POSITIONING UMMAH IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: A SOUTH-SOUTH PERSPECTIVE

HADZA MIN FADHLI ROBBY

Department of International Relations, Faculty of Psychology and Socio-Cultural Sciences, Islamic University of Indonesia, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
e-mail: hadza.fadhli@uii.ac.id

Abstract

This research would like to discuss the reconceptualization of Ummah in the context of contemporary international politics. Ummah, as a concept, has been implemented since the era of Prophet Muhammad. Since the advent of the modern era, the concept of Ummah has been deemed as irrelevant due to the existence of modern nation-state. However, newly independent countries that are having a majority of Muslim populations tried to rebuild the new consciousness among Muslim communities by establishing organizations that resemble Ummah. There are at least three endeavors noted throughout history: Asian-African Islamic Conference, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and Developing-8 (D-8). Only two endeavors successfully emerged as an active international organization representing the Muslim community's interest in world politics. Using the English School and South-South perspective, this research tried to decipher the reason behind the creation of those organizations.

Keywords: South-South cooperation, Ummah, English School

POSISI UMMAT DALAM POLITIK INTERNASIONAL: SEBUAH PERSPEKTIF SELATAN-SELATAN

Abstrak

Riset ini hendak mendiskusikan rekontekstualisasi umat dalam konteks politik internasional kontemporer. Umat sebagai sebuah konsep telah diterapkan sejak era Nabi Muhammad saw. Sejak awal era modern, konsep umat dianggap sebagai konsep yang tidak relevan karena eksistensi negara-bangsa. Namun, negara-negara Muslim yang baru saja merdeka membanagun kesadaran baru di antara masyarakat Muslim dengana mendirikan organisasi yang menyimbolkan peran umat. Setidaknyaa ada tigaa upaya yang dijalankan oleh negara-negara tersebut dengan terbentuknya forum seperti Konferensi Islam Asia-Afrika, OKI, dan D-8. Hanya ada dua yang bertahan, yakni OKI dan D8 yang kemudian menjadi organisasi internasional yang mewakili kepentingan Muslim dalam politik global. Dengan menggunakan perspektif Mazhab Inggris dan perspektif Selatan-Selatan, riset ini mencoba untuk mengungkap alasan dibalik terbentuknya organisasi tersebut.

Kata Kunci: Kerjasama Selatan-Selatan, Umat, Mazhab Inggris

INTRODUCTION

In the landscape of contemporary international politics, many countries have risen as emerging forces. Previously, these countries were also known for their status as less-developed countries because of their status as newly-independent nations. These newly independent nations also categorized as part of the Global South. Contrary to their counterpart in the Global North, countries affiliated with Global South have a less prosperous economy. Nowadays, the economic condition of the Global South has reached significant achievements. Some countries in the Global South are creating new coalitions that could be observed in the examples of BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) and MIKTA (Mexico, India, South Korea, Turkey, and Australia).

Many kinds of research are investigating the role of emerging Global South countries or coalition in international politics. These researches tried to explain the formation and the inner workings of cooperation between countries in the Global South, which often called South-South Cooperation (Gray, & Gills, 2016; Robledo, 2015; Vieira & Alden, 2011; Puri, 2010). Besides that, some research explored the tendency of several countries from the Global South and Global North to create triangular cooperation, allowing funds and technical assistance channels to countries in need ((Piefer, 2014; Ashoff, 2010; Kakonge, 2014). Although South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation are mainly discussed and seen in its technical aspects, it is essential to note that South-South cooperation has its ideological and political aspects. It is known that South-South cooperation has its historical antecedent in the Bandung Conference.

This paper would like to touch on one of the often-dismissed discussions in the research about South-South cooperation, which is the role of Muslim countries in solidifying and creating its version and understanding of South-South cooperation. It is necessary to note that Muslim countries are the majority part of the Global South, but Muslim countries' role in constructing the definition and the form of South-South cooperation never discussed in detail. This paper would like to establish an argument that Muslim countries have their understanding of South-South cooperation and have its framework of South-South cooperation which idealizes not only the achievement of more just, democratic and equal global political order, but also the unity of Muslim Ummah which is under the domination and colonialization of Western power. Facing the realities of international politics during the Cold War, some parts of the Muslim community all over the world realized that the only way to survive the ideological and power competition between the United States of America (USA) and Union of Soviet Socialist Republic is to be realistic. The term realistic here means that the Muslim community needs to adopt modern political thought and approach to face new challenges. Thus, it can be understood that there are many Muslim nations, and Muslim nation-states became independent countries during the Cold War. These Muslim-majority nations and Muslim nation-states are eventually forming coalitions and cooperation as a way to strengthen Muslim communities' role in international politics.

