

O you who believe, respond to the call of Allah and His Messenger when He calls you to that which would give you life...

# Khilafah

SAFAR - RABI AL-AWAAL 1431 ... FEBRUARY 2010 ... ISSUE: 10 *magazine*



## Yemen: The Next Piece of the Colonial Jigsaw

YEMEN: THE NEXT PIECE OF THE COLONIAL JIGSAW - AFTER HAITI'S EARTHQUAKE, WHAT WILL CHANGE? - BRITAIN'S NEOCONS - THE PROPHETS OF ALLAH (SWT) IN THE QURAN - FROM COPENHAGEN TO BROKENHAGEN - SO WHO WILL SAVE THE ENVIRONMENT? - A POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE RECENT IRAQI OIL AUCTION

# NEWSBITES



## “BROKEN BRITAIN”

David Cameron is highlighting Britain's “broken society” as an election issue. The Tory leader cited recent research that “among the richest countries, it's the more unequal ones that do worse according to almost every quality of life indicator”.

Among 21 developed countries, the Guardian found Britain does worst on child wellbeing and badly on teenage births, imprisonment, drug abuse, trust, obesity, social mobility and mental illness. A government commissioned study – An Anatomy of Economic Inequality in the UK – described a nation in which the richest 10% are more than 100 times as wealthy as the poorest 10%. The key issue is that the politicians perpetuate and support fully the system, values and way of life that underpins this rapidly declining society. Dare suggest that an alternative ideology or belief system can lead to greater fairness and cohesion and watch the sparks fly. At least the Muslims are now getting into this debate, after all vilification of Islam and Muslims could hardly be at a higher level.

## VEILED THREATS

A French parliamentary commission has called for a ban of the wearing of the face veil (niqab and burqa) on the grounds that they threaten France's republican values of secularism and equality. Not only to be banned in public places but veil wearers or others that displays outward signs of “radical religious practice” should be refused citizenship and access to public services. British opportunist parties such as the UK Independence party are making similar demands in the UK. Isn't it perverse that in societies that pride themselves on unbridled freedoms to wear or believe in whatever you like,

that such basic rights are to be denied Muslims. One might think that this is mere pandering to extreme right wing elements, but Muslims living in Europe are wondering what will be next.

## DRONE ATTACKS KILL 700

Its estimated that the US killed at least 700 civilians in Pakistani Drone strikes in 2009.

While the number of “targets” hit is estimated at 5, both numbers are unverified. Barack Obama promised there would be a dramatic escalation of the aerial bombardment of Pakistan's tribal areas and didn't disappoint the neo-cons that endorse such butchery. On June 22, the US struck at a house in Waziristan that officials called a “suspected militant hideout” burying several locals inside. When others rushed to the scene to rescue them, they launched another missile, killing 13 innocent Pakistanis. When they held a funeral procession on June 23, the US hit that too on the assumption that Baitullah Mehsud “might” be amongst the mourners. The sanctity of life is a key issue for all right thinking people, can you imagine the outrage the following report might engender: “US Law enforcement officers expressed satisfaction at the assumed killing of a key target in downtown Manhattan. The apartment building in a fashionable district in which he was hiding was successfully leveled, no one knows how many civilian casualties resulted.”

France accuses US of occupying Haiti  
France accused the US of “occupying” Haiti in mid January, as thousands of American troops flooded into the country to take charge of aid efforts and security. The French minister in charge of humanitarian relief called on the UN to

“clarify” the American role amid claims the military buildup was hampering aid efforts. Alain Joyandet admitted he had been involved in a scuffle with a US commander in the airport's control tower over the flight plan for a French evacuation flight. “This is about helping Haiti, not about occupying Haiti”, Mr Joyandet said. Geneva-based charity Medecins Sans Frontieres backed his calls saying hundreds of lives were being put at risk as planes carrying vital medical supplies were turned away by American air traffic controllers. But US commanders insisted their forces' focus was on humanitarian work and later to prioritise aid arrivals to the airport over military flights, after the intervention of the UN.



## BLAIR'S WAR

Amidst great fanfare and hype Tony Blair took to centre stage at the Chilcot enquiry into the Iraqi invasion on the 29th of January. The Chilcot enquiry has been widely criticized as a gentle discussion shop with little in the way of inciteful or probing enquiry and even weaker cross-examining of the witnesses. One commentator described the questions put to Blair as being as cutting as a month old lettuce.

It is not really a surprise that Blair could easily brush aside his questioners. In his opening address to the enquiry Lord Chilcot set out the terms of the enquiry including that no one would be found guilty and the enquiry was all about “learning lessons”. There is ample evidence of the illegality of Blair and Bush's war, yet the closest Blair will ever come to being behind bars is the effigy of him held up by the many protestors held in a mock prison outside the enquiry.

# Editorial

On January 28th several world leaders gathered in London to plan their next steps in the failed campaign in Afghanistan. While the drums of war have started beating over Yemen (the subject of our feature article this issue), the latest Afghani surge is still to be implemented and the chaos of Iraq is hardly settled. Muslims take no solace in the failure of these appalling military adventures, particularly as a key objective of them is to dampen and destroy the path forward to the re-establishment of the Caliphate throughout the Muslim world. Yet with each desperate attempt to subdue Muslim countries to their “secular, liberal, democratic” straightjacket, Muslims continue to defy these crude plans for pushing Islam to the margins. Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain this month have launched a report coinciding with the Afghanistan London conference, entitled “Afghanistan & Pakistan: the Unwinnable War” the full report can be downloaded from: <http://www.hizb.org.uk/hizb/resources/reports/report-afghanistan-&-pakistan-the-unwinnable-war.html>

The following is from the executive summary of the report:

A major sign of incompetence is a person who does the same thing over and over again while each time expecting different results. President Barack Obama and Prime Minister Gordon Brown seem to be trapped in such an illusion. In 2001, when Western leaders ordered the invasion of Afghanistan, they set out their objectives for its occupation. They talked of bringing peace to the region, establishing a government which is accountable, promoting economic and industrial development, ending the opium trade and securing the rights of the Afghan people.

At the end of the decade, the West has been unable to deliver in Afghanistan.

Instead, the people of Afghanistan have been subjected to a brutal occupation, thousands of civilians have been killed and many Afghans have witnessed firsthand the West’s empty promises of ‘freedom’ and ‘human rights’ when detained and tortured in Bagram and Kandahar. The Karzai regime, thoroughly discredited by ineptitude, corruption and dealings with brutal warlords, continues to be propped up by both London and Washington. The opium trade is booming and politicians with close ties to the West are alleged to be wrapped up in it. There is no economic or industrial development and despite pledges of billions of dollars in aid, there is little evidence of the rebuilding of Afghanistan that was promised.

After eight years the West has lost any form of moral authority to continue its occupation and its support of the widely discredited Karzai regime. There is no cogent reason to believe that they would even begin to make progress given another eight years. The neo-colonial mission in Afghanistan has failed. The West and its client regime in Kabul have no legitimacy or credibility in the eyes of the Afghan people or wider Muslim world. This eight year long folly must now come to an end.

Although it was their warmongering predecessors who launched the Afghan war, both Obama and Brown have decided to double down and have devoted more resources in a vain attempt to “finish the job.” But with no coherent strategy, an excess use of violent tactics coupled with gross incompetence, NATO rule has led to Afghanistan being controlled by drug barons and corrupt officials. Far from being able to defeat Al-Qaeda or the Taliban in Afghanistan, the war will cause more resentment and hatred especially in the Muslim world

where the West’s reputation is already in tatters perpetuating instability and chaos. Yet after the defeat in Iraq, the continued failure in Afghanistan and being fully exposed under the war on terror, Obama and Brown are now engaged in an “undeclared” war in Pakistan to destabilise yet another country in the Muslim world. Though the overt neo-conservative agenda may have ended with the previous US administration, its spirit lives on with active wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and now undeclared wars in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia. There is little doubt that the latest strategy articulated by the president of the United States in his West Point speech of 1st December 2009, like all the previous strategies conducted since October 2001, will fail and that Afghanistan will continue to suffer as a nation and as a people.

