

Geopolitical Myths



Adnan Khan
Khilafah.com

الم

غُلِبَتِ الرُّومُ

فِي أَدْنَى الْأَرْضِ وَهُمْ مِّنْ بَعْدِ غَلَبِهِمْ سَيَغْلِبُونَ
فِي بضعِ سِنِينَ لِلَّهِ الْأَمْرُ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَمِنْ بَعْدُ وَيَوْمَئِذٍ
يَفْرَحُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ

بِنَصْرِ اللَّهِ يَنْصُرُ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الرَّحِيمُ

“Alif Lam Mim

The Romans have been defeated in a nearby land. They will reverse their defeat with a victory in a few years’ time – Allah is in command, first and last. On that day, the believers will rejoice at Allah’s help. He helps whoever He pleases: He is the Mighty, the Merciful.”

Surah ar-Rum 30:1-5

Contents

Introduction	4
1. Democracy is a prerequisite for development	5
2. The world is over populated	7
3. Global warming is due to the development of India and China	9
4. The world is running out of Oil	11
5. Western intervention in the Balkans in the 1990's was in order to help Muslims	13
6. The United Nations upholding of international law makes it best placed to regulate international relations and solve international conflicts	15
7. The Colonial nations in Africa brought stability to the continent, whilst their departure is a cause for the continued instability	17
8. America is invincible	19
9. Israel Controls the US as well as the world	22
10. Israel is invincible, it has proven this in 4 wars, hence the Muslim world should accept its here to stay	25
11. The third world is in poverty because there is not enough food in the world	29
12. The third world need to liberalise their economies for them to develop	32
13. Globalisation is the epoch of free trade and essential for economic development in the 21 st century	34
14. Foreign Aid from western nations helps the development of recipient nations	36
15. The prosperity and progress the world has witnessed in the last two centuries is unheralded in history and is evidence of Capitalisms superiority	38
16. The Muslim world is not ready and nor does it want Islam	41
17. Islam is outdated	43
18. The unity of the Muslim world is impossible due to the number of diverse sects and countries	46
19. Islam has no system of governance	50
20. The Industrialised nations developed due to the adoption of free trade and markets	55
21. The development of Japan historically and China today is evidence of globalisation's success	56
22. The Asian tiger economies developed due to free markets	58
23. Dubai presents a new Economic Model for the Muslim world	60
24. Is the Iran-US Conflict Real?	62
Conclusion	65
Notes	70

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

Introduction

Geopolitics has traditionally been the study of the relationship and links between political power and geographic space. The doctrine of Geopolitics gained attention largely through the work of Sir Halford Mackinder in England and his formulation of the Heartland Theory in 1904, which in reference to the British Empire at the time explored the significance of sea power in world conflict.

Whilst politics looks at the application of power, geopolitics looks at power in relation to geography and resources. The Western world has dominated the geopolitical scene for the past three centuries and has fought many wars over resources with each other. It was the British Empire's supremacy at sea that gave it superpower status. Its control of the seas through concentrating on navel development allowed it to conquer key sea trade routes and project its power across the oceans. It was its navel power that allowed it to conquer large parts of the world. Napoleon attempted to challenge British supremacy and was eventually defeated at the battle of Waterloo in 1815.

Germany revolutionised the global geopolitical scene in the late 19th century by developing submarines and railways, allowing her to challenge the British Empire in the form of World War 1. Allied victory saw Britain and France distribute the spoils amongst themselves including the emergence of the key to global geopolitical supremacy – oil. Within 25 years Germany resurfaced bigger, bolder and bloodier with state of the art rockets that would propel missiles and lead to the development of airplanes and fighter jets and another attempt to shift the global balance of power – World War 2. However, it was the US that emerged as the world's superpower after World War 2 and this ushered in the era of economic competition and nuclear and energy development. The ability to harness resources through the development of technology has led the US to achieve full spectrum dominance, where an aura of invincibility surrounds her.

The dominance of the Capitalist West has been aided through the use of propaganda in order to create an image of supremacy; at the same time a number of myths alongside a number of narratives were fashioned in order to hide internal problems and weaknesses. An unfortunate result of this has also been the fact that many people across the world were duped by the supposed superiority of the West and Capitalism. This has made it difficult for many to see through the artificial bubble the West has created which allowed it to stand tall, needing only a strong wind for it to collapse.

It is for this very reason this book has been written. As Muslims we should be acquainted with the global situation for not only is this necessary for the defence of the Ummah and Islam, it also exposes the weakness of the Capitalist West. It should also be borne in mind that Geopolitics is important because most wars are fought over resources as President Woodrow Wilson said in 1919: *'Is there any man, is there any woman, let me say any child here that does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry?'*¹

Adnan Khan
2nd October 2008

1. Democracy is a prerequisite for development

In almost all studies of development, democracy is considered a prerequisite for progress, be it economic or technological and scientific advancement. Mancur Olsen (University of Maryland) the world renowned economist presented in his award winning book ‘*Power and Prosperity*’ (2000) that democracies generally develop and progress relative to other systems of governance. Olson argued that under anarchy there is an incentive only to steal and destroy, whilst a dictator has an incentive to encourage a degree of economic success, since he will expect to be in power long enough to take a share of it. In democracies he observes that the protection of one’s citizens and property leads to greater prosperity as leaders could be removed at the ballot box. Olson saw in the move to democracy the seeds of civilization, paving the way for prosperity, which improves incentives for good government by more closely aligning it with the wishes of the population.

Other research has even made democracy a precondition for economic success. Evan Rodrik political science expert at the University of Illinois argued that “*democracy as the ‘meta institution’ helps build other institutions and democracy is the only appropriate institutional conditionally for success.*”² Even though there is no universally accepted definition of democracy there are two principles that any definition of democracy is required to have. The first principle is that all members of the society have equal access to power and the second that all members enjoy universally recognised freedoms and liberties.³

A cursory glance at the nations who continue to advocate such a view and who continue to intervene around the world in the name of democracy illustrates that such an argument holds no weight. In fact much of the developed world developed through anti-democratic polices and there is an argument that the absence of democracy aids development. When voting was first introduced in the West it was confined to a very small minority of land and property-owning men with an unequal number of votes apportioned according to a scale based on property, educational achievement and age. In the US, black males were only given voting rights in the Voting Rights Act of 1965 after the civil rights movement. Although they were permitted to vote in 1870 by the fifteenth amendment to the constitution which would not deny vote to anyone on account of race and colour, Southern sates were disfranchised through the use of poll tax and property conditions by central government.

Introduction of Democracy (Years when universal suffrage was achieved)

New Zealand	1907
Denmark	1915
Sweden	1918
UK	1928
France	1946
Germany	1946
Italy	1946
Belgium	1948
USA	1965

France by 1830 only gave voting rights to those above the age of 30 who paid 300 francs in direct taxes, which was around 0.02% of the population of 32 million. In 1848 male suffrage became universal and it was only during World War 2 that France allowed women to vote, well after it industrialised. Japan achieved universal suffrage after reaching its military pinnacle and even then it was a condition imposed on it by the US to distribute power away from the original regime. The US saw it fit to give Japan full voting rights by 1952 but felt another 13 years were needed to give the same rights to its own citizens!

In 1800 which is considered the peak of Britain's colonial superiority only 3% of Britain's population had the right to vote. Only voters who owned sizable areas of land in a patchwork of districts created during medieval times could elect members to the House of Commons. This system denied the vote to merchants, manufacturers, and skilled labourers who did not own land. Regions that had been prosperous hundreds of years earlier were overrepresented in Parliament while many new urban centres had no representation at all. Some parliamentary seats were virtually owned by individuals. By 1867 13% of the population could vote. It would take until 1928 (another 61 years) before men and women were given equal voting rights. Democracy most certainly came after development and played no role in the rise of Britain.

The developing world today has given its population more voting rights compared to when the developed nations were going through the same stages. Hence democracy causing economic development should be viewed with caution before buying into economic orthodoxy.

China, Russia (formerly the USSR) and Germany clearly prove democracy is not a prerequisite for economic development and is decisive proof that much can be achieved without democracy. Russia and China appear to be doing rather well without following the example of Western liberal democracy and, indeed, challenge the model with disdain. So the question needs to be asked: is there any relationship between democracy and economic development?

Economic development is a set of policies to industrialise a nation so it can feed its population and create an environment where their interests can be achieved. This requires a consistent set of policies which takes the whole nation in one direction otherwise they will be contradictory. Britain's initial stimulus came from abandoning the church and the adoption of liberal values, which unified the nation. The ability of the aristocracy to inherit property and land and through this influence the direction of colonialism drove forward the nation. The Soviet Union received its stimulus from the failings of the Tsar and was then propelled by being unified with Communism and through successive leaders deriving economic policies from the communist ideology. The US unified and moved forward after freeing itself from Britain's stranglehold over life and liberty, and Japan received its wake up call when it realised how far behind the developed world it was and so pursued a war economy to develop. China is the only nation whose development is not entirely ideological however it has developed initially based upon unification on a 'great nation' status. Germany was similar, even utilising racism for its development.

Democracy has played virtually no role in developing an economy. Hence none of the nations mentioned bothered with a mandate from their people. The link between democracy and economic development at best is tenuous. The nations that advocate democracy actually became democratic at the end of their rise and the Chinese model shows democracy is not needed for economic success.

2. The world is over populated

Modern research on the genetic structure of human populations suggests that nearly 15,000 years ago the world population was 15 million (the present population of Delhi, India). The population by the time of Jesus (*Isa*) over 2000 years ago had increased to 250 million (about the same as present day Indonesia). On the eve of the industrial revolution in the 18th century world population had tripled to about 700 million (nearly the size of current day Europe). In the two centuries that followed, the global population increased at an annual rate of 6% reaching 2.5 billion by 1950 and more than doubled in the next 50 years at a rate of 18% to reach 6 billion on the eve of the 21st century. Although growth rates are slowing, barring some demographic catastrophe the world population should reach 9 billion by 2050. The current population of the world stands as of September 2008 at 6.72 billion.⁴

The rate of population growth over the last century has been labelled as the underlying cause of the world standing on the brink of disaster; it is argued we are running out of food to sustain such a growing population. It is argued by the proponents of overpopulation that the huge growth in world population is responsible for poverty, environmental destruction and social unrest and that economic development in the third world is impossible as long as populations continue to grow. As a result international agencies and governments have developed and implemented numerous programmes in the third world to curtail the rate of population growth.

This alleged overpopulation has to be in relation to something to qualify it being over. That something is the use of resources. The resources being consumed leading to global imbalances are attributed to population sizes.

However, when all assumptions on the effects of population growth are scrutinised population increase in no way has ever contributed to the many ills of the world today and what becomes clear is that there is a clear political agenda in attributing the increasing global population as the cause of the world's potential disaster. This agenda is to shift the real cause away from the lifestyles, living patterns, un-sustainability of consumerism, poverty and blatant abuse of the third world in order that the Western world can live off the third world.

The developed world also faces a very serious conundrum; Japan, Russia, Germany, Switzerland and much of Eastern Europe are experiencing population decline, due to a huge reduction in births. The rest of the Western world would also have declining populations were it not for immigration. As population numbers decline in the West relative to the third world and Muslim nations, such countries will have a legitimate right based upon their numbers to demand greater say in so called international institutes and representation on international bodies. The issue of overpopulation is a very useful tool to vilify nations with rising populations and at the same time protecting its potential loss of future influence. This can be seen clearly with Turkish EU accession; upon joining the EU, Turkey's almost 70 million inhabitants would bestow it the second largest

World Population 2007

1. World	6.7b
2. Asia	3.9b
3. China	1.3b
4. India	1.1b
5. Africa	887m
6. Europe	774m
7. Latin America	558m
8. North America	332m
9. US	304m
10. Indonesia	231m
11. Brazil	187m
12. Pakistan	163m
13. Bangladesh	158m

United Nations Department of
Economic and Social Affairs –
Population Division

number of MEP's in the European Parliament. In addition, demographic projections indicate Turkey would surpass Germany in the number of seats by 2020. Turkey's membership would have wide ranging consequences for the future direction of the EU including the thorny issue of future enlargement plans, grounds by which Valéry Giscard d'Estaing of France has opposed Turkey's admission.⁵ D'Estaing has suggested that it would lead to demands for accession by Morocco.

Although there is no consensus as to why the first nation in the world to industrialise was Britain, its causes are generally accepted as potentially eight factors, one of them being the growth in population. Following the union with Scotland in 1707, the British population stood at 6.5 million; a century later it had doubled to well over 16 million. More importantly, most of that growth had taken place after 1750 in one of the greatest population explosions in British history. This increase was critical as it increased the potential labour force and consumers of commodities.

China and India have also proven that a large population is a good thing. Despite implementing programmes of population reduction under the influence of the West, China and India have been unable to curtail the rate of population growth and yet both represent the fastest growing economies in the world, which contradicts the overpopulation view that more means more resources being depleted.

The world is not overpopulated. There is more than enough food and resources for the people of the world. However, the lion's share of this is consumed by the West.

3. Global warming is due to the development of India and China

Climatic change is an important field of study in science. However, as with all sciences, it is not an exact science. The understanding of the climatic sciences is always changing. Climate change is not new, there has always been climate change, and there will always be climate change. The period known as the Ice Age, which was a long-term period of reduction in global temperatures is an example of this.

Global warming and climate change refer to an increase in average global temperatures. Natural events and human activities are believed to be contributing to the increase in average global temperatures – this is the area of current considerable debate. This is caused primarily by increases in the greenhouse which is the rise in temperature on Earth as certain gases in the atmosphere trap energy gases such as Carbon Dioxide (CO₂). This latest warming period has also coincided with the Industrial Revolution, which saw the greatest output of human induced CO₂, leading many, like Al Gore, to compare the rise in CO₂ levels with the rise in temperatures, drawing a conclusion that the rise in CO₂ in the earth's atmosphere was the determining factor in the rise in temperatures. The CO₂-temperature connection is considered the dominant cause for global warming, however this view is not conclusive and there is a number of issues with the samples used for this conclusion.

Every few years, leading climate scientists at the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) have released major reports detailing the progress in understanding climate change. From the outset they have recommended that there be emission reductions. This body is comprised of hundreds of climate scientists from around the world. At the beginning of January 2007, the IPCC's fourth major report summarised that they were even more certain than before of human-induced climate change because of better scientific understanding; *'The understanding of anthropogenic warming and cooling influences on climate has improved since the Third Assessment Report (TAR), leading to very high confidence that the globally averaged net effect of human activities since 1750 has been one of warming.'* Their definition of "very high confidence" and "very likely" is a 90% chance of being correct (their 2001 report claimed a 66% certainty).

In terms of historical emissions, industrialised countries account for around 80% of the carbon dioxide build-up in the atmosphere to date. Since 1950, the US has emitted a cumulative total of roughly 50.7 billion tons of carbon, while China (4.6 times more populous) and India (3.5 times more populous) have emitted only 15.7 and 4.2 billion tons respectively. Annually, more than 60% of global industrial carbon dioxide emissions originate in industrialized countries, where only about 20% of the world's population resides.

Much of the growth in emissions in the developed world stem from rapid industrialisation from the industrial revolution era. The US with its \$14 trillion economy is the world's largest polluter and has acted as an obstacle to any agreement on emission reduction targets. Reducing emissions would mean industry in the West would need to produce less – this

Global Polluters (2004)

By Carbon dioxide emissions through human activities as a percentage of total emissions

1. USA	22%
2. China	18%
3. Russia	5%
4. India	4.9%
5. Japan	4.6%
6. Germany	3.1%
7. Canada	2.3%
8. UK	2.2%
9. South Korea	1.7%
10. Italy	1.6%

Metric tons

would lead to economies in the West shrinking rather than growing. To reduce consumption is considered '*Shirk*' in Capitalism. By the same token, the rate of consumption of fossil fuels in developed countries is also extremely high relative to the rest of the world. The depletion of non-renewable resources and environmental destruction is primarily caused by the consumption patterns of the US. US consumption of fossil fuels is well over five times the global average.

Global warming is the result of rapid industrialisation from the West with the sole concern of profit making. Although there exists technologies that allow the development of clean low-emission industries, their costs are high and as a result have been unable to break into the mainstream market. China and India have only in the last 20 years seen rapid development, global warming was already high prior to that. However, the US continues to blame China and India for developing too quickly, in an attempt by the world superpower to stifle their development.

4. The world is running out of Oil

The struggle for global supremacy between Germany and Britain at the beginning of the 20th century drove them to search for alternative fuels to power their bulky coal based war machines. The discovery of oil fields in the Middle East in the early 20th century spurred a century of new technologies, created new patterns of society and consumption and changed the global balance of power.

Fossil fuels by their nature are limited and will eventually diminish. For most of the 20th century this was never a discussion as most of the world's oil was still undiscovered. With technologies such as the fighter jet, tanks and automobiles all designed to run on oil, if oil is drying up then apart from oil prices exploding, such technologies would also become redundant.

'Peak oil' was first introduced in the 1970's; it is a theory which calculates the point where half of the worlds known oil reserves have been pumped.

There are three vital numbers that are needed to project future oil production. Firstly, the tally of how much oil has been extracted to date, a figure known as the cumulative production. The second is an estimate of reserves; the amount that companies can pump out of known fields before having to abandon them. Finally, one must make an educated guess at the quantity of conventional oil that remains to be discovered and exploited. Together they add up to the ultimate recovery i.e. the total number of barrels that will have been extracted when production ceases many decades from now.

Global oil Reserves (2006)

World	1.13t
Saudi Arabia	260b
Canada	179b
Iran	136b
Iraq	115b
Kuwait	99b
UAE	97b
Venezuela	80b
Russia	60b
Libya	41b
Nigeria	36b
USA	21b

BP Statistical review of world
Energy 2007

The easiest way to comprehend an understanding of peaking dates is to see if production of oil has outstripped oil discoveries. The most damning evidence for this is that oil discoveries actually peaked in the 1960's. The most recent large oil field was discovered in Mexico in 1985, while the majority of today's producers have mature fields that were discovered in the 1950's. The world now consumes four times the quantity of oil as is found. The oil companies are spending a fortune on trying to find new oil reserves, but the ones that they find are getting smaller and smaller, and therefore produce less oil. With diminishing discoveries the current production of oil is depleting the last reserves of the black gold.

