



مفاهيم سياسية لحزب التحرير

Political Concepts Of Hizb ut Tahrir

Understanding Global Politics from an
Islamic Perspective

The Political Concepts of Hizb ut Tahrir

One of the publications of Hizb ut Tahrir

**Forth Edition
1425 H — 2005 CE**

(Authentic version)

Contents

Introduction	2
Politics is and idea and a method	5
Political plans and styles	11
International situation	18
International conventions and international law	30
Motives of struggle between states	54
Major world issues	61
1. The Issue of Europe	92
2. Middle East (ME) Issue	99
3. Far East Issue	119
4. Issue of Central Asia	126
5. Indian Subcontinent Issue	134
6. Issue of Africa	136
Causes of World Misery	153
How to influence world politics	169
Political awareness	171



Introduction

Politics is taking care of the affairs of a nation (ummah), internally and externally. This is conducted by the state and the ummah. The state conducts that practically; whilst the ummah takes the state to task over that.

Taking care of the affairs of the ummah, internally and externally, by the state is discharged through the implementation of the ideology internally; and this represents the domestic policy.

As regards taking care of the affairs of the ummah externally, by the state, it consists of her relations with other states, peoples and nations, and propagating the ideology to the world; and this represents the foreign policy.

Understanding of the foreign policy is fundamental for safeguarding the entity of the state and the ummah; it is essential for the enablement of conveying the da'wa to the world; and it is indispensable for the sound regulation of the relations of the ummah with others.

Since the Islamic ummah is entrusted with carrying the Islamic da'wa to the whole mankind, it is thus indispensable for Muslims to stay in contact with the world, where they comprehend its circumstances, understand its problems, be aware of the motives of its states and nations, pursue the political actions that take place in the world. In this context, they have to pay attention to the political plans of the states in terms of the styles they use for the execution of such plans, the relations between these states, and the political manoeuvres they use. Therefore, it is indispensable for Muslims to understand the reality of the situation in the Islamic world in the light of understanding the global international stance. This is vital for them so that they can find out the style of work they use to establish their state, and to convey their da'wa to the world.

However, it must be understood that the situation of any state would not remain the same internationally. It rather goes into many changes, in terms of strength and weakness, power of influence or its absence, and in terms of difference and change of its current relations with other states. Therefore, it is not possible to draw constant and general guidelines for the international position, and nor giving a constant thought about the position of any of the existent states in the world. It is rather possible to give a general guideline about the political situation at a certain period, taking into notice the possible change of this position. It is also possible to give a specific thought about the situation of any state at a certain circumstance, bearing in mind the possible change of such position. Therefore, it is necessary that the politician has to pursue with the ongoing political actions in the world and to link them with his previous political information. This is necessary for him so that he can properly understand politics, understand whether the political situation remains the same or has changed, and understand the political situation of every state and whether such situation remained the same or has changed as well.

Change of the international situation is subject to the change of political situation of some states from one circumstance to another. Such change of a political situation of a state is either because it became stronger or weaker, or because its relation with other states became stronger or weaker. In such a case, a change in international balance would result due to change in the balance of powers existent in the world. Therefore, understanding of the situation of each state that has influence on the international situation is the basis for understanding the international situation. Accordingly, attention must be focused on obtaining information about each state; because this is the first pillar for political understanding. Understanding of the situation of each state is not related to its position in the international situation; it is rather related to any thing related to its domestic and foreign policy. Thereupon, it is necessary to be acquainted with the thought upon which the policy of each existing state in the world is built; particularly those states that might have influence on the stance,

which the Islamic ummah must take towards them. It is also necessary to know the plans and styles used by such states. This knowledge of the plans and styles must be linked with pursuing them constantly and with the extent of their change. Understanding of the motives behind such change or the reasons that forced such states to change these plans and styles is necessary as well; besides the sound knowledge of the matters that affect these states or drive them to change their plans and styles.

Politics is and idea and a method

As regards the thought upon which the policy of a state is established, it is the thought on whose basis the state builds its relation with other nations and peoples. The thoughts of the states that do not adopt an ideology, are different and dissimilar; besides such thoughts are open to change. The policies of such states would be studied through the study of their political plans and styles; where the study of the political thought is irrelevant.

As regards the states that adopt an ideology, their thought is constant without a change. This thought would be the propagation of the ideology, which it adopts, to the world via a constant method that does not change, regardless of the change of styles; so the study of the political thought applies to such states.

Accordingly, the present states in the world have to be viewed based on the assumption that each one of them has a basic thought for drawing its relation with other nations and peoples; whether this thought was constant or not. It also has a specific method for executing this thought, whether such method was constant or not. In the light of its thought and method, it draws the plans, and follows the styles that help it to realize its objective. However, the present states in the world today give free rein to themselves in terms of the styles. So, they would follow a style that realizes the objective, even if it violates the method; and thus they follow the rule that says: “The end justifies the means”.

Whatever the case may be, all the states draw political plans that change according to the need; and they follow styles that differ and diversify in accordance with the situations.

The states undertake political actions so as to take care of the interests of the ummah. They build relations with other states in accordance with the interests. Despite that, there is a big difference between the states. The state that does not adopt a certain ideology would make the interest alone as the effective factor in

its international relations. As regards the state that adopts a certain ideology that conveys to the world, it makes the ideology an effective factor in its international relations, and makes the interest assigned by the ideology a supportive factor in this course. Therefore, it is necessary to understand a state in terms of the thoughts it adopts, whether it adopts an ideology or not. Then the factors that affect its international relations would be understood. Since an ideology affects the state that adopts it, and consequently it affects the international relations and the international situation, therefore it is necessary to be acquainted with the ideologies that prevail in the world today. It is also necessary to know the extent of effect each ideology has today on international politics, and its possible effect on international arena today and in future. In the light of these ideologies and the extent of their effect at present and in future, the international relations can be understood.

When we examine the world today, we find it dominated by three ideologies only, which are: Islam, communism and capitalism, where hundreds of millions of people embrace each one of them. However, Islam has no state today to adopt; therefore we do not see any effect to it in the international relations and international situation that prevails the world today. As regards the actions that are undertaken by the states of the world to prevent the return of the Islamic state to life, after the unrest amongst Muslims became quite noticed, this has nothing to do with the international situation, and nor it affects the international relations. This is because effect on the international situation and international relations requires the presence of a state that adopts Islam as an ideology, upon which it conducts its domestic and foreign policy.

As regards that which is noticed, in terms of the prospects of international, particularly American, politics for attempting to reshape the Islamic region via plans of hegemony, such as 'Greater Middle East Initiative' in 2003. All of this is due to the growing fear of these states that emergence of a state to Muslims is

potentially near. It is not because Islam affects on international politics the way it would do when there is a real Islamic state.

As regards the other two ideologies, each one of them has a state, rather more. Therefore, they have effect on international relations, international situation, and international politics, particularly when the Soviet Union (SU) was present, and before its downfall. One sign of their effect is that world was divided into two camps: the eastern one and the western one. However, after the collapse of the eastern camp, and fragmentation of Warsaw Pact, the bi-polar policy in the world came to an end. So, Communist ideology is no more implemented, even formally, except in China and North Korea. Accordingly, struggle in the world ceased to be international; it rather became regional. This is because after the downfall of SU, its (communist) thought ceased to have effect on the global politics. This was due to the fact that the propagation of communism, upon which its foreign policy was established, ceased to be implemented.

As regards the states that still adopt communism, their foreign policy is not based on this thought. Chinese policy, as an example, is not built on propagating communism in the world. This is due to the reality of Chinese people, which was content with influence in the Asian neighbourhood; and it did not historically aspire for a global role. Due to this reality of the Chinese people, China did not strive any time to prepare itself and its resources for acquiring an effective position in the global politics. All the Chinese activities are still focused on winning regional influence in the neighbourhood.

As regards the capitalist camp, the thought upon which its policy is built is the propagation of capitalism, which is separation of religion from life affairs, worldwide. Though there are numerous and different states that adopt capitalism, all of them work to propagate their capitalist intellectual leadership in the world, and to make their viewpoint about live dominate over the world.

As regarding the method, which the capitalist camp follows for executing its thought, it is colonialism; ie imposing the political, military, cultural and economic authority over the conquered peoples for the sake of their exploitation. This method of colonialism is constant, and does not change regardless of the change of governments and their laws. Colonialism is not as Lenin described, where he said: 'It is the last stage of capitalism'. Rather, colonialism is part of the viewpoint of capitalism; and it is the method by which capitalism is propagated to the nations and peoples. Therefore, the foreign policy of the capitalist camp is constant, in terms of its thought and its method; and it does not change following the change and competition of states. Thus, Britain is like America, France, Italy and any other capitalist state; where its policy is based on propagating its ideology and its viewpoint about life, through colonizing the nations and peoples.

For understanding the method of the western camp, it is worth noticing that though this method, which is colonialism, is constant, however the styles of realizing colonialism and view towards it have developed a little in the western camp. This was in term of its link, as a method, with capitalism, as a thought, through time. And also in term of change of styles and difference in the view towards colonialism, which occurred as a result of this development. As regards the change in the styles of the method (colonialism), it used to depend on military domination in what was known as old colonialism, but then it became to depend on other matters in what was called new colonialism. So, America started to depend on the economic side, such as loans, development projects, experts and the like; this is beside political pressure and harassment. However, America returned to use, beside these styles, the style of military domination over the nations and peoples, so as to subjugate them to her influence and will. She also began to endeavour to building military bases in her colonies so as to safeguard her influence in them. England became to depend on finding agents for her, English intelligence, making rulers as agents for her and on notorious trading deals. Her dependence on loans retreated because of her weak financial

situation. Likewise, her dependence on military bases diminished due to her weak international influence, though she still holds fast to her military garrisons and bases in her colonies, as in Cyprus, or close to those colonies. Thus, change of styles became an inseparable attribute of colonialism.

As regards the change in the view towards colonialism, concerning its link (as a method) with capitalism (as a thought), this view started to fluctuate between two matters. On one side is the strength of this link, i.e. colonialism is just a method for propagating capitalism, which means the prime attention is for propagating capitalism. On the other side is the weakness of this link, ie the prime attention is colonialism, itself, while the second attention is propagating capitalism. In this case, colonialism was close to become an objective. The strength and weakness of this link depend on the country, which the capitalist states want to dominate. Has such country a civilization, where these states want to invade it and enforce the corrupt capitalist civilization on it, so as to enable its control and pillage of its wealth? Or, is it empty, having no civilization to be attacked; they rather colonize it for robbing its resources and controlling it only? This is manifested in the fact that the severity of competition between the western states over the colonization of Africa was for its exploitation, and the propagation of the capitalist thought hardly existed. Civil war in Uganda and Rwanda continued for many years, causing hundreds of thousands of human victims. In the events of Zaire (Democratic Congo), there was only material greed and competition over influence between Europe and America. Britain and her European allies, together with America, did not look for anything in Africa except for material benefit. Thus, colonialism in Africa was close to become an objective rather than a method. However, in the Islamic world: the Middle East and North Africa or in Central and South Asia, the colonial powers, including America, besides they struggle to exploit its material resources, they strive to propagate capitalism as well, as represented in their attention to the conferences of ‘freedom of women’ and ‘consolidation of women’, the contents of the American plan for the Middle East, imposing the

cultural hegemony as manifested in ‘rebuilding of cultures’, dialogue between religions, meeting of civilizations, and focus on changing or modifying the education curriculum; all of that is for breaking the attachment of Muslims to their civilization and culture. Thus, the method of capitalism started to develop with time. However, colonialism is a fundamental pillar in capitalism, whether it was a method for propagating capitalism or a method that is more to become an objective.

Political plans and styles

Political plans and styles used to execute such plans change in accordance with interest; though the plans are of less change than the styles. From following international politics, it is noticed that a plan is a general policy, which is devised for realizing one of the objectives required by the propagation of the ideology or by its method. However, the style is a specific policy related to one of the details that help in accomplishing and strengthening a plan.

As an example, the American plan for Iraq was to occupy it whether with or without an international resolution. Then, a government would be established that gives international legitimacy to the occupation via the United Nations, after it was ignored at the beginning of occupation. This is beside another (local) legitimacy through some form of Iraqi elections. After that, this government would sign, on behalf of the people of Iraq, an agreement that accepts the presence of the occupation forces, and thus give them legitimacy through the request and acceptance of the people of Iraq of their presence, and via an international resolution. This plan would prevent the other states and Security Council from interfering in Iraqi matters, and make America the only country that freely runs the entire affairs of Iraq. This would give legitimacy to the occupation, because its presence was accepted by the legally elected Iraqi government. A new constitution would then be put for Iraq under the supervision of occupation, where division would be devoted, the state would be fragmented under the pretext of federalism, fire of sectarianism would be kindled, and Muslims would be engaged in fighting each other instead of engaging themselves in removing occupation. Therefore, America has used all means and styles available to her for occupying Iraq, according to a devised plan, and then making such occupation legitimate by giving it an international and local legitimacy.

On the other side, the plan devised by France was based on forming, under its leadership, an axis made of great states for confronting the American plan. This French plan necessitated to obstruct Security Council from issuing explicit resolutions that give a cover for the American Plans related to using the SC for invading Iraq. Thus, America completely failed to use the card of SC; and it was also internationally exposed as acting against the (international) law. This made America appear to follow the tyrannical force against the law, instead of being seen as defender to international law, as it used to be seen before. France managed to incite and provoke the emotions of the Germans to a point they upset America by their actions. Russia stood on the side of France by preventing America from using SC to support her plans. As a result, the French plan succeeded in exposing the American aims from the invasion, rather than in preventing it.

The British plan was complicated, devious, where Britain supports America superficially so as to gain a part of the spoils. She appears on America's side on the international arena whenever the balance of power is in her favour; but it stabs her in her the back every time she found it possible. Britain went along with America because the balance of international forces was in her favour. However, on the other side, it pushed her to propose the issuance of a resolution from the SC concerning the attack on Iraq. Britain did that despite it knew in advance the impossibility of issuing a resolution due to the stance of France, Russia and Germany. Thus, the fault of America was exposed that she wanted to attack Iraq with or without a resolution. Britain emphasised that approach through the presence of Blair in the summit held between Chirac and Schroeder on 20/9/2003. Thus he used the British political cunning so as to consolidate the position of the two states against the American stance, by provoking them through some of the views presented by Britain. This would drive the two states to become more rigid, without showing this British stance openly before America. Britain maintained the same policy even after the

occupation of Iraq, and after the presentation of American projects to the UN for granting legitimacy to the occupation.

Another example is the American plan, which she devised to prevent the EU from becoming truly united and becoming threat to America. This plan was based on three axes, which are:

Firstly: It is through expansion of EU so as to contain the states of East Europe. These states are America's willing tools and her spearhead for inserting America's influence into the EU. This was demonstrated when these states supported America's view concerning attack against Iraq. This made Rumsfeld ridicule Europe by calling it old and new Europe. French President, Chirac flared up because of the actions of these (East Europe) states; and he tried to allude that their stance on the side of America would obstruct their final acceptance in the union. Despite that, their entry was agreed upon in the decisive EU meeting held for accepting the new members, and France could not obstruct their entry.

Secondly: It is also through the continuation of NATO pact despite the break-up of the opposite WARSAW pact. Then the strategy of the NATO pact was expanded so as to interfere in the security issues of Europe, instead of its defence against foreign danger as it was since its first formation. When Europe felt of the danger of the alliance against it because its actual leadership is with America, France, Germany, Belgium and Luxemburg called for forming special European force. America objected to that; and she still causes troubles to Europe even before this special European force comes to exist.

Thirdly: America exploits the British stance; this is because Britain, using its famous cunning, does not want the EU to become a unified power where Britain melts inside it and becomes a marginal state like Luxemburg, as an example. It still carries in its depths the glory of the empire, whose territories are not veiled from the sun. Therefore, we had seen it try to obstruct the

development of the union; and it did not join it except after it had seen it a reality, so it joined it to weaken it. Until this moment, it did not join the unified European currency (Euro). Its imperial mentality drives it to look for a role on the international arena via any possible mean.

On the other side, the French plan was to strengthen the EU and make of it an appropriate umbrella that faces the American umbrella. This is beside its struggle to form a European army, independent from the NATO pact. It managed to pull Germany to its side in that regard, where it acted very smartly by reaching an agreement with it to an extent that it made Britain join them lest it misses its share in the cake in case France and Germany succeeded in that plan. Thus, France succeeded recently together with Britain and Germany in establishing a nucleus of this army despite the strong American pressures against Britain and Germany for preventing its formation. The plan of the three states also succeeded in drawing long term policies for the EU, in seclusion of the interventions of the small states of the union and the states that endeavour to influence it, like Italy and Spain.

Thus we find France has succeeded in finding a way, though it is still early, to consolidate the EU, through forming an independent military nucleus in Europe by agreement with Germany and Britain. Had not these states embraced capitalism that makes the special interest of each state at top of its own priorities, then they would have succeeded in creating a strong EU that faces America. However, the fact that France succeeded in presenting the plan to the powerful states in Europe, namely Germany and Britain, is considered an important action counter to America, which she cannot ignore.

Another example is the plan devised by America to contain Russia and make of it a state without even regional influence. So, America is working to drive it out of the Balkan area, East Europe and Central Asia. Besides, she tries to annul the effect of its nuclear arsenal that represents an important factor of its

power and to tower over it in space as well. America adopted various styles for achieving that. It attacked the Yugoslavian army (Serbia and Kosovo), where there is the Slavic racial relation with Russians, through using the issue of Kosovo. She also established economical and military relations with East Europe states so as to infiltrate in them. Then she annexed many of them in the NATO pact. She also took advantage of war against terrorism, so she established for herself military bases in Central Asia states after she managed to attract some of the rulers of those states through economic aid. Besides, she occupied Afghanistan. Furthermore, she resorted to developing an anti missile system against the Russian missiles so as to annul the effect of the transcontinental Russian missiles that carry nuclear heads. She exploited the poverty in Georgia to push her agents to assume highest position of authority there. This removed the buffer zone between Russia and the NATO in Turkey. She also persuaded Russia to give up its space station, Mare, and take part in the international space station 'ISS', so as to obstruct its competition in invading space. Thus, America continues in devising plans for containing Russia, so that it remains without regional influence, after losing its international influence via the collapse of the SU.

She does the same to China, because America views the necessity of forcing China to bow and changing it into an ordinary state, particularly it does not have the elements of a great power. However, since mid nineties and due to the power it has, it became a regional great power, where it has the right of Veto in the SC, besides it has some regional ambitions and wishes, a matter that is not accepted by America. America views China as a huge trade market that must be used, and a human giant that must be tamed, so as not become danger to American interests in the region of East Asia. Therefore, America found it necessary after the end of cold war to contain China and, at best, restrain it within a narrow area of influence if she could not completely cut it of its area of influence. Therefore, America gives attention to normalise the relations with Vietnam so as to make of it a blocking stone before China, once the American-

Vietnamese relations improved. She also tries to make the Korean subcontinent an advanced dangerous line around China, through increasing pressure on North Korea under the pretext of axis of evil. At the same time she works to keep her military bases in the area close to the borders of China and at its gate. She also tries to make of India a rival to China; besides her endeavour to create strategic allies and regional military alliances in Central Asia and Middle East. She established as well military bases in Central Asia on the western borders of China, at the other side of Himalaya.

Thus, political plans and styles are devised for an immediate action. However, it is not unlikely that a state changes current styles and search for others if such styles were exposed and became unsuitable. It might also change a plan if it became useless, or its presence caused unnecessary troubles to the state. However, when a state changes its plan, it replaces it with another one. Likewise, when it changes a style, it uses another; and it never restrains from devising plans and styles unless it became weak and declined from its level at international situation, as it happened with those states that lost their political influence like Japan, Italy, Holland, Belgium and Portugal.

As an example for the change in plans is that which America devise for Germany. Her plan was to awaken German militarism and establish West German republic. Then it changed to weakening West Germany, and making a union between it and East Germany, together with controlling armament of Germany. In 1990 it decided to unify it and make of it a strong European state that competes with France and Britain and vies with them for the leadership of EU; a matter that will reduce the possibility of unifying Europe as one force.

The American plan devised for China was to support it and make of it an international player. This was through improving her relations with it, as well as improving the Chinese-Japanese relations. This plan aimed at making of China one of the pillars of international order, in order to weaken the

international situation of the SU at that time and to increase the rift between the two archenemy communist allies. After the end of cold war, America changed her plan, and viewed the need of a plan for containing China, and secluding it behind its great wall. So, it resorted to devise a plan that does not allow China to pose danger to America's interests in East Asia, particularly China has enough means to do that.

The example for change of styles is that which America undertook in the Islamic world countries. In the past she used military coups for bringing her agents into power, economic aid such as loans and development projects, using the experts and the like, besides using the policy of the stick and the carrot. However, she started now to depend on military solutions and intimidation, and returned back to using alliances and military bases, after she abandoned them. This would remind of the period of military colonialism and western imperialism.

Britain had as well changed its styles; so it abandoned the military treaties and bases, and used instead the agent rulers, economic agreements and armament treaties. It seems it is trying to go along with America by returning back to the military bases as an old and new style.

This is a demonstration of the political plans and styles. So, Muslims must know for sure that the western camp does not change its political thought and nor its method. It rather changes its plans and styles so as to draw new plans and follow new styles, in order to be able to propagate its ideology. If its plans were destroyed and its styles were frustrated, then its projects for whose sake these plans and styles were drawn will fail. Therefore, political struggle has to be directed against the plans and styles, by exposing them and resisting them. This struggle has to be undertaken, at the same time, against the political thought and its method. Thereupon, it is inevitable that Muslims have to know the political plans of every state, and distinguish their styles.

International situation

Understanding of political situation differs from understanding the policy of each state. This is because understanding the policy of the influential states is related to the understanding of the thought and method upon which the policy of such states is based, as mentioned before. As regards the international situation, it is the structure of the effective international relations. In other words, it is the situation of the leading state and those states that compete with it. This situation is not related to the thought and method. It is rather related to the international relations, and the constant competition between the states over the position of the leading state and over having influence on international politics. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the international situation.

However, it must be clear that international situation is not stable; it rather changes and differs in the world according to its circumstances, events, and conditions. Despite that, it is possible to draw a clear picture for it, and give general guidelines about it; besides giving some details about its circumstances. However, this would only apply to it as it appears to people at the time of its description, where the description would apply to an existing reality. When the international situation changes, its previous description would not be wrong; it is rather a description for something in the past, so it becomes part of the history. In this case it is necessary to describe the reality in progress, ie to the new international situation. Therefore, the description of the international situation that we will present, in terms of drawing its picture, giving general guidelines about it, or addressing its details, all of this is description to a reality that has occurred before, or occurring now, or expected to occur in future; however it cannot be considered constant. Therefore, a politician must have information about international situation, and international politics, where he links them with what he watches, in order the matter becomes clear, and he can judge on it.

Understanding of the international situation requires of Muslims to know the post of the leading state in the world, and the position of the other states in relation to her and to the global politics. It is also necessary to know the subordinate states, those states that revolve in the orbit of others, and the independent states.

As regarding the subordinate state, it is that which is linked to another state concerning its foreign policy and in some domestic issues. This is like Egypt in relation with America, and Kazakhstan (currently) with Russia. As regarding the state that revolves in the orbit of another one, it is the one that is linked in its foreign policy with another state based on common interest and not as subordination. The example to this is Japan with America, Australia with each of America and Britain, Canada with each of America, Britain and France, and Turkey (currently) with each of America and Britain. As regarding the independent state, it is the one that runs its foreign and domestic policies as it wishes and in accordance with its interest, such as France, China and Russia.

There are cases that do not come under international politics. They are rather incidents that emerged due to the withdrawal of the colonial powers from their colonies. Such cases and the like are not discussed within international politics, and nor general guidelines are given about them. Rather, each case has to be studied alone, where then a judgment is given about it. As an example to that is Iraq after the withdrawal of English from it, on the 14th July 1958 military coup, and the termination of all treaties and links; so it became an independent state internationally like France, England and any other independent state. However, since its ruler at that time was an American agent, Iraq became in reality subordinate to America, though internationally it is independent. When 17th July 1968 coup took place, and the English agents assumed the power, Iraq became subordinate to America.

Thus, when the ruler of an independent state becomes an agent, or when an agent ruler assumes power, then the independent state becomes subordinate to the state, to which he became an agent.

Therefore, these cases apply to all of the states that were colonized before; and they changed their subordination by the effect of the change of their rulers. Such states are independent from superficial international aspect, but in reality they are subordinate. However, these are individual cases that result from the liberation of the colonies from imperialism, and the attempt of the colonial powers to restore the colonies, or the attempt of other states to replace them in their colonies after their withdrawal.

It is very vital to know the post of the leading state in the world, because of its importance in understanding the global politics and understanding the international situation. At time of peace, the leading state in the international situation would be internationally the effective power; while the second state would not be much different than the others concerning its capability of having global political influence.

The effect of the other states comes only from those that can have influence on the leading state. The degree of such influence fluctuates in accordance with the self- created\force of such state as well as its global power. The stronger a state is, and the greater is its global weight, the greater would be its influence on the leading state, and consequently on the international politics, from an international aspect.

The most obvious example of attempting to influence the leading state, and then influencing global politics, is the example of Britain nowadays (2004). Its effect on global politics, from an international aspect, comes from the influence it has on America, as a leading state, and from its constant influence on its colonies. France, Russia and France have also worked together after the American-British war against Iraq to generate some form of influence on the

leading state, and consequently on the global politics, from an international aspect.

The example of the states that have no influence on the leading state, and consequently on global politics is the subordinate state as well as that which revolves in orbit. With regards the subordinate state, it is not possible to influence the leading state except by how much it is used by the state it follows. Likewise, the state that revolves in orbit, obtains its influence from the superpower in whose orbit it revolves.

With regards to other than non subordinate states and those not revolving in orbit, namely the independent states, such as Switzerland, Spain, Holland, Italy and Sweden, as an example, these can influence global politics, from an international aspect, if they safeguarded or threatened the interests of the leading state. As an example to that is what each of Italy and Spain has done of safeguarding one of the important interests of America through supporting her in her occupation of Iraq in 2003.

Therefore, any state that wishes to have influence on global politics and use it in its favor must follow one of two courses: It has either to pose effective threat to the real interests of the leading state in the international situation; or it has to safeguard the interests of the leading state by making compromise for its favor.

The effective threat is the assured productive path; as well as it is the appropriate one for the true state that aims at a guaranteed effect and a heard voice in the international situation. With regards to the second path that aims at safeguarding interests, this is gloomy and unreliable; where it might achieve the aim, but it might lead to destruction. This is because it is a gamble with the entity of an ummah, and a foolish adventure of the destiny of a state. Since safeguarding the interest of a superpower by any state does not prevent the superpower from making a bargain over this interest with any state of less importance and capabilities.

America has compromised her traditional western European states in 2003 after she called them 'old Europe', and started to look for states of East Europe to replace them in her alliance over the issue of Iraq. She also alluded to Britain when she tried to dissuade her from pursuing her path concerning invasion of Iraq without referring to the United Nations for obtaining legitimacy from it. Rumsfeld, the American defence minister said then: "America is capable to go for Iraq without Britain".

In order that a state can pose a threat to the interests and create effective influence, it must have obtained defence capabilities and means of complete domestic control. The only right course to achieve this is to proceed in the advanced revival path; ie it should have an ideology and carry a global message. It starts with its neighbours so as to protect itself from intervention in its domestic affairs. It should not restrict itself on defending its borders; it should rather expand with its ideology and influence, so as to compete with the leading state in the international situation.

In order a state can budge the leading state from its leading role, it must change the political environment to its favour, and attract the other states politically to it and its thought. This is like what Germany did before World War II. Once a state managed to do that, the international situation becomes unstable, thus waiting a state to assume the position of the leading state. This does not generally happen unless a war takes place and changes the situation, whether it was a world war or a limited partial war. This might also happen when the danger of a war against the leading state was most likely, and this state needs the help of the state that vies with it in its camp.

The position of the leading state in the world is not new; it rather existed in the past. In old history Egypt was the leading state; while Ashore in Iraq was competing with it over this post. Romans were the leading state, while Persia was competing with it over this post. Islamic state was the leading state since

Khilafa Rashida till the crusader wars; and it did not face then any competition over this post. France was the leading state and England was competing with it over this post. Ottoman state, as a Khilafah state, was the leading state for about three centuries, and it did not have any competition over this post till mid 18th century. Before World War I Germany was the leading state, while England and France were competing with it over this post. After World War I England was the leading state and France was competing with it over this post. Little before World War II Britain was the leading state, and Germany was competing with it over this post till it was about to be the leading state just before the break out of World War II. However, America took part in this war, which ended by assuming this post by America. She started to draw the international politics and political situation, for she was the strongest state in taking the international politics to her side. She continued to control the international situation, where only the political events that she wanted would take place and be executed. SU, as well as Britain and France continued their trail to compete with her then; and they joined her in influencing the global politics to a certain extent in accordance with the power of these states, where SU tried strongly and Britain did less.

With regards to the SU, it succeeded to stand as a partner and an ally on the side of America. While England retreated and started to decline till it reached its current situation. This was because England started to wake up after the blow it received in World War II, and started its attempt to budge America from the leading state post. It started to undertake political actions to influence America; so it did not play except a symbolic role in the Korean War. It used to pass to China the military information of America, where China was the real power that conducted the Korean War. England managed through its devious hidden means to influence the international position of America in the Korean War, which led to destabilize her post. It also stood on the side of the Eastern camp in Geneva Conference, which was convened to solve the Indo-Chinese issue, so it came out with resolutions in favour of the Eastern camp. Moreover,

it used to pass to Russia the intelligent and military news of America; and one of the news it passed to Russia was the information about the plane U2, which led to bringing it down. In Paris Conference, Macmillan stood on Khrushchev's side against Eisenhower, trying to humiliate him as a president of USA, which led to the failure of the conference and weakening of America's position. Thus, England undertook many actions for attacking America, trying to influence the post of the leading state; but America noticed that. Then, the meeting between Khrushchev and Kennedy took place in Vienna; where England turned since then from the position of attacking America to defending itself, because Russia (SU) and America started since then to work together for eliminating England in the world.

