

## **Europe, the Muslim Mediterranean and the End of the Era of Global**

### **Confrontation**

**Arno Tausch\***

1) Europe is the loser from the present confrontation and European hegemonic rivalry with the US will increase

This article starts from the assumption that both Europe and the Muslim world are facing the same tendency of a basic and underlying shift in global economic activity away from the West of the Euro/Asian/African landmass towards the countries of the Pacific, and that the United States Government's main interest today is in preserving and intensifying the US Government global hegemony after the end of the Cold War, and to maximize access to global wealth and energy resources in a world that looks more and more like the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The conditions of this political economy of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century were spelled out by the world system theory school of thought in the social sciences, pioneered by such scholars as Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Volker Borschier, Christopher K. Chase-Dunn, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein.

Chances to arrive at an alternative world order – one that is based on strengthened United Nations, on global cooperation, and global civilizational dialogue, were lost in the decade after the end of the Cold War. The positioning in the global power game, and nothing else, was the reason for this Iraq war, and forget all about the fight against “WMD” (weapons of mass destruction) and all the other “holy” principles.

America's long term agenda under Bush, the argument runs, is not just interested in establishing its vision in the Near East, but in the end is interested in blocking European peaceful ascent to global leadership – as envisioned by the European Union's Lisbon agenda until 2000 – at the same time. As it is well-known, at the Lisbon European Council (March 2000), the European Union set itself a new strategic goal for the next decade: to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. The rift between Europe and America – especially between France, Germany and Russia on the one hand and the US on the other hand, has a very basic political economic background – the growing hegemonic rivalry between the world's leading capitalist blocs, that characterize world capitalism since 1450. An EU comprising up to 40 nations of the third and fourth enlargement wave indeed would be a major change in the structure of the international system and could be driven by America's power play, but also by its own internal deficient dynamics, characterized by low innovation and high government spending, into such a position.

A large, wider Europe, driven into hegemonic rivalry by the present hyperpower play by the United States - is a somber scenario, it enjoys a high kind of probability, and it has dire world political consequences. It was shown in recent quantitative research that there is a recurrent and shortening cycle of conflict in the international system, linked to the long cycles of economics and politics. According to Arrighi, the usual, recurrent slumps in the long, fifty year economic (Kondratieff) cycles are called signal crises; while the interaction between the end of world hegemonies (1340, 1560, 1750 and 1930) and the regular Kondratieff slumps are called terminal crises or - Tsunami waves, because they have catastrophic and devastating effects on the world system and have a high probability of leading - in a shortening time period - to major power wars.

Those that hoped for world peace after the end of the Cold War will be bitterly disappointed. Warfare and not peace are, it seems, on the agenda. We non-Muslim Europeans should not lean back and wait and think, that this war in Iraq, as Goethe once observed Germans talking among themselves about political conflicts during their Easter walk, happens “*far back in Turkey*”.

Our empirical analyses of world systems dynamics first showed that the danger of such a more but not too distant Tsunami cataclysm after 2030 is real. First of all, the social consequences of the ongoing phase of globalization already have the character of a Tsunami wave in itself. This leads us to expect sharper and even deeper social effects, should a terminal crisis - like during the 1930s - hit the world economy again.

Let us now look at the most likely trajectory of Europe in that global context (for more on that, see also Tausch and associates, 1986 – 2003).

Non-Muslim Europeans and non-European Muslims, so to speak, sit in the same world economic boat. The joint dramatic decline of European growth rates and Arab/MENA country growth rates over time since the 1960s can be shown from the new “*Global Development Network Growth Database*” of the World Bank. Only the **Irish Republic** had **real accelerating economic growth**, while **12 of the 15 present European Union members were confronted with decreasing economic growth** from 1962 to 1998 (the acceleration of economic growth in Luxembourg is negligible, and there is no complete data series for Germany within the new borders after the fall of the Berlin Wall).

An imperial path for a United Europe, entering into major power conflict with the US over raw materials in Central and Western Asia would be the last thing that the world needs, although there are - from past experiences - lots of indicators that would warn us that the leading powers in the center could follow precisely this path. A look into history shows how dangerous imperial confrontation, as driven by the present “power-play” by the United States of America, is. 218 repressive regimes (141 state regimes and 77 quasi-state and group regimes) killed from 1900 to 1987 nearly 170 million of their own citizens and foreigners - about four times the number of people killed in domestic and international wars during that same period. Most of these deaths occurred during the ‘earthquake’ of the “Tsunami” wave of confrontation in world politics and economics that hit the globe from 1914 to 1945.

Very sharp and bitter confrontations might arise between America and Europe over access to the Caspian Sea and its bn 150 barrels oil reserves, and over foreign policy vis-à-vis the Balkans, and the Middle East, with Europe favoring a *rapprochement* with Serbia after its October 2000 transition, a *rapprochement* with the Palestinians and the Kurds, while America staunchly favoring their own privileged access to the oil fields in the Caspian sea and in Iraq. US relations with the new government in Ankara will most probably further deteriorate in the wake of the Iraq war, with the latest “war of words” on the issue of Turkish special forces arrested by the Americans only the “tip of the iceberg”.

<http://www.turkishdailynews.com/FrTDN/latest/for.htm#f1>

A European led counter-world political project, a transition to global governance and democracy might be based, Boswell and Chase - Dunn argue, on the high social standards, prevalent in the European Union as a possible future catalyst for other regions of the world to follow. In a similar vein, Bornschier (1999) argues that the European Single Market has the potential for a positive transformation of the world system.

But Western Europe lost in terms of world market shares in a secular trend *vis-à-vis* the countries of the Pacific; the dynamics of growth in the world economy seem to work to the detriment of the old European centers. Asia's 'basics' are healthier than expected, and the tide turns to the detriment of the Europeans, now that the initial positive effects of European Monetary Union fade away and transnational capital flows again to the Pacific region.

**Table 1: the EU in the capitalist world system. Relative share in %**

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| EU share in top world collective service companies     | 74,60        |
| EU share in world development aid                      | 56,40        |
| EU share in top world intermediary good companies      | 55,30        |
| EU share in top world insurance companies              | 55,00        |
| EU share in top world energy companies                 | 50,20        |
| EU share in OECD total unemployment                    | 47,70        |
| EU share in top world banking companies                | 45,90        |
| EU share in top world automobile industry              | 41,60        |
| EU share in top world chemical and pharma companies    | 40,00        |
| EU share in top world electrical equipment companies   | 38,30        |
| EU share in top world distribution companies           | 38,10        |
| <b>EU share in OECD total GDP</b>                      | <b>36,50</b> |
| EU share in top world food industries                  | 34,30        |
| <b>EU share in OECD population</b>                     | <b>34,30</b> |
| EU share in top world telecom companies                | 33,70        |
| EU share in OECD defense expenditure                   | 33,50        |
| EU share in top world electronical companies           | 25,70        |
| EU share in the turnover of the top 45 world companies | 21,10        |
| EU share in top world consumer good companies          | 17,10        |
| EU share in top world defense/aeronautic industries    | 16,80        |
| EU share in top world mass communication companies     | 10,10        |
| EU share in top world informatic companies             | 0,00         |

Legend: Our own calculations from Le Monde, *Bilan du Monde*, 2000

But latest « *Economist* » country data suggest that also the **imperial decline** of the United States **continues**:

**Table 2: The imperial decline of the United States of America**

|                                   | 1999   | 2000   | 2001   | 2002   |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| GDP per head (\$ at PPP)          | 33,250 | 34,860 | 35,450 | 36,410 |
| GDP (% real change pa)            | 4.11   | 3.75   | 0.25   | 2.45   |
| Government consumption (% of GDP) | 17.69  | 17.82  | 18.43  | 18.89  |
| Budget balance (% of GDP)         | 1.36   | 2.44   | 1.27   | -1.53  |
| Consumer prices (% change pa; av) | 2.19   | 3.37   | 2.83   | 1.58   |
| Public debt (% of GDP)            | 61.33  | 57.94  | 57.52  | 60.25  |

|                                  |       |       |       |       |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Labour costs per hour (USD)      | 19.11 | 19.72 | 20.32 | 20.87 |
| Recorded unemployment (%)        | 4.22  | 4.00  | 4.77  | 5.78  |
| Current-account balance/GDP      | -3.16 | -4.18 | -3.90 | -4.82 |
| Foreign-exchange reserves (bn\$) | 60    | 56    | 57    | 67    |

Legend: compiled from "Economist"

The hegemonic decline of the USA will most probably set in slowly, cushioned by the present weaknesses of Japan and of the European competitors. But this coming world political and world economic period will be a period of violent conflict and confrontations.

## 2) Globalization marginalizes the Muslim world

No question that the world economy is characterized at present, as happened in earlier periods, by a quantitative and qualitative jump in the degree of globalization (Arrighi and Silver, 1999; Boswell and Chase-Dunn, 2000; Cornia and Kiiski, 2001). Luttwak defines this present phase as 'turbo capitalism' by private enterprise, liberated from government regulation, unchecked by effective trade unions, unfettered by concerns for employees or communities, and unhindered by taxation or investment restrictions. **Globalization** is generally understood to be the **growing transborder flow of goods, services, capital and labor**. The following UNDP 2000 numbers might illustrate this:

World exports are more than 21% of world GNP

Foreign direct investments are above 400 thousand million \$

Daily currency exchanges are 1500 thousand million \$, i.e. the annual world currency trade is 18.6 times the yearly world GNP

International bank credits are above 4200 thousand million \$

There is a never-ending flow of literature on the interrelation between globalization and poverty, with a very wide array of research results. Nobody in his minds would negate that we are confronted with the phenomenon of globalization – just suffice to draw our attention here to the fact that foreign assets per world GDP fluctuated in the following fashion since 1870.

