
A Critical Study of Western Agenda in the Perspective of Cultural War

☆
Dr. Muhammad Akram Sajid/ Dr. Umer Hayat ☆☆

Abstract

"Orientalism new or old has many aspects. The scene they show the world has double edges, the picture which is shown to the people does not reveal the fact rather it conceals. Today west in the coalition of NATO, under the supervision of United States depicts the Muslim World by many terms like fundamentalists, terrorists, conservators, backward and suicidal attackers. If one looks into the matter impartially it comes out that west has its own targets. They can be listed as, to create a new culture that suits the present secular and agnostic western civilization and weaken Muslim states by getting control over oil reservoirs. Tightening the clutch of debts and arms embargo. Creating misunderstandings towards Muslim countries particularly neighboring states. Highlighting sectarian differences and propagating it into horrible scenes. Putting economic sanctions by creating a storm in the tea-cup. Destabilizing Muslim states, by the name of establishing democracy. Banning Muslim raw material and goods to the western markets. This paper is going to unveil this alarming situation and show the true picture of this."

Keywords: Western Agenda, Cultural War, NATO, Economic Sanctions, Fundamentalism and Islamic Bomb.

Introduction

In the first phase of Orientalism, Orientalists discussed Quran, Hadith, the life of Prophet (Peace be upon Him) teachings of Islam, Muslim scientists, Muslim Jurisprudence and Muslim sects. With the passage of time they found many new topics¹.

☆ Ph.D Scholar, Islamic Studies and Arabic, Government College University, Faisalabad

☆☆ Assistant Professor, Islamic Studies and Arabic, Government College University, Faisalabad

The indulgence of Muslim rulers in pleasures and eventually their demise provided the west a walk over to criticize Islam and its belongings, particularly its civilization. With the dismemberment of United Soviet Socialist of Russia, the idea of clash of civilizations emerged².

The American think tank took it like a hot cake, U.S. Press coloured it with their own meanings and formed the agenda to crush Muslim Army in strongholds of Muslim states. New World Order had already decided to deprive sources of the Gulf-States particularly, and man-power and mineral resources in the Muslim states commonly. American led western press took the responsibility to make western civilization superior and Muslim culture inferior³.

This is not much important if Muslim intellectuals and scholars would have unveil western agenda and disclose this conspiracy at world forums. It is important if the fellows of the same minds oppose their fellow minded that the negativity of their nationals that they are merely looters, black-mailers and have sheward targets. Yes, there are such positive approaches who criticize the west particularly American led NATO and the aggressive Alliance, that Allies are liars, wolves and cowardly nations who merely run around imaginary framed and self-made stories. So we have a long list of such persons, at the moment there are three brave persons. George Galloway, Robert Fisk and Seymour Myron Hersh who unveil the totally self-framed terms of terrorism, fundamentalism and Islamic bomb. The coming lines are going to highlight their views alongwith the contemporary analysts.

Seymour Myron Hersh with an interview to Spiegel online, conducted by Charles Hawley and David Gordon Smith stresses as American Government need not to ban Iranian nuclear programe as it is for civil and peaceful purposes. United States wants to reshape Middle East. Hersh is of the view this all propaganda will be ended up on an oil deal. Though in the press, president declares that he is doing according to God's will. He desires to Balkanize the Middle East⁴.

He says that Vietnam was a tactical mistake and Iraq a strategical. This wound is got by stupid acts. He says, he is writing, "an alternative history of Bush war". The government is hijacked by neoconservatives. The result is state is losing but personalities wining, so I say openly that I am an anti-war

person. American aim is not to democratize Middle East but to protect Israel from Iraq and to protect the flow of oil to America. It has not cynical reasons but ideological. Even the president claims that God talks to him so he will do to crush the world for the sake of this “talk”. He even sets the directions of democracy in Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Pakistan⁵.

What kind of democracy and welfare, they brought it Iraq, Herold, writes, that Tony Blair, advised, “kill all the women and rape all the men” is this a civilized west?

The aim is to get all the persisting sources from the Gulf States and more especially oil riched countries, i.e. Iran, Iraq, Kuwait. By knowing this someone can find the mind setup of Europe and its neo-allies, i.e. United States and North Atlantic Treaty organization, cooperating countries. Western Civilization secular and atheist is widespread all over the three continents America, Australia and Europe.

Western Civilization and Widespread Atheism

Atheism means denying God’s existence and his concept, which of course does involve rejecting His commandments, as well as religious reflection, and believing in the possibility of total self-independence that is apart from God. As such beliefs negate the concept of sin, people consider that they can live as they please. Therein lies in the corruption of people's arts and minds. Atheism gets a circle as education is misused, young people are neglected by the elders, and schools actually defend and foster it.

