

## *Survival of the Islamic Ummah*

**Dr. Abdul Ghafur Muslim\***

The *Ummah*, the supra-national political community of Islam,<sup>1</sup> established by Muhammad (pbuh), the Prophet of Islam, about fourteen hundred years ago, today consists of fifty-five sovereign states. It comprises over one billion people, that is, one fifth of the world population and one third of the total membership of the United Nations. It has vast territories, immense potential in human, material and geo-political resources, and four most strategic international highways — the Strait of Malacca, the Gulf of Bosphorus, Suez Canal and the Strait of Hormuz — form part of its areas. It is not only extremely rich in natural resources but also exercises a monopoly or claims major share in the production of items of vital importance such as oil, tin, rubber, phosphate, jute, coal, natural gas and rock salt. However, in spite of its political and economic importance, the Islamic *Ummah* is divided and set against itself. It is underdeveloped and backward. A vast majority of its members are illiterate, and despite its economic potential, it is living in abject poverty and ignorance. It is also heavily dependent upon the West even for the basic necessities of life, such as the staple foods, clothing, energy and hardware.

---

\* Professor, Faculty of Law, West London School of Management and Technology, U.K. (03005132340).

1 The significance of this community rests in the fact that it embraces all the followers regardless of their blood-ties, race, language or geographical considerations, etc. It also transcends all political boundaries and set the community of believers in direct opposition to the modern concept of state as a geographical unit. For details see, H.A.R. Gibb, *Law in the Middle East*, eds., M. Khaddudri and H.J. Liebisncy, Washington, 1955, Vol.1, p.3. Also see G.E. Von Grunebaum, *Medieval Islam*, Chicago, 1953, p.142.

## The Process of Disintegration

An examination of the past history of the Islamic *Ummah* reveals that from 621 to 756 A.D. the Muslim society remained politically united under one central authority, namely the *Khalifah*, irrespective of differences and internecine wars.<sup>2</sup> Thereafter, however, with the establishment of a separate Umayyad state in Spain in 726 A.D., the concept of a unified Islamic *Ummah* shattered, which ultimately led to its disintegration. Gradually various regional chiefs and governors declared their independence, and the *Khalifah* was compelled to grant them independent legal status after accepting their nominal oath of allegiance. With the sack of Baghdad in 1258 A.D. by the Mongols, even this nominal allegiance was never sought and the *Ummah*, which was united so far theoretically at least under one central authority, became divided into independent empires and princely states, having no political linkage with each other.

The Ottoman Turks established a vast empire over a large part of the three continents from the fourteenth century onwards. At its zenith, this vast empire stretched far and wide, including under its sway Eastern Europe to North Africa and the main areas of the Middle East. In contrast, the contemporary Safawids established the first Shi'ite empire in Iran and ruled the region with its immediate vicinity to the north and to the west. In the early sixteenth century, the Mughals established an independent empire in the subcontinent. Other princely states controlled the western and Saharan Africa, Central Asia and South East Asia. The Western imperialism started trying its fate in this area from the early seventeenth century and gradually succeeded in securing political control and influence over almost all the territories of the Muslim World.

The Portuguese occupied Socotra in 1506 A.D. and Goa in 1510 A.D. and laid a maritime blockade to the Islamic World. Turkish naval expeditions against them in 1509 A.D. and in 1538 A.D. failed to achieve their objectives. The Dutch occupied Indonesia in 1641 A.D. Malacca and Colombo in 1654 A.D. and Malabar in 1663. In 1857 A.D. the French established their supremacy in Indo-China. The British established themselves in India and slowly expanded from Calcutta to occupy the whole of India. In addition to several other territories from time to time, they also occupied Ceylon in 1802 A.D. and Burma in 1885 A.D.

---

2. Amir Ali Siddiqui, *Islamic State*, Karachi, 1975, pp.21-45. Also Sir Thomas W. Arnold, *The Caliphate*, Oxford, 1924, pp.99-107.

In Europe, the Turkish fleet was destroyed in 1571 A.D. and again annihilated by the Russians in 1770 A.D. The West then started slicing up the Ottoman Empire. France occupied Algiers in 1830 A.D. and Tunisia in 1881 A.D. Italy captured Tripolitania in 1921 A.D. Likewise, Palestine, Transjordan and newly created country of Iraq went to the U.K., Syria and Lebanon to France and Central Asian states to the USSR. After the World War I, the Turks had to struggle hard for the protection of their homeland. They fortunately succeeded but several other countries of the *Ummah* were occupied by the West.