Summarizing the unique UNCTAD *World Investment Report* 2002 data base<sup>1</sup>, freely available on the Internet, one is lead to the following conclusions:

1) there was a tremendous increase in the process of globalization in the 1990s,

but

2) this process experienced a sharp decline in its growth rate already prior to the 09/11 attacks in New York, indicating a qualitative and quantitative reversal in the capitalist world economy, preceding the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Both inward and outward investments increased tremendously until the year 2000, and declined sharply in 2001. Also the value of cross-border mergers and acquisitions declined sharply in that year. September 11 cannot alone explain the dramatic implosion of world-wide FDIs, other – world economic – factors of a beginning Kondratieff downturn after the Reagan and Clinton boom must have been also at play.

At the same time, East Central Europe and the MENA region – a World Bank shorthand expression for large parts of the Muslim world between Morocco and Iran – were the only

world regions which saw an increase in the percentage of people affected by poverty between 1990 and 1999, and lost in value terms against the centers:

**Table 3: The social effects of globalization, 1990 – 1999**

| <u><i>absolute and relative values</i></u> | Millions of people < 1 \$ a day 1990 | % pop < 1 \$ a day 1990 | Millions of people < 1 \$ a day 1999 | % pop < 1 \$ a day 1999 |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| East Asia and Pacific                      | 486                                  | 30,5                    | 279                                  | 15,6                    |
| Eastern Europe and Central Asia            | 6                                    | 1,4                     | 24                                   | 5,1                     |
| South Asia                                 | 506                                  | 45                      | 488                                  | 36,6                    |
| Latin America and Carribean                | 48                                   | 11                      | 57                                   | 11,1                    |
| <b>Middle East and North Africa</b>        | 5                                    | 2,1                     | 6                                    | 2,2                     |
| Sub-Saharan Africa                         | 241                                  | 47,4                    | 315                                  | 49                      |
| Total                                      | 1292                                 | 29,6                    | 1169                                 | 23,2                    |
|  |                                      |                         |                                      |                         |
| <u><i>absolute and relative values</i></u> | Millions of people < 2 \$ a day 1990 | % pop < 2 \$ a day 1990 | Millions of people < 2 \$ a day 1999 | % pop < 2 \$ a day 1999 |
| East Asia and Pacific                      | 1114                                 | 69,7                    | 897                                  | 50,1                    |
| Eastern Europe and Central Asia            | 31                                   | 6,8                     | 97                                   | 20,3                    |
| South Asia                                 | 1010                                 | 89,8                    | 1128                                 | 84,8                    |
| Latin America and Carribean                | 121                                  | 27,6                    | 132                                  | 26                      |
| <b>Middle East and North Africa</b>        | 50                                   | 21                      | 68                                   | 23,3                    |
| Sub-Saharan Africa                         | 386                                  | 76                      | 480                                  | 74,7                    |
| Total                                      | 2712                                 | 62,1                    | 2802                                 | 55,6                    |
|  |                                      |                         |                                      |                         |
| <u><i>1990 = 100</i></u>                   | Millions of people < 1 \$ a day      | % pop < 1 \$ a day      | Millions of people < 2 \$ a day      | % pop < 2 \$ a day      |
| East Asia and Pacific                      | 57,4                                 | 51,1                    | 80,5                                 | 71,9                    |
| Eastern Europe and Central Asia            | 400                                  | 364,3                   | 312,9                                | 298,5                   |
| South Asia                                 | 96,4                                 | 81,3                    | 111,7                                | 94,4                    |
| Latin America and Carribean                | 118,8                                | 100,9                   | 109,1                                | 94,2                    |
| <b>Middle East and North Africa</b>        | 120                                  | 104,8                   | 136                                  | 111                     |
| Sub-Saharan Africa                         | 130,7                                | 103,4                   | 124,4                                | 98,3                    |
| Total                                      | 90,5                                 | 78,4                    | 103,3                                | 89,5                    |
|  |                                      |                         |                                      |                         |

| <b><i>changes since 1990</i></b>    | Millions of people < 1 \$ a day | % pop < 1 \$ a day | Millions of people < 2 \$ a day | % pop < 2 \$ a day |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| East Asia and Pacific               | -207                            | -14,9              | -217                            | -19,6              |
| Eastern Europe and Central Asia     | +18                             | +3,7               | +66                             | +13,5              |
| South Asia                          | -18                             | -8,4               | +118                            | -5                 |
| Latin America and Carribean         | +9                              | +0,1               | +11                             | -1,6               |
| <b>Middle East and North Africa</b> | +1                              | +0,1               | +18                             | +2,3               |
| Sub-Saharan Africa                  | +74                             | +1,6               | +94                             | -1,3               |
| Total                               | -123                            | -6,4               | 90                              | -6,5               |

Thus, the final balance of globalization since 1990 was the income impoverishment of Eastern Europe and the Muslim world in the Middle East and North Africa

**Table 4: Changes in the social structure of the world system, 1990 - 1999**

| changes since 1990                     | % pop < 2 \$ a day |
|--|--------------------|
| <b>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</b> | 13,5               |
| <b>Middle East and North Africa</b>    | 2,3                |
| Sub-Saharan Africa                     | -1,3               |
| Latin America and Carribean            | -1,6               |
| South Asia                             | -5                 |
| East Asia and Pacific                  | -19,6              |
| Total                                  | -6,5               |

Source: our own calculations from ILO sources, 2003 (Report of the Director-General: “*Working out of Poverty*”. International Labour Conference 91<sup>st</sup> Session 2003, ILO, Geneva)

**World system analyses** – that started with the writings of the Austro-Hungarian socialist Karl Polanyi after the First World War - tended to confirm and expand the argument, that capitalism in the world periphery, like in the center (i.e. the US, Western Europe, Japan ...), is characterized by strong cyclical fluctuations, and there are centers, semi-peripheries and peripheries. The rise of one group of semi-peripheries tends to be at the cost of another group, but the unequal structure of the world economy based on unequal exchange tends to remain stable.

What is happening today is that two world regions – the former world of Communism, and the Arab/Muslim world dramatically lost in value terms.

Wallerstein tended to discard the “culturalist” explanations, offered by Huntington, and rather would support the argument that world economic position, and not culture, determines conflict.

*Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations Vol.3, No.4, Winter 2004*

**Wallerstein** comes clearly up in defense **against demonizing the Arab/Muslim world** and thinks that opposing forces against the present world order will increase:

*This brings me to my very last theme. Can the West do without a demon? I doubt it at the moment. The West is facing a massive crisis - not merely economic, but fundamentally political and social. The capitalist world-economy is in crisis as an historical social system. I cannot review here the crisis in detail, something I have done elsewhere on several occasions, but I raise these issues to insist that the consequence is a great deal of confusion and self-doubt in the West, a situation which always evokes the need for demons. This same confusion and self-doubt pervades the Islamic world, as is evident from the zigzagging tactics of all the main actors. The secularist forces are in disarray. The Islamist forces are not very clear, and not at all agreed among themselves, what their real political program is or ought to be. Once again, we should put this in the context of the world-system as a whole, and not limit our attention to the Islamic world. Systems that are in crisis enter into a chaotic period, out of which eventually emerges a new order. Their trajectories bifurcate, and it is intrinsically impossible to predict the branch that will prevail. In practice this means two things. Even small pressures in one direction or another may be decisive, since the system is far from equilibrium. And the social struggle is therefore extremely acute. The question that arises therefore is how the sides in the struggle for shaping the successor social system will align themselves. When the struggles were less acute, the lines seemed to be sharp. That is why we can speak of antisystemic movements within the modern world-system. These movements thought they knew what they were about and who their primary enemy was. So did the forces that defended the existing system. What the last twenty-five years has taught us all - I think of it as the lesson of the world revolution of 1968 - was that our vision of the struggle was deeply flawed that opponents were not real opponents, and allies not real allies, whichever side one was on. In this sense, the Islamists are profoundly correct in saying that we have to recalibrate our understanding of what are the issues that divide the existing historical system and what are the alternative historical possibilities of a possible reconstructed world-system. Their critique is on the mark, but what of their solution? As I have said, I do not believe they are sure of what solution they really intend. Those of us who do not share some or most of their premises and are heirs of a more secularist tradition find it difficult to accept most of what they offer as first steps to a better future. What I do feel is that there is a need for a genuine dialogue, or multilogue, about the essential limitations of our existing world-system, and the parameters of our historical alternatives. Personally, I think the basic conflict is that between those who seek to establish/reestablish a hierarchical world order in which some are privileged and most others not and those who wish to construct a maximally democratic and egalitarian order. I think that each requires different kinds of value-systems to undergird it, and that the historic world religions may have much to teach us about what is crucial in such value-systems. The real problem is that among the secularist and the fundamentalist camps in all parts of the world, there are persons on both sides of what I anticipate will be the great politico-social struggle of the coming fifty years. I think myself that posing the issue as one of secularism versus fundamentalism is distracting us in a very major way from clarity of vision. And clarity, not demons, is what we need most at the present time. (Wallerstein, 1997: <http://fbc.binghamton.edu/iwislam.htm>)*

The present wave of global politics and economics negatively affects the social balances in many countries. Several European countries, but also in Japan and even in the US, inequality and globalization are on the increase since 1980, as the present author could show in his recent works. Malaysia is practically the only major Muslim country with a falling rate of inequality since 1980:

**Model (1) Strong tendency towards globalization (>0.5), tendency towards slow growth (<0.0), tendency towards rising inequality (>0.0) – the worst of all worlds under globalization. The rallying-point of the anti-globalization movements**