Ignorance about the essentials parts of faith and religion is the fundamental reason why atheism initiates to grow and develop. People whose minds, and souls have not been yet directed to the truth automatically become vulnerable. Only God's help and His grace can save them. If a society does not confront the trend decisively and successfully; its members' hearts and minds become open to this influences that lead to deviation⁶.

Religion, science, nature and human mind is unanimously agree that all the universe has a vivid and delicate harmony with one another. Nothing clash can be seen in between two things. If there is no clash between two matters why man has a contrast view about his creator. Moreover why manipulating different ideas man, differ from each other. This serial gets ahead and the

day comes there is an armed contradiction between a man to man⁷.

This gulf is widened by media, little knowledge rather illiterate people, having little knowledge are blowing the hatred into heavy fire. This develops them, instead preparing into positive mindedness, a pleasure seeker triviality and banality loudness and vulgarity⁸.

So the need is to opt deeper ways of religious life, the ways that lead them refraining from anxiety and going towards righteousness and right. Without the true path of religion people become hasty, lusty and pleasure seekers, this ultimately leads them in a situation where they find no way but to be negotiate it. Moreover this develops imbalance and disharmony in the life, then atheism is developed agnostic and at the end no need of religion. As a result the ignorant culture spreads darkness, this darkness brings destruction. One can be saved from such wild activities by organizing society by the beautiful hold of balanced life provided by the religion. So the worst habits may not develop themselves in the youth, obviously the youth of west is directly hitted by this situation. They must be led to systematic, straight and honest way of thinking. Where, such qualities do not exist such community and native or nations get a moral and spiritual corruption until it can be rescued⁹.

This theory, regardless of where it has been applied, has never produced sane, caring, and compassionate human beings. Rather, it has intensified misery and selfishness by isolating individuals from their families, traditions, and even from themselves. Its adherents do not cultivate their morals or tastes, rather live shallow, private lives and make no effort to find the truth. In short, they simply survive from moment to moment in the illusory hope that they may not find happiness.

These few reflections do not cover the whole subject. Let's I hope that future guides, teachers, and leaders with discernment and foresight will consider them when trying to stop the spread of deviation and atheism. I have presented a brief insight into the problem, with the prayer that some people may be alerted to the truth, conquer the self, and regain the means to do what is good.

Islamic Jihad and misunderstandings of the West

Amitabh Pal writes, Jihad is not war: Grappling with the most controversial aspect of Islam; everyone depicts that pillar of Islam in his own picture while the truth is as under.

“In actuality, the notion of jihad has much more complex overtones, with the word “jihad” meaning to strive or to struggle. This may be a struggle against your own evil proclivities or for the sake of Islam, nonviolently or violently. ‘The Arabic word, Jihada, found throughout the Qur’an, basically means ‘striving,’ ‘effort’ or ‘to try one’s utmost’.”

Gulan explains, the major subtext of Jihad is to do with social justice, scholars have contended, and stripped of its violent overgrowth, the term has a lot of positive things to offer. “Jihad has come to mean the advocacy of social justice in a widening circle that also includes economic participation and prosperity for Muslims,” Professor Bruce Lawrence says, and goes so far as to assert that “the future may yet belong to those who learn to wage economic jihad in English.”

As examples, he cites “jihad of the heart,” which involves struggles against your own sinful inclinations, and “jihad of the tongue,” which requires speaking good and banishing evil. And what will astonish a lot of people is that the term jihad is used in Arabic to describe the best-known nonviolent movement in history¹⁰.

Roland E. Miller, a Lutheran minister and Islamic scholar, compares “jihad” to the word “crusade.” Many Muslims realize that it has a disturbing connotation for non-Muslims in spite of its many innocuous undertones. But similarly, many Christians use “crusade,” even if they comprehend the enormous negative baggage it carries in the Middle East.

So, there are multiple meanings here, too. As you can launch a crusade against poverty, you can also wage a jihad for, say, affordable housing. In fact, there is an Iranian organization called jihad-i-sazandigi a campaign for housing. Professor Nasr asserts that the West has carried out more wars in the nature of crusades either the “civilizing mission” of the French in the past or the war against communism more recently than Muslim countries have carried out sanctioned or unsanctioned Jihad¹¹.

