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3.1 Clash of Civilizations

3.1.1 Introduction

The concept of a “clash of civilizations” was first drafted in 1990 C.E. by Bernard Lewis, a one-time British military intelligence officer during World War Two and a committed Zionist, to describe the conflict between political Islam and the West. “This is no less than a clash of civilization — the perhaps irrational but surely historic reaction of suppressed rival against tyrannical Judeo-Christian heritage, secular present, and the wicked worldwide expansion of both”\(^1\).

The Clash of Civilizations, as described by Harvard University’s Samuel P. Huntington, is not necessarily war\(^2\). It can be just intense competition. However, the world has entered its most-competitive stage, where one civilization tries to physically eliminate the other, it is war, and war is fought like, well, war! The object is to destroy the emerging side\(^3\).

Why should we not use, “clash of regimes” or “clash of empires”? Or, why not use another word for ‘clash’, like ‘competition among states’

---


\(^3\) Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?”, pp. 21-49.
or ‘conflict of nations’. Or, to be more provocative, why not to say, ‘war of civilizations’ or the ‘crusade against the infidel’? Let it be said, the term “civilization” is what most object to. The reason is that it suggests ego-based conflict without having the candor to say so. In other words, “clash of civilizations” is academic code for oppressor’s hatred, contempt and fear for another group of human beings who seem to be so different as to be qualitatively subdued all of which is intensified in the belief ‘make others silent or crush them’.

Writing in 1993 C.E. in *Foreign Policy*¹, the Harvard political scientist, Samuel P. Huntington, coined the term “Clash of Civilizations” to characterize the post-Cold War world. While the world had been characterized by an ideological bipolarity between 1945 C.E. and 1989 C.E., after the latter year it had become evident that the world could more accurately be seen as multipolar, with cultural boundaries separating several ancient civilizations. For Huntington these civilizations were best to be understood with reference to their religious roots. The largest civilizations are the post-Renaissance Western, the Islamic and the Sinic or Chinese. But also of significance are the Latin American, Eastern Orthodox, sub-Saharan African, Hindu, Buddhist and Japanese civilizations³.

The post-Cold War world brought a number of new pictures of the world which have been created to explain, make sense of and possibly predict and prescribe the direction of international affairs¹.

The Cold War set scholars and policymakers on a new home task: how to craft a new paradigm capable of revealing the principal sources of conflict and collaboration in a rapidly changing international system². In “The Clash of Civilizations?”³, Samuel Huntington boldly attempted to fill that theoretical vacancy. Huntington’s model of competing civilizations seeks to provide an analysis of current international conflicts, a method of predicting future strife, and a solid theoretical foundation for constructing foreign policy.

A civilizational paradigm thus sets forth a relatively simple but not too simple map for understanding what is going on in the world as the twentieth century ends. No paradigm, however, is good forever. The Cold War model of world politics was useful and relevant for forty years but became obsolete in the late 1980s, and at some point the civilizational paradigm will suffer a similar fate. For the contemporary period, however, it provides a useful guide for distinguishing what is more important from what is less important. Slightly less than half of the forty-eight ethnic conflicts in the world in early 1993 C.E., for example, were between

---
groups from different civilizations. The civilizational perspective would lead the U.N. Secretary-General and the U.S. Secretary of State to concentrate their peacemaking efforts on these conflicts which have much greater potential than others to escalate into broader wars.

In the early years of the Cold War, the Canadian statesman Lester Pearson presciently pointed to the resurgence and vitality of non-Western societies. "It would be absurd", he warned, "to imagine that these new political societies coming to birth in the East will be replicas of those with which we in the West are familiar. The revival of these ancient civilizations will take new forms". Pointing out that international relations "for several centuries" had been the relations among the states of Europe, he argued that "the most far-reaching problems arise no longer between nations within a single civilization but between civilizations themselves". The prolonged bipolarity of the Cold War delayed the developments which Pearson saw coming. The end of the Cold War released the cultural and civilizational forces, which he identified in the 1950s, and a wide range of scholars and observers have recognized and highlighted the new role of these factors in global politics. "[A]s far as anyone interested in the contemporary world is concerned", Fernand Braudel has sagely warned, "and even more so with regard to anyone wishing to act within it, it 'pays' to know how to make out, on a map of the world, which civilizations exist today, to be able to define their borders, their centers and peripheries,

---

their provinces and the air one breathes there, the general and particular 'forms' existing and associating within them. Otherwise, what catastrophic blunders of perspective could ensue!”¹

After the WTC-Pentagon attacks on September 11, Silvio Berlusconi, the then prime minister of Italy, proudly proclaimed that Western Civilization was superior to Islam. But where is its superiority? What are its achievements? It is a ‘civilization’ of mass-murders (of the Aborigines of Tasmania and the Plain Indians of North America, for instance, and today the Palestinians and the Muslims of the Balkans) and rape. Perhaps that is the great achievement of Western Civilization: its persistent denial of its horrific past, living in historical amnesia of its own atrocities, while proclaiming to the world that it and it alone is the crowning achievement of humanity, the end and crest of human development. Surely that must be the single greatest accomplishment of Western Civilization: its success in fooling the world into believing that it alone deserves to rule².

3.1.2 Clash between West and Islam

With the end of the Cold War the West is contending that Islam is the new threat. For example, Samuel Huntington of Harvard in a well known article “The Clash of Civilizations?” has argued that in the post-

¹ Quoted in Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, p. 104.
Cold War world, cultures or civilizations consisting of groups of countries will be the basic unit of international relations; the world’s two major civilizations are those of the West and Islam; because Islam’s values are different from those of the West, a clash is inevitable. Or is it?¹

When war in the name of clash came to be seen as unavoidable, however, the traditional mind-set of Japanese pacifism started to set in, and a rejection of the “clash of the civilizations” theory began to be expressed in public discourse. However, they did not reject the idea itself, but rejected its adoption to Japan; that is Japan was seen to be outside of the two-worlds in conflict².

The understanding of Muslim society among the Japanese people is very poor. Here, the pacifists’ logic runs as follows: we do not understand Islam nor Muslim society very well, and so we cannot pass a judgment before we learn about them. However, we know the U.S. well, and what is important for Japan is to examine our relations in order to not be a loser in this clash between “the U.S. and Islam”³.

Lee weaves together several arguments:

➢ Culture, he insists, must be taken seriously. Values are formed


³ It might be worth noting that many books on Islam became best-sellers after 11 September, but at the same time a number of books and articles on the U.S. were published, most of which showed ambivalent feelings toward the U.S.
out of the history and experience of a people, are absorbed with a mother’s milk. They are not learnt from a book and cannot be imposed from without.

What will happen in the coming decades will not be a one-way process, whereby the Confucian countries and the rest of the world simply take instruction from the West and adopt its ways. Those days are over. What will occur will be an interaction between civilizations, in which a Darwinian process of selection will take place, with each culture borrowing from others in terms of what works best and what suits its needs. He points out that Western countries have already successfully borrowed Japanese management practices, with their emphasis on group solidarity, and anticipates that there will be more to such borrowings, given the way Asian economies are outperforming Western ones.

In this new world the most pervasive, important, and dangerous conflicts will not be between social classes, rich and poor, or other economically defined groups, but between peoples belonging to different cultural entities. Tribal wars and ethnic conflicts will occur within civilizations. Violence between states and groups from different civilizations, however, carries with it the potential for escalation as other states and groups from these civilizations rally to the support of their “kin

---

countries”. The bloody clash of clans in Somalia poses no threat of broader conflict. The bloody clash of tribes in Rwanda has consequences for Uganda, Zaire, and Burundi but not much further. The bloody clashes of civilizations in Bosnia, the Caucasus, Central Asia, or Kashmir could become bigger wars. It is said that in the Yugoslav conflicts, Russia provided diplomatic support to the Serbs, and Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, and Libya provided funds and arms to the Bosnians, not for reasons of ideology or power politics or economic interest but because of cultural kinship. “Cultural conflicts”, Vaclav Havel has observed, “are increasing and are more dangerous today than at any time in history”, and Jacques Delors agreed that “future conflicts will be sparked by cultural factors rather than economics or ideology”. And the most dangerous cultural conflicts are those along the fault lines between civilizations1.

Until very recently, the concepts of “civilization” and “culture” have played a minor role in thinking about international politics. Realism, which has been the dominant theory of international politics for the last fifty years, allows no significant role for civilizational influences — not in its older version which posits a universal and unchanging human nature, nor in its neo-realist form in which the structure of the international system is what is considered decisive2.

With the Cold War over, the historic conflict between Islam and

---

1 Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, pp. 68-69.

the West has retaken center stage, and the world is again embroiled in a clash of civilizations\textsuperscript{1}. Many conservative intellectuals, journalists and politicians were searching for a new enemy to replace the communist evil empire\textsuperscript{2}.

Islamic Civilization was expected from the very beginning as most likely to be the primary challenger in the twenty-first century C.E. Culture is at the core of the clash of civilizations between the West and Islam\textsuperscript{3}.

The theorist puts it clearly maintaining that what ultimately counts for people is not political ideology or economic interest. Faith and family, blood and belief, are what people identify with and what they will fight and die for. And that is why the clash of civilizations has replaced the Cold War as the central phenomenon of global politics\textsuperscript{4}.

Moreover, by associating "faith" with "family" and "belief" with "blood", it is suggested that cultural values are inextricably bound up with ethnic identity. Finally, all Muslims are part of a vast multi-ethnic group whose values lead them to preserve faith and establish \textit{Khilafah} (Caliphate)\textsuperscript{5}.


\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 113-114.
Writing on October 29, 2001, in *The Weekly Standard*, William Kristol and Robert Kagan, strong supporters of Israel, were predicting that Afghanistan will only be an “opening battle” in a long war that will “spread and engulf a number of countries in conflicts of varying intensity”\(^1\). More ominously, they declared, this war “is going to resemble the clash of civilizations everyone had hoped to avoid”. Other pro-Israelis were more direct. Norman Podhoretz, editor of the *Commentary*, a leading Zionist monthly, was urging the United States to be ready to “fight World War IV - the war against treasured Islam”, and to “impose a new political culture on the Muslim parties”\(^2\).

Three hundred years ago, no one knew that there was a Western Civilization, not even those that were living within it. The term then, and the one that would be parallel to Huntington’s terms for the other civilizations, was Christendom. The story of how Christendom became Western Civilization and how most other civilizations have retained a religious identity is crucial for understanding the clash of civilizations in the future\(^3\).

The unity of the non-West and the East-West dichotomy are myths created by the West. The polarization of “East” and “West” culturally is in part another consequence of the universal but unfortunate practice of

---


\(^2\) Quoted in M. Shahid Alam, “Is This a Clash of Civilizations”, *Media Monitors Network*, http://www.mediamonitors.net/mshahidalam2.html

\(^3\) Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, p. 16.
calling European Civilization Western Civilization. Instead of “East and West”, it is more appropriate to speak of “the West and Islam”, which at least implies the existence of many non-Muslims. The world is too complex to be usefully envisioned for most purposes as simply divided economically between North and South or culturally between East and West.

The phrase ‘clash of civilizations’ has become a popular expression. The Australian Foreign Affairs Minister, Alexander Downer, used it quite often in relation to the ‘war on terror’. He called it a battle of ideas between imperialistic principles and a fundamental vision of an Islamic ummah. President Bush launched a war against terrorism as if terrorism were a malignant tumor, which could be surgically removed from the body.

It is not whether the West chose to wage a war on Islam or any civilization, but, rather, are they waging war on Muslims as a civilization. The strikes at Wall Street and the military establishment, it has been argued, were strikes at symbols of American culture, at the financial system that supported it, at the American way of life. The Taliban employed this paradigm themselves in arguing that a responding U.S.

---


attack on Afghanistan would be an attack on all of Islam, a response of one civilization to another¹.

The World Conference Against Racism is really confirmation of the theory of war against Islam. The majoritarian power of Islamic culture in the United Nations - 22 Arab League members, 55 Organization of Islamic Conference members and various pro-Arab delegations of the 113-member Non-Aligned movement has been brought to bear. In addition, the presence of the Non-Governmental Organizations, has turned a regional conflict between Israel and the Palestinian Authority into a global clash of civilizations and religions².

Differences in wealth may lead to conflicts between societies, but the evidence suggests that this happens primarily when rich and more powerful societies attempt to conquer and colonize poor and more traditional societies. The West did this for four hundred years, and then some of the colonies rebelled and waged wars of liberation against the colonial powers, who may well have lost the will to empire. In the current world, decolonization has occurred and colonial wars of liberation have been replaced by conflicts among the liberated peoples³.

Of course this is a clash of civilizations and a conflict between good and evil or some other analogue of the war between the fundamentally

civilized and the fundamentally barbaric. Less strictly speaking, the "clash of civilizations" refers to a conflict between values and ideas, which are expressed through regimes.

At the most superficial level, a clash of any kind, especially of civilizations, has to be a confrontation wherein there are comparable aggressive intentions in the two opposing civilizations, along with comparable material resources available to carry out the aggression. No such conditions exist today. Thus one cannot really speak of a clash of civilizations; only of the aggression of one civilization bent upon wiping out all other ways of living. This is not merely a play on words, nor a distinction based merely on semantics; it is a logical consequence of historical reality.

Second, and more importantly, to perceive the present conflict in terms of civilizations is a flawed methodology, because a civilization is not a primary entity; it is a product of another primary entity: a set of beliefs. What gives birth to a civilization is a belief system according to which specific ways of life appear in a given polity. These specific ways of life of a large social group, then, produce specific way of organizing social, political and economic activities of that polity; this, in turn, necessitates the establishment of institutions to carry out the various tasks which fulfill the

---

1 Christopher Vasilopulos, "Clash of Civilizations: Prophecy or Contradiction in Terms", p. 90.

commandments, customs and rites originating from the set of beliefs held sacred by that polity1.

Thus seen, the ‘clash of civilizations’ is a facile doctrine because it constructs the fault lines of the present global conflict on the basis of an outward expression of a much deeper and more fundamental entity: the worldview that gives rise to civilizations2. It is important to understand that the source of all action is belief.

The war currently going on did not begin on September, 2001 C.E., nor will it end with the peaceful transition to civilian authorities in Iraq (where Colin Powell himself accepted failure of Western democracy). In fact, Iraq is but a footnote in the bigger context of this encounter, but an important one none the less3.

Is America’s intimate embrace of Likudnik policies, its ongoing war against Afghanistan, its impending war against Iraq, and projected wars against Iran, Syria and Pakistan, prove that the clash of civilizations has begun? Hardly. This only demonstrates the power of the lobbies that have been planning, predicting and promoting the “clash” against Islam. They were predicting what they were planning to carry out in due time. The attacks of September 11, 2001 C.E. only advanced their war plans4.

The pattern of conflict among the civilizations is shaped mainly by

---

1 Dr Muzaffar Iqbal, “The ‘clash of civilizations’: an alternative understanding”.
2 Idem
4 M. Shahid Alam, “Is This a Clash of Civilizations?”.
challenges mounted by the others against the dominant Western culture, and that the main challenge has come from "the Islamic Civilization" — a civilization that currently manifests itself mainly in religious terms.

Huntington sees the central conflict to be between the West and the Islamic Civilization, with the Islamic Civilization strong in oil reserves and geographical proximity to the West. Given a civilizational perspective, Muslims are continuously tyrannized and it seems to continue for long time to come.

The most prominent of these conflicts have occurred on the "fault lines" of civilizations. The most obvious is the conflict between Muslims, Serbs, and Groats in Yugoslavia, which represents a conflict between Islamic, Orthodox, and Western Civilizations. Similarly, the conflicts within and among the successor states of the former Soviet Union have been not just between different ethnic groups but between different civilization groups, e.g., the Muslim Azeris and the Orthodox Armenians.

Islam has the will, and control of a good deal of the world's oil, lacks and shows no signs of acquiring the economic base to be a credible challenger as instilled in the Qur'an.

---

3 There have, however, been violent clashes in Moldova, between Orthodox Slavs and orthodox Rumanians. When the civilization is defined as Slavic-Orthodox, rather than the more obvious Orthodox alone, this anomaly can be overlooked.
The civilization that came into existence on the basis of the message of the Qur'ân – the Islamic Civilization – now does not possess military and economic strength comparable to the West, but it still holds that its belief system is the only valid one, and that it is for all of humanity. This claim is not presently asserted through any material prosperity and strength, but simply on the basis of the Qur'ânic claim that it is a protected message, eternally safe in the “well-guarded tablet”¹, accessible to all through the “uncorrupted and incorruptible Book”, the actual Words of God, addressed to all human beings. This belief is simply unshakeable. Hence a materially superior West finds itself face to face with a civilization that had its golden days of strength and power but is now much reduced, yet refuses to accept the universalist claim of a civilization stronger in military and economic terms by several orders of magnitude. That is not all. This exhausted polity, now standing in the way of a universal expansion of Western Civilization, itself believes that it will achieve a similar universal expansion because of a Divine promise that, in the end, it is the Truth that prevails. This, then, is the dialectic foundation of the contemporary conflict, erroneously called a “clash of civilizations”².

1. The clash between the Revealed Message and man-made beliefs is as old as human history. This continuity also allows us to draw parallels between its present and past manifestations, such as the encounter between Musa عليه السلام and Pharaoh and the clash that once occurred in Makkah

¹ Qur'ân, 85:22.
² Dr Muzaffar Iqbal, “The ‘clash of civilizations’: an alternative understanding”.
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between the leaders of the Quraysh and the final Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم of God who brought a clear Book which sets out this conflict in the most lucid ways.

2. Because the present conflict thus viewed is, in fact, a conflict of two sets of beliefs, both claiming to be universally valid, one can situate numerous unfolding events in the broad categories where they resonate with the previous events; even certain arrogant utterances of men like Donald Rumsfeld and George Bush remind one of the sort of thing that Abu Lahab and Abu Jahal used to say. Likewise, statements of American generals often echo those of Pharaoh.

3. The most important benefit of situating the present conflict in the general flow of human history and of viewing it through this particular construction is to be found in gaining a model for success against the onslaught of the Western Civilization through the sunnah (practice of Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم of the last Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم of Islam. This is a sure path to success, as the Prophetic model is not a man-made, ad hoc model; it was moulded by the One Who revealed the universal message of the Qurʾān and it proved its veracity in a similar conflict between a Revealed belief system and a man-made construct.

4. As far as Muslims are concerned, they cannot afford to view the present conflict as a "clash of civilizations", because this construction automatically puts them at a massive disadvantage because Islamic Civilization is presently so much weaker in material and worldly terms compared to the Western Civilization. It is precisely due to this false
construction that many Muslims today feel hopeless and helpless against the onslaught by the West; an attitude that breeds defeatism which has now become a deeply entrenched attitude in the ruling classes in the Muslim world. They forget that civilizations are not primary entities and can therefore change and decay, and yet regain their strength, as long as they remain attached to the unchanging, Divinely-revealed truths.

5. This alternative construction also provides a globally applicable framework to view various aspects of the current realities. Thus, when applied to resistance against occupation, this construction allows us to see the situation in Iraq from the same perspective from which we can view the situation in Palestine and other Muslim lands. When applied to cultural aggression, myriad forms of aberrations being promoted in the Muslim world by Western Civilization achieve a universal context. When this framework is applied to the economic subjugation of the Muslim world, the strategy used by various international monetary institutions as well as those being used to promote "globalization" can be examined from a unified Islamic perspective that draws its tools of investigation from the Qur’ân and sunnah. Likewise in other realms.

6. This recasting of present realities also allows us to remove the erroneous impression that Islam is only for the people who live out there in the poor, undeveloped and backward areas of the world. It allows us to open ways to the message of the Qur’ân and to the noble example of His Messenger صلِّي الله عليه وسلام for all humanity – ironically, through its own devices, the Western Civilization has opened ways for the spread of this
universal message to all humanity. The inherent truth and power of Divine Revelation as manifested in the Qur'ân can guide us to a straight path. The Western Civilization has produced a crumbling world, beset with myriad social and moral problems. Although Muslims face a global terror today, they have a fortification that is beyond the reach of the most sophisticated weapons: their faith. All that this faith requires them to do is to live by this veritable Truth, convey it to those who have not received it, and trust that the force of Truth will itself open hearts and minds. It is only in Allah that Muslims trust¹.

The physical assault on Muslims is an admission of the West's failure to entice the overwhelming majority away from the din (religion) by either hedonistic materialism or under the guise of freedom and democracy. Perhaps most insidious is the campaign to attack Islam itself by raising questions about the Qur'ân and the character of the Messenger صلی الله علیه و سلم of Allah, in the name of "scholarship". The enemies of Islam know that as long as Muslims seek inspiration from the Qur'ân and the example of the noble Messenger صلی الله علیه و سلم, they will never accept submission to any alien ideology².

While arguing that the current conflict is one with Islam, President Bush, with his "axis of evil" analogy, nevertheless calls upon conservative Judeo-Christian sensitivities to rally the nation (and a few others) behind

¹ Dr Muzaffar Iqbal, "The 'clash of civilizations': an alternative understanding".
his cause. The inclusion of the concept of evil incorporates religion, underpinning the notion that this is a clash of cultures and that ultimately this is a war between civilizations — Judeo-Christian vs. Islam

Muslims will not and cannot tolerate an outpost of Western or Judeo-Christian civilization in its midst — one which espouses universal tyranny, malpractice, secularism, shallow and fake democracy, unidirectional capitalism and globalism; in other words, a rowdy state.

The logical implication, then and now, was not merely that the Other was different, but that he was inferior. If each civilization is the product (and prisoner) of its unique traditions, no basis for supracultural judgment or action exists.

The clash of civilizations has already begun. Still there is a chance to overcome, where it becomes an obligation of a more conscientious Western people to learn from their mistakes of the near and distant past to salvage the future of their free and sanitized and once-impregnable world. Those who don’t learn from history, demonstrably and most regrettably, are condemned to repeat it.

The West needs to get the context right and understand fully that this phenomenon is a very clear part of the “Clash of Civilizations”, which

---


is now manifesting itself as a war between faith and military power and that Israel and Palestine are at the center of that war. It is particularly important to understand that, whether or not we want it to be, this is a clash between Islam and the West, and both sides are with a determination, one with faith and the other with material power.

The challenge for Western scholars and policy-makers, says Huntington, is to make sure that the West gets stronger and crushes off all the others, Islam in particular. In fact, Huntington is an ideologist, someone who wants to make "civilizations" and "identities" into what they are not: shut-down, sealed-off entities that have been purged of the myriad currents and countercurrents that animate human history, and that over centuries have made it possible for that history not only to contain wars of religion and imperial conquest but also to be one of exchange, cross-fertilization and sharing, not running with the history but history runners. This far less visible history is ignored in the rush to highlight the ludicrously compressed and constricted warfare that "the clash of civilizations" argues is the reality.

3.1.3 Clash between West and Other Civilizations

The outlook of the clash of civilizations is that the West is blinded by its arrogance to the true nature of world politics. While American

---


politicians indulge in the naive fantasy of a coming liberal universalism, Asian countries are girding themselves to fight off American intrusions into their spheres of influence\(^1\), which they openly reject.

The competition arises out of cultures about the dominance of values, about integration and assimilation and not about pluralism. Only when Bush and his foreign policy advisors understand these very basic principles will they be able to address even the most rudimentary of possible solutions to what is happening in the World — today. That solution has to deal with societies, cultures, and civilizations, not with just killing off the frontline fighters\(^2\).

The key issues on the international agenda involve differences among civilizations. Power is shifting from the long predominant West to non-Western civilizations. Global politics has become multipolar and multicivilizational\(^3\).

“The Clash of Civilizations” can be a gimmick like “The War of the Worlds”, better for reinforcing defensive self-pride than for critical understanding of the bewildering interdependence of our time\(^4\). But the Clash of Civilization's strength (and usefulness, as a frame of analysis in the post-September 11 world) is its honesty. Its premises are


\(^3\) Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, p. 118.

straightforward and (romantic, make-believe world views aside) undeniable: the world is not Westernizing\(^1\); Islam is expanding; and belief consciousness is getting stronger.

Huntington predicted a conflict in the offing between the Middle East and the West. But it is to be judged whether continuing clash is just the beginning of a long-term civilizational stand-off or a stimulus to democracy’s and capitalism’s final and decaying push to establish themselves around the world\(^2\). Huntington wants the West to limit its democratic traditions as a specifically Western cultural heritage, not as magical solutions to the problems of the world because it will always be “counter-cultural” policy in an inherently missionizing Western democracy.

This ingrained self-righteousness engendered by the Western Civilization are accompanied by a multi-billion dollar effort to spread the “fruits” of the Western Civilization to the rest of the world through domination, control and occupation. This, the most massive and aggressive march of any civilization that human history has ever witnessed, is also viewed as the most natural outcome, as if the self-proclaimed fittest civilization has a birthright to extinguish all other civilizations as a process of natural selection. This extrapolation of the doctrine of “the survival of the fittest” into the domain of civilizations is based on the assumed


superiority of three basic doctrines held sacrosanct by the West: democracy, individual liberty and free-market economy. It is these three components of the Western Civilization which are now being exported to the rest of the world because they are considered to be the universal aspiration of the entire human race.

Benjamin Barber, respected scientist, entertains a view in his remarkable book, *Jihad vs. McWorld*, argues that the forces of globalization (centered on and coming from the West) are endangered by the forces of fundamentalism (meaning the protection and promotion of cultural values and traditions). This fear will increase and become fierce. In this respect, the world is in a period of conflictual relations. Western Civilization is a shallow civilization based on consumerism and short-lived fads. Even so-called democracy has become an empty concept, ruled by polls and spin masters. This civilization uses modern technology and rules the world after the forces of fundamentalism are conquered in vicious wars.

The West is militarily the most powerful civilization. Yet its power relative to that of other civilizations is declining. As the West attempts to assert its values and to protect its interests, non-Western societies confront a choice. Some attempt to emulate the West and to join or to “bandwagon” with the West. Other Confucian and Islamic societies

---

1 Dr Muzaffar Iqbal, “The ‘clash of civilizations’: an alternative understanding”.
attempt to reject forcible imperialism and to expand their own economic and military power to resist and to reciprocate against the West. A central axis of post-Cold War world politics is thus the competition of Western power and culture with the power and culture of Islamic Civilization\(^1\).

World War I was the "war to end wars" and to make the world safe for democracy. World War II, as Franklin Roosevelt put it, would "end the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the balances of power, and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries — and have always failed"\(^2\).

There exist two Worlds: Us and Them. While one-world expectations appear at the end of major conflicts, the tendency to think in terms of two worlds recurs throughout human history. People are always tempted to divide people into us and them, the in-group and the other, our civilization and those barbarians. Scholars have analyzed the world in terms of the Orient and the Occident, North and South, center and periphery. Muslims have divided the world into *Dar al-Islam* (the abode of peace) and *Dar al-Harb* (the abode of war). This distinction was reflected, and in a sense reversed, at the end of the Cold War by American scholars who divided the world into "zones of peace" and "zones of turmoil"\(^3\). The former included the West and Japan with about 15 percent of the world's population, the latter everyone else.

---


The clash of civilizations question, from the Muslim side, is whether the ummah should accept the international community or whether it must incorporate the international community into itself. From the Western side, the clash of civilizations question, though essentially the same question inverted, must begin with the perhaps grudging recognition that there exist, in the first place, two bona fide international communities separated by a genuine cultural border along which for a long while now there has been more war than peace¹.

Secretaries of state may have to learn some theology if the current clash between Western and Muslim Civilizations is to yield to disengagement and peaceful coexistence², to say nothing of more fruitful kinds of relationship.

The very possibility of a definitive, radical, and large-scale mobilization of the Muslim world is already at the center of Western policy calculations. And of course, the threat of such a mobilization explains the entirely sensible decisions of Presidents Clinton and Bush to publicly proclaim that our problem is only with the extremists and has nothing to do with Islam or Islamic society itself³.

The problem for the West is not Islam. It is the Muslims, people of a different civilization who are convinced of multiethnicity of their

² Ibid., p. 454.
religion and are certain about the success of their power: faith. The problem for Islam is not the CIA or the U.S. Department of Defense. It is the West, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the imperialism of their culture.

3.1.4 Clash between West and Itself

After leading the West to a victory over Iraq in the Gulf War, President George Bush (Sr.) boldly promised a new world order for the twenty-first century C.E. That hope received a major blow on September 11, 2001 C.E. In response, his son George W. Bush launched a military assault on Afghanistan. The American era appears to be alive and well. The real clash of civilizations, the one most pregnant with significance, is not be between the West and the rest, but one that is already underway within the West itself, particularly within its central power, the United States.

The fact of the matter is that Western Civilization is the only civilization that is explicitly non-religious or post-religious. This is the radical difference of the West from the other civilizations. It helps to explain why there are new conflicts between the West and the rest. It predicts that these conflicts will become more intense in the future. And it

---

1 Stanley Kurtz, “The Future of ‘History’: Francis Fukuyama vs. Sameul P. Huntington”, p. 43.
3 James Kurth, “The Real Clash”, p. 3.
also points to a possible fatal flaw within Western Civilization itself\(^1\).

The real clash of civilizations will not be between the West and one or more of the rest. It will be between the West and the post-West, within the West itself. This clash has already taken place within the brain of Western Civilization, the American intellectual class. It is now spreading from that brain to the American body politic\(^2\).

The 1990s have seen another great transformation, this time in the liberal and the conservative movements that have long defined American politics and that, whatever their differences, had both believed in the modern ideas represented by the American creed. Among liberals, the political energy is now found among multicultural activists. Liberalism is ceasing to be modern and is becoming post-modern. Among conservatives, the political energy is now found among religious believers. Conservatism is ceasing to be modern and is becoming pre-modern. Neither these liberals nor these conservatives are believers in Western Civilization. The liberals identify with multicultural society or a post-Western Civilization (such as it is). The conservatives identify with Christianity or a pre-Western Civilization. A question thus arises about who, in the United States of the future, will still believe in Western Civilization. Most practically, who will believe in it enough to fight, kill, and die for it in a clash of civilizations?\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) James Kurth, "The Real Clash", pp. 5-6.
\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 6-7.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 8.
Of all nations which fall within the sphere of the Western Civilization, the United States of America has achieved a unique role with its technological and economic power. It now stands as the embodiment of this civilization, and thus its self-assumed right to rule the world is reflected in various spheres of contemporary life — from its military adventures to its insatiable desire to export the American way of life to the rest of the world¹.

Newt Gingrich, former Speaker of the United States House of Representatives (1995 C.E. – 1999 C.E.) wrote an article “America’s right to world leadership”, in which he claimed:

Only America can lead the world. America remains the only global, universal civilization in the history of mankind. In the space of less than 300 years, our system of representative democracy, individual liberties, personal freedoms and free enterprise has provided the foundation for the greatest economic boom in history. Our value system is emulated around the world. Our technology has revolutionized mankind’s way of living and has been the primary force for globalization².

The continuing clash of civilizations holds that the United States is in decline, that democracy is limited to Western cultures, and that America must accept Asian authoritarianism as a good thing³. This means that

¹ Dr Muzaffar Iqbal, “The ‘clash of civilizations’: an alternative understanding”.
America should stop about seeking to spread its democratic creed and reject the proposition that other peoples can, or even should, aspire to achieve democratic self-government\textsuperscript{1}.

Since the end of the Cold War, two opposing schools of thought on American foreign policy have emerged. The first school consists of what we might call triumphalists. They argue that America has an obligation to democratize the world\textsuperscript{2}.

Then there is school number two: the debunkers. They view the post-Cold War era with apprehension and gloom. Far from believing that the end of the Cold War will usher in a new golden age of American foreign policy, debunkers insist that America should avoid foreign entanglements with a world now driven by ethnic conflict. America, they maintain, should seize the opportunity to mend its own woes rather than waste precious treasure on crusading abroad\textsuperscript{3}. At the present juncture the United States is a decadent society as claimed by Western writers.

Francis Fukuyama is at pains to point out how established democracies take up arms against one another. Huntington insists that promoting democracy and modernization abroad means more war, not less. Electoral competition in non-Western countries, says Huntington, heightens appeals to nationalism and brings belligerent fundamentalists to power, thus increasing international conflict. Social and economic

\textsuperscript{1} Jacob Heilbrunn, "The Clash of Samuel Huntingtons", pp. 22-23.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 22.
\textsuperscript{3} Idem
modernization, he adds, uproots societies and thereby spurs traditionalist reaction. But Huntington's deepest assault on liberalism may be his insistence on treating American belief in democracy's global appeal as a characteristic (and characteristically naive) trait of Western culture rather than as a universal truth¹.

California Senator Dianne Feinstein, after viewing a large number of photos of the obscene atrocities at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq by the U.S. army, was reported to have said, "If anyone wanted to plan a clash of civilizations, this is how they'd do it. These pictures play into every stereotype of America Arabs have: America as debauched, America as hypocrites"².

Multiculturalism is destroying the United States. According to Huntington, Western culture is challenged by groups within Western societies, who reject assimilation and continue to adhere to and propagate the values, customs, and cultures of their home societies. This phenomenon is most notable among Muslims in Europe³.

The populations today of France, Italy, Germany, Spain, Britain, America, even Sweden, reveal that Islam is no longer on the fringes of the West but at its center. Buried in the collective culture are memories of the first great Arab-Islamic conquests, which began in the seventh century C.E. and which, as the celebrated Belgian historian Henri Pirenne wrote in

² Rolf Gentry, "The 'Clash of Civilizations' — present or future?".
his landmark book *Mohammed and Charlemagne* (1939 C.E.), shattered once and for all the ancient unity of the Mediterranean, defeated the Christian-Roman synthesis and gave rise to a new civilization: Islamic. Even Dante, great enemy of Muhammed صلى الله عليه وسلم, had to concede when he placed the Prophet at the very heart of his Inferno.

3.1.5 Clash between United States and European Union

American primacy is not far less durable than it appears, but it has already entered the decaying stage. And the rising challenger is not China or the Islamic world but the European Union, an emerging polity that is in the process of marshaling the impressive resources and historical ambitions of Europe’s separate nation-states. The European Union is a formidable counterweight to the United States because of new members such as Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic. The transatlantic rivalry will inevitably intensify at the larger scale. The competition is of power, influence and prestige.

Ironically, Johns Hopkins University scholar, Fouad Ajami, inadvertently suggested that there has been and is a clash between civilizations, although a nonviolent one, and that the West is ruining. The

---

implication is that the clash can be pursued without war and that the best way to reduce the lines of conflict is for the West to accept competitors, overlook cruelty and let others live.

The coming clash between the United States and the European Union will doubtless bear little resemblance to the all-consuming standoff of the Cold War. Europe will resist rather than backstop U.S. leadership, perhaps paralyzing the World Bank, the United Nations, and other institutions that since World War II have relied on transatlantic cooperation to function effectively. An ascendant European Union will surely test its muscle against America, especially if the unilateralist bent in U.S. foreign policy continues. A once united West appears well on its way to separating into competing halves.

America and Europe are driven by different political cultures. And the cultural distance appears to be widening, not closing, putting the two sides of the Atlantic on diverging social paths. As the European Union continues to rise, its economic and political interests are likely to collide frequently with those of the United States, intensifying the ill will. The union decided earlier this year to construct its own satellite network, called Galileo — a move that will reduce European reliance on U.S. technology. All these initiatives enjoy strong public support, with more

---


2 Charles A. Kupchan, "End of the West: The Next Clash of Civilizations Will Be Not between West and the Rest but between the United States and Europe — and Americans Remain Largely Oblivious", p. 43.
than 70 percent of Europe's citizens favoring.

The principal reason why civilizations and the differences between them have not been considered important in the study of international politics is, surely, that until very recently power politics was a Western game. All the leading actors belonged to one civilization, so that the question of the effect of civilizational differences did not arise. The states and societies of other civilizations figured in the script not as participants but as objects. As such they were usually dealt with under the heading of "colonial policy", and were subject to different kinds of theorizing and moralizing. 

The world is heading towards an increasingly particularistic world of civilizations in which differences will be emphasized, not softened, and which will allow plenty of scope for conflict and violence. Passions will be stronger, since civilizational differences are more basic than ideological ones, less mutable, less easily compromised. Technological and economic forces will not override culture but will be subordinate to them. The fact that the world is shrinking will make for more, not less, friction.

Finally, from the Huntington perspective, one would expect renewed conflict between the United States and Russia or between the United States and China. The United States represents Western Civilization, Russia represents Orthodox Civilization, and China represents Confucian / Communist Civilization. The conflict may take
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2 Ibid., p. 110.
different forms than it did during the Cold War, when the language was ideological. The language of the new conflicts will instead be cultural. But there will still be conflicts between great powers, and nuclear powers at that, who represent different world-views and different ways of life. And although Huntington does not himself say so, they conceivably would take the form of a cold war, complete with those old and familiar features of nuclear deterrence and military alliances¹.

The overthrow of the Enlightenment by the post-Enlightenment is also the overthrow of the modern by the post-modern and therefore of the Western by the post-Western. At the very moment of its greatest triumph, its defeat of the last great power opposing it, Western Civilization is becoming non-Western. One reason is that it has become global and therefore extra-Western. But the real, and the fatal, reason is that it has become post-modern and therefore post-Western².

In the contemporary world mankind can neither live happily within modern civilization nor return to pre-modern culture, and is therefore destined to suffer from ever-more ambiguous problems of identity, is the essence of inter-civilizational clash. It has become minutely subdivided, internalized, and fallen into a state where there is no resolution in sight. That Fukuyama's the "End of History" and the "Last Man" ends on a pessimistic note is no accident. On the other hand, Huntington's "The Clash of Civilizations" appears superficial, even

¹ James Kurth, "The Real Clash?". pp. 3-4.
² Idem
optimistic, despite its negative predictions about the future of world politics, because it fails to recognize this most fundamental inter-civilizational conflict¹.

For 50 years thereafter the world had to live in terror while the US and the USSR squared off. That did not happen, yet the ‘Cold War’ claimed millions of lives in the ‘third world’; the American war in Southeast Asia alone killed nearly four million people. One could easily number 100 million people killed in the twentieth century C.E. by the wars fought in the name of Western Civilization. But perhaps it is not fair to judge a civilization only by the wars it has fought and the people it has killed. Surely there are other achievements of Western Civilization apart from its warfare².

Maybe the West is best at economics, some may suggest. Neo-liberalism is supposed to be the crowning achievement of Western economic thought, but to the ‘third world’, and increasingly in the West and Japan, it is looking like a disaster or, as some put it, a “doomsday machine”. Deregulated global corporations are constantly on the prowl for cheaper resources and labor in order to make even greater profits at the expense of local cultures and sustainable systems. Meanwhile, American-style consumerism is endangering environments and ecosystems as the world begins to mimic the Americans’ voracious appetite for luxuries,


² Yusuf al-Khabbaz, “The dogs of Western Civilization are Barking Again”.
comforts and conveniences, which if pursued in countries such as China and India would require two additional earths to sustain. That brings to mind space-exploration, with rockets blasting off in search of interplanetary gold mines and garbage dumps, while millennarists pin their hopes on extraterrestrial domiciles once they have destroyed the earth. The billions of dollars spent on such fantasies seem criminal in the face of increasing global poverty.

3.1.6 Conclusion

The West needs to learn from its mistakes in Iran, Afghanistan and Iraq to avoid repeating them elsewhere in the world specifically with Muslims. There is more to life than just surface appearances; there is more to life than just the pursuit of money; military power has its limitations, especially when there is widespread popular support for the other point of view.

Whether for reasons of strategic necessity or convenience the US wants to hold onto and build cross-civilizational coalitions against terror or not, it is in the context of the clash of cultures and civilizations that the 'war on terror' is being fought. There will inevitably come the time when for reasons of war and in order to succeed, the US and the West will have to ignore the sensibilities of some of their allies and will have to stop worrying about destabilizing some or all of the Arab or Islamic regimes.
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1 Yusuf al-Khabbaz, “The dogs of Western Civilization are Barking Again”.
whose basic values are in profound contradiction to those of the West. There will also come the time when Islam as a major religion will — through its leading clerics, elders and philosophers — have to ask itself what laws, values and predispositions have to be purged from it in order for it to play a constructive rather than a reactionary and destructive role as this century unfolds.

In a balanced, multicivilizational world, tolerance and cooperation are the best that can be hoped for. To encourage this, Huntington proposes that the U.N. Security Council be reformed to include representatives from each of the world’s major civilizations.

Muslim reaction to this formulation has, however, often been rather facile: some call it a statement of the agenda of the West, rather than an analysis of the current global conflict by a political scientist; others misunderstand the thesis; still others deny outright the global onslaught of one civilization against others. Only a small minority have realized that a “clash of civilizations” is, in fact, already under way. The “clash”, in fact, is not of civilizations but of something much deeper and more fundamental.

When Samuel Huntington hypothesized a “clash of civilizations”, he at least recognized other civilizations beside the West. But what Huntington meant by “civilization” does not take into consideration the kinds of historical and ethical problems discussed above; for Huntington

---


2 Dr Muzaffar Iqbal, “The ‘clash of civilizations’: an alternative understanding”. 
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and other policy pundits, "civilizations" are spheres of influence and what they are really talking about is power and allegiance, not abstract principles or real world achievements. Now, with the American 'war on terrorism' being fought in the name of "civilization", it seems that part of Huntington's prescription has come true. But the war, like the West, is a sham, and when Muslim speakers extol the virtues of a "caravan of civilization" they are either suffering from amnesia, along with the West they venerate, or they are part of a post-Cold War plan to intimidate and cajole the rest of the world into the American sphere of influence. Perhaps a more realistic depiction of what is really going on in the world today has been nicely captured by the Palestinian poet Ma'een Bisaysou, who once wrote that "Muslims are like a beautiful prancing gazelle being hunted down by loudly barking dogs".

3.2 Dialogue among Civilizations

3.2.1 Introduction

'Dialogue among Civilizations', is the most widely underestimated term. A civilization is considered to be a group of peoples, which develops a common culture with the passage of time. Dialogue is not negotiation or polemics occurring among civilizations nor does it simply result in the satisfaction of personal interests of both parties as is the case with
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1 Yusuf al-Khabbaz, "The dogs of Western Civilization are Barking Again".

negotiations, whereas, polemics is the controversies. According to Foucault (the French philosopher), the polemicist sees his interlocutor "not as a partner in the search for the truth, but an adversary, an enemy who is wrong, who is harmful, and whose very existence constitutes a threat... his final objective will be, not to come as close as possible to a difficult truth, but the triumph of [what he thinks is] the just cause he has been manifestly upholding." In dialogue, there is a cooperative search for truth.

Dialogue is a method used by philosophy for the common enterprise to make feasible the way, which can unfold its search for the hidden aspect of the visible in particular and the good in general. The truth will never be achieved with lies, nor safety with violence.

Perhaps the words that best capture the virtue of dialogue among civilizations are in the logo of the National Issues Forums in the United States: "A different kind of talk. Another way to act". Another way of saying this is to state that individuals learn different patterns of interaction in dialogue and those changed patterns of interaction change relationships.

Thus dialogue becomes an important aspect of human life and a significant category of social activities. Abstractly speaking, it is a form of

---


interaction among social forces; a means either for communication or avoiding conflicts and moderating confrontations\(^1\) as held by Shen Qurong.

Consequently, the dialogue is an immediate process between and within civilizations, desired to learn, understand values and beliefs, and integrate multiple perspectives. It is a method to discover and implement equity, equality, justice, tolerance and inclusion in human interactions; promotion and protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms; and development of a better understanding of common ethical standards\(^2\).

Dialogue means shedding light (dia) into things through the spoken word (logos), bringing forth that which is hidden, namely, the ground or foundation of what is present, and which nevertheless pertain to the essence of things, to make them complete. Things have a sort of virtue, the virtue of being ‘spoken’, being named. They cannot name themselves. The purpose of dialogue is to open the things, to clarify them, to bring them forth to full presence for you and for me, for us. Hence, we have here a serious problem for intercultural dialogue, a problem that cannot be solved with UN translators or businessmen’s interpreters\(^3\).


Dialogue among civilizations is an effective means to wiping out racial discrimination, ethnic superiority and religious bigotry\(^1\). It is the most powerful factor for establishing the principles of full equality and justice between peoples, nations, countries and civilizations in terms of rights and obligations.

The dialogue among civilizations is a method to avoid misunderstandings and distrust among different groups of people, and to solve humanity's economic, social, humanitarian, cultural and political problems by sharing experiences on the national, sub-regional, regional, inter-regional and international levels\(^2\). It has the capacity of creating the congenial climate for understanding, reconciliation, consensus, and accommodation by opening the gates to progress and prosperity by softening all sharp angularities and rough edges. Confrontation as against dialogue, leads to civil strife and war, causes colossal death and destruction of vast masses of mankind. But dialogue is meant to bring out the most often forgotten truth that 'in life there are far more threads that unite than those that divide'\(^3\). No man or a civilization is an island capable of living in isolation, but a current in the ocean of mankind. Actually, all human beings bound by fraternal bonds share one common indivisible destiny.


Poverty, illiteracy, violence, pollution, the danger of thermo-nuclear confrontation etc. are some of the obvious enemies of mankind. These problems are common to everyone and affect every human being variedly at different levels.