Ecuador  
Gambia, The  
Latvia  
Romania  
Ukraine  
Moldova  
Bulgaria  
Pakistan  
Turkey  
South Africa  
Zambia  
Brazil  
Jamaica  
Russian Federation  
Zimbabwe  
Mongolia

**Model (2) Strong tendency towards globalization (>0.5), but tendency towards higher growth (<0.0), and tendency towards rising inequality (>0.0) – model: globalization with growth – at an inequality price. Countries that could tend towards stronger protest movements**

China  
Slovak Republic  
Nigeria  
Czech Republic  
Bangladesh  
Hungary  
Panama  
Mexico  
Venezuela, RB  
Philippines  
Mozambique  
Netherlands  
Azerbaijan  
Ireland  
Portugal  
Poland  
Malawi  
Honduras  
United Kingdom  
Ethiopia  
Denmark  
Tanzania  
Sweden  
Canada



Cote d'Ivoire  
Israel  
Austria  
Trinidad and Tobago  
United States  
Bolivia  
Peru  
Lesotho  
Argentina  
Madagascar  
Finland  
Albania  
Norway  
Chile  
Armenia

**Model (3) Strong tendency towards globalization (>0.5), tendency towards higher growth (<0.0), and tendency towards falling inequality (<0.0) – model: redistribution with growth under globalization. Countries, whose experience contradicts the anti-globalization movements and theories**

Germany  
Belgium  
Nepal  
Costa Rica  
Uganda  
Dominican Republic  
India  
Croatia  
France  
Nicaragua

**Model (4) Stronger tendency towards globalization (>0.5), tendency towards slower growth (<0.0), and tendency towards falling inequality (<0.0)**

Korea, Rep.  
Lithuania  
Kyrgyz Republic  
Thailand  
Tonga

**Model (5) tendency towards weaker globalization (> 0.5), tendency towards slower growth (<0.0), tendency towards rising inequality – the worst of all worlds for neo-liberal growth theory (failed anti-globalization)**

Bahamas, The  
Egypt, Arab Rep.

Cameroon  
Congo, Dem. Rep.  
Japan  
Burundi  
Colombia  
Algeria  
Italy  
Morocco

**Model (6) tendency towards weaker globalization (< 0.5), tendency towards higher growth (<0.0), but tendency towards rising inequality (>0.0) – model: “successful anti-globalization” – at an inequality price**

Spain  
Australia  
Portugal  
Gabon  
Uruguay  
Central African Republic  
Papua New Guinea  
New Zealand  
Slovenia  
Tunisia  
Greece  
Malta  
El Salvador  
Kuwait  
Barbados  
Guatemala  
Senegal  
Seychelles  
Iran, Islamic Rep.  
Macedonia, FYR  
Ghana  
Rwanda  
Syrian Arab Republic  
Yemen, Rep.  
Fiji

**Model (7) tendency towards weaker globalization (<0.5), tendency towards higher growth (<0.0), and tendency towards falling inequality (<0.0) – model: “successful anti-globalization” – at no inequality price**

Mauritius  
Iceland  
Sri Lanka  
Togo  
Liberia

**Model (8) tendency towards weaker globalization (<0.5), tendency towards slow growth (<0.0), and tendency towards falling inequality (<0.0) – model:**

Singapore  
Indonesia  
Kenya  
Cyprus  
Jordan  
Haiti  
Swaziland  
Malaysia

It is no wonder therefore that one of the leading Muslim economists in the world today, Professor Syed Mansoob Murshed, presently the *Prins Claus* Chair Holder in Development and Equity at the Utrecht School of Economics (USE) in the Netherlands, has this to say on the issue of “*Islam and globalization*” (in Tausch/Herrmann, 2004):

*Globalisation has always produced winners and losers, and both historical episodes of globalisation produced a backlash, involving both intellectual opposition as well as direct action. The intellectual critics of globalization came from the radical-left, then and now. The alternative ideology a century ago was socialism, something no longer viable, as it is widely regarded as a system that has been tried and failed. Islam is the only truly self-contained ideological opposition to the forces of globalisation and hegemonistic Anglo-American capitalism. This is not to say that the leadership in Muslim states (except Iran) resist the economic and political forces of globalisation. Ideological Islam, nevertheless, has replaced socialism in its role as the principal challenger of the capitalist/globalist dogma. Other movements, environmentalism for example, oppose globalisation on single issues. At another level, other religions, Hinduism, Buddhism and Confucianism have better adapted themselves to globalisation and capitalism.*

*This is not the first time in history that a religion has challenged hegemonic power. As pointed in Milanovic, early Christianity played an important role in opposing Roman imperialism. The Roman Empire was, however, not global, as other parts of the civilised world, China, India and the Parthian/Sassanian realms were outside its sphere of influence.*

Development instability in the Muslim world

Ideally, nations should reach their highest real per capita income today, starting from a lower level of real per capita income earlier on in their history. The idea of a development reversal, i. e. progressive impoverishment in the course of history, contradicts everything that market economy optimism stands for. Yet it can be shown with UNDP data (2000) that the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, i. e. the period between 1975 and 1998, was a period of dramatic development discontinuities. Our – empirical – concept of development stability is simply calculated by talking the UNDP figure for the year, when a nation reached its highest real per capita income since 1975, and subtracting that from the year, when the nation had its lowest real per capita income since 1975. Saudi Arabia, from 1975 to 1998, lost 18 out of possible 23 valuable years of development; while most capitalist western democracies lost no year in that period. About a third of the world’s entire land surface suffered from such dramatic development turn-arounds since 1975.

Faced with the specter of such development reversals and even progressive impoverishment in value terms, brought about in the final analysis by the workings of the capitalist world economy that continuously redistributes the fruits of labor on a global scale to the benefit of the centers (unequal exchange, see below), it is no wonder that in the Muslim world, which is heavily, but not exclusively affected by this phenomenon, critical theories of development fall on a fertile ground.

The Arab scholar Samir Amin – who was born in Egypt (1931) – can be termed as the most influential Marxist thinker in the region. He is skeptical of capitalist development in the Muslim world and a critic of development instabilities. Amin – who to this day frequently writes not only for Western academic and public media, but also for such journals as *Al Ahrām Weekly* and Arab publishing houses, combines elements of various social theories. He himself recalls in his intellectual itinerary, published in 1994 that the transition from mercantilist capitalism to the era of the Industrial Revolution, the widening wage gap and the fall in the terms of trade of the periphery since around 1880 serve as starting points for his political economy. He shares many theoretical assumptions of fellow Marxist political economists but, on other points, his theory of global capitalist development, which he frequently also applied and tested in numerous Arabic country case studies, is indeed very different from the mainstream of contemporary neo-Marxist political economy.

For one, he shares with some neo-liberals like John Laughland the belief that the abolition of the gold standard by the United Kingdom in 1914 formed the true beginning of the period of inflation and facilitated the new forms of competition between capitalist monopolies. Economic cycles are the periodic expression of the imbalance between consumption and production. Apart from the development and critique of such economic theories as Harrods, Hicks and Kondratieff, Amin also focuses quite extensively on the equilibrium in the balance of payments. Amin offers – in development of his theory of the effects of the abolition of the gold standard – a concept of a dominant exchange rate ensuring a distribution of returns consistent with the structural adjustment of the weakest nations to the worldwide expansion of capitalism. This ‘structural adjustment of the weakest to the strongest’ opens up the debate on a theory of unequal power relationships in world capitalism and a critique of contemporary theories of equilibrium exchange rates.

Apart from this debate of exchange rates and what Amin terms the problem of ‘banking integration’ of the periphery, the author deals extensively with the role of the peripheries in global capitalist crises. The peripheries play a significant role in the worldwide expansion of capital. They allow the recovery of exports from the centers by speeding the break-up of the non-capitalist or pre-capitalist environments. There are various phases in the globalization process, ranging from the classic models of raw material exporting economies to the semi-industrialization of the periphery, and the re-incorporation of the countries of Eastern Europe. There is a persistent tendency at the periphery for a deficit in the external balance of payments. Pressure on the external balance of payments always follows the continual progression of absolute advantage benefiting the centers; the limited range of products available in the periphery; the pressure for repatriation of profits; and the social impact of the worldwide polarization in urbanization, inequalities of income distribution, increase in administrative costs, and so on. Amin mentions in this context what he calls the transfer of the multiplier effect of investment from the peripheries to the centers of the system, produced by the strong marginal propensity of the peripheries to import, and export the profits of foreign capital. The underdeveloped economy is not a backward economy, but a limb of the dominant economy. Such limbs you find – as Nafeez Mossadeq Ahmed shows so impressively in his recent books – throughout the region.

Several other aspects of his theory can only be sketched in a rudimentary way: the observation that in 9 out of 10 cases, devaluation leads to price increases that cancel it out; the necessity of what Amin terms the distinction between the balance on real account and the balance of bank capital movements. The structural deficits in the periphery are accompanied by the monetarization of sectors of the subsistence economy, the ruination of craftsmanship, the flows of foreign investment into the mining and export cash crop sectors; peripheral growth, under such conditions, Amin says, leads to *'miraculous hopes suddenly dashed'*. The overall dynamic of accumulation of the periphery is governed by exports, whereas in the centers production of the means of production is linked to the production of goods for local consumption. In addition, there is according to the theory a strong causal link between this export orientation and the increasing inequality of income distribution in the periphery. Impoverishment of the peasants, enhancement of the position of the landowners, preference for investment in light industries, markedly low wages in relation to productivity, disarticulation of the economy and the juxtaposition of 'miracles' with large areas of social devastation are the final consequence of this structure.