Karen Armstrong writes, a very illuminating passage on jihad: “The root JHD... signifies a physical, moral, spiritual and intellectual effort. There are plenty of Arabic words denoting armed combat, such as harb (war), siras (combat), nzaraka

(battle) or qital (killing), which the Qur'an could easily have used. Instead, it chose a vaguer, richer word with a wide range of connotations. The only country where a majority interpreted jihad in an aggressive way was Indonesia, generally thought to have a very relaxed version of Islam. In addition to these dominant understandings of jihad, there were many others, such as "a commitment to hard work" and "achieving one's goals in life," "struggling to achieve a noble cause," "promoting peace, harmony or cooperation and assisting others," and "living the principles of Islam." As can be seen, the interpretations of jihad are really multifaceted and almost as varied as the number of people responding¹².

Professor John Esposito and Dalia Mogahed. "The word jihad has only positive connotations. This means that calling acts of terrorism jihad risks not only offending many Muslims, but also inadvertently handing radicals the moral advantage they so deeply desire"¹³.

Professor Nasr claims that no word from Islam has been as distorted as Jihad, both in the West and by extremist Muslims. "To wake up in the morning with the name of God on one's lips, to perform the prayers, to live righteously and justly throughout the day, to be kind and generous to people and even animals and plants one encounters during the day, to do one's job well, and to take care of one's family and of one's own health and well-being all require jihad"¹⁴.

The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) himself preached, a multifaceted notion of jihad. Very famously, he is said to have stated, "We return from the minor jihad to the major jihad," on leaving a battlefield and resuming normal life. Here, the greater jihad was meant to be an internal battle within the soul against evil tendencies of the self, such as selfishness and greed. This is the sense in which the Sufis (and numerous other Muslims) have understood Jihad.

He also gave many other connotations to jihad. After [true prophets] came successors who preached what they did not practice and practiced what they were not commanded," the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) is quoted by Professor Firestone. Whoever strives (jahda) against them with one's hand is a believer, whoever strives against them with one's tongue is a believer, whoever strives against them with one's heart is a believer." He is also reported to have said, "Pilgrimage is one of

the highest forms of jihad.” Muhammad (peace be upon him) also said in a Hadith quotation that ‘the ink of the scholar is more precious than the blood of the martyr’¹⁵.

So, there is a whole span of activities that is encompassed under the notion of jihad. This ranges from being ethical and speaking well to defending Islam and/or spreading the faith. Even under this last category, taking up arms is just one way. “Jihad cannot be equated semantically with holy war, for its meaning is much broader,” explains Professor Firestone. “Even ‘jihad of the sword’ is not quite equivalent to the common Western understanding of holy war”.

Abdul Aziz Sachedina, a Muslim scholar educated in India and Iran currently a professor at the University of Virginia, has an understanding of jihad that he claims is firmly grounded in Islamic texts and sources. He says that in certain special circumstances when security cannot be guaranteed to Muslims for the free practice of their religion, Muslims can take up jihad as a defensive measure. Here the key notion is security, however, and it includes the rights of followers of other faiths and nonbelievers alike to practice their faith. As long as the rights of Muslims and other believers are respected, there is no justification for jihad, Sachedina says.

Even here, the unbeliever is meant to be granted protection: “If any one of those who join gods with Allah ask an asylum of thee, grant him an asylum, in order that he hears the word of God, then let him reach his place of safety. This, for that they are people devoid of knowledge”. The overriding principle is that there should be no coercion in religion¹⁶.

The Americans and Islam

Mr. Ata Rabbani touches the core issue in this way; Obama said that it is time of tension between the United States and Muslims around the world. This has been due to fear and mistrust. America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition, Islam has always been a part of America’s story. Muslims have fought in our wars, served in government and stood for a civil rights. There are nearly eleven million American Muslims and there are over 1200 mosques within America. He emphasized that let there be no doubt: Islam is a part of America¹⁷.

Terrorism: He referred to the events of 9/11 where nearly

3000 people were killed. "These extremists have killed people in many countries, they have killed people of different faiths more than any other, they have killed Muslims". He showed his determination to fight till the complete elimination of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban.

President Obama's Cairo address was received with mixed reactions. It was a clean divide: the West, particularly the media called it empty rhetoric to gain prominence amongst the world of Islam and the Middle-East; whereas the Muslims in general and the Arabs in particular viewed it with sceptical hopes. It stirred the world all right in talking and commenting upon it.

Three major points confronting America, Islamic World and the Arabs stood out in his address. These were:

A - Terrorism and 9/11

B - Israel, Palestinians and the Arabs.

C - America, vis-a-vis Iran.

Obama was forthright and clear in his observations and confident to solve these issues. He even gave road maps for the solution.