SU used to ignite cold war against the western camp, singling out America with the greatest part. It was trying to take initiative from the western camp, and working to budge America from the post of leading state in order to become the leading state in the world. It succeeded in many actions, where it managed to displace America from its strong fortress, which is the UN, to holding conferences outside UN, for solving international problems. It used to encourage England for competing with America so as weaken the role of the leading state, and to increase the split for the sake of weakening the role of the leading state. It also increased the split between France and America and made great effect on international actions. Besides; SU made progress in space till it surpassed America; it also surpassed her in the field of nuclear weapons and transcontinental ballistic missiles. It established a military basis for it in Cuba to pose threat to America, and exposed many of the American (colonial) styles in Congo, Egypt and Algeria, besides other countries. However, despite that caused great effect on America, it did not budge it from the post of the leading state. It was rather partial gains in some political issues, internationally. SU did not however despair from attacking America by using the cold war styles till the meeting between Khrushchev and Kennedy in 1961. The two leaders met in June of 1961 in Vienna, the Capital of Austria, and agreed to divide the world

between them. After that date, each of Britain and France was dropped from international politics; and SU and America drew alone together this politics. Britain failed in all of its attempts after that to have a voice in global politics; and the same happened to France, even at time of De Gall, where it could not advance one step in creating influence to itself in discussing global politics. The situation continued like that till 1989 when Berlin wall was brought down, the SU was fragmented two years after that and the cold war came to an end. Russia officially inherited the situation of the SU in the beginning of the nineties of last century. However, it was dropped from the second rank in international politics, where a new international situation existed in which USA became for the first time without an international partner. The world entered into an unprecedented international stage. So, America tried, in the last days of Bush, the senior, to draw a unilateral international policy, and he used the term of new world order. However, this order did not succeed, and it remained ambiguous; besides the international situation remained clouded till Clinton assumed authority in 1992. He laid down a new world order that does not depend on unilateralism, rather on superiority. Clinton administration started to lay down the pillars of the new order, whose most important pillar was the policy of partnership with other superpowers. This was reflected in the settlement of the Balkan problems in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, and in the disassembly of nuclear weapons in Ukraine and Byelorussia through mutual understanding with Russia. Memorandums of mutual understanding were signed between America and the states that were part of the eastern group, where Britain and Germany participated in the signature of some of these memorandums. America also managed in that period, and through the politics of partnership, to expand the NATO pact through cooperation with west Europe states, which they benefited from the expansion of EU. All of this expansion was done on the account of Russia and its influence.

This period was distinguished by the ascent of German power. This is because the fall down of Berlin wall, and removing the support to East Germany was

accompanied by unification of East Germany and West Germany with outstanding speed. New Germany became the biggest economic force in Europe, and grew into an effective and influential political force, where America and Europe started to seek its favour. The matter reached a point where discussion started about the entry of Germany into the club of permanent states in the SC, by America, Europe and the world.

This new political situation was accompanied with new economic situation, where the politics of (open) market have been greatly activated. This was manifested in politics of globalization, which became imposed on the world. Thus, the companies went into Cartels to become of giant scale; and they appeared as a principal economic player that imposes its policies on the governments. Multinational companies became the talk show of the economists. GATT treaty was transformed in 1995 into a global trading organisation, so as to protect the politics of globalisation under a legal cover. The role of World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) was activated, such that this trio: World Trade Organisation (WTO), WB, and IMF started to be used by superpowers as a means of intervention and pressure in the economic policies of the states. Laurence Eagleburger, the past American foreign minister, and Michel Kamdiso, the head of WB acknowledged that the WB was used to bring down the authority of Suhartu through forcing the policy of floating the currency and depriving him of loans in case he did not accept such policy. So, he surrendered to this demand, floated the currency, and then he was deposed.

The role of the G7, which are the seven industrial states, was activated by adding Russia to them. Thus, these eight industrial countries, which are: America, Japan, Germany, Britain, France, Italy, Canada and Russia have controlled the international economic and financial policies. The state of China can be added to these eight states, because it has a great economic weight, a nuclear force, population weight and a permanent seat in the SC. This would

mean with some liberty that the current superpowers in the world are these nine states. The disparity of the force of these states allows us to eliminate two of them, namely Italy and Canada, because they do not have any political or geopolitical forces that qualify them to play a global role. This means there would remain only seven states that have influence on international politics, which are: America, Britain, France, Germany, Russia, China and Japan. Though there is a difference between these states in terms of global influence, the first five states strive to have influence in different regions of the world; yet America has huge superiority over the other four. China, on the other side, yearns for influence within its regional sphere; whilst Japan looks for influence in various regions in the world, but on economic basis.

The former French foreign minister, Hoper Vidrin said in his book “Pledges of France at globalisation time”: “This single power (America), which dominates over all of the economic, technologic, military, currency, linguistic and cultural areas, is an unprecedented case in history”, as he described it. Vidrin puts then a classification for the states in terms of power and influence, saying: “USA represents the first rank in the world, without a rival. In the second rank comes the seven states that have global influence, which are: France, Britain, Germany, Russia, China, Japan and India, on condition they start to widen their vision, which is still regional”. He adds saying: “The criterion of this classification are many, which include national income, technological level, nuclear weapons together with the quantity and quality level of these weapons, association with international organisations and formations, Security Council, G8 group or EU and then the propagation of the past heritage of language and cultural influence”.

There is an opinion, which is more accurate than Vidrin’s opinion that after the giant state, America, which is not matched by any other state at the beginning of 21st century, there are three real superpowers, which are: Russia, Britain and France. After these three states Germany comes next. These four states have

international ambitions in many places in the world. China comes next as a regional superpower. Had it not been narrow in its international ambitions, it would have competed some or all of the mentioned four states. With regards to Japan, it is the greatest state after America, economically. Therefore the order of the power of the states is as follows: America, Russia, Britain, France, Germany, China and Japan. The term of superpower can apply to these seven states. With regards to India, Canada and Italy, they do not deserve to be called a superpower, though they come next to these seven states; where they form with them the first ten states in the world.

By the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the third thousand years, the administration of George Bush, the son tried to change the rules of the game. It gave up the partnership policy followed by Clinton, and started to impose its policies over the superpowers by force. It withdrew from many international treaties such as that of Kiyoto, international court of crimes, Salt treaties for reduction of ballistic missiles and others. Tension increased between her and other superpowers after the events of 11th September 2001, where explosions took place in World Trade Centre in New York, and Pentagon building in Washington. This gave her a new incentive towards unilateralism; and she used these explosions as excuse to fight what she called terrorism. So she occupied Afghanistan and Iraq under this pretext. Political arrogance reigned over the American administration, where it adopted the policy of “you are either with us or against us”. These new policies provoked angry reaction from Europeans and others, who accused them of simplification and naivety, and asked the American to resort to consultation and partnership. However, the American refused to return to the rules of partnership and consultation followed by Clinton. The so-called neo-conservatives, led by Dick Cheney, the vice president, Rumsfeld, the defence minister, Wolvowitz, his deputy, Richard Pearl, the head of the centre of defence policies, Douglas Feith, John Bolton, Condoleezza Reis and others, these managed to influence the decisions of

Bush. They employed all of their faculties, influence and the companies that support them to serve these policies.

One of these important policies was to ignore the UN and its legitimacy in taking resolution: and giving the priority to the American interest instead. If such interest contradicted with international legitimacy, international legitimacy has to be ignored. If however it did not contradict, then it would be activated. This is the way she dealt with SC; if she succeeded in producing resolutions from the SC, it will be alright; otherwise it would be ignored and neglected.

Europe, represented by Britain tried to dissuade the American administration from bypassing the international legitimacy. This attempt won to its side the American foreign minister, Collin Powel, and the president Bush inclined to it. However, the neoconservatives group foiled this attempt. America continued to ignore the partnership policy, as well as giving an effective role to the international organisation.

However, the administration of Bush, the junior failed to exclude the superpowers, Britain, Russia, France and Germany from playing a role in international politics. Rather, this policy followed by the administration of Bush, the junior strengthened the positions of these states instead of weakening them. This is because they resorted to unite for defending themselves against this forceful American attack on them. This axis cooperated secretly with Britain; so these states managed through opposition and leniency to hold on their positions as effective superpowers, to a certain limit, in international politics.

International conventions and international law

During competition over the post of the leading state in the past, there did not appear political actions linked to any international law; because there was no such law. Rather, since early history competition was through military actions represented by wars, invasion, and biting some frontier territories. This situation continued till mid 18th century, where the international law expanded, or rather existed as a law and legislation. Since that time, political actions started to assume an important part in international relations, and in the settlement of international problems. Thus, political actions started to replace military actions concerning settlement of problems, containing the domination of the leading state and competition over its position. Since that time, arbitration to international law regarding international relations increased; besides the use of political actions as a means for solving international problems, either alone or together with wars and invasions, increased as well. This approach has consolidated obviously after 1919, where World League was established. Thus, more arbitration was made to international league, and international diplomatic norm. International actions generally undertaken by the sates and those competing with the leading state, besides those particularly undertaken by the leading state depended on what is called international diplomatic norm and international law. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the international diplomatic norm and international law so as to understand the reality of political actions and the way of undertaking political actions from an international aspect.

As regards international diplomatic norm it is old, where it existed together with the emergence of emirates and (political) entities. It is the host of rules that emerged due to the relations that existed between the human groups at time of war and peace. Due to observation of these rules for a long time by these groups, they became international diplomatic norms. This host of rules became firmly established between these states later on, and the states started to

consider themselves voluntarily bound by these diplomatic norms; and then became like a law. This commitment is ethical rather than physical, where the human groups used to commit themselves to this diplomatic norm voluntarily, and in fear of public opinion. Whoever failed to follow it will be exposed to anger of public opinion and would be disgraced because of that. As an example for this subject, ie international diplomatic norms, is the agreement of Arabs before Islam on preventing fight during sacred months. Therefore, Quraysh reproached the Messenger ﷺ when the expedition of Abdullah ibn Jahsh killed Amru ibn al-Hadhrami, arrested two men from Quraysh and took the trade caravan. It shouted every where that Muhammad and his companions had infringed the sanctity of the sacred month, shed blood and seized property in it, and arrested people. So, it incited the public opinion against him, because he violated the international diplomatic norms.

Thus, there were between all human groups some mutually acknowledged rules, where they follow at time of war and peace. Some of these rules are the delegates, which are known as ambassadors, war spoils, and the like. However, some of these norms are general, which are followed by all human groups, like ambassadors, ie delegates/messengers. Some others are specific to certain groups. This norm developed based on the needs of the states, emirates and (political) entities, ie in accordance with the needs of the human groups for their mutual relations as groups. People used to arbitrate to the public opinion concerning these international norms, and they would reproach whoever violated them. So, they were observed voluntarily and willingly based on the ethical influence only, without having a physical force to apply them. Dependent on these norms, human groups used to undertake political actions.

With regards to the international law, it has emerged and existed against the Islamic state when it was represented in Ottoman state. This is because the Ottoman state, as an Islamic state, invaded Europe and declared jihad against the Christians in Europe. It started to conquer their lands, one after the other.

So, it took over what is called Greece, Romania, Albania, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Austria, to the point it knocked the gates of Vienna. It scared all the Christians in Europe; so a general norm existed amongst the Christians that Islamic army is invincible, and when Muslims fight they do not give regard to death, because they believe they will enter Jannah once killed, and because they believe in fate (qadar) and life-term (ajal). The Christians have seen of the bravery and severe assault of Muslims that made them run away from them. This helped Muslims to sweep over lands and subjugate them to the authority of Islam. Christians at that time consisted of emirates and feudal estates; so they were fragmented states, where each state was fragmented into emirates, each of them is governed by a feudalist who shares authority with the king. This made the king unable to force these emirates to fight, and nor he has right of speaking on their behalf with the conquerors concerning issues of foreign affairs. This helped Muslims to fight and conquer lands. This situation of the European states continued till medieval ages, ie till the end of 16th century. In that century, ie in the medieval ages, the European states started to gather for forming one family/community that can confront the Islamic state. The church used to dominate these states and Christian religion used to combine them; so the church started some attempts for forming a Christian community out of this group of states. They started to determine relations between them, which led to the emergence of accepted rules for organising the relations amongst them. This was the first emergence of what was called later on international law. Therefore, the basis of the emergence of international law was the fact that the European Christian states gathered on the basis of Christian bond to confront the Islamic state. This led to the emergence of what is called international Christian community. It agreed on rules amongst it, which include equality of member states concerning rights, these states hold the same common principles and ideals, and all of these states submit to the Catholic pope regarding the highest spiritual authority, including all of its schools. These rules were the nucleus of the international law. However, gathering of these Christian states

did no work at the beginning, because the rules they agreed upon were unable to combine them. The reason was that the feudalist system was an obstacle before the strength of the state and before its ability to conduct foreign relations. Besides; the domination of the church over the states made them of the subordinates of the church, and deprived them of their sovereignty and independence. Therefore, there was struggle in the state for controlling the feudalists, which ended with the success of the state and removal of feudalist system. At the same time there was struggle between the state and church that led to the removal of the authority of the church over the domestic and foreign affairs of the state, after the church used to control them. However, the state continued to be Christian, but it organised its relation with the church in a form that emphasises the independence of the state. This led to the emergence of strong states in Europe; however they were unable to confront the Islamic state. This situation continued till mid 17th century, ie till 1648. In that year, the European Christian states held the conference of Westvalia, where the permanent rules for regulating the relations between the European Christian states were laid down, and the community of Christian states was organised to face the Islamic state. The conference laid down the conventional rules of the so called international law, though it was not general international law. It was rather international law for the European Christian states only, which prevented the Islamic state to join the international community; besides the term of international law does not apply to it. Since that date, what is called international community emerged, and it consisted of all European Christian states, without distinction between the monarchist and republic states, or the Catholic and Protestant ones. It was first confined to the states of West Europe; then the rest of European Christian states joined it, followed by the non-European Christian states. However, it remained proscribed to the Islamic state until the second half of 19th century. At that time, the Islamic state became weak, and was called the sick man. So, the Ottoman state requested entry to the international community, but its request was rejected. Then it made a more

earnest request of that; so harsh conditions were imposed on it, which included want of arbitration to Islam concerning its international relations, and inserting some Europeans laws. Ottoman state accepted these conditions and surrendered to them. Thus, after its acceptance of giving up its character as an Islamic state in international relations, its application was accepted, and it was included in the international community in 1856. After that, other non Christian states, like Japan joined the community. Therefore, Westvalia conference, which was held in 1648, is the one that organised the conventional rules of the international law. Based on its rules, political actions existed distinctly, together with the collective international actions.

The most important amongst these rules were two dangerous ideas: The first is the idea of international balance, while the second is the idea of international summits. With regards to the idea of international balance, it decides that if a state tried to expand on the account of other states, then all other states would come together to prevent its expansion, in defence of international balance, which is capable of preventing war and spreading peace. With regards to the idea of international summits, a summit consists of the different European states, and it convenes to study its problems and matters in the light of European interests. This idea has developed into the summits of superpowers, which meet to review the matters of the world in the light of the interests of the superpowers. These two ideas were the source of what the world suffers of difficulties, which it faces in the course of removing the authority of the colonial powers and superpowers.

The first time these two ideas were used was at time of Napoleon, at beginnings of 19th century. When the French revolution took place, and spread the ideas that are built on freedom and equality, and recognition of the rights of individuals and peoples, it managed to change the political map of Europe, build new states and destroy old ones. Thus, the European states gathered together under the pretext of balance, and rallied against France. After

defeating Napoleon, these states gathered in Vienna summit in 1815 and discussed restoring of balance, and organising the affairs of the International Christian community. Thus, monarchism was restored in Prussia and Austria; and Sweden and Norway were united in a federation; besides Belgium was annexed to Holland, making one state that prevents French expansion; and Switzerland was made permanently neutral. In order to execute the resolutions of this summit, the states participating in it concluded alliance between them, which is the alliance of kings of Prussia, Russia and Austria, with the agreement of King of England; and France joined it after that. It thus represents an alliance of the superpowers to dominate over the other states. In 1818, treaty of X-Lachable was held between Russia, England, Prussia, Austria and France, where these states agreed on military intervention for suppressing any rebellion that threatens the results concluded in Vienna summit. Thus, the five superpowers appointed themselves as an organisation for protecting security and order in the international community, ie in the Christian community. Then these states expanded their authority to include some Islamic countries after the weakness of the Ottoman state. They made some interventions under the pretext of safeguarding peace. So, they intervened in Naples in 1821, in Spain in 1827, in Portugal in 1826, and in Egypt in 1840. These states tried to intervene in America; so they tried to help Spain in restoring its colonies in America. However, USA, after becoming strong and feared, prevented that. So, the president of USA, James Monroe, issued his famous statement, known as Monroe statement, in 1823, where he said in it: **“USA will not allow any European state to interfere in the issues of the America continent, and nor occupy any part of it”**. Thus, these states ceased from intervention.

This is the origin of the international law; and this is what gave justifications of intervention; and allowed the superpowers to control other states; besides this is the basis of the political actions, which the states undertake to execute their interests or to compete with the leading state. However, these rules went under some change; but it was a change in favour of the superpowers, for regulating

their ambitions; or in other words, for dividing the benefits of the world amongst them in a way that does not lead to wars and military conflict. Nineteenth century was the century of colonialism; so the states rushed in the world for colonizing the weak countries. This resulted in conflict that did not develop to become Great War. However, England, France and Russia realised that Germany, with its huge power, started to threaten them. They saw it would take the oil of the Islamic countries in Iraq, besides threaten England over the oil of Iran and Arab Peninsular. So, these three states agreed together against Germany, and declared war on it. Ottoman state entered the war on the side of Germany and against the allies; but victory was for the allies. However Russia withdrew from the alliance, leaving England, France and America. America returned back to its isolation; so the field was left to England and France. These two states established the League of Nations in order to regulate colonialism between them, and prevent military conflict. This was through organising the affairs of the states and preventing war between them. However, league of Nations; besides it was established in a strange atmosphere of contradiction, it stumbled, because the policy of the superpowers did not change. The concern of each one of them in the peace conference was to achieve balance between the various states, safeguard its interests, and divide the territories of Germany and Ottoman state. The colonial states did not accept any interference in their sovereignty, they maintained their colonies and added to them new form of colonies under a deceptive name called 'states under mandate'. This caused the stumbling of the League of Nations in its attempt for making international conciliation and maintaining security. It tried to conclude international treaties for securing peace, ie for guaranteeing absence of conflict over the colonies. Protocol of Geneva was laid down in 1924 under the sponsorship of the League, so as to settle disputes through peaceful means, and to impose resort to compulsory arbitration. Locarno agreements were laid down in 1925 for mutual security and common aids. Covenant of Brian Kellogg was put in 1928, which prohibited resort to war; and Geneva Convention in 1928 that relates to

compulsory arbitration. However, all of such agreements were unable to prevent the failure of the League of Nations in its task, for many wars broke out under its eyes. These included the Chinese-Japanese war in 1933, Italian-Abyssinian war in 1936, invasion of Germany to Austria in 1938, to Czechoslovakia in 1938 and to Poland in 1939, and finally the break out of World War II in 1939.

This is the change that occurred to the international relations. So, they changed from summits to an international organisation that assumes the maintenance of international security. However, this development did not bring any change, for the states continued in struggle over the spoils till World War II broke out. After that war the superpowers viewed the build up of an international organisation was the best way for organising the relations between them. They make it at the beginning made of the states that were involved in the war; but they expanded it after that to become a global organisation, where all the states of the world were allowed to join it. Thus, the international relations between the states were regulated in accordance with the convention of this organisation. Accordingly, the international relations have changed from a summit of the superpowers for controlling the world, dividing the spoils and preventing the emergence of other superpowers, to become an international organisation for regulating the relations between the states and guaranty of the control of the superpowers, which changed after that to become as a global state that regulates and controls the states of the world.

International situation after Vienna conference in 1815 was represented in the four superpowers: Prussia, Russia, Austria and England. Then France tried to move these states away from their situation, and it changed the map of the world together with the international situation, thus becoming the leading state. Superpowers and other states rallied against it, foiled its ambitions, but associated it with them in controlling the world. The international situation became then represented in these five superpowers. Then England started to

surpass others gradually till it became the leading state. When Germany tried to compete with the leading state and win the oil of the Islamic countries, England agreed with France and Russia against it, fought it, foiled its ambitions and unilaterally colonized most parts of the world. Thus, England took the lion's share, pleasing France with the crumbs and giving it some colonies. So, the international situation became represented in England, France, together with Italy. However, England remained the leading state. The League of Nations then emerged, which was actually established to safeguard the position of the leading state, and prevent other states from competing with it, besides preventing any state from becoming a superpower. This is despite it was established under the pretext of safeguarding world peace. When Germany tried again to compete with the leading state, and it became a superpower, England agreed first with France, and then with Russia and America as well, where they waged World War II against it till they destroyed it.

However, the outcome of the war this time was against England, for it came out smashed at the end of war. The victorious state was America; therefore international force shifted from England's hand to America's hand. Thus, America became the leading state; and the international situation became represented in America as the leading state and SU as the competing one; while England and France became second degree states, ie secondary states in the international situation.

However, after World War II, a new factor occurred on the international situation, which is the division of the world internationally into two camps. This aggravated the severity of international conflict, and complicated the international situation. This situation did not exist before in such form. Yes, indeed the international situation before World War I was made of blocks, but these were not camps. Before World War II, it was divided into front of democracies and front of Nazi and Fascist dictatorship. However, its division was not based on ideology, because neither Nazism and nor Fascism was an

ideology or reach the level of an ideology. Therefore, there were no camps before World War II in ideological sense. After World War II, the world was divided internationally into two camps, which are the western camp and the eastern camp. America was considered the leading state in the western camp, while Russia (SU) was the leading state in the eastern camp. Though the two camps struggled over ideological basis, and over their conflicted interests, they emerged on international basis. This is because ideology was not the only centre of their division into two camps; rather there were also international interests. However, these international interests were in accordance to the communist ideology in the eastern camp, and based on the requirements of its propagation. While in the western camp, they were in accordance to the propagation of the ideology, in pursuance of the national interests. This was on the basis of the capitalist ideology, which considers benefit as criterion for all actions in life. Therefore, there are states in the western camp that are not based on its ideology; however their interests are linked with its interests. This did not exist in the eastern camp. So, all of the states of the eastern camp were communist, because the ideology was their foundation. While the western camp was loose; so it was possible to create cracks in the western camp, and to move out some of its states to the eastern camp. It was also possible to create another camp from the western camp, which is different from the two camps, and which can stand as one unity that has its influence on the international situation, at time of peace and war.

Whoever examined the western camp would find internal division because America holds the position of the leading state. This is after Britain held that position and America was in isolation of the international situation. This division is apparent and hidden, and it was the reason for delaying breakout of a world war. This leading state did not behave in international politics as a leader of the camp as Britain did when it was the leading state. She rather behaved like a general of a military camp, where she imposed this leadership over the soldiers by force. Therefore, the states of the camp that were closer in

terms of power to the leading state, like Britain as an example, were more resentful and disobedient than the weak states. This is related to the policy of America, herself; for after her victory in World War II, she insisted on wresting sovereignty from all the states, and imposing her sovereignty over the world. She was also seized with arrogance because of her feeling of her power and huge wealth. She viewed that she must dominate over the entire world, and all nations and peoples have to ask for her help and seek her pleasure. Therefore, she invaded Europe with political actions and financial projects, and then with military coups in its colonies; particularly England, which was the leading state and had more colonies, followed by France and Holland. Instead of attacking the colonies, she attacked the colonial states themselves by using the plan of Marshal, and giving aid and loans. When she controlled them, she turned to the colonies and started to annex them gradually to her dominion, so as to seize all the colonies, but with a style different to that she used in attacking other European states.

Thus, dispute took root amongst the states of the western camp. However, this dispute is not new; it is rather old, where it started in the western camp before World War II; but it was not a dispute inside one camp. It was rather an economic dispute between two states, and then changed into a political one inside one camp. The reason of this dispute is the economic problems, particularly the problem of oil. This is because the treaties related to it were between Britain and America. Britain's need to America's support led to dispute between these two states, and consequently between the states of the western camp. The explanation of this is that after the situation settled down to Britain after World War I, France was competing with it. This competition was apparent; so Britain worked to weaken France through strengthening Germany at one side, and encouraging national and patriotic movements in the colonies on other side. Thus, it created troubles to France, and kept it busy in defending itself of the danger of Germany.

However, Italy emerged in the international situation, besides Germany emerged also as a power that threatens the position of Britain and France together. Thus, Rome-Berlin emerged, so Britain found it must bring America out of its isolation. Therefore, it tempted it through the oil of the Middle East, which led to the treaties of oil. However, once America started exploration for oil, its companies realised the great value of the Middle East, not only for economic profit, rather for the American entity itself. Therefore, the American companies started to wrest the oil fields and oil concessions from the English companies and started to excel them, which created competition between the English and American companies. Once the American (oil) companies went out and entered the Middle East, America went out of its isolation. Then World War II broke out, so America moved to the position of the leading state in terms of colonialism, while England, France and Holland retreated. Since Holland was weak, it finished as a considerable state. As regarding Britain, it lost some of its influence in the Middle East, some of its influence in the area of Mediterranean Sea and some of its influence in some small states. This led to its further international decline, where America continued to chase it for finishing its influence all over the world. As regarding France, it weakened after it lost its colonies in the Far East and Africa. Despite De Gaulle tried to revive it and restore its international influence, he could not bring it back to its previous position on international arena, though it is still considered of the superpowers.

This shows that the division of the Western Camp and its fragmentation after World War II and during the cold war have weakened all of its states except America. America managed through the liquidation of these states by wresting their colonies and via its own force and influence, remained the leading state, besides its influence strengthened. Britain however continued for some time to do some political manoeuvres and partial military activities for influencing the situation of its ally, America and for shifting it from the leading state position. But later on it became content in attempting to protect its interests without influencing the position of its ally, America. It took this approach after it

discovered its weakness and the great retreat of its power, particularly in confronting a superpower of such huge military and economic capabilities like America. Therefore, the Western Camp, as one block, became fragmented and disputing within itself, where all of its states quarrel and compete with each other over interests; beside they plot against each other.

As regarding the Eastern Camp, it was built on the ideological basis only until the beginning of the sixties of last century. Russia (SU) used to lead it intellectually and militarily. It assumed in it the role of the teacher and guardian on one side, and the role of the guard and leader on the other side. Therefore, there was no any state that competes with Russia (SU) over the intellectual and military leadership; there was no even any state that dared to object to the Soviet policy; and if any objection happened it was suppressed by military force if necessary. The internal policy of the Eastern Camp was built since the time of Stalin on the basis of strengthening the apparatus of the state, besides the preparation of the military fighting forces for both defence and offence at the same time. As regarding its foreign policy, it was built on the basis of inconceivability of peaceful coexistence between capitalism and socialism. Therefore, the Eastern Camp viewed the necessity of taking capitalism as a political opponent, because in reality it is an intellectual opponent. When World War II took place, Russia (SU), cooperated with England, France and America in the war, and worked side by side for some time. However, this was an exceptional case that vanished once the war ended; and the cold war came back again between Russia (SU) and the western states, besides maintaining the political contact between them. This political contact was inside the United Nations, international summits, diplomatic courtesies and diplomatic representation. This did not mean change in the basic communist policy; it was rather one of the miscellaneous political styles. As regards the communist policy towards the Western Camp, it was fundamentally based on the idea upon which the SU is built. It is namely that which the communist ideology states; that capitalism and communism are impossible to live side by side peacefully.

Rather, one of them must finally defeat the other. All communist literature mentions the impossibility of averting dispute between the two ideologies; an opinion which was viewed by both of Lenin and Stalin, without any difference between them; besides all communists agreed on this view. It was not possible to allow any communist politician, whether a ruler or otherwise, to proceed in a policy of peaceful coexistence between capitalism and communism; because he would be considered deviant from the communist thought in foreign policy.

This is the reality of the two camps from an ideological, political and international aspect. However, since 1961 a change had occurred to the two camps from an international angle that led to a change in their real situation and a change in the international situation. Since the mid of the fifties of last century, ie in 1956, some motions and agitations started in both camps, which increased till it led to the complete fragmentation of the two camps. The two camps thus became two states: USA and SU, where these two states gave no any regard to the other states of their camps.

As regarding the communist camp, the communist state was built on a non-national basis, rather on an ideological basis. This meant it was built as a communist state all over the world and for the entire world. This basis dictated two issues: Firstly, it must remain internally in a state of readiness for war and serious preparation of economical and military forces for spreading communism. This dictates continuous political and economical pressure on the people. Therefore, the communist state remained as an unpleasant nightmare to the Russian people; and this people remained economically deprived of the luxuries, and even of the necessities. All of this was for the sake of spreading the communism in the world. As for the second issue, which the communist state was obliged of was taking an ingrained state of hostility towards all the western states as imperial capitalist states, and kindling permanent cold war with them, besides being ready for indulging in real war with them at any time. This matter put the two camps in open hostility, and in a situation that might

drag them into real war at any time. However, the compound evils of communism did not enable its proponents to proceed with its theories till the end. Therefore, in the last fifties of last century a new school of thought (in communism) assumed power, and started to give a new interpretation to it favourable to the interests of Russia, and it was more close to national rather than communist interpretation. So, in terms of the internal policy, they created some relaxation to the people from political aspect. As from economical aspect they reduced the pressure on the people and started to gradually allow consumption goods. In terms of foreign policy, they started to approach America and establish stronger relations with it; besides quick contacts between Russia and America started for preventing war between them. These contacts developed till they covered all the international issues of potential dispute between them. When these contacts became ripe, the important meeting between Khrushchev and Kennedy took place in Vienna in 1961. They agreed in this meeting to all international issues. Thus, Russia (SU) gave up an important idea from an international aspect, which is the permanent hostility between communism and capitalism; and adopted instead the idea of peaceful coexistence, in its capitalist sense.

As regards the capitalist camp, America realised that England is working against it and attempts to compete with it over the spoils. It also discovered that the state of cold war between the Eastern Camp and the Western Camp exhausts its power, because it is neither a state of war, where it turns its attention from economic development to military preparations, and nor it is a state of peace, where it turns its attention from economic development to military preparations. It is rather a state between peace and war, and it exhausts a great portion of the wealth of the state for the sake of military preparations for an imagined matter, ie for a war, which is not known whether it will happen or not. Besides, she noticed that it is England that provokes this cold war, intending to keep America in a situation that depletes her wealth and resources leading to her weakness gradually, where imbalance of power will then take

place. America realised also that her interest lies in rapprochement with Russia (the communist) against Britain (the capitalist). Since the evils of capitalism are compound also, and because benefit is in the top of the priorities of the capitalists, where there is no fixed value in their view, rather they rush after material interests. Therefore, she also started to close the gap of differences between her and Russia (SU), and started attempting to enter into negotiations with it since the second half of the fifties of last century, ie since the time of Eisenhower and before the coming of Kennedy. Once Kennedy came to power he took the initiative by taking the step towards rapprochement between America and Russia. Just one year and a half after assuming authority his meeting with Khrushchev took place in Vienna in June 1961. In that meeting they reached a comprehensive agreement over the international issues that they might have different views towards them. Thus, America gave up also an important thought, which she embraced for about half a century, which is the elimination of communism and its removal from the whole world. She started rapprochement with SU over the so called peaceful coexistence, which she maintained for more than two decades. However, when Reagan came to power in the eighties he revived again the thought of working to eliminate the SU.