Some overly optimistic predictions give peaking dates up to the year 2060, but the most reliable estimates for when global oil production will peak vary from between now and 2012.⁶

If production is meant to start diminishing worldwide very soon, then we should already see countries that have reached their peaks or are just about to reach their peak. Of the top seven oil producers, six are in decline or near peak production. USA peaked 1971, Norway peaked 2001, and the UK peaked in 1998. Russia, Mexico and China are forecast to peak in 2008. It is also possible that Saudi Arabia peaked in 2005. The only one of the top seven producers that has clear capability to increase production is Iran.

There are a number of other factors that support the early peak argument. Major oil companies (e.g. Shell) are finding it difficult to replace reserves and to backfill previous reserve over-estimates.

Oil industry consolidation hides reserve shortages by combining existing reserves. Oil companies such as BP have resorted to replacing reserves through production agreements on old fields (e.g. Russia) rather than pure exploration. Investment in exploration is falling. Technical feedback from the state of major Saudi Arabian oil fields indicates a high level of depletion. US foreign policy vis-à-vis the Middle East, Afghanistan, CIS, India, China and Asian states indicates frantic scouring for oil and gas.

It is these reasons that have allowed peak oil to enter the mainstream and the view that the world is running out of oil is considered a geopolitical headache for the world's powers. However in reality this argument masks a number of deeper political issues.

The world is running out of oil is a convenient excuse for the West's over consumption, since to reduce consumption is considered the ultimate taboo. As more and more nations scramble for the ever dwindling supply of oil, this has exposed the West. The Western world consumes 50% of the 21st century's most important resource but produced less than a quarter of it. It is over consumption rather than the fact that oil is depleting that is causing the energy crisis.

Global oil Consumption (bpd 2007)

World	85m	
USA	20.6m	24%
China	7.8m	9.3%
Russia	2.6m	3.2%
Germany	2.3m	2.8%
France	1.9m	2.3%
UK	1.6m	2%
Spain	1.6m	2%

BP Statistical review of world energy 2007

The US specifically produced only 8% of the world's oil but consumes 25% of it. Such huge consumption by the West is never sustainable; this is because the West essentially has relied on a relatively small number of mammoth fields for the lion's share of their daily intake. Though the world possesses tens of thousands of operating fields, only 116 of them produce more than 100,000 barrels per day and they account for 50% of global output. Of these, all but a handful were discovered more than a quarter of a century ago, and most are showing signs of diminished capacity. Indeed, some of the world's largest fields – including Ghawar in Saudi Arabia, Burgan in Kuwait, Cantarell in Mexico, and Samotlor in Russia – appear to be now in decline or about to become so. The decline of these giant fields matters greatly. Compensating for their lost output will take increased yield at thousands of smaller fields, and there is no evidence that this is even remotely possible.

As US consumption continues to rise, the competition for dwindling energy sources will intensify. This will make the Muslim lands even more important and as with Iraq, occupation may well be justified for stable supplies of the black gold. Although oil is running out, it is due to Western consumption patterns rather than there merely being too little oil.

5. Western intervention in the Balkans in the 1990's was in order to help Muslims

The NATO attack on Yugoslavia in 1993, was presented by the West as the consequence of Yugoslavia's stubborn refusal to settle for any reasonable peace plan - in particular its rejection of plans for an international security force to implement a peace plan in Kosovo. Intervention by the West and then the eventual bombing campaign by NATO is continually held as evidence that the current 'war on terror' is not a war on Islam and that the West will intervene across the world for 'humanitarian' purposes, even helping Muslims as they apparently did in 1993. James Rubin former assistant to President Bill Clinton and state department spokesman advocated such a view in 2003. He said: *'By invading Iraq, America has squandered the moral authority built up over years of promoting human rights, saving Muslims from slaughter in Kosovo, and belatedly in Bosnia.'*⁷

In reality however the geopolitical aims were very different. The political instability in the Balkans during the 1990's was exacerbated by American determination to reduce Russia's influence in the region, increase Europe's dependency upon her and confer new legitimacy to NATO when it appeared increasingly redundant after the Cold War.

The Western powers and specifically both the US and Britain worked for the fragmentation of Yugoslavia as was revealed by the then US Ambassador to Yugoslavia Warren Zimmerman in January 1992 before the outbreak of hostilities: *'we are aiming for a dissolution of Yugoslavia into independent states.'*⁸ On the 18th March 1992 the EU brokered a deal in Lisbon among Bosnian Muslims, Croats and Serb communities partitioning the Serb republic into three ethnically based cantons which would act as a confederation functioning as an independent state. This agreement was sabotaged by the US which urged the Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic to renege the deal by declaring statehood saying *'this was justified by the referendum on March 1st.'* Jose Cutileiro, secretary general of the Western European union confirmed *'to be fair President Alija Izetbegovic and his aids were encouraged to scupper the deal and to fight for a unitary Bosnian state by Western mediators.'* This is what caused the Bosnian civil war.

Today 11,000 troops are stationed in Bosnia, Kosovo and Macedonia allegedly for peace; however such troops have ensured US economic interests are secured. Former US congressman Lee Hamilton commented in the New York Times: *'we have completely taken over the control of the Balkans. US officials exercise managing functions over all states of the former Yugoslavia. We are virtually the pro consul.'*

Karen Talbot geopolitical expert confirmed *'the determination by the U.S and NATO, at all costs, to occupy Kosovo and virtually all of Yugoslavia, is spurred on by the enticement of abundant natural resources. Kosovo alone has the richest mineral resources in all of Europe west of Russia.'*

The New York Times observed that *'the sprawling state-owned Trepca mining complex, the most valuable piece of real estate in the Balkans, is worth at least \$5 billion, producing gold, silver, pure lead, zinc, cadmium, as well as tens of millions of dollars in profits annually. Kosovo also possesses 17 billion tons of coal reserves and Kosovo (like Serbia and Albania) also has oil reserves.'*⁹

President Bill Clinton at the time let slip *'If we are going to have a strong economic relationship that includes our ability to sell around the world, Europe has got to be a key...That's what the Kosovo thing was all about.'*¹⁰

Since the bombing has ended, numerous US bases in the Balkans have been set up. A military base is being built in Kosovo, described as the largest US foreign base built since the Vietnam War. US domination of NATO meant intervention by NATO forces in the Balkans would ensure US influence in the region. A leaked version of the Pentagon's 1994-1999 Defense Planning Guidance report advises that the United States *'must seek to prevent the emergence of European-only security arrangements which would undermine NATO...Therefore, it is of fundamental importance to preserve NATO as the primary instrument of Western defense and security, as well as the channel for US influence and participation in European security affairs.'*¹¹

This all confirms that the influence of Russia, the oil in the Caspian Sea and the revitalisation of NATO (to continue US influence) were the geopolitical aims behind US and Western intervention. The lives of thousands of innocent people and the lives of those slaughtered in Srebrenica were a price worth paying by the US for continued US dominance.

6. The United Nations upholding of international law makes it best placed to regulate international relations and solve international conflicts

It was the horror of the atrocities and genocide during World War 2 that led to a ready consensus that a new organisation must work to prevent any similar tragedies in the future. The United Nations was founded in 1945 primarily to achieve the lofty aim of having to '*save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.*' Since then there have been more than 250 conflicts worldwide. It is blatantly clear that the UN has been unsuccessful for the purpose it was created for.

The West as well as many policymakers from the third world consider the UN a non-biased, internationally represented institution boasting nearly 200 member states, who uphold the beacon for the values of internationalism, multilateral action, democracy, pluralism, secularism, compromise, human rights and freedom. This could not be further from the truth.

The UN in reality is a tool of exploitation where it is manifestly apparent from the inherent structure of the organisation that it legitimises wholesale abuse by the colonialist and permanent members of the Security Council.

In 1994 the UN failed to prevent genocide in Rwanda, which resulted in the killing of nearly a million people, due to the refusal of Security Council members to approve any military action. The French (a permanent member of the Security Council) supported the Hutu regime against the Tutsi rebels, in this ethnic civil war that dates back to the colonial era. In the midst of the crisis, UN peace keeping troops were instructed to focus on only evacuating foreign nationals from Rwanda, rather than protecting the Tutsis. This change led Belgian peacekeepers to abandon a technical school filled with 2,000 refugees, while Hutu militants waited outside. After the Belgians left, the militants entered the school and massacred those inside, including hundreds of children. Just four days later, the Security Council voted to reduce its force to only 260 men.¹²

A similar scenario occurred just a year later in what has come to be known as the Srebrenica genocide. Although both Britain and the US wanted the break-up of the region, the US wanted NATO to be the de-facto security force. The UN designated Srebrenica a 'safe haven' for refugees assigning 600 Dutch peacekeepers to protect it, who handed over the camp to Serb forces, who then massacred them.

The United Nations again failed to intervene during the second Congo war in the Democratic republic of Congo. A UN peacekeeping force was established in February 2000, by Resolution 1291 of the United Nations Security Council in order to monitor the peace process. However, failure by the peace keeping force to intervene during the civil war claimed the lives of nearly five million people.

The United Nations created the problem of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and has continued in its failure to implement provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolutions by selectively applying international law.

The United Nations was exposed as being ineffective and run by imperialists when it was essentially thrown aside in the run up to the second Iraq war. The US didn't hide this fact. John Bolton, acting US Ambassador to the UN, made several statements critical of the UN saying in 2004, *'There is no such thing as the United Nations. There is only the international community, which can only be led by the only remaining superpower, which is the United States.'*¹³

In reality the UN is an international organisation that the five permanent Security Council members (US, Russia, Britain, France and China) have used as an extension of their own foreign policies. The problem actually lies in the concept of international law, which in reality does not exist. There can only really be international norms and customs not international law. For international law to exist enforcement must be possible at a global, supranational level. As this does not exist we must expect nation-states to flout the regulations of the international agencies when it suits them – neo-realism (cf. Waltz. K. 1979. 'A Theory of International Politics').

7. The Colonial nations in Africa brought stability to the continent, whilst their departure is a cause for the continued instability

The Colonial nations continue to hold the view that they brought benefits wherever they went. In Africa, historians affected by the colonial mentality tend to describe the so called positive aspects of colonialism such as the development of infrastructure and education. The racism, exploitation, and, genocide committed by the colonialists continues to be glossed over. Colonialists view that Africa as well as other colonised people were incapable of surviving without the help of the Europeans.

The immense resources and rich minerals in Africa attracted many Western nations to colonise the continent. European nations competed with each other over the spoils. Hence there should be no doubt that the severity of competition between Europe over the colonisation of Africa was in order to exploit the people for slavery and steal the continents natural wealth. The propagation of democracy and Western values hardly existed.

European nations directly colonised whole swathes of Africa using their armies. Parts of what are now Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Namibia were ruled by Germany. Italy carved up parts of Eritrea and Somalia. Spain established a foothold in Western Africa. The Portuguese held onto Angola, Mozambique, and other smaller territories. Belgium brutally ruled over the Congo and Britain created its mandates throughout East Africa and in what is today Sudan, Ghana, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi and Nigeria. France set itself up in a dozen West African nations, including Senegal and the Ivory Coast, as well as in Chad, Madagascar and the Comoros.

For decades, Africa provided them with open markets for goods. More importantly Africa also supplied the Europeans with cheap or in many cases free raw materials such as cotton, rubber, tea, and tin and of course free human labour through the slave trade. All of this was aided by unhindered missionary efforts to help pacify the presence of European colonisers among the 'natives.' The continent was afflicted with bloody military disputes because of the competition between the Western nations. The struggle resulted in various states supporting dictators, carrying out coup d'états and giving loans for loyalty. Such competition has resulted in the continents debts surpassing \$370 billion, which represent 65% of the total national income of the entire continent. Such struggle and competition has even resulted in more than 30 million land mines being planted in Africa, which is 25% of all land mines planted in the entire world.

In colonising Africa the European imperial powers engaged in a major territorial scramble, creating borders ensuring their claim was not usurped by other powers. This insistence of drawing borders around territories to isolate them from those of other colonial powers had the effect of separating otherwise contiguous political groups, or forcing traditional enemies to live side by side with no buffer between them. Prior to the scramble for Africa the Congo River was the natural geographic boundary, there were groups living on both sides that shared a language and culture. The division of the land between Belgium and French occupiers along the river isolated these groups from each other. Those who lived in Saharan or Sub-Saharan Africa and traded across the continent for centuries found themselves crossing borders that existed only on European maps. In managing the natives and ensuring continued colonial supremacy a number of policies were carried out. Places

that had substantial European settlements, such as Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and South Africa, systems of second-class citizenship were set up in order to give Europeans political power far in excess of their numbers. In the Congo the native population was submitted to inhumane treatment and a near slavery status.

Europeans even altered the local balance of power by creating ethnic divisions where there had never been any. In what is now Rwanda and Burundi, two ethnic groups the Hutus and Tutsis had merged into one culture by the time German colonists had taken control of the region in the 19th century. They were no longer divided by ethnicity since intermingling, intermarriage, and merging of cultural practices over the centuries had long since erased visible signs of a culture divide. However, Belgium instituted a policy of racial segregation upon taking control of the region, as racially based segregation was a fixture of the European culture of the time. The term Hutu originally referred to the agricultural-based Bantu-speaking peoples that moved into present day Rwanda and Burundi from the West, and the term Tutsi referred to North-eastern cattle-based peoples that migrated into the region later. The terms described a person's economic class; individuals who owned roughly 10 or more cattle were considered Tutsi, and those with fewer were considered Hutu, regardless of ancestral history. The Belgians introduced a racist system, whereby features such as fairer skin, ample height, and narrow noses were seen as more ideally Hamitic, and belonged to those people closest to Tutsi in ancestry; they were then given power amongst the colonised peoples.

Although some of the natives made high office, in almost all cases this was a strategy by the Europeans to cause friction between tribes rather than recruit skilled individuals. Vincent Khapoya outlined this in his book which assessed European claims of developing Africa: *'Belgian colonial rule saw massive transfers of wealth from Zaire [the Belgian Congo] to Belgium. Africans received only limited education, which would allow them to read the Bible, take orders efficiently from the missionaries, and function, at best, as clerks in the colonial bureaucracy.'*¹⁴

Khapoya also explains the myth of European contribution to Africa's development: *'all colonial powers exercised significant attention to the economics of the situation. This included: acquisition of land, enforced labour, introduction of cash crops, even to the neglect of food crops, halting inter-African trading patterns of pre-colonial times, introduction of labourers from India, etc. and the continuation of Africa as a source of raw materials for European industry, therefore a continent not to be industrialised.'*¹⁵

Africa continues today to bleed from the policies of the European colonialists. Where Britain was the dominant force in the 19th century they have simply been replaced by the US in the 21st century. The departure of the colonialists from the continent since the 1960's has merely seen colonialism change from direct control to control through dictators, arms, loans and economic hegemony. It is not the departure of the colonists that has caused instability in Africa; it is the interference of the colonialists for nearly 200 years that has caused Africa to continue bleeding due to the thirst for the continents resources.

8. America is invincible

On the eve of the 21st century the US was the world's foremost power. With the collapse of the Soviet Union 10 years earlier the US faced very little challenge from any other nation and was considered to have achieved full spectrum dominance. There was no longer any meaningful dispute between Marxism and the market. It looked as though Western liberal democracy was becoming 'the final form of human government.' This led to the arrogant Neoconservatives developing policies to ensure such a scenario continued into the foreseeable future. It was this climate that led many observers to accept unrivalled US supremacy and invincibility. However a decade on, this could not be further from the truth. An astute observation of the global balance of power and US foreign policy suggests a faltering US.

America is slowly bleeding to death from two open wounds in Iraq and Afghanistan that show no signs of abating. Both wars have now lasted longer than World War 2. The US army, the most technologically advanced in history has been unable to defeat groups of untrained resistance fighters using weapons developed in the 1960's. As a result the US has to rely on regional nations to avoid embarrassment. The US has enlisted Syrian and Iranian assistance via back door channels to maintain stability. It is through Iran that stability has come to the South of Iraq and this has been achieved through two Ayatollahs from Iran - Ayatollah Sistani and Abdul Aziz al-Hakim the leader of the Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution (SCIR). Abdul al-Aziz Hakim has 10,000 soldiers at his disposal and has aggressively pushed for federalism for the southern regions, calling for nine provinces to merge. Hakim's declaration for greater Shi'ite autonomy coincides with the US plan of the dissolution of Iraq. This was the primary reason the Baker-Hamilton report called for the engagement of Iran and Syria because Iran specifically is the home for Southern Iraqi loyalty.

It is Iran who has maintained stability in Northern and Western Afghanistan which borders Iran and has prevented the Pushtun resistance from expanding into such areas which has helped the US. Tehran has achieved this by carrying out a number of reconstruction projects which has allowed NATO to work on a much smaller area of resistance. Iran was a key factor in the overthrow of the Taliban and has built roads, power transmission lines, and border stations, among other infrastructure projects. Colonel Christopher Langton, who heads the Defense Analysis Department at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, said Iran is an important country in the future reconstruction and development of Afghanistan, *'They are being closely linked by efforts against the Taliban in the past, but also because of the influence that Iran can bring there with the Hazara population [who, like Iranians, are Shi'a Muslims]. And in the development sector, there are already projects which Iran is involved in -- for instance, the road from Bandar Abbas on the Persian Gulf up through Afghanistan to Central Asia is a very, very important project for the future of Afghanistan...There is a whole list of political, economic, and security issues which connect Afghanistan and Iran.'*¹⁶

This has prompted Richard Hass the head of the most powerful US think tank to comment: *'the age of US dominance in the Middle East has ended and a new era in the modern history of the region has begun. It will be shaped by new actors and new forces competing for influence, and to master it, Washington will have to rely more on diplomacy than on military might.'*¹⁷

The US is facing numerous challenges in regions of the world which only a decade ago it completely dominated. In the Middle East apart from needing the help of regional surrogates, the Middle East is gradually shifting from being a uni-polar region in which the US enjoys uncontested hegemony to a multi-polar region. The US is facing more competition from China and Russia over access to Middle East oil. The US is now increasingly competing with India and Japan as well as the European Union for the lion's share of the regions black gold. Britain has also managed to foil American projects under the guise of partnership and co-operation. Graham Fuller former vice chairman of the National Intelligence Council described America's predicament when he wrote in the issue of the National Interest, *'diverse countries have deployed a multiplicity of strategies and tactics designed to weaken, divert, alter, complicate, limit delay or block the Bush agenda through death by a thousand cuts.'*¹⁸

Britain under Tony Blair's tenure thwarted America's bid to oust President Kabbah of Sierra Leone and worked diligently to rescue Gaddafi's government from the clutches of American neoconservatives who after 9/11 wanted regime change in Libya. In Sudan the US has been unable to separate Southern Sudan due to the Darfur crisis which has been used by France and Britain to interfere in Sudan. In South Africa Blair competed tirelessly with the US to protect British influence and made the country the mainstay of anti-government activities in neighbouring African countries. The US is also facing the prospect of being left out to dry as China has taken leadership on African development by completing over 100 deals, worth over \$20 billion, to secure a stable supply of oil.