These three knotty complicated problems had been defying solution for the past many-many decades and to resolve them now would be great but even if any progress is made towards their final amicable settlement, then all credit will go to President Obama. It will be like his dramatic entry as the first non-white President into the Oval Office and his name will go down in history as a land mark.

President Obama was positive that with good will and honest intentions and given time he could and certainly would deliver. It must be remembered that the 'American objectives and priorities' are all worked out by respective "think tanks" and finalised by both the houses and no matter which party is in power it has no authority to make any changes in it. The President at his discretion in any particular case and in extreme American interests may make a minor deviation from the laid down objectives? priorities but no more¹⁸.

Emergence of Taliban and America's Role

There are some measures for the cure:

A: It may be categories as under; Since 2001, Al-Qaeda and Taliban were spreading their tentacles in many countries of

the world including Europe. Afghanistan and Pakistan were their hot beds. Taliban were American creations during Russian occupation of Afghanistan. American dollar and resources were used to indoctrinate and train “Mujahids” present day “terrorists” who are now creating havoc all around particularly in Pakistan. According to American administration America is also threatened. Unless the Americans dry up Al-Qaeda and Taliban sources of supply of funds and weapons, it would be difficult for Obama to exterminate the danger.

B: Israel has a powerful lobby in America. The Jews virtually dictates the economy and politics of both Republicans and Democrats. President Obama in his opening gambit when talking about Israel stressed about the strong bonds that exist between the two countries. “This bond is unbreakable” he said. With this categorical admission he goes on to boldly propose “two independent states of Israel and Palestinians”. It is a declaration of intents by a US President against all Israel odds working against it. What would be the eventual outcome, will have to be watched and seen.

C: America vis-a-vis Iran. History bears it that due to geostrategic reasons America never relished Iran to be dominant in the Gulf. It invariably tried to destabilize Iran’s legitimately established governments. In 1953 the US undermined and overthrow the democratically elected government of Prime Minister Mussadegh. Their latest effort was to manipulate world opinion and isolate Iran by propaganda against the re-election of President Mehmoud Ahmadinejad.

President Obama offered Iran an olive branch by declaring, “My country is prepared to move forward. Forget the past and let us talk without preconditions on the basis of mutual respect”. Referring to Iran’s nuclear quest Obama observed that “any nation should have the right to access peaceful nuclear power if it complies with its responsibilities under the nuclear “Non-Proliferation Treaty.”

What could be expected!

With all the sincerity of President Barack Obama the prospects of an encouraging outcome are not bright. As far as terrorism is concerned the Americans are known to charge their stance as and when required by their interests. At one time Osama bin-Laden was their favourite and they lavished favours

on Taliban but it apparently does not suit them anymore¹⁹.

As regards B; and C; these two are chronic problems ailing relations between America and the Muslim World for the past many decades. Call them whatever you may but the fact is that oil and geo-strategic factors, are at the core of it. Added to it is the American commitment to Israel both in the Mid East and in Iran. Only the other day the US. Vice President said, "We cannot stop Israel from making a nuclear attack against Iran because Israel is an independent country." Partially contradicting Vice President's statement on 6th July the State Department spokesman Ian Kelly remarked that Washington would not dictate Israel how to deal with Iran's nuclear ambitions. But we are committed to Israel's security and we share Israel's deep concern about Iran's nuclear programme.

In the existent scenarios in Palestine and Iran with all his pious declarations President Obama is unlikely to make much head-way unless there is a miraculous change of heart and in the American policies.

Scenario in Middle East and Western Interests

R.D McLaren writes about the situation: For the purposes of this discussion and analysis, Egyptian objectives and policies may be grouped into four categories; political, military, economic and social. This classification, however, should not be constructed to mean an independent existence of these categories. The military, economic, and social objectives and policies are generally formulated to achieve a set of political goals that provide the reasons for all other objectives and policies pursued by the state. And often the success or failure of the military, economic, and social policies is a direct reflection of the success or failure of political objectives and goals for example, in 1961. Nasser established a set of economic goals to be achieved during the next two decades. Although some of these goals were considered to be economically unrealistic, in political terms they were essential for the continuous existence of the regime, which wanted to establish its credentials as a revolutionary socialist state.