This is because these strategies were not just hopelessly executed, but hopelessly conceived. The analysis of Western war strategists is that the Afghan war has been under resourced due to the war in Iraq and this explains the resurgence of the Taliban. The proponents of the new strategy believe that the lack of troops has led the people of Afghanistan to lose confidence in NATO’s ability to provide greater security, a pre-requisite for effective governance. Lacking economic opportunities, ordinary Afghans in particular the Pashtuns, effectively channelled their frustrations through joining the Taliban as the latter provided both salaries and status. Due to the perception that the central Afghan government was corrupt, these people turned to violence against NATO, seeing them as defenders of a corrupt status quo, to drain the swamp of radicalism the supporters of the new strategy believe that the US should increase troops in the short term and peel off those who are not hard core ideologues in the insurgency. By regaining momentum, the West believes they can then build up Afghanistan’s indigenous security forces to take over from NATO at some undefined future date. However, to ensure this strategy works effectively Pakistan must also be fixed through a mix of getting the Pakistanis to do more and escalating covert US military action.

■

# YEMEN: The Next Piece of the Colonial Jigsaw



In the aftermath of the alleged failed terror plot to target a US airliner involving the Nigerian born Umar Farouk Abdul Mutallab the finger of blame has most surprisingly been pointed at Yemen. Up until now the world had become used to American and British government rhetoric blaming 'terrorists' based in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region at every opportunity.

Prior to this alleged incident the recent attack at the Fort Hood base was also tied to Yemen. On this occasion it again seems that it is Yemen's turn. British Prime Minister Gordon Brown announced the holding of a 'Yemen conference' alongside his Afghanistan conference which was held on January 27th to discuss the 'radicalisation' problem inside Yemen, declaring "I have said before that Yemen - as both an

incubator and potential safe haven for terrorism - presents a regional and global threat." Barack Obama, the American President and Nobel Prize winner for 'Peace' also indicated that American airstrikes and Special Forces operations are also on the cards citing that 'Al Qaeda' was behind the attack. Senator Joseph Lieberman, a notorious advocate of the Iraq war, also weighed in saying "Somebody in our government

said to me in Sana'a, the capital of Yemen, Iraq was yesterday's war. Afghanistan is today's war. If we don't act preemptively, Yemen will be tomorrow's war."

It seems incredible that in such a short space of time since the Christmas day incident international conferences were being planned with the prospects of Western military action inside another sovereign Muslim country. What should be in the first instance a law enforcement and prevention predicament has already been propelled to the top of world politics.

This situation seems even more bizarre when one considers the fact that the alleged bomber's own father, allegedly concerned about his son's behavior and intent, reported him to the US embassy in Nigeria in November 2009 and was on a US suspect watch list; Obama admitted as much when he said that US intelligence had enough information to uncover the plot but "failed to connect those dots." British intelligence also knew about his alleged involvement for three years. The American government's version of events that the US security and intelligence agencies, despite all the upheaval they went through in the aftermath of September 11, are still incompetent enough to have allowed Abdul Mutallab on a flight to the US

American and British governments that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, ready to be used within 45 minutes and the world was witness to what subsequently happened there. It does not matter whether any credible evidence has been presented or not, whether there has been any legal process of any kind, or whether such evidence presented has undergone rigorous scrutiny in a court of law given that thousands if not millions of human lives are potentially at stake. Instead what we see repeatedly is Western governments acting as the judge, jury and executioner all rolled into one; they expect the rest of the world to accept at face value whatever they proclaim. Even the inherently loaded and token rubber stamp of the UN Security Council has been dispensed with.

To concoct a story, a ruse, has simply become a rite of passage for the American and British governments as a public relations prelude to launching hostilities as they press on with their neo-colonial war inside the Muslim world. Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair said as much when in a recent interview he declared that finding WMDs inside Iraq was 'not important', saying "I mean obviously you would have had to use and deploy different arguments, about the nature of

govern their evil intent and behaviour.

In the case of Yemen the truth is that the Americans have already been very active inside Yemen as early as 2002. More recently America has also been covertly helping the regime to put down a rebellion led by the Houthi tribesman in the North which has resulted in a growing cascade of civilians being killed by the Yemeni regime. The military action inside Yemen during the month of December before the airline plot was seemingly discovered is widely suspected of having direct American involvement via airstrikes and Special Forces operations. This co-operation was strengthened and enhanced by a recent military agreement between Washington and Sana'a agreed in November 2009. As General Petraeus's visit now shows, clear plans are being made with the Yemeni leadership for more direct American military involvement. Justifying the presence of their forces for the foreseeable future Britain announced the financing of a new 'anti-terror' Yemeni Police unit while the American's announced an increase of military aid to \$120 million. Having learnt from Bush's mistakes and subsequent painful loss of global public opinion, Obama has discreetly and quietly started another war in Yemen. The airline 'plot' marks the next, overt, phase of Britain's and America's 'War on Terror' in Yemen.

However with the carrots there are plenty of sticks as well. As is the case with such Western support it is conditional, and the threats are clearly held out as well. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has often played this role with Pakistan as she infamously proclaimed in April 2009 that Islamabad and the entire Pakistani state were facing an 'existential threat' if they did not act immediately against the 'extremists' in Pakistan. This was followed by the massive Swat operation by the Zardari regime which made over 3 million people homeless. Now Clinton has again made plain that they require compliance, saying "It's time for the international community to make it

After having destroyed Iraq, America is deliberately fanning the flames of instability and insurgency in Pakistan. There is no reason to doubt that this is part of the real American objective in Yemen as well.

despite knowing all that they did about him is an outlandish story to believe. Yet despite this apparent new 'intelligence failure', America and Britain still have enough faith in their security and intelligence services to pinpoint the perpetrators as being based in Yemen and are now prepared to attack another Muslim country in the process.

Unfortunately this Western version of events is unbelievably all too familiar. The world was repeatedly told by the

the threat". Not only is such behavior completely illustrative of Western foreign policy skullduggery, it is amoral and hypocrisy of the highest order as they violate all known norms. These same Western powers held the Nuremberg trials in the aftermath of World War Two where they convicted and executed many of Hitler's German accomplices for launching what they deemed were illegal wars of aggression. For the likes of the British and American governments their abominable colonial values justify and



clear to Yemen that there are expectations and conditions on our continuing support for the government so that they can take actions which will have a better chance to provide that peace and stability to the people of Yemen and the region." Clinton's statement is an ominous precursor of what is to come.

Yemen, a former British colony, has been a victim of internal wars since independence in 1967 and after the unification of North and South Yemen has been undergoing another civil war since 2004. The Houthi tribes are fighting the corrupt regime led by President Ali Abdullah Saleh who is a former colonel in the Yemeni army, has been in power in one shape or form since 1978, ostensibly 'democratically' elected. In the first direct Presidential election in 1999 Saleh was elected with an astonishing 96.3% of the vote. In an impoverished country where political abuse of power, manipulation and corruption are rampant the value of such elections is farcical where the ruler has populated his government with close family members. Saleh's General People's Congress has used constitutional changes, tradeoffs and deals with the main political opposition to strengthen and maintain his grip on

power. Saleh is now using America's 'War on Terror' as his version of the American global franchise to use an anti-terror campaign to mask his fight to crush growing dissent against his corrupt regime. International Crisis Group in its 2009 report on Yemen stated that "Increasing domestic repression under cover of an anti-terrorism campaign reflects growing state insecurity."

America is actually deliberately seeking to exploit the situation in a strategically located country at the foot of the Gulf, Red sea and off the horn of Africa in an area which contains some of the world's most important shipping lanes. The port of Aden in Yemen was of prime logistical importance to the British Empire and explains why Britain is so anxious at getting involved in its traditional asset lest it lose out to America. The failure of America to pacify Somalia through its proxies explains why Washington is so eager to settle down in Yemen as an alternative vantage point on the Gulf of Aden through which passes most of the oil from the Middle East. Moreover China is making inroads into Africa and recently announced its intention to build a Middle Eastern naval base as it seeks to expand its influence into the warm waters of the Persian Gulf, once the exclusive preserve of Western colonial powers. Washington seeks to deny and dominate completely this key strategic space vital to China for its oil imports and other material interests in an attempt to control China's spectacular economic growth.

