

TANZEEM-e-ISLAMI



Striving for the Law of Allah, on the Land of Allah

PERSPECTIVE

The official online newsletter of Tanzeem-e-Islami

... Uploaded twice a month to [www. Tanzeem.org](http://www.Tanzeem.org)...



'PERSPECTIVE' is a trend-setting newsletter issued by Tanzeem-e-Islami that focuses on a candid commentary on the current national and international issues, in the light of the Qur'an and the Sunnah.

A blend that gives Muslims an insight into the events of the past, those happenings at present and the Signs of things to come...

Postal Address: 23 KM Multan Road, (Near Chung) Lahore.

Tel: +92 42 35473375 - 79

URL: www.tanzeem.org

Email: markaz@tanzeem.org

Tweet us @tanzeemorg

Follow us on FB <https://www.facebook.com/Tanzeem.org>

Disclaimer: Unauthorized use and/or duplication of the entire Newsletter or any part of it without the express permission of the editorial board of 'Perspective' is strictly prohibited. Permission can be received by sending us a formal request on the postal address, email or telephone numbers given on the last page of this newsletter.

Excerpts and links in this newsletter may be used, provided that full and clear credit is given to 'Perspective' and 'Tanzeem-e-Islami', with appropriate and specific directions to the original content.

The views expressed by the authors in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect the official views of Tanzeem-e-Islami.

All trademarks, service marks, collective marks, design rights, personality rights, copyrights, registered names, mottos, logos, avatars, insignias and marks used or cited by the newsletter are the property of their respective owners and 'Perspective' or 'Tanzeem e Islami' in no way accept any responsibility for an infringement on one of the above.

Striving for the Law of Allah, on the Land of Allah

PERSPECTIVE

The official online Newsletter of Tanzeem-e-Islami

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Editorial 1 & 2
Press Releases issued by
Tanzeem-e-Islami 3

Patron: Hafiz Aakif Saeed
Chief Editor: Dr. Absar Ahmad
Editor: Raza ul Haq

From the Qur'an:

"Indeed, the penalty for those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger and strive upon earth [to cause] corruption [fas'ad] is none but that they be killed or crucified or that their hands and feet be cut off from opposite sides or that they be exiled from the land. That is for them a disgrace in this world; and for them in the Hereafter is a great punishment."

(*Surah Al-Mai'dah: Verse 33*)

Selected Hadith:

Narrated Ibn Umar (RA), the Prophet (SAAW) said:

"O Muhajirun (migrants)! Beware of five practices, to be afflicted with, I take refuge in Allah that you may not be hit with; if ever lewdness (sexual depravity and immorality) spreads among people till it is regarded as a common open practice, plagues and new diseases which did not exist before will spread among them. If they decrease the measures and weights, they be overcome by poverty, their provision will decrease and their ruler will be unjust. If they refrain from paying Zakah due on their properties, they will be deprived of rain, and if it were not for the sake of the cattle, they would not have any rain. If they renounce their commitment to Allah and His Messenger, they will be governed by an enemy who is a stranger to them and who will take away some of what they possess. If their rulers do not rule according to Allah's Book, they will be afflicted by civil war".

(*Sun'an of Ibn Ma'jah*)

EDITORIAL

All praise is due to Allah (SWT), and peace & blessing on his noble Messengers (AS), in particular, on the last of them all the blessed Prophet Muhammad (SAAW).

Military defense is generally treated in economics texts as a "public good" because the benefits are presumed to be shared by all citizens. However, defense spending by the United States cannot legitimately be classified as public good, since the primary purpose of those expenditures has been to project power in support of private business interests. Throughout the course of the 20th century, U.S. military spending has been largely devoted to protecting the overseas assets of multinational corporations that are based in the U.S. or allied nations.