This research would like to discuss the ideas behind the coalition and cooperation between Muslim countries who are classified in the group of Global South. This research explores the dynamics of the coalition and what kind of factors that have influenced the

dynamics. Some study cases related to the coalition-building among Muslim countries will be brought up in this research, namely the Asian-African Islamic Conference, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and Development-8. All of these forms of cooperation have different historical conjunctures which are unique to each other. Nevertheless, all of these organizational platforms created by Muslim countries have a similar vision, which is to create a robust platform to be used by Muslim countries to voice the interest of Muslim communities worldwide, despite the diversity of Muslim communities in itself

The English school of international relations and the concept of South-South cooperation are the two conceptual frameworks that would be used to analyze the case studies. The next chapter will discover the concept of Ummah and Ummah in the course of modern international politics. The concept of Ummah will be seen both as an idea and as a political phenomenon. Therefore, the Ummah will not be seen as a mere concept, but as a living concept which has been transpired and influenced global history. The Ummah here will also be seen as something which always tried to adopt the *zeitgeist* or temporal spirit while also strive its best to keep its *ummatic* ideal. Afterwards, the paper will be focused on analyzing the case studies given in this research. Conceptual frameworks mentioned will be engaged in this stage. The English school of international relations will be used to answer how and why Muslim countries are creating their coalition in international politics. At the same time, there are already some other organizations and platforms in international politics representing their interest. The concept of South-South internationalism or South-South cooperation will explain the inner

workings and the formation of ideas within the organizations or coalitions formed by Muslim countries.

LITERATURE REVIEW

For the scholars of International Relations, both concepts of the English School of International Relations and South-South Cooperation are known as concepts that are useful to decipher the patterns of international cooperation founded by an alliance of countries. These concepts developed during the Cold War. It means that these concepts were originated from the Grand Theory of International Relations (Realism and Liberalism, notably). However, the founder of these concepts eventually found some faults within the theory and set up new concepts that are more suitable to the contemporary. As a concept (or some say that this school was a theory), the English School of International Relations was initiated during a critical phase of social science development.

At that time, there were some debates about how social scientists should conduct their research. This debate, which was occurring between Behavioralists and Traditionalists, has a significant impact on International Relations. While Behavioralist emphasized the importance of making 'social science' including International Relations as a 'pure science' similar to natural science, Traditionalist focused on how 'social science' should be a science which used interpretation as a method. Realizing this condition, the English School of International Relations founder suggests that there should be an alternative to this debate. Founder of the English School of International Relations believed that the research and investigation conducted within the realm of international relations should turn

back to the traditionalist approach (Kurki, M., & Wight, 2013). This tendency makes the English School of International Relations emphasized its analysis of the importance of value, norms, and culture. The English School of International Relations different from Grand Theory, particularly Realism theory, which only focused itself on the condition of anarchy and state interest.

English School defends that there is no such thing as an international system or world society. The school founders believe that the anarchical character of a 'realistic' international system makes the international system not work accordingly. After all, each country only works for its interest. A system that worked without an effective interaction could not be called a working system. The concept of the world system is also criticized by Barry Buzan, one of the proponents of English School. Immanuel Kant first developed world society as a concept to build a new conception of the world with eternal peace. World society describes international politics as an eternal place for nations and states to build cooperation and friendship with the eventual goal of constructing a world without war. This concept, however utopian, became a rallying call for many pacifists until today.

Nevertheless, this school considered that world society is not a realistic concept that could be applied and observed in practice, due to its flowery and unrealistic promises. The proponents of English School argue that there should be a more realistic explanation of world society's creation. Instead of the malfunctioning' international system' and the out-of-world world society, the proponents of English School believes that international society might be the answer to explain the existing phenomenon in international politics.

According to the proponents of this school, international society is formed by a group of states. These groups of states need not come from a particular system, but they usually united through the process of interaction and communication with each other (Palabiyik, 2014). Here, as what Realist have thought before, these school views state similar to individuals. While individuals enter the international society, it will make the encounter with individuals, communicate with those individuals, and thus as time goes, these individuals will create distinct characteristics or rules related to their community or society. The same case also goes with the states. Whenever states face certain conditions, problems, or enemies, they tend to create agreement or arrangement among themselves so that they can face those problems in a coordinated and effective manner. One of the most concrete examples of international society is the existence of the United Nations Organization.

Although united on these principles, the proponents of this school were usually divided into two groups. The first group is usually called as pluralist. Pluralist defends an argument that proponents of English School should not characterize this world as a world under Western domination by value and power, but a world with various system and believe which needs to be investigated deeply. Pluralist believed that by acknowledging the differences of system, it enables the international society to function in its best way, as it can provide freedom and independence for all societies and nations to find what the best for them. The second group is called as solidarist. Solidarist defends the argument that states in international politics should be able to unite their vision and principles to defend human

rights and champion democracy. Solidarist disagrees with the pluralist opinion in terms of letting states making their own choices with differences of system, as Solidarist believes that not all system is purely dedicated to democratic and human rights principles (Palabiyik, 2014). It is the task for states all over the world to assist societies in danger. In the context of cooperation, the English School of International Relations is useful to see why particular states tend to build a coalition. The English School of International Society argues that states are usually bound with the norm and states participating within the arrangement or agreement are at the very least trying to commit themselves with limited responsibilities, to ensure the stability and the orderliness of international society.