### **Western Domination**

During the heyday of Western domination in India in the nineteenth century, the Islamic *Ummah* endured a twofold assault: (a) political subjugation and (b) alienation from its institutions and values. Islam was belittled and ridiculed and was made to appear backward, barbaric and a source of embarrassment. The *Ummah* was de-culturalized in such a way as to ensure that it would not be able to recover and reorganize itself again into a vital force. During its period of colonial control the West, in the words of Arnold Toynbee, aspired towards “nothing less than the incorporation of all mankind in a single great society and the control of everything on the earth, air, and sea.” According to him:

The struggling Muslims are once more facing the West with their back to the wall. But this time the odds are more heavily against them than they were even at the most critical moments of the Crusades, for the West is superior to them not only in arms but also in the techniques of economic life on which military science ultimately depends.<sup>3</sup>

Under the Western domination a liberal elite was created which treated its own faith and history with indifference and unconcealed contempt. A sense of inferiority was injected into the masses who were looked down upon for their simple way of life. A “native” was considered an outcaste, while the Westernized elite stood out as a symbol of success for everyone else to emulate. A selected few were admitted to educational institutions in the West, and they later joined the power elite, which exercised authority over the people on behalf of the foreign rulers. During the nationalist movements it was this elite which gained political power in their respective areas.<sup>4</sup> The Westernized Muslim leaders could have united on one platform the entire *Ummah* in the postcolonial period; contrarily, they preferred to remain divided. Every community has in it people of rank susceptible to alien ideas, influences and selfish motives,

---

3 Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History*, London, 1954, p.153.

4 Siddiqui, *op.cit.*

who are even prepared to compromise their faith and betray communal interests. The conduct of such people, however, stands challenged in history.

### **The Unsuccessful Revival**

At the end of the World War I, efforts were made to form an Islamic union under the banner of the central authority of the Ottoman caliph, but they did not succeed. Iran had severed its ties with the Caliphate long ago, while the other Muslims states such as the Yemen, Egypt, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon also withdrew. In 1924 Kemal Ataturk abolished the institution of Caliphate. Thereafter, according to Asif A.A. Fyzee:

King Husayn of Hejaz tried to appropriate the title. King Fuad was also considered by some to be eligible but others thought that he was an Albanian and personally not fit. Ibne Saud would have probably suited but was not willing. In India the Agha Khan, Ameer Ali and Ali brothers deplored the deposition of the Islam's spiritual head. The Khilafat Movement in India came to nothing and the Caliphate may be said to have gone for ever.<sup>5</sup>

A conference to discuss the future of the Caliphate held in Cairo in 1926 ended without a solution.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, the concept of nationalism prevailed and the traditional concept of the *Ummah* was declared as "outmoded"; it "had no practical applicability in the contemporary age."<sup>7</sup> Now, the only way left possible for unity was through the establishment of socio-economic and political institutions of common interest on the basis of equality, mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs and sovereignty of other states. This option was generally accepted by the rulers of the Muslim countries. However, it provided no safeguards against exploitation of these states by the neo-colonialists. The West depicted the Islamic *Ummah* in deprecating terms and often described it as "a confederation of barbarian

---

5 Asif A.A. Fyzee, *Outlines of Muhammadan Law*, Oxford, 1949, p.xv. See also Sylvia Haim "Abolition of the Caliphate and its Aftermath" in Sir Thomas W. Arnold, *The Caliphate, op.cit.*, pp.205-44. In March 1924, after the abolition of the Caliphate in Turkey, Sharif Husayn of Mecca declared himself the Caliph of the Muslims, and the representatives of Iraq, Hejaz, and East Jordan swore the oath of allegiance to him but the Muslims of British India and Egypt rejected him as a British agent. For details see A.L. Tibawi, *Anglo-Arab Relations and the Question of Palestine*, London, 1977, pp.152-56.