Companies extracting oil, mineral ores, timber, and other raw materials are the primary beneficiaries. The U.S. military provides its services by supporting compliant political leaders in developing countries and by punishing or deposing regimes that threaten the interests of U.S.-based corporations. The companies involved in this process generally have invested only a small amount of their own capital. Instead, the value of their overseas assets largely derives from the appreciation of oil and other raw materials in situ. Companies bought resource-rich lands cheaply, as early as the 1930s or 1940s, and then waited for decades to develop them.

In order to make a profit on this long-range strategy, they formed cartels to limit global supply and relied on the U.S. military to help them maintain secure title over a period of decades. Those operations have required suppressing democratic impulses in dozens of nations.

The global "sprawl" of extractive companies has been the catalyst of U.S. foreign policy for the past century. The U.S. Department of Defense provides a giant subsidy to companies operating overseas, and the cost is borne by the taxpayers of the U.S., not the corporate beneficiaries.

Defining military spending as a "public good" has been a mistake with global ramifications, leading to patriotic support for imperialist behavior.

The use of military spending in the U.S. to defend private interests has received surprisingly little attention over the years. International economists who question many other aspects of the U.S. federal budget seem reticent to turn their skeptical gaze upon the military budget. For many analysts, that spending is sacrosanct. They hesitate to pry open the lid and look inside.

The single biggest factor in the general reluctance to ask who benefits from military spending

(continued on page 2)

Editorial*(continued from page 1)*

(and implicitly to ask who should pay for it) is the philosophical premise that defense is a public good. Although the term “public good” is used in casual speech to mean any service that government provides (roads, health, education, and so on), economists have a more specific meaning. A public good is one that is indivisible in production and undiminished by use. It is a service with universal benefits from which it is hard to exclude potential beneficiaries. One standard example is education, but it is only a quasi-public good. It has some properties of a private good, since it permits exclusion and mostly offers direct benefits.

Thus, a better example seems to be national defense, which is often presented as a pure public good. If your country is invaded by a foreign power, every citizen benefits from the effort to ward off the attack, which means the benefits are universal and non-excludable. But no foreign army has attacked the U.S. directly since 1941, and even then, the mainland remained secure throughout World War II. Thus, the argument that military spending is a public good does not have the degree of plausibility with which it is usually presented. The argument is even less plausible in countries where the main function of the military is to repress domestic dissent and protect the power of an elite. That describes a high percentage of countries today.

Thinking of defense as a public good runs counter to the historical origin and nature of national governments, including the United States. National governments originated to establish, maintain, legitimize, expand, allocate and police the tenure of land—both inside and beyond their borders.

Thus landowners benefit from defense in proportion to the value of their holdings. The public goods argument becomes even more tenuous when military power is used on foreign soil to protect the economic interests of Americans abroad, which largely consist of large and influential corporations. They benefit disproportionately from military outlays.

One aim of military spending by the United States today is to extend sovereignty outside its borders. Since the prior goal of securing the heartland itself has been achieved, a high share of the discretionary or marginal military dollar should be imputed to marginal expansion or territoriality. It goes by names like policing the world, naval patrol, counter-insurgency, technical advice, surveillance, C.I.A., overseas bases, military aid, bringing democracy to the world, or humanitarian intervention.

Which brings us to the fundamental question of the legitimacy of the continuation of the U.S. led global War on Terror.

All evidence from the past proves that weapons that the U.S. has sold to foreign governments and rebel factions aiming at regime change have ended up in the hands of “terrorists”, because America either did not have the necessary regulations and safeguards in place or it was part of the grand American design from the word go.

The concerns surrounding the most recent examples of U.S. and Russian attacks on Syria are compounded by the fact that both the Trump and Putin administrations are also dropping record numbers of bombs either directly or indirectly via proxies in various parts of the Middle East and South Asia, which has led to a marked increase in civilian casualties (mostly innocent Muslims) compared to any time in human history.

Make no mistake that the Trump and Putin administrations, along with their proxies, are ready to drive the entire world into an unprecedented level of chaos, anarchy, insecurity and wars.

