

Answers to Questions

Question 1: The 21st Arab summit was held on Monday, 30th March, 2009 and instead of the scheduled 2 days of deliberations, it was all over in one day itself. How far can its resolutions be effective?

Answer: This summit meant nothing at all and its resolutions will not be productive in any sense whatsoever. Therefore there is no question of their effectiveness to any extent. To explain the picture more clearly, we mention the following:

1. It has now become a matter of 'routine' to hold summit meetings in the month of March every year.
2. The big powers have held such Arab summits and fully exploited them to further their Palestine Agenda which they refer to as the "Middle East Issue". In the 1960's, when these summits began, it was the two big powers; America and Britain, who controlled these. With the weakening of the British influence, it is now the US alone that influences and controls such summits.
3. In the recent past, the situation of the US has become rather shaky and unstable and it has its own priorities in the 'Middle East Issue', especially after the economic crisis that it is confronted with as well as its own predicament in Iraq & Afghanistan where it is focussing its priorities.
4. Therefore, despite the fact that Benjamin Netanyahu has clearly expressed that he does not want to pursue the two nation agenda which the US is keen about, and inspite of the fact that America was in a position to manoeuvre his defeat in the elections as it had done in the past, it chose to let the event run their course and did not intervene. It was merely content to have Ehud Barak with Netanyahu so that Netanyahu does not become the sole authority but there is Barak who subscribes to the view of the two-nation concept. Moreover the US is aware that the thin majority which Netanyahu holds will allow him to pursue his course alone.

All of this indicates that the US is not sticking to its own course of action i.e. the solution of the dispute or even a semblance of one. In other words, it has allowed the event to run their course without itself intervening seriously so that it is free to steal some time from this race and focus on its own priorities and then take up its "Middle East Issue" at a time of its convenience without having to be bowed down by Netanyahu or any other politician in the Jewish entity. This is specially true because the existence, and even annihilation of the Jewish entity is at the mercy of America. Thus while the US appears to have abstained from the current leg of the race, it has its own trusted and sincere agent in the person of Hosni Mubarak to stand-in for his masters and take care of their interests. It is not as if the US does not want to engage in any of the conferences at present.... in fact it has its delegates at all such events who meticulously collect information which the US will use when it returns actively to focus on the "Middle East Issue".

5. Therefore America has left this particular summit conference to run as per its routine without any direct intervention i.e. the Arab rulers met, they enjoyed lavish food & drink, exchanged smiles with some and showed the disdain and detest for others, talked about the conciliation in ambiguous terms.

Therefore, what can be said about this summit conference is that it was a general meeting of the Arab rulers while the US is engaged elsewhere focussing on its current priorities. After this, the US will return and organise major and minor conferences which will result in such decisions that will serve its agenda.

Question 2: The Turkish President Abdullah Güл paid a two-day visit to Iraq on 23rd March, 2009. This was the first visit by a Turkish President to Iraq in 33 years. He met the Iraqi President Talabani and the Prime Minister Noori al Maliki as well as the Kurdistan Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani. This prompted the Kurdish Prime Minister to emphasise that this meeting meant an implicit recognition of Kurdistan by Turkey. [Turk TV News 25.03.09]. The Iraqi President Talabani clarified during a press conference with Abdullah Güл that it was now for the Workers Party of Kurdistan (the PKK) to either lay down their arms or leave. [Sawa Radio station: 23.03.09]. Does this mean that the PKK has ceased to exist in Iraq in exchange of recognition by Turkey for the Kurdish province within the state of Iraq? Consequently, have the Kurds in Iraq lost their hopes in the American promises of a separate state independent of Iraq? Also, does this visit have any international ramifications or is it merely within bilateral contexts?