The second analytical tool that would be used here is the concept of South-South cooperation. As explained in the introduction, South-South cooperation was mainly defined in technical aspects, mainly as a way for countries from the Global South to access technical and financial assistance from both partner countries from the Global North and international organizations to restore and rejuvenate its economic condition. Before exploring the concept of South-South cooperation, it is vital to clarify the term South. The term South here is not intended to be used as a geographical term, but somewhat a political term. South here could be defined as any country which is not or could not be categorized as an industrialized country by the early 20th century.

Contrary to some widely believed view about the South, not all countries included in the Global South are colonized by colonial powers. Some parts of the Global South, for example, Thailand and Turkey, did not experience colonization. However, these two countries were not subject to rapid and advanced industrialization by the early 20th century, so they are categorized as part of the Global South. As countries in the Global South were released from the chain of colonialism and imperialism, they united to build alternative blocks to balance the USA and the USSR interests. At that time, as newly-independent countries united to create new blocks, the term North and South has not been explicitly used both by political actors and academicians.

The term used to describe the newly-independent countries is Non-Aligned. Non-aligned as a term itself is self-explanatory, meaning that countries which participate in the non-aligned movement would not follow the orientation of any great powers during the Cold War. Instead, it follows a multi-vectored approach when it comes to applying its foreign policy. Countries that participated in the non-aligned movement tends to have a more independent foreign policy, as countries are not sanctioned by great powers to conduct its relations with another country. The 1955 Bandung Conference served as the first forum where newly-independent countries and even independence movement could meet amid the bipolar international system.

From this moment, Global South had gained recognition and position in the international system. The term South itself used as a technical and political term in the 1970s. By the 1970s, many nations whose previously colonized was now freed and established their own countries. At this time, the United Nations, along with nations from the Global North, realized that there are needs to alleviate the Global South's poor economic conditions. Countries from the Global North, especially those who have been colonizers, felt a responsibility to

assist the nation that they have colonized in Global South. Therefore, the United Nations started to create a mechanism that regulates the cooperation between countries of the Global South and Global North under the supervision of international organizations. As more countries of the Global South gain their prosperity, the United Nations tried to regulate a new mechanism called as South-South Cooperation (in another term, South-South Cooperation is also known as Triangular Cooperation) (Gray & Gills, 2016).

Many countries of the Global South have currently emerged as new economic powers, and many of them have assisted fellow countries from the Global South. South-South Cooperation mainly operated within economic and technological aspects, but it is not only limited to these aspects. Sometimes, capacity building for civil servants and workshops on political and administrative reforms is also included as one of the South-South cooperation programs. In this research, South-South Cooperation would be used as one of the concepts to explain how Muslim countries focus their agenda on assisting each other. Some examples had shown that the existing platforms founded by Muslim countries have been competent in repairing the economic, social, and political conditions in Muslim countries.

It is also important to explore the concept of ummah. The concept of Ummah could be defined as a specific community who returns to certain principles and values. Initially, Ummah was not considered as a political concept. As mentioned in the Quran, Ummah was described as a religious concept. Ummah was a concept used to describe the existence of communities believing heavenly religion, such as Jewish and Christian (Nieuwenhuijze, 1959). Along the course of Islamic history, Ummah

slowly becomes a political concept. The leader of the Islamic community at that time follows accordingly the order of Prophet Muhammad PBUH, which asked the Muslim Ummah to remain steadfast and kept their unity under two principles, which are the Quran and Sunnah. As Islamic authority became more durable than before, rulers often considered their subjects, especially Muslim subjects as Ummah, because they are united in religion and belief. The expansion of Islam makes the Muslim community grows exponentially, and this brings a new challenge to the traditional conception of the Ummah. During the Prophet Muhammad's era, it is pretty easy to draw the borders of the Ummah itself, as Ummah is only confined within the border of Madinah. As many ethnicities and cultures are incorporated into the abode of Islam, it is becoming harder to define Ummah's border.

Ummah might be one in its principle, but it was divided into different authorities, making the implementation and application of Islamic teaching diverse. Using another phrase, Ummah might be called as a community which shared similar vision, principles and consciousness, but with different context and realities surrounding the diverse and vast Muslim geographies, Ummah also has its trans-local characteristic (Widhiyoga, 2017). At this moment, Ummah was indeed divided physically, as many political leaders are striving to gain status as the rightful leader of the Ummah. It is not until the Ottoman claimed the title that Ummah started to gain its status of political and social unity. Ottoman tried to manage the conception of Ummah by offering acknowledgments to local Islamic states in return for the recognition of local Islamic states to the Ottoman as the sole leader of the Ummah.

