

# **The Political Concepts Of Hizb ut-Tahrir**

*Taqiudine an-Nabhani*

*Hizb-ut-Tahrir*

*1969*

**(Translated from the Arabic)**

## Contents

<b>1. What Is Politics?</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. The International Situation</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Political Idea And Method</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.1 Ideological Powers</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.2 The Political Idea And Method In Communism</b>	<b>7</b>
3.2.1 The Issue of Nationalism in Communism	8
3.2.2 The Idea Of Contradictions In Communism	9
3.2.3 Communist View Of Co-Existence	9
<b>3.3 The Political Idea And Method In Capitalism</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. A New Colonialism</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1 British Plans In Muslim Lands</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.2 American Plan For Germany</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.3 Soviet Plan in The Far East</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.4 Changing The Political Plans And Means</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5. The International Situation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.1 The World Leading State</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5.2 Struggle For The Position Of Leading Power</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5.3 British Struggle Against The US</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5.4 USA Uses The UNO</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.5 International Tradition</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.6 The Spread Of Islam In Europe</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>5.7 Establishment Of International Law</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5.8 World Balance And International Conferences</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5.8 Formation Of The League Of Nations</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5.10 Development Of The International Situation Prior To WWII</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5.11 Post WWII Ideological Blocs</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5.12 Rivalry In The Western Bloc</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5.13 Eastern Bloc Policy</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.14 The Socialist Basis In Russia</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>5.15 Rapprochement Between The US and USSR</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>5.16 1961 US/USSR Agreement</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>5.17 US/USSR Pressure On China</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>5.18 Plans Towards England</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5.19 Plans Towards Germany</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5.20 Post 1961 International Situation</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6. Changing World Powers</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>6.1 Motives Behind Global Struggle</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>6.2 The Concept Of World Peace</b>	<b>31</b>

6.3 International Conferences	32
6.4 International Alliances	32
6.5 World Political Actions	33
<i>7. The Issue Of Europe</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>8. The Issue Of The Middle East</i>	<i>37</i>
8.1 Colonisation Of The Middle East	37
8.2 The Nature Of Nations	38
8.3 The Anglo-American Conflict in The Middle East	40
8.4 1950 Istanbul conference	40
8.5 America Leaves Its Isolationism	42
8.6 Conflict In Syria..... Again	43
8.7 English Plans In The Middle East	45
<i>9. The Issue The Far East</i>	<i>46</i>
9.1 British Policy In The Far East	46
9.2 French Policy In The Far East	46
9.3 American Calls For Independence In The Region	47
9.4 Liberation In The Far East	48
<i>10. The Issue Of Africa</i>	<i>49</i>
10.1 The Idea Of Positive Neutrality	49
<i>11. Political Traps</i>	<i>51</i>
11.1 The US and China	51
11.2 The US and Europe	52
11.3 The US and Germany	52
11.4 The Cuban Missiles	52
11.5 Neutrality Of Turkey In WWII	53
11.6 1968 Middle East Crisis	55
11.7 Russian Invasion Of Czechoslovakia	55
<i>12. The Major World Powers</i>	<i>56</i>
12.1 The Growth Of The US As A World Power	57
12.2 England	58
12.3 France	60
12.4 The Soviet Union	61
12.5 Germany	62
<i>13. The International community</i>	<i>64</i>
13.1 The Concept Of International Law	64
13.2 International society	65
13.3 International Law	66
13.4 International Tradition	67

<b>13.5 International Alliances</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>13.6 The Issue Of Colonialism</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>13.7 Colonialism And Capitalism</b>	<b>69</b>
<b><i>14. The Role Of Politicians On International Politics</i></b>	<b><i>71</i></b>
<b><i>15. The Role Of The Islamic State</i></b>	<b><i>72</i></b>
<b><i>16. Political Awareness</i></b>	<b><i>73</i></b>
<b>16.1 Examples of The Special Angle</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>16.2 Importance Of Political Awareness To Muslims</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>16.3 Essence Of Political Awareness</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>16.4 Political Education</b>	<b>76</b>

## **1. What Is Politics?**

Politics means the taking care of internal and external affairs of the nation. It is practised by the state, which discharges this care practically, and by the nation, who call upon the state to account for its practices. The internal policy, which is the care exercised by the state over internal affairs, is fulfilled by applying an ideology upon the society. The foreign policy, which is the care exercised by the state over external affairs of the nation, is accomplished through the relations of the state with other countries and through the spread of Islam in the world.

It is of paramount importance to understand foreign policy to protect the state and the nation (ummah), and as a requirement for conveying the message of Islam. Foreign policy is also a prerequisite for the correct establishment of the relations of the ummah with other nations.

## **2. The International Situation**

Since it is the divine duty of the Ummah to spread Islam to all of mankind then it is an absolute must for the muslims to be attentive on the world arena; with awareness of the world situation and problems, knowing the motives and incentives of the nations and following closely the political events of the world. It is equally important for the muslims to observe the political plans of other countries and to comprehend how they are implemented. Similarly it is important to keep a close watch over the relations between those countries and the political manoeuvres they exercise. To draw a successful and feasible plan to establish the Islamic state and hence spread Islam, it is necessary for the muslims to understand the reality of the situation in the muslim world in the light of the international situation (world order). For all of these reasons, and more, it should be apparent how important it is that muslims understand perfectly the international situation, knowing all the details related to it and comprehend the situation of each country that has an influence on the general situation of the world.

However, it must be made clear that the international situation is very unlikely to remain at a standstill if the international circumstances undergo any significant change. This is also true of the situation of each individual country, which will alternate between strength and weakness, influence and non-influence, and good and bad relations with others. Thus, it is not feasible to establish a fixed perspective of the international situation or to give fixed ideas on the situation of each country in the world. It is, however, possible to construct a picture of the international situation at a given period of time bearing in mind that this picture can change at any time. It is also possible to define the situation of a country in certain specific circumstances, bearing in mind that this situation is by no means free from change. Accordingly, following the political events in the world and linking them with political information already acquainted is a prerequisite for the politician to correctly understand politics and to be able to realise whether the international situation, as well as the situation of each country, has changed.

The international situation changes as a result of a change in the situation of some countries from strength to weakness or vice versa, or a change in their international relations. This change, as a consequence of a change in the world powers, upsets the world balance. In the light of this we can say that understanding the situation of all countries that have influence on the international situation is a basic requirement for understanding the international situation itself. Consequently, attention must therefore be focused on collecting information about each country because this information is the cornerstone of any political understanding. However, understanding the situation of each country is not related to its position relative to the international situation but to the composition of its internal and foreign policies. Therefore, it is important to know the idea upon which the policies of the influential countries are based and the method they follow to implement them. This knowledge is a basic necessity for the muslim ummah to be able to decide on the right stance towards these countries. Evidently, the same emphasis must be placed on knowing the political plans devised by these countries and the means they use to fulfil them. This knowledge must be accompanied by continual observance of these plans and means so that any change in them, and in the motives or the reasons which forced this change, can be understood, together with the correct knowledge of the matters which affect these states and that which forces them to change their plans and means.

### **3. Political Idea And Method**

As for the idea upon which politics is based, it is the idea on which the state builds its relations with other nations. A country with no ideology will possess ideas that differ and conflict and will be liable to constant change. These countries are discussed from the perspective of the political plans and means, while the study of the political idea does not apply to them. Contrary to this is the ideological country which builds its policies on a fixed idea, which is to spread its ideology to the entire world according to one fixed method no matter what means are used. This type of state falls under the area of study for its political idea.

#### ***3.1 Ideological Powers***

Hence countries must be viewed on the basis of whether they have fixed ideas and methods, and whether or not they draw up their plans and follow means in the light of these ideas and methods. But today as a matter of fact the countries of the world give free reign to themselves and follow any means which may achieve the target, adopting the maxim: "the ends justify the means". Whatever the case, all countries draw political plans according to needs which change, and follow means, which change, according to the condition.

The countries, in their political actions, care for the interests of their nations and establish their international relations on the basis of these interests, but there is an immense difference between the ideological countries, which make the ideology the prominent factor in their relations - giving the interests assigned by the ideology an auxiliary role - and the non-ideological countries, which make the interests the dominant factor in their international contacts. So it is essential to distinguish between the ideological and the non-ideological countries in order to realise the factors influencing their policies. Since the ideology exerts a major influence on the state, international relations and the world situation, it is evidently important that one acquires a good knowledge about the ideologies that prevail in the world today, the influence they have on world politics today and the degree to which this influence is likely to be exerted in the future. International relations can be comprehended in the light of these ideologies and their influence on the present and the future.

Today there are three ideologies in the world: Islam, capitalism and communism. Each ideology is embraced by hundreds of millions of people. But Islam has no state at the present time, thus we do not witness its presence either in world relations or in international politics, nor in the international situation, thus Islam has no significant effect on current world politics. But the other two ideologies are embraced by many countries and so enjoy an immense influence on world politics and the international situation and relations. This influence has led to the division of the world into two blocs: the eastern communist and the western capitalist. Both of them contain many countries headed by the Soviet Union and the U.S.A respectively.

#### ***3.2 The Political Idea And Method In Communism***

The idea on which the communist block builds its politics, i.e. its relations with the other nations and peoples is the spread of communism. Therefore, the basis upon which the politics of the eastern block is built is the spread of communism in the world. This basis never changes or differs regardless of which people are in authority.

With regard to the method followed in politics by the communist block, it is to create contradictions in every part of the world through: creating insurrection, circulating anarchy, encouraging disturbances and unrest, sowing hatred, inciting complaints and making

dissension and conflict perpetually among people. In other words creating the class struggle among people, i.e. creating conflict between the classes. They divide the people in society into classes, and they think that inciting dissension and conflict between these classes is the fixed method to create communism or to prepare for spreading it. This is the fixed method to create communism or to prepare for spreading it, and it is a fixed method which does not change as the people who implement it change.

Therefore the foreign policy of the communist block is fixed in its idea and method, and it is not changed by the change of the people in authority. Whether there was in power Lenin, Stalin, Malinkov, Bulganin, Khrushchev or Kosygin. Thus this policy does not change at all nor its relations with other countries. Hence, neither trade agreements, friendship pacts or diplomatic relations will have any significant influence on this policy, both in its idea and method. Rather, it remains fixed as it is until all states become communist like it.

### 3.2.1 The Issue of Nationalism in Communism

But the failure of the Communists to solve radically the issue of nationalism has weakened the solidarity of the communist block and caused disintegration between its states leading some of them to withdraw from the block, thus leaving it as if it is split into two camps.

With respect to the issue of nationalism, on the 24th of April 1917 the seventh Bolshovic General Congress known as the “April Congress” was convened to discuss amid other issues the critical issue of nationalism. Lenin and Stalin had both already laid down the principles of the Bolshovic party policy concerning this issue which advocated the struggle of national liberation movements against colonial powers. They also defended the right of nations to self-determination, free political separation and independent states. When Lenin presented the congress with the report including this opinion, Stalin, then the head of the party central committee, advocated this report. Through the recognition of the congress the view of Lenin became the principle of communism concerning nationalism. In its pamphlet the congress stated *“The right to self-determination, including the right to secede and form an independent state must be recognised for all nationalities forming the Soviet Union. The denial of this right and the refusal to implement it practically would mean the endorsement of the policy of colonialism and annexation. Indeed it is this recognition of the rights of nations to free separation that guarantees the solidarity and the unity of the proletariat of all nations in the world and helps to bring these nations closer together in a true democratic way”*.

This is a part of the decision reached at the conference, and it would have been nearer to the solution had it been limited to this, because it gave a decisive opinion on the issue of nationalism, which is the right to separate. But it did not restrict itself to this, rather the communist party was given the right to authorise the self determination. In the same decision it was mentioned: *“The right of nations to free separation must not be mixed with the merit of such separation at that point in time. This latter matter must be decided by the proletariat party case by case in the light of the interests of social development and class proletariat struggle for the cause of socialism.”* These two statements obviously offered no radical solution and made the issue of nationalism a thorn in the heart of the communist party and the communist bloc. They caused the Yugoslavian communist party led by Tito to announce the split of Yugoslavia from the communist bloc. This announcement caused conflict and dissension between Tito and Stalin till Khrushchev came to power and succeeded in removing the signs of tension between the two parties, but failed on the other hand to bring the Yugoslav communist party back to its original position before separation. China, being influenced most by the issue of nationalism tried to snatch the leadership of the communist world from Russia and to bring back its land seized by Russia during the era of the Tsar. This caused a dispute between the two countries, which was intensified by the new interpretations of the school of Khrushchev and Brezhnev about peaceful co-existence

and led to an escalation in the dispute between China and Russia. Thus China accused the Russian party of deviating from communism, so it tried, and succeeded in attracting to her side some countries like Albania, North Korea, North Vietnam and Romania all of which built closer ties with her. So internationally, and even ideologically, the communist world became more like two blocs. This split influenced the foreign policy of the communist bloc where Russia and the countries under her sphere had a foreign policy different from that of China and the countries supporting her.

### 3.2.2 The Idea Of Contradictions In Communism

In addition to the split in communist opinion over the issue of nationalism, similar results occurred due to the interpretation of the Russian communist party over the issue of contradictions. This deepened the division among the communist states and led to a deviation from communism, and a transformation of the policy of the Soviet Union from a strictly communist policy to a Russian policy, or to a Tsarist policy. The idea of contradictions in communism is considered to be one of the basic ideas of the ideology and of its politics. So deviation from these basic ideas, even through the pretence of their interpretation, is considered to be a deviation and it leads to a change in the relationship of the communist state with the capitalist states, or in other words, it leads to a radical change in the communist policy. Communism says that to avoid falling into the wrong politics man must be revolutionary and not a liberal.

If it is true that evolution happens by the emergence of internal contradictions, and by the conflict between the contradictory forces based on these contradictions, and that the target of this conflict is to suppress these contradictions and to overcome them, then it is clear that the class proletariat struggle is completely natural and an inevitable event. Consequently, the contradictions of the capitalist system must not be concealed, rather they must be revealed and exposed. And the class struggle must not be suppressed, rather it must be pursued to the end. Therefore, to avoid falling into the wrong politics one must follow a determined proletariat class politics, not liberal politics that suggests coordinating between the interests of the proletariat and the interests of the bourgeois, nor politics of mutual understanding which adopts the incorporation of capitalism with communism. These contradictions occur in the normal society as in international society. So the struggle of the contradictions is inevitable whether in the normal society or the international society. Thus, the struggle between the communist states and the capitalist states is an inevitable matter, and they cannot live in peace side by side, and it is necessary that one of them conquers the other at the end of the matter, and it is impossible to avoid dispute between the two ideologies.

### 3.2.3 Communist View Of Co-Existence

This is the true communist conception of peaceful co-existence. But the Russian communist party has interpreted these politics and explained it in a way that produced a peaceful co-existence between Russia and America, i.e. between a communist state and a capitalist state. The Russian communist party viewed the idea of contradictions and dispute between the communist states and the capitalist states as dangerous to the communist states and the world. So after the invention of nuclear weapons, exploration of space and the existence of the intercontinental missiles, this dispute could not continue except through the destruction of both communism and capitalism, and this contradicts with the spread of communism, therefore they suggested the possibility of peaceful co-existence between the communist and capitalist states. Communist China disagreed with them over this matter, so a conflict occurred between the leaders of communism in the Soviet Union and the leaders of communism in communist China. Thus the leaders of communism in the Soviet Union started to proceed on a policy which adopts coordination between the interests of Russia

and the interests of America, and mutual understanding between Russia and America. While the leaders of communism in communist China started to condemn this policy and fight against it, and refuted the words of the Russian leaders that western capitalism with its nuclear weapons, is a tiger which cannot be conquered, China asserted that the capitalist states are but a paper tiger. Therefore, they saw the necessity of revealing the contradiction between the interests of the communist bloc and the interests of the capitalist bloc to create a contradiction in the international society. This difference increased the gap between China and Russia, thus the communist bloc split ideologically and internationally into what appears to be two camps. But the communist concept on the issue of nationalism and the difference in applying the contradictions in the international arena did not affect the communist ideas in politics, nor in the method of its implementation. Rather, the communist idea of politics remains the same, which is the spread of communism in the world. And the method also remains the same, namely, to create destruction, anarchy and disturbances. However, Russia allowed itself not to use this method with some capitalist countries such as America, but still uses it against other capitalist states such as England, while China still uses it against all capitalist countries. So the method was not cancelled completely and was not deleted from the communist books, rather a new interpretation was found for it, which was brought by the leaders of the communist party in the Soviet Union for the benefit of Russia.

### ***3.3 The Political Idea And Method In Capitalism***

The idea upon which politics in the capitalist bloc is based is the spread of capitalism which detaches religion from life's affairs. Although in conflict amongst themselves, all capitalist countries seek to spread the capitalist intellectual leadership and to make its viewpoint dominate the entire world.

Colonialism, the enforcement of political, military, cultural and economic control over the weak nations in order to exploit them, is the method employed by the western bloc to spread capitalism. In spite of the change of governments and laws in the western countries this method remains unaltered.

It is incorrect to say that colonialism is the highest stage of capitalism, as Lenin has stated. For colonialism is an essential part of capitalism and the method by which this ideology is spread throughout the whole world. Consequently, one can say that the foreign policy of the western bloc is fixed in both its idea and method, and is free from any influence of the conflict occurring between the western countries. Britain, the U.S.A., France, Italy and the remaining western countries all seek to colonise other nations so as to spread capitalism.

To understand the method employed by the western bloc, one has to recognise that this method develops with time. The change in the means of colonialism is one such example of this development, and so too is the making of colonialism an objective rather than a method.

## **4. A New Colonialism**

In the modern imperialist policy, the western countries have abandoned resorting to military occupation and have replaced it by other newer means. In addition to the exertion of political pressure and harassment, the U.S. for instance, has started to use her assistance in so called development projects; uses American experts who are present in many countries, and also uses loans, as the new means of colonialism. Britain too has developed some new means of colonising, such as the recruitment of agents, British intelligence, loans, suspicious trade deals and reliance on its agents amongst the leaders of other countries. Beside all these means, Britain still adheres to the use of force and the construction of military bases in its colonies or in close proximity to them.

As an illustration of how colonialism has become an objective rather than a method, one can refer to the fierce conflict between the capitalist colonialist countries to exploit Africa. The Congo crisis which lasted for several years illustrates very clearly the wild avarice and greed of the colonialist countries to exploit this continent, as does the Rhodesian crisis which set free the hands of the British to exploit it. However, in spite of all this, colonialism is still the method used by the west to spread capitalism and western civilisation. Actually, means such as schools, universities and missionary activities cannot be effectively used unless the colonisation of other countries by the west is achieved first.

### ***4.1 British Plans In Muslim Lands***

As for the political plans and styles, they vary according to the colonialist interests of the country. Of the two, the latter is more variable than the former. In examining international politics one can define the political plan as a general policy drawn to achieve certain objectives related to the spread of the ideology or its method, whereas the means is a specific field used to implement the plan and maintain its achievements. For example, the political plan drawn by Britain to rule the muslim world after she had divided it and made these divisions deeply embedded, was to join the muslim countries in various confederations, and to link these confederations with a mere spiritual bond called the Islamic League. Libya, Algeria, Tunis and Morocco would form the North Africa confederation, which would preserve the internal independence and international identity of each country. The Nile Valley Union would consist of Egypt and Sudan. Kuwait, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine (after the removal of the name Israel) would form the Fertile Crescent confederation. The Arabian Peninsula state would include Saudi Arabia, North and South Yemen and the Gulf Sheikdoms. Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Malaysia, and Indonesia would remain as single units. A conference similar to the African Unity Conference with a permanent secretariat would link these confederations and units by a spiritual bond, the Islamic League. The conference would meet annually and take upon its shoulders the responsibility for solving any problems in these countries. Britain employed various means to accomplish this plan. She managed to convert King Faisal, who was an American agent to her camp by tempting him with leadership of the aforementioned conference. Responding to this temptation King Faisal paid visits to various muslim countries in order to achieve this objective. Britain also managed to expel America from Morocco and Algeria. She worked to bring the North African states closer to each other and eased the way for them to form the confederation. Now Britain is working to quickly bring into existence the confederation of the Fertile Crescent. To establish the state of the Arabian Peninsula, she worked to unite the Gulf Sheikdoms. She subsequently left Aden and gave her independence, she expelled America from North Yemen by forcing out Egypt and the Egyptian army, and recruited covert agents to work in Yemen. Other means employed by Britain to achieve her plan for the muslim world was the dependence on agents from among the people of the muslim countries, the establishment of regimes which

are ostensibly democratic and in reality dictatorial, deluding the people to take regional independence as an objective and to use this policy of forming confederations as the means to keep these regions separate.

#### ***4.2 American Plan For Germany***

Another example is the plan drawn by the U.S. to perpetuate the division of Germany and to prevent her from becoming once again a threatening force to her neighbours and others. In order to keep West and East Germany as two independent countries with the consent of the German people themselves, the U.S. wanted to form a federal or a confederal state of the two. By this method, she would have satisfied the Germans desire for unity and at the same time ensured Germany remained divided. To stop the return of Austria and other territories to Germany, that were annexed and given to countries like Russia and Poland, the U.S. adamantly opposed any investigation of the borders of East Germany and sought to keep this issue confined solely between the two sides of Germany. As for Berlin, the U.S. wanted to make it a third country and then join it with the other sides in a federal state. To accomplish this plan the U.S. employed various means. Firstly, she wanted to remove from the mind of West Germany, the idea of severing relations with any country that might recognise East Germany. Then she wanted to reduce the gap between both sides by signing trade agreements. She showed her support for West Germany in its right to West Berlin. She tried to bring both sides of Germany to the table to discuss travelling between them. She wanted West Germany to sign the agreement of nuclear disarmament. Finally, she limited the extent to which West Germany could reach her policy of establishing its military industry and rebuilding the German army.

#### ***4.3 Soviet Plan in The Far East***

A third example is the plan drawn by Russia for the Far East. Russia wanted to keep China away from the Indian Ocean and to stop her expansion in South East Asia. She also wanted to isolate China by distancing North Korea and North Vietnam from her and allowing the U.S. to keep her presence deeply penetrated in Thailand, Laos and Cambodia. Russia employed several means to achieve her plan. Firstly, she established within China a powerful group calling for peaceful co-existence with the U.S. This forced Mao Tsetung to resist this strong group. This resistance - known as the cultural revolution - paralysed the external activities of China for more than two years. Russia also embraced the question of North Vietnam and started to supply her with weapons and to back her international affairs. Finally, she tried to bring close together North Korea and North Vietnam. Thus, it followed different means to achieve its plan.

#### ***4.4 Changing The Political Plans And Means***

It is clear from the above examples that the political plans and means are laid down for direct actions. However, it is not unlikely that a state may replace her present styles by new ones if she finds that the old styles fail to achieve the desired objectives. Equally, the state may change its plan if it finds that its plan is no longer fruitful and causes difficulties which work against the interests of the country.

However, when the state changes its plan it replaces it by another, and when it abandons one means it adopts another. The state does not stop planning and developing its means unless it becomes weak and declines from its status in the international arena. Italy after the Second World War being an example of such a case.

For instance, Britain initially planned to divide the Islamic world into various states and confederations, she then changed this plan choosing to split the Islamic world into an Arab

world and a Muslim world. She then again changed her plan to establish instead the organisation of the Islamic Conference.

The initial American plan drawn up for Germany was to stir up German militarism and make West Germany a republic. She then changed this plan to weaken West Germany and to form a union between West and East Germany and limit her rearmament.

The old Russian plan for the Far East was to cleanse it from the presence of the west and at the same time encourage China to expand in South East Asia and to become active in the Indian Ocean. She then changed this plan and began to work against China to engulf her and to limit her vital sphere of influence.

Similarly, like the political plans, the means also undergoes changes. Britain in her plan to colonise the Muslim world used to depend on political pacts and military bases. She abandoned these means and started to use small loans, economic agreements, arms deals and assisted her agents to attain power in the Muslim countries as a new means of colonialism. The U.S. in her colonialist policy used to rely on alliances, military bases, and economic projects, then would weaken her presence in the alliances and diminished her dependence on arms deals. Then she began to give more emphasis to loans and economic agreements. Russia, in her plans, used to depend on the communist parties of the world. She then started to depend on her embassies, state machinery, arms deals and loans.