Answer:

1. Yes Indeed, the American promises made to the Kurds of Iraq of a separate independent state were not meant to be serious even for a moment. This was merely a ploy hatched in order to exploit the Kurds and fight with their own brothers in Iraq so as to enable the Americans to conquer and keep Iraq in occupation. Similarly Britain had promised a Kurdish state to Mahmood Al-Hafeed in 1919 C.E in exchange of fighting the Ottoman forces in Sulaimaiyyah. Al-Hafeed's men fought, killed their own Othmani brethren and expelled them, but of course Britain not only backed away from its promises, it also exiled Al Hafeed to its colony -India. Again at the the Sèvres treaty in 1920, Britain insisted with the Ottoman state to include a clause regarding the state of Kurdistan only to frustrate Khaleefah Mohammad Waheeduddin. At this treaty, it was the delegation of the Khaleefah that was negotiating. When Britain succeeded in destroying the Khilafah and installing its own man Mustafa Kemal as the president of the Republic of Turkey, and after it signed the Lausanne treaty with it in 1924, Britain refused to include the Kurdish state clause simply because it had already achieved its aim, which indeed was to destroy the Khilafah State, therefore this promise had now become redundant! It was Britain that instigated the Kurdish nationalistic sentiments and slogans as well as all other nationalistic 'aspirations' in the entire region and it was Britain again that also exploited these sentiments and exhorted them to fight and rebel against the Islamic State so that Britain could achieve its aims. It then used all such elements who cooperated with it and used them as its agents and installed them as rulers and leaders in those countries. Then came America and played its part and used its agents just as Britain had been doing. i.e. making empty promises with no intention of honouring them, making promises solely with the aim to exploit the people to serve its interests. Therefore when they achieved their goals, the promises would simply evaporate as if they were never made!
2. It is not ruled out that Turkey may officially recognise the Kurdistan province, but merely as a part of Iraq and not as a separate entity and that too will be linked to expelling the PKK. Abdullah Güл clarified this to the journalists after his talks with Kurdistan Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani: "I have made it clear that the PKK is a terrorist outfit and its military facilities are located in your region and it is required that you take a clear stand against them. After they (PKK) have been eliminated, everything is possible between us. You are our intimate neighbours. [Reuters: 25.03.09]. Güл had met Talabani on 17th March, 2009 on the sidelines of the 5th World Water Forum in Istanbul and clarified that formation of an independent Kurdish state was preposterous and that such nation of a Kurdish state was merely a fantasy of the Kurdish poetry. Güл also demanded that the PKK surrenders its arms.

It appears that the Kurdish officials want to give in to the Turkish demands in exchange for recognition by Turkey. Nechirvan Barzani said: "We want the relationship Turkey to be very good, we understand their concerns". [CNN: 25.03.09]. He added: "We do not accept attacking of Iraq's neighbouring country bordering Kurdish region." [CNN: 25.03.09]. It was recently announced by the Turkish foreign ministry that Turkey has accepted the request of Kurdistan region President Masood al-Barazani to visit Ankara. [CNN: 26.03.09]. This visit is also linked to the same issue i.e. the expulsion of PKK from the Kurdish region in exchange of

recognition by Turkey of a Kurd region within the state of Iraq. This is despite the fact that the very existence of the PKK in the northern Iraq was camouflaged in Barazani's Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP).

3. In addition to this, Gul's visit also dealt with the solution of the Kirkuk issue; Turkey is opposed to the annexation of Kirkuk in the Kurdistan province. Gul met with the Turkman representatives and assured them that Turkey will reject annexation of Kirkuk to any region. He of course did not stress much on this issue because it is of secondary importance to Turkey. On the other hand, Turkey acknowledges that there will be formidable impediments if the Kirkuk region is not tied up to the Kurd province, Turkey itself is one such hurdle.

Other issues such as transportation of crude oil through Turkey, trade and increase in water supplies were also discussed and the two parties made efforts to show that they are in agreement over these issues.

4. As for this visit being of a global nature, yes, indeed it has international ramifications and it was important. The visit of the Turkish President comes in the aftermath of the decision by the US to pull out its forces gradually from Iraq except from the very sensitive places. America wants a loyal and close ally to play its role so as to prevent the entry of another big power in the region and exploit the situation or may work to weaken American influence there.