Egypt, however, failed to achieve its economic goals not necessarily because they were economically unrealistic but because Nasser's political goals and policies at the systemic and regional levels proved to be incompatible with the country's

economic needs. A successful completion of the economic projects depended largely on a massive infusion of foreign capital and technology and a sharp reduction in defense expenditure. Egypt failed to attract enough foreign capital because the country's new laws, promulgated under the socialist decrees, did not provide enough incentives and guarantees to private foreign capitalists. Also, Egypt could not reduce its defense expenditure because of its conflict with Israel and its military involvement in the Yemen civil war. Although the socialist decrees were designed to broaden the regime's popularity, they proved to be a serious impediment to achieving the country's economic goals which in turn would have strengthened its political objectives and policies. In other words, it may be said that the politically essential goals may prove to be politically difficult to achieve. That was essentially true of Nasser's Egypt.

In addition to such general and obvious objectives as maintaining territorial integrity, political independence, and national defense goals that all independent states are obliged to pursue Egypt's current policies are formulated with a view to achieving the following political objectives:

Recovering the Egyptian (the Sinai Peninsula) and other Arab lands (the West Bank of the Jordan, including the Arab section of Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights) under Israeli occupation since the June War; Restoring the political and territorial rights of the Palestinian people; accelerating the rate of economic and industrial development; modernizing political, economic, and social institutions; strengthening inter-Arab ties that have recently been forged on the basis of political consensus and economic cooperation among the Arab states; enhancing Egypt's regional and extra-regional prestige and role in international affairs. The above objectives are being pursued by means of political, military, economic, and social programs.

Although the Egyptian political objectives have changed little since the July 1952 revolution, Egyptian policies under President Sadat have shown remarkable differences in substance and style compared with those of Nasser. Unlike his charismatic predecessor, whose rhetoric and alleged intrigues often created apprehension and militancy among his Arab opponents, Sadat has accepted a pragmatic approach to resolving the major problems confronting the country. Recognizing Egypt's military

and economic inadequacies for regaining the Egyptian and Arab lands, Sadat offered, as early as December 1970, to recognize the existence of Israel as an independent and sovereign state if it would return the Sinai Peninsula to its rightful previous owner. Sadat was the first Arab leader of stature to publicly indicate his willingness to recognize Israel and to resolve the conflict by peaceful means. It should be noted that at this stage Sadat linked his willingness to recognize Israel only with the recovery of the Sinai Peninsula. This was his first condition for resolving the Egyptian-Israeli dispute. In addition, he offered to enter into immediate negotiations with Israel on the question of the freedom of passage for Israeli ships through the Strait of Tiran. This was Sadat's "step-by-step" approach to resolving the Arab-Israeli dispute. The second step in this process, he indicated, would involve the settlement of the Palestinian problem, which he linked with a promise that a just solution of this issue would give Israeli ships the right to use the Suez Canal.

In summary, it may be argued that Sadat's strategy achieved its main goals: it reactivated the U.S. role as a peacemaker in the Arab-Israeli conflict; it further isolated Israel from a number of European and African states; it achieved a substantial degree of Arab unity, expressed in the form of an oil embargo and increase in oil prices; and it strengthened the argument that the security Israel sought could not be obtained and maintained by military force alone. Since the end of the hostilities and the disengagement agreement between Egypt and Israel, Sadat has endeavored to strengthen Egyptian-U.S. ties by publicly voicing his approval of Secretary of State Kissinger's diplomatic efforts; by reestablishing diplomatic ties with the United States; and by providing a rousing reception for President Nixon during his visit to Egypt.

Recognizing that Saudi Arabia, because of its oil and monetary resources, is destined to play a much more decisive and significant role in regional and extra-regional affairs, Sadat made deliberate efforts to move politically and ideologically closer to Riyadh than to Tripoli, which publicly expressed disapproval of Sadat's reliance on the United States for a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute. Saudi Arabia, along with Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, and the United Arab Emirates, provided hundreds of millions of dollars for Egypt's war-shattered economy; and collectively these donors promised even

larger amounts in economic and military aid. In addition, under the terms of the 1974 Rabat Conference, the Arab oil-producing states promised Egypt annual aid of \$1 billion for the indefinite future.

How the Israel is aggressive to crush the Iranian peaceful nuclear programme, shows the views of Dana and Steven in these lines; Visitors to Israeli air force headquarters in Tel Aviv report frequent sightings of a striking poster. Emblazoned with the words "IAF Eagles over Auschwitz," it depicts three Israeli F-15 aircraft above the iconic gate of Birkenau, the huge death camp adjacent to Auschwitz. The poster celebrates the 2003 flyover of a Polish-Israeli commemoration of Holocaust victims 60 years earlier²⁰. The appearance of the aircraft, which left observers divided on the question of whether a show of military prowess was appropriate to the contemplative nature of the memorial service, had been more or less impromptu: the three planes were in Poland for an unrelated air show. The inspiration for joining the air force presence to the concentration camp ceremony belonged to then-brigadier general and future air force chief of staff Amir Eshel, who piloted one of the F-15s. He and his Israeli colleagues were more serious about seeking peace. It was, according to Kissinger, an extremely rare case of a statesman who fought a war "to lay the basis for moderation in its aftermath" and it worked²¹.