In the final analysis, which leads Amin also to state that the bourgeoisie in the periphery is a 'comprador class', the polarization between the centers and the peripheries is the most important feature of the capitalist world economy. Rewards for labor are lower in the periphery than in the center for equal productivity. Secondly, capitalist self-reliance means the interlinkage between the production of capital goods and consumer goods; while in the peripheral social formation, the basic linkage is between exports and luxury consumption at home.

For Samir Amin (1997), ascent and decline in the one and single capitalist world economy is largely being determined in our age by the following 'five monopolies'

- 1) the monopoly of technology, supported by military expenditures of the dominant nations
- 2) the monopoly of control over global finances and a strong position in the hierarchy of current account balances
- 3) the monopoly of access to natural resources
- 4) the monopoly over international communication and the media
- 5) the monopoly of the military means of mass destruction

Let also recall that for Amin (1975), there are four main characteristics of the peripheral societal formation

- a) the predominance of agrarian capitalism in the 'national' sector
- b) the formation of a local bourgeoisie, which is dependent from foreign capital, especially in the trading sector
- c) the tendency of bureaucratization
- d) specific and incomplete forms of proletarianization of the labor force

In partial accordance with liberal thought, (i) and (iii) explain the tendency towards low savings; thus there will be

- 1) huge state sector deficits and, in addition, their 'twin'
- 2) chronic current account balance deficits

in the peripheral countries. High imports of the periphery, and hence, in the long run, capital imports, are the consequence of the already existing structural deformations of the role of peripheries in the world system, namely by

- a) rapid urbanization, combined with an insufficient local production of food

- b) excessive expenditures of the local bureaucracies
- c) changes in income distribution to the benefit of the local elites (demonstration effects)
- d) insufficient growth of and structural imbalances in the industrial sector
- e) and the following reliance on foreign assistance

As I already hinted at above, the history of periphery capitalism, Amin argues, is full of short-term ‘miracles’ and long-term blocks, stagnation and even regression. Dependency has, according to Amin, a commercial, financial and technological aspect. ‘Rent seeking’ - originally a neo-liberal concept, interpreted from the viewpoint of dependency theory, has its basis in big landholding, which throughout the periphery was introduced in the Orient and elsewhere, supported and upheld by colonial and post-colonial structures. Profitable investments in many periphery countries are - in part - constrained by the (emerging) unequal income distribution, which again determines that the local ‘surplus’ is being squandered by luxurious consumption, transferred abroad in the form of capital flight, or being used for speculation. Past and present foreign domination and colonialism cause long-term structural imbalances. Countries as far apart as large parts of Africa and Asia were no national state during the important era of the Industrial Revolution. Their economies were geared to the needs of others, i. e. their colonizers. The structural heterogeneity between the different economic sectors on the one hand and the ‘modern’, export oriented sector, the medium sector and the ‘traditional sector’ in agriculture, industry and services became the main reason for the unequal income distribution in the countries of the periphery. Colonial trade, foreign investment in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, import substitution in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, and the new international division of labor that we observe from the middle of the 1960s onwards did not really change the structures of inequality in the world system. While mass demand and agricultural structures (Elsenhans, 1983, a disciple of Amin) were responsible for the transition from the tributary mode of production in Western Europe to capitalism from the Long 16<sup>th</sup> Century onwards, periphery capitalism was and is characterized by the following main tendencies (Amin, 1973 - 1997):

- 1) regression in both agriculture and small scale industry characterizes the period after the onslaught of foreign domination and colonialism
- 2) unequal international specialization of the periphery leads to the concentration of activities in export oriented agriculture and or mining. Some industrialization of the periphery is possible under the condition of low wages, which, together with rising productivity, determine that unequal exchange sets in (double factorial terms of trade < 1. 0; see Raffer, 1987)
- 3) these structures determine in the long run a rapidly growing tertiary sector with hidden unemployment and the rising importance of rent in the overall social and economic system
- 4) the development blocks of peripheral capitalism (chronic current account balance deficits, re-exported profits of foreign investments, deficient business cycles of the periphery that provide important markets for the centers during world economic upswings)
- 5) structural imbalances in the political and social relationships, inter alia a strong ‘compradore’ element and the rising importance of state capitalism and an indebted state class.

Mass migration is for Amin (1997) part and parcel of the process of transnational capitalism. Migration is even part of the five pillars of international inequality (Amin, 1997):

- a) unequal exchange: the gaps in wages are much greater than the gaps in productivities
- b) capital flight from the peripheries to the centers
- c) selective migration from the peripheries into the centers
- d) the monopoly position of the centers in the international division of labor
- e) the control of the centers over the earth’s natural resources

The critique of the political economy in Arab countries, which Amin offers, is radical and sounds – at least to a European observer – often harsh. His earlier prognosis that ‘*Arab Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations Vol.3, No.4, Winter 2004*

*socialism*’ will one day lead – just as in the former Soviet Union – towards a general opening towards capitalism, has come true; his predictions about the results of this opening sound very pessimistic. Amin, who is not only a theoretician of political economy, but also a development planner, an academic teacher and a political activist, combines in his more recent writings a rather *Gaullist* analysis of an alternative European project that is a critical force against the driving mechanisms of globalization and a Europe that serves as a model in terms of food-self-sufficiency and as a model of relative ‘delinking’ from the forces of global capitalism to the third world.

The *University of Texas Inequality Project (UTIP)* for inequality in over 70 countries of the world since 1963 shows indeed that the 1990s brought along a huge increase in inequality on a global scale, as measured by the Theil Index of Inequality of Sectoral Incomes.<sup>2</sup> This increase especially affected the Muslim world and the MENA region; inequalities in Israel also increased sharply (Source: our own compilation from University of Texas Inequality Project, University of Texas at Austin, <http://utip.gov.utexas.edu/>. For further notes on the **Theil measure** of inequality:

<http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/inequal/methods/measure.htm>

<http://www.economics.uni-linz.ac.at/Paper/papers/9614.htm>)

Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed’s recent well-documented analysis of the geo-strategic “Bush-Sharon”-plan for the Middle East finds its equivalent in the available data about income polarization in the State of Israel – the rising costs for the Israeli population of the current state of affairs in terms of foregone social justice in a country that during the heyday of the Israeli Labor movement was once regarded as an oasis of social security and progressive social policies in the entire Mediterranean. The data series on the so-called “GINI”-coefficient of household income inequality, that ranges from 0 to 100, compiled by Professor James K. Galbraith from the University of Texas Inequality Project, shows this. It is the poor throughout the region that have to bear the burden of the imperial strategic designs.

#### Muslim nations do not need foreign occupations

In a forthcoming essay printed by Pluto Press in London and also to be found in Herrmann and Tausch, 2004, Johan Galtung provides lists of US-interventions in the world, based on Grossman and Blum, who in turn base their evidence, among alia on Congressional Records and the Library of Congress Congressional Research Service. The list is impressive indeed:

1) 134 small and big, global and domestic, US-interventions in the 111 years from 1890-2001, with an average of 1.15 interventions per year before the end of the Second World War, and an average of 1.29 after that. In the period after the end of the Cold War, there are 22 interventions, i.e. an average of 2.0 per year.

2) 67 global Interventions from 1945; in chronological order:

China 45-51, France 47, Marshall Islands 46-58, Italy 47-70s, Greece 47-49, Philippines 45-53, Korea 45-53, Albania 49-53, Eastern Europe 48-56, Germany 50s, Iran 53, Guatemala 53-90s, Costa Rica 50s, 70-71, Middle East 56-58, Indonesia 57-58, Haiti 59, Western Europe 50s-60s, British Guyana 53-64, Iraq 58-63, Soviet Union 40s-60s, Vietnam 45-73, Cambodia 55-73, Laos 57-73, Thailand 65-73, Ecuador 60-63, Congo-Zaire 77-78, France-Algeria 60s, Brazil 61-63, Peru 65, Dominican Republic 63-65, Cuba 59-, Indonesia 65, Ghana 66, Uruguay 69-72, Chile 64-73, Greece 67-74, South Africa 60s-80s, Bolivia 64-75, Australia 72-75, Iraq 72-75, Portugal 74-76, East Timor 75-99, Angola 75-80s, Jamaica 76, Honduras 80s, Nicaragua 78-90s, Philippines 70s, Seychelles 79-81, South Yemen 79-84, South Korea 80, Chad 81-82, *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations Vol.3, No.4, Winter 2004* 15

Grenada 79-83, Suriname 82-84, Libya 81-89, Fiji 87, Panama 89, Afghanistan 79-92, El Salvador 80-92, Haiti 87-94, Bulgaria 90-91, Albania 91-92, Somalia 93, Iraq 90s, Peru 90s, Mexico 90s, Colombia 90s, Yugoslavia 95-99.

3) bombings in 25 cases:

China 45-46, Korea/China 50-53, Guatemala 54, Indonesia 58, Cuba 60-61, Guatemala 60, Vietnam 61-73, Congo 64, Peru 65, Laos 64-73, Cambodia 69-70, Guatemala 67-69, Grenada 83, Lebanon-Syria 83-84, Libya 86, El Salvador 80s, Nicaragua 80s, Iran 87, Panama 89, Iraq 91-, Kuwait 91, Somalia 93, Sudan 98, Afghanistan 98, Yugoslavia 99.

4) assassinations, attempted or successful, of leaders including heads of state, were tried in 35 cases, and assistance in torture was given in 11 countries

5) actions against leaders who once worked with the USA because they had an enemy in common: Pol Pot, Manuel Noriega, Saddam Hussein, Mohammed Aidid and Osama bin Laden.

