بِسْمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

Islam's Conception of a World Order

The question of World Order is intimately linked to the self-image of a nation or a society. How does that society view itself? What is that society's mission? What is that society's identity? And how does this self-image of the nation relate to other societies and relations in the World? So the quest for a World Order is a nation or society's quest for its relationship with other nations and societies in the World, in a manner which reinforces and reaffirms that nation or society's own self-image. So the quality, nature and shape of World Order at any given time is a direct consequence of the ideological orientations, interests and passions of the most powerful nation or nations at that time. It is therefore more appropriate to see World Order as a natural consequence of the competition between great powers, where each nation or society seeks to impose its viewpoint about how relations between different societies should be organized, on others, and what we see as the final structuring of the relations, between different nations or societies of the World, is a function of the power and influence of the strongest nations involved in this competition. Thus it is important to approach the question of establishing a World Order in a cautious manner. World Order is not and should not be defined as a stable institutional mechanism of organizing the relations between different societies of the World in a permanent manner. For such an approach misunderstands international relations and does not differentiate between a domestic society and an international society.

What sets the domestic society apart from an international one is in fact the permanency in the nature of relationships in a domestic society, which is absent in international relations. Domestic society comprises of permanent relations between members of the society and so the members of the society develop concepts, convictions and criterions towards organizing these permanent relationships. Once a consensus about how these relationships are organized is reached, the domestic society appoints a ruler or authority to manage these permanent relationships of the society, according to the concepts, convictions and criterions which the domestic society holds towards these relationships. It is important to note that what changes in the domestic society as result of an ideological transformation is the concept, convictions and criterions of the society towards organizing the relationships between its members, not the permanency of the relationships between members of the domestic society. This permanency of relationships dictates a fixed structure of organizing the domestic society which comprises of the masses, the dominant thoughts and emotions about the relationships in the society, and the authority, which manages those relationships, according to the dominant concepts and convictions of the society.

This is not the case with an international community. There is nothing permanent about the relationships between different societies. For relationships between different societies are a function of the viewpoint of individual states, as to how these states view themselves, and hence their relationship with the World. Thus, no permanent consensus about the nature of international relations can exist among different nations of the World. Naturally, if there are no permanent relationships between nations, there is no authority required to manage international relations between different societies. So, the quest for permanent institutions to organize a World Order, with structured relations between states is a false quest. It is rather an ideological position of the West and her specific viewpoint about organizing the World affairs.

It is however possible to see a permanency and consistency in approach towards organizing a particular nation's relationship with the rest of the World, where a nation adopts a permanent, fixed and inflexible method in its approach towards organizing its relationship with the rest of the World. Such a permanent approach would be adopted by ideological nations which adopt a fixed method in the conduct of their foreign relations. However, this permanency of approach emanates from the internal organization of that nation and its viewpoint about life and its own self-image. It is not automatically going to shape the World in

a fixed structure of organized relationships. Any permanency in the relations between different nations of the World would be only be visible if an ideological nation with a fixed approach towards foreign relations becomes the dominant and most influential nation of the World. Such a nation would use its power and influence to force the world upon its specific view about how relations between different nations of the World are organized.