Similar happy results from air strikes against Iran even if they lead to a wider war implicating the United States cannot be ruled out. Iran's prestige could be usefully tarnished. Fearful Arab regimes might be secretly or openly gratified. The Iranian regime already fragile might even fall to a Green movement eager to end Iran's international isolation.

All of these consequences are possible. They are not, however, predictable. It is worth remembering, in this regard, the predictions of a positive, democratizing, regional domino effect that supporters of the Iraq war made for it in 2003. Some of those same supporters now claim vindication in the fact that Iraq in early 2010 is far more peaceful than the Iraq that was sinking into civil war in 2006. This is true enough, just as it is also true that the removal of Saddam Hussein was a great benefit to the Iraqi people and the wider world. It can obviously be compared, the peace, prosperity, democracy and scientific development in American revolutionized Iraq! Of course, things

were likely to get better sometime. Meanwhile, the carnage and chaos was immense, and the costs in Iraqi, American, and other coalition lives, treasure, American prestige, and Arab and Islamic anger have been huge.

A war launched by Israel against Iran might have similar strategic costs. Rallying millions of Muslims, whether Sunni or Shi'ite, to the Iranian cause could revive the specter of a civilizational war between Islam and the West, inspire fresh recruits to global terrorism, draw in Arab states both allied with and against Iran, and doom Obama's initiatives in the Middle East and beyond²².

Afghanistan, Soviet Union and Central Asian States

The Soviet Union was not less behind the American from Islamic Afghanistan, Hofmann writes; From all accounts, including some from Moscow, the Kremlin was motivated purely by the cold calculations of Realpolitik. As an Islamic border state, backed against the formerly Islamic regions of Soviet Central Asia, Afghanistan has long been a neuralgic point for Russia's rulers. In the 19th century, the czars fenced with the British to insure that Afghanistan would be a friendly buffer state. But what appears new is the Kremlin's current effort to incorporate Afghanistan as an outright satellite of Moscow.

A high-level Soviet military mission to Kabul this past fall apparently concluded that the Soviet-backed military campaign against the Islamic tribal insurrection was on the brink of an embarrassing defeat, barring massive Soviet intervention. According to American specialists, Soviet leaders feared that unless they acted forcibly, they would be faced with hostile Islamic Government in Kabul.

By Soviet reckoning, the Kremlin had little to lose by invading Afghanistan. Washington was handcuffed by the Iranian crisis and no longer offered the major attractions of détente. Relations with the United States had been souring steadily, and there were only dim prospects for ratification of the strategic-arms treaty. To the east, China was hostile, and in the west, the Europeans had just agreed to deploy more modern nuclear-armed missiles rather than grasp the Soviet carrot of regional arms talks. Better to take a quick gain by converting Afghanistan into a satellite than risk rebellion at the Soviet back door²³.

Montgomery Watt calls back the change, Muhammad

(Peace be Upon Him) brought in Arab society; in the social sphere also, when people became Muslims, life 'went on much as before. This statement must be qualified somewhat, however. At the period when Muhammad was forming his state at Medina Arabian society was already experiencing certain changes, some of which will be mentioned presently. In addition to this Muhammad's activities slightly altered the character of society in the oasis of Medina. To begin with he brought the Emigrants with him from Mecca, and this had certain social repercussions; for example, the Emigrants found the position of women slightly different in Medina from what they had been accustomed to in Mecca, and there had to be read justifications. In the closing years of Muhammad's life many nomads also settled in Mecca, attracted by Muhammad's success; and this meant further adjustments. Thus in Qur'anic passages revealed at Medina there are many regulations affecting the social life of this new mixed population at Medina²⁴.

Two points may be selected for implication, namely, the regulations about inheritance of property, and the regulations about marriage. There is a set of complex arithmetical rules for dividing up the property of someone who has died. These appear to be designed to ensure that all the close relatives of the deceased, male and female, receive an appropriate share of what he leaves. Now this is very appropriate to the situation of the embryonic Islamic community. As was noted in an earlier chapter, the growth of commerce at Mecca had led to greater individualism; men used what had been communal property to advance their own commercial schemes, and then regarded the profits as belonging to themselves personally. Those women and children who had no honour-able adult male to look after their interests were often defrauded. The matter was further complicated by variations between matrilineal and patrilineal family structure. Qur'anic regulations maybe said to have accepted the trend towards individualism by regarding all property as individually owned; yet at the same time they acknowledge that relatives have certain rights in a man's property so that he is in a sense only a steward of it on behalf of his family. The arithmetical proportions make the right of each relative quite definite, and in a way that seems perfectly fair²⁵.