6) 23 countries where the US was "perverting elections", and interfering with a democratic process:

Italy 48-70s, Lebanon 50s, Indonesia 55, Vietnam 55, Guyana 53-64, Japan 58-70s, Nepal 59, Laos 60, Brazil 62, Dominican Republic 62, Guatemala 63, Bolivia 66, Chile 64-70, Portugal 74-5, Australia 74-5, Jamaica 76, Panama 84, 89, Nicaragua 84,90, Haiti 87-88, Bulgaria 91-92, Russia 96, Mongolia 96, Bosnia 98.

This trail of US-interventions in the world can also be interpreted as an attempt to do away with peripheral and semi-peripheral socialism. The socialist and Kemalist legacy from the days of Bandung, in combination with contemporary cautious liberalization strategies and the nature of Muslim civil society, in which income redistribution for religious purposes indeed takes place, make social development more viable than one would imagine under such adverse external conditions. In the Islamic tradition, social security always has an important place. According to the electronic website *'The Light of Islam'* we find the following description by Shaykh Shawkat Husayn:

*The first instance of social security laws in Europe can be seen in the scheme of compulsory State insurance, which was introduced by Bismarck in Germany in 1883. Germany was followed by Austria and some other countries. By the beginning of this century most of the European countries initiated promulgation of laws in this direction. In America, except the Workman's Compensation Act passed in 1908, no significant legislation was enacted until 1935 when the Social Security Act was passed by Congress.*

*Contrary to the European tradition, in Islam, right from the beginning, fulfillment of the basic needs of the subjects was conceived to be the concern of the State. Zakat is the first institution of social security in Islam. Payment of 2 ½ percent of his/her savings of the zakat fund is one of the fundamental duties of a Muslim. The State is responsible to collect zakat and make arrangements for its distribution. Non-payment of it is tantamount to waging war against the State. The Caliph Abu Bakr subjugated by force all those who refused to pay it.*

*Non-Muslims are also included in one of the categories of the recipients of zakat. While prescribing laws for the distribution of zakat, the Quran includes them among those 'whose hearts are to be conciliated'.*



*Some present day scholars also hold the view that poor and destitute among non-Muslims can be helped out of the zakat funds. It is reported that 'Umar interpreted the word masakin in the verse "Alms are for the poor and the needy (masakin) and those employed to administer the funds. . . ." as non-Muslims. Besides zakat, the Quran provides for collection of sadaqat<sup>3</sup>. Although sadaqah is not an obligatory duty like zakat, the Quran has given great Importance for it. Emphasizing the payment of sadaqah, the Quran goes to the extent of declaring; "You will never attain piety until you spend of what you love. "*

*The difference between zakat and sadaqah is that while the former is to be paid at a fixed rate, no such rate has been prescribed for the latter (...) Collection and distribution of sadaqah along with zakat are among the fundamental duties of the government.*

*If the funds raised out of zakat and sadaqah are insufficient to meet the needs of the poor, the State can impose other taxes to realize funds for this purpose. While prescribing the rules of zakat and sadaqah, the Quran emphasizes that the needs of those who are economically hard-pressed and unwilling to ask for help out of self-respect should be given priority. Thus it is clear that these funds are to be spent primarily to relieve people from immediate hardships without creating a class of social parasites. Besides Quranic institutions of zakat and sadaqah, there are several Prophetic traditions which hold the State responsible for the fulfillment of the basic needs of all its subjects. The Prophet (S) is reported to have said : "I am the guardian of a person who has no guardian". Another hadith declares: "The State is the guardian of a person who has no guardian". <http://home.swipnet.se/islam/articles/Non-Muslim.htm>*

There is no justification to scornfully look at the Muslim world. In the end, it is this basic welfare net that gave the countries of the region certain **social pro-poor** structures in times of **economic** relative or absolute **impoverishment**. Both sides along what still might look like a cultural dividing line should begin to learn again from the very positive co-existence that existed in Spain before the Reconquista<sup>4</sup> 1492. The peaceful coexistence and economic convergence between Europe and Islam could even become the basis of future European well-being in world society. Zakat and Sadaqah would serve well the poor in Latin America, Southern Africa and Eastern Europe, and proposals for a "Tobin tax" even could be interpreted as a kind of contemporary, global "zakat". Human development (still the best yardstick of social development, world-wide) increases in the Muslim countries were among the most rapid in the entire world.

Even allowing for the fact that human development increases over time are in mathematical-statistical terms a fourth-order polynomial function of already achieved human development levels, it emerges that the efficiency of human development policy in the region (residuals from this 4<sup>th</sup> order polynomial function) was among the best in the world. Thus, in the long run, the European Union would only have to gain from a more bold and forward-looking policy of applying the Copenhagen criteria to the Arab *mezzogiorno* of Europe. The map of the best performers on a world scale is clear – most of the Arab nations already today show a great dynamism in their human development, irrespective of levels achieved in 1995.

It has been shown in this article already that Europe in the long run could gain a lot from looking more positively even at very long-term prospects of EU-membership of the Southern Mediterranean neighbors, or at least extending the European Economic Area (EEA) under the provision of the implementation of the European Union's internal market provisions ("*Acquis Communautaire*") in the countries concerned. "Muslim" or "Islamic" "development efficiency" in quantitative terms suggests a more positive approach than has been hitherto suggested in the literature.

### The Muslim nations – victims of unequal exchange

The calculations of unequal exchange, that Gernot Kohler and I presented, are based on trade data from U.N. trade statistics and on purchasing power parity data from the World Bank (and Penn World Tables). The underlying theory and method are explained in our book (2001).

Losses or gains from unequal exchange are calculated as the difference between a "fair value" of exports/imports and the "actual (unfair) value" of exports/imports. The estimation is based on

- a) the exchange rate deviation index (also designated as "ERD" or "ERDI" in the literature)
- b) the volume of exports from a low- or middle-income country to high-income countries (valued at the actual exchange rate)

Professor Amin published an estimate of the magnitude of unequal exchange between developing and advanced countries for the year 1966. According to Amin the global total of unequal exchange in 1966 was US \$ 22 billion (22 thousand million) at exchange rates of 1966 (Amin 1976: 144). Kohler's estimate for 1965 is US \$ 19 billion. Amin's and these new estimates are thus very similar even though they are based on two different methods of estimation. In the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s this phenomenon practically exploded:

**Table 5: Historical Trend of Unequal Exchange 1865 - 1995**

|      | Unequal Exchange<br>as a |                    |                 |
|------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
|      | % of World GDP           | % of Periphery GDP | % of Center GDP |
| 1865 | 0%                       | 0 %                | 0%              |
| 1965 | 0.9%                     | -1.8%              | +1.4%           |
| 1995 | 6.6%                     | -24%               | +8 %            |

Kohler and I started from the assumption of the reality of the process of unfettered globalization as the basic characterizing feature of the world economy at the end of the millennium, and showed the statistical influences of unequal exchange on various development indicators in multivariate models. 'Emerging markets' under such circumstances become an almost Orwellian misnomer; instead, we should speak of 'submerging markets', allowing for the fact, that more than five hundred million people in such 'emerging markets' around the globe suffer today from the severest recession since the Great Depression in the 1930s. We also dealt with an issue, that was touched upon by Jeffrey Kentor from Johns Hopkins University in a publication (1998) and that also features prominently in the books, written by Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed: the very long-run effects of political foreign domination on the "host" countries in the periphery and semi-periphery.

Transnational capital penetration and unequal exchange have at best only a mixed results for the host countries concerned during the development marathon 1960 - 2000, with inequalities and social imbalances rising in the long run. The successive crises - or let's term them abysses - that shattered entire continents since the mid 1970s, spreading the burden of misery from Latin America to Africa, Asia and Russia, brought home to the world and to millions and millions of human beings that their livelihoods are determined by the ups and downs of the world market and the forces of the international economy.

Unequal exchange is THE determining mechanism of the world economy. The amount of unequal exchange (global exploitation, transfer value) can be calculated according to the new formula presented in our book (2001), namely:

$$T = d * X - X$$

where "T" means transfer value (gain or loss of value as a result of unequal exchange); "X" means exports of a low-income country to the high-income countries in the world economy; and "d" means exchange rate deviation, also called ERDI (exchange rate deviation index). The structures of political domination, shown by Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, coincide with the economic ones.

According to Gernot Kohler's estimates, the annual losses suffered by the major Muslim countries in the world system due to the workings of unequal exchange are enormous. The centers reap ever larger benefits from the exploitation of the periphery:

**Table 6: Unequal exchange in the world system – Muslim states compared to the centers of world capitalism**

| Country                 | UNEQUAL EXCHANGE |          |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------|
|                         | gain (+)         | loss (-) |
|                         | 1965             | 1995     |
|                         | % of GDP         |          |
| Algeria                 | .                | -47%     |
| Bahrain                 | .                | -11%     |
| Bangladesh              | .                | -33%     |
| Egypt                   | -1%              | -21%     |
| Indonesia               | -8%              | -52%     |
| Iran                    | -19%             | .        |
| Iraq                    | -41%             | .        |
| Jordan                  | 0%               | -8%      |
| Kuwait                  | .                | -13%     |
| Malaysia                | -12%             | -79%     |
| Morocco                 | -4%              | -28%     |
| Oman                    | .                | -23%     |
| Pakistan                | -6%              | -27%     |
| Qatar                   | .                | -4%      |
| Saudi Arabia            | -1%              | .        |
| Syrian Arab Republic    | -1%              | -55%     |
| Tunisia                 | -2%              | -56%     |
| Turkey                  | -3%              | -10%     |
| United Arab Emirates    | .                | 0%       |
| <b>NON-OECD SUMMARY</b> |                  |          |
| number of countries     | 88               | 97       |
| average (arithmetic)    | -8%              | -33%     |
| unequal exchange as     |                  |          |
| % of NON-OECD GDP       | -1.8%            | -24%     |