In the Indian Subcontinent US dominance has been stifled as Britain reasserted its influence over India through the ascendancy of the Congress Party in 2004. The defeat of the pro-American Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) was a severe blow to American interests. In Pakistan the US was forced to share power with Britain to salvage the declining popularity of General Musharraf.

Russia and China are rapidly developing without following the example of Western liberal democracy. However, it is Russia, which over the last year has opted to openly challenge the West as well as the US at practically every turn, whether by planting a flag on the seabed beneath the Arctic icecap, testing the massive ordnance air blast bomb or disputing the siting of US early-warning defence systems in eastern Europe. Russia has begun re-inventing itself as a regional power, after winning back Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan from America's grip and managing to stop the influence of the three revolutions in central Asia. The US after nearly 20 years of having no rival is now facing the grim prospect of a challenge from a nation with the world's largest gas reserves and substantial oil reserves.

The US is also losing its grip on Latin America which it essentially turned into its back yard since the time of the Monroe declaration in 1823. America prevented all the European states from interfering in the American continent, and from threatening the interests of the US. Due to US hegemony, Latin America remained outside the grip of the European imperialism.

However, with the elections of left wing governments in Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia, Chile and Nicaragua, the US for the first time is facing the threat of independent governments who are following an independent agenda separate to Washington. Nations such as

Venezuela, Brazil and Bolivia have nationalised key utilities and have developed an alternative to US dominated institutions such as the IMF and World Bank to their own version – Bank of the South. After nearly 200 years the US is finding its hegemony being openly challenged by popular independent leaders in the American continent.

The US is also losing its grip on its economic hegemony which it developed from the day it entered World War 2. The American economy used to be the world's powerhouse, but today it is being left behind by emerging economies. It stands in third place now behind China and India in economic growth. This problem is further compounded by America's continued demand for greater oil.

America's biggest threat economically comes from China and already both nations have a complex relationship. US companies are eager to tap into the 1.5 billion Chinese population, whilst at the same time 70% of Chinese goods end up on US shores. China has benefited more from this relationship than the US by accumulating over \$1.2 trillion in dollar reserves. Domestic US companies on the other hand are unable to match Chinese low prices for quality workmanship and this has led the US trade deficit to balloon to nearly \$1 trillion. The US funds this by issuing treasury bonds, of which China is the world's largest purchaser after Japan at \$502 billion, 20% of total US foreign debt. Added to this is that the very economic boom America is benefiting from is increasing demand for oil by China. The relationship between the two is interdependent which the US does not have full control over and cannot easily dictate terms.

The debacle of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars has severely dented US prowess around the world. The US rather than being invincible has been exposed as being ever more reliant upon others and is drowning in a sea of misery domestically. FBI statistics highlighted in 2005 show that a crime was committed every 22 seconds in the US, with a murder committed every 31 minutes, a rape every 5 minutes and a robbery every minute.¹⁹

The US is far from invincible; it is finding its days of empire are fast eroding.

9. Israel Controls the US as well as the world

Many people around the world look in awe towards Israel, a nation only 60 years old, built by a people who were persecuted for centuries and have one of the most advanced militaries in the world. Israel has managed, from its inception, to defeat its neighbouring nations in four wars, even though its population is that of a small island. It is such realities that have led to many believing it is Israel that pulls the strings around the world even controlling US foreign policy. What needs to be explored is who controls who and to what extent?

The close relationship between the US and Israel has been one of the most salient features in US foreign policy for nearly three and a half decades. The \$3 billion in military and economic aid sent annually to Israel by Washington is rarely questioned in Congress, even by liberals who normally challenge US aid to governments that engage in widespread violations of human rights, or by conservatives who usually oppose foreign aid in general. Virtually all Western countries share the United States strong support for Israel's right to exist in peace and security. The US often stands alone with Israel at the United Nations and other international forums when objections are raised over ongoing Israeli violations of international law and related concerns.

The US took an interest in the Middle East after World War 2 when it tasted the benefits of Gulf oil and decided that it could no longer remain isolated and began manoeuvring in the region. In 1944 the State Department described the Arabian Peninsula as constituting: '*A stupendous source of strategic power and the greatest material prize in the world's history.*' The United States was aware that control of the region's oil supply was a lever to control the world. As George Kennan, the influential planner of the containment of the Soviet Union put it in 1949: '*If the US controlled the oil, it would have veto power over the potential actions in the future of rivals like Germany and Japan*' Realising the potential of the Middle East, the US set forward multiple plans and strategies to control the region.

The establishment of a Jewish homeland had been proposed by British Prime Minister Henry Bannerman in 1906: '*There are people (the Muslims) who control spacious territories teeming with manifest and hidden resources. They dominate the intersections of world routes. Their lands were the cradles of human civilizations and religions. These people have one faith, one language, one history and the same aspirations. No natural barriers can isolate these people from one another ... if, per chance, this nation were to be unified into one state; it would then take the fate of the world into its hands and would separate Europe from the rest of the world. Taking these considerations seriously, a foreign body should be planted in the heart of this nation to prevent the convergence of its wings in such a way that it could exhaust its powers in never-ending wars. It could also serve as a springboard for the West to gain its coveted objects.*'²⁰

Israel was created on the basis of fulfilling a British interest by being placed in the middle of the Muslim world; however British weakness after World War 2 led to the US reorganising the region. The US looked towards Israel, within defined and secure boundaries, even though it was established with dreams of Eretz Israel (a greater Israel). This was the first difference between the US and Israel. The position of Israel is very clear since it has refused to define its borders from the very

beginning. This exposed the fact that Israel was not a colony of the US and there were conflicting interests between the two.

Ever since the establishment of the Zionist movement, the Jews have been aiming to achieve economic and political domination over the region. America rejects the idea of substituting European influence with Jewish influence, and she also rejects the idea of sharing power with any other country. America is committed to protecting Israel, guaranteeing her security and securing a prosperous standard of living for the Jews living there. However, she refuses to allow Israel to share the influence with her. In order to prevent Israeli expansion and the spread of Israeli influence in the region, American policy has been based on isolating Israel from the rest of the region in an attempt to curtail her and minimise her role in the quest to solve the Palestinian issue and the Middle Eastern issue. US policy is centred around establishing a Palestinian state to act as an instrument of containment; by establishing a host of international guarantees and by bringing multinational forces to be deployed along the borders between Israel and the neighbouring Arab countries - Jordan, Syria, Egypt and the future Palestinian State. The American policy has also been based on working towards the internationalisation of Jerusalem, as America sees this internationalisation as a solution to the sensitive crisis of Jerusalem that would please the Christians and guarantee a strong American presence through the presence of the United Nations.

There are a whole host of factors which has led the US and Israeli foreign policies to reach the extent they have today:

- Many US citizens share a sentimental attachment with Israel especially many liberals - particularly among the post-war generation in leadership positions in government and the media. Many Americans identify with Israel's historical struggle, internal democracy, relatively high standard of living and its role as a sanctuary for an oppressed minority group that spent centuries in diaspora.
- The Christian Right in the US, with tens of millions of followers and a major base of support for the Republican Party, historically has thrown its immense media and political clout in support of Israel and other right-wing Israeli leaders. Based in part on a theology that sees the ingathering of Jews to the Holy Land as a precursor for the second coming of Christ, the battle between Israelis and Palestinians is, in their eyes, simply a continuation of the battle between the Israelites and the Philistines, with God having deemed that the land belongs to Israel alone.
- Mainstream and conservative Jewish organisations have mobilised considerable lobbying resources, financial contributions from the Jewish community, and citizen pressure on the news media and other forums of public discourse in support of the Israeli government. The role of the pro-Israel lobby is to create a climate in line with Israeli interests and help in the creation of a climate of intimidation among those who seek to moderate US policy, including growing numbers of progressive Jews.

- The arms industry, contributes five times more money to congressional campaigns and lobbying efforts than AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Committee) and other pro-Israel groups combined. The industry however does have a considerable stake in supporting massive arms shipments to Israel and other Middle Eastern allies of the United States. It is far easier for a member of Congress to challenge a \$60 million arms deal to Indonesia, for example, than the \$2 billion of arms to Israel, particularly when so many congressional districts include factories that produce such military hardware.

Israel has successfully managed to build a state and then mobilise its resources to achieve many of its long term aims. However, without Western support it is impossible to see how Israel could reach the position it is in today. Israel has however failed in its ultimate aim of establishing a state with fixed borders encompassing the lands it was supposedly promised by God and this is due only to one reason – such an aim is not in the interests of the US.

The US plans defined Israeli borders alongside a Palestinian state. The Likud party which has been the party of power for most of Israel's history attempted to unilaterally define the borders by building settlements and expelling Muslims. However, Israel still needs the US for any final settlement and for these reasons it has organised lobbying in the US and the world's media in order to achieve a favourable outcome. The endeavour to achieve Eretz Israel is complicated by the fact that the Labour party in Israel believes in giving up land for permanent defined borders. It believes this is a price worth paying for the security it needs.

Hence Israel does not control the US but has been very efficient in influencing US policy. The US is organising the Middle East. It is the one that dictates, and on many issues the US and Israel have the same policy, however this should not be seen as the US abandoning its interests for Israel. US support for the Israeli government, like US support for its allies elsewhere in the world, is not motivated by objective security needs or a strong moral commitment to the country. Rather, as elsewhere, US foreign policy is motivated primarily to advance its own perceived strategic interests.

10. Israel is invincible, it has proven this in 4 wars, hence the Muslim world should accept its here to stay

Since its formation in 1948, the reality of Israel's military strength has been shrouded by a mythical aura of invincibility. Interestingly such myths have not been actively expressed by Israel, but have been given life by the actions of the treacherous Muslim rulers.

Israel's performance in the wars of 1948, 1956, 1967 and 1973 against the Muslims in the region has long been seen as confirmation of Israel's military superiority. In light of this apparent superiority and its seizure of Muslim lands, it is argued that direct military conflict with Israel is not a viable course of action for the Arab states, creating the necessity of entering into negotiations. The direct consequence of such a move has been the acceptance of Israel's sovereignty through plans such as the peace process.

In reviewing Israel's supposed military might one must keep in mind: What purpose does the construction of this myth serve?

The 1948 war – Israel's creation

The war of 1948 led to the establishment of the state of Israel. On the surface it's difficult to understand how 40 million Arabs could not match the fighting strength of just 600,000 Jews. A closer study of the defenders of the Palestinian cause shows how their actions in fact led directly to the establishment of Israel.

The primary representatives of the Palestinian cause were King Abdullah of Transjordan, King Farook of Egypt and the Mufti of Palestine, all of them were extremely weak rulers subject to constant manipulation by the British. King Abdullah's portrayal of himself as a defender of the Palestinian cause was a façade. It was known that he and Ben Gurion (Israel's first Prime Minister) were students together in Istanbul and that in clandestine meetings Abdullah had offered to accept the establishment of Israel in return for Jordanian control of the Arab populated parts of Palestine.

King Abdullah had the Arab Legion at his disposal, a highly trained unit of 4,500 men, with General John Glubb an Englishman as its commanding officer. Glubb in his memoirs recounted that he was under strict orders from the British, not to enter areas under Jewish control.²¹ Egypt further weakened the attack against Israel when Nokrashi Pasha, the Prime Minister, initially did not use existing military units but sent an army of volunteers that had only been organised in January of that year. Jordan also delayed the passage of Iraqi troops across its territory thus thwarting any attack on Israel. This is why a blind Imam brought to rouse the Jordanian army prior to the battle embarrassed Abdullah when he said: "O army I wish you were ours" (referring to the Arab Legion being British).²²

Although the combined Muslim forces were 40,000 only 10,000 were trained soldiers. The Zionists had 30,000 armed personnel, 10,000 men for local defence and another 25,000 for home guard. Furthermore there were nearly 3,000 specially trained Irgun and Stern gang terrorists. They were armed with the latest weaponry and funded heavily through Zionist agencies in America and

Britain. Despite the preparedness of the Jews, the treachery of the Muslim rulers secured a foothold for the Jews in Palestine.

The 1956 Suez Canal crisis

This conflict was never a war for the liberation of Palestine but rather a struggle between America and Britain for control over the strategically important Suez Canal.

The US saw Egypt as a critical ally if America was to gain influence in the Middle East. Through the CIA, she moved to depose the Pro-British King Farook in a coup in 1952, bringing into power the Free Officers who were to be led by Gamal Abdul-Nasser. The CIA worked on a project in 1951 known as "The Search for a Moslem Billy Graham." Mike Copeland the CIA operative, published classified information in his memoirs in 1989, 'The Game Player,' about the CIA backed coup d'état that ousted the British puppet King Farook. Copeland, who activated the project, explains that *'the CIA needed a charismatic leader who would be able to divert the growing anti-American hostility that was building up in the area.'* He explains both the CIA and Nasser were in agreement on Israel. For Nasser talk of war with Israel was irrelevant. Much more of a priority was British occupation of the Suez Canal Zone. Nasser's enemy was Britain.

In 1956 Nasser carried out American demands of nationalising the Suez Canal. The response of Britain was to lure France and Israel into the struggle. This was outlined by historian Corelli Barnett, who wrote about the Suez in his book, 'The Collapse of British Power': *'France was hostile to Nasser because Egypt was helping the Algerian rebels, and attached to the canal for historical reasons. After all, a Frenchman built it. Israel was longing to have a go at Nasser anyway because of Palestinian fedayeen attacks and the Egyptian blockade of the Straits of Tiran. so Sir Anthony Eden (British Prime Minister) concocted a secret tripartite plot with France and Israel.'*²³ He further explained *'that Israel would invade Egypt across the Sinai Peninsula.'* *'Britain and France would then give an ultimatum to the parties to stop fighting or they would intervene to 'protect' the canal.'*²⁴

The US and USSR exercised diplomatic pressure to force Britain to withdraw. Russia directly threatened Paris and London with nuclear attacks. The immense international pressure forced the British and French to withdraw and consequently lose their footing in Egypt. The American administration, under Eisenhower, went as far as threatening the Israelis with economic sanctions if they did not withdraw from occupied territory seized from Egypt, a measure that would have had disastrous consequences on Israel at the time. In the aftermath of the crisis, America emerged as the dominant force in the Middle East.

The 1967 Six Day War

This war was again another episode in the Anglo-American conflict for control of the region. Britain had been surpassed as the region's dominant force 11 years earlier, but still retained some influence through its agents in Jordan, Syria and Israel. In an attempt to weaken Nasser, Britain sought to lure Israel to drag Egypt into a war whereby Israel would seize territory and use it as a bargaining tool in any future peace settlement; a means through which to achieve the security which

the Israelis so desperately sought. On 5th June 1967 Israel launched a pre-emptive strike destroying 60% of Egypt's grounded air force and 66% of Syrian and Jordanian combat aircraft.

The Israelis seized the West Bank and east Jerusalem from Jordanian control. King Hussein, prior to the battle, had positioned his troops in different areas from where the main battle was taking place. In a matter of 48 hours the Israelis seized the major West Bank towns. In a similar manner the Israelis seized the strategically important Golan Heights on the 6th day of the war. The Syrian troops occupying the Golan Heights heard news of Israel's capture of the heights through their own State radio despite the Syrian troops clearly occupying them. Israel also dealt America's Nasser a blow by capturing *Sharm al Sheikh* and securing the waterway of the Straits of Tiran. The objective of weakening the regime of Nasser was achieved, thus indirectly aiding British interests within the region. Israel was able to seize more land and use it as a bargaining asset in any land for peace negotiations, which today is still used as a basis for negotiations rather than the status of 1948. The United Nations established the UN Partition plan in 1947, which gave 57% of territory to Israel with Palestine becoming 42% of its former self. In the 1967 war Israeli occupation increased further with its territorial gains of up to 78% of historic Palestine.

The 1973 War

An examination of the October 1973 war launched by Egypt and Syria against Israel shows that the aims were limited and never included the liberation of Palestine. The aims never even included the liberation of the Golan Heights which were designed to be restored as part of a peace treaty between Syria and Israel. The aims were to solidify the positions of Anwar Sadat and Hafez al-Assad who were relatively new leaders in countries prone to military coups. Sadat in particular was vulnerable given the fact that he had succeeded the charismatic Nasser.

Mohammed Heikal the respected editor of Al Ahram from 1957 – 1974, who witnessed the war, explained the extent of Anwar Sadat's underlying motives in his book 'The Road to Ramadhan' where he cites Sadat's mood in the run up to the war. Heikal quotes one of Sadat's generals, Mohammed Fouwzi who gave the analogy of a samurai drawing two swords - a long one and short one in preparation for battle. Fouwzi said that this battle would be a case of the short sword, signifying a limited battle for certain motives.

Anwar Sadat had no intention of having a protracted war of liberation with Israel. This is why he sought peace with Israel whilst commanding a winning position in the war. In the first 24 hours of the war Egypt smashed through Israel's much heralded Bar-Lev fortifications east of the Suez Canal with only 68 casualties. Meanwhile 2 Syrian divisions and 500 tanks swept into the Golan Heights and retook some of the land captured in 1967. In two days of fighting Israel had lost 49 aircraft and 500 tanks. In the midst of this Sadat sent a message to US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in which he said that the objective of the war was '*the achievement of peace in the Middle East and not partial settlements.*' The message went on to state that if Israel withdrew from all occupied territories Egypt would be prepared to participate in a Peace conference under UN or neutral auspices.