Dialogue as a method of cultural discourse has a hoary antiquity. Dialogue is thus an ongoing process of renewal and resurrection. It involves coping with the living present as it has grown out of the past with a view to paving the way to a better future. Cutting one's self from the advances of civilization and culture as a result of the application of science and technology and fixing one self nostalgically on some imagined golden period of ancient history cannot be accepted the right approach for a growing organism\textsuperscript{1}. For the mind of man neither tires nor retires so the world around is always in a state of flux.

Dialogue among civilizations is the choice of reasoned people fully aware of their responsibilities towards the human destiny and discharging the trust they are shouldering. It is also the approach of wise men caring for the safety, stability and prosperity of societies; and an alternative to conflict that leads to wars and crises at all levels\textsuperscript{2}.

Different religions have their own specific cultures\textsuperscript{3}; hence, inter-religious dialogue means intercultural dialogue. For centuries religion has

\textsuperscript{1} Dr. Madan G. Gandhi, "Dialogue Among Civilizations".

\textsuperscript{2} "Dialogue among Civilizations for Coexistence".

enriched the culture, has been the carrier of culture — a task that today, it seems, it can accomplish less and less. Expansion, shortage of tolerance toward those who are different, lack of dialogue lead to conflicts and wars between religions, cultures and civilizations.

Dialogue is not just a technique for solving a problem; it is a different way of relating. As we think about dialogue among civilizations, it is important to recognize two points: (1) We begin with identifiable groups in deep-rooted human conflict across ethnic, religious, cultural, or even civilizational divides, but we must deal with these at a human level—person by person, small group by small group over time. (2) Only in a process of systematic, disciplined, sustained dialogue will they learn a way of talking that enables people to interact peacefully in transforming their relationships and resolving their problems. This different way of talking and relating is essential both to a culture of peace and to economic development and justice, which are critical to peace.

'Dialogue among Civilizations' is both a realistic and idealistic logic. Realistic because dialogue does approve to be an effective approach to honour differences, remove confrontation and avoid conflicts in modern times. Idealistic because of the complexity of the source of conflicts, the evident lagging spiritual civilization progress behind material civilization
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of human society and the long, long process involved in purifying human souls\(^1\). Chen Luzhi, a Chinese expert on international relations, maintained that, “Dialogue is meant for removal of obstacles rather than creation of new ones...It should not deviate from the basic values for international relations\(^2\).

Dialogue among civilizations is a useful concept because it is an appropriate and necessary answer\(^3\) to the notion of an inevitable clash of civilizations as Kofi Annan put it. This is possible only when people learn to distinguish propaganda and false history that, in turn, eases the path to peace.

Ismail Raji al-Faruqi comments upon the definition:

Dialogue held with sound reason and with no unnecessary fear of losing personal identity strengthen and crystallizes personal views and ideas. In the spiritual field there is no better means for strengthening personal identity than in meeting with others. Therefore, dialogue should not be a betrayal of personal views; it accepts the views of others and their experience, as well as positively including the willingness to accept, assimilate, or inculturate the valuable systems of attitudes of other cultures\(^4\).

---


\(^2\) Idem


According to the words of its initiator, Iranian President Mohammad Khatami, it should be interpreted as a process of "speaking and listening among civilizations and cultures".1

Dialogues take place between people rather than civilizations. By dialogue we do not mean sporadic, one time exchanges, but rather sustained dialogue that builds a "cumulative agenda", develops a "common body of knowledge", and teaches participants that "relationships can be transformed".2

There is often a misconception of what occurs in dialogue. Many believe that it is a polite meeting where the depths of their respective faiths are set aside in the name of an easy tolerance. But this is a misconception. Genuine encounter and dialogue is a meeting and of the deepest levels of their respective faiths, where they bear witness to what of the spirit and of God has been given to them.3 Individuals in dialogue learn that a seemingly preponderant party cannot accomplish its goals without the collaboration of another party.

Dialogue requires both effective government and committed citizens outside government. That requires a new dialogue between the
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1 Sayyid Muhammad Khatami, Islam, Dialogue and Civil Society, New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru University, 2003, p. 3.
citizens inside and outside government to replace the present alienation and confrontation between them. It requires a new view of living and politics. Politics is not just about power, as political scientists argue. Politics is about relationship, of which power is only one component.

Dialogue is meant to promote civic culture, social capital, democratic freedoms, human rights and social justice. It means fostering peaceful living among people belonging to different religions, belief systems; cultures, races and civilizations. Dialogue holds fast to the human dimension and reinforces the humane values of civilization.

Somewhat different interpretations have been publicized for the dialogue among civilizations in the Chinese academic community. Professor Zhang Yijun held that “Dialogue among civilizations should emphasize on dialogue itself”. This signifies the recognition that all kinds of civilizations have right to exist. Thus dialogue rather than confrontation enables people to understand and handle mutual relations and divergences which in itself signifies a major improvement. Dialogue has been made impossible due to the disintegration of common moral language by the Western Civilization. So if the West needs to survive and have meaning, dialogue should be re-established at inter and intra-civilizational levels through common themes of languages. Professor Lopez-Garay proposes
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1 Harold H. Saunders, “The Virtue of Sustained Dialogue among Civilizations”, p. 35.
2 Dr. Madan G. Gandhi, “Dialogue among Civilizations”.
3 Shen Qurong, “Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations”, p. 11.
universities as one loci for this activity, and that the United Nations provide the organizational setting.

In August 1997 C.E., eighteen years after the Iranian Rhad stunned the world, the newly elected president of the Islamic Republic surprised the international community in his inaugural address. President Mohammad Khatami called for a dialogue of civilizations, “[I]n our world, dialogue among civilizations is an absolute imperative”\(^1\). The president of a country that America labeled ‘terrorist’ became one of the major advocates for a new policy debate within Iran and within the global community about the clash of civilizations\(^2\).

Alfonso Valdivieso, Permanent Representative of Columbia, emphasized the need for cooperation in promoting dialogue: “We must shoulder the responsibility of sowing the seeds of dialogue to harvest respect for human rights”\(^3\).

There is a danger that even the discussion of dialogue among civilizations can be conducted in such a way that it actually reinforces barriers to dialogue, instead of bringing them down\(^4\).

It is true that proposals such as a dialogue of civilizations is a process that requires centuries of distillation. But one cannot know unless he tries. One cannot try unless he imagines that dialogue is possible and


\(^3\) “UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations”, p. 43.

that he has something to learn from the other. In order to start trying, one must engage in dialogue. That sort of dialogue can give world, a better world, a better Huntington.

The Secretary-General of United Nations, Mr Kofi Annan, has established a trust fund for the purpose of promoting the dialogue, to which all Member States, funding institutions, civil society organizations and the private sector are invited to contribute.

A point was made by John Taylor and Muzammil Siddiqui in “Understanding and Experience of Christian-Muslim Dialogue” when they wrote: “Dialogue was essentially to be undertaken in a spirit of repentance wherein we turned to our neighbour in the spirit of love, wherein we turned to God, as He offered Himself to us”.

Few of us would claim to belong exclusively to one civilization. Rather, we understand as never before that we are the products of many cultures and impulses, that our strengths lie in combining the familiar with the foreign; and that the search for an exclusive, inward-looking civilization is doomed to fail.

That is not to say that we cannot rightly take pride in our particular faith or heritage. We can and we should. But the notion that what is ours
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2 “UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations”, p. 43.


is necessarily in conflict with what is theirs is both false and dangerous. In contrast to what some would suggest, we can love what we are without hating what we are not.

The concept of dialogue took on greater importance in the wake of the "terrorist" attacks of 11 September, 2001 C.E. Less than two months after the tragic event, the General Assembly United Nations held a two-day debate on the 'Year of Dialogue', which began on 8 November 2001 C.E. and drew 56 speakers, including three heads of State and Government and ten foreign ministers.

"From an ethical perspective, the paradigm of dialogue among civilizations requires that we give up the will to power. Instead what we need is the will for empathy, compassion and understanding, otherwise there would be no hope for the prevalence of order in our world." "Our task today is to transform the logic of international relations, distancing it from the logic of power." "We should not replace the ideological confrontation of the Cold War with scenarios of 'global cultural wars'. Without a solemn rectification of the Cold War mentality, confidence and peace would be unavailable. The advances of peaceful cultures are conditioned on acknowledgement of the constructive role of the state and avoidance of dominance, unilateralism, confrontation and rejection".
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1 Kofi Annan, "Dialogue among Civilizations", p. 25.
2 "UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations", p. 43.
Furthermore, dialogue is not limited to oral communication and the exchange of ideas but can also take other forms. Here we can mention the four different forms of dialogue. First is the dialogue of life, which is carried out in the daily relations between followers of different worldviews and cultures, when they live together in peace, solidarity, and tolerance. The second form of dialogue is when the representatives of different cultural circles and communities jointly engage in various projects, with a goal of humanization of the society. The third form is seen when individuals or communities meet to exchange scholarly and scientific thoughts about their different views and cultural values. The fourth occurs when the scientific and scholarly reflections are linked with the different cultural experiences in order to enrich the participants in the dialogue.

3.2.2 Need of Dialogue

President Muhammad Khatami’s vision called for civilizational dialogue by which all societies could get justice through mutual respect, understanding, and the exchange of information and ideas. Khatami regarded dialogue among civilizations itself as “an alternative paradigm for international relations”, namely “the new paradigm of dialogue among cultures and civilizations”\(^1\).

Promoting dialogue among civilizations is a joint human responsibility to be shouldered in particular by decision-makers at

different levels of responsibility, as well as by intellectual and cultural elites and media leaders in the entire world, in order to ensure a collective involvement in the construction of peace in the present and in the future; a peace based on solid foundations of truth that would withstand contingent crises resulting from unexpected events likely to undermine world stability and shake the human conscience.

Partially due to the importance of pluralism for the modern world, and partially due to their own nature, Muslims today are called to enter into a dialogue with the Ahli-Kitab (People of the Book) and with those positive movements that are found in the modern world, in order to build a just society in the concrete setting and historical time in which they live.

In the so-called plural world in which we live, the different levels of dialogue play an important role in building human society, where peaceful coexistence would be based upon solidarity and respect of mutual positive values of every member of a given society. The principle of dialogue is accepted as one of the most important foundations of coexistence in the plural world of different religions, social values, groups, and worldviews. Dialogue is recommended in contacts with other religions, with the contemporary world, and with the worlds of science and the arts. That
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1 “Dialogue among Civilizations for Coexistence”.

dialogue is more than necessary in this world is evident from the 'end of history' and the 'clash of civilizations'.

Wolfgang Schussel, Federal Chancellor of Austria, said that dialogue should "aim for the children, our future. They all ... need to be taught the merits of mutual respect and solidarity". In this way, he said, they would grow up with an understanding to figure out the truth.

The mankind is concerned about the instability of the contemporary world. The acts of injustice, terrorism, violence against a human being make all to cooperate in search of truth, of ways, of developing dialogue among civilizations.

Post-Cold War gave rise to disgusting situations in the world and the need for replacing confrontation with dialogue, abandoning power logic and Cold War mentality and seeking harmony between the generality and diversity arose.
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1 Positive responses and reactions to these theses are coming from many sides, expressing the deepest hope that the human being is capable of creating history with the help of intercultural dialogue. This dialogue creates the foundations for peaceful coexistence of all cultures and nations. It is entirely possible that the thesis presented by Samuel P. Huntington in The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996 may present an overly simplified picture of our world, but the positive side of this book is that the author has observed that culture or cultural circles play a greater role in the contemporary world and that this role would be even greater in the future.

2 "UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations", p. 43.

3 Elena Krivosheina, "Dialogue among Civilizations as the Pathway to Peace", p. 1.

Dialogue holds the prospect of converting confrontation to cooperation, depleting environment to sustainable environment, sectarian clashes to harmonic co-existence, fratricidal strife to fratricidal harmony\(^1\). Dialogue can be a well-trusted means for the least developed and most disadvantaged among the peoples to have an effective voice.

The fight against terrorism, HIV/AIDS, the regulation of new technologies such as human cloning, genetic transformation and bioengineering, copyrights on intellectual property, anti-narcotic rules, disease control, and control of interference in the computing systems of institutions, countries, parties and organizations are only some of the dimensions that require for their success the full cooperation of all members of international society\(^2\).

Song Jian, Chinese member of the UN special panel of prestigious public figures for dialogue among civilizations, maintained that “Diversity of culture and civilization is the general law of the universe, the legacy of history, the treasure handed down from human ancestors, the permanent fountain of human wisdom and knowledge and the origin of the brilliance of the modern world”. “In the course of fusion among civilizations, more similarities can be discerned and common values be developed... The calling for dialogue among civilizations aims at enhancing tolerance and understanding, widening consensus, resolve conflicts, forwarding the

---

1 Dr. Madan G. Gandhi, “Dialogue Among Civilizations”.

stable, healthy progress of world cultural and economy, and realizing peace and common prosperity of human society in the end"1.

To remind all, as one example of the peacemaking use of dialogue, this process has been used for more than two decades between Israelis and Palestinians2 but due to mean attitude of the interfering third party, nothing was actually implemented and so situations worsened each day.

We all have to be in God's service, not in the service of politics, because otherwise we will be each other's slaves rather than God's servants. What had been essentially a conflict between nations is in danger of becoming a religious conflict, as well. In this case, an honest and constructive dialogue could help disentangle the so-called civilization and religious questions from the political and territorial, and provide a path to resolution that would ultimately honor all faiths by choosing a just peace over an interminable war3. The challenge facing our time is to create a multicultural and multipolar environment within a single global civilization4.

1 Shen Qurong, "Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations", p. 10.


3.2.3 Implementation of Dialogue

Initiators of dialogue among civilizations, no matter whether they come from the Islamic World, Europe, East Asia or other regions, need to uphold openness and tolerance toward alien cultures and heterogeneous civilizations in the hope of realizing mutual communication, learning and understanding through dialogues and exchanges\(^1\). Development of such a dialogue will not only save the world from further conflicts and disaster but will add to the developing world if and only if dialogue is based on Universal Truth.

Member States, the United Nations system, other international and regional organizations and civil society can themselves promote dialogue among civilizations in many ways\(^2\).

The United Nations has been built to maintain peace, security, justice, equality, develop friendly relations among people, achieve international cooperation and solve international problems, as the Charter of the United Nations describes where everything is centred on dialogue and understanding\(^3\).

The United Nations itself was created in the belief that dialogue can triumph over discord, that diversity is a universal virtue, and that the

---

1 Shen Qurong, “Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations”, p. 5.

2 “UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations”, p. 43.

3 Draft Resolution in UN General Assembly, Request and Draft Resolution in the 53\(^{rd}\) session of the UN General Assembly on 8\(^{th}\) October, 1998, http://www.iranhouseindia.com/dialogue_draft.htm
peoples of the world are far more united by their common fate than they are divided by their separate identities\textsuperscript{1}.

The United Nations was aimed to be the true home of the dialogue among civilizations; where it was supposed that dialogue can flourish and bear fruit in every field of human endeavor. Dialogue was supposed to take place everyday among and within all civilizations, but unfortunately United Nations' first half century shows the different story where both peace and prosperity were insecure\textsuperscript{2}. It is a lesson that we ignore at our peril.

Globalization has brought us today to the situation that we all live in a global village, where information and the speed of communication have almost totally erased the borders of time and space. This is surely a brand new experience for humankind, because it leaves the impression that the world is small and closed and that it is impossible to change the course of events. But, it is precisely here that the need for closer communication, dialogue, and understanding appears\textsuperscript{3}.

Globalization brought with it global issues that require global solutions. Successful solutions demand sustained efforts and even necessary

\textsuperscript{1} Kofi Annan, "Dialogue among Civilizations", p. 25.

\textsuperscript{2} Idem

price. And fruitful dialogue is indeed a process of interactions on the basis of humanism which can be found in the world’s major civilizations¹.

Promoters of dialogue among civilizations will neither believe in the myth about globalization nor fall into its pitfalls². Iranian President Khatami said “Dialogue among cultures and civilizations should be transformed from a doctrine into a program of action, addressing international developments at his time. ‘Globalization’, as the most pressing of such developments, has opened new horizons for human societies, albeit affected by the monopolies of power and capital. Globalization should not be utilized to open greater markets for a few or to assimilate national cultures into a uniform global one. Instead, what is required is the collective articulation of common interests, norms and laws”³.

While drafting the report on dialogue among civilizations, Kofi Annan’s personal representative Mr. Pick and his colleagues noted that, the new paradigm had to make clear that diversity was not a synonym for enmity and that globalization was not the opposite of individual identities; the new paradigm of international relations should include elements of accommodation, equality, search for generality, participation, recognition of the value of every single human life in each society. The ‘UN Millennium Summit Declaration’ states that freedom, equality, solidarity,

² Ibid., p. 7.
³ Khatami, Islam, Dialogue and Civil Society, p. 10.
tolerance, caring for nature, shared responsibility and so on are "certain fundamental values considered to be essential to international relations"\textsuperscript{1}. President Khatami held that "International relations are in the process of transition from the previous bipolar system to a new stage of history. The United Nations in the common endeavor to initiate a participatory dialogue is based on tolerance, equality and synergy"\textsuperscript{2}.

The United Nations needs to reaffirm that the rights of both parties are to be "different" and to be "equal" simultaneously. It should bring about a deeper mutual understanding among peoples belonging to different civilizations by increasing their knowledge of each other's ideals, value systems, motivations and ways of thinking and ways of life. United Nations' ongoing and peaceful process, such dialogue is based on tolerance and mutual respect, and requires from all participants to engage on an equal footing and listen carefully to both viewpoints\textsuperscript{3}.

Apart from politicians, natural scientists, philosophers, social scientists and artists need to play their roles regarding dialogues among civilizations and cultures\textsuperscript{4}. Unless dialogue is not valued at each level, common man cannot attain peace, security and justice. In turn, this will

\textsuperscript{1} Shen Qurong, "Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations", p. 10.

\textsuperscript{2} Khatami, Islam, Dialogue and Civil Society, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{3} Walid Abdelnasser, "The Media and Dialogue Among Civilizations".

\textsuperscript{4} Shen Qurong, "Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations", p. 3.
promote progress of human civilization, thus propelling the cause of peace and development, the central theme of the era.

Civilizations based on the belief of its people hold that the diversity of human cultures is something to be celebrated, not feared. Indeed, many wars stem from people's fear of those who are different from themselves. And only through dialogue can such fears be overcome as claimed by Kofi Annan.

The world (common man) urged the United Nations to conduct the dialogue with the purpose of removing the negative impact of cold-war mentality from international relations and promoting the principles of equality and justice in its place. President Khatami stressed that all cultures, civilizations and faiths were bound to cohabit the same world by the “inviolable verdict of technology”.

Dialogue has a “purpose and a destination”. Dialogue can be progressive only if it is dynamic and combines the perennial and innovative characteristics of a civilization. This will in a way help resolve the dichotomy between the old and the new, tradition and modernity, continuity and change.

---

1 Shen Qurong, “Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations”, p. 3.
5 Dr. Madan G. Gandhi, “Dialogue Among Civilizations”.
We must recognize that civilizations in themselves do not talk, civilizations speak through human beings and groups of people. One of the reflections we quickly come to as we think about civilizations is how many different voices they have — through cultures and subcultures, through national and sub-national groups, through religious and ethnic groups.

Successful dialogue can be achieved only if followers of all religions or beliefs become equal participants in what the contemporary world calls humanity, human rights, social justice, and freedom for all. If this is not achieved, if someone feels deprived of the above-mentioned rights / points, then, regardless of all efforts at dialogue, there will be no result at all. It is essential that each party be allowed to define itself and should understand each other’s faith and community. This can also help move beyond the stereotypes and misperceptions. Since listening along with understanding allows to meet in freshness and openness.

In dialogue, people should meet as fellow human beings and pilgrims in faith. Too often in the history of religion — not only in the history of Christians and Muslims — we have "demonized" those of other faiths. People in the Christian traditions have too often called all non-Christians "pagans" and acted as if God were not present to other peoples unless

1 Harold H. Saunders, “The Virtue of Sustained Dialogue among Civilizations”, p. 35.


Christians were there. This is an insufferable arrogance and a betrayal of faith in the God Who is the Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier of humankind. There are parallels to this attitude in other religions. However, when people meet in dialogue, people quickly discover that they share a common humanity and that they are fellow pilgrims in their respective journeys towards God. People do not have the same faith; they have their own distinctive faiths and their fundamentals differ. But at the same time, we discover crucial things that are shared across tradition: beliefs in the Ultimate, values of compassion and virtue, concerns for the welfare of “all sentient beings”, and so on. To come into dialogue is illuminating and transforming. It can and will profoundly alter the relations between different communities.

The United Nations, however, needs an intercultural dialogue to begin a revision of the United Nations Charter because it has become the political and military arm of the culture of the West, of the rootless man and globalization. One might think in terms of a Chart of Human Duties in order to de-emphasize much of the UN’s “Human Rights” talk which, is fed by a rootless individualistic conception of man and has become a weapon of control by some powerful economic nations over others.

Words alone will not resolve anything. But a dialogue of words and deeds through five dimensions of the new era: education, ecumenism,

---


environmental responsibility, economy and electronic media”\textsuperscript{1}. Of reciprocal actions based on respect and a genuine appreciation for the other sides’ grievances — can make a difference. We should not wait until we are in the thick of conflict to begin this kind of dialogue. Dialogue should be started whenever and wherever people get the chance — and often it will be easier to do so well away from the battlefield\textsuperscript{2}.

The United Nations, as the centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of common ends, should have the central role in the promotion of dialogue among civilizations and cultures. It is on this basis that President Khatami suggested that this item be placed on the agenda of the fifty-third session of the General Assembly, and a resolution be adopted in the course of that session to designate the year 2001 C.E. the “United Nations Year of Dialogue Among Civilizations”, so that humanity begins the new millennium with a determination to build a better tomorrow based on dialogue and mutual respect\textsuperscript{3}.

Media is an important factor and plays a role in shaping public opinion, they have great potential to facilitate the dialogue among civilizations by expanding the public’s knowledge about the belief systems and the practices of other cultural, religious, ethnic, and social groups. This potential, however, is not automatically realized, as the media operate under various constraints, such as financial limitations and strong

\textsuperscript{1} “UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations”, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{2} Kofi Annan, “Dialogue among Civilizations”, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{3} Draft Resolution in UN General Assembly.
competition, commercial marketing considerations, ideological biases on
the part of individual media, a public demand for sensational and "exotic"
news, or a growing demand for visual material. These constraints, more
often than not, lead to a shortsighted, one-dimensional, stereotypical, and
biased coverage of events in other cultures.1

Media professionals should realize the need of informing the public
and its potential to foster justice, peace and mutual respect among different
cultural, religious, ethnic and social groups, nationally and
internationally.2

In facilitating dialogue among civilizations, it remains to be true
that in inter-civilizational dialogue, face-to-face direct communication
serves as the best tool to rectify distorted, stereotypical views about other
groups of people or events in other cultures, formed on the basis of
information received indirectly, e.g. through the media.3 Media should
cooperate closely among themselves at the local, national, regional and
international levels to implement inter-civilizational dialogue effectively.

So far the only response of United Nations is seen when they
identified the year 2001, the first of the new millennium, as dedicated to a
"Dialogue (rather than clash) Among Civilizations".4

1 Walid Abdelnasser, "The Media and Dialogue Among Civilizations".
2 Idem
3 Idem
4 Hans van der Diessen, "Dialogue among Civilizations", International Journal on
   World Peace, Vol.: 18, Issue: 1, Professors World Peace Academy, 2001, p. 3.
3.2.4 Islamic Approach towards Dialogue

Carriers of Islamic humanism understand the spirit of dialogue and participate in creating a more humane world, a more dignifying world in which people can live\(^1\). Surely, the Qur'ân teaches to be dutiful towards humanity and building a better human society in a safer and purer world of justice and solidarity.

Example is that of the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO) in seeking to spread the values of dialogue among civilizations, invites elites of intellectuals and academics of the world to participate in international symposia held on this subject and urges other international organizations and bodies concerned with this field, to collaborate with ISESCO in this vital area, in order to entrench the culture of dialogue among civilizations designed to salvage humanity from the dangers threatening it, as a result of attempts to push civilizations and cultures towards conflict instead of dialogue\(^2\).

Islamic perspective on worldview / International relations is an organized system of ideas and perspectives about the human being and his or her role in the world. Although Islamic World Order is a concrete and practical way of understanding (hermeneutics) of the world (worldview), it should not be understood as a model of a sociopolitical system that must be concretized in given historical circumstances.

---

\(^1\) Ismail Bardhi, "Islamic Humanism: A Foundation for Interreligious Dialogue", p. 68.

\(^2\) "Dialogue among Civilizations for Coexistence".
President Khatami believed that at the beginning of the twenty-first century C.E. the need was for the creation of a new civilization. However, his call for dialogue must be seen within the context of his particular worldview, which differs from that of many in America and Europe. Many in the West assume that dialogue with the West means that eventually non-Western peoples will see the advantages of Western Civilization and become more westernized. This would be a complete misunderstanding of Khatami’s vision of dialogue, which is not a passive policy of accommodation but a competitive strategy for strengthening and transforming Islamic Civilization. It transcends a vision of justice and offers a way to avoid destructive conflict. Dialogue with the West is an important way of strengthening Islam. Khatami’s vision holds out the hope that, as the West evolves and possibly declines, Islam will regain its position as the leading progressive world civilization. The first concern should be to uphold the right of peoples to self-determination guaranteed by Divine laws and human principles.

Active as intellectuals and politicians, Anwar Ibrahim, former deputy prime minister of Malaysia, Mohammad Khatami, former president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and Abdurrahman Wahid, former president of Indonesia, have played important roles in defining the terms for an intercivilizational dialogue, rather than a clash of civilizations. At the same time, each takes a position that is uniquely different from the West’s, reflective of his own culture and political environment. Though all

---

1 John L. Esposito, *Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam*, p. 139.
three object to concepts of development that presume the desirability of Western secularization for Islam societies, they recognize the strengths and weaknesses of Western-style modernity. Thus, they advocate an active two-way dialogue among civilizations, especially between Islam and the West.¹

'Summit of the Organization of the Islamic Conference' on 7-8 December, 2005 C.E. in its Makkah Declaration, emphasized the imperative of positive interaction, dialogue and understanding among cultures and religions, and rejected the concept of war and disharmony, which breed mistrust and diminish the grounds for peaceful interaction among nations.²

### 3.2.5 Effects of Dialogue

Since the end of the Cold War, China has launched an all-directional dialogue diplomacy and taken an active part in multidimensional and multi-leveled dialogues in various forms.

Zi Zhongyun (former Director of the Institute of American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences) explained the phenomenon this way, “Differences in cultures themselves should not have sparked conflicts, the real culprit was the attitude toward other cultures.” She added that, “Conflicts or wars related to beliefs, thoughts or ideologies

---


were actually driven by interests, which used religion or ideology just as an excuse; in other cases, they may be traced to ignorance, arrogance or biased narrow-mindedness, which regard the beliefs and cultures of other nations as heathen cults"\(^1\).

The West is nothing more than a moral wasteland as held by writers. Crime, depravity, and licentiousness are the order of the day. It is a lost society of aimless wandering souls\(^2\). It is against this background, "we must engage ourselves in civilizational dialogue", comments Anwar Ibrahim, "for we fear that protracted mutual miscomprehension will lead to a supplanting of the Cold War with more insidious forms of confrontation"\(^3\). Indeed, this dialogue has become an imperative at a time when the world has shrunk into a global village. For it is a pre-condition for the establishment of a *convencia*, a harmonious and enriching experience of living together among people of diverse religions and cultures.

President Khatami said that "among the worthiest achievements" of the twentieth century C.E. are the "acceptance of the necessity and significance of dialogue and rejection of force". Elevation of human civilization, whether at national or international level, "is contingent upon dialogue among societies and civilizations representing various views,  

\(^1\) Shen Qurong, "Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations", p. 4.  
\(^3\) Idem
inclinations and approaches”. If humanity at the beginning of the new century and millennium “devotes all efforts to institutionalizing dialogue, replacing hostility and confrontation with discourse and understanding, it would leave an invaluable legacy for the benefit of the future generations”¹. Former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali said that only through sustained state-to-state dialogue and exchange of views, would it be possible to promote democratization of international relations, which would serve as the foundation of the world peace. He added, “War and conflicts originate in human hearts and minds. We should hold dialogue with souls of the people ... our hopes for a new type of interstate relationship may be realized through cross cultural exchanges and dialogue”².

Looking at history it could be inferred that Muslims and Christians are burdened by the legacy of their not so pure past, but they need to come to the encounter, dialogue and interaction. As Albert Hourani saw so clearly, “We are creatures who face four directions simultaneously. Backward and forward in time, inward and outward in space. And here at the intersection of these four fronts — the crux we live — we are continuously with what from the past we need to let go of and what we need to retain, what from the future we must respond to and to that to

which we must say no. These are certainly questions that confront the Muslims and the Christian in the present solution”¹.

If we study history more carefully, there would be no problem to see how this rule of dialogue clearly leads us to the area of culture, because dialogue is, indeed, a cultural phenomena; it is a fruit of reasonable human activity, not just a coincidence².

A truly historical and particularized notion of the world would suggest that cultural change is a reality and that this is especially true where a dialogue with other civilizations is happening³. Civilizations should learn from other civilizations, then only can they be universal. Huntington proposes that the West is in no position to learn from other civilizations because it assimilates immigrants willingly. This proves that the West is arrogant and it should not try to universalize its culture as explained by Huntington in his historical, *The Clash of Civilizations*.

Two opposing features seem to dominate today’s society. On one hand, there is a trend toward homogenization the likes of which we have not seen before. On the other hand, we have also seen the blossoming of identities where we had groupings and commonalities, the rise of many

---


different voices demanding to be heard and the claim to participation made by smaller and smaller units, even by groups as small as one individual\(^1\).

Dialogues either among civilizations, cultures or states all have a long history. Yet it is difficult to portray the last century as a period of dialogues. Rather last century gave birth to a period of confrontation. This confrontation already gave rise to two world wars and a Cold War lasting over four decades, putting human society into immense disasters and sufferings. The 1980s were a big blow and it was only a decade ago that America and the former Soviet Union met a strategic balance. It was the time when the developed countries and the developing world was involved in a certain kind of dialogue\(^2\). This was the period of search but at the same time there was the larger backdrop of tensions between the West and East Europe.

Conclusively, the 1990s were marked by indignities suffered by those caught in conflicts incited and justified by individuals — be they leaders or followers — on the basis of ethnic, religious, tribal, cultural, gender or other perceived differences. Those who committed these indignities presented them first as the consequences of social, political, economic and other diversities; then they attributed them to a collectivity;

---

\(^1\) Elena Krivosheina, “Dialogue among Civilizations as the Pathway to Peace”, p. 1.

and third they told us they were 'unavoidable'. Now we have to ask ourselves, "Is it possible to avoid clash of civilizations through dialogue?"

3.3 Fundamentalism

3.3.1 Introduction

The activist affirmation of a particular faith that defines faith in an absolutist and literalist manner is termed fundamentalism. It involves the effort to purify or reform the beliefs and practices of adherence in accord with the self-defined fundamentals of the faith. Fundamentalist interpretation entails a self-conscious effort to avoid compromise, adaptation, or critical reinterpretation of the basic texts and sources of belief. Fundamentalism is a distinctive way of defining and implementing a particular worldview and fundamentalisms are most frequently presented as styles of religious experience within broader religious traditions.

In Christianity, fundamentalists are "Born again" and "Bible-believing" Protestants, as opposed to "Mainline", "liberal", "modernist" Protestants, who represent "Churchianity"; in Islam they are jama'at (party) self-consciously engaged in jihad against Western culture that suppresses authentic Islam (submission) and the shari'ah (path); in Judaism they are Haredi (Torah-true Jews); and they have their equivalents in

---

1 Elena Krivosheina, "Dialogue among Civilizations as the Pathway to Peace", p. 2.


3 Belief in the Church as the only authority.
Hinduism and other world religions. These groups insisting on a sharp boundary between themselves and the faithful adherents of other religions, and finally between a "sacred" view of life and the "secular" world and "nominal religion". Fundamentalists direct their critiques toward and draw most of their converts from the larger community of their religion, by attempting to convince them that they are not experiencing the authentic version of their professed religion.

In his book, *Defenders of God*, Bruce Lawrence defines "fundamentalism" as: "The affirmation of religious authority as holistic and absolute, admitting of neither criticism nor reduction; it is expressed through the collective demand that specific creedal and ethical dictates derived from the scriptures be publicly recognized and legally enforced".

It has become a common practice to define fundamentalism as — and to quote Richard Stephen Humphreys —

[T]he affirmation, in a radically changed environment, of traditional modes of understanding and behaviour. In contrast to conservatism or traditionalism, which assumes that things can and should go as much as they have for generations past. Fundamentalism recognizes and tries to speak to a changed milieu, and altered atmosphere of expectations. Fundamentalism is by no means a blind opponent of social change, but it insists that change

---


must be governed by traditional values and modes of understanding.

"Fundamentalist" connotes a certain kind of believer who wishes to form or defend a state or society based in some explicit way upon sacred history, customs, traditions, and moral obligations. Yet there are both moderate fundamentalists.

"Fundamentalism" is quite often also attributed to activists within the religious community who oppose, through word and deed, injustices within a political society, and who seek to find legitimization for their condemnation of such injustices from within a decidedly religious value structure. Depicting the testimony and conduct of such activists as a manifestation of fundamentalism is mostly intended to discredit those actors.

Robert Wuthnow has called it "one of the defining elements of the religious mosaic" in our period. Some have even claimed that fundamentalism was "the religious phenomenon of the twentieth

---


century"¹. At present, fundamentalism serves as a transforming force in all of the major traditions of the world. Arguably it will be among the most important religious movements of the twenty-first century C.E.².

For many, "fundamentalism conjures up images of mobs shouting 'death to America', 'embassies in flames', 'assassins' and 'hijackers threatening innocent lives', 'hands chopped off', and 'women oppressed'"³.

"Fundamentalism" is a morally charged, emotive term, often used as a term of opprobrium, particularly in combination with other epithets (as in the phrase "Muslim fundamentalists" and "right-wing fundamentalists")⁴.

In current parlance, "fundamentalism" in matters of religion has acquired a distinctly negative connotation. As commonly understood, fundamentalism is associated with certain trends within a particular religious community. Precise definition of fundamentalism within these general confines seems impossible. Martin Marty and Scott Appleby therefore suggested another way to define fundamentalism, namely "as a

⁴ "Fundamentalism", Wikipedia.
generalized tendency, a habit of mind, that may inspire a variety of specific activities". \(^1\)

Nevertheless the term, in the Christian world, is synonymous with the 'Bible Thumpers' and the tele evangelists\(^2\).

Many scholars have questioned the use of the term 'fundamentalism' as an analytical category in the comparative study of religious movements. Their criticism tends to revolve around the following points:

- The term 'fundamentalist' is both polemical and prejudicial, insofar as it portrays all those who refuse to dilute the fundamental tenets of their religions as bigots and fanatics;
- The term is of Protestant origin and to apply it in other religious contexts distorts the true nature of the movements so described; and
- The term is used to refer to such a wide range of movements that it glosses over many of their distinctive features\(^3\).

A term like "fanaticism" might be apposite, because it refers not to a set of beliefs held, but to a manner of holding any belief. Fundamentalism

---


had historically began life as a designation for Christian opponents of modernism¹.

Fanaticism is the triumph of reflex over reflection. It differs from the more primitive reflexes in that it is conditioned — contingent on symbols rather than sensory stimuli — but it is reflex nonetheless: an absolute, fixed, undifferentiated, immediate response of the organism to a set of self-selected signals. As a variety of reflex, fanaticism is deeply rooted in human behavior; reflection, on the other hand, is as yet only tenuously established — for we were first reacting organisms, and only lately, reasonable men. To be human, however, means to reflect: to delay, critique, analyze, modify our responses to sensory and symbolic reality. For it is through this process that we gain that measure of control — not so much over environment, but over self — which distinguishes us from the beasts. The human enterprise flourishes, then, to the extent that our reflexes — including such symbolic reflexes as fanaticism — are brought within our control through the development of our capacity to reflect. And the human enterprise is threatened when the roots of reflection — the rational process — are for one or another reason allowed to atrophy, or worse, come under subtle or direct attack².

Paul Merritt Bassett in *Grolier's Academic American Encyclopedia* writes:

Fundamentalism is a term popularly used to describe strict adherence to Christian doctrines based on a literal interpretation of the Bible. This usage derives from a late nineteenth and early twentieth century transdenominational Protestant movement that opposed the accommodation of Christian doctrine to modern scientific theory and philosophy. With some differences among themselves, fundamentalists insist on belief in the inerrancy of the Bible, the virgin birth and divinity of Jesus Christ, the vicarious and atoning character of his death, his bodily resurrection, and his second coming as the irreducible minimum of authentic Christianity. This minimum was reflected in such early declarations as the 14-point creed of the Niagara Bible Conference of 1878 and the 5-point statement of the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1910\(^1\).

Bertrand Russell says

> Reason may be a small force, but it is constant and works always in one direction, while the forces of unreason destroy one another in futile strife. Therefore every orgy of unreason in the end strengthens the friends of reason, and shows afresh that they are the only true friends of humanity\(^2\).

---


Peter Huff wrote in the International Journal on World Peace:

According to Antoun, fundamentalists in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, despite their doctrinal and practical differences, are united by a common worldview which anchors all of life in the authority of the sacred and a shared ethos that expresses itself through outrage at the pace and extent of modern secularization.

One can discern a common thread running through all the twentieth and twenty-first century C.E. Christian, Jewish, and Islamic movements commonly called fundamentalist: despite obvious differences, all of these movements have insisted on strict conformity to sacred texts and a moral code based on these texts.

3.3.2 Chronology

New ideas such as democracy, secularism, nationalism, secular education, a new concept of the state, and the separation of religion and politics entered into the Arab-Muslim lands only after Napoleonic conquest of Egypt in 1798 C.E. and the following conquest of Syria in 1799 C.E. The response of Muslim intellectuals during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to those new ideas and practices ranged from complete support to absolute rejection. Some chose to reject as *bid'ah* (deviation /

---


distortion) anything that was foreign to Islam, while others insisted upon embracing ideas and innovations from Europe, even if they defied Islam¹.

3.3.3 Historical Development

Fundamentalism arose as a religious movement among conservative members of various Protestant denominations early in the twentieth century C.E., with the object of maintaining traditional interpretations of the Bible and of the doctrines of the Christian faith in the face of Darwinian evolution, secularism, and the emergence of liberal theology². The term itself is borrowed from the “Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy” which appeared early in the twentieth century C.E. within the Protestant churches of the United States, and continued in earnest through the 1920s³.

The present generation of fundamentalism studies, begun in the late twentieth century C.E., grew out of the history of religions and the social sciences. Here “fundamentalism” functions as a heuristic device teasing into relief typological “family resemblances” that unite religious protest


³ “Fundamentalism”, Wikipedia.
movements across the globe. Fundamentalism is treated as one way to be religious in the contemporary world. Fundamentalism has been a significant political force in the United States since the 1920s.

Fundamentalism was the religious phenomenon of the twentieth century C.E., the wider ecumenism can no longer afford to ignore it or abhor it. It may be the religious phenomenon of this century, too.

Fundamentalism as a religio-political ideology can be found all over the world. As a significant political movement aspiring to create a religious state it can be found in about thirty nations, but as a dominant power it exists in very few countries.

Fundamentalism may not be as potent a force as some thought in the 1980s, but it remains an important religious, social and political phenomenon. In a world of wrenching change and uncertainty, millions of people will continue to turn to fundamentalist movements in their search for a more secure and morally-grounded social order.

The term “fundamentalist” was first used with reference to a group of US Protestant churches that arose in the 1920s. For many liberal or
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mainline Christians, the term “fundamentalist” is pejorative. It is applied rather indiscriminately to all those who advocate a literalist Biblical position. Generally, fundamentalists are regarded by their opponents as static, retrospective, and extremist. Three decades ago, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* described them as “a motley group of theologically conservative communities which emphasize total and even literal inspiration from the Holy Scriptures and their absolute authority in matters of faith and works”· The term eventually came to be used for all religious movements that seek to return to “fundamentals” and to any movement seeking political power for the purpose of governing according to religious values.

The name fundamentalist was coined in 1920 C.E., to designate those “doing battle royal for the Fundamentals”. Curtis Lee Laws, editor of a conservative publication entitled *Watchman-Examiner* is credited with coining the term “fundamentalism”.

History reports the birth of fundamentalism when a group protesting “modernist” tendencies in the churches circulated a 12-volume publication called ‘The Fundamentals’ (1909 C.E. – 1912 C.E.), by 64 British and American scholars and preachers... in which five points of doctrine were set forth as fundamental: the Virgin birth, the physical
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resurrection of Jesus, the infallibility of the Scriptures, the substitutional atonement, and the physical second coming of Christ. With this fundamentalists and modernists entered into a regular debate with some special cases like so-called Monkey Trial (1925 C.E.), when the fundamentalist leader William Jennings Bryan won Tennessee’s case against J. T. Scopes, for teaching evolution in the public schools.

The Christian theologian Paul Enns writes:

Historically, fundamentalism has been used to identify one holding to the five fundamentals of the faith adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the USA in 1910 C.E. The five fundamentals were the miracles of Christ, the virgin birth of Christ, the substitutionary atonement of Christ, the bodily resurrection of Christ, and the inspiration of Scripture.

The early twentieth century C.E. Christian fundamentalists who believed they should live according to a strict, biblically based moral code, were outraged by the ‘higher criticism’ of the Bible, opposed the teaching of evolution, and supported the temperance movement.

The conventional wisdom is that after the Scopes trial of 1925 C.E., most Christian Fundamentalists avoided the political arena until the late 1970s. This is only partially true. Fundamentalists like Gerald B. Winrod
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(1900 C.E. – 1957 C.E.) and Gerald L. K. Smith (1898 C.E. – 1976 C.E.) ran for public office in the 1930s and 1940s on platforms that combined anti-Semitism, anticommunism, populism, and Christian revivalism. From the 1950s through the 1970s, fundamentalist preachers like Billy James Hargis combined similar themes with opposition to racial integration. Most Christian fundamentalists in the South opposed the civil rights movement and the federal government’s attempts to deny tax-exempt status to the many Christian schools founded to circumvent the court-ordered racial integration of public schools.

Fundamentalists were outraged by US Supreme Court rulings that legalized abortion and banned school prayer. The new Christian Right distanced itself from the racism that had marked earlier Christian fundamentalist movements in the South. Some would argue that to oppose abortion, feminism, and civil rights for homosexuals, and to sanction school prayer, is inevitably to oppose ‘modernity’. Religious conservatives called fundamentalists would respond that such an argument is biased and based on liberal religious and political assumptions. With the time, the fundamentalist impulse came to be ‘meshed with a militant form of nationalism in religious Zionism’.

One argument is that the term belonged only in the United States, where Protestant fundamentalist Curtis Lee Laws coined the term and
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where a famous nonfundamentalist minister, Harry Emerson Fosdick, once defined a fundamentalist as “a mad evangelical”\(^1\).

Unlike words like ‘zealot’ and ‘puritan’, which have transcended their original Jewish and Christian contexts, it is sometimes hard to separate the generic use of the term ‘fundamentalism’ from its original Protestant meaning. This is one reason most people would not speak of ‘Catholic fundamentalism’. Moreover, Protestant fundamentalists have traditionally condemned Catholicism as an illegitimate perversion of Christianity, so the very phrase ‘Catholic fundamentalism’ seems absurd. Yet to compare Catholic conservatism with other forms of religious conservatism, both militant and moderate, is useful\(^2\).

It is a very strange expression. Marxism is the ideas of Marx, and nationalism is the nation conceived as some sort of ideal identity. What is fundamentalism the idea of? What is this “fundament” promoted to an “ism”? It is slippery stuff whatever it is. It might, for example, refer to the irrational attachment some people have to a few basic ideas from which all conduct is said to follow. This indeed seems to be one of its meanings. Or, it might refer to having any deeply held beliefs at all. But what fundamentalism actually means in the conventional wisdom of the moment is beliefs generated by some old text. In other words, “fundamentalism” is an all-purpose expression denigrating the peoples of
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the Book (as the Muslims call them). Anyone who takes the Qur’ân seriously falls under the terminological lash of ‘terrorism-inducing’ fundamentalism¹.

In the late twentieth century C.E., the term ‘fundamentalist’ was often applied to three main trends in Orthodox Judaism: militant religious Zionism, Ashkenazi ultra-Orthodoxy, and the Sephardic (Middle Eastern) ultra-Orthodoxy represented by the Shas Party. All three groups stress the need for conformity to sacred texts and to a moral code based on such texts, and they have all played important roles in Israeli politics².

Strictly speaking, of course, the concept of “fundamentalism” is properly limited to a movement in conservative American Protestantism which began in the early twentieth century C.E. As Nancy Ammerman’s superb essay shows, the strains of industrialization in the United States led to an attempt to return to the “fundamentals” of the faith. It is this reaction to modernity that provides much of the intellectual scaffolding³.