However perhaps the threat to the stability of the pro-American Saudi stooges in Riyadh is the most compelling factor for Washington to intervene directly; half of Yemen's population is Shiite and with Iran's backing the flames of rebellion could easily spread well into Saudi's oil rich but Shiite dominated provinces.

The strategy the US will actually deploy in Yemen is something that only time will tell. However as seen with Pakistan, America's promises of aid and providing

stability in reality mean next to nothing for the ordinary Muslim; Pakistan today is sliding into a terrible disaster with frequent bombings and American military operations on its own territory. The US may promise one thing but what actually happens is plain for everyone to see. After having destroyed Iraq, America is deliberately fanning the flames of instability and insurgency in Pakistan. There is no reason to doubt that this is part of the real American objective in Yemen as well.

This is because there is a wider strategic goal being pursued aside from immediate material interests. From the coast of Western Africa through the Middle East, right across South and Central Asia stretching out to Indonesia the American Pentagon has defined an 'arc of instability', countries which are inherently unstable because of repressive rulers, with some such as Pakistan, now experiencing violent convulsions. They also happen to be entirely Muslim, rich with abundant resources, whose populations are enraged by the oppressive dictatorial rule of tyrants and despots who masquerade as Kings' and Presidents which Western governments continue to strongly support such as Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia and now of course as seen with President Ali Abdullah Saleh of Yemen.

This is the crux of the problem in the Muslim world, the continued betrayal by Muslim rulers supported by Western governments. The Saudis are currently demonstrating their latest criminal treachery. When Israel was slaughtering the Palestinians in Gaza like animals last year, the Saudis did nothing militarily to prevent the Israeli attacks. They did not use their expensive Western purchased tanks and aircraft while its army sat in its barracks; instead they tried to placate ordinary Muslims by issuing token statements condemning Israel. Now, at the instigation of America, the Saudis have launched their own version of the Israeli slaughter on the Muslims of Yemen. How far removed the apparent champions of Islam are from

the Ummah.

If anyone doubts true American intentions then let them consider what STRATFOR, a widely known mouthpiece for the CIA, said on 7th December 2009 where it argued "The jihadists are currently playing directly into U.S. hands because, rhetoric aside, the United States cannot regard instability in the Islamic world as a problem. Let's be more precise on this:

ward off others. They seek to directly militarily occupy Muslim lands such as Iraq and Afghanistan where they can no longer rely on puppet rulers to do their bidding and safeguard their interests. Their primary motive for doing so is that they fear the Islamic revival across these Islamic lands. They fear that the secular, usually pro-western, regimes in these lands will fall and in their place will rise the unified Islamic Caliphate.

The 'War on Terror' is a bogus war which lost its credibility long ago in Bush's first term. Obama's words too are losing their gloss as people increasingly judge him on his actions, not on his words.

An ideal outcome for the United States would be the creation of stable, pro-American regimes in the region. ... The second-best outcome for the United States involves a conflict in which the primary forces battling — and neutralizing — each other are Muslim, with the American forces in a secondary role. This has been achieved to some extent in Iraq. Obama's goal is to create a situation in Afghanistan in which Afghan government forces engage Taliban forces with little or no U.S. involvement. Meanwhile, in Pakistan the Americans would like to see an effective effort by Islamabad to suppress jihadists throughout Pakistan. If they cannot get suppression, the United States will settle for a long internal conflict that would tie down the jihadists." The 'arc of instability' serves American interests perfectly; it cannot get more black and white than that.

Britain and other Western governments share this view; their long term goal and strategy is to deconstruct potentially strong and strategic Muslim countries and to rebuild them to the extent where they achieve the desired geo-political outcome; they seek to create situations where controlled anarchy prevails, or 'managed chaos', whereby they achieve their material goals of extracting resources and use these lands as strategic holding areas to

As part of their rhetorical propaganda Western leaders seek to portray anyone who talks of politics based on Islam as being a 'terrorist' as Gordon Brown declared recently that "Of course it's.....a murderous ideology that tries to create a caliphate." Western leaders insult the intelligence of Muslim and non Muslim alike when they effectively argue that Muslims are incapable of a mature peaceful Islamic political discourse; either you are a secular politician or an extremist. This is an insult to the collective intelligence of 1.5 billion Muslims worldwide, who cherish the memories of the first Caliphs and the Caliphate ruling system as a golden era. This in truth is a malicious attempt to smear all Muslim opposition to Western wars of occupation and support of corrupt dictators like Saleh in Yemen. Arguments from the likes of Brown and Obama do not wash with anyone, even with the majority of their own populations, who can see that it is Western foreign policy that is the real driver to more wars and the threat to world peace and security.

The 'War on Terror' is a bogus war which lost its credibility long ago in Bush's first term. Obama's words too are losing their gloss as people increasingly judge him on his actions, not on his words. This is a man who has increased the war effort in Afghanistan

and Pakistan and now seeks to initiate a new one in Yemen. Obama is no different from a snake oil salesman, who cuts an increasing figure as an empty vassal, devoid of any genuine thought but merely tries to re-package the same old tired rhetoric. Bush was loud and reckless but Obama too is resorting to the law of the jungle never having deployed a real argument in the first place. Yet today despite the West being overwhelmingly superior in military, economic and political strength it has failed to remould and pacify the Muslim world in its vision. Despite all their best efforts the Muslim masses today are seething, restless and ready for change in favour of an Islamic ruling system.

The West in turn has paid a tremendous price, particularly America and Britain; their economies are practically bankrupt from the national debt that has ballooned ever since they launched their 'War on Terror' culminating in the global economic crisis; and their militaries are stretched to breaking point where they are forced to spill ever more of their own blood. Saner elements within western policy circles should consider that if this is the case today where the Muslim world is at its weakest, then certainly with the advent of the Caliphate tomorrow, the situation will be entirely different, one in which the superiority that they enjoy in every arena will be neutralised. Memories are not short and ideas can only be stopped with stronger ones, not by bullets and bombs; it is only a short matter of time before the corrupt regimes in the Muslim world fall and ironically Western governments are damaging the very interests they seek to protect. Yet with their new adventure in Yemen there is no evidence to believe that any of this will change for as Allah (SWT) informs in the Quran: *"And when it is said unto them: Make not mischief in the earth, they say: We are peacemakers only."* [Surah Al Baqarah 2:11]

■

# After Haiti's earthquake, what will change?



Images from the aftermath of last Wednesday's magnitude seven earthquake in Haiti vividly highlight the huge human tragedy and desperation of the survivors. Such events remind us all of human frailty and weakness while Allah (swt) remains the All Powerful. Disasters like these should remind us all of yawn al-qiyama (the day of judgement) and should make us more obedient to Allah (swt).

*When the earth is shaken with its (final) earthquake.* [TMQ Az-Zalzalah 99:1]

Islam also teaches us that these disasters are a test for us to see whether we rush to help the survivors of such tragedies.

*And if anyone saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of all mankind.* [TMQ Al-Maidah 5:32]

Will the Muslim governments in the Gulf and elsewhere be at the forefront of delivering aid to the suffering Haitians? Or are they too busy wasting the ummah's wealth building the tallest skyscrapers, shopping malls and indoor ski resorts in the middle of the desert? The fact that they have failed in their Islamic duty and hardly rendered help to the starving millions in Somalia and Afghanistan does not fill one with confidence that they will now mobilise for Haiti. Why Haiti's lack of basic infrastructure even before this tragedy?