Thus, the interests of the two leaders of the two camps conformed so as they both stay influential internationally and they prevent others from emergence. It seems they have agreed to the policy of the containment of China, expelling Britain from its colonies and removing its influence from the Middle East and the Far East, besides preventing Germany from returning to become a nuclear power. They also agreed to peaceful coexistence between them, or what they called concord. They also agreed to not resorting to military power for solving their problems, besides dividing the world between them, defining their regions of influence and the necessity of helping each other, each in its region of influence. In other words, they were allied to form one global power, thus the whole world situation and the international situation have changed as a result to these agreements.

As regards the international situation, the world ceased to be two camps facing each other, where they competed politically and economically, and the relations between them faced numerous problems, as they were before 1961. Rather the world became two camps intellectually, where the communist thought at that period remained represented in the communist states, while on the other side, the capitalist thought remained represented in the capitalist states. It was not possible to make conciliation between the two thoughts; so the world, from this angle, was undoubtedly two camps. From an international angle, the entire world became one power represented in America and Russia; and these two superpowers controlled exclusively the entire world, where America held the position of the leading state.

Therefore, the two Eastern and Western camps disappeared, and so there were no more camps in the world. The international situation had went through a radical change, and returned to its form before World War I. This means it returned to become individual states, where each one of them struggled to obtain spoils and weaken other states, and the friction became between states, rather than between camps. The difference between the accord situation after the summit of Vienna and the situation before World War I is that the new international situation was governed by two superpowers, while the remaining states attempted to defend themselves against the designs of the two states, besides they tried to form a powerful block that can stand in the face of the two states. This is different to the situation before World War I, where the great powers were close to each other in terms of their power, though the leading state was the strongest amongst them. This closeness in power changed to disturbing the balance of power and acute dispute over the spoils, which led to World War II.

However, in the period of accord (*détente*), the power of the two states together was many times more than the power of any of the states of the world, even more than the force of all the other states. Therefore, there was no global war as

known before; there was even no possibility for the accumulation of other states to create a friction that might lead to a world war. This also applies to the international situation at the time of détente and at the time before World War I. Before World War II, the world was formed of separate states, though it took the form of fronts. However, at the beginning, the states were close in power, and then imbalance in power happened, where Germany became stronger, as well as Italy and Japan, while England and France did not. America was in her isolation; so this imbalance in power led Italy, Germany and Japan, each alone, to seize territories through war. Succession of such individual wars led to strong friction that led to World War II. This is different to the détente situation, where the international situation was represented in the two superpowers and their accord. Such situation does not allow an international dispute that leads to a global war. It rather allows dispute between some of the states with the two superpowers, or between the states themselves. Though a local war might develop from such dispute, the force of the two superpowers is capable to put off such war once they wanted.

The détente policy that started between USA and SU in compliance with the 1961 pact did not mean the end of struggle between communism and capitalism. However, it has its own reasons and justifications, where both sides were exhausted by the cold war and preparation for an unknown event that might or might not occur. Therefore, they turned to détente policy and to dividing the world between them, so as to turn their attention to settling their domestic issues. By the end of Vietnam War, the détente started to lose its importance, where France was driven out of its colonies and it returned to Europe so as to strengthen itself with it. Likewise, Britain felt of its weakness, and so started to seek strength by Europe so as to deliver as much as it can. SU, on the other side became a huge strategic military force and it achieved superiority in the field of invading space; besides it managed to extend its influence to areas far from its vital domain, so it became an influential world power.

Attack against the détente policy started from most of the political groups, including the conservatives and liberals. USA started to evade observance of this policy because SU built under the shade of this policy a huge mass destruction force that created worry to USA and posed danger to her. The time of absolute security of USA came to an end and it turned to become based on reciprocal deterrence, ie on linking the destiny of one of them on the destiny of the other. One of the side effects of this détente policy is that European states started to split from USA, and started to follow a policy towards SU independent of USA. This led Kissinger to call 1973 as the year of Europe. It is because by 1973, when the agreement of Paris regarding the situation in Vietnam was signed, USA and SU had driven France from most of its colonies, and they forced Britain to dismantle most of its military bases worldwide, and drove it from many of its colonies, besides the containment of China. Thus, détente has lost its justifications. No doubt, America came out of the détente as a huge military force bigger than before. She also won a considerable political influence due to removing Britain, France and Holland out of their colonies and replacing them. This means détente gave fruits to USA. However, this did not mean it did not have disadvantages; but these were not comparable to its advantages to USA. In 1973, détente however lost its justifications; so America started to look to the disadvantages that resulted from it. She put in her priorities the following: restricting SU from extending its influence to regions far from its vital domain, frustrating the SU economically and returning Europe back to the American umbrella.

As regarding the extension of the influence of SU outside its vital domain, this was fragile due to the weakness of the Soviet economy. Despite this was easy to uproot it at any time, it gave SU the right to participate in the international issues; a matter that was not accepted by USA, which viewed the détente policy a means to contain the SU, rather than making it a rival to USA. Therefore, she considered it necessary to remove it from its regions of influence outside its vital domain.

As regarding frustrating the SU economically, USA viewed armament competition with SU would exhaust its economy and drive it into collapse. It started that at the end of the seventies, at time of Carter, but strengthened and became the most prominent element that distinguished the policy of Reagan administration; for he was the one that kindled armament race. He executed the programs designed by Carter that contained mainly the mobile MX missiles; but added to that the initiative of strategic defence, or what called star wars. This strategy dictates starting a technology for generating a preventive shield against the enemy missiles. This made the SU believe that its nuclear arsenal would be then of no value once a nuclear war broke out. Since this meant disturbing the balance of forces and encouragement for America to wage a nuclear war. This motivated the SU to attempt developing its defensive systems, because, according to the available data, there was no possibility for competition in offensive weapons. Therefore, competition changed from developing offensive weapons systems to defensive ones. Though, the defensive strategy adopted by Reagan, or star wars, had achieved some progress at the beginning, but it did not reach a degree that can be described as a technology capable of building these shield missiles. It has been proved scientifically that it is almost impossible to produce laser canons capable to direct laser rays dense enough to destroy the intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) before they enter the atmospheric zone. However, Reagan announced adoption of this defensive initiative despite it did not reach enough progressive stage of development. Thus, he confused the SU and withdrew it to a new arms race, which its original weak economy was unable to afford. This is besides the strategy of star wars disagreed with the agreement signed by USA and SU in 1972 related to missiles anti missiles. However, Reagan insisted his initiative did not violate the agreement, a matter that escalated the situation with the SU. It can be said that by doing so, Reagan had put an end to the last aspects of détente policy.

These activities of Reagan withdrew the SU into new arms race; though this was for developing defence rather than offence systems. This race aimed at frustrating the SU economically, and driving it to remain within its vital domain agreed upon in the agreement of 1961, in Vienna or even driving it to collapse.

As for Europe, which used the détente period to escape the hegemony of the USA, the American politicians started their actions to bring it back under the American umbrella, after it was at the point of leaving this umbrella since 1973, the year that was called by Kissinger as the year of Europe. At that time the European states started to reiterate that their interests are different to those of America; and they started to distance themselves from entering any war on the side of USA in defence of American interests only. So, America started installing medium range missiles of Pershing-2 and Cruz in Europe under the justification that SU installed its medium range missiles in Europe and refused to remove them. Thus, the USA linked the security of USA with the security of European states, under the pretext of defending them, leading to linking their destiny with the destiny of USA in a way Europe cannot break away from it.

When Reagan won a second term in administration in 1985, Gorbachev became the leader of the SU. Once he assumed authority SU started to give continuous concessions to USA; and thus SU started to stagger in its way to collapse. Therefore, Reagan was right when he was asked after leaving the White House about his most important achievements, that he answered saying: “they say I won the cold war”.

Thus, a radical change had occurred to the international situation at the time of Reagan’s departure to the White House. The détente policy finished completely, and the SU started to stagger after it was withdrawn into arm race and exhausted economically; this is besides the support of the Soviet dissidents and opposition groups. An international media campaign was waged in attack to the Soviet ideology, which meant USA ceased to have any regard to the détente.

She rather waged a political, economic and ideological attack against the SU that led to the retreat of its influence or to its attempt to having influence in the world outside its vital domain. This also led to its economic collapse internally, besides the emergence of opposition movements inside the SU, the Eastern camp and the world against the Soviet policy. This continued till the SU collapsed at the beginning of the nineties of last century, and USA became the leading state without having any competing state close to its position, as it was the case before.

In summary, the situation through which the states of the world changed was that the old world was dominated by: the Ottoman state, Prussia, Russia, Austria, England and France. These were the states that controlled the world affairs, posed threat to peace and decided war. USA emerged after that, which restricted these states into the old world and distanced them from America. Austria fell later on from the level of great power leaving five world states, which were Russia, Germany, England, France and the Ottoman state. The Ottoman state fell down after that leaving four world states controlling the world which were Russia, Germany, France and England. Russia went into isolation after World War I, and after the emergence of communism in it, and assuming the authority in it by the communist party. Germany fell down due to its defeat in World War I. Thus, the great powers became only two, which were England and France. England became to control the entire world excluding America, while France was breathing heavily behind England. At the beginning of the fourth decade, ie in 1933, the Nazi party took power in Germany, and started working to elevate the situation of Germany till it became a great power. Little before that, Mussolini took power in Italy and worked to raise the situation of Italy, so it became a great power. Besides, Japan began to emerge and its influence expanded after it became one of the industrial states and thus it was considered of the great powers. The state of the SU strengthened and became to have an international presence, and thus returned as a great power. The world great powers became then six, which were SU, Germany, England,

France, Italy and Japan, while America remained in her isolation. After World War II, Germany, Italy, and Japan were defeated and their situation declined. Besides, America got out of her isolation and rushed to participate in running the affairs of the world, and maintained the situation of England and France as two great powers. Thus, great powers became four, which were SU, England, France and USA. After the agreement signed by USA and SU in 1961, each of England and France fell from the situation of being a great power, leaving SU and USA as the only two super powers in the world. Through their agreement, they became as one force, and the world became one superpower made of two states. So, there were no super powers that control the world other than them until the SU collapsed.

When Gorbachev became the leader of the SU in 1985, the same time Reagan won a second presidential term, the SU started to give continuous concessions to USA; and thus SU started to stagger in its way to collapse. Therefore, Reagan was right when he was asked after leaving the White House about his most important achievements, so he answered saying: “they say I won the cold war”. This led to the control of the international position by the leading state; and the SU fell from being a super power. After that, the fragmentation of the SU started, and Russia inherited the union’s military and wealth resources. However, it started to suffer of political bankruptcy and loss of ideological identity; this is besides its domestic economic and political problems inherited from communism, which led to the retreat of its political influence on the world politics.

Thus, USA became the only superpower in the world, ie the leading state that can steer the trend of world politics without any competition over this post. Though the European trio (France, Britain and Germany) has tried and is still trying to indulge in competition with USA, as it happened during the occupation of Iraq in 2003, and as it happened also in their meetings in the same year regarding forming a European force independent from NATO force,

as well as their discussion of the American plan for Middle East, which was presented in the G8 summit in June 2004. However, these are only attempts that do not reach the level of the known competition over the post of the leading state. These can be considered as attempts to participate with USA in having some influence on the international politics.

This is the situation at this moment. It is necessary to understand that it was only the great powers, particularly the leading state that controlled that world throughout history. The great powers can also decline and be replaced by other states, which would lead to change of international stance. This change of the international situation is the thing that changes the structure of relations between the great states, and creates the disparity of force and weakness between the situation of the leading state and the situation of the remaining states that compete with it. Then the situation of the leading state would weaken as it happened with England when it was competed with Germany (after World War I). Or it might strengthen as it happened with America when she destroyed the influence of England and France, leaving the international influence confined to her and Russia after Vienna meeting in 1961. It might also become the leading state, but without any competition over this post as it happened after the collapse of the SU. So, it is very necessary to understand these issues exactly and progressively so as to understand international politics.

Motives of struggle between states

There is no other than two motives behind international struggle since start of history till the Hour time. These are either love of supremacy and pride or competition over material benefits. Love of supremacy could be for loving the supremacy of the nation or the people, as it was the case of Germany the Nazi and Italy the Fascist. It might also be for loving the supremacy and propagation of the ideology, as it was the case of the Islamic state throughout about thirteen centuries, as well as the case of the communist state during its thirty years age, and before it collapsed at the beginning of the nineties of last century, seventy years after its formation.

As regarding the motive of restricting the build up of another's state power, as it happened with the states in restricting Napoleon, restricting the Islamic state, as well as restricting Germany the Nazi, all of this comes under loving the supremacy, because it is challenge for the supremacy of others.

After the removal of the Islamic state and the collapse of the Soviet state, the motive that dominates the entire world became competition over material benefits. This motive will continue as such till the return of the Islamic state to the world once again as a superpower that influences the international struggle. At that time, the motive of loving the supremacy and propagation of the ideology will come back.

The most dangerous motive behind struggle between the states is colonialism, including all of its forms. This is because this is the motive that caused the small wars, the two world wars, the Gulf wars and wars in Africa, besides the wars of Afghanistan and Iraq. It is also still responsible about the disturbances and crises in the world.

The present competition, conflict and struggle between America, Britain, France and Russia, whether the open or hidden, over the issues of Iraq,

Afghanistan, Middle East and other areas, besides other international issues, all of this is for the sake of colonialism and for controlling the benefits and resources. Colonialism controls nowadays the international struggle, over the resources and influence, besides competition over domination in all of its forms and types.

It is a fact that competition over material benefits, particularly the colonial greed, is the reason behind the political struggle between the great states. This indeed led to the breakout of local as well world wars. In order to avoid such destructive struggle, they invented the so called world peace and security, and came out with the pretext of safeguarding peace and security.

The pretext of safeguarding peace is not new in the world. It is rather old, and existed since the beginning of nineteenth century. The X-Leachable treaty signed in 1818 by the five powers at that time was under the pretext of safeguarding peace. In accordance with this treaty, or alliance, the five great states appointed themselves a guardian over peace and order in the international community, and they interfered in the affairs of other states every time they noticed – according to their claim – there is a threat to peace or order. This pretext of safeguarding peace and order in the international community was later on used as excuse for the intervention of the great states and for war. It became as well an international slogan that is used as a tool to maintain colonialism and influence.

Peace used to be safeguarded according to their claims through alliance between great states, or through international conferences. After World War I, peace became maintained through international organisations, where it was stipulated in the peace treaties of 1919 the formation of an international organisation for safeguarding peace, which was called League of Nations. It was supposed to maintain peace by this organisation. However, the states that formed such organisation broke their pledges and violated the purpose aimed of

this organisation. It was supposed these states concede their colonies, and the organisation by itself looks after safeguarding peace and preventing wars. Instead of that, the great states did not concede their colonies and nor changed their situation. They rather made their main interest maintaining the balance of powers, and protection of their interests. Furthermore, they divided amongst them the territories of Germany and the Ottoman state, where England took the lion's share. This led to threatening the peace, for whose sake the organisation was formed, and the breakout of many wars that ended with World War II. After this world war, the attempt to create a global organisation for safeguarding international peace and security was repeated. So, the great states; England, America, and SU discussed, after including France the necessity of establishing a new post war world, by following a new way that guarantees stable peace and prevention of war. They added to this facilitating economic cooperation between the different and various systems, besides protection of human rights. Since then, the United Nations (UN) became the guardian over peace; and the word of peace and international peace became an international slogan repeated by every body and used by the great states as pretext for safeguarding peace and preventing other states from liberation and emancipation from the noose of colonialism. Thus, the concept of safeguarding peace developed to its current form.

The issue of safeguarding peace by an international organisation developed into the fable of disarmament. So, the League of Nations tried to proceed with the issue of disarmament, and England used it as a means to weaken France. It also encouraged the armament of Germany so as to create balance in Europe between Germany and France. However, the issue of disarmament failed, leading to World War II.

When the UN was established it also proceeded in the subject of disarmament. However, until now no one of the great states managed to deceive another state as England did with France in the League of Nations. UN could not also create

any effect on this subject, so hardly people feel of it, leaving it as a name without substance.

Struggle between the great states has created what is called international conferences as well that which is called alliances. As regards the conferences, the first conference in this regard was that of Vienna that was held in 1815. Before World War I there were also some conferences, which included Berlin conference that was held for agreeing on abolishing the Islamic state and dividing its territories. After World War II, there were also many conferences that included Berlin conference, Geneva conference and Paris conference. However, after the agreement between America and SU and after forming together a world power, there were no more conferences, except that held in 1969, where the envoys of the great powers: France, England, SU and America held a conference within the functions of UN to study the crisis of the Middle East. However, this is not considered a conference, for it was held within the functions of the UN.

Conferences were held after World War II for discussing the problems present between the Eastern and Western camps. This is because the Eastern camp was weak in the UN; therefore Russia tried to take the initiative from the Western camp and worked to shift America from the leading state post. Thus, it tried to discuss the problems outside the UN. It succeeded in Berlin conference to increase the gap of differences between Britain and France on one side and America on the other, as well as it succeeded in taking a decision for holding Geneva conference, where it succeeded there. Thus, holding conferences weakened America and strengthened SU. England tried as well to hold conferences between it and America to solve problems outside the UN, where Bermuda conference was held but with England being successful in it. Later on there were no conferences amongst the states of Western camp, except traditional meetings between America and England. America realised then that holding conferences outside UN weakens her situation and her post

internationally. Therefore, she did not agree after that to holding conferences outside UN, particularly after the agreement, or say after the alliance between her and SU in their meeting in Vienna 1961.

As regards alliances between states, these were very old in history, where states undertook them to strengthen themselves in face of others, or to prevent some states from disturbing the balance of power between them. So, the X-Leachable treaty held in 1815 was an alliance. Likewise, the alliances that were held between England and France and between Austria and Germany were for gaining strength and maintaining balance of power. While, the alliance held between France and England against Germany in World War I, and the alliance held between America, England, France and SU against Germany in World War II, were alliances against a great power. NATO alliance held after World War II against SU, and Warsaw pact held after World War II against the Western camp were alliances against other powers. Thus, alliances as well as international conferences are means for getting strength against other powers or for maintaining balance of power. Such alliances are considered of the tools of international struggle.

There are alliances and treaties, which the great powers sign between the small states, or between them and the small states. Such alliances are not considered of the tools of direct international struggle. They are rather considered colonial means or means by which the great powers that sign them strengthen themselves. As an example, the treaty signed between Iraq and Turkey, and that signed before World War I under the name of Sa'dabad pact, England has done them to strengthen its influence in such countries and to shift the international balance of power in its advantage before the other great powers, like France and SU. The treaties that England held between it and Iraq, and between it and Egypt, before World War II were means to consolidate its colonialism rather than for war. Likewise, the alliances that England held after World War II, such as Baghdad pact, or that America held such as South-East Asia pact, besides

America naming Kuwait, Pakistan, Egypt, Morocco, Argentina, South Korea, Bahrain, Australia, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand as well as (Israel), as strategic allies outside NATO pact, are colonial means for consolidating her influence and not alliances for war. All of such alliances are not considered of the tools of direct international struggle; rather the alliances that are made between the great powers themselves are considered of the tools of direct international struggle.

The role of the NATO pact was supposed to cease by the collapse of the SU and the Eastern camp. However, America preserved the alliance; she rather tried to expand it, and even expanded it. So, she annexed to it many of the East European states, and tries to add much more. All of this because the aim of the alliance has changed, for it was no more directed against the Eastern camp. It rather became directed against the member states of Western camp; because America felt the attempt of the European states to escape her grip. So she kept the alliance in order to keep them under her guardianship, particularly she dominates the NATO, and in order to keep their security and defences linked with her.

Nowadays, the states that associated America in the second Gulf war, and in the occupation of Iraq, which they were the alliance states are considered a model of the alliances used to strengthen the American influence and strengthen the unilateral trend of the American administration, besides they are of the means of new American colonialism.

These are the foundations upon which the international policy is generally built; besides they are the foundations upon which the policy of each internationally effective state is built. In the light of these foundations it is possible to understand the political actions that occur in the world, in a way close to truth and in agreement, as much as possible with the reality. Political actions undertaken by any state, whether great or small, cannot be understood

except based on these foundations, or whatever branches from them or is linked with them. In such case, the action is understood, in terms of its nature, place of its occurrence, and its circumstances. Then all of this is linked to one of these foundations so as to understand its nature, its motives and lastly its results.

Major world issues

Political actions that take place in the world are many and relate to many issues. However, it is possible to limit these in six main issues, which are: issue of Europe, issue of the Middle East, Central Asia issue, Indian subcontinent issue, Far East issue and issue of Africa.

Study was limited to these six issues for the following reasons:

Firstly: Struggle or competition takes place between the great powers in these regions; so it is naturally the issues of these regions to be the most important world issues.

Secondly: The peoples of these regions live in a state of intense unrest and attempt of liberation. Therefore, it was necessary to try controlling the situations of these peoples; particularly the majority of them are Muslims that vividly yearn to rid themselves of their rulers for establishing an Islamic state there.

Thirdly: Most of the political events that take place in the world practically occur there; so they can form a good model for understanding the other political issues.

Fourthly: These regions are rich in terms of resources and wealth. Therefore, the colonial powers and world monopolies severely compete with each other over them. They spend their utmost for controlling these regions and put their hand over their sources and wealth.

Fifthly: The other American regions were neutralized from such struggle since the time of Monroe declaration in 1823 in which America prevented the great European states from interfering in the American continent, and from threatening the vital interests of USA in that continent. Therefore, there is no

struggle, in the well known sense, in this continent; for the interests of America in it are far from any real threat. As regards the relations that SU had with Cuba in the closing years of the fifties and beginning of the sixties of last century, USA turned a deaf eye about them. This is because she aimed at dragging the feet of the SU so as to expand its obligations outside its territories and Eastern Europe. This would increase its economic and military burden for protecting Cuba from the danger of USA. Increasing the burden of the SU for protecting Cuba is the reason that made USA silent over its relations with Cuba. Therefore, when the matters escalated and reached the level of a nuclear basis, USA made her utmost to remove that basis from Cuba.

In brief, the American continent is outside the well known international struggle, while all the happenings in the continent were internal unrests not far from the make of USA.

Therefore, those six issues are the major world issues. Before starting talking about them, it is good to know the great states that influence the international politics. This is because identifying any issue as a major world issue requires knowing first that this issue is a field for effective international politics. Since the important actions are those carried out by the great powers, then it is necessary to recognise the great powers in every age.

Great powers are the states that influence international politics and which undertake actions that influence other states. The great power is not that of high population or it is rich or the like. Rather it is the state that influences the international politics and other states. Thereupon, the current great and leading state, ie in the 15th Hijri century (1425), 21st century (2004) is the USA. This is because she is the state that has the greatest influence on International politics; she rather has almost unilateral control over the international situation. However, since Russia inherited the SU, which was a superpower till its collapse. Besides, England and France were great powers before World War II,

and each one of them clings to remain in international politics, and each of them, unilaterally or through Europe, undertakes actions that influences international politics and America, though it is a weak influence that does not reach the level of the known competition over the post of America in international politics. Because of all of that these three states can be described as great states, by tolerating the use of the term. England undertakes political actions that give it some presence in the international politics, besides France and Russia undertake some attempts to prove their presence in international politics, as it happened in Iraq war crisis.

As for Germany, it is considered as a great power, in terms of the German people and the German history in history. However, after its defeat in World War II it fell from its position as a great state, as it happened with it when it fell down after its defeat in World War I. Therefore, because it returned little after World War I as a great state, it is possible to return again as a great state, no matter when this would happen. Its activity with France in some international issues indicates this.

As regarding China, it is difficult to consider it a great state that has the known influence on international politics, influence in the world, or many of its regions. This is despite its populations is about 1.2 billion, despite Russia takes it in its account, and despite America takes it in her accounts in international politics. However, it is not considered a great state for two reasons: firstly, it has never been a great state in the past, and nor it influenced international politics in the past. Moreover, since it became a communist state till now it did not give attention to spreading communism and nor to influencing the different regions of the world. It rather confined its interest in its region, particularly after it failed in its political attempts it undertook in Africa and some Asian states. This activity brought no fruits, and nor it could to pursue it; it rather returned back to its original domain.

As regarding India, its population has increased over 935 millions, and it possesses nuclear weapons. However, its influence in international politics is almost absent. Therefore, it is not correct to contemplate including it within great powers, because it is unlikely that it would have influence in international politics. As regarding Japan, it started to have some influence in international politics before World War I when it was a member in the axis group. However, it was temporary like Italy; thus neither it and nor Italy are considered of the great powers.

As regarding the Islamic ummah, it was a great state until the crusader wars. Then it returned back as a great power after it exterminated the crusader wars, and continued to influence the international politics till the nineteenth century. After that, its international influence declined till the state of this ummah was destroyed at the beginnings of the twentieth century, after World War I.

However, the elements of the great power are still hidden in this ummah. The signs of her vigour started moving since the concluding years of last century, and her dawn is about to rise and thus returns again as a great state, rather the leading state, by Allah's leave.

Therefore, it is necessary to be acquainted of these peoples and states because they influence the major world issues:

Firstly: The first great powers are four: America, Britain, France and Russia.

Secondly: The peoples of the states that were great powers and ready to return as great powers are: the Islamic ummah, and Germany.

Thirdly: In addition to these peoples and states, there are the Japanese people because it is an economic power that has a great international economic influence in the major world issues, though Japan is not a great power in the well known sense.

As regarding China, though it is a great power but it is within its regional domain, ie it can be described as a regional great power. Therefore, its influence in the international issues in the different regions of the world is weak except within its regional domain. Thus, we will not talk about it in the subject of the worldly influential states and peoples; rather we will study it when we discuss the issues within the regional domain of China.

Let us start the study of these states and peoples as follows:

1. The Islamic ummah

This Ummah came into existence after Allah ﷻ sent His Messenger, Mohammad ﷺ with Islam to deliver mankind from the darkness of *jahiliyyah* (ignorance) to the light of Islam. Then the Islamic state, the state of this ummah emerged after the emigration of the messenger of Allah ﷻ to the Medina al-Munawwara.

The Islamic state continued after the death of the prophet of Allah ﷻ through the time of the guided caliphs (*khulafaa' rashidun*), and the khulafaa' that followed them. It continued to make conquests and spread goodness worldwide till it was demolished in the beginnings of the last century; but its close return is expected, by Allah's leave.

The Arabs were the first to carry the Islamic message; but Islam spread worldwide and thus many races, including Arabs and non Arabs, embraced Islam and were all melted in the crucible of Islam without difference between an Arab and a non Arab except by taqwa.

Since Arabs were the first people that carried Islam, then it is necessary to acquainting ourselves about Arabs particularly, then the Islamic ummah generally.

As regarding **the Arab people**, it used to live through invading each other, and it liked wars. Thus, through this what is called military natural disposition and responsibility towards others emerged in it. Therefore, it was qualified for carrying the Islamic message through its method decided by Allah, which is the da'wa and jihad, ie the material fight for spreading goodness rather than for enslaving. So, it involves in war with the peoples after informing them of Islam in a way that attracts their attention to it, for the sake of spreading the Islamic thought which they (the Arabs) carried and not for the sake of colonizing and enslaving these peoples. Therefore, it developed within it the concept of being a candle that burns to give light (to others), and developed one of its most prominent characters, which is feeling of responsibility towards others and equating itself with others as well.

The Islamic ummah became after her embrace of Islam as one people, and developed within her the jihadi military natural disposition, where jihad is the peak of her deen. She also developed within her the concept of spreading guidance amongst men, besides helping mankind was deep rooted in them. Therefore, despite her decline and the very long time that separates her from her origins that embraced Islam and carried it through its method of da'wa and jihad, the jihadi military natural disposition, the so called responsibility towards others and spreading of guidance amongst men still exist in her as a whole. This is not much different to the situation of the Arabs who were the first to carry Islam till all the peoples of their different races that embraced Islam were melted in the pot of Islam.

2. As regarding the German people: They are a deep rooted people in terms of their existence and originality. They are intractable, energetic, firm and brave; but they are excessively proud of themselves, and extremist in their claim of the right of domination over others. Militarism and love of war are almost of their natural disposition, which is born with it. This German militarism stirred fear amongst its neighbours, particularly the great powers as

Britain, France and Russia. The German people had spent many long years in internal wars and invasions, and spent many generations in wars with its neighbours, like France as an example. It lived on industry, particularly the developed war industry. Therefore, despite it is banned from possessing nuclear weapons it scared its neighbours and provokes terror in its competitors and enemies. So, the vying powers had always conspired against it so as to prevent it from acquiring the level of great powers. They are still however a vigorous people that possesses the capability of becoming again a great state, because the living being normally overcomes obstacles put in its way. When it embraced capitalism, the benefit became a part of its life like other western peoples. So Germany, which is the home land of the German people, is considered a colonial state; and it possessed colonies before World War I. It indulged in World War II with the intention of restoring its lost colonies and winning colonies from other states, besides making new colonies for it. Therefore, colonialism is the policy of Germany, rather than the policy of Hitler alone. Germany today is not far from colonialism. Though it was deprived from the wide direct colonialism, but it is one of the first states in terms of the economic colonialism. It is noticed today how it expands economically through a distinct economic hegemony, particularly in the regions of East Europe.

As regarding its ruling system, the autocratic aspect is quite clear in it despite its claim of democracy. This aspect appears in the actions of the leaders of Germany, in the past and recently.