Saba Mehmood once again elaborates the situation; Focusing on the Middle East, in what follows I analyze how the discourse on religious freedom from its inception has been

intertwined with the exercise of Western power first in its Christian and later secular modalities, shaping its formulation in contemporary national and international law. In this alternative genealogy of the right to religious liberty is the figure of the “minority” in Middle Eastern history that has served as a site for the articulation and exercise of European power. As I will show, from the seventeenth century onward the discourse on religious liberty in the Middle East has been intertwined with European projects of extending “protections” to non-Muslim minorities (primarily Christian) as a means of securing European interests in the region. As I will argue, such a historical project cannot simply be understood as an instrumentalization of religious minorities for geopolitical ends. Instead, one must ask as to how the very concept of “religious minority” its space of problematization is indebted to this history. viewed from this perspective, “religious minorities” do not just signify a demographic entity that are accorded a space of freedom and immunity by the institutionalization of religious liberty, but are also produced through the process of the legal confrontation of this principle. One of the key questions that guides this essay is that of how the discourse on religious liberty has participated in the production of “the minority problem” in international law, and how this “problem” has unfolded in the history of the modern Middle East.

She writes; while the fundamental relationship between religious liberty and the doctrine of modern sovereignty in European history is widely acknowledged, far less appreciated are the exceptions this narrative enacted as the discourse of religious liberty traveled to non-European shores. Notably, the introduction of the principle and practice of religious freedom to non-Western lands was often predicated upon the violation and subjugation of the principle of state sovereignty instead of its consolidation²⁶.

This history of the interrelationship between religious liberty, minority rights, and geopolitics that I have traced here is often read as the cynical instrumentalization of otherwise noble principles in the service of real politik, or as the distribution of a moral good that Western Europeans discovered for themselves that they slowly introduced to less enlightened cultures sometimes through imperial force and sometimes through soft means such as international diplomacy. Seen in this way, the principle itself its logic, its aim, and its substantive meaning

remains unsullied by the impious intentions of the empires and states that sought to promote or subvert it. Such an argument needs to be complicated for several reasons. First, it is important to understand that European efforts to subject weaker states to accept provisions for religious freedom for minorities (since the seventeenth century) cannot be understood as a simple extension of a “culture of tolerance” to non-Western peoples and lands, if this were so, the European powers would have accepted similar provisions in regard to their own minorities, which they refitted to do throughout history²⁷.

How the conspiracy was netted around the Muslim world, rather its centre, David Ghanim explains the true story.

There is, however, a strong tradition of cross-border smuggling in the north of Iraq. Smuggling has been the business of choice for the, Kurds for a very long time. In fact, the control of the transit trade and smuggling was one of the crucial factors igniting the intra-Kurdish fighting for four years in the 1990s. This fighting stopped only when the UN program of oil for food allocated 13 percent of the receipts of this program to the Kurdish enclave, which meant in reality new corruption opportunities for the ruling Kurdish politicians.

It transpired in July 2010 that hundreds of millions of dollars in crude oil and refined products were smuggled from Iraqi Kurdistan to Iran, in contravention of international sanctions on Iran. The scale and organization of this operation is alarming. Hundreds of tankers, each with a capacity of at least 226 barrels, enter Iran every day. The operation is supported by an estimated 70 mini refineries, many of them unlicensed. Officials in the two ruling Kurdish parties and the KRG denied these accusations of smuggling. However, an electronic website run by the opposition Gorran posted an official document issued by the regional Ministry of Finance, which was acting upon instructions from the regional Ministry of Natural Resources, instructing customs officials to allow the fleet of tankers to cross the border with Iran without paying customs duties.

A paper published by Gorran estimates that the revenues derived from this smuggling reach a level of \$264 million a month, and these revenues do not reach the budget of the regional government. A newspaper affiliated with the opposition Gorran, Rozhnarna, published a story on July 20 claiming that the two ruling parties, KDP and PUK, have made millions of dollars from oil smuggling in Iraqi Kurdistan. In response, the

KDP has filed a \$1 billion defamation lawsuit, which is the biggest compensation request in the history of Iraqi journalism²⁸.