For many people, the tragedy of this earthquake is mixed with anger at the

total incapacity of Haiti's state structures to respond to the disaster because little infrastructure and apparatus of a functioning modern state existed in the first place. Even before Wednesday's tragic events, Haiti was the poorest country in the western hemisphere. Nearly 80% of its population live on less than US\$2 a day. Only 62% of its adult population are literate and 25% are in any form of employment and 30% have sanitation in their homes.

## **Debt to France**

When Haiti gained independence from France after its revolution, in exchange for diplomatic recognition from France, the new republic was forced to pay enormous reparations: some 150m francs, in gold. It was an immense sum, and even reduced by more than half in





1830, far more than Haiti could afford. "The long and the short of it is that Haiti was paying reparations to France from 1825 until 1947," says Alex Von Tunzelmann, a historian and writer. "To come up with the money, it took out huge loans from American, German and French banks, at exorbitant rates of interest. By 1900, Haiti was spending about 80% of its national budget on loan repayments. It completely wrecked their economy. By the time the original reparations and interest were paid off,

the place was basically destitute and trapped in a spiral of debt." It is ironic that in the last few days France's President Sarkozy started talking about wanting to rid Haiti of poverty once and for all when he said "From this catastrophe, which follows so many others, we should make sure that it is a chance to get Haiti once and for all out of the curse it seems to have been stuck with for such a long time,". He conveniently failed to mention France's role in perpetrating Haiti's tragedy.



### US interference

Over the last two centuries, the US has also repeatedly interfered in Haiti and even invaded and occupied it in 1915 terrified that Haiti was about to default on its massive debts. A 1922 loan of millions of dollars owed to the US resulted in a financial system that siphoned the country's wealth to offshore creditors instead of reinvesting it in the country's economy. France and the United States have repeatedly intervened in Haitian politics since the country's founding, sometimes at the request of one party or another. The last time the US officially invaded the country was as recently as 1994 after which it then formally withdrew to be replaced by a UN force.

### Local leaders as looters

Added to all this is the fact that a succession of Haitian leaders more or less gave up on trying to resolve Haiti's problems, and started looting it instead. During the 28 years in power of Papa Doc Duvalier and his playboy son and heir, Jean-Claude Duvalier, or Baby Doc, they made themselves very rich indeed reportedly embezzling up to 80% of Haiti's international aid, while the debts they signed up to -account for 45% of what the country owes today. And when Baby Doc -finally fled, estimates of what he took with him run as high as \$900m.

Corrupt Western backed leaders and direct interference by western powers have contributed to the tragic state that became Haiti despite its human and natural resources. As the masses of the world empathise with the people of Haiti, many struggle to imagine how its next chapter will be different to its previous ones.

■

# Britain's Neocons

Right-wing think tanks linked to political power in the United States were the recipe for the global war on terror. Now history seems to be repeating itself as Britain heads for a general election and a new generation of war-mongers looks set to assume office.

Very few people had heard of neoconservatism when George W Bush came to power in 2000. Yet over the next 8 years the word became associated with some of the most ruthless, war-mongering and blood thirsty colonial policies the world had ever seen.

## What is Neoconservatism?

Neoconservatism is a political philosophy within secular and capitalist thought. It was first postulated in the years after World War 2 by the political thinker Leo Strauss. Its most significant aspect is that it believes in using economic and military power of the State to bring liberalism, democracy, and the western way of life to other countries.

But one of the most striking things about this political thought is that its founder indoctrinated some of his students with these ideas, and over the decades the views found a foothold within political think tanks, and eventually into mainstream US politicians.

## Neocons in the US

Before the election won by George W Bush, the think tank called the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) launched a mission statement which is noteworthy because many of the signatories became associated with the Bush administration.

PNAC said that "The history of the past century should have taught us to embrace the cause of American leadership" and it aimed to establish four core missions for the US military including to "defend the American homeland; fight and decisively win multiple, simultaneous major theater wars; perform the "constabulary" duties associated with shaping the security environment in critical regions; transform U.S. forces to exploit the "revolution in military affairs"

Signatories and contributors to significant documents and reports included "Jeb" Bush (the President's brother and Governor of Florida), Richard Armitage (former Deputy Secretary of State), Zalmay Khalilzad (former US Ambassador to UN, Iraq and Afghanistan), Lewis 'Scooter' Libby (Vice President Dick Cheney's chief of staff), Richard Perle (Chairman of the Defense Policy Board Advisory Committee from 2001 to 2003) and Donald Rumsfeld (former Defence Secretary).

This think tank was by no means unique in Washington. The Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute, the Nixon Centre and the Hudson Institute have all been associated with this strand of thinking. However, ultimately it was this think tank that had the strongest links to people within the government.

Generally, all these right-wing think tanks and politicians created the political opinion that eventually translated into policies that included:

-The invasion and occupation of Afghanistan

-The invasion and occupation of Iraq  
-The founding of Camp Delta in Guantanamo Bay in Cuba for 'enemy combatants' without rights

-The use of torture by the CIA and the outsourcing of torture to secret locations around the world, known as extraordinary rendition

-The launch of the global war on terror  
For these reasons, the word 'neocon' became a despised word across the world, including amongst many ordinary citizens of Europe and America who have become war-weary and regret the seizing of power by these arrogant and aggressive politicians who caused so much bloodshed and chaos.

## Neoconservatism in Britain

Despite the fall in support for this strand of thinking in America, in Britain a curious thing has happened almost unnoticed by the general public. An almost identical process to that in the US has led to right-wing neoconservative thinking dominating a political party - this time the British Conservative (or Tory) Party.

The Tory party lost the 1997 UK General Election and was in disarray for some years after. However, in 2005 there was a leadership election which was won by David Cameron, supported by a coterie of 'young turks' who seized the political vacuum caused by the divisions in the party. These Cameron supporters, known as the 'Notting Hill set' (because they live in Notting Hill - the same London locality as Cameron), include Michael Gove MP, George Osborne MP and Ed Vaizey MP - all of whom are known as supporters of neoconservatism.

Some of these politicians, most notably Gove, strongly supported their opponent former British Prime Minister Tony Blair in his pro-war anti-terror policies and wars of pre-emption.

Gove was a former director of a British right-wing think tank called the Policy Exchange, now infamous for producing anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic reports. This think-tank, which has strong links to David Cameron, issued a pamphlet in 2007 called 'The Hijacking of British Islam: How Extremist Literature is Subverting Mosques in the UK' by Denis MacEoin. It claimed to be 'the most comprehensive academic



The Henry Jackson Society's statement of principles originally argue a "forward strategy" to assist those countries that are not yet liberal and democratic to become so" involving "diplomatic, economic, cultural or political" policies as 'carrots' but also "those 'sticks' of the military domain." It also "supports the maintenance of a strong military, by the United States, the countries of the European Union and other democratic powers". Like PNAC it fosters a western supremacist viewpoint saying that "that only modern liberal democratic states are truly legitimate".

#### **Cameron's Neocon Credentials**

David Cameron has very deliberately manufactured a media image as a moderate, centrist and liberal politician. He has tried to distance himself from neoconservatism calling himself a 'liberal conservative'. However, this image cultivated by media advisors and spin doctors has not deceived everyone.

On the 26th November 2005 the Spectator magazine carried an article entitled: "Now Cameron is positioning himself as the heir to George W. Bush" whilst the Guardian newspaper has published an opinion piece titled "Cameron is no moderate". Political writer David Morrison, writing before Cameron's leadership success, wrote about 'David Cameron: Blair Mark II' citing his support for the Iraq war, and exposing the neocon ties of his closest supporters Gove, Osborne and Vaizey. George Osborne, who is Shadow Chancellor and a school friend of Cameron's, once hailed the 'excellent neo-conservative case' for action against Iraq and that he was a 'signed-up, card-carrying Bush fan'!

His current spokesman for Home Affairs Chris Grayling gave key speech on terrorism to the US think tank the Heritage Foundation. In 2003 Douglas J. Feith - former under Secretary of Defence in the Bush administration said that "The Heritage Foundation helped created the alliance of the neocons".