In the 1970s, '80s, and '90s, however, fundamentalism again became an influential force in the United States. The term fundamentalist has also been used to describe members of ‘militant’ Islamic groups⁴.
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It is important to underscore the fact that fundamentalism, as an aspiration to return to the bases (fundamentals) of the religion, is not exclusively a Muslim experience. Christianity has also had similar aspirations. Various fundamentalist groups, mainly from the end of the nineteenth century C.E. to the present, have emerged in Christianity. Christians proved to be the worst in the name of fundamentalists, when once a Christian community rejected for a patient to receive blood from another person. They would rather see the patient die during surgery than to accept a transfusion. Christian fundamentalists did it in the name of following Jesus' teachings and they wanted to become an example in society, which could be followed by many. Among them, for example, is the Charismatic Group in the Catholic Church.

3.3.4 Development of Islamic Fundamentalism

With the emergence of Islamic fundamentalists, the second and third generation of nationalist leaders found it very difficult to hold the fort. The basic argument of the fundamentalists is this: the idea of secularism is Western in origin. The imperialistic West sold its idea of secularism to the nationalist leaders of the newly independent states so that the West could dominate the indigenous culture and religion by proxy. After the breakup of the Soviet Union and the failure of the West to solve
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all the problems of humankind — because the West is basically areligious and devoid of morality — there was a renewed challenge to the Western value system. A belief grew among the majority people of Western Asia and sub-Saharan Africa that Islam should go back to its roots to find an alternative to Western life, culture, values, and institutions.

Karen Armstrong in *Muhammad — A Biography of the Prophet*, said:

Another theme of the new fundamentalism has been an attempt to get Islamic history back on the right track and to make the ummah effective and strong once again. The Iranian revolution was not just an atavistic return to the past, but an attempt to impose decent values in Iran again.

Fundamentalism, however, is stronger than it might otherwise have been, particularly in Islamic third-world countries, because the United States’ fear of communism led it to support any alternative, including fundamentalism, which previously had been only a fringe movement. The United States also had another reason for supporting fundamentalism — namely, vast quantities of Arab oil, mostly in more conservative Arabic countries such as Saudi Arabia — and it did not want to threaten the American investments there.
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The result was that money from both the U.S. government and U.S. businesses (as well as those of some other Western countries) supported Islamic fundamentalism. The most noticeable result of this effort was the defeat of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan by a coalition of forces, made up mostly of Islamic fundamentalists. The defeat caused tremendous disillusionment in the Soviet Union.

One of the after-effects of the collapse of communism has been the growing influence of fundamentalism. In fact, some of the same forces that in the past led to the growth of communism have now resulted in individuals embracing fundamentalism. This is particularly true in the Islamic world, which has been undergoing a period of rapid change over the past fifty years. Though Westernization and modernization have benefitted many, particularly members of the upper economic and professional classes, it has unsettled even larger numbers. When such changes took place in the United States and other Western countries in the nineteenth and first part of the twentieth centuries, it gave rise to movements ranging from secular socialism to the rebirth of Protestant fundamentalism, to utopian dreaming.

In fact, Islamic fundamentalism thrived in France, in England, and to some extent in the United States, and the fundamentalists funneled money and arms to their compatriots back home, often assisted by the Central Intelligence Agency as in Oliver North’s arms deals. As the
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United States began to slowly awaken to the dangers of its policy with the assassination of Sadat in Egypt and the fall of the Shah in Iran, it began to withdraw some support. The United States supported Saddam Hussein and his efforts against Islamic fundamentalists. It also took some tentative steps toward ending West's long dispute with Syria. Since both Iraq and Syria claimed to be “secular” states, this marked some change in policy. Even when Saddam Hussein attacked Kuwait, the United States government was reluctant to force him to resign, fearful that his removal would make fundamentalist Iran more dangerous. Instead, a treaty was made that kept him in power, but then quarantined him so severely that in order to hold on to his own power, he began to rely on some of the very fundamentalist Islamic groups that he had previously condemned. He even tried to lessen the gap between the Iranians and himself. It was probably not until the bombing of the World Trade Center that the American government finally realized the full extent of the danger it had helped create. Islamic fundamentalism was no longer a problem simply in Islamic countries — it had become one in America's own.

Finally, the United States can afford to pay less attention to Islamic fundamentalism. But the attempt to do it will almost certainly fail, and there is no better way to guarantee continued tension between Islam and the West.

1 Vern L. Bullough, “Some Thoughts on Islamic Fundamentalism”, p. 43.
3.3.5 Islamic Fundamentalism

Fundamentalism has become pressing concern in the past few years for various reasons like the major U.S. interests in oil, stability, American power, and the Arab-Israeli peace process. U.S. officials see fundamentalism as a potential threat to each of these\(^1\).

Ideologically ‘Islamic fundamentalists’ perceive the world as two broad but distinct realms: the community of believers and the non-Islamic world. While there are great variations and divisions within each of those worlds, policy toward one is radically different from policy toward the other\(^2\). All fundamentalist movements strive for the unification of the *ummah* and the implementation of *shari'ah*.

Secular groups as such cannot be called fundamentalists because they call upon its followers to make the ultimate sacrifice and that too without eternal rewards. The absence of the Ultimate affects thinking of those secular groups and their missions.

‘Islamic fundamentalists’ dedicate themselves to change their godless world but their impression is misrepresented globally. They are not active to reserve or recreate the past rather they are “progressives”, not conservatives; most people simply do not agree that the world they envision could be called “progress”. They have inhabited the modern
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material and technical world while attempting to cast off its pernicious, dehumanizing, materialistic philosophy\textsuperscript{1}.

These characteristics / traits which are termed as characters of Islamic fundamentalism were already there especially \emph{tajdid}. It is only lately that movements with these characteristics were dubbed by Western oriented media as ‘fundamentalists’. Some of the thinkers even welcomed this term and embraced this term as positive while others continue to question the applicability of this outside term.

In the long run, Islam represents, therefore, a movement towards economic reform, greater Islamic democracy, and popular government\textsuperscript{2}. Islamic fundamentalism, like Protestant fundamentalism, is more a religious response to the confusion of the modern world.

It should be made clear that neither Islam nor Islamic fundamentalism is, by definition, “anti-Western” or anti-American or against Christianity of Western civilization \emph{per se}. They are a reaction to American policies, especially Washington’s support for authoritarian regimes and the long history of U.S. military intervention\textsuperscript{3}.

Islamic fundamentalist movements adopt positions rejecting the simple copying of Western methods and affirming the comprehensive and effective nature of the Islamic message.

\textsuperscript{1} R. Scott Appleby & Martin E. Marty, “Fundamentalism”, pp. 18-19.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 37-38.
Tawhid has become for the fundamentalists the thread that weaves together all the materials of politics, economics, ethics, theology, and all other aspects of life. Because, God the source of knowledge and of matter, is the Creator of both, He is given the Ultimate say in political life as well. Man, they contend, should submit only to God; this submission is not only theological as understood by traditional thinkers, medieval and modern, but more importantly, the fundamentalists endow this concept of tawhid with ultimate political significance. Their insistence on subjecting the political regime to religion leads them even to consider as infidel and unqualified to rule those individuals who disregard either the establishment or the maintenance of the state on the basis of God's governance.

There is no doubt that modern fundamentalist movements have emerged as a response to the perceived failures of secularism and as a reaction to the governments that postulate a separation of religion and state, or impose laws that contradict the sharī'ah.

Islamic Civilization is not destined to clash with the rest of the world, and Islamic fundamentalists in power do not necessarily represent a threat to international security and peace because most Islamic fundamentalists have no ambition other than the most anodyne desire for
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justice. In this respect, Islamic fundamentalism ought to matter no more to the non-Muslim world than Quebecois nationalism matters to Thailand.

Islam and in particular Muslim fundamentalists are considered to be an international threat to Europe and to the West as a whole. The reason is that Islam has once again gained strength and is now considered by many as the solution and the only alternative. Consequently, many Muslims have reacted negatively towards local supportive groups of imperialism and towards the Westernization, which tries in various ways to impose itself over Islamic societies. Islamic fundamentalism is active at both national and international levels.

In addition, the diffuse nature of Islamic fundamentalism and the disunity among such fundamentalists suggests that a Middle East dominated by fundamentalism would be less of a problem for the United States than a secular dictator with illusions of grandeur. As the Persian Gulf war ought to have demonstrated, there is a far greater likelihood that U.S. hegemony will be diminished by secular autocrats than by Islamist
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puritans. There is a long history of Saddam Husseins. Khomeinis, however, are far more unusual, and Khomeini’s Iran never posed the kind of military challenge to the region that Hussain’s Iraq had1.

Saudi Arabia and Iran are fundamentalist regimes, yet the Saudis are friends, not enemies. To confuse matters even more, it was Saddam Hussain’s secularist, modernized Iraq — not clericalist, Islamist, “revolutionary” Iran — that twice in a decade mounted aggressions that threatened to upset the West’s position in the Persian Gulf2.

Saudi Arabia and fundamentalist Iran have created far fewer difficulties for the United States than has either secular Iraq or divided Lebanon. While relations between Iran and the United States are not likely to be warm, little is gained by current policy toward Iran3.

In Iran, the figure who is thought to have played the most important part in the radicalization of Shi’ite youth in the recent past was neither a mulla (Muslim priest) nor an ayatullah (high ranking Shi’i) but rather a Sorbonne-trained sociologist, Ali Shariati. In Shariati’s writings, religion often assumes the aspect of a sociological instrument, a means to resist the versions of modernity he had witnessed in France4.

1 Zachary Karahell, “Fundamental Misconceptions: Islamic Foreign Policy”, pp. 81-82.
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Those troubled by the fundamentalist Islamic groups find political Islam anti-democratic, absolutist, narrowly focused and anti-Western (particularly anti-American). They view Islamic shari'ah as clearly opposed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, democratic governance, religious tolerance, ethnic diversity and political pluralism.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, European powers colonized and conquered most of the Islamic world. By the mid-1950s, most predominantly Muslim countries were independent, but the Islamic world remained relatively weak, and many Muslims saw the establishment of Israel in 1948 as a manifestation of their weakness vis-a-vis the West. Meanwhile, the fundamentalists argued that if Muslims once again obeyed the laws of God, they would again be strong and capable of defeating not only Israel, but all the Western powers. This argument was made, for example, in 1972 C.E. by Ayatullah Khomeini, the leader of Iran’s Islamic Revolution of 1978 C.E. – 1979 C.E.

Similarly, if we consider the public statements and writings of Osama bin Laden, we find that while he too clearly rejects the idea of a modern secular state in which everyone has equal rights regardless of their religious and sexual identities, he became politically active as a result of his resentment of Western domination — not because of his rejection of
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'modernity'. From 1979 C.E. to 1989 C.E., he actively supported the resistance to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, which he saw as a jihad1.

In 1996 C.E., after the Gulf War, bin Laden told Robert Fisk, "Now the people understand the speeches of the 'ulama' in the mosques—that the Land of the two Holy places (Saudi Arabia) has become an American colony. They act decisively with every action to kick the Americans out of Saudi Arabia"2.

Several forms of fundamentalism promote revivalist movements of various religions, but internationally, Islamic fundamentalism is the most pronounced and widespread3.

At the core of Islamic fundamentalism is the argument that success and victory are signs of God's favour, while failure and defeat are signs of His wrath. (This logic is of course also found in conservative Judaism and Christianity). This means that when Muslims obeyed God's commandments, He enabled them to create great empires and civilizations; when they ceased to obey Divine law, they became weak and God enabled the infidels of Europe, and later the United States and Israel, to subjugate them4.

1 Henry Munson, "'Fundamentalism' Ancient & Modern", p. 38.
4 Henry Munson, "'Fundamentalism' Ancient & Modern", pp. 36-37.
During the Cold War, some Muslim intellectuals in the Middle East and North Africa worked very hard to portray Islam as a “third way” between Karl Marx’s proletarian utopia and Adam Smith’s capitalist bliss. The overall reaction, was one of indifference, if not disbelief. Since the 1979 C.E. Iranian Revolution, however, Islamic fundamentalism has been depicted as a serious challenge not only to the established Western-oriented order in many secular Muslim countries, but to the West itself. Concern over this threat has sparked a global debate on the nature and implications of Islam as a new political force for change¹.

Because Islamic fundamentalism is expansive within the *ummah* and limited without, U.S. policymakers have framed notions that fundamentalists do not abide by international norms in foreign affairs².

Similarly the intellectual progenitors of religious extremism in Egypt, Hasan al-Bana and Sayyid Qutb, were not educated in traditional religious institutions. Both were graduates of the *Dar al-‘Ulûm*, or House of Sciences, in Cairo, an institution described as a “modernist teacher training institute”. Sayyid Qutb first made his name as a literary figure, a writer of fiction and critic who was actively involved in debates centered on questions of literary modernism in Cairo of the 1930s and 40s. Like the Anagarika Dharmapala in Sri Lanka before him, he began his career in the educational bureaucracy. His bosses in Egypt's Ministry of Public


² Zachary Karabell, “Fundamental Misconceptions: Islamic Foreign Policy”, p. 82.
Instruction sent him to America in 1948 C.E., apparently in the hope that he would be won over by American ways. His discovery of his religious mission is said to have occurred as he stood on the deck of the liner that was carrying him to New York.

Islamic fundamentalist foreign policies are an opposition to Israel and a rejection of U.S. hegemony in international politics. The two are linked, since the existence of the state of Israel is seen by many as the most naked example of Western imperialism and intrusion on the ummah. “The Islamic Republic”, said Khomenei, “opposes the hegemony of the United States and its influence and interference in Islamic countries and in all oppressed countries”. In this view, the international system is the creation of the West and its current standard-bearer, the United States. The rules of the international system — the rules of realism and state power — work to the disadvantage.

Of course, fundamentalist leaders act and interpret within the bounds of tradition because fundamentalist leaders may be charismatic, like Sayyid Qutb, Sheikh Muhammad Hussain Fadlallah, Hizbullah’s spiritual guide, or they may not be. In other words, such leaders’ appeal for potential recruits is their continuity with the ancient religious tradition, which they claim to uphold and defend. Thus fundamentalists
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are different from cult leaders such as Branch Davidian leader David Koresh, Jim Jones in Guyana, or Aum Shinrikyo’s Shoko Asahara because the cultic leaders have decisively broken with tradition, in rhetoric as well as behaviour.1

There is considerable disagreement about what precisely constitutes “Islamic fundamentalism”. At one time or another the label “fundamentalist” has been attached to groups as diverse as Hamas in Israel/Palestine; Hizbullah in Lebanon; the Refah (Welfare) Party in Turkey; the al-Nahda Party in Tunisia; the al-Ikhwan al-Muslimum (Muslim Brotherhood) in Egypt, Jordan, and Syria; the Armed Islamic Group (GIA) in Algeria; and the Jama‘at-i-Islami in Pakistan. In the Muslim World, according to Western ideology, fundamentalism ranges from pietist organizations to revolutionary groups committed to the violence.2

On one side are largely secular governments; on the other, there are individuals and groups who believe that politics and religion are one and who reject the secular Western division between the state and religion. As the scholar Nazih Ayubi has observed, for fundamentalists, Islam is understood as dīn (a religion), duniya (a way of life), and dawla (a state). Fundamentalists call for a return to pure Islam. They simply want to replace secular, civil law with the shari‘ah, and they view the modern state
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system in the Islamic world as an illegitimate and immoral division of the ummah\(^1\).

In the 1970s most Muslim analysts rejected the term “fundamentalism” as an identifying label for the movements of Islamic affirmation. By the 1990s, however, Muslim critics of fundamentalism began to use the term in political and scholarly debates and some supporters also accepted the term, recognizing its wide use and visibility. Writers in Arabic by the 1980s began to use the term Usūliyyah, an Arabic neologism that is a direct translation of “fundamentalism” based on usūl, the Arabic word for “fundamentals”. In this way “fundamentalism” became a part of the vocabulary of the Islamic resurgence itself as well as of study of that resurgence\(^2\).

U.S. government claims to be the champion of democracy and free elections but turns a blind eye on 1991 C.E. in validation and subsequent cancellation of democratic elections in Algeria, when the Islamic Salvation Front won at the ballot box and appeared poised to assume control of the parliament\(^3\). This was not terrorist attempt at all in their view. And yet, a concept denoting something like American fundamentalism seems clearly appropriate\(^4\).
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Fundamentalists have reason to react negatively to the support of Western powers, especially the United States, to Israel, a state considered hostile to the Muslim world. Islamic fundamentalists emphasize the need to end such “puppet” governments to stop the spread of Western culture into Muslim societies and to create an Islamic state under the laws of the *shari'ah*, the principles of the Qur'an, and the Sunnah. This is their major objective. The Western response *de facto* have been designed to defame, insult, and make erroneous generalizations about the Muslim world by blaming Muslims. Muslims were being started labeled as ‘violent’ and ‘aggressive’, ‘terrorists’, ‘against modernization’, and ‘illogical people’. As James Piscatori points out:

Islam was hostile to the West because it was fanatical ...

Consequently, Muslims came to be seen as a uniformly emotional and sometimes illogical race that moved as a one body and spoke with one voice.

This description gives the image of Muslims that has been fostered in the United States and disseminated worldwide by the international press. There is no doubt that this false image defames Muslim societies. It reflects the West’s ignorance of the Islamic world. Moreover, Muslims are
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not a race, nor are they all emotional and illogical. Imperialism and colonialism restricted Muslim societies to utilize their own resources. Behind this was the reason for resentment, antagonism, and opposition to the West. At the same time, undoubtedly, there is an economic, technological, and scientific dependency upon the West. This resulted in confrontations between the two cultures. The West has also reacted to this clash by portraying stereotypes and racism against Islam in general, and against 'fanatical' Muslims in particular.

There is one common portrayal of Muslim fundamentalists that they are committed to handling every situation with violence in the name of *jihad* with the non-Muslim world. And there seems to be a consensus among Western powers that fundamentalism poses a threat to the international system. Thus fundamentalism is thought of a ‘dangerous’ and ‘volatile’ force at international level. Thereby, misunderstanding Islamic fundamentalists.

Christian minorities in Muslim countries like Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and Palestine are aware that they are free citizens because those societies respect freedom specifically of conscience and religion. This has encouraged cultural pluralism in those lands, which

---


3 Zachary Karabell, “Fundamental Misconceptions: Islamic Foreign Policy”, p. 76.

enabled these Christians, despite being minorities, to ascend the social ladder and even to occupy important administrative positions. This is proof of the tolerance that has characterized Islam for centuries. A.R. Cornelius, a Catholic in Pakistan, who served as a member of the Supreme Court for 17 years, is an excellent example.

3.3.6 Application in General

For many years the term "fundamentalism" was applied almost exclusively to this particular Christian tradition. By the 1970s, as scholars and the general public became increasingly aware of the resurgence of religion in many different societies, the term began to be applied to movements of religious revival in a wide variety of contexts. People spoke of Hindu and Jewish fundamentalism and, in the context of the ideological debates of the 1990s, it was even possible for a major scholar such as Ernest Gellner to speak of "Enlightenment Secular Fundamentalism" when describing the position that both rejected relativism and denied the possibility of revelation. When applied to non-Christians, the term mostly denoted individuals and movements in the Islamic resurgence of the final quarter of the twentieth century C.E. By the 1990s the phrase

---


“Muslim fundamentalism” (or “Islamic fundamentalism”) was widely used in both scholarly and journalistic literature.

By the 1930s many fundamentalists began to withdraw into independent churches and splinter denominations, and fundamentalism became identified in the public mind with anti-intellectualism and extremism. Many fundamentalists rejected this image, and a movement was begun in the late 1940s to present their position in both a more scholarly and popular way. This movement, known as neoevangelicalism (or, more simply, evangelicalism), sought a wider following from the major denominations through its various schools, youth programs, publications, and radio broadcasts. The separatists saw these efforts as compromising fundamentalist views and sought to disassociate themselves from these religious institutions and such well-known evangelical fundamentalists as Billy Graham.

“All Fundamentalism Is Religious” as it is true that fundamentalist groups expend enormous energies maintaining boundaries between the pure and impure. Indeed, some may be tempted to seek manifestations of “secular fundamentalism” in Marxism or Soviet-era state socialism, in the many virulent strains of nationalism in evidence today, or in the unqualified extremism of ideologically driven revolutionary or terrorist movements, from Peru’s ‘Shining Path’ to Germany’s ‘Baader-Meinhof

3 R. Scott Appleby & Martin E. Marty, Fundamentalism, p. 16.
gang'. In a similar vein, one might speak of "scientific fundamentalism" to connote the assumption, held by many modern scientists, that empirically based knowledge is the only reliable way of knowing reality.

Indira Gandhi, for example, was assassinated by Sikhs, a devout sect that can fairly be called fundamentalist. While the religious and political motives for the assassination have not yet been sorted out, the Sikhs desired greater autonomy for the Punjab and were resisting the creation of Khalistan and centralizing thrust of the New Delhi government.

Before the term fundamentalist was branded for Muslims, it was, and still is, being used by certain Christian denominations. Most of them are radical Baptist, Lutheran and Presbyterian groups. The Southern Baptist Convention is one such group, they take pride in being called the 'Fundamentalists'. Because, according to them, they have gone back to the fundamentals of Christianity. They want the Church to be the only authority. This reminds the modern man of the Dark Ages in Europe when the Church was in fact supreme.

Christian fundamentalists, who generally consider the term to be positive when used to refer to themselves, often strongly object to the placement of themselves and Islamist groups into a single category. There
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is however no objection to the term fundamentalist when used to describe only Christian groups, and objections to the term Muslim fundamentalist are much less strong.

American Christian fundamentalists claim that they are and always have been law-abiding citizens and don't like any comparison with others. "Why do you compare us to extremist Arabs and gun-toting Jewish settlers?" a fundamentalist friend once demanded. "We do not stockpile arms in the basement of Moody Bible School in Chicago!" Although they have been involved in abortion — clinic bombers and white supremacist or anti-government militia — neither of which qualify as fundamentalists because of their connections to organized Christianity — American Christian1.

With the word "fundamentalism" not everyone is at ease, and may be no one ever would want to be. Untutored onlookers wrongly conclude that all believers are fundamentalists, that all fundamentalists are terrorists, and therefore that every form of orthodox religion should be banished from public expression2.

Some newspapers avoid the term and refer to fundamentalist movements only as "extremist", "militant", or "fanatic". In the beginning readers had a hard time making out just what people were "extremist" about. Militias are militant but not often fundamentalist. Football fans can

---

1 R. Scott Appleby & Martin E. Marty, "Fundamentalism", p. 18.
2 Ibid., p. 20.
be fanatic\(^1\). But now one easily understands the words due to synonymical approach.

It is said that the attack on fundamentalism fights a war on two fronts. One of them is cognitive, the other normative. The cognitive attack is directed against the sacred texts to which religious believers appeal. The Qur'ān is bad because it blocks the moral degradations generated by our ever-changing society\(^2\). The second attack on fundamentalism is normative. It affirms toleration as the highest value. Tolerating the tolerant presents no problems\(^3\).

They, ironically, observe that what distinguishes the Islamist leaders is "political activism rather than a dogmatic or literalist attitude toward Holy Scripture". Notwithstanding the title of their book they conclude that "the word 'fundamentalism' with its original Christian implications should not be brought into an Islamic context"\(^4\).

### 3.3.7 Application to Muslims

The application of the term "fundamentalism" to Muslims is controversial. Much of the debate starts from the pejorative implications of the term, even when used to describe Christians. It is said by some that

---

\(^1\) R. Scott Appleby & Martin E. Marty, "Fundamentalism", p. 20.

\(^2\) Kenneth Minogue, "Fundamentalism Isn't the Problem", pp. 20-21.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 21.

\(^4\) Imad-Ad-Dean Ahmad, "Islamic Fundamentalism", *Arab Studies Quarterly*, Vol.: 21, Issue: 2, Association of Arab-American University Graduates and Institute of Arab Studies, 1999, p. 104.
the term has connotations of ignorance and backwardness and thus is insulting to movements of legitimate Islamic revival. Others have argued that there is no exactly cognate term in Arabic or other major languages of Muslims, and that this indicates that there is no cognate phenomenon in Muslim societies to which the term might apply1.

Akbar S. Ahmed in *Living Islam from Samarkand to Stormorway* says,

Western commentators often use — or misuse — terms taken from Christianity and apply them to Islam. One of the most commonly used is fundamentalism. As we know it, in its original application it means someone who believes in the fundamentals of religion, that is the Bible and the scriptures. In that sense every Muslim is a fundamentalist believing in the Quran and the Prophet صلی الله عليه وسلم However, the manner that it is used in the media, to mean a fanatic or extremist, it does not illuminate either Muslim thought or Muslim society. In the Christian context it is a useful concept. In the Muslim context it simply confuses because by definition every Muslim believes in the fundamentals of Islam. But even Muslims differ in their ideas about how, and to what extent, to apply Islamic ideas to the modern world2.

---


Fundamentalism is a term used mainly by Christians and the West. When the term is applied to Islam, it causes difficulties and misunderstandings. The use of this term has become common and it is often applied to those Muslims, individuals or groups\(^1\), who preach *jihad* in order to eradicate evils. Thus, Islamic fundamentalism aims to return to the fundamentals of Islam, which include the Qur’an, the Sunnah and the *shari‘ah*. In other words, to rescue the core values of Islam, to restore the Islamic state and to oppose anything that has penetrated *ummah* as *bid‘ah* or as a foreign particle. Fundamentalism teaches the real teachings of original Islam and makes no distinction between politics and religion\(^2\).

In the past decade almost all Islamic revivalist movements have been labeled fundamentalists, whether they be of extremist or moderate origin. The widespread impact of the term is obvious from the following quotation from one of the most influential encyclopedias under the title ‘Fundamentalist’: “The term fundamentalist has ... been used to describe members of militant Islamic groups”. Why would the media use this specific word, so often with relation to Muslims?\(^3\)

To apply the same terminology to Muslims is neither fair nor valid. Because in the case of Islam all Muslims believe in absolute inerrancy of the Qur’an, since it is a basic Islamic tenet. Therefore the media would have to use the word fundamentalist for all Muslims! which it does not do.

---


\(^2\) Idem

\(^3\) Macksood Aftab, “What Does Fundamentalism Really Mean?”.
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It only uses the word fundamentalist for both the extremist and terrorist groups, and the true moderate Islamic revivalist movements. Both these definitions are incompatible with each other. Using the word fundamentalist for the former may be acceptable, since it does have some parallel to the Christian definition. But if that definition is to be used, however, then using the same word to describe the latter would be erroneous and completely unacceptable. It is this dual definition that is unfair to the Islamic faith. Therefore the media should either stop using the word fundamentalist to describe any and all Islamic organizations, or be much more careful in its usage.

It is very surprising that the desire of today’s publishers to thrust is the suspect title “Islamic Fundamentalism” on every book that deals with the subject of political Islam. They are engaged in proving that leaders of fundamentalist movements are not theologians but social thinkers and political activists.

In Islam, after the Iranian Revolution (1979 C.E.) led by Ayatullah Khomeini in Iran, the term was applied to a number of Islamic movements there and in other countries, such as the Taliban of Afghanistan, Shi‘ite and Sunni fundamentalist leaders and groups, such as the Ayatullah Khomeini and the al-Ikhwan al-Muslimum. The term has also been applied to Hindu nationalist groups in India (Bharatiya Janata party).

---

1 Macksood Aftab, “What Does Fundamentalism Really Mean?”.  
2 Imad-Ad-Dean Ahmad, “Islamic Fundamentalism”, p. 102.  
3 “Fundamentalism”, *The Columbia Encyclopedia*.  

Everyone knows very well that Western societies find Muslims a problem because Islam demands that Muslims must live in terms of the Qur’ân as elaborated into the shari‘ah. To attack ‘terrorists’ (and others!) as “fundamentalist” is inaccurate1.

Targeting Muslims as the source of ‘terrorism’ and ‘fundamentalists’ looks like Western Civilization getting up on its high horse to denounce the ‘Other’2. It is not in America’s interest to launch a crusade and search for a new enemy after the Cold War. Instead, it should realize that doing so will really pose a danger to America’s security3.

Fundamentalism aims to motive the Muslims to work towards progress and development. It sees Islam as necessary for the reformulation of history and reformation of civilization. Islam should provide the metaphysical foundations as well as the motivating force for regeneration. However, Islam as has been understood for centuries should be re-examined and re-interpreted in the light of modernity4. Sayyid Qutb and other fundamentalists transform history into a justifying vehicle for renewal, reassessment and revolution5.

The scholars like Martin Marry and Ro Scott Appleby (who direct Fundamentalism project of the American Academy as well as Bruce

---

1 Kenneth Minogue, “Fundamentalism Isn’t the Problem”, p. 21.
2 Ibid., p. 19.
4 Ahmad S. Moussali, “Two Tendencies in Modern Islamic Political Thought: Modernism and Fundamentalism”, p. 73
5 Ibid., p. 62.
Lawrence) argue that fundamentalism is distinctively the product of common era, even though it may have some historical antecedents. In this view the conditions of modernity are unique and fundamentalism are distinctive responses to the religious challenges of modernity. The major examples of Islamic fundamentalist movements are from this perspective not the traditionalist movements or nativist revolts of the nineteenth century C.E. nor the puritanical holy warriors of pre-modern times. They are those movements — for example, *al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun* in Egypt that developed in the twentieth century C.E. and became most visible in the Islamic resurgence of the last quarter of that century C.E.\(^1\)

There is no doubt that the enormous scientific and technological achievements, conquering of space and discovery of new medicines and cures to the illnesses of the past — have not succeeded in making people happy. Instead, people have ended up feeling cheated, possessing all the material possessions and status one could possibly wish for, and yet feeling that somehow, there ought to be much more to life\(^2\).

Interreligious dialogue will never fulfill its unique mission until it recognizes the fundamentalisms of the world as valued conversation partners\(^3\). At the end of modernity, the future of interreligious dialogue is

---


contingent upon its ability to find common ground with fundamentalists in all world traditions.

In every ways the world is getting much more dangerous place, and so there arises a need to build links of trust and friendship among communities. The Jewish philosopher Martin Buber talked about world history as having ‘epochs of habitation’ and ‘epochs of homelessness’. In the former, man lives in the world as in a house, as in a home. In the latter, man lives in the world as in an open field and at times does not even have four pegs with which to set up a tent.

If fundamentalism is acknowledged at all, it is branded as the prime threat to international spiritual harmony. In fact, nothing exposes the limits of pluralism better than the phenomenon of fundamentalism.

This is the time for Western analysts and policymakers to recognize Islam as a diverse civilization, divided along cultural, ideological, religious, ethnic, and national lines.

---

2 Helen Freeman, “Facing Fundamentalism”, p. 30.
3.4 Islamic Approach towards Society

3.4.1 Introduction

Society is generally defined as a large group of people who live together in an organized way making decisions about how to do things and sharing work that needs to be done\(^1\).

On different occasions of history and with the development of human consciousness various theories, definitions and ideologies about the society have been put forth by social scientists from time to time and different concepts of society have been formulated in various ways in sociological thought. Society has also been defined in different ways with the development of various religious ideologies. In major world religions one comes across such definitions of society that are conceptually rooted in a particular religion. Thus Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism and a host of other religions have produced their own concepts of human society, necessarily having their own ideological orientation. Islam, as a religion, too advocates a particular concept of society that has been studied by social scientists right since the emergence and development of this religion. Before analyzing briefly the Islamic theory and viewpoint of society it is relevant to see some of the prominent definitions about society that can help us subsequently in understanding the Islamic viewpoint of society.

Society, as held by some sociologists, is the result of a natural historical process governed by certain laws. This process is based on the

development of economic relations. These relations, including those of production and those between people arising during production, constitute the specific form of man's existence and development. They are the structural elements of a historically defined social system.¹

Thomas Hobbes, the propounder of the Contract theory² has presented the evolutionary view of human society where law of jungle prevailed and the fear of existence played a key role. As man could not combat with forces of fear individually therefore he developed a sort of gregarious instinct. With the passage of time social values began to develop as a man felt these necessary for his growth. The process went on developing until men used to live in groups. The number of such groups went on increasing with refined and developed form and consequently as a result took the name of society.³

Society has also been defined as a system that is designed in part to facilitate the everyday task of its members; and societies of each type usually share features that are related to their primary mode of livelihood.⁴ It is again defined as a system of interconnected human actions, distributed

---


² Social Contract Theory, nearly as old as philosophy itself, is the view that persons' moral and/or political obligations are dependent upon a contract or agreement between them to form society.


over a determinate territory and maintaining an approximate identity of its main components through time\(^1\).

Another definition of society is its being a universal and pervasive phenomenon that has no definite boundary or assigned limits. It is the collection of individuals united by certain relations or modes of behaviour, which mark them off from others who do not enter into those relations or who differ from them in behaviour\(^2\).

One more definition of society is that it is a system of usages and procedures, authority and mutual aid, many groupings of divisions, control of human behaviour and of liberties. It is the web of social relationship and it is always changing\(^3\).

*Dictionary of Sociology* defines society as an association of people with limited ends, who in their pursuit make certain organizational arrangements\(^4\).

Some other sociologists have defined society as the complex or totality of the relationships existing between people living in a community relationship such as marriage and the family and sharing the ethical ideas

---

and political and religious ties\(^1\). While the economic and social structure of a society is determined by the character and substance of human social activities, it is at the same time, itself the result of these activities\(^2\).

The well known functional concept of society is that it is a group of human beings sharing a self-sufficient system of action which is capable of existing longer than the life-span of an individual, the group being recruited at least in part by the sexual reproduction of the members\(^3\).

### 3.4.2 Islamic Society

Islamic definition of society is different from all these definitions. An Islamic society comes into existence according to Divine law which organises the individuals and constructs their minds in such a way that they mould their lives according to this law which encompasses every aspect of human conduct. In other words Islamic society is “an association, formed according to Divine law, for the purpose of harmonious and peaceful co-existence”\(^4\).

Islam, one among the major religions in the world, emerged in Arabia, the Hijaz, The religion of Islam was the last of the great prophetic

---

traditions to emerge from the Middle East, and the revelations made to the Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم are seen as continuous from the time of Abraham عليه السلام, through Musa عليه السلام, to ‘Isa عليه السلام. Moreover, Islam recognizes and revers all of the previous prophets¹.

The origin of Islam has been found in Arabic word Salama meaning ‘peace’. Islam means “submission”, submission to Allah (God), the one and only deity in the uncompromising monotheistic faith. The person who submits is known as a “Muslim”², although the English equivalent of this term has historically been “Moslem”. “Mohammedan” is definitely archaic, erroneous, and offensive³.

Islam is not only about angels and divine revelations. As a theology it generates particular social practices in culture, manners, food and language, and in this respect Islam is also sociology. The Prophet’s صلى الله عليه وسلم sayings encourage Muslims to greet one another warmly, to avoid gossip and slander, to accept invitations to visit one another, to call on those who are sick, to join funeral processions. It is also about children respecting parents, and parents giving love and affection to children. Islam encourages social activity, a sense of community, a sense of belonging, a sense of place. It explains the remarkable resilience of Muslim communities through the ups and downs of history and in their changing

situation in different non-Muslim civilizations. Islam is an entire civilization; it is a philosophy of life.

Islamic society is entirely governed by Divine law because human law changes according to change in society while as Divine law is immutable and never allows society to change or stray from the right path.

Islam is rooted in the spiritual and cultural traditions of the Qur’ān and Sunnah. The time of ignorance, the period before the revelation of Qur’ān; is known as the jahiliyyah, after which came revelation from God to Prophet Muhammad صلی الله علیه و وسلم of the new religious law, reason, enlightenment, and reform. The reference to a time of jahiliyyah resonates in today’s world, as many inspired by contemporary Islamic revival see the dominance of secular ideology or Western culture as another kind of jahiliyyah; thus Muslims need to play a role, which can stem the tide or prevent the return of darkness and ignorance that characterized society before the coming of the last Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم 2.

The single factor which is credited with shaping the character and history of Arabia is Islam. In 570 C.E., the Prophet Muhammad صلی الله علیه وسلم was born in Makkah in the Arabian Peninsula. At that time, the Arabs appeared to be a backward people who were simply ignored in their desert by the two giants that dominated the region, the Romans and the Persians. By the time of the Prophet’s صلی الله علیه وسلم’s demise in 632 C.E., most of the Arabian Peninsula had become united under Islamic rule, Islam entered

---

1 Akbar S. Ahmad, Living Islam from Samarkand to Stornoway, pp. 7-8.
2 Carolyn Fluer-Lobban, Islamic Society in Practice, pp. 18-19.
Iran, which was Islamicized forever, and Islam became a promise of power, unity, and triumph for a marginalized people, divided and occupied, who wasted their energy in intertribal wars. Yamani states that the fundamentalists today lay claim to as the solution to economic problems and military defeats, treasures the memory of this scarcely believable life of a young Makkan who declared himself a prophet at the age of 40 and, in 22 years of preaching interspersed with military expeditions, realized before his demise the dreams that seemed impossible to his contemporaries: the union of the Arabs through a religious faith and their emergence on the international scene as a world power.

The heart of the Islamic faith is the belief in one God who is directly involved in the affairs of humanity. God is seen as requiring submission to His will and as having made that will known to humanity through revelations to a series of prophets. For Muslims, the final and complete form of those revelations was given to the Prophet Muhammad صلی الله علیه و سلم in the seventh century C.E. It is carefully recorded in the Qur’an and is the foundation of Islam. Muslims, then, are those people who accept the unique Oneness of God and recognize that Muhammad صلی الله علیه و سلم was the messenger of God.

Muslimness in itself, the label of Muslim, is no guarantee of good behaviour. This is what the Qur’an tells us — that each individual is

---

responsible for his or her own actions\textsuperscript{1}.

Islamic society is based on the holy sources of the Qur’\textsuperscript{a}n and Sunnah and is therefore a religious society in theory and in practice. The Qur’\textsuperscript{a}n, is the revealed word of God, and Sunnah, the teachings and the practice of the Messenger of God, Muhammad صلی الله علیه و سلم. These fundamental sources have been interpreted over the ages, but cannot be altered. Indeed various schools of interpretation have developed since the introduction of Islam, primarily in the first century after the Hijra (seventh to eighth centuries C.E.). These include the M\textsuperscript{a}liki\textsuperscript{2}, Hanafi\textsuperscript{3}, Hanbali\textsuperscript{4}, and Shafi‘i\textsuperscript{5}, as well as others which are a bit more obscure, which have had their origins and influence in various parts of the original core of the early Islamic world\textsuperscript{6}.

\textit{Shari‘ah}, as a religious law, is comprehensive and theoretically applies to all legal matters that are differentiated in the West as civil, criminal and family law. There is even a system of economics, banking, and finance that has grown out of Islamic prescriptions. In practice, in the modern period, Islamic \textit{shari‘ah} has been circumscribed by nationalist movements, which overthrew Ottoman Caliphate and secularized much in

\textsuperscript{1} Akbar S. Ahmad, \textit{Living Islam from Samarkand to Stornoway}, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{2} Founded by Malek ibn Anas ibn Malek ibn ‘Amr al-Isba‘i (b. 714 C.E. – d. 796 C.E.)

\textsuperscript{3} Founded by Abu Hanifa, An-Nu‘mân ibn Thâbit (b. 699 C.E. – d. 765 C.E.)

\textsuperscript{4} Founded by Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal (d. 855 C.E.)

\textsuperscript{5} Founded by Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn Idris ash-Sha‘fi‘i (b. 767 C.E. – d. 820 C.E.)

\textsuperscript{6} Carolyn Fluer-Lobban, \textit{Islamic Society in Practice}, p. 115.
commerce and trade, and relegated the shari'ah more to a law governing personal status matters of Muslims. The colonial powers reinforced and amplified this model, introduced their own Western laws in civil and criminal areas, and left Islamic law to govern family matters almost exclusively. Thus the current movement by the Islamists wishes to restore the comprehensive role of the shari'ah in Islamic society and has a historical legitimacy.

The truth is that very little is known or understood about the basic values underlining Muslim society. Islam is not complex and complicated in any way. Muslims are ordained to believe and practice five basic tenets — Shahadah (Profession of faith), Salat (Obligatory prayers), Saum (Fasting), Zakah (alms) and Hajj (Pilgrimage to Makkah) — and it assists everyone towards the same belief: submission of the daily behavior of the individual to a strict discipline. Above everything else, Islam is an earthly religion, rooted in the most banal acts of everyday life (washing, eating, etc.), but also permitting one to constantly situate oneself in the cosmos. The Shahadah is the first rukn (fundamental belief): it is a profession of faith that recognizes Almighty Allah* as the only Deity and Power and Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم as His Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. The second rukn is to perform Salat (obligatory prayers) five times a day. Salat is offered facing the Holy Ka'bah. Salat is the means of putting oneself in contact with the Divine Being. The first prayer is said at dawn, the second

---

2 Ibid, p. 44.
when the sun is at midpoint, the third when the sun begins its descent, the fourth at sunset, and the fifth when the night has fallen. The third *rukn* is to fast during the month of Ramadan from sunrise to sunset — *Sawm*. Giving alms to the poor and needy is the fourth *rukn*. Finally, *Hajj* (the pilgrimage to Ka'bah in Makkah) for those who can make it is the fifth *rukn*.

Though in Islam the five fundamentals are dominant (namely, profession of the faith, prayers, almsgiving, fasting, and pilgrimage to Makkah, other doctrines are also important

The five fundamentals which form the foundation for faith and experience have significance for all aspects of life. The revelation was not only to define a creed or a set of beliefs rather it set forth the basic blueprint by which humanity should live. In this way, the Qur'ân is the foundation for the ideal society, which Muslims believe will result from submission to God and His will. Muslims are not concerned with individual belief only; it means participating in the effort to implement God's will on earth. As one modern Muslim explains it, “Islam teaches not only that the realization of the good is possible in this world but that to bring it about here and now is precisely the duty of every man and woman”. In the broadest sense, the Islamic community is that community which works to implement God's will as defined in the Qur'ân here on

1 *Bukhari*, Kitah al-Iman, Hadith No.: 8.
earth in the contexts of history and society.

Islam marked the history by bringing a shift in the basis of the social foundation — from blood kinship to fellowship in a community (ummah) of believers, from loyalty to the tribe to that of the extended family as its basic unit. Classical family law as finally formulated was the product of Qur’anic reform and customary practice.

A complete society is based on the social unit constituted by the family. The family is linked up with the next larger group, the clan, the village, the guild.

Society is based on an institution of marriage. Marriage is the central institution around which all other social and kin institutions revolve, and it is guarded and protected by the seniors of the family and so revered by the entire social group. The ties that are created through marriage are very important traditionally. Marriage in Muslim society is the main vehicle by which families and communities are bound in all important networks of mutual interest.

Family is an important aspect of society and ultimately of the

---


Because everybody is rooted in family\textsuperscript{1}. It is the family, which at the very first teaches manners, honour, pride, dignity, identity, reputation, behaviour and much more. It is a moral duty upon family and parents to raise children properly and above all adhere to the principles and practice of the religion of Islam. A good Muslim family has its honor intact and help in making a healthy society by nourishing their children according to Islam\textsuperscript{2}.

Family is a matter of pride within the shari‘ah. It includes important areas such as marriage, divorce and succession and has a prominence that reflects the Qur’anic concern for the rights of women and the family. Thus, the traditional family social structure as well as the roles and responsibilities of its members and family values, may be identified in the law\textsuperscript{3}.

Parentage is established in Islam to make a successful marriage and thereby a healthy society exists and continues for long\textsuperscript{4}. Marriage in Islam is the basis of society, the means by which the race is perpetuated.

The society is engrained and powerful due to the concept of family and the fact is that it is rarely invoked inside the family, as it might be in the West where a family member is called upon to do something “for the sake of the family” or family name. Family is everything; there is no need

\textsuperscript{1} Carolyn Fluer-Lobban, \textit{Islamic Society in Practice}, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Idem}
\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
to stress its importance to those who are well aware of the fact. The family is the background for a successful society.

Except for Arabia, the most important social unit next to family in all Muslim countries is the village or agricultural community; yet it has hitherto been one of the most neglected.

Social good is understood in a complex way because it aims to maintain modesty, conduct, appearance, honour, respect, behaviour. The power of society is that it reinforces the positive idea that one's behaviour is a direct reflection of one's honour and dignity and that one's personal behaviour represents a part of the whole family and society.

The status of Muslim society is raised by establishing rights of family members which were incorporated by Qur'anic reforms and values. Qur'anic reforms, as well as customary practice, constitute the substance of classical family law.

Social good is maintained by descent and inheritance within the family. Inheritance follows a modified form of patrilineal transmission of wealth and property that is prescribed by Islam to maintain social sanctity. The heirs in Muslim family law are outlined in the Qur'an, are therefore defined religiously, and are not subject to very much in the way of human interpretation. These prescribed heirs include the father/mother, the

---

grandfather/grandmother, the son/daughter, with as a general principle the patrilineal kin being favored over relations through the mother's side, and blood or consanguinal relations favored over affines (relatives by marriage)\(^1\).

Fosterage is one of the basic fundamentals of Islamic society. Because it is through fosterage only that society remains balanced and ultimately a healthy one. Fosterage as a specialized topic in Islamic law deals with the legal ramifications of the relationship established between non-kin individuals where a woman has suckled a child who is not her own. According to *shari’ah*, the children of the mother who nursed such a child and her own biological children are as brothers and sisters. They are subject to the same incest and marriage taboos as brothers and sisters and cannot marry one another. This is the rather specialized meaning of fosterage in Islamic society\(^2\).