6 Hamid Enayat, *Modern Islamic Political Thought*, London, 1982, pp.53-54.

7 C.C. Admass, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt: A Study of the Modern Reform Movement Inaugurated by Muhammad Abduh*, Oxford, 1933, pp.259-65.

and blood thirsty nations created to destroy the Christian culture and civilization.”<sup>8</sup> It suffered from atavistic fears which found expression as follows:

Every Muslim regards himself as the citizen of an ideal state in which the earth is the Lord’s and in the fullness thereof this state knits together all his brethren in the faith, under obedience to the Imam-Khalifah, the successor of the Prophet and the Vicegerent of God. The aspiration of Islam is to dominate the World and make the precepts of the Shariah or sacred law effective in every department of administration and the social life. To this end the missionaries of faith labour unceasingly, and the Khalifah ought year-by-year to wage Jihad against unbelievers until there is no government on the earth, save that of Allah.<sup>9</sup>

### **The Issue of an Islamic Political System**

Muslim jurists and writers, according to Abu Sulayman, no longer insist on the immediate establishment of one central authority. They have come to terms with what he calls “the political corruption of military dictators and illegitimate new independent sovereigns”.<sup>10</sup> Accepting these contemporary realities, he suggests that Muslim writers and decision-makers should evolve sound and realistic combinations and alternatives for a simple central or semi-central authority as the symbol of power. In suggesting this, however, Abu Sulayman, ignores the traditional basis for the unity of the supra-national *Ummah*. On the contrary, he suggests that “the writers and the decision-makers need to study the federal and multi-national experience of North America, especially of the United States and the emerging United Europe.”<sup>11</sup>

### **The Islamic State**

“Islamic State” is a fairly new name for what was formerly termed as (a) the Khilafat (constitutional presidency elected on the basis of free will and common consent of the Muslims), and (b) the Imamate (apostolic succession preordained from God within the family of Ali, son-in-law

8 Edward W. Said, “Whose Islam?”, in *The New York*, 29 Jan., 1979; Stephens S. Rosenfeld, “The Dark Forces of Islam” in *The Washington Post*, 5 January 1979; Geoffery Godsell, “Militant Islam” in *The Christian Science Monitor*, 14 December 1978; and Roy Vicker, “Can Islam Adopt to Modernity?” in *The Wall Street Journal*, 24 January, 1979.

9 Arnold, *op.cit.*, pp.182-83; also see R. Rhodes, ed., *Imperialism and Underdevelopment*, New York, 1978.

10 Abdul Hamid Ahmad Abu Sulayman, “The Islamic History of International Relations: Its Relevance, Past and Present,” unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (University of Pennsylvania, 1973), pp.180-92.

11 *Ibid.*

and cousin of the Prophet, as the Imam, the supreme law-giver, vicegerent and shadow of God on earth).

The concept of “constitutional presidency” or “the caliphate” is subscribed to by a vast majority of Muslims. Its first expression came about when the people of Medina, by common consent, invited the Prophet to Medina as arbitrator and Head of the State. A similar consent was given to the Rightly Guided Caliphs on the occasions of their appointments to the position of the head of the Islamic state. This practice was based on several verses of the Quran, and on the *Sunnah* of the Prophet.<sup>12</sup>

Once the Caliph was elected, his powers were restricted within the limits imposed by the Quran and the *Sunnah*. He was not supposed to be an autocratic ruler; he could be removed from office. He and the *Ummah* were to follow the Quran and the *Sunnah* in letter and spirit but whenever the two sources did not give clear guidance, the *Ummah* was entitled to legislate by *Ijma'* (Consensus) which had validity and was a binding rule of law, just as were the established provisions of the Quran and the *Sunnah*. The exercise of *Ijma'* had been established as a public right which every Muslim could exercise.<sup>13</sup>

The notion of sovereignty in Islam is different from the one that is prevalent in international law or in political science. In Islam the ultimate source of authority and sovereignty is God alone and everyone, including the Prophet, the Caliph and the *Ummah*, is subordinate to Him. Rulers, according to the Islamic concept, are not sovereign.<sup>14</sup>

The Quran and the *Sunnah* are the expression of the sovereign will of God. He alone institutes general authority and entrusts it to the community for execution and enforcement. The exercise of the authority was delegated in the first instance to the Prophet, who was instructed to rule by consultation, and make decisions with justice. After the death of the Prophet, the power to exercise sovereignty was delegated to the *Ummah* through the institution of *Ijma'*. The *Ummah* exercised this authority when it moved to choose its leader after the death of the Prophet. The Caliphs were aware of this. When some of the supporters of Ali tried to persuade him to seize power secretly and by force, he replied, “I cannot come to power secretly; it must be with the consultation of the