Grayling showed his true colours when he criticised the decision of former Home Secretary Jackie Smith to ban Michael Savage from the UK - the American talk-show host who was once quoted as saying Muslims "need deportation", and that adherents of Islam would do well to "take

your religion and shove it up your behind" because "I'm sick of you."

Also, Cameron's new defence advisor retired General Sir Richard Dannatt, echoed Bush and Blair making an attack on the Caliphate, whilst Cameron's Shadow Defence Minister Liam Fox, wrote a belligerent war-mongering article against Iran in the Times newspaper on 1st January 2010.

#### **Cameron's Neoconservative anti-Muslim Policies**

As time has gone on there have been clearer examples of Cameron's and the Conservative's hostile attitudes towards Muslims. These include a recent attack on Muslim schools; repeated calls to ban Hizb ut-Tahrir (a non-violent but strong voice opposing colonial foreign policy); arguing - like Blair - that Muslims have false grievances and a sense of victimhood; a pro-Iraq war policy; a policy that would escalate Britain's foothold in Afghanistan and Pakistan; escalating the war rhetoric on Iran; and a policy that even describes some integrationist Muslim groups as 'extremist'!

Cameron, described himself as a Zionist in 2007 and once said his belief in Israel is 'very deep and inside of me' and 'indestructible'. In 2009 when addressing a gathering of the Conservative Friends of Israel in the aftermath of Israel's massacres in Gaza, described by the UN as war crimes, Cameron went out of his way to praise Israel because it "strives to protect innocent life".

#### **Conclusion**

Cameron and his party appear to be manoeuvring their way to power on a moderate ticket. But there are all the signs that they will pursue a foreign policy and Muslim policies every bit as aggressive as Bush's Neocons or Tony Blair. People should realise that they will continue to mask their true face until they feel they have safely won moderate opinion in Britain and secured power, very much as their predecessors Bush and Blair did over a decade before. Those who hoped for peace after so much war, or stability after so much chaos will have to put up with yet more masters of war in positions of power.

■

survey of such literature ever produced in this country' but was later exposed as being so flawed the Policy Exchange have even removed it from their website.

Gove is also the author of the book Celsius 7/7, a book that led to many feeling that he harboured a hostile attitude towards Islam and Muslims. The respected historian and author William Dalrymple, when reviewing the book, said it was a "confused epic of simplistic incomprehension". The book's cover jacket boasted that Gove was a leading writer and thinker on terrorism, but Dalrymple challenged his qualifications on this statement saying "Throughout Gove's book, neocon myths are reheated and served up, despite being long discredited, most recently by the 2005 CIA report just released by the Senate Committee on Intelligence. Saddam, believes Gove, "invited Islamists into Iraq"; was "determined to pursue his WMD programme" and "dreamt of emulating" 9/11, strongly suggesting the central lie of Saddam's non-existent links with 9/11."

Gove, together with Ed Vaizey MP (a Cameron ally), is a supporter to the Henry Jackson Society - a UK based think tank that shares neocon principles, and whose other supporters also include Michael Ancram MP (a former Conservative frontbencher), David Willetts MP (part of Cameron's Shadow Cabinet team), David Trimble (who sits on the Conservative benches in the House of Lords), as well as Sir Richard Dearlove - former head of the British Secret Intelligence Service. Other supporters for this Society include the American economist Irwin Stelzer - known to be close to media magnate Rupert Murdoch - a Cameron supporter - and Richard Perle and William Kristol two of the signatories to the Project for the New American Century.

# The Prophets of Allah (swt) in the Quran



All Praises are due to Allah (swt), we bear witness nothing is worthy of worship except for Him, and we bear witness that the Prophet Mohammad (saw) is His slave and Messenger

There are more than 50 chapters in the Qur'an that mention various stories of the Prophets

From Musa and Banu Israel, the story of Adam with details in multiple places, the story of Nuh, the story of Yusuf, the story of Luqman and so on.

It is known that not even a letter of the Qur'an has been revealed without a wisdom and a purpose, not a single letter of the Qur'an was revealed without a reason, so when we see the amount of chapters and ayaat that discuss the stories of the Prophets, we have to know there is a reason behind it.

And we know that Allah (swt) revealed the Qur'an with the truth: *"It is He who sent down the book to you with the truth"* [al-Imran: 2]

*"That is because Allah has sent down the Book with the Truth"* [al-Baqara :176]

These stories are haq, and they are part of the haq, just as we are ordered by the haq, and to carry the haq to all people. Just as we are ordered by the Islamic aqeeda, by our 'ibadaat, by the rules and regulations of the mu'amalaat, to learn and teach the ahkam we need to live our lives in accordance with the haq.

We are ordered to learn, to teach and act upon the Qur'an - in its entirety - that Allah mentions (addressing bani Israel). *"Do you believe in part of the book, and disbelieve in part"* [al-Baqara : 85]

So we believe in the Qur'an in its entirety, and we learn, teach and act upon the Qur'an in its entirety, and from this Qur'an are those ayaat which contain these stories of the Prophets - which are there for us to contemplate over, learn from and act upon the examples - otherwise what is the application of these large amounts of narrations in the Qur'an, and Allah does not reveal anything which is of no use.

Allah (swt) - has ordered us to be witness over mankind: *"Thus We have made you a just/middle ummah, in order to be witnesses over mankind and the Messenger a witness over you"* [al-Baqara 143]

We are the middle ummah - in all issues. If you look at the economic crisis that afflicts Capitalism, the global financial markets, and compare it to what happened at the time of the collapse of the Communists - these two extremes in economic theory. One which sanctifies state ownership, and the other which sanctifies private ownership. Both have now proven to be false, whereas Islam recognises private ownership, state ownership, and public ownership, and gives each its due. When it comes to the relation between the spiritual and the material, here you have the secular which negates the spiritual in the public arena, and then in some ideas in the personal life people will take the spiritual to the extremes. In communism the spiritual aspect was completely denied and the material was sanctified. Whereas in Islam - we mix the material and spiritual in all issues, our lives are as a worship to Allah because we recognise that is the reason we were created. So from our food, to drink, to our politics, and business, we mix the two by recognising Allah's rules and laws in all that we do, by applying the Shari'a in life's affairs whether personal or public.

In order for the Muslim ummah to be described as witnesses over mankind - it means that daw'a must be carried to mankind, to inform them of their purpose in this life, to inform them of the belief in Allah, and the shari'a of Islam. Whoever carries this to mankind, he deserves to be characterised as being a witness over them, and if not then he does not deserve this characteristic.

So daw'a, is an honourable work, which no

Muslim should neglect, otherwise he has neglected and lost out on a great deal of good, and has denied himself the description of being a witness over mankind, as being part of this middle ummah that was sent to deliver Islam to all the peoples and nations of the earth. *"And we did not send you except as a rabma to the 'aalameen"* [al-anbiya :107]

**"I was sent to all the people"** (Bukhari)

So the Prophet Muhammad (saw) was sent to the whole of mankind, to bring the whole of mankind within the fold of Islam, and after the death of the Prophet (saw) we take his place - not in terms of Prophethood but in terms of continuing to carry the daw'a of Islam to the World, and to all the different peoples of the World.

It should be noted - that different peoples, have different characteristics, different mannerisms, behaviours and morals. For example the Japanese and the oriental concept of honour, the Americans are known for self-confidence and brashness, Germans are known for their discipline and methodical approach.

So the character of this ummah that was sent as a witness over mankind, to convey the call of Islam to the whole of mankind, needs to be prepared to deal with different people, different mentalities and behaviours. When a daw'a carrier deals with farmers in the villages of rural communities he should be able to relate to them and convey to them the message of Islam in an appropriate way, and in the same manner he should be able to relate to people of a scientific nature, or people who hold power, or people who are oppressed.

And this is where the story of the Prophets that came before are so important, since they are examples of how the daw'a was carried to different people. The underlying, critical message of all the Prophets is the same - tawheed, to worship only Allah, to leave behind anything other than Allah, but the peoples they were delivering the message to were each different, different peoples, different ideas, different culture, different ideas and different corruptions.