The Western view towards World Order seeks to introduce permanency in international relations, thus aiming to shape these relations according to the Western viewpoint. The foundational idea of the Western conception of World Order is the concept of Westphalian sovereignty, developed by the warring nations of Europe in 1648 in the German state of Westphalia. At Westphalia, States were recognized as political units independent of the Christian Churches they committed to, an intra-Christian peace was agreed upon, ending the sectarian wars in Europe and the idea of the State was confined to territorial boundaries, in the image of nations rooted in ethnicities with a history of existence as single societies or within certain geographical limits. Thus international relations would now be conducted with a certain permanency in their nature; the foremost being the inviolability of the territorial boundaries of the States, the defining of a society's identity as a nation either rooted in a particular or a set of ethnicities or a people confined to certain geographical limits and a commitment to respect and protect a particular society's right to define its own ideological orientation. Instead of States conducting their foreign relations in accordance with their own viewpoint about such relations, States were asked to commit to aforementioned principles in the conduct of their foreign policy, thereby setting the basis of an international order, which would structure international relations on the principles mentioned above. The natural question which arose about such an approach to international relations was; what if a state or multiple states refused to abide by the principles mentioned above in the conduct of their foreign relations? It was agreed that a coalition of States will be mobilized to force the dissenting State or States in to reverting to the principles agreed in the peace of Westphalia. Thus, the quest for permanency in international relations based on certain principles gave rise to the need for an international authority to ensure that such a permanency is ensured and such principles adhered to. This idea of ensuring the commitment of States to the principles agreed at the peace of Westphalia, through the mobilization of a coalition of States was conceptualized as maintaining the Balance of Power, one of the defining organizing principles of the modern system of World Order, first championed by Europe and then the US, which can easily be referred to as the Westphalian conception of World Order. The Congress of Vienna held in 1814-1815 was organized to revert the European Order back to the pre-Napoleon Balance of Power where Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia formed a coalition of States to check France's expansionist designs and made geo-political adjustments, like annexing multiple German States in to Prussia to strengthen it as a State, so that it can act as a check on French Power on Continental Europe. The Concert of Europe represented the European balance of power in two phases, the first from 1815 to the early 1860s, and the second from the early 1880s to 1914. The first phase of the Concert of Europe, known as the Congress System or the Vienna System after the Congress of Vienna (1814–15), was dominated by the five Great Powers of Europe: Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and the United Kingdom. Seeking to maintain the Balance of Power in Europe, France, Russia and Britain declared War on Germany culminating in World War I after Germany's announcement of war against Russia. And it was the effort to revert the Balance of Power in Eurasia to its pre-existing configuration that the US, Britain, France and Soviet Russia formed a coalition of States against Germany, Italy and Japan in the Second World War to check their expansionist designs. And it was the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Europe, comprising of the European states and the US which aimed to keep the Balance of Power in Europe against Soviet expansion and later Russia.

The concept of Balance of Power in its origin was a pragmatic reflection of the power realities on continental Europe. No power in Europe was strong enough to single handedly dominate the whole of Europe. Although on different occasions different powers were able to dominate other powers in individual conflicts, complete domination against a coalition of

powers was not achieved. It was this pragmatic reflection of power realities in Europe which was developed into an operational concept of Balance of Power, used for maintaining and managing a European and then later a World Order.

The idea of Westphalian sovereignty was not a rigid concept of territorial limitations on the boundaries of the states. It was rather a restraint and check on the ambitions of Great Powers who had both the ability, motivation and ambition to territorially alter their own and the boundaries of other states. So in its origin the idea of Westphalian Sovereignty and the related concept of Balance of Power sought to distribute global power amongst the Great Powers of an era; not necessarily rigidly putting a constraint on the physical expansion of their territorial boundaries and empires. Thus, we see Russia continue to expand its territorial boundaries in all of the last four centuries. Germany expanded its boundaries in the earlier and later halves of the nineteenth centuries, while France and Britain continued to expand their colonial empires in Africa, Asia and the Americas from the seventeenth century onwards, whilst the US continued to territorially expand its territory through much of the nineteenth century. All such expansion was acceptable as long as other Great Powers did not feel such an expansion was a major threat to their core interests. It was only after World War II that America encouraged and sought a more rigid adherence to the territorial boundaries of States, as it sought to challenge the Soviet Union and contain its expansion in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

So the idea of Westphalian Sovereignty and the resultant concept of Balance of Power seeks to introduce a permanency in the nature of how different areas of the World are governed and how power is distributed globally. This particular organization of international relations is not an inevitable result of the march of history, but rather a very deliberate structuring of international relations in the image of the Western viewpoint about how such relations should be organized.

As a thoroughly Western European conception of organizing global affairs which emerged in Western Europe, like many aspects of Western Civilization, the idea of Westphalian Sovereignty, as argued earlier, sought to freeze or preserve the status quo of global power distribution. The tool used towards this end was a conception of sovereignty which was rooted in a society which was ethnically homogenous or a society which historically existed as a unified entity and which inhabited a certain geographical area for long periods of time. Again Westphalian sovereignty was not imagined as a concept based on internal organization of societies, rather it was a concept developed based on geo-political realities and distribution of power as it existed in Europe at the time of the peace of Westphalia. When the European empires declined, whilst the US and Soviet Union rose to global preeminence, these two powers pushed for decolonization to reduce and eliminate European influence in global affairs. This wave of decolonization led to the independence of dozens of new States on the global stage, which were conceived in the tradition of the Westphalian Sovereignty. This has been one of the most profound impacts of Westphalian Sovereignty in the organization of global affairs, along with the carving up the territories of the former Caliphate into nation states, subsequent to the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916. The idea of Westphalian Sovereignty was expanded to define internal organizations of societies, where new societies were carved out in different areas of the World based on the conception of a society, being rooted in ethnicity or a group of ethnicities and which were merged together to form new single societies. This conception of a society was hence not always organic even in the case where new societies were formed from homogenous ethnicities. The bond of an identity based on a common ethnicity is neither the only nor the strongest bond which holds a society together. Society is a much broader conception of a set of permanent relations between individuals living together for long periods of time. This permanency in relations spread over a vast array of relationships, developed organically after living together for significant periods of time, pushes the single society, which develops from these relationships to develop concepts, convictions and criterions, towards managing these relations and eventually appointing an authority, which rules this society according to the convictions it holds. This more expansive and historically rooted conception of societies was