Despite harsh conditions were imposed upon Germany after World War I, it managed to overcome such conditions and return as a great state. Two factors helped it in achieving this, which were: the first was the intellectual feeling that took over its sons, which motivated them to work for restoring its situation as a great state; and the second was the fact that England wanted to disturb the balance of power between Germany and France. So, it secretly encouraged Germany to compete with France and stand in its face. This led to the return of

Germany as a great state. After World War II, there were no such factors that could help Germany to return as a great state. This is because all the allies, without any exception, imposed all the constraints that prevent Germany from returning as a great state. The most important factors that prevented its return as a great state till this moment are: the first factor was keeping its people engaged with economy instead of war industry, thus preventing it from influencing international politics. Directing their attention to the economic side diverted their feelings and activity away from the war industry, which makes states influential great states and enables them of gaining power in the productive political aspect. The second factor is the continuous awareness of the SU of the German danger against it. This alertness about this danger never escapes it a moment, and it continues to take towards Germany a harsh and merciless policy that is detached of any value. Nothing dominates this policy towards Germany except one thing, which is crushing Germany forever. Therefore, it crushes every move that Germany undertakes. This is the reason that America failed when it adopted the revival of German militarism after 1955; besides England failed to reunify Germany. France failed as well when De Gaul tried to unify Europe so as to make this unity assist Germany in rearming itself and restoring its unity. Thus, all attempts failed to prevent Europe from strongly confronting Germany.

As regarding the German unity that happened later on, it was not the result of policies, actions and political plans undertaken by the German politicians. It was rather the result of concessions that Russia offered to America when the SU collapsed. This is because the USA decided to attack the European unity by using the German unity, so as to obstruct it or delay it through creating economic problems to Federal Germany, which is the main financier to the European unity, through annexing to it East Germany, of weak economy. However, Germany managed to overcome this problem, and started looking for escaping the American pressures, and looking towards Europe, particularly France so as to involve itself in the events and influence them. It had an

effective role in the EEC (European Economic Community), which became later on EU (European Union). Germany, however still endeavours to achieve that with the economic means, which means it will have an influence in European states, particularly in East Europe, through economic support. This does not mean it will have a role in international politics, because influencing international politics is built mainly on military force and political actions that lead to executing and realizing political plans. Germany still needs to do that though it started doing it through coordination with France. However, these are only attempts or actions, which are not more than reaction that increased to become effective in confronting America, as it happened in the events of the American attack against Iraq. This is besides the attempt of Germany together with France, and associating Britain later on regarding the subject of the common European defence force, separate from the NATO. This annoyed America despite it is still in the stage of formation.

All of this indicates Germany started to yearn for having a role in international politics. Therefore, no matter how long it will take, the return of Germany as a great state is expected. This is because even if the artificial forces succeeded in preventing the development of the vigorous peoples, this success will be temporary; but finally the development of the living being will overcome all the problems that obstruct its growth.

In brief, the current policy of Germany can be summarized as follows:

The German policy is built upon pragmatic European foundations. From one side it cooperates with France in forming the German French axis as the cornerstone of the unified European policy in future. From another side, it bears in mind the American interests in Europe, as well as the strategic American protection of the German security after World War II. It does not threaten the American interests; rather it always put them in the top of its priorities. Thirdly, the German policy takes into consideration the economic specificity, which is

represented in its attempt of unilateral control of the economy of East Europe and unilateral use of it without associating its European allies.

It was noticed recently that the German policy started to show increasing interest in the military and political aspects that have global dimension. One of the examples for that is its increasing participation in the NATO activities in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Kosovo. This is besides the participation of its foreign minister with his two French and British opposites, as it happened with the tertiary visit of the three ministers to Iran, and putting pressure on it for accepting signature of an additional protocol that allows unplanned inspection of its nuclear installations. This also includes the active role of Germany in the successful mediation in the issue of exchanging prisoners between the Jewish entity and Hezbollah.

Thus, we notice a development in the German policy represented in departing from its previous isolationist role that made Germany confine itself to economical aspects only. Therefore, we started to notice the increasing role of the Germans, which looked equivalent to the French as well as the British role.

If Germany wished to quicken its return as a great power, then it must embark upon the war industry and make of it its vital issue. It must also be politically aware of its meetings with France and Britain. This is because it is well known that France and Britain strive to use the EU for supporting their international influence. France tries also to strengthen itself by using Germany so as to be prominent in Europe. Likewise Britain uses its political shrewdness in its meetings with France and Germany for realising its own interests. So, though Germany continues to coordinate with France particularly, and with the remaining states of the EU generally, it must think of becoming a military force with German political weight inside the EU so as not to be used for only realising the interests of others; and it must observe the international situation

from a German rather than European angle, and take a lesson from the history of Europe.

3. As regarding the Japanese people: They started by living from trading and navigation and lived in a small country. One of its prominent characters is courage and handling of matters. Therefore, once the industrial revolution emerged it immediately embarked on industry; and it became one of the great powers despite the small size of its country. It did not hesitate in entering war with China to rob a part of it. It did not hesitate as well from attacking America because it viewed her danger against it. Therefore, one of the most important plans of America for controlling it was making Japanese industries not based on war, rather on the basis of trading and economic growth. She did all of that so as to prevent it from entering into the international sphere. Thus, it is now an economic force that has a great weight.

4. As regarding the American people: They are a rich people who live in a land of big wealth. Then it entered into a bitter struggle with the European states which they occupied it, particularly England, and won its independence with force through vision and awareness. This developed within the Americans some dispositions, most of which is pragmatism, ie the concept of expediency. Due to its opposition to the European colonialism, tendency and respect to high values originated within it. However, the American people embraced capitalist ideology like other Christian world, so it started to be attracted by two factors, which are: the factor of contentment and honesty and the factor of benefit and colonialism. Britain used to use the first factor, where it has used it on its side as a force in war and economy when that factor dominated it. When World War II broke out, and the American people tasted colonialism in terms of the oil of the gulf, the second factor, which is benefit and colonialism, dominated it. Thus, it went out of its isolation for colonizing the peoples and subjugating the world to its domination and influence. It will never return back again to its isolation except with force, because capitalist ideology had dominated it and

started to govern its life. Besides, benefit alone started to control its conduct, in addition to arrogance and vanity that filled its life.

America was occupied by the European states, particularly England. She was also divided into many states. So, she started first to reduce the burden of English colonialism, and then entered into many liberation wars with it that led to expelling the English from their land. Then these American states agreed to establish a federation from them, and formed one single state. After that this federal state started to annex the other states voluntarily or by force and made them states in this federal state, till she was finally formed in her current form, by including 51 states. Thus, a powerful state emerged that proceeded in the international field as a strong state. She managed to protect the two American continents from the control of the European states, and became another world, known as the new world, established from an active people and a wealthy country. USA set a ruling system, which though it is of the democratic systems, but it was laid down based on deep thought and practical understanding of the meaning of government, which is governance of humans and conducted by humans. So, she did not view the ideal ruling in a logic perception; she rather viewed it in its practical and real form. This is quite clear in the way of appointing the president, his wide functions, his role in the state, the functions of the other institutes of the state and the strong unity, which is represented in the state and forms its foundation though it is federal. This is also reflected in the wide authority given to the people for electing the president and the institutes of the state. All of this had great effect in the strength of the state and in the huge speed of the development of this strength. USA got out of her isolation at the World War II, and associated in managing the world. She even tried to run the world unilaterally; but she associated her enemy, the Soviet Russia with her in running the world since 1961 till 1979. Besides she frustrated the ambitions of other great states. When she realised that she fulfilled her objectives from the détente policy and from associating the SU with her. And that this Russian association has brought her negative results,

where Europe started to escape her control and try to establish direct relations with the SU. Besides, the SU started to undertake brave attempts, though unsuccessful, to indulge in the international politics so as to impose itself as an international power independent from the policies of America. When USA noticed all of that, she decided to return to the policy of escalation with Russia and involvement in new arms race, which tells of new cold war. Thus, USA indulged in cultural, intellectual and economic war with Russia and the Eastern camp. She restricted Russia with treaties that led finally to the collapse of the SU, leaving America as the world leading state that have the greatest influence on international politics.

There are two main parties in America, which are: Democratic part and Republic party. It is hard to notice big difference between the written programs of the two parties, and nor in the followed policies. The two parties almost follow one way, without much change between the two parties in the rotation of the authority, whether in the domestic or foreign policy. Any changes in such policies are only dictated by the circumstances rather than by the difference of their programs.

Democratic Party is the deep rooted one, besides it is the party of the people, where it wins massive majority of it. Therefore, the majority of the Congress is generally on its side. As regarding the Republic Party, its emergence is more recent than the Democratic Party. It is the party of the rich and those who possess huge wealth. Most of its members belong to the owners of huge wealth and the owners of the monopolies; besides it includes a great number of the educated. It does not give much attention to win the general masses or the ordinary people to its side. It is only the system of presidential elections that helps it; otherwise it would never be able to win the presidency, because it is the party of the minority rather than the majority.

USA, like other capitalist states, is dominated by the owners of the monopolies and the businessmen, and these are the ones that have influence on its policies. However, because every individual enjoys truly the right of citizenship, and can influence the governance, whether through elections or accounting, its governance appears to be that of the entire people more than it appears in other capitalist states. Due to her massive and incessant wealth, together with the abundance of educated, intelligentsia and thinkers; besides the environment of (freedom) and atmosphere of activity dominate over her; its strength is real rather than superficial. Though she is not a deep rooted people, and it consists of individuals and groups that emigrated from different countries; however citizenship truly binds them with a strong bondage. Even the foreigner that lives there for a few years and takes the nationality and thus owns the right of citizenship, he becomes more concerned about the state, the people and its interests than his original homeland. This comes as a result of the strength the country enjoys, in terms of its individuals and the relations between the people.

As regarding her foreign policy, it is the policy of her rich and owners of the monopolies, ie it is a pure colonial policy, where there is no role in it for the high human values. Despite the naivety that sometimes looks like stupidity, which appears in her politicians, they are deep thinkers much more than many politicians in the world. They enjoy huge capability for making changes, diversifying the styles and solving the problems. It might be that the colonial zeal, besides the high culture had effect on their political activity. They view the remaining parts of the world as their own ranch; besides the states that were great in the past are not entitled to enjoy the influence they had. So, it is time for these great states to retire, relax and be content with submission to the authority of the strong, as the other states of the world do.

America owns today a huge nuclear arsenal that exceeds by many times the nuclear weapons owned by other nuclear countries altogether. The military expenditure of America compared with the other states reveals the extent of the

American superiority over such states. As an example, the military expenditure of the great western states in 2002 was as follows:

Britain	35 billion dollar
France	32 billion dollar
Germany	23 billion dollar

Total	90 billion dollar

As regarding America, she has alone spent 350 billion dollar; this is in addition to the quality difference in terms of armament and that Americans come before Europe tens of years in terms of technological advancement. USA controls the UN and its organisations; besides she dominates over the greatest financial reserves in the WB and IMF, which means her domination over the wide political influence exercised by the IMF and WB over the states of the world. She also sought to strengthen her trade through the globalisation policies, which employed the WTO (World Trade Organisation) and worked for using it as one of her tools for interfering in the local markets under the pretext of unified tariffs. Thus, she worked for freeing the trade. Since she owns a huge economic power and has the greatest number of multinational companies, she benefited of the legal cover provided to her by the WTO for opening the markets that were closed before her, or those that were difficult to assimilate in the open global economy, which America runs.

These huge military, political and economic capabilities of America made her interfere in the affairs of all the current world states, and made them as if they a part of her domestic policy. She tries to exercise the policies of hegemony over all the states without exception, making no difference between the developed and non developed states. Though she sometimes fails in this hegemony policy, she does not cease from attempting that.

America has a role in all the problems of the world. She is that state that stirs tension in the burning regions. So she introduced new classifications for the states, like the term of 'axis of evil' and the 'states that patron terrorism' and the like. Even the allying states or the compliant states did not escape her harm. She rather obliged the world that it either stands on her side or on the side of terrorism. So there is no place for a state to stand neither on her side and nor on the side of terrorism.

She creates the crises, provokes the problems and creates tensions, and then she manages these crises and seeks solutions for them. She does all of that as a part of her strategy for dominating the world.

Thus, America made the worst use of her military and economic forces in her political actions, such that her influence was not limited to the economic and trading aspects, as the traditional colonialist states normally used to do. She rather extended her influence to all the aspects of civic life, so she extended her influence to education, media, society, thought, culture and security.

Her role in changing the education curriculum so as to comply with her ideological views became quite obvious. Therefore, we found Arab states like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Jordan and Egypt and others had indulged in reviewing their curriculum under the pretext of development and compliance with the age. Saudi Arabia had changed one of the most important religious subjects in its school books, which is the subject of allegiance (to whom) and dissociation (of whom), (al-walaa' and al-baraa'). Likewise, Jordan, Egypt, Kuwait and others changed subjects related to jihad against the aggressor kuffar, of Jews and Christians and others; besides other Islamic concepts, which America hates.

In media, America assigned hundreds of millions of dollars for the sake of media influence in the Arab and Muslim masses. So, it set up (Radio Suwa) and the TV channel of (Freedom) to spread her poison in every home in the Arab countries.

In the social field, America focused on the woman so as to distance her from the Islamic values. She assigned the funds and imposed pressure on the governments to hold conferences over the subject of women. She also imposed pressure for inserting women in the governments and parliaments; besides she propagated again the concept of the freedom of women within new forms and new presentations.

In the field of thought and culture, America employed centres for thought, democracy and pluralism; besides she set up organisations for human rights. These centres and organisations would promote the thoughts of freedom within the western concepts and following the American way. These organisations and centres were supported by Hollywood cinema films and advanced technological production, which dominated the propagation of most of the Arab and non Arab channels.

In the field of security, America worked to link the intelligent services in the Arab states and the states of the Islamic world with her intelligent services, particularly with the CIA and FBI. So, we became to see the American intelligence people move with complete freedom in the cities of the Islamic countries, and under legal protection, as it is the case in Sudan, Yemen, Kenya, Tanzania, Libya, Pakistan and other states. This intelligence linkage covered handing over of the accused to America; besides it allowed the special American forces to undertake specific military actions against those described by America as terrorists.

Thus, the American hands reached the joint points of the daily life in the societies of the Islamic countries and the non Islamic societies. She spreads corruption in them as she likes, as she does in the Middle East, Africa and South Asia, even in Latin America, where she deposed the elected president of Haiti, Aristide and expelled him outside his country, and she tries now to depose Chavez, the president of Venezuela, from authority. Thus, America is

about to control the affairs of the weak states due to the submission and surrender of their rulers to her.

However, this American hegemony will not remain long; it is rather going to disappear. Despite the American presence in every corner in the world, and despite the cooperation of the rulers and governments with this presence, the increasing hatred of the peoples, particularly the Islamic ones, to America, besides the increasing abhorrence of most of them to the Americans, because of their arrogance, hollow pride and bias towards the Jews, and because of their colonialism and enslavement of others. We say: this increasing hatred and abhorrence will generate opposition and struggle against the American presence everywhere, whether inside or outside its continent. Moreover, the annoyance of the other great states and the attack against their interests due to the arrogance of America, beside her unilateral control over the benefits and her continuous attempts for hegemony, besides her attempt to have monopoly over the management of the international affairs.

The presence of a state built upon the capitalist ideology, which is based on colonialism and exploiting the wealth of others; besides this state leads the world without competition over this leadership; all of this makes the world live in continuous suffering, where its problems continues and its crises follow each other. The tangible American corrupting and perverting of the world, besides her forging of continuous crises in it confirm that.

The hardship and misery of the world resulting from the capitalist states, particularly the USA, will never disappear except by establishing the Khilafah state, which will implement the right and great ideology, Islam, which was revealed by Allah ﷻ upon His Messenger ﷺ as mercy for mankind. At that moment, the justice of Islam will disclose the ugliness of the capitalism, in terms of its materialistic thought and colonial method. The righteous power of Islam will also demolish the suppression and arrogance of America, and forces

her to return to her isolation and her new world, in case that new world remained to her. Then, goodness will spread worldwide, and the world will have a deep sigh after the hardship and misery it lived for long.

5. As regarding the English people: Fishing and ship manufacturing dominated it since its existence. Later on, navigation and trade emerged in it. This created in it the character of hunting of the benefits and exploitation, besides the character of the merchant. Due to the small size of the English country, it found it necessary to seek the help of others. This is like the hunters who seek the help of each other inside the oceans; and hardly have they gone out there alone. When the capitalist ideology emerged and they embraced it, the love of benefit became deep rooted in them. This explains how the political life of England, since its start till today, was based on seeking the help of others, and on preparing the bait whenever it wanted to hunt something; whether this was a country it wanted to colonise, or a state it sought its help. Therefore, all of its policy was based on making alliances, formation of blocks and partnership in colonialism. Thus, in the nineteenth century, it associated other states in colonialism, and gave them free reign for colonising some countries, so as to be on its side and defend its own interests. Therefore, it brought France in the Middle East after World War I, so as to stand at its side once there was a danger to the region, and to put it before the danger. So, it was said: England fights till the last French soldier.

Thus, the character of the fish hunters created with it the natural disposition of seeking the help of others for realising its own interests.

There is another natural disposition, which Britain is famous of; rather it is its most known natural dispositions. It is adhering to the old and the rejection of its change or development except slowly and when its change becomes unavoidable. The English people are conservative in the full sense of this word. It has been, since the old times till today, dominated by the old (noble) families,

the rich and the owners of huge capital. Though it claims to follow democracy and it is a democratic people, careful investigation shows it is not, and the people has no effect in appointing rulers. Rather, those who appoint the government are the old families and the owners of the monopolies, and not the people. There is no difference in this matter between the old time and the modern age; for its future is still dominated today by the noble families and the capitalists as it was in the past. Since the old times it maliciously opposed every popular movement that comes about in England, and eliminated it by a style of its kind. The revolution of Cromwell, which the English show pride in it is not a popular revolution; it was rather the revolution of the noble families against the popular revolution. At that time, a revolution broke out that aimed at removing the authority of the noble families and the capitalists, and it was about to succeed. So, the noble families conspired against it, and thus they sent Cromwell to start a revolution, in which he demanded of some rights. Many of the people rallied around him, and he achieved to them some of the demands, so he destroyed the revolution and nipped in its bud. The Conservative Party governs England for tens of years; while Labour Party is only a tool used when England wants it, or when there are issues the Conservative Party is unable to solve. In that case Labour Party is brought in so as to be used in their solution. It seems the leaders of Labour Party understood lately this fact, so they tried to adapt themselves. Accordingly, the rotation of the authority between the two parties became like alteration of roles between the Conservative and Labour parties, rather than Labour Party being a tool in the hands of the Conservative party. Therefore, we find Tony Blair, the current leader of the Labour Party and the British Prime Minister had changed the nature of the party and became closer to the policies of the Conservative Party. He appeared in terms of the political image in a way not different to the most prominent members of Conservative Party, to the point he took Margaret Thatcher, the past leader of the Conservative Party as a model to him in foreign and domestic policy. Labour Party itself became also not much different to Conservative Party; and

these two parties in Britain became twin brothers to Republic and Democratic parties in America.

If some members of Labour Party itself discovered that England is governed by its noble families and capitalists, then these members would be put under circumstances that lead to removing their influence on the party, and hence from the political influence. The Labour member, Bevin in the period of the thirties until sixties and George Brown in the sixties are the best example for the control of Conservative Party over even Labour Party, and for dismissing those who want to restrict the authority of the government over power. Conservative Party itself does not elect its leadership; rather the past leader appoints the succeeding one, as it happened with Macmillan when he appointed Lord Hume, and when Margaret Thatcher appointed John Major. Though Heath and Major were appointed by election, but this was only formal. Therefore, though the ruling system in England is described as democratic, however it in fact comes through appointment by a specific class, which are the noble families, capitalists and owners of monopolies.

England is an island, and its land does not suffice their livelihood. Therefore, their exit from the island in search for livelihood was unavoidable. Though they went out, but they did so as colonialists rather than merchants. They went out for exploiting the peoples and robbing their wealth, rather than for exchange of commodities. This is because they did not have in the first place wealth to exchange with; they rather went out in search for wealth. This was their case from the moment they left their island. When they embraced capitalist ideology, where benefit is an indivisible part of it, this ideology agreed with their nature. So, the colonial aspect concentrated in them, and thus they became a colonial state of first grade. Since they were also a small people and could not face bigger forces, they addressed this problem through using other peoples and states for helping them. They designed this help in form of blocks, such as alliances, conferences and treaties. Therefore, the structural aspect was an

indivisible part of their policy. Though they are normal like other peoples regarding the level of mind brightness, yet they use their mind to its maximum. So, they excelled in understanding actions, understanding politics and solving the problems; and thus they developed the mentality of outstanding problem solution. Due to their pressing need for expansion, they established their industry on the basis of war industry, which led to becoming a true state. They thus acquired a military force, and military machines, together with acquiring industrial power; this is beside their rooted experience in politics and governance, and their cunning that is sometimes closer to malice.

As regarding their foreign policy, it is built on colonialism. However, two matters manifest in it: the first is maintenance of international balance of power; and the second is maintenance of the presence in international politics at any cost. Therefore, they participated distinctly in the crusader wars; besides they were at the forefront of the great states in the sacred alliance. And when Napoleon rushed in his conquests, they led the forces that destroyed him and pushed France back to its previous position. When Germany moved at the time of Bismarck, England participated in the conference of Berlin, where one of its objectives was to restrict the force of Germany. When it felt of an extraordinary increase in the power of Germany, it declared war against it, and fought against it in two world wars. It also tried to attract the entire world into a world war for the sake of changing the map of the world, and for weakening the two superpowers at the time, which they used to control the world at that time during the *détente* period. When it was removed from the international politics after the agreement of the two superpowers, it looked as if it lost its entity. So it started to act nervously, and desperately try to return to the international arena and to participate in the international politics.

It depends on concluding deals with the states and on winning the men and influencing them. It does not mind in giving the opponent a big bait for the sake of making a bargain with him. It does acknowledge a friend or an enemy in

politics; it rather acknowledges benefit only and nothing more. It considered that which is known as international ethics as a means of deception, without having belief in it. Though it tried not to be caught lying, so as to create trust in it; however it uses lies as an effective weapon in its politics. Churchill, the Prime Minister of Britain was once in a meeting with Roosevelt and Stalin for discussing the issue of war and the future of Germany. So, some of that which he told them so openly: “truth in war is so expensive to the extent that it is necessary to protect it with a complete army of lies”. This shows the fundamental importance of lies in British politics.

This is the reality of Britain and the reality of its politics. It has to be treated as a colonial state, and as a state that lives at exploiting its people. Time and events did not change this method of its life. Thus, it deceived the popular revolts it undertook, without letting any one to succeed. Opposition of its colonialism is not possible except through understanding its means. Its power lies in the saying of the poet: “cure me with that which was itself a disease”. Its power abroad lies in its use of others in its favour, even using those who oppose it. There is no a possible way to overcome it except through stripping it of its traditional political weapons, and through confronting it alone, without having an assistant or a partner.

6. As regarding the French people: They are a people who formed a deep rooted state in centre of Europe, who boasted over all the states of Europe that the French people are the one who generated the high concepts of freedom, justice and equality. France is well known that it cultivated extraordinary people in the fields of politics and thought. However, it is a colonial state, which is distinct from other states in terms of the influence of the freedom concepts on it, as being an individual high character that changed to become one of the French natural dispositions, rather one of their inherited innate.

At the time the French people adopted freedom as their thought, fragmentation was deep rooted in them. So, they became much closer to be a collection of individuals rather than being a nation, a people or a community. Therefore, there were little strong governments in France, besides there was no strong power in it. This facilitated for England to use France many times. So, France continued to follow England from the time of departure of Napoleon till the time of De' Gaul. This is because the concept of freedom has taken root in it. Even when France went out for colonialism in America, Asia and Africa, it was England that sent it out so as to seek strength with it, despite competition between the two states used to float on the surface in the colonial history of the two countries.

Therefore, one cannot decide that the French people have any characteristic more than freedom. For the intellectual freedom created philosophers, poets and intellectuals besides others. Political freedom created dignity, pride and self confidence, which created a great multitude of outstanding people. While the personal freedom made of Paris habitat of lewdness, debauchery and dash into whims and lust. Freedom had also created gaps in France that helped foreigners, particularly the English to infiltrate in it. Thus, freedom, in its absolute meaning is the source of evil in France.

One cannot claim there are such and such parties in France, and that party is such and such, while the other is such and such. This is because it is difficult for parties, in their actual party sense, to exist in such a people; there are rather collections of individuals that call themselves parties. Therefore, it is difficult to have a strong authority or a stable government in France. For each French is a ruler by himself, besides each French yearns to become a ruler. Therefore, one cannot say the domestic French policy is such and such, and the foreign policy is such and such. Rather, the domestic policy would be according the taste of the rulers and their understanding of freedom. Likewise the foreign policy would be according to the power of France in dominating the others for

colonising them and extending its influence over them. France is considered a colonial state because it embraced the capitalist ideology. Benefit is a fundamental part of the life of France; therefore it was bent on colonialism and eager to maintain its colonies.

If it is necessary to give a view about the foreign policy of France, it has to be noticed that its policy is based upon creating influence abroad, whether it was through colonies, cultural influence or economic influence. Its political actions against the great states include the manifestation of its character and participation in glory and suppression. It cannot handle political manoeuvres nicely; it rather generally refers to confrontation. This makes it easy to discover the struggle between it and America at this time, while it is difficult to discover such American struggle with other states, particularly with Britain. Therefore, the course of confronting its actions should avoid hurting its pride, and preventing it from taking the initiative; besides it should not be accepted as a great state except within the limit agreed by the great states in the international politics.

7. As regarding the Russian people: They are active, with vitality and strength, but with naivety and simplicity as well. Though they embraced the capitalist ideology first, then secondly communism and then it returned back to capitalist ideology, it remained behind Europe, without being able to reach the level of European peoples. So Russians developed within them the complex problem towards the Europeans, which created negative effect with it.

The Russian people are brave and good fighter, but inside their own country. However, once they went outside their country they lost their characteristics. Therefore, it was expected since long ago that it will lose its control over the states of East Europe. Now, it actually lost this control after the collapse of the SU. The historic facts confirm the Russian people did not win outside its country in all the historic events. Its current stalemate in Chechnya, the small

country confirms this fact. However, it managed to defeat its enemy when it was attacked inside its country, as it happened against Napoleon and Hitler.

The ruling system at time of Caesars is different to that at time of communists, and to that at current time. However, it was all the time autocratic. Caesar used to particularly rely upon the land feudalist, while the big landlords used to ally with the rich over the lands, as masters. They used to give full support to the Caesar's domestic and foreign policies; and they together used to make the ugliest exploit of the people that led to the decline of the country and the backwardness of the people.

Russia was behind Europe before World War I, and it was exploited by some European countries. The main industries in Russia were in the hands of France, England and Belgium. The main mining factories were in the hands of French; the coal industry in Donitz basin was in the hands of the foreigners, and about half of the oil wells were in the hands of the English and French. A great part of the profits that came from the Russian industry used to go to foreign banks, particularly the English and French banks. The country was till 1914 declined in the systems of ruling, economy, culture and education. Despite that Russia was a great state; and it was considered internationally one of the great powers, and used to influence international politics. When communist party seized authority, the ruling did not change except in terms of style. The communists governed the country with an iron fist, where they used killing, suppression and intimidation. Thus, they built their authority over the skulls of the people. Russia managed to force the leading state to abandon the concept of its fight, and entered in pacts with her till it almost became her ally. Thus, SU was an associate with the leading state in running the world; rather the two super powers, SU and USA dominated the whole world. As regarding the policy of communist Russia, it was built on the basis of the thought. Its thought was propagating communism; while its method was destruction, demolition and provoking contradictory things. This policy tried, whenever it were possible to

insert communism in some countries; besides it tried to dominate the countries that took communism as their ruling system.

After the collapse of communism, the Russian people as well as its leaders found it necessary to have an identity different to Russia of the Caesars and that of the communist period; so, they resorted to capitalism. Thus, they were like the one that jumps from the frying pan into the fire; where they increased in poverty, the image of Russia was shaken, besides its position in the world.

The ruling system in Russia became capitalist, and like its form at the time of Caesars, just keeping some features from the communist period. Thus, the capitalist class and owners of huge wealth emerged. They had their influence on ruling exactly as it was the case at the time of Caesars. However, this time instead from being governed by the Caesars, it is governed by the people of the Soviet KGB (intelligence service) and the old communist politicians, who only changed their skin colour and became of new fashion capitalists.

Its foreign policy focused only on having a role, without having a world viewpoint about the foreign policy. Therefore, its presence on the international domain disappeared, and it started to only search for any role, and not to be completely marginalised in the international politics. This situation in terms of losing the ideological intellectual identity by the Russian people, besides the situation of political bankruptcy at the level of the leaders and Russian people, provides the opportunity for confronting the policies of Russia, through establishing trade relations with Russia that enable Muslims to enter Russia, and enable the Russians to see Islam alive in the people relations. There must also be resistance to the attempts of Russia for influencing international politics by depriving it of the opportunity to do so. Relations with it should be confined to trade aspect, resisting at the same time relations in other areas, the same as with all capitalist states. This is because its foreign policy is built upon

exploitation and colonialism; though this does not appear except in the neighbour countries.

The last four peoples, ie the American, the English, the French and the Russian people are the peoples of the states that are considered currently great states. These peoples have ambition for controlling and competing for international politics in numerous regions in the world, taking in consideration the disparity between them in terms of strength and weakness. Through examining their influence in the international politics in the 21st century it is possible to summarise the general political guidelines of the four states as follows:

America has increased its force with quick pace since the sudden collapse of the SU. She became the superpower that has the strongest influence in the world, particularly there was no great state capable to fill the vacuum it left behind, till America became an unconstrained superpower. There is no state among the present great states that was capable till this moment to reach the second degree state that was occupied by the SU. This strange situation in international stance, which enabled America to tower over others made the American politicians incline to haughtiness and arrogance in their dealing with others. The foreign secretary at time of Clinton, Madeline Albright might express about this case when she said: “America is the necessary nation and she has the international responsibilities; besides she is ready to do everything any time she wants. Let everybody knows that we do whatever we like and change whatever we like. There are no obstacles in our way, because the world is ours; the world is for the Americans”.

This arrogance and haughtiness of the American politics provoked even the Europeans who were her allies to reject her haughtiness and those statements that carried the arrogant American tone. Therefore, they responded to her through their press that expressed their annoy towards her. The French newspaper (Le Mond Diplomatique) reacted to the statement of Albright by

saying: “The American hegemony must not be an unavoidable destiny. America must understand from now on that she will not be able to impose her laws upon the five continents in accordance with her interests only. Likewise she will not be the police of the world forever in the regions of crises and struggle”.