Such practices were standard during that time because Muslim communities felt the need to return to a singular power that could unite them. Despite the fall of Islamic civilization, the unity of already separated Muslim communities could be ensured because they lead under the Ottoman Empire's guarantee. Ottoman Empire has been successful in building such consciousness, mainly through the political and social campaigns, to win the heart of Muslim communities all over the globe. However, after the dismissal of the Empire, Muslim communities were again lost, with no leader tried to unify their interest. The feeling of loss was a huge burden for all Muslim communities, particularly those communities who were forced to submit themselves under the dominance of colonial or imperialist powers.

The existence of the Ottoman Empire once helps them, because the Ottoman Empire acted as a defender of ummah polity and ummah interest. Therefore, efforts were made to ensure that Muslim polity could restore the existence of the defender of ummah polity in the form of Caliphate. The notable example of this effort is the foundation of the Khilafat movement in the South Asian subcontinent. Khilafat movement found its momentum during the era of the anti-colonial resurgence in the area (Minault, 1982). Alongside the Khilafat movement, there are several efforts to unite the Ummah through conferences in Quds, Morocco and many parts of the Muslim world (Pankhurst, 2013). All of these efforts did not meet its initial goal because of political constraints and clashes of interest between Muslim groups. Eventually, the Muslim community was left without any leaders or centralized authority. Consequently, every Muslim has to live according to the condition in their

nation. It is not until the Cold War Muslim community realized that they could still be united despite the division. However, in order to be united, they have to adopt a new and distinct strategy. This strategy was not a planned one, but somewhat typical and spontaneous response towards a new reality.

The Asian-African Islamic Conference: The Initial Effort
The first study case that would be explained is the formation of the Asian-African Islamic Conference. Asian-African Islamic Conference was first initiated after the conference bearing the same name but without the word 'Islamic.' The Asian-African Conference, also known as the 1955 Bandung Conference, was founded as an international conference to gather all countries which have declared independence from colonial powers to support their fellow colonized nation in their struggle to gain full independence. Aside from that agenda, the 1955 Bandung Conference also struggled to create a new and alternative agenda for international politics, which is international politics free from exploitation and domination from one party to the other. This conference thus gives fresh air to international politics, as it tried to go against the current of the bipolar international system. 1955 Bandung Conference became a hallmark for many of the newly-independent nations to stand confidently at the face of many other nations who have achieved a lot.

The 1955 Bandung Conference inspired another conference to come, which is the Asian-African Islamic Conference. Who first initiated the Asian-African Islamic Conference? It is said that the Asian-African Islamic Conference was initiated by groups of Indonesian,

Syrian, and Egyptian Muslim scholars who had shared similar concerns about the dangers of Western-led capitalism (Chisaan, 2012). Both of these ideologies had brought danger to Muslim societies. Therefore, these scholars felt that ulama or scholars' responsibility to establish a discourse of Islamic nationalism according to the Cold War situation. Islamic nationalism teaches that Muslims should be ever ready to defend the interest of their nation-state according to Islamic teaching while also doing its best to defend the Muslims aboard their homeland by opposing imperialist and colonialist forces (Singh, 2008; Ibatullin, 2015).

The anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement here could be considered as a part of jihad. Asian-African Islamic Conference's main message was mainly preached by Azhari ulama, who were willing to support Gamal Abdel Nasser's regime against the threat of Western powers. In Indonesia, the message of the Asian-African Islamic Conference was disseminated by Nahdlatul Ulama, a Traditionalist Islamic organization that considered Sukarno as a legitimate leader in the time of emergency (Mumazziq, 2017). After building a coalition with Nationalist and Communist, Nahdlatul Ulama tried its best to strengthen the discourse of Islamic nationalism amid the complicated political landscape in Indonesia back then. After its inception in 1965, Asian-African Islamic Conference successfully turned into a formal organization called as Asian-African Islamic Organization. This organization was led by Achmad Sjaichu, one of the initiators and project manager of the Asian-African Islamic Conference and one of the leading scholars of Nahdlatul Ulama (Suryanegara, 2015).

It was agreed that the Islamic Organization would consist of these following committees: defense committee, economic and social committee, liaison committee, and cultural committee. Each committee has different functions. Defense committee intended to defend the human rights of Muslims in the political, economic and social field, while economic and social committee intended to help Muslims prosper in economic and social fields. Liaison committee was created as a committee to ease the communication between member states of the Islamic Organization, and at last, the cultural committee envisioned to enhance the educational, scientific and cultural development in Muslim countries (Affairs, 1965). According to Oded, 1987, Asian-African Islamic Organization initially began its activities mostly in the geographical range of Western Africa. Asian-African Islamic Organization was successful at the beginning to spread and strengthen the Islamic belief, mostly with the assistance of Arabic countries. In 1970, the Organization held an Islamic conference in Liberia, Monrovia, which invited Muslim leaders across Africa (Oded, 1987).

Unfortunately, the Asian-African Islamic Conference was eventually failed as a movement. Not only because it had lost its momentum, but the movement also failed because of the dominance of Soviet Union interest in the forum, which makes the forum lost its original ideas (Ibatullin, 2015). Besides, the Asian-African Islamic Conference also failed because no real deals and action plans were made during the conference. There are no concrete organizations that created the conference afterward to sign that Muslim communities and Muslim nation-states are willing to rebuild a new organization. The existence of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation also inhibits further development of the Asian-African Islamic Conference.