Thus despite having an immense strategic advantage Sadat was in the mood for negotiations at such an early stage. Sadat's refusal to press home his initial advantage and his delay in launching the second Sinai offensive allowed Israel to mobilise, with aid from the US and she began to seize back lost territory. Hostilities formally came to an end on 25th October 1974.

All the wars with Israel best illustrate how the Muslim rulers have never seriously fought Israel with the intention of liberating Palestine. All the aforementioned examples illustrate the reality behind the myths which the Ummah has been led to believe. The real treachery has been committed by the insincere rulers who have collaborated and helped create the myth of Israeli superiority, kindling it, nurturing it and maintaining it. The wars that the Arab world fought, show that the Muslim countries have never singularly nor collectively fought Israel with the intention of destroying it. Each of the wars was conducted in order to meet specific objectives, none of which were to liberate the land of Palestine and eliminate Israel. Hence the objective of seriously threatening Israel was never an aim, despite the unquestionable strength of the combined Arab armies.

11. The third world is in poverty because there is not enough food in the world

Numerous organisations have researched into the general causes of poverty which range from the lack of resources to the nature of the local climate to the lack of democracy. There is generally no consensus on the causes by sociologists and think tanks. However, a dominant idea that exists is that only the diffusion of capitalism with its free markets is the cure. A cursory glance at not just the Muslim world but the third world in general shows a handful of factors have played a large part in contributing to the poverty in the world today rather than the shortage of food.

The role of IMF and World Bank and their notorious structural adjustment policies in countries such as Pakistan, Turkey, Indonesia, Bangladesh and Egypt have directly aided some of the underlying economic problems. The general solution provided by such institutions is one of trading their way out of poverty. They were forced to implement policies such as reducing and eliminating grain reserves, eliminating tariffs on food coming from Europe and the US and removing subsidies for fertilizer and other agricultural inputs. What this actually means is that Western goods should be imported rather than allow imports from poorer countries. The theory is that only via trade will nations pull themselves out of poverty. The development of a market economy with a greater role for the private sector was therefore seen as the key to stimulating economic growth and removing poverty.

As an example, Pakistan actually required essential investment in health, education and infrastructure before they could compete internationally. The World Bank and IMF instead required Pakistan to reduce state support to these sectors and concentrate on exports. They insisted on pushing Pakistan into markets where they were unable to compete with the might of the international private sector. Such policies inevitably undermined the economic development of Pakistan.

Another factor which has handcuffed the third world in poverty is debt. Africa is being asked to repay its legacy of the colonial era. Africa's debt is partly the result of the unjust transfer to them of the debts of the colonizing states, in billions of dollars, at very high interest rates. It also originates from 'odious debt', whereby debt was incurred as rich countries loaned funds to dictators and corrupt leaders when it was known that the money would be wasted. South Africa, for example inherited "apartheid-caused debt" at \$28 billion (which is now \$46 billion). Post Apartheid Africa was forced to repay debts incurred by the apartheid regime so, in effect, South Africans are paying for their own oppression. In 1998 ACTSA (Action for Southern Africa) estimated that South Africa borrowed \$11 billion (now \$18 billion) to maintain apartheid, and neighbouring states borrowed \$17 billion (now \$28 billion) because of apartheid. Therefore, destabilisation and aggression now represents 74% of African owed debt.

Poverty across the world – Those living below the poverty line, which is the minimum needed for sustenance as percentage of total population.

Sierra Leone	70%
Colombia	64%
Georgia	54%
Kenya	52%
Bangladesh	50%
Iran	40%
Pakistan	33%
Jordan	30%
Indonesia	27%
Turkey	20%
Egypt	20%
Syria	12%

United Nations

Colonialism has played a large part in the poverty of the third world. Colonialism has ensured dependency on the West, which allowed the continued presence and interference in parts of the world where extensive mineral resources exist. Africa today still labours from Western interference which began in the colonial era and has been forced to concentrate on commodities which the native populations would never be able to purchase.

The current global agriculture setup replaced subsistence farming where the cultivation of land was primarily for domestic consumption. Since 1960, international financial institutions have attempted to eliminate such a system and the mechanisms whereby governments can control food supplies. In their absence, national and international private companies have stepped in and have been dictating food policy in the interests of their profit margins. In times of stress, the mechanisms whereby governments could protect their citizens from the impacts of fluctuating prices no longer exist. Hence the world's poor are held to ransom by the international financial markets where the prices of global commodities are set. Although speculation has been the driving factor behind the surge in food prices during the global credit crunch, all was not well prior to the crisis. Since 1960, global food production has been transformed from a primarily local activity, albeit with the import and export of luxury foods, to a primarily global business.

International trade rules reward those who produce their goods for export over those who produce for local consumption. Though farmers in British Columbia and California both grow tomatoes in the summer, it is more profitable for them to ship those tomatoes over the border than to sell them domestically. Aside from the obvious ludicrousness of the situation, the increased transportation costs of shipping goods by truck across vast distances adds even more expense. In Asia, Latin America, North America and some parts of Europe, small farmers are becoming increasingly rare. The industrialisation of agriculture through monocropping and over-reliance on chemical fertilizer and pesticides has effectively created economies of scale such that it is almost impossible for small farmers to succeed. Genetic modification of seeds adds yet another layer to that industrialisation, ensuring that large agribusiness companies including Monsanto, Archer Daniels Midland, and Cargill continue to post record profits.

The developed world continues to argue there is not enough food in the world, with populations rising there are just too many mouths to feed. Food shortages has also been utilised to explain the rise in food prices, however this fails to explain why in an increasingly productive and affluent global food system up to one billion people will likely go hungry? The problem is in the global food system i.e. the distribution of agricultural goods around the world and more importantly the corporate monopolisation of the world's food system.

The dominance of the richer nations and companies in the international arena has had a tremendous impact on agriculture, which, for many poor countries forms one of the main sources of income. A combination of unfair trade agreements, concentrated ownership of major food production, dominance (through control and influence in institutions such as the World Bank, IMF and the World Trade Organisation) has meant that poor countries have seen their ability to determine their own agricultural policies severely undermined.

Policies such as structural adjustment demanded by these institutions meant most developing countries had to not only cut back on health and education, but food stamps and other support for the very poor. Trade barriers and other support mechanisms for local industry also had to be removed, allowing foreign companies to more easily compete (yet richer countries have hardly reduced their barriers in return). In addition, most poor countries were strongly encouraged to concentrate more on exporting cash crops to earn foreign exchange in order to pay off debts. This resulting reduction in biodiversity of crops and related ecosystems meant worsening environments and clearing more land or increasing fertilizer use to try and make up for this.

Increasing poverty and inequality thus fueled corruption making the problem even worse. Food dumping (while calling it aid) by wealthy nations onto poor countries, vast agricultural subsidies in North America and Europe have all combined and have had various effects on the poverty in the third world.

The third world remains poor due to the policies of the West and will remain poor not because of a shortage of food but due to the excessive consumption of the West:

- The West with 20% of the world population consumes 80% of the world's agricultural production
- Consumes 86% of the world's goods
- Consumes 75% of the world's milk
- Consumes 70% of the world's timber
- Consumes 62% of the world's water
- Consumes 48% of the world's energy
- Consumes 45% of all meat and fish

There is more than enough food in the world; the West just consumes the lion's share of it.

12. The third world need to liberalise their economies for them to develop

The last three decades have seen Capitalism dominate the international development scene. It has completely monopolised economic development and enforced its formula upon the world. The Asian tiger economies of China, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong are shown regularly as successful nations who adopted liberalism and progressed. The IMF alongside the World Bank proclaimed industrialisation and the diffusion of liberal economic ideas would transform traditional economies and societies. These influences would place poor countries on a path of development similar to that experienced by Western industrialised nations during the Industrial Revolution.

Today poverty is the state for the majority of the world's people. Three billion people in the world live on fewer than two dollars a day; another 1.3 billion people live on less than one dollar a day. 1.3 billion have no access to clean water; three billion have no access to sanitation and two billion have no access to electricity. Liberalism has actually been the cause of the wealth disparities in the world and the poverty the majority of the world's people face. Liberalism has resulted in the Western world feeding off the remainder of the world. Liberalism has in no way helped alleviate poverty, it actually contributed to it, and hence any continuation of liberal economic policies in the third world will result in the poor getting even poorer.

Liberalism has even created huge wealth disparities in the West and this can be seen by looking at just the US and the UK. The UK for example generated wealth (GDP) of £2.2 trillion in 2005, this was an increase from the previous year which for liberal economists means people have more wealth, have more to spend thus they must be happy. However, if we look at how much the 60 million population of the UK received of this generated wealth, 2005 statistics from HM Revenue and Customs show that the richest 10% have more than 50% of the nation's wealth and that 40% of the British population shared in only 5% of this wealth. This has resulted in the majority of the population resorting to borrowing to fund their lifestyles and this is why UK consumer debt is more than £1.3 trillion, more than the actual economy. The US situation is even worse; the US may generate \$13 trillion a year in wealth but national debt is \$8.5 trillion. This means US citizens are funding their lifestyles by borrowed money rather than the \$13 trillion the economy generated. In a 2005 Harvard report it was calculated that 10% of the population owned 71% of the wealth, and the top 1% controlled 40%. On the other hand, the bottom 40% owned less than 1% of the nation's wealth.

Hence liberalism has created an enormous wealth disparity even in the developed world who have lived under free markets for over a century.

The Western world themselves developed with policies completely opposite to what they are propagating today. In his groundbreaking work, *Kicking Away the Ladder* (2003), Professor Ha Joon Chang of Cambridge University documented the development of every industrialised country, showing that protectionist policies were a fundamental part of development strategy in almost every case. The process of development that emerges from this story is not maximizing comparative advantage but rather shifting comparative advantage to high value goods through calculated market

distortions. In the case of the UK and the United States, those market distortions originally came in the form of colonialism and slavery. But market distortions continue in the US today in the form of agriculture and steel subsidies, not to mention the tremendous government spending on biotechnology and defence, which largely serves as a subsidy for those sectors.

Hence liberalism is the obstacle for development in the third world not the solution. It is the direct cause of poverty for the third world.

13. Globalisation is the epoch of free trade and essential for economic development in the 21st century

The first time the word *globalisation* was used was in describing the activities of the large American companies during the mid-1990s. The end of the cold war put the US in a conundrum; the arms race with the USSR resulted in financial circles pouring money into the US resulting in an expensive dollar which in turn made the climate for US multi-nationals to export their goods virtually impossible. US Companies found it too expensive to maintain a competitive position overseas when it was costing them so much making the products at home.

Hence cheaper foreign markets had to be found. The setting up of production facilities in a foreign country making use of the cheap labour, with very little labour laws and outright abuse was termed globalisation.

The first nation to be given the globalisation treatment was Russia and what was left of it after the collapse of the USSR. The fall of communism in 1990 and the break-up of the Soviet Union represented a wonderful opportunity for capitalist institutes to transform a huge centralist economy to one that was market orientated. A total of \$129 billion poured into Russia with the IMF and the World Bank implementing a number of its development schemes. The Russian economy was opened to foreign investment and industry was sold to foreigners leaving the country vulnerable to swings in world prices. In 1997, due to a loss on confidence in Russia, speculators began to withdraw their money and Russia was unable to defend itself as liberalisation required there to be no restrictions on capital flows. The crisis raised poverty from 2 million to 60 million, a 3000% increase. UNICEF noted that this resulted in 500,000 'extra' deaths per year. Russia is a clear example that globalisation directly allowed the crisis to reach the peak it did.

Globalisation today in reality is the superpower pushing for various policies that imply free trade which is in fact a continuation of mercantilist processes seen throughout history. The US broke away from British colonial rule in 1776, recognising the unfairness and harshness in Imperial Britain's policies. However, the US has now taken on that role and is doing the same things that the British once did to others. Shortly after the War of 1812 that was fought to defeat British mercantilist trade practices, US statesman Henry Clay pointed to the necessity of the United States developing a defensive capability by quoting a British leader, *'Nations knew, as well as [ourselves], what we meant by "free trade" was nothing more nor less than, by means of the great advantage we enjoyed, to get a monopoly of all their markets for our manufactures, and to prevent them, one and all, from ever becoming manufacturing nations.'*²⁵

The Reagan and Thatcher era in particular, saw free trade pushed to most parts of the globe under the guise of globalisation. Almost demonising anything that was state owned, and encouraging the privatisation of anything that was owned by the public, using military intervention if needed. Structural adjustment policies were used to open up economies of poorer countries so that big businesses from the rich countries could own or access many resources cheaply.

Globalisation has a track record of failure. In perhaps the most comprehensive study of poverty to date, Scorecard on Globalization 1980-2000, Mark Weisbrot, Dean Baker and other researchers at

the Centre for Economic and Policy Research documented that economic growth and rates of improvement in life expectancy, child mortality, education levels and literacy all have declined in the era of globalization (1980-2000) compared to the years 1960-1980. From 1960-1980 many countries maintained protectionist policies to insulate their economies from the international market to nurture their domestic industries and allow them to become competitive. Those policies are the same ones on which US economic prosperity was built.

14. Foreign Aid from western nations helps the development of recipient nations

For decades foreign aid has been seen as a fast track to economic development. Since World War 2 over \$2.3 trillion has flowed out of the Western world into projects that would aid the third world in its endeavour to move out of poverty. The question is really one of what motives the developed world has when it gives aid?

Aid is seldom given from motives of pure altruism. It is often given as a means of supporting an ally in international politics and with the intention of influencing the political process in the receiving nation. The consideration of such, being bad or not, has depended on whether one agrees with the agenda being pursued by the donor nation in a particular case. During the conflict between Communism and Capitalism in the twentieth century, the champions of those ideologies, the Soviet Union and the United States, each used aid to influence the internal politics of other nations, and to support their weaker allies. The US developed the Marshall Plan in order to pull European nations toward Capitalism and away from Communism. Aid to underdeveloped countries has always been in the interest of the donor than the recipient. Specific motives have included defence support, market expansion, foreign investment, missionary enterprise and cultural extension. In recent decades, aid by organisations such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank has been exposed as being primarily a tool used to open new areas up to global capitalists, and being only secondarily, if at all, concerned with the wellbeing of the people in the recipient countries.

Global Foreign aid assistance 2007 (billions)

1. US	21b
2. Germany	11b
3. France	8.9b
4. UK	8.8b
5. Japan	7.8b
6. Holland	5.6b
7. Spain	5.1b
8. Sweden	3.8b
9. Canada	3.5b

Source OECD

Professor William Easterly, a noted mainstream economics professor on development and aid issues has criticized foreign aid for not having achieved much, despite grand promises. He says: *‘A tragedy of the world’s poor has been [that] the West spent \$2.3 trillion on foreign aid over the last five decades and still had not managed to get twelve-cent medicines to children to prevent half of all malaria deaths. The West spent \$2.3 trillion and still had not managed to get four-dollar bed nets to poor families. The West spent \$2.3 trillion and still had not managed to get three dollars to each new mother to prevent five million child deaths...It is heart-breaking that global society has evolved a highly efficient way to get entertainment to rich adults and children, while it can’t get twelve-cent medicine to dying poor children.’*²⁶

The effectiveness of foreign aid has long been questioned since in all cases it has come with strings attached. Donor countries as well as the US have used aid to meet their geopolitical aims. For example:

- a. The US has directed aid to regions where it has concerns related to its national security, e.g. Middle East, and in Cold War times in particular, Central America and the Caribbean.
- b. Sweden has targeted aid to “progressive societies”.

- c. France has sought to promote maintenance or preserve and spread of French culture, language, and influence, especially in West Africa, while disproportionately giving aid to those that have extensive commercial ties with France.
- d. Japan has also heavily skewed aid towards those in East Asia with extensive commercial ties together with conditions of Japanese purchases.²⁷

Africa in particular has been promised aid ever since the end of colonialism. Countless G8 summits have promised aid and debt relief to the continent. However, this has been in order to win support for national interests rather than helping the impoverished continent. As noted by Action for Southern Africa: *'It is undeniable that there has been poor governance, corruption and mismanagement in Africa. However, the legacy of colonialism, the support of the G8 for repressive regimes in the Cold War, the creation of the debt trap, the massive failure of Structural Adjustment Programmes imposed by the IMF and World Bank and the deeply unfair rules on international trade. The role of the G8 in creating the conditions for Africa's crisis cannot be denied. Its overriding responsibility must be to put its own house in order, and to end the unjust policies that are inhibiting Africa's development.'*²⁸

The status quo in world relations is maintained through foreign aid. Rich countries like the US continue to have a financial lever to dictate what good governance means and to pry open markets of developing countries for multinational corporations. Developing countries have no such handle for Western markets, even in sectors like agriculture and textiles, where they have an advantage but continue to face trade barriers and subsidies.

15. The prosperity and progress the world has witnessed in the last two centuries is unheralded in history and is evidence of Capitalisms superiority

Year 2007 was an unprecedented time in history; the wealth generated in the year reached a record \$54 trillion, the most generated in any year in history. After World War 2 the world economy was a mere \$1 trillion. The adoption of Capitalism in Europe set in motion the industrial revolution which has led to unqualified prosperity and progress, unmatched in history.

Advocates of Capitalism since the fall of Communism continue to remind the world how prosperous the world's population is, even considering Capitalism's progress itself. Some capitalists have even been 'civilisationally' racist - if such a term existed - due to considering themselves superior to every other civilisation. The Italian Prime Minister, Silvio Berlusconi boasted after the events of 9/11, *'we must be aware of the superiority of our civilisation, a system that has guaranteed well being, respect for human rights and - in contrast with Islamic countries - respect for religious and political rights, a system that has its values understanding of diversity and tolerance...The West will conquer peoples, like it conquered Communism, even if it means a confrontation with another civilisation, the Islamic one, stuck where it was 1,400 years ago.'*²⁹ The Economist even had the audacity in the middle of the global credit crunch meltdown to say: *'Bubbles, excess and calamity are part of the package of Western finance. And still it is worth it.'*³⁰

For the West, Capitalism is synonymous to progress itself. The path the West took to achieve such grand claims is called history and everything else is considered primitive and in need of a reformation. However, the place where such a claim begins is essentially where the problem lies.