Islam does not encourage direct adoption and so there is no notion of adoptive paternity in Islamic law, and the fundamental criterion of legitimacy derives from the conception of a child during the lawful wedlock of its parents\(^3\). While informal fosterage is quite appreciated and needed. Under this pattern a child is not biologically a member of patrilineage.

*Waqf* (bequests in the name of God) have historically been an

---

important part for maintaining social good. Those bequest generally serve to benefit the local community. A parcel of land set aside in holy trust for the construction of a mosque, hospital or school can be nominated as a \textit{waqf}. The formation of waqfs is consistent with the strong emphasis on charitable deeds that is stressed in Islam.

Qur'anic reforms corrected many injustices in \textit{jahiliyyah} society by granting people right to which they were entitled. Since men had more independence, wider social contacts, and higher status in the world, their social position was translated into greater legal responsibilities (especially in maintenance regulations), as well as more extensive legal privileges proportionate to those responsibilities. The most notable examples of such rights and duties can be found in the areas of guardianship of marriage, extensive divorce rights, wider privileges of custody, and greater shares in inheritance.

In its attempts to meet the needs of a particular social milieu, Muslim family law reflected the social mores of the time — the traditional roles of men and women and the function of the extended family in a patriarchal society. This understanding of classical family law, which demonstrates the interrelatedness of law and society, provides a valuable perspective for modern legal reform. The duties and responsibilities of men and women in classical law remained virtually unchallenged up to the twentieth century C.E. because they paralleled the socially accepted roles

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1] Carolyn Fluer-Lobban, \textit{Islamic Society in Practice}, p. 73.
\end{itemize}
of individuals and the function of the family in a basically unchanging society. Profound social forces in modern times have affected the status and roles of women and the family in Muslim society. This process has been accompanied by reforms in Muslim family law which have sought to respond to as well as to foster social change.

Islamic world is based on the complex and rich heritage of the Islamic community. There are many significant elements which can be viewed in terms of three general themes: the historical development of the community, the common elements of the continuity of the Islamic experience, and the basic elements of diversity within the Islamic community. The Qur’an repeatedly stresses the need of unity in *umma* and calls it the best community produced by mankind. Members of the *umma* have to command good and forbid evil as part of their religious duty. The Qur’anic *umma* is governed by Divine Laws wherein God’s will is implemented through revealed words to His Chosen Prophet Muhammad صلّى الله عليه وسلم. Membership to the Qur’anic *umma* is open to all followers who surrender themselves to Almighty’s will, worship Him only, and performs duties and righteous deeds for both spiritual and moral well-being.

The *umma* is based on the concept of unity. To put it more

---

informally, the concept of *jama’at* in Islamic Society is the basic requirement due to its powerful collective consciousness. Muslim community comprises some 1 billion people from widely differing geographical and cultural backgrounds. *Ummah* derives from *jama’at* and connotes unity within the collective.

Islam constantly points to the interlinking of everything, the unity of the universe. It is in this context that the notion of *tawhîd*, or the Oneness of God and the unity of existence in creation that it reflects, is so critical in understanding the Muslim attitude to life.

The history of the Islamic community is a dynamic part of the Islamic experience. The early and continuing success of Islam provided a confirmation for Muslims of the message of the revelation, and the starting point for an understanding of Islam in the modern world must be the historical experience of the *ummah*. The long interaction between changing conditions and the permanently established Qur’ânic message has set patterns and ideals, and an analysis of the continuing effectiveness of that interaction is a necessary foundation for an understanding of Islam in the contemporary world.

The pivotal concern and the fundamental concept of an Islamic society has got to be based on two fundamental principles the equality before law and accountability in this life and the hereafter. The whole

---

Islamic value system and social norm emanates from these two principles. According to this norm an individual is supposed to enjoy complete freedom of consciousness in the society but at the same time he has to conform to some of the most strict responsibilities and duties. Unlike other societies, where human beings perform their duties to get the dues and the reward in this life, in an Islamic society the individual is incited to strive for greater reward in the hereafter. The development of a human society is perhaps more guaranteed by the zealous activities of human beings which they perform especially to be rewarded by Allah. In this way, in an Islamic society the individuals perform their duties with the two fold ambitions of being rewarded in this world and in the hereafter. Thus an Islamic society has to be doubly alive and certainly more egalitarian, more profitable, more relevant and completely humane because whatever actions the members of society perform, those have to be rewarded doubly. As a result the whole society becomes action oriented.

3.4.4 Basis of Society

With the passage of time and with the development of human societies there has been a remarkable exercise of determining and finding out principles that work as the basis of a society. It has been argued by Emile Durkheim that particular social arrangements and rituals maintain a
social structure\(^1\). It is also argued that the legal norms that correspond to moral imperatives and are enforceable and help in maintaining a proper social equilibrium, form the core basis of a society\(^2\). Some thinkers suggest that alongside the proper training and education, it is the religious ideology, which can uphold society and guarantee its prosperity and development with changing patterns of human behaviour\(^3\). Yet again some thinkers like V.I. Lenin, Fedrick Angles and Karl Marx are of the view that it is the just economic order and economic prosperity that could work as a fundamental base of a society. According to Lenin, “the material equipment of society ceaselessly directing new methods of production, new social and economic process of development ...\(^4\). Ali Shariati, though emphatically criticizes the Marxian views, is motivated by his claim that the economy is the fundamental infrastructure of a society\(^5\).

In the same context Karl Marx writes:

> In the social production that man carry on, they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum

---


\(^4\) Renuka Birdi, \textit{The Readings in Modern Sociology}, p. 258.

total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political super structure, and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of social, political and intellectual processes of life1.

In more clear words the sum total of the forces of production accessible to men determines the conditions of society and is at the base of society according to Marx.

Islam, while considering all these factors necessary for proper functioning of a society, however, does not determine them as its basis.

There is a definite council in a society, which is meant to handle all affairs according to Islam. Those leading the Islamic community are in charge not because they are powerful, wealthy, or popular. In a true Islamic ummah, leading men are those who have shown themselves to be most learned, most faithful, most just and most compatible. There are no czars, shahs, or caesars in Islam. It is only when tyrants and dictators dominated in the Muslim world that Islamic zest and fervour declined and waned2.

---


2 M. S. Daoudi & M.S. Dajani, “Religion and the State in the Contemporary World”, pp. 2-3.
3.4.4 Basis of Islamic Society

Islamic society has been established, the three principles always served as its infrastructure. These are *Tawhid* (Oneness of Allah), *Risalah* (Belief in the prophethood) and *Takaful-i- Ijtima'i* (Mutual social responsibility). These three constituents combined together forms the core basis of the Islamic society that further paves the way for all other elements necessary for the prosperity of Islamic society. Let us discuss them in brief:

1. **Tawhid**: Allah’s Oneness is not simply a doctrinal position in Islam. It is rather the basis for entire worldview. It is, in fact, says Ismail Raji al-Faruqi “the first determining principle of Islam, its culture and civilization”\(^1\). In human history it presents the crux of prophetic mission. *Tawhid* thus, assumes a universal significance to which every nation can rely a claim.

With the emergence of Islamic ideology in history the most crucial dimension that was unfolded upon the human beings was the concept of *tawhid*. As a matter of fact this concept not only emancipated the human beings from the age-old yoke of hallucinations and superstitions and it not only liberated him from the worship of fears of heavens but it also inculcated in the human beings a sense of superiority over all other existing things in the universe and incited them to realize, by the gift of intellect that Allah has created everything in the universe for the benefit of

---

man and the whole universe lies at the dispose of "man". It is in fact this tawhidic inspiration that ultimately gave birth to the scientific inquiry because man is supposed to unfold the mysteries of universe with the help of his wisdom that is his divine quality and that makes him Ashraf al-Makhlugat (the most superior creature).

Islam had taken serious steps to foster the sense of mutual responsibility from the beginning of one's social life, obviously for the establishment of a prosperous society. It, for the same reason has prescribed severe punishments for those who try to harm this spirit e.g. it has closed every door that brings instability in family relations.

The continued strength and durability of Islam comes from the emphasis on unity. To a Muslim, religion and politics, faith and life, are inseparable. Islam's immense success lies in the conviction of the believer that God is One, that God is Compassionate and Merciful, that He is Omnipresent Ruler and an Omniscient Judge. Islam survived hard ordeals because it is a brotherhood of men working hard to please their Creator. It is that kind of brotherhood that transcends barriers of race and nations, all united in one effort; to execute God's will. When Muslims adhered to their faith and practiced it properly Islam remained ascendent. As Muslims were lured to the dens of materialism and became intoxicated by secular

---

1 Ibn Hayan reported it in Akhlaq al-Nabi صلی الله علیه و سلم, authenticated by Allamah Nasir al-Din Albani in Silsilat al-Ahadih al-Sahiha wa Sa‘n min Fiqhiha wa Fawa‘idiha, Maktaba Ma‘arif, Riyadh, 1995, Hadith No. 68.

pleasures, the Islamic ummah or nation began to disintegrate and crumble. Today the crucial dilemma is not social, political, or even economic. It is spiritual. Although today it is in a state of crisis, Islam as a faith will outlast time and history. It has already survived the test of time. The question is: will the Muslims survive?1

2. **Risalah:** The second fundamental base of Islamic society is belief in the Prophethood. History reveals that success of the communities depends on their unquestioning submission to prophets علیهم السلام who were sent to them. History teaches us that whatever be the talent of people if they do not love, follow and strive for the mission of their prophet they can never succeed. Abdul Hasan Ali Nadwi writes:

   The nation which give up the track of their prophet and lean on their maneuverings or on the help of anything power for gaining strength and importance ultimately end up in collapse, internal disorder and ignominious ruin2.

   The institution of Prophethood provided from ages centrality to human thought which serves as the uniting force for societies. The personalities of prophet علیهم السلام always serve as the great factor to change the lot of the societies from wretchedness to happiness. It does not mean that they were the products of history or society but when men get stunted and wasted, their selves becomes rotten and the man within

---

1 M. S. Daoudi & M.S. Dajani, “Religion and the State in the Contemporary World”, pp. 9-10.

human frame becomes uncommon then the prophets came forward to the aid of humanity with divine guidance where the human reformation would not have been sufficed, they guided humanity not with their own ideas but with *al-Kitâb* (the Book) and *al-Hikmah* (the Wisdom). They provided the man the values to solve himself the problem of coming ages. They laid the foundation of society on divine principles which confirmed the nature of humanity. They incited human consciousness by the divine message and succeeded in their mission. Their teachings according to Abul Hasan Ali Nadwi were “like a moral force, operating in history, which sharpens the wits and puts the coming generations in the way of righteousness”\(^1\).

All prophets before Muhammad صلی اللّه علیه و سلم were sent to particular nations, their teachings were somehow localized, however, through the previous divine code, humanity was now “... able to receive the final message for the attainment of its perfection”\(^2\). Moreover, the final code satisfies all the prerequisites needed for the guidance, upliftment and purification of the mankind. This final guidance is meant for the whole world, it is perfect and Allah himself took the responsibility for its protection while the guidance before prophet Muhammad صلی اللّه علیه و سلم were tampered by human hand.

The idea of termination of prophethood on the one hand marked the intellectual development of man and on the other hand, inites the

---

\(^1\) A. H. Nadwi, *Islamic Concept of Prophethood*, p. 143.

ummah of Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم to perform their duties as intermediary community¹ to become the torch-bearers of the world. The idea further teaches that man “now needs to exercise his mind and think out how to build up a healthy and progressive society, on the basis of spiritual and moral foundations”². The last guidance left the mankind with complete living code besides provides a field for human judgement. Muhammad Iqbal points towards the same as “…the constant appeal to reason and experience in the Qur’ân, and the emphasis that it lay on nature and history as sources of human knowledge, are all different aspects of the same idea of finality³.

It was the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم who practised this final Divine Guidance to raise an ummah which could discharge the responsibility of prophets. The ummah was taught by the best of teacher of mankind therefore, it was entrusted the duty of spreading this Divine Message, safeguarding pristine purity of Islamic society against all deviations and distortions and also it was incited to assume the leadership role in order to guide the whole humanity on the right path⁴. Therefore, Muslim ummah got the inspiration of social reformation from the finality of prophethood. The concept incited ummah to wipeout all antisocial factors which threaten the existence of the Islamic society. The finality of prophethood

---

¹ Qur’ân, 2:143.
⁴ Qur’ân, 3:10.
has also terminated the way of every new-comer, claiming a supernatural origin to build the Islamic society with alien ideals which could have definitely damaged its very fabric. Therefore, “the integrity of Muslim society is secured by the idea of the finality of prophethood alone”1.

3. *Takaful-i-Ijtimai*? The third base of Islamic society is *Takaful-i-Ijtimai*?2, sense of mutual social responsibility or brotherhood. In the discussion on *tawhid*, we have talked much about how an individual’s consciousness is emancipated from internal and external pressures and how the sense of equality and justice is cemented in him by the same concept of *tawhid*, likewise, the concept was enough to create the spirit of brotherhood among Muslims. However, it is so important that paying regard to it, it is extensively and emphatically referred by Qur’ân and *Hadith*. The spirit serves as backbone for Islamic society.

The development of collective ego does not mean to neglect one’s own ego rather it implicits individual responsibility than individual freedom, more explicitly, Islam, limits individual’s field in enjoying his freedom for not to exploit the rights of others. It ingrains the spirit of altruism in man but not the sense of self-negation3. It laid a balance between these factors which serves as a base to develop the sense of collectivism in him “the individual find nothing wanting, nothing against

---


3 Qur’ân, 28:77.
his natural inborn disposition, by commanding to develop the collective ego, an individual is fully equipped to keep pace with society... it [Islam] allows both society and individual to blossom without allowing one to impair the growth of other.

Broadly speaking Islamic sense of mutual social responsibility enclosed all other communities in general because the peace and the solidarity of the world is depended on the sense of mutual responsibility. To strengthen the spirit of this mutual social responsibility Islam, does not make any distinction among Muslims and non-Muslims. Inspite of practicing their own faiths, Muslims are exhorted to fulfill their worldwide social responsibility towards the whole humanity. Islam does not only make Muslims responsible to protect lives, property etc of other communities but Allah's Mercy on them is laid conditional until they show their mercy towards the whole humanity.

When one examines the importance of consideration and responsibility exhorted by Islam towards the whole humanity, it is not difficult for him to understand its value in Islamic society, where to one's belief the conditionality attached is his unconditional love and consideration for its members.

Every member in Islamic society has been made responsible for the

---


3 Reported by Hannad in his work *Al-Zuhd*, and authenticated by Albani, *Hadith* No. 167.
overall welfare of its members. Where a person witnesses any indecent and immoral and social factor he has to wipe it out. For the welfare of the poor he has to set out a fixed amount in the shape of zakah, moreover, he has to help others in righteousness and piety. Therefore, to purge Islamic society from all the evils and to become thoughtful for its welfare and progress, is the spirit in which the mutual social responsibility of Muslim community is manifest. In the ethically religious character of the whole system, mutual help is regarded as a legal duty.

To end this discussion, we may say that all the qualities — consistent balance, exemplary conduct, unity of purpose, reciprocity of feelings, solidarity and equity which identifies Islamic society are brought to it by the same belief in tawhid. The belief in prophethood and the cultivation of the sense of brotherhood are the inevitable results of the concept of tawhid.

When Islam first appeared, it came with a big idea. The idea was that you could believe in the Divine directly and yet live in the here and now; this reflected the central principles of ‘adl (balance) and ihsan (compassion) in all walks of life. Today, in sharp contrast, Muslims are often stuck with small ideas. Some are locked in battles ranging around political parties, others in conflicts regarding ethnic identity. The idea of a

---

1 Bukhari, Kitab al-Ahkam.
2 Qur’an, 5:2.
single integrated unity that explains the universe to the village is as
dramatic a jump as one can make and highlights the dilemmas of
contemporary Muslims¹.

Islam is considered to be the threat for the West because Islam is a
dynamic force in the contemporary world at the end of the twentieth
century C.E. and the beginning of the fifteenth century A.H. Islamic
revival has shown remarkable increase in visibility and influence. From
success in elections in Algeria and Jordan to political prominence in
southeast Asia and effective expansion in Africa, North America, and
Europe, the entire world of Islam shows the continuing appeal and power
of the message of the Qur'ân².

The foundation for the Islamic awareness of historical experience is
set in the Qur'ân itself, as it “lays great emphasis on the fact that the
process of history is not neutral in respect of nations and communities for
it says clearly, ‘God is on the side of those who fear Him and do good’”³.
The success or failure of actual communities of Muslims becomes a major
concern, with political structures, economic practices, and social customs
all being relevant to the historic vocation of faithful Muslims. However,
throughout Islamic history, there have been disagreements over the way
God’s will is to be implemented. These disagreements are the basis for a
variety of styles and modes of Islamic experience, and they provide a

¹ Akbar S. Ahmad, Living Islam from Samarkand to Stornoway, p. 5.
² John Obert Voll, Islam Continuity and Change in the Modern World, p. 3.
³ Mazheruddin Siddiqi, The Qur'anic Concept of History, Karachi: Central
starting point for understanding the dynamics of Islamic history.\(^1\)

Islam is a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural religion and many ethnic groups have adopted Islam without severing their traditional unstIslamic ties and loyalties. Customs and traditions need to be changed only when they conflict directly with *shari'ah*. Unfortunately, Muslims made little effort to reform them. Therefore, in Muslim societies we expect to find both the 'adāt (common practices) and the *shari'ah*, particularly among later ethnic groups.\(^2\)

It is well to remember that there are more than a billion Muslims in the world today. Significantly, about ten million of them live in the West and are shared about equally between the USA and Europe in the world.\(^3\)

In the next decades the planet will continue to shrink at a breathtaking pace because of the rapid technological changes in the media, transport, communications and so on. Islam, unlike other religions does not reject the world so does the Islamic society. The Muslim ideal balances between material and spiritual aspects of life; a good Muslim must participate in both. This goes a long way towards explaining the power and popularity of Islam in today's world.\(^5\)

Although Islam emphasizes balance and order, many Muslim

---

4 *Idem*
societies show signs of internal warfare and confrontation, the issues are not Islamic but often tribal or ethnic. Many societies are witnessing a breakdown of law and order as people lose faith in the administrative and political systems. These societies have moved away from the Islamic ideal which is based in the Qur’ân and the life of the Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم. It does not help them but further worsens the situation, since Muslims are aware of how far they are moving from the ideal. So the further they move the greater the dissatisfaction in society and the stronger the need to move back towards the ideal. However, although Muslim society and Islam in the ideal are fused, in reality many Muslims do not live by the ideal, it is the attempt to live, as far as possible, according to the custom and laws of Islam that provides one of the most crucial dynamics of Muslim society⁴.

From Algeria to Pakistan similar tensions are evident in society. Those who sympathize with Islam were to be given a chance to explain and implement their vision of society. They stress that what exists is not Islamic and has clearly failed to deliver the goods. They point to the anarchy, corruption, nepotism and general dissatisfaction among the people².

Inspite of taking serious measures to emancipate the human consciousness from all bondages, it has not been completely freed until it comes out from the bondage of one’s own lust and avarice. “A life

---
⁴ Akhar S. Ahmad, Living Islam from Samarkand to Stornoway, p. 5.
² Ibid., p. 6.
dedicated to the pursuit of sensual pleasures, or of power and wealth.

bleakness reasoning facilities, distorts thinking and perverts judgment
which amounts to a real loss of freedom\(^1\), it accepts the superiority of one's
own lust\(^2\).

According to Qur'\(\text{\'an}\) every community or group has its fixed
period (probation)\(^3\), however, Qur'\(\text{\'an}\) also mentioned "...which is for the
good of mankind remains on earth ..."\(^4\). From these Qur'\(\text{\'an}\)ic verses it may
be deduced that though the change and decline in societies happens yet
Islam has left a vast field for human efforts to bring lasting persistence to
society through being beneficial not only to Muslims but without
discrimination to whole humanity. In more clear words, Qur'\(\text{\'an}\) demands
Muslims community to be giver in all respects rather than to be taker.

The factors which can save the Islamic society from decline and add
in its life-span are mentioned by the Muslim scholars in different ways.
\textit{Ijtihad} (Exertion to the fullest), \textit{jihad}, \textit{Amar bi al-Ma'\textsuperscript{r}uf wa Nabi 'an al-
Munkar} (order right conduct and eradicate evil), establishing pillars of
Islam are some of the factors mentioned by Shahwaliullah necessary for
running an Islamic society\(^5\) because society would not function properly

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} M. N. Siddiqui, "Tawhid: the Concept And the Process", \textit{Islamic Perspectives},
  Khurshid Ahmad and Zafar Ansari, ed(s), New Delhi: Markazi Maktabah Islami, 1979, p. 21.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Qur'\(\text{\'an}\), 45:23.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} \textit{Ibid.}, 7:34, 10:49.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} \textit{Ibid.}, 13:17.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} Shah Waliullah, \textit{Izzalat al-Khifa 'an Khilafat al-Khulafa}, Muhammad Abdul
\end{itemize}
inspite of having a good ideology, if its responsibles are not in a position to activate these factors.

However, keeping in view the importance of an Islamic society we may add here few points. Peter Berger an American sociologist mentioned, a society once produced, cannot maintain its objective reality on its own but must be continuously supported and maintained by on going human activities. In Islamic perspective, the Divine Law by which society comes into existence, so far as it is revealed, is not subject to change, mutation, addition or subtraction.

How then to fulfill the demands of shari'ah, the ever growing, rich and complex life of the Muslims of all times...? The key lies in the dynamism and the inner growth of the revealed provision of the law without any limitation of time and magnitude.

Another important factor which instills life and maintains justice in Islamic society is jihad against aggressive forces. The institutions of jihad and Amar bi al-Ma'ruf wa Nabi 'an al-Munkar the another factor, which from ages has provided the life-giving blood to Islamic society, are so closely related to each other that while discussing this issue it is difficult to mark a line of demarcation between them. When the spirit of Amar bi al-Ma'ruf wa Nabi 'an al-Munkar is explained, the essence of Islamic jihad

---


becomes manifest as both serve for the same goal i.e., the establishment of the justice, peace and prosperity in the whole world especially in Islamic society.

Qur'ân has prescribed a systematic and affable approach for Muslims to follow in every conduct. It has taught them to show patience in every aspect of life without compromising in matters of “faith”. The system or the law which directly or indirectly poses threat to one’s faith and wants to rule upon Muslim by man-made law by ignoring Divine, must be outrightly rejected by Muslims. Muslims are not allowed to compromise in these circumstances but to what extent they can defend their faith, they must do. Infact, in such conditions one would not be able to protect his faith. The protection of faith for a Muslim, according to Mohd Hashim Kamali, is essential for the normal order because its destruction and collapse will precipitate chaos and collapse of normal order in society.

In more clear words Islam demands from Muslim not to accept the domination of evil because in such conditions a Muslim will not be even able to secure his faith, honour, life etc. his service as being the member of “Khair Ummah” (The best community among people because one enjoins good, serves mankind, forbids evil) is a matter far-off.

The purpose of jihad is to fight zulm (injustice) because for maintaining peace and prosperity of a society, it is essential to destroy and

---

persecute the forces of oppression and injustice. An Islamic society has also
to wage jihad against internal factors which pose threat to its communal
life e.g., to check and punish those forces which strive with might and
main for mischief.

Securing the essence of an Islamic society from external aggressive
and internal disruptive forces is not the end of Muslim ummah but actually
the means for the mission for which Muslims have been created. The
mission is that they have been created for the service of the mankind.
Wherever they witness injustice and disturbance they must bring an end to
it even at the cost of their lives. The spirit of ithâr (altruism), khidmat-i-
khalq (service of mankind), himayat-i-mustazaf (supporting the oppressed)
are the highest human values, which Islam wants to cement in Muslims by
declaring them as the “Khair-Ummah”, the community which was evolved
for mankind, without any discrimination. In the words of Abdullah Yusuf
Ali, “it was to live not for itself, but for mankind”.

The spirit of Amar bi al-Ma'ruf wa Nahi 'an al-Munkar is not only a
true feeling of sympathy for mankind but also an indispensable and the
best device to save the organisation of civilization from mischief and
disturbance. Tumult, oppression and mischief should be totally eliminated
from the world and there should be left no possibility for the aggressors

---

1 Qur'ân, 5:33.
2 Ibid., 3:110.
3 Ibid., 3:110.
4 Ibid., 8:73.
to kindle the fire of war\textsuperscript{1}, to hinder man from the path of Allah\textsuperscript{2} and to oppress people for professing a faith different from their own\textsuperscript{3}. Infact, the courage to fight against all these forces is incited in Muslim by the spirit of *Amar bi al-Ma‘ruf wa Nabi ‘an al-Munkar*, therefore, it is a service to maintain peace in the world and to develop humanitarian qualities in people\textsuperscript{4}. This crucial duty is entrusted to Muslim *ummah* to wipe out the *fitnah* (mischief) from the face of the earth.

The spirit of Muslim community to enjoin good and to forbid evil performs a double function. It is service, not only to the mankind but to one’s own-self also. Inspite of being good-tempered and pious, to become silent spectator of evil and vice, at last makes one to indulge into it. According to a *Hadith*, it was the first weakness of *Banulsrail*, the well-known nation of the world that they stopped up to abhor the evil and gradually they themselves were involved. That is to say when a person witnessed another doing wrong he forbade him but when he met him next day he himself started doing the same, at last they were affected by each others vice and immorality and their consciousness became dead, when Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم was saying this he was laying down but he at once sat and zealously said, “to whom in his hands is my life, you must order good and forbid evil and must withhold the hands of wrong-doer and to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Qur’ân, 5:67.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Ibid., 15:88.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Ibid., 2:190-193.
\end{itemize}
turn him towards righteousness otherwise, Allah will also affect your hearts by each others sin or will curse you as he cursed them\textsuperscript{1}.

Perhaps there is no any other religion in the world, which has laid so much stress on the sanctity of human life as Islam has laid. It equalizes the slaying of an innocent person, irrespective of his faith as the slaying of the whole humanity\textsuperscript{2}. But human life loses its dignity when it becomes hazardous for common peace, strives for mischief and injustice etc\textsuperscript{3}. Therefore, for the salvation of humanity it is inevitable here to persecute the forces of disturbance. It is here that jihad rather qital (warfare) becomes an inseparable part of Amr bil Ma‘ruf Wa Nabi ‘an al-Munkar. Therefore, the ultimate purpose behind the Islamic jihad is “to end repression and to obtain immediate conditions of justice and peace”\textsuperscript{4}. It should eliminate corruption and reform the earth. According to a Hadith, to restrain the hands of mischievous person is not persecution but a kind of assistance to him\textsuperscript{5}.

The spirit of a group which earmarked itself for the world-wide duty with its belongings and person not to bear mischief and tumult anywhere in the world and strives for wiping it out, for no worldly gain, is

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Abu Dawud, Kitab al-Mulahim, Tirmidhi, Kitab al-Fitna, Imam Ahmad, and Ibn Majah have also reported this Hadith with slight difference of words.
\item Qur’ân, 5:32.
\item S. A. A. Mawdudi, Al-Jihad fi al-Islam, p. 30.
\item Bukhari, Kitab al-Mazalim.
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\end{footnotesize}
the highest human value about which humanity was unknown before Islam. Such is the essence of Islamic *jihad* and for this, it has been regarded as the best of worships and for which the highest reward is mentioned in Qur’ân and Hadith.

‘Ulama have a role to play in the society and in context of social good naturally they come first. They need to research the influence of the religious ideals and religious ethic in the lives of individuals of all classes and in the social groups, singly and collectively, and the extent to which customary usages and elements foreign to Islam were bound up with them. Thus they are dutiful towards expressing things to public and making them aware of the various happenings and providing ways to tackle with the problems.

3.5 World Order

3.5.1 Concept: Definition and Origin

The term New World Order (NWO) has been used by numerous politicians through the ages, and as reported by historians is a generic term used to refer to a worldwide conspiracy being orchestrated by an extremely powerful and influential group of genetically-related individuals (at least at the highest echelons) which include many of the world’s wealthiest people, top political leaders, and corporate elite, as well as

---

members of the so-called Black Nobility of Europe\(^1\) (dominated by the British Crown) whose goal is to create a One World (fascist)\(^2\).

The term New World Order refers to a possible conspiracy among people that a powerful secret group has created a secret plan as referred to it by various scholars, known as the New World Order (NWO), to rule the world via a unitary (as opposed to federal) world government. The belief may stem – at least partly – from the phrase *New World Order*, which has been used in politics for much of the twentieth century C.E.\(^3\)

The concept of the new world order is a concept that emerged prominently three times in the twentieth century C.E. Woodrow Wilson sought to create a ‘new world order’ after World War I only to find that the world, as well as the U.S. Senate, was not ready for his brand of idealism. During World War II, Franklin D. Roosevelt envisioned a new world order that would ensure greater stability and peace through the creation of an international body of United Nations (UN), although he saw it as a body that would be based on great power cooperation. Later in the century, during the Persian Gulf crisis (1990 C.E. – 1991 C.E.), the administration of George Bush revisited this abstract concept in line with

---

\(^1\) See Appendix for details.

\(^2\) “Three World Wars What is the New World Order?”, [threeworldwars.com](http://www.threeworldwars.com/new-world-order.htm)

the effort to reverse Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990 C.E.1.

The voyages of Vasco da Gama (Abdul Majid) and his contemporaries were strands in the grand tapestry of the Western European renaissance. The expansion of European influence and domination over virtually the entire planet was a central aspect of European ambition in that period of European history. Thus was the foundation of a world system laid as inferred by Nelson Mandela2.

While a similar phrase (*Novus Ordo Seclorum*), in fact a quotation from Virgil appears in Latin on the back of the U.S. one dollar bill. Although some have claimed the phrase was not used at all, Virginia Gildersleeve, the sole female delegate to the San Francisco Conference in April of 1945 C.E., did use it in an interview with the *New York Times*3.

Richard N. Gardner, professor of law and international organization at Columbia University, is the intellectual godfather of the modern new world order, an academic counterpart to the David Rockefeller who finance and the Henry Kissinger who lend political support to the accelerating drive for global government4.


Wrote Harlan Cleveland, President Kennedy’s Assistant Secretary of State, in 1999 C.E., “A decent world order will only be built brick by brick. Those who wish to help build it, and not merely to talk about building it, will concentrate on the next brick — on how it can be fashioned, where it belongs, how it will fit, when it should be added to the structure.... Richard Gardner ... has helped fashion most of [these bricks] during the past four years as part of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. He understands the process of international institution-building as clearly and deeply as any American of the time”1.

It was the “brick by brick” approach that obviously inspired Richard Gardner to lay out, a decade later, a comprehensive strategy for world order in an influential article in *Foreign Affairs* entitled “The Hard Road to World Order”. The significance of this article cannot be overstated; it lays bare, in plain if somewhat academic prose, the strategy for global control that internationalist insiders have followed with slavish dedication ever since2.

Gardner prescribed, “The ‘house of world order’ will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It will look like a great ‘booming, buzzing confusion’, to use William James’ famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned

---


2 *Idem*
frontal assault”. This would entail the “decentralized, disorderly and pragmatic process of inventing or adapting institutions of limited jurisdiction and selected membership to deal with specific problems on a case-by-case basis, as the necessity for cooperation is perceived by the relevant nations. Such institutions of limited jurisdiction will have a better chance of doing what must be done to make a ‘rule of law’ possible among nations”. Calling for “strengthened international institutions at the global and regional levels”, Gardner repudiated the older formula of “building up a few ambitious central institutions of universal membership and general jurisdiction”, such as the United Nations itself.

Dante, the great poet, at the beginning of the fourteenth century C.E., proposed in publication an imaginative proposal for world order. According to him, the multiplicity of cities, states, and kingdoms was the source of great discord and strife. They were depriving mankind of that tranquility which was necessary for the full development of its intellectual powers. So there was a need for a single impartial ruler who, standing above the contentiousness of lesser governments, could bring about a regime of universal justice and peace.

Gorbachev said, at a turning-point in the history of mankind, a third millennium, a world order has come into being and is developing.


The world has entered a new age, the age of what was called, over forty years ago, by one of its prophets, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, 'the age of Planetary Man'\(^1\).

While Bush Sr. introduced the concept in its most inchoate form in an August 8, 1990 C.E., address to the nation in which he spoke of a "new era", it was first coined as the "new world order" in a reflective late August fishing trip\(^2\) that the president took with Scowcroft. The outing was the first chance that they had to "unwind and talk" about the events of the previous weeks, and Bush and Scowcroft became absorbed in a long discussion concerning the unfolding crisis\(^3\). As Deputy National Security Adviser Robert Gates jokingly remembers, a concept such as the new world order is what happens when "you send Brent and Bush fishing with time on their hands"\(^4\).

The term has developed pejorative meanings. Certain American traditional conservative educational organizations such as the John Birch Society have long used the phrase to warn about the United Nations' emerging character as a world government. The left-wing may prefer to use it to promote an image of the United States as a bully which no longer
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has to answer to anyone, and which uses the situation to extend its influence. Thus, extension of the NATO pact to regions in Eastern Europe, the Kosovo War, the war in Iraq, and isolation of small "unbending" nations are all seen as examples of this bullying attitude. The elder Bush's use of the term "New World Order" was picked up as a convenient catchphrase to symbolize this attitude\(^1\).

The new world order is a new phase in an ongoing history of the U.S. control over third-world peoples and resources\(^2\). But Bush's "new world order" is as old as capitalism and as modern as a laser-guided missile\(^3\).

Saddam Hussein had by his folly provided all with a snapshot preview of New World Order as what such an empire would be like: the U.S. as sole superpower taking independent military action, but also leading a coalition of allies to suppress others with the United Nations blessing American action in return for being allowed to influence it at the margin\(^4\).

The idea of a new world order, as it appears, entails and conveys the


collapse of the old system and the emergence of another, different one\(^1\).

The 'new world order' is reminiscent of the society described in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. It is a society in which the traditional concept of justice no longer exists, and in which the individual sacrifices himself for the collective "good". It is a society in which all material needs are catered for, and in which there are no spiritual needs of any kind because the spiritual needs of human beings have been suppressed by conditioning. It is the triumph of American communism (the characters in the novel are called Ford, Marx, Lenin, etc.) and the degradation of human beings to an animal existence\(^2\).

The 'new world order', the final stage of militant evolutionism, is nothing less than an authoritarian, despotic and genocidal World Government, an Evil Empire controlled by capital. The World Government is now controlled by only 200 firms (the "fittest", that is, the greediest materialists), 187 of which are based in Japan, Europe or the United States. The authoritarian rule of these firms has turned the world into a "market" in which democracy exists only in concept but not in practice, in which parliaments exist but have no real power, in which political parties exist but cannot exert real influence. It is a world in which unilateral business decisions rule and where issues like human rights, civil
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liberties, social assistance and charity appear only in rhetoric and are of no real moment.

The best new world order we need to understand then, is that the U.S., in using its military power to maintain stability, may be persuaded to go beyond a narrow interpretation of its national interest by the support of its allies and by the UN’s blessing. America wants to be similar to that of a medieval king in a feudal society: the sole sovereign with a recognized monopoly of force, but reliant for levies of both troops and money upon powerful barons to whose opinions he therefore paid a decent regard, dealing halfheartedly with a parliament on whose moral support he sometimes called but which he otherwise circumvented, protecting merchants and suppressing brigandage on the highways, but ignoring the condition of remote provinces where half-eivilized tribes carried on their traditional practices of rape, pillage, and plunder. Such a system would not be perfect, as quoted by Burnham himself.

According to George H. W. Bush Sr. and James Baker we are entering into one of these “rare, transforming moments of world history”, “a new era full of promise”, “a new order” based on international law, justice and peace.

U.S. claims that they are at a crossroads in the development of yet
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1 Hector Abu Dharr Manzolillo, “Uncovering the ‘Evolution Deceit’ and its Role in the Western Capitalist World Order”.

2 John O’Sullivan, “James Burnham and the New World Order”, p. 43.

another new world order-defined by either the realization of a new multilateralism, or its rejection in favor of a more unilateralist US interventionism following the mold of the Cold War¹.

In 1980s globalization, technological change, and state debts and deficits were used as excuses to advance cutbacks, privatization, and deregulation at the state level, and to further economic restructuring at the corporate level. In the wake of the Persian Gulf War, U.S. President Bush Sr. pronounced his 'New World Order'².

World order is often replaced with the domestic order and disagreement about world order is disagreement of domestic order. This entertains certain traditional political terms like sovereignty, multilateralism, global governance and customary international law³.

A new conversation is on forefront—a conversation about order, about the principles that are to guide the New World Order, about the principles that are to guide concerned authorities at the disorders of the world⁴. Conversations on these bases are expected to be good for the world.


In fact, Bush’s (Sr.) conception was based chiefly on three related dimensions: (1) the aggressive use of force was unacceptable, (2) it would be rejected through collective security, and (3) to meet that goal, great power cooperation was necessary\(^1\).

Bush’s conception of the new world order was firmly rooted in great power cooperation, with a particular focus on the then Soviet Union. While Moscow had longstanding relations with Iraq and was very reluctant to see it attacked by U.S.-led forces, it was more interested at the end of the Cold War in positive relations with the United States than in playing its Baghdad card. This consideration and Iraq’s blatant aggression against Kuwait helped Washington garner the support it needed from the then Soviet Union in the UN Security Council. Had Iraq invaded Kuwait during the Cold War, when it was one of Moscow’s key regional allies and the superpowers were stuck in global rivalry, the costs to Washington of taking a strong stance against Iraq would have been far higher\(^2\).

Bush’s (Sr.) concept of the ‘new world order’ also envisioned, although not as a central component, an enhanced UN peacekeeping role, and yet even in this tertiary area of importance, he stressed the need for U.S.-Soviet cooperation. As Bush (Sr.) put it in early February 1990 C.E.,

> My vision of a new world order foresees a United Nations with a revitalized peacekeeping function. I think most that follow the United Nations see the economic and social side of United
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\(^1\) Eric A. Miller, Steve A. Yetiv, “The New World Order in Theory and Practice: The Bush Administration’s Worldview in Transition”, p. 64.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 67.
Nations as having performed well since it was founded [but] the peacekeeping function for the most part has not been effective.... I think there's going to be new credibility for that peacekeeping function, new credibility for the United States. But we should have and should strive to have Soviet cooperation all along the way.1

During a triumphant speech before the Congress on September 11, 1990 C.E., President Bush (Sr.) announced that the pursuit of a 'new world order' would be an objective of American foreign policy. The speech's tone and emphasis marked a new phase in international politics, for only a few months earlier the United States and the Soviet Union, former Cold War foes, had demonstrated an unprecedented level of cooperation to eject Iraq — a former then Soviet client — from Kuwait. In that speech, Mr Bush (Sr.) stated that

The crisis in the Persian Gulf, as grave as it is, also offers a rare opportunity to move toward an historic period of cooperation. Out of these troubled times, our fifth objective — a new world order — can emerge: a new era — freer from the threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice, and more secure in the quest for peace. An era in which the nations of the world, East and West, North and South, can prosper and live in harmony.2

Thereafter, Bush (Sr.) invoked the new world order at several
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critical junctures. On September 9, 1991 C.E., he told Gorbachev in Helsinki that he thought there was "an opportunity to have developed out of this tragedy a new world order.... But the bottom line ... must be that Saddam Hussein cannot be allowed to profit from his aggression"\(^1\). Two days later, Bush (Sr.) asserted that the United States, in addition to its four key objectives in the crisis, had a "fifth objective" of producing a new world order that "a hundred generations have searched for" in vain\(^2\). For Bush (Sr.),

Iraq's aggression [was] not just a challenge to the security of Kuwait and other Gulf nations but to the better world that we all have hoped to build in the wake of the Cold War. And therefore, we and our allies cannot and will not shirk our responsibilities\(^3\).

According to a report of presidential documents published by the White House, "Bush referred to a new world order at least forty-two times from the summer of 1990 to the end of March 1991"\(^4\). After Bush's articulation of the new world order concept in September, 1990 C.E., it began to appear in policy statements by numerous Bush administration officials. For instance, Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney prioritized U.S. interests in a statement before the Senate on December 30, 1990 C.E.,

\(^1\) George Bush & Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed*, p. 363


\(^3\) Ibid., p. 1581.

\(^4\) Don Oberdorfer, "Bush's talk of a "new world order": Foreign policy tool or mere slogan?", *Washington Post*, May 26, 1991, 31A.
stating that the "first reason behind the president's policy is the prospect for further aggression"; the second, which is related to the first, is the domination of global oil supplies; and the third is the notion of the 'new world order'. That the 'new world order' concept did not emerge in policy speeches until well after Iraq's invasion suggests that it was not critical in motivating the United States to deploy forces to the Gulf. However, one reason that it did not appear until later was that Washington, as one Bush (Sr.) insider points out, could not talk about a new world order officially until the then Soviet collapse became clearer. A reversal of that fall would have been the death knell for the 'new world order'.

In front of the UN General Assembly on October 1, 1991 C.E., Bush (Sr.) proposed colorful imagery of the world that could emerge if Iraqi aggression was defeated: "Success, too, will have lasting consequences: reinforcing civilized standards of international conduct, setting a new precedent in international cooperation, and brightening the prospects for our vision of the future". Bush in any way did not mean that Washington would surrender any critical aspect of sovereignty to the United Nations either during or after the crisis. It also did not mean that it would forfeit national interests or be constrained in pursuing them. While the United States sought to promote collective action, it did not reject balance of
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power as such or commit to responding to all acts of aggression against sovereign states as collective security required in theory. Nor did Washington forsake unilateralism. It remained ready during and after the crisis to pursue its interests unilaterally if need be, with or without the United Nations or the U.S. Congress for that matter. While Bush (Sr.) preferred to realize American national interests fully, even if that meant dispensing with a larger UN and multilateral role, he preferred the latter route if he could, in essence, meet U.S. interests. It is not clear how much American sovereignty he was willing to forego to achieve a collective approach to the invasion, but he managed to avoid a serious trade-off between the two.

On March 6, 1992 C.E., Bush (Sr.) pronounced to Congress in his victory speech:

Now we can see a new world order coming into view. A world where the United Nations, freed from the cold war stalemate, is poised to fulfill the historic vision of its founders.... The Gulf War put this new world to its first test. And my fellow Americans, we passed that test.

George W. Bush, on October 11, 2000 C.E. said:

I don't think our troops ought to be used for what's called nation-building. I think our troops ought to be used to light and


In his 2002 C.E. State of the Union address, President Bush (Jr.) used the term ‘axis of evil’, and accused Iraq, Iran and North Korea of developing weapons of mass destruction. He implied that all three also sponsor ‘terror’ and threaten the new pillars of ‘global order’\(^2\).

Washington’s approach to managing the Iraq crisis and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict raises serious questions about its ability to generate a viable, stable world order\(^3\).

George W. Bush, (Jr.) February 26, 2003 C.E. said:

We meet here during a crucial period of the history of our nation, and of the civilized world. Part of that history was written by others; the rest will be written by us ... Rebuilding Iraq will require a sustained commitment from many nations, including our own: we will remain in Iraq as long as necessary, and not a day more\(^4\).

The Gulf crisis allowed the ‘new world order’ concept to be developed and executed. Indeed, prior to this, the notion of a new era was


\(^4\) Francis Fukuyama, “Nation-Building 101: The Chief Threats to Us and to World Order Come from Weak, Collapse, or Failed States. Learning How Lo Fix Such States-And Building Necessary Political Support at Home-Will Be a Defining Issue for America in the Century Ahead”, p. 159.
an Utopia. Bush (Sr.), in fact, spoke of an "extraordinary new world"\(^1\) but did not attach this language to the broader vision of a new world order. Elements of what would become the new world order, such as the role of the then Soviet Union, were hopeful but inchoate\(^2\). On May 12, 1989 C.E., Bush (Sr.) announced that it was time to move "beyond containment to a new policy for the 1990s" and that Washington would now "welcome the Soviet Union back into the world order"\(^3\). While the earlier superpowers had begun to surrender or engage in productive dialogue on a series of issues ranging from resolving regional conflicts to economic reform\(^4\), the Gulf crisis (1991 C.E.) offered Moscow the opportunity to demonstrate on a crucial global question that it could cooperate with the United States. This was especially true because Iraq was a former regional ally that still owed Moscow billions in dollars for arms sales, and elements of the foreign policy establishment in the Russian Federation were quite reluctant to support U.S.-led efforts against Baghdad\(^5\).

Prior to the crisis, moreover, the United States had not expressed its bona fide leadership role in attempting to implement a 'new world order'.
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\(^3\) *Ibid*, p. 541.


Bush (Sr.) understood and asserted that American leadership in the world had become "crucial"\(^1\), but such assertions had a rhetorical ring, partly because America was widely viewed as in decline at the time. The Gulf crisis allowed Washington to crystallize positive feelings about a new era into a more palpable vision and approach while advancing its national interests and asserting its global primacy\(^2\).

The end of the Cold War and the Gulf crisis in fact motivated the development of the concept of the end of Cold War. Moreover, it contributed fundamentally to the development of the concept of the new world order and the Gulf crisis was also viewed by the Bush (Sr.) administration as a test of it. Thus, the concept was developed in the fall and then tested, in Bush's (Sr.) view, successfully in war\(^3\). With the result, the end of the Cold War created conditions that made a 'new world order' possible in theory\(^4\).