Thus, America embarks in her politics from her viewpoint that she owns the world, she is worthier of it and more suited of it. She declares always, openly and explicitly that she is the leader of the world as Bush said during his election campaign in the states of America in August 2004. She always declares projects designed for the world, like (new world), (new Middle East), (the Major Middle East), beside others. However, this haughtiness and arrogance of America will bring to her evil consequences; we see even the signs of this have started. We see America is drowning in the predicament of Afghanistan and Iraq; and her reputation has been despised and humiliated. Despite her crimes of blind bombardment of the civilians and her brutal and horrible actions in the prisons, she started to send back the dead bodies of her soldiers to their homeland in America after their killing in Afghanistan and Iraq. Besides, the peoples of the region became furious against her due to the ugliness of her crimes that reached humans, trees, stones, and even the programs of education, media and culture.

Europe, Asia, and Africa were also displeased of that which USA has done, in terms of looting their wealth, constant aggression against the country and the people, and the American attempt to have unilateral hegemony over the entire regions of the world.

Thus, the American politics is distinguished, on one side with arrogance, haughtiness, diversity of crimes and her view to the world as their own ranch. On the other side, it is distinguished with great hatred and severe abhorrence of all the peoples of the world, their enemies and even their previous friends. All

of this tells of a painful end to America, and a heinous collapse like all the tyrants of the world.

As regarding Britain, it put one leg in Europe and the other in America, where it is under two tendencies: European tendencies and Anglo-Saxon ones; so it tries to maintain balance between these two.

This balance became the basis of its relation with each of Europe and America. So, it plays on both robes, and benefits of both sides. It seeks strength with Europe as it does that with America at the same time. It can neither abandon America and nor dissociate itself from Europe. However, its interests tend more towards Europe. Therefore, we see it approach Europe more and more with time. Its entry to the EU is evidence to that. Britain participated lately in the formation of the European army, independent from the NATO pact. It has done that in cooperation with France and Germany despite the strong objection of America to that. This is the European policy of Britain, and this is the angle from which its political actions in Europe embark.

As regarding France, it is different to Britain; for it builds its policies on pure European basis, without giving any attention to America. It tries to strengthen the EU and tries to dominate it so that it becomes a united European political power, completely independent from America. It wants it to be an equivalent rival to the American power, in terms of all the political, economic, military and cultural aspects, without being confined to economy or to formal political cooperation.

France uses its rapprochement with Germany as the corner stone in realising this policy, to the extent it considers the French-German axis the foundation of this unionist European policy.

This is the European policy of France; which is of a clear, independent, and challenging nature that makes of France and Germany the heart of the European force and the true motivator of it.

As regarding Russia, its current policies towards Europe are manifested in two issues:

First: It is the entry to the European states, and association in the discussion of the European matters, on equal terms. It succeeded in that partially, where it managed to join the European Council and the group of G7. However, it did not succeed in joining the EU or even to be nominated for entering it.

Second: It is the attempt to maintain a distinguished relationship with the states that were in the past a part of the SU, and the states that were in its camp, such that it becomes a relation of constant guardianship. It badly failed in this matter, for it lost completely its control over all states of East Europe, which are: Bulgaria, Romania, Check, Slovakia, Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia fragmented states. It started also to lose part of its authority over Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Ukraine, White Russia, Moldavia and Muslim Central Asia republics. Its full control remained only over Kazakhstan. Besides, it early lost all of its control over the three Baltic States, which are: Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia.

In brief, the European policy of Russia is that it was not qualified, from European pointview, to the degree it planned and endeavoured for it. Perhaps, it could not achieve that because it is Euro-Asian state, ie European and Asian, so it cannot claim it is completely European. Consequently, it cannot ignore its extensive Asian space, and nor abandon its huge relations and interests with the Europeans. Thus, it is preoccupied in defining its extensive vital space, which causes its confusion that makes it unable to focus on the European side only.

Thus, we have been acquainted with the peoples of the great states (America, Britain, France and Russia), as well as (the Islamic ummah) whose great state, the guided Khilafah is about to return, in addition to the German people, which is expected to return as a great state, no matter how long this might take. We then talked about the Japanese people due to its great economic influence.

The influence and effect of these peoples in international politics would appear when we examine the great world issues.

1. The Issue of Europe

The issue of Europe is the prime world issue since many centuries. It is related to the great states, balance of power between these states, the world colonial domination, including its military, economic, political and cultural extent. It is of the oldest issues, and most dangerous upon what is called world peace.

It is the oldest world issue because it created in the world what is called international family or international community; where international law was founded because of that. The international family/community consisting of the Christian European states was founded so that Europe can face Islam. However, what is called the sacred alliance was founded to attack Napoleon and to prevent the expansion of France. World War I took place to prevent Germany from taking the oil of the Middle East and to restrict its power. For confronting Germany and preventing it from disturbing the balance of power in Europe, the four great states: England, France, USA and SU agreed to destroy Germany and prevent it from returning again as a great state. To prevent the unification of Europe and strengthening of Germany, there were political manoeuvres that delayed for many years the formation of the EU; besides they delayed the unification of Germany for tens of years. The two superpowers undertook actions for achieving this purpose, whether before or after the détente. At the beginning, France had a role in that, but it turned away from it later on, and it started to endeavour for strengthening Europe through using Germany. England

had a role as well in the original plan, though it pretended endeavouring to unify Europe. Therefore, the issue of Europe together with its links is of the oldest issues.

As regarding the fact that the issue of Europe is most dangerous to the so called world peace, this is represented in the conduct and actions of each of France, England and Germany; besides the actions of the SU and America, before their agreement, and the actions of the two superpowers, America and the SU after their agreement, and after the end of détente between them. This was also the case even after the collapse of the SU and the Eastern camp, and after dissolving Warsaw Pact. France, England and America represented the Western Camp before the agreement between the two giants. The issue of Europe at that time represented the settlement of World War II, and it was represented in discussing the future of West Europe as well as Germany. The Western camp adopted the unification of Europe so as to stand in the face of SU; and America was particularly interested in reviving German militarism and founding a strong German army so as to stand in the face of the SU, and create new balance of power between Germany, France and England. The SU represented the Eastern Camp, and it viewed the certain danger against it coming from Europe, and particularly from Germany. Therefore, it challenged the unification of Germany, the unification of Europe, as well the European army and rearmament of Germany. It managed through the cold war, political actions and diplomatic activity to succeed in achieving that. It thus prevented Europe for tens of years from moving one step forward in its issue.

However, after the emergence of the two giants, and through the agreement reached between Khrushchev and Kennedy, the situation has changed. The views of America and SU towards the issue of Germany have unified, and they agreed on one opinion regarding the issue of Europe. This has been manifested immediately at their meeting; because John Kennedy, the American president at that time, gave a statement saying: “The fear of the SU from being military

invaded by Europe is justified, for Russia was attacked by Europe twice in history. In the first it was attacked by France at time of Napoleon, and in the second by Germany at time of Hitler. Therefore, it is necessary to have something that safeguards the absence of danger against SU by Europe, such as disarmament of Central Europe, as an example". This statement unequivocally indicates that the opinion of the SU and America towards the issue of Europe and Germany particularly became the same. After the end of the détente, the opinion of America regarding Europe did not change in terms of controlling and attacking its ambition for independence (from America) and participation in drawing the international politics, preventing it from returning back to its past regions of influence, elimination of its influence in South East Asia and the gulf region, subjugating it so as to remain under the American umbrella of the NATO pact and confronting every European attempt for creating a military force specific to it. This is because when Europe felt the fears of war have become remote after the détente, and after it restored vigour and improved its economy, it started to yearn for participating with the two giants in drawing the international politics and building its policy with America on the basis of participation and equality, rather than on subordination. It also started to work for returning to the regions of its old colonialism, particularly Britain and France, which made America watch closely the activities of Europe. Moreover, America rushed after the collapse of the Eastern camp and the disintegration of Warsaw pact to fill the vacuum that resulted from that in the states of East Europe through building relations with them. This aimed at intercepting the efforts of EU, particularly Germany for expansion towards the east. America retained also the NATO pact, and it opposed and still opposes building of European military force independent from the NATO. As regarding Russia that inherited the SU it does not hide its fear of the EU expansion towards the east; so it strived for having safeguards. However, because of the international situation resulting from the collapse of the SU and the Eastern camp, besides its feeling of its weakness before USA, it did not find escape from coordinating

with EU states for reaching agreement over the dossier of East Europe. It also strives through coordination with some EU states to become effective in world politics. This forced it to take a more lenient stance towards EU and its states, different to its situation immediately after World War II, during the *détente* period, and immediately after that.

As for France, it used to work for unifying Europe and making of it a third force between the two camps, after De Gaulle assumed the authority till he visited USA and met with Nixon in March 1969. So, he worked for strengthening Germany to an extent it does not pose danger to France, and for creating federal union between the states of Europe on condition of safeguarding the sovereignty of France. He endeavoured to distance England from Europe, because he believed England's traditional policy since old history was to prevent, with all possible means, the unification of Europe. After the resignation of De Gaulle in 1969, and his death one year after that, the French president George Pompidou met with the PM of Britain, Edward Heath in 1971 in long and condensed negotiations, after which Pompidou accepted the membership of Britain.

France and Germany, in particular, still attempt to develop a common European foreign policy, particularly Germany that realises the extent of opposition to its emergence as a German force. So, it tries through coordination with France to emerge as a force within the frame of EU, thus achieving by that most of its special objectives, like expansion to the east. The two states succeeded, during the war against Iraq in 2003, to emerge with one stance opposing the war, which might prepare the environment for making of France and Germany a polarisation axis for a common European foreign policy. The struggle of the two states for founding a draft of a new European constitution and a common European general military staff independent from the NATO is only for making Europe a global power influencing the international politics.

As for England, it tried during the détente period to cement its relation with Germany, and disclose to it the conspiracies of America and SU against the development and strengthening of Germany. After that it decided to join the European Common Market after the long and condensed meeting between Pompidou and Edward Heath in 1971, despite the severe domestic opposition in Britain. Britain started to strengthen itself with Europe in facing the two giants before and after the collapse of the SU, but without showing open enmity to America. This was due to the necessity of the stage, for Europe was still in its first steps to become a global force, and its path was still full of dangers; besides it might not end with the aimed success. Particularly, America is conscious of the objectives of France and Germany, and she tries always to frustrate the French- German plans, because she is the strongest in the international arena and has enough capabilities that help her to accomplish that any time she wants. The policy of Britain today stands on the basis of putting one leg in Europe and another leg in America, where it hunts the benefits wherever it might find them.

This different (national) reality of the European states, particularly the great powers, represents an obstacle before forming a strong unified Europe that can act together in international politics. This view is emphasised by the information that came while preparing this book that the EU made of 25 states has closed its meeting in Dublin on 18/6/2004 without agreeing on choosing a president for the EU, and it postponed the meeting to a next time. Despite the national factor and the capitalist benefit embraced by the EU states, which are the two factors that obstruct a true European unity, the EU became a huge economic force that competes with the American economic force. The Euro started also to compete with the Dollar over the size of international dealings. Despite the conflict between the interests inside the EU and the penetration of its states by America through its strong relations with some of its states, particularly the East Europe states that joined the EU recently on 1/5/2004, the

EU started to pose, to a certain extent a hot embarrassment to the American economic plans.

In summary, we can say had the EU been firmly connected, it would have managed to compete with America over the international influence, economically, politically, and to a certain extent militarily. But, it is a loose union, a matter that weakens much its strength. However, this is the nature of any union, where it lacks the force that exists in the unity.

The EU is an economic giant, which America fears of and she does her utmost to shrink its force because it is a genuine competitor to her in the field of economy. AFP agency reported on 19/4/2003 “that USA depends to a great extent on the investments of the EU for balancing her big deficit in the current accounts that exceeded (500) billion dollars in year 2000, according to the report of Fred Birghiston, manager of International Economic Institute, which is a private centre for studies, in Washington”. Ten states have signed in Athens on 16/4/2003 for joining the past 15 states in the EU on 1/5/2004, a matter that makes of Europe the greatest trade area in the world that consists of 450 millions of people.

However, the EU is weak compared to America in the political and military fields; and America succeeds in weakening it through some factors as:

- a. She kept the NATO that was supposed to be dissolved since the end of the Warsaw pact led by the SU that was fragmented. However, America insists on maintaining the NATO under the pretext of the protection of European states from Russia and other enemy once needed. This would keep the hegemony of America over Europe. Romano Broody, the head of European Commission said on 19/4/2003 (AFP): “The EU must make its view heard inside the NATO. In that case we would have a pact based on two pillars: a European and An American”. He added: “That will be the true NATO pact, instead of the pact that we used to and which complied with the USA

only”. He said also: “We cannot give Europe the responsibility over the budget and leave the responsibility of security to America”.

- b. The British policy does not want Britain to melt in the EU and becomes a state like Luxemburg as an example. Therefore, it puts one leg in the EU and another one in America. Thus, its interests meet with the interests of America in one aim which is weakening of the EU: Britain wants to remain controlling Europe, while America does not want Europe to compete with her once EU became a unified force.
- c. Most of the states that signed on 16/4/2003 for joining the EU on 1/5/2004 are in the influence region of America, or as Broody said on 19/4/2003: “some of the new EU states have strong relations with the USA regarding security issues”.
- d. The increasing control of America over the oil fields gives her hegemony over the EU states that need oil. Besides, the increasing hegemony of America over the rulers of the third world gives her monopoly over the lucrative trade deals and makes her rob the resources of the world, thus depriving European states from such profits.

Therefore, we can say the European balance of power is not holding together to the point that we can say there is no unified European force, rather there are strong states in Europe, led by France, which endeavour to form a block made of other European states with them, thus creating a European force. While Britain on the other side is not concerned about forming a strong European block, rather it wants Britain, which influences Europe.

Thus, the interactions of the European issue, the international relations amongst them, or between them and America, or between them and the other hot issues; all of these interactions drive the rest of Europe to be internationally important. The difference of balances (of force) between them and the conflict of interests

and relations makes it a dangerous issue on the so called world peace, whether in terms of its stability or instability.

Therefore, the effect of the European issue on the other five issues and its interaction with them, besides its interlock with them; all of this cannot be overlooked. Thus, it is necessary to view the European issue in a way that agrees with its reality and its importance from the moment when Europe was made of competing states till it became a common economic market, then an EU that tries to have a significant weight in the world. This will be explained clearly when we review all the other issues and their relation with Europe.

2. Middle East (ME) Issue

It is an issue related to Islam and its danger; the strategic location and its control over the communications between Europe, Africa and Asia; the Jewish entity and its being the first line for defending the Western interests; colonialism and its material benefits particularly the oil. Thus, such an issue that is related to Islam, the strategic location, the Jewish state, colonialism and oil, is indeed a very important one, not only for the people of the region and Muslims, but rather for the entire world.

As in regards with Islam, it was and still forms the greatest danger to America and the West. Besides, the region of the ME is considered the natural departure point for the Islamic da'wa to the world. Therefore, it was not strange that America looked at Islam as the prime and sole enemy to her after the collapse of socialism. She used the slogans of terrorism, religious extremism and fundamentalism as a cover to her campaign against Islam and Muslims in this region. She tries, using her utmost to distance the political Islamic movements from authority through using the styles of suppression, repression, torture and containment, which her puppet governments in the region follow. Bush has declared this new crusader war openly against Muslims. John Ashcroft, the American minister of justice said: (Sincerely, terrorism is hidden in Islam itself,

and not only in some of those that embrace it). He also said that Allah encourages terrorism in Quran, as he claimed.

As in regards with the strategic location of the ME and its control over the communications, this results from its existence at the crossroad of the old three continents: Africa, Europe and Asia, besides it controls over the straits of Gibraltar, Bosphorus, Aden, Harmuz, and Suez Canal, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea, Red Sea and the Gulf. This is besides its being a crossroad of the raw materials and goods between the three continents.

Its strategic importance used to form a critical point between the Western and Soviet camps before the détente. This is because the ME forms the western belt in the military ring imposed against the past SU. This western belt was the first line of the west for defending ME and Africa in the face of the SU. Therefore, military bases were built in the ME including nuclear bases. There were also many attempts to connect the ME states to military alliances. Besides, many airports and highways were built in it; so it had a great strategic importance. After the agreement between the two superpowers in 1961, it lost its military importance. Therefore, the issue of military alliances in it was ignored, and the nuclear bases were removed. The two superpowers worked together ahead in removing the English military bases, and succeeded in removing the bases in Eden, Libya and east of Suez Canal; besides they tried to remove its bases in Cyprus. Thus, at that time the ME ceased to have a strategic importance. However, after the end of the cold war and the elimination of the SU, the ME restored its strategic importance, particularly for America in facing Russia and Europe. So, America started again to build military bases in the gulf, occupied Afghanistan and Iraq, and declared Bahrain, and then Pakistan and Kuwait as strategic allies.

She recently considered it as the front line for defending the security of USA; and she prepared a plan for it, which she called (The Great ME Plan). Then she

adjusted it to (The ME and Africa Plan). She presented it to the G8 summit that was held in June 2004 in C-Land area.

However, the important location of the ME that extends from Morocco at the Atlantic Ocean in the west to Iran and Iraq on the gulf in the east, and from Turkey in the north to the Great African desert in the south, ie it includes all the Arab states in addition to Turkey and Iran, this important location made of it a target for the colonialists and an object for the desires of the ambitious, due to its huge importance in the issue of transportation and communication, not only at this time, but even since the crusader wars till today.

As regarding the Jewish entity planted in Palestine it became the heart of the ME issue and it became a cause for instability, not in the ME but also in the entire world, as acknowledged by the west itself that agreed 90% of the problems of the Islamic world that annoys the west returns to the problem of the existence of the Jewish state in Palestine, ie in the heart of the Islamic world.

As regarding its colonial importance it is the one that caused its affliction and eliminated it as a great state and a global force. It also changed it to a western colony where the western states compete in it over colonialism and hegemony. This is because the oil that exists in it is more than half of the world reserves; besides the raw materials that exist in Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Iran and others form a huge wealth that represents 10 times the wealth of Europe and America, put together. This is the reason of the competition and struggle between the states over it, where the wars of America in the gulf are tangible evidence to that.

Getting these four angles together in one issue, namely; Islam, the oil, the strategic location and (Israel) is enough to make of this issue the most dangerous and most complicated one; to the point it became the focus and the prime issue. So, it is more complicated than the great states can solve it, and

more than they can understand it. Therefore, it is a thorny issue and hugely complicated, which the great states have no solution for it; and it will not be solved except by the establishment of the Islamic State (Khilafah).

ME was under the authority and control of Islam and the Islamic state till mid 18th century. Since Berlin conference, ie since late 18th century the great European states started their attempt to invade it. So, each of France, England and Italy attacked it; and attack was repeated till the Islamic state was demolished through the destruction of the Ottoman state and the complete removal of Khilafah. Thus, the ME settled down under colonialism, authority and influence of England. Its influence covered all of its states even those that were not colonised like Turkey and Afghanistan. France had only a little part, which was confined to the northern part of sham known as Syria, including its south west coast known as Lebanon. This situation continued till the end of World War II, where France was thrown away from it, and the English colonialism changed into a new other style through concentrating its division and giving a name of a state for each part of it. Therefore, World War II ended while the entire ME was considered a western colony, actually an English colony. Thus, it was considered a part of the free world and part of the western camp, where the eastern camp had no any presence in it. Two factors helped England to solely colonise the ME: The first is the political, economical and international weakness of France. So it could not match and compete with England regarding colonialism in the ME. The second is the insistence of America to follow isolation policy after World War I; so England acted unilaterally in colonising the ME through all 19th century and until mid of 20th century. However, after 1950 the situation differed and radically changed, because colonial struggle started between England and America, which led to what the ME witnessed of wars, military coups, manoeuvres and conspiracies. The struggle went on ups and downs till America managed to take the initiative in the ME, where Britain became so weak that it could not face America openly. It however, acted stubbornly for preserving as much as it could of its

colonies; and it endeavoured to have even a partial presence in the region through associating America in her plans as it did in the occupation of Iraq.

Hence, it can be said the struggle over the ME after World War II was effectively concentrated between America and Britain as follows:

The American and British policies regarding the ME after World War II went on through partnership. So, the two states used to meet and review their policies and coordinate their plans and styles. Britain continued allowing America to devour some benefits particularly in terms of the oil of the Arab Peninsular. It also remained to please her at some times; but it used to face her over whatever it considered harmful to its interests.

When the issue of the Jews in Palestine was raised America had the view of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine in order to use it a means for colonising the region. Britain at that time did not take a decision regarding establishing a Jewish state. It was hesitant between making Palestine an entity controlled by Jews and having a Jewish state. It wanted to link that to its colonisation of the rest of the Arab countries. Therefore, it did not decide the matter, so it transferred the issue to the UN. When the UN decided establishing a Jewish state under the pressure from America, Britain remained silent and left the issue for the future time to decide whether the region can accept the presence of a Jewish state amongst Muslims, or this Islamic body will spit it out. Its policy towards the Jewish state continued on the basis of waiting the decision of the future.

As regarding America, it worked hard to concentrate (Israel) and eliminate anything that might obstruct this task. Britain used to oppose her over this issue but secretly. So, this created severe struggle between Britain and America over the presence of the Jewish state.

Moreover, America tried to draw oil pipelines across Jordan, Syria and Lebanon to the Mediterranean Sea, but England obstructed her plan. Because it was old in the region, it was cable to influence all the rulers of the region for they were agents to it. Therefore America found that the only means to change the situation of the region was to apply the same policy she used in South America, which is bringing in military rulers and undertaking military coups. So, it carried out the first military coup in Syria through Husni Za'im who gave concession to America for drawing an oil pipeline, where the pipeline was drawn and thus she overcame the problem. However, England noticed that America wanted to colonise and take the region from it; so it started to ferociously resist that by the political styles and manoeuvres and through the people of the region.

After the military coup of Husni Za'im, the ferocity of the opposition by England to all the American projects, and the change of secret struggle between the two states to almost open one, the diplomatic representatives of America in the ME noticed the threat against the military and economic interests of America in the region. They considered the continuous link between the American policy and the British policy means America will remain, as it was before World War II, just a tool used by England. Where it will only give her a small bait to keep her in the region for defending it, but it deprives her of all the resources of the region, and keeps the entire region under the control of England alone. The authorized American diplomats in the Arab group have noticed that and realised the necessity of introducing fundamental amendments to the direction of Washington policy, and the need of making new adjustments. So, they decided to use cooperation with the people of the region as a basis for the development and improvement of such policy. They however found themselves at the same time before a large set of problems, in addition to the presence of (Israel), and the great hatred and grudge Muslims carry towards it. Therefore, they found it necessary to address these problems before starting serious thinking and before starting changing the region from an English basis

to an American basis. So, they called for holding a conference amongst them to discuss this subject. In November 1950 they held their first conference in Istanbul. This was chaired by Mr George Magi, a deputy in the American State Department responsible for the affairs of the ME and North Africa. This conference lasted for five consecutive days. They discussed in this secret conference the most important political, strategic and economic conditions of this region. Their opinion settled that it is not possible for the American policy to be linked to the British policy if America really wanted to change the ME into an American basis and use the cooperation with the people of the region as one of the styles to change this region. They used the rejection of Syria at the time of the president Shukri Quwwatli to give concession for drawing an oil pipeline, and taking that concession through the coup carried out by Husni Za'im as tangible evidence to the validity of their view. Add to that the English carried out another coup at the same year of 1949 by Al-Hinnawi who removed Husni Za'im and thus Syria returned back to the control of English. All of that supported their view that the American policy must be detached from the British policy if America wanted to work in the region. This conference is considered one of the most important tools to direct the America diplomacy in the Arabic field. It presented recommendations to each of the White House, State of Department, Pentagon and Marine. These recommendations were presented after an important introduction, as follows:

The experience of the recent World War II has proved that the ME is a fundamental basis, where exist all the factors necessary for waging a war against the SU. There is no chance of success in contemplating an attack against the Russian oil fields in the Caucous and depriving the machine of Soviet war from its richest oil revenues through military cooperation with Turkey only. It is rather necessary to found organised air bases in Syria, Lebanon and Palestine, on condition that Iraq and Egypt change to become a big depot that secures supplies of men, arms and provisions to any offence plan that aims at

surrounding and sabotaging the Soviet oil fields in Baku and the Caucasus, in general.

Moreover, the military campaigns against Greece, Sicily and Italy during the entire period from 1941 to 1944 showed beyond any doubt the importance of the ME in providing and supplying such type of decisive military operations that secured victory for the war of the allies forces and containment of the enemy armies inside the European fortress.

This introduction ended with presenting recommendations that were coined by the agreement of all the delegates in form of four recommendations:

First: Detachment from the British policy in every matter related to the pending issues between it and the Arab world.

Second: Using the support of Arabs' national demands as a basis of an American policy in the ME.

Third: Support of Egypt regarding its demands from Britain, and encouraging similar movement in Iraq.

Fourth: Abstain from the constant diplomatic and economic support to (Israel) and encourage the UN to executing the project of dividing Palestine into two states, an Arab and a Jewish, besides executing the resolutions of the SC regarding the settlement of Arab refugees on the basis of their return to their homes and compensating those who do not want to return.

It is said that they gave a special recommendation regarding Egypt, where they advised it is necessary that America takes Egypt from Britain and expels Britain from it. This is besides founding a strong authority in it that leads the entire region, because history proved Egypt is the gate of the ME.

These recommendations were submitted to the ruling authority in the USA, where the Democratic Party was in power at that time, who was used to flatter the English. Truman was the president of USA, and he came to power supported by two factors: first is the Jewish influence, and second is the British influence amongst the American circles. Besides, Truman was linked with many obligations towards Britain and towards the Jews as well. Therefore, these decisions were not given the attention the diplomats hoped for them, though they were given some attention at the time of Eisenhower.

However, the American became active in the ME after the mentioned conference of the diplomats. So, America undertook a brave attempt to make peace between the Arab states and (Israel) and to expel England from Jordan and Iraq. The American diplomats made contacts with King Abdullah and negotiated with him for reaching a deal with him. The deal is summarized that Abdullah turns away from England and instead goes along with America. In return, America would give him a free hand for annexing Iraq and Hijaz to him, thus making a state made of Jordan, Iraq and Hijaz, where he annexes Syria and Lebanon to it after that. In return for that he would conclude peace with (Israel), and America would give him the necessary aid and loans for reviving this new state economically. King Abdullah agreed to that and started working to realise this plan. He went to Iraq where he met with Abdulilah and Nuri Said, discussed the matter with them and asked them to work with him. However, these two officials made contact with the British ambassador in Baghdad and disclosed to him the plans of king Abdullah. The English prevented them from working with him; therefore they did not accept his offer but did not stop him, thus leaving the matter pending. The king returned back to Jordan and invited Riyad Sulh (PM of Lebanon) to work with him and help him in the plan. Riyad Sulh accepted that; for it seems he had already changed to the Americans. So, the English killed Riyad Sulh in Amman in his way to its airport while returning to Beirut. One week after that king Abdullah was killed in Al-Quds, inside Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa due to an open conspiracy planned by Glob for

killing him. The American ambassador in Amman warned him openly, one day before his killing of the conspiracy; and thus this plan died down. In that year, 1952 American presidential elections took place where the Republic Party won the post, manifested in Eisenhower. He assumed authority at the beginning of 1953, where struggle between England and America intensified, because Eisenhower is known of giving preference to the American high interest in its military and international forms over the Jewish and British pressure. Therefore, the struggle between America and England became ferocious, where America managed to take Egypt from England and then expelled it from Egypt. Earlier to that America made a coup in Syria where she brought to power her agent Adib Sheeshakli. Thus, Egypt and Syria became with America. Since that date all Arab states became an open field for Anglo-American struggle. Many actions took place in it that made of it like a ball that moves from America's hand to England's hand, and back again from England's hand to America's hand, and so on. This was manifested in many actions that covered Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Yemen. Most of these actions were in Syria, as being the heart of the region, and it generally influences all Arab countries. Therefore, many political actions happened in Syria, most prominent of which was the frequency of military coups. After killing Husni Za'im in a way that revealed the grudge of England against him, and once his authority ended, England started to strengthen authority in Syria on democratic basis, and to work for annexing it to Iraq as a step towards the creation of Fertile Crescent. Thus, elections were conducted in Syria; a constitution was put for the country, and the People's Party and National Party dominated the authority and declared in their programs unification with Iraq. America tried to obstruct the efforts of England; but it could not find an opportunity for achieving that except after assuming the authority by Adib Sheeshakli, who initially controlled the authority from behind the screens, and then openly, where he declared himself a president of the republic. Thus, Syria turned to America till 1954 when the English agents, and by the support of Iraq removed Sheeshakli; after

which Syria returned to England and parliamentary rule. At that moment England started to promote Baghdad Pact in the region. By 1955 the region entered into violent and ferocious Anglo-American struggle. America started to use Egypt for playing the game of liberation, unity and socialism. Abdul Nasser started to plunge in struggle against the English in the name of America. So, by direction from America he concluded a deal for buying a big quantity of weapons from the communist camp, and he implied to the people he bought these weapons for attacking and eliminating (Israel). This created a huge reverberation in the entire Arab people. He also adopted Arab nationalism, and declared Egypt as an Arab state and recorded that in the constitution of the Egyptian state. He started to call also for social justice and unity. Such actions made the Arab people rally behind him, and he thus became one of the leaders of the Arab world. This was helped by the style used by America to attack England and to create confusion amongst the people of the region. So, despite the bitter enmity between America and SU at that time, she used some styles to attract Russia into the region and make of it an international element in the region and an international factor used against England. Despite the fight of America against communism, she persuaded Jamal Abdul Nasser, the ruler of Egypt of socialism and call for it. Thus, the fact that Egypt purchased weapons from the communist camp was a factor that introduced Russia to the region. Besides, the call of Abdul Nasser to nationalism was a fundamental factor in reviving Arab nationalism after it had almost died. His adoption to socialism that developed from social justice was an effective factor in the spread of left-wing politics and making it dominate the public opinion in the region. Egypt's adoption of attacking the foreign alliances, particularly Baghdad Pact had great effect in removing the doubt of Nasser's subordination to America, taking in consideration he used to attack American colonialism. Therefore, there was no more doubt with the entire Arab people that Jamal Abdul Nasser was the great saviour that was sent by Allah to this nation for delivering it from colonialism. So, all the people were devoted to him, except one group that tried to disclose

him and attack him. However, their work did not make any effect, whatsoever; so he continued to have full control over the public opinion. Due to this control, the agents of England in Jordan and Iraq, as rulers, became unstable. The agents of England in Syria and Lebanon became in a very unfortunate popular position. Thus, the atmosphere was wonderful for America to work for the elimination of the English; though the region was not aware that such actions were for bringing America into the region to replace Britain. The region should have instead realised that their duty was to eliminate the colonialism of both states: America and Britain, rather than replace one of them with the other.