Watt tells how the social set up can be framed; The setting of social life is provided by material factors. These include the geography of the country in which the society lives, the techniques known to it, and its relations to neighbouring societies. In a sense these are all economic factors, though the wider term 'material' seems preferable. It is more important to notice that there is a certain inevitability about them. If the society next to yours has a better kind of cereal and a better way of growing it, so that it can feed a larger population more adequately, then (assuming similar geographical conditions) your society will be defeated and perhaps exterminated by this other society unless you adopt their technique and get seed from them. The change of grain and technique is in one sense a matter of choice, but in another sense your society has no alternative, since it cannot contemplate extermination²⁹.

The conscious attitudes on which the life of a society is based have deep, and so partly unconscious, roots. Because of this they are firmly held, and it is usually impracticable to eradicate them. To produce new attitudes, equally firmly held, would take several generations. Men therefore try to modify rather than uproot the basic attitudes in making adjustments in a social system. They do so by making slight modifications in the accepted set of ideas and by analyzing the new situation in terms of these ideas. This leads to the propounding of a goal which is in accordance with the analysis. Thus, where there is adjustment to a new material situation, religious ideas not merely provide a positive goal but also harness traditional attitudes in the pursuit of this goal. In this way religious ideas provide a focus for a social movement. Without ideas there would not be a movement at all in the strict sense, but only social discontent without a single clear direction³⁰.

Conclusion

To conclude it can be said that the roots of civilizational clash between Christian and Islamic identities are very deep. It can be traced out in religious circles in the very initial stages. With the passage of time it developed into many phases and spheres i.e. cultural, defence, scientific fields, economy and much more in the war arsenals. Several complicated reasons can

be counted behind this wrestling. One aspect remained always superior and that is spiritual entity as compared to Christianity, towards Islam. Instead of improving this side the west laboured in war techniques that rolled over the monitorial powers towards it by hook or by crook!

References

1. Orientalism, Edward W, Said Geo-9 Roohani Art Press Islamabad, 1994, P. 4.
2. The Daily Telegraph, Oliver Roy, January, 2005, P. 3.
3. Paul Todd and Jonathan Bloch, Global Intelligence, The World's Secret Services, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York United States of America, 2003, P. 129.
4. Hersh, M, Seymour, The Samson Option Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy, Random House, New York, 1991, P. 139.
5. Ibid., P. 155.
6. Gilbert Achear, Perilous Power, Paradigm Publishers, London, 2007, P. 16.
7. Ibid.
8. Gulan, Muhammad, Fetullah Questions and Answers about Islam, V-I New Jersey, United States, 2010, P. 59.
9. Ibid., P. 61.
10. Ibid.
11. Miller E; Roland, Islam and Jihad Penguin Books, London, 2009, P. 101.
12. Karen Armstrong, Muhammad Oxford University Press, United States, 200, P. 79.
13. Esposito, L. John, Muslims and the West Encounter and Dialogue, Penguin Books, Vigo Street London, 1996, P. 131.
14. Nisar Ahmad Dr., Islam and Mustashriqeen, Dar-ul-Musahafeen, Azam Garh Bharat, 2003, P.7.
15. Douglas Pratt, The Independent, London, September 21, 2012, P. 4.
16. Amitabh Pal, Islam Means Peace, Understanding the Muslim Principle of Non-Violence Today, Senta Barbara, California, United States of America, 2011. P. 121.
17. Atta Rabbani, The Daily DAWN, Karachi, Pakistan, August 21, 2011, P. 11.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Mclaurin R. D., Muhammad, Oxford University Press, London, United Kingdom, 1977, P. 31.
21. Robert Fisk, Pity the Nation, Lebanon at War Andri Doutsch, Limited, London, 1990. P. 377.
22. Allien H. Dana and Steven Simon, The Sixth Serial. Iran, Israel, America and The Rumors of War, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010. P. 131.

-
23. Hoffmann, Erik, P. and Fleron, Frederic J, Jr The Conduct of Foreign Policy, Aldine Publishing Company, New York, 1971. P. 299.
 24. Montgomery, Watt Muhammad, Prophet and Statesman, Penguin Books, London, 1981. P. 121.
 25. Saba Mehmood, The Economist, Singapore, January 16, 2014, P. 11.
 26. Ibid.
 27. John Freely, Light from the East, I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd. 6 Salem Road, London, 2011. P. 110.
 28. David Ghanim, Iraq's Dyfunctional Democracy, Santa Barabara, California, United States of America, 2011. P. 208.
 29. Montgomery Watt, P. 21.
 30. Ibid.