missing from most of the new states which emerged on the idea of the Westphalian Sovereignty. In the absence of a powerful ideology to bind the new society together and the inertia of history to sustain the permanency of relations established over long periods, these new nation states were weak in most of cases and outright unnatural in the case of a significant number of countries. Moreover, in some cases these new societies had history acting against their functioning. Most of these societies did not have experience of actual sovereignty. Historically they were governed by imperial neighbors or Great Powers and in the case of local autonomy, as provinces administered by Great Powers or being at the frontiers of Great Powers. Even if they were governed independently in some cases, they normally never controlled or had very limited or brief experience of foreign and defense policies. Some of these new societies never had any experience of self-governance and had been ruled by Great Powers of their time or had lost their self-governance for long periods to expansionist ambitions of Great Powers. Thus it was no wonder that these new nation states were weak and faced massive governance and ruling issues. In most of the cases these new States simply continued with the colonial or imperial structures of administration, devised by their former imperial masters, and never managed to develop indigenous and more organic mechanisms and systems of ruling and governance.

Thus what the world faces today of the issue of "failed states" and an under-developed "Third World" is the direct consequence of the universalization of the idea of Westphalian Sovereignty and the West's insistence in the permanency of international relations based on the Westphalian ideals. It brought great misery and despair to the millions living in these new nation states which were conceived as new, and in many cases were actually, artificial societies. It is also no surprise that many of these states face internal cohesion issues, based on challenges from strong organized sub-nationalisms, which seek independence from parent states, based on the Westphalian ideal of a state rooted in ethnicity. Many modern states to this day, seek to cultivate a broader nationalism, through organized state policy, making one wonder about the rationale behind the creation of such a state, which is trying to give purpose and meaning to the society it governs after it has been established. In some cases such an effort of cultivating a broader nationalism to unite a society continues for decades, after the initial establishment of that State, without much success. This phenomenon of weak and failed states present in different areas of the World today further consolidates and strengthens the grip of Great Powers over world affairs. Furthermore, it helps consolidate the distribution of global power between Great Powers, something which the treaty of Westphalia originally envisaged.

A cursory look at global affairs today and the Great Powers which shape them reveals that the effective and most influential great powers of today have historically been single societies for long periods of time. It is also this much smaller number of influential states which shape global affairs. Much of the geopolitical questions of today which are critical to global management of international affairs and which are central to Great Power competition are in fact questions rooted in the history and ambitions of these older societies. The US seeks to preserve its global primacy based on the historical fact that no power can dominate the globe, without controlling the twin and geographically connected space of Europe and Asia, called Eurasia. Thus, America has sought to address old geopolitical questions in different regions of the World and through specific solutions to these geopolitical challenges the US has ensured its global primacy. In Europe, the US has sought to avoid war and geopolitical competition between different European States, the foremost being Germany and France, by providing for their security through NATO, thus lowering their need for defense spending and dampening the military ambitions of these states. Washington has deliberately sought to channel the energies of these historic and old societies towards economic development through the establishment of the European Union, hence distracting them from geopolitical ambitions of their own. Similarly, the US seeks to contain a Russia which has continuously expanded for four centuries and historically sought prestige and recognition as a Great Power through military conquest and expansion. Thus, the formation of NATO and European Union achieves for America the twin objectives of containing the

