

29/03/2003

US promoting new world disorder

Shaikh Mohd Saifuddeen Shaikh Mohd Salleh

THE world has gone through a long history of human civilisation, and borne witness to numerous conflicts and countless wars.

During the infancy of civilisation, the Empire of Babylon was extended through invasion with Nebuchadnezzar storming into Judah. During the medieval period, history recorded a series of conflicts and wars, including feudal wars in Europe, wars between dynasties in China as well as the Crusades between Christians and Muslims.

In modern times, we still see on-going conflicts and wars resulting in territorial invasion and expansion.

During the first few hundred years of the modern age, the superpowers were those who controlled the oceans and the seas, who would then embark on colonisation by laying claim to so-called "new territories".

As a result, many Governments in Asia, South America and Africa became part of the colonies of Europe.

The make-up of the world superpowers changes every hundred years or so.

With the end of World War II, two new superpowers emerged, namely the United States (US) and the Union of Socialist Soviet Russia (USSR). The two had differing ideologies, with each viewing the other as a potential and real threat.

As such, there was balance in the equilibrium of global dominance as the bipolar situation provided for a check-and-balance in maintaining peace in the world. No doubt there were still conflicts and wars during this time, but no one nation dared to be the global police, or "globocop" as some pundits put it.

After the disintegration of the USSR and subsequently the communist bloc, a New World Order emerged with the US being the sole superpower of the world. Of late, the New World Order, it seems, is pro-war. The latest atrocities is the aggression on Iraq.

Three "official" reasons were given to justify the action on Iraq. The first was to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. The second was to continue the war on terror, and the third was to promote democracy.

These three reasons were stated by President George W. Bush during the State of the Union Address and during several White House statements that preceded it since September of last year. Ironically, these reasons stand out as being the paradox of the New World (Dis)Order.

It seems that in order to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, one must go to war. The invasion of Iraq is now in its second week, and it has led to nothing but the loss of civilian lives, including women and children. Countless others have been injured while many more have lost their homes when the coalition forces bombarded Baghdad with thousands of bombs.

Is the bombardment not an act of mass destruction? Apparently, according to the logic of the invaders, in order to destroy weapons of mass destruction, one must indulge in an act of mass destruction. Hence, ends lesson Number One on the New World (Dis)Order.

The second reason cited to justify the invasion of Iraq is the war on terrorism. This is, in essence, toying with the post-Sept 11 fears of the American people. The Bush administration has blamed al-Qaeda for its network of terror. However, there is no shred of evidence that links Iraq with al-Qaeda. As such, this second reason is in itself unreasonable.

The action of the coalition forces is akin to the Malay proverb of

burning the kelambu (mosquito netting) just to get rid of one mosquito. It appears that in tackling terrorism linked with al-Qaeda and its networks, US is burning down Iraq.

Iraq may fall into the hands of the coalition forces, eventually. But what good will this do then when it will only further fuel the anti-American sentiments already running high at this point in time?

As Prime Minister Datuk Seri Dr Mahathir Mohamad has pointed out so many times before, the root cause of terrorism must be removed in order to stop terrorism.

Instead, what the US is doing is pouring oil onto a raging fire. The fire (read: terrorism) will spread further and wider, thus bringing about more damage. The coalition forces seem to reason that Iraq is the root cause of terrorism. Remove the regime in Iraq, and the root cause of terrorism is removed. Therein ends lesson Number Two on the New World (Dis-Order).

The third reason quoted is to promote democracy in the region. By removing Saddam Hussein by means of force - which is far from the concept of democracy - it has been said democracy would then be able to take root in Iraq and subsequently the Middle East.

This is perhaps the most farcical of excuses used to invade Iraq. If indeed the America and its allies uphold the sacred tenets of democracy, why is it that the voices of the majority of the countries in the United Nations being ignored?

The aggression on Iraq is carried out sans the mandate from the UN.

Is it acceptable for a superpower to go into other countries whenever it feels that such countries are not democratic? Would an undemocratic action lead to the flourishing of democracy in a region so full of tension? The pretense of "war to spread democracy" is indeed a paradox. Thus ends lesson Number Three on the New World (Dis)Order.

It is very clear that the actions taken unilaterally by this New World (Dis)Order have only created further instability in the Middle East, a region already brewing with tensions and uncertainties. Doubtless, the act of attacking Iraq is motivated by several reasons other than the three official reasons given by the White House.

The people of the world are not blind to the real reasons behind the attack. Anti-war protesters around the world are chanting the slogan "No War for Oil". It is evident that the main motivation behind the attempted invasion of Iraq is the need to control the oil fields of Iraq.

Iraq is known to have an estimated 112 billion barrels in its oil reserve. In all probability, Iraq has a further 215 billion barrels of oil which has yet to be ascertained. It is also public knowledge that Iraq has approximately 110 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserve, while a further 150 trillion cubic feet which has yet to be found.

The US is the biggest petroleum consumer in the world. The country imports 25 per cent of its domestic needs from the Middle East. The imported petroleum and natural gas is to meet 60 per cent of its domestic consumption.

In 1990, Dick Cheney, currently the Vice-President of the United States, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the country which controls the flow of the Persian Gulf oil maintains a stranglehold on the economies of the other nations of the world.

The domination of Iraqi oil fields would indeed guarantee a sustainable and stable oil supply to America. As it is, the country is relying heavily on supplies from Saudi Arabia. By dominating the oil fields of Iraq, America would be able to "free" itself from relying on Saudi Arabia which is actively lobbying for the cause of the Palestinians.

Iraq provides a viable alternative to the US. It seems that America has

no plans to leave Iraq after invading it. American presence in the region will continue in its effort to establish Pax Americana.

There is a new form of colonialism around, and it is using the process of globalisation by exerting military might to dominate the world.

* The writer is a Fellow of the Centre for Economics, Social Studies and Technology, Institute of Islamic Understanding Malaysia (IKIM)