So the way Prophet Nuh addressed his people, was different from the address of Ibraheem, or Musa, or Saleh, or Lut.

Although the basic message was the same:

*"And indeed we sent Nuh to his people "I have come to you as a plain warner ; that you worship none except Allah"* [Hud 25-6]

*"And to Aad (we sent) their brother Hud, who said "O people worship Allah, you have no other God but him"* [Hud 50]

*"And to Thamud (we sent) their brother Saleh, who said "O people worship Allah, you have no other God except him"* [Hud 61]

So this is tawheed, the basic message to mankind, which each and every Prophet without exception delivered to who they were sent to warn, but each had to deal with different concepts, behaviours and ideas that stood in the way of delivering that message.

*"And they said you will not leave your Gods, and you will not leave Wad nor Suwa'a and not Yaghuuth nor Ya'ooq nor Nasra (names of their idols)"* [Nuh 23]

At the time of Musa, Fir'own used to claim divinity for himself *"So he (fir'own) said "I am your Lord Most High"* [An-naazi'aat 24]

At the time of Lut, the behaviour which his people had adopted was something which no one had done previously:

*"And (remember) Lut when he said to his people "Do you commit the worst sin such as none proceeded you has committed in the 'alameen"* [al-Araaf 80]

So each nation had their own peculiarities, and each Messenger as well had certain characteristics, and each was sent to their people alone.

And this is the difference with the Prophet Mohammad - that each of the prophets who came before him was sent to their own people, whereas the Prophet Mohammad was sent to his people, and to the whole of mankind not only at his time but until the day of judgement.

**"Each messenger was sent to his people specifically, and I have been sent to Mankind generally"** (Bukhari)  
As we already mentioned, after the death



Mohammad) of the news of the messengers is in order that We may make your heart strong and firm. And in this has come to you the truth, as well as an admonition and a reminder for the believers” [Hud 120]

Patience - in confronting the slander, lies and problems (and not to be reactionary): *“Truly, Messengers before you were (also) denied/lied against, but they were patient over what they were denied and they were hurt, until our victory/ help reached them, and none can alter the Words (decisions) of Allah. Surely there has reached you news about the (previous) messengers”* [al-An’aam 34]

And we know that sabr - patience - is to remain steadfast on the rules and laws of Allah.

Sincerity, and working purely for the sake of Allah and not seeking any other reward *“I don’t ask you any reward for it, the reward is only from the Lord of the ‘aalameen”* [as-Shu’ara 109]

Leaving behind desires and referring to Allah

Carry the daw’a with full confidence and without fear, since Allah is with those who call to the Straight Path Belief that the victory is only from Allah - and that those peoples who came before us who used to think of themselves as the superpowers, were destroyed when their time came.

*“As for Aad, they were arrogant in the land without right, and they said “Who is mightier than us in strength?” Do they not see that Allah Who created them is mightier in strength than them, And they used to deny our Ayaat (lessons, evidences, verses etc.)”* [Fusillat 15]

All of these lessons, we should seek to learn and reflect upon as we embark on this journey through the beautiful stories of those Prophets who came before, and whose stories remain for us as examples and guidance. The differences between their times and ours is only in technology, and is not in the ideas, beliefs and behaviours.

And all Praises are due to Allah.

of the Prophet Mohammad , it is the whole of the Muslim ummah who continues to shoulder this responsibility to fulfil this trait.

So we are one ummah, who has been ordered to carry the daw’a of Islam to all the world, across the ages, and we have several examples to help us in knowing how to carry the daw’a to the different people and nations.

And Allah has revealed in the Qur’an, several examples, which we can equip ourselves with, and benefit from. So every Muslim, seeking to fulfil his obligation of carrying the call to the Deen of Islam, should stop to reflect and consider these stories seriously, not for the sake of enjoyment or pleasure, or simply attaining knowledge, but rather we want to attain the beneficial knowledge, that which will benefit us in this life and the next.

And these stories take on extra significance again today - given that many of them were revealed to the Prophet Mohammad (saw) in Mecca, during the time when the Prophet (saw) and those around him from the sahaba were in a position of weakness, suffering from slander, abuse, torture, exile, boycotts, and all kinds of personal and political pressures, before the victory of Allah came. And we are living in parallel times, without the protection an Islamic state provides: *“Indeed in their stories there is a lesson for men of understanding. It is not a forged statement but of confirmation of which were before it and a detailed explanation*

of everything, and a guide and mercy for the people who believe” [Yusuf 111]

So they are a confirmation of al-Islam, and an explanation of everything, and a guidance and a mercy for us - and it is upon us to learn about them for guidance

*“They are those whom Allah had guided so follow their guidance. Say “I don’t ask you any reward for this rather it is only a reminder for the ‘aalameen”* [al-An’am 90]

The Prophet was ordered to follow their example, and so this is an order for us as well. This order is not an order to follow them in the details of their shara’ih, but rather in the usool/ roots of the deen, the issue of tawheed, and this is the discussion of the Laws of the Prophets that came before.

### Conclusion

As such, when one reads these stories in the Qur’an (which is the lifeblood for the Muslim), he wants to take more than just the reward of the tilawa. Rather he has to contemplate on these stories, and what they contain in experience, guidance and lessons for him.

To briefly mention some of these critical points that the muslim should take from these stories - so that we can know what to look out for when we discuss these stories in detail inshahAllah -

To fortify himself - as the Prophet (saw) himself was fortified:

*“And all that we narrate to you (O*

# From Copenhagen to Brokenhagen – So who will save the Environment?



In the final weeks of 2009, world leaders alongside thousands of delegates attended the 2009 United Nations Climate Change Conference, commonly known as the Copenhagen Summit. This was billed as the summit to save the planet, whereby an international accord set by binding promises to reduce global CO2 levels would have been achieved – thereby forestalling the effects of catastrophic climate change that has been modelled by scientists to occur a few decades from now. Hopes ran so high, that preceding the summit, well wishers christened the Danish Capital as ‘Hopenhagen’.

By the end of two weeks of deadlocked negotiations, no sweeping deal was achieved. The outcome of the Copenhagen Summit, which was brokered by US president, Barack Obama, and known as the Copenhagen Accord, was so breathtakingly unambitious that the whole summit was universally condemned as a

disaster. No binding targets to reduce CO2 emissions were set, no guarantees for funding to poorer nations made, and only vague references were made for future projects. In all, ‘Hopenhagen’ had turned into a ‘Nopenhagen’ (with a midway phase of being Constipagen).

## CRISIS UPON CRISIS

Climate change has become identified as the most serious environmental challenge facing humanity. Climate change hypothesises that the climate responds to increasing levels of human induced global ‘greenhouse’ gases such as CO2. This in turn it is argued causes global warming – a permanent and irreversible increase in global temperature which leads to adverse ecological and environmental impacts. There is however disagreement on the evidence for global temperature change and to what extent the estimated increase in global temperature is related to human

industrial activity. Nevertheless, it is generally accepted that continually pumping copious volumes of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere has the potential to lead to global warming.

An increase in the global temperature of the planet is likely to have many harmful effects such as rising sea levels from melting polar caps and an increase in extreme weather events such as floods and droughts. This will adversely affect millions of people through loss of life and property; farming output may drastically drop, while an increase in waterborne diseases may overwhelm the healthcare systems of less prepared nations.

The Copenhagen Summit was designed to focus on an internationally binding approach to mitigate the effects of climate change; much of this approach has been centred on carbon trading schemes, whereby companies are given



an allocation of CO2 allowances from which they can buy and sell allowances according to a capped limit. In effect the desired outcome is to create a commodity of "permits to pollute", and to turn the atmosphere into a market. This is premised on the belief that the market is the most efficient means of allocating resources, thus when applied to CO2 allowances, the market would establish a 'price' for CO2; this price would then yield itself to the technologies that can most effectively absorb this new price, as an example building a wind farm would be preferable to a coal powered power station due to the avoided CO2 costs.