powers of Europe and stopping Russian expansionary ambitions by maintaining a Balance of Power in Europe. In the Far East end of Eurasia, the historical geo-political challenge has been a belligerent Japan and its relationship with its neighbors and a very old Chinese society which seeks grandeur and prestige for its civilization. The US seeks to manage the Far East through a military pact with Japan, which serves to both contain Japan's belligerence and channel Japanese energy towards economic development. Together with its military presence in Japan and Korea, the US seeks to maintain a Balance of Power in Far East to manage the rise of China and stop it from becoming a global player. In the Southern end of Eurasia, in the Persian Gulf, the US seeks to maintain, through its military presence there, the control of the energy resources of the region and to prevent the rise of an Islamic State on the vast geopolitical space spread over the Muslim lands. In doing so, as in the other areas of the Word, the US is acutely aware of the region's history and historical geo-political challenge posed by it. It is also in this area, where the centuries old society, governed by the Islamic State was completely dismantled and replaced by dozens of the new Westphalian nation states discussed earlier. It is this fear of history, of the resilience and the inertia of older, established, single societies, which has continued to force the US and the West to treat the Middle East and the wider Muslim World as a geo-political challenge, which has the potential to upend or radically change the global World order.

History of societies plays a very important role in determining their global influence. Unless captivated by a powerful idea which radically, completely and comprehensively alters the self-image of a society and which alters the organization of the permanent relationships which exist in a society, human societies generally tend to rely on their historical roots to find the resilience and organizing potential to marshal their creative energies and ambitions towards seeking global status and influence. In fact it can be argued that it was only religious scripture which earlier radically altered the European World and parts of the Middle East, and then Islam which forced societies to abandon their past conception of the self and adopt a totally new self-conception and mission of life. Although the Soviet Union adopted a new ideology contrived from the human mind which radically altered the Russian society, Communism as a radical idea only truly captivated the Soviet society in the era of Lenin and Stalin. As early as the era of Nikita Khrushchev, who assumed control of the Soviet Union as its powerful leader after the death of Stalin in 1953, the Soviet foreign policy began to express the goals of the more historically rooted Russian foreign policy, seeking prestige and influence for the Russian society rather than the propagation of Communist ideas, which his two powerful predecessors espoused.

As for why history plays such an important role in a society's quest for global influence, the first reason is that being a historically influential society at a global stage by itself endows a society with a sense of superiority and confidence in its own ability and potential, which defines that society's ambition for global power. Global power is sought by nations to affirm their sense of superiority over others, to seek wealth and exploitation of resources abroad or in the service of a mission dictated by an ideology. Being a historically important influential player can fuel all three, or any one of these ambitions. Secondly, societies with a long history of existence as undisrupted single societies tend to develop institutions less dependent on individual human brilliance and agency, reinforcing the capabilities required for global power and influence. These are capabilities like military and economic strength, technological innovation and a unique culture which breeds a sense of mission and purpose in those societies. A long history of military engagement often develops in a society a breed of fighters and a culture which puts a premium on fighting capabilities and which values and honors fighters as noble men. Similarly such societies tend to be highly industrious in the production of military armament. Long spells of prosperity and a history of innovation brings a sense of political empowerment and ambition, which wealth may bring in a society along with a work ethic and a culture of industriousness, which reinforces the productive forces of that society. A continuous engagement in the affairs of the globe builds an institution of political leaders and intellectuals who can count on the continuous legacy of political experience and expertise, extending back for centuries, in their effort to manage the affairs of the globe

today. However, perhaps the most important aspect of a historical sense of mission which a society may have, is the because of its cultural constraints. Ethnically a homogeneous and old society, with a culture which puts a premium on war heroes and which celebrates a ruling hierarchy in which Japanese emperors are seen as possessing divine powers, Japan's sense of its own superiority unleashed in it the potential of being a great military and economic power. However, due to its inability to present its culture to the world to adopt and the unlikelihood of the world to accept it, Japan's ultimate geo-political influence is limited. culture and ideas which addresses the mission, self-worth and identity of that society and the reason for its existence. It is also the inherent ability of this culture to be more universal in nature which ultimately defines a society or nation's global influence for culture and ideas are the most important and often most under-estimated components of global power. Although, being a historically belligerent military hegemon and a great economic power today with the industrial potential for rapid, substantial militarization, Japan remains unable to project power regionally