The Organization of Islamic Cooperation: The Ummah in the Form of Modern International Organization

However, the weakness and inability of the Asian African Islamic Conference were eventually replaced by the existence of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Although it could not be inferred that the Organization of the Islamic Conference is the direct continuation of the Asian African Islamic Conference, we could see that the formation of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation tried to continue at least some of the ideas that have been articulated and implemented by the Asian African Islamic Conference. As an organization, OIC was founded as a response towards the burning of the Al Aqsa Mosque in Quds, Palestine. The burning incident flames anger in the Muslim world. Therefore, with the initiative of several leaders of Muslim countries, the Islamic conference was held in 1969. This Islamic Conference was held to envision a new organization that would be a place for consultation of the Muslim government to enhance and strengthen their cooperation and mutual assistance in many fields, ranging from economic, social, scientific, cultural to the spiritual field. First Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers shortly followed the 1969 conference, and this conference, which was held in Jeddah, agreed upon the establishment of the permanent Organization of Islamic Cooperation, which would be headquartered in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia (Kayaoglu, 2015; Castillo, 2014).

The organizational chart on the following page explained the central system of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation is divided into four different main bodies. The first body is the Islamic Summit, which is the highest and most prestigious amongst all bodies within the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Islamic Summit is held annually and attended by the head of states or equal representatives. The second body is the Islamic Conference of Foreign Minister, which became a forum where Foreign Ministers from all member states of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation meet annually to discuss problems related to the Muslim world. Permanent Secretariat manages the Organization of Islamic Cooperation's day-to-day activities, headed by a Secretary-General. Under the Permanent Secretariat's office, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation has several other bodies with differing functions, such as the specialized institutions, affiliated institutions, and subsidiary organizations.

After the establishment, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation soon enough began its program to build permanent secretariat and establish functionary bodies within its hierarchies. During the 1970-1990s, many subsidiary bodies were established to answer the immediate need of the Muslim community, which is to improve living conditions and education. The creation of these subsidiary bodies supported by the funds collected by member countries of the OIC, many of them were oil-exporting countries. Many Islamic Universities were founded by the Organization to open up the access of ordinary Muslims in all Muslim countries to higher education. Some research institutions were also founded by the Organization, which focused on providing technical and scientific assistance to member states (Hassan, Sarwar, & Muazzam, 2015). Some research bodies and institutions are successful in helping countries alleviate their social and economic conditions (Mohieldin, Iqbal, Rostom & Fu, 2011). It could be said that the Organization of

Islamic Cooperation is one of the best examples of South-South Cooperation, noting that developing countries mainly initiated many of the projects and actions. Aside from the technical assistance, one of the most remarkable achievements that have been made by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation is the Cairo Declaration of Human Rights. CDHR has been mentioned as one of the documents which discussed human rights in a specific manner.

The CDHR tried to provide a new light to the idealization of human rights as a shared value, which can be agreed upon by humanity. Many points covered in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are also covered in the Cairo Declaration of Human Rights (Al-Ahsan, 2009). Some scholars even considered that CDHR is more comprehensive than UDHR, noting that CDHR touches on issues that are not covered on CDHR, such as the right of the deceased person. By introducing CDHR, the Organization is offering a new way of looking into human rights. Despite several criticisms that said CDHR is not universal and exclusivist in its character, it is essential to note that the existence of CDHR has painted the debate on human rights (Carle, 2005; Arzt, 1996; Bielefeldt, 2000). Also, the existence of CDHR is a remark that international society does not have to agree upon the interpretation of commonly agreed principles. The existence of CDHR proves that it is suitable for the opinion of pluralist school in the English school, which agreed that it is not a problem to disagree. Pluralists argue that the existence of CDHR and Organization of Islamic Cooperation is a prove that Organization working with specific moral values did not worsen the international society, but rather enrich the dialectics of international society (Senturk, 2005).

Nevertheless, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation was not without any criticism. One of the main criticism directed toward the Organization because of the dominance of Saudi Arabia in the Organization. Saudi Arabia dominates the workings of the Organization because of two main reasons. First, the headquarters and many strategic assets of the Organization is located in Saudi Arabia, which allows Saudi Arabia to exert its control over the daily operation and to work of the Organization. The exertion of this control supported could be seen from the funding, which was supported mainly by Saudi Arabia. These two reasons made Saudi Arabia have a considerable influence on the Organization, and this influence sometimes comes at a negative cost toward the Organization (Akbarzadeh & Ahmed, 2018). One of the examples that needed to be mentioned is that the Council of Fiqh at the Organization used to legitimize Saudi's action and even commemorate Saudi's prince as a *mujaddid* of the century (Ahmed, 2018).