The measure of progress for Capitalists is the amount of wealth generated by the world economy – Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The invention of technology and scientific discoveries are tools to make production and industry more efficient and give the economy the ability to pump more out of less. However, what has driven science and technology? It is one thing to claim one's civilisation is superior. However, looking at the causes highlights how such superiority was achieved. Britain is considered the world's first nation to industrialise and this was driven by the desire to colonise the world. Britain's advantage on the oceans led to the development of new working patterns and institutional development. The accumulation of the colonised people's raw materials led to a huge increase in Britain's wealth.

The development of technology and most scientific breakthroughs have to a large extent been driven by wars and especially both the world wars. It was the US civil war that led to the development of submarines. The need to win World War 1 drove the development of railways. Although railways existed well before the war huge advances were made in order to transport troops during the war. Through Operation Paperclip, which was the kidnapping of Nazi scientists and technology the United States embarked upon an ambitious program in rocketry. The developments in rocketry led to the space race, the development of ballistic missiles, satellites and primitive computers. Such innovations are what allowed the development of a number of consumer items which have become common household items. The combustion engine used in both cars and aeroplanes was a result of the mobility needed in World War 1. Televisions, the modern radio etc.,

were developed from the need to miniaturize essential information on cockpit screens and communicate with fighter jet pilots. There are only a handful of inventions that took place outside the military and were not needed for war.

Although the capitalist West has the position of being the most technologically advanced in history, the search for resources, colonialism and war has characterised Western technological and scientific prowess.

Capitalism may have driven wealth creation like never before. However, there are a number of developments that it should also be certified with. The world economy maybe generating record wealth with liberal democracies driving this, but half of the world's population will not have had enough food today as they earn less than \$2 a day – 95% of the world lives on less than \$10 a day.³¹ World poverty has accelerated under Capitalism. It was Europe that scrambled for resources around the world in the past, whereas today they have been replaced by the US. All that has changed from the 19th century is that the gun has been replaced by the factory, slavery has been replaced by consumerism, armies have been replaced by the media and subsistence farming has been replaced by the financial markets.

Capitalism's next success has been creating history's greatest ever wealth fault line. Whilst the majority of the world barely survives on a few dollars, the US has most of the world's billionaires, in what is mankind's greatest lopsided world economy. In 2006 the World Institute for Development Economics Research of the UN released the culmination of a global study. A number of its findings are staggering. By gathering research from countries all over the world the study concluded that the richest 1% of the world owns 40% of the planet's wealth and that only 10% of the world's population owned 85% of the world's assets.³² Richard Robbins in his award winning book 'Global Problems and the Culture of Capitalism' confirmed this when he said: *'The emergence of Capitalism represents a culture that is in many ways is the most successful that has ever been deployed in terms of accommodating large numbers of individuals in relative and absolute comfort and luxury. It has not been as successful, however, in integrating all in equal measure, and its failure here remains one of its major problems.'*

Capitalism has also created the most indebted world in history, where individuals and nations have more debt than income. The fact that the world generated \$54 trillion is irrelevant when most of this has been funded by debt. The Western world has become obsessed by consuming more than it really needs and most of this is funded by debt as most of the wealth generated is in the hands of a few. The USA, the world's superpower, the world's largest economy and for many a symbol of Capitalism's success is drowning in a misery of debt, which the credit crunch crisis brought to the forefront. The US generated nearly \$14 trillion in 2007, however the national debt – this is money the central and federal governments owe to the US public and the world through the bonds they have sold - stands at \$9.7 trillion. US citizens have a huge appetite for imports and real estate. As a result consumer debt stands at \$11.4 trillion. The debts of US companies amounts to \$18.4 trillion. This makes the US indebted to the tune of just under \$40 trillion – nearly 75% of what the world produces. 37 million Americans live below the poverty line. Capitalism's continued endeavour of perpetual economic growth has drowned the world in money it does not have which makes the prosperity liberals insistence on reminding us, rather irrelevant.

Capitalism was named after its most prominent aspect (capital). It makes material wealth the ultimate aim in life, without this life is not worth living. This led the aristocracy to influence national governments to ensure they maintain their wealth and undertake actions for the aristocracy to make more wealth. The aristocracy came to be replaced by companies and big business heads such as John Rockefeller in Oil, Henry Ford in Automobiles, Jay Gould in railroads, J. Pierpont Morgan in Banking and Andrew Carnegie in steel. Governments in the West organised the colonisation of the world whilst the capitalist – big businesses - accumulated even more wealth. It was initially the effects of World War 1 that forced the West to address the massive wealth disparities since it was impossible for Western economies to pull themselves out of a downturn when the majority of their population had very little wealth to spend. It was this problem which led to the creation of consumerism where spending, enjoying new inventions and new fads would become life's aim and at the same time conveniently helped stimulate the economy.

Capitalism will always generate wealth as Capitalism is all about perpetual economic growth. However, this is all Capitalism is about. It pays little attention to the distribution of its vast wealth. It cares little if anything if whole continents live in poverty due to their colonisation or as they usually term it - free trade and globalisation. Capitalism far from being superior has actually been a disaster.

16. The Muslim world is not ready and nor does it want Islam

For years the West argued that Muslims across the world want democracy and freedom rather than Islam. They argued that only a minority of people in Pakistan and Afghanistan want Islam, whilst the majority of the world was smitten by the West and wants to live by Capitalism. However, today it is modernist Muslims who argue the Muslim world does not want Islam and are not ready for it. The West on the other hand is convinced the Muslim world wants Islam and therefore has begun the process of defending itself from the emergence of such a threat.

The US national intelligence council published a report following its 'global 2020' project, entitled 'Mapping the Global Future.' The National Intelligence Council (NIC) is the American intelligence community's centre for mid-term and long-term strategic thinking. The report set out the likely scenario the world will face in 2020. The report concluded that the appeal of Islam today revolved around its call to return to earlier roots of Islam where the Islamic civilisation was at the forefront of global change under the *Khilafah*. The report portrayed a fictional scenario '*of how a global movement fuelled by radical religious identity could emerge.*'³³ The report revealed unequivocally that at the highest levels of US policy planning, preparation is being made for the emergence of the *Khilafah*. Other reports from US policy makers and think tanks across the world acknowledged there is a broad based ideological movement seeking for the return of the *Khilafah*.

The CIA has already revitalised programs of covert action that once helped win the Cold War, targeting Islamic media, religious leaders, and political parties. The agency is receiving an exponential increase in money, people, and assets to help it influence Muslim societies.

At the same time various surveys, think tank reports and policy makers have all accepted that Muslims globally have rejected Western values. This represents a glaring failure on the part of the West as it has faced no challenges to its global supremacy. This means the battle for hearts and minds has been lost and physical occupation represents a last ditch effort to salvage the emergence of an alternative system of governance.

The actions by Western governments show they believe even more than many Muslims about what the Ummah wants. The actions of the West clearly show rather than the Muslim wanting Islam, they are not very far from achieving such aims.

In April 2007 the University of Maryland commissioned a poll, which confirmed an earlier survey from the University of Jordan. The poll conducted across four majority Muslim countries (Egypt, Pakistan, Morocco, and Indonesia) showed overwhelming support for the *Khilafah* with support well over 75%. Such nations supported the application of *Shari'ah* law in Muslim countries, unification with other countries in a Pan Islamic state i.e. Caliphate, opposition to occupation and Western foreign policy, opposition to the imposition of Western values in Muslim lands and opposition to the use of violence against civilians.

In another huge poll conducted by worldpublicopinion.org across the Muslim world over 70% of respondent's wanted to live under the *Shari'ah* and the *Khilafah*.

The Ummah after undergoing a lengthy period of decline now wants to return back to the *deen* and today she adheres more than she ever has to Islam. She understands Islam better than she has for a few centuries. The corruption in the Muslim world is mainly due to people having to make the best out of the chaos that exists due to the absence of any system. This in no way means the Ummah is not ready for Islam as change always comes from chaos. This can be seen with the emergence of liberal democracies in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries, the emergence of Communist Russia and the current rise of China. The Muslim Ummah's aspiration for Islam is continually being shown when she moves as one body to the attacks on Islam, whether it's the banning of hijab in France or the cartoons printed against the Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم. The Muslim Ummah is more than ready for Islam, now she just needs a state.

17. Islam is outdated. Since the development of Capitalism, Islam has made no contribution to science and technological development – It belongs in the stone age

For the last two centuries the world has witnessed unprecedented leaps in science and technology, the development of railways, aeroplanes, nuclear technology, the Internet, IVF and genetically modified food. Such developments have taken place in parallel to the development of the West, reaching levels unparalleled in history. This monopolisation of technological and scientific inventions has led to the belief that liberal values are a pre-requisite for development.

Most thinkers, scientists and philosophers claim Islam has no place in the world today. This view is built upon the premise that none of the Muslim countries have produced anything in terms of scientific research or technological invention. The West claims that progress in science and technology occurred when the West rid itself of the authority of the Church and separated religion from life. For them the church stifled the development of science and reason as religion is inherently built upon faith and superstition. Only with its removal from the public sphere did the West manage to launch an industrial revolution and then flourish. Today for liberals it is they who invented science as we know it. They claim they laid its foundations and have created its numerous branches.

Such a narrative omits a number of historical developments that are not Western and shows how the West continues to view its history as the history of the world. Such a narrative also conveniently omits what the West took from previous civilisations and especially the Islamic civilisation. Historically all civilisations have been characterised with some form of technological and scientific development. The West has documented the contributions the Romans made to the discipline whilst the Islamic world in the 8th – 10th century translated the works of the Greeks in the area.

Science in essence is the study, research, and experimentation into the observable parts of the universe.

The development of automobiles was due primarily to the development of the combustion engine. This is where the burning of fuel in an engine acts on the pistons causing the movement of the solid parts, eventually moving the automobile. This was possible due to the British Empire who originally used steam and then coal to drive pistons and then eventually to generate rotary (motion) to move machines. Such developments were based upon Al-Jazari's work in the 12th century where he invented the crankshaft, and created rotary motion through the use of rods and cylinders. He was the first to incorporate it into a machine.

A parachute is a device used to slow the motion of an object through an atmosphere by creating drag. Current day parachutes were developed from the designs and experiments of the past. In the 9th century, Ibn Firnas invented a primitive version of the parachute. He jumped from the minaret of the Mezquita mosque in Córdoba using a huge wing-like cloak to break his fall and landed with minor injuries. Subsequent Parachutes were made more compact and from stretched linen over a wooden frame. Then folded silk, was developed as the material for parachutes taking advantage of silk's strength and light weight.

Such examples amongst others show that no civilisation can lay claim to science belonging inherently to them but rather they made a contribution to this universal area. The fact atoms and molecules are subjected to the rules of the universe which can be manipulated will not change if one is a Muslim, Christian or a liberal. This is something that is universal and not affected by one's belief. The real debate is therefore *which* civilisation made significant contributions to science and *what* exactly drove them to excel in the field.

The Islamic golden age is considered to be the period from the 8th century to the 13th century. During this period, engineers, scholars and traders in the Islamic world contributed to the arts, agriculture, economics, industry, law, literature, navigation, philosophy, sciences, and technology, both by preserving and building upon earlier traditions and by adding to them. Howard Turner, an expert on medieval history mentioned in his book 'Science in Medieval Islam,': *'Muslim artists and scientists, princes and labourers together created a unique culture that has directly and indirectly influenced societies on every continent.'* There were a number of specific elements within Islam that were the driving engine which motivated Muslims to excel in this field.

The worship of Allah سبحانه وتعالى was one such factor that led to a number of inventions. The times of the five daily prayers, the direction for *Qibla* and the beginning and ending of Ramadan required accurate readings of the positions of the stars and the moon. It was due to this that Muslims began to invent observational and navigational instruments. This is why most navigational stars today have Arabic names such as Acamar, Baham, Baten Kaitos, Caph, Dabih, Furud, Izar, Lesath, Mirak, Nashira, Tarf and Vega.

Muslims made a number of contributions to Astronomy and eventually to the development of the astronomical clock. A Mechanical lunisolar calendar with a gear train and gear-wheels was invented by Abū Rayhān al-Bīrūnī in the 10th century. Based on such designs Taqi al-din invented the mechanical clock in the 15th century. The need to ascertain the *Qibla* led to the development of the compass, which itself was based upon the findings Muslims astronomers had collated. Muslims developed the compass rose which displayed the orientation of the cardinal directions, north, south, east and west on a map and nautical chart.

Allah سبحانه وتعالى says in the Holy Qur'an:

وَهُوَ الَّذِي جَعَلَ لَكُمُ النُّجُومَ لِتَهْتَدُوا بِهَا فِي ظُلُمَاتِ الْبَرِّ وَالْبَحْرِ

“And it is He who ordained the stars for you that you may be guided thereby in the darkness of the land and the sea.” [TMQ 6:97]

This motivated Muslims to begin to find better observational and navigational instruments. Such instruments were used to explore the world, which many Muslim geographers collated into manuals. They were driven by the ayah in the Qur'an where Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

وَجَعَلْنَا فِي الْأَرْضِ رَوَاسِيًا أَنْ تَمِيدَ بِهِمْ وَجَعَلْنَا فِيهَا فِجَاجًا سُبُلًا لَعَلَّهُمْ يَهْتَدُونَ

“And we have placed in the earth firm hills lest it quake with them and we have placed therein ravines as roads that happily they may find their way.” [TMQ 21:31]

Early Muslims understood that Islam views all the material matters which include the sciences, technology and industry, as merely the study of the reality and a study of how matter can be manipulated to improve the condition and living standards of humanity. As many lands came under the fold of the Islamic civilisation, urbanisation led to a number of developments. The Arabian Desert had scant water springs making most of the region uninhabitable. This was overcome by Muslim engineers developing canals from the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. The swamps around Baghdad were drained, freeing the city of Malaria. Muslim engineers perfected the waterwheel and constructed elaborate underground water channels called *qanats*. This led to the development of advanced domestic water systems with sewers, public baths, drinking fountains, piped drinking water supplies and widespread private and public toilet and bathing facilities.

Muslims thinkers, scientists, engineers and experts made significant contributions to science as well as many other disciplines. Many of these contributions were later used by the West who made further contributions to the field. The nature of science as a universal subject means no single civilisation can lay claim to inventing it but rather most civilisations have documented their contributions throughout history which acted as previous information when experimentation was carried out by latter civilisations. Prior to the emergence of Islam in the Middle East the host population made no contribution to science. When the very same people accepted Islam they made contributions which later generations utilised to invent new items which today still remain with us. Islam rather than being an obstacle to science, was the catalyst that drove Muslim’s contribution to science.

18. The unity of the Muslim world is impossible due to the number of diverse sects and countries

For many the Sunni and Shi'ah fracture is sufficient evidence that the concept of one Ummah is no longer practical in the modern world. Whilst Islamic history has been characterised by unity with the odd schism amongst Muslims, today many national boundaries have become the new unity, with the Islamic concept of Ummah predated to a model that existed centuries ago. Such a schism has led to both Muslims and non-Muslims to view secularism as the only way to deal with differences, whilst calls for Islamic unity and the *Khilafah* are perceived by some to be idealistic.

In essence the debate is about how Islam deals with differences and does the existence of many groups, sects and nations mean a pan-global state with Muslim unity is impossible?

In understanding this it must be clearly understood that the Islamic world is not the first nation to have such differences. The US suffered from a Civil War in 1861 which was a bitter, sectional conflict between the United States of America and the Confederate States of America, formed of eleven southern states which moved to secede from the Union after the 1860 election of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States. Britain today is facing the prospect of Scotland separating and becoming an independent country by 2013. Both conflicts never saw any discussion on secularism's ability to unify people. The civil war in the US is considered a part of its history and taught in its schools.

Islam is no stranger to different peoples, customs, cultures, languages and different schools of thought. As the Islamic lands expanded people of different denominations all became Islamic subjects. Islamic rule under the Abbasids reached lands where the inhabitants of other religions clashed with the thinkers and scholars in the conquered territories. It was this clash that resulted in the development of the rational sciences, i.e. the studying of the creed of Islam. The development was also due to the need for presenting the Islamic belief with rational evidences. As a result, disciplines became divided into branches and Islamic disciplines became diversified accordingly. These disciplines dealt with many issues and were enriched every time the conquests expanded further. As a result many Muslims in the state began to devote themselves to the disciplines, sciences, study and research. A multi-faceted Islamic culture took shape within the Islamic lands, so the people dedicated themselves to learning it to elevate the *Khilafah*. Every scholar, whatever type of culture he or she specialised in, and every writer, whatever their literary approach, and every mathematician, scientist or artisan, would debate and articulate Islam due to this clash.

This led to the emergence of a variety of groups, sects and differences of opinion, only a handful of which were considered to have gone outside the fold of Islam. However, such sects which went into the hundreds were not considered a division amongst the people. In fact under the Abbasids, Baghdad became a centre for intellectual and revolutionary ideas. Thinkers from various backgrounds and learning were welcomed and given a platform to debate. This resulted in a pristine understanding of Islam by society as Islam was withstanding the various tests thrown at it. Hence the existence of diverse groups and sects actually strengthened the understanding of Islam rather than being a source of problems. This was because the differences were on understanding the

Islamic sources, which were going through the period of being catalogued and codified. The existence of multiple groups and sects actually aided this.