**GROUP = OECD** (N=19 countries (1965) and 22 countries (1995))

| Country     | UNEQUAL EXCHANGE |      |
|-------------|------------------|------|
|             | 1965             | 1995 |
|             | % of GDP         |      |
| Australia   | +1%              | +6%  |
| Austria     | +1%              | +9%  |
| Belgium-Lux | +4%              | +14% |
| Canada      | +1%              | +5%  |
| Denmark     | +2%              | +9%  |

|                   |     |      |
|-------------------|-----|------|
| Finland           | +4% | +9%  |
| France            | +2% | +7%  |
| Germany, Fed R    | +2% | +11% |
| Iceland           | +8% | +6%  |
| Ireland           | +2% | +13% |
| Italy             | +1% | +6%  |
| Japan             | +1% | +11% |
| Korea, R (note a) |     | +10% |
| Netherlands       | +2% | +17% |
| New Zealand       | +1% | +6%  |
| Norway            | +3% | +7%  |
| Portugal (note a) |     | +4%  |
| Spain (note a)    |     | +6%  |
| Sweden            | +3% | +7%  |
| Switzerland       | +1% | +7%  |
| United Kingdom    | +3% | +6%  |
| United States     | +1% | +6%  |

|  |        |     |
|--|--------|-----|
| <b>OECD SUMMARY</b> (note a)             |        |     |
| number of countries                      | 19     | 22  |
| average (arithmetic)                     | +2%    | +8% |
| unequal exchange as<br>% of OECD GDP (a) | +1.38% | +8% |

**Unequal exchange**, we stated, is strongest in the periphery, and weakest in the centers, with the semi-periphery showing medium levels of exposure to unequal exchange. According to Kohler in his latest article, to appear in Herrmann/Tausch, 1994, first, war and armed violence tend to increase unemployment in Arab economies, but they account only for some portion of the existing unemployment. The effect is, partly, direct - through destruction of economic assets and reduction of economic activity, and, partly, indirect. For example, the low rate of foreign direct investment (FDI) in the region may be influenced by the actual and perceived political-military instability of the region. Secondly, the natural wealth of some Arab countries with respect to oil and gas is no guarantee for full employment. High unemployment rates can be found in both oil exporting and oil importing Arab economies. Thirdly, unemployment rates in Arab economies have a strong correlation with GDP growth rates. The correlation between a 6-year average of the national GDP growth rate with the national unemployment rate is  $r=-0.8$ . Global economic policies affect unemployment in Arab economies through their effect on national GDP growth rates.

The impact of the world system and of global economic policies on GDP growth in the Arab region can be described, according to Kohler, as follows. From 1961 to 1980 the Arab region had a high average GDP growth of 7.2 percent per annum. This trend rate dropped, around 1980-81, to a much lower trend rate. From 1981 to 1999, average GDP growth of the region was 2.4 percent per annum. This historical shift in the economics of the Arab region is closely related to the restructuring of the world political-economic regime around that time. Margaret Thatcher became prime minister of Britain in 1979; Ronald Reagan president of the United States in 1980; both launched their neo-liberal revolutions in domestic and international economics. This was also the time of the second oil price shock, causing high rates of inflation. Inflation fighting rose to the top of the agenda of U. S. and OECD economic policies. One of the main instruments of inflation fighting was a high interest rate. For example, U. S. real interest rates were, on average, 1.9 percent between 1961 and 1980. In contrast, the average U. S. real interest rate between 1981 and 1999 was 6 percent. These radical changes in global economic policy, known as Thatcherism, Reaganomics, New World Order, or global neo-liberalism, induced the observed slowdown in Arab economic growth after 1980 (and in other

countries as well). Another effect of global neo-liberalism on Arab (and other developing) economies was a rapid deterioration of the value of their currencies after 1980, which affects the export earnings of these countries.

The Arab Human Development Report 2002 recommends a mobilization of the human potential of the Arab world. Kohler's analysis suggests that, in addition to that, unemployment in the Arab world is also a world-system problem - as is unemployment in Europe. It follows that the fight against unemployment in Arab economies could be strengthened by a reform of the world political economy - in the sense of moving away from global neo-liberalism to global or regional Keynesianism.

During the 1990s, penetration by transnational capital dramatically increased in many parts of Europe (especially in what was described by Donald Rumsfeld<sup>5</sup>, US Secretary of Defense, recently as "the new Europe"); in eastern Latin America, in Southern Africa, in Central Asia and in South and Southeast Asia. However, there was a **dramatic decrease of MNC penetration in most countries of the Muslim world** during the second half of the 1990s. The multinationals withdrew from the region at an unprecedented scale, long before the September 11 attacks.

World capital withdrew from the Muslim Middle East and went into Eastern Europe, Central Asia, East and South-East Asia, Eastern Latin America and Southern Africa instead. So is Giovanni Arrighi proven right again, when he maintains that the ascent of one region conditions the decline of another one? Most probably, yes.

These results are all the more striking, since we also have to consider that in our recently published multivariate analyses on a world level – contrary to popular assumptions – membership in the **Islamic Conference** is not an impediment against political democracy and human development. The empirical record, presented in Tausch (2003b), speaks a clear language in favor of Islamic democracy and against those in the West that attempt to treat Islamic cultural heritage as a general development burden. It should be also clear that a reliance on the "Washington Consensus" alone will not "fix" the performance of countries beyond a better and more predictable "development stability". The most consistent consequence of the "dependency" analysis of our analyses is the realization that a reliance on foreign capital in the short term might bring about perhaps positive consequences for employment - especially female employment - but that the long-term negative consequences of dependence in the social sphere, but also for sustainable development, outweigh the immediate, positive effects. Our three-fold empirical understanding of the process of globalization - reliance on foreign savings, MNC penetration and unequal exchange, - goes beyond the average analysis of the workings of dependency structures and shows how different aspects of dependency negatively affect development performance. Islamic culture, we could show, is not a development blockade; on the contrary. Membership in the Islamic Conference has - ceteris paribus - a very positive effect on political democracy, on life expectancy, and on the indicators of the Kyoto-process and the eco-social market economy. Far from being a "religion of the Middle Ages" Islam has an important message for the 21st Century.

Our results clearly contradict many of the expectations inherent in the writings of Professor Samuel Huntington. 4 development indicators – 2 for the environment, 1 on human development, and 1 on democracy – are positively and significantly determined by membership in the Islamic Conference, once you properly control for the effects of the other influencing variables. However, gender justice and redistribution remain indeed the "Achilles heel" of today's members in the Islamic Conference, strengthening the cause of those Muslims who advocate – like in the *United Nations Arab Human Development Report* – more social inclusion and more gender justice in the region, and thus a more adequate contemporary reading of the *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations Vol.3, No.4, Winter 2004*

Holy Scriptures. Needless also to say, that the various Christian liberation theologies and liberation theologies from other denominations are working in the same direction (see also Muller, Tausch and Zulehner, 2000).

By way of political conclusions: beyond the “Bush Crusade”

The recent books by Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed quite correctly show that in the final analysis the decision to go to war in Iraq also meant a decision against renewable energies and against a social contract to be based on solar energy and “the hydrogen economy”. Oil, however powerful in the present, Texas-based (un)social “social contract” of the Bush years, is a thing of the past, and the ecological movement in the United States would be well advised to link up with the peace movement in yet more increasing its opposition to this senseless war and occupation.

The Yale University/Columbia University ESI Index is a measure of the overall progress towards environmental sustainability and was developed for 142 countries. ESI scores are based upon 20 core indicators, each of which combines two to eight variables for a total of 68 underlying variables. It is the first time in the research literature that a single yardstick of sustainable development has been developed.

The Yale/Columbia project also calculated a “capacity” variable that shows the underlying chances of a country to realize an environment-friendly policy. The residuals from the linear standard regression comparing environment political capacity and environment policy (with capacity on the x-axis and the ESI index on the y –axis) shows how several nations, including large parts of Latin America, but also many parts of East Central and Eastern Europe and Turkey performed much better than might have been expected on the basis of their limited capacities; while the United States, China, India and states on the Arab Peninsula did not realize enough their existing policy potential for a sustainable development strategy (interestingly also Germany, its present red-green government notwithstanding).

When Boabdil, the last Muslim ruler of Spain, handed over the keys of the city of Granada to the Catholic rulers in 1492, it was perhaps for the first time in history that the keys to the European common house figured prominently. Are we non-Muslim Europeans entitled to keep these keys in our hands forever, and to exclude the neighboring world of Islam<sup>6</sup>?

In political terms, the consequences for us Europeans should be clear – to strive for peace within the “Kantian” framework of democracy, equal exchange and international law in the region of the Muslim Mediterranean and with the region of the Muslim Mediterranean.

We non-Muslim “Europeans” should remember that the keys of the ‘*common European house*’ do not belong to one cultural tradition only. The world of Islam was pivotal to the European path to the Renaissance and to the re-discovery of classic Greek philosophy. Islamic tolerance and knowledge enabled us Europeans to develop. While there were terrible persecutions of Jewry in Europe, the world of Islam was generally tolerant towards Jewry and to Oriental Christianity, and even provided a safe heaven of refuge for the Sephardic refugees, expelled from Spain in 1492.

At the time of the enlargement of the European Union, the real enlargement question – that of the ‘*cultural enlargement*’ of the European Union - cannot be excluded any longer in the long run. A successful integration of the Mediterranean Muslim South would have tremendous and positive repercussions for regional and world peace. And this question is made all the more relevant by the expected demographic shifts in the vicinity of Europe until 2050.

After 20 years of increasingly intensive bilateral trade and development cooperation between the European Union, the 15 Member States of the European Union and its 12 Mediterranean Partners, the Conference of EU and Mediterranean Foreign Ministers in Barcelona (27-28 November 1995) marked the start into a new "partnership" phase of the relationship including bilateral and multilateral or regional cooperation (hence called Barcelona Process or, in general, Euro-Mediterranean Partnership).