As David Lake points out, American foreign policy has always shifted between approaches of unilateralism and security cooperation and within the latter between "more anarchic and more hierarchical security relationships"\(^5\). Washington could have chosen any strategy along that
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continuum for dealing with world affairs in general or the Gulf crisis and specific aspects of it in particular. Indeed, many observers called for a policy of American isolationism, rather than interventionism at the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, while the end of the Cold War created the conditions for a new world order in theory, the crisis allowed it to be put in motion. It allowed for Iraq's aggression to be reversed through some form of collective security.

'New world order', 'Western imperialism', 'US hegemony' and 'Globalization' are modern terms that may have fallen victim to this tendency. Their use has become so commonplace that people no longer need to think what they mean; instead it is taken for granted that their meaning is understood, both by those that use them and by those they are addressing.

Thus, the mid-1990s, showed world the new version of "Pax Americana" had re-emerged. The post-Cold War world seemed to be a unipolar one with the United States as its sole superpower, yet the United States no longer commanded the broad unconditional support characteristic of a unipolar system. Rather, countries around the world pushed for a more multipolar framework for international relations.
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Indeed, the post-Cold War world has been defined by this tension between the US image of a unipolar world — an image captured in Madeleine Albright’s characterization of the United States as the “indispensable nation”, implying that other nations are, by contrast, dispensable — and the international movement toward a more egalitarian multipolar system¹.

The Gulf War heralded the coming of a ‘new international order’. At issue are implications for how the world should be run. The United States is bitterly disappointed with the United Nations and the failure of major powers such as France, Germany, Russia and China to support its invasion of Iraq in 2003 C.E. This has led to a dramatic shift in the international system between those who identify themselves with Washington’s intention to change the international order, including by military pre-emption if necessary, and others who are determined to resist what they see as US hegemony².

3.5.2 Chronology


> Obviously there is going to be no peace or prosperity for mankind as long as [the earth] remains divided into 50 or 60
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independent states until some kind of international system is created...The real problem today is that of the world government.

1932 — New books were published urging World Order:

*Toward Soviet America* by William Z. Foster. Head of the Communist Party USA, Foster indicates that a National Department of Education would be one of the means used to develop a new socialist society in the U.S.

*The New World Order* by F.S. Marvin, describing the League of Nations as the first attempt at a ‘New World Order’. Marvin says, “nationality must rank below the claims of mankind as a whole”.

1939 — *New World Order* by H. G. Wells proposes a “collectivist one-world state” or “new world order” comprised of “socialist democracies”. He advocates “universal conscription for service” and declares that “nationalist individualism...is the world’s disease”. He continues:

The manifest necessity for some collective world control to eliminate warfare and the less generally admitted necessity for a collective control of the economic and biological life of mankind, are aspects of one and the same process. This be accomplished through “universal law” and propaganda (or education).
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2 *Idem*

3 *Idem*

4 *Idem*
1940 — *The New World Order* was published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and contains a select list of references on regional and world federation, together with some special plans for world order after the war\(^1\).

1942 (December) — American Institute of Judaism, excerpt from article in the *New York Times*:

The statement went on to say that the spiritual teachings of religion must become the foundation for the new world order and that national sovereignty must be subordinate to the higher moral law of God\(^2\).

1947 — The American Education Fellowship, formerly the Progressive Education Association, organized by John Dewey, called for the:

...establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority...\(^3\)

1950, Feb. 7, — Statement made before the United States Senate on by James Paul Warburg ("Angel" to and active in the United World Federalists)

We shall have World Government, whether or not we like it. The only question is whether World Government will be
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1 D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D, “A Chronological History: The New World Order”.
3 D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D, “A Chronological History: The New World Order”.
achieved by conquest or consent.¹


The United Nations has not been able — nor can it be able — to shape a new world order which events so compellingly demand. ... The new world order that will answer economic, military, and political problems, urgently requires, I believe, that the United States take the leadership among all free peoples to make the underlying concepts and aspirations of national sovereignty truly meaningful through the federal approach².

1975 — In Congress, 32 Senators and 92 Representatives signed *A Declaration of Interdependence*, written by historian Henry Steele Commager. The Declaration states that:

We must join with others to bring forth a new world order...Narrow notions of national sovereignty must not be permitted to curtail that obligation³.

Congresswoman Marjorie Holt refused to sign the Declaration saying:

It calls for the surrender of our national sovereignty to international organizations. It declares that our economy should be regulated by international authorities. It proposes that we enter

¹ "New World Order Quotes", *freedomdomain*.

² D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D, “A Chronological History: The New World Order”.

³ *Idem*
a 'new world order' that would redistribute the wealth created by the American people¹.

1988, December 7 — In an address to the U.N., Mikhail Gorbachev called for mutual consensus:

World progress is only possible through a search for universal human consensus as we move forward to a new world order².

1989, May 12 — President Bush (Sr.) invited the then Soviets to join 'World Order'. Speaking to the graduating class at Texas A&M University Mr. Bush (Sr.) states that the United States is ready to welcome the Soviet Union "back into the world order"³.

1990, September 11 — President Bush (Sr.) called the Gulf War an opportunity for the New World Order. In an address to Congress entitled Toward a New World Order, Mr. Bush (Sr.) says:

The crisis in the Persian Gulf offers a rare opportunity to move toward an historic period of cooperation. Out of these troubled times...a new world order can emerge in which the nations of the world, east and west, north and south, can prosper and live in harmony....Today the new world is struggling to be born⁴.

1990, September 25 — In an address to the U.N., Soviet Foreign
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¹ D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D, "A Chronological History: The New World Order".
² Idem
³ Idem
⁴ Idem
Minister Eduard Shevardnadze described Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait as “an act of terrorism [that] has been perpetrated against the emerging New World Order”. On December 31, 1990 C.E. Gorbachev declared that the ‘New World Order’ would be ushered in by the Gulf Crisis.¹

1990, October 1 — In a U.N. address, President Bush (Sr.) spoke of the:

...collective strength of the world community expressed by the U.N... an historic movement towards a new world order...a new partnership of nations...a time when humankind came into its own...to bring about a revolution of the spirit and the mind and begin a journey into a...new age².

1991 — President Bush (Sr.) praised the ‘New World Order’ in a State of Union Message:

What is at stake is more than one small country, it is a big idea — a new world order...to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind...based on shared principles and the rule of law....The illumination of a thousand points of light....The winds of change are with us now³.

1991, February 6 — President Bush (Sr.) told the Economic Club of New York:

My vision of a new world order foresees a United Nations

¹ D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D, “A Chronological History: The New World Order”.
² Idem
³ Idem
with a revitalized peacekeeping function\(^1\).

1991, October 29 — David Funderburk, former U. S. Ambassador to Romania, told a North Carolina audience:

George Bush [Sr.] has been surrounding himself with people who believe in one-world government. They believe that the Soviet system and the American system are converging\(^2\).

1991, October 30 — President Gorbachev at the Middle East Peace Talks in Madrid states:

We are beginning to see practical support. And this is a very significant sign of the movement towards a new era, a new age...We see both in our country and elsewhere...ghosts of the old thinking...When we rid ourselves of their presence, we will be better able to move toward a new world order...relying on the relevant mechanisms of the United Nations\(^3\).

1994, April 19 — Henry Kissenger in World Affairs Council Press Conference at Regent Beverly Wilshire Hotel said:

[The New World Order] cannot happen without U.S. participation, as we are the most significant single component. Yes, there will be a New World Order, and it will force the United States to change its perceptions.\(^4\)
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1 D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D, “A Chronological History: The New World Order”.
2 Idem
3 Idem
4 “New World Order Quotes”, freedomdomain.
1995 — The *State of the World Forum* took place in the fall of this year, sponsored by the Gorbachev Foundation located at the Presidio in San Francisco. Foundation President Jim Garrison chaired the meeting of who's-who from around the world including Margaret Thatcher, Maurice Strong, George Bush (Sr.), Mikhail Gorbachev and others. Conversation centered around the oneness of mankind and the coming global government. However, the term "global governance" is now used in place of "new world order" since the latter has become a political liability, being a lightning rod for opponents of global government\(^1\).

### 3.5.3 Implementation of 'New World Order'

Actually the 'new world order' concept as referred to by various writers was not just one definitive vision rather it assumed multiple roles and meanings. At the same time it was an idealistic theory and a political strategy that helped Washington execute its national interests by offering political cover, legal justification, and the basis for collective action in war as described by Eric A. Miller and Steve A. Yetiv\(^2\).

Scowcroft declared his view in an interview, "The U.S. had to be the leader. No one else could be a focal point for dealing with aggression, but it was not coercion. It was infinite consultation, cajoling, and listening to their views. We led and got our way, but no one felt steam-rolled. We
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\(^1\) D.L. Cuddy, Ph.D, "A Chronological History: The New World Order".
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worked at it every day". Thus, the Gulf crisis could serve as a postwar precedent for the importance of generating international action authorized by an international body such as the UN and led by the United States. As White House Chief of Staff John Sununu in an interview on BBC put it, Bush's ability to weave together a coalition under UN auspices "laid the foundation for multilateral versus unilateral action for the twenty-first century". As Haass recalls, decision makers sought to establish a model for post-Cold War leadership and coalition building in which aggression could be reversed by collective security. Confirming that view, Scowcroft notes that the United States tried "to behave in the Gulf crisis in ways that would be a model for dealing with future crises in the post-Cold War world. That's how the 'new world order' concept came up, as a model for dealing with aggressors. The U.S. should behave in a way that others can trust and get UN support". Even Chas W. Freeman, who was critical of Bush's (Sr.) inability to develop a coherent war termination strategy at the end of the ground war in late February 1991 C.E., found that the Gulf War taught the United States significant lessons about military coalition building and coalition management1.

As per political writers, the regular check for the offensive use of force was the overarching principle of Bush's (Sr.) 'new world order', and it rested heavily on the rule of law, although, as Bush (Sr.) recounts, "this objective remained distinctly secondary in our public explications of our
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purposes in the Gulf crisis. Reflective of his view during the crisis, Bush (Sr.) noted in late January 1991 C.E. that what was, and is, at stake is not simply American energy or economic security and the stability of a vital region but the prospects for peace in the post-Cold War era — the promise of a 'new world order' based upon the rule of law.

It has been analyzed that America, especially, decision makers in President Bush's (Sr.) exclusive inner cabinet and in the lower-level deputies committee that served the inner cabinet consciously tried to setup a framework for a 'new world order' through their actions and statements during the crisis. Since this effort remained secondary to other objectives during the crisis and the concept of the 'new world order' was dramatized for political effect, it did play an important role which was proved later by the writers. Bush (Sr.) according to reports at that time was widely criticized and ridiculed for lacking vision for the creation of basis of a new world order. New era with a better world was expected only in late 1980s.

'New World Order' was presumed to be implemented through 'globalization' because globalization is supposed to create both economic prosperity and better governance by sovereign states as was declared by various US officials. Moreover, it was made necessary that international structures and organizations with the accountability, checks and balances have to be at par with globalization to make it a success. Otherwise

Globalization would usher in an era where global governance is a mask for uncontrolled power that will inevitably contract the scope of human freedom which is described by various writers like John O. McGinnis. It was put forth by various political scientists during the Cold War that the World Order — and the Charter system — was not an equilibrium mechanism like global climate. But it could be preserved only if governments and international institutions, and the men and women behind them, were able to understand its importance and the courage and tenacity to fight for its survival.

According to some leading American strategists, Japan, a united Europe, Germany and China would be the patrons of the 'New World Order' besides the United States of America. For these reasons, some American strategists were concerned with the balance of power in Eurasia. American roots have deepened in Japan, Korea and Germany and after 50 years some repositioning is in prospect as noted by Terence O'Brien.

1 John O. McGinnis, "Individualism & World Order", p. 44.
The lectures of Bush (Jr.) at various occasions clearly infer that the US does not want any government in a position to check it through international institutions or legal opposition, which is why the United Nations most of the times remains silent and has to go. Washington as reported by its officials wants a new international regime of democratic coalitions, which it says would possess a legitimacy the UN lacks, and could deal expeditiously and effectively with threats to the international order. To make it more simple and as per Sharif M. Shuja, the Bush Administration envisages a world run by the United States, backed by as many states as will sign on to support it but not interfere.

US according to Robert Keohane and Joseph S. Nyre, Jr., now aims at the progressive militarisation of international relations and disavowal of great power accountability. The US according to them believes that the legitimacy for the exercise of power provided by the UN Security Council is dismissed by major powers, not the United States alone, wherever it does not serve their immediate interests. Transparency, accountability and equality before the law are, of course, fundamental precepts of democratic life within domestic society. Yet with reference to present scenario as claimed by some leading writers world is witnessing a retreat from those very precepts in international relations, in an era when democracy at the
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1 Sharif M. Shuja, “Is the New world Order Emerging?”, p. 152.
level of the individual nation state is advancing as hesitant, erratic or ambiguous as that advance may sometimes be\textsuperscript{1}.

‘New World Order’ proclaims the greater pooling of sovereignties as claimed by its proponents for the greater common good, whether over peace and security, sound environmental behaviour or an even-handed system of international justice, but it does not seem imminent. Yet the deepening interdependence of the planet, and the rise of trans-national business and of global democratic civil society united by the worldwide web, means that the democratising of democracy itself must extend upwards beyond the level of the nation-state. This may be the more readily achievable at the regional rather than the global level\textsuperscript{2}, but an effort must be made.

According to Terene O’Brein, if it is not, the cause of democracy as a foundation for peace will surely be undermined. In devising and articulating its role for the contemporary world, the United States is confronting the challenges of its own success as has been seen in the previous decade. It has, for half a century, been to the fore in spreading democracy and respect for human rights internationally. It cannot now ignore the consequences of its accomplishments as it elaborates a new doctrine of leadership. No previous imperial power had ever to contend with the fact of democracy or the inducement of human rights. The


British, French and Spanish empires were, for example, autocratic, exploitative, racist and totally unaccountable. The United States enjoys no such similar latitude as held by Terene O'Brein. Inspite of this fact there are voices that there exist racists.

Yet on the one previous occasion in modern history where America occupied similar such unchallenged pre-eminence, it drew precisely the opposite conclusion. This was in 1945 C.E. after the Second World War when the United States alone possessed the atomic bomb, had vast military forces under arms and the strongest economy by far in the world. Washington opted creatively for the establishment of a so-called ‘liberal multilateral world system’ by fashioning the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and related institutions. The judgment then was that US vital national interests were best served by mediating US power and influence through a global system. The judgment was made that by accepting some measure of restraint upon its absolute freedom to do as it saw fit, the United States was more likely to engage support of others for its broad objectives of an open, liberal peaceful, democratic world from which America itself would derive over-riding benefit. That proved to be sound judgment according to the leading personalities of the world of the time.

---


2 Ibid., p. 27.
According to US policy makers, it is official that every new member of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) must gain entry into the European Union (EU), thus cementing the new relationship with Eastern Europe at both the military and economic levels. In the end, every NATO member will be a free-market democracy, observing the rule of law and respecting human rights and co-operating with the United States to promote democratic values throughout the world\(^1\) in a way implementing 'New World Order'.

It is noteworthy here that while the Gulf crisis was hardly on the scale of the two great wars of the century, it did motivate decision makers to attempt consciously to create the rudiments of a new world order. The concept as defined earlier which was more than mere politics, was largely a function of both the Gulf crisis and tectonic shifts in global affairs. In 1989 C.E., it was an ambiguous, scarcely articulated notion; by the fall of 1990 C.E., it was created in rhetoric; and by the end of the war, it was made tangible by UN action and by the use of force under collective security\(^2\). Another factor is that Washington was / is interested in geopolitics of the Middle East\(^3\).

Alvin Toffler describes Violence, Wealth, and Knowledge as the three main instruments of power in the modern world. Violence to be
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more definitive is embodied in “the rule of law”: the vaguely suggested threat of violence used, for the most part, by the State through police, courts, and armies. Wealth as usual is embodied in corporations, in capital, and in the control of natural resources. Knowledge as proved by all is largely the province of the new information technologies, although educational and cultural capital, like libraries and museums, are also included1.

Toffler quotes:

In sum, the rise of the industrial nation-state brought the systematic monopolization of violence, the sublimation of violence into law, and the growing dependence of the population on money. These three changes made it possible for the elites of industrial societies increasingly to make use of wealth rather than overt force to impose their will on history2.

Samuel P. Huntington at the beginning of the 1990’s alarmed all by exposing certain strategies that US would adopt in order to maintain its dominance: 1) Prevent any single power from dominating Europe, Asia, or both; 2) Prevent the total disintegration of the then Soviet Union; 3) Limit German power by encouraging its participation in NATO and other European international organizations. At the same time, however, such participation would be coordinated with the United Kingdom and France to prevent Germany, from dominating those organizations; 4) Prevent a
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united Europe from becoming a political entity with a united foreign policy; 5) Place constraints on Japanese power in East Asia by supporting the movement towards Korean-reunification and maintaining a limited military presence in the area; and 6) Contain China internally by encouraging it to make more progress towards a market economy and democratization.

These strategies have somehow been adopted by the US and various writers on that basis predicted that events effective to all would occur under 'New World Order' and have come true, like:

- The abolition of and gun ownership.
- World-wide equalization (economic equalization of nations) under UN control (controlled by the US)
- all national and local elections controlled by the UN (controlled by the US)
- the UN charter replaced by the US constitution
- only approved versions / interpretations of religions will be allowed to exist – as parts of the One World Religion
- Loss of the Freedom of speech.
- Important UN documents being rewritten along pro-US lines.

---

2 “New World Order” (conspiracy), Wikipedia.
3.5.4 Reasons behind Implementation

The boon of ‘New World Order’ is a call for a system of world parliamentary democracy under the United Nations as explained by politicians like Brent Scowcroft and others. It, therefore, as its exponents claim is a justification for sustaining the democratic practices of checks and balances and of separation of powers in appropriate ways at the level of international institutions. To achieve this requires according to ‘New World Order’ propounders a very delicate balance, while at the same time recognising that there are justifiable circumstances for external intervention in states where peace, security or values are seriously threatened. Such intervention requires legitimisation by the UN Security Council.

Viven A. Schmidt while expressing his views over stated that, soon after George Bush (Sr.) announced the beginning of a ‘new world order’, it was proved that peace was a pipe dream, as has been global prosperity.

The Western alliance, under the leadership of the United States determines to maintain its ascendancy through military superiority, cultural dominance, and technological advantage as claimed by various thinkers like Muhammad Ayoob. It is obvious that the ‘new world order’
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1 Terence O’Brien, “Multilateralism and World Order: Terence O’Brein Criticises the United States’ New Doctrine of pre-Emptive Intervention and Urges the Importance of International Affairs”, p. 25.

prioritizes, as did the old one, the security concerns of world security\(^1\).

Emphatically, it seems at this particular historical moment, the United States holds the key to whatever new international order will emerge or fail to emerge. In one of the issues of *Time* Magazine, Charles Krauthammer summarises the reasons for America's current pre-eminent position in the world:

By every measure, the extent of America's dominance astonishes. Militarily, there has never in the past thousand years been a greater gap between the No. 1 world power and the No. 2. Not even the British Empire at its height displayed the superiority shown by American arms today. Economically? The American economy is more than twice the size of its nearest competitor. We enjoy, almost uniquely, low inflation, low unemployment and vigorous growth. Culturally? ... There has been mass culture. But there has never before been mass world culture. Now one is emerging, and it is distinctly American .... Diplomatically? Nothing of significance gets done without us. True, we are not interested in doing terribly much except enjoying our success and getting even richer. But that just makes the point... When America takes to the sidelines in the Middle East, nothing moves. We decide if NATO expands and who gets in. And where we decide not to decide, as in Cambodia — often held up as an example of how the U.N. and regional powers can settle local conflicts without the U.S. — all hell breaks loose. All right then. We all . . .
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agree on the premise: the bipolar world of the cold war begat not, as predicted, a multipolar world but a unipolar one with the U.S. standing alone at its apex¹.

According to O'Brien the United States has a strong preference for American-led coalitions to deal with international trouble spots as opposed to working through the United Nations to solve these same problems². In fact, the United States as stated by Lewis Fretz either lacks interest in or demonstrates outright opposition to reforming and strengthening the United Nations³.

History clarifies that there have been many ever since 1945 C.E., and for that matter much earlier: quite simply, numerous stages to make the world safe for capitalism, particularly American capitalism. Writers like Ralph Milliband strengthened this statement by justifying that this is a gigantic, global enterprise, conducted in every part of the world by diplomatic, economic, cultural, and, where required, military means; it is intended to subdue and defeat attempts at radical reform and independence from Western domination. It used to be conducted in the name of resistance to Communist expansionism; now it is conducted under the guise of democracy, freedom, and whatever other legitimating device is deemed appropriate. It is an enterprise that has the support of all Western governments and to a greater or lesser degree of many governments

---


² Lewis Fretz, “Bill Clinton’s New World Order Takes Shape”, p. 18.

elsewhere as well; it is also supported by the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the European Commissions, and the media, which is proved in writings from *Times*, *New York Times* and *Washington Times*, etc¹.

According to Ralph, there has probably been no time in the last hundred years when capitalism as a world system has been more secure from fundamental challenge than now. Of course, capitalism is plagued by a multitude of problems, in some areas including growing mass unemployment, the underemployment of resources, poverty on a huge scale, even in the so-called affluent societies of the West, the inadequacy of social and collective services in these societies, the degeneration of the inner cities, crime, drugs, and corruption; in many parts of the world are found truly abominable conditions for the mass of the people, with horrendous rates of infant mortality, the lack of the most elementary services, and generally conditions of life that no human being ought to endure².

Furthermore, Ralph feels satisfied over people who understand that the globalization of capital and the ever-greater independence of economies mean that there is no space for any national government to introduce and implement radical measures of reform in an international context dominated by multinational corporations, governments, and international
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agencies bitterly hostile to any such reform. National opposition would be bad enough; international opposition, so it is said, would be conclusive. The new world order in this sense, is also taken to mean, and is indeed taken to mean above all, the end of any radical challenge to the capitalist status quo by any individual country; since the simultaneous adoption of radical program by many countries is not very likely, nothing much by way of radical reform by any single government, however determined, is possible.

Political scientist Samuel Huntington most aptly captures 'New World Order' tension in his 1999 C.E. article “The Lonely Superpower”, in which he dubs the contemporary international framework a “uni-multipolar” system of one superpower and several major powers. On the one hand, the United States has, as the world's sole superpower, the military and financial capacity to take any form of action it desires. But on the other hand, there is a strong international movement toward establishing a truly multipolar world in which no one nation dominates others. According to Huntington, as a result, the United States has the physical ability to pursue a unilateralist foreign policy, but it is politically constrained from doing so.

In an internal Defense Department memo, US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld does show some sensitivity to the unique situations of
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1 Ralph Milliband, “The New World Order and the Left”, p. 20.

individual countries. "While most countries are concerned about terrorism, each country has a different perspective and different relationships" that will require it to change its level of support for the coalition as time passes. But Rumsfeld clearly indicates that the shifting nature of the coalition will not prevent US action\(^1\).

This coalition, therefore, is neither an expression of true multilateralism, nor is it a return to strictly unilateralist Cold War-era policies. Rather, it is a dangerous mix of the two, in which the United States will make an effort to secure some form of international sanction for its actions but will ultimately pursue its own design regardless of the strength or validity of such support. The result is that the United States will get enough international backing to legitimize its actions, but not enough to protect it from political censure. Such piecemeal international support will not be strong or widespread enough to prevent the impression that the United States is once again asserting its hegemonic authority over a reluctant international community as has been explained by Sabeel Rahman\(^2\).

Joseph Nye quotes

A pre-eminent United States will face three types of conflicts in the future — great power conflicts, major regional conflicts, and communal conflicts in peripheral states. Great power conflicts are the least likely because nuclear weapons are
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\(^1\) Sabeel Rahman, "Another New World Order? Multilateralism in the Aftermath of September 11", p. 44.

\(^2\) Idem
involved; however, they are not unthinkable, as conflict could still occur at the conventional level. Major regional conflicts, especially in the Middle East and East Asia, are far more likely to occur, as regional powers seek to become regional hegemons by either challenging the United States or challenging one another. Communal conflicts in peripheral states, located predominantly in the developing world, will be the most common problem facing the United States and its allies as they seek to maintain order and stability in a world where the law of the jungle still counts for more than the rule of law.

Nye concludes his analysis with these words:

Leadership by the United States, as the world’s leading economy, its most powerful military force, and a leading democracy, is a key factor in limiting the frequency and destructiveness of great power, regional, and communal conflicts. The paradox of the post-cold war role of the United States is that it is the most powerful state in terms of both ‘hard’ power resources (its economy and military forces) and ‘soft’ ones (the appeal of its political system and culture), yet it is not so powerful that it can achieve all its international goals by acting alone. The U.S. role will thus not be that of a lone global policeman; rather, the United States can frequently serve as the sheriff of the posse, leading shifting coalitions of friends and allies to address shared
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security concerns within the legitimizing framework of international organizations.

World is no longer structured according to the political realities that prevailed at the end of the Second World War. Of course, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War cleared for a long time that the world is no longer divided into two opposing ideological and military camps whose rivalry set the framework for much of international public life between 1945 C.E. and 1991 C.E. According to Lewis Fretz, the new situation helped U.S. military, economic, and cultural power in the world to emerge, develop and rule. Other relevant factors as described by Nye, include the absolute and relative decline of Western European influence in the world; the emergence of China, India, and Japan as international actors with potentially global impact; the new influence of international economic and financial institutions such as the World Bank, the IMF, and the World Trade Organization (WTO); the impact of international nongovernmental organizations on the world political debate; the global communications revolution and the emergence of a “real-time” global politics; and the new assertiveness of religious conviction as a factor in the politics of nations.

One of the striking features of the ‘new world order’ is the way in which it unfolded. Although peaceful change in the international system is
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2 Lewis Fretz, “Bill Clinton’s New World Order Takes Shape”, pp. 16-17.
possible, some students of world politics postulate the need of a world war or a hegemonic war as the main mechanism for achieving change\(^1\). Hassan Elhag Ali asserts that the internal disintegration of the then Soviet Union left the United States as the only major superpower. Also, a war, which was not hegemonic, the second Gulf War, asserted and confirmed the ascendancy of the United States as the dominant world military power\(^2\).

On the basis of the analysis given above, it can be inferred that there is a perpetual hope that the present or next generation of leaders in the United States will also revert, once again, to that same broad strategic conclusion. American power is not eternal and the need to ensure solid foundations for a workable and equitable international system for the time when that mantle of US power recedes represents good insurance policy. The paradox for American power right now, as even Iraq proved, is that the United States will not be able to secure its existing goals alone or with a handful of understudies.

### 3.5.5 Effects of World Order

The clear lesson of history, especially prior to the Second World War, is nonetheless that once the rules unravel in one domain, the greatest

---


danger is that they will unravel everywhere\(^1\).

Now, we can see a 'new world' coming into view. A world in which there is the very real prospect of a 'new world order'. Using Winston Churchill words (posthumously), a "world order" in which "the principles of justice and fair play ... protect the weak against the strong ..."). In the words of George Bush, "A world where the United Nations, freed from cold war stalemate, is poised to fulfill the historic vision of its founders". "A world in which freedom and respect for human rights find a home among all nations"\(^2\).

In many ways, the 'new world order' that is emerging in the aftermath of September 11, 2001 C.E. was supposed to resolve the contradictions inherent in the nature of post-Cold War international relations as presumed by writers like Sabeel Rahman\(^3\).

Although the events of 9/11 and the Iraq war after 2003 C.E. demonstrate US hyperpower, it is a little too early to be sure, and it is also uncertain whether or not they will produce some kind of 'new world order'. Sharif M. Shuja illustrates that it will yet take a long time to shape a new order of international relations, but the key principle governing the new order should be non-interference in other nations' internal affairs and

\(^1\) Terence O'Brien, "Multilateralism and World Order: Terence O'Brein Criticises the United States' New Doctrine of pre-Emptive Intervention and Urges the Importance of International Affairs", pp. 27-28.


\(^3\) Sabeel Rahman, "Another New World Order? Multilateralism in the Aftermath of September 11!", p. 41.
U.S. under the ‘New World Order’ banner is creating similar situations as did Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries C.E. The rich got richer; the poor got poorer. World is facing the same prospects today as was reported by the Washington Times.

So one becomes desperate to respond that there is nothing new in the ‘New World Order’. There isn’t even a ‘new world order’. And for that matter there isn’t any world order at all. On the other hand, it makes more sense to speak of a new world disorder as Paul M. Sweezy has described it.

Thus, according to the New American report, what the world really needs, in other words, is a central ruling elite who can exercise power as Lenin defined it. Since the end of the Cold War, theorists, such as Kenneth Waltz, have argued that in the absence of effective countervailing pressures, the United States is likely to become increasingly unilateral in seeking to secure its foreign policy interests, and in so doing rely on its military preponderance to realise its vision of a ‘new world order’.

September 11, 2001 C.E. and subsequent attacks in Yemen, Bali, Kenya,
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Morocco and, more recently, Saudi Arabia, have changed little in this regard. Instead, the effect of September 11, 2001 C.E. has been to enhance American power and extend its military presence in the world as depicted by Sharif M. Shuja¹.

Steven Yates comments, “New World Order would not be good for the majority of people on the planet”². It would be defined as a system run by and for a cadre of superelites: that minority of the world population that finds itself obsessed with power and is compelled to build empires. The rest of the world would be little better than livestock, no matter their economic status as per theorists elucidation.

‘New World Order’ as remarked by D. Lossman, gave one specific gift to the world in the form of ‘sanctions’. The end of the Cold War has marked economic sanctions (the interruption of some or all economic relations)³ as a common instrument of diplomacy⁴ and tools of international pressure. However, in late twentieth century C.E. sanctions have become more frequent tool of implementing hostile foreign policy.

In a two-superpower world, sanctions were less effective because states could build an alliance with any country cut off by the other. Richard Garfield pinpoints that the US has been continuously using its ground troops to settle international disputes\(^1\).

It appears that the sanctioned country bears the full cost of sanctions. But many of those costs are borne solely by the civilian population. Most sanctions increase suffering among civilians, particularly among the most disadvantaged\(^2\). The cases of Iraq, Haiti, and Cuba show how damaging sanctions can be, especially in terms of human suffering. Increasingly, reports of human suffering have made the subject of sanctions a volatile issue in the mind of the American public. In response, the State Department has criticized the methodology of the studies rather than their substance\(^3\). So ‘Just World Order’ demands the search for alternative hostile foreign policy of paramount importance.

While the ‘new world order’ has led to the birth of democracies, particularly in Eastern Europe, it is assumed that it will produce the same
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effect in some parts of the Middle East. The ‘new Arab order’ is supposed to mean less democracy in the wealthy Gulf states.

According to Lewis Fretz, in its quest to construct a ‘new global order’ dominated by a grand confederation of Western democracies, U.S. succeeded in many places and has a reasonably good chance of succeeding in other areas like the Asia-Pacific region. In the Middle East it will face nearly insuperable difficulties; nevertheless, failure in that region will not wreck his chances of creating a ‘new world order’. With the result life of people has become extremely unpleasant for people of that region. North America, Europe, Russia, and the Asia-Pacific region determine the future shape of the international order. The emerging world order now appeals both to prototypes of Woodrow Wilson and Henry Kissinger. In 1988 C.E., Charles Krauthammer accurately predicted what might happen in the post-Cold War era:

[T]here is the opportunity in the coming decades for . . . a unipolar system centered on an integrated West of Western Europe, North America, Japan .... Radiating from the center would be . . . the de-socializing states (China, Russia, Eastern Europe), increasingly finding themselves in a condition of economic and technological dependency on the West. To the extent that they reform — free up prices, enterprise, human energies, and freedoms — they become less dependent, but more
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Western and thus less threatening. It is even conceivable that part of the communist world . . . could progressively become integrated in the Western system through such mechanisms as the IMF, GATT, and even the EEC [and NATO] .... If we intelligently manage Western integration . . . the next century holds out the promise of a Western Peace as global and secure as any that we have known before¹.

It seems that the 'new world order', at least as far as many actors at different levels in the Islamic world (i.e., states, organizations, or individuals) are concerned, does not mean change for the better, for the issues which it raises are not of major concern to those actors. Hassan Elhag Ali delineates that issues of external military threats, nuclear deterrence, and balance of power are not urgent issues for most Islamic world actors. When Third World countries proposed a 'new world information order' and a 'new world economic order', they were faced with fierce opposition on the part of the West. For the Western industrialized nations, preservation of the status quo means the continuation of their dominance².

Brzezinski puts the argument:

With nuclear weapons inhibiting the recourse to war among the leading powers, global politics are becoming in some ways similar to American urban centers: a mixture of


interdependence and inequality with violence concentrated in the poorer segments of the society\(^1\).

Furthermore, the ‘new world order’ as per David A. Luke, did not signify that the world was moving into an era of ‘peace’. Rather, it represented in part a “challenge to keep the dangers of disorder at bay”\(^2\). And it also did not refer, as some observers assumed, to a Pax Americana. Even during the crisis, Washington had to cooperate with Middle Eastern and European states, with some twenty-eight nations in the U.S.-led military alliance, and with numerous other states in the United Nations. Moreover, it had to draw on many states for financial support, which covered nearly 90 percent of the incremental cost of the campaign\(^3\).

It would be more apt to term much of what is happening on in the world in the words of Samir Amin as ‘chaos’\(^4\). The world is witnessing a systematic crisis — an era of chaos. However, Wallerstein cautions:

To be sure, after systemic chaos will come some new order, or orders. But here we must stop. It is not possible to discern what such a new order would be. It is only possible to assert what we would like it to be and struggle to make it so\(^5\).


\(^3\) David A. Lake, *Entangling Relations: American Foreign Policy in its Century*, p. 229.


As is evident from the rising business the 'new world order' is becoming incorporated, meaning nation-state is in decline. Viven A. Schmidt states that for times to come this is a serious problem, since the nation-state will continue to be the prime interlocutor in an increasingly complex world, and the only one that speaks with authority to both supranational and subnational authorities. The challenge for the nation-state is two-fold: First, it must ensure that as the world becomes increasingly interdependent economically as a result of the internationalization of trade the social spillovers are not neglected. This is not so difficult theoretically, as long as advanced industrialized nations exercise leadership. Second, it must find new ways of ensuring democratic access to the national decisions that are part of the supranational decision-making process. This is much more complicated. But unless nation-states make their citizens feel that they are participating in the supranational decisions that increasingly affect their lives, the legitimacy of both the supranational organizations and the nation-state will be increasingly open to question as has been questioned time and again by various scholars¹.

Nation states are supposed to experience the disruptive effects continuously of the new economic world order at different rates. Many will undergo a weakening of the nation-state and of the voice of the

¹ Viven A. Schmidt, "The New World Order, Incorporated; the Rise of Business and the Decline of the Nation State", p. 80.
people, but a few like Italy and Japan may find one or the other strengthened. Overall, however, Just World Order is at demand.

For the emergence of ‘New World Order’ no nation state will ever surrender its sovereignty and power to some other nation or to the United Nations; especially to a super-power like the United States, which, in all matters, values its independence and freedom of action above all else.

It has been proved time and again that the international and regional organizations in no way constitute supranational governments, because all quite narrowly focus on trade and now they are freeing business from the traditional constraints imposed by national governments and societal interests. The problem is that all is happening without substituting some equivalent at the supranational level. The result is expected as a strengthening of business, with transnational corporations less tied to nations and national interests, and this obviously weakens the nation-state overall, in particular of the voice of the people through legislatures and nonbusiness, societal interests.

Increase in international corporations will diminish the autonomy whereas executive power will be enhanced thereby weakening societal interests. By liberalizing their trade policies, by deregulating their economies, and by privatizing their enterprises, national governments have
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1 Viven A. Schmidt, “The New World Order, Incorporated; the Rise of Business and the Decline of the Nation State”, p. 76.
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much less control over what goes on in their own territory or what their own multinationals do elsewhere, and they no longer have the resources they had in the past to solve social problems. At the same time, multinational corporations are less bound economically, politically, and morally to nation-states, while supranational bodies such as General Agreements on Tarrifs and Trade (GATT), North American free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the EU, by concentrating on trade, have given scant attention to the social spillovers.

There is a view fashionable in the media that the world is being taken over by huge multinational corporations, accountable to no one. It is folly to believe that big business on its own is shaping the new world order.

The Russian economist and activist Boris Kagarlitsky wrote,

Globalisation does not mean the impotence of the state but the rejection by the state of its social functions in favour of repressive ones, irresponsibility on the part of governments and the ending of democratic freedoms.

Arnold J. Toynbee Historian, Royal Institute of International Affairs, in 1931 C.E. wrote:

I will merely repeat that we are at present working,

1 Viven A. Schmidt, “The New World Order, Incorporated; the Rise of Business and the Decline of the Nation State”, pp. 75-76.
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discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands.... ¹

The international order which emerged after World War I was based on the primacy of the nation-state. Achieving and maintaining national independence became the driving force of politics. The system that developed after World War II, however, rested on a different foundation: that of ideology². It seems to Hassan Elhag Ali and others that in the ‘new world order’ which is now emerging, economic factors will play a larger and more dominant role³.

Critics of nation-building point out that outsiders can never build nations, if that means creating or repairing all the cultural, social, and historical lies that bind people together as a nation. What US is really talking about according to Francis Fukuyama is state-building — that is, creating or strengthening such government institutions as armies, police forces, judiciaries, central banks, tax-collection agencies, health and education systems, and the like⁴.

² Zbigniew Brezenski, “Selective Global Commitment”, p. 3.
⁴ Francis Fukuyama, “Nation-Building 101: The Chief Threats to Us and to World Order Come from Weak, Collapse, or Failed States. Learning How To Fix Such States-
The idea of a 'new world order' has been widely ridiculed, rightly so if it is taken to mean the coming into being of a new era of 'peace' and 'prosperity'. It is acclaimed true by Ralph Milliband that the threat of global annihilation by nuclear war has been somehow lifted, but the world is nevertheless as much in the grip of crisis and violence as it has ever been.

Mr Mikhail Gorbachov said:

I hope, Mr. Bush [Jr.], as the new American president, that you will give up any illusion that the 21st century can, or even should, be the 'American Century'. Globalization is a given — but 'American Globalization' would be a mistake. In fact, it would be something devoid of meaning and even dangerous.

The fact is that the chief threats to world order come today from weak, collapsed, or failed states. Francis Fukuyama reports that the United States has done a lot of intervening over the past fifteen years, and has taken on roughly one new nation-building commitment every other year since the end of the Cold War. It is a high time for the US and its allies to

And Building Necessary Political Support at Home-Will Be a Defining Issue for America in the Century Ahead”, p. 161.


2 Mikhail Gorbachev, “Mr. Bush, the World Doesn't Want to Be American”, International Herald Tribune, U.S.A., December 30, 2000, p. 46.

3 Francis Fukuyama, “Nation-Building 101: The Chief Threats to Us and to World Order Come from Weak, Collapse, or Failed States. Learning How To Fix Such States-And Building Necessary Political Support at Home-Will Be a Defining Issue for America in the Century Ahead”, p. 160.
stop disturbing others and concentrate upon their own affairs and matters because there are masses who still die for the want of food and many lack necessities even in this twenty-first century C.E. where world is supposed to have reached the highest limits of success.

3.6 Democracy

3.6.1 Origin and Definition

'Democracy' meaning 'rule of the people', is said to have originated in ancient Greece. This term designated "a government where the people share in directing the activities of the state, as distinct from governments controlled by a single class, select group, or autocrat". Democracy can, however, be expanded to describe "a philosophy that insists on the right and the capacity of a people, acting either directly or through representatives, to control their institutions for their own purposes. Such a philosophy places a high value on the equality of individuals and would free people as far as possible from restraints not self-imposed. It insists that necessary restraints be imposed only by the consent of the majority and that they conform to the principle of equality."

In world history, Athenian democracy as noted, was the first such government in the world, although there is evidence of democratic city-state republics in India that may have preceded the Greek example. Still,

---

1 "Democracy", The Columbia Encyclopedia.
2 Idem
3 Idem
most history and government teachers trace the growth of democracy from Athens to the Roman Republic, to the British Magna Carta, to the Enlightenment, the American Revolution, and the writing of the U.S. Constitution

The history of democratic institutions, as held by Mishal Fahm al-Sulami, actually begins not in ancient Greece but in the ancient Middle East, despite a widespread perception among almost all political theorists in the West that democracy was invented by the Greeks and their tendency to refer to the Greek experience as the first example of democracy in ancient history.

It is said that the Greeks were no doubt the first to think systematically about politics, and to comment on, observe and formulate political theories. But the experience of the ancient Middle Eastern democracies was, nonetheless, articulated in a documentary, rather than a theoretical, mode as held by writers.

Springborg provides strong evidence and many examples to show that some democratic institutions existed in the second and third millennium city-states of Mesopotamia and Egypt, anticipating to a

---


4 Patricia Springborg, “The Origins of Liberal Institutions in the Ancient Middle East”, Economic and Political Liberalization in the Middle East, Tim Niblock and Emma Murphy, ed(s), London: British Academic Press, 1993, p. 35.
significant degree the Greek institution of the city-state. Further, she argues that the ancient Middle East probably pioneered those political institutions that Western political theorists associate with economic liberalism in the West¹.

There were four main principles of government in ancient Mesopotamian and Egyptian cities. First is the concept of citizenship. The second principle of government was political representation². The third principle was the rule of law³. The fourth principle of government of ancient Mesopotamian and Egyptian cities was selection by lot, a procedure of electing officials to public office. It was considered democratic, as Greek philosophers argued later, because it took the choice completely out of individual control and all candidates thus could have an equal chance⁴.

It must be noted that these democratic institutions, which had lasted some three millennia, did not develop further. Their decline, as Springborg argues, was mainly the result of huge taxes imposed by the Roman Empire on the cities. Public office, such as municipal offices, carried with it such a heavy burden of fiscal responsibility that few candidates were willing to fill the municipal magistracies. As Stern notes:

² Ibid., p. 28.
[The] class of leading citizens represented on the council was degraded to a group whose main function was to serve as hostages for the taxes imposed on the city, obliged to make good any deficit from their own pockets.

Democracy could be understood in various manners. Some regard democracy as a citizen's right; some say democracy is a style and method of leadership; some think democracy is a form of political life, etc. Marxism, as described by Marxists themselves, always considered the problem of democracy, and connected it with the system of state; therefore, it grasps the essence of the problem. Lenin said: “Translating directly from the original Greek, the term democracy means the people's political power”. He also said, “Democracy is a pattern of the state, a formation of the state”. That means foremost that democracy refers to a state political system that opposes dictatorship. As for “democratic rights”, “democratic style”, “democratic life”, etc., they should be contained by this definition of democracy as the form of the state.

Democracy in its classical mode has meant, first and foremost, 'the rule of people' or 'the will of a people'. This view of democracy as a process of selecting governments, articulated by scholars ranging from Alexis de Tocqueville to Joseph Schumpeter to Robert Dahl, is now widely used by social scientists. In his book, The Third Wave:


Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century, Samuel P. Huntington explains why “Elections, open, free and fair, are the essence of democracy, the inescapable sine qua non”\textsuperscript{1}. Similarly, Joseph Shumpeter maintains that “the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote”\textsuperscript{2}. To Robert Dahl, a system is democratic if it has at least two inseparable features: free and fair political contestation and participation\textsuperscript{3}.

In the light of democracy as defined by Aristotle and Plato, this law that all men are equal — equal not in wealth, in talents, in physical strength or learning but equal in the capacity to distinguish justice from injustice, right from wrong. And it is this capacity, guided by the law of nature that makes possible to all men equally the life of virtue which Plato thought possible only for the few. And it is these two doctrines — the doctrine of natural law and the equality of men — which lie at the foundation of what today we call “democracy” and which sharply distinguish it from the totalitarian systems\textsuperscript{4}.

Democracy is a renewed idea. Now that authoritarian regimes have collapsed in the East and the South and the United States has won the

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
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Cold War against the then Soviet Union — which, after having lost its empire, its all-powerful party, and its technological pride, has finally ceased to exist—many people believe that democracy has won. Many now believe that democracy is of necessity the normal form of political organization, the political face of modernity, whose economic form is the market economy and whose cultural expression is secularization. Reassuring as this belief may be for those living in the West, it is so flimsy that we should find it worrisome. An open and competitive political market is no more identifiable with democracy than a market economy is in itself constitutive of an industrial society. In both cases, we can say that an open system—whether political or economic—is a necessary but not a sufficient precondition for democracy or economic development. There is indeed no democracy unless the ruled are free to choose their rulers, or without political pluralism, but we cannot speak of democracy if the voters' only choice is between two fractions of the oligarchy, the army, or the state apparatus¹.

According to Bobbio, democracy is primarily “a set of rules (primary or basic) which establish who is authorized to take collective decisions and which procedures are to be used”².