---

12 The Quran, 3: 159; 42: 38. Also see, Hamid Enayat, *op.cit.*,

13 Ahmad Hassan, *Doctrine of Ijma' in Islam*, Islamabad, 1976.

14 The Quran, 29:25: 64: 204; 59.

Muslims.”<sup>15</sup> Owing to the fact that the final interpretation of law and its application and administration were left in human hands, a broad range of legal authority was bestowed upon the Caliph. He was assigned the responsibility for performing two inseparable function: (a) to safeguard the purposes of *Shari’ah*, and (b) to manage the economic political affairs of the state.<sup>16</sup>

The edifice of the *Shari’ah* was built on the notion of *Maslahah*. This was elaborated by Imam Ghazali to include the fundamental rights of the citizens as enunciated in the Quran and the *Sunnah*. It further implied that these were the goals of preservation and protection of the basic public interests. Such public interests included: first, freedom in the choice of religion and its practice as required by the Quran. Second, the protection of life and the preservation of human dignity, which implied freedom of action, of opinion and of thought, and that man’s faculty of thought may not be curtailed or influenced by any means. From this derived the prohibition of liquor or drugs. Third, the guarantee of procreation. This involves family, affirms marriage, rearing of children, the prohibition of fornication and so forth. Fourth, the protection of the individual’s property, so as to forbid robbery and theft, and to systematize transactions and dealings among people, to discourage bribery, monopoly and aggression.<sup>17</sup> The political concept of the Caliphate is at variance with the concept of the theocratic state whose main feature is a direct rule of “God” or “gods”.<sup>18</sup> Malcom Kerr interprets the nature of the Islamic political system as follows:

Juridically he (Caliph) is simply the legitimate ruler of the Muslim Community, subject to a system of law. The community is therefore governed by a nomocracy which, regardless of its religious origin, is still the rule of law and not of a priestly class.<sup>19</sup>

Majid Khadduri also holds that the use of the term “theocracy” is undesirable or even erroneous for the Islamic political system, and he suggests that “nomocracy” is a more meaningful term, since it refers to a political system based in a code of law believed to be of divine origin.<sup>20</sup>

---

15 Shafi’i, *Risala, Islamic Jurisprudence*, translated by M. Majid Khadduri, Baltimore, 1961, p.38.

16 Ibn-i-Khaldun, *Al-Muqaddamah*, Cairo, 1966, p.169.

17 Al-Shatibi, *Al-Muwafaqat fi Usul al-Shari’ah*, Cairo, 1975, Vol.II, p.376; Al-Ghazali, *al-Mustafa fi ’Ilm al-Usul*, Cairo, 1982, Vol.1, p.287.

18 M. Majid Khadduri, “The Nature of the Islamic”, in *Islamic Culture*, Vol.21, p.327.

19 Malcom H. Kerr, *Islamic Reform, the Political and Legal Theories of Muhammad Abduh and Rashid Rida*, Berkeley, 1966, p.27.

20 M. Majid Khadduri, *op.cit.*, p.328.

With the passage of time, the Quranic concept of state, which was essentially republican, lost its essence as a doctrine. It degenerated into an authoritarian system whereby the Caliph was designed as an absolute sovereign by his predecessor, father or relative in the same dynasty. Quite often, a ruler was installed by force and maintained by oppression.<sup>21</sup> The jurists, in their deviation from the original Islamic concept based on the right of the *Ummah* to choose the Caliph, gave justifications for the hereditary system on the grounds of political necessity and “fear of bloodshed”. They defended the tyrant Caliph as the lesser of two evils when the alternative was anarchy.

### The Age of Globalization

Over the past several decades as colonial regimes were overthrown and collapsed, the Soviet Union and its satellite states forming the Communist block in Europe at the end of the twentieth century, gave way to the United States of America to establish a new form of sovereign empire to rule the unipolar world.

Standing before Congress in the wake of the U.S.-lead victory over Iraq in 1981, President George Bush announced beginning of a New World Order organized under the U.S. hegemonic leadership.<sup>22</sup> Echoing these sentiments, conservative policy analyst, Charles Krauthammer proclaimed that now is the unipolar moment, there is but one first rate power and no prospect in the immediate future of any power to rival it.<sup>23</sup>

The United States has acquired natural capacities to act unilaterally. It is spending more on its military than Russia, China, India, Israel, Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan put together. That is well over one third of world expenditure on arms.<sup>24</sup> The domain of the informal U.S. empire extends from West to East from its military protectorates in Korea and Central Europe, North to the Pole and South to its dependences in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

This is the stage of Globalization whereby the United States is aiming to transform the whole world into a single global governance replacing territorial states; a single culture replacing local cultures; and a

---

21 Abdur Razik Ali, *Al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukum*, Beirut, 1966, pp.74-79; also see note 12, above.