Another criticism that is often directed to the Organization is that the Organization could not achieve the idea of Muslim unity. The Organization, according to some experts, is still focusing itself on building organizational infrastructure to support the daily activities but ignoring the real need of the Muslim community to unite. The organization has been blamed for some time because of its silence towards sectarian issues between Sunni and Shia, and did not give any special treatment or produce significant works that would eventually close the gap between Sunni and Shia. The economic inequality continuously appearing in the Muslim countries was one of the main problems left unsolved by the Organization. Besides these concerns, Gokhan Bacik

also noted that the lack of rigid membership requirements and lack of rule enforcement within the Organization also affected the functionality of the Organization (Bacik, 2011).

The D8: Rekindling the Economic Solidarity among Muslim Countries

Considering the Organization's inability to answer the urgent problems faced by the Ummah, a think tank institution in Turkey called ESAM (*Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Merkezi* – Economic and Social Research Center) convened a conference in Istanbul on 1996 discussing the future of economic cooperation. ESAM mentioned the absence of real peace, security and cooperation amongst the nations had caused prevailing injustice. This injustice has affected people from all over the globe, particularly from developing countries. The ESAM also noted that international organizations, particularly the United Nations, European Union and NATO, have not brought significant results towards the development of peace and cooperation. ESAM considers that instead of creating peace and cooperation, these organizations tried to hijack any effort to sustain the peace and cooperation amongst nations. Using the conception initially developed by Necmettin Erbakan (Prime Minister of Turkey, 1995-1997) called *Milli Görüş* (National Outlook) and *Adil Düzeni* (Justice Order), ESAM seek to develop a new organization that could advocate the rights of developing countries in attaining a better political and economic leverage in international politics (ESAM, n.d.).

The ESAM then accordingly cooperated with the Government of Turkey to create another meeting by inviting members of a group of developing countries, especially

countries which have significant Muslim populations. Finally, in 1997, Turkey as a founding member, together with countries such as Egypt, Malaysia, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Iran, Indonesia and Malaysia, agreed to create an organization called Developing 8 (D-8). Establishment of D-8 is the reflection of Erbakan's thought on *Milli Görüş* and *Adil Düzeni*. *Milli Görüş* is a political outlook that has been formed by Erbakan as a way to freed Turkey from Western influence, both in political and economic aspects. Erbakan saw that Turkey had been trapped by neo-imperialists' games using the hands of the European Union and the United Nations. Therefore, Erbakan thought that Turkey should not follow into the ways and methods that the European Union developed unless Turkey would fall into a severe crisis. Erbakan also thought that Turkey has its capability and capacity to develop an independent, democratic and just political and economic system. Turkey has had a very long experience developing such a system during the era of the Ottoman Empire.

Erbakan believed that in order to create a modern Turkey free of foreign influences, Turkey has to believe in its capacity and capability. Therefore, Erbakan suggested his policy proposals under the name of *Milli Görüş.* One of the main policy proposals that are being suggested in *Milli Görüş* is the creation of a self-sustaining state-owned industrial system. To catch up with the accelerating economic development in Western Countries, Erbakan believed that it is essential for developing countries like Turkey to develop its industrial system independent from any influences from foreign countries, especially Western countries. Erbakan put greater emphasis on creating factories producing machines and vehicles that could assist the development of other industries,

ranging from fisheries, agriculture, and textile industries (Erbakan, 1975).

According to Erbakan, these industries' success would not also bring economic benefits and advantages, but consequently also brought social welfare. Here *Milli Görüş* will bring society to *Adil Düzen*. However, in order to eventually reach *Adil Düzen*, Erbakan considered the importance of reintroducing long-abandoned morality. In this aspect, Erbakan would like to bring counter-argument to the process of secularization, which he thought has worsened the characteristics of Turkish people and brought the Turkish nation into endless calamity. To achieve a just system for everyone, Erbakan thought that the Turkish nation should not copy the Western ways of developing a modern society. *Adil Düzen* or Just Order would only be achieved by emphasizing morality based on Turkish and Islamic values. Considering the importance of both values, Erbakan then decided to introduce these values to fellow developing countries, especially countries with a significant Muslim population. Erbakan wished that the adoption of *Milli Görüş* and *Adil Düzen* could help Muslim countries to unite among themselves, and eventually create a stock market (Erbakan, 2019a; Erbakan, 2019b; Kösebalaban, 2011). After the establishment of D-8, D-8 set up several priorities to help accomplish the Organization's vision. D-8 put at least seven sectors to be the leading sector for strengthening cooperation amongst Muslim developing countries. These seven sectors are agriculture and food security, trade, transportation, industrial cooperation, energy and minerals, tourism and health sectors. Aside from these seven sectors, D-8 also gives a significant focus on the development of human capacity through the creation of D-8 International University, a series of

conferences and training, and also cooperation between national news agencies.