From this explanation of the idea on which policies are based, the method by which they are carried out and the political plans and means, the Muslims must be absolutely in no doubt that both blocs - East and West - neither alter their political idea nor their method. They only change their plans and means and replace them by new ones to help spread their ideologies. The destruction of these plans and means would condemn to failure the objectives for which these plans were drawn. Thus, the political struggle must be directed against these plans and means, to expose and resist them, and simultaneously against the political idea and method. Accordingly, it is incumbent on the Muslims to familiarise themselves with the plans drawn by each country and the means used to achieve them.

## 5. The International Situation

With respect to the international situation, the case is not the same. Here, no relation exists between the situation and the idea or the method. Here, the importance lies in international relations and the permanent race between the countries to become the most dominant power and the most influential force in world politics. Consequently, it is very important to understand the international situation.

However, one should bear in mind that the international situation is very unlikely to stay stagnant and at a standstill. Change is certain to occur and new conditions are certain to arise as a result of the events taking place in the world and its various circumstances. But despite the changing characteristics of the international situation a clear picture can be drawn of it and details can be given about its condition. Clearly, the picture and details describe the status of the international situation which is evident to the people at the time of its description. Hence, the description applies correctly to this manifest situation. It is not right to consider the picture and details incorrect and false if the international situation changes. They must be looked upon as a description of a situation that existed and has now become part of history. Thus, another description to encompass the new developments in the situation should be given. So the picture we project of the international situation describes a situation that has either been seen before, or still exists, or is expected to develop. Notwithstanding this it should not be considered as a fixed matter. Evidently, it is incumbent upon the politician to have enough information about the international situation and world politics, and to link this information with his observations to make things apparent and subsequently allow him to assess the situation.

Understanding the international situation demands Muslims to comprehend the position of the most powerful country and the position of the remaining countries in relation to it, and to world politics. It also demands Muslims to acquire knowledge about the subordinate countries, the satellite countries, and the independent countries. The subordinate country is one which is tied in its foreign policy and some issues of its domestic policy with another country, like Kenya with Britain.

The satellite country is one which is linked in her foreign policy with another country on the basis of mutual interests, like Japan with America. Finally, the independent country is one which conducts its foreign and internal policies freely according to its own interests, such as France.

There are cases which lie outside the frame of international politics. They occur due to the withdrawal of the colonialist powers from the territories they occupied. These cases are neither studied in the framework of world politics nor are outlines given about them. Every case is analysed separately and then assessed.

For example, when Britain pulled out of Iraq and the Coup d'état of the 14th July, 1958 took place, which was followed by the nullification of all pacts with other countries. Iraq then became an independent country like Britain, France and any other independent country. But because Abdul-Kareem Qasim, then the ruler of Iraq, was an American agent, Iraq was in actual fact a subordinate country to the U.S. although internationally it was an independent country. When Abdul-Kareem Qasim deserted America, Iraq was on the verge of releasing herself from the grip of the U.S. However, when the Ba'ath party backed by America overthrew Qasim, Iraq remained under the dominance of the U.S. When the 17th July, 1968 Coup took place, the rule came into the hands of British agents and thus, Iraq again became a subordinate country to Britain. With the usurping of power by the Ba'athists in the 30th July, 1968 Coup d'état Iraq enjoyed the position of an independent country, but when the Ba'athists linked themselves with Abdul-Nasser, an American agent, Iraq through Abdul-Nasser became tied with the politics of America. Thus, if the ruler of

an independent country becomes an agent or if an agent attains power in a particular country, this country will become a subordinate one, naturally, to that country whose agent is in power. All countries that were occupied pass through these stages alternating between the dominance of different powers as a consequence of the change in its rulers. Such countries despite being independent from the international point of view are in reality subordinate countries. But these are individual cases which arise as a consequence of the liberation of these countries and the attempts of the colonialist powers to return to their colonies, or through the endeavour of a new power seeking to replace the old.

### ***5.1 The World Leading State***

We put great emphasis on understanding the position of the most powerful country because of its importance in comprehending international politics and the world situation. During the time of peace, the most powerful country has the upper hand and decisive word on the international stage. Though, the second power, the third and indeed the rest of the countries with potential, all enjoy the same ability to influence the world politically. The countries with potential are those which can influence the most powerful country. The degree of influence these countries enjoy on the leading power, and hence on world politics, depends on their own possessed and international strength.

The might of Russia and the huge resources and power she has, makes her the most influential force on the most powerful country and hence on world politics. Britain too enjoys some influence on the most powerful country but to a much lesser extent than Russia. During the reign of de Gaul, France tried to have some impact on world politics and the most powerful country. But after the death of de Gaul, the role of France is expected to recede on one hand, and on the other, she is expected to co-operate with other countries to obtain some influence on the most powerful country and in world politics.

Countries other than the major ones vary in their influences. For instance, the influence of the subordinate country on the greatest power depends on the extent to which this country is used by the dominant country. The orbital satellite country achieves its influence from the superpower around which this satellite country revolves. Finally, the independent country such as Italy, will enjoy some influence on world politics if it either secures or threatens the interests of the leading power.

Thus, any country that seeks to have influence on world politics and steer it in its favour must pursue either of the two following means: it either effectively threatens the real interests of the most powerful country in the international arena, or alternately secures the interests of this country by bargaining with her. Without doubt, a threatening stance is the fruitful and correct way for any state that seeks to make its voice heard in the world and for it to influence its situation. The alternate method is shady and unsafe; its results cannot be predicted. It may lead to the objectives or equally it may lead to disaster. It is gambling with a nation and a foolish adventure, the price of which may be the future of the state. Because securing the interests of the greatest power will not prevent this power from bargaining for a superior deal with any other country inferior to it in position and strength.

To be able to threaten the interests of the most powerful country and to have influence on the world, the state must have enough strength to defend itself and be in full control of the internal situation. The correct way to achieve this is to follow the path of advancement and assent, namely, the state must have an ideology and carry this ideology to the world; but to protect herself from a war of intervention she must start first with the adjoining countries. The state must not confine itself to its borders, rather it should expand its influence and spread its ideology in order that it may have a chance to rival the most powerful country in world standing.

Any state that wishes to dislodge the most powerful country from its leading position must prior to this, transfer the international political climate to its favour and attract the other countries to its side and its idea, as happened to Germany prior to the Second World War. When a country has succeeded in doing this the international situation will fluctuate, and keep doing so, until a country manages to ascend to the position of the most powerful country. Generally, this does not happen unless a war, whether international or local, takes place and results in the change of the situation or alternately where the most powerful country is threatened by war and in this war she needs the support of the rival power on her side.

### ***5.2 Struggle For The Position Of Leading Power***

This position of the greatest country alternates between the states. Prior to the Second World War this position was occupied by Britain, who later on was dislodged by Germany, who then became the occupant of this position. When the U.S. joined the Second World War and entered the international arena, she became the greatest power in the world, due to the fact that she was most able to shape world politics in her favour. The U.S. kept control of the international situation and allowed no political events to happen against its will.

Both Russia and Britain tried to seize from the U.S. the position of the leading country; and Russia, Britain and France tried to have some impact on international politics. The U.S. did not stand against them in having an influence upon international politics, for Russia was its ally in the Second World War, leader of the eastern camp, and a founding member of the United Nations. Thus, her influence was unavoidable, moreover, the U.S. wanted Russia to have an influence on international politics to avoid the possibility of another World War, and to open the way for the peaceful means to prevail. As for Britain and France, they were her allies in the Second World War and after. They are also two of the leading members of the western bloc. Thus, the U.S.A., who is the leader of this bloc, had no choice but to allow them to take part in world politics and drew them to her side as reinforcements against Russia and the eastern camp. Hence, these four countries, the U.S.A., Russia, Britain and France were the powers that directed international politics and convened conferences to solve its problems and participated in international debates. They convened several conferences such as the Berlin conference, Geneva conference, Paris conference and others. The situation remained so until the Prime Minister of Russia, Khrushchev and the President of the U.S.A., John Kennedy met in Vienna, Austria, in June 1961 and agreed to divide the world between their countries. Since then, Britain and France have lost their influence on international debates and discussions, and Russia and the U.S. have started to run world politics alone. All attempts by Britain to restore its influence on world politics failed, all French attempts suffered the same fate even during the era of de Gaul, the situation remains so until now. The roles which seem to be taken up by the major countries in discussing the Middle East crisis are in actual fact an attempt by Russia and America to overcome Britain in this problem. They invited Britain and France to take part in this crisis only, whilst they do not allow them to participate in international politics. In respect of Britain because it is the real opponent in this problem, and France was included in order to be in a rival position to Britain. When this problem is over the role of Britain and France will vanish in international politics. So simply, it can be said that Britain and France have neither weight nor influence on world politics, and the only real powers which can direct world politics are Russia and America.

### ***5.3 British Struggle Against The US***

As previously stated, Britain and Russia have tried to remove the U.S. from its leading position. However, in respect of this act, the situation of Britain is somewhat different from that of Russia, due to the big difference in strength and influence of the two countries. For

this reason, Russia succeeded in standing beside the U.S. as partner and ally, whilst Britain failed to do the same and declined from bad to worse until she reached the deteriorated state in which we see it today. To elaborate more on this point, we see that Britain, after recovering from the blow of the war, began to rival the U.S. for the leading position, she embarked on certain political actions to weaken America. For example, she did not assist the U.S. in the Korean War, her role in this war was nothing more than symbolic. She passed secrets concerning America to China which was the real enemy of the U.S. in this war. Britain, through her shrewd and hidden means succeeded in weakening the international position of the U.S. in this war and hence jolted the leading position of America. In the Geneva conference convened to discuss the problem of Indochina, Britain stood beside the eastern camp and thus weakened the position of America in this conference. This stand of Britain turned the decisions of the conference in favour of the eastern bloc. In addition, Britain passed information to Russia about the espionage and military activities of the U.S. including information about the espionage mission of the U2 airplane. This enabled Russia to shoot down this plane. At the Paris conference, MacMillan stood beside Khrushchev against Eisenhower and tried to humiliate him in his capacity as president of the U.S. This British stand caused the failure of the conference and weakened the position of the U.S. So we see that on several occasions it acted against the interests of the U.S. in an attempt to weaken her leading position in the world. However, America observed this, and the meeting between John Kennedy and Khrushchev in Vienna ensued. Since then, Russia and America have started to eliminate the influence and presence of Britain abroad and consequently Britain was transformed from its position of attack against the U.S. to defending itself.

As for Russia, she waged a cold war against the western bloc in general, and the U.S. in particular. She tried to grasp the initiative from the western bloc and dislodge the U.S. from its position as the leading country to take for herself this position. She succeeded in several actions. For example, she pulled the U.S. away from her strong fortress, the United Nations, to convene conferences on world affairs outside the courtyard of the United Nations. She encouraged Britain to rival the U.S. to weaken her leading position. She widened the gap between France and the U.S. and delayed many of the international acts. She achieved rapid progress in space and even led America in this area. She advanced in her nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles. She established a military base in Cuba to threaten the U.S. She exposed many of Americas policies in the Congo, Egypt and elsewhere.

Although these actions affected America, Russia could not dislodge her from its position as the leading country. Russia could only achieve partial success against America until the meeting between Khrushchev and Kennedy in 1961. Since then, Russia stopped that cold war and stopped her attempts to overthrow America from the position of the leading country. She accepted to be in agreement with the U.S. on international politics to the extent that she has become an ally, or near ally to the U.S. in world politics.

#### ***5.4 USA Uses The UNO***

Accordingly, from the view-point of the international situation the U.S. is still the leading country in the world. This is, relatively speaking, due to the fact that America is still the country most able to influence the international situation and turn world politics to its favour. What reinforces the position of the U.S. is the United Nations Organisation, which has become a very important factor to the leading country in order to maintain its leading position. After the First World War, the international situation was contained by the group of countries which belonged to the League of Nations, which was replaced by the United Nations Organisation after the Second World War. The League of Nations and the United Nations began to look into the general problems of the nations and the countries, and to

limit the international situation into their activities and decisions. The countries which refused to join these organisations or had no chance to do so were secluded from the international situation and enjoyed no influence upon it, regardless of their strength and position. Russia after the First World War and Spain after the Second are two examples of such powerful countries which could not influence the international situation. Hence, it was difficult to shift the international situation against the will of the leading country and its interests. Furthermore, the UNO has naturally become a device to legalise the tyrannical oppression of the leading country and to cover it with the garment of justice. The UNO has become a shield to protect the leading country from the rage of international public opinion and to maintain its position secure from any instability. The UNO also obstructs the political events which may change the international situation without war, and hence, change the position of the leading country, and always influences the international situation in favour of this power whether she is right or wrong.

For this reason we see America doing her utmost to back and strengthen the UNO. She has left the door of this organisation wide open for any country to join, and she has expanded the Security Council. She also increased the number of institutes belonging to the UNO and has tightened her grip over it. This helped the U.S. occupy this remarkable position and made its law operative. Her control of the UNO has given her considerable influence upon all countries and especially those which rival the U.S. and try to affect her position, such as Britain. It is apparent that the U.S. appreciates that its powerful international position and its ability to continue as the leading country demands that it strengthens the UNO, keeping it under its grip and control, thus maintaining her strong influence in the world and protecting its leading position from instability. Historically, it has been proven that after the disintegration of the League of Nations the international situation became undecided and the position of the leading country changed from England to Germany; America, therefore, works to avoid any political crisis and to remove the danger of another world war, which would destroy the UNO and hence, change the international situation and shake the position of the leading country. So it is necessary to hold the UNO under a firm and strong grip and preserve its international position, so that the U.S. maintains her influence on the world and keeps herself in first place.

### ***5.5 International Tradition***

This idea of the leading country is not new, it was present in all times of old. Egypt in ancient history was the leading country and Assyria was her rival power. The Roman state was a leading country and Persia was her rival power. The Islamic state from the era of Rashidite Khalifate till the crusades was the leading country and Britain was her rival power. The Ottoman state in its capacity as an Islamic state was a leading country for three centuries and had no rival power till the mid eighteenth century. Prior to the First World War, Germany was the leading country, and Britain and France were her rival powers. After the First World War, Britain became the leading country and France was her rival power. Thus, at all times there has been a leading country and occasionally a power to rival her. This rivalry did not involve political actions but took mainly the form of wars, invasions and annexation of the bordering parts of the rival country. The situation remained as such till the mid-eighteenth century when international law expanded, or to be more precise became a law and an established legislation. Since then, political practices started to play a very important role in world relations and in the solution of international problems. The countries began to replace military actions by political ones in their attempt to block the domination of the leading country, to rival her for the leading position and to solve problems. As a result arbitration of international law has become very common in international relations and resorting to political actions alone or in addition to wars and invasions has increasingly begun to occur as a means of solving the international problem.

This became very well established after 1919 when the League of Nations was formed, hence, arbitration of international law and international tradition became frequent. The political actions carried out by the countries in general, and countries which rival the leading country, and the leading country itself, depend on the use of international law and tradition. Therefore, it is necessary to have an insight of international tradition and law to appreciate from the international standpoint the reality of these political actions and how they are performed.

With regard to international tradition, it is as old as the existence of the countries and states themselves. It is the set of rules which developed as a result of the relationships between the different groupings of human beings in the times of war and peace. These rules have become international traditions because the people have observed them for a long period of time. The states adopted these rules as law and voluntarily considered themselves under the obligation to abide by them. This obligation is moral rather than physical, and done voluntarily out of fear of public opinion. Whosoever acts against international tradition is vulnerable to the outcry of public opinion. The agreement between the Arabs, prior to Islam, to prohibit war in the sacred months was of these traditions. Because of this tradition, the tribe of Quraysh reproached the prophet (SAW) severely, when the detachment of Abdullah ibn Jahsh killed Umar ibn Al-Hadramy, captured two men of Quraysh and took the caravan of trade, Quraysh publicised this everywhere and announced that Mohammed and his companions violated the sacredness of these months by shedding blood, seizing money and capturing men. Quraysh agitated public opinion against the prophet (SAW) because he acted contrary to international tradition. Thus, between all groups of people there were rules common to them, which were followed in time of war and peace, such as ambassadors, spoils of war and so on. Yet some of these rules are common to all people, like ambassadors, whilst some are special to certain groups. Nevertheless, the international tradition used to develop in accordance with the needs of countries and states i.e. in accordance to the needs of the groups of people in their relationships with each other.

The people resort to these rules to reproach and appeal to public opinion against those who act against them. There was no physical power to impose these rules, however, the people followed them freely and morally. On the basis of these rules, the different groups of people carried out their political actions.

### ***5.6 The Spread Of Islam In Europe***

As for the so-called international law, it was established against the Islamic state when it was represented by the Ottoman state. This was so because the Ottoman state in her capacity as an Islamic state conquered Europe, declared Jihad against the Christians in Europe and swept through their countries one after another. She swept through Greece, Romania, Albania, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Austria until she reached the walls of Vienna. She installed fear in all the Christians of Europe who held the opinion that the Islamic army was undefeatable, and that the Muslims do not care for death due to their belief that if they die they will be granted paradise, and due to their belief in divine destiny (qadr) and the time of death (ajal). The Christians witnessed with their own eyes the courage and bravery of the Muslims, and their own severe extermination at the hands of the Muslims. This forced the Christians to flee before the Muslim army, which consequently had an easy task of sweeping through Europe to bring it under the authority of Islam. During this time, the European Christians were divided into emirates and feudal provinces. Each country was fragmented into emirates ruled by feudal lords who used to share power with the King. This rendered the King unable to force these emirates to fight and removed from him the right to represent them before the invaders and in everything related to foreign affairs. This made the task easier for the Muslims to conquer Europe.

### ***5.7 Establishment Of International Law***

The status of the European countries remained as such till the Middle Ages i.e. till the end of the sixteenth century when the European countries started to assemble themselves to form one group capable of standing against the Islamic state. These countries were under the dominance of the church, and Christianity was the link between them. So these countries attempted to form a christian community and started to organise the relations between themselves. They agreed on a set of rules to organise relationships between themselves and this was the start of the establishment of the so-called international law. Hence, the root of the establishment of international law was the assemblage of the European christian states on the basis of the christian bond to stand against the Islamic state. This attempt of assemblage led to the establishment of the international christian community which agreed on certain rules and measures. Included in these rules was the provision that all subjects of the countries belonging to this community should enjoy equal rights, and that these countries should have the same ideas and ideals, and that they should also accept to give to the Catholic Pope supreme spiritual authority over all countries, regardless of their school of thought. These rules became the nucleus of the international law. In actual fact the assemblage of these countries was ineffective and the rules agreed upon, failed to unite them. The feudal system was a real obstacle to the state in strengthening itself or in practising its foreign policy. The control of the church over the state, took away the authority and the independence of these states. Due to this situation a conflict took place in these countries which ended in the elimination of the feudal system. At the time there was a collision between the state and the church which resulted in the removal of the church's control over the domestic and foreign affairs of the state. The states remained christian however, and what occurred was an organisation and rearrangement of the relations between the state and the church, to secure the independence of the state. As a result of this, the states in Europe became strong, although, not strong enough to stand against the Islamic state. The situation remained as such, till the mid seventeenth century i.e. 1648 A.D. when in this year the European countries convened the conference of West-Valia. In this conference, the christian countries of Europe laid down fixed rules to organise the relations between themselves and formed the community of christian countries to stand against the Islamic state. The conference laid down the traditional basis of the so-called international law which was not a common international law, but a law concerning the christian countries of Europe. This law prohibited the admission of the Islamic state as part of the international community and excluded her from the international law. From this time, the so-called international community came into existence and consisted solely of European christian states regardless of them being monarchical or republican, Catholic or Protestant. Initially, the community consisted of the western European states, then it included all christian European states and then expanded more to encompass also, the non-European christian states. The Islamic state was deprived admission till the mid nineteenth century, when it became very weak to the extent that it was called the "sick man of Europe". At that time, the Ottoman state asked to join the international community but her request was turned down. She then persisted in demanding to be allowed admission until she was accepted, but with very harsh conditions, including the abandonment of Islam in her international relations and adopting some of the European laws. When the Ottoman state yielded to these conditions and accepted to abandon Islam in her international relations (i.e. accepted to act as a non-Islamic state) her request to join the international community was accepted, in 1856 A.D. After this, other non-christian countries like Japan joined the community. So the conference of West-Valia, convened in 1648 A.D., is considered to be the first conference that regulated the traditional basis of the international law. According to this basis, the political actions started to happen in a distinct shape, and collective international actions began to occur.

### ***5.8 World Balance And International Conferences***

In respect of this basis, there were two very distinct and dangerous ideas. One was the notion of world balance and the other was the idea of international conferences. The notion of world balance required that if a country tries to expand, at the expense of another, then all other countries should gather and stand against the expansionist country, to prevent her from expanding and hence, keep the world balance which is the guarantor of preventing wars and establishing peace. As for the second idea, the European countries used to convene such conferences to discuss the problems and affairs of the world in the light of the interests of these powers. Fundamentally, these two ideas are the reason behind the misery and the difficulties which the world faces in its effort to up-root the control of the colonialist and major powers.

These two ideas were first used during the time of Napoleon at the beginning of the 19th century. When the French Revolution took place and the ideas of freedom, equality and the recognition of the rights of the individual and the nations spread, the political map of Europe changed as a result of the revolution and its ideas. The change was manifested by the creation of new states and the destruction of old ones. Under these circumstances, the European countries assembled together on the pretext of world balance and stood against France. After the defeat of Napoleon, these countries met at the Vienna Conference convened in 1815 and looked to restore world balance and organise the affairs of the international christian community. Monarchy was returned to Prussia and Austria, a confederation was formed between Sweden and Norway, Belgium was joined with Holland to establish one state able to prevent French expansionism and Switzerland was put in a neutral position. To implement the decisions of the conference, the participant countries formed an alliance between themselves known as the alliance of the Kings of Prussia, Russia, Austria and agreed upon by the King of England. Later on, France joined this alliance to become an alliance between the major countries to control and occupy other countries. Then in 1818, Russia, England, Prussia, Austria and France signed the agreement of X-Lashapel in which these countries agreed to intervene militarily against any revolutionary movement which might threaten the goals of the Vienna conference.

This is how these five major powers made themselves the security guard, to keep peace and establish order in the international community i.e. the international christian community, then expanded their authority to include some of the Muslim countries after the deterioration of the Ottoman state. These countries on the pretext of keeping peace, intervened on several occasions. They intervened in Napoly in 1821, Spain in 1827, Portugal in 1826 and Egypt in 1840 A.D.

These countries tried to intervene in America to help Spain restore her colonies, but, the U.S. which had become a strong country and a power to reckon with, foiled the attempt of these countries and the president of the U.S.A., James Monroe, made in 1823 his famous declaration known as the Monroe Doctrine in which he said: "*The U.S. shall not allow any European country to intervene in the affairs of the American continent or occupy any part of it*". These countries as a result ceased intervening.

### ***5.8 Formation Of The League Of Nations***

This is the root of international law and that which has provided the excuses for the major countries to intervene and rule over other countries, and this is the basis on which these major countries depend in executing their political actions to achieve their aims and to secure their interests, or to compete and rival the leading country. But some changes did take place in these international rules. These changes favoured the major powers and were for their sake so as to organise their interests i.e. to divide the wealth and goods of the world between them in such a way as to avoid wars and military conflicts with each other.