22 Cronin Bruce, “The Paradox of Hegemony: America’s Ambiguous Relationship with the United Nations”, in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.7, No.1, March 2001.

23 E. Charles Krauthammer, “Unipolar Moment”, in *Foreign Affairs*, Winter, 70, 1991.

24 S. Bromley, *American Hegemony and World Oil: The History, The State System and the World Economy*, Oxford University Press, 1991, p.177.

single global community allegiance replacing national loyalties.<sup>25</sup> While the United States is turning its back on sovereignty of the nation states, there are some, however, who have no intention of giving in to outside pressure so easily. They are largely seeking economic and technological progress to produce or purchase those arms which they feel are essential for their security, as the Indian Defence Minister is reported to have said when asked about the lesson India learned from the Gulf War, “Do not fight the United States unless you have nuclear weapons.”<sup>26</sup>

The United States labels such countries as rogue states, and counts the countries such as Libya, Iraq, Pakistan, Iran, North Korea, Argentina, etc., as potential danger to the safety and security of the United States. Calling them “The Weapons States”, Krauthammar remarks:

These states have deep grievances against the United States and the World Order that it has established and enforced. They are, therefore, subversive of the international status quo which they see as a residue of colonialism. These resentments fuel an obsessive drive to high tech military development as the only way to leapfrog history and to place themselves on a footing from which to challenge a Western imposed order.<sup>27</sup>

In spite of the fact the United States enjoys an unchallengeable military predominance over any combination of hostile states for the foreseeable future, the whole country is in a grip of terror of the Islamic fundamentalists. The world analysts do not agree with the imaginary fears of the superpower, nor do they find any potential threat to its hegemony.<sup>28</sup>

This is generally believed that the United States is aiming at preserving and extending its presentday advantageous position as far into the future as possible. To achieve these objectives, Krauthammar suggests to deny any export to such states and to develop a coordination committee to impose export control; to impose a strict outside control and disarm them by force, to defend ourselves by developing antiballistic missile and air defense system against any future attack, and to lay down

---

25 Iain Watson, “Politics, Neo-liberalism and Globalization” in *Global Society*, Vol.15, No.2.

26 Samuel Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations” in *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), pp.22-49.

27 E. Charles Krauthammar, *op.cit.*

28 Mark Neufeld, “Theorizing Globalization: Towards Politics of Resistance” in *Global Society*, Vol.15, No.1, pp.20-37. For a detailed discussion also see, Agnes Heller “Cultural Memory, Identity and Civil Society” in *International Politics and Society*, 2001, Vol.2, No.2, pp.141-42.

rules of the World Order and unashamedly being prepared to enforce them.<sup>29</sup>

The New World Order, a Post Cold War paradigm, includes a gradual transformation of the whole world into a single economy, a single political system and even a single culture for the whole community of mankind. This is the irreversible destiny of the Nation-States and any refusal to it is punishable severely.<sup>30</sup>

The whole programme of Globalization is carefully formulated and enforced in consultation with western industrialized countries, through multinational corporations, multination agreements and international financial institutions (IMF, World Bank etc). Globalization is, in principle, expected to offer opportunities for all nations. However, developing countries of the South, especially the Muslim states are very poorly positioned to capitalize on them. So, they are further behind than ever before. Free trade may be good among equal partners but in the presentday global economy some countries are more equal than others. The industrialized nations have erected higher barriers against immigrations making the world economy seem more like a gated community than a global village. A world of free trade with the United States as the dominant competitor, have had, and will continue to have, adverse effects on an increasing scale. The United States through the network of international Agencies and multinational firms has sought to maintain and enlarge its power, promoting its products, technology and cultural values to the detriment of other nations. 400 rich individuals of the North are richer than the total wealth of the 60 per cent of the South. Almost four billion people of the global village earn less than 2 dollars per day.<sup>31</sup>

Nation building, under the presentday World Order, will begin with international loans. As a condition of any international loan, the debtor

---

29 Krauthammar, *op.cit.*; also see, Smith Neil, "The Satanic Geographies of Globalization: Uneven Development in the 1990s" in *The Public Culture*, 1997, Vol.10, No.1, pp.92-93.