However, until now, D-8's effectiveness as an organization have been asked by many. D-8 has not been recognized as a prominent organization that has brought any significant achievements. Due to the lack of initiative driven by the founding country and its members to further the agenda of the Organization. Another thing that it is essential to be discussed is that there are no significant efforts taken actually to innovate organizational structure and programs within the D-8 itself. D-8 was motorized because of Erbakan's idea, but no efforts have also been made to rediscover and contextualize Erbakan's idea in contemporary international politics. The last aspect that might be one of the essential weaknesses of the D-8 is that D-8 members have differences in their foreign policy priorities. For example, Egypt and Turkey are now having significant differences over how the Middle East's future should be formed. The divergence and differences between member states could be one of the most significant obstacles that could inhibit D-8 to develop as an organization.

Looking at all these three main cases, we can see that throughout different phases of history, Muslim countries had tried to work its best to find a new way to create a new sense of unity among themselves. Muslim countries realized that the conception of the classical Caliphate is obsolete and could not be implemented within the modern context. Some efforts have been made, indeed, during the early years after the abolition of the Caliphate to reinstate the Office of the Caliphate. Eventually, the Muslim communities did not succeed in creating the Office of the Caliphate. Instead, the Office of the Caliphate is then left undiscussed. After

Second World War, as new consciousness over the importance of independence arose, Muslim countries started to build a new form of cooperation that did not resemble the Caliphate itself but instead empower the idea of unifying Muslim countries with a new kind of Organization.

Beginning with the creation of Asian-African Islamic Cooperation in 1965, Muslim countries realized that they should also create a stronger union and cooperation among themselves in this modern era. Here, the concept of the English school of international relations became more relevant than ever. The concept of the English school of international relations had said that the existence of cooperation within the anarchical international system is possible as long as there are countries that are willing to drive cooperation based on shared values and mechanisms. The effort that has been created since Asian-African Islamic Cooperation is precisely trying to build a kind of Organization that ties Muslim countries into a shared vision and works with a common mechanism. The Organization was successfully created in the case of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. There are some efforts done by member countries to create a common mechanism, such as by declaring the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights. CDHR is proof that Muslim communities would like to set itself as a distinct community, different from that of Western communities. Thus, according to the English school of international relations, Muslim communities would like to preserve their uniqueness and could be classified as representing the pluralist outlook.

Another thing that is important to remark here is that the creation of the organizational framework of Muslim countries seems to follow a pattern consistent with the framework of South-South cooperation. It is important to note that Muslim countries used similar concerns as those organizations which have been created by a member of the Global South. Concerns such as creating alternatives to Western hegemonic views, having the independent political and economic system, strengthening cooperation amongst developing nations, and reconstructing international order were shared by members of Global South and the members of the Muslim World. The only difference lies between Global South and Muslim World because the Muslim World has its principle grounded upon the Islamic principle and universal principle as has been agreed by the international community, albeit voicing concerns and criticism on existing universal values. Organizations founded by Muslim countries seek to actualize the Islamic values and Islamic unity in the modern era, while also strengthening their cooperation with existing international bodies.

CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that despite all the challenges that existed in the modern era, Muslim communities under the banner of their respective nation-state are trying to re-unite themselves in regional and global Organizations. Instead of trying to re-enforce the idea of Caliphate, which has been implemented by Ottoman Empire, these Muslim countries were trying to create several platforms in order to realize their goal to unite Muslim Ummah, to solidify the agenda of Muslim community, and to prepare Muslim countries against the contemporary challenges in many aspects, ranging from social, political and economic aspects. These platforms, namely the Asian-African Islamic Conference, Organization of Islamic

Conference and D-8 has its strength and weakness, but this Organization has tried to address the concern of Muslim communities.

It is also important to note that the creation of several organızatıons created by Muslim countries is in line to the spirit of South-South cooperation, which seeks to create an alternative world order vis-à-vis current world order dominated by the interest of Western and capitalistic hegemonic power and a more just and transparent international governance. The establishment of the Asian-African Islamic Conference and D-8, in particular, tried to serve those purpose strived by organizations and movements initiated within the framework of South-South cooperation. On another side, the creation of organizations by Muslim countries in the 20th century also compatible with the theories proposed by the English school of international relations. English school of international relations told that the cooperative tendency among countries in the anarchical international system could be promoted if two or more countries are willing to bind by rule and mechanism.

References

Affairs, P. (1965). No Afro-Asian Islamic Moot. *Pakistan Affairs*, *11*(1), 18–19.

Ahmed, N. (2018). How far will Saudi Arabia go to make sure that Bin Salman survives? Retrieved from MEMO. Retrieved from https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20181114-how-far-will-saudi-arabia-go-to-make-sure-that-bin-salman-survives/

Akbarzadeh, S., & Ahmed, Z. S. (2018). Impacts of Saudi Hegemony on the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, *31*(2),

297–311.

Al-Ahsan, A. (2009). Law, Religion and Human Dignity in the Muslim World Today: An Examination of OIC's Cairo Declaration of Human Rights. *Journal of Law and Religion*, *24*(2), 569–597.