The division in the Muslim world today is down to two issues. The first is the weakness that overtook Muslims in understanding Islam and the second was encapsulated by Professor David Fromkin, expert on Economic History at the University of Chicago. He highlights very clearly in his book that much of the situation in the Muslim world stems from the colonial era. He says: *'Massive amounts of the wealth of the old Ottoman Empire were now claimed by the victors. But one must remember that the Islamic empire had tried for centuries to conquer Christian Europe and the power brokers deciding the fate of those defeated people were naturally determined that these countries should never be able to organize and threaten Western interests again. With centuries of mercantilist experience, Britain and France created small, unstable states whose rulers needed their support to stay in power. The development and trade of these states were controlled and they were meant never again to be a threat to the West. These external powers then made contracts with their puppets to buy Arab resources cheaply, making the feudal elite enormously wealthy while leaving most citizens in poverty.'*³⁴

Creating divisions in the Muslim world by establishing 'small, unstable states' was a deliberate policy by the European colonialists to ensure the Muslim world never can unite. France and Britain prior to World War 1 had already carved up the Middle East amongst themselves. They drew lines on paper maps and created Transjordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq and Iran. Pakistan, India and Afghanistan were later created which separated people who had lived for hundreds of years together. It is such colonial policies which have now ballooned into multiple problems. Each nation was appointed with rulers who were subservient to both Britain and France. The Saud family actually collaborated with the British to destroy the *Khilafah* in return for leadership of the *Hijaz*. Such artificial boundaries have today become the lens through which many Muslims view the world. Hence the problem in the Muslim world to a large extent was an organised affair by the colonialists where initially they segregated Muslims physically, and then they ensured any ideas of Muslim unity would never arise by creating national flags, national independence days and national anthems.

Unity in the past was built upon Islam and it turned the Islamic lands into prosperous societies which welcomed all and excelled in various fields. Hence the absence of Islam, which is what the colonialists worked for, is the reason why over 50 nations exist where one nation once stood.

It is not Islam that is the cause of divisions but the absence of Islam that causes problems. A pertinent example of this is the attempts by the Western world in imposing secularism as the model to deal with the Sunni and Shi'ah problem. Such an approach is alien to the people involved in the conflict and rather than solving the conflict it is in fact placing it in the private sphere ensuring it has no influence in policies in the public sphere. The original dispute over the successor to the Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم can in reality only be solved by assessing the Islamic evidence in this regard, from this perspective only Islam can ever be the solution. The actions of some Muslims in the past against the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم family, the actions of Mu'awiyah and history generally are not sources of Islamic jurisprudence and hence cannot be the reference point. The reference point in this case would be the Qur'an and the hadith and naturally

different interpretations can occur here, which is the case with all jurisprudence. However, interpretation is not a limitless process and there are rules for interpretation.

In every ideology there exists difference of opinion on solutions built upon the creedal tenets. In democratic countries, numerous schools of thought have arisen due to differences in interpretation. In the US today we have Democrats and Republicans. In the UK we have Labour, Liberal Democrats and Conservatives. Across the Western world we have neoconservatives as well as libertarians, Fabians, environmentalists and Christian Democrats. All differ in the manner that liberal ideas should manifest themselves but they all have secularism – the Capitalist creed - as their basis. Economics is also prone to such difference with the Keynesian school, advocating government intervention, against the Monetarists. Socialism also had a number of schools of thought built upon their creed. Advocates of Socialism saw the injustice that resulted from the concept of ‘Freedom of Ownership’ and concluded that the difference in private ownership between people was the problem that required a solution. One school of thought (the communist school) advocated practical equality in everything and absolute abolition of private property. Another school of thought (the agrarian socialists) proposed abolishing private property in agricultural land only. Then came a third socialist school of thought (known as state Socialism) where private property was transferred to public ownership in the name of public interest i.e. nationalization in every situation where public interest called for it.

Many academics and researchers in the West have presented papers on the Sunni-Shi’ah schism and have used it as a basis to undermine the concept of one Ummah. However, such actions have contributed to a process of change that has been gaining momentum for decades and is just coming to the boil now in the Muslim world.

We are currently witnessing the Muslim Ummah openly rejecting Capitalism and individualism all over the world as one body. Even the Muslims in Palestine, themselves under occupation, held marches and rallies in solidarity with the Muslims of Afghanistan and Iraq. The Ummah feels revulsion when the concept of ‘freedom of expression’ is used to attack Islam, as can be seen in the case of the cartoons printed against the Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم in Europe.

The Ummah globally has clearly seen that the traitor rulers are not representatives of her. In fact a widening gulf now exists between the rulers and the Ummah. Considering the lengthy period of decline the Ummah underwent she has never been so united. All that remains in the final part of the jigsaw which protects unity is a state.

A government built upon the ideals society believes in, ensures unity is created and protected. The *Sahabah* dealt very harshly with the *Khawarij* who introduced foreign ideas into Islam which would have created disunity. The return of the *Khilafah* is today considered well on the horizon, with various think tanks and experts including the CIA national intelligence have predicted the emergence of the *Khilafah*. Without a state it is virtually impossible to have unity. Without central government the US civil war would have resulted in two countries in North America. Without a government there would have been no union between England and Scotland. It is a state that brings unity amongst people. Without it unity is virtually impossible. As Islamic history has shown Islam has detailed rules for unity and integration and actually has a successful track record of uniting

people from different backgrounds. The disunity we see today was created by the West and continues to be fed by them.

19. Islam has no system of governance

For nearly 1400 years no debate existed on whether Islam had a system of governance. The destruction of the *Khilafah* in 1924 was when such an issue raised its head. It was when many individuals succumbed to the onslaught of western culture and denied Islam had any system of government. ‘Ali Abd ar-Raaziq went to great lengths in his book ‘*al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm,*’ published in 1925 a year after the destruction of the *Khilafah* to prove there was no evidence in Islam for any type of government. Many orientalist’s such as Sir Thomas Arnold also played their part by scrutinizing Islamic evidences and producing much literature arguing Islam has no system of governance.

Today many Muslims unfortunately smitten by the call to modernise Islam have gone to great lengths to prove Islam has no system of government. They advocate that Muslims can live according to any system of government of the day and choose the most appropriate. Cambridge University, in England organised one such event in June 2007 on ‘Islam and Muslims in the world today.’³⁵ The grand Mufti of Egypt, Ali Gomaa, alongside many ‘moderate’ Muslims were invited to discuss how Islam can be changed to meet the needs of the West. Ali Gomaa responded by outlining how Islam had no political system:

‘Many assume that an Islamic government must be a caliphate, and that the caliph must rule in a set and specific way. There is no basis for this vision within the Islamic tradition. The caliphate is one political solution that Muslims adopted during a certain historical period, but this does not mean that it is the only possible choice for Muslims when it comes to deciding how they should be governed. The experience that Egypt went through can be taken as an example of this. The period of development begun by Muhammad Ali Pasha and continued by the Khedive Ismail was an attempt to build a modern state. This meant a reformulation of Islamic law. This process led Egypt to become a liberal state run by a system of democracy without any objections from Muslim scholars. Muslims are free to choose whichever system of government they deem most appropriate for them.’³⁶

Whilst think tanks and government ministers across the Western world continue to highlight the threat posed from the emergence of an Islamic government (implicitly accepting Islam has a system of government) it is generally certain Muslims who argue that Islam did not outline any form of government. They go as far as arguing that what was seen in Islamic history is specific to that time period and cannot be used as a basis for Islamic governance today, i.e. the previous form of ruling seen in the Islamic world was merely customary, and hence Islam has no system of government. To understand this myth the Islamic evidences need to be surveyed in order to assess if Islam has provided a model of government.

The Qur’an reinforces in many verses the need to rule by what Allah سبحانه وتعالى has revealed, Muslims are commanded to rule by Islam:

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ
وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْفَٰسِقُونَ

“And whosoever does not rule by what Allah has revealed such are the disbelievers...oppressors...rebellious” [TMQ 5: 44-47]

He سبحانه وتعالى also says:

فَاحْكُم بَيْنَهُم بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ عَمَّا جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْحَقِّ

“So judge between them by that which Allah has revealed and follow not their desires away from the truth that has come to you.” [TMQ 5:48]

Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

وَأَنِ احْكُم بَيْنَهُم بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ وَاحْذَرْهُمْ أَنْ يَفْتِنُوكَ عَنْ بَعْضِ مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْكَ

“Judge between them by that which Allah has revealed and follow not their desires and beware of them lest they seduce you from some part of that which Allah has revealed to you.”
[TMQ 5:49]

Furthermore, establishing the *Deen* and implementing the *Shariah* in every single aspect of life is an obligation upon Muslims proven through evidences definite in report and in meaning, and this cannot be achieved unless there is a ruler who possesses the authority to do so. This is why there are numerous evidences that make the appointment of a ruler an obligation.

The evidence concerning the obligation of appointing a Khaleefah over all the Muslims is understood from the Sunnah and the Ijmaa' of the Sahabah. As for the Sunnah, Nafi'a reported saying: “Abdullah ibn Umar said to me that he heard the Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم saying: **‘Whosoever takes off his hand from allegiance to Allah سبحانه وتعالى will meet Him سبحانه وتعالى on the Day of Resurrection without having any proof for him, and whoso dies whilst there was no Bai'ah (allegiance) on his neck (to a Khaleefah), he dies a death of Jahiliyyah (ignorance).’**” Narrated by Muslim.

So the Messenger صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم made it obligatory upon every Muslim to have a *Bai'ah* on his neck. He described the one who dies without having a *Bai'ah* on his neck as if he died the death of *Jahiliyyah*. The phrase having '*Bai'ah on his neck*,' means having the Khaleefah present. The process of appointing the ruler was clearly outlined by the Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم.

Abu Hazim reported that he accompanied Abu Hurayrah for five years and heard him talking of the saying of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم: **“The Prophets ruled over the children of Israel, one after the other. Whenever a prophet died another Prophet succeeded him, but there will be no Prophets after me. There will be *Khulafaa'* and they will number many. They asked what then do you order us? He said “fulfil the *bay'ah* (pledge of allegiance) to them one after the other and give them their dues, surely Allah will ask them about what he entrusted them with.”** (Muslim)

Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم established a clear structure for Islamic governance, laid down its rules and outlined its details.

When the Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم established the first Islamic State in Medina in the 7th century it was a small city state with a belligerent tribe, the *Quraysh*, out to eliminate the newly founded society. The Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم moved quickly to develop a self sufficient economy to ensure the State could be defended and be able to feed its populace. The Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم in the first year sent military expeditions to various parts of the Arabian Peninsula along the trade routes to intercept *Qurayshi* caravans, develop foreign relations and trade treaties to ensure regular protected routes for trade.

The Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم ruled over both Muslims and non-Muslims and he managed their affairs from the first day he set foot in Medina. Once the Islamic State was founded, he set about forming an Islamic society in which the welfare of the people was properly catered for. Acting in his capacity as a statesman he signed treaties with the Jews, with Banu Dhamrah and Banu Madlaj. He then later signed treaties with the Quraysh and with the people of Aylah, al-Jarba' and Uzrah. As commander of the armed forces, the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم planned and executed many military campaigns. Additionally, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم appointed a *Wali* (governor) in every province and an '*Amil* (mayor) in every area. For example, he appointed 'Utab ibn Usayd as *Wali* over Makkah shortly after its liberation and once Badhan ibn Sasan embraced Islam, he was appointed *Wali* of Yemen. Mu'adh ibn Jabal al-Khazraji was appointed as *Wali* over al-Janad and Khalid ibn Sa'id ibn al-'As was appointed '*Amil* over San'a.

The Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم appointed judges to settle the people's disputes. He صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم appointed Ali (ra) as judge over Yemen and 'Abdullah ibn Nawfal as judge over Medina. He صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم would enquire from them, **"What would you judge by?"** They replied, **"If we do not find the judgment in the Book nor in the Sunnah we shall use Qiyas and extract a judgment."** He صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم approved of that method. Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم also established tribunals (*Madhalim*) to deal with complaints concerning judges and *Wulaa'* alike. He appointed Rashid ibn 'Abdullah as an *Amir* of the judiciary and the tribunals of complaints, with powers to supervise the cases brought before such tribunals.

Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم appointed registrars, who functioned as the heads of departments of State:

- 'Ali ibn Abi Talib was the writer of treaties,
- Mu'ayqeeb ibn Abi Fatimah was secretary of the booties,
- Hudhayfah ibn al-Yaman was in charge of assessing the crops and fruits throughout Hijaz (Arabian Peninsula),
- Zubayr ibn al-'Awwam was secretary of Sadaqah (Charities),
- Al-Mughira ibn Shu'bah was given the task of writing all the loan agreements and transactions, and
- Sharkhabeel ibn Hasanah was employed as the writer of messages which were sent to various kings.

The Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم would appoint for every department a secretary or director regardless of the number of departments. In these matters, he صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم consulted his

Sahabah extensively, especially those who showed a large degree of understanding and deep thinking and who possessed aptitude in the relevant areas.

The Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم levied taxes upon Muslims and non-Muslims on land and on some properties, fruit and livestock. These consisted of the *Zakat*, the '*Ushr* (10% of specific crops), the *Fay'i* (war booty), the *Kharaj* (land tax) and the *Jizyah* (paid by the non Muslim covenanted citizens of the State). The *Anfal* and the booties belonged to the State treasury. The *Zakat* was distributed among the eight categories of people entitled to it, as mentioned in the Qur'an, and nobody else.

Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم set up everything himself and completed it during his lifetime. He صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم was the Head of State; he had assistants, governors, judges, an army, secretaries and a council of *Shura*. This type of structure was termed the *Khilafah* and this is the Islamic system of governance. Information concerning all these details of the structure of the Islamic State has been transmitted from generation to generation via *Tawatur* (collective and assured testimony).

The Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم held the post of Head of State from the very first day he arrived in Medina, until his death. Abu Bakr and 'Umar (ra) were his two assistants. The *Sahabah* agreed after his death on the obligation of appointing a *Khaleefah* to follow him as the Head of State only, and not in the Message, nor as a Prophet, for he صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم was the seal of the Prophets. Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم established a complete system of government during his lifetime. He صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم left behind him the type of rule and the governmental structure known by and evident to everyone at the time.

The *Sahabah* agreed upon the necessity of establishing a successor (i.e. *Khaleefah*) to the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم after his death. They all agreed to appoint a successor to Abu Bakr (ra), and upon his death, appointing 'Umar (ra) as successor and upon 'Uthman's (ra) death to appoint 'Ali (ra) as a successor to him. The general consensus of the *Sahabah* on the appointment of a *Khaleefah* manifested itself emphatically upon the death of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم where they busied themselves in appointing a successor to him even though it is known that the burial of the dead person after his death is obligatory. It is also prohibited upon those in charge of preparing the burial to engage themselves in anything else until they completed the burial. Despite this, some of the *Sahabah* engaged themselves in appointing a *Khaleefah*, even though they were obliged to engage themselves in preparing the burial of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم. Other *Sahabah* kept silent about this and participated in the delaying of the burial for two nights, despite having the ability to deny the delay and to bury the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم.

Hence after his صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم death the *Sahabah* appointed a *Khaleefah* from amongst them, and such a leader was contracted with the consent of the *Ummah*. As the Islamic lands spread, *Wali's* were appointed in those lands and Islam was consolidated. Furthermore, all of the *Sahabah* consented throughout their lives, upon the obligation of appointing the *Khaleefah*. Although at times they differed about the person who should be selected as a *Khaleefah*, they never disagreed about the fact that a *Khaleefah* must be appointed, whether in the wake of the death of Prophet

Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم nor after the death of each of the *Khulafaa' ar-Rashideen*.' Accordingly, the general consensus of the *Sahabah (Ijmaa')* is both strong and clear evidence that the appointment of a Khaleefah is obligatory.

Although on some occasions Islam may have been misapplied, the Khilafah existed from the death of Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم until it was destroyed in 1924 in Istanbul. The system outlined by Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم is too detailed to be considered customary and it was considered by all at the time to be a huge departure from the monarchical and autocratic types of government. All this indicates that the Khilafah is a unique form of governance legislated by Islam. It is the Khilafah that implements Islam and it is the Khilafah that would implement the Islamic system in all its territories.

The Khilafah's track record is unparalleled in history, its success being recognised by all. The orientalist Bernard Lewis wrote in his book 'What Went Wrong?':

'Islam represented the greatest military power on earth...It was the foremost economic power in the world...It had achieved the highest level so far in human history, in the arts and sciences of civilization...Islam in contrast created a world civilization, poly-ethnic, multiracial, international, one might even say intercontinental.' (Lewis, 2002)

Francis Fukuyama who is considered one of the most important living public intellectuals considers Islam as the only remaining system that poses a challenge to Capitalism. He states: *'Democracy's only real competitor in the realm of ideas today is radical Islamism. Indeed, one of the world's most dangerous nation-states today is Iran, run by extremist Shiite mullahs. But Sunni radicalism has been remarkably ineffective in actually taking control of a nation-state, due to its propensity to devour its own potential supporters.'*³⁷

20. The Industrialised nations developed due to the adoption of free trade and markets

Britain is regarded as the fountain of *laissez-faire* doctrine and the only country to have practised free trade. Britain is regarded as the only nation to have developed with little or no state intervention. However, this cannot be further from the truth since Britain was the first country to establish infant industry protection. This is where obstacles are placed upon foreign competition to ensure domestic companies develop with no competitors.

The 1721 reform of the mercantile law was summed up by Brisco, an economic historian in 1907: *'manufactures had to be protected at home from foreign finished products; free exportation of finished articles had to be secured; and where possible, encouragement had to be given by bounty and allowance.'*³⁸ This meant import duties on raw materials were lowered, duties on foreign manufactured goods were significantly raised. Specifically, Britain banned the imports of superior goods from some of its colonies if they happened to threaten British industries.

The next big change came in 1846 with the repeal of the Corn Laws, which were import tariffs ostensibly designed to protect British farmers and landowners against competition from cheap foreign grain imports. But this was intended to halt the move to industrialization on the continent by enlarging the export market for British agriculture. Britain's technological lead that enabled the shift to a free trade regime had been achieved behind high and long lasting tariff barriers. The overall liberalisation of the British economy was a highly controlled affair overseen by the state and not achieved through a *laissez-faire* approach.

With the use of industrial promotion strategies, Britain, when it reached its pinnacle in 1800, was navigating the seas in search of riches around the globe. This programme of aggressive colonisation entrenched Britain's position in the world and changed battles from being fought for territories to offshore markets. It was this colonial war machine that drove a large chunk of Britain's scientific research, innovation, new ways of organising labour and military strategy. The liberal values which are trumpeted as the source of Britain's development arrived after achieving global domination. It was only after Britain achieved global supremacy that it championed free trade and this was to gain access to foreign markets. Free markets most certainly came after development rather than being the catalyst that launched the British Empire.