One of the largest contiguous land empires in the history of the World was established by the extremely skilled Mongol fighters under the leadership of Genghis Khan, which laid waste to many powerful States of its era and who were eventually defeated by Saif ad Din Qutuz, the Mamluk ruler of Egypt, after they had wreaked havoc in the Islamic State and killed the Abbasid Khaleefah in Baghdad. Although their rule extended over an enormous land mass, the lack of any unique or any significant culture or ideas which they could universalize as the defining element of the Mongol Empire, meant that the Mongol Empire and rule was eventually absorbed by the areas which it conquered and which were inhabited by people possessing a superior culture. Thus the Mongol empire disintegrated in to smaller Khanates, of which the Western Khanates embraced Islam and dominated Central Asia. One of the defining elements of Islam's rise to global influence and centuries of global domination was the superior culture it possessed, which it carried to the World and which helped it consolidate its rule in the newly conquered territories. It was the spread of Western culture and its appeal in continental Europe which helped America stave off Russian influence in Europe and eventually defeat her in their competition for influence over Europe. It was the spread of Western culture which consolidated European colonialism over much of the globe, including the Islamic lands. It is only as the impact of this culture in Islamic lands recedes and the superior Islamic culture re-asserts itself within Muslim populations in Islamic lands that the West has increased in its fear of the return of the Caliphate to Muslim Lands.

Islam's view towards international relations matches the nature and reality of international relations. Islam does not seek to impose a World Order on the globe which can only be built on a more permanent structuring of international relations. In that context Islam rejects any conception of a World Order, which is based on a formal structured organization of international relations, eventually leading to the establishment of international institutions such as the United Nations. Instead, Islam views international relations through the more organic view of an Islamic society's own self-image. Islam thus divides the World in to Dar ul Islam and Dar ul Harb. This approach towards international relations views the World from an Islamic society's own conception of itself. The Muslim Ummah is endowed by Allah (swt) with the responsibility of being the Dawah carrying Ummah. This Dawah is practically carried to the whole of the World, through establishing the rule of Islam over new societies, which do not just receive the oral and verbal invitation to Islam, appealing to their intellectual faculties, but a very tangible and practical invitation to Islam, when they observe the rules of Islam practically governing and organizing their affairs, which they witness to be superior to the previous systems of governance under which they lived. In this manner, Islam presents Dawah as a whole to individuals in their capacity as individuals, as well individuals in their capacity as members of a society. Thus, Islam employs a comprehensive persuasion policy, appealing to the emotions of the individuals and addressing his or her intellectual capabilities as well as addressing the emotions of the society and its dominant thoughts. Islam mandates that in this comprehensive presentation of the Islamic Dawah, the recipient of the Dawah as an individual, still retains his free will and choice in accepting the new Deen for himself or

herself. Thus Islam's World view divides the World into the areas, which are ruled by Islam and areas which are ruled by non-Islamic laws. Through Jihad, Islam seeks to extend the boundaries of the Islamic State and hence the rule of Islam to new areas, thus taking the new community under the direct care and ruling of Islam. Such a view towards international affairs demands that Islam categorically rejects any permanency in international relations. Islam neither seeks to distribute global power among Great Powers of the World, nor to establish a Balance of Power in international relations. It rejects international institutions because it rejects any permanency in international relationships and any authority of other States over the conduct of Islamic State's affairs in its execution of its foreign policy. Islam's policy towards the World is thus a policy based on war. Until the Islamic State is ready to militarily challenge and then extend Islamic rule onto other societies, Islam views international relations as a totally voluntary conduct of political and military actions by States, where States are allowed to take any or all actions, without any coercion or compulsion. They are free to voluntarily join and voluntarily opt out of bilateral and multilateral treaties and all foreign societies, whether powerful or weak, as long as they are independent societies, are considered equal in the context of their right to act in the international domain, according to their own convictions and interests. Thus Islam views international relations as temporary, flexible and in a state of flux and a function of a State's own convictions, without any compulsive international law, or international culture, or a sense of compulsive responsibility through being part of a greater international community.

Islam however accepts the Islamic State's adherence to a more limited scope of international norms, such as the right of diplomatic immunity for ambassadors or norms regarding certain rules of war. However such norms are adhered to by the Islamic State and other States because of an ethical commitment and fear of public opinion and disgrace, rather than any coercion. The Islamic State is free to sign treaties with various States, which commits the Islamic State to peace and truce with any other State for a limited amount of time, provided that such a peace agreement serves the interests of Islam and Muslims. It is not allowed for the Islamic State to establish military alliances with States of the kafireen, for it is not allowed for Muslims to fight to protect a non-Islamic entity. Fighting in Islam is for the sake of establishing the rule of Islam only. It is allowed for the Islamic State to take political actions and sign good neighborly treaties with other States, using its power and influence to open opportunities in these States to create positive public opinion towards the Islamic Dawah. Thus, Islam's vision of international relations is based on conveying the Islamic Dawah to other societies, where such societies are annexed under the authority and ruling of the Islamic State through Jihad. If for some reasons of prudence or compulsion the Islamic State is unable to annex these societies under its rule, such societies are considered as independent societies which are allowed to voluntarily conduct international relations, without any compulsion. The Islamic State can enter into treaties with all such societies, until it is ready to annex them under her authority.