At this period in time some internal developments happened in Syria that were induced by the rally of the people behind Abdul Nasser. In that period Ba'th Party merged with Socialist Arab Party, which created presence in the army for Ba'th party. The two parties raised the slogan of (unity, freedom and socialism) taht gave them influence on authority, which they took part in it. The two parties found in Abdul Nasser and his call an opportunity for making the people rally behind them and for making obvious steps towards unity and socialism which they wanted. Thus, Syria became controlled by governments dominated by Ba'th party, as a way for avoiding its harm, and for fear of its imagined popularity amongst people. Therefore, Syria was with the English in reality, but it was dominated by the two ideas of unity and socialism, which had influence on public opinion. Then Abdul Nasser nationalised Suez Canal, which was followed by the trio aggression against Egypt that pushed the popularity of Abdul Nasser over the moon. Therefore, the English agents were scared from showing themselves on political theatre, and their voice died down to the point they were hardly noticed.

In August 1957 some army officers met and discussed the authority in Syria, in terms of its orientation towards the west and the infiltration of the western influence in it. So, they decided to hold the authority, but keep ruling, ie the president and ministers in their posts, while the army officers run the affairs and

discharge ruling matters. Thus, they actually detached Syria from western colonialism. Before its detachment from the western colonialism, Syria was actually with the English, though apparently it was linked with America because the dominating thoughts were those promoted by Abdul Nasser, namely, freedom, socialism and unity. This is besides Ba'th party, which has the prime word in public opinion presented itself as a friend or ally to Abdul Nasser. Therefore, detachment of Syria from the west was directed against America, though in reality it was directed against the English more than the Americans. Despite that the English remained silent about this detachment and did nothing. As for America it got mad, and started to work with apparent nervousness for hitting the army officers and for restoring it to the domain of the west. Many attempts were undertaken in this regard but they all failed. After the failure of America in solving the problem, Abdul Nasser moved to do that. He sent Mahmood Riyad to Syria, where he worked for making a union between Egypt and Syria, by which Egypt controls authority in Syria. Through this approach America held the rein in Syria, and she started working to expel Britain from Iraq and Lebanon. By 1958 the revolution of Lebanon broke out followed by the revolution of Iraq. Thus, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon and Egypt became in the hand of America, leaving only Jordan for the English. Abdul Nasser continued chasing England in Jordan; so it was about to be eliminated from the entire region. However, England did not despair and continued to work from its basis, namely Jordan. By 1961 England had some forces that work on its side in Syria. So, all the political forces, People's Party, National Party and Ba'th Party (ie, Ba'th and Arab Socialist parties) worked together against Abdul Nasser and against the unity. Thus, Syria was separated from Egypt, and the English agents assumed the authority there. America also removed Abdul Karim Qasim from the authority in Iraq after he turned away from her and worked with the communists. This resulted in an American regime controlled by the Ba'th party, which started to work to change the situation in Syria and Jordan for annexing them to Iraq. England became scared

of that; so its agents in Damascus made a forged coup, and made Ba'th just a cover for the authority. In 1971, after Hafiz Asad went to Egypt and joined the four- state union he returned to Syria with a different face. He was convinced there that he can become a president to Syrian republic though he is from the Nusairiyya Alawi sect. It seemed at that time America was behind it, and it would support him as long as he worked with her. Moreover, Egypt would make its groups there support him; besides Egypt and America would work to remove the obstacles before his appointment as a president to the republic because he is an Alawi. This is because people in Syria do not accept an Alawi rather a Muslim as their president. Thus, America prepared the matter and eased the difficulties after he agreed to go along with her; so execution of that started. He started to work gradually to become president of the republic. He visited the north of Syria and conducted contacts with the masses. When he discovered the people agree with the ruler without an apparent opposition to that, he embarked on that practically. So, Hafiz Asad was nominated for the presidency post, and the day of 12/3/1971 was assigned for referendum. Hafiz Asad became a president of Syria after that, where Syria fell again in the claws of America, and she is still till today.

These are some examples of the Anglo-American struggle in Syria, which is the most prominent aspect of it. As regarding other Arab states, Jordan remained under the control of English because 2/3 of its people are Palestinians; many of them depend on UN rations and the salaries of their sons who work outside Jordan. The other third are Bedouins of east Jordan; many of them depend on the salaries of their sons in the army. Therefore, America did not find the fertile soil she found in Syria. Thus, there was no any political action in Jordan that manifests international struggle except the demonstrations that took place against Baghdad Pact, and the fabricated coup attempt by King Hussein in 1957 which he forged to throw some of Abdul Nasser's agents outside the country. Therefore, Jordan is not considered to have important political actions related to political struggle, though it is one of the most important places over which

there is struggle between America and England due to the amazing wealth it has underground and under Dead Sea water.

As regarding Iraq, despite that Abdul Salam Arif that succeeded the Ba'thists in power had clung to Abdul Nasser's heels the English agents of politicians and army officers found opportunity to move. So, with little effort they controlled the army and the economic capabilities. Thus, Iraq returned back to the influence of the English. Though America returned back to Iraq at the time of Abdul Rahman Arif, but the people of the English, of Ba'thists and others dominated the authority in 1968, where the influence of the English in Iraq continued till 9/4/2003 when Iraq fell down, together with the regime of Saddam Hussein and Ba'th power in Iraq. Since then Iraq fell under the American occupation.

As regarding Egypt; since Abdul Nasser held its power it became the major American basis, and it still continues till today the important America basis. There were no important political actions in it that can be part of struggle except that which happened little after Abdul Nasser's death. At that period there were three factors that could return Egypt back to Britain, which were:

Firstly: There was a weak regime in it that was unable to protect itself, not to mention filling the vacuum left by Abdul Nasser.

Secondly: Some movements emerged in Egypt within the army and the people that called for war (against Israel) and expelling the (communist) Russians and called for complete liberation.

Thirdly: There were contacts between the English and Egypt that started with the visit to Egypt by Douglas Hume, foreign minister of England, for attending the funeral of Abdul Nasser. This visit was followed by many of the English through Libya. Then these contacts became official, not only by the visit of Mohammad Hasanain Haykal, but also through official memorandums, and

requesting from Egypt openly to strengthen the relations between it and England. Thus, the return of Egypt to England was only a matter of time rather than efforts, due to the unstable position of Sadat at the beginning of his authority. However, America managed to strengthen Sadat in power; and she forged the 1973 war to pave the way for peace with (Israel). This war made of Sadat a hero and helped him to take the initiative. Thus, international struggle inside Egypt disappeared, and it continued as the most important and major American basis till today.

As regarding the states of North Africa, Morocco entered under the American control when it got its independence at time of Mophammad al-Khamis. Algeria became under American influence through Ahmad bin Bella. However, this did not last long, because Mohammad al-Khamis died and his son Al-Hasan ascended to the throne and moved with the English. Regarding Algeria, the English concocted a coup against Ben Bella by the help of King Al-Hasan and through Mohammad Khayder. So, they attracted to them Tahir Zubiri and Abu Madyan who undertook a coup that removed Ahmad Ben Bella. Thus, America was removed from Algeria, and England got the influence there. As regarding Libya and Tunisia, America could not enter any one of them, and nor generate any political actions in any one of them. Rather the English influence remained stable in them, and they did not take part in the Anglo-American struggle. As regarding Yemen and Gulf states, they all, to the exclusion of Saudi Arabia submit to the English influence. There is no struggle in the proper sense in them except in Yemen, where the English influence there is exposed to harassments from America, together with ups and downs. In Saudi Arabia, America managed to attract some the members of the royal family there, while England still has its people in the royal family as well. The Anglo- American struggle in it goes on via the personalities of the family. When Fahd ben Abdulaziz assumed the authority for example, Saudi Arabia became to proceed in the domain of the American policy. If this situation changed, where one of the people of England ascended to the throne, like Abdullah, the current Crown

Prince, Hijaz and Najd will return to the British influence, and so on. America however tries since the explosions of 11/9/2001 to cement its influence in Saudi Arabia away from the fluctuation of the Royal family members, through changing the model of authority in it. The news reports show this is under study by the policy makers in Washington.

The Anglo-American struggle in the Arab countries continued ferocious during the fifties and sixties of last century. The Palestinian issue remained the heart of this struggle. The British concluded in 1964 that there is no possibility for the region to accept a foreign state inside it, and the experiment of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine is a failure. They found it is better to establish a secular state on the model of the Lebanese state by reviving the project of the White Paper which Britain issued in 1939 and made it the basis for the settlement of the issue. It reviewed this with the Jewish leaders who were convinced of the idea. Bourqeebah, the leader of Tunisia undertook a visit to Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia, where he presented the mentioned British plan to the Arab leaders and some of the Palestinian people. He took their agreement to the plan and thus Britain started its attempt for executing it. However, America and through Abdul Nasser managed to frustrate the plan by its fierce opposition to it.

This shows that the ME issue was supposed to be, from an international aspect an issue of struggle between the people of the region and the colonialist states as it happened with America when she expelled colonialism and formed the USA. And as it also happened with China after World War II, where it expelled the Japanese colonialism and foreign influence, and established a communist state of a distinguished situation in the world. This is natural for every colonised country that has international and local capabilities to liberate itself from foreign influence and develop itself into a state of international weight. However, unfortunately this was not the case with the ME issue. It was rather an issue of severe struggle between America and Britain over the colonialism

and exploitation of the region, so as to create new tight restrictions that prevent the people of the region from even thinking in liberation and emancipation. Struggle between America and Britain continued in the seventies and eighties of last century, but with less force.

By the collapse of the SU at the beginning of the nineties of last century, and after the success of the American invasion to Iraq, besides her control over Kuwait and the Gulf region, the force balance in the world changed. America started to draw a new map to the region, where the British would be a secondary player in the region. They became unable to struggle with America; and their level and weight declined. So, they were forced to work through using weak scheming and intrigues. They were also obliged to depend on EU for pushing their plans that were in origin pale like Oslo accords which they tried to use to bypass America. However, America managed to change them into other courses that serve her objectives. Britain was also obliged to acknowledge the failure of its secular state project; so it declared its termination and accepted the American project that dictates the formation of an Arab Palestinian state beside the Jewish state. Arafat, PLO chairman officially abandoned the concept of the secular state in the Palestinian National Conference (PNC) held in Algeria in 1988. Since that date, he officially announced his acceptance of the concept of two states in all the international circles. King Hussein was also obliged to reluctantly announce the legal and administrative separation between the West Bank and the East Bank of Jordan River, and acknowledged the necessity of establishing the Palestinian State.

Thus the project of the secular state has failed officially and practically. The only project left is the American one, which is the establishment of the Palestinian state beside (Israel). This project became an international request adopted by the UN, EU, and Russia in addition to America. This international quadric group consisting of these four sides was formed to support the concept of establishing the Palestinian state beside (Israel) through the view presented

by Bush that is called Road Map. America is not currently concerned, about the implementation of the Road Map (RM) because this year of 2004 is her year of elections and she wants to use this project for only keeping the region preoccupied with it. America used to preoccupy the region with a project after a project till the time becomes suitable for realising her interests. At that moment the Jews will surrender to America's command when she asks them seriously to execute her plans. This is because they cannot reject her orders if these orders were delivered seriously to them, particularly they realise America aims to fulfil her interests from these projects presented to the region, taking into consideration the interest of the Jews as well.

As Britain was forced to go along with America regarding the concept of the Palestinian state, she also went along with her in the invasion of Iraq and removal of its agent Saddam Hussein in order to preserve some of the gains that keep it as a great power by an American discretion.

America managed also to push strongly her influence alongside the British influence in all the Gulf States, Yemen and Jordan. She also managed to compete with the British and French influence in North African states and Turkey. Thus, America has the true domination over the states of the ME that exceed 24 states. However, Britain is obliged to run behind America for obtaining some crumbs and for disturbing secretly some of her plans without daring to present openly its own plans for competing with the American plans in the region, as it used to do that before. Therefore, it can be said the open struggle between the two states has finished since the end of last century till today. It changed into a style of partnership and deals, crowning America as the leader of the region that has the biggest share. Britain, on the other side plays the role of the maid of honour so as to remain in the lime light. This is because the capability of Britain currently, rather the capability of the entire EU to imposing settlement plans for the region, is weak. Therefore, we see Britain and the EU states jump over the projects of America and function work with

them. Neither Britain and nor the EU are capable to execute any thing without an effective role by America. However, we cannot say the role of Britain in the region has finished; rather its feeling of greatness and of being a great state still exists; besides its political shrewdness has not ceased. Moreover, its agents still have a breath, ie the force of Britain is still hidden, where it emerges from time to time.

As regarding France, it still strives to have some influence in Algeria, Tunisia and Lebanon. This is due to the presence in these states of many people educated with French culture, after it completely lost its influence in Morocco and Mauritania.

(Israel) has arranged its policies in compliance with the American interests, and it merged itself completely in these interests particularly at the time of the neoconservatives in the administration of Bush, junior. It warmly and quickly rode the current of defending these interests. So, America protected its reputation as a great regional state in the region, and considered defence of the existence of (Israel) as defence of America herself; and so it remained the spoiled child that his father does not like to annoy.

The rest of Arab rulers went to the extreme in America's service to the point of slavery. So, they lost any credibility they had with their peoples, which led to being disdained by their (western) masters who went to the extreme in humiliating them and pressing for more concessions from them. Thus, they became easy tools in the hand of their enemy, where they replace them when they wanted, as it happened with Saddam and might happen with others. Therefore, they lost the support of their peoples, and remained in power by the support of their masters as well under their mercy. Their position became worse, because they became exposed to gunfire from both of their peoples and their masters, as if they are put between the hammer of their peoples and the anvil of their masters. Thus, the ME region is susceptible to explosion at any

time and has great likelihood for the birth of true Islamic state; the signs of its emergence are quite obvious for eyes to see.

3. Far East Issue

The case in the Far East (FE) differs from the issue of the ME. This is because though it is an issue of strategy and colonialism, but its situation differs completely from that of the ME. Taking the issue of the Indian Subcontinent as one by itself in this century, there are five peoples in the FE, which are people of China, people of Japan, people of Korea, people of Indochina, and people of Indonesia, where each one of them has its own issue. Before discussing the partial issues of the FE, we talk generally about its whole issue. It is considered important strategically to USA and Russia. It stands at the borders of USA from the Pacific Ocean side, where there are two powers that might pose danger to America, which are China and Japan. Besides, these two powers can pose danger to Russia as well. Its issue is thus considered strategic from this angle. This explains why America endeavoured to have forces in the FE so as to remain in it, even before it was attacked by Japan in Pearl Harbour in World War II. After that, the FE became important to America from strategic point of view. This explains that her warships and military planes remain continuously moving in the region. Philippine is considered an American basis before World War II till now. Therefore, she gives great attention to this region so that she protects herself from its potential danger. As regarding Russia; due to its being neighbour to this region without presence of oceans that separate between them as the case with USA, it does not take military precautions towards it, though it strengthens its borders with China and tries to keep good and friendly relations with Japan.

As regarding the colonial aspect, it was almost limited in the past to England, France, Holland and Portugal. This is because though America imposed her authority over Philippine and it almost became her colony, she did not take part in colonialism outside the new world when colonialism spread in the nineteenth

century. Therefore, it is safe to say England, France and Holland were the states primary involved in colonising the FE, while Portugal joined that just in a small part. England has occupied Hong Cong at the south east coast of China. It also occupied Malay, Singapore, the northern part of island of Borneo, Burma and Ceylon; this is beside the occupation of India. Its whole policy was based on holding to all of these colonies. When the western camp was one unity before the agreement between the two superpowers, the policy of Britain differed from the American policy in the FE despite Britain's extreme need to America for helping it in holding to its colonies. Britain used to look to China as market to its trade; therefore it did not consider China's presence in the eastern camp a danger to its presence in the FE. Thus, it did not find a justification for attacking and having friction with China. It rather wanted this region to remain quite and stable, because any movement in that region would cause its worry about the colonies.

Therefore, it resisted the movements undertaken by Indonesia in its struggle for expelling Holland. On the other side it was amicable with China, recognised it and opened the door of trade with it; besides it opposed America regarding the policy of the FE. All of that was for the purpose of preserving the colonies, for they were not only a market for its goods, they were rather rich with raw material used by Britain alone, which existed firmly in it and exploited it since the past. Therefore, its position in the FE revolved around maintaining any form of its colonialism of this country and keeping its influence in the region.

As regarding France; it restored Indochina after World War II, which consists of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. This is considered the richest and biggest among France's colonies, because it was the greatest source of French wealth due to the rich raw material of this colony. However, France could not hold on to this colony, because China overpowered them from one side, and America from the other till it was forced to abandon and leave the entire colony. As regarding China, it founded and supplied the past liberation movement in Vietnam,

known as (Viet Mina). This revolution managed to defeat France till it forced it to withdraw from most of Vietnam. France was defeated militarily and politically to the point it completely withdrew from the colony. As regarding America, it wanted to take Indochina colony from France. It pretended to helping France, but at the same time it secretly encouraged the revolution, leaving France to have hope in survival by the help of the western camp, particularly America, and despair of victory over the revolution. Finally, Geneva conference was held, which discussed the issue of Indochina. It resulted in withdrawal of France from the colony, and America took its place in Laos, South Vietnam and Cambodia, while China took its place in North Vietnam. Thus, China supported the state of North Vietnam that became independent and later on annexed South Vietnam, leading to the complete elimination of France from the region.

As regarding Holland, America encouraged the Indonesians to revolt against Holland. They undertook a severe revolution that was supported by both the SU and America despite their contradiction. England took the side of Holland against the Indonesians, who finally defeated Holland militarily. They raised the case to the UN, where America supported them, and thus UN declared independence of Indonesia. Holland left Indonesia, holding only to West Iriana. However, Indonesia chased it by the support of America till it expelled it from it. Thus, Holland got out of the entire region, without having any colonial presence left to it there.

As regarding Portugal, it used to occupy Gowa in India. When India saw Holland thrown out of the region it took heart to expel Portugal. So, with encouragement from England and America it occupied Gowa and threw Portugal from it, where Gowa became a part of India.

Thus, the only colonial powers left in the region were England and America. England was assured of its presence in the region before the agreement of the

two superpowers (USA and past SU). After their agreement and the change of the international situation, England became worried about its colonies and it became threatened of danger. This is because America started her attempts to drive England out of the region so as to take its place through a new style of colonialism under the concept of elimination of colonialism and giving independence to peoples, which was adopted by UN. She thus started to harass England and force it to give independence to the peoples. England employed artful means to avoid that pressure, so it set up a union made of north of island of Borneo, Sarawak, Sabah, Malay, and Singapore as a federal state called Malaysia. Thus, it changed the form of colonialism and remained of control over the country. America immediately stirred Indonesia against it, where it made demand over Borneo and started to attack Borneo, Malay and Singapore through raids by rebels. It started also to incite the people for revolting against England. This led to a semi-military state between Indonesia and Malaysia that was called encounter policy, which continued for many years. When the two superpowers came to an agreement between them, one of the issues they agreed to was to eliminate the military bases from the world, and to expel England from the FE. This led to increasing the pressure over England in the FE; so it decided to abandon the basis of Singapore and withdraw its military forces from east Suez and from the FE. It also embarked briskly upon resisting Sukarno that led to the encounter policy, through using its agents in Indonesia. Then America accepted removing Sukarno from power and brought some of her other agents in the army, led by Suharto. After England's withdrawal from the basis of Singapore, the latter was separated from Malaysia, which remained consisted of North Borneo, Sarawak, Sabah and Malay.

After these operations, the region went through some quietness, where actions were confined to attacking China. It seems that part of the general agreement between the two superpowers in the FE was elimination of Britain completely and leaving no presence to it there. It was expected the two superpowers would eliminate the English presence there after concluding the issue of China.

However, the events hastened, America returned to accelerate the tension with the SU immediately after the end of Vietnam War, China surrendered to the demands of the two superpowers and America thought that through the admission of Malaysia into the economical projects and the regional organisations it will be able to replace England in Malaysia. All of this prevented that from happening till now; so Britain still enjoys some influence in the FE.

As regarding America, she is linked with Philippine by semi-colonial treaties that are so much similar to the colonial treaties that linked each of Egypt, Jordan and Iraq and others with Britain. Though Philippine was not an American colony theoretically, but practically it is so. After America succeeded in expelling Holland from Indonesia, she tries to replace it, but the Indonesians resisted that for many years, and rejected to expel a colonialist to allow another. So, America started to create obstacles to Indonesia, and set up revolts against it; besides it remained silent about the attempts of infiltration by England into Indonesia through the agents, and encouraged the emigration of Chinese to Indonesia as well as insertion of communism into it. Due to these harassments, the rulers of Indonesia submitted to the pressure, so they accepted the American loans, and the military aid. Thus Indonesia came under the American control, and became dependent on her since the time of Sukarno. After the agreement of the two superpowers (USA and the past SU), the position of America in Indonesia became stronger, and she thus became the dominant force in it, particularly its control over the army and the economies of the country, a matter that still continues till today.

Besides Indonesia, America controlled most of Indochina after expelling France from it and South Korea after Korean War. She still tries to replace Britain in its colonies in the FE after expelling it from there. If America succeeded in that then the issue of the FE will change from an international issue to an America ranch.

This is the situation generally in the FE. As regarding the peoples of the FE, they are intellectually below the level of the peoples of the ME. However, the concept of liberation from colonialism that spread in the world little before and during World War II spread there much more, after it has influenced the peoples of this region more than it did to the peoples of the ME. This is because this concept was brought by the communists and it is part of the struggle of communism against capitalism. Therefore, this concept has streamed strongly from the SU through China to the peoples of the FE and incited these peoples. This explains the fact that the people of Indochina revolted against France before and after World War II; besides the people of Indonesia revolted against Holland before and after World War II, as well as the people of Korea embraced the communist thought, which had influenced it. Even the people of Malay, North Borneo and Singapore revolted against the English. As a result of these revolts Indonesia won its independence and expelled Holland; North Vietnam became a strong state, and England was obliged to create the union of Malaysia. All of this happened due to the concept of liberation from colonialism that prevailed in the region.

America and Britain realised that; therefore they do their best that their influence in the region does not appear in the old colonial form, rather in form of economic, political and cultural relations, as well other similar treaties. Thus, their influence will apparently look like international relations rather than colonial dictations.

There are still two remarks in the FE issue:

First: It is that which USA raises regarding North Korea and the elimination of its nuclear weapon.

Second: It is the growing Islamic expansion in the region, particularly in Indonesia and Malaysia.

As regarding North Korea, America raised it to create a hot issue at the borders of China. This is because the fixed policy of America in the region is to encircle China with strong states or hot issues that keep it preoccupied by itself. This is in order that it does not have ambitions outside its borders, otherwise it would compete for control and influence on the interests of America. America would not hesitate to unify Korea as she did to Vietnam to create strong states around China if she could do so, as she does with India regarding China.

Therefore, it is expected America will continue in stirring the issue so that it continues burning without a chance of quietness, on condition she keeps China busy with the problem, rather than to be a problem to America alone. Therefore, she endeavoured to associate the states of the region in the issue of Korea; so the meetings were held in six fold: America, North Korea, China, Russia, Japan and South Korea.

Creation of hot problems inside China or at its borders is a constant trend in the American policy. She chooses for that the right opportunity, where she stirs that sometimes through India or through internal provocation under the name of human rights, or through warming the environment with Korea at the borders of China, or otherwise. She seeks every possible opportunity in this regard. That opportunity came at the right time when America was planning for attacking Iraq after she finished her war against Afghanistan. The excuse of war against Iraq was weapons of mass destruction (WMD), in which Iraq and Iran are accused of possessing them, where the two countries are Muslim. In order that America does not appear she is against WMD when owned by Muslims, but does not bother if owned by others, Bush found it a suitable opportunity to raise the issue of the nuclear weapons of North Korea. So, he added it to both of Iraq and Iran in the axis of evil as it came in his statement in January 2002. This is in order he is not accused that he attacks Iraq just because it is a Muslim country that possesses WMD, as he claimed. Rather America adds other communist states in the axis of evil together with Iran and Iraq. However,

the objective was attacking Iraq as it came in the testimony of Collin Powel to the Congress two weeks after the speech of Bush about the axis of evil. Powel said regarding Iran and North Korea: “There is no plan to start war against these states...and we do not have a plan to attack North Korea or enter into dispute with Iran”.

Therefore, it is not expected America would intend to escalate the situation to the point of military actions for solving the issue of WMD in North Korea.

As regarding the growing Islamic expansion, it is the apprehension to the great states, particularly America, and the west generally. This apprehension keeps them sense the danger represented in Islam and Islamic resurgence. This is particularly there are more than 250 million Muslims that live in that region. Indonesia is the largest Islamic country; besides it is the fourth country in the world in terms of its population, ie it comes immediately after China, India and America.

Indonesia and Malaysia can create an enormous force in the region, which is not less than the influential great powers in the region, if the two countries adopted Islam as an ideology and a system of life. Besides, it is possible the two countries can communicate with the rest of the Islamic world with the presence of this scientific advancement in the technology of communications and transportations.

This emphasises the causes that make of the FE an international issue.

4. Issue of Central Asia

The issue of Central Asia (CA) differs from that of the FE and the ME. Though it is geographically connected with the ME and cannot be separated from the FE, it is different from them in terms of the type of colonialism and influence present in it. Therefore, it is different in terms of the type of struggle and its objectives. Besides, CA region was until the collapse of the SU a part of it.

Struggle over CA and Caucus did not start except after the collapse of the SU; therefore the parties of struggle in it are different to the sides of struggle in the ME and the FE. As regarding the difference in terms of the objectives of the struggle, this is because the objective of America from the struggle is expelling Russia from its areas of influence, besides its containment through reducing its field of activity by expelling it from the states of Caucus and CA.

Therefore, this issue emerged after 1991, when the SU disintegrated, and 15 new republics were formed at its ruins, 5 of which are of Muslim majority and lie in CA. These are Uzbekistan, which is the biggest and most important, then Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Kyrgyzstan. These four republics speak a language close to Turkish, while the fifth republic is Tajikistan, which speaks Persian.

These five republics are linked geographically and in population. They, together with the (Islamic) western part of China connected to them, are called Turkistan (East Turkistan, for the Chinese section, and West Turkistan, for CA part). These five republics are located east and north of Caspian Sea, where China is at east occupying East Turkistan, Russia at north, Caspian and Russia at west, and Afghanistan and Iran in the south.

Before indulging in the details of the struggle we must have a look at the strategic importance of CA and Caucus. From strategic aspect, the region is considered an extension to Russia inside Asia until the ME. There are no natural borders that separate Russia from this region, so there are no seas or oceans between them. This is the same case regarding China; so it is considered the back door to China. Since most of its population are Muslim, China is scared of their influence upon Muslims inside China, in East Turkmenistan. Because of this strategic importance, America put her plans since the collapse of the SU to enter the region and contain Russia, from one side, and put siege

around China and prevents it from infiltrating into its neighbours, from another side.

America succeeded in realising some of her objectives, so it established military bases in Uzbekistan after its ruler yielded to her with disgrace and humiliation. Under the name of war against terrorism, she managed to make military coordination with Tajikistan, and economic and cultural cooperation with Kyrgyzstan. She tries to extend that to Kazakhstan, and still attempts to infiltrate in the remaining states in the region and grapple them from Russia. In Caucasus, it also managed to remove Shevardnadze and replace him with a government ally to her in Tbilisi. This represented a strong blow that threatens Russia in the depth because this removed the barrier between the bases of the NATO pact in Turkey and the Russian borders, by the presence of a government ally to America in Georgia.

As regarding the colonial issue, CA and particularly the area of Caspian Sea is rich in oil, besides the region is also rich in many precious minerals like gold. This region is considered like the region of the ME of the richest regions in the world in natural resources and wealth that tempted the American capitalists (businessmen) and pushed them to spend their utmost for inserting the huge companies into the region under the name of investment. As it is the case with the ME, the colonial issue is considered one of the most causes of its misfortune, besides it is the main cause of struggle over it.

As regarding colonialism in CA and Caucasus, it started since 18th century, at the worst European imperialism era. At that time Russia seized those wide areas in CA and Caucasus from the Ottoman state and Safawite state and annexed them by force to Caesarean Russia. After the Bolshevik revolution, Russia continued to hold to CA and Caucasus with fist iron, and did not give any opportunity for any other state to interfere in them. However, after the collapse of the SU, and the weakness of Russia, America was encouraged to enter the region, rather to

attempt removing the Russian influence. This is because America considers herself the only inheritor in the world after the collapse of the SU and the elimination of the Eastern Camp, as she considered herself the inheritor of the western colonialism after World War II, when the SU existed. So, she considered herself inheritor of SU after its collapse. America is spellbound by arrogance and haughtiness, so she considers herself more entitled of the world. She thus endeavours to subjugate the world states to her influence through expelling the great powers, including Russia from their colonies and areas of influence.

Russia tried to inherit the SU in CA and Caucus; so it hurried to restructure the republics of the SU after its collapse through forming the commonwealth of the independent states, or (Independent Community of States) that is consisted of the states of past SU. It also maintained the federal form of Russia so as to retain wide areas of Caucus under its authority, such as Chechnya, Ingush, Dagestan and others.

America's attempts have succeeded in Uzbekistan and Georgia. She also succeeded in occupying Afghanistan that has direct borders with CA. She has as well declared her policy of strategic allies in Asia where she declared Pakistan as a strategic ally; and she makes her preparations to consolidate her position in CA after she occupied Iraq. Moreover, the American companies became powerful in producing the oil and minerals in CA and Caucus. Despite these entire achievements, political struggle is still at its beginnings, and the conclusion of the struggle to the advantage of America is still early. This is because though the region is vital for America, it is the lung with which Russia breathes, and it is its gate to other regions in the world. Therefore, it is not easy for Russia to withdraw from it. Hence, it is unexpected from Russia to evacuate the entire region in the foreseeable future.

In order to understand the American strategy in CA, it is necessary to examine the statements of the American officials and their agents in the region and its surrounding:

At the beginning of this year of 2004, Prevez Musharraf offered a concept that his country becomes a route to trade and energy pipelines between three regions, which are: CA, South Asia (India) and West Asia (Middle East), benefiting of the midpoint location of his country between these three regions. Islamabad built a chain of huge sea ports at Arab Sea linked with a net of highways on the American model that extends to Afghani borders.