US development also occurred in a similar fashion. It wasn't until after World War 2 that the US began to liberalise trade and the reasons for this was outlined by Dr Joon Change, an expert in economic history at Cambridge *'it was only after World War 2 that the USA – with its industrial supremacy unchallenged - finally liberalized its trade and started championing the cause of free trade.'*³⁹

Once Western countries establish industrial dominance behind protectionist walls, they tend to advocate free trade in order to kick away the ladder from the followers and consolidate their dominance as was certainly the case for Britain in the mid 19th century which led the liberalisation drive in Europe. The United States followed a similar path a hundred years later.

21. The development of Japan historically and China today is evidence of globalisation's success

Japan historically is advocated as a success story by the liberal movement, who adopted free markets, reduced trade barriers and entered the global economy and has in less than half a century become one of the largest economies in the world. Similar tales are also made about China's recent rise to fame. However, the reality is very much different.

Japan's development has evolved from policies which are the complete opposite to liberalism and globalisation. The Japanese government required key sectors to develop and protected them from foreign competition. The government retained the right to allocate foreign exchange, and by this it was able to restrict inward investment, manage the acquisition of foreign technology by Japanese firms and to influence the composition of foreign trade. The export bank of Japan and Japan development bank were setup to become the main vehicles for expanding the flow of finance to government targeted industries.

Central to the development of Japan was the role of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) which was a ministerial department. This central government department regulated production and the distribution of goods and services. It developed plans concerning the structure of Japanese industry, controlled Japan's foreign trade, ensured the smooth flow of goods in the national economy, promoted the development of manufacturing, mining, and distribution industries; and supervised the procurement of a reliable supply of raw materials and energy resources. Hence Japanese development was centrally driven and not through the free market.

China has evolved from its decades of long, narrow and reactive approach to global affairs. China is abandoning its long-held victim mentality of 150 years of shame and humiliation and adopting instead a great power mentality (*daguo xintai*). The natural extension of this is the increasing role of China in global affairs. With the abandoning of the victim mentality and the adoption of a great power mentality, China is increasingly seeing itself more akin to the world's major powers. This represents a shift from the 1990's and China is now openly speaking about the need to share global responsibilities and this is the lens through which China's strategists view the world.

China represents an interesting conundrum for orthodox economics experts and for all those who believe the adoption of liberal values equals economic success. China firstly undermines the belief that progress is exclusive to the Western formula of free markets, democracy and liberal values and demonstrates how much of the wider world remains unconvinced of such a formula.

China has managed to achieve phenomenal economic growth and industrialisation by not adopting democracy or joining the globalisation elite but by remaining deeply authoritarian, where liberal values have not featured remotely in China's economic rise. China's President Hu Jintao said in 2004: *'We will never blindly copy the mode of other countries' political system. History indicates that indiscriminately copying western political systems is a blind alley for China.'*⁴⁰ This shows there is very little likelihood that China will adopt liberal values in the near future and is secure in the knowledge that it has achieved success without the Western model of development.

Economically China has utilised and retained its centrally driven and interventionist approach similar to Japan and Germany. China has extensive levels of government involvement across all market sectors. By being centrally driven China has been able to direct its resources in one direction which has propelled it into a regional power and the largest economy in the world after the US. China has received little assistance from the Western world mainly due to its historic communist credentials and has shown that an independent, nation first, centrally driven policy can attain economic success.

22. The Asian tiger economies developed due to free markets

The 'tiger' economy was a term coined to describe South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Taiwan who underwent rapid growth and industrialisation in the 1960's and 1970's. The four Tigers share a range of characteristics with other Asian economies, such as China and Japan, and pioneered what has come to be seen as a particularly "Asian" approach to economic development, that of an export driven economy. These countries and territories focused on developing goods for export to the industrialised West and domestic consumption was discouraged through government policies.

A closer look at the development of such nations shows their development was a largely centrally driven affair with huge government subsidies and protectionist policies to achieve development.

Upon independence in 1965, Singapore was faced with a lack of physical resources and a small domestic market. In response, the Singapore Government set up the Economic Development Board in 1968 where national economic strategies were formulated to promote Singapore's manufacturing sector. The Singaporean administration curbed unemployment and raised the standard of living through the implementation of a large-scale public housing programme, alongside the adoption of a pro-business, pro-foreign investment, export-oriented economic policy combined with state-directed investments in strategic government-owned corporations. State intervention played a direct role in steering the Singapore economy towards high end electronics, chemicals and service industry. The Singapore government directed the economy through Temasek-linked companies (TLCs). These are companies which act as sovereign wealth funds. TLCs were established particularly in manufacturing, operating as commercial entities and accounted for 60% of GDP.

Taiwanese development began after World War 2 when the Kuomintang regime (first leaders of Taiwan) established several economic plans and policies to develop the small islands economy. A new currency policy was initiated and in addition huge aid from the US aided the rapid development of the economy. The government directly intervened in the economy with an import substitution policy, taking what was obtained by the agriculture sector to give support to the industrial sector, trading agricultural product exports for foreign currency to import industrial machinery, thus developing the industrial sector. The government raised tariffs, controlled foreign exchange and restricted imports in order to protect domestic industry. By the 1960s, Taiwan's import exchange industry was faced with the problem of saturating the domestic market and consequently, the economic policy of Taiwan changed to pursue export expansion. Through the premier Chiang Ching-kuo's 10 major construction projects and the establishment of Asia's first export processing zone the basis was laid for heavy industrial development in Taiwan.

South Korea pursued a similar strategy of central government intervention. In 1961 the first of many 5 year plans were initiated by central government, as only it rather than the free market had the capacity or resources to direct such drastic change in a short time. The economy was dominated by a group of large private conglomerates, known as chaebol, and was also supported by a significant number of public corporations in areas such as iron, steel, utilities, communications, fertilisers, chemicals, and other heavy industries. The government guided private industry through a

series of export and production targets utilising the control of credit, informal means of pressure and persuasion, and traditional monetary and fiscal policies.

Central government by 1965 extended its control over business by nationalising banks and merging the agricultural cooperative movement with the agricultural bank. The government's direct control over all institutional credit further extended its command over the business community. The Economic Planning Board created in 1961, headed by a deputy prime minister allocated resources, directed the flow of credit, and formulated all of South Korea's economic plans.

The Asian tigers developed with large aspects of government intervention, which played an important role and is seen as the backbone to their progress. Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong followed similar strategies and this clearly shows orthodox capitalism was not followed in order to develop but rather government intervention has steered the Asian tigers into the positions they are in today. The tiger economies are fundamentally consumer economies where exports are the driving engine.

23. Dubai presents a new Economic Model for the Muslim world

Dubai has been heralded as an economic success story and a new model for economic development for the Muslim world. Dubai with its \$46 billion economy has attracted world-wide attention through innovative real estate projects and sports events in a relatively short period of time. Many economists have emphasized that Dubai's diversification away from oil has placed it upon a path of development which presents a new formula for economic development for the region and a distinctly Islamic approach to economic development.

Oil revenues after the Persian Gulf War encouraged Dubai to focus on free trade and tourism. The success of the Jebel Ali free zone allowed the city to replicate its model to develop clusters of new free zones, including Dubai Internet City, Dubai Media City and Dubai Maritime City. The constructions of *Burj Al Arab*, the world's tallest freestanding hotel, as well as the creation of new residential developments, were used to market Dubai for purposes of tourism. Since 2002, the city has seen an increase in private real estate investment in recreating Dubai's skyline with such projects as The Palm Islands, The World Islands and *Burj Dubai*. In essence the measure of success of Dubai has been on developments such as skyscrapers and vast shopping malls.

Due to this, Dubai is unique amongst the Muslim world in that it has witnessed phenomenal development over the last 20 years. It is today a modern city, with much wealth on display in the form of tall buildings and unique developments. It is a city that not only Muslims from Islamic countries head towards in large numbers, but people of all kinds from all over the world. Dubai offers a western lifestyle with an Eastern flavour for all. The native population is a minority, 85% of Dubai's population is composed of expatriates. For many this would be considered a success story as Dubai has attracted the world to its tiny island, but in this apparent success lays the myth of economic development.

Dubai has been blessed with a vast amount of oil, the revenues of which have allowed a modern city to develop out of a once small fishing village. In recent years Dubai has also taken to orienting its economy towards the tourism and service sectors. This has led to Dubai becoming a hub of tourism in not only the Middle East but the world. It is also aspiring to become a financial centre to rival the likes of London and New York.

The problem with Dubai is that it's not a model for others to follow, but a unique case of development. It has developed in such a manner that it is in fact existing in an economic bubble. The driving force behind Dubai's growth has been largely its oil wealth, followed by companies that are run by foreign workers. Its position as a trading hub has also brought it wealth. The problem with this is that the oil is not unlimited, and is already running out. The skilled workers that are helping to develop the service sector are mostly from overseas, with only a tiny part of Dubai's population now considered to be native Arabs.

These factors show why Dubai is not an example of true economic development. It has merely exploited limited natural resources and has been importing talent from abroad with little skills and knowledge transfer to drive its economy. This is coupled with the fact that Dubai does not produce

any manufactured products that the people in the city buy. It is a nation that is not self-sufficient, as it does not have the infrastructure or natural resources in place to develop the products it consumes. Its growth has been a direct result of it becoming an essentially tax free zone for foreign nationals and companies. These companies, whilst providing jobs and income to people in the country, are not transferring any technical skills to the people. Its real estate prices are rising in large part due to speculation that the prices will continue to rise, and a profit can be made from selling the property on.

Dubai has modelled itself as a service based economy where the government will provide all the necessary services such as infrastructure, communications, flash apartments, parks, retail outlets and tourism for the worlds companies to operate from. The problem with this type of development is companies do not necessarily need to operate from only one location, they can move around if needed and any instability will usually lead to this. Such a development makes the nation reliant on foreigners to continually want to work from Dubai. With the Middle East being the most unstable region in the world and prospects of war this could lead to a departure of such companies at any time.

These reasons show why Dubai is nothing more than a mirage in the desert. Its growth and survival are dependent upon the talent and expertise of foreign entities. It can only offer specialist services such as banking and finance as a means to guarantee its future, along with tourism. As these sectors rely heavily on the goodwill and confidence of foreigners, Dubai is vulnerable to economic collapse if ever these powers decide to pull out. This could be caused for a variety of reasons. A regional war could render Dubai an unsafe place for workers, with trade routes also being cut off. Housing prices would collapse and money that is currently pouring into real estate would rush out of the city. Though this may appear an extreme scenario, it is not an unlikely one given the political reality of the Middle East. Even while this prosperity continues, it comes at a cost in the dilution of Islamic values since alcohol and other vices are permitted in order to attract a western workforce to drive the economy.

The limitation upon anyone trying to emulate Dubai is that there can only be one hub of tourism and finance in the region. By definition, there cannot be two hubs in one place. The example of two regional airlines is sufficient to explain this point. Emirates are an airline that runs out of Dubai, whilst Etihad runs from Abu Dhabi. Emirates have managed to establish itself as a brand and are popular with people travelling to the region. Etihad on the other hand struggles, as there simply is not enough traffic to make two airlines so close to each both as popular as Emirates.

In a post-industrial world having a large service sector is considered a prerequisite for the 21st century economy, both the US and the UK have service sectors that make-up more then 70% of the economy. However, Dubai as well as the Muslim world never went through industrialisation, thus becoming service based economies is not a sustainable model and is in complete contradiction to the path the Western world took to become independent economies, which today have a manufacturing base, large militaries and state funded agricultural sectors. Like the credit crunch the Dubai model is an inflating bubble waiting to burst.

24. Is the Iran-US Conflict Real?

The Persian Gulf with its immense energy reserves and strategic location as well as being the world's largest single source of crude oil, has been the centre of conflict for over 100 years by various powers with the most powerful force in the region being Iran. Hence whoever has Iran on their side will have control over the entire region since Iran is the key to the region.

Since the invasion of Iraq by the US, Iran has been on the receiving end of a barrage of criticism by US officials and has even been threatened with war by George W. Bush. Since Bush's axis of evil state of the union speech in 2002, Bush has refused to engage with Iran. Iran is continually accused of arming the insurgency in Iraq, supporting Hizbollah and developing nuclear weapons. The dispatch of an additional aircraft carrier to the Persian Gulf all increased speculation that the US may launch an attack against Iran. All of this on the surface indicates that the US and Iran are diametrically opposed to each other, have interests which widely differ and as a result Iran represents a direct threat to the US in the region hence it needs to be disarmed, especially of its nuclear weapons and stripped of its Islamic credentials and showered with democracy and freedom.

Since the so called 'Islamic Revolution' in 1979 successive governments from Rafsanjani and Khatami have tried to dispel the image of ultra-conservatives by building links with Europe and the West. This has resulted in the US-Iran cooperation in various areas. In 1986 the Iran-Contra Affair was exposed where the US administration sold arms to Iran, an avowed enemy at the time, and used the proceeds to fund the Contras, an anti-communist guerrilla organisation in Nicaragua. Anti-Tank missiles were provided to Iran along with shipments of surface-to-air missiles totalling more than \$2 billion via Israel.

Despite being publicly derided by the Bush administration, such reformists in the Iranian government continue to promote US interests in Iran, and neighbouring Afghanistan and Iraq. In Iraq, Tehran continues to extend support to the leader of SCIRI, Ayatollah Hakim and the Badr Brigade who have become the lynchpin of US plans for Southern Iraq. In Afghanistan, Iran runs extensive reconstruction and training programs in Kabul, Herat and Kandahar. Thus far, Iran has successfully prevented the Pushtun resistance from spreading to Northern Afghanistan. The Baker-Hamilton report confirmed such engagement: *'...the United States should engage directly with Iran and Syria in order to try to obtain their commitment to constructive policies toward Iraq and other regional issues. In engaging Syria and Iran, the United States should consider incentives, as well as disincentives; in seeking constructive results...Engaging Iran is problematic, especially given the state of the US-Iranian relationship. Yet the United States and Iran cooperated in Afghanistan, and both sides should explore whether this model can be replicated in the case of Iraq.'*

On the other hand the US has attempted to make a compelling case about the threat posed by Iran's nuclear capability, and continues to push for sanctions as the country's nuclear aspirations contravene international norms. Israel is the only country that continues to propagate the view that Iran's nuclear bomb is months away. Sylvan Shalom, Israel's Foreign Minister told a meeting of Jewish leaders in New York: *'According to our people, security and intelligence, they are very, very close. It may be only six months before they will have that full knowledge.'* In 2005, at the meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna, Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah

Khameni, issued a fatwa, which forbade the stockpiling, production, and use of nuclear weapons. The supreme leader had also offered peace talks with Israel in 2003.

Over a period of over half a century the US has engaged with Iran in different ways. Currently what we are witnessing is a number of mixed signals coming from Washington where engagement and cooperation takes place between the two nations whilst on the other hand Iran is publicly rebuked for being Islamic and aggressive in its pursuance of weapons of mass destruction.

For the US the Islamic revolution which it engineered has outlived its use. The US for some time has been working to officially end the revolution (similar to the Jihad in Pakistan it promoted during the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan) as those objectives for which the revolution was engineered, have been achieved.

The revolution's objectives were to overthrow the Shah who had by 1979 moved away from US influence. His replacement by a credible alternative in the eyes of the people of Iran was a key US strategic priority. The meetings between Ayatollah Khomeini and the US to organise the 'revolution,' have been confirmed by the then Sudanese leader Sadeq Al-Mehdi, who was the mediator between the US and Khomeini, as well as the former Attorney General, Ramsey Clark who held direct talks with Khomeini in 1979. The revolution led to the 'conservatives' led by Khomeini taking effective control of the military, judiciary, intelligence and security apparatus. For all the anti-US rhetoric from Iran it never stopped supplying the US with oil and never ended any agreements with them. With the hardliners in such key positions the US has been unable to completely reverse the Islamic revolution in Iran. It is the same hardliners who are working on developing nuclear weapons and purchasing sophisticated weaponry in order to strengthen their position whilst the US is attempting to end this.

Iranian society today has over 70% of its population under the age of 30; this means the majority of the people in Iran were not even born when the Islamic revolution took place. Such a young population is ruled by conservatives who believe in the revolution's ideals, whilst the public have very little with such ideals. The US has directly engaged with student groups and the reformists in government but is also making it clear that it is prepared to act militarily when US interests are at stake.

The biggest problem the US faces is how exactly to achieve this. Should this be through engagement or military force in order to change Tehran's behaviour? This has actually plagued the Bush administration ever since George W. Bush rose to office and is what sends mixed signals.

At the heart of the issue was the dispute between the realists and the neoconservatives regarding the best approach towards Iran. The row permeated all sections of the US government and divided institutions like the State Department, the Pentagon and the CIA. The disagreements over Iran came to a head in July 2004 with the publication of the report entitled 'Iran: Time for a New Approach' which was prepared by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) under the direction of Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Jimmy Carter's National Security Adviser. The report argued that Iran was not ripe for regime change as advocated by the neoconservatives. The report stated: *'Despite considerable political flux and popular dissatisfaction. Iran is not on the verge of another*

revolution. Those forces that are committed to preserving Iran's current system remain firmly in control.' The report also stressed, that a 'grand bargain' to settle all outstanding conflicts between Washington and Tehran is unrealistic and that talks should focus instead on making 'incremental progress' on a variety of key issues, including regional stability and Iran's nuclear ambitions.

The recommendations of the report were instantly dismissed by the neoconservatives who were closely associated with Vice President Dick Cheney and the then defence secretary Donald Rumsfeld. Arch neoconservative Micheal Ledeen, who considers Tehran the global capital of Islamist 'terror masters,' wrote in National Review Online that the CFR recommendations were 'humiliating' and constituted 'appeasement.'