The 19th Century was the age of colonialism in which the major countries hastened to colonise and exploit the weak nations. Because of the nature of colonialism, conflict between these countries was inevitable, although they never reached the extent of full scale war. But when England, France and Russia felt that Germany with all her might had become a real threat to them, who could take the oil of Iraq and threaten the oil interests of England in Iran and the Arabian Peninsula, these three countries gathered against Germany and declared war on her. The Ottoman state stood on the side of Germany and fought against the 'allies' who won this war. After the completion of the war, Russia decided to quit the alliance and America preferred to go back to its isolation. Thus in the field remained England and France. To organise their colonialist interests and to avoid conflict with each other, these two countries decided to establish the 'League of Nations', the aim of which was to organise the affairs of the world and to prevent wars. However, this League of Nations which was formed in an atmosphere full of contradictions could not perform its functions and stumbled because the major countries did not want to change their policies. In the peace conference convened after the war the concern of each of those countries was to establish a balance between the various powers, protect interests and divide the properties of Germany and the Ottoman state. The colonialist countries refused infringement of their sovereignties, and insisted on keeping their colonies to which they added a new type called deceptively 'the countries under mandate'. The consequences of all this was the failure of the League of Nations to establish international reconciliation and the securing of world peace. The major countries tried to sign international agreements to secure peace and avoid conflicts in the colonies. They established under the wing of the League, the Geneva accord of 1924 the aim of which was to settle the disputes in a peaceable manner and impose a return to compulsory arbitration. In 1925, the agreement of Zycarns was signed to include reciprocal obligations and cooperation. In 1928, the charter of Berian Kilage was signed to prohibit resorting to war. Then followed the signing of the Geneva charter of 1928 which was specific on compulsory arbitration. But all of these charters and accords could not prevent the failure of the League under whose own eyes occurred several wars, such as the China-Japan War of 1933, the war between Italy and Ethiopia in 1936, the invasion by Germany of Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938 and of Poland in 1939 ending with the Second World War in 1939. So the formation of an International Organisation instead of the idea of conferences, was the major change which occurred in international relations, but this change, as a matter of fact, did not alter anything, for the major countries remained in dispute with each other over the resources and spoils of the world until the Second World War took place. After the war, the major countries found that the best way to organise relations between themselves was to establish an international organisation. This organisation initially consisted of the warrant countries then expanded to enable other countries wishing to join, to do so. World relations were organised by the charter of this organisation. So the phases in which the international relations passed were:

1. A conference in which the major powers participated to arrange their control over the world, to divide its resources between themselves and to prevent the emergence of another major power besides themselves.
2. An international organisation to organise the relations between these powers and to secure their control over the world, and
3. An international organisation which acts as an international state to organise the affairs of the world and to enforce its authority over it.

### ***5.10 Development Of The International Situation Prior To WWII***

To further explain this, we say that the international situation was first represented by the major powers of Prussia, Russia, Austria and England. When France tried to dislodge these countries from their positions, and managed to alter the map of the world and change the

international situation, these four countries gathered against her and destroyed her ambitions. But they allowed her to join them to dominate the world. So the international situation became dependent on these five powers. Then England started to gradually edge in front of the others until she became the first country. When Germany tried to shake England from her position and seize the oil of the Muslim world, France, England and Russia gathered and fought against her and destroyed her ambitions. Then these three countries alone occupied most of the world. Britain had the lions share of this and satisfied France with some colonies and the crumbs of the table. The international situation consequently became dependent on England, France and Italy to a certain extent, but England for herself maintained the position of the leading country, preventing any other country from rivalling her and stopped the emergence of another major power. Of course the league was formed under the pretext of keeping world peace. When Germany tried once more to dislodge England from her position and become a major power, England and France initially gathered against her, and then, joined by America and Russia declared war on her and managed to destroy her. But this time the result of the war went against England who left the war exhausted and wrecked, in contrast to America which left the war healthy and victorious and thus became the leading country. The international situation became dependent on America with Russia as her rival power. England and France became second order countries in the international situation.

### ***5.11 Post WWII Ideological Blocs***

But after the Second World War, a new development occurred in the international situation. It was the split of the world into two blocks. This resulted in the intensification of the international conflicts and the complication of the international situation which never before has been seen to be as complex as it is now. Yes, it is true that prior to the First World War, there were different groups of countries but these groups were not blocks. It is equally true that prior to the Second World War, the international situation was divided into democratic, nazi and fascist fronts, nevertheless, these fronts were not ideological blocs because nazism and fascism were neither ideologies nor sublime enough to be so.

So prior to the last war, there were no blocs in the ideological sense. But after the Second World War the world became divided into two blocs; the western bloc and the eastern bloc. America is considered to be the leading country in the western camp and Russia occupies the same position but in the eastern camp. Although the two blocs struggle with each other on an ideological basis and have conflicting interests, their establishment was based on a worldly basis. This is so because the ideology was not the only factor which divided the world into two blocs. The global interests were the other major factor beside the ideology, but in the eastern bloc these global interests follow the communist ideology and its requirements of expansion, whereas in the western bloc they follow the policy of the spread of the ideology according to the national interests which are based on capitalism, which makes 'utility' the measure of all actions. So in the western bloc, there are countries which do not embrace capitalism but have their interests interrelated with the western camp. In the eastern bloc, such cases do not exist and all its countries are communist. This is so because communism is at the centre of this bloc. Due to disunity in the western bloc, it was possible to create gaps inside the bloc and bring out some of its countries to join the eastern bloc. It was also possible for another bloc to emerge from the western bloc which would stand as a single independent bloc and have influence on the world situation in times of war and peace.

### ***5.12 Rivalry In The Western Bloc***

In looking at the western bloc, we find that it is internally divided. The cause of the division is the occupation by the U.S. of the position of the leading state after Britain had

occupied this position for quite some time and after America's isolationism. The division is visible and it is the reason behind the delay in the eruption of another world war. In the field of world politics, the leading country did not act as the chief of the bloc - as was the case with England who paid no attention to her allies - but as the commander who imposes his leadership over his soldiers. For this reason, we find that countries close in strength to the leading power like Britain for instance are more spiteful and rebellious than the weaker ones. The cause of this goes back to the policy of America itself. America leaving the war triumphantly, decided to strip all countries of dominion and to impose her will all over the world. Due to the immense strength and huge wealth she has, the U.S. became conceited and arrogant, to the extent that she felt that she must rule the entire world. Countries started to ask for her assistance and to seek her countenance. This situation encouraged America to 'invade' Europe in general, and in particular Britain, which was the greatest country and the one with the most colonies. She achieved her aims through the Marshall plan and a policy of economic assistance and loans.

When she acquired command of the European countries, America started to attack their colonies and to bring them under her domain in a gradual way and in a manner different from the style it used to attack the European states.

Consequently, the dispute between the member states of the western bloc intensified and deepened. As a matter of fact this dispute is not new but an old one, and started before the Second World War on an economic basis between two countries and then changed to a political dispute within the entire bloc. It is related to economic problems and in particular those concerning oil. This was the case because the agreements between Britain and America related to oil, and it was Britain's need for American support that was the reason behind the dispute between these two countries, and consequently, between the member states of the western bloc. After the end of the First World War, the situation changed in favour of Britain, although France rivalled her and this rivalry was clearly apparent. Thus Britain worked to weaken France, by on the one hand strengthening Germany, and on the other by supporting the patriotic and nationalistic movements in France's colonies. Accordingly, Britain created trouble for France and kept her engaged to protect herself from Germany. But by this time, Italy emerged as an international power, and Germany became a threatening force to both Britain and France and then emerged the Rome-Berlin Alliance. Hence, Britain inevitably had to bring the U.S. out of her isolation by tempting her with the oil of the East, thus the oil agreements were signed between Britain and America. However, when America commenced exploration for the oil, her companies recognised the precious value of the oil in the East, not only for economic profits, but also for the existence of America itself. America therefore started to strip Britain and her companies of their oil fields and concessions. America began to have the upper hand, and the rivalry between the Americans and British companies intensified. Through this venture of the American companies in the East, America ceased her isolationism. Then the Second World War took place and America moved to the leading colonialist position, whilst Britain, France and Holland all declined. As far as Holland is concerned, due to her weakness, she became insignificant.

In respect of Britain on the whole, she lost some of her influence in the East, the Mediterranean and in some other small countries. This rendered Britain's international position similar to any other country and no better than any small country in the world. America is still pursuing Britain to liquidate her influence from the world. As for France, she became a weak country due to the loss of her colonies in the Far East and Africa. Despite attempts by de Gaulle to revive her, she is still lower than Britain, with no real influence on the world. Although she is still considered one of the major countries, this does not however give her more influence on the international position than many other countries.

Hence this demonstrates that the division of the western bloc has weakened all its members except the U.S. which by weakening these countries through taking their colonies and by its might, has strengthened her position and has become the leading power. However Britain, through political manoeuvring and military actions is still attempting to influence America's position and to dislodge her from first place.

So, in viewing the western bloc as a unit, there is disintegration and disputes among its members which all race for benefits and cheat each other.

### ***5.13 Eastern Bloc Policy***

As far as the eastern bloc is concerned, its basis is only ideological and is led by Russia ideologically and militarily. Russia in the eastern bloc plays the role of teacher and the tutor on one hand and guardian and leader on the other. None of the member states of the eastern bloc rivals Russia for this intellectual and political leadership. Since Stalin, the internal policy of the eastern bloc has been to strengthen the state system and machinery and to prepare military forces capable of defending and attacking at the same time. As far as foreign policy is concerned, it is based on the impossibility of any peaceful coexistence between socialism and capitalism. Capitalism has always been seen as a political enemy due to the fact that it is an ideological enemy. When the Second World War took place there was cooperation between Russia, Britain, France and America and the four countries lived peacefully with each other. But this was short-lived, for what happened was exceptional and the urgency of the situation soon vanished after the war ended. Then the cold war between Russia and the western bloc resumed, although diplomatic communications were maintained. However, this communication which took place through the U.N. and the international conferences, and the diplomatic gestures and ties, did not signal a change in the fundamentals of communist policy. All these were different political means thought effective by the Russians.

The communist policy, towards the western bloc emanates from the idea upon which the Russian policy is based. There are inferences in the communist ideology about the impossibility of peaceful co-existence between capitalism and communism, and that one of them will eventually overcome the other. All communist books speak about this inevitable clash between the two ideologies. This view was embraced by Lenin and Stalin and all Communists alike. No communist politician, whether a leader or not, was allowed to proceed in a policy of peaceful co-existence and any one daring to do so would be classified as a dissident, who deviated from communist policy. It is true that when Malinkov succeeded Stalin, he increased diplomatic communications and became active in diplomacy outside of the Soviet Union. However, this was not a change in Russian policy but merely a development in the means used by Russia in her policy. It would be a mistake to think that Malinkov intended to establish a policy of peaceful coexistence between capitalism and communism. Although on several occasions he made some inferences about this, in actual fact he wanted to increase diplomatic contacts only to delay the possible eruption of another world war, so as to gain more time and hence a better chance to spread communism, and to gather as many peoples as possible against the western bloc. His resignation later on was not as a consequence of any deviation from the communist policy otherwise he would have been infringing the communist ideology. But it seemed that the means he used in internal and foreign policy were not to the liking of the other leading figures in the communist party. Nevertheless, the communist policy based on communism indicates clearly that sincere co-operation and permanent peaceful coexistence between the two blocs is not possible and the conflict between them is everlasting.

This is the situation of the two blocs from the ideological, political and international points of view. But since 1961 a worldwide change has occurred inside the two blocs resulting in a change in their real situations and hence the international situation. Since 1956, moves

and activities have been taking place within both blocs that developed and increased till it led to the complete disintegration of both of them.

#### **5.14 The Socialist Basis In Russia**

In the communist bloc, the state is based on a non-nationalistic foundation i.e. a communist state for the entire world. This is the case even after the interpretations of communism by Stalin. In the conference convened in Petrograd between the 26th July and the 3rd August, 1917 the communist party decided to lead a militant revolution to hold power. In the conference a member of the Trotsky Group suggested to modify this decision by adding that this country cannot lead its way to socialism unless the revolution is initiated first in the west. Stalin opposed this suggestion and said *“Nothing prevents Russia itself from being the first country to lead the way to Socialism. We must discard the absolute idea which says that Europe alone can give us the right direction. There are two kinds of Marxism: a stagnant dogmatic one and a dynamic one, and I stand beside the latter”*. This is how the communist ideology changed from a universal socialist revolution - breaking out where there is labour and factories, i.e. in Europe, to a Russian revolution starting in Russia and then spreading to the rest of the world. Accordingly, the state in Russia was established to be a communist state for the entire world. In the report presented to the meeting of the joint committee held on the 14th May 1918 on foreign policy Lenin said: *“We do not defend the secret agreements, we actually refuted them and exposed them to the whole world. We defend the country against imperialism; we defend it and we shall triumph. We do not fight for the sake of the major powers privileges; in Russia nothing remained except the Great Russia. We do not defend national interests; we are concerned about the interests of Socialism. Socialist interests in the whole world come before the national interests and the state interests. We are the defender of the socialist country”*. This was the basis on which the communist state was established in Russia.

#### **5.15 Rapprochement Between The US and USSR**

This forced the Soviet Government internally to be on full alert and to seriously prepare her economic and military might for the sake of propagating socialism. This required the nation to be kept constantly under the strong political and economic pressures. The communist state was therefore a nightmarish ordeal for the Russian people who were deprived of luxuries, and even some of their basic needs, all for the sake of propagating socialism. Russia was also obliged to adopt the line of full enmity towards all western countries in their capacities as capitalist and imperialist powers. The Russian state was obliged to wage the cold war against all these countries and to prepare herself in case a military war broke out. All this split the world into two open hostile blocs and placed them in a fragile situation which was liable to explode at any time. The situation remained so during the reign of Stalin and continued for a short time after his death. With the coming of Bulganin to power, and with him Khrushchev, a new school appeared in Russia, carrying a flavour of nationalism instead of communism. As a consequence, the people of Russia were politically and economically more relieved. The pressure on the people was eased slightly and consumer goods were allowed to circulate in the market. Externally, Russia tried to move closer to America and build better relations with her. Then secret contacts took place between the two countries to prevent war between them, and these contacts were extended to encompass all international issues on which they were in disagreement. As soon as the contacts were fully developed, the important meeting between Khrushchev and Kennedy in 1961 was held. At this meeting, both sides agreed on all international issues and Russia for her part and from its international viewpoint dropped the idea of constant hostility between communism and capitalism, embracing instead the idea of peaceful coexistence in its capitalist meaning.

As for the capitalist bloc, America realised that England conspired against her and tried to compete with her for the spoils. The U.S. felt that the cold war drained her power and exhausted her wealth. The Cold War is neither a state of military war - to go and commit herself for military preparations instead of economic development, nor a state of peace - to go and commit herself for building her economy instead of military preparations. It is a state between peace and war, and this makes it consume an immense amount of the country's wealth for a war that is not certain to happen. In addition, America noticed that England, in particular, was the main catalyst in agitating this war so as to exhaust American wealth and strength and hence disturb the world balance. Upon realising this America started to narrow the gap between herself and Russia. Since the advent of Eisenhower, attempts to negotiate with the Russians were accelerated. When Kennedy came to power he took the initiative to complete the steps of bringing relations closer together and this was crowned by the meeting that took place between Kennedy and Khrushchev just a year and a half later. In the meeting, the two sides agreed on all international issues, and America consequently deserted the fundamental idea of destroying communism and ridding the world of it.

#### ***5.16 1961 US/USSR Agreement***

The issues discussed in the meeting by the two sides have been kept secret until today. Nevertheless, the announcements made by the two sides after the meeting and the policies they implemented towards certain matters in due course indicate some of the issues which were on the agenda. It could be said that China was one of the issues, being a neighbour to Russia and having a population three times that of Russia and looking eagerly to take leadership of the communist world, China became a great worry to the Soviet Union. Similarly, China became a tiresome worry to the U.S. who thought that if China managed to possess nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles and entered the space race, it would certainly pose a great threat to her.

#### ***5.17 US/USSR Pressure On China***

So the Russian and American interests coincided over the common fear and threat of China and therefore decided to act jointly to remove the Chinese threat against them and world peace. They agreed to propose to China to accept the policy of peaceful coexistence already embraced by Russia. They also agreed to restrict China's activities to the Pacific Ocean and to prevent her from the Indian Ocean so as to keep her away from Africa and western Asia. They also wanted her to sign a treaty preventing the spread of nuclear armaments and in return they would let her enter the nuclear club formed by the U.S., U.S.S.R., England and France, where she would occupy the third position. In case the Chinese rejected the offer, the two sides agreed to exert pressure on her internally and externally until she yielded. If China would not yield, America would initiate a limited war against her to replace the communist party with another communist party that would be loyal to Russia and change the Chinese government to one which would accept the policy of peaceful coexistence. It seems that China rejected these proposals presented to her and accordingly America and Russia started to work against her. Russia began to mount pressure on China through the collaboration of her agents inside, promoting the idea of peaceful coexistence and to split the Chinese communist party on the basis of this idea. At the same time, Russia pushed North Vietnam and North Korea to separate themselves from China and hence isolate her from the world in general and the communist world in particular.

On the other side, America started to prepare herself for a limited war with China in case the pressurising process failed to achieve its purpose. America began to build a huge army in the Far East and ignited a fictitious war between North and South Vietnam. She despatched a large army to the Far East on the pretext of the Vietnamese war to make

military manoeuvres which tested her war machine and trained her armies. She called these manoeuvres the Vietnam war to delude and deceive the world and to cover her real intentions. She stockpiled huge quantities of weapons in Thailand and in the rest of the Far eastern regions under her control. By the end of 1968, a million trained American soldiers were ready to enter a war immediately. The plan drawn up by the Russians and the Americans against China is still in process and in progress.

### ***5.18 Plans Towards England***

The Americans and the Russians were also united against England. They decided to liquidate all the English bases in the world by ridding the world of all military bases. They agreed to drive England out of her colonies by seriously putting an end to colonialism and granting all colonies their independence. They agreed to uproot England from the entire Far and Middle east, and from Africa. They drew up practical plans to achieve this and up until now they have succeeded in liquidating the bases of Singapore and Aden and made England withdraw her forces from the Suez. As a result of such events, several British colonies became independent countries. The Americans and Russians are still chasing England. The Middle east crisis and the troubles and inconveniences caused to England in Africa are manifestations of the American and Russian common agreement to liquidate completely the English influence from the world.

### ***5.19 Plans Towards Germany***

The Americans and Russians had also common interests against Germany. They agreed to uproot completely the danger of German militarism. They decided not to return the land annexed from Germany in the Second World War and to keep her eastern borders permanently as they stand now. They agreed not to return Berlin as the capital of Germany and decided to keep her divided into West and East Germany, and to perpetuate this division by making some kind of unity between the two parts. They agreed to prevent Germany from manufacturing nuclear weapons and to restrict the German weapons industry. They also agreed to put Europe as a whole in a situation that would never endanger Russia militarily.

### ***5.20 Post 1961 International Situation***

These were some of the major issues discussed in the meeting between America and Russia. Adding to these the agreement to support each other militarily and economically against other countries be they communist or capitalist, and to have reached coexistence between them and never to resort to force in settling differences between themselves. They agreed to divide the world between them and to define the sphere of influence of each and the extent that one should support the other in her region of influence. In other words, America and Russia became two allies which form one universal power. As a result of all these agreements, the situation of the world changed and so did the international situation.

With regard to the international situation, the world is no longer divided into two camps of conflicting political and economic interests. The problems which used to entangle relations between the two blocs before 1961 are no longer there. Communism is still of course represented in the communist countries and capitalism is still represented in the capitalist countries, and from this view, the world is undoubtedly split into two ideological camps. But from the point of view of the international situation, the two blocs have disappeared and the world has become one universal power formed from Russia and America. These two superpowers alone control the world and nothing happens against their wishes. Obviously, America is still the leading power and has an edge over Russia.

One might say that NATO is still in existence as a counter force against the eastern camp and it still holds its meetings and prepares its forces to stand as a united bloc against the East. Similarly, the Warsaw pact is still a united alliance threatening the west. It invaded Czechoslovakia as a united bloc to protect communism from the west and it stands as a bloc against the west. If the case is so, how can it be said that the two blocs have disappeared and consequently the international situation has changed?

The answer to this is that America and Russia agreed secretly to divide the world amongst themselves. They secretly agreed to keep the two blocs as a matter of formality and in a likewise manner they treated the differences between them. The aim was for each to preserve its strength and to be able to carry out the policies they agreed to, without affecting the strength of either of them. To reveal publicly their intentions of liquidating England as a colonialist power would undoubtedly cause the western countries to distance themselves from America and to gather around England which would in this case become a potential force that might threaten America and topple her from her mantle. Similarly, if they had revealed their intentions to pressurise China and possibly fight her they would have shaken the confidence of the communist states in Russia and thus her leadership of the eastern countries may have been endangered, thereby leading to her decline. So both sides thought that they should keep the two blocs as a formality in order to preserve their leadership over their respective camps. Accordingly, we could say that in reality, the two blocs are no longer in existence and hence the international situation has radically changed and returned to the state it had prior to the First World War.

This change has meant that today we have states working individually to obtain as many spoils as possible and at the same time they try to weaken other rival powers. The conflict is no longer between blocs but it is between one state and another. The present condition of the international situation is different from its condition prior to the First World War. Today, there are two powers which determine the international situation. The rest of the countries try to shield themselves from the harm of these two superpowers and to protect whatever spoils they have already seized. They also try to form between themselves some sort of grouping strong enough to face the two giant powers. Before the First World War, the major countries were close in strength to each other although the leading country was the strongest. This closeness then changed to a disturbance in the balance of power and a tense conflict over spoils which eventually led to the First World War. Today, such closeness between the two super powers jointly and any other country or between them and the remainder of the other countries in the world does not exist and therefore there is no danger of another war erupting. Moreover, if all the other countries grouped themselves together it is unlikely that such an action would cause friction that would lead to another war. A similar difference exists between the present condition of the international situation and its condition prior to the Second World War. Prior to the Second World War there was some kind of fronts of countries which were in reality separate. At the start, these countries were close in strength to each other. Then when Germany, Italy and Japan strengthened themselves, whilst England and France did not follow suit and America kept herself isolated, the balance of power was disturbed. This disturbance in power drove Italy, Germany and Japan to go forth and individually to start annexing other countries by war. These practices by reoccurrence led to a strong friction which resulted in the Second World War. Today, the international situation is represented by the two super powers. As long as this condition prevails, the possibility of an international conflict may occur between some countries and the super powers or between some countries with each other which may lead to a local war, but the strength of the two super powers makes them able to put an end to such a war whenever they wish to do so.

## **6. Changing World Powers**

In regard to the international situation, the world in the old times, had the Ottoman state, Prussia, Russia, Austria, England and France. These are the states which used to run world affairs, threaten peace and decide war. Then the U.S. came into existence, so it limited the authority of these states and constrained it into the old world, and distanced them away from America. Then Austria ceased to be a great power, thus the great states in the world became five: Russia, Germany, France, England and the Ottoman state. Later on the Ottoman state fell, so the four great powers which remained controlling the world became: Russia, Germany, France and England. After the First World War, Russia went into isolation as a result of the emergence of communism and the taking of power by the communist party. Germany was defeated in the First World War, therefore leaving two great powers: England and France. England then controlled all the world except America, and France started to run behind England. In the beginnings of the third decade, i.e. in 1933, the Nazi party took power in Germany, and started to promote its position till it became a great power. A little before that date Mussolini took power in Italy and started to work for promoting Italy's position until it was considered one of the great powers. Then the star of Japan emerged and its influence expanded after it became of the industrial countries, and it became considered as a great power. Thus, the great powers became six: The Soviet Union, Germany, England, France, Italy and Japan. America remained in isolation. After the Second World War Germany, Italy and Japan were defeated, and their position weakened. Besides that, America came out of its isolation, and rushed to participate in the world's affairs, and maintained England and France as great powers. So the great powers became four: The Soviet Union, England, France and the U.S. Then after the agreement between the Soviet Union and the U.S. in 1961, England and France both fell from being great powers, and the super powers became two: The Soviet Union and the U.S. and through their agreement they effectively became one power, and the world became one great power which is formed of two states, and no other states remained to control the world.

This is the situation of the states in the world, and this is the condition which we have arrived at to this moment.

It must be understood that the world is controlled by the great powers, particularly the leading power. These states could weaken and be replaced by other states thus changing the international situation. This change of the international situation changes the international position, i.e. it changes the form of relationships between the great powers, and creates a difference of strength and weakness between the position of the leading power and the position of the remaining powers which are competing with it. So the position of the leading state weakens as happened with England when it was competing with Germany, or it strengthens as happened with the U.S. when it hit England and France and made an alliance with Russia. It is important to understand this matter accurately and to develop this understanding so as to understand international politics.