Hence the role of Iran, in tandem with the US and agreed upon it by them. It was only after this that the Iranian president paid a visit to Baghdad last year. But of course, America does not want to rely on one country alone, which may be useful to an extent but may not be able to fulfil all American aspirations. It is with this aim that America wants to have Turkey and Syria as well on board...Gul's visit to Baghdad comes in this context, immediately after which the Syrian foreign minister visited Iraq and met Talabani. America can not realise all its aims by isolating the neighbours of Iraq, and this is true of any nation. We can see the US engaging with Pakistan and Iran, who are Afghanistan's neighbours, so that it can achieve its objectives there. It even engages with such nations where it shares influence with Britain; like Saudi Arabia which it works with in order to bring the Mujahideen to the negotiating table. The Laha conference held yesterday 31st March, 2009 bears strong testimony to this. Some 70 countries attended the conference and Iran was prominent among these. The head of the Iranian delegation met the US envoy to Afghanistan and remarked that their meeting was cordial...!

After tasting defeat at the hands of the resistance forces in Iraq, the US wants to protect its stronghold and influence in Iraq and its position as the biggest global superpower. It was almost on the verge of losing its eminent position as a great power, however its position of preeminence when it boasted that it could do whatever it pleases, has taken a beating!

It was in this context that Obama sent a letter to Turkey seeking its assistance. Thus Turkey's help to America, or rather a correct way of putting it is, America's use of Turkey, is not in the Iraqi scenario alone; there are many other issues the US wants to use Turkey like the nations of Caucasia, Russia and the Middle East Issue. This is why the new US president Obama has said that he intends to visit Turkey shortly. Obama had sent another letter to Iran to seek its help, or rather to use Iran, in the Afghan issue as well as in Iraq.

Question 3: Sheikh Shareef Ahmad has become the president of Somalia, so does this indicate the resurgence of the Shar'iah courts as they were two years ago. If it is so, why is the al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement opposed to them though they are a part of the courts or at least very close to them? Has in the meantime Sheikh Shareef changed and the al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement is trying to sideline him, does this mean that the al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement is a sincere and dedicated force?

Answer: Yes, Sheikh Shareef Ahmad is not what he used to be. He was the head of the Islamic courts in the past, and has now come to head the country. He was earlier fighting the greedy foreign kafir colonialists and was talking about implementing the Islamic Shariah, but his

political acumen and awareness was very weak, just like most of the Islamic militant movements have. Therefore the sincere ones or al-Mukhlisoon sent him a delegation advising him against negotiating with the government of Abdullah Yousuf who was an American agent. He was also advised not to negotiate with the US, either directly or even through American agents or under the auspices of the United Nations or even the African Union...all of these are loyal to America, rather they are all America's hands which it manipulates at will. The delegation also advised him remain opposed to the kuffar colonialists...it is another matter that he did not heed the advice and negotiated with the government of Abdullah Yousuf in Khartoum under the aegis of the UN, Arab League and the African Union...

Anyway, now he is in power, after the destruction of Ethiopia and expulsion of Shareef from Somalia to Kenya and later to Djibouti, he became the president of the Somalian Liberation Front (Djibouti Wing) when the Islamic courts were split and remained so in Asmara and Djibouti, despite both of these countries being loyal to the West...! During this period the Sheikh indulged in direct and indirect negotiations until he came to the position of becoming the head of the Somalian government which is not very different to that of Abdullah Yousuf-thanks to the blessings of America, the West and their agents...the events have now come to be as follows:

1. At the end of 2006 when the Islamic courts were defeated at the hands of the Ethiopian forces which were in turn backed by America to subdue Somalia on its behalf, Shareef went into exile to Kenya where he met the US Ambassador in the presence of US intelligence officials.
2. After the split of the Islamic courts into two factions, Sheikh Shareef led the Djibouti faction and began to negotiate with Abdullah Yousuf's government and with Ethiopia until he signed the Djibouti agreement on 26th October, 2008 C.E.
3. The agreement was reached under American patronage and after acceptance by Ethiopia, this was because the Ethiopian forces had incurred huge losses and wanted to withdraw, but at the same time they wanted to save their face; i.e. through an agreement to that effect.this is why after the treaty was signed, Ethiopia began issuing statements about withdrawal of its troops.

