

Arab Super State or Islamic State?

“He is not one of us who calls for Asabiyya (nationalism, tribalism, or partisanship), or who fights for Asabiyya, or who dies for Asabiyya.”

,Muhammad (Saaw)

Abdul Aziz Shawish, head of the Iraqi parliamentary commission for financial affairs, announced Jan. 30 that Iraq would sign free-trade accords with Jordan, Lebanon and the United Arab Emirates. The announcement follows other recent Iraqi free-trade deals with Egypt and Syria.

It has been said that these agreements could be seen to be moving the Arab Countries closer together a trend that could eventually evolve into a Pan-Arab bloc or state. This process of normalisation between the countries in the Middle East is being carried out on the basis of economic unity for the Arabs alone. However real unity cannot come without political unity.

Even they are not brave enough to change the current ineffective model of the Arab League and look at what is going on in Europe. Their proper organisations and institution are put in place together with some development evolution towards one state for the whole of Europe. In the Arab world the leaders are so selfish and suspicious of each other that any improvement in the situation at their hands seems impossible.

Economic unity would result in Arab countries competing for their individual needs only leading to partial solutions to solve internal problems with no tendency to look outward. Hence opening the way for external influences - the United States, France and Britain - to manipulate regional matters such as the Jerusalem and the Golan Heights etc. Where was unity for the Arabs when the Jews created rivers flowing with the blood of slaughtered Muslims in Al-Quds?

Where was unity for the Arabs when the Americans came with their army bases and flattened Iraq? Where was the unity for the Arabs when the people of Iraq lye dyeing in squalor, hunger and misery?

Where was unity for the Arabs when the colonialist kuffar occupied and divided their lands and usurped them of their honour and dignity?

It is narrated that Muhammad (saw) said: “None of you believe until you wish for your brother what you wish for yourselves”.

On the other hand political unity would mean that the people have a bond grouped by an idea and not by any cultural or geographic ties. The correct bond would be permanent, not limited to a particular land, not restricted to a race, and not subject to individual whims and desires. For this is the bond of Islam and is implemented through the Khalifah State.

The Khalifah State is for all Muslims, it is not a nationalist idea or built on the idea of economic benefit. To have an Iranian State, Saudi State, Pakistani State or even Arab State etc. is not acceptable in Islam. When the Islamic State stretched



from Africa to Austria to Indonesia, it was the belief in Allah (swt) and His Messenger (saw) that acted as the bond between the people, not any cultural or geographical grouping.

Muhammad (saw) said: “He is not one of us who calls for Asabiyya (nationalism, tribalism, or partisanship), or who fights for Asabiyya, or who dies for Asabiyya.”

Source: Abu Husam , Middle East Correspondent,
19 February 2001 - Ziq'a'd 24, 1421 A.H

The Role of the Army in Islam

On October 12th 1999, news broke of dramatic events in Pakistan. After receiving intelligence reports from Islamabad of his proposed removal, General Parvez Musharraf kick-started the Pakistani Military into motion – unravelling events that would be described by experts as a “textbook coup d’état”. Taking only 17 hours and orchestrated with impeccable precision, the Military had once again ousted an elected leader. Not content with its already influential role in controlling state resources and policies, it placed itself firmly in full control of the reins of power – following in the footsteps of Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan and General Zia.

Pakistan is not alone in. Indonesia and Nigeria too are examples of Muslim nations that have shown to the world the dominance of the military in controlling domestic affairs.

In 1999, General Kiki Syahnakri of Indonesia ordered troops to pull out of East Timor as the international troops moved in. Surely it seems odd that this request was not that of the ruling government but of an Army General. (And yes – Pakistani troops were there also – taking notes on their Laptop computers!). Its not surprising to see why the Indonesian government couldn't quell violence on the island – they couldn't control the actions of their own army let alone a band of militia roaming the streets with bandanas shooting at anything that they deemed worthy of a bullet. Note also, that in Indonesia, the army owns some of the largest banks and holds 38 of the 500 seats in Parliament.

One should ask the question “Why is it that the army is stealing the show – surely it's the job of the Politicians to run the country”. Correct. In a state where the Politician has a clearly defined role – that of fostering the affairs of the people; and where the army has a clear objective – that of carrying out those actions that will implement the foreign policy of the land, such actions as exhibited in Pakistan and Indonesia would be deemed an act of lunacy.

Under Islam, the Khalifah's role is that of taking care of the affairs of the Ummah internally and externally. This is done through the political system that Islam dictates i.e. that which Allah (swt) has ordained to be implemented upon the land. The carrying of da'wa to the rest of the world also falls under the authority of the Khalifah. Both of the acts – establishing the Shar'a and carrying of the da'wa to the world are matters which the Khalifah supervises. It is not permissible for anyone else to take on these roles.

As it is the Khalifah's role to convey the da'wa to the world, he

must also hold the position of Amir of Jihad. The Khalifah's supervises the creation and preparation of the army. He supervises but does not undertake its administration nor decide upon its training and technical issues.

The Khalifah's control of the carrying of this da'wa has a specific method – Jihad. This is where the army comes in. The army itself has no place in deciding the foreign policy that is to be implemented. Since the foreign policy is to carry Islam to the world, the Islamic State is in a perpetual state of jihad. This requires an army that is ready at all times to be deployed in all conditions, in all lands, and with the very latest technology. Technology that will be used to implement the foreign policy of Islam. The army requires people who have a strong understanding of the military strength of other nations, their preparation for war, their overall threat to the Islamic State. Hence the army is the pillar of the State's foreign policy. Unfocused, this power can pose a considerable threat to the foreign policy of the State.