30 Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents*, Penguin Press, 2001, pp.41-68. Before 1990, the West was known as the 'First World', the Communist Block, as the 'Second World' and the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, as the 'Third World'. This conception was derived from the three estates of French society before the Revolution in 1789. After 1990, however, the world is divided into The North, referring to the industrialized developed countries, and The South, to understand the underdeveloped world. For details, see *United Nations Press Release GA9437-42*, and *United Nations Development Programme Report for 1999*.

31 Cris Tenove, "Values", *Adbuster*, July-August, 2002, No.2, p.36.

nation shall immediately put up for sale its social resources, government owned industries and public infrastructure. International Monetary Fund and World Bank call it privatization. If a weak nation's economy is going to succeed, its government will need to have strong ties with successful multinational corporations for investment/loans and look beyond the confusing demands of local people. It will have to create favourable regulatory environments for the corporations and facilitate their operations and profits with suitably constructed property guarantees, tax cuts, labour laws, and police protections.

With the growth of the transnational corporations and trillions of dollars in free market operations and free flow of capital, in relative detachment from territorial jurisdiction, the sovereignty in the traditional understanding accorded by the Peace Agreement of Westphalia executed in 1648, have become wholly impracticable.

The multinational corporations can readily override state sovereignty by frustrating a government, because they can easily relocate production facilities and sales outlets to other jurisdictions if they find a particular state's regulations burdensome. Usually this threat alone is sufficient to make a state amenable to submit before the demands of the Corporations.

Globalization is a multifaceted phenomenon; its critical analysis reveals that it involves a change at the level of production from tripartism to global enterprise corporatism, enhancing productivity through the intensification of work. Besides, it degenerates shared community identities that can facilitate action in favour of a generic American mass culture entailing an ideology of possessive individualism promulgated by means of advertising and products of entertainment industry such as television and movies. Consequently, the cultural imperialism is imposed and the traditional family/community identities built around a shared distinct cultural heritage are being supplanted by a nondescript American (i.e., Mickey Mouse, McDonald) culture which promotes the ideology of possessive individualism where an individual is seen as absolute natural proprietor of his own capacities owing nothing to family and society. His essence is freedom to use his capacities in search of satisfaction. Freedom comes to be identified with domination over things.

The United States' assumption that other people must become Americanized is a bit of US arrogance. The idea that the people, especially the Muslims, will give up their culture and civilization and come to a single West-defined universal civilization is a disgrace in the face of reality. What automatically counts for people, especially the Muslims, is not political ideology or economic interests. Faith and

family, blood and belief are what they identify with and what they will fight and die for.

Tony Blair, while paying a bent kneed tribute to George Bush Senior during a visit to his personal library, said:

We must go further than smashing unfriendly regimes and hunting infidels into the ground. We must also ensure that the governments and populations we allow to survive are convinced that our way is the High Way...we want Muslim college kids and school children on our side before they are even aware that the war of values has begun. We want them intoxicated.<sup>32</sup>

In the United States a hero-worship is given to the idea of individual freedom. Some believe that much good came from this idea, slavery ended and universal franchise followed. But freedom does not only solve problems, it can also cause them. The United States has undertaken a massive social experiment, tearing down social institutions after social institutions that restrained the individual. The results have been disastrous. Since 1960 the US population has increased 41 percent while violent crime has risen by 560 percent, single mother births by 419 percent, divorce rate by 300 percent and the percentage of children living in single parent homes by 300 percent. But instead of travelling overseas with humility, Americans confidently preach the virtues of unfettered individual freedom blithely ignoring the visible social consequences.<sup>33</sup> Rather there is a consensus to impose their culture on others.

## Conclusion

The Islamic *Ummah* is divided into various independent sovereign states. Under the Peace Agreement of Westphalia executed in 1648, all states were accorded exclusive right to rule over their territories. Rich or poor they were equal in the eyes of the international law, free in dealing with their national and international affairs, without overt interference by other states. With the end of the Cold War in 1990, and disintegration of the Soviet Union, however, this era has ended, making room for the new World Order and globalization organized by the United States of America. The paradigms of Globalization are to gradually transform the whole world economically, politically and even culturally in the light of the standards and values approved in the West, especially in the United States of American.

