30. Ayman Al-Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" Parts 1–11*, Al-Sharq Al-Awsat,* FBIS translation (December 2001), available at: (http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/813856/posts), accessed October 24, 2008.

31. Gilles Kepel, *The War for Muslim Minds: Islam and the West* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Belknap Press, 2004), 94–100.

32. "The Liberation of Mankind," *The Qutb Reader* (see note 26 above), 47–49, quote taken from 48.

33. Mohammad Hafez, *Manufacturing Human Bombs* (Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace, 2006), 46–48; and Augustus Richard Norton, *Hezbollah* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

34. The term Wahabbi is often used to describe this movement. However, adherents of this movement do not self identify with this term and it carries the perception of being derogatory and Saudi centric. Therefore, the term Salafi, which is how these groups self identify, will be used instead. See: Quintan Wiktorowicz, "Anatomy of the Salafi Movement," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 29 (2006): 207–239, especially end note 1.

35. Ibid.

36. The term *jihad* means, literally, to "struggle or strive." Most Muslims recognize two jihads in Islam: The Greater Jihad is to struggle spiritually in one's life, to strive to overcome temptations and to lead a pious life. The Lesser Jihad is the physical struggle to defend the faith, which involves the use of force. See: John L. Esposito, *Islam: The Straight Path* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 93–94.

37. Ayman al Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner," in Gilles Kepel and Jean-Pierre Milelli, eds., translated by Pascale Ghazaleh, *Al Qaeda in its Own Words* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press Harvard University Press, 2008), 194–195.

38. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 203–204.

39. Ibid.

40. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 194.

41. Ayman al Zawahiri, "Bitter Harvest," in Gilles Kepel and Jean-Pierre Milelli, eds., translated by Pascale Ghazaleh, *Al Qaeda in its Own Words* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press Harvard University Press, 2008), 171–181.

42. March 1997 Peter Arnett Interview with Osama bin Laden, *Messages to the World* (see note 11 above), 49.

43. See, for example, Wright, *The Looming Tower* (see note 11 above).

44. *Qutb Reader* (see note 26 above), 39.

45. *Qutb Reader* (see note 26 above), 40.

46. Also translated *The Forgotten Obligation*. For a complete translation, see: Johannes J. G. Jansen, *The Neglected Duty: The Creed of Sadat's Assassins and Islamic Resurgence in the Middle East* (New York: Macmillan, 1986).

47. Abd al-Salaman al Faraj, *The Neglected Duty* (see note 46 above), 200.

48. Azzam (see note 1 above), 1–2.

49. Gilles Kepel, *The Prophet and the Pharaoh: Muslim Extremism in Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), especially 70–102. For other examples, see: Meir Hatina, *Islam and Salvation in Palestine: The Islamic Jihad Movement* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2002), 13; Glenn Robinson, "Hamas as a Social Movement," in Quintan Wictorowicz, ed., *Islamic Activism: A Social Movement Theory Approach* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 119–120.

50. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 194–195, 201.

51. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 198.

52. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 198–199.

53. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 196.

54. Brynjar Lia, *Architect of a Global Jihad: The Life of Al-Qaida Strategist Abu Mus'ab al-Suri* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 3.

55. Lia (see note 54 above), 7–8.

56. Lia (see note 54 above), 1–34; see also Mark E. Stout, et al., *The Terrorist Perspectives Project: Strategic and Operational Views of Al Qaida and Associated Movements* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2008), 126.

57. Lia (see note 54 above), 7.

58. Fawas Gerges, *The Far Enemy: Why Jihad Went Global* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1–15.

59. 1998 *Al Jazeera* Interview with Osama bin Laden, *Messages to the World* (see note 11 above), 68.

60. David Rapoport argues that Al Qaeda perpetrated the September 11th attacks to actually draw the United States further into the Muslim world as a means of stirring the *ummah* to join the Jihad against the far enemy. See: David C. Rapoport, "The Fourth Wave: September 11th in the History of Terrorism," *Current History* 100, no. 650 (December 2001): 419–425.

61. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 193.

62. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 204.

63. Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner" (see note 37 above), 193–194.

64. Peter L. Bergen, *Holy War, Inc: Inside the Secret World of Osama Bin Laden* (New York: Touchstone, 2001), 80.

65. October 20, 2001 *Al Jazeera* interview with Osama bin Laden (see note 11 above), 119.

66. *Terrorist Perspectives Project* (see note 56 above), 97.

67. 1997 Peter Arnett Interview with Osama bin Laden (see note 11 above), 54.

68. 1998 *Al Jazeera* Interview with bin Laden (see note 11 above), 82.

69. 1998 *Al Jazeera* interview with bin Laden (see note 11 above), 70.

70. For more on Gamaat's books criticizing the use of violence and Al Qaeda, see: Chris Zambelis, "Egyptian Gama'a al-Islamiyya's Public Relations Campaign," *Terrorism Monitor* 3, no. 35 (September 12, 2006), (http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=900), accessed January 13, 2009; Lisa Blaydes and Lawrence Rubin, "Ideological Reorientation and Counterterrorism: Confronting Militant Islam in Egypt," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 20, no. 4 (Nov. 2008): 1–37.

71. See also: Lawrence Wright, "The Rebellion Within: Al Qaeda Mastermine Questions Terrorism," *The New Yorker* (June 2, 2008).

72. Abu Bakr Naji, *The Management of Savagery*, translated by William McCants, (http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/olin/publications/miscpubs.htm), accessed October 3, 2008.

73. "Managing Savagery in Saudi Arabia," *Jihadica* (June 26, 2008), (http://www.jihadica.com/managing-savagery-in-saudi-arabia/), accessed October 3, 2008. See also: "Jihadi Thinker Emphasizes the Media's Importance," *National Public Radio* (July 10, 2008), (http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5545157), accessed October 3, 2008.