Powel gave a brief about these projects in his statement before the committee of American Senates responsible for military expenses in 27 March 2004, where he said: “the region of Caucus, CA, West Asia and South Asia provides many opportunities once linked with a net of trade and transportations...However, this is possible in case we managed to impose security and safety”. He added saying: “Pakistan studies this matter, and it reshaped its structure and sea ports (...) and we will continue building highways in Afghanistan by the help of our partners of Saudis and Japanese”.

The American diplomatic movements point to convince the region to have (military, political or economic) alliances that start from the Pakistan-Afghani borders and pass through Tehran and Kabul. This would pave the way for redrawing a map of strategic alliances in its centre. Some political sources in Islamabad give predictions of possible new alliance between the two military establishments in Washington and Islamabad that goes beyond fight against terrorism. There is talk about American visions for establishing an Asian (NATO) led by America on the model of the European (NATO). This would include the traditional allies of Washington in the region together with new allies for Washington in Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan. It would aim at building a regional order that provides security and military

protection for the net of energy pipelines and thus prevent any Chinese or Russian influence.

Moreover, contradiction between the positions of Washington and Moscow emerged regarding the problems related to the past Soviet republics. This emerged during the visit to Moscow by the American Secretary of State, Colin Powell in 26/1/2004. The American ambassador in Moscow declared before the visit that Powell intends to discuss with the Russian side the issues related to the past Soviet republics. He pointed out that one of the most important objectives of the visit is represented in finding “common points” between the Russian and American sides in past Soviet space. The American ambassador agreed there are “certain problems” that encounter the settlement of the relations between the two sides in the region. At the time Moscow denied the presence of so called “a deal” between the two sides to divide the influence in the region, America sources pointed to the presence of “problems” that encounter the relations between the two countries regarding addressing this subject. It seems the escalation of debate over this matter came at the same time of leaking some news by western media about some arrangements for concluding a Russian-American “deal” that aims at dividing the influence in the past Soviet region. Some Russian analysts considered the words of the American ambassador in Moscow a pointer to an agreement between the two sides.

It is well known that Moscow expressed its worry of the increasing American influence in many of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) particularly that related to the American military presence in the republics of CA and Georgia. This is in addition to what is considered direct American intervention in the arrangement of the internal situations in states like Georgia.

Under the shadow of Powell’s visit, some Russian politicians demanded discussing this subject with the American secretary. The head of foreign affairs committee in Russian parliament, Constantine Kotsacheve called for adding the

subject of the American military presence in the region to the agenda of the visit.

All of this indicates America is still at the first step of the road in CA and Caucus; and the American plans have not gone beyond the first step. This is because the struggle in the region is still new, for the region, till recently was considered a monopoly to the SU. However, the struggle over the region involves threats to the vital interests of Russia as well as regional threats to China. It also represents strategic interest to America for realising her plans in remaining the only superpower in the world, which requires throwing Russia from its areas of influence and containment of China. All of this makes of this issue one of the important international issues, where struggle over it goes beyond the regional boundaries.

Moreover, there is another factor that makes of this region focus of attention to the states that have regional and international influence, thus making of it an international issue. This factor is represented in the return of this region to its Islam after it has been prevented of it by force during the communist era that extended to about seventy years. People returned back to their deen in a remarkable speed; not only to the worships (ibadat), but they rather started to yearn, in an amazing degree to be governed with Islam and for the system of Khilafah. So, **“Hizb ut-Tahrir”** managed to attract to its call for **“Khilafah”** within few years many thousands of men and women, whose iman was wonderful, and they were ready to face hardships without fearing the blame of any body for the sake of Allah.

However, their rulers who belong to the past era were not pleased with this strong return to the roots, so they exercised persecution and torture against their people. They sought for that sake the help of the Russians, American and British, and even the Jews to prevent the return of political Islam to power. The local intelligence forces moved and cooperated with the Russian, American and

British intelligence forces to contain this sweeping Islamic expansion in these countries. Thus, they used the means of suppression and prosecution as well as the styles of raising doubts and vagueness about Islamic thought, besides the styles of praising and colourful portray of the secular thought. However, Islam has settled in their hearts, it is on increase daily and these satanic styles would not turn the people away from their Islam and Iman. The west realised the self possession of Islam of the hearts of these people and its change into a kindling inspiration. Robert D. Kaplan, an American expert in the affairs of the third world says: “In the middle of Asia... in this part of the world, Islam will become, due to its unlimited support to the oppressed and the tyrannized more attractive. This deen which is on constant increase globally is the only deen ready to encounter and strive”.

The region became one of the important fortresses of Islam. It represents the upper part of the Islamic crescent that extends from Indonesia and Malaysia in South East Asia and reaches the ME. The possibility of connection between this region and Pakistan and Iran geographically sends dangerous threats to the Russians and Americans that a huge and nuclear Islamic state might emerge in this widely extended region. Therefore, one of the reasons of the American occupation to Afghanistan is to have a close supervision over this region, particularly its rulers do not belong to the ummah and they are in their way for departure.

The danger that arises from the expansion of the Islamic movements in these countries was the reason for holding routine conferences by these states with each of Russia and China to ward off the dangers coming out of this region. Most of which was conference of Shanghai that put as its priority the danger of so called Islamic fundamentalism, together with Islamic movements.

Thus, the abundant wealth in this region and its strategic location to Russia and China, besides the ambitions of America and the growing Islamic resurgence in it; all of these connect together to make of CA an important international issue.

5. Indian Subcontinent Issue

The issue of Indian subcontinent is old, but it did not appear as it is today in the past, and nor it was one of the main world issues. The factors that emerged recently in this issue and changed it to a great issue are three: Islamic expansion caused by issue of Kashmir, the growing power of China in the region, and the entry of India and Pakistan to the club of nuclear powers.

As regarding the Islamic expansion, it became difficult to dominate over it. Therefore, one of the causes behind the invasion of Afghanistan by America was conducting a new crusader campaign to attack Islamic movements that support Muslims of Kashmir. Particularly, the power of Muslims emerged obviously in 1999 when the Islamic militia, and by support of Pakistan attacked Cargill heights at the Pakistan-Indian borders in Kashmir heights. They almost defeated the Indian army and liberated Kashmir had not Nawaz Sherrif, past Prime Minister and his Chief of Staff at that time, Pervez Musharraf betrayed them and withdrew the attacking forces in compliance with the orders of America.

This incident particularly rang the bell of danger with the Americans, and made them give much attention to the growing power of Muslims in the region. Therefore, they put pressure on their agent, the current Pakistani president, Prevez Musharraf to attack and fragment the Islamic training camps in Pakistan, under the excuse that the fighters against India in Kashmir come from Pakistan, and under the pretext of being terrorists.

America put also pressure on Pervez Musharraf to withdraw his political support to the Islamic issue of Kashmir. He responded to these American

demands and declared his waiver to the right of people of Kashmir to self determination. Then the negotiations indeed started in Islamabad between the state of India and the state of Pakistan to settle the issue of Kashmir bilaterally. These negotiations started off from the agreement of the government of Pakistan of the right of Hindus in Kashmir. So, they negotiate over this Hindu right to give it legitimacy rather than to eliminate the Hindu occupation to Kashmir.

The purpose of America from putting pressure on her agent, Prevez Musharraf regarding the question of Kashmir is not only for attacking the growing Islamic power in Pakistan, but also to create balance of power in the region. She does not want India to be busy with dispute with Pakistan, which will leave China the only power in the region. She rather wants cooling down the matters between India and Pakistan so that India can challenge China while its western borders with Pakistan remain secured. Therefore, India and Pakistan were merged in the block of (SARK) of South Asia. This would create a big force capable to confidently face China. If struggle continued between India and Pakistan, India will be unable to face China or be in balance of power with it, particularly after China became a growing economic power and the first demographic power in the world. This is beside it has a permanent seat in the Security Council and it is an old nuclear power. So, based on all measures it is a growing force. In addition it did not fall in the error committed by Russia, ie it preserved its internal solidity. The Chinese leader, Huxi Wang who renovated China after Mao Tse Tang said: "The great danger Gorbachev committed was his allowance to the political freedom before renovating the economy".

Thus, America started to give account to the growing China. She wants to keep busy in the region by creating a power that stands in its face. Therefore, America is concerned about ending the dispute between India and China so as to give her attention to China. This explains the silence and acceptance of

America of possession of nuclear weapons by both India and Pakistan. She rather helps India particularly to possess developed weapons and facilitate its obtainment of its needed weapon technology. The evidence to this is that America prevented (Israel) from selling to China the developed radar Falcon planes, though it allowed their sale to India. In addition, America entered herself in pacts of strategic partnership with India, ie it deals with it as it deals with (Israel), though it is not a western state, and nor an Anglo-Saxon state.

This is the most prime element in this issue, which is the Islamic expansion, the Chinese expansion and the nuclear expansion. Therefore, America put down her strategy in the region on the basis of containing the Islamic expansion as well as the Chinese expansion, counter balancing the power of China through bringing stability to the region and removing the causes of struggle in it, so that it becomes a great homogeneous force equal and in balance with the power of China.

6. Issue of Africa

The issue of Africa is new that did not emerge in international arena except after 1960. It is an issue of colonialism only; because it is an intellectually backward country, and has many raw material resources, and an imaginary agricultural and animal wealth. When the colonial powers rushed in late 18th century and in 19th century for colonialism, the African continent was one of the places they invaded. Each one of these states occupied as much as it could. There was no fierce friction between the states over their colonialism, so most of the colonial states settled in Africa, and the entire continent became occupied by Europe. There were in it colonies for England, France, Spain, Holland, Germany, Italy, Portugal and Belgium. However, England had the lion's share in it, followed by France, Belgium and then Portugal. These eight colonial states continued to control their colonies in Africa till the end of World War II. When the UN convention was coined, some clauses related to elimination of colonialism were inserted in it. However, these clauses were put in a way that makes the

elimination of colonialism gradual. Therefore, the great powers did not come to discuss elimination of colonialism in Africa except after 1960. Before that some of the colonies were put under mandate power, such as the Italian colonies as an introduction to eliminate colonialism in them. Besides, some political actions existed as introductory steps to eliminate colonialism. Some of the most important political actions were the concept of active neutralism, conferences of active neutralism and neutrality (non-partiality). The concept of active neutralism was originally English given by Churchill, PM of Britain to the English agent, Nehru. He asked him to declare it as policy to India, and to promote it amongst the states in Asia. England did that because it saw its entire colonies in the FE and Asia under threat from America and Russia (SU). Russia (SU) was inciting the people of these colonies to liberate themselves from colonialism, as it has seen the happenings in Indonesia. America as well put pressure on England to give independence to its colonies, where America would attract these colonies after giving them independence through giving them loans and sending them experts. As regarding the concept of independence, England is experienced in using it as a means for changing the style of colonialism. So, it gave independence to some of its colonies, made them independent and formed of them so called British Commonwealth. Therefore, it did not fear much from the concept of independence; it rather preferred it and manipulated it, because it knows how to use it for consolidating its colonialism. However, it used to fear of the control of America over the independent states through the loans, aid and experts. It thus used the thought of active non-alliance (neutrality) and gave it to Nehru to use it for encountering America and Russia (SU). Indeed, Nehru started the call to the concept of active neutrality and made remarkable activity. Russia understood the significance of this concept, so it preferred it and started to use it. This is because if an independent state took a neutral position, then there is a hope for separating it from the west. As regarding America, its politicians differed regarding it. Some of them preferred it because it helps America to attract the

neutral states to her side for accepting loans and aid. Some others opposed it because it helps communism to enter these neutral states. However, Nehru went on calling for active neutrality and began to look for physical actions that represent the concept. So, he made contact with China and called for the concept of holding a conference by the neutral states. China agreed to that immediately; and a committee was set up to prepare for the conference. The committee started to contact some of the states that were colonies before their independence and called them to active neutrality. Indonesia was a member in this committee, and it did not proceed with America at that time, but feared this might be considered going with communism. It seems it tried to seek the opinion of America, which encouraged it. This is because Eisenhower was in power and he supported the concept of neutrality. Therefore, Indonesia rushed into the concept and recommended holding the conference in Indonesia and in Bandung specifically. The entire committee agreed to that, and thus the conference was actually held in 1954 in Bandung. Each of Russia (SU), China, England and America tried to use it. However, the conference came out with a result that pleases Russia (SU), China and America, by taking resolutions that call for liberation. England was not happy, because it wanted it to discuss the active neutrality only, or be dominated by this subject. America made a huge use of the conference, for she made Tito, Sukarno and Abdul Nasser adopt this conference and this concept strongly. They stuck with Nehru, the agent of Britain, the original preacher of the concept, and started to use this as a means for calling to liberation from colonialism and campaign against the colonial powers. They directed their efforts primarily to Africa; so by 1960 the concept worked in Africa and thus new agents to America emerged in it. Struggle moved since then to Africa, and America started to seriously attempt to expel the colonial powers from Africa and replace them. She started to put pressure on these colonial states to give independence to the colonies. She had before that, in 1954 kindled the revolution in Algeria, and established agents to her; besides it made Egypt and Arab countries support this revolution, which had a

remarkable effect on the colonial powers for giving up their colonies. As regarding England, which is experienced in the meaning of giving independence, it gave within a short period independence to many colonies. So, new states emerged, such as Zanzibar, Tanganyika, Nigeria, Uganda, Union of North Rhodesia, South Rhodesia and Nyasaland, beside others. France was hesitant, but after De Gaulle saw the quick change of the situation in the world he followed the plan used by Britain. So, he gave independence to many colonies bringing in the states of Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Senegal, Gabon and others. As regarding Belgium, it used to occupy Congo, which is the treasure of Africa and contains the greatest amount of Uranium, which is fundamental in manufacturing nuclear bombs. Therefore, it was not easy to give independence to Congo, particularly England used to dominate over the companies that used to run the mines in Katanga, one of the provinces of Congo. Therefore, giving independence to Congo represented a great problem. However, America put pressure on Belgium till it gave independence to Congo, and it thus became an independent state. This enraged England; so it pushed its agent, Moïse Tshombe who declared independence of Katanga. The case was then raised to UN, which sent an international force to restore Katanga. The UN General Secretary at that time, Mr Hammershold went to the region but England prepared a plan for him and killed him. Struggle between America and England intensified there for many years till America dominated the country, established a government puppet to her and expelled Tshombe from it. Thus, the issue of Congo settled, though for a while. During that period England was worried about the Union of North Rhodesia, South Rhodesia and Nyasaland. So, it broke the union and gave independence to Nyasaland under the name of Malawi, to North Rhodesia under the name of Zambia, and attempted to put South Rhodesia in a situation that keeps its colonialism over it. But, because America continued to chase it regarding it, England later on gave independence to it under the name of Zimbabwe.

America succeeded in taking off the states of the African Horn, the states of the Great Lakes, namely Uganda, Rwanda, and Burundi from France. However, she failed to rob Chad from it in the late nineties. The matter was settled to the advantage to the French agent, Idris Dbi after he defeated the forces of Hussein Habree whose loyalty was not settled. He used to ally with France, but America attracted him, a matter that pushed France to strongly support its agent Idris Dbi, who managed to take over the authority.

Colonel Idris Dbi was one of Habree's men and a strong ally to him. He assumed the post of General Commander of Chad military forces till April 1989, led Habree's forces in the battles of (Fialargo) in 1983, and succeeded in the evacuation of the Libyan army from Chad. However, a tribal dispute broke out that led Dbi to take part in an unsuccessful coup attempt with his ally Hasan Jamoos after Dbi was removed from his post in April 1989. He fled after that to Sudan where he set up the National Movement for Salvation, which contained an alliance between two tribes, opponent to the government of Hussein Habree, namely Zaghawa and Hijara, which live in the Chad-Sudan territories. Colonel Dbi had strong relation with France, and he is the son of the French military establishment; besides he went through a military course in the military school in Paris in 1958. Therefore, the victory of Dbi and the defeat of Habree was a great blow against the American influence and strengthened the French influence; for France restored through this the initiative by blocking the way of the growing American influence.

By the arrival of the neoconservatives to authority in the USA, USA started new styles to invade African continent. She is no more content with stirring domestic wars and crises and supporting revolt movements for defeating the agents of Europe and replacing them with her agents in African states. She rather added to these styles the style of direct military intervention, as it is reflected in the defence and foreign policy of the American administration. It embarked upon attempting to establish military relations and treaties with many

of the states in north, west and centre of Africa under the name of fight against terrorism. This implies the direct American military intervention will play a basic role in the struggle over Africa in the coming period; this is besides the other styles. Thus, it can be said the coming period will witness a more ferocious struggle in Africa. America has established and still establishes military bases to her in north, west and east of Africa so as to use these for supporting the revolt movements and as a means of pressure upon the local governments for the purpose of expelling all European states, particularly England, from the remaining colonies. However, because of the interwoven European interests in Africa, the coming period will be sanguine and harsh in Africa, particularly there are only material accounts and plunder of natural resources in it. Thus, struggle in Africa is between the colonial states, and it therefore became an international issue, and still continues to be so. Hence the issue of Africa is one of the international issues.

Thus, struggle over Africa between the great powers intensified since the sixties of the 20th century. Therefore, America and Russia (SU) had influence in the continent beside the influence of the European colonial states. Due to the weakness of Russia (SU) and the absence of an old colonial presence to it in Africa, it was obliged to get out of it when it left Angola in the eighties of last century. Besides, the remaining small European colonial states went out of Africa, leaving only Britain and France behind. These two colonial states kept their influence under the framework of British Commonwealth Organisation, and French Francophone Organisation. America used her entire weight in a frenzy competition with Britain and France for dominating over Africa; a matter that drove the British and French to defend the interests of Europe in Africa through coordination between them and arranging common visits by their two foreign ministers to the different African states.

Struggle is still going on in Africa between these three states, and it is still represented in domestic wars that exceeded twenty. The most apparent areas of

struggle till now are the happenings in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ivory Coast, Somalia, Uganda, Congo, Rwanda, Burundi and Sudan.

This black continent has been afflicted with bloody military disputes because of this colonial struggle. These exceeded in the last years 26 disputes amongst more than 30 states. These fabricated disputes contributed to the increase of the debts of this continent over 370 billion dollars, which represent 65% of the total national income of the entire continent. Because of these disputes, more than 30 million mines were planted in 18 states, which represent one quarter of the total mines planted in the entire world.

It is worth mentioning that struggle between the western colonial states over Africa changes sometimes to deals and agreements between the great states as it happened in the American-British agreement to separate South of Sudan from its north, and the American-French agreement in Ivory Coast. However, the economic and political competition between the states remains the dominant mark.

Thus, international struggle over colonialism moved to Africa, so its issue became international, and it is still international. This is because though England, America and France agreed to one form for gathering Africa under one bond they named Organisation of African Summit, and then African Union (AU), the struggle inside and outside this summit and union still exists between the states, particularly between America and England. Once the division of the world into two camps came to an end, and America turned to remove the European states, particularly Britain from their last colonies, specifically in Africa, it became noticed that America tries to infiltrate to the African states under the name of war against terrorism so as to make contact with the armies of these states. America has established and still establishes military bases to her in north, west and east of Africa so as to use them for supporting the revolt movements and as a means of pressure over the local

governments for the purpose of expelling all European states, particularly England, from the remaining colonies. However, because of the interwoven European interests in Africa, the coming period will be sanguine and harsh in Africa, particularly there are only material accounts and plunder of natural resources in it.

Hence the issue of Africa is an international issue.

These are the great issues in which political actions take place. However, this does not mean political actions do not occur except in these issues; it rather means the most prominent aspect of struggle between the states is these issues.

Struggle between the states at time of peace is manifested in using political actions that might be associated with military actions as was the case in Vietnam, and recently in the ME (Kuwait, Iraq and Afghanistan). It might not be associated with military actions as was the case in Africa before, in Rhodesia and South Africa, and recently in Tunisia and Libya. Since this struggle only takes place for the sake of a question or an issue, and these six issues are the most important issues that created competition between the states, therefore we advanced them as examples to the political actions. Otherwise, political actions could take place in other than these issues; they even might exist without struggle. As long as there are states that compete with each other, and conspire against each other, then they have to undertake political actions against each other. This might be for setting international traps to another state to fall in them; or it might be for weakening the other state; or it might be for strengthening itself, or otherwise. There are so many examples for that. As an example is the concept of disarmament, which was inserted into the League of Nations and England used it as a means to weaken France. So it put pressure on France to execute this concept, and it itself pretended it started to cut down its weapons. France believed in that and started really to cut down its weapons and limited its armament activity. This was a plot from England to weaken France

before it and before Germany. Therefore, France could not stand up in the face of Germany in World War II, and it collapsed horribly and quickly. Its adoption of the concept of decreasing armament had great effect in that.

When World War II took place, Russia (SU) worked actively in China and established a strong communist party and supported it for taking power in China. America used to support the regime there at that time, but then she started to support Chan Kai Sheck. At the beginning she made him associate the communists with him till they became powerful and have weight. But they separated from him and started to fight against him. She used to support Chan Kai Sheck openly and provide him with funds and weapons, though in limited form. She also used to support the Communist Party, but secretly; besides she contained the activity of Chan Kai Sheck. She continued to proceed with secret steps, though concentrated in a way that led to the victory of the communists and their take over of authority in entire China. Chan Kai Sheck was thrown away and contained in island of Formosa (current Taiwan). Chan Kai Sheck used to notice that and be surprised of it. He did not conceive America worked to make China a communist state. He rather thought that was due to the American ignorance, and they did not understand the situation. However, it was discovered later on that America put a plan for making China a communist state. This was for making it stand in face of Russia (SU) and for fragmenting and destroying the communist camp. Indeed, the American plan succeeded, though this came after 20 years. Thus, this is a political action undertaken by America, and it is considered of the great international traps.

Likewise, after Europe came out of World War II, destroyed, poor and threatened by Russia (SU), it threw itself in the arms of America and sought her help. America rushed to help it and thus set up Marshal Plan. The American aid flooded to Europe, where this aid was economic material, weapons and experts. Through this aid, America entered into partnership with the companies. She encouraged the educated people to migrate to America, and connected the

economy of Europe with the economy of America. After few years Europe became dependent on America and under its shade. The economies of Europe became generally possessed by the American companies. Thus, the American help to Europe was a conspiracy to link it with her, to take its educated people and in order to participate in its economies.

Another example is that Germany came out of World War II inflicted by wounds and its industries destroyed; so America rushed to its help. However, America knew an important point regarding the set up of industry in a state. A state would not be truly an industrial state internationally unless it made the military industry the basis of its industry, and built its entire industry on the basis of military industry. If industry was restored in Germany on this basis, then it will quickly return as a great power. Therefore, America rushed to Germany and adopted programming of its industry. She did that on pure economic basis rather than military one. It was built on investment basis rather than military industry basis. So, she inserted the American companies in Germany for that purpose and built in the industry with American funds. Thus, through this policy she hit Germany as a military state. This created huge factories in Germany, and the economies of Germany improved from industrial aspect. Germany thus became from economic aspect wealthier than before World War II, and the world watched how Germany rebuilt its industry in fabulous speed.

However, in reality and through this industry Germany has committed suicide and will never come back again unless it revised its industry and changed it from the basis and built it on the basis of military industry. It will not also progress economically unless it expelled the American companies and funds from the country. This form of aid America provided to Germany is a political action that is considered an international trap, and instead of helping it, it rather hit it.

Another example is that when Castro, the leader of Cuba contacted the communist camp and sought the help of Russia (SU), America did not bother though the principle of Monroe prevents all states from thinking in invading America. When Russia (SU) started to supply Castro with weapons, America remained silent, though this was considered in the norms of the states as direct intervention with weapons in America. America's silence was not out of fear and nor of ignorance, particularly Cuba is so close to her. It was rather deception to pull the feet of Russia (SU) in the new world so as to widen the Russian range in a way that makes it unable of protecting it; it would rather weaken its position and strengthen America against it. Therefore, there were many politicians; even some Russian saw what Russia (SU) has done in Cuba was stupid. Had not the two superpowers reached an agreement in Vienna, the expansion of Russia (SU) in America would have brought it disaster.

It is not correct to say America was annoyed of it, and a war was about to break out because of it had not the Russians acted sensibly and drew the nuclear missiles which they built in Cuba. This is because the warning of war Kennedy directed to Russia (SU) over the issue of missiles in Cuba and their withdrawal after that by Khrushchev was a forged process that came through an agreement between the two sides. As one of the agreements reached between Khrushchev and Kennedy was removal of the American nuclear basis in Turkey and the nuclear basis present in Cuba. America could remove her basis from Turkey without much noise because Turkey would not be harmed of its removal and nor it will cause misunderstanding between Turkey and America. However, the removal of the nuclear basis from Cuba by Russia (SU) willingly would mean abandoning the defence of Cuba. This would provoke all the communist states and Cuba particularly; besides it would create misunderstanding between Russia (SU) and Cuba. Therefore, there was a need for a style to remove the basis without affecting Russia (SU) in the sight of the communist states. Hence, they agreed America forges a cause to create international tension that leads to its removal. Kennedy chose for that style a time he used for his advantage.

When he saw England mobilizing its forces in Eden and Beejan to intervene in Yemen against Egyptian army for throwing it out of Yemen, and saw England had really started a brawl with the Egyptian army and tried to attack it from Beejan, he raised the issue of the nuclear missiles in Cuba and created international tension, so England and France feared of the break out of a world war. Then England retreated from intervention in Yemen, and Khrushchev pretended he retreated and he was ready to withdraw his basis from America if America withdrew her basis from Turkey. Kennedy showed he is ready to discuss the matter, and thus the nuclear basis was removed from Turkey. This is the reality of the issue; it is fabricated to justify the removal of the Russian (SU) basis from Cuba and to scare England.

The evidence that the silence of America about the build up of the nuclear basis by Russia (SU) in Cuba was a deception and an international trap is that which happened in Greece after World War II, when the communist revolution broke out in it. Tito at that time proposed to Stalin that Yugoslavia would interfere against Greece and establish in it a communist state that joins the communist camp. Stalin realised the risk involved in this proposal, and explicitly said to Tito: Do you want us to establish a basis at the Mediterranean Sea against the strongest and richest state in the world? Can we protect this basis? All that we can do is to muddle America. We cannot take Greece from America, for this is beyond our capability and will never contemplate in its like.

Another example is that when World War II broke out Hitler feared Turkey might enter the war on the side of England, ie on the side of the allies. He knew the ruling group in Turkey, the group of Mustafa Kemal known as People Party proceeded with England and acknowledged it favour upon them. Therefore, he knew it is easy for the English to involve them in war to their side. He therefore feared Turkey might enter war against Germany, so he wanted it to stand neutral. This is because he knew Turkey's entry in war against him would harm him in three aspects; the first is that Turkish people are brave and braver than

the English, braver than the French and braver than the Russians. So, their entry in war on the side of the allies will create considerable force to them. The second is that Turkish people are Muslim, so their entry in war makes the sentiments of Muslims, Arabs and non Arabs against Germany, which has effect in world propaganda. The third is that the location of Turkey is strategically excellent. If she remained neutral it would be a fortress at the North West front, thus preventing the entry of the allies into Europe and representing a powerful barrier that protects him from being attacked from back. It is because of that he endeavoured to keep Turkey neutral. Therefore, he sent his most skilful men, Fon Papin as ambassador of Germany to Turkey to accomplish this task by keeping Turkey neutral and preventing her from entry in war on the side of the allies. This is because her entry in war against the allies was unlikely and unexpected. Therefore, the concern of Hitler was that Turkey does not enter in war on the side of the allies. So, he sent his best men for this task. In order to hide his purpose he made the task of Fon Papin as to attempt bringing Turkey to the side of Germany, and to try convincing her to enter war on the side of Germany and against the allies. Therefore, the allies endeavoured from their side to keep Turkey neutral. Their ambassadors worked hard for this objective, while Fon Papin worked openly to take Turkey to the side of Germany. This approach encouraged the allies to make sure Turkey remained neutral. Through this political game and by the genius of Fon Papin Hitler succeeded in keeping Turkey neutral through the war time, though it was easier for the allies to invade Germany from the side of Turkey by winning Turkey to their side. However, they did not do that lest they would open that front and in desire of keeping Turkey neutral so as to protect that front by her neutrality. Such a political action is considered of the powerful actions at time of war.

These are some examples of the political actions, which the states undertake against each other in international struggle and political field. These are for designing international traps, for weakening other states, or as political

manoeuvres, or the like. These actions take place in the general political field as well as in the struggle that goes on in the six issues. These are usually confined in one point and between the two or more states involved in the struggle. However, their occurrence in general way makes their international effect greater. Therefore, the politician must not restrict his mind to the important issues and the international actions involved in them. He must rather widen his vision by making it contain every political action undertaken by any great power. When the politician examines political actions he must not divest them from their own circumstances and nor generalise them. He must rather link every action with the circumstances that surround it and the environment that encloses it. So, it is invalid that he takes the action detached from its conditions and circumstances. And nor it is proper to generalise the issue, compare other actions with this action or dispose actions in a logical order to conclude logical results. He must rather avoid that and stay away from it, because logic and analogy are very dangerous to political understanding. This is because actions in life differ from each other and do not resemble each other. Rather every action has its own conditions and circumstances. Therefore, the politician must link the action with its related political information, and he must examine it within its own circumstances and surroundings. Then he can reach the most possible correct understanding of it. There are abundant examples that illustrate this, because the daily incidents that take place in international field and in the actions of the great powers are full of such examples. However, every action is linked with its origin, which is related to the policy of the state, to the international situation, or the situations of the states. Every action has also its own circumstances and its own surroundings that are not shared with other actions. As an example, in April 1969 North Korea attacked an American spying plane in the Far East. America was upset and the National Security Council held a meeting, but the president Nixon took a decision that USA does not intend to revenge for the plane. Instead, the spying planes and ships took protection against any future attack. However, North Korea captured a spying

ship in 1968, where America was upset and the National Security Council held a meeting, and the president Johnson gave statements of warning and threat; besides the seventh navy in the Pacific Ocean moved towards Korea. When America noticed its threats and war of nerves did not materialize it resorted to the negotiation and friendly means till the crew of the ship was released. These are two similar incidents, where a small state like Korea interfered with a great state like USA by hitting her plane and killing its pilots and capturing her ships including their crews. Why America took different stances in the two incidents? Is it due to difference of people? It might be so. Is it because the threats did not materialize? It is possible as well. However, it seems the circumstances of the ship were almost normal, and China was preoccupied with the Cultural Revolution; therefore threats would not possibly lead to danger. The conditions of the plane on the other side were abnormal, where Russia (SU) was mobilising its huge ground and air forces in central Europe together with its navy forces in the Mediterranean Sea. At the same time China was in a position it wants to show itself to the world after the Cultural Revolution, and it started a brawl with Russia (SU) for prominence. Had Nixon threatened Korea, it was possible that China might respond, which might lead to friction and more tension. England might use that as a means for provocation against the eastern camp. Therefore, it was not proper for America to make any threats and nor war of nerves. This explains the silence of Nixon.

