

55 'Islamic' Regimes Meet in OIC Summit...to Lie about Unity, Dignity and Strength

“The leaders will gather in a conference chamber, have their photos taken, deliver fiery speeches, hold banquets and celebrations, huddle in bilateral meetings, kiss and hug each other and then head home. Days will pass and then the public will discover the bitter truth - the party is over and nothing good has been done”. This is a quote from the secular, nationalistic daily ‘Al-Hayat’. It was said of the Arab League, yet it can be seen to apply to the eighth summit of the Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC), where 55 ‘Islamic’ regimes met in Tehran last month.

In the case of the OIC there were many grandiose speeches, even before it started.

“The Muslim world is still suffering from a state of fragmentation and disruption....,”

said Saudi Arabia’s Crown Prince ‘Abdullah. Pakistan’s Ambassador to Iran, Javed Hussain, said the summit will prove to be a historic milestone in promoting unity, mutual cooperation and friendship among the Islamic countries.

These and other calls were about unity. In the case of the OIC the public did not need to wait till the end of the summit to realise they were but empty words. For the very existence of the OIC or any such league is an anathema to Islam. The Prophet (saw) said, “If two Khaleefahs were given bay‘ah (pledge of allegiance) then kill the latter of them.”

In Islam there is no permission for any league or confederacy, Arabic or Islamic or otherwise. Leadership of the Islamic Ummah is unitary. No matter how fiery a speech is, it cannot hide the fact that fifty-five does not equal one. Nor does such a division ever lead to strength. In reality, the whole notion of leagues and confederacies actually comes from a foreign nation that was a master of ‘divide et impero’ (‘divide and conquer’).

It was none other than Britain that originally concocted the idea of a ‘Muslim League’ and an ‘Arab League’ as a way of fragmenting the Islamic Lands, weakening them, so making them less resistant to her will. To achieve her plan Britain invited delegates from Egypt, Iraq, Transjordan, the Saudis and the Yemenis to a conference in London in early 1939. Anthony Eden, the then foreign minister, suggested the idea of the establishment of the Arab League. He said, “Britain would like to secure the friendship and cooperation of the Arabs in the event of war. It is natural to consolidate the cultural, political, and economic bonds between the Arab states, and the British government will fully support any agreement to this plan.”

By May 1941, Anthony Eden had announced British support for any plan to bring about Arab unity. Predictably, in December, 1942, the very pro-British leader of Iraq, Nuri as-Sa‘eed announced his proposals for a Fertile Crescent unity. Britain’s dream was realised with the formation of the Arab League in March, 1945.

That was not enough. In the early 1960’s Britain drew up new proposals for new leagues and confederacies, again along divide and conquer lines. The plan is summarised as follows :

1. Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria and Libya would become a united confederacy called the States of North Africa.
2. Egypt and Sudan would be a united state called the Nile Valley.
3. Kuwait, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan/ Palestine would become a united confederacy called the State of the Fertile Crescent.
4. Saudi Arabia with Yemen and the Gulf States would become a united confederacy called the State of the Arab Peninsula.
5. Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Indonesia/ Malaysia would be separate, independent states.

Collectively, these ten new entities would be gathered in a conference called the ‘Muslim World League’. Though Britain did not succeed, it can be seen that the OIC is based on the same ‘blue-print’ of division and weakness. A ‘blue-print’ that leaves all the Islamic Lands open to the wills of

foreign nations. In the past that foreign nation was Britain, today, as will be made clear in the Editorial, it is America.

Khilafah Magazine, January 1998