The 12 Mediterranean Partners, situated in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean are Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia (Maghreb); Egypt, Israel, Jordan, the Palestinian Authority, Lebanon, Syria (Mashrek); Turkey, Cyprus and Malta; while Libya currently has observer status at certain meetings.

The Barcelona Declaration adopted at the Barcelona Conference expresses the 27 partners' intention to

1. Establish a common Euro-Mediterranean area of peace and stability based on fundamental principles including respect for human rights and democracy (political and security partnership),
2. Create an area of shared prosperity through the progressive establishment of a free-trade area between the EU and its Partners and among the Mediterranean Partners themselves, accompanied by substantial EU financial support for economic transition in the Partners and for the social and economic consequences of this reform process (economic and financial partnership), and
3. Develop human resources; promote understanding between cultures and rapprochement of the peoples in the Euro-Mediterranean region as well as to develop free and flourishing civil societies (social, cultural and human partnership).

Against all odds, Europe will continue its Mediterranean policy, and this policy will be in the interest of world peace in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

## **Bibliography**

This bibliography is not exhaustive and is only meant as an invitation to the world-systems approach, that in many ways can be regarded as a social scientific theory, explaining the post-Cold-War years. For more references, see especially Herrmann/Tausch (2004, forthcoming).

Abdullah M. S. and Khoury A. Th. (1984), *'Mohammed für Christen. Eine Herausforderung'* Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder.

Abu - Lughod J. (1989), *'Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250 - 1350'* New York: Oxford University Press.

Abu - Lughod J. (1990), 'Restructuring the Premodern World-System' *Review (Fernand Braudel Center, SUNY Binghamton)*, 13, 2: 273 - 86.

Ahmed N. M. (2003), *'Behind the War on Terror. Western Secret Strategy and the Struggle for Iraq'* First British Edition, East Sussex: Clairview Books

Amin S. (1973), *'Le développement inegal. Essai sur les formations sociales du capitalisme peripherique'* Paris: Editions de Minuit.

Amin S. (1976), *'Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism'* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Amin S. (1980) "The Class Structure of the Contemporary Imperialist System", *Monthly Review (USA)*, 31 (1980), 8: 9-26

- Amin S. (1984), 'Was kommt nach der Neuen Internationalen Wirtschaftsordnung? Die Zukunft der Weltwirtschaft' in *'Rote Markierungen International'* (Fischer H. and Jankowitsch P. (Eds.)), pp. 89 - 110, Vienna: Europaverlag.
- Amin S. (1989), *'Eurocentrism'* Translated by Russell Moore. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin S. (1992), *'Empire of Chaos'* New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin S. (1994a) 'The Future of Global Polarization', *Review* (Fernand Braudel Center, USA), XVII, 3 (Summer), p. 337-347
- Amin S. (1994b), 'Die neue kapitalistische Globalisierung - die Herrschaft des Chaos' *Starnberger Forschungsberichte*, 3, 4, May: 7 - 26.
- Amin S. (1994c), *'Re-reading the postwar period : an intellectual itinerary'* Translated by Michael Wolfers. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin S. (1997a) *'Capitalism in the Age of Globalization'*. London, England: Zed Books
- Amin S. (1997b), *'Die Zukunft des Weltsystems. Herausforderungen der Globalisierung. Herausgegeben und aus dem Franzoesischen uebersetzt von Joachim Wilke'* Hamburg: VSA.
- Arrighi G. (1989), *'The Developmentalist Illusion: A Reconceptualization of the Semiperiphery'* paper, presented at the Thirteenth Annual Political Economy of the World System Conference, University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign, April 28 - 30.
- Arrighi G. (1991), *'World Income Inequalities and the Future of Socialism'* Fernand Braudel Centre, State University of New York at Binghamton.
- Arrighi G. (1995), *'The Long 20th Century. Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times'* London, New York: Verso.
- Arrighi G. and Silber B. J. *'Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System'* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arrighi G. and Silver, B. J. (1984), 'Labor Movements and Capital Migration: The United States and Western Europe in World - Historical Perspective' in *'Labor in the Capitalist World - Economy'* (Bergquist Ch. (Ed.)), pp. 183 - 216, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Arrighi G. et al. (1991), *'The Rise of East Asia. One Miracle or Many?'* State University of New York at Binghamton: Fernand Braudel Centre.
- Arrighi G. et al. (1996a), *'Modelling Zones of the World-Economy: A Polynomial Regression Analysis (1964-1994)'* State University of New York at Binghamton: Fernand Braudel Center.
- Arrighi G. et al. (1996b), *'The Rise of East Asia in World Historical Perspective'* State University of New York at Binghamton: Fernand Braudel Center.
- Arrighi G. et al. (1996c), *'Beyond Western Hegemonies'* State University of New York at Binghamton: Fernand Braudel Center.
- Barro R. (1996), *'Getting It Right. Markets and Choices in a Free Society'* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Barro R. and Grilli V. (1994) *'European Macroeconomics'* Basingstoke and London: Macmillan
- Barro R. and Sala-i-Martin X. (1995/98) *'Wirtschaftswachstum (Economic Growth)'* München: Oldenbourg (McGraw Hill, New York).
- Barro R. J. and Sala-i-Martin X. (1991), 'Convergence across States and Regions' *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1: 107 - 179.
- Beaud M. (1990), *'Histoire du capitalisme de 1500 à nos jours'* 4e édition revue et corrigée en 1990, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Bello W.; with Shea Cunningham and Bill Rau (1999), *'Dark Victory. The United States and Global Poverty'* London: Pluto Press.
- Bornschieer V. (1976), *'Wachstum, Konzentration und Multinationalisierung von Industrieunternehmen'* Frauenfeld and Stuttgart: Huber.
- Bornschieer V. (1988), *'Westliche Gesellschaft im Wandel'* Frankfurt a.M./ New York: Campus.
- Bornschieer V. (1992), *'The Rise of the European Community. Grasping Towards Hegemony or Therapy against National Decline in the World Political Economy?'*. Vienna: paper, presented at the First European Conference of Sociology, August 26 - 29.
- Bornschieer V. (1996), *'Western society in transition'* New Brunswick, N.J. : Transaction Publishers.
- Bornschieer V. (1999), 'Hegemonic Transition, West European Unification and the Future Structure of the Core' in in *'The Future of Global Conflict'* (Bornschieer V. and Chase - Dunn Ch. K. (Eds.)), pp. 77 - 98, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bornschieer V. (Ed.) (1994), *'Conflicts and new departures in world society'* New Brunswick, N.J. : Transaction Publishers.
- Bornschieer V. and Chase - Dunn Ch. K (1985), *'Transnational Corporations and Underdevelopment'* N.Y., N.Y.: Praeger.



- Bornschiefer V. and Chase - Dunn Ch. K. (1999), 'Technological Change, Globalization and Hegemonic Rivalry' in *The Future of Global Conflict* (Bornschiefer V. and Chase - Dunn Ch. K. (Eds.)), pp. 285 - 302, London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bornschiefer V. and Heintz P., reworked and enlarged by Th. H. Ballmer - Cao and J. Scheidegger (1979), *'Compendium of Data for World Systems Analysis'* Machine readable data file, Zurich: Department of Sociology, Zurich University.
- Bornschiefer V. and Nollert M. (1994); 'Political Conflict and Labor Disputes at the Core: An Encompassing Review for the Post - War Era' in *'Conflicts and New Departures in World Society'* (Bornschiefer V. and Lengyel P. (Eds.)), pp. 377 - 403, New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London: Transaction Publishers, World Society Studies, Volume 3.
- Bornschiefer V. and Suter Chr. (1992), 'Long Waves in the World System' in *'Waves, Formations and Values in the World System'* (Bornschiefer V. and Lengyel P. (Eds.)), pp. 15 - 50, New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.
- Bornschiefer V. et al. (1980), *'Multinationale Konzerne, Wirtschaftspolitik und nationale Entwicklung im Weltsystem'* Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Chase - Dunn Ch. K. (1996), *'Conflict among Core States: World System Cycles and Trends'* Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University, available from the Internet at <http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/archive/papers/c-d&hall/warprop.htm>
- Chase - Dunn Ch. K. (2000), *'World State Formation: Historical Processes and Emergent Necessity'* Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University, available from the Internet at <http://www.jhu.edu/>
- Chase - Dunn Ch. K. (Ed.), (1982), *'Socialist States in the World System'* Beverly Hills and London: Sage.
- Chase - Dunn Ch. K. and Grimes P. (1995), 'World - Systems Analysis' *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21: 387 - 417.
- Chase - Dunn Ch. K. and Hall Th. D. (1997), *'Rise and Demise. Comparing World - Systems'* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Chase - Dunn Ch. K. and Podobnik B. (1995), 'The Next World War: World - System Cycles and Trends' *Journal of World Systems Research* 1, 6 (unpaginated electronic journal at world - wide - web site of the World System Network: <http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html>).
- Deutsch K. W. (1960), 'Ansätze zu einer Bestandsaufnahme von Tendenzen in der vergleichenden und internationalen Politik' in *'Political Science. Amerikanische Beiträge zur Politikwissenschaft'* (Krippendorff E. (Ed.)), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Deutsch K. W. (1966), *'Nationalism and Social Communication. An inquiry into the foundations of nationality'* Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: M.I.T. Press.
- Deutsch K. W. (1978), *'The Analysis of International Relations'* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Deutsch K. W. (1979), *'Tides Among Nations'* New York: Free Press.
- Deutsch K. W. (1982), 'Major Changes in Political Science' in *'International Handbook of Political Science'* (Andrews W.G. (Ed.)), pp. 9 - 33, Westport, Con.: Greenwood Press.
- Dossa Sh. (1987), 'Political Philosophy and Orientalism: the Classical Origins of a Discourse' *Alternatives. A Journal of World Policy*, 12, 3, July: 343 - 358.
- Dossa Sh. (1988), 'Auschwitz and the Palestinians: Christian Conscience and the Politics of Victimization' *Alternatives. A Journal of World Policy*, 13, 4, October: 515 - 528.
- Elsenhans H. (1983), 'Rising mass incomes as a condition of capitalist growth: implications for the world economy' *International Organization*, 37, 1: 1 - 39.
- Elsenhans H. (1992), *'Equality and development'* Dhaka, Bangladesh: Centre for Social Studies: Distributor, Dana Publishers.
- Elsenhans H. (1996), *'State, class, and development'*. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers.
- Elsenhans H. (Ed.), (1978), *'Migration und Wirtschaftsentwicklung'* Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
- Frank A. G. (1978a), *'Dependent accumulation and underdevelopment'* London: Macmillan.
- Frank A. G. (1978b), *'World accumulation, 1492 - 1789'* London: Macmillan.
- Frank A. G. (1980) *'Crisis in the world economy'* New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers.
- Frank A. G. (1981), *'Crisis in the Third World'* New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers.
- Frank A. G. (1983), 'World System in Crisis' in *'Contending Approaches to World System Analysis'* (Thompson W.R. (Ed.)), pp. 27 - 42, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Frank A. G. (1990), 'Revolution in Eastern Europe: lessons for democratic social movements (and socialists?)' *Third World Quarterly*, 12, 2, April: 36 - 52.
- Frank A. G. (1992), 'Economic ironies in Europe: a world economic interpretation of East - West European politics' *International Social Science Journal*, 131, February: 41 - 56.