Democracy is still a contested term in the West as well. When Britain and France developed the concept of multiparty system in

---
parliaments, they were not accepted as the sole model for democracy. More importantly, the French Revolution developed an "antiparliamentary, plebiscitary" democratic style that had a long-lasting impact on European politics\(^1\). Marxism provided the major alternative in the West. "Marx believed that democratic government was essentially unviable in a capitalist society. . . . The post-capitalist state would not. . . bear any resemblance to a parliamentary regime. Parliaments create unacceptable barriers between the ruled and their representatives"\(^2\). It has been analyzed by Esposito and Obert Voll, "Marxist political alternatives took a variety of forms in practice, but most represent, even in principle, a very different Western model of democracy"\(^3\).

Democratization is viewed as "a process that introduces foreign and inauthentic institutions and norms into societies. The contestation over the definition of democracy thus expands into the areas of conflict between 'foreign' and 'authentic'"\(^4\).

If we look at the concept, democracy is described as about equality and public decision making. Capitalism is about the opposite. Private property rights, the essence of capitalism, denote power relationships

\(^4\) Ibid, p. 18.
between people.

W. B. Gallie some years ago said, "Democracy is an essentially contested concept". He noted that "there are disputes, centred on [such concepts] . . . which are perfectly genuine: which, although not resolvable by argument of any kind, are nevertheless sustained by perfectly respectable arguments and evidence".

Democratization is conceptualized as the demand for empowerment in government and politics made by a growing portion of populations around the world. As the technologies of government and rule became more sophisticated, there was a growing sense of marginalization among most people, even in those states universally thought of as “democratic”. High-tech administration and growing bureaucracies accompanied the increasing size and scope of governmental operations in the twentieth century C.E. Such technologies could transform more traditional autocracies into relatively effective authoritarian dictatorships of both the right and the left, and transform leaders of old-fashioned democratic republics into elites capable of manipulating the masses and creating a sense of departure from participatory politics.

The heart of the democracy, as per Wayne Gabardi, is “the community” understood as a group of people who share the same framework of values. For deliberative democrats, “it is ‘the public sphere’

---

understood as a public space of rational collective deliberation”. For agonistic democrats, “it is ‘identity/difference’ understood as the egalitarian reconstitution of cultural life within a radically pluralized, postmodern political culture”1.

Democracy should be reviewed as something other than a form of government. It should rather be understood as a “mode of being that is conditioned by bitter experience, doomed to succeed only temporarily, but is a recurrent possibility as long as the memory of the political survives”2. Wolin has described democracy as “a mode of action that is episodic, fugitive, and challenges boundaries. The demos is activated and takes shape in the midst of revolt, resistance, and revolution, releases of human energies that contest established boundaries, institutions, and practices. It is always in an ongoing struggle with its more powerful rival — the domus (a bounded political community where likeness and unity are the dominant norms)”3.

James Mill's son, John Stuart Mill, the philosopher whose name is always identified with the development of liberal thought in the nineteenth century C.E., accepted elected representative democracy as the best form of government. More importantly, he pushed the debate about democracy to a much more sophisticated level. First, he distinguished in

---


3 Ibid., p. 33.
Considerations on Representative Government (1861 C.E.) between two different types of democracy:

Two very different ideas are usually confounded under the name democracy. The pure idea of democracy, according to its definition, is the government of the whole people by the whole people, equally represented. Democracy (the second type) as commonly conceived and hitherto practised is the government of the whole people by a mere majority of the people, exclusively represented.

Democracy is considered as the broad model of government as such communism is no more alive, military rule everywhere lacks appeal and normative justification as thinkers put it.

Schumpeter described democracy in his way and outlined an elite model of democracy that has since become dominant. He rejected earlier visionary models that focused on self-governing communities of citizens who are made capable of common purpose through civic education and participation which was proposed by Barber. Instead, Schumpeter described the way elites continued to rule despite formal structures of
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3 J. Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, p. 269.

democracy\(^1\) proposed by Machperson. Rather than "the people" deciding the important questions, and then choosing representatives to carry out their wishes, Schumpeter suggested that the "democratic" process be reversed. Electorates should choose the men who are to do the deciding. This is a "democracy of personnel selection"\(^2\) as said by Gordon Laxer.

This clarifies that democracy is the real control of decision making in all spheres of society, public and private, by non-elite people as described by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the participative system of John Stuart Mill\(^3\).

Internet and other modes of communication pose a new challenge to the meaning of "democracy". In his widely praised but controversial book, *The New Prince: Machiavelli Updated for the Twenty-First Century*, political consultant Dick Morris argues "that the foundation of U.S. democracy - that is, Madisonian representative government - is rapidly shifting to a Jeffersonian model where direct citizen involvement and interest is almost constant. We are about to enter an era of pure Jeffersonian democracy, where Internet town meetings will convey daily or weekly advice to elected officials and structure most of the major decisions on important issues"\(^4\).


It is important to recognize that multipartyism is not democracy. Too often the terms "liberalization" and "democratization" become confused. As explained by Abdelhamid Brahimi, "liberalization indicates a diminished role for government in the lives of its citizens. It means relaxing government supervision of individual and collective life and allowing free expression of ideas and the formation of interest groups". Democracy, however, requires not only the proliferation of political parties, but fair contestation amongst them.\(^1\)

If democracy be expressed as a mode of governance it clearly explains as to how the demos has been effectively colonized by the domus. In Wolin's view, it is difficult to tell where democracy is located and experienced today. To explain democracy more emphatically, Wolin expresses it as an event when ordinary people become "political beings through the self-discovery of common concerns and modes of action for realizing them".\(^2\)

Within the framework of the law of nature, secular political theorists, who had done much of the work in this area in the Renaissance, introduced ideas and institutions to look beyond the absolutist state — which had been created to sort out certain constitutional problems in a particular period of the historical development of Western governments (people give their power into the hands of an absolute sovereign in return


\(^2\) Sheldon Wolin, "Fugitive Democracy", p. 31.
for peace and security). They developed a model of government where the power of government is not exercised by one person, but by many.1

In the beginning of the twentieth century C.E., H. A. R. Gibb noted that nationalism "in its Western manifestations is confined to the intellectuals who are in direct and close touch with Western thought. As the nationalist idea penetrated into the popular mind, it was transformed, and could not avoid being transformed, by the pressure of the age-long instincts and impulses of the Muslim masses".2 Similarly, democratization loses its secular dimensions as it becomes a popular, and more truly democratic movement because its base of support is the Islamic orientation. With the result, the pressures for democratization in the Islamic world reinforce and gave added strength to the Islamic resurgence3.

Democracy is thus defined in varied ways. Democracy, as inferred by Kofi A. Annan, is the method directly involved with managing and resolving disputes peacefully and most of all to implement mutual trust. Nothing destroys that atmosphere more than fear and intolerance, combined with injustice and discrimination. People lose faith in such institutions because they feel that they are treated unfairly, and are threatened or excluded simply by belonging to a particular group or

---
1 Mishal Fahm Al-Sulami, *The West and Islam: Western Liberal Democracy versus the System of Shura*, p. 84.
Conclusively, it could be inferred that, democracy is an 'essentially contested concept'. It has no single precise and agreed meaning. It has had very different connotations in its long history and there is an entirely different version of the concept in modern times from that in ancient Greece, for example. Contemporary understanding of the concept of democracy requires, as Arblaster points out, an examination of the historical development of democratic ideas and institutions from their inception to their present forms.

To sum up, 'democracy' has a new interpretation in the twentieth century C.E. 'Democracy' means in modern democratic theory an 'elective representative system'. Many modern commentators, from Burke, Madison, John Stuart Mill and Schumpeter to those of the present day, have seen representation as a means of limiting mass participation and control, and of retaining the day-to-day powers of government in the hands of an elite.

Contrary to this, the greatest misfortune of the European continent (birthplace of modern democracy) in the twentieth century C.E., as per David Macey, has been not poverty but totalitarianism. For a long time to come, many of us will agree that “the limitation of power is the primary

---

3 Ibid., p. 60.
definition of democracy”\textsuperscript{1}.

3.6.2 Historical Development

Democracy is said to have flourished in Greek city-state where from it reached its fullest expression in ancient Athens. Athenians, as members of the assembly, directly participated in the making of their laws. A democracy of this sort was not possible in large state because it needed an environment where the people were politically educated. Moreover, the majority of inhabitants were slaves or noncitizens, which also helped in its development. But Athenian democracy could not resist imperial rule like other ancient democracies in the early Italian cities and the early church. This was the period in the Middle Ages when ideas crucial to modern Western democracy like ‘representation’ were developed\textsuperscript{2}.

Ancient Athenians called non-participating inhabitants in public affairs, as idiots. On that basis it seems that existing capitalist democracy turns the greater population into political idiots because political processes nowadays are commercialized and so it turns to be a commodified politics. Moreover, participatory institutions, like political parties and labor unions, that make popular participation in decision-making in mass polities even theoretically possible are systematically dismantled and mass

\textsuperscript{1} David Macey, \textit{What Is Democracy?}, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{2} “Democracy”, \textit{The Columbia Encyclopedia}. 
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Democracy, as per history, at first emerged in capitalist societies or that were becoming so. This means that capitalism had something to do with it as put by Gordon Laxer. Marxists, as noted, thought of bourgeoisie\footnote{The "middle class".} as the main agent of democracy\footnote{Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Stephens, Evelyne Huber, and Stephens, John D. ed(s), \textit{Capitalist Development and Democracy}, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992, p. 271.}. It is a fact that they were the harbingers of a larger franchise to challenge the feudalistic approach. Most capitalists opposed full democracy. The proof is that democracy did not reach most Western countries until the early 1900s and not in the U.S.A. until the 1960s\footnote{Many blacks in the United States south did not have the vote until the breakthrough by the civil rights movement, led by Martin Luther King.}. Long after when capitalists and their allies gained political power in a number of countries, democracy became a political issue as political theorists put it.

According to Francis Fukuyama\footnote{Francis Fukuyama, \textit{The End of History and the Last Man}, New York: Free Press, 1992.}, capitalism was not prior establishment of democracy. Many liberals assumed that liberal democracy was the natural final stage of mature capitalism. Germany and Japan, two of the most dynamic countries, ushered in monopoly capitalism, moved toward fascism and militarism. They nearly succeeded in imposing their versions of capitalism on the world. If they had won World War II, liberal...
democracy might have been but a brief historical interlude as held by Gordon Laxer\textsuperscript{1}.

The French Revolution of 1789 C.E. probably marked the beginning of modern democracy in Europe. It transformed the social and political identity of the whole European region. Political ideas that had been only dreams or aspirations of political theorists were placed on the agenda of real politics\textsuperscript{2}.

Many political systems enjoyed the idea and described themselves as democracies in the mid-twentieth century C.E., but most of them did not encourage competing political parties and showed little interest in individual rights and other elements typical of classic Western democracy. With the collapse of Soviet Union and the end of Communist rule in Eastern Europe, the fall of authoritarian dictatorships in Latin America, and the end of some one-party states in sub-Saharan Africa, however, the number of true multiparty democracies has increased. Inspite of the fact that there was an increase in the number of countries holding multiparty elections the United Nations\textsuperscript{3} stated that "in more than half the world's nations the rights and freedoms of citizens are limited"\textsuperscript{4}.

During regular fight of bourgeoise with the feudal dictatorship, as noted in history by Marxists, they found democracy as their political

\textsuperscript{1} Gordon Laxer, "Social Solidarity, Democracy and Global Capitalism", p. 297.

\textsuperscript{2} Mishal Fahm Al-Sulami, \textit{The West and Islam: Western Liberal Democracy versus the System of Shura}, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{3} It is as per the report of analysis done in 2002.

\textsuperscript{4} "Democracy", \textit{The Columbia Encyclopedia}. 
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guiding principle and ultimately established a bourgeois republic that actualized democracy within their own class. According to the bourgeois, as held by Marxists, the entire bourgeois class governs the proletariat and the working people, but it describes itself as a so-called democracy of the whole people. This "universal democracy", therefore, has a highly fraudulent nature. Essentially, democracy in a capitalist society is always restricted by capital (or property), and any exercise of democratic rights can by no means violate the capitalist system¹.

Zhang Lin comments:

Reviewing the history of the emergence and development of democracy, we can see only concrete democracy, not abstract democracy, only class democracy, not class-less democracy. Those who have been promoting bourgeois liberalization hyperbolized democracy but neglected its class content².

The notion of natural rights like 'all people have certain rights, such as self-preservation, that cannot be taken from them' got evolved. This was followed by the idea of contract³, postulated by John Locke, wherein, rulers and people were bound to each other by reciprocal obligations. According to the contract, "If the sovereign failed in his duties or

¹ Zhang Lin, "What Kind of Democracy Do We Need?", p. 167.
² Ibid., p. 168.
³ This idea is said to have strongly influenced the development of British parliamentary democracy and as defined in the social contract theory of Jean Jacques Rousseau, helped form the philosophical justification for the American and French Revolutions.
transgressed on natural rights, the people could take back their sovereignty” 1. Socialists and other challenged the idea that equality of opportunity can be maintained through political democracy. The idea was based on the theory that “economic equality and public ownership of the major means of production is the only foundation upon which a true political democracy can be erected”2.

Democracy arose in opposition to the idea that participation in government should be limited to those deemed to be specially qualified to govern on account of the possession of wealth or by virtue of noble birth. And in this sense democracy is opposed to the principle of aristocracy. To the extent that aristocracy means government by those who are wealthy or well-born, the principle of aristocracy is clearly incompatible with democracy; but to the extent that aristocracy means government by those best qualified by virtue and capacity to rule, it is not a principle opposed to democracy3.

The Italian city-republics developed a very distinctive political system, self-government, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries C.E.4

With the growth of democratization more and more people began to demand increased empowerment and participation. Movements for
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1 “Democracy”, *The Columbia Encyclopedia.*

2 Idem


democratization and transformation of governing structures of all kinds arose out of this ferment¹.

Democracy received a greater blow when English settlers in America insisted on the importance of the individual. This in a way helped in breaking down class distinctions and prejudices. Thus, democratic political structure marked by a high degree of individualism, civil liberty, and a government limited by law started gaining its roots. In the nineteenth century C.E. the franchise was broadened to improve the machinery for enabling the will of the people to be more fully and directly expressed².

Locke argued, government is a trust held on behalf of the people; if the trust is breached, the people have the right to rebel against the government and replace it³. The significance of Locke's ideas is that they challenged the prevailing theory of absolute power, which was based on the divine right of kings and held that people had no right to oppose and depose their kings. The influence of Locke's philosophy, which spread in England, France and North America, was huge. As Lasech points out, it produced two radical revolutions, the American War of Independence and the French Revolution⁴.

The American Revolution brought about the legal creation of the

² "Democracy", *The Columbia Encyclopedia*.
³ Anthony Arblaster, *Democracy*, pp. 31-33.
United States in 1776 C.E. The significance of the revolution was that it established a new political system, representative republican government, which challenged the prevailing system of hereditary monarchy in Europe. The essence of the new political system was its commitment to equality (despite the contradictory continuation of slavery until the middle of the nineteenth century C.E.) and constitutionalism\(^1\).

Modern democratic states came into being largely as the product of the secularisation of states in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries C.E.\(^2\) At the end of the eighteenth century C.E., all political system were non-democratic but the modern era showed the widespread acceptance of democracy as a legitimate basis for political order. Democracy, until very recently, was not considered as the very good way of structuring political life. It was only after when some political thinkers had a pre-ponderance for about two and a half millennium, they defined democracy as the moral character of political system\(^3\).

The fact that the “idea of popular sovereignty was simply incompatible with the theocentric concept of princely power and the increasingly rigid imperial structure of the Roman Church”\(^4\) did not

---


prevent people who still believed themselves to be Christian from creating
democratic systems in Western Europe and North America\(^1\).

Thus, ‘democracy’ has been used as a label for ‘elected
representative government’ from the eighteenth century C.E. onwards. This was obviously a turning point in the concept of ‘democracy’. ‘Democracy’ before the eighteenth century C.E. meant ‘direct participatory government’ based on the experience of the Greeks in city-states. Here in the eighteenth century C.E. the major development and shift in the interpretation of democracy occurred. ‘Representation’ replaced ‘direct participation’. Democracy was reinvented in a new form. Representation has become the fundamental mechanism of democracy in modern times\(^2\).

Universal suffrage for all adult males was established by the end of the nineteenth century C.E., yet the idea of democracy as a system of government was still being resisted in the twentieth century C.E. Not all of the political spectrum accepted democratic ground rules. For example, Fascists campaigned for a new political system of government called ‘authoritarian democracy’. The main features of this system were explained by Mussolini as follows:

Fascism denies that the majority, through the mere fact of
being a majority, can rule human societies...By democratic regimes
we mean those in which from time to time the people is given the

\(^2\) Mishal Fahm Al-Sulami, *The West and Islam: Western Liberal Democracy versus the System of Shura*, p. 28.
illusion of being sovereign, while true effective sovereignty lies in other, perhaps irresponsible and secret, forces...Fascism rejects in democracy the absurd conventional lie of political equalitarianism

In the mid-1970's the wave of democracy away from authoritarianism begun in Southern Europe, reached Latin America in the early to mid-1980s, and finally engulfed Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The move of 1990s has been the most influential because it involved maximum number of states and people involved. It has also been revolutionary in its swift transformation of different forms of authoritarianism, Confucianism, Communism, and even Islamic political theorists (Afghani, Iqbal). Moreover, the current wave is truly ‘global’, having reached virtually every corner of the earth

A wave of democratization is a group of transitions from non-democratic to democratic regimes that occur within a specified period of time and that significantly outnumber transitions in the opposite direction during that period of time. A wave also usually involves liberalization or partial democratization in political systems that do not become fully democratic
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1 Anthony Arblaster, Democracy, p. 48.
3 Sameul P. Huntington, The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, p. 15.
Nowadays, the most widely accepted way of expressing desires is the demand for democracy. It is the broad heritage of concepts and images associated with democracy that provides the foundations for democratic revolutions and movements around the globe. The discourse of democracy has become, in most societies, the dominant discourse of politics. It is for this reason that even the most authoritarian of dictators now speak the language of democracy. This discourse is controversial because the heritage of democracy is complex as held by Esposito and Obert Voll.

Samuel Huntington, in his book, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, argued that there were 59 democracies worldwide, down from 62 in 1974 C.E. Francis Fukuyama, in *The End of History and the Last Man*, counted 61 democratic nations. And Freedom House, which defines democracy in terms of the existence of universal adult suffrage, contends in an end-of-century study that there are 119 “democratic” nations.

However, there is also a different opinion. In the last several decades, as per Sociological records, the world has experienced a democratic revival. In 1974 C.E., only 39 countries (25% of the world’s independent nations) were democratic. By 1996, 66% were using elections to choose their top leaders. Dismantling totalitarian regimes and replacing them with democratic ones are momentous societal transformations. The
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2 C. Frederick Risinger, “Democracy.gov?”.
new democracies were celebrated in a rich and diverse literature that addressed the antecedents and causes of the democratic transitions. A few authors, observing the "historical clustering", offered an analysis of Europe's southern rim. Then, in the 1980s, several Latin American countries embarked on the transition to democracy. A new "transitions" literature connected these 1980 C.E. events to those of the 1970s. When that set of democratizations was joined (in the late 1980s and 1990s) by South Korean, Taiwan, Eastern Europe, and even South Africa, the "Third Wave" literature was born¹.

In 1974 C.E., third wave of democratization is said to have begun and at that time, as it is said, there were only about 40 democracies in the world, and these were mainly in the advanced industrial countries. A few other democracies were scattered through Africa, Asia, and Latin America — such as India, Sri Lanka, Botswana, Costa Rica, and Venezuela. Most of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, were held by one-party dictators, while all of Eastern Europe and the then Soviet Union were under communist rule².

Democracy after the American and the French Revolutions meant an 'elected representative government'. The idea of pure democracy in which the people could participate directly in public affairs was impracticable in modern times. Moreover, some political theorists went

² Larry Diamond, "Universal Democracy?", p. 3.
further and considered it a recipe for bad government. As James Mill pointed out in his *Essay on Government* (1820), ‘a community in mass is ill adapted for the business of Government...all numerous assemblies are essentially incapable of business’. The system of representation was the way to solve this dilemma. Political commentators from the eighteenth century C.E. onwards have worked within the framework of ‘representative democracy’ to construct ‘liberal constitutional democracy’.

Democracy after the French Revolution also meant, as Maier points out, majoritarian rule. Numbers obviously became the fundamental source of politics in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries C.E. This included both quantity (in counting votes or filling the streets) and quality (the votes of citizens, whether inherited nobility or ordinary labourer, had the same weight; no citizen’s vote could be ranked higher than another’s).

3.6.3 Western Democracy

One cannot according to Larry Diamond surely claim that democracy is a universal phenomenon although it is present in virtually every major region of the world. This is a real fad or contemporary concession to international pressure. In his words, “Democracy may exist today in far reaches of the globe, but only temporarily and superficially. It
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1 Quoted in Anthony Arblaster, *Democracy*, p. 43.


is not really valued by the people, and it will not last”. Even to think of democratizing the entire world is a bold endeavor as held by various political scientists.

In 1946 C.E. Seymour Martin Lipset argued that the richer the country the greater the chance that it would sustain democracy. Time and again it has been proved that democracy is not an extravagance for the poor, but very nearly a necessity. Amartya Sen, winner of the Nobel Prize for economics in 1998 C.E. showing in part that democracies do not have famines, said:

People in economic need also need a political voice. Democracy is not a luxury that can await the arrival of general prosperity. Moreover, there is very little evidence that poor people, given the choice, prefer to reject democracy.

According to Amartya Sen, democracy is not successful only when it has the consent of everyone but when people have reason to see it valuable.

In the current situation many view people demanding democracy as “perverse and lunatic”, and are open to the alternatives. This is especially
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2 Ibid., p. 20.
5 Ibid., p. 59.
true of advocates who believe themselves to be the true heirs to the only legitimate democratic tradition and thus view any other efforts to create democracies as false and undemocratic\textsuperscript{1} like Western Europeans and Americans.

In global environment, democracy is identified mainly with the political traditions of Western Europe and the United States. This means, Western politics (democracy) is the basis for definitions of democracy. This has been claimed by a major scholar, Giovanni Sartori, who raised the question, "Can there be a non-Western path to democracy?\textsuperscript{2}
Moreover, this identification of "democracy" with the Western experience that remains common among contemporary analysts and of the acceptance of the Western pattern as the appropriate model for all societies to emulate. In this context, Western scholars continue to examine the prospects for "exporting democracy" from the West to the rest of the world,\textsuperscript{3} and ask questions such as, "Why has the Westminster Model failed in Africa?" and to be more current, "Why has Western democracy failed in Iraq?\textsuperscript{4}

American foreign policy was based on the principle of "promoting democracy abroad" during the Clinton Administration. The then-Secretary of State Warren Christopher said, "this involved encouraging the global revolution for democracy that is transforming our world. By helping promote democracy, we do more than honor our deepest values. We are also making a strategic investment in our nation's security"¹. Former senator Timothy Wirth, stated, "We want a lot of small programs that can be exported to the grassroots level"². Democratic institutions were, in other words, things that would and could be "exported" from the United States to strengthen global democratization³.

Western governments appear to impose a particular model of democracy as an absolute truth. This in a way weakens their influence because they ignore the fact that the character of Western democracy is the most contested term⁴.

When scholars and leaders of the West outside the US and Europe talk about "democracy", they express the need of consensus on the meaning of the term and also the necessity of establishment of institutions required to replace an existing regime. During the introduction of global democratization, its authors — political leaders of the US — insisted on the need of American support for developing democracies. This made clear in

---


many minds that the American leaders had a distinctive model in mind when they defined what America was supporting. As the then Soviet Union began to disintegrate, then-Secretary of State James Baker spoke, in his address to a meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Moscow in September of 1991 C.E., of "democracy's season"; and presented to "all Soviet citizens and their leaders" five fundamental principles that he urged them to follow, including multiparty, free elections and a Jeffersonian understanding of the rights of minorities\(^1\).

Western world, more specifically its leaders, scholars and "common people" actively are involved in an effort to establish global democratization.

Economic development,\(^2\) as Huntington notes, has played a major role in the expansion of democratization of third wave. National wealth as well pressurizes adoption of democratization with some major effects like increase in education level; emergence of diverse middle class; development of a more pluralistic, active and resourceful society with the result giving rise to a more questioning, assertive, pro-democratic political culture\(^3\).

After 1974 C.E., democracy expanded dramatically in the world. This was proved when the number and percentage of democracies in the
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1 James Baker, "Democracy's Season", *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*, Vol.: 2, Issue: 37, 16 September 1991, pp. 679-680. This approach and the five principles were then frequently repeated by Secretary Baker and other U.S. officials as they traveled throughout the former Soviet Union and on other occasions.

2 Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?", p. 34.

3 Larry Diamond, "Universal Democracy?", p. 11.
world expanded gradually after April 1974 C.E., spreading first to Greece and Spain in the mid-1970s as held by Larry Diamond¹.

After 1985 C.E., the third wave of democratization had spread to Asia as per history reports. The year 1987 C.E. marked the spread of the third wave of democratization as has been put by writers to the point where about two of every five states in the world were democracies: all of Western Europe, much of Asia, and most of Latin America. Eastern Europe, Africa, and the Middle East were still gapping the holes and democracy was still a regional phenomenon. The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 C.E. at once changed the whole scenario of the world and it was further strengthened after the collapse of the then Soviet Union in 1991 C.E. By 1990 C.E., most of the states of Eastern Europe — and even poor and isolated Mongolia — held competitive elections and began to institutionalize democracy². This democracy became a global phenomenon. Today about three-fifths of all the world's states are democracies as held by various strategists.

America supported democracy in Africa but at the same time emphasized features like multiparty system as being essential for democracy. American leaders also promised a direct financial aid for the "promotion of this democratic infrastructure", as then-Assistant Secretary
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¹ Larry Diamond, "Universal Democracy?", p. 4.
² Ibid., pp. 4-5.
for African Affairs Herman J. Cohen described. He pledged two kinds of assistance from the United States:

One is that assistance that is needed to start a democratic process: That is the assistance in the development of free and fair elections and multi-party systems. . . . But. . . we are going to do more than that. . . [and will provide] growing amounts of assistance for what we call “governance”. Governance, in effect, is the entire process that will enable people to participate and to fulfill their responsibilities to make democracy work. It is the civic associations; it is the independent [judiciary]; it is the free press that will make democracy work and put a check on government.

Thus as per Cohen, to establish democracy, a state must accomplish five basic norms. First, the existence of free and fair elections, and the attachment of any other contingencies to the definition of democracy may be justified but only serves to muddle the definition. Second, those elected must wield actual power and must be part of the decision-making process; otherwise, elections would only have a decorative function. Third, the stability of a government is not the same as the nature of a system. Therefore, the presence or lack of stability in a state does not determine whether it is democratic. Fourth, democracy is a dichotomous variable, fully separate from non-democratic regimes rather than being part of a

---


continuum. This, according to Huntington, allows the transition from a non-democratic regime to a democratic one to be easily comprehended. Lastly, Huntington defines non-democratic regimes as those that do not hold elections and do not encourage widespread electoral participation. This five-point definition is sound. Most people/scholars do not feel the need of defining pluralism in a democracy for although there are some disagreements as to whether or not pluralism has a place in the definition of democracy, but having a deep feel it is important to explain pluralism as an important factor in the maintenance of a democratic society.

"Fig-leaf democracy" occurs when rulers attempt to legitimize or perpetuate their power by holding flawed elections. Truly free and fair elections are held in a peaceful atmosphere, in which all parties can compete on equal footing, with a chance to make their case through the mass media—including, of course, any media that are owned or controlled by the state. It must be an atmosphere in which unpopular opinions can be voiced; in which facts embarrassing to those in power can be exposed; and in which peaceful campaigning and political meetings are not only permitted but also protected from violence. In short, democracy requires the rule of law, administered without fear or favor, by independent courts and impartial police.

Amjad-Ali, advocating a plurality of political orders and democratic

---

1 Samuel P. Huntington, The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century, p. 108.
views, writes, "Peace is most threatened when the historical basis and experience of a particular people is hegemonically thrust upon others who have a completely different history and experience"\(^1\).

In other words, what happens between elections is at least as important for democracy as what happens during them. Opposition parties must have the chance to build coalitions and to make their case over time. When an election comes, voters must be in a position to make mature and informed choices\(^2\).

Democracy as an international issue is not in any way connected with international peace as claimed by Westerners. Domestic peace all over has broken down and there is an urgent need for its restoration. The United Nations\(^3\) (UN) not only can offer essential help in repairing democratic breakdowns in domestic peace but also must explore democratic principles at the global level\(^4\).

Democracy is responsible for state relations as well as harmony and development within them. But world requires more democracy at the global level, which is what the United Nations has been about from the very beginning. Charter Article 2:1 established the democratic principle of the "sovereign equality of all its Members", which are not individual

---


\(^3\) The status, functioning & approach of United Nations discussed earlier. For further details, see appendix.

\(^4\) Kofi A. Annan, "Democracy as an International Issue", p. 135.
citizens but sovereign states that are very unequal in size, wealth, and power.

The United Nations itself is increasingly involved in global democratization, even outside the context of peacekeeping and peace building. Kofi Annan said:

This work helps prevent deadly conflicts and makes a broader contribution to development. States that respect the rights of all their citizens, and allow them a say in decisions that affect their lives, are also likely to benefit from their creative energies and to provide the kind of economic and social environment that attracts investors. Hence, democracy is crucial not only to international peace but also to development and, therefore, to the agenda of the United Nations as a whole.

Various theoreticians such as Aristotle, Rousseau, Locke, and de Tocqueville warned against the control of minority society over the state. The state is viewed as a neutral arena where various groups compose changing coalitions to promote their goals. In this dynamic process all groups of society can organize themselves, participate in coalitions and achieve some of their goals. In this way the democratic regime is supposed to give expression to the principle of equality between all citizens. But it
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2 Idem
3 Idem
4 Israel being a minority rule over majority of Palestinians.
5 Gabriel Almond, “Introduction: a Functional Approach to Comparative Politics”, The Politics of Developing Areas, Gabriel Almond and James Coleman (eds.), New Jersey:
also makes clear that 'democratic rule' is not always a majoritarian rule. So far, Smooha\(^1\) is the first to declare that democracy is not about the fulfillment of the principles of the French Revolution: \textit{liberte, egalite et fraternite}.

Young's response to the problem of domination in liberal society is to call for a form of "participatory democracy" in which all social institutions — not just government, but all business and professional enterprises, as well as all voluntary organizations — would be redesigned so that they allow everyone who is affected by them an equal say in determining their operations. As Young puts it,

[Justice ... requires ... participation in public discussion and processes of democratic decision-making. All persons should have the right and opportunity to participate in the deliberation and decision-making of [all] the institutions to which their actions contribute or which directly affect their actions. Such democratic structures should regulate decision-making not only in government institutions, but in all institutions of collective life....]

---


Democracy is both an element and a condition of social justice\(^1\).

We do not derive concepts like democracy from political experience, but we use such concepts to understand political experience\(^2\).

Thus the three concepts, democracy, nationalism, and socialism, are about self-government. This remains the central problem of modern Western democracy.

By bringing common people into the affairs of government and achieving universal white male suffrage by 1825 C.E., Americans found themselves increasingly not only willing to accept the word 'democracy', but celebrating it as the most accurate way of describing their new political system. Democracy had become for Americans a 'faith' that they believed in\(^3\).

### 3.6.4 Implementation of Western Democracy

Lenin putforth his revolutionary idea of global dictatorship. Woodrow Wilson and Ronald Reagan, also had a revolutionary global vision, but a vision of democracy. Lenin comments, "If the whole world is ever to become democratic, the most powerful democracy cannot be passive or timid (yet neither can it transform the world alone)"\(^4\).

---

David Macey states that the world can no longer conceive of a democracy that is not pluralist and, in the broadest sense of the term, secular. When a society sees its institutions as the incarnation of a conception of “the good”, it is liable to impose its beliefs and values on a highly diversified population. Freedom of opinion and freedom of assembly and organization are essential to democracy in part because they imply that the state may make no judgment about moral or religious beliefs.

US was not the only country to back and press for democracy. The European Union, as per writers, actively is engaged in the game and was well outspoken particularly in its financial and organizational efforts to promote democracy in postcommunist Europe. The states seeking entry into European Union, as noted, had to follow truly democratic practices and respect fundamental rights and freedoms. Over the past so many years European Union has been technically and politically assisting the candidate states for entry meets their pre-defined political and economic conditions. Regression, as stated by Larry, away from democracy has become unimaginable in countries like Southern Europe, Central and Eastern Europe as well as Turkey, because of the enormous economic and political costs it would impose through isolation from the community of European states and ‘free trade’.

According to Thomas Franke, during the ‘Third Wave’ the status of

---

democracy is changed to human rights in international discourse, treaties, law, and collective actions\(^1\). In June 2000 C.E., 106 states, gathered in the “Toward a Community of Democracies” conference, agreed to “respect and uphold” a detailed list of “core democratic principles and practices” — including individual liberties, the rule of law enforced by an “independent and impartial judiciary”, and “the right and civic duties of citizens to choose their representatives through regular, free and fair elections with universal and equal suffrage, open to multiple parties, conducted by secret ballot, monitored by independent electoral authorities, and free of fraud and intimidation”\(^2\).

Still in today’s world to build the culture of democracy needs a more lot to do. People have not yet completely understood its rules, possibilities, obligations, and limits, the norms of tolerance, civility, participation, and mutual respect. According to Western scholars and politicians, increase in economic development, increase in education, and exposure to the global environment can be helpful in this cultural change. Much of it can and should happen and much more remains to be done\(^3\).

3.6.5 Reasons for Implementation

Bogdan Denitch states that, dis thought of a field where one can


fight for better social change because the goal of democrats is the creation of a legal order.

Democracy, as opposed to authoritarianism, is supposed to cultivate broad coalitions of support to gain and maintain power as put by Jr. Manuel Pastor & Jae Ho Sung.

Because government is dangerous, as per Lino A. Graglia, so people should have it according to the need and strive to make what people must have as little dangerous as possible. It is said that the only way this can be done is by making it effectively democratic, that is, subjecting it in a fairly direct and immediate way to popular control as described in the earlier phases.

The just-out and common means of intrusion by international actors — the United Nations, regional organizations, other governments, and NGOs — as inferred, is through international election observation often by invitation, on the internal politics of sovereign countries. This type of intrusion is replacing the very idea of ‘democracy’ because states are no more free to do what they like within their own borders as per local / regional politicians.
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1 Bogdan Denitch, “Democracy and the New World Order: Dilemmas and Conflicts”, p. 22.
The United States as per its well-wishers proved itself as an imperial power because it imposes its will largely unilaterally on the rest of the world. Analysts suggest that it is not even good for American people while taking deeper, long-term interest in consideration to think of building a world of democracies.

According to F. Gregory Gause III, America keeps on peeping its nose into other countries for supporting them for free and fair elections. But when American security and economic goals are concerned Washington drops its normal rhetoric of "democratic enlargement". When countries opposing the United States on these issues, such as Iran, have elections, those elections are ipso facto seen as 'undemocratic'. When countries that support the United States on these issues have sham elections, or ignore their own constitutions in prohibiting or postponing elections, Washington remains silent as held by writers.

Democracy, as per Lino A. Graglia, presents a dilemma. On the one hand, government should necessarily obtain certain benefits, such as the creation and enforcement of property rights that are essential to the efficient use of resources. On the other hand, giving some individuals organized power over others is very dangerous. Power, the ability to command and enforce obedience, is not good for the soul; it seems inevitably to lead to an exaggerated appraisal of one's wisdom and
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1 Larry Diamond, "Universal Democracy?", p. 21.
goodness as compared to those qualities in others. Power expands ego, and ego yearns for more power, with the result that government tends inexorably to grow far beyond what justifies its existence and therefore to limit human freedom unnecessarily. 

In view of Immanuel Kant, republic states — with open and accountable systems of governments — have proved to be more peaceful world than the one in which we live. 

Guiseppe Diaplma on the issue of democratic transition writes, "Reaching democratic agreement is sufficient to usher in a fruitful period of implementation and institutionalization, with all that the period holds in store for democratic stabilization." Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter argue that success is largely determined by elite dispositions, calculations, and pacts. Huntington argues that democracies come about through negotiations, compromise, and agreements. Other scholars generally agree that democracy can be crafted and promoted so as to survive and grow even in a culturally and structurally unfavorable environment.

1 Lino A. Graglia, "Revitalizing Democracy", p. 28.
5 Samuel P. Huntington, The Third Wave: Democratization in The Late Twentieth Century, p. 114.
Kofi A. Annan states, “These so-called democracies often have behaved aggressively toward non-democracies. These wars are not always the fault of non-democracies, as the history of colonialism illustrates. Sometimes democracies argue that their opponents are illiberal, autocratic, or undemocratic. They may be right, but saying so does not justify war”¹.

Kofi A. Annan further talks of democracies:

‘Democracies’ are least true to themselves when their governments pursue covert policies. Even the greatest democracies have worked to undermine the stability of other elected governments, by means that they would probably not have dared to use if decisions had been open to public scrutiny”.

Dialogue among civilizations is possible if democracy viz-a-viz cultural legitimacy is promoted keeping in view the notion of human rights. Observers contend that the Gulf War proved that secular nationalism is bankrupt and that it is the Islamic heritage which offers to the millions of the dispossessed a sense of identity and the power to struggle against zulm (injustice)².

3.6.6 Failures of Western Democracy

It has been professed by writers like Przeworski¹, that democracy supplements the “one dollar, one vote” rule of the market place with the “one person, one vote” rule of the polling booth. There seems a great risk that democracy could overturn capitalism (or at least greatly alter the profile of income generated by a skewed distribution of income-generating property) because the voter is not always a capitalist owner. Marx argued that democracy “unchains the class struggle”² and that elites in the United States and elsewhere initially tried to limit the franchise to property owners. This argument that “person rights” threaten property rights still resonates, especially with radical economists like Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis [1986 C.E.] argue strenuously that “capitalism and democracy have come to a parting of the ways, at least in the advanced capitalist countries”³.

The problem with the democracy is the ruling elites who have hijacked the structures of state power and barricaded themselves inside. As long as these rulers can corner a sufficient flow of resources to feed their

apparatus of political predation and domination, they can survive\(^1\).

The 'deluge' of bourgeois ideas, according to Zhang Lin, have thrown the meaning of democracy into an unbearable confusion\(^2\). Just as democracies are more prone to the will of the majority, they are also more prone to the influence of special-interest groups\(^3\).

Yu Ping Chan comments:

Undemocratic governments may get quicker results in implementing or imposing policy, but of greater ultimate importance are the long-term effects of such policies. It is only democracy that creates the environment of security of property and person that makes long-term economic development possible. In democracies, economic activities take place undeterred by the fear of future curtailment, as an electoral mechanism provides for a change in the government if it is continually ineffective or abusive\(^4\).

Some have with clear facts argued that “democracy” — the presence of freely elected institutions and the ability to participate in them — is unnecessary and it causes hurdles in the way of progress of developing countries. There are theoretical arguments, empirical evidence, and events from recent history that may appear to support this thesis; yet, upon
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\(^1\) Larry Diamond, “Universal Democracy?”, p. 15.


\(^4\) *Idem*
closer examination, the bulk of the argument proves untenable. Indeed, it cannot be moved out from the minds that the practice of democracy is critical for long-term sustainable growth.

As said rightly by Winston Churchill that the reluctance of democracies to fight or to take risks can sometimes be a handicap, when action in a just cause is really needed. Much of the carnage of World War II might have been avoided if democracies had been more decisive about standing up sooner to Nazi Germany. And even today, the United Nations, in its efforts to maintain peace and security, often finds that affluent democracies do not support peacekeeping as inferred by Kofi A. Annan.

Critics of democracy say that in the area of economic-policy implementation, undemocratic governments may be superior because, unlike democracies, they are not beset by constantly changing governments, bureaucracies, and interest groups.

During the Third Wave, as reported in history, some states strongly gained immunity to democratic breakdown. The main factors responsible are:

1. Some countries became democracies after they had become relatively rich — in fact, richer than any

---

1 Yu Ping Chan, “Democracy or Bust?”, p. 36.
4 Yu Ping Chan, “Democracy or Bust?”, p. 37.
country that has ever suffered a breakdown of democracy.

2. The second factor is public opinion and normative change within countries. In many of the democracies that have emerged over the past two decades, citizens are broadly dissatisfied with the performance of the political system and distrustful of many of its institutions (especially parties and politicians). Yet they do not see an alternative to democracy¹, which is rather an apathy and withdrawal. This is presumed bad for democracy, but worst is when people actively clamor for an authoritarian alternative. According to the Centre for the Study of Public Policy's New Europe Barometer survey, “In the 10 postcommunist candidate states for EU accession, 61 percent are dissatisfied with the way democracy works in their country. Still, overall, 72 percent would not approve of its suspension”².

In the past several decades, democracy has spread enormously and so its adherents have grown not shrunk. But there is a possibility of evolution of

---

¹ Even in Brazil, where active support for democracy stood at only 37 percent in 2002, people did not prefer authoritarian rule (only 15 percent could imagine wanting it).

some form of non-democratic rule which can capture the passion and imagination of some peoples; but at this point the collapse of communism has not left fertile land for any anti-democratic ideology to generate universal claims. Most likely, authoritarian rule is likely to reassert itself in coming years as General Pervez Musharraf did when he seized power in Pakistan in 1999 C.E. — and said that the suspension of democracy would be temporary. Or elected rulers will gradually whittle down the quality and competitiveness of democratic institutions.

3. The third factor suppressing potential reversions to authoritarian rule have been the unfavorable climate for such reversals at the regional and international levels.

Xenophobia (fear of foreigners) is most common in Europe today and so its political manipulation poses the greatest threat to democracy. Immigrants, as noted, are still posed as a threat to their security inspite of the potential contribution to a productive economy and diverse society.

Kofi A. Annan further states:

Of course, there are other, more traditional sources of legitimacy for political power: divine sanction, dynastic

---

2 Kofi A. Annan, “Democracy as an International Issue”, p. 139.
succession, the charismatic authority of a strong leader, or the force of history as represented by a highly organized ruling party. Quite a few states still derive their success and stability from an appeal to one or another of these, or to some combination. But they can do so with confidence only so long as they rule with their people's consent. Once consent has broken down, or conflict has broken out, stability has to be restored by negotiation. Normally, the only source of legitimacy all parties can accept, at least in principle, is the will of the people.1

We live in a time when liberal democracy dominates worldwide, leading governments, supra-national institutions and political scientists to declare the 'end of history'. Yet, at the same time the worry is that liberal democracy has failed to produce goods such as distributive justice, peace, gender equality, community and ecological values.

3.6.7 Islamic Democracy

Islamic politics is frequently described in some way as combining "religion and politics". Most Islamists like sayyid Qutb put it as, Islam is dīn wa dawla, that is, "religion and state". Many scholars, Muslim and non-Muslim, speak of Islam as a comprehensive way of life3 and note the
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1 Kofi A. Annan, "Democracy as an International Issue", p. 137.
absence of ordained priesthhoods and the formal institutions of a "church". The structure of states in the Muslim world as per Qur'ân involves both Islam and politics.

Islamic law as it is described has given the larger space for the compatibility between the moral teachings of Islam and the nature of democracy as a system of government based on various principles like accountability, freedom of expression and the rule of law.

Abu al-Ala al-Mawdudi, stated that the "political system of Islam has been based on three principles, viz: Tawhîd (Unity of God), Risalâh (Prophethood) and Khilafah (Caliphate)."

Acceptance of tawhîd as the core concept of Islamic faith and practice is agreed by all Muslims. Although tawhîd can have many expressions, it is simply defined by scholars like Ismail Raji al-Faruqi, as "the conviction and witnessing that 'there is no god but God'", and the consequence of this is that at "the core of the Islamic religious experience, therefore, stands God Who is Unique and Whose Will is the imperative and guide for all men's lives". Keeping this objective in mind, Muslims affirm that there can be only one sovereign and that is God.
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1 John L. Esposito & John O. Voll, Islam and Democracy, p. 4.
3 Larry Diamond, "Universal Democracy?", pp. 8-9.
Both non-Muslim observers and some conservative Muslims have argued that *tawhid* means that it is impossible to have an "Islamic democracy", because the concept of the sovereignty of the people conflicts with the sovereignty of God. In Mawdudi's analysis, the main lines of an Islamic democratic theory that remains closely tied to *Tawhid* become clear. Because there is a profound tie between God and political legitimacy, "Islam, speaking from the view-point of political philosophy, is the very antithesis of secular Western democracy. . . . [Islam] altogether repudiates the philosophy of popular sovereignty and rears its polity on the foundations of the sovereignty of God and *Khilafah* (Vicegerency) of man".

*Khilafah* is a helpful concept in understanding of Islamic politics and thereby of Islamic democracy because, as per writers, it deals directly with the issue of defining political leadership for the community. "*Khalifah*” or "Caliph" (successor) is the title of the leader of the Muslim community following the demise of the Prophet Muhammad صلی الله علیه وسلّم and the system is called the "*Khilafah*” or "Caliphate". Thus, political thought in medieval Islam^3^ centres round the caliphate as held by Rosenthal.