In our opinion, it would be the Muslims countries, particularly those situated in the Arabian Peninsula and South Asia that will be at the receiving end of the greatest suffering and loss, once again. The leaderships of the Muslim countries in these regions beware! May Allah (SWT) protect us all from the tribulations that the future holds in store.

Aameen!

Signing off...

Dr. Absar Ahmad (Chief Editor)

**Press Release issued by Tanzeem-e-Islami****Date: 7 September 2018****Lahore (PR): “It is good practice to take religious scholars into confidence on issues pertaining to religion.”**

This was said by the Ameer of Tanzeem-e-Islami, **Hafiz Aakif Saeed**, in a statement. The Ameer remarked that our rulers need to understand the difference between *Qadianis* and other non-Muslims. The *Qadianis* do not consider themselves as a non-Muslim minority and instead propagate themselves as the “real Muslims”, thus trying to severely dent the ideology of *Khatm-e-Nabuwat* of the Muslims by having faith in a self-proclaimed, false prophet. The Ameer said that we expect that Atif Mian would be removed from the Economic Advisory Council and the religious sentiments of the people of Pakistan would be honored.

While expressing deep shock and distress on the advertisement of the *Jamaat-e-Ahmadiyya* (*Ahmadiyya* Movement) that appeared in daily *Nawa-i-Waqt* on 6 September, the Ameer said that we never expected the progeny of *Hameed Nizami* and *Majid Nizami* to publish an advertisement on behalf of the open enemies of the Holy Prophet (SAAW) in their Urdu newspaper.

While commenting on the visit of the U.S. Secretary of State, the Ameer remarked that it was nothing but false optimism and vain hope to expect that USA would discontinue its enmity against Islam and Pakistan. The Ameer noted that the real reason why the Trump Administration had promoted the ex-CIA director, Mike Pompeo, to the position of Secretary of State was, in fact, his notorious hardline stance of bigotry against Islam and Pakistan. The Ameer further stated that USA wanted to take revenge of its embarrassing defeat in Afghanistan at the hands of the ill-equipped Afghan Taliban from Pakistan, therefore, the new government of Pakistan ought to tread carefully and avoid falling into the trap being set by the U.S. He remarked that loans taken from the U.S., Europe and IMF would never be helpful in making the Pakistani economy to stand on its own feet and become self-sufficient. The Ameer concluded by stating that both the ruling elite and the masses of Pakistan would have to make sacrifices in order to rid the country from the menace of foreign debt.

**Date: 4 September 2018****Lahore (PR): “While strongly condemning the government decision to include a Qadiani as member of the Economic Advisory Council of the country, the Ameer of Tanzeem-e-Islami, **Hafiz Aakif Saeed**, demanded that the government ought to terminate the membership of the Qadiani member from the Economic Advisory Council with immediate effect.”**

The Ameer clarified that although there was no harm in giving such a position in the government to a non-Muslim, but because the case of *Qadianis* was different due to the fact that they tried to undermine and endeavored to cause a severe dent in the *Deen* of Islam and the ideology of *Khatm-e-Nabuwat* by accepting *Mirza Ghulam Ahmed* as a prophet, therefore giving a *Qadiani* a government position would amount to grave betrayal with the *Deen* of Islam as well as the Final Messenger (SAAW) of Allah (SWT). The Ameer added that ever since the *Qadianis* were declared as non-Muslims, their anti-Pakistan activities have had come to light on numerous occasions. According to very reliable sources, the *Qadianis* have established an office in the Israeli capital, Tel Aviv, and the office is actively involved in perpetrating anti-Islam activities. The Ameer remarked that the government of Pakistan should investigate and identify those elements within their ranks who actively support the *Qadianis* and pressurize the government to take such bad decisions. The Ameer concluded by posing the question that our Prime Minister, who wants to make Pakistan similar to the State of Madinah, should ponder on the point that could any person who does not accept the real Head of the State of Madinah - the Holy Prophet (SAAW) – be a participant in the setup of the government of Pakistan?