### ***6.1 Motives Behind Global Struggle***

Since the dawn of history to the day of judgement, the motives of the nations for global struggle are either pride and the desire for sovereignty or the pursuance of material interests. Sovereignty is either for the nation as was the case with Nazi Germany or for the ideology as was the case with the Islamic state during its entire history, or the communist state for some thirty years.

The urge to stop other countries growing in strength as happened against Napoleon, the Islamic state and Nazi Germany is a desire motivated by sovereignty, because it is a stand

against those powers seeking to be sovereign. With the extinction of the Islamic state and abandonment of the idea of contradictions by the communist state the motives which control the whole world have become the pursuance of material interests. Unless the Islamic state returns once again as a major influential power in the global struggle there is no hope for the present situation to change.

Colonialism in all its forms is the most dangerous materialistic motive of the global struggle. This motive was the cause of the minor wars and indeed the two major world wars. It is the prime reason of unrest and trouble in the world. The First World War was ignited by Britain, France and Russia against Germany and Austria to prevent Germany taking the oil of Iraq. Britain ignited the Second World War and dragged France into it to prevent Germany from expanding into Russia and Europe. The visible and invisible conflicts between Britain and America are for the sake of colonialism and colonies. So the global struggle today is ruled by the motive of colonialism.

## ***6.2 The Concept Of World Peace***

The pursuance of material interests and in particular colonialist greed, created the political disputes between the states and especially the major powers. Indeed these disputes led to local and global wars. To prevent such wars, the idea of world peace was introduced and the pretext of protecting security and peace was invented. This pretext is not new. The Treaty of X-Lashapel signed in 1818 by the five major powers at that time was agreed upon with the pretext of keeping peace and security. By signing this treaty or “alliance” the five major powers made themselves the custodians of peace, security and order in the international community. These powers interfered in the affairs of other countries whenever there was a chance to do so using the pretext that a threat to world peace or monarchy rule existed. This pretence was used by the major powers as an excuse to intervene and to wage wars, and became an international slogan used to keep colonialism and the influence of the colonialist powers. The major powers pretended that to keep peace they had to form alliances between themselves and convene international conferences. After the first war, this job was transformed to international organisations. The peace treaties of 1919 included the establishment of an international organisation responsible for keeping peace and accordingly the League of Nations was formed. The organisation was supposed to keep peace but the establishing countries violated their promises and accords, and acted contrary to the intended aim of the organisation. These countries were supposed to yield their sovereignty and to let the organisation take upon its shoulders the responsibility of keeping peace and preventing wars. But the major countries did not yield their colonies and were concerned with protecting their interests and establishing the balance of power between them. Moreover, they divided between themselves the properties of the German and Ottoman states, with England having the lion's share. This resulted in the violation of peace for which the organisation was established. Several wars took place and ended with the Second World War.

After the Second World War, they tried to establish an international organisation to maintain world safety and security, where the major powers: England and the U.S. firstly, and then England, U.S.A., and the Soviet Union together with France discussed the necessity of establishing a post war world in a new form, that secures the stability of peace and prevents war. They added to that objective the easing of economic cooperation and of the other different systems and the protection of human rights. Since then, the United Nations Organisation became the protector of peace; and the words “peace” and “world peace” became an international slogan repeated by the different parties, and used by the major powers for maintaining the peace, and for preventing the other countries from liberation and emancipation from the shackles of colonialism. Thus the concept of maintaining the peace has developed till it settled in its current form.

The question of maintaining the peace by an international organisation created the superstition of disarmament, and England used it as a means to weaken France, and it encouraged Germany in rearmament in order to establish balance in Europe between Germany and France. Thus the subject of disarmament failed, and wars erupted that led to the Second World War. When the United Nations Organisation came, it pursued the subject of disarmament, and it still proceeds with it slowly. In other words it created the subject of disarmament to preoccupy the states with it. But until now, no major power managed to deceive another state as England deceived France in the League of Nations. The United Nations Organisation could not also create any effect, therefore the people rarely take notice of it, and it still remains as a name without a reality.

### ***6.3 International Conferences***

The conflict between the major powers has led to the convention of the so-called international conferences and created alliances between the countries. The first conference held in this respect was the Vienna Conference of 1815. Before the First World War several conferences of this nature were also convened, and among them was the Berlin Conference held to discuss the issue of eliminating the Islamic state and distributing its properties. After the Second World War several conferences were also convened; among them were the Berlin conference, the Geneva conference and Paris conference. But after the agreement between Russia and America, and the pact to act as an international power, such conferences ceased to be convened except that held in the year of 1969, when the delegates of the Major countries: France, England, Russia and the U.S., met within the U.N.'s agenda to discuss the issue of the Middle East. If we suppose that the leaders of such countries convene a conference, but within the United Nation Organisation, then this conference will not in fact be an international conference. After the Second World War it was customary that conferences be held to discuss the problems existing between the eastern and western blocs. Such conferences were favoured by the eastern bloc due to its weakness in the U.N.O. Russia tried to gain the initiative from the western bloc and to dislodge the U.S. from the leading position. She tried to discuss the problems in conferences held outside the U.N.O. and managed to achieve some success in the Berlin Conference when she widened the split between the U.S. on one side and France and Britain on the other, and when she also made the conference agree to the convention of the Geneva conference in which she enjoyed once again some success. So the convening of such conferences had weakened the U.S. and strengthened the Soviet Union. In the meantime England tried to convene conferences between her and the U.S. outside the U.N. to discuss her problems. Upon this effort the Permoda conference was held but to no avail for England. Since then no conferences have been held between the western countries except for those conventional meetings that used to take place between Britain and the U.S.A.. America has realised that convening such conferences outside the U.N. weakens her stand as well as her international position. For this reason, the U.S. no longer agrees to hold conferences outside the U.N. especially after an agreement - indeed an alliance - was reached between her and Russia.

### ***6.4 International Alliances***

As for the alliances between the states, they are very old and usually established between countries so that each one of them strengthens herself against the others, or to prevent each other from breaching the balance of power. The agreement of X-Lashapel signed in 1818 was in fact an alliance of the above nature and so were the alliances between England and France, and Austria and Germany. They were established to reinforce each other and preserve the balance of power. Similar to these was the alliance between England and France against Germany in the first war, the alliance between America, England, France and the Soviet Union against Germany in the Second War, both were formed to stand

against a major power. Also the North Atlantic treaty; established after WWII against Russia, and the Warsaw pact established against the western bloc after the second war were both alliances against another power. Thus the alliances like international conferences are means of reinforcement against other powers or are used to maintain the balance of power.

These are the sort of alliances which are considered tools of global struggle. There are other types of alliances or treaties which the major powers form between the small countries or between themselves and the small countries. Such alliances are not considered as direct means of global struggle though they are means of colonialism and reinforcement to the large country which creates them. The alliance convened between Iraq and Turkey and the pact known as Sa'ad Abad pact which preceded the Second World War were both created by England to affirm her influence in these countries and to shift the balance in her favour against the major powers like France and the Soviet Union. The pacts which England convened between herself and Iraq and between herself and Egypt before the Second World War aimed to affirm British colonialism and was not for the sake of war. The pacts created by England after the second war like the Baghdad pact or created by America like the South Eastern Asia pact were means of colonialism and to strengthen their influence and were not for the sake of war. For this reason such pacts are not considered direct means of global struggle. The alliances which are formed between the major powers are the only means of such nature.

### ***6.5 World Political Actions***

These are the foundations upon which the international politics in general and the policy of each influential country are established. In the light of these foundations, the political actions which take place in the world can be understood and explained in the manner that agrees with reality or comes close to it. Therefore, the political actions carried out by any state, whether big or small, can only be understood according to these bases or to what branches out from or relates to these bases. Only then the action can be understood, and its conjunction be cleared and linked with one of the aforementioned bases. At that time the action will be comprehended, its incentive will be revealed and even its results can be contemplated.

The political actions taking place in the world are many and related to different issues. The issues of concern here can be confined to four main issues: the question of Europe, the Middle East problem, the Far East problem and the question of Africa. The research has been restricted to these issues for two reasons:

1. The current conflict between America and Russia, which both form one global power on one side and the other countries, which were once major powers and try now to compete with the two superpowers on the other side, takes place in these four areas. Therefore, the problems relating to these regions are naturally the most important world issues.
2. These questions are the best examples to facilitate understanding other basic problems. Moreover, the majority of the political actions occur over these issues. Also, these problems are the main concern for those countries which were once major powers and now try to compete with the two superpowers. The Monroe Doctrine has put the new world under U.S. mandate and declared it a prohibited area for any other power. Thus, the new world has not entered the global struggle, although Russia had attempted that through her manoeuvres in Cuba to drag this part of the world to such a struggle.

But it must be realised that these four issues are in effect not the same and thus must not be studied according to the same principle. Every issue must be investigated according to its reality. As for the issue of Europe it relates to the existence of the major powers in their capacities as major powers to the balance of power, and to global control and its extent.

This issue is the oldest among the others and certainly the most dangerous to the so-called 'world peace'.

## 7. The Issue Of Europe

In regard that it was the oldest issue, this is so because it is the issue which founded the international community or society, for the sake of which the international law was invented. The reason that the European christian states formed the international society was to be able to stand against Islam. Similarly, to strike against Napoleon and to prevent the expansion of France, the holy alliance was formed. Also, to stop Germany taking the oil of the Middle East and to limit her strength, the First World War was instigated. Then to resist Germany and prevent her from disturbing the balance of power in Europe, the four major powers England, France, U.S. and Russia acted together to crush Germany and to stop her becoming once again a major power. To prevent the unity of Europe and to stop Germany recovering her strength, the political actions and manoeuvres are in the same manner, instigated by the two superpowers and England and France, although the latter two pretend to advocate the unity of Europe. Thus the issue of Europe is the most important amongst the others, and certainly occupies the main concern of the two superpowers as well as the other major powers.

The fact that the issue of Europe poses the greatest threat to world peace is manifested by the conduct and behaviour of France, England and Germany as well as Russia and America before their agreement, and in their behaviour as two super-powers after the agreement. Before agreement France, England and America used to represent the western bloc. Their main concern in the issue of Europe was how to wind up the Second World War. As far as the two blocs were concerned, the main discussion between them was about the future of Europe and Germany. The western bloc saw the need to unite Europe to stand against Russia, and America in particular was very much interested in reviving German militarism and building a strong German army capable of standing against Russia and able to find a new balance of power between Germany, France and England. Russia, who acted as the representative of the eastern bloc, saw the main danger coming from Europe in general and Germany in particular, and she therefore strongly resisted the reunion of Germany and the unity of Europe. She equally resisted the idea of a European army and rearmament of Germany. Through the cold war, the political actions and the diplomatic activities, she managed to achieve her aims. She stopped Germany from moving a step forward in her cause. But, since the agreement between Khrushchev and Kennedy which brought into existence the two superpowers, the situation has experienced a fundamental change, and both Russia and America now hold a united view towards the issue of Germany and the issue of Europe as a whole. This change made itself visible immediately after they ended their meeting when Kennedy announced that *“the Russian fear of a military invasion by Europe has its justification, since she has been attacked twice by Europe. First when France at the time of Napoleon attacked her, and second when Germany at the time of Hitler attacked her. Therefore, there must be a guarantee that such a European threat is not repeated, and to satisfy this, it might be necessary to disarm central Europe”*. This announcement indicates beyond any single doubt that the view of Russia and America towards the issue of Europe and Germany in particular had become united. As far as France is concerned it can be said that after de Gaul came to power till he visited the U.S. and met Nixon in March 1969, France was working to unite Europe and to make her a third global power standing between the two blocs. Therefore de Gaul worked to strengthen Germany to the limit that does not pose any threat to France, and to form a confederal union between the European countries, in which France would have the upper hand. He also tried hard to keep England away from Europe, because he realised that the traditional English policy, since dawn until now, was to keep Europe disunited. But after the resignation of de Gaul, the French policy towards Europe and Germany in particular is not yet known. As for England it began to strengthen her relationship with Germany, and notify her of the

American and Russian conspiracy against her advancement and strengthening. She started to try entering the E.E.C. to register herself officially as a European country and to use Europe as a force against the two Superpowers. So the issue of Europe before the existence of the two superpowers as one international super power, and after becoming so, has been looked at as an issue which threatens the ignition of war. For this reason, the issue of Europe is considered a dangerous problem for the so-called world peace. Accordingly, the issue of Europe must be studied in the manner that agrees with its reality and the degree of its danger. It is the top issue in the world among all others.

## **8. The Issue Of The Middle East**

As for the question of the middle East, it is an issue which relates to strategy, colonialism and means of communications. As for strategy, it was a matter of concern before the agreement of the two superpowers due to the fact that the Middle East formed the western belt in the military siege made against Russia. It was the first line to defend the Middle East and Africa, and for this reason military bases, which included nuclear bases were set up in the Middle East. Also, several attempts were made to link the Middle Eastern countries in military alliances, and many airports were built as well as motorways. However, since the agreement of the two superpowers the area no longer has the same military importance and for this reason, the military alliances were ignored and nuclear bases were removed. The two superpowers now work side by side to remove the British bases, and they succeeded in removing the base of Eden, and they are still working to remove the bases in Cyprus and Libya. They also succeeded in putting pressure on England to withdraw her military forces from the East of Suez Canal, and thus the Middle East has lost its strategic importance.

As far as the means of communications is concerned, the Middle East is very important because it lies between Europe and the Far East, Europe and Africa, and Russia and Africa. The Middle East, therefore controls commercial and economic communications, transportation of passengers whether they are merchants, businessmen, tourists or others, and the transportation of goods and raw materials; crude oil, steel, rubber, tin, phosphates or others depend on the means of communication in the Middle East, a matter which makes it of great importance in transportation and communication.

As for its colonialist importance, it is the cause of its misery and the reason for its elimination as a great state and a global power, and transformed it to a western colony for which the western countries compete to colonise and control. The huge quantity of oil in the Middle East which count for more than half of the world reserves, and the vast wealth of the raw materials which equal ten times the wealth of Europe and America together and which exist in Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Iran, India and other countries, are the reasons why the major powers race and struggle with each other to colonise it.

### ***8.1 Colonisation Of The Middle East***

The Middle East had been under the authority of Islam and the Islamic state till the middle of the eighteenth century. Since the conference of Berlin i.e. the end of the eighteenth century the great European states began attempts to invade it. France, England and Italy were the first to do so, and the policy of aggression persisted till the Islamic state, represented by the Ottoman state, was destroyed and the Khilafah was demolished. The matter settled down when the Middle East finally came under British colonial control and influence. The British influence was so wide spread that it included uncolonised countries like Turkey and Afghanistan. The share of France was scant and restricted to the north west coast known as Lebanon. The situation remained as such till the end of the Second World War when France was removed from the area and the British colonialism took a new shape in which the division of the Middle East was consolidated, and each division was made a separate state. So when the Second World War ended, the Middle East was entirely a western colony, and more precisely a British one. For this, the Middle East was then considered part of the free world and the western bloc, and the eastern bloc had no presence whatsoever. Two reasons helped England alone to colonise the Middle East:

1. The political, economic and international weakness of France which made her unable to keep pace and compete with England to colonise the Middle East.

2. The resolution of America after the First World War to follow a policy of isolation. For these reasons England alone colonised the Middle East during the whole of the nineteenth century until the middle of the twentieth century.

But after 1950 the situation radically changed and a new phase of colonialist conflict between England and America began to take place and resulted in the wars, coups, manoeuvres, conspiracies and small crises seen over the past years until the conflict reached a major crisis which started in 1964 and still exists till now in May 1969. The conflict between them will intensify sometimes and ease sometimes until one of the two powers expels the other or till a great power arises in the area and takes upon her shoulder the responsibility of ridding the area from all the colonialist powers, or in a precise term, until the Islamic state becomes a great state and a major power in the international field.

The question of the Middle East has no scope of discussion before and after the agreement of the two superpowers. The agreement of the two superpowers by comprehensive alliance has not caused any change in the situation of the Middle East, and has not introduced anything new to its issue in regard to international politics. This is so because from the start the Middle East was considered part of the free world and the western bloc. There was no room for the eastern bloc in this area, and Russia has nothing to do with it. Its issue remains confined between the western countries alone, whether before or after the agreement of the two superpowers. The problem is a conflict between America and England to colonise the area and to put it under their influence.

Before we talk in general terms about the conflict between England and America in the Middle East, we find it important to examine an important concept that relates to the nature of nations and apply it to the Anglo-American conflict.

### ***8.2 The Nature Of Nations***

Every people and every nation, is to a very large extent, influenced by the deeds she practices in her life. The influence of these deeds upon the nation is so strong that it creates in it many characteristics which turn, over time, to natural dispositions. The Arab nation used to earn its living from raiding and was accustomed to wars. This style of life developed in this nation a militant disposition and the feeling of responsibility towards the affairs of others. For this reason, the Arab nation was suitable to carry the message of Islam in the war revealed by Allah (swt) i.e. Jihad, which is a material fight for the sake of spreading the idea of Islam. It is a distinctive nature of the Arab nation to feel of itself as being a candle which burns itself to cast light upon the others and to feel responsible for them and to equate them with itself. The Muslim Ummah after embracing Islam became one single nation in which the militant nature has been developed and the idea to spread guidance to mankind and to offer human support has become an inherent part of it. No matter how much this Ummah declines and how far it goes away from its ancestors who embraced Islam and carried it to mankind by Jihad, it still as a whole preserves the militant nature and the feeling of responsibility to others and for spreading guidance to mankind.

The German nation spent years in internal wars and conflicts and had several of its generations engaged in wars with its neighbours like France. It obtained its earnings from industry and in particular the military industry. For this reason we find one of its main characteristics is the military disposition and excessive confidence in itself. Despite being badly fettered, this nation still frightens its neighbours and enemies who conspire to prevent it from departure.

The Japanese nation used to depend on trade and navigation. It lived on a small piece of land. For this reason we find that courage as well as tackling the matter from the right side is part of its distinctive nature. So this nation embarked on industry as soon as the industrial revolution took place, and managed to become a great country despite the smallness of its

land. It did not mind waging a war against China to annex part of it, and did not hesitate to attack America when she became a threat to her. Thus it was not surprising to find that one of the most important plans of America to control Japan was to make the Japanese industry built on a non-military basis i.e. on the basis of trade and economic development so as to prevent Japan from advancing in the international field.

The same case applies to the rest of the nations including America and the English who although they speak the same language are different, and even contrary to each other. Initially the English depended to a large extent on the fishing industry and shipbuilding. Then they embarked upon navigation and trade. This style of life created in them the nature of hunting the interests and exploitation, and made them adopt the character of the tradesman. Due to the smallness of England, the English had to seek the support of others exactly like the fishermen who assist each other at sea and rarely sail upon it individually. When capitalism arose, the English people embraced it. This, together with the aforementioned characteristics made utilitarianism deeply rooted in them. Thus, if one reviews the political life of England since existence till now one would find that it is based on seeking support from others and on a policy of “the bait and fish”. This policy is used by England whenever she wants to hunt something whether it is a country to colonise or a state from which it intends to seek support. It is therefore natural to see the entire policy of England based on the formation of alliances, blocs and partnerships. In the nineteenth century she used to make partnerships with other countries in colonialism. She used to allow some countries to colonise some lands so that these countries would stand on her side and defend her interests. She made France her partner in colonising the Middle East after the First World War for France to stand on her side in case the area came under threat. In fact England wanted to put France in the front line to defend the area, and it was once said that England would fight until the last French soldier.

England with this nature - the nature of the fisherman - used the oil of the Middle East to tempt America to come and have some interests in the area. England wanted the American presence in the Middle East to make America defend the area if it came under any threat. Upon this basis, rather to say by this natural disposition, the English have managed to bring America to the Middle East and paved the way for her to have some economic interests there. This was done before the Second World War and by this England guaranteed to use America to defend the area if something threatened them.

As for the Americans they are a wealthy nation living in a country of vast almost inexhaustible wealth. The American nation opened its country for all peoples. It engaged itself in a bitter struggle with the countries that were colonising it. It managed to obtain its independence by the force of arms and with awareness and realisation of the situation. It prevented the great powers from invading its land and threatened with war any one that dares to do so. Thus it protected the whole of America or the ‘new world’ from the danger of Europe and the great powers. As a result of this attitude, pragmatism became one of its natural dispositions; and the inclination towards the high values and the respect of them became one of its natural dispositions or characteristics. But the American nation, like the rest of the christian world, embraced capitalism and therefore came under the attraction of two factors: the factor of contentment and chastity, and the factor of utilitarianism and colonialism. When the Americans were content and chaste, England used to exploit them to strengthen herself in war and economy. When the Second World War took place and the Americans went to the Middle East they tasted colonialism and became captives of utilitarianism and capitalism. When this happened, the Americans released themselves from isolation and went out to colonise the nations and subjugate the world to their control and influence. The Americans will never go back to isolation because capitalism dominates them and directs their life, and utilitarianism alone controls their behaviour.

### ***8.3 The Anglo-American Conflict in The Middle East***

So because utilitarianism dominates both the English and the Americans, and colonialism is the method adopted by both in their international politics, and because their original characters differ as far as their origin, life style and means of sustenance are concerned, it is natural for the two nations to dispute and collide over the colonisation of other countries. And it is inevitable that this dispute will continue to dominate the relationship between them. The events of this dispute began in 1950 and started gradually to intensify till it has reached the present tense situation which overshadows the Middle East.

To explain this in general terms: after the Second World War the American and English policies remained side by side in a partnership. The two countries used to meet to study their policies and to arrange their plans and means. England allowed America to devour some benefits and get on with her occasionally, but if matters developed against her interests she used to resist America. When the issue of the Jews in Palestine arose, America wanted to establish a Jewish state in Palestine in order to use it as a tool in colonising the area. England had not decided yet on the establishment of a Jewish state. She was hesitant whether to make Palestine an entity in which the Jews would have the upper hand or a Jewish state. She wanted to arrange this matter to suit her colonisation of the rest of the Arab world. Therefore, she did not determine the issue and referred the matter to the U.N. to decide it. When the U.N. under the influence of the U.S. decided upon the establishment of a Jewish state England kept silent and left for the time to decide whether the region would digest the presence of a Jewish state amongst the Muslims or eject it. She followed in her policy towards the Jewish state the rule of "wait and see". On the other side, America started to push the steps forward to solidly establish Israel and to remove any obstacle standing in her way. England opposed America on this issue but secretly, and therefore the severe conflict between America and England over the existence of Israel began. Besides this, America tried to build oil pipelines through Jordan, Syria and Lebanon to the Mediterranean but England resisted these projects and could do so because she was deep-rooted in the area, and able to influence all the leaders of the region, since they were all her puppets. America then thought that the only way to change the situation of the region was to apply the same policies she applied in South America. That policy was to instigate military coups and bring military leaders to power. The first coup she plotted was in Syria led by Husni Az-Za'im who gave America the concession to build the oil pipelines which were actually built, and thus America overcame the difficulty thrown in her way by England. But with the feeling that America wants to colonise the area and wrest it from her, England started with all ferocity to resist America, but through political means and manoeuvres and the use of the people of the region.