However something is dangerously amiss with this whole approach. Such intense efforts have been made to publicise the climate change challenge, one would assume this is the only environmental threat the planet is facing. Whilst climate change is a serious issue, it is only one scene in a motion picture of environmental woes the planet is facing. Disaster after disaster is pushing the Earth's ecosystems to the brink of collapse; whether it be the ozone layer depletion, soil erosion, deforestation, toxic waste dumping, acidification of the oceans, or acute loss of biodiversity – the litany of proven and evidenced environmental problems and their toll on human societies are too long to list.

However, the solutions to these problems do not lie in new international regulations, summits or accords - which are ostensibly designed for public appeasement. Indeed the Copenhagen summit exemplifies everything that is wrong in the current approach – ignoring the cause of the

problem, and treating the symptoms. Nor is this the first time either. Whether it be last year's financial crisis that plucked the bottom of a recession or the food crisis the year before that raised the cost of essential foodstuffs beyond the reach of millions. Solutions were targeted at enforcing new regulations or endless name blaming exercises, all the while ignoring the depraved system that produces and nurtures such crisis after crisis.

#### ....AND THIS SYSTEM IS CAPITALISM

Capitalism as the dominant ideology and mode of life in the world has smothered this planet like a giant vampire squid, sucking the planet of its precious resources and spreading its tentacles in every way to continually choke the life of the planet and its inhabitants.

This system cannot survive without perpetual growth. In the context of finding an equitable economic solution to meeting man's various material needs, it has none. It believes in a constant and incessant need to increase production. Only by massively increasing production of all goods, then it believes mankind can satisfy its needs. In doing so, Capitalism will drive to find and create new markets. Even when man has no need to fulfil, Capitalism through intense marketing and advertising has created consumerism as a means to fulfil new markets.

To illustrate with an example, a person may only need two teaspoons of sugar in his tea. Under capitalist conditions the market would have been oversupplied to provide two kilograms of sugar. The man

cannot be forced to take more than two sugars in his tea. So in a capitalist society it will create a sweet fizzy drinks market to utilise the excess sugar. It will then promote brands to entice the man to drink fizzy drinks in addition to his tea. Once the man starts drinking fizzy drinks, demand will have increased for sugar, and the markets will then proceed to further oversupply the market with sugar from increased production – starting the process of finding new markets once again. This though is no hypothetical tale. Decades of slash and burn policies have destroyed pristine hectares of Amazon rainforests to grow sugarcane. When little more use could be found for the sweetener in food products, sugar production was used for gasoline substitution. This sequence will continue until there are no forests left.

Consumerism is designed to create rapacious appetites for the useless. To create need when there is none. Few would argue that humans should live in safe and affordable conditions, and access to basic amenities such as electricity, gas, water and sanitation should be a given. But should we be goaded into believing that two cars are better than one? That we need a new kitchen every six months? That clothes are for wearing only until the next sale comes along? That our mobile phones need upgrading every year? That our 26" television needs to be traded in for a 42" one? If so, then it is little wonder that the planet's environment is teetering on an edge.

The attachment accorded to endless growth is clearly seen when the yardstick of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) figures are used to measure whether a nation is prospering. Only positive figures are worth hearing about, and negatives ones indicate a recession. In the Capitalist ethos, all products are good if they help to increase GDP. A nation may have a high GDP solely attributed to tobacco, alcohol and the pornography industries – yet these are all seen as positive economic gains. Capitalism is seen to engender no moral or societal interests, only economic. So when it comes to the environment, its importance is simply rendered last when measured against material interests. In specific relation to the matter of climate change and the Copenhagen Summit, Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez quite aptly



surmised why it failed so miserably when he said 'if the climate was a bank, they would have already saved it'

#### WITH ISLAM THERE IS A WAY...

If we lived in a time where Islam was present in the lives of man, his community and under the ordinance of a righteous Caliph, then our times would be characterised by a harmony and peace that millions across the world would cherish and flock to. For we are well aware that Allah Most High has not left man unguided,

**Islam does not make economic gain a priority over other values, but achieves equilibrium between the economic, spiritual, ethical and humanitarian needs of man.**

for indeed He gave us a unique religion that perfectly resolves all of man's issues, whether it be personal to himself, his relationships with others, his relationships in society and indeed his relationship with the world at large. In saying this, when we look at the calamities facing the environment, there is no silver bullet solution, rather the realisation that adhering to Islam as a way of life renders an effective balance that ensures such tragedies never occur in the first place.

A fully detailed guideline to the Islamic solution is covered in the book published by Hizb ut Tahrir Denmark "The Environmental Problem - Its Causes & Islam's Solution"

Islam does not make economic gain a priority over other values, but achieves equilibrium between the economic, spiritual, ethical and humanitarian needs of man. When the economic value is prioritised over all others, man is characterised by excess greed and over consumption, profit becomes the key motive in life, as exemplified by Capitalism. In Islam the seeking of profit from enterprise and commerce is a commended activity, but not at the expense of human life or that of the environment. In a hadith of our beloved Prophet (salallahu alaihi wasallam), he stated "There should neither be harming nor reciprocating harm" [Ibn Majaj, Daraqtuni]. Consequently, as an example, a manufacturing plant would be prohibited from polluting the atmosphere or waterways if this caused harm to human

life or destructive harm to the environment. The greater imperative is laid on preventing harm than increasing profits.

Islam nurtures an important sense of responsibility of care and trust towards the environment and animal life. There are many traditions of our beloved Prophet (saw) that exhort the believer to not urinate in commonly used waterways; to not squander water during ablution; to do your best to protect trees even in the

process of Jihad and to enjoin good welfare upon animals. One hadith in particular displays that this sense of responsibility itself carries a great reward, narrated from Abu Hurayra, when the Prophet (peace and blessing be upon him) said **"While a man was on a road, he became very thirsty and he found a well and went down into it. He drank and then came out. There was a dog panting and eating mud out of thirst. The man said, 'This dog has become as thirsty as I was.' So he went down the well and filled up his shoe with water and then let the dog drink. So Allah thanked him and forgave him".** They (companions) said, 'Messenger of Allah, do we have a reward for animals?' He (saw) said, **"There is a reward for every living thing (with a moist liver)."** [Bukhari]

Islam mandates that the public resources are the property of the Muslims and the benefit to be apportioned to the public only and not for private gain. The likes of fossil fuels and mineral resources such as iron and copper are defined as public property from the Shari'ah perspective. Their utilisation is then maintained via the Islamic State and not private companies. Examples such as strip mining and the dumping of heavy metals in the local environment is a common feature for Capitalist private companies striving for the quickest profits. As public properties are for the benefit of the people in Islam, there is no benefit in harming the people to achieve this benefit, accordingly the utilisation of fossil fuels and their like are managed in a sustainable and

environmentally conscious manner.

Islam does not cater for specific regulation or oversight to manage environmental issues - as concern for the environment is already intrinsically present in the God-fearing piety of individuals, the individuals that partake in business and industrial activities, as well as the actions of State governance that impact the environment. If though, transgressions occur, the Islamic State's judicial apparatus will intervene and apply punitive measures. The first is the presence of the Qadhi al-Hisbah (Supervisory Judge), who monitors the public's activities such as those in the markets, businesses, factories and industries to ensure they are not in contravention to the Shari'ah. This typically includes fraud and cheating, but harm caused to the environment is also a Shari'ah violation that will be punished. The second is the Qadhi al-Khusamat (Judge of Disputes). This judge will determine matters raised by victims. In cases where pollutants have caused harm to humans, this judge will determine according to the Shari'ah the recompense required to the victims of harm caused by other humans. The final measure, is the presence of the Qadhi al-Madhalim (Judge of Unjust Acts), here the judge relates to matters pertaining to violations of the Shari'ah or conflicts between the ruler and the people. If state-run factories were found to be causing environmental harm, the Judge of Unjust Acts would intervene to ensure the Shari'ah rules pertaining to the environment are applied by the ruler and the State.