The Islamic Ummah today is in a unique position to revive the Islamic civilization by re-establishing the Khilafah (Caliphate) on the Method of the Prophethood of RasulAllah (saw). It has the advantage of possessing the Islamic ideology, with its correct understanding thus possessing a radically transformative set of ideas, which alone have historically served to alter the course of history. It also of the advantage of a strong and powerful history of Islamic rule, spread over more than a thousand years, with a legacy of institutions from that era, which serve to bolster its confidence in its ability to reclaim its place in the World as the dominant global player. Institutions such as the cultural institution of Islamic Fiqh and wider Islamic culture, whose strengthening and revival has served to crystallize the Ummah's understanding of the ideology, the institution of Jihad and the willingness to fight the enemy even with meagre means, a powerful sense of unity rooted in the Islamic identity of belonging to a single Ummah and a sense of superiority of possessing the divine culture brought by the last Prophet, our master Muhammad (saw), all position the Islamic Ummah above other nations as the inheritor of the mission of Prophets (as), engendering a confidence in its ability to overcome great adversity based on her historical and more recent triumphs against her

enemies.

The discontinuity of Islamic rule for more than a century however completely destroyed a vital institution necessary for global dominance. The presence of a political and intellectual class which draws upon the experiences, discussions and ideas related to Islam's historical dominance and which is able to study, contemplate and present opinions on matters of regional and global significance, in the light and service of the Islamic State's mission in World affairs. It was this weakening of the Islamic political medium which led to the weakening of the Uthmani Khilafah and its eventual destruction. After colonialism took roots in Muslim lands, it deliberately targeted this old political and intellectual medium in Muslim lands and completely wiped it out, replacing it with a ruling elite, which was schooled in Western culture and history. This new ruling elite sought to redefine and reinterpret Muslim history in the interest of continuation of colonialism in Muslim lands, thus depriving the Muslim society of the historical experience and confidence from a long period of global dominance. This disconnect from our historical roots and our culture as the leading state of the World was perhaps the West's greatest victory over Islamic lands. It is only after the Ummah overcame this disconnect and reconnected with its roots that it is now firmly placed on the path to revival. However, the Ummah remains deprived of the Islamic political medium and from the benefit of a continuous legacy of statesmen, who pass on their knowledge and geopolitical experience, with regards to the most difficult geopolitical challenges of the World. This gap was understandable, as after the destruction of the Khilafah State, the Ummah lost its mission, purpose and aspiration to become the leading state in World affairs. It was then governed by rulers who were subservient to Western interests. Moreover the West killed or displaced the old Muslim ruling elite. It was only in Turkey and Iran, where some of the old elite survived to a certain extent. However, even in these countries the Muslim ruling elite, under the influence of Western culture, totally abandoned its role in managing and influencing global affairs, thus totally wiping out the Islamic political medium from the Muslim World. We hope and pray that in its detailed and exhaustive efforts to understand the political events in the World, from the perspective of interests of Islam and Muslims, Hizb ut Tahrir and its Shabab, who master this understanding of global affairs, are serving to revive a vital institution, the creation of the Islamic political medium and a cadre of statesmen, who will serve as the pillar of the soon to be established Islamic State, as it seeks to assert itself in global affairs with the aim of becoming the leading state and a beacon of light and guidance for all of humanity.

﴿وَكَذَٰلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا لِتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَيَكُونَ الرَّسُولُ عَلَيْكُمْ شَهِيدًا﴾

"And thus we have made you a just Ummah that you will be witnesses over the people and the Messenger will be a witness over you." [Al-Baqarah-143]

Written for the Central Media Office of Hizb ut Tahrir by

Engineer Moez – Pakistan

Hizb ut Tahrir Official Website | The Central Media Office Website | Ar-Rayah Newspaper Website | HTMEDIA Website | Khilafah Website

www.hizb-ut-tahrir.org   www.hizb-ut-tahrir.info   www.alraiah.net   www.htmedia.info   www.khilafah.com