### ***8.4 1950 Istanbul conference***

When the coup of Husni Az-Za'im occurred, England intensified her resistance to all the American projects, and the existing covert conflict between the two countries entered a new phase of almost a public dispute. After this the American diplomats in the Middle East realised the danger surrounding the military and the economic interests of the U.S. in the area. They thought that if the American policy remained side by side with English policy then America would be, as it was before the Second World War, a mere tool in the hands of England which would suffice to give America a spoon-full to keep her in the area to defend it, whilst England enjoys all the resources of the area keeping it under her own authority. The American diplomats in the Arab world saw this matter and were convinced that basic changes had to be introduced to Washington policy, and that this policy had to be revised. They thought of the necessity to cooperate with the people of the area to develop and integrate this policy. But at the same time they found themselves faced with huge problems in addition to the existence of Israel to which the Muslims conceal deep hatred and

animosity. Therefore, they felt it was necessary first to deal with these problems before making any serious thought of changing the area from an English base to an American one. Therefore they called for a meeting between them to discuss this issue. In November 1950 they convened the first conference in Istanbul chaired by Mr. George Magee the deputy in the ministry of foreign affairs for the Middle East and North Africa. The conference continued for five days where the diplomats reviewed in this secret meeting the most important political, strategic and economic conditions of the area. They agreed that if America is serious in changing the Middle East into an American base then there is no room for the American policy to remain linked with the English policy. They validated their argument by what happened in Syria when president Shukri Al-Quwatli refused to give the American concession to build the oil pipeline and that they had to plot the coup of Husni Az-Za'im to achieve this. Their argument gained more weight when the English in the same year 1949 instigated the coup of Al-Hinnawi and removed Husni Az-Za'im and brought Syria back under their influence. This conference is considered one of the best tools of directing the American diplomacy in the Arab field. The conference made certain recommendations to each of the White house, the Foreign department, the Ministry of defence and the Navy, and it introduced these recommendations with an important resume' briefed in the following:

The experiences of the Second World War proved that the Middle East is a fundamental base which has all the necessary elements for every military action against the Soviet Union. The attack on the Russian oil fields in Al-Qawqaz to deprive the Russian war machine from its richest oil supplies won't have much success if it depends on military cooperation with Turkey alone. Rather it requires building air bases in Syria, Lebanon and Palestine, and to transfer Iraq and Egypt into a big reservoir, that secures supplies of men, ammunition and food. They believed that these requirements are necessary for the success of any attack to surround and dismantle the Soviet oil fields in Bako and Al-Qawqaz as a whole. The military expeditions against Greece, Sicily and Italy dispatched during 1941 to 1944 made absolutely clear the extreme importance of the Middle East to supply and reinforce such types of decisive military operations which guaranteed victory to the allied forces and the surrounding of the opposing forces in the European castle.

They ended the resume with certain suggestions and recommendations agreed upon by all the participants. Among these recommendation were four important items:

1. The disassociation of the American policy from English policy in all issues concerning the Arab world.
2. Adopting the nationalist demands of the Arabs as the basis of the American policy in the Middle East.
3. Supporting Egypt in her demands from Britain and encouraging such moves in Iraq.
4. Desisting from the continual diplomatic and economic support of Israel, and encouraging the U.N. to implement the resolution to divide Palestine into two Arab and jewish states, and to implement also the resolutions which relate to the settlement of the Arab refugee issue on the basis of returning them to their homes, and to compensate those who don't wish to go back.

It was said the conference made a special recommendation regarding Egypt, and suggested that it be taken from Britain, and the latter must be expelled, and a strong regime be established to take charge of the whole region, because history has proven that Egypt is the gate of the Middle East region.

These suggestions were submitted to the American administration. The democratic party was in Government, and it usually inclined to be courteous to the English. Truman was the president of the U.S. and he came to power with the help of two factors: the jewish influence, and the British influence in some American circles. Truman was bound with certain commitments towards Britain and the jews. So these suggestions were not paid the

attention the diplomats hoped for. However, later on and in the time of Eisenhower they were considered seriously.

### ***8.5 America Leaves Its Isolationism***

Whatever the case was, the American policy after the aforementioned conference became active in the Middle East. America made a daring attempt to find peace between the Arab countries and Israel. She tried to expel England from Jordan and Iraq. So the American diplomats contacted King Abdullah to make a deal with him. Briefly, King Abdullah in this deal was asked to abandon England and work with America. In return, America would set his hands free to annex Iraq and Hijaz, annexing to it later on Syria and Lebanon, if in return he made peace with Israel. Americans promised to give him loans and the necessary assistance to develop and revive his state economically. King Abdullah agreed to go ahead with the project and started to make contacts to accomplish it. He went to Iraq and met Abdul-ilah and Nuri As-Said and opened the subject with them. He asked them to go ahead with him. But they contacted the British Ambassador and informed him of the king's plan. The English ordered them not to proceed with him and therefore they did not accept what the king said to them nor did they repulse him. They left the issue open. So the king went back to Jordan and then sent for Riyad As-Sulh (PM of Lebanon) asking him for assistance in the plan. Riyad As-Sulh accepted, and it seemed that he had already turned to the Americans. He went to Amman and on his way to the airport back to Beirut the English assassinated him. A week later king Abdullah was killed in Al-Aqsa Mosque in Al-Quds as a result of an open conspiracy made by General Klubb. The American ambassador had warned King Abdullah frankly of this conspiracy and of the danger in going to Al-Quds, one day before his assassination. As a result of this the American plan faded away. In the same year 1952, the American elections were held and won by the Republicans, Eisenhower was their candidate. He assumed power at the beginning of 1953. Following this the Anglo-American struggle intensified because Eisenhower was known to place the high military and global interests of America above the Jewish and British pressure. So the struggle between the two countries was acute, and one of the important aspects of this struggle is that America took Egypt and expelled England. Before this America had made a plot in Syria and brought to power her agent Adeb Ash Sheeshekly, So Egypt and Syria came under the dominance of America. Since that time, the Arab world has become a wide theatre for the Anglo-American struggle. Several events have occurred which made it like a ball moving from the hands of America to the English and back again, and so forth. This struggle manifested itself in several actions, seen in Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Yemen. However, most actions centred upon Syria, because it is in the centre, and can in general influence all Arab countries. So several political actions took place in Syria and the repetition of coups was most distinct. When the English viciously assassinated Husni Az-Zalim and ended his reign they took back Syria on a basis of democracy and started to join it with Iraq as a step towards creating the union of the fertile crescent. Indeed elections took place in Syria and a constitution for the country was written. The People's Party and the National Party controlled the power and declared in their manifestos the union with Iraq. America tried to hinder the English attempts but did not have the chance to do so until Adeb Ash-Sheeshekly came to power and controlled the situation from behind the scenes, and then publicly later, when he appointed himself the president of Syria. So Syria went back into American hands and stayed there until February 1954 when English agents with Iraqi support toppled Ash-Sheeshekly and thus Syria once again came into the hands of the English and parliamentary rule was restored. At this time England started to bring into existence the Baghdad pact and as soon as 1955 came an acute phase of the Anglo-American struggle over the area commenced. America started to play through Egypt the game of liberation, unity, and socialism, and Nasser engaged in a severe struggle with the English for the benefit of America. After prompting from America Nasser

struck a huge arms deal with the communist bloc and inspired within the nation the thought that he made this deal to fight and destroy Israel. This caused huge reverberations in the entire Arab nation. He adopted Arab nationalism and declared Egypt as an Arab country and registered it as such in the Egyptian constitution. He started to call for social justice, unity and liberation from colonialism. He also called for socialism, freedom and unity. These actions made the Arab nations gather around him. Nasser became one of the magnates of the Arabs. The means used by America to hit England and to create confusion amongst the people, helped the cause of Nasser. Despite the bitter enmity between America and Russia at the time, the former tempted the latter to come to the area and made it an international factor against England. Although America fights communism, she convinced Nasser to call for socialism. The arms deal Nasser made with the communist bloc was a factor which brought Russia to the region. Nasser's call for nationalism was a basic factor in the revival of Arab nationalism which was almost dead. The adoption of socialism which evolved from social justice helped the spread of leftist thought and made it prevalent within the public opinion in the area. The fight against foreign alliances by Egypt helped to cover the links of Nasser with America, especially since Nasser used to publicly attack American imperialism. Thus, the Arab nation had not even a grain of doubt that Nasser was the great rescuer sent by Allah (swt) to this Ummah to save her from colonialism. So all the people gathered around him except one band of people which did not have a significant influence on society or politics. This band tried to expose Nasser but more or less did not affect the situation and Nasser kept in full control of public opinion. Due to this the English agents who ruled Jordan and Iraq were in an unstable position, and the English agents in Syria and Lebanon were in a very bad public situation. Thus America had achieved a magnificent atmosphere to work to liquidate the English presence in the Middle East.

### ***8.6 Conflict In Syria..... Again***

At this time, Syria witnessed some internal developments. The popularity of Nasser helped to advance these developments which saw the union between the Ba'athist party and the Arab Socialist party. This union facilitated the Ba'ath party in gaining influence in the army. Both of the above parties adopted socialism as their ideology and raised the banner of "Unity-freedom-socialism". This helped them to exert a pressure on the rule, and later, to have a say in the governing of the country. Because Nasser raised the same banner the two parties had a golden opportunity to attract the nation around them and to push forward the process of socialism and unity. Now the government of Syria was under a strong influence of the Ba'ath party. The government allowed the Ba'ath party to have such authority because it wanted to avoid its harm and was also deluded into thinking that the party enjoyed a strong popularity. Therefore, Syria was in reality in the hands of the English but under the strong influence of the slogans of socialism and unity. Then Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal Company and England, France and Israel attacked Egypt. The outcome of this was that Nasser became the hero and his popularity reached the clouds. In this atmosphere the English agents did not dare to show up and were hardly felt.

In August 1957, some army officers met to discuss the situation in Syria. Realising that the western influence was deeply penetrating the country, they decided to usurp power and run the country from behind the scenes whilst keeping the president and the ministers in their posts. They achieved their aims and freed the country from the western influence which was at that time dominantly American, due to the fact that the ideas of socialism, unity and freedom adopted by Nasser, were widespread in Syria. The Ba'ath party being the ally of Nasser and enjoying the strongest influence on public opinion, considered the action of the officers as an act against the Americans, though in fact it was more against the English than the Americans. Despite this, the English met what happened with silence. While America went wild and seemed to act nervously to strike against the officers and bring Syria back to

western domain. However, all her attempts to achieve this failed. So Nasser came to achieve what the Americans failed to do. For this Nasser sent Mahmoud Riyad to Syria to propose unity with Egypt by which the latter aimed to control the former. Riyad had remarkable success in his mission and unity was put into effect. Thus America through Nasser went back to control the situation in Syria. Having achieved this, the Americans started to chase the English in Iraq and Lebanon. By 1958, Lebanon and Iraq were in turmoil. Now Egypt, Lebanon and Iraq were in the hands of the Americans. Nothing was left for the British except Jordan and Nasser chased them there to liquidate their existence completely from the region. But England did not despair and strived hard against this American assault. Jordan was the base for English activities and in 1961 England had success in recruiting forces in Syria loyal to her. The People's Party, the National Party and the Ba'ath, or the Ba'ath and Socialist Arab parties gathered against Nasser and the unity between Syria and Egypt. The unity came to an end and the English took control of the situation in Syria. In Iraq America toppled Abdul Karim Qasim because he deserted her and went to work with the Communists. So an American backed regime through the Ba'ath party was in control of the situation there. The regime started to work to join Syria and Jordan to Iraq. England was scared by this, so it fabricated a coup in Damascus and used the Ba'ath party there as a cover up and since that time Syria was in the hands of the English.

The above are examples of the Anglo-American conflict in Syria where the conflict was most distinct. As for the rest of the Arab world, Jordan remained under the grip of the English. The Jordanians being two thirds Palestinians depending on U.N. refugee cards and Palestinians working abroad, and one third Bedouins depending on their sons in the army, which helped England to keep firm control of the situation, and aborted American attempts to achieve what they had in Syria. Nothing significant really happened in Jordan except the demonstrations against the Baghdad pact and the fabricated coup made by King Hussain in 1957 to expel some of Nasser's agents in Jordan. Despite this, Jordan is considered highly as a potential target for conflict between the English and the Americans due to the vast resources it has beneath the ground and in the sea.

In Iraq, Abdul Salam 'Aref who succeeded the Ba'athists in power was himself a follower of Nasser. But the English agents from the politicians and the army officers had the right opportunity to act with little effort to control the army and the economy of the country. Iraq therefore returned to the hands of the English and is considered to be as such until now.

When Nasser usurped power in Egypt, it became the major American base in the area. Since then no significant political actions have happened there in relation to the Anglo-American conflict. The triple attack against Egypt by England, France and Israel was in fact an act of self defence by England to protect her imperialist interests. Thus no global conflicts have been taking place in Egypt.

In North Africa, America controlled Morocco when it became dependent at the time of King "Muhammad V", and it did so in Algeria through her agent Ahmad bin Billa. But when King Muhammad V died and was succeeded by Al Hasan, Morocco changed allegiance. In Algeria Bin Billa was thrown out by a coup instigated by the English through King Hasan and Muhammad Khaider. They attracted to their sides Tahir Al-Zubairi and Abu Median and helped them topple Bin Billa. In Libya and Tunis, America failed to achieve any significant breakthrough. The Middle East is therefore considered to be entirely under English dominance except Egypt for which a struggle is taking place between the two sides for its control. This struggle is bitter and it is the basic ingredient of the Middle east crisis.

### ***8.7 English Plans In The Middle East***

With reference to the conflict in the region, it is necessary to touch upon the recent English plan for the area. In 1964 hints emerged and seemed to indicate that England was making a comprehensive study of the issue of the Arab countries. As far as Israel was concerned, England became convinced that the area does not have the appetite to digest the presence of a foreign state, and the experiment of establishment of a Jewish state is a failure. England found however, that the idea of establishing a Christian state from the Muslims and the Arab Christians did prove to be possible in Lebanon. So England decided to adopt the idea of a Palestinian state consisting of the Arabs and the Arab Jews which means the revival of the White Paper put forward in 1939 to solve the problem. England put the new idea before the Jewish leaders and convinced them. Livi Ishkol, the then Prime Minister of Israel went to London and met the British cabinet of the Labour party which was in power, the Conservative party, some of the eminent English figures, and the Jewish leaders in Britain. Ishkol formally agreed to the plan and thus England sent Abu-Rukaiba to Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia to inform the leaders of these countries and some Palestinian figures of her plans and to obtain their agreement. These leaders agreed, and England seemed to have embarked on implementing the plan. As for the issue of the Arab States, England gave up all hope to reach an agreement with America to mould the area into a certain form. The Arab League failed to link between the countries of the area, and the establishment of one federal united state is an American plan, nevertheless it was seen by England as an impossibility. So England came up with a new plan to divide the Arab countries into four groups and to link the Islamic countries including the Arabs by an Islamic conference similar to the African Conference. England informed King Faisal of her plan and it might be possible that Abu-Rukaiba talked about it with the leaders of the region. England also called upon King Hussain, the Shah of Iran and King Hasan to support the plan, so they accepted the plan and soon King Faisal started to try to implement it.

This is the plan England wanted to implement in the area but she is faced with enormous American opposition. America incited her agents, Nasser in particular, to oppose the Islamic Conference. The idea of establishing one Palestinian state and abolishing Israel was resisted relentlessly by the U.S. This friction between America and England generated all those actions seen since 1965 till now (1969). From all that has been mentioned previously, it becomes obvious that the question of the Middle East, from the global viewpoint, was supposed to be a struggle between the inhabitants of the area and the imperialist colonialist powers. The course of action should have been similar to that which America herself did when she expelled the colonialist powers and established the United States, or the action of China after the Second World War when she rid herself of all foreign presence on her land and formed a prestigious state in the world. All of this is naturally expected from any nation that falls into the hands of foreign powers, when the nation achieves the global and local strength to free herself and form a state of considerable position in the world. Very sadly, the case was not so with the Middle East, and what a pity it is to see its issue a scene of bitter struggle between England and America to control and exploit the area and to prevent the people from even thinking of liberating themselves. Therefore, when the crisis of the Middle East is studied globally it is done so in the framework of the Anglo-American conflict, and to the extent that this conflict affects the peace in the region and the friction between the major powers.

## **9. The Issue The Far East**

As far as the question of the Far East is concerned it is totally different from that of the Middle East although it too is an issue of strategy and colonialism. If we consider the affairs of India as part of the Middle East problem, although its geographic position forms part of the Far East, then we are left with the five nations there. These are the Chinese, the Japanese, the Koreans, the Indonesians and the nation of Indochina. Every one of these nations has its own question. Before we talk about each individual part of the Far East, let us summarise the question in general terms. From a strategic point of view the Far East is considered very important to both the U.S. and the Soviet Union. From the side of the Pacific Ocean the Far East is considered to border the U.S. In this ocean there are two major powers that can form a threat against both the U.S. and the Soviet Union. These two powers are China and Japan. So from this consideration the question of the Far East is a strategic one. This explains the concern of the U.S. to have forces in this area to keep her presence there. America looked for this even before the Japanese strike against her in the Second World War. After this strike the Far East became a very important strategic region for the U.S. It is noticed that American warships and planes always go and come to this area. The Phillipines has been an American base since the Second World War. So America takes the utmost care in this area to protect herself from the potential danger in this region. As for Russia, the Far East directly borders it since no oceans separate them. Yet Russia doesn't take military precautions in the region, though she fortifies her borders with China and always tries to build friendly relations between her and Japan.

From a colonialist viewpoint, the area is mainly colonised by England, France, Holland and Portugal. Although America colonised the Phillipines, she did not take part in colonialism outside the new world when the trend of colonialism in the 19th century was very strong. Thus it can be said that England, France and Holland were the major colonialist powers in the Far East while Portugal had only a small share.

### ***9.1 British Policy In The Far East***

England colonised the island of Hong Kong on the south eastern coast of China. She also colonised Malaysia, Singapore and the northern part of Borneo island, Burma, Ceylon and India. The policy of England is entirely based on the protection of these colonies. When the western bloc was one unit before the agreement of the two superpowers, the British policy in the Far East was in disagreement with the Americans despite the fact that Britain looked at China as a market for her goods. She did not consider the Chinese presence in the eastern bloc a threat to her presence in the Far East. So England found no excuse to attack China or to create friction with her. She wanted to keep the area peaceful because any unrest would cause worry for English colonies. For this reason England opposed the Indonesian movements in their struggle to expel Holland. She adopted courteous attitudes towards China and recognised her, and she opened the door of trade with her. England therefore acted against the American policy in the area in order to protect her colonies, which were not only markets to the British goods but were also very rich in raw materials which England wanted alone to exploit. So the English policy in the Far East is centred upon keeping her colonies and her influence in the area in any form it may appear.

### ***9.2 French Policy In The Far East***

France managed after the Second World War to bring Indochina back under her control, an area consisting of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. This colony is considered the biggest and most precious French colony because it was a major source of wealth due to its richness in raw materials. However, France could not keep this colony because China on one hand and

America on the other got the better of it and France was forced to leave. China created and supported the liberation movement known as 'Viet Minh', which managed to overcome France and force her to withdraw from most of the Vietnamese land. France was militarily and politically defeated and had to leave completely. America on the other hand wrested the colony of Indochina from France. She pretended to help France but at the same time she was supporting the revolution against France by covert means. She put France in a sensitive position: either to stay with the support of the western bloc particularly America, or become desperate from the revolution against her. Eventually a Geneva conference was convened and the question of Indochina was discussed. The outcome of the conference was the exit of France from the area and the entry of China to North Vietnam.

In Indonesia, America encouraged the Indonesians to revolt against Holland. A veracious revolution took place which was supported by both America and Russia despite both being diametrically opposite. England took sides with Holland but the Indonesians won the battle. Then the issue was taken to the U.N. where America stood on the Indonesian side and the U.N decided on the independence of Indonesia. So Holland left Indonesia and nothing was left except for western Airyana. But Indonesia with the support of America chased Holland even from these areas.

Portugal had colonised Goa in India. When India saw Holland forced from the area she too was encouraged to expel Portugal from this colony. England and America supported India till Portugal was out.

### ***9.3 American Calls For Independence In The Region***

So the only colonialist powers remaining in the area were England and America. Before the agreement of Russia and America, England felt safe with her colonies. But after the agreement and the change of the international situation, England began to worry and came under threat. This happened when America started to try and expel England and replace her. America shrewdly called for the end of colonialism and the independence of the nations. England used a policy to overcome this by creating a union between the North of Borneo Island, Sirwak, Sabah, Malay and Singapore and called this unionist state Malaysia. Thus England changed the form of colonialism in the area. But America responded to this English trick and incited Indonesia to ask for the north of Borneo Island. Indonesia started to attack Borneo, Malay and Singapore through rebels and encouraged the inhabitants to revolt against the English. So a state of semi-war which was called the 'confrontation policy' existed between Indonesia and Malaysia. This situation continued for some years. When the two superpowers signed the agreement which included the liquidation of military bases from the world and the liquidation of England from the Far East, the pressure on England was great and as a consequence she decided to abandon her base at Singapore and to withdraw her forces from East of Suez and the Far East. However, through her agents, England became active in Indonesia against Sokarno who led the confrontation policy. America was content to remove Sokarno from the Indonesian theatre and brought her agents in the army headed by Suharto. When England left Singapore the latter was separated from Malaysia which consisted now of North Borneo, Sirwak, Sabah and Malay. After this the area enjoyed a relative calmness and the preparations were confined to strike against China. It seemed that the plan of the two superpowers was to liquidate England completely from the Far East. The success of the two superpowers in putting pressure on China is an indication that the battle to remove England from the area completely was definitely under way and it is only a matter of time and a matter of implementing the policies already drawn to achieve this aim.

America maintains a colonialist treaty between herself and the Philippines. This treaty is to a large extent similar to the treaties which linked Egypt, Jordan, Iraq and other countries to Britain. Although in theory the Philippines is not an American colony, in practice it is.

After the success of America in expelling Holland from Indonesia she tried to replace her there. But Indonesians resisted her for a long time and refused to expel one colonialist power and bring another. America then started to create difficulties for Indonesia. She instigated revolts and acted passively against the English attempts to infiltrate Indonesia through her agents. She encouraged Chinese immigration to the country and opened the way for communism. As a result of these harassments the Indonesian leaders yielded and accepted American loans and military assistance. So Indonesia fell under American influence and became one of her followers. After the agreement between the two superpowers the American position in Indonesia became stronger and she became the dominant force in the army and the economy.

In addition to Indonesia, America controlled Indochina after expelling France, and controlled Korea after the Korean war. America is expected to inherit the English colonies after expelling the latter from the region. America would then be alone in controlling the Far East strategically and Imperially, especially since the American influence in Japan is very strong and China is contained. Therefore the question of the Far East would have been changed from a global issue to an issue between the two super powers.

#### ***9.4 Liberation In The Far East***

This is the situation of the Far East question in general. As far as the nations of this area are concerned they are lower in intellectual standard than the nations of the Middle East. However, the idea of liberation which spread in the world prior to and during the Second World War and became more popular after the war influenced the nations of this area more than the nations of the Middle East. This was so because the idea of liberation was brought to them by the Communists and it was part of the Communists struggle against capitalism. The idea came from Russia through China in a strong form. Thus the nations of Indochina revolted against France before and after the Second World War as did the nation of Indonesia against Holland. The Korean nation embraced communism which influenced it to a certain extent. Also the nations of Malay, North Borneo and Singapore all revolted against England. The result was that Indonesia expelled Holland and became independent, Korea became a strong country as did North Vietnam, and England was forced to create the Union of Malaysia. All this was by the virtue of the idea of liberation which spread strongly in the region. It can be concluded that it is possible to free this area from western colonialism and prevent communism from spreading within it.

## **10. The Issue Of Africa**

As for the question of Africa, it is a new problem which emerged on the global level just after 1960. It is a question of colonialism and nothing else. Africa is intellectually backward but has vast resources of raw materials and unlimited animal and agricultural wealth. When the colonialist countries rushed in the late 18th and 19th century to colonise the other countries, Africa did not escape this imperialism. Every power tried to wrest as much as it could from this continent and clashes occurred between the colonialist powers. Therefore, the majority of these powers enjoyed some control over various parts of the continent, and Africa became a European colony. England, France, Spain, Holland, Germany, Italy, Portugal and Belgium had colonies in Africa. But England had the lion's share followed by France, Belgium and Portugal. These eight colonialist countries kept their African colonies till the end of the Second World War. When the charter of the United Nations was laid down it included articles calling for an end to colonialism. But these articles made the process of liquidation of colonialism gradual. For this reason the major powers came to discuss this only after 1960. But before this date some colonies like the Italian ones were put under mandate as a prelude to end colonial rule over them. Also some political actions were taken towards this goal, of the most important were the emergence of the idea of Positive Neutrality, the conferences of Positive Neutrality and non-partiality (Non-alignment). The idea of positive neutrality was originally English which Churchill, Premier of Britain, passed to the English agent Nehru and asked him to announce it as the policy of India and spread it amongst the Asian countries. The secret behind this was that Britain had seen that her colonies in the Far East and Asia were under threat from America and Russia. The latter encouraged the inhabitants of these areas to liberate themselves from colonialism, and Indonesia was the first to achieve this. As for America, she started to put pressure on England to give independence to her colonies. Then America would attract these colonies to her through loans and experts.