---

32 Cris Tenove, "Values", *Adbuster*, July-August, 2002, 2, p.36.

33 Mahubani Kishore, "Dangers of Decadence", in *Foreign Affairs*, 1993, Vol.72, No.4, pp.110-14.

The Westphalia states in future are no longer to be regarded as sole owners of their citizens' fate. Henceforth, as pointed out earlier, nation building will begin with international loans from IMF, World Bank or Multinational Corporations, under the condition that the debtor nation shall put up for sale its social resources, government owned institutions and public infrastructure. This is called privatization. These global actors, IMF, World Bank, Multinational Corporations, etc., are not only wielding military, economic and political power to interfere in the internal affairs of states, but are also codifying, modifying and propagating world cultural structures; and, through education, transmitting them to new generations all the world over.

As a culture, Islam is universal in principle with a systematic and coherent ideology. It has its own worldview, code of morality and doctrines of political and social justice. It confirms the sublime principles and values enunciated in the Judeo-Christian scriptures which, once upon a time, prevailed in the West, and are now replaced by the destructive cultural traits.

Islam has always stressed that it is open to all people. Individual can convert to it, not just be born into it. In the context of the Globalization, Islam claims itself as universal in essence. It looks at humanity as a single community, a whole that is ultimately to be harmonious and not divided in conflict. This ecumenical face of Islam makes it a resource for criticizing the process of Globalization especially for unilaterally depriving people from their cultural identities, and for failing to live up to the universal and global ideals.

In the Muslim world, West is looked at as arrogant and exploitative and due to some of its cultural values such as possessive individualism, materialism, permissive sexual practices and other unattractive features like guns, violent crimes, drugs, untreated mental illnesses, suicides, epidemic of teenage pregnancies, high rate of divorces, it is regarded as a morally bankrupt civilization. It is also felt that as long as the Muslims maintain and cultivate their own culture, they will exist, and the moment they turned their backs on it they will lose their identity. It is also felt that globalization is eroding their cultural identities and by doing so, it is enhancing the importance and domination of the western culture. However there is no denying the fact that religion lies at the heart of the Muslims and they would defend it at all costs. But, nevertheless, they firmly support the just ideals of universalism and believe that mankind as a global community will have to follow a set of agreed rules so that all its members could live together peacefully. In framing these rules enough attention will have to be paid to the rights and obligations of the rich and

the poor and they must reflect a basic sense of decency and social justice and must be arrived at through a transparent democratic process. The West has 800 million people while the East makes up almost 4.7 billion. In the domain of national politics no western society would accept a situation where 15 percent of its population legislates for the remaining 85 percent. This is exactly what the West is trying to do at the global level. This is not fair by any standard and needs to be reconsidered.

Muslim participation in the New World Order is very low. They appear to be observers and peripheral players. The fact that they are divided castes doubt on their ability to participate as a significant entity in the sphere of the world events and it is generally believed that only a miracle can change them enough to be able to become equal partners in the New World Order. So they stand to lose on the potential benefits of Globalization. The main reason for their non-participation, in the opinion of Professor Huntington, is the nature of their religious traditions, "which seem to show the energy of a resistance to globalization and westernization."<sup>34</sup> However, the Muslims themselves do not think so. They believe that the process of Globalization is just another American conspiracy to keep the Muslim world down. In the eyes of some critics, this is, in effect, much worse than this. Much worse because Globalization is not just thinking about Muslims alone. It has put every country under pressure.<sup>35</sup> Like the Muslim states, every other nation state is worried about what the Wall Street institutions are going to do next. Thus, it is not designed to keep down the Muslim states alone.

If the Muslim states like to survive this deluge, they must build an Islamic bridge to the train of Globalization, because if they failed to do so, the train will leave without them.

The institution of *Ijma'* plays an important role in the socio-economic and political life of the *Ummah*. The real problem, however, lies in the existing political conditions, and the consequent failure of the decision makers to understand public opinion and surrender before it. The rulers always patronized a selected group of the '*Ulama* to approve and sanction their socio-political decisions. They consider the opinion of the '*Ulama* as a consensus, whereas the fact is that they no longer represent the mainstream of the Muslim intelligentsia and their knowledge does not reflect the changes occurring in the modern world.

---

34 Samuel P. Huntington, "If not Civilization? What? Paradigms of the Post Cold War World", in *Foreign Affairs*, 1993, 72:5, p.186.

35 Agnes Heller, "Cultural Memory, Identity and Civil Society", in *International Politics and Society*, 2001, Vol.2, p.141.