The French news agency (AFP) reported on 28th November, 2008 that Ethiopia will pull out its troops from Somalia by the end of the year and this was confirmed through two official letters addressed to the African Union and the United Nations. AFP reported Waheedi Bella, the Ethiopian foreign ministry spokesman saying: "We have come to the conclusion that it is inappropriate for Ethiopia to keep its forces in Somalia. We have accomplished our task and are proud of this achievement, but the hopes that we pinned on the international community have been frustrated". But the same spokesman before the treaty had remarked to AFP on 24th November, 2008 and said: "It (the treaty) follows the Ethiopian direction of troops withdrawal in a phased manner."

Indeed Somalia is important for Ethiopia, not only in the context of fighting America's proxy war, but because it is Ethiopia's neighbour and occupied its Ogaden region during wars in 1977 and 1978 which Somalia wants to regain, but has failed to do so. Therefore Ethiopia wants a regime in Somalia which will not be hostile to it and which will not demand the Ogaden territory. Moreover Ethiopia serves US interests in the horn of Africa and it was America that sent the Ethiopian troops into Somalia and the same US asked it to withdraw from thereafter the Djibouti accord on 26th October, 2008 when it at last found what it was looking for, in the person of Sheikh Shareef.

4. America has seen that Sheikh Shareef is better equipped to confront the Mujahideen because of his Islamic past. The Americans also understand that Ethiopia being an African country cannot remain in the midst of the Islamists for long, thus it was more suitable for the US to employ one of the Islamists to play this role. Hence America worked on Sheikh Shareef

and its agents and Sudan and Kenya, especially of Sudan were able to overwhelm him, Hasan Makki, a political expert observes: "The Sudanese government explained to Sheikh Shareef that it was not possible for him to overcome the Ethiopians, nor it was possible for him to work with the international community, as if he did not exist for them. Therefore Sheikh Shareef began to heed such advices, after all, he was educated in the Sudanese educational institutions." He adds: "The Sudanese mediation played a major part in these (Djibouti treaty) deliberations."

Thus America had won over Shareef to the extent that he began to sing in America's praise. In an interview with Voice of America's Somalian branch on 20th February, 2009, he described American policies in Somalian as being positive right since the start of the negotiations until the present time, and added: "We hope these efforts fructify."!!

5. Sheikh Shareef became Somalia's president winning a majority votes of the same parliament which was elected in Abdullah Yousuf's term! Now the next step was the appointment of a prime minister, where again America played a major role. Omar 'Abd alRasheed Sharmarki, a US- resident, and a moderate according to US standards. He had held various positions at the UN and was also the Somalian ambassador to Washington during Abdullah Yousuf's period. He is the son of a former Somalian president Abdirashid Ali Shermarke.
6. America was keen that Omar 'Abd alRasheed Sharmarki should be the prime minister due to the fact he had earlier lived in the US, he was not involved in the civilwar because he was away from it and far away in the US and this placed in a position of better acceptability to the common man in Somalia.

It may be pertinent to mention that such is the usual norm of the colonialist powers; whenever they would find a man who has the potential to effectively serve their interests and agenda, they would replace their existing agent with their new-find who could serve them better. Thus America abandoned Abdullah Yousuf who had now been worn-out and exposed as a traitor to Somalia, so the US forced him to resign on 29th December, 2008 C.E and had him expelled from Mogadishu to Muscat (Oman). He had earlier ruled Puntland region of Somalia from 1998 until 2004 when he was declared president. He later took refuge in Yemen....