It was inevitable that the Copenhagen summit turned into Nopenhagen as present consumption patterns are leading to the depletion of key minerals such as water wells, fossil fuels and agricultural land. At the same time the consumption of such minerals is leading to pollution entering the atmosphere and the effect of this is now being felt across the world. Although most if not all of the models used to track the temperature in the atmosphere or the cooling effect is debateable and open to speculation, one thing that is for certain is Capitalism has no intention of reducing its consumption of the world's limited minerals any time soon.

■

# A political analysis of the recent Iraqi oil auction



Between the 30th of June and the 11th and 12th of December of 2009, the Iraqi government auctioned off much off Iraq's proven crude oil reserves.

Among the oilfields that went under the hammer were the giant Rumaila oilfield with an estimated contents of 17 billion barrels (peak production expected to be around 2.9 million barrels per day), the West Qurna oilfields 1 and 2 with an estimated contents of 8.6 billion barrels and 12.9 billion barrels respectively (total peak production expected to be around 4.4 million barrels per day), the Majnoon oilfield with an estimated contents of 12.6 billion barrels (total peak production expected to be around 1.8 million barrels per day) and the Zubair oilfield with an estimated contents of 4 billion barrels (peak

production expected to be around 1.1 million barrels per day).

The most striking outcome of the bidding process was that American oil companies were largely excluded from the deals struck. Only ExxonMobil (together with Shell) landed a deal with the Iraqi government to develop the West Qurna Phase 1 oilfield, and Occidental Petroleum is part of a deal between Eni of Italy and the Iraqi government for the Zubair oilfield. Most other contracts went to the oil companies of countries that were opposed to the American/British war in Iraq, most notably Russia and China. The Rumaila oilfield went to BP and CNPC from China; the West Qurna Phase 2 oilfield went to Lukoil from Russia and Statoil of Norway; and the Majnoon

oilfield went to Shell and Petronas from Malaysia.

This outcome of the Iraqi oil auction is presented by some as a discreditation of the claim that the American invasion of Iraq in 2003 was about the Iraqi oil. Instead, it is said, the auction results prove that the invasion was, and has always remained, about bringing freedom and democracy to the people of Iraq. For most Iraqi oil deals went to Non-American companies.

The correctness of this assertion will be analysed below.

## THE REALITY OF WARS FOR OIL

The strategist is concerned with crude oil because it is a commodity of strategic importance, for various reasons. For instance, crude oil provides the energy that enables economic activity. And crude oil fuels the airplanes, rockets and tanks that are used to fight wars. That is why it can be said that crude oil is always on the mind of strategists, as access to crude oil can make-or-break economies (just ask the Chinese...) and win-or-lose wars. Because crude oil is this important in military and economic affairs, its market value is considerably higher than its production value. In Saudi-Arabia and Iraq, for instance, the production cost of crude oil is estimated between \$1.00 - \$2.00 per barrel. In the market this crude currently trades at around \$65 per barrel. This is why the businessman is also concerned with crude oil, as it is a source of significant profits.

But of these two perspectives on crude oil, it being a tool for power and a tool

for profit, clearly the first is by far the most important. Power establishes influence, and that can easily be used to establish profits. And crude oil is so much a tool for power that control over it can easily be used to establish profits far beyond the profits associated with the profits in pumping up the oil. That is why when it is said that wars are fought for crude oil, this should not be understood as meaning that wars are fought to enable certain businessmen rather than others to profit from crude oil. The meaning of the statement “wars are fought for oil” is that nations go to war with the intent to establish control over the flow of crude oil.

As such, the importance of the recent crude oil deals between the Iraqi government and certain oil companies does not lie in who exactly they allow to make a profit from the Iraqi crude oil. It lies in who is given control over the Iraqi oil.

The reality of the Iraqi oil deals  
The contracts recently agreed between the Iraqi government and various oil companies differ markedly from what is the standard in the oil industry. Usually, governments and oil companies agree to so-called “Production Sharing Agreements (PSA)”. Under a PSA the government gives the oil company the rights to a certain share of the proven crude oil reserves, in return for pumping up (extracting) crude oil. The oil company can then do whatever it wants with its crude oil. Governments usually grant the oil company a share of the crude oil in the range of 30 - 70%.

The contracts in the case of the Iraqi crude oil, however, are “Service Contracts (ST)”. Under the ST an oil company is only contracted by the government to perform the service of pumping up the crude oil. For each barrel it pumps up, the oil company is then awarded a remuneration fee. But ownership of the crude oil remains in the hands of the government. The remuneration fees for the big fields that have been auctioned off are all fairly close to what the estimated cost is for operating fields in the Saudi-Iraq area

(\$1.00 - 2.00). The operators of the Rumaila and Zubair oilfields will receive \$2.00 per barrel if they are able to significantly increase production. The operators of the West Qurna Phase 1 oilfield will receive \$1.90 per barrel. The operators of the West Qurna Phase 2 oilfield will receive \$1.15 per barrel. And the operators of the Majnoon oilfield will receive \$1.39 per barrel. This means that the oil companies will have quite a struggle to make a profit on these deals. And if they are able to generate a profit at these remuneration rates, then these profits will be taxed by the Iraqi government at 35%.

The ST's the Iraqi government has agreed with various international oil companies have left the control over the Iraqi oil firmly in the hands of the Iraqi government. The oil companies can lay no claim on the Iraqi oil whatsoever, as they merely have been contracted by the Iraqi government as service providers.

Also, these ST's have as a consequence that by far the largest slice of the profit in pumping up crude oil will go to the Iraqi government. They will pay the oil companies no more than \$2.00 for the service of pumping up the crude oil that in the market today is worth around \$65, and they will tax whatever profits the oil companies are able to make.

America has only strengthened her positions through the Iraqi oil deals. It is quite clear, therefore, that through the recent auctioning of the Iraqi crude oil America has strengthened her position in Iraq.

America has full control over the Iraqi government, which means that through the established ST's America has maintained full control over the Iraqi oil industry. Even though it will be run by primarily non-American oil companies. The ST's between the Iraqi government and the international oil companies are structured in such a way, that control over the physical commodity crude oil remains in the hands of the Iraqi government, and thereby America.

Under these ST's even the profits resulting from production of the commodity remains in the hands of the Iraqi government, and thereby America. The fact that through the ST's the Iraqi oil industry is opened for investment for the first time in decades brings an important additional benefit for the American economy. Most services companies in the oil & gas industry, the companies that supply the oil production companies with the rigs, pipes and pump stations, are American. The top three in the industry, Schlumberger, Halliburton, and Baker Hughes, are all based in Houston, Texas, and should be expected to profit greatly from the renewed activity in Iraq.

At the same time, through allowing foreign oil companies to enter into Iraq, America will have built some goodwill with these other nations. The ST's will give to the other capitalist nations the idea that America is “sharing the pie” and isn't greedy. As far as the greater public is concerned the same kind of public relations can be built on the ST's. The people can now be led to believe America was honest and sincere in its intention of bringing freedom and democracy to Iraq all along, and was not interested in the Iraqi oil.

Questions may be asked as to why, if the American intentions were only to deceive, did the international oil companies play the game and accepted the terms of these deals. The answer is that from the fact that America sought to establish benefit through the ST's, it is not necessarily the case that the other countries and their oil companies lose a benefit through them. The oil companies are still likely to see important benefits in these deals, although they leave little profit margin, such as gaining a foot in the Iraqi door, through which they could work for getting more profitable deals in the future (large parts of Iraq are as of yet unexplored). Also, the oil companies could have accepted the terms of these deals hoping they will be able to renegotiate the terms at a later date.

■

hizb.org.uk

Hizb ut-Tahrir Britain, Suite 301, 28 Old Brompton Road, London SW7 3SS  
Tel: 07074 192 400 - [www.hizb.org.uk](http://www.hizb.org.uk) - [info@hizb.org.uk](mailto:info@hizb.org.uk)

**Khilafah**  
*magazine*