Thus, the circumstances of the two incidents were different and accordingly the measures were different.

Another example is when Nixon made a visit to Europe immediately after assuming his presidency post. He claimed then he would seek the views of his allies before contacting Russia (SU) regarding the crisis of the Middle East. His statement could have been assumed true if there were no other circumstances that stand to be a better cause of the visit. Through examination, it was discovered England was making contacts with the European states for rallying

them behind her regarding the crisis of the Middle East. It wanted to convince them to stand on its side against Russia, even if this led to a world war against the eastern camp. This was a very dangerous situation; and this forced Nixon to visit the European states immediately after assuming the presidency post and before undertaking any action. So, his visit to Europe was for dispersing its states from England.

Russia (SU) as well invaded Czechoslovakia at end of 1968 and associated Warsaw Pact with it, where all of them joined it except Romania. The armies of the alliance entered Czechoslovakia under the pretext of maintaining communism and protecting the communist state and the communist party from possible western assaults. That might be true. However, the conditions of the incident are more dangerous than a communist party and maintenance of communism. This is particularly it was only a matter of interpretation of communism by the leaders of the communist party. By examining the conditions at that time it appears the Russian (SU) navy present at the coasts of Egypt became under threat from England. England was mobilising its forces in the Mediterranean Sea. (Israel) might attack Egypt, which would oblige Russia (SU) to interfere under the pretext of protecting communism. Then England might rush to attack Russia (SU). Thus it became necessary to prepare for war and prepare the means of supplies.

The arrival of supplies from Russia (SU) through Gibraltar at time of war is not feasible besides it is a long way. Therefore, it was necessary to find a passageway to the Mediterranean Sea, which is close to Egypt. For that purpose, Russia (SU) mobilised two million soldiers and three thousand war planes together with nuclear weapons in central Europe. It also prepared Warsaw Pact to participate in the war. Thus the alliance entered Czechoslovakia openly to intimidate England through mobilising its forces in central Europe ready to cross Yugoslavia and Albania reaching the Mediterranean Sea in case Russia (SU) involved in war with England. Hence entry in Czechoslovakia

under the pretext of maintaining the communist state aimed at threatening England and preparing for war, and for putting Warsaw Pact in readiness to enter war.

This is the way of linking political actions with their origin and within their circumstances and surroundings. They have to be understood at the day they happened and not the day before, taking notice of the developments and changes within the same day, even the same hour. One must not remain standstill at a time even if it was only one hour or even minutes before. He must rather move with the time and understand matters and actions according to the last moment noticing what is going on of matters and actions at that time.

These are the main world issues, and these are the great states that influence international politics. This is also the way of linking the political actions with their origin and placing them within their own circumstances and surroundings, besides understanding them at their own time, within the day or hour, due to the quick change and motion of events.

Causes of World Misery

Indeed the world has faced misery with the great states since they controlled it as great powers in the world. It also faced misfortunes because of the concept of an international group or community which they created. It as well faced hardship because of colonialism since the capitalist ideology existed, i.e. since colonialism existed. The world will continue to live in misery as long as the fiction of international community or international family remained as long as the great powers compete over the world and control it and as long as colonialism remained, regardless of its different forms and styles. Therefore, it is not possible to deliver the world from the misery it lives in and put it on the path of happiness unless these three problems present in it were solved i.e. unless these three elements were removed from it, which are: the fiction of international community, the control and domination of the great powers and the presence of colonialism and monopoly.

As regarding the international community, the basis upon which it was built from origin and the presence of such situation is an invalid basis. This community was first established on the basis of the family (community) of the Christian states in West Europe to form a block that stands in the face of the Islamic state. Then it annexed the Christian states in East Europe, and thus became the family of Christian states (community) in Europe. It remained as such from 16th century, i.e. since the Islamic state started to sweep over Europe till the second half of 19th century, i.e. till 1856. At that point in time the weakness of the Islamic state reached to a degree that it was called the sick man, and plots started for dividing its heritage, i.e. its territories. During this entire period, i.e. about three centuries, the international community meant the Christian family and meant hostility to the Islamic state.

Though it was a community of Christian states only, and for Christian states in Europe only, which was prohibited for non Christian states to join, they called

it the international family and the international community, This alone granted it the international character and it was alone entitled to discuss the international affairs, without including others or applying to others. The matter would be insignificant had this family been confined to a Christian gathering and they made it opposite to Islam; but they gave it an international character, and endeavored to perpetuate it with the international character. This is because the concept of the international family (community) was determined and coined on the basis of Christian states. International matter was equivalent to this community, and the international issues meant that community as well. For organising and perpetuating that, conventional norms were coined, which were later on called international law. They actually turned to the international pacts concluded between the Christian states and to the norms that prevailed then among the Christian groups as groups and shaped these in form of rules, which they made international, or the so called international law.

Thus, the international family or international community is in origin built on the basis of the European Christian international community. International law is in origin equivalent to the treaties concluded between the Christian states together with the norms prevailing among the European Christian groups. Therefore, designating the international community to the European Christian states only is considered fabrication and deception, because the world is not only the European Christian international community. Designation of the international law to the treaties and norms of the Christian states only is also a lie and forging. This is because the thoughts fitting to this are the total of the norms that exist amongst the (human) groups that exist in the entire world, and the treaties and pacts concluded between the human groups in the entire world. Therefore, the meaning of international community is wrong in regards of its creation, as well as the meaning of international law. This matter could have been avoided had these states accepted other states in the world. However, in reality this community did not accept others at all; it did not rather accept except Christian states to join it. In the second half of 19th century it accepted

the entry of some non Christian states so as to be counted from the international community. However, it did not accept other than conventional rules, which it coined on the basis of being European Christian states. So, it demanded from the Ottoman state to abandon arbitration to Islam in its international affairs and stipulated that on it. It did not accept its entry except after it accepted this condition and submitted to the conventional rules of the European Christian states. This means this community allowed the entry of some states to it, but it never accepted other than its own rules and norms to have any presence in the international relations. This situation continued till the end of World War I and the elimination of the Islamic state. It was possible to address this error after World War I after the enemy for whose sake the international community existed, and for whose opposition the international rules were coined has been eliminated. However, the matter was different. These states stuck to the basis upon which the international community was built and upon which the international rules existed. Therefore, they agreed to set up an international organisation that reflected the international community, but it did not make it general for all the states; they rather made it for specific states. So, they accepted some non Christian and non European states in it. However, they did not accept other than the conventional norms of the European Christian states, and did not care about the norms and concepts present in the remaining world states. Moreover, it meant that the international community is the European Christian states, and the states that joined the League of Nations have been accepted in the international Christian community. When the UN emerged it was intended to limit its membership to the states that participated in the war against Germany, i.e. the Christian states and those dependent on them. However, America expanded the membership of the UN and allowed the world states to join it in order to extend her influence over the world and to bring the world states under her authority. However, America and all the Christian states did not allow any rules to infiltrate into the international law and nor the convention of the UN. Rather, the rules of the Christian states remained the

basis in the international law, even the international law itself and the convention of the UN. Though the eastern camp under the leadership of Russia embraced the communist creed, which contradicts the capitalist system and the rules of the Christian states, it could not change anything in the basis of the international convention, and nor could make any of its thoughts infiltrate in this convention. Therefore, the conventional rules of the Christian states or capitalist states alone controlled the human communities present in the entire world, giving no regard to that which other states have in terms of conventions and thoughts. The international community continued in reality to mean the community of the Christian states, or in other words the capitalist states, though many other states were allowed to join it. Hence, it is necessary to reconsider the concept of international community and international family, as well as reviewing the meaning of the international law.

That which made things worse is that these European Christian states or capitalist states did not leave the matter of executing the conventional rules, which became later on international law to the ethical factor, as is the case with international norms. They did not even leave the matter of their execution limited to those who abided by them. They rather obliged their implementation by force, and upon the entire states of the world, whether they abided by them or not. The great states in the past appointed themselves as the organisation responsible for maintaining peace and order in the international community. So, they intervened in the affairs of other states whenever they noticed some threat to peace or violation of order. Nothing could prevent such great states from intervention in any state except the power of that state or the incapability of these great states from confronting it. Before World War I the European Christian states, individually or collectively appointed themselves as international police in the world so as to implement the world order. Even after establishing the League of States and then the UN, the capitalist states continued to appoint themselves as international police in the world for implementing the law and order. Intervention of America and Britain in the

Middle East in 1958 by disembarking American troops in Lebanon and British troops in Jordan, besides their invasion of Iraq in 2003 are just examples of this fact. This action, which these capitalist states assigned for themselves, is from the most horrible actions they performed. It was one of the causes of disaster brought upon the world by the international community in its European sense and what is called international law. Therefore, it is necessary to solve this problem for delivering the world and salvaging it from disaster.

As regarding the solution of this problem, it is necessary in case there is a need for founding the international community in the international society and that international society must not be compared to normal society. Indeed, in the normal society there is a need of an entity that removes injustices, eliminates quarrels and settles disputes between people. Therefore, in every society there is a need of a state, an authority, a law and compulsory implementation upon the people. International society, on the other hand, is made of human communities where relations arise between them. It is not individuals with relations among them. Each one of these human communities has the right of sovereignty and the right of absolute rather than restricted will. Any external compulsion upon such community or state would rob its sovereignty, a matter that is equivalent to slavery. This slavery is manifested in colonialism and imposing control and compulsion by force. Preventing such community from executing its own decisions means fettering it with shackles and imposing paralysis and cripple upon it. Therefore, there must be no authority over the entire human community that represents an authority like that existing in the single human community. In other words, it is not proper that the international society becomes a community controlled by an authority that has the function of taking caring of affairs. In other words, it is not proper to have a global state that governs many states, and nor it allowed have a global state that has authority over many human communities. Rather, it is necessary the human communities remain groups that have their entity, sovereignty, and will. If it is necessary to form an international community from these communities, this

must not be a global state. Besides, this international community must be established from those who wanted willingly to be pan of it, rather than be established by a specific state that has specific concepts, or by a specific state that has a power superior to the power of all others. It must not be as well a global state. This international community must rather be established by all of those who want willingly to form it, regardless of the type of their concepts, and regardless of the size of their power or their influence. Any state that did not participate in the formation of such international community must be left free to join it any time it wishes; besides it should have the same duties and rights as the founding states. All of its members must also be left free to quit the international community any time they like; besides no one of its members must be obliged to implement the resolutions by force. In that case the international community would be truly an international community, rather than be a specific international community that is falsely and forcibly called an international community or a global state that is falsely and forcibly called the United Nations.

This is regarding the community. As regarding the law, it is not correct for the international community and nor for the states of the world to have an international law. Rather, the international community needs to have of proceedings that regulates its administrative affairs, and explains the way of managing its actions. Such law of proceedings has to be agreed upon by majority opinion, and amended by majority opinion, in accordance with the events and incidents.

As regarding the so called international law, it is invalid to exist or to be coined as such. This is because the law is the decree of the ruler (sultan), and there is no global state and nor a global ruler. It is even invalid for a global state to exist, which has authority over all the states. This is because it is impossible for such a state to exist; besides the claim of its existence means the existence of wars and violent disputes. Therefore, it is not allowed to have a global state

or global authority; and accordingly it is invalid to have an international law or to coin any international law, for three reasons: firstly, the law is the decree of the ruler (sultan), and there is no ruler (sultan) over the entire states of the world nor over the international society. Accordingly there is no (need for) international law, and nor there is presence in origin for such international law. Secondly: law must be implemented, so it is necessary to have an authority for implementing it. However, it is not correct to have a global authority that implements by force its orders upon all the states of the world. This is because this will lead to wars and violent disputes. Thirdly: the law regulates the relations; and the international relations arise willingly between the human groups. So every two or more states regulate the relations between them in accordance with their interests and with their consent. Such relations are not necessarily the same relations that exist between other two or more states. Thus, relations are organised by treaties and by law. In reality, the current relations are only organised by pacts. So, there is no international law that organises the relations between all the states. Because of all that it is invalid to coin an international law.

Moreover, most of the people even in the west denied the presence of a general international law, and refused committing the states to any international law, i.e. forcing them to implement it. Since the concept of international law emerged, difference spread amongst the jurists of the west over nature of its rules, and many of them doubted its binding force. Kant and Hegel in Germany, Hobbes and Austin and their followers in England denied the presence of a common international law. This view was embraced by many of the jurists of the west. Even the western jurists who advocate the presence of the principle of international law they do not advocate the presence of an indispensably implemented law. They rather view it not more than an ethical rule; opposition of which does not entail any legal responsibility. Moreover, those who try through intrigues to explain the meaning of legality of international law, their explanations indicate the absence of international law and that which exists is

the international norm ('urf) and not the international law. Therefore, it is only a few of the thinkers, even in the west, who view the existence of common international law; and that which they can prove its existence is only the international norm ('urf).

To norm ('urf) acknowledged among the human communities exists. Some of which is general norm that exists among the human communities in the past till today. One of its examples is not to kill the messengers going between states, or that which is called immunity to ambassadors or diplomats. Some of which is specific between certain human groups, such as that which was known amongst Arabs of preventing any body from visiting the Ka'bah. These norms indeed exist, and they are not laws. They are rather general conventions acknowledged by all the people or by specific groups, due to the repetition of certain incidents. Hence, the international norm ('urf) exists, but the international law does not exist.

The other issue is the implementation of the international law upon people by force. This implementation by force or compulsion of implementation is invalid. This is because if this implementation was by a global authority, i.e. by an international state it would be impossible, for there is no such international state. If this implementation was by a group of great states, two or more, it would be considered aggression rather than implementation of a law. This is because if one of the two states or one of the states that undertakes the implementation violated the law, then the remaining states cannot implement it upon it, for this would mean war. Had the two states or the group of states that undertake the implementation violated the law, then who is going to implement the law upon it? Of course nobody can do that. Accordingly, the implementation of the law by the strong states upon the small or weak states is considered aggression, rather than implementation of international law. This clearly shows there is no implementation of common international upon all the

states. So, it is improper to think of the concept of implementing the international law by force, for this would be considered aggression.

All of this shows it is improper to have international law; it is rather impossible to exist actually. That which exists are treaties between states, and conventions they agree upon regarding these treaties, and regarding the relations at times of war and the relations at times of peace between the human communities. Therefore, if there was a necessity to form an international community, then it should not have other than an administrative law. Its function would be examining the international norm and its violation. This includes the norms regarding the international agreements, in terms of their conclusion, implementation and break up from them, and the like. It is stipulated that the entire international norm is not adopted; rather the norm, which is taken is that developed in the international society from which the international community is formed. Development of norm does not come out by decisions taken by the states, for this is wrong, and very harmful. Its development should rather come out from its observation by the states for a long time till it settled; and the states, through self-created motive believe this norm must be followed. As regarding the states' observation to it, this comes through the repetition of a rule, the matter or the concept that is considered a norm. This is because the people's practice and agreement to something does not form a norm just by practice or agreement. Rather, this must be repeated till it becomes a general norm. This is the general norm, which the international community examines when it examines the international disputes and the violations of the states that form such a community. Thus, the international norm, in its true meaning is the subject of examination at the time of settling the international disputes. This international norm is not correct to think of applying it upon the states by force; it is rather applied by using the public opinion and by the ethical factor. This is because the states participating in the international community would not consider such a rule or a matter an international norm except after they realised of its becoming a norm. At that point the belief of these states that this norm

must be followed would exist, and thus there would be no need for applying it by force. Furthermore, the force of the public opinion against the state that violates the norm would force the states voluntarily and personally more than the external physical compulsion. The fear of the human community of being disgraced because of its violation to the general norm affects it more than its fear of the physical application. Therefore, the public opinion and the ethical factor must be left to assume the responsibility of executing the decisions of the community, and to consider this as the method of their implementation.

As regarding the misery of the world due to the great states, it does not result from the fact that a state is great, it rather results from the formation of a block by these states and their agreement to divide between them the interests and benefits. This block formation is the origin of misfortune. Therefore, the treatment must be focused on the block formation rather than on the fact that a state is a great state. The Sacred Alliance, which is the first alliance formed from the great states has been generated for the sake of dividing the interests and benefits between these states. It was generated for defending the allying kings, and formed for suppressing any revolutionary movement that stood against any of these kings or against any actions they agreed upon. It was founded to facilitate their intervention against any state in the world under the pretext of threat to peace or threat to (world) order. This block was disastrous upon the world and upon Europe particularly. It is true that the European people managed to hit the influence and paralyze the forces of this block, because they undertook revolutions and revoked its decisions. However, the concept of block formation by the great states for the sake of dividing the interests and benefits remained dominating the world till today. France rebelled, swept away the monarchy system and declared the republic system. Belgium rebelled as well, separated from Holland and became independent. German people managed to destroy the small states it was divided to and established the German unity. All of those took place against the alliance of the five kings. However, these same great states, and after the change of their system, remained attached to the

concept of international alliance, which itself led to the World War I, and also to World War II.

It is true that America and Russia (SU) had eliminated the two world blocks, i.e. the communist and capitalist camps after their agreement, and they removed the danger of World War III, after the agreement between Khrushchev and Kennedy in 1961, in Vienna. However, they did that by forming a new block made for them. Therefore, they did not treat the concept of forming blocks between the great states; they rather transferred this block to their interests through a new block made from both of them. They created a new danger, which was the division of the world between two great states, which harmed the international stance. Therefore, instead of treating the international block formation they complicated it, made it into a firm block and removed the possibility of benefiting from the difference between the two states by the small ones, in terms of supporting their issues. A greater danger in international politics had resulted from the alliance of these two states.

Thus, block formation, wherever it exists, is a danger to peace. It rather forms danger to other states, whether these were small or great, and whether it was a conventional block, i.e. where the states of the block divide the interests between them equally, or it was a block in its current form, i.e. where the leading superpower (USA currently) utilizes the remaining states of the block to primarily realise her own interests. She would seize the whole or most of the spoils, leaving just a little to the remaining members of the block, as it happened in the international alliance in Gulf War II. Iraq occupied Kuwait, and then America waged her barbaric aggression against Iraq at the beginning of the nineties in last century, forming a block to her side made of about thirty states. The same happened when America attacked Iraq in the beginning of 2003, where America led in Iraq with her about thirty states under various alliance names.

All alliances, regardless of their forms create a widespread danger in the international theatre. Therefore a quick solution for the concept of international alliances is necessary, whether the members of such alliances are great states, or mixed of great states as well as small states.

The treatment we advocate is not possible except by changing the concept from its basis. This is because man's behaviour in life is only in accordance with his concepts about it (life). So, it is necessary to first change this concept of the people consisting the great states which adopt the concept of international alliance, and then to move for eliminating the present international alliances. Unless this concept is changed, the misery of the world due to the great states will continue; the misery might even increase. The way of changing the concept is through generating an international public opinion against alliances. This is the useful solution for this misery. The evidence to this is that the concept of colonizing the weak peoples in the 19th century was a subject of pride and glory with in all the states of Europe, both the small and great. They competed to colonize the peoples and nations in a frenzied way, without difference between Britain and Holland, or between Germany and Belgium or between France and Spain, for all the entire states of Europe went out for colonizing the peoples. When the communist state emerged in Russia after World War I, it adopted the concept of fight against colonialism. It attacked colonialism harshly and ferociously, and urged the peoples of the world to oppose colonialism, and incited them against the colonialists. By the advent of World War II, there was a sweeping public opinion in the world against colonialism; besides the concept of liberation spread. So, the colonial states retreated from colonialism, and were obliged under the pressure of the international public opinion to give the people their freedom and independence. However, some states used that as a style to change the shape of colonialism. Whatever the case may be, the public opinion managed to change the view towards the concept of colonialism, as well towards the great states, or more correctly towards the concept of alliances between the great states. Therefore,

the people who suffered and still suffer from the alliances of the great states, in terms of misery and agony, must endeavour seriously to ferociously oppose the concept of alliances between the great states till they achieve its elimination. However, the elimination of this concept completely needs a powerful state that adopts such a concept of elimination. As long as the current great states support the concept of alliances from different aspects for serving their interests, then it is difficult for the peoples who suffer due to the concept of alliances to succeed in complete elimination unless they succeeded in establishing a powerful state that adopts this concept of elimination. The establishment of the Islamic state might be the only hope for the oppressed people to get rid of this concept of alliances.

It still remains the concept of colonialism or robbing the wealth of the peoples and humiliating them. Though the world has made reasonable step in its resistance, it undoubtedly remains the most dangerous action that causes misery to the weak peoples, and the most dangerous action to local and world stability. The crisis of Congo that lasted for many years and is still a region of colonialism till today, and the current crisis of the Middle East are examples of the danger of colonialism to stability. Therefore, it is most needed to treat the problem of colonialism.

Colonialism is an indivisible part of the capitalist ideology; it is rather the method for implementing its thought. Therefore, there is no way for treating it radically except through resisting the capitalist ideology and eliminating it. Hence, efforts have to be spent to eliminate and destroy the capitalist ideology. Communism advanced in great strides in treating colonialism and resisting capitalist ideology. However, it proceeded by using a wrong thought and a limping resistance. This is because it resisted the creed of detaching religion from the state by the creed of material evolution, which is a wrong creed and contradicts man's innate nature (fitra). Therefore, it has not been accepted in the capitalist societies; besides the individuals who embraced it, it did not affect

their behaviour in life. This is because the one who believes in material evolution finds no harm in implementing the creed of separating religion from the state. For the creed of separating religion from the state can be embraced by the one that believes in the existence of Allah and the one who does not believe in His existence, since it neither means atheism or belief. It rather means abstaining from arbitration to religion regarding the state's affairs, a matter that does not affect the behaviour of the one who believes in the creed of material evolution. Therefore, the communist creed did not affect the capitalist societies, and not created any change in them. The resistance of capitalism by communism started by the thoughts of Karl Marx and the communist philosophers who followed him, so it found some of the individuals and groups that embraced it. However, it could not make, just through study and discussion, all people to embrace it. Moreover, the method of its materialization in an entity, i.e. a communist state was wrong and fanciful. So, it is wrong from the aspect that it made the creation of a state a way to its (state) complete elimination; and it is fanciful because it wanted to make the revolution global, where it starts with the industrially advanced peoples and then it dominates the world. Therefore, Lenin was obliged to diverge from it under the pretext of its explanation. So, he established the communist state in Russia, which was then behind Europe industrially, and he established it in Russia alone. After a third of a century, the successors of Lenin made alliance with the biggest colonial state, meaning America, i.e. they allied with colonialism. The result of this alliance was the final fall down of communism, and thus the main communist state disappeared and failed in achieving its objectives. Therefore, it was necessary to look for another solution for resisting capitalism and destruction of colonialism. There is no other than Islam that has the capability to achieve that; it is rather the only solution for eliminating colonialism and destruction of capitalism. Its solution is built upon presenting the collective thought about universe, man and life to world discussion, and inserting it into the convention of the international community, which is based upon executing the international

norm through consent and free will. This global discussion of the collective thought about universe, man and life is the matter that changes the concepts, removes the erroneous concepts and corrects the international norm. Colonialism is a specific view point about life, and it cannot be destroyed unless this view point has been changed. It is true that the international public opinion that emerged in the world against colonialism has affected it; but it did not destroy it and neither weakened its presence. All that which happened is changing its style; where the countries that were colonised in Africa, Asia and Latin America are still colonies, though they were put in the style of independence. These colonies will not be liberated except by revolutions, and local and international wars. However, as long as the great states present in the world adopt colonialism as a thought and use their forces for its sake, then there is no way to eliminate colonialism from the world except through eliminating its thought from the minds of those who adopt it, as their view point about life. It is true colonialism must be resisted materially and the public opinion must continue against it; besides the efforts must be increased in that course. However, this is not the right solution; rather the right solution is presenting Islam as a collective thought about universe, man and life for world discussion, where all the people and nation address it. It has also to be presented to all the states for international discussion, particularly in the international community. This is the only right solution for colonialism. This cannot be implemented practically except by the presence of a powerful Islamic state in the international arena.

These are the three matters that caused misery to the world; and because of these matters the world was prevented from proceeding in the course of happiness. This is also the way by which these three calamities can be solved. However, saving the world from these calamities does not mean preventing wars, nor preventing worry and disturbances, or preventing international traps, political manoeuvres and vicious tricks. It rather means removing a heavy and collective nightmare, which is difficult to get rid of. This is because disputes

between states are natural, resorting to wars is natural and undertaking manoeuvres and tricks is also natural. However, these will be individualistic or limited, where the entire world is not drawn into war as it happened in the two past world wars. Moreover, the states do not focus their mind to exploiting the peoples as it is the case currently. Rather, the world will have that which exists in human nature, in terms of guidance and falsehood, good and bad, and pretty and ugly. Thus, it would contain from both of these, rather than all evil as it is the case now, from the time the concept of block formation between the great states existed, together with the concept of international community and the concept of colonialism, till today. Therefore, it is necessary to put an end to this evil that prevails over the world since many centuries; and it is necessary to establish the state that can do that, which is the Islamic Khilafah state.

How to influence world 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.

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.

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, which for us is the angle of Islamic Aqeeda. It is the angle of:

لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله

“There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.”

أُمرتُ أن أقاتل الناس حتى يقولوا: لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله، فإذا قالوها
عصموا مني دماءهم وأموالهم إلا بحقها.

“I have been commanded to fight against the people till they say: There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah; if they said it they would have safeguarded from me their blood and their property except for its due right.”

This is political awareness. Thus, viewing the world without having a specific angle is considered superficiality and not political awareness. Viewing the local arena or the regional domain is considered triviality and not political awareness. There cannot be political awareness except with the presence of two factors: the view must be to the entire world; and that this view must emerge from a special defined angle no matter what this angle is, whether it is an ideology, 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 the expression might be figurative, metaphorical or indirect (*kinaya*). It might also be a sentence, whose meaning comes from its syntax and not from its words. However, this does not prevent from moving outside (his mind) and viewing the reality that indicates it, in accordance with the imports of the language as mentioned by linguists. So, the politically aware person must go along with the truth, but in accordance with his viewpoint that he embraces with certainty and conviction. He must see the facts as they are, in accordance with his perception or intellectual vision. In this way he will perfect his awareness after he takes account of the means of perfection. However, the basis of everything he has in terms of vision, comprehension, perception and understanding must remain to viewing the world from a specific angle.

The following question might arise in this context. How can the political aware be free in terms of sticking to the truth and viewing the facts as they are despite his view of the world from a specific angle? If such a question arises, then this is due to the superficial view of the matters. If the person was deep in study,

then such a question would not arise. This is because there is a difference between the reality of things and judgement upon them. People do not differ over the reality of things. If the matter is related to sight, then whoever has sight would see the thing as it is, unless he is cheated or deceived. If it was related to sensation, then whoever has sensation he would sense the thing, whether it was by tasting, the bitter taste or the sweet, or by senses like the soft and rough, or by hearing like the sounds, or by smelling like the smells. Thus, people sense things as they are, despite the disparity in that. However, people can differ regarding judgement on things. So, viewing the world from a specific angle is related to judgement on things and actions. While viewing the facts as they is related to the senses and comprehension. Therefore, it is necessary to see the facts as they are and to stick to the truth. It is necessary as well to view the world, incidents and things from a specific angle.

How can this apply to international politics? We can examine some examples that show the way of viewing the political events from a specific angle. These examples will be from the politics of the Messenger ﷺ, politics of the middle ages and the current political examples. The specific angle from which the Messenger ﷺ used to view the world was propagating the da'wa. Since the Quraysh were the leading state in the Arab Peninsular, and were the head of kufr in obstructing the da'wa, he directed his attention to confine the political and military actions to it. So, he sent the spies to observe it, stand up against its trade and involve in wars with it. He was content that other states, i.e. tribes will stand as spectators, or as they say: they stand neutral. Thus, his political and military actions used to emanate from viewing the world from a specific angle. When the Messenger ﷺ came to know that Khayber was negotiating with Quraysh for concluding an alliance between them to attack the Medina, destroy Mohammed ﷺ and crush Islam, he defined the angle of action to conclude a truce or peace treaty with Quraysh and thus devote himself to crushing Khayber. 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 of the actions of the Messenger ﷺ; one of them is general which is focusing on a great state that comes at the head of his enemies, based on a specific angle. The second is a particular action, which is to focus on a particular objective, and thus make it a specific 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.

After World War II, America said the world is a company, and America has the biggest number of its shares, so the management of this company must be in her hand. She took this saying as the specific angle from which she viewed the world. So, her actions conformed to this angle; and she started to look at the political actions that take place in this world from this angle. The view from this angle made her agree with, rather ally herself with the SU, and made her

snub Britain and France. After the collapse of the SU, her view changed; so she did not only snub Britain and France, rather snub the entire states of the world. She exaggerated in that course till she disavowed the international pacts agreed upon by the entire world. So, she withdrew from Kyoto agreement, and refused to enter the treaties regarding the removal of the land mines, and regarding establishing an international court of crimes and others. The specific angle from which she views the world became built upon the basis of the absence of equals with whom she can ally herself on equal footing. Thus, she turned to unilateralism; and started to deal with other great states with hegemony and supremacy.

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'wa 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.

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.

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, this is because the Ummah is the soil in which men grow. So this soil must be a soil of political awareness 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.

The manner of generating political awareness in the individuals and in the Ummah is political culturing in the political sense, whether it was culturing with the thoughts and rules of Islam, or it was the follow up of the political events. Thus, a Muslim politician must be cultured with the thoughts and rules of Islam, not as abstract theories, but rather by connecting them with realities. He should also follow up the political events, not like the journalist who follows up the news or like the teacher who aims at gaining information. He should rather view them from the special angle so as to issue his judgement upon them, to link them with other events and thoughts, or to link them with the reality (a political action as an example) that takes place before him. This political culturing with the ideology and politics is the method of generating the political awareness in the Ummah and the individuals; and it is the matter that makes the Ummah assume her prime task and original duty, which is carrying the da'wa to the world, and spreading guidance among people. Therefore, political culturing is the method of generating political awareness in the Ummah and individuals. Accordingly, the Muslim Ummah must be cultured politically on the largest possible scale, because this is what establishes political awareness and helps the Ummah to produce a mass of creative politicians.

Jumada Thaniya 1425 H

August 2004