### ***10.1 The Idea Of Positive Neutrality***

As for the independence of the colonies, England was very well versed in how to use it as a tool to change her from colonialism of the area. She gave independence to some of her colonies and then formed from these independent countries the British Commonwealth. So England did not bother about the idea of independence, rather she encouraged it because she knew how to use it to affirm her colonialism. But England was afraid that America through her loans, assistance and experts, and Russia through the idea of socialism and liberation would dominate these independent countries. Therefore, it brought the idea of positive neutrality and gave it to Nehru to adopt and use for facing America and Russia. Nehru started calling for this idea with noticeable activity. Russia realised the aim behind this idea and supported it to make use of it. Russia was hopeful that any independent country that becomes neutral could be detached from the West. As for the American politicians, some supported it because it would help America attract the neutral states towards her to accept loans and financial aids, and some of them opposed it because it would enable communism to spread in these countries. Anyway, Nehru went on calling for the idea and wanted to create practical measures to represent the idea, so he contacted China to convene a conference for the neutral countries. China responded to this idea immediately and a committee to prepare for the conference was set up. The committee contacted the newly independent states to attend the conference. Indonesia was a member in this committee and she had not yet fallen into the American orbit. But she was afraid to be thought of on the side of communism. Indonesia seemed to have sought the opinion of America. Eisenhower who was in power, believed in the idea and so America gave Indonesia the green light to go ahead with the idea. Indonesia suggested that the conference

be held on her land in Bandung. The committee approved this and indeed in 1954 the conference was convened in Bandung. Russia, China, England and America all tried to exploit the conference to their advantage. However, the decisions of the conference were to the satisfaction of Russia, China and America but not England who wanted the conference to discuss principally the idea of neutrality and not liberation. Also America exploited this conference enormously and pushed Nasser, Tito and Sukarno to support the conference and adopt this idea strongly. The latter adhered to Nehru, the first to call for this idea, and began to call for liberation from colonialism and to attack the colonialist countries. They focused their attention on Africa, and by 1960 the idea worked in Africa, and America started to have agents there. Since then the conflict began in Africa and America seriously started to try to expel the colonialist powers to replace them. To achieve this, she began to pressurise these powers to give the colonies their independence. Before this, America had worked to flare up a revolution in Algeria and recruit agents for her. She made Egypt and the Arab countries support this revolution which had a strong influence on the colonialist powers to abandon their colonies. England was expert in granting independence and soon she gave independence to several colonies and this created the states of Zanzibar, Tanganyika (Tanzania), Nigeria, Uganda, and the Union of North Rhodesia and Niasaland and others. As for France, she waited initially but de Gaul saw that the situation in the world had quickly changed and decided to follow in the footsteps of England.

De Gaul gave independence to several countries including Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Senegal, and Gabon. As for Belgium, she used to colonise the Congo, the treasure of Africa and the richest in Uranium, the basic element for making nuclear bombs. So it was not easy to give this colony its independence especially that the companies which mined the Uranium in Katanga, one of Congo's governorates, were controlled by England. Therefore, it was a major question whether to give Congo her independence or not. But America tightened the screw against Belgium until Congo gained her independence. When this happened England went wild and pushed her agent Moïse Tshombe to declare the independence of Katanga. America took the issue to the United Nations which sent an international force to bring back Katanga. The U.N. secretary Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld went there, but England intrigued to assassinate him and did so. The dispute between America and England intensified and remained as such for several years until America overcame England and established a government under her direction and removed Tshombe. The Congo question cooled for a while, but England worried about the Union of Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Niasaland. So she dissolved this union and gave Niasaland its independence and it was called Malawi. She gave Northern Rhodesia independence and it was called Zambia. She tried to keep Southern Rhodesia in a suitable situation to keep it under her colonialism. But America still harries her there and the question of Rhodesia is still under discussion.

## **11. Political Traps**

This is how the global question shifted to Africa and the question of this continent became a global one. It is still so, despite the fact that America, England and France agreed on a pattern for Africa with one bond called the Organisation of African Conference (O.A.U.). The dispute is still going on between the powers, America and England in particular, inside and outside the Conference.

These are the major problems to which the political actions relate. But this does not mean that the political actions which occur relate to these issues only. It means that these issues are the most important aspects of the struggle between the states. The struggle between the states during peacetime exhibits itself in political actions which may be accompanied with military actions as was the case in Vietnam and the Middle East, or may not be so, as in the case of Africa regarding Rhodesia and South Africa. We brought these four issues as examples for political actions because they are the most important cause of friction between the states.

However, political actions also take place outside these issues; and it is not necessary that a struggle take place between the states for these political actions to occur. As long as there are great powers which compete and intrigue with each other, political actions are either to set traps for others, or to weaken other states, or simply for the state to strengthen itself, or for other matters. The examples for such actions are numerous. For instance, when England introduced the idea of disarmament to the League of Nations she wanted to weaken France. England started to put pressure on France to implement this idea and pretended that she reduced her weapons as a step towards this aim. France trusted England and embarked in reality to reduce her weapons and limit her armament. This was an intrigue by England to weaken France in relation to her and in relation to Germany as well. Because of this France could not stand in the face of Germany during the Second World War, and collapsed in astonishing speed, due to the reduction of her armament.

### ***11.1 The US and China***

As another example, when the Second World War took place, Russia became active in China and established and supported a strong communist Party to take control of China. America, initially, used to support the then existing regime, then supported Shan Kai Tschec and made him give the Communists some governmental posts. The Communists became strong and had good influence. Then they distanced themselves from Shan Kai Tschec and started to fight him. America openly supported Shan Kai Tschec and provided him with money and weapons but to a limited extent. At the same time she supported the communist Party secretly and restricted the activity of Shan Kai Tschec. She kept her well calculated secret plans in motion till the Communists triumphed and controlled the power in China and expelled Shan Kai Tschec and confined him to Fermoza island. Shan Kai Tschec suspected that America supported the Communists and he was surprised of that. He did not imagine America would weaken him and support the Communists because he never thought that America would work to make China a communist country. He attributed this to American ignorance and their unawareness of the situation. But later on it became clear that America put the plan to make China communist in order to stand before Russia and to divide and destroy the eastern Bloc. Indeed, the American plan succeeded, though it took almost twenty years to achieve. This was a political action taken by America and considered one of the great global traps.

### ***11.2 The US and Europe***

Also, Europe left the Second World War wrecked, poor and threatened by Russia. So she threw herself into the arms of America and appealed for her help. America responded quickly and put forward the Marshall plan. The American help started to flow to Europe in economic aid, arms and experts, and through this America entered as partner in the companies, and encouraged the European elites to migrate to America. She also linked the European economy with hers, and in over ten years Europe became a follower of America and under her umbrella. The European economies in general became owned by the American companies. So American help was an intrigue to link Europe with her, to tempt the European elites to migrate to America, and to participate in the economies of Europe.

### ***11.3 The US and Germany***

Also, when Germany left the Second World War with inflicted wounds, economically wrecked, and her industry destroyed, America rushed to help her. America was aware that the arms industry is the basis upon which any country should establish its industry if this country wants to be an industrial state. So if Germany revived her industry on this basis soon she could once again become a great power. So America offered her help to Germany and took on her shoulders the responsibility of building her industry, but on an economic basis and not a military one, and on the basis of growth and not an arms industry. Besides this she paved the way for the American companies to enter Germany. She established the German industry with American money, and thus America hit Germany militarily as a state and economically as a nation. Huge factories were built in Germany, the economy improved greatly and Germany's wealth became much greater than it was before the war. The world witnessed the quick revival of German industry. But in reality Germany committed suicide when she let her industry grow on this basis. She will never stand on her feet again as a great power unless she reviews her industry and establishes it on the basis of arms. She also will not progress economically unless she expels American companies and money. Therefore, the American help to Germany in the form it was made, was a political action and an international trap into which Germany fell. It hit Germany instead of helping her.

### ***11.4 The Cuban Missiles***

In another example Castro, the Cuban leader, contacted the communist Bloc and asked for Russian help, America was not annoyed though the Monroe doctrine prohibited any country from even thinking of invading America. When Russia began to supply Castro with arms, America remained silent although according to the traditions of the states, this was an indirect interference in America. When Russia installed nuclear missiles in Cuba, America was aware of this but remained silent again. The American reaction to this matter was not because she was afraid or ignorant of what took place, where Cuba is but a few yards away, but it was an intrigue to pull Russia to the New World and expand her influence widely to such an extent that she would not be able to protect this influence and would weaken the Russian position and put it under American reach. So many politicians and even some Russians considered this Russian action as stupid. Had not the two superpowers agreed between them, this Russian expansion would have been pernicious to herself.

It should not be said that America was annoyed at this and a war was about to happen had the Russians not pulled out their missiles. This is so because Kennedy's threat to Russia and the withdrawal of the missiles by Khrushchev was a fabricated operation by both sides. Part of the agreement between Khrushchev and Kennedy required America to dismantle her nuclear base in Turkey and for Russia to abandon her nuclear base in Cuba. America could dismantle hers without much fuss because Turkey would not be really hurt and no

misunderstanding would happen between America and Turkey. But if Russia willingly withdrew her base from Cuba, this would mean giving up the protection of Cuba, and would stir up the communist countries and Cuba in particular, and would cause misunderstanding between Russia and Cuba. Therefore, it was necessary to devise a way to dismantle this base without affecting Russian relations with the communist countries. For this reason, the two superpowers agreed that America should create a cause to create an international crisis that makes Russia abandon her base. But Kennedy timed the crisis to his advantage because he saw that England mobilised her troops in Aden and Bejan to interfere in Yemen against the Egyptian army to expel it; he saw that England really started to provoke the Egyptian army, and tried to attack it from Bejan. When Kennedy saw this, he brought on the issue of the nuclear missiles in Cuba and an international crisis broke out. England and France were frightened from the break out of a World War, so England held back from intervening in Yemen, and Khrushchev pretended to retreat from Cuba and showed his readiness to pull out the nuclear missiles if America dismantled her base in Turkey. Kennedy pretended to review the situation. Then the Russian base in Cuba followed by the American base in Turkey were removed. This was the reality of this issue. It was fabricated to help Russia remove her base, and it was used also to scare England.

The evidence that American silence over the Russian base was an intrigue and a trap could be derived from what happened in Greece after the Second World War when the communist revolution took place there. Tito suggested to Stalin that Yugoslavia should intervene in Greece and establish a communist state, which would join the communist Bloc. But Stalin was aware of the danger of that suggestion, so he said frankly to Tito: Do you want us to establish a base on the Mediterranean sea against the strongest and the richest state in the world? And can we protect this base? All we can do is disturb America. To take Greece from her is a matter out of our reach and we will not think of it.

### ***11.5 Neutrality Of Turkey In WWII***

Another example: When the Second World War started, Hitler was worried that Turkey might enter the war on the side of England, i.e., the allies. He knew that the ruling Ataturk's party known as the People Party was pro England and very appreciative of her favour, and thus it would be easy for England to pull Turkey to her side. Hitler was aware that if Turkey entered the war it would threaten Germany considerably because:

1. They are a brave nation and braver than the English, the French and the Russians and thus could be a potential force in the war.
2. The Turks are Muslims and therefore their entry in the war would drag the feeling of Muslims, Arabs and non - Arabs, against Germany and this would have an important role in the international propaganda.
3. Turkey has an excellent strategic position, and if it was made neutral, it would form a shield on the north west frontier, and prevent the alliance from entering Europe, and also prevent any attack on him from behind.

For all these reasons Hitler was determined to make Turkey neutral in the war, bearing in mind that there was no hope for her to enter the war against the allies. To succeed in making Turkey neutral, Hitler sent Von Paben - the most cunning person among his men - as ambassador to Turkey. But to hide his real intention, Hitler deluded the other sides to think that the mission of Von Paben was to attract Turkey to the German side against the allies. So the allies started to work to make Turkey neutral, and their ambassadors put great efforts to achieve this aim, especially when they saw the apparent endeavour of Von Paben to pull Turkey to the German side. Due to this political game and the cunning of Von Paben, Hitler succeeded in making Turkey neutral in the war. Of course, it would have been easier for the allies to invade Germany from the Turkish side if they had Turkey on their side, but the allies were afraid of opening this front, and were keen to keep Turkey

neutral, thanks to the trick of Von Paben; and thus such political action could be effective in the war.

These are examples of political actions which countries carry out against each other in the field of global struggle. They are designed as international traps, or to weaken other countries, or to be political manoeuvres or for other reasons. These actions occur in the international life as well as in the four main problems discussed previously. In the latter case, the action would be confined to one point, and between the two or more rival powers. But when they happen in the general international life their effect would be great. For this reason the politician should not limit his mind only to the important question but he should make his view wide enough to encompass every political action carried out by a major power.

It is important to mention that when viewing the political actions, the politician must avoid abstraction and generalisation and relate every action to its own surrounding conditions and conjunctures. It is incorrect to view the action isolated from its conditions, and it is incorrect to generalise the issue, or to compare an action with other actions. Also it is incorrect to arrange the actions in a logical way to produce logical conclusions. Nothing is more dangerous than the logic and analogy, because the actions of life are diverse and different and every action has its own conditions and surrounding circumstances. So every action should be linked with the related political information and studied amid the conditions and the circumstances in which it occurs, and only then can an understanding close to the truth be reached. The examples for this area are more than ample. The daily actions which take place on the international scene and the activities of the great powers provide us with examples which show very clearly the link between these actions and state policy, or the international situation, or the conditions of the countries; and that every action has its own conditions and circumstances. For example in April 1969 North Korea hit an American spy aircraft in the Far East. America was shaken by this incident and the American national security council met to discuss the issue. When the meeting ended President Nixon announced that America would not take revenge for the incident, and all that America did was to decide to protect her spy aircraft and ships. However, when North Korea in 1968 seized an American spy ship, the U. S. was shaken and the American national security council was convened. Then President Johnson declared threatening measures and the seventh fleet in the Pacific Ocean moved towards Korea. But when America saw the futility of threatening measures and the war of nerves she decided to resort to negotiation and reconciliation to free the crew of the ship. These two actions were of the same nature, a small country (Korea) resisted a great power (U. S.) by hitting her aircraft and killing its crew and then capturing her ship and the crew, so why did the U. S. react differently? Was it because the persons in charge of U.S. policy were different? Maybe so; or was it because the threatening measures did not work? Maybe so. However it seemed that the circumstances which surrounded the seizure of the ship were ordinary, and China was busy with her cultural revolution. America thought that her threats would not really lead to any possible danger. The circumstances of the spy aircraft were not, however, ordinary. Firstly, Russia at that time was mobilising her land and air forces in central Europe, and her navy in the Mediterranean against England who mobilised her navy in the Mediterranean as well. China was eager to show herself up to the world after the isolation imposed on her by the cultural revolution, and try to meddle with Russia to achieve this purpose. Amid these circumstances Nixon found it unwise to direct any threats to Korea fearing the interference of China which might lead to serious friction. Also there was England who might have exploited the situation to provoke action against the eastern Bloc. So Nixon did not make a threat or embark on a war of nerves for these reasons. The conditions of both events were different and so were the responses to them.

### ***11.6 1968 Middle East Crisis***

Another example: When Nixon became president of the U.S. (in 1968) he immediately paid a visit to Europe claiming that he would like to consult his European allies before making any contacts with the Russians in regard to the Middle East crisis. It would have been possible to believe him had not there been other circumstances which through thorough reflection, revealed that England was making contacts with the European countries to have them on her side in the Middle East crisis and to convince them to stand against Russia if this would mean another World War against the eastern bloc. Because the situation was very critical, Nixon decided to visit Europe soon after he became president to separate Europe away from England.

### ***11.7 Russian Invasion Of Czechoslovakia***

Another example: In 1968 Russia invaded Czechoslovakia and made the Warsaw Pact take part in the invasion with the exception of Romania. Their armies entered Czechoslovakia on the pretext of protecting communism, the communist state and the communist party against a possible western attack. Possibly some danger of this nature was present. However, the situation was more critical than just protecting communism, because the communist party there did not do anything except try to interpret communism. The actual matter was that the Russian fleet on the Egyptian coast came under threat from England, who mobilised her forces in the Mediterranean. Also Israel might have attacked Egypt in which case Russia would have to intervene under the pretence of protecting communism and England might have then been prepared to hit Russia. So it was essential for Russia to prepare herself for war. To supply reinforcements from Russia through Gibraltar is difficult and its a long route. So the alternative was to gain an outlet on the Mediterranean close to Egypt. For this, Russia mobilised 2 million soldiers, three thousand planes and nuclear arms in central Europe. She also prepared the Warsaw Pact to take part in the war. The forces of the pact entered Czechoslovakia openly to frighten England and to gather in Central Europe ready to penetrate Yugoslavia and Albania to reach the Mediterranean had Russia engaged in war with England. So the intention behind the invasion of Czechoslovakia was to scare England and to make herself and the Warsaw Pact ready and prepared for war.

In this way the political actions are linked with their origins and studied amid their circumstances and conditions. They should be understood on the day they happened not the day before, observing any development and change which may take place in a single day and even a single hour. It is incorrect for someone to standstill at a time already passed even if this time was an hour or even minutes. He should proceed ahead with time and understand the events in the light of the latest developments and actions.

## 12. The Major World Powers

The political actions which are a place of consideration are those carried out by the major powers. So it is essential to have information that tells us which are the major powers and we should have important information about each of these powers. The major powers are those which have influence on international politics and can affect the other major powers by the actions they carry out. The major power is not one which necessarily has a large population or is rich in similar matters. Rather, major powers are those which have effect on international politics and the other major powers. Therefore, the major powers at the present, in 1969 are America and the Soviet Union. These two superpowers are the major powers because the international situation is decided by them; the other countries are not considered major powers. However, since England and France were major powers before the Second World War and they still struggle to remain, England in particular, in international politics, and they carry out actions to influence world politics, and influence Russia and America, so England and France may be called major powers, and allowed to be called as such due to the fact that England still carries out some political actions which give her some presence in world politics, as is the case with France who tries to prove herself in international politics. Accordingly, the major powers at present are four: the two superpowers America and Russia, and England and France. As for China, it is difficult to consider her as a major power though her population is 800 million, although Russia gives her some consideration as does America. There are two reasons for not considering China a major power.

1. She has never been a major power before or had any influence on international politics.
2. Moreover, China became a communist country and until now she has not been able to influence world politics in any significant way. She has been trying for several years to undertake political activities in Africa and some Asian countries but to no avail, and could not continue this activity and retreated to her original orbit, therefore China is not a major power. Although India has a population of 420 million, Indonesia more than 100 million and Pakistan 100 million, none of them should be thought to be a major power because it is a remote possibility for any of them to have influence on world politics.

As for Japan, she had some influence on world politics before the Second World War during the days of the Axis, but it was temporary similar to the position of Italy. So neither Japan nor Italy are considered major powers. As for Germany, it was as a nation and a state a major power, but after her defeat in the Second World War she lost status exactly as happened to her after her defeat in the First World War. Therefore, as she returned to being a major power shortly after the first war it is possible for her to become a major power once again, no matter how long this may take. So the nations which can be major powers and have influence on the world political arena are: The American nation, The Russian nation, the English nation, the French nation and the German nation. Others have a very remote possibility to enjoy such status although some nations like the Italian and Japanese had unexpected upsurges before the Second World War. So if one wanted to know the major countries or visualize them he has in front of him these five nations and nothing else. They are alone the major powers in the international community during recent history. Therefore, it is better to have a brief idea about each of these countries.

As for the Muslim nation (Ummah) she was a major state until the crusade wars. Then she became a major power once more after her victory over the crusaders and continued as such till the 19th century. After this, she shrank and became a small power and made no attempts to return as a major power. Rather she continued to shrink until removed from existence. Despite that half a century have passed since its removal, and no tangible actions by the

Islamic Ummah as an Ummah or by any of its peoples have been carried out to restore the Islamic state as a major power. Although there are attempts by some political parties to re-establish the Islamic state as a major power, these attempts are not considered done by the Islamic Ummah or even by any one of her peoples. Therefore, the Islamic Ummah now is not considered a major power like the German nation, and accordingly these five nations are the only major powers in the world.

### ***12.1 The Growth Of The US As A World Power***

As for the U.S., she was colonised by Europe and England in particular, and was divided into several states. She first tried to reduce the pressure of English colonisation then entered into a strong war of liberation against her and succeeded in expelling England from the country. Then these American states agreed to form a union between themselves and emerged as a single state. The new state started then to annex other states until the state emerged in its present form. The U.S. now consists of 51 states and enjoys a powerful position in the world. She was able to enjoy a powerful position in the world, and was able to protect the two American continents from the European countries and has become another world, known as the New World. The U.S. was built by a conscious, clever and active nation. She established a governmental system, democratic, but unique, and based on a deep realisation and practical comprehension of the meaning of rule being a rule for the people administered by human beings. She did not develop logically the ideal rule but contemplated it practically and realistically and this is seen well in the way of appointing the President and the broad authority given to him, his role in the state and the authority to define the responsibilities of the other state organisations. This American realisation of rule is also manifested in the strong unity of the state upon which it is based, although the American system is a system of union. Also this practical understanding is clear in the absolute choice given to the people in electing their President and selecting the state organisations. All this enhanced the strength and the growth of the state power quickly. Before the Second World War the U.S. was trapped in isolation away from the political affairs of the world, satisfied with her own world. But after this war she decided to pick herself up from this isolation and take part in the administration of the world and limit the ambitions of the rest of the major powers.

In America, there are two prime parties, the Democrats and the Republicans. The written policies and also the policies followed in practice by the two parties are hardly different. The two parties almost follow a single program, and very little change takes place during the circulation of government between the two parties whether in domestic or foreign policy. If some changes happened to take place it would be as a result of certain surrounding conditions and not an alteration of the parties programs. The Democratic party is the inveterate party and it is the party of the nation and has an overwhelming majority among the people. Therefore the congressional majority is always on its side. The Republican party is more recent in its existence and it is the party of the rich, and the majority of its members are from those who have big capital and the owners of the monopoly companies. It also has a large number of the elites, and is not concerned with gaining the support of the ordinary people. Had the system of the American elections been different, the party would have no chance to win any election because it is the minority party.

The U.S. like the other capitalist states is controlled by the owners of the monopolies and businessmen. They have potential influence on U.S. policy. But since every one enjoys the right of nationality and can influence the rule, either through election or criticism, the rule appears in the U.S. as if it is the rule of the entire nation, more than any other capitalist country. Because of the inexhaustible wealth, the abundance of educated men and the thinkers, and due to the atmosphere of freedom and activity, the U.S. strength is real and

not superficial. Although the American nation is not inveterate but a group of communities from different places, the citizenship binds them truly with a strong bond, and even the foreigner who lives for some years and takes nationality becomes more concerned about the state and the nation and their interests more than his country of origin. This is a result of the strength which the country enjoys in her individuals and in the relationships between the people.

U.S. foreign policy is the policy of the rich and the monopolies i.e. it is a pure colonialist policy lacking all noble values. Although the American politicians seem to be simple and occasionally idiotic, they generally have a deep thought, more so than all other politicians of the world. They have remarkable ability to introduce quick changes in the means and they are ingenious in solving problems. Probably the colonialist urge besides the high educational standards and intelligence have an influence on their political activities. They look at the rest of the world as a big farm which belongs to them, and consider the countries which were great unworthy of the influence they enjoy, and that it is time for them to retire and accept the condition of obedience the world gives to the strongest nation.