The theory of sovereignty, according to al-Turabi, is based on the

---


*tawhid* principle, upon which the entire fabric of Islamic life rests. In this context, the *tawhid* principle has two main elements. First, the Islamic state is not secular and all public life matters should be decided according to *shari'ah* values and norms. Sovereignty is one of the basic points of divergence between Western liberal democracy and *shura* system (consultation) as described by al-Turabi. Sovereignty, in Western liberal democracies, is vested in people. People are accepted as the holders of all authority and power, whereas in *shura* sovereignty, as al-Turabi points out, relies on two fundamental principles: first, the sovereignty of God — God is the Sovereign and His sovereignty is expressed through *shari'ah* (the supreme law) — and, second, the sovereignty of the popular vicegerency, which is shared by all believers. The society is governed in accordance with the will of the people.

It is thus clear, as per writers, that the absolute sovereignty of God makes any human hierarchy impossible, since before God all humans are equal. Thus, *tawhid* provides the conceptual and theological foundation for an active emphasis on equality within the political system. A hierarchical, dictatorial system has historically been condemned as non-Islamic. A dictator or king who claims sovereignty for his own self is not a legitimate ruler.

---

Shari'ah, as per Islamists, in this sense is a supreme authority covering all ways of life, from prayer to socio-economic policies. It must be remembered, al-Turabi stresses, that Islam is not a religion in the limited sense of the word, as the term is used in Western philosophic and religious literature. In this context, the advantage that shura has over democracy, in al-Turabi's view, is that, while human reason is often fluid, there is a Divine text that is always present. In this way, authority in Islam proceeds not from below (people), but from above (shari'ah). Liberal democracy has, however, no divine text, since people are the ultimate, absolute, final and highest source of political power. Second, as per Qur'ânic instructions, in an Islamic state there is no one, whatever his post, who has the right to alter or cancel any doctrine of divine law.

Muslims explain governmental procedure with the main focus on implementing shari'ah, or Qur'ânic holy law. The shari'ah authorizes rulers to mandate their rule based on the concept of Qur'ân and Sunnah. Human rights, then, are given by God to the people; and are not inherent in human nature. Ann Mayer explains this viewpoint as shari'ah is absolutely just being handed down directly from Muhammed صلی الله علیه وسلام. This line of thought then gives Divine sanction to the relationship

---


between a ruler and the ruled in Islamic society\textsuperscript{1}. Since shari'ah is seen as the word of God, legislation passed by the government cannot contradict the laws laid out by the divine law. Shari'ah acclaims that each man shall be truly a law unto himself.

\textit{Shari'ah}, as per Mawdudi, is explained through the Islamic concepts of \textit{shura} (consultation), \textit{ijmā'\textsuperscript{2}} (consensus), and independent interpretive \textit{ijtihad} (judgement). It is difficult to appreciate different aspects of the Islamic polity without fully understanding these three principles\textsuperscript{2}.

\textit{Shura}, as defined, is a political and social necessity in the principle of the \textit{khilafah}\textsuperscript{3}. \textit{Shura} is based on the principle of the sovereignty of God and the supremacy of \textit{shari'ah}\textsuperscript{4}. Second, the supreme and higher power, in the Islamic state, is the Divine texts — the Qur'an and the Sunnah — and the second power is the guided people (who follow \textit{shari'ah}). Within the framework of \textit{shari'ah} people seek solutions for new problems. No one can assume that sovereignty is 'absolute, an ultimate end in itself'. One of the main aspects of Islamic government is, according to al-Turabi, the primacy of God’s revelation and not people’s legislation. The practices of the ruler,


\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 40.

the legislature and the judiciary are ultimately bound by shari'ah\(^1\).

Qur'\(\text{an}\) laid down the principle of \(shura\)\(^2\) to guide the community's decision-making process, and at certain stages in history, \(shura\) was misinterpreted by some. As held by Fazlur Rahman, it was the process of one person, the ruler, asking other people for advice, whereas the Qur'\(\text{an}\)ic understanding of \(shura\) "does not mean that one person asks others for advice but, rather, mutual advice through mutual discussions on an equal footing"\(^3\). During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries C.E., there have been significant efforts to broaden the conceptualization of consultation, and this is associated with advocates of Islamic democracy. Fazlur Rahman emphasizes the importance of this democratizing task: "[T]he participatory association of the \(ummah\) through directly ascertaining the will of the \(ummah\) in the political and legislative decisions affecting the life of the community can neither be rejected nor postponed. Those who advocate such a course of action are wittingly or unwittingly guilty of rendering Islam null and void"\(^4\). \(Shura\) is a key operational element in the relationship between Islam and democracy. But to differentiate, as per al-
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\(^2\) Al-Qur'\(\text{an}\), 42:38.


\(^4\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 95.
Turabi, Western liberal democracy has a secular basis, while shura has a religious basis.

The authority to rule, as al-Turabi explains, has been promised to the whole community of believers and not to any particular person, family, tribe or group. That is, al-Turabi argues, why the mode of decision-making for the *ummah* has been characterised as *shura*, their affairs are managed through consultation among themselves. Though people are given some forms of authority, this authority is not absolute; it is subject to the higher norms of *shari'ah*, which represents the will of God.

A second important operational concept is consensus or *ijmâ‘*. *Ijmâ‘* (consensus) as, al-Turabi states, is the decision-making procedure in *shura*. From the standpoint of language, al-Turabi points out that *ajma‘*, the verb, and *ajma‘u*, the noun, have two meanings: to determine and agree upon something and to have a clear decision, after having considered different thoughts and discussion. Conceptually *ijmâ‘* means, for al-Turabi, a decision procedure that is agreed upon (a) by *al-Sawad al-A‘zam* (the vast majority), and if *al-Sawad al-A‘zam* cannot be achieved within a reasonable time, then (b) the vote can be reduced to a simple majority vote.

*Ijmâ‘* has long been accepted as a formal validating concept in Islamic law, because “consensus played a pivotal role in the development
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1 Hasan al-Turabi, “The Islamic State”, *Voices of Resurgent Islam*, p. 44.
3 Ibid., p. 114.
of Islamic law and contributed significantly to the corpus of law or legal interpretation\textsuperscript{1}: The foundation for the validity of consensus is an often-cited tradition that the Prophet Muhammad صلی الله علیه و سلم stated, “My Community will not agree upon an error”\textsuperscript{2}. However, for most of Islamic history, consensus as a source of Islamic law tended to be limited to the consensus of the learned scholars, and general popular consensus had less significance in specific and operational aspects of Muslim community life. This also tended to be a conservative force, because a consensus on a subject tended to lead to an end of speculation in that area\textsuperscript{3}. The concept of \textit{ijmā’} provides the basis for the acceptance of systems recognizing majority rule.

Al-Turabi sees a real difference between the procedures of decision-making in \textit{shura (ijmā’)} and in Western liberal democracy (majority rule, which is the most common procedure). He contends that the procedures of decision-making in Western liberal democracy are such that the elected representatives cannot in practice give expression to their views. Representatives usually follow the party line. This process is, according to al-Turabi, similar to a football team that usually follows and implements its coach’s plans. Also, decisions are usually made on a ‘winners and losers basis’. The will of the majority defeats the minority will. The minority can do nothing except take every opportunity to show that the majority


\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Bukhari}, Kitab al-Jum’ah 11, Hadith No.: 893.

\textsuperscript{3} John L. Esposito & John O. Voll, \textit{Islam and Democracy}, p. 28.
decision was incorrect. In *shura* the notion of sticking to a particular ideology, idea or view should be, according to al-Turabi, avoided under *ijmā* rule. The society can progress and move forward. This process of movement, al-Turabi argues, is the complete spirit of democracies, does not oppose the implementation and enforcement of laws after *ijmā*.

A simple majority is the most common system in Western liberal democracies as held by Westerners. This means that decisions with regard to laws and legislation in parliament are taken by less than 50 per cent of those involved in the vote. *Ijmā* is, according to al-Turabi, the decision-making procedure in *shura*. *Ijmā* means that decisions are taken first by the vast majority (super-majority) and then by a simple majority vote if the vast majority cannot be achieved within a reasonable time. Al-Turabi is clear that *ijmā* does not mean that all people must agree to one view.

The concept of 'representation' in Western democratic theory, as per writers, is vague, complex and so enormous that it is difficult to provide an account of the topic even in broad outlines. It has no universal definition and it may not always connote the same thing today in different countries.

---


2 Ibid., p. 117.


Representation means, for al-Turabi, that somebody is acting on behalf of somebody else. In the political context, a representative, al-Turabi states, is a member of a shura council who reflects the views of his constituents on both the national and official level. An elected representative should reflect not only the views of those who voted for him, but the views and interests of all the people in his constituency\(^1\).

In al-Turabi’s shura system the representative must fulfill his campaign promises and should frequently consult with his constituents, particularly on important and new matters. The representative is chosen by his constituents to represent them, so, al-Turabi argues, he is bound to consult with them when he is acting on their behalf\(^2\). On this basis, consensus can become both the legitimation and the procedure of an Islamic democracy\(^3\) as held by Louay M. Safi.

A third operational concept of major importance is *ijtihad*, or the exercise of informed, independent judgment. In the minds of many Muslim thinkers, this is the key to the implementation of God’s will in any given time or place. The Pakistani Islamist leader Khurshid Ahmad presents this position clearly: “God has revealed only broad principles and has endowed man with the freedom to apply them in every age in the way suited to the spirit and conditions of that age. It is through the *Ijtihad* that

---

\(^1\) Mishal Fahm Al-Sulami, *The West and Islam: Western Liberal Democracy versus the System of Shura*, p. 120.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 124.

people of every age try to implement and apply Divine guidance to the problems of their times”\(^1\). In the context of the modern world, the advocacy of ijtihad can be a call for radical reform, as is reflected in the words of Altaf Gauhar:

The present represents a great opportunity to reconstruct our society. The forces of Imperialism and Colonialism are on the retreat. . . . We have to break out of our present state of intellectual stagnation. . . . It is possible for a secular leader to suggest that power flows out of the barrel of a gun. In Islam power flows out of the framework of the Qur’an and from no other source. It is for Muslim scholars to initiate universal *Ijtihad* at all levels. The faith is fresh, it is the Muslim mind which is befogged. The principles of Islam are dynamic, it is our approach which has become static. Let there be fundamental rethinking to open avenues of exploration, innovation and creativity\(^2\).

This reflects the enthusiasm for ijtihad found among virtually all Muslim reformers in the twentieth century C.E. In specifically political terms, the great South Asian Muslim intellectual reformer Muhammad Iqbal had already noted in the 1930s the relationships between *ijma‘*, democratization, and ijtihad:

---


The growth of republican spirit, and the gradual formation of legislative assemblies in Muslim lands constitutes a great step in advance. The transfer of the power of *Ijtihad* from individual representatives of schools to a Muslim legislative assembly which, in view of the growth of opposing sects, is the only form *Ijma* [*ijma*] can take in modern times, will secure contributions to legal discussion from laymen who happen to possess a keen insight into affairs. In this way alone can we stir into activity the dormant spirit of life in our legal system¹.

In terms of the implications of this for representative government, Iqbal is very clear: “The republican form of government is not only thoroughly consistent with the spirit of Islam, but has also become a necessity in view of the new forces that are set free in the world of Islam”².

Appropriate *ijtihad* will make it possible for Muslim social scientists to study social phenomenon... with an Islamic framework and epistemological paradigm and then begin the process of rebuilding Islamic Civilization on the basis of its own understanding of the social sciences. This deconstruction and subsequent reconstruction is what is needed if the Muslim *ummah* is ever to assume its divinely ordained position as a witness to other nations³.


Shura, ijmâ', and ijtihad are crucial concepts for Islamic democracy. These enable in explaining democracy within the framework of the Oneness of God and the representational obligations of human beings. Depending upon the definition of these terms, Muslim perceptions are shaped which represent legitimate and authentic democracy in an Islamic framework. However, these terms as well provide an effective foundation for understanding the relationship between Islam and democracy in the contemporary world.\(^1\)

In practical terms, Islamist political groups have widely gained power as per analysts reports, with the moves toward greater democracy as elections at various places demonstrated. For the first time in the history of the Turkish Republic, a party with an explicitly Islamist platform received a plurality of votes in a legislative election as held in history. The Refah (Welfare) party polled over 21 percent of the vote and received 158 seats (nearly 30 percent of the total) in the Turkish elections of December 1995 C.E. The Islamic Action Front, the political face of the Muslim Brotherhood, was the largest group in the Jordanian parliament. The arrest and military trial of about 100 Muslim Brotherhood leaders in Egypt, on the eve of the November 1995 C.E. elections to the Egyptian parliament, was a signal of where the Mubarak government saw its most threatening challenger. While Hamas, in 1997 C.E., boycotted the legislative elections to the Palestinian Authority, according to historians, it is clear that this Islamist group was Yasir Arafat's major opposition in Palestinian politics.

Eighteen of the 40 Kuwaiti parliamentarians elected in October 1992 C.E. were members of the three Islamist groups that fielded candidates or independents endorsed by one of those groups. Islamists held on to about that number of seats in the 1996 C.E. elections as stated by Gause III and Murphy.

More recently, it was seen that when Hamas — the Islamist party in Palestine — in January, 2006 C.E. participated in elections in Palestine, they had a crushing victory.

Again, according to reports, in late November and early December 1995 C.E. Egyptians went to the polls to elect a new parliament in two rounds of voting. As per history, during the campaign the government arrested a number of leading figures in the Muslim Brotherhood who were running for election. In a pre-election security round-up, hundreds of campaign workers and poll watchers for Brotherhood candidates were detained by the police as held by reporters. President Mubarak’s National Democratic party won a crushing victory, with party members and affiliated independents taking 444 out of 458 seats. Only one candidate affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood won a seat. More worse was seen in recent elections, when candidates were not allowed to participate and as per reports they were killed overnightly, because the other side had the danger of losing the state.

---

1 F. Gregory Gause III & Richard W. Murphy, “Democracy and U.S. Policy in the Muslim Middle East”, p. 60.
2 Ibid., p. 61.
The head of the Egyptian Organization for Human Rights, a local non-governmental organization which monitored the voting, called the elections “a real insult to democracy”. The group reported widespread ballot rigging, fraud, harassment of candidates and voters, and arrests. The Egyptian government contended that the poll was free and fair as reporters put it1.

Called upon for a comment, the Embassy simply said that it took cognizance of the fact that there were reports of fraud in the voting. This response, as per writers, pleased no one. The Egyptian government, as noted, was enraged, with government newspapers rejecting what they termed American interference in the domestic affairs of Egypt. Advocates of democracy and human rights as per newspapers questioned why Washington would keep silent in the face of such massive fraud. Egyptian liberals with whom writers spoke were genuinely puzzled and hurt that the United States would not even provide verbal support to a cause — free elections — that Washington actively encourages elsewhere. Egyptian Islamists did not have to be told why: the United States prefers the increasingly autocratic Mubarak regime to any democratic alternative, because that alternative would inevitably be more “Islamic” as held by Gause and Murphy. Thus the American waffle on “democracy” in Egypt irritated a pivotal Middle East ally without gaining the United States any friends in Egyptian society. Far from settling issues, as noted, the Egyptian

elections only raised tensions and increased the political polarization in the country.

The United States, as mentioned in history, faced another uncomfortable moment in March 1996 C.E., when Iran elected a new parliament. The range of acceptable political positions allowed to contest the elections was very limited. A large number of candidates for parliament, as noted, were prevented from running by the authorities because they were insufficiently “Islamic”. But the Iranian elections were an open affair, with rival factions hotly contesting seats and the local press presenting the points of view of all the various political tendencies fielding candidates. Washington’s reaction to the elections was wholly negative. While this stance, as per history, did not make the headlines in Iran, people in the Middle East noticed it, as they noticed Washington’s reticence back in December 1991 C.E. to condemn the Algerian military coup that derailed the electoral victory of the Islamic Salvation Front. It served as another proof to them that America’s support for Middle Eastern democracy is limited to those results that serve American interests as noted by Gause and Murphy.

History proves that Islamists were winners whenever they participated in fair elections. Example is that of Algeria in 1991 C.E., where dictators were allowed to retain Western and anti-Islamic support.

---

2 Ibid., p. 62.
According to author Noah Feldman, "Islamic democracy could take several forms with Islam as a source of identity; values, ideas, or legislation". Democracy within Islamic law, as per contemporary writers, is proved better than autocracy, dictatorship, imperialism, because leaders are accountable to their Creator.

The events of 1991 C.E. in Algeria are essential to an understanding of the idea of an Islamic democracy. Algeria has functioned under a single-party system of government since its independence from France in 1962 C.E. However, as per reports, the Algerian people became dissatisfied with the lack of social and economic progress and began to push for reforms in the hope of an eventual move toward democratization. This discontent came to a head in October of 1988, when in six days of civilian food riots, 400 people were killed. As John Entelis and Lisa Arone note, "Mostly [the riots] represented a revolt against existing political arrangements, a demand for change and a degree of political accountability" as well as a "protest against a corrupt and inefficient government" and were "a product of declining living standards and frequent food shortages". It was projected that by 1992 C.E. more than 14 million of the total Algerian population of 25 million would be living under the poverty line. This popular uprising,

---


as noted, led the government to announce, on November 3, 1988 C.E., a national referendum to amend the 1976 C.E. constitution. The referendum, held in February of 1989 C.E., as reported, led to a newly drafted constitution that ended the socialist system in Algeria. As per strategists, it split the state from the party, the party in this case being the National Liberation Front (FLN), and gave opposition parties full protection under the law.1

The government, led by President Chadli Benjedid, then made the decision to hold local and regional elections in June 1990 C.E. As reported in history, the results came as a complete surprise to the ruling FLN. The Islamic Salvation Front (FIS), the only major opposition party that did not boycott the elections, won 55 percent of the popular vote compared to 31 percent for the FLN, won 32 out of 48 provinces (67 percent) and 853 municipalities out of 1,539 (55 percent). The FLN totals were 14 and 487 respectively, with smaller parties and independents winning 2 provinces and 199 municipalities.2 An overwhelming FIS victory was predicted in the first round of legislative elections in December of 1991 C.E. as per writers.3 With legislative elections slated to take place in December of 1991 C.E., the FLN became increasingly concerned about its political future.

According to Robin Wright, these had been the most pluralistic

elections possible, with over 50 parties participating. This overwhelming victory seemed to assure that the FIS would win a dominating majority in Parliament during the second round of elections, scheduled for January 16, 1992 C.E. That election would decide the recipients of 199 additional seats. As stated it seemed certain that the first Islamic democracy would be installed in Algeria.

Soon after, as per reports, A "High Security Council" consisting of the main players of the West in the coup was formed to act as the government. The council's first order of business was to annul the results of the December elections and to cancel the January 16, 1992 C.E., second round elections. The FIS, as reported, was officially banned, and most of its leaders and supporters were arrested and/or detained. The fighting led to the imposition of a state of siege by the High Council in February 1992 C.E.

Writers claim the Islamists have been the body pushing hardest for democracy. On January 14, 1993 C.E., Ali Kafi, Algeria's acting head of state, promised to hold a referendum to decide the future direction of the nation. Meanwhile, as per Christopher G. Khukla and Mahmood Monshipouri, the five-man High State Council, acting as a collective-style presidency, extended a state of emergency to counter the Islamic

---

1 Robin Wright, "Islam, Democracy and the West", p. 135.
dissidents, and Kafi's promise proved to be hollow.

The results in Algeria, according to Western newspapers, feared many of the US leaders about the effect of fairy elections. The Algerian experience, however transient, offers vital evidence for understanding democratization and politics in the Islamic world.

Despite the fact that the FIS won in what can be considered fully democratic elections, its lack of external support — especially from the West — led to its eventual downfall. The Western response to the situation in Algeria calls into serious question the sincerity of Western rhetoric, which promises to support democratic movements on a global scale. This contradiction was best characterized when, as per reports, the U.S. State Department released an official statement professing that the United States "regretted" the situation, but then took no formal action to address it.

Meanwhile, addressing the U.N. General Assembly, President George Bush (Sr.) said, "People everywhere seek government of and by the people. And they want to enjoy their inalienable rights to freedom and property and person", and he added that the United States would support these rights worldwide. After the U.S. response to the Algerian situation, it has become apparent that the United States is not ready to accept an

---


4 Robin Wright, "Islam, Democracy and the West", p. 137.
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Islamic-led, albeit democratically elected, government and would rather support an autocratic regime that promotes Western interests as held by Robin Wright. Unfortunately, in the Algerian case, the first instance of a truly democratically elected, though Islamist, government was not allowed to exist, and it will never be known if such a result would actually have come about.

Islamic resurgence in the Muslim world exists in a dynamic global context as held by John L. Esposito and John O. Voll. Throughout the world people express their desires for making religious resurgence and democratization two of the most important themes in contemporary world affairs\(^1\) as these were two of the most important developments of the final decades of the twentieth century C.E.

Muslim world, as per analysts report, is highly becoming conscious of Islamic resurgence and the effect is seen on clothing, social life-styles, arts and more specifically the arena of politics and political power\(^2\). Concurrent to all this is the demand for greater participation in the political system.

Thus it is clear, according to analysts, that Islamist movements have gained momentum in the last ten to twenty years. It is disturbing that, in four countries with major Islamic movements, groups in only one country, Algeria, claimed to value democratic ideals and the protection of human rights. James C. N. Paul, who examines the recent demands for

\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 15-16.
democratization of the constitutional orders in Algeria, Pakistan and Tunisia, is optimistic about the prospects for Islamic states achieving human rights. He states, however, that

[T]he problem in many [Islamic] states may be not so much with Islam as a religion (for it is difficult to believe that a religion, in itself, can be hostile to universal rights), but with those who interpret and apply it to politics and law — the religious establishment built around Islam. . . . Much may depend on the future position, outlook and power of the ulama ['ulamâ'] and traditional community, religious leaders, and the educational institutions which reproduce them: specifically, whether they can be brought to terms with human-rights principles1.

Ayatullah Khomeini, propounder of Islamic Revolution of Iran, emphasized the necessity of popular participation in selecting leaders. In his Last Will and Testament, he stated that it was the heavy responsibility of the people to select experts and representatives for the selection of the leader or the Leadership Council. He advised the people of Iran that

In all elections, those of the president, Majlis representatives, or selection of experts for the choice of the Islamic Leadership Council, you must take part. . . . All of you, from the Maraje' (religious authorities) and great ulama ['ulamâ'] to the bazaaris, farmers, workers and government employees, are responsible for the destiny of the country and Islam. This is

because the people are the rightful bearers of this trust (government)\textsuperscript{1}.

Islamic parties and existing governments both have seen the political importance of promoting Muslim beliefs in political endeavors. John L. Esposito and James P. Piscatori write:

Governments have attempted to manipulate Islam to enhance their legitimacy, and opposition movements have scored limited victories by using Islam to press governments into making social reforms. The question is thus not so much whether this mass sentiment has acquired a political voice today, but whether it can be routinely expressed through formal channels of political participation\textsuperscript{2}.

In a global perspective, as analyzed, Muslims are highly involved in utilizing longstanding traditions and conceptualizations of consultation and consensus. According to writers, these efforts disturb Western ideology because it creates more effective forms of “participatory democracy”. Having a look at the general history of the development of Western democratic institutions and practices across significant cultural boundaries over the millennia, it seems at least possible that the new forces of globalization will not eliminate wars but will make it possible for

---

\textsuperscript{1} Hamid Algar, tr., \textit{Imam Khomeini's Last Will and Testament}, distributed by Interests Section of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the Embassy of Algeria, Washington, D.C., 1981, p. 79.

different experiences of democratization to assist and influence each other. In this very context, Elie Kedouri, states that “democracy is alien to the mind-set of Islam”.

Hamid Enayat felt the need of evolving the theory of Islamic democracy:

What is blatantly missing from contemporary Muslim writings on democracy, in spite of all the claims to the contrary, is an adaptation of either the ethical and legal precepts of Islam, or the attitudes and institutions of traditional society, to democracy. This is obviously a much more complex and challenging task than the mere reformulation of democratic principles in Islamic idioms. It is because of this neglect that the hopes of evolving a coherent theory of democracy appropriate to an Islamic context have remained largely unfulfilled.

As per writers, in the field of political theory, especially as it relates to democracy, Muslim scholars and activists are in a time of major transition. This transition is similar to that visible in economics. A major Muslim economist Khurshid Ahmad describes that change: “Initially, the emphasis was on explaining the economic teachings of Islam and offering Islamic critique of the Western contemporary theory and policy. Gradually the Muslim economists and other professionals became involved

---

1 John L. Esposito John O. Voll, Islam and Democracy, p. 32.
in this challenging enterprise... [and set in motion] the transition from 'economic teachings of Islam' to the emergence of 'Islamic economics'.”¹ A major issue in democratization in Muslim societies is whether or not scholars and leaders have successfully made the transition from listing “democratic doctrines of Islam” to creating coherent theories and structures of Islamic democracy that are not simply reformulations of Western perceptions in some Muslim idiom².

Islam in particular has been identified by some as inextricably and fundamentally opposed to democracy³. Casually, the ideals of democracy and Islam, as per writers, seem diametrically opposed to each other to the extent that the schism between the two is irreconcilable. Initially, the opposition between the ideals of Western democracy and Islamic social justice seems pronounced. Upon closer scrutiny, however, one may find many similarities that do not appear at first glance. Islam, as per its norms, in any way cannot reconcile with the democracy according to Western standards⁴.

3.6.8 Conclusion

Inspite of all these truths outlined above, it has been declared by


³ Nasser Momayesi, “Iran’s Struggle for Democracy”, p. 41.

many that ‘Islam is violent’ irrespective of the fact that many Muslims strive for democratic systems, while as repressive regimes with US support increase the potential for violence.

The concept of “Islamic democracy” is hated by many especially in the West. But democracy is in many profound ways an essentially contested concept, it is important to understand the perception of democracy with all dimensions. This understanding is important even for those who view the Islamic resurgence as a threat, because it is important to understand the competing definitions of democracy. It may be even more important for this group because, as Gallie suggested some decades ago, advocates of democracy in the West might also be able to learn something about democracy from others. In the present global context, parochial and narrow understanding of democracy is dangerous and limiting, even for long-established democratic systems. Thus, the prospect, in the view of various American analysts, is likely to mean more “Islamic” politics. That is something that unnerves Washington as held by Gregory and Murphy.

As per writers, coming to the Middle East, the democracy conundrum for the United States is straightforward. American interests are tied up with incumbent regimes; American values, if pursued vigorously, could weaken those regimes. The problem is not that Muslims

---


2 F. Gregory Gause III & Richard W. Murphy, “Democracy and U.S. Policy in the Muslim Middle East”, p. 60.
are not "ready" for democracy, as some have condescendingly argued. It is that Washington is not ready for the choices that they would probably make¹.

All are on the knees to democratize Muslim world in their own way, inspite of the fact, Iran, for example, has more than a 100 years history of being democratized. The previous century convulsed the country by three powerful political upheavals. The Constitutional Revolution of 1906 C.E., the nationalist revolt of 1951 C.E. - 1953 C.E., and the Islamic revolution of 1978 C.E. - 1979 C.E. All stand as parallel movements driven by the same core issues: "opposition to a corrupt, unjust king, resentment against the intrusion of foreign powers, and a strong desire for freedom and democracy"².

It thus becomes clear that Mawdudi and other Muslim writers do not reject the idea of a democratic political system. They simply insist the implementation of tawhīdīc worldview. Mawdudi explained what these structures would be:

A more apt name for the Islamic polity would be the 'kingdom of God' which is described in English as a 'theocracy'
But Islamic theocracy is something altogether different from the theocracy of which Europe has had bitter experience... The theocracy built up by Islam is not ruled by any particular religious

¹ F. Gregory Gause III & Richard W. Murphy, "Democracy and U.S. Policy in the Muslim Middle East", p. 60.
class but by the whole community of Muslims including the rank and file. The entire Muslim population runs the state in accordance with the Book of God and the practice of His Prophet. If I were permitted to coin a new term, I would describe this system of government as 'theo-democracy', that is to say a divine democratic government, because under it the Muslims have been given a limited popular sovereignty under the suzerainty of God. The executive under this system of government is constituted by the general will of the Muslims who have also the right to depose it.

Thus, it becomes quite clear that Muslims have a well-developed political system and they are not willing to adopt Western democratic models. Moreover adoption of external ideas is meant for those who lack well-defined systems. Gone are the days when techniques and concepts from Western model of democracy were unquestioningly borrowed because Muslims are becoming more conscious all the time and so now the effort is to establish an authentic Islamic democratic system. It should be remembered that this effort is not anti-Western or anti-Europe or anti-America in any ways but at the same time Muslims cannot think of Western interference into their system. Muhammad Iqbal is recognized as one of the major figures in modern and modernist Islam and is not


thought of as a chauvinist nationalist or religious fundamentalist. Yet he presented a very strong critique of Western democracy.

Aristotle in 330 B.C. said, “The rich are few and the poor many . . . where the poor rule, that is a democracy”\(^1\). With reference to globalization, it is definitely hostile to Western democracy because it takes power away from communities and the propertyless workers, most of whom, unlike the transnationals, are destined to live and die in the countries where they were born\(^2\).

The harsh conclusion is that democracy can exist only in the richest countries, those that dominate the planet and world markets. Democracy is an attempt to reconcile private liberty and social integration or, in the case of modern societies, subject and reason. To regard democracy as an attribute of economic modernization and therefore as a stage in the progress of history toward instrumental reason, is a very different matter. According to the first view, democracy is a choice, and in every situation the opposite, antidemocratic choice is always possible and often adopted. In the second view, democracy emerges naturally at a certain stage of development, and the market economy, political democracy, and secularization are three aspects of a general process of modernization. The objection to this theory of modernization must be that democracy is as threatened in developed countries as in other countries, either by

---


totalitarian dictatorships or by a laissez-faire (free-economy) attitude that leads to greater inequalities and concentrates power in the hands of restricted groups. More important still, the presence of democratizing action — and the forces opposing it — can be detected in societies undergoing modernization of both exogenous and endogenous origin\(^1\).

As such, the interest of the ummah should have the first priority. In marked contrast to the ideals of Western society, Islamic society sees freedoms and rights as means and not ends. Muslims are expected to work for the good of the general society, which will lead to the protection of rights. Human rights, then, are seen more as a way to better society than as protection for the individual\(^2\). All of these arguments support the idea that rights are handed down by God rather than existing inherently in human nature.

Finally, it can be claimed that the concept of absolute authority in Western political thought was derived from Islam. The Western political philosophers, who had some intellectual contact with Muslims in the Middle Ages, took the concept of the absolute sovereignty of God from the Muslims and remoulded it. The new mould of sovereignty was at first the monarch, then the state and finally the nation.

\(^1\) David Macey, *What Is Democracy?*, pp. 16-17.

3.7 Peace-Process

3.7.1 Introduction

The phrase “peace process” probably has no definition in the literature of political science or international relations. But the term was coined in 1974 C.E. - 1975 C.E. — using it perhaps imprecisely at first — because the academicians held that there was a need of a shorthand expression for solving disputes.

Harold H. Saunders in his book, The Arab-Israeli Peace Process in a Global Perspective, says, “the peace process is more than conventional diplomacy and negotiation. It encompasses a full range of political, psychological, economic, diplomatic, and military actions woven together into a comprehensive effort to establish peace between Israel and its neighbours.” So this makes clear that ‘Peace-Process’ was born out from Palestine – Israel War.

Theodor Herzl according to Herbert Druks was the first person in the early twentieth century C.E. who worked to bring peace and understanding between Muslims and Jews. He tried to accommodate with the Turkish Sultan and his officials, who occupied the Holy Land, but he made little headway.

---

2 Idem
It was said that the peace process is meant to bring peoples of the region closer to each other but till now has only gone to aggravate the depth of suspicion and rejection that the Arab masses feel towards the West. It is more and more confirmed that this peace is nothing else but the same old imperialism clothed in a new garb\(^1\).

3.7.2 Genesis of Palestinian Problem — Establishment of Modern Israel

Israel is the result of the collapse of Jewish life in Eastern Europe during the nineteenth century C.E. The dispersion of Jews for centuries gave rise to three main categories:

1. the Oriental Jews of the Middle East.

2. the Sephardi Jews descended from the Medieval Spanish community around the Mediterranean basin.

3. the Ashkenazi — the Western Jews of European Christendom\(^2\).

Half of the world’s Jews at the end of the nineteenth century C.E. lived within the Russian empire and two and a half million more lived in Eastern Europe.

At the time of the Crusades the Jews persecuted in Western Europe had found refuge in Poland but at the end of the eighteenth century C.E. the Polish kingdom declined anarchy. With the result most of the Jews

---


were inherited by Russia. By the end of the century, nearly half of the Jews were subsisting on charity.

The Jews were religious and couched in terms of spirit. The Jews of Europe had a religious identity but when they felt the need of cultural, social and more specifically Jewish identity, they had to face problems in Europe because of the secular impact of Enlightenment and the wake of Napoleon's armies.

Within the West, Britain and France exerted less pressure upon their Jews to discard their tribal personality than did Germany and the United States\(^1\). As per census report of 1921 C.E., hundreds of Jews registered themselves as Jewish nationality and Roman Catholic religion.

The Jews of Israel were not the progenitors of modern Israel. The Zion of Zionists was borrowed from the religious tradition that had already ripened at the Roman expulsion eighteen centuries ago — exile of religious doctrine by restoring the Jews at Palestine on the political plane.

Since the Roman domination (birth of 'Isa عليه السلام) the Palestine had come under the successive rule of Byzantines, Persians, Arabs, Seljuk Turks, Saracens, Mamluks, Mongols and finally the Ottoman Turks who incorporated it within their empire in the year 1517 C.E. and maintained their control until 1917 C.E.

In the nineteenth century C.E., Palestine was sparsely populated by an Arab peasantry and various foreign Arab religious foundations,

including the Jews engaged in religious study and subsisting and Palestinian charity.

In 1870 C.E. the first Mikve agricultural school was established under the auspices of the Alliance Israelite Universelle. Then in 1878 C.E., a group of Jews in Jerusalem hired some land and found the first modern agricultural settlement, Petah, Tikvah. These two ventures inspired the Jews in Russia (Zionists) for understanding agriculture in Palestine and encouraged the first wave of Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe. Of the massive Zionist immigration only a minority succeeded with the end of the first immigration in 1903 C.E.

Within the second immigration wave that flowed into Palestine between 1904 C.E. - 1914 C.E. there was a small group with distinctive characteristics who actually were the founding fathers of modern Israel. These succeeded in shaping the institutions based on their ideology. The main aim was to claim the Jewish national statehood. Immediately they set about for an economic foothold and the voice in the building of the country\textsuperscript{1}.

In 1905 C.E. - 1907 C.E. (the peak years of immigration), the Jews having been thrown out of Europe, the founding fathers now found themselves within Jewish community of Palestine. It is this fact that marks the moment of their arrival as the inception of modern Israel.

As a result of Turkey's entry into the first World War (on the side of Germany) and its defeat in 1917 C.E., Britain gained control of Palestine.

\textsuperscript{1} Noah Lucas, \textit{The Modern History of Israel}, p. 52.
until the inauguration of civil administration in 1920 C.E. This was followed in 1923 C.E. by the formal award of the League of Nations mandate to Britain to administer the country.

The Palestine mandate was assigned to Britain by the allied powers in April, 1920 C.E. It was determined that Palestine would extend from the Ladder of Tyre in the north to the Gulf of Akaba in the south, and from the Mediterranean in the West to the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea in the east. At that time Arabs were under French military action. This enabled Zionists to claim that all Jewish settlements be included within the British mandated territory.

The ongoing continuous growth of immigrants troubled Arabs, who were slow to react at many points and due to their continuous resistance the Zionists in 1920 C.E. stopped the absorption of new comers. In 1921 C.E., the regulation was modified for definite specific employment.

Since then regular demands from Zionists in the Palestine were fulfilled by the Western forces. In 1939 C.E., Israelis succeeded in instituting a general army against Arabs. Ben Gurion was appointed as the first chief.

In May, 1947 C.E., the UN set up the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine to investigate the matter and made it clear that Arab sovereignty should not be violated at any cost. But in late September 1937 C.E. the Britain terminated the mandate and thought to work towards a bi-national solution irrespective of partition.
Zionist political pressure within America in conjunction with Soviet administration to hasten the collapse of the British position in the Middle East brought about a momentary convergence of American and Russian policy in support of partition. Later the Zionist effort and mission succeeded in New York by a professional team led by Moshe Shertok and assisted by Weizmann. Weizmann was responsible during Balfour declaration to project Zionists as a strong political movement\textsuperscript{1}.

On 14 May, 1948 C.E., Britain literally withdrew from Palestine when Ben Gurion announced the establishment of a ‘Jewish State’ in Palestine.

Thus the illegal Jewish immigration became the main battleground of the conflict in Palestine. Moreover, the Jews purchased lands in large tracts from absentee Arab proprietors and regarded it as cultivable area. Now the world specifically, the US (on Israeli side) for its own interests is looking to solve the conflict and asking Palestine to negotiate for their own land on terms dictated by the US.

3.7.3 Background of Peace-Process

History reports numerous events of the search for peace between Arabs and Israelis with more failures. Third party involvement has been found there since the beginning in order to reach fruitful results starting right from the attempts of Count Bernadotte in the 1940s, which resulted in armistice agreements, to those of Henry Kissinger and Jimmy Carter in

\textsuperscript{1} Noah Lucas, \textit{The Modern History of Israel}, pp. 72-73.
the 1970s, which led to disengagement agreements and then the first peace treaty between an Arab state and Israel.1

According to Talcott W. Seelye, Syria was the first Arab country to propose a peace treaty with Israel in the course of the 1949 C.E. armistice talks with Israel that followed the Arab-Israeli war of 1948 C.E. Since then Syria has been more pro-peace but it was never acknowledged to be so. Except for a two-year period from 1974 C.E. – 1975 C.E., Syria's attitude toward peace with Israel was generally regarded as negative and often stridently so.2

According to George Wilson, the Middle East Peace Process was not possible if collapse of the Soviet Union in Dec'91 C.E. would not have occurred. For example, Paul Findley is correct to note that President Carter inherited a 'no-talk' policy when it came to the Palestine Liberation Organization and that this lack of communication hampered his ability to broker peace in the region.3

In the wake of peace-process, it is important to mention that Israel cultured a principle since its inception and that was the exclusion of Palestinians (and all other Gentiles) from meaningful politics, which is /

---


was rightly followed since then. Once the Zionist movement fixed on Palestine as the location to establish a Jewish state as a solution to European anti-Semitism, it had to deal with three problems:

1. how to establish itself on the land legitimately and expand into all of Palestine,
2. how to remove or significantly reduce the majority Palestinian Arab population indigenous to Palestine; and
3. how to ensure absorption of dispersed Palestinians elsewhere in the Arab World so as to eliminate Palestinian claims to Palestine.

Dr. Hisham Sharabi, CPAP chairman, provided the historical background of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Palestinians have been "victims of a colonialist settlers' project", he explained. As a result of Israel's 1948 C.E. "war of liberation", Dr. Sharabi asserted, Palestinians became either 'refugees' or 'second-class Citizens'. 'Systematic Judaization of Palestine' became the order of the day, as Israel replaced Palestinian names of villages with Hebrew names, confiscated lands from their native inhabitants and subsidized newly arrived Jewish settlers as they moved into the Palestinian homes and towns. Moreover, Dr. Sharabi asserted,

---


Israel institutionalized racist policies to further subjugate Palestinians living within the Green Line and in the occupied territories\(^1\).

To make things clear, it needs to be remembered that Palestinians were never a matter of concern for Zionists as Thomas L. Are claims it. It has been the trend since very beginning and it is clear to us from nineteenth and twentieth centuries C.E. where classical imperial movements colonized weaker nations only to capitalize on cheap labor and extract natural resources. Zionism, on the other hand, wanted to dispossess the Palestinians altogether; its goal was to substitute one people on the land for another. Zionist propaganda insisted that Palestine was an 'unpopulated wasteland'\(^2\).

It is becoming clear more than ever before that all that the Zionists want more than 70% of the Palestinian land out of 'peace process' and keep the entire Arab world open for an extended market. This may enhance their cultural and colonial enterprise. Azzam Tamimi comments, "this is what has been driving Arab intellectuals to speak ever more loudly against what they perceive as a plain lie"\(^3\).

It is held that numerous schedules have been set and broken before, of course specifically in case of Israeli-Palestinian issue. But, as stated, when


\(^3\) Azzam Tamimi, "Growing wariness of false peace: Can Israel ever be repentant, and in what way?".
Arafat took over a Palestinian state, things seemed to process more or less on schedule. As per historians the Madrid Arab-Israeli agreement was signed in 1991 C.E. and since then there has been enough of diplomacy which helped in changing the nature of the deal from the 'land for peace' utopia set out at the time (and maintained ever since) to one altogether more acceptable to Israel: the establishment of a Palestinian 'bantustan' with minimal self-rule, over which Israel would effectively exercise total control without the costs — particularly in lives — involved in maintaining security against an angry Palestinian population as stated by 'peace-process' propounders.

According to some Arab intellectuals especially pro-Israelis there is an urgent need for Israel to first recognise the rights of the Palestinians and concede the principle of withdrawing from the occupied territories.

From 1945 C.E. until early 1949 C.E., during the Israeli War of Independence, there were regular efforts to make peace between the Jews and the Arabs. The reason was that Israel was extensively involved with in negotiations with the Kingdom of Jordan and King Abdullah. As delineated meetings were held before, during, and after the War of Independence, but no peace was achieved with Jordan or any of the Arab states. In 1949 C.E., after a long and bitter war and tedious discussions,

---

1 Iqbal Siddiqui, "Revision of Wye agreement takes Arafat closer to 'statehood' — on Israeli terms, of course", *Crescent International*, Canada, September 16-30, 1999.

2 Azzam Tamimi, “Growing wariness of false peace: Can Israel ever be repentant, and in what way?”. 
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Israel concluded armistice agreements with Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt¹.

After that from 1949 C.E. until 1956 C.E., there was talk of peace, but only talk. At times, major powers were called up by Israel to intervene and persuade the Arabs to conclude peace. Israel as noted by Herbert Druks asked for face-to-face negotiations and peace agreements (of their own norms and standards), so no Arab state could surrender through such talks. Israeli leaders believed that if Egypt would conclude a peace agreement then the other Arab states would likewise make peace. As mentioned the United States could not succeed in bringing about this Israeli-Egyptian reconciliation².

From 1974 C.E. to 1975 C.E., there were held three Arab-Israeli agreements. Moreover, disengagement agreements were concluded between Israel and Egypt, and Israel and Syria. Israel gave up the Mitla and Gidi passes in the Sinai and parts of the Golan Heights areas³. But more importance was that of political reorientations happening in the region. These reorientations were meant to change the environment politically so that it would support those negotiations as held by various politicians⁴.

¹ Herbert Druks, The Uncertain Alliance: The U.S. and Israel from Kennedy to the Peace Process, p. 241.
² Ibid., pp. 241-242.
³ Ibid., p. 242.
Months prior to the clashes of 1940s, Barak’s gradual but forceful consolidation of his powers as prime minister put the 52-year-old conflict onto a new and dangerous path. Since assuming his position as prime minister of Israelis, as reported, Barak had done nothing to recognize Palestinian demands for an independent sovereign state. He had not accepted the right of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes, and he had not recognized the legitimacy of Palestinian historical claims to East Jerusalem. Prior to the Camp David negotiations it was clear that Barak did not intend to provide any concessions as held by Asma Yousef.

On 29 November 1947 C.E., the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 181 calling for the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. As is now well known, Ben Gurion accepted the partition plan tactically, as part of his strategy to gain all of Palestine. What he really accepted was the establishment of a Jewish state, but he did not actually accept the idea of an Arab state, borders, Jerusalem as a corpus separatum and other arrangements. Indeed, Ben Gurion stated as early as the original 1937 C.E. partition plan that “...as a result of the creation of a [Jewish] state [on a piece of Palestine], we shall abolish partition and expand to the whole of Palestine”. This policy, according to Simha, continued to dominate his thinking when the 1947 C.E. partition plan was passed. Consequently, between 29 November 1947 C.E. and 14 May 1948

---

C.E., more than 200,000 Palestinians were dispossessed of their properties and dispersed as held by Finkelstein\(^1\).

The Palestinian challenge to exclusive Israeli sovereignty in Palestine intensified after the 1967 C.E. war both by the newly occupied and the diaspora Palestinians. At the end of the 1967 C.E. war, Palestinians were found under three jurisdictions:

1. as citizens of Israel working within the system for equality based on having Israel be a state of its citizens rather than a state of the Jewish nation only;
2. as refugees primarily in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and in camps in Gaza and the West Bank (1948 C.E. refugees) demanding their right of return under Resolution 194; and
3. under occupation in Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem where Israeli withdrawal was sought\(^2\).

From 1948 C.E. to 1967 C.E., the independent Arab states represented Palestinian rights and sought redress for them through the United Nations. In 1949 C.E. United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 194 which recognized the right of return or compensation for the 1948 C.E. Palestinians. Resolution 194 has never been implemented.