74. For example, bin Laden mentions Taymiyah in his letter to bin Baz, the 1996 declaration of war, and his critiques against the Saudi regime. See: *Messages to the World* (see note 11 above).

75. Faraj, *The Neglected Duty* (see note 46 above), 200–210.

76. See, for example: "Dozens Held over Jordan Bombings," *BBC News* (November 11, 2005), available at: (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4428204.stm), accessed October 18, 2008.

77. "Iraqis Vow to Fight Al Qaeda After Sheikh's Death," *Reuters* (September 14, 2007), available at: (http://uk.reuters.com/article/idUKL1477322720070914), accessed October 18, 2008.

78. Scott Shane, "Global Forecast by American Intelligence Expects Al Qaeda's Appeal to Falter," *New York Times* (November 20, 2008), available at: (http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/21/world/21intel.html), accessed January 5, 2010.

79. *Terrorist Perspectives Project* (see note 56 above), 48.

80. The so-called "Biden Plan." See: Peter Baker and Elizabeth Bummiler, "Obama Considers Strategy Shift in Afghan War," *New York Times* (September 22, 2009), available at: (http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/23/world/asia/23policy.html), accessed November 6, 2009.

81. See, for example: "U.S. Public Diplomacy: State Department Efforts to Engage Muslim Audiences Lack Certain Communication Elements and Face Significant Challenges," *Government Accountability Office* (May 2006), http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06535.pdf (as of November 7, 2009).

82. Heather S. Gregg, "U.S. Relations with Islamic Groups in the Middle East," in Robert Looney, ed., *Handbook of Middle East Relations: Formative Factors and Regional Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2009), 109–117.

83. Daniel Brumberg, "Islam is Not the Solution (or the Problem)," *The Washington Quarterly* (Winter 2005–2006): 97–116, especially 106–108.

84. Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?" *The National Interest* 16 (Summer 1989): 3–18.

85. Roksana Bahramitash, "Iranian Women during the Reform Era (1994–2004): A focus on Employment," *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 3, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 86–109, especially, 92; Fereshteh Ahmadi, "Islamic Feminism in Iran: Feminism in a New Islamic Context," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 22, no. 2 (2006): 33–53.

86. A 2008 Pew Report summarized U.S. favorable ratings during the Bush administration and found that a positive perception of the United States had declined since 2000 in the four European countries polled (United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Spain), and that favorable ratings in most Muslims countries continued to decline from the initiation of the Global War on Terror and particularly in response to Operation Enduring Freedom. Lebanon, Pakistan, and Indonesia saw slight improvements in favorable ratings in 2008, with Lebanon showing the highest rating at 51 percent. Of the 33 countries polled, only Russia, Lebanon, South Korea, Tanzania, and Nigeria had higher favorable opinions of the United States in 2008 than in their first polling to 2008. Leading up to U.S. elections in 2008, Pew polling data showed a general favorable rating towards Barack Obama, and the general perception that U.S. foreign policy would improve under a new administration. Egypt, Lebanon, and Pakistan were the only countries that perceived U.S. foreign policy worsening under Obama. See: "Global Public Opinion in the Bush Years: 2000–2008," *Pew Global Attitudes Project* (December 18, 2008), http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/263.pdf (as of April 4, 2009); and "Global Economic Gloom—China and India the Exceptions: Some Positive Signs for U.S. Image," *Pew Global Attitudes Project* (June 12, 2008), available at: (http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/260.pdf), accessed April 4, 2009, especially page 31.
Directly confronting Al Qaeda's message is argued in Peter Krause and Stephen Van Evera, "Public Diplomacy: Ideas for the War of Ideas," *Middle East Policy Council Journal*, Vol. XVI (Fall 2009), available at: (http://www.mepc.org/journal_vol16/3VanEveraFull.asp), accessed November 9, 2009.

87. See: *Combating Terrorism Center at West Point*, (http://www.ctc.usma.edu/), accessed April 30, 2009. For Zawahiri's message, see: "Bypassing Cars Can be Heard in the Background in Al Zawahiri Video," *CBS Internet Terrorism Monitor* (November 28, 2008), available at: (http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2008/12/01/monitor/entry4640665.shtml), accessed November 6, 2009.

88. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America, Volume II* (New York: Vintage, 1990), 111.

89. Y. Yehoshua, "Reeducation of Extremists in Saudi Arabia," *Middle East Media Research Institute, Inquiry and Analysis Series* No. 260, January 16, 2008.

90. "Guidance for Tomorrow's Leadership Scholarships II (Middle East and North Africa), *U.S. Department of State*, available at: (http://mepi.state.gov/opportunities/2009/133701.htm), accessed February 16, 2010.

91. "Middle East Partnership Initiative," *U.S. Department of State*, available at: (http://www.mepi.state.gov/), accessed February 16, 2010.

92. For more on Qatar's conferences, see: "Ulama on Islam and Cultural Heritage," available at: (http://portal.unesco.org/culture/es/ev.php-URL_ID=28671&URL_DO=DO_PRINTPAGE&URL_SECTION=201.html), accessed February 19, 2010; "Symposium on Islamic Art," available at: (http://portal.unesco.org/culture/es/ev.php-URL_ID=28671&URL_DO=DO_PRINTPAGE&URL_SECTION=201.html), accessed February 19, 2010; "7th Doha Conference on Inter-Faith Dialogue," available at: (http://www.qatar-conferences.org/dialogue2009/english/), accessed February 19, 2010; "Dialogue of Islamic Sects," available at: (http://www.qatar-conferences.org/mazaheb/english/viewlastnews.php?id=3), accessed February 19, 2010.