Military considerations should not be dominant on the foreign policy. Neither should it have any influence in the foreign policy. This is the role of the politician. This is not to say that the army cannot put forward an opinion in a matter. However, it remains just that – an opinion. It is the Khalifah and his political advisors who hold the responsibility of understanding world opinion; the political manoeuvrings by the enemy and the overall effect of the State's activities on the enemy.

The military mind is trained to be subjective and devoid of a comprehensive political outlook. Military matters on the whole tend to be tangible and quantifiable – numbers of soldiers, range of weapons, area of land etc. All of these issues can be assessed and effects understood. The political thought is not so easily quantifiable. The military mind is not trained to be considerate of the current political climate. To rule effectively the highest consideration should be given to the instilling of Iman and Islamic inclinations. Imagine if the Battle of Badr was taken purely on a quantifiable basis. The mind devoid of the concept that "Allah grants the victory", would never en-

gage in a battle where the army is outnumbered 3 to 1, or in the battle of Uhud 4 to 1.

History as shown all too painfully to us how the influence of the Military in the foreign policy of the State led to the demise of the carrying of Islam to the world. The examples of Pakistan, Indonesia and Nigeria are recent events that we can relate to since the collapse of the State. However, the influence of the army can be seen when the Muslim army pushed no further than the opening of Spain, and when they stopped their opening of Byzantine land at Turkey. This was all due to the military's influence in dominating the State's foreign policy through it's strategic outlook on actions – devoid of the political as well as spiritual view that the aqeeda dictates in the formation of foreign policy. Remember 1990 when Iraq entered Kuwait. This is a prime example of how a military regime lacked the political awareness of the time, hence did not foresee the subsequent reaction from the international community. Looking further back, note how the Ottoman Khilafah consisted skilled strategists conquering vast amounts of land, to the extent that they reached France. However they lacked the understanding of the importance of consolidating the thoughts and ideas of the people of those lands - in order to enrich them with the Islamic sentiments that would carry through to their forthcoming generations. Without instilling the concept of accountability to Allah, the State will require an iron fist approach to keeping order. This ruling with a heavy hand can lead to the birth of a police state scenario where the people fear the heavy hand of the law rather than live in harmony based upon Taqwa, and their correct understanding of life's objective as a Muslim.

This lack of vision and understanding led the army to be vulnerable to the politicians of the enemy. They were less well equipped to notice the covert way in which the actions of the enemy introduced dangerous thoughts into the society. The embassies of foreign countries present during the Ottoman Khilafah and the various news agencies that sprang up pushed kufr ideas in to the Muslim's minds. These ideas were instrumental in the demise of the State. (ITG apologise for the small size of the print.)

Source: Abu Zahra

Would you vote for these Political Parties? Ever! Muslims are not permitted to vote in Kufr elections. How these leaders mock us by congratulating us on Ramadan - What do they practice?



Prime Minister of Britain, Tony Blair (New Labour). Under his leadership the British government, army and airforce are dropping bombs upon innocent Muslim Men, Women &

Children in Iraq. Over half a million children under 6 years have died due to british endorsed UN sanctions. His government provided financial aid to bankrupt Russia to buy weapons and pay the Russian soldiers to kill innocent Muslims in Chechenya, Dagistan and Uzbekistan. Allied with the Serbs since the second world war, she planned the destruction of Muslim institutions in former Yugoslavia. The Bosnian Muslims where killed indiscriminately by the Serb, Christian Serbs & Croat forces. His government worked to crush the Muslim political movement in Bosnia that were working to re-establish Islam in the region. Would Muslims vote for Labour knowing this?



William Hague, Conservative Leader. His previous Government planned with the US the Gulf War where the Kufur forces entered Hijaz and desecrated our Muslim land, where

the Muslim army of Iraq was destroyed by a pre-planned fake war and where Kuwaiti Oil was handed over from the British to the US. This all done with the killing of Muslims that is still continuing today. Lied to the British public by planning the Live aid campaign to raise millions of pounds for charity only to have paid for weapons destined for the Ethiopian army to kill the Muslim army of Eriteria and areas that had fallen to rebel forces. Now you know what the Red Nose day is all about? Its about comedians (fools) making fools of the British people to further the Kufur occupation of Ethiopia by killing Muslims & Christians of Ethiopia. How can we vote for such parties?



Charles Kennedy, Liberal Democrat Leader. His party has stood by the atrocities being carried out by both New Labour and Conservative parties against the Muslims in

Bosnia, Chechenya, Iraq, Kashmir and Palestine. All three parties up hold the rights of Homosexuals and Lesbians in all walks of life. Millions of pounds are spent each year in Britian by all parties to promote gays into society and upholding their rights, any opposition is seen as racial harassment and the loss of votes both within the government and from the general public, even threatening re-election. The Education Curriculum is designed to integrate Muslims into society by viewing historical facts through a anti-Islamic establishment. Remember the government is kind to Muslims so long as Oil flows in from the Gulf. Do Muslims choose these parties over the parties of Allah(swt)? **NO!** Refer to full Islamic Answer on Website.