This is a review of the reality of the U.S. and it must be treated as a colonialist country. However, it is essential to be aware of the strength of the state, the nation and her influence. The first step to force the U.S. and overcome her is to expose her colonialist side and compel her to return to her New World. It is useful in this respect to use the ideological weapon as well as the political one. Also it is worth trying to influence her ideas internally besides resisting her political actions and foreign policies.

## ***12.2 England***

England is an inveterate country that has enjoyed the status of a great power for a long time. One of her basic dispositions is to adhere to the old, not allow changes or development except slowly and once change is inevitable. The English people are truly conservative. From remote times until now this nation has been controlled by the high class families, the rich and the wealthy capitalists. Though the English claim that they follow democracy, this can be proved untrue through close investigation. As a matter of fact, the people have no real influence on the appointment of the rulers and it is the established families and the monopolists who appoint these rulers. There is no difference in this respect between the present and the past. Since old times the English have resisted every popular movement which appeared in the society and destroyed it by using deceptive means of the same nature as the movement itself. Cromwell's revolution which the English are proud of was in fact instigated by the rich families against the popular revolution, which broke out at the time to remove the authority of the rich families and the Capitalists and was about to succeed. These families conspired against this revolution and pushed Cromwell to revolt and demand certain rights. Many people gathered around him and the authority agreed to meet his demands. So he put an end to the popular revolution and buried it in its cradle. The party which enjoys a strong influence in the country is the Tories (Conservatives) who have ruled the country for decades. The Labour party is merely a tool in the hand of the conservatives. If England requires that Labour should be in power or the Tories are stuck with foreign policy problems then the Conservatives leave the way open to Labour to attain power. So unless the Conservatives want Labour to attain power Labour has no real chance of achieving this themselves. In case the Labour party find some of its people understanding the real situation of the country and realise the dominance of the rich families and the Capitalists, these people will be isolated and kept away from having any real influence on the policies of the Labour party. The Labour member Bevan in the 1930's to the 1960's and George Brown at present are good examples showing the influence of the Tories on Labour to remove those who have ambitions to reduce the control of the established families and the Capitalists on the country. The Conservatives themselves do

not appoint their leader by election and the successor is appointed by his predecessor as happened when MacMillan appointed Lord Hume as his successor. When Heath was elected as the leader of the Tories, he was first appointed and then elected only as a formality. From this we can say that despite the democratic appearance of the British rule, the Capitalists and the monopolists are those who actually decide the rule of England.

Because England is an island and not big enough to accommodate all its inhabitants it was essential for it to look for other places to seek out their living. Although the English went out for trade, they went out as colonialists and not tradesmen. They went out to suck the blood of other nations and exploit their resources and wealth. The English did not leave their island to exchange goods with other people because they had nothing to exchange in the first instance. This was their condition since they left their island. When they embraced capitalism, where utilitarianism is an inherent part of it, it was in harmony with their nature, so the colonialist aspect became concentrated in them, and England became a colonialist power of the first rank. Because the English are small in number they had to manipulate other nations to help them to stand against other great powers. For this reason, the English formed alliances and agreements with these nations and gathered them in conferences. The policy of alliances is a major one in English politics. The English are normal in intelligence, however, they use their intelligence to the maximum. This helped them to understand full well the events and policies of the world and made them capable of solving the problems. This created in them distinctively the mentality of problem solving. Because colonialism occupied the core of the English policy, England based her industry on a military basis. Due to this England became an influential power which enjoys military power with machine and industrial power. This is besides their experience in government and politics, not to mention their shrewdness and malice.

As for English foreign policy, it is based on colonialism. However, keeping of world balance, and keeping their influence in world politics at any price are two distinctive issues in British foreign policy. Therefore, England took a major role in the crusades and the Holy alliance, and it was at the top of the list of the Great powers. When Napoleon pursued his conquests England was at the head of the countries which resisted him and destroyed him. When Germany became active during Bismarck's rule, England took part in the Berlin conference; and one of her aims was to limit the strength of Germany. When England felt the unusual growth in power of Germany, she declared two wars against her and now she is trying to drag the world into a Third World War in order to change the map of the world and to weaken the two superpowers which rule the world today. After the agreement of the two superpowers, England was pushed aside from world politics. She became then nervous, and tries desperately to return to the international scene and world politics. She depends on striking deals with other countries and attracting influential men to her side. She does not mind to offer to the enemy a large piece of the cake if she can attract him for bargains. England does not know in politics friends and enemies. She knows only her interests. She uses international morality as a tool of deception and does not believe in it, though she tries to conceal her lies to create confidence in her, whilst making lies is an efficient weapon in her politics. Churchill was once in a meeting with Roosevelt and Stalin discussing the situation of the war and the future of Germany. He said frankly to them: "The truth in war is so precious to the extent that it is essential to protect it by a full guard of lies". This shows the importance of lies in British politics.

This is the reality of Britain and her policy. This country must be treated as a colonialist power which depends on the exploitation of her nation. The time and events could not change the way Britain tricks all the popular revolutions which happened inside, and not a single revolution managed to succeed due to this. So to be able to resist her colonialism it is important to comprehend her means and to confront her openly together with the use of superficial naivety and hidden means. The strength of Britain inside its territory lies in the

saying of the Arab poet “cure me of the disease with the disease itself”. Her strength outside lies in the use of others and even those who resist her. The way to defeat Britain is to disarm her of the traditional political means and to face her alone without any helper or partner.

### ***12.3 France***

France is an inveterate state that feels superior to all other European countries, because the French people believe they were the originator of the high principles of freedom, justice, and equality. France is known for producing remarkable politicians and thinkers. But regardless of this she remains a colonialist power. The relationship between her politicians is weak and she is characterised with less discipline. The ideas of freedom have affected her greatly and caused disintegration of its people. Freedom as an individual attribute is one of the highest and most splendid dispositions rather a part of human nature. The human being has two attributes; the sovereignty and the will, with these two together the personality of man and his distinctive existence are completed. Also with these two attributes man becomes free and not a slave. If he loses the will he becomes incomplete and paralysed, and his sovereignty becomes meaningless, it rather can be said that if the will is lost the sovereignty is lost as well. But, if he loses sovereignty then he becomes a slave to others even if he has a will. This is because sovereignty decides and the will implements. Decision without implementation does not materialise, while implementation without decision is slavery. Therefore it is sovereignty which protects man from slavery. One of the aspects of sovereignty is freedom of disposition. Therefore freedom is a human disposition and part of his nature.

However, the community in its capacity as a community, whether it is an Ummah, a nation, or a party, considers that absolute freedom without restriction is a destructive tool which destroys the existence of the community. The individual in the community is like the block in the building. If nothing is broken from the block then it will not fit in the building, and so it is the individual who must give away part of his sovereignty or freedom in order to fit into the community. If he refuses to do so, then no community can be built from such individuals. So to give away part of the sovereignty is an indivisible part of the nature of the community and an essential and vital element in its structure. The French people, when it adopted the idea of freedom, began to fragment, to the extent that it looks more like a group of individuals than a nation or community. Thus you rarely find a strong French government. For this reason England easily used France several times to achieve certain goals. Thus France, since the departure of Napoleon until now i.e. since it became firmly obsessed with freedom, continued to run in the shadow of England. It was the latter which dragged France to America, Asia and Africa to establish colonies. England by so doing wanted to strengthen herself, even though the conflict between the two countries was of the most distinctive in history. Accordingly, freedom might be the only distinguishing trait of the French nation. The intellectual freedom helped to found the philosophers, poets, thinkers and so on. The political freedom helped to establish dignity, and self confidence and helped to found a large number of unique men. The personal freedom made Paris a place of prostitution and debauchery and it also created cracks in France, through which foreigners and particularly the English, managed to infiltrate. Therefore, freedom in its absolute meaning is the cause of misery in France.

So one cannot say that there is in France the party of so and the party of so, because it is difficult for a nation of this character to have parties in the real sense of the word. What this nation has is groups of people calling themselves parties. Therefore, it is difficult for France to have a strong and settled government. Every Frenchman is a ruler unto himself and every Frenchman has ambitions to become a ruler himself. Therefore, it is difficult to define French domestic policy or foreign policy, because the domestic policy depends on

the dispositions of the rulers and their understanding of freedom, and foreign policy depends on the ability of France to conquer and overcome difficulties. France is considered a colonialist power because she embraced capitalism, so utilitarianism is an inherent part of French life, and thus France was keen to follow colonialism and to maintain her colonies.

If it is necessary to mention a notion about the French foreign policy, one can say that this policy is based on the idea of establishing her influence in the world, whether this is achieved by colonialism or by cultural influence or economic influence. The French political actions against the super powers is to promote her personality and to share in the glory and control. France is not good at using political manoeuvres and generally resorts to confrontation. Therefore, the way to face France is to avoid hurting her pride but also to prevent her from taking the initiative, and not to consider her a super power except only to the extent the super powers accept her in world politics.

#### ***12.4 The Soviet Union***

As for the Soviet Union or Russia it has been a super power from the times of old whether at the time of the Tsars or the Communists. The Russian people are an active dynamic nation but simple and naive. Although the Russians embraced capitalism before communism they lagged behind Europe and did not advance in industry until ruled by communism. The Russians are brave fighters at home but away from home they lose these characteristics. Therefore, it is strange to see Russian control over eastern Europe continuing for more than 25 years since the Second World War until now. At no time in history did the Russians gain victory outside their country but they were always triumphant over enemies who attacked them. Napoleon and Hitler's attacks are two famous examples.

The ruling regime during the Tsarist period was different from the communist one. However, both rules were tyrannical. The Tsars used to depend particularly on the landlords. The landlords in alliance with the rich people used to control the country. They supported the domestic and foreign policies of the Tsars completely. They exploited the nation in the worst possible manner, a matter which caused the country to decline and the nation to be backward.

Before the First World War Russia was behind the rest of Europe and was exploited by some of its neighbours. The major industries in Russia were in the hands of England, France, and Belgium, the mining industry was in French hands, and the coal industry in the Donetz Basin was controlled by foreigners. Half of the oil wells were in the hands of Britain and France. A large share of the profits of the Russian industries used to go to the foreign banks, particularly the English and the French. So until 1914 the country was backward in its systems of rule, economy, culture and education. Nevertheless, Russia was a major power and internationally was considered as such, and had influence on world politics. When the communist party gained power, the position of ruling did not change except in its style. The Communists ruled the country by force, using bloodshed, oppression and terror. They thus consolidated their rule over the heads of the people. But since they established their rule on the basis of an intellectual creed and a comprehensive ideology, they managed to raise the level of the Russian nation. So within a third of a century, Russia not only became a great power but a camp standing in the face of all the western countries; and it gained an international power which the Tsars could only dream of, so Russia grew to a position whereby she could intimidate all the capitalist countries. It managed to force the leading power (the first state) to abandon the idea of fighting against her and to sign agreements with her, to the extent that it almost became its ally. Russia today is considered the partner of the leading power in the administration of the affairs of the world, in reality the world has come under the control of these two super powers Russia and America.

The Russian foreign policy is based on communism, so its idea is to spread communism, and its method is destruction, vandalism, agitation and incitement of contradictions. She seized every opportunity to spread communism to other countries and tries to control those countries which adopt communism. The way to resist this policy is to prevent communism from entering into the country and to avoid all cultural ties with her, rather work should be done to establish commercial ties that can help the Muslims enter Russia and make the Russians see Islam in practice in relations amongst the people. It is also necessary to strongly resist communism like the resistance against capitalism, and make this resistance an indivisible part of political relations, so it becomes a part of resisting the Russian policy i.e. the communist policy of Russia.

### ***12.5 Germany***

As for Germany, it is a nation of noble people from the angle of its existence and origin. It went through many ordeals and was divided into many countries. It struggled to achieve unity and engaged in many wars, especially with France. Sometimes it was triumphant and at other times it was defeated. The Germans are stubborn, brave and energetic. They have excessive confidence in themselves and went too far when they claimed the right to have sovereignty over others. Militarism is considered one of the Germans' disposition as it is innate in them from birth. It is this German militarism which scares their neighbours, in particular the great powers like England, France and Russia. The Germans embrace capitalism and hence utilitarianism is part of their life. Germany is considered a colonialist power because she had before the First World War many colonies, and when she entered the Second World War she had in mind the regaining of these colonies and to wrest other colonies from rival powers. Expansionism is considered not only a Hitleric policy but a basic German policy. Hitler wanted this expansion to be achieved at the expense of Russia. As for German rule, it was dictatorship before the First World War and remained as such after the First World War, whether before or after Hitler came to power. Although after the Second World War the rule became democratic with the knowledge of the allies; however, the despotic side appeared from time to time in the actions of the leaders.

Germany managed to overcome the severe conditions imposed upon her, after the First World War, and returned back as a great power, and even to occupy the position of the leading power. Two factors helped her to achieve this.

1. The intellectual feeling which appeared in the Germans and encouraged them to work to make Germany a great power once again.
2. England wanted to disturb the world balance between her and France and therefore, encouraged Germany secretly to rival France and to face-off against her; a matter which helped Germany to return as a great power. But after the Second World War, Germany had nothing of this kind to help her in becoming once again a major power. All the allies without exception this time imposed restrictions on the Germans to make sure that Germany never again returned as a great power.

The most important factors which prevented Germany until now, from returning back as a great power are:

Firstly, the diversion of the attention of the Germans to economic matters away from politics. So their attention was directed to the economic side, a matter which diverted their feelings and activities from a more productive political side, thus they remained backward politically.

Secondly, Russia remained constantly vigilant towards any German danger, so the German danger is not forgotten at any moment, and Russia adopted a very strict policy towards Germany without any mercy or let-up. The core of this Russian policy is to destroy Germany forever and to demolish any German attempts to become powerful. For this

reason America could not succeed when she tried after 1956 to revive German militarism and such was the fate of England's attempt to unite Germany, similarly for the French when de Gaul tried to unite Europe and help Germany through this unity to arm and unite herself. The situation became worse when America afterwards agreed on Russian plans to keep Germany under the mercy of the allies. Therefore, Germany went from bad to worse as far as politics is concerned in her attempt to return as a great power. The matter which helped this condition is that Germans are militarists rather than politicians. Therefore, Germany is not expected to return as a great power in the near future, unless something unexpected happens either inside Germany or on the international scene. However, no matter how long it takes, Germany inevitably will become a great power, because the artificial forces, however much they succeed in preventing the growth of the energetic nations, their success is only temporary, and the live being will inevitably overcome all the factors which hinder its growth.

The approach for Germany to follow is to ignore the attention of German unity, and not to concern herself solely with the economic aspects because the western and eastern countries actually want Germany to preoccupy herself with these matters. Germany must now be content to rule West Germany and stand to establish her industry on a military basis and follow what Hitler did when he established secret industries, and to focus her attention on nuclear weapons. She should also practice international policy intelligently and watch the international position. Once she does this Germany will undoubtedly become a great power.

This is but a quick look at the two superpowers; America and Russia, and the other three countries that are traditionally considered great powers. It is a general look which gives a summarised idea about each country, so that the political actions each of them carries out alone or together with other countries, can be understood. These five countries are colonialist powers. The Soviet Union however, before the agreement with America, had the ideological aspect apparent in its policies which were focused on the resistance of capitalism and colonialism. But after its agreement with America the interest of Russia became the pivot of its policy i.e. it was dominated by nationalism though communism is still the system upon which it is based. Russia started to favour extending influence and dominance over communism, and accept to help knowingly pro-western countries for the sake of finding a way to control them. Thus, Russia helps India though it is in the orbit of England and helps Tanjaniqa or Tanzania though it is an English colony of formal independence. Therefore, it can be said now that the five great countries in the world are colonialist powers which try to extend their influence over the rest of the countries and the world.

The world undoubtedly became miserable since these great powers controlled the world in their capacity as great powers. The world became miserable also because of the idea of the international community which they created, and because of colonisation since the capitalist system existed. The world will remain as such as long as the mythical idea of the international community exists and as long as the great powers compete to control the world, and as long as colonialism exists regardless of the form it takes and the means it uses. So to save the world from misery and to put it on the path of happiness, this can only be achieved if the myth of the international community, the dominance and control of the great powers, and colonialism and exploitation are removed.

### **13. The International community**

With regard to the basis upon which the international community was established, it is false. It was first established as a community of the christian states in western Europe to stand against the Islamic state. Then it joined to it the community of the christian countries in eastern Europe. It remained as such - the christian community of Europe - since the 16th Century when the Islamic state started to invade Europe till the second half of the 19th Century in 1856 when the Islamic state became so weak that it was called the “sick man”, and was conspired against to divide its territories. During that period, about three centuries, the international community really meant the christian community and it was the enemy of the Islamic state.

#### ***13.1 The Concept Of International Law***

It was a community of christian states only and of christian states in Europe only, the non-christian countries could not join it, yet they called it the international community so that it alone reflects the international face and on which alone is applied the study of international affairs. The matter would have been easy if this community restricted itself to christian gatherings in opposition to Islam. But it gave itself an international description and worked to perpetuate this international description upon it. The idea of the international community was defined and written down for the christian states. The international affairs and problems were considered as those which concern this community. In order to organise and perpetuate this, conventional principles were put forward which were later called the international law. So they aimed at the international agreements signed between the christian states and the traditions practised by the christian community and formed from them rules and made of them international principles, or what is called the international law. So the international community was originally based on the christian European states, and the international law was originally the agreements signed by the christian states and the traditions practised by the christian communities. So to designate the name of the international community to the christian European states only, is an illusion and a lie, because the world is not formed only from the European christian community. Also to give the name of the international law to the agreements and traditions of the christian European states only, is falsification and illusion. The ideas suitable to form the international law are not only the agreements and traditions of the christian-European states, but all the traditions existing between the human communities in the entire world, and all the agreements signed between the various communities in the whole world as well. Thus, the concept upon which the international community was based is wrong, and so is the concept of the international law. The matter could have been avoided if these states recognised the rest of the countries in the world. The fact of the matter was that these states did not recognise any of these countries at all, and did not accept any state to join them if that state was not christian. In the second half of the 19th century this attitude changed a little and some non-christian countries were accepted to join the international community. However, the christian states accepted only the traditional rules laid down by them, as christian countries. Thus, they imposed on the Ottoman state the condition of forsaking Islam in her international affairs. And only when the Ottoman state accepted this condition, and submitted to the traditional rules of the European christian states, did they allow her to join. So this community allowed non-christian countries to exist in the international relations, but only after they totally adopted the principles and traditions of this community, thus rejecting any other ideas and traditions other than their own. This situation remained so until the end of the First World War and the demolition of the Islamic state. This situation could have been rectified after the First World War since the enemy for which the international community and the law were put had disappeared. But this did not happen.

These countries adhered to the basis upon which the international community and rules were established, and therefore they agreed to form an international organisation restricted to specific countries. They accepted within it some non-christian and non-European countries, but refused to adopt any laws other than the traditions of the European christian states. So this community meant the christian European countries, and the other countries who joined this league were accepted within this christian organisation. When the U.N. was formed, there was the intention to restrict its membership to the countries which entered the war against Germany i.e. in other words the christian countries and those in their orbits. But America, in order to control the world and put the other countries under her wing, expanded U.N. membership and allowed the countries of the world to join in. However, neither America nor the rest of the christian states allowed any other rules and traditions to be adopted by the U.N. The rules of the christian countries remained the basis of the international law and the U.N. Even the eastern bloc under the leadership of Russia could not change anything within this international system or introduce any of its communist ideas to the system, despite the fact that this bloc embraces communism which opposes the capitalist and the rules of christian states. Therefore, the conventional traditions of the christian or the capitalist countries remained to rule the communities in the world, and to reject the traditions and ideas of the other nations. The international community continued, at the same time, to mean in reality the christian states or in other words the capitalist countries, although some other countries were accepted to join. Therefore, the concept of the international community and also the international law must be reviewed.

What exacerbated the situation was that the European christian or capitalist states did not leave the implementation of these traditional rules, later known as the international law, to the moral motive, as is usually the case with the international traditions and agreements. Nor did they leave them to apply only those which they accepted. Rather, they applied them on all countries and by force. So as in the past, the great powers made themselves the guardians of security and order in the international community. They interfered in other countries affairs whenever there was a threat to the peace, or a disturbance of the established order. Nothing could deter the intervention of these powers i.e. enforcing the traditional rules they agreed upon, except the power of the attacked state and the failure of the attacking state to repel her. Prior to the First World War the christian European states together or separately made themselves the police of law and order in the world. Even after establishing the league of nations and later on the U.N., the capitalist countries continued to make themselves the international police to implement law and order. The intervention of the American forces in Lebanon, and the English forces in Jordan in 1958 are examples of how these capitalist countries appoint themselves as international police to implement international law or what they call the international moral order. This action was one of the causes of the world's misery in its European conception through what is called the international law. Therefore, it is necessary to solve this serious problem so as to save the world from its misery.

### ***13.2 International society***

As a solution for this issue, if it is essential to establish the international community in the international society, then we should not compare the world society to the ordinary society. The latter must have an authority which removes injustice and prevents disputes within society. Therefore, every society must have a state and an authority and a law, and the implementation of the law upon the people must be compulsory. The international society, however, is a group of human communities among which there are relations. It is not a society formed of individuals with relations existing amongst them. Every community has the absolute right of sovereignty and the absolute right of determination without any restrictions. Any outside compulsion on any community or state means the wresting of the

sovereignty from that community or state, which is slavery represented by colonialism and outside control. Any attempt to prevent a community or a state from carrying out its decisions is an attempt to fetter this community or state and paralyse it. Thus, it is wrong to have a power which rules over the world communities. It is wrong to put the world society under the control of an authority i.e. there must not be an international state which rules over several countries and communities. The human communities must remain independent and have their own existence and sovereignty. If it is essential to form an international community of these groups, this community must not be an international state. This international community must be formed of those who are willing to be part of it, and not be formed of certain states which have specific concepts, or by certain states whose power exceeds the power of other countries, nor should it be an international state. So this community should be formed from all those who like to do so willingly regardless of their concepts, power and influence. Every country must be left free to join this community any time she desires and have the same rights and duties as the founding countries. Also, every country must have the freedom to leave any time she wants, and no country must be forced to implement the decisions of this community. Only then will the international community be a true worldly community; and not a family of particular states, falsely called an international community; or an international state falsely called the U.N.O.

### ***13.3 International Law***

As for the law, there should neither be for the world community nor for the countries of the world an international law. The international community may only have a procedural law which regulates the administrative affairs of the community and shows the procedure to run its activities. This law is agreed upon by the majority and is changed by the majority according to world events and what is required by these events.

What is called the international law should not exist, because law is the order of the authority and there is no international state or authority. Even, it is not right to have an international state which has power over all the countries. It is impossible for such a state to exist. Such a claim leads to wars and bloody conflicts. Therefore, there must not be an international state or an international authority, and it is wrong to have an international law or establish an international law for three reasons:

1. The law is the order of the authority, and there is no authority over the world's countries or the world society. So there is no international law nor should it exist in the first place.
2. It is obligatory to implement the law and therefore, there must be an authority which upholds the law. But it is wrong to have an international state which carries out the law and imposes it on others by force as this leads to wars and bloody conflicts.
3. The law organises the relations, and the international relations exist between human communities by consent, so every two or more states organise their relations according to their interests and by consent, and in a way different than those relations between two or more other countries. So what organises the relations is agreements not a law. And the relations are actually organised only by agreements. Therefore, there is no international law which organises the relations between all countries, and accordingly it is improper for an international law to exist. Yet the people in the West disapprove of the existence of a common international law and disapprove of the compulsion for any country to implement this law. Since the emergence of the idea of the international law the western jurists disputed over the nature of its rules and many doubted the binding power of this law. Cant and Hegel in Germany, Hopz and Austin and their followers in England, all disapproved of the existence of an international law, and many western jurists adopted this view. Even those western jurists who approve of the existence of such law do not view it as a binding law, but just a moral

rule, disagreement with which does not entail any legal responsibility. Even those who contrive to interpret the legality of the international law, their interpretation indicates in reality the nonexistence of the international law. What really exists is the international tradition and not the international law. Therefore, we think that none of the thinkers, even in the West, can claim the existence of the international law, what can be proven to exist is the international tradition only.