Arzt, D. E. (1996). Religious Human Rights in Muslim States of the Middle East and North Africa. *Emory International Law Review*, *10*(1).

Ashoff, G. (2010). Triangular Cooperation: Opportunities, risks, and conditions for effectiveness. *Development Outreach*, *2010*, 22–24.

Bacik, G. (2011). The Genesis, History, and Functioning of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC): A Formal-Institutional Analysis. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, *31*(4), 594–614.

Bielefeldt, H. (2000). "Western" versus "Islamic" Human Rights Conceptions? A Critique of Cultural Essentialism in the Disucssion on Human Rights. *Political Theory*, *28*(1), 90–121.

Carle, R. (2005). Revealing and Concealing: Islamist Discourse on Human Rights. *Human Rights Review*, *6*(1), 122–137.

Castillo, V. L. (2014). The Organization of Islamic Cooperation in Contemporary International Society. *Revisita Electronica de Estudios Internacionales*, *27*(1), 1–21.

Chisaan, C. (2012). Heirs to World Culture: Being Indonesian 1950-1965. In & M. H. L. J. Lindsay (Ed.), *In Search of An Indonesian Islamic Cultural Identity: 1956-1965* (pp. 283–314). Leiden: KILTV Press.

Erbakan, N. (1975). *Milli Görüş*. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınlar.

Erbakan, N. (2019a). *Adil Ekonomik Düzen*. Ankara: MGV Yayinlari.

Erbakan, N. (2019b). *Yeni Bir Dünya ve Adil Düzen*. Ankara: MGV Yayinlari.

ESAM. (n.d.). D8 - ESAM Toplantilari. Retrieved from http://www.esam.org.tr/d8-esam-toplantiari_k61.html

Gray, K., & Gills, B. (2016). South-south cooperation and the rise of Global South. *Third World Quarterly*, *37*(4), 557–574.

Hassan, S.-U., Sarwar, R., & Muazzam, A. (2015). Tapping into intra- and international collaboration of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation states across science and technology disciplines. *Science and Public Policy*, *43*(5), 1–5.

Ibatullin, A. (2015). Perviye islamskiye konferentsiy stran azii i afriki: rol SSSR. *Vetsnik RUDN*, *15*(4), 182–191.

Kakonge, J. (2014). The Evolution of South-South Cooperation: A Personal Reflection. *Global Policy Essay*, *2014*, 1–7. Retrieved from https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/articles/development-inequality-and-poverty/evolution-south-south-cooperation-personal-reflection

Kayaoglu, T. (2015). *The Organization of Islamic Cooperation: Politics, problems, and potential.* New York: Routledge.

Kösebalaban, H. (2011). *Turkish Foreign Policy: Islam, Nationalism, and Globalization*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kurki, M., & Wight, C. (2013). No Title. In & S. S. I. R. Diversity, T. Dunne, M. Kurki (Ed.), *International Relations and Social Science.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Minault, G. (1982). *The Khilafat Movement: Religious Symbolism and Political Mobilization in India*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mohieldin, M., Iqbal, Z., Rostom, A., & Fu, X. (2011). *The Role of Islamic Finance in Enhancing Financial Inclusion in Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) Countries*. New York: The World Bank.

Mumazziq, R. (2017). Bung Karno, Islam dan Politik Internasional. Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://m.nukita.id/read/327/20170416/133715/bung-karno-islam-dan-politik-internasional/

Nieuwenhuijze, C. v. (1959). The Ummah: an analytical approach. *Studia Islamica*, *10*(1), 5–22.

Oded, A. (1987). The Promotion of Islamic Activities by Arabic Countries in Africa - Contemporary Trends. *Asian and African Studies*, *21*(3), 281–304.

Palabiyik, M. S. (2014). Uluslararasi Iliskiler teorileri. In *Ingiliz Okulu* (pp. 217–254). Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari.

Pankhurst, R. (2013). *The Inevitable Caliphate? A History of the Struggle for Global Islamic Union, 1924 to the Present.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Puri, H. S. (2010). Rise of the Global South and Its Impact on South-South Cooperation. *Development Outreach*, *12*(2), 7–10.

Robledo, C. (2015). New donors, same old practices? South-South Cooperation of Latin American emerging donors. *Bandung: Journal of the Global South*, *2*(3), 1–16.

Senturk, R. (2005). Sociology of Rights: "I am therefore I have rights": Human Rights in Islam between Universalistic and Communalistic Perspectives. *Muslim World Journal of Human Rights*, *2*(1), 1–33.

Singh, R. (2008). *The Military Factor in Pakistan*. New Delhi: Lancer Publisher.

Suryanegara, A. M. (2015). *No Title* (2nd ed.). Bandung: Surya Dinasti.

Vieira, M. A., & Alden, C. (2011). India, Brazil, and South Africa (IBSA): South-South Cooperation and the Paradox of Regional Leadership.

Global Governance, 17(4), 507–528.
Widhiyoga, G. (2017). *Understanding the Umma as an Islamic "Global" Society*.