---


Palestinians did engage in resistance activity, but the main effort for their rights was led by the Arab States and through diplomacy.\(^1\)

### 3.7.4 Development of ‘Peace-Process’

Some Palestinians maintain that the peace-process started during the Reagan administration with visits to the Middle East by the then Secretary of State George Shultz and the then Assistant Secretary Richard Murphy, who began to construct a new framework for peace. In subsequent visits to the region, then Secretary of State James Baker built on the foundations laid by his predecessors. American officials now appeared to be smarter and started engaging the parties in more discussion; they seemed more conscious of Arab and Palestinian sensitivities as mentioned by Don Peretz.\(^2\)

As several contributors like Steven note many factors contributed to the willingness of the Arab states to engage in the peace process, including severe economic problems in Jordan, Syria, and the West Bank and Gaza Strip, a feeling of obligation to the United States on the part of the Gulf monarchies, and the continuing fear that further conflict might directly threaten domestic stability. The extensive immigration of Soviet Jews to Israel has also led many Arabs to believe that in the future Israel will be even less likely to accept territorial compromise on the Palestinian


states (West Bank and Gaza), thus increasing the pressure to negotiate now\(^1\).

It was the crucial juncture in the history of Palestine when Arab leaders began increasingly to accept Israel as a permanent presence and began to talk about peace. Historians mention the commonplace statement of that time that “the pursuit of an Arab-Israeli settlement is the centerpiece of American strategy in the Middle East”\(^2\).

Harold H. Saunders comments:

As time passed, we started to use the phrase less broadly. We referred less to our own regional strategy and more pointedly mentioned the politics and diplomacy involved in bringing the parties in the conflict to the peace table and to agreement once they had begun negotiating. The more the political situation settled down after the 1973 War and the oil embargo, the more we concentrated on ways of bringing about the next step in negotiation. During his first year in office, President Carter focused on arranging for resumption of the Middle East Peace Conference in Geneva to negotiate a comprehensive peace. In his second year he focused on ways of translating Sadat’s visit to Jerusalem into concrete agreements and practical progress toward peace. That year witnessed the unique negotiations at Camp David and the beginning of

---

1 Steven L. Spiegel & David J. Pervin, “The Search for Arab-Israeli Peace After the Cold War”, p. 3.

negotiations on the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. The third year saw ratification of the peace treaty and the beginning of negotiations on autonomy for the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. We understandably came to see the peace process in terms of the negotiations and the agreements they produced.

3.7.5 Peace Efforts

The substantive and procedural elements of the peace process as has been said were laid out and tested in the years between the 1967 C.E. and 1973 Wars C.E., but, as has been said by Harold, the barriers to peace were still not removed.

As held by writers, before the larger consequences of the Six Day War had been fully understood, political leaders in the United States wanted new efforts to resolve the conflict once and for all. Israeli troops were asked to stay strong until there is peace. But as per history clarifies, this one was also not chosen by a formal decision. As Harold put it, “no one ever sat down and examined the consequences of the position that had been taken.”

On November 22, 1967 C.E., the Security Council of the United Nations however, defined the objective in Resolution 242 — and it was

---

2 Ibid., p. 10.
3 Idem
called to be a balanced formula for an Arab-Israeli peace settlement that had one notable omission — political participation by the Palestinians, who were mentioned as refugees in the Resolution 242 although Arab governments had been actively involved in negotiating its wording. This resolution with already distorted phrases called for a "just and lasting peace", recognition, and security for all states in the region, including Israel, in return for Israel's withdrawal from territories occupied in the war. Resolution 242 pursued the words of the United States it had taken since the mid-1940s that Palestine should be partitioned and shared by Jews and Palestinian Arabs. In the American view, the parties could evolve the terms of peace only in negotiations. "Clearly the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace"¹, said Lyndon Johnson on June 19, 1967 C.E.

It is said that Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, a representative of the UN Secretary General, was under the Johnson administration, made responsible for negotiating a settlement within the framework of Resolution 242. The United Nations diplomatically supported the Jarring Mission in 1967 C.E. and 1968 C.E. but the U.S. government was engaged

in Vietnam so the Resolution could not grow as was expected by its propounders.

During the first years after the 1967 C.E. War and the passage of Resolution 242, it was put forth that the aim in working toward a peaceful settlement was to negotiate a comprehensive settlement, which was called a "package deal". All outstanding issues had to be addressed in a settlement before real peace could exist. In other words, Israel was supposed to resolve all issues with its neighbours, mutually understand and thereby cooperate on various critical issues, including the status of Jerusalem, a refugee settlement, and freedom of passage through international waterways such as the Strait of Tiran.

In 1969 C.E., the Nixon administration held the charge of the US office with Henry Kissinger as national security adviser. The Arab-Israeli conflict was given the higher priority but still did not put forward a U.S. mediation effort until a war of attrition across the Suez Canal had intensified in early 1970 C.E. and the Jarring Mission seemed to have lost momentum in early 1971 C.E. The Nixon administration's early effort instead attempted to establish a larger international political environment — particularly through a new relationship with the then Soviet Union — in which the Arab-Israeli impasse might be surmounted.

---


2 Ibid., p. 11.

3 Ibid., pp. 10-11.
The inauguration of Anwar Sadat as president of Egypt after 1967 C.E. war, after the death of Gamal Abdel Nasser in September 1970 C.E. determined Sadat to relieve the human problems of Egypt. To achieve that goal he needed to end the Arab-Israeli conflict, which had drained Egypt’s resources, energies, imagination, and manpower for almost three decades.

It is noted that early 1971 C.E. brought with itself a focus on taking partial steps toward peace. The United States played a central role during the summer of 1970 C.E. in mediating a ceasefire and standstill agreement to end Egyptian-Israeli fighting. It was coupled with an agreement to attempt a diplomatic settlement. When Ambassador Jarring was unable to arrange a full-scale negotiation, President Sadat in early 1971 C.E., with tacit U.S. and Israeli encouragement, suggested trying to negotiate an agreement for partial withdrawal around the Suez Canal, so that the canal could reopen to world shipping. The effort eventually foundered, but the stage was set for a series of steps and interim agreements that would gradually advance toward comprehensive settlement.

It is reported that Sadat and Kissinger met for the first time in Cairo when the latter arrived there in early November, 1973 C.E. The two politicians discussed the need of re-orientation of economic and political situations in Egypt. Kissinger could not resist the opportunity to shift the map of strategic allegiances in the Middle East. Harold feels free to report

---

2 Idem
that in Sadat, however, Kissinger found a man prepared to engage in political maneuver that might at least enable him to test how much the war had shaken the barriers to Egyptian-Israeli negotiation\(^1\).

Till the early summer of 1973 C.E., as it is said, Sadat attempted half-dozen methods but found no alternative but to go to war. This war, as said, was meant to recapture all of Egypt’s lost territory but to change the political environment. The limited purposes of that war were (1) to restore Arab honor by erasing the humiliation of the 1967 C.E. defeat so that Egypt could negotiate with Israel from a position of dignity and (2) to bring the superpowers more actively into the negotiating process with concern for a fair settlement. He succeeded on both counts\(^2\).

The 1973 C.E. War, as reported, set the stage for the peace process of the mid-1970s. The war ended with passage of Resolution 338 in the United Nations Security Council\(^3\). That resolution called for immediately beginning negotiations within the framework of Resolution 242. In addition to agreeing on the wording of Resolution 338, the foreign ministers of the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to convene the Middle East Peace Conference in Geneva in December 1973 C.E. as cochairmen under the auspices of the secretary general of the United Nations. This step paved the way for the beginning of the intense

---


\(^3\) *The Search for Peace in the Middle East: Documents and Statements, 1967-1979*, p. 97.
diplomatic and political effort that came to be called the Arab-Israeli peace process as reported by US House of Representatives.\footnote{The Search for Peace in the Middle East: Documents and Statements, 1967-1979, p. 97.}

Shamir, as per Naser Aruri, resuscitated his 1989 C.E. initiative which was derived from Camp David, and recycled it at Madrid with no intent of any real negotiations with Palestinians, as he admitted later. The Palestinian delegation, representing only the Palestinians in the occupied territories, were joined to the Jordanian delegation. The PLO was not recognized as the negotiating partner. Nonetheless, Arafat, as head of the PLO, instructed the Palestinian delegation. It was told to gain an admission from Israel that it was an occupying power, and hence by logical extension, it would have to yield the territories at some point to a Palestinian state even after a period of autonomy. Israel, as noted, rejected this. The secret talks in Oslo with Arafat were made possible when Arafat agreed to drop the admission of occupation demand, hence moving him into the Israeli/American orbit for acceptable discussions. In return, Arafat as head of the PLO was recognized as the negotiating partner.\footnote{Naseer Aruri, The Obstruction of Peace: The U.S., Israel, and the Palestinians, Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press, 1995, pp. 210-211.}

The Middle East peace process, as per Haddadin, started in the Madrid Conference on 31 October 1991 C.E., and was divided into a bilateral conference and a multilateral conference. In the bilateral, the Arab Core Parties (Lebanon, Syria and a Joint Jordanian — Palestinian delegation) would each negotiate separately with Israel to resolve the
various issues that since 1948 C.E. caused wars among them and stood in the way of making peace. The multilateral conference had in it many more participants in addition to the Core Parties and would discuss five distinct topics with the aim of reinforcing and enhancing the work of the bilateral conference. These topics as noted were: Palestinian Refugees, Water Resources, Regional Economic Development, Regional Security and Arms Control, and the Environment¹.

While the work of both conferences was progressing Israel and the Palestinians initiated a parallel secret track of negotiations in Oslo, Norway, outside the framework of the Madrid Conference. The Oslo secret talks culminated in a framework agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), signed between them at the White House on 13 September 1993 C.E. The PLO and Israel exchanged political recognition and the joint Jordanian–Palestinian delegation split up into two separate entities and continued to negotiate with Israel in accordance with the Madrid formula: the return of the Arab lands captured by Israel in 1967 C.E. in return for a comprehensive and lasting peace².

Thomas L. Are reports the incidence, probably the biggest event in Washington in 1993 C.E., where 3000 guests witnessed two arch enemies give peace a chance. Mr. Rabin fidgeted and shuffled papers from one

² Idem
pocket to another. He applauded timidly and only in response to the nudge of President Clinton did he reach forward to take the hand of Yasser Arafat. Henry Kissinger fought tears; Jimmy Carter cried. Clinton spoke:

Today we bear witness to an extraordinary act in one of history's defining dramas, a drama that began in a time of our ancestors when the word went forth from a sliver of land between the River Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea. He spoke as though it was the final touchdown of a great victory. The most amazing speaker was Yitzhak Rabin:

We have come from a people, a home, a family that has not known a single year, not a single month in which mothers have not wept for their sons... We who have fought against you, the Palestinians — we say to you today, in a loud and a clear voice, enough of blood and tears. ENOUGH!

Yasser Arafat seemed equally optimistic as he spoke to the Prime Minister of Israel: “We share your values for freedom, justice, and human rights.” All over town people were saying, “I never thought I would live to see Rabin and Arafat standing together”. At the signing of the peace accords, only 15 percent of Americans surveyed said that their sympathies

---

1 Thomas L. Are, Israeli Peace/Palestinian Justice: Liberation Theology and the Peace Process, p. 141.
2 Ibid., p. 142.
3 Idem
were with Arafat. As one resident said, "No matter what happens, if peace fails, I put the blame on Arafat".1

Thus according to analysis, the dramatic progress in the peace process began with the handshake between Israeli Prime Minister Rabin and PLO Chairman Arafat, so continued progress in the peace process depended upon the successful implementation of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles, which as noted by Lutick and others were never truly implemented2.

As soon as the Israeli government showed, in spring 1993 C.E., that it wanted some kind of peace process with Syria or with the Palestinians, the Israeli opposition to any withdrawal and/or change in status of the territories became stronger and began to affect basic issues of politics in Israel. By the end of April the Hebrew press already had recognized that, as the chief political commentator of Haaretz, Uzi Benziman, put it (Haaretz, April 30)3.

Oslo I agreement was signed on September, 1993 C.E. and since then, as held by Edward Said, the Israel-Palestine 'peace process' has been punctuated by a series of dramatic developments. The essence of the September 1993 C.E. Oslo agreement, according to Edward Said, was that it gave 'official Palestinian consent to continued occupation'. Indeed, the

1 Thomas L. Are, Israeli Peace/Palestinian Justice: Liberation Theology and the Peace Process, p. 142.


3 Israel Shahak, “Questioning the Legitimacy of the Arab Vote in Israel as a Result of the Peace Process”, p. 61.
Palestinian Liberation Organization agreed to serve as 'Israel's enforcer'. ‘The occupation continued’ after Oslo I, Meron Benvenisti similarly observes, ‘albeit by remote control, and with the consent of the Palestinian people, represented by their “sole representative”, the plo’. A close reading of the September 1995 C.E. Oslo II agreement only reinforces these judgements.

Moreover, Norman holds that the 1979 C.E. Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty comes to less than ten pages. Yet, the Oslo II accord fills more than three-hundred folio-size pages.

As has been described by AbuSada and others, on 13 September 1993 C.E., the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Israel signed the Oslo Agreement, which included letters of recognition from both sides acknowledging their right to exist in peace and the right of the Palestinians for self-determination. What began in 1993 C.E. as a document of understanding, the Declaration of Principles (DOP), resulted in a dramatic change in the peace prospects for the Middle East region. Despite tension

---

and conflict over its interpretation from both sides, the peace process has created many facts on the ground that appear to be irreversible\(^1\).

The controversy over the peace negotiations as per, P. R. Kumaraswamy, between the PLO and Israel has intensified from 1993 C.E. - 1994 C.E. to the present. The signing of the Oslo Agreement may have led many Palestinians to question the timing and the legitimacy of this agreement. The Palestinians led by the PLO have struggled for many years to regain their homeland and establish their own independent state. Also, when the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza launched their *intifada* against the Israeli occupation in December 1987 C.E., one clear purpose was to regain and to secure their political rights and end the Israeli occupation. However, the agreement fell short of these hopes and for many did not satisfy the Palestinian core demands of political and national rights\(^2\).

The bilateral peace negotiations, as delineated by analysts, between Jordan and Israel gained good impetus after the Washington meeting at the White House on 25 July 1993 C.E. between the leaders of both countries, King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin, under the auspices of President Clinton. A Washington Declaration was signed by which the state of war

---


between the two countries was ended, and the two leaders agreed to do their utmost to remove barriers still inhibiting progress towards a peace agreement. On 26 September 1994 C.E., the Israelis presented the Jordanians with a draft peace treaty to negotiate its contents. The Jordanians presented a counter proposal a day later, and the two sides sat to negotiate a peace treaty on 27 September 1994 C.E. The two sides negotiated for many hours and achieved progress on a joint text for the first seven articles. Article VI, as per agreement, was on water, and only general language was used to facilitate agreement, but reference in it was made to an annex in which details of a water agreement would be spelled out.

On September 5, 1999 C.E., the new agreement between Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinian President Yassir Arafat, was to be signed at Sharm al-Shaikh, near Alexandria. According to reports this agreement was widely greeted as a new start to the ‘peace process’ that had appeared on the verge of stalling during the premiership of Benyamin Netanyahu. Few commentators admitted that it was merely a revision of the Wye agreement signed by Netanyahu and Arafat in 1996 C.E.

According to Harold H. Saunders, with the U.S. help, parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict concluded the Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement of January 1974 C.E., the Israeli-Syrian disengagement

---

2 Iqbal Siddiqui, “Revision of Wye agreement takes Arafat closer to ‘statehood’ — on Israeli terms, of course".
agreement of May 1974 C.E., a second Egyptian-Israeli interim agreement in September 1975 C.E., the Camp David accords between Egypt and Israel in 1978 C.E., and the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty in 1979 C.E. The president and secretary of state were extensively involved; Secretary Kissinger shuttled back and forth, and President Carter hosted unprecedented negotiations at Camp David and concluded them in his March 1979 C.E. trip to Egypt and Israel.

That historic pact, as per writers, had paved the way for a number of important accords in the Middle East peace process, including: the 4 May 1994 C.E. Cairo Agreement between Israel and the PLO on Palestinian self-rule in Gaza and Jericho; the 26 July 1994 C.E. Washington Declaration, which ended the state of belligerency between Israel and Jordan, and the ensuing 26 October 1994 C.E. Peace Treaty between the two countries; and the 28 September 1995 C.E. West Bank agreement.

3.7.6 Israeli Approach towards Peace-Process

The critics of the peace-process somehow manage to declare that the Israelis do not even bother to deny that the ‘peace process’ is another means of waging war and achieving their objectives. Shimon Peres, the former defence minister and ‘father of Israel’s nuclear bomb’, has said that “when I created the nuclear option, I was not planning a Hiroshima, but I


did so to reach Oslo”, adding that he had never lost his way in the “40 years it took me to reach there”.

Even a towering statesman like the David Ben-Gurion told many visitors, as noted by Robert, that there could not be such a thing as an “American Zionist”. “A Zionist”, said Ben-Gurion, “is a Jew who settles in Israel”. Foreign Jews, even the most generous supporters of Israel, were told repeatedly that their duty was to support Israel, especially financially, but to keep their noses out of Israeli affairs. Participation in the Israeli policy process belonged exclusively to those who shared Israel’s dangers.

Thus it could be inferred by various writers that things were not easy for American Jews. But it is a fact that in their overwhelming majority, they support Israel and take pride in Israel’s achievements. Most American Jews are not deeply religious, and their common pride, therefore, is for support of Zionist political movement of Jews as held by historians, despite many divergent views on other subjects.

The Arab conflict with Israel after its proclamation in 1948 C.E. was rooted in the conflict that arose because foreigners were forced upon Arab state. Several hundred thousands of them were turned into refugees living in the Arab territories surrounding Palestine. The conflict as per

---

3 Idem
writers was thus demographic and territorial in nature and water became part of the geography of the conflict. 

To de-escalate the mounting violence in 1953 C.E. and to promote certain strategic objectives of the United States, President Dwight Eisenhower, as noted by Haddadin, dispatched a special envoy, Eric Johnston, to try and obtain consensus among the riparian parties on the Jordan River over a 'Unified Plan' for the utilization of its water resources. Such a plan would quiet the violence that had erupted, provide means for the resettlement of Palestinian refugees, and promote a tacit cooperation between Israel and her Arab neighbours. Additionally, incentives for the entry into the region of communist ideology that flourished on want, would be minimized.

Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, the man widely blamed for trigerring the initial outbreak of Israeli-Palestinian disturbances in late September 2000 C.E., told an evangelical gathering in Jerusalem that the Oslo peace process is dead and at best Israel demands a period of "nonbelligerency" before entering any future peace negotiations.

---

1 Munther J. Haddadin, "Water in the Middle East Peace Process", p. 325.
2 Primary objectives of the United States in the Middle East were: (a) Israel's security and her acceptance by the countries of the region; (b) resettlement of Palestinian refugees; (c) continuity of oil supplies from the region; and (d) obstructing and arresting any Soviet influence in the region.
The Israeli settlements were deemed “illegal” by the Carter administration, as noted by Maksoud, they were labeled “obstacles to peace” by the Reagan and Bush administrations, and Clinton administration spokespersons called them “not helpful”. But they have acquired a material presence and a life of their own of which the United States is increasingly accepting. Such an American attitude encourages Israeli policy and discourages both Palestinians’ aspirations and a sense of justice.

Thereafter, Israel, as per Charles, had demanded, as a pre-condition of further movement in the peace process, that Palestine re-arrest Hamas activists and stop Hamas activities all over. Rajoub’s comment was not the comment of an overexcited rogue lieutenant. Arafat himself, at the Islamic Conference in Islamabad, said: ‘It is the duty of all Muslims to save Jerusalem from the settlements and from Judaism’. This, as per Charles Foster, was the language of jihad, the last refuge of the politically impotent. It was not the language of the Oslo peace agreement.

The interim period, as per analysts, envisaged by the peace process gives Israel a free hand to more heavily populate and expand the settlements and their infrastructure. The expansion of municipal Jerusalem

---


into “Greater Jerusalem” in effect incorporated much of the West Bank into Israel’s self-proclaimed capital.

The floating by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon of the idea of “unilateral disengagement” from Gaza posed problems, since it attempted to alleviate Israel from the need to negotiate over and rectify its 37-year occupation. “No solution can be unilateral”, Ashrawi noted, since this type of solution would be the imposition of the strong over the weak. Secondly, because of the “connection between the West Bank” and Gaza. Israeli withdrawal from Gaza is only relevant if it is part of an overall withdrawal from all of occupied Palestine and is “transformed into a multilateral process.”

With the seemingly perpetual “disintegration of Palestinian realities” in the present period of Israeli occupation and militarization, Ashrawi observed that “all military solutions (to conflict) have proven to be failures”. Ultimately, she concluded, “what’s good for the Palestinians is good for the whole region and for humanity.”

According to Iqbal Siddiqui, editor of Crescent International, the Israelis always indulged in brinkmanship so that they could play a card of last-minute concessions from the Palestinians. As a clear indication, the deal was supposed to be ready for signing on September 2, 2000 C.E. when

---

1 Clovis Maksoud, “Peace Process or Puppet Show”, p. 117.
3 Idem
US secretary of state Madeleine Albright arrived in Alexandria. However, Barak refused to arrive on schedule, instead saying that he would arrive the next day for talks. His message was blunt according to writers. To make things more clear P. M. Ehud Barak said, “unless the Palestinians made further concessions, Israel would throw out the results of all recent negotiations, and revert to implementing the Wye agreement without modification”.

It is said that this was a position of rare duplicity and audacity. Two reasons were mentioned for this: firstly, it was Israel and not the Palestinians who had insisted on revising the Wye agreement; the Palestinians' original demand had been precisely that Wye should be implemented as agreed. And secondly, it was the Palestinians, not the Israelis, who had made all the concessions during the last few weeks of talks since Barak’s election. However, Barak’s implication that it was the Palestinians who had been obstructing the progress of the peace process, and that Israel was running out of patience, was widely accepted.

To conclude, the Declaration and the derivative Cairo accords undermine the legal foundations for a Palestinian national patrimony and therefore the rights of the Palestinian people to eventual self-determination. In addition, by glossing over the issue of the legal status of the Palestinian territories as occupied and by refusing to comply with the

---

1 Iqbal Siddiqui, “Revision of Wye agreement takes Arafat closer to ‘statehood’ — on Israeli terms, of course”.

2 Idem
articles of the Fourth Geneva Convention, the Declaration gives Israel license to continue violating the human, civil, national, and political rights of the Palestinians.

As per reports, the people (independent and free members of the ‘Arab and Muslim communities’) do not perceive Israelis as neighbours, friends or business partners but as colonial occupiers. History proves that whenever there occur some initiatives to ‘normalize relations’, the makers of such initiatives succeeded only in casting light on a situation the Israelis, their peace partners and American sponsors hate to acknowledge.

3.7.7 Palestine in Peace-Process

As noted by Ziad Abu-Amr, the Palestinians as and when entered the peace process only because of their dire need of a resolution to the conflict in order to ameliorate their “suffering under Israeli military rule”. And Palestinians are genuine in their search for a peaceful solution.

On all crucial issues — Jerusalem, water, reparations, sovereignty, security, land — Palestinians, according to Said, ‘have in effect gained nothing’. The actual picture is, if anything, even bleaker than Said suggests.

1 Clovis Maksoud, “Peace Process or Puppet Show”, pp. 116-117.
2 Azzam Tamimi, “Growing wariness of false peace: Can Israel ever be repentant, and in what way?”.
Elias Chacour understandingly questions that how the Jews could be given a homeland on top of the 700,000 Palestinians already living in the land without prejudicing their rights? It seems that Britain never intended to protect the rights of anyone but the Jews. According to Balfour’s own words, he had no desire to be fair. In 1919 C.E., in a memorandum to the British Cabinet, he wrote:

In Palestine we do not propose even to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants of the country. So far as Palestine is concerned, [we] have made no statement of fact which is not admittedly wrong, and no declaration of policy which at least in the letter [we] have not always intended to violate.

According to Oslo agreement, Israel retains ‘responsibility for external security’, as well as ‘responsibility for overall security’ of Israelis. In the name of ‘security’, Israel is thus free to pursue any Palestinian anywhere. Although duty bound to protect Israeli settlers and settlements that are illegal under international law, the Palestinian police cannot — ‘shall under no circumstances’ — ‘apprehend or place in custody or prison’ any Israeli as has been clearly mentioned in Oslo agreement. Said dismisses these arrangements as a ‘one-sided farce’.

The first phase of Israel’s redeployment as per Oslo agreement leaves Palestinians with territorial jurisdiction over only 30 per cent of the

---


West Bank. Further redeployments are promised in the future but their extent is not specified. And within the areas coming under Palestinian territorial jurisdiction, Israel continues to claim undefined 'legal rights' as was held in Oslo. Moreover, the Palestinian areas are non-contiguous.

Edward Said is plainly right that Israel 'achieved all of its tactical and strategic objectives at the expense of' the Palestinians. More problematic, however, is his explanation of how this defeat came to pass. Perhaps because Peace and its Discontents was written with an 'Arab audience in mind', Said puts the onus on PLO bungling. With unfortunate echoes of Abba Eban's famous quip, 'the Palestinians have never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity for peace', Said ruefully recalls Arafat's 'catastrophic misjudgements and failures', running from the 'folly of Palestinian involvement in Lebanese affairs that was to lead to the disasters of 1982 C.E.', through peace overtures of the Carter Administration that 'Arafat categorically turned down', to 'the misguided policies of the PLO leadership during the Gulf crisis'. Not only are these judgments open to question but cumulatively they tend to obscure us-Israeli responsibility for the undermining of Palestinian national

---

2 Ibid., p. xxiii.
3 Ibid., pp. 7-8, 73, 82-3, 120, 180-1.
4 No one knows better than Said that the impetus behind Israel's 1982 C.E. Lebanon invasion was not PLO 'folly' but rather its 'peace offensive' (Israeli strategic analyst, Avner Yaniv); Norman G. Finkelstein, Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict, ch. 6, note 52; and Norman G. Finkelstein, The Rise and Fall of Palestine, Minnesota, November 1996, ch. 3.
aspirations. As stated by Norman, the PLO did endorse, from the mid 1970s, a full peace with Israel in exchange for a full Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza. Notwithstanding the international consensus favouring such a two-state settlement, the US and Israel blocked implementation. Oslo signalled the complete triumph of US-Israeli force as held in history.1

According to Said, in February 1971 C.E., Egypt offered Israel a full peace treaty in exchange for a full Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Sinai. Claiming security imperatives, Israel obdurately refused. Said opines that ‘for the Arabs, war has had disastrous effects’.2 Israel, according to Norman, like all conquering powers, only understands the language of force. Said no doubt knows all this. Indeed, he himself insists that the ‘struggle over Palestine is principally’ a ‘real or material one’, not a ‘psychological misunderstanding’. To prevail, Palestinians must match Israel tit-for-tat in the hardball politics of power.3 A quantitative juxtaposition of the Camp David and the Oslo II accords also points up the reality of Israeli intentions in the West Bank. Specifying in simple, lapidary phrases a full Israeli withdrawal and reciprocal Egyptian pledge of peace, the historic Camp David accord runs to barely seven pages as Norman put it.

---

The peace process, despite the great hopes that it engendered and its much-celebrated achievements as analyzed is at a tragic impasse. Some aspects of the process are irreversible. But instead of moving forward, there is a downward spiral. In this situation, the Palestinians are the big losers, because once again they become the victims of an asymmetry of power that has marked their entire political history and, an asymmetry of concern and an asymmetry of pressure — pressure imposed upon them almost exclusively to move the process forward1.

The problem as per theorists is that on entering into the implementation phase, there is the difficulty of asymmetry. To some extent the negotiations appear more as dictation than negotiation2.

It is tragic according to Lustick and others that today Palestinians are criticized for violating the human rights of their own people when, in fact, in each instance the violations that they commit are violations that have been imposed upon them by the negotiating partners — holding people under administrative detention, cracking down on dissent, arresting people for what they believe and for groups they belong to rather than for allegedly having committed specific acts3.

Given the inability of the Arab states to achieve their rights, Palestinians became restive in the 1960s. The League of Arab States, encouraged by Egyptian President Gamal Abdul Nasser, created the

---
2 Ibid., p. 92.
3 Ibid., pp. 92-93.
Palestine Liberation Organization in 1964 C.E. in order to give Palestinians a voice and to mute their anger. After the 1967 C.E. war it was Yasser Arafat’s 1965 C.E. — organized Fateh group that received the greatest attention¹.

The Palestinians, as per historians and theorists, lost Palestine, but they refused absorption elsewhere, and they did not give up the right of return and reassertion of their national rights in Palestine. During the 1970s and early 1980s, they continued guerrilla activities against Israeli targets, but focused as well on diplomatic efforts².

The Arab League, as inferred by writers, has long demanded that no Arab country grant citizenship to Palestinians, saying that “Palestinians must return to their homeland”³. The Intifada, as noted, brought considerable attention to the Palestinian plight, while capturing Israeli oppression on film. Given the favorable world climate, Arafat was enjoined by Palestinians in the occupied territories, the Palestinian National Council (PNC), and other parties to explicitly recognize Israel and accept the historic compromise of a two-state solution based on the principle of the U.N. partition plan, Resolution 181. The key paragraphs in that declaration are the following:

² Idem
³ Quoted from the IINS News Service, Israel, 28 July 1997, AP/Dow Jones and forwarded by electronic mail by the SNS News Headlines Services to list subscribers.
Despite the historical injustice inflicted on the Palestinian Arab people resulting in their dispersion and depriving them of their right to self-determination, following upon U.N. General Assembly Resolution 181 (1947 C.E.), which partitioned Palestine into two states, one Arab, one Jewish, yet it is this Resolution that still provides those conditions of international legitimacy that ensure the right of the Palestinian Arab people to sovereignty and national independence¹.

... It calls upon all peace-and freedom-loving peoples and states to assist it in the attainment of its objectives, to provide it with security, to alleviate the tragedy of its people, and to help to terminate Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories².

Palestinians obviously have every interest in concluding a comprehensive, just and lasting peace with Israelis as soon as possible. The original Oslo accords had mandated that the peace talks be concluded in 1999 C.E. with a Palestinian state and an Israeli state living in freedom, security, and equality side by side. Yet, as Israel attempted to colonize as much of the West Bank and Gaza as possible before beginning final status talks, the Palestinians were compelled to focus on interim issues in negotiations, rather than addressing the key permanent status issues³.

² Ibid., p. 5.
Once mandated by domestic political considerations in Israel and the United States, Palestinians have been placed under tremendous, and sometimes unconscionable, pressure to sign weak and vague agreements that could be used by political leaders to show progress to their constituencies. Rather than place a matter of such great existential importance to both Palestinians and Israelis above the fray of politics, the timetable for reaching agreements has been based on immediate domestic concerns, even when the necessary background work on substantive issues has not been done¹.

Pointing to Israel’s “deliberate development” of occupied Palestine, Ashrawi said the Palestinians are “totally traumatized” by the illegal Israeli occupation. It is a fallacy, she said, that “one side can defeat the other” in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. With Israel refusing to accept the U.S.-backed road map (adding 14 objections) and the marginalization of the Quartet, she continued, the default mode of conduct is to put the Palestinians “on probation”. The situation persists, Ashrawi charged, because of “lack of will and good faith” on Israel’s part and “lack of political will” on the part of the EU and the U.S.²

In a 1978 C.E. article, I.F. Stone asked, “How can we [Jews] talk of human rights and ignore them for the Palestinian Arabs? How can Israel talk of the Jewish right to a homeland and deny one to the Palestinians?

How can there be peace without some measure of justice?" He concluded, “This, a binational state, is the path to reconciliation, and reconciliation alone can guarantee Israel’s survival. Israel can exhaust itself in new wars. It can commit suicide. It can pull down the pillars on itself and its neighbors. But it can live only by reviving that spirit of fraternity and justice and conciliation that the prophets preached and the Other Zionism sought to apply”.

The real fact as per analysis is that Israel fears an airing of its “guilty secrets”, while Western countries fear a “dangerous precedence” will be established.

3.7.8 West against Muslims

The study of history reveals that Palestine is not the only theatre in which the West uses its tactics. The US/Israeli war in Palestine is only a part of the world-wide war on Islam, for the West, as per records, takes global Muslim ummah as the only threat to its global hegemony.

It is commented by writers that Middle East has always remained a matter of great concern to the United States because of oil that is needed to stoke the fires of industry and transportation. On the basis of the study it

---

4 “The west’s war of euphemisms”, *Crescent International*.
can be inferred that if industrial world would develop an alternative sources of energy the US interest in the Middle East could decline and situations could be improved

It was the decline and demise of the Soviet Union in 1991 C.E. that enabled US to increase influence and interference in the region and also Arab states were more open to the peace-process that way as has been described by Steven.

The two bases for U.S. involvement in the Palestinian-Israeli peace process have been 1) the physical fact that the United States is the primary power in the Middle East and 2) that the United States has promoted itself to the parties in the region as an honest broker wishing to promote Israel's security as well as Palestinian national aspirations.

On the basis of the facts especially the following, it can be inferred that the US has directly / indirectly supported Israeli ideological assumptions.

1) The United States began the peace process based on the goal of implementing U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. These Resolutions, as repeatedly interpreted by the international community, simply mean that Israel must withdraw from the Arab territories it occupied in 1967 C.E. if it wants to have peaceful

---

1 Herbert Druks, *The Uncertain Alliance: The U.S. and Israel from Kennedy to the Peace Process*, p. 267.
relations with its neighbors. After seven years of negotiations, the U.S. negotiating team now effectively advocates the position that the West Bank and Gaza are Israeli territories, or at best disputed territories, for which the Palestinians must bargain.

2) U.S. negotiators have accepted the Israeli world-view concerning the primacy of Israel’s security needs while ignoring the long-term development of the Occupied Palestinian Territories and the improvement of the Palestinian quality of life¹.

As Secretary of State Baker has repeatedly emphasized, “it is the Arabs and Israelis who will have to live together. Outside parties cannot want peace more than those who live in the region. External powers, especially the United States, still have an important role to play in creating conditions leading to a peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli dispute, but that role is limited”².

With the end of the Cold War and the Gulf War, Washington, as per ‘peace-process’ postulated, is not merely the most important external actor, arguably the case since 1973 C.E., but the only one with the potential of exerting effective, if not determining, influence on the course of the peace process³.

---


³ Ibid., p. 3.
For America, as per analysts and strategists, the pursuit of its national interest has always meant "land for peace". Nothing else will do. Every American administration since 1967 C.E. has recognized this\(^1\).

Railroading the Oslo agreement between Israel and the PLO through to completion and proclaiming an ultimate diplomatic success were opportunities too tempting for the United States and its allies to pass up; but this approach only deepened the frustration and humiliation permeating large segments of the Palestinian and Arab constituencies\(^2\).

In his introductory remarks, Council for the National Interest (CNI) president Eugene Bird, a retired diplomat, predicted that with a "broad span and a broad vision", he said, will the U.S. be able to resolve the Middle East conflict based on "realistic negotiations", and not on Sharon's unilateral disengagement plan, which, according to Bird, is "worse than any Bantustan"\(^3\).

Following Bird's remarks, Edward Peck, a retired diplomat, commentator and consultant introduced Dr. Ashrawi. Peck described the situation in occupied Palestine as "dreadful", and what might happen in the near future as "worse". The U.S. media, he said, is unwilling to cover the occupation which "we [the United States] make possible financially, militarily, and politically". Noting that the occupation of Palestine is

---


causing “tremendous problems for Israel and its people”, he stated that this is “our [the United States’] fault indirectly”. Ashrawi, he said, is one of those Palestinian spokespersons who “don’t get the attention here they should” — and one who has the “ability to articulate the dream of her people”.

“Conditions have become extremely critical” in occupied Palestine, Ashrawi began, with “all sorts of adverse conditions converging” to make the possibility of peace in Palestine unattainable. Basically, she said, the issue of Palestine has been put on the “back burner” because of the upcoming presidential elections in the US. This “deep freeze” on a resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, Ashrawi pointed out, has precipitated “de facto accommodation” of Israeli actions — and she noted that any political vacuum caused by U.S. disengagement in the region “will be filled by Israeli unilateralism”.

According to Ashrawi, both parties feel the U.S. involvement in the region is drastically needed in order to facilitate negotiations and bring the international community into the political fold. Even though Palestinians (and other regional actors) recognize that the U.S. is “not entirely evenhanded”, Ashrawi suggested that even this kind of broker is preferable to Israel dictating “realities” in the region.

---

2 Ibid., pp. 80-81.
Moreover, she added, the U.S.-Israeli alliance is a "great liability" for the U.S. in the region. "Feelings of injustice" are created by the unequal treatment meted out to Iraq / Iran, which may not have verified weapons of mass destruction (WMD) stocks, she noted, whereas Israel — with its vast stocks of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons — has received no serious condemnation from Washington.¹

* The U.S. role as a superpower with strong strategic and economic interests in the region often conflicts with its role as mediator in the Israeli-Syrian peace process.

* The United States has maintained its strong support for Israel’s negotiating position, even though Israel now takes a more hard-line posture than its autocratic neighbor.²

Unfortunately, the US’ emphasis on process over substance has led the domestic constituencies of many governments in the region to conclude that the peace process was only a mirage designed to trick their governments into prematurely establishing economic ties that would help Israel break out of its regional isolation.³


3.7.9 Failure of Peace-Process

Negotiating process, as defined by its propounders, encompasses two large periods — one that precedes actual negotiation and one that starts when negotiators are gathered around the table. The theorists and the diplomats normally concentrate on identifying the formulas and techniques that are useful in the negotiating room. They have historically paid less attention to ways of persuading people to enter that room. It remains important to build political support even during negotiation, but in Arab-Israeli case the politics of getting to negotiation is neglected as critics put it¹.

According to historians these failures have proved to be more serious and were marked by the outbreak of war in 1948 C.E., 1956 C.E., 1967 C.E., 1969 C.E. – 1970 C.E., 1973 C.E., and 1982 C.E. The involvement of third parties strengthened the wars because of the supply of military, economic, and political support to the Israelis. Writers deduce that at different times and for various reasons, both the United States and then Soviet Union pursued policies that exacerbated the preexisting regional conflict because of their own interest².


Thomas L. Are says that the problem in writing about the Israeli/Palestinian tragedy is that there is no place to put a period and peace will not be built upon land. The formula is “Justice for Peace”¹.

In his comment on the Oslo accords, Edward Said comments:

Oslo brought one significantly new thing, namely, the first-time official admission by an Israeli prime minister that there was a Palestinian people (approximately 7.5 million in number) with its own representatives. Beyond that, the terms of the agreement exactly reflected the huge difference in power between the two sides. Nothing was said about Palestinian sovereignty and self-determination. No end to the presence of the settlements was mentioned.... East Jerusalem remained under Israeli control: Oslo passed that over. The refugees expelled in 1948 were left as they have been for the last fifty years, homeless and uncompensated, despite numerous international and UN covenants and resolutions².

No longer condemned as an occupying power, Israel rather stands beyond reproach as a full-fledged peacemaker. Indeed, all the United Nations resolutions which, as Said observes, ‘although . . . paper resolutions . . . represented the only international guarantee that


[Palestinian] claims would not be ignored\(^1\), have been effectively nullified by Oslo.

At the Center for Policy Analysis on Palestine (CPAP) briefing on March 7, 2001, Robert Malley, former special assistant to the US president for Arab-Israeli affairs and director for Near East and South Asian affairs at the National Security Council (NSC), as held by Sara Powell, discussed U.S. mistakes concerning its role in the Middle East peace process. Malley told the attentive crowd that there were conflicting interpretations of the peace process\(^2\).

Malley, according to writers, first contended that there were three myths regarding the peace process that were taking shape in the public consciousness: first, that there was a grand conspiracy between Clinton and Barak; second, that Clinton's role was fueled principally by a quest for glory; and finally, that the process was doomed to fail due to the presence of "too many Jews" on the U.S. negotiating team as Sara put it\(^3\).

Malley, who was a principal Clinton adviser, also listed seven mistakes made by the Clinton team. 1) The U.S. relied too heavily on Barak's timetables. 2) Each Israeli success was greeted by the U.S. with unwarranted enthusiasm. 3) The U.S. was unwilling to engage in power politics, but should have applied such tactics to both sides. 4) The U.S. was overly distrustful of "third party interlopers". 5) Washington neglected


\(^3\) *Idem*
what was happening on the ground—“settlements” on the Israeli side, “hate-mongering” on the Palestinian side. 6) The U.S. was “driven” into intra-Palestinian politics. 7) It allowed the process to become presidentialized. Malley claimed that Clinton was both the most pro-Palestinian as well as the most pro-Israeli president the U.S. had ever had. Moreover, he acknowledged Clinton’s vulnerability to domestic politics.1

The fact as viewed by scholars is that while propounders of ‘peace’ are focusing on the victories on the seventh and eighth stories of this edifice of Middle East peace, the foundation is crumbling, as described by Lustick and others. Even that part of the foundation that was laid early on was not complete. The edifice of Middle East peace is like an inverted pyramid. The seventh and eighth stories are big and promise great amounts of hope.2

3.7.10 Weakness of the Arabs

The Gulf War and the demise of the Soviet Union, as per writers, weakened the Arab governments and so the permanence of Israel’s could no longer be seriously denied.3

It is said that the recognition that Israel is here to stay is the result of facts on the ground, the certainty that no combination of Arab military

---

1 Sara Powell, “U.S. Peace Process Failures under Clinton”, p. 87.
forces can defeat Israel’s effective and high-tech military, and that the United States, no matter how strained its relations with the present Israeli government, simply will not permit Israel’s destruction. It is regrettable as claimed that most Arab leaders do not understand politics in democratic countries, especially in the two key countries, the United States and Israel, and cannot or do not verbalize this reality\(^1\).

President George Bush (Sr.) and Secretary of State James Baker, as held by Hagopian, saw the Gulf War as an opportunity to dissolve the Palestinian problem. Arafat and the PLO had become isolated from the Arab states for their perceived support of Saddam Hussein. Clearly, Arafat’s ill-informed leadership led to a further weakening of the PLO. The Madrid conference offered a framework for peace negotiations developed by United States Secretary of State James Baker, which was actually a synthesis of previous U.S. proposals, especially that of Camp David. The opening meeting was held on 30 October 1991 C.E. It precluded an international conference preferred by the Palestinians. It included a weakened Soviet Union as co-sponsor with the United States, the United Nations in observer status, and high level representatives from Israel (Prime Minister Shamir), a joint Palestinian/Jordanian delegation, Syria and other Arab states, along with a number of observer states. The Madrid framework, as noted, allowed for bilateral negotiations, favoured by Israel and the United States, between Israel and the relevant Arab states,

and offered the facade of multilateral talks on regional issues such as the environment and water, and also included refugee issues.

The Arab parties directly involved in the peace process were persuaded that responding to U.S. pressure and a U.S. timetable would help avert another Likud victory and thus ensure a relatively better deal. With the United States committed to a militarily superior Israel — it is the only nuclear power in the region — and with the Arab front fragmenting, Israeli hegemony has been assured.

3.7.11 Results of Peace-Process

Since 1948 C.E., Israel and Palestine went through numerous negotiations but as per Don Peretz, none produced positive results. So, now the situation is that Palestinians are prepared to be disappointed again. Beginning with the Lausanne conferences in 1949 C.E., through the Eric Johnston and Joseph Johnson plans in the 1950s and 1960s, from Glassboro to Camp David, the Palestinians complain, they have gained nothing. But still, most of them await peace in their portion of the world.

The years of occupation according to strategists have shown that there is no chance for real cooperation between the Israeli and Palestinian economies. The Palestinians, as the weak party, need more protectionism

---


2 Clovis Maksoud, “Peace Process or Puppet Show”, p. 118.

and economic delinking from the Israeli economy. Although globalization threatens to subsume national-level processes and increase dependency, poverty, and social tension in Third World countries in general, it is even more dangerous for the Palestinian economy, already captive to the Israeli economy. The Palestine Authority’s (PA) blind adherence from its creation to neoliberal polices has led to sharper class differentiation, corruption, and polarization inside Palestinian society\(^1\).

As long as the “peace process” sponsored by the United States (the main controller of globalizing financial institutions) continues, the occupied territories will continue to be deeply affected, economically and socially, by these institutions to the extent that Palestinian Authority policies will be globally, not internally, oriented. Despite the experiences of the many developing countries that have already taken this route, the PA unquestioningly adopts the wave of globalization, with seemingly little awareness of alternatives as held by writers\(^2\).

The author, Professor Donna E. Arzt of Syracuse University maintains, in essence,

\[
\text{... that Middle East peace can only be achieved when all Palestinian refugees are offered dual citizenship, compensation for lost property (to be shared on a “no fault” basis by all parties involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict, and that they should also share responsibility for refugee absorption), and voluntary}
\]


\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 117.
residence in either a future Palestinian state or other Arab states, the broader international community, or, 'on family reunification grounds', repatriation in Israel1.

3.7.12 Conclusion

Israelis fully expected and had a right to expect that the process would create greater security and regional acceptance for them. Palestinians fully expected that the process would yield the same benefits to them as well: economic prosperity and political life; their independence would move forward, and they too would have security and recognition within the region2.

The above analysis allows us to conclude that a viable peace is desired, and that therefore a different peace process must emerge to effect this. It is further premised on the acceptance of the fact that Palestinians feel, claim and understand with absolute conviction that they have national rights to sovereign statehood in Israel/Palestine. Indeed, both rights need to be recognized internationally, although, as developed herein, the peace processes erode the Palestinian legal claim to sovereign statehood as claimed by Hagopian3.