### ***13.4 International Tradition***

The traditions acknowledged between the various human communities do exist. Some of these traditions are common to all, since remote times until now, e.g. not to kill envoys (diplomatic immunity), and some of them are particular to specific people, e.g. the Arab tradition of not preventing anyone from visiting the Ka'ba. These traditions undoubtedly exist, but they are not a law rather they are conventions, agreed upon due to the repetition of certain acts by all people or certain groups. Therefore, the international tradition exists but the international law does not exist.

What remains to be discussed in this regard is the question of implementing the law on others by force, a matter which is totally wrong.

Firstly, because it is impossible to implement the law by an international authority due to the nonexistence of such authority.

And secondly, if it is forced by a group of great powers, two or more, then it will be an aggression and not an implementation of the law. This is so, because if one or more of these great powers disobeys the law, the other countries cannot force them to observe the law, otherwise this will mean war. Also if the two countries or the group of countries which implement the law disobey this law who will force this law on them? Of course, no one. Then the enforcement of the law by the strong countries on the weak countries is in fact an aggression and not an implementation of the law. It then becomes clear that there is no implementation of the general international law on all of the countries. So it is incorrect to think of applying international law by force on others because this is nothing but aggression.

It becomes evident from this, that not only should the international law not exist, but it is impossible for it to exist. What does exist however, are the agreements between the countries and traditions that are acknowledged about these agreements, and about matters covering the time of war and the time of peace amongst the human communities. So if it is essential to have an international community, then there must also be an administrative law that is responsible for looking into the international tradition and the instances where the tradition is broken. This includes the traditions which relate to the international agreements as far as their establishment (contracting), implementation and abandonment, and the like. Yet not all of the international traditions must be adopted, rather only those which developed in the international society from which the international community is formed. The emergence of these traditions should have not been by decisions taken by the states involved, rather this should have emerged through the common usage of these traditions over a long period of time until they are established. In this case the countries through self urge would mandatorily follow these conventions. With regard to the observance of the states of these traditions, this occurs when the idea, the matter or the concept which is considered a tradition is repeatedly used. Because the agreement of the people to something does not make it a tradition unless it is repeatedly used. In this case the tradition becomes a common one. So when there is an international dispute or disagreement between the countries which form the international community then that community resorts to the common traditions. So the international tradition in its real meaning is what matters when there is an international dispute. No one must think to implement the international tradition

onto countries by force, rather it is implemented through public opinion and the moral factor. The countries which take part in the formation of the international community do not consider a certain rule or other as an international tradition unless they are absolutely sure that the rule has become a tradition. Then these countries believe that this tradition must be followed. Therefore, there is no need to implement it by force. Moreover, the strength of public opinion against the countries which disobey these traditions compels the countries voluntarily and spontaneously to observe these traditions. The fear within a community of being disgraced because of disobeying these traditions is more effective than the fear of outside physical compulsion. Therefore, the implementation of the communities decision should be left to the strength of the public opinion and the moral factor. This is as far as the international community is concerned.

### ***13.5 International Alliances***

As for the misery brought to the world by the great powers, it is not because a certain state is a great power. Rather, it is due to the alliance of these powers, and their gathering to divide the interests between themselves. These alliances are the root of the world's ordeal. So the solution must be focused on the alliance of the great powers not on the countries which are great powers. The holy alliance, the first alliance formed of the great powers was established to divide the interests and utilities between these countries. It aimed to protect the thrones of the allying Kings, and to destroy any uprising that might happen against these Kings or against whatever actions they agreed upon. It was also formed to enable them to intervene against any country in the world, under the pretext of the threat to world peace and order. So this alliance was evil to the world and to Europe in particular. It is true that the European nations succeeded in halting its effect and removing it through revolutions. However, the idea of the alliance between the great countries is still deeply rooted in the world. France revolted against monarchy and declared the republic. Belgium revolted and was separated from Holland to become independent. The Germans managed to destroy the small states into which they were divided and established German unity. This was all done against the alliance of the five Monarchs. However, these great countries themselves, after their system changed, still adhered to the idea of the international alliance. This alliance itself was the cause of the First and Second World Wars and it is a threat not only to world peace but also to the other countries, whether small or large. Therefore, it is necessary that the idea of the international alliance be treated in such a way as to remove it completely from the world.

It is true that when America and Russia agreed with each other they removed the two world blocs, i.e. the communist and capitalist camps, and reduced the possibility of a third war. But they did that through forming a new alliance between themselves. Therefore, they are not considered to have solved the idea of international alliances. What they did was to transform this alliance to their favour and to pose a new threat to the world by dividing it into two great powers. This impairs the international position and makes it difficult to get rid of the danger posed by both or either of them. Therefore, these two powers made the idea of the international alliance more complex and, through their alliance, made it very difficult for other nations or small countries to break or destroy its strength. Thus, a quick solution is needed to treat the idea of the alliance between the great powers.

What is the correct solution? We see that the solution cannot be achieved unless the concept is changed from its very root, because the behaviour of man in life follows his concepts about life. So initially this concept must be changed within the nations which form the great countries that embrace the idea of international alliances, and then the next step is to remove the international alliances. Unless this concept is changed, world misery at the hands of the great powers will remain, and may even increase. The way to change this concept is to create a world public opinion against the alliances, and this is the effective

remedy to the problem. The proof for this concept can be seen in the idea of colonising the weak nations which occupied a noble and proud place among all the European nations, the small as well as the great, in the 19th century. These nations competed madly to colonise these nations, with no difference between England and Holland or between Germany, Belgium, France or Spain. The European countries aggressively went out to colonise other nations. When the communist state was established in Russia after the First World War, colonialism was fiercely attacked and it encouraged other nations to resist the colonialist powers. As soon as the Second World War came public opinion against colonialism prevailed throughout the world. For this reason, articles relating to the termination of colonialism were included in the UN charter. The idea of liberation spread around the world, so this forced the colonialist powers to retreat and to give (under the pressure of world public opinion) colonised nations their freedom and independence, although some countries merely changed the form of colonialism. Despite this, public opinion succeeded in changing the view towards the idea of colonialism. The same thing should be done towards the idea of alliances between the great powers. The nations which suffer from the alliance of the great powers must try seriously and whole-heartedly to resist this idea in order to succeed in removing it completely from the world.

### ***13.6 The Issue Of Colonialism***

The idea of colonialism or the sucking of the nations blood (resources) and humiliating them still remains. Although the world has proceeded towards resisting it, it is still undoubtedly the most dangerous thing from which the weak nations suffer, and it is also the most dangerous thing to domestic and universal peace. The Congo Crisis which lived for several years and the present Middle East Crisis are examples of the dangers of colonialism to the peace and stability of the world. Therefore it is essential to treat the question of colonialism.

### ***13.7 Colonialism And Capitalism***

Colonialism is an inherent part of the capitalist ideology and it is in fact the method of implementing the capitalist idea. Therefore, to solve it radically the capitalist ideology must be resisted to remove it from the world. Therefore, serious and sincere efforts must be taken to destroy the capitalist ideology; and communism has stepped forward to treat the idea of colonialism and to resist the capitalist system. But it has done this with the wrong idea and a poor resistance. Communism resisted the idea of separating religion from state by the idea of material evolution. The latter idea is a false creed and against human nature. So this idea did not spread in the capitalist societies and didn't even have an influence upon the behaviour of those who embraced it. This is so, because the one who believes in this creed does not care if the idea of separating religion from life is applied on him. Because this idea can be embraced by those who believe in the existence of God and those who do not, since it neither means atheism nor faith. It only means that life's affairs are not run according to religion and this does not influence the behaviour of those who embrace the idea of material evolution. For this reason we find that the communist creed did not influence the capitalist societies, nor make any change in them. The communist resistance to capitalism started with the ideas of Marx and the communist philosophers after him. Individuals and groups embraced these ideas. However these ideas could not succeed in making whole nations embrace them, based on research and study only. Moreover, the method which was employed to represent the communist idea in a communist state was wrong and imaginary. It was wrong because it used the establishment of the state as a way for abolishing it completely. And it was imaginary because it wanted to make the revolution world-wide, starting with the advanced industrial nations and spreading to the rest of the world. Therefore, Lenin was forced to disagree with it under the pretext of

interpreting it. So Lenin established the communist state in Russia, which was at that time a backward industrial country compared to the rest of Europe. Lenin established the communist state only in Russia. And after 30 years the successors of Lenin allied themselves with the biggest colonialist power i.e. America. So they made an alliance with colonialism. Therefore, no one should depend on communism to solve the question of colonialism and to resist it. Hence another solution is needed to oppose capitalism and to destroy colonialism.

The only solution to the question of colonialism is to put forward the comprehensive thought about the universe, man and life, to debate it on the international scene and to introduce it to the charter of the world community, which is established on implementing the international tradition willingly and freely. This international debate about the comprehensive idea about the universe, man and life is the one which changes the concepts, removes the erroneous concepts, and corrects the international tradition. Colonialism is a specific view point in life, and unless this view point is changed it will remain in existence. It is true that the public opinion that emerged in the world against colonialism has affected it, but it did not destroy it completely nor weaken its existence. What happened was a change in the form of colonialism. The countries colonised in Africa, Asia and Latin America are still colonised despite the independent appearances of these countries. Unless revolutions, and local and international wars take place, these countries will remain colonised. But as long as the great powers embrace colonialism as an idea and use their forces for its sake, then it will not be possible to remove colonialism from the world except by removing its very idea from the minds of the people who embrace it as a viewpoint in life. Whilst colonialism must be resisted materially, and world public opinion must remain against it, and these efforts must be multiplied, however, these measures are still not the effective remedy for this problem. The proper remedy is to put to debate at the international level the comprehensive idea about man, life and the universe, discussed by all nations, and debated internationally amongst all the states and particularly in the world community.

These are the three things from which the world has suffered and is being prevented from heading forward in the path of happiness, and this is the way by which these problems are solved. However, this solution does not mean that wars will stop or worry will end or that international traps, political manoeuvres and deception will disappear. It means that a heavy communal burden difficult to get rid of is removed. Yet the conflict between countries is natural, the resorting of countries to war is also natural and carrying out political manoeuvres is natural, but these will be individual and limited matters so the whole world will not be dragged into war as happened in the First and the Second World Wars. Moreover, the thinking of the countries will not only be limited to sucking the blood of the nations, as is the case now. The world will rather have that which naturally exists in man's nature, like guidance and misguidance, good and evil and beauty and ugliness; that is to say some of this and some of that. It will not be all bad and evil as has been going on since the creation of the idea of the international alliances, the idea of the international community, and the idea of colonialism. So it is essential to put an end to this evil which has been dominating the world for several centuries.

## 14. The Role Of Politicians On International Politics

It might be raised as to how individuals influence the international politics? Or how can the political parties affect the direction of the countries? Particularly if we know that this direction is deep rooted and has continued to exist for several centuries. The answer to this is that the individuals or the parties when they follow up the political actions and contemplate international politics must not do so for the sake of intellectual pleasure and luxury, nor for the sake of seeking knowledge and increasing their information. They must work with the intention that they want to take care of the affairs of the world, and in order to find out how they can exert influence on the world i.e. in order to develop themselves to be politicians. And far be it for the politician to seek intellectual pleasure or even to be one of the great wise men, and far be it for him to aim at intellectual luxury, or even be one of the deep thinkers. The politician follows politics, understands the international position and observes world politics, because he is a politician only, and not a thinker or intellectual. The meaning of being a politician is that he takes care of the affairs of the world i.e. to have influence on international politics. Also, the politician does not work with the feeling that he is singular or individual but he works in the capacity of being part of a nation and existing in an establishment i.e. in a state. Although he may not be of those who decide and carry out the policies of the state, he is of those who have the ambition to be able to decide and carry out the policies, or to bring to task those who have the responsibility. Thus, one can influence internationally, even though he is still an individual with no authority to decide and implement policies. So when he acts as such he will have influence, because the state which he is a member of, has influence through persons like him, or he and his like strive to make the state effective in international politics and in its international position. In this case the result will come from the yield of the political concepts. This would yield the fruits of the political concepts, which enable the state to have influence on world politics and the international position, by finding the politically aware people and those knowledgeable of the political actions that take place in the world especially from the great powers. Thus, the first step in having influence in international politics and the international position is to crystallise the political concepts, and the first building block is to motivate people to follow up the political actions and understand the international politics i.e. to find politicians aware of international politics. Then the influence of the country in international politics and the international position will come naturally. From this the necessity of the political concepts and the value of them become clear. But it must be known that the state would not be a state of international presence except through her relations with other countries. The individual in society has no presence in the society unless he has relations with the other members. His position in society and among the people depends on these relations and how far he can influence relations between the people. As is the case with the state, where her presence in the world depends on her relations with the other countries. Her position is strengthened or weakened according to these relations and according to her influence on international relations.

## **15. The Role Of The Islamic State**

The Islamic state is an ideological state, and its prime role is to carry the message of Islam to the world. Thus, it is compulsory on her, and it is very much a part of her existence to have a respected international standing and to be able to influence international relations. Thus there is no escape from the fact that the political concepts of the politicians must be of the sort which are international concepts and not domestic or regional ones. Therefore, there is no escape for the politicians in their capacities as Muslims to have political concepts of the international aspect and not only of domestic or regional matters. Hence they have a great responsibility to gain a full political awareness. Being Muslims and the state being Islamic, the basic and original role is to carry the message of Islam to the world, this necessitates that they have political awareness and that this awareness be comprehensive.

## 16. Political Awareness

Political awareness does not only mean to be aware of the political situations, the international position, the political events or to follow up the international politics and the political actions, although these are part of the requirements for a comprehensive political awareness. Rather, the political awareness is to view the world from a special angle, and for Muslims the special angle is the Islamic creed i.e. the view of (There is no god but Allah and Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah). The Prophet (pbuh) said “I was commanded to fight the people till they say there is no god but Allah and Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah, if they said it, they would protect from me their blood and money except for its right”. This is political awareness. So the view towards the world from no special angle is superficiality and it is not political awareness.

The view towards the domestic and regional domain only is triviality, and not political awareness. The political awareness does not exist unless it satisfies two elements:

1. The view towards the entire world.
2. The view must emerge from a special defined angle no matter what this angle is, whether it is an ideology, a particular idea or a certain interest or anything else.

This is the reality of political awareness. Of course, for the Muslim, political awareness must come from the angle of the Islamic creed. So if this is the reality of the political awareness, then it is a natural necessity for the politician to engage himself in the struggle in order to form a particular concept about life for man in his capacity as man, wherever he lives. The formation of this concept is the first responsibility thrown on the shoulder of the politically aware person who would have no rest unless he makes the effort to form it.

The politically aware person must struggle against all the trends which contradict his view, and against all concepts which oppose his. At the same time he strives to firmly establish his own concepts and direction. So he heads in two directions simultaneously, and these directions never part in struggle from each other at all, even by the measure of a hair, because they are one thing. So he dismantles and establishes, destroys and builds, clears away the darkness and ignites the light. Thus, as it was said, he is a fire that burns the falsehood, and a light lighting the path of guidance. As he engages in consolidating the concepts and planting the directions, he concerns himself in applying the thoughts on the events, and in distancing himself from abstraction and logic. He also enters into struggle against the directions, strife and slanders attacking his view of life, and against the deep-rooted concepts which developed during the age of decline, and against the mischievous influence which the enemies spread about the Islamic thoughts, and against belittling the high aims and distant goals into partial aims and immediate, impatient goals. So he struggles on two fronts: internal and external, and in two directions: destroying and building; and he works on two levels: the politics and the thought. In summary, he immerses himself into the battlefield of life in its most high and valuable sense. Therefore, the collision of the aware people with the issues, through their friction with the situation, people and life's problems, is inevitable, whether at the domestic local scene or the worldly international one. Through this collision, his capability will emerge in giving the message which he carries, and the special angle from which he views the world, according to the concept which he adopts, is the basis, the judgement, and the goal which he strives to establish and the aim which he endeavours to achieve. But because he commits himself with a special view, and because he has a certain taste and inclination, whether they are natural or ideological, unless he is fully aware of himself he might colour the facts in the colour he likes, and interpret the thoughts the way he wants, and understand the news to give the result which he wants to arrive at. Therefore, he should beware lest his inclinations dominate his opinions and the news. The self desire for a personal, or a partisan or

ideological thing might make him interpret the opinions and news wrongly, or it could add to it points that make him think the opinion is true when it is false, or think it false when it is true. Therefore, the aware person should understand the speech which is said and the actions which are made. In regard to the events, whether they were matters or incidents, he must understand them tangibly and logically, as they are, not as he wants them to be. With regard to the thoughts, he has to understand them according to their reality, so he moves with his mind outside, to see by his heart the reality expressed by that thought, and understand that thought according to his vision of the reality which denotes it, as it is, not as it agrees with what he wants. It is true that the expression may be metaphorical, or indirect, or a sentence whose meaning is understood from its context in the whole sentence and not from the words which compose it. But all this does not prevent him from thinking widely and seeing the reality which the expression denotes, according to the meaning of language, and what is meant by the linguistics. So the practical aware person has to go with the truth, but according to his viewpoint which he adopts with conviction and decisiveness. He has to see the facts as they are, but in accordance with his tangible or intellectual vision. By such he would have perfected his awareness, where the tools of meditation become available to him. But for him the view towards the world from a special angle has to be the basis for everything; of vision, awareness, feeling, and understanding.

The question may arise as to how one who is politically aware can be absolutely free in regard to committing himself with the truth and seeing the facts as they are, when he has to view the world from a special angle? If such a question arises, then it would be due to adopting a superficial view towards things. If the person was deep in study he would not bring such a question because there is a difference between the reality of the matters or events and judging upon them. People do not differ over the reality of the matters. If it was related to eyesight or vision, then everyone who has sight would see things as they are, unless cheated or misguided. And if it was related to the feeling or senses, then everyone who can sense reality can feel, whether by tasting, like bitter and sweet, or by touching such as the soft and rough, or by hearing, or by smelling. So the people feel with the things as they are no matter what the differences between them are. What the people disagree over is the judgement on the matters. So the view of the world from a special angle is related to judging over the things and actions, whereas seeing the facts as they are, is related to the feelings (senses) and understanding. Therefore, he must see the facts as they are, and limit himself to the side of the truth, and he must look at the world, the events and all matters from a special angle.

### ***16.1 Examples of The Special Angle***

As for how this is applied to international politics, a demonstration of some examples show how the view of the political events from a special angle works. Let us review some examples from the politics of the Prophet (pbuh), examples from the politics of the Middle Ages, and examples from modern politics. The Prophet (pbuh) made the spread of Islam as the angle from which he looked at the world. Because Quraysh was the great state in the Arab peninsula and was the spearhead of kufr that stood against the Da'wah, the Prophet (pbuh) limited the political and military actions to Quraysh. He used to send people to spy on Quraysh and to intercept her trade. He also engaged in wars against her. He accepted from the rest of the tribes to remain as spectators or to be neutral. So his political and military actions were planned according to the view of the world from a special angle.

When the Prophet (pbuh) knew that Khayber was in the process of convening a pact with Quraysh to attack Medinah and destroy Mohammed and Islam, he limited his angle of work to suspend hostilities with Quraysh or to sign a peace treaty with her to free himself to destroy Khayber (the Treaty of Hudaibiyah). From this special angle he adopted the policy of peace with Quraysh as the basis of his future actions as long as these actions fulfilled his

aims. So all his actions in this period i.e. going to Umrah, accepting that Quraysh avoid him, his soft attitude towards the adamant Quraysh, and opposing his companions, etc. were all done in accordance with his peaceful policy. So his view of the political actions towards his enemy which he focused his attentions upon, emerged from a special angle, and were modified according to the requirements of this special angle.

These are two examples from the actions of the Prophet (pbuh), one is general and focused on a great state that was his main enemy and the focus was from a special angle. The other action was specific and restricted to a defined aim. This defined aim was the special angle, and the Prophet (pbuh) began to view his political and military actions from this special angle. This makes it clear how the view of political events from a special angle dominates the actions and the behaviour, and had not the view been taken from a special angle the actions would have had no meaning.

The great powers after the Berlin conference took the plunder of the Islamic state's (Ottoman state) properties as the special angle of their view, although they discussed both the destruction of the Islamic state and its plunder it was the latter issue they adopted. Thus they modified their actions to suit the robbing of the Ottoman state and hence entered into a political struggle with each other for more than a century. Though the struggle ended with the destruction of the Islamic state, this was not the special angle from which these countries viewed the political events and actions.

America after the Second World War said that the world is a company in which America has the largest share, and therefore this company must be administered by her. She took this as the special angle from which she views the world. All her actions were conducted to suit this angle. Her view from this angle was the reason which made America agree or rather ally with the Soviet Union and snub England and France.

This is the manner by which the view towards the political events of the world should be taken from a special angle, whether this angle is general, like taking the spread of Da'wah as the basis of foreign policy, or specific, like restricting the enmity towards a specific country whose defeat would enable us to go forth in the world. The angle can also be more specific than this, like engaging in a political war, so that the other countries can see a model of our political wars. So the application of the view to the political actions and events from a special angle is an easy matter which does not need the practice of politics in reality. To understand this, it is enough to review the political events deeply. From this it becomes clear that following politics and comprehending the political concepts must lead to the creation of political awareness. This political awareness is very essential for political work and it is a necessary precursor for having influence on the political events.

### ***16.2 Importance Of Political Awareness To Muslims***

Seeing that political awareness has become intuitive for the great countries, and the knowledge of international politics is the daily bread of the politicians, then the sons of the Muslim Ummah who are the sons of the Islamic state, are supposed to have political awareness as the first political concept to be endowed with, and the basis of their political actions. They are also supposed to make an effort to make this political awareness common between the masses and intuitive within society and the daily bread of the politicians. Their major function and prime role is the spread of the Islamic Da'wah in the world and spreading guidance amongst mankind. This cannot be achieved unless they are politicians and view the world from a special angle and enjoy full political awareness.

### ***16.3 Essence Of Political Awareness***

In order that political awareness does not appear as something too big, and that it not be considered a huge thing that is only possible for the intelligent and educated people, they

should know that it is an easy matter and it is also possible for the illiterate and common people. This is true, because political awareness does not require an acquaintance with the political actions in the world nor an acquaintance with everything in Islam, or with what must be taken as the special angle to view the world. It rather means that the view should be towards the world, regardless of how much information he has about it, and it is this view which must be from a special angle. So what matters is that the view should be universal, even if the action is a single political action, and this worldly view must be from a special angle. So the view of the world from a special angle is enough indication for the political awareness.

It is true that this political awareness differs in strength and weakness according to the amount of information the person has about the world and the political events, and also differs according to the knowledge that person has about the special angle. However, it is still political awareness which leads to the same result i.e. an elevation above superficiality in politics and triviality in looking at the events. Accordingly, the political awareness is not restricted to the politicians and thinkers, and it is wrong for it to be restricted to them. It must be common to all the people and it can be established among the illiterate and common people, as it can be established amongst the scholars and the learned people. The political awareness must be established amongst the Ummah even in a general manner, because the Ummah is the ground in which men grow. So this Ummah must be politically aware in order to be able to produce men of real character and in order to be able to criticise the leaders, to evaluate the men, and to face the foreign dangers with real awareness.

#### ***16.4 Political Education***

The way to establish political awareness amongst the individuals and the Ummah as a whole is through a political education in the political sense, whether this education relates to the rules and ideas of Islam or to the following up of political events. The ideas and rules of Islam should not be taught as abstract theories but they should be applied to the events and the situations. Also, the follow up of political events should not follow the line of the journalist who wants to know the news, nor the learned person who wants to increase his information. But the political events must be followed and viewed from the special angle so the events can be judged or linked with other events and ideas, or with the current situation of political actions that lies before us. So the education of the people with the ideology and politics is the way to establish political awareness in the Ummah and the individuals, and this education is what enables the Muslim Ummah to carry out her duties and fulfil her role i.e. to spread the Islamic Da'wa to the world and to spread the guidance amongst the peoples of the world. Accordingly, the Muslim Ummah must be educated politically on the largest possible scale, because this is what establishes political awareness and helps the Ummah to produce a mass of creative politicians.

Rabee'a awwal 1389 May 1969