7. America believes that it has consolidated its hold over Somalia by bringing Sheikh Shareef, who has an Islamist past in the Shariah courts which enjoyed popular support during its rule, as the president; and by having Omar 'Abd alRasheed Sharmarki, who was not involved in the civil war which makes him more acceptable to the masses, as the prime minister. However, its hopes have faltered, it has now become clear that this regime is not very different to the earlier ones except in outward appearance.

Speaking with all optimism about the present regime, the real difference between the former regime and the present one is that while Abdullah Yousuf knowingly served American interests and he did so on purpose, the present one led by Sheikh Shareef is unwittingly doing so while believing that he is doing good for Somalia! We had hoped that Sheikh Shareef would remain alert about the intrigues and conspiracies of the kuffar colonialists just as he had been earlier. We still hope that Allah willing, he will return to his earlier self.

8. In light of what this government stands exposed of. The Muslims especially the al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement have continued to resist it even more intensely.

The al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement has split from both (Asmara & Djibouti factions of) the Islamic courts after the Asmara accord in September 2007 C.E and accused them both hobnobbing with the secularists and abandoning Jihad in the path of Allah (swt)...

The al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement has declared its intention of waging jihad against Ethiopia and the United States to recover the entire lost territories in the Horn of Africa. It also intends to establish the rule of Islam which overrides petty nationalism etc... The US State

Department has issued a statement decalring the al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement to be a separatist, extremist and violent outfit with many of its members to the al-Qaeda organisation. [Chines NewsPage: 18.03.08]. The US had arrested its former leader Ismail 'Arali in mid 2007 in Djibouti and sent him to the Guantanamo Bay prison. It had also chosen the movement of Mukhtar Abd al Rahman "Abu Zubair" and Mukhtar Rabbou "Abu Mansour" as its official spokesman. [al-Arabia: 22.12.2007]. this official spokesman responded to the US State Department saying: "Our relationship with al-Qaeda is the relationship that one Muslim has with another, the essence of which is loyalty, to keep away from kuffar and reach all Muslims and love them. He said that "the movement is pleased and happy that it been placed by the US in the list of terror." A statement issued by the movement on 5th April, 2008 said: "We are fully aware that we are not targeted for being Somalians, but because we carry the concept of jihad as it is generally understood which does not recognise either imanginary boundaries or what is known as the 'Global Order".

The al-Shabab Mujahideen Movement has been successful in controlling many of Somalia's cities and towns and is in effective control of more territory than the government. What is apparently clear about this movement is that it sincerely and truthfully fights the kuffar colonialists... but there is weak point as we mentioned earlier, and which is true of most Islamic militant organisations, which is the lack of political awareness. We pray to Allah (swt) that this movement persists in its strong stance against the kuffar colonialists.

However, this movement is politically more aware than the Hizb Islami which is also opposed to the regime of Sheikh Shareef and is composed of 4 separate movements of which the Somalian Liberation Movement (Asmara faction) led by Hassan Tahir Aweys is more prominent, while the other three are: Kamponi Militia, Islamic Front and the Farouq Militia. The Webpage of the al-Shabab movement, "Gorenje" (A webpage considered close to the al-Shabab movement), asked Hassan Tahir Aweys on 24th January, 2009 as to why is still lived in the Eritrean capital Asmara, Hassan Aweys replied that they (Eritreans) are like what al-Najashi was to the early Muslims!! This is him!!

We pray to Allah (swt) for all Islamic movements to be sincere and dedicated to Allah's Prophet (saw) and that they become fully aware for the conspiracies and schemings of the kuffar who try to deceive Islam and conceal their evil designs more than they reveal,

﴿قد بدت البغضاء من أفواههم وما تخفي صدورهم أكابر﴾

"*They desire to harm you severely. Hatred has already appeared from their mouths, but what their breasts conceal is far worse.*" [TMQ aal Imraan: 118]

Those who seek their support or provide support to them, they shall indeed be clear losers and this fact is amply proved.

6th Rabee al Thani. 1430 A.H

1st April.2009 C.E