However, in Bush's second term of office and with the debacle of Iraq, the Neocons influence declined considerably. Some of the neoconservatives like Paul Wolfowitz and John Bolton were ushered out of foreign policy making roles and given policy implementation roles at the World Bank and the UN, while others like Douglas Feith were forced to leave. The departure of the neoconservatives gave way to realism and soft power in the Bush administration. To a large extent parity was restored between the influence of the US State Department and Pentagon over foreign policy matters. Collaboration with other nations to solve the political crisis in Sudan, Lebanon, North Korean, and Iran is reminiscent of multilateralism employed by previous US administrations. The ascendancy of realism in the Bush administration has not completely silenced neoconservative views on Iran. The ever present Dick Cheney an ardent supporter of neo-conservatism has taken it upon himself to ensure that should the opportunity avail itself, America is prepared to use overwhelming force against Iran to occupy its oil and gas fields.

In summary, the conflict between the US and Iran is real, however there are many areas where this conflict has been put aside and cooperation is taking place. The realists in the Bush administration now have the upper hand and their preferred method of dealing with Iran's nuclear programme is through multilateralism and diplomacy, as opposed to unilateralism and military intervention. However, the failure of the Bush administration to subdue those voices who exhort military action against Iran continues to alarm the world.

Conclusion

The global situation at any given time can have multiple events taking place which can cloud who is doing what and the motives behind such actions. Since the Ummah is entrusted with carrying the Islamic *da'wah* to the whole world, it is indispensable for every Muslim to pursue the global situation, comprehend its circumstances, and acquaint oneself with the motives of the world's nations and their political plans. In order to understand the global situation or the global balance of power the following points should be kept in mind:

1. In order to assess the validity of any political situation or the strategic advantage a particular policy may bring, or even whether a certain fact in reality is a myth - this can only really be understood if one is acquainted with the international situation and the nations that compete with each other. Geopolitical realities on their own give no indication of their validity, linking wider factors such as the nations that make up the global balance of power alongside national policies is the way to comprehend any global struggle and distinguish myths from truths.
2. Geopolitics is a branch of politics. It is impossible and dangerous to follow the global geopolitical situation without first understanding politics. It is through politics that geopolitics is clearly understood. This is because politics is the policies, plans and styles used to take care of the nations affairs domestically through the implementation of an ideology whilst a nation's foreign policy is the relations a nation builds with the world in order to achieve its goals. It is the politics that will define the geopolitical arena, hence the dwindling water wells around the world, the politics of oil, control of the Suez canal or the Persian Gulf are not issues in themselves, but the multiple interests a variety of nations around the world have makes them strategically important.
3. Nations around the world are either ideological in nature where they have adopted an ideology which gives the nation direction and acts as a basis for deriving legislation and building policies, such as the US, Britain, France and Germany with Capitalism. Then there are other nations which do not embrace an ideology but have interests which are defined by their history or location, for them the protection of the interest is what drives policy development as can be seen with Pakistan attempting to defend itself against India and Tibet wanting independence from China. The application of the ideology and the attempts to protect and achieve national interests leads to interactions across the world and this is the international situation.
4. The state of affairs in any nation of the world does not remain the same. It goes through many changes, in terms of strength and weakness, power of influence or its absence, and in terms of difference and change in its foreign relations with other nations. This is why it is impossible to draw a constant framework or a set of guidelines to view the international situation as the international situation is always in a state of flux. However, an analysis of the international situation at any given time is possible bearing in mind it is liable for change. It is also possible to analyze the strength of the powers in the world bearing in mind such an assessment is liable for change.

5. The international situation is the structure of the international relations between the world's nations. It is the status of the superpower and the nations that compete with it. Understanding the global balance of power apart from knowing the nations who are the world's powers, their policies and aims requires the knowledge of international relations, which is the constant competition between the world's powers over the position of the superpower. This is why the international situation is not stable and goes through many changes. Hence any analysis of the global balance of power is a description of a particular point in time. When the international situation changes such an analysis becomes part of history.
6. The international situation will always be in a state of flux because it is determined by the political-economic situation of some states from one circumstance to another. Such change of situations and circumstances is either because a nation became stronger or weaker, or because its relations with other states became stronger or weaker. In such a case, a change in the global balance of power would result due to a change in the balance of powers existent in the world. This is why understanding the status of each state that has influence on the international situation is the basis for understanding the global balance of power.
7. Understanding the global situation at any given time does not mean one must be acquainted with all of the world's politics. The nations who do not make up the global balance of power need not be pursued as the major actions in the world are a result of the world's powers competing with each other and in different arenas across the world.
 - The North Korea Nuclear weapons stand-off with the US is a direct result of US attempts to contain China. China has been pursuing multilateral talks for the reunification of North and South Korea trying to ensure its back door is not set on fire. The statements from such meetings have been contradictory where China has been pessimistic about the talks with distance on most issues whilst the US has continually remarked successful negotiations. The US has not directly negotiated with North Korea which is exasperating the issue. The continued sluggish progress and prolonging fits perfectly for the presence of nearly 100,000 US troops in the region and with North Korea testing its nuclear arsenal in October 2006 this will expend Chinese efforts and gives a suitable justification for sustained and substantial US presence in South Korea. J Rielly outlined this in a policy paper: *'These U.S. troops are in the region not simply to fight the "terrorist groups" causing local instability, but to enhance U.S. military control over territory in the South China Sea. This strategic area with vast potential oil reserves sits aside the shipping lanes to the Middle East and offers access to much of Southeast Asia. The expanded U.S. presence and nascent military alliances with Southeast Asian nations exacerbates Chinese anxieties and impedes independent accords among Asian states though such mechanisms as the ASEAN Regional Forum.'*⁴¹
 - The call for independence by South Ossetia from Georgia is a direct result of competition between the US and Russia for control over Eastern Europe. The Balkan wars were essentially created by the US to contain Russia in a post Soviet world and bring the former

communist states under the US area of influence. Russia was able to bring Serbia under its area of influence due to its history and has used it as a bulwark to frustrate US dominance. Serbia has been a barrier for the American agenda and as a result the US was keen to weaken it initially by engineering the separation of Montenegro from Serbia, then separating Kosovo from it and then the NATO attack on Serbian armed forces in Kosovo as well as in Serbia itself. North Ossetia is a semi autonomous region in Russia, whilst South Ossetia fell into Georgia in the dying days of the USSR. Russia has used its relations with North Ossetia to push South Ossetians to call for independence thus thwarting US aims in the region. Russia maintains close contacts with the leadership in Tskhinvali where separatists welcome Moscow's supportive stance. To Georgia's deep annoyance, most South Ossetians have Russian passports and the Russian rouble is commonly used in trade.

- The call by Tibet for separation from China is also a struggle between China and the US. US interference in the region begun in the 1950's through the CIA in order to counter China's adoption of communism. The disastrous bloody uprising in 1959 by the Free Tibet Movement was a CIA conducted large scale covert action campaign against the communist Chinese in Tibet. Tens of thousands of Tibetans were left dead, while the Dalai Lama and about 100,000 followers were forced to flee across the treacherous Himalayan passes to India and Nepal. The CIA established a secret military training camp for the Dalai Lama's resistance fighters at Camp Hale near Leadville, Colorado, in the US. The Tibetan guerrillas were trained and equipped by the CIA for guerrilla warfare and sabotage operations against the communist Chinese. China is faced with significant problems, with the Uighur Muslims in Xinjiang province, and the activities of the Falun Gong among many other dissident groups aiming for independence. Tibetan people find themselves trapped between an oppressive Beijing and a manipulative Washington attempting to weaken China.
8. Competition between the world powers is something that has existed from the beginning of time and will continue until the day of judgement. In ancient times Egypt under the pharaohs was the superpower and Mesopotamia competed with it. The Roman Empire became the superpower and the Persian Empire competed with it. The Khilafah then defeated the remnants of the Persian and Byzantine empires and was the world's superpower until the 18th century facing challenges from the Mongols and the crusaders during this time. France and England then competed with the Uthmani Khilafah for nearly three centuries until the mid-18th century. On the eve of World War 1 Germany shifted the global balance of power, whilst France and Britain competed with it. After World War 1 Britain emerged as the world's power and France competed with it. Germany once again challenged Britain as the world's superpower and only World War 2 stopped German hegemony. The US emerged the world's superpower after World War 2 and was challenged by the Soviet Union for five decades until its collapse in 1990.
 9. In 2008 the US is the world's superpower. Although faltering it still has the greatest influence around the world on international politics. The US is the world's largest economy by far and the most advanced nation technologically, and maintains military bases across the world in order to protect its interests.

The nations that are able to compete with the US are Russia, Britain, France and Germany. All four nations have international ambitions across the world. Russia in the last decade has managed to gain control over its mineral resources and utilities and banished many oligarchs who benefited from the break-up of the Soviet Union. With some of the world's largest energy reserves it is now developing a state of the art military and competing directly with the US in regions where the US for nearly a decade had uncontested hegemony.

Britain historically has been a world power and still has influence in its former colonies. Britain is a key player in Europe and has frustrated many US plans. Britain continues to have global ambitions and works to maintain its interests by cooperating with the US and on many occasions competing with it.

France like Britain has been a key player in European history and politics, its policies for decades have been centred on creating influence across the world through its colonies, French culture and through its economic strength.

Germany is the third largest in economy in the world at \$2.7 trillion and an economic powerhouse in Europe. It is the world's largest exporter of goods at \$1.1 trillion. Germany today is expanding economically through a distinct set of economic policies with a virtual hegemony in the regions of Eastern Europe. Germany also played an active role in the successful mediation in the issue of exchanging prisoners between Israel and Hezbollah. Germany also deployed a naval force in the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 2006. Its deployment consisted of two frigates - the Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Karlsruhe - supported by helicopters, supply ships and patrol boats, with about 1,500 men on board. This is Germany's largest military deployment since World War 2.

After the nations that directly compete with the US across the world, China has the most influence however it remains currently a regional power. Had China not been narrow in its international ambitions, focusing only on its region it would have competed with the world's powers. However, this situation is very likely to change in the future.

Japan is an economic power with the largest economy in the world after the US. However, outside the economic sphere it has no influence. Its current policy of taking part in the coalition in Afghanistan and the removal of article 9 in its pacifist constitution allowing it to deploy troops and develop nuclear weapons, is the US attempting to counterbalance Chinese influence in the region. Japanese influence actually proves US dominance, rather than Japanese development.

After the great powers there are some nations that have influence in some circumstances on specific issues due to their history or location, but this has been temporary. India has a large population and possesses nuclear weapons and has the potential in the future to influence its region, whilst Italy was once a power prior to World War 2 but this was temporary.

Currently this is the global balance of power, which is liable to change at any time. Understanding the histories of these states, how they developed, their beliefs and values as well as the ideologies they have embraced would give one an understanding of the motives of these individual states. These nations all compete with each other globally as well as with the superpower - the US. This international situation can be understood very clearly as the global situation is the competition between the world's powers to achieve their interests.

10. Muslims should bear in mind that however dire the situation may look globally for the Ummah, much of this picture is a mirage and can very easily be changed and replaced. The Muslim Ummah has historically been a superpower and continued to influence international politics until the nineteenth century. With the destruction of the Khilafah in 1924 its international influence declined as it was without a state and ever since it has remained in a situation of gloom and anarchy. However, in the last decade change has reached boiling point where now the signs of the coming of the Khilafah is a mainstream idea amongst even non-Muslims. After tasting the corrupt thoughts of the West, the Ummah globally rejected Capitalism as shown by her desire for Islam and by Allah's leave the dawn of the Khilafah is about to rise as prophesised by the Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم in the following hadith:

“The Prophethood will last among you for as long as Allah wills, then Allah would take it away. Then it will be (followed by) a Khilafah Rashida (rightly guided) according to the ways of the Prophethood. It will remain for as long as Allah wills, then Allah would take it away. Afterwards there will be a hereditary leadership which will remain for as long as Allah wills, then He will lift it if He wishes. Afterwards, there will be biting oppression, and it will last for as long as Allah wishes, then He will lift it if He wishes. Then there will be a Khilafah Rashida according to the ways of the Prophethood.”
Then he kept silent. [Musnad Imam Ahmad (273)]

Notes

-
- ¹ Woodrow Wilson speech at St. Louis 11 September, 1919
- ² Rodrik D (1999) *Institutions for high quality growth; What are they and how to acquire them,* Paper prepared for IMF conference on 'second generation reform' Washington DC, 8-9 November 1999
- ³ R. Alan Dahl, I. Shapiro, J. A. Cheibub, *The Democracy Sourcebook*, MIT Press 2003 and M. Hénaff, T. B. Strong, *Public Space and Democracy*, University of Minnesota Press
- ⁴ World Population Clock – Worldometers, retrieved September 2008, <http://www.worldometers.info/population/>
- ⁵ "The ins and outs: The EU's most effective foreign-policy instrument has been enlargement. But how far can it go?" The Economist, October 2008, http://www.economist.com/research/articlesBySubject/displaystory.cfm?subjectid=682266&story_id=8808134
- ⁶ Koppelaar, Rembrandt H.E.M, 'World Production and Peaking Outlook,' 2006-2009, retrieved 18th September 2008, http://peakoil.nl/wp-content/uploads/2006/09/asponl_2005_report.pdf
- ⁷ James Rubin, November 2003, retrieved 2nd October 2008, <http://www.newstatesman.com/200311170002>
- ⁸ US Ambassador Warren Zimmerman in an interview with the Croatian daily *Danas*, 12 January 1992, reprinted at <http://www.emperors-clothes.com/interviews/nothing.htm>
- ⁹ Karen Talbot 'Backing up Globalization with Military Might' New World Order Onslaught, Covert Action Quarterly, Issue 68, Fall 1999, <http://www.globalissues.org/Geopolitics/Articles/Backing.asp>
- ¹⁰ Benjamin Schwarz & Christopher Layne 'The Case Against Intervention in Kosovo,' the nation, 19th April 1999, <http://www.thenation.com/doc/19990419/schwarz/single>
- ¹¹ <http://www.fair.org/press-releases/kosovo-solution.html>
- ¹² UN Security Council Resolution 912 (1994), implementing an 'adjustment' of UNAMIR's mandate and force level as outlined in the Special Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda, April 20th 1994 (document no. S/1994/470), retrieved 2nd July 2008, <http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=S/1994/470&Lang=E&Area=UNDOC>
- ¹³ Watson, Roland, "Bush deploys hawk as new UN envoy," The Times, March 2005, retrieved 1st July 2008, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article421888.ece
- ¹⁴ Vincent B Khapoya, *The African Experience*, Prentice Hall, 1998, p 132
- ¹⁵ Ibid pp 134-143
- ¹⁶ Golnaz Esfandiari, Afghanistan/Iran: Relations Between Tehran, Kabul Growing Stronger, http://www.parstimes.com/news/archive/2005/rfe/afghanistan_iran_relations.html
- ¹⁷ Richard Haas, 'The new Middle East,' Foreign Affairs, December 2006, retrieved June 2008, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20061101faessay85601/richard-n-haass/the-new-middle-east.html>
- ¹⁸ <http://www.iht.com/articles/2006/11/21/news/assess.php>
- ¹⁹ FBI crime clock, 2005, retrieved June 2008, http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/about/crime_clock.html
- ²⁰ Prime Minister Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Campbell-Bannerman Report, 1907
- ²¹ John Bagot Glubb, 'A soldier with the Arabs,' Hodder & Stoughton, 1957
- ²² Abu Ghazi, *Political views on Palestine*, Al Khilafah Publication, ISBN 1 899574 042,

-
- ²³ Barnett C (1972) *'The Collapse of British Power,'* Macmillan, ISBN 0333679822, and also Paul Reynolds, 'Suez: End of empire.'
- ²⁴ Barnett C (1972) *'The Collapse of British Power,'* Macmillan, ISBN 0333679822
- ²⁵ J.W. Smith, *'The World's Wasted Wealth 2,'* (Institute for Economic Democracy, 1994), p. 123
- ²⁶ William Easterly, *The White Man's Burden; Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest have Done So Much Ill and so Little Good,* (Penguin Press, 2006), p. 4
- ²⁷ Rethinking foreign aid,' Cato institute, Vol 22, No 2, autumn 2002,
http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/cato/v22n2/cato_v22n2ose01.html
- ²⁸ *It's the 'Blame the Victim' Summit,* Action for Southern Africa, June 25, 2002.
http://www.actsa.org/News/press_releases/250602_nepad.htm
- ²⁹ BBC News Online, *'EU deplores 'dangerous' Islam jibe,'* 27th September 2001, retrieved 3rd July 2008,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/1565664.stm>
- ³⁰ Barbarians at the vault, *'Modern finance is under attack. Yet the banking system has done much better than it is given credit for,'* the Economist print edition, May 2008,
http://www.economist.com/opinion/PrinterFriendly.cfm?story_id=11376185
- ³¹ World Bank Development indicators 2008
- ³² www.iariw.org/papers/2006/davies.pdf
- ³³ National Intelligence Estimate, December 2004, Report of the National Intelligence Councils 2020 project, *'Mapping the Global Future,'* Pg 83-92, <http://www.foia.cia.gov/2020/2020.pdf>
- ³⁴ Fromkin D, *A Peace to End All Peace,* New York: Avon Books, 1989
- ³⁵ <http://www.divinity.cam.ac.uk/cip/islam-conference.php>
- ³⁶ Ali Gomaa, June 2007, *'Fatwas and modernity,'* Dar al-Ifta al-Misriyyah, reproduced in Newsweek Blog, Washington Post (Translated from Arabic),
http://newsweek.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/guestvoices/2007/06/fatwas_and_modernity.html
- ³⁷ Fukuyama F, *'Is this the age of the autocrat,'* the age.co.au, August 2008, retrieved 10 Sep 2008,
<http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/is-this-the-age-of-the-autocrat-20080827-43yf.html?page=-1>
- ³⁸ Brisco N, 1907, *'The economic policy of Robert Walpole,'* New York, The Colombia university press
- ³⁹ Joon Chang H, (2003) *'Kicking away the ladder; development strategy in historical perspective,'* Anthem Press
- ⁴⁰ Mary Hennock *'China's graft: Tough talk, old message,'* 27th Sep 2004,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/3693714.stm>
- ⁴¹ Reilly J, Feb 2002, *The U.S. "War on Terror" and East Asia,'* Foreign Policy In Focus,
<http://www.fpif.org/papers/asia2002.html>.