- Frank A. G. (1994), 'World System History' Lecture at the University of Amsterdam, 23 April 1994, available from the Internet at: <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/10/034.html>
- Frank A. G. (1998) *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*. Ewing, USA: University of California Press
- Frank A. G. and Frank - Fuentes M. (1990), *Widerstand im Weltsystem* Vienna: Promedia.
- Frank A. G. and Gills B. (Eds.)(1993), *The World System: Five Hundred or Five Thousand Years?* London and New York: Routledge, Kegan&Paul.
- Gurr T. R. (1991), 'America as a Model for the World? A Skeptical View' *PS: Political Science and Politics (Washington D.C.)*, 24, 4: 664 - 667.
- Gurr T. R. (1994) *Ethnic conflict in world politics* Boulder: Westview Press.
- Gurr T. R. (1994), 'Peoples Against States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System' *International Studies Quarterly*, 38: 347 - 377.
- Herrmann P. and Arno Tausch (2004, forthcoming) *Dar al Islam. The Mediterranean, the world system and the "wider EUrope"*. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science Publishers
- Huntington S.P. (1991), *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Huntington S.P. (1993), 'The Clash of Civilizations?' *Foreign Affairs*, Summer: 22 - 49.
- Huntington S.P. (1996) *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order* New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Khoury A. Th. (1980), *Toleranz im Islam* München: Kaiser und Grünwald.
- Khoury A. Th. (1981), *Gebete des Islams* Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, Topos TB
- Khoury A. Th. (1991), *Was its los in der islamischen Welt? Die Konflikte verstehen* Freiburg, Basel, Vienna: Herder.
- Kohler, G. (1975) 'Imperialism as a Level of Analysis in Correlates of War Research', *Journal of Conflict Resolution (USA)*, 10: 48-62. French version: 'L'imperialisme, dimension de l'analyse des aspects correlatifs de la guerre' (1976) *Impact: science et societe (UNESCO)*, 28: 47-56
- Kohler, G. (1976a) 'An Empirical Table of Structural Violence' (with Norman Alcock) *Journal of Peace Research (Norway)*, 13: 343-356 [includes 'plateau curve' of life expectancy with income]
- Kohler, G. (1976b) 'The Global Contract: An Essay on International Economic Order and Foreign Policy Theory', *Alternatives (World Policy Institute, USA)*, 2: 449-477
- Kohler, G. (1978a) 'Disarmament and Global Apartheid', *Humanity Calls (New Delhi, India)*, (June): 9-14,47-50
- Kohler, G. (1978b) 'Global Apartheid', *Alternatives (Institute for World Order/World Policy Institute, USA)*, vol. 4, no. 2 (October), pp. 263-275
- Kohler, G. (1980a) 'Structural and Armed Violence in the 20th Century: Magnitudes and Trends' (with William Eckhardt) *International Interactions (USA)*, 8: 347-375
- Kohler, G. (1980b) 'Determinants of the British Defense Burden, 1689 - 1977: From Imperialism to the Nuclear Age' (1980) *Bulletin of Peace Proposals (Norway)*, 11: 79-85
- Kohler, G. (1981a) 'Approaches to the Study of the Causes of War', *UNESCO Yearbook on Peace and Conflict Studies 1980*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 1981: 115-127
- Kohler, G. (1981b) 'Soviet/Russian Defense Burden, 1862 - 1980: From Czarism to Socialism', *Bulletin of Peace Proposals (Norway)*, 11: 131-140
- Kohler, G. (1981c) 'Toward Indicators of Detente: An Extension of the Zurich Content Analysis' in: Daniel Frei, ed., *Definitions and Measurements of Detente: East and West Perspectives*. Cambridge, USA: Oelschlager, Gunn & Hain, 1981: 39-55
- Kohler, G. (1995) 'The Three Meanings of Global Apartheid: Empirical, Normative, Existential', *Alternatives (World Policy Institute, USA)*, 20: 403-423
- Kohler, G. (1998a) 'The Structure of Global Money and World Tables of Unequal Exchange', *Journal of World-Systems Research* 4: 145:168; online: <http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html>
- Kohler, G. (1998b), 'Unequal Exchange 1965 - 1995: World Trend and World Tables', *World-Systems Archive, Working Papers*, online: <http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/archive/papers/Kohlertoc.htm>
- Kohler, G. (1999a) 'A Theory of World Income', *World-Systems Archive, Working Papers*, online: <http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/archive/papers/Kohler>
- Kohler, G. (1999b) 'Global Keynesianism and Beyond', *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 5: 225-241, online: <http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/jwsr.html>
- Mossadeq Ahmed N. (2002), *"The War on Freedom. How and Why America was Attacked September 11, 2001"* Joshua Tree, California: Tree of Life Publications

- Mossadeq Ahmed N. (2003), *“Behind the War on Terror. Western Secret Strategy and the Struggle for Iraq”* Froest Row, East Sussex: Clairview Books
- Muller A., Arno Tausch and Paul Michael Zulehner (2001, Editors) *‘Global Capitalism, Liberation Theology, and the Social Sciences: An Analysis of the Contradictions of Modernity at the Turn of the Millennium’* Huntington, New York: Nova Science Publishers
- Raffer K. (1987a), *‘Unequal Exchange and the Evolution of the World System Reconsidering the Impact of Trade on North-South Relations’* London, Basingstoke and New York: Macmillan and Saint Martin's Press.
- Raffer K. (1987b), 'Tendencies Towards a 'Neo Listian' World Economy', *Journal für Entwicklungspolitik*, vol.3, n.3, pp.45ff.
- Raffer K. (1993) 'International financial institutions and accountability: The need for drastic change', in: S.M. Murshed & K. Raffer (eds), *Trade, Transfers, and Development, Problems and Prospects for the Twenty First Century*, E.Elgar, Aldershot, pp.151ff.
- Raffer K. (1995) 'The Impact of the Uruguay Round on Developing Countries', in: F. Breuss (ed), *The World Economy after the Uruguay Round*, Service Fachverlag, Vienna, pp.169ff.
- Raffer K. (1996) 'Exportorientierte Entwicklung und Weltmarkt - Das Beispiel der asiatischen "Tiger"', in: E. Binderhofer, I. Getreuer-Kargl, H. Lukas (eds), *Das pazifische Jahrhundert?*, Brandes & Apsel/Südwind, Frankfurt aM/Wien, pp.41ff.
- Raffer K. (1997) 'Debt Management and Structural Adjustment: Neglected Issues', in: S.D. GUPTA (ed) *The Political Economy of Globalization*, Kluwer, Boston etc., pp.269ff.
- Raffer K. and Singer H.W. (1996) *The Foreign Aid Business, Economic Assistance and Development Co-operation*, E.Elgar, Cheltenham [paperback: 1997].
- Tausch A. (1986), 'Positions within the Global Order, Patterns of Defense Policies, and National Development: Austria and Pakistan Compared' in *'Security for the Weak Nations. A Multiple Perspective. A Joint Project of Pakistani and Austrian Scholars'* (S. Farooq Hasnat and Pelinka A. (Eds. )), pp. 245 - 55, Lahore: Izharsons.
- Tausch A. (1987), 'Transnational Corporations and Underdevelopment' *Acta Sociologica*, 30, 1: 118 - 121.
- Tausch A. (1989a), 'Stable Third World Democracy and the European Model. A Quantitative Essay' in *'Crisis in Development'* (Z. Bablewski and B. Hettne (Eds. )), pp. 131 - 161, Goeteborg: The European Perspectives Project of the United Nations University, University of Gothenburg, P. A. D. R. I. G. U - Papers.
- Tausch A. (1989b, appeared 1991), 'Armas socialistas, subdesarrollo y violencia estructural en el Tercer Mundo' *Revista Internacional de Sociologia, CSIC, Madrid*, 47, 4: 583 - 716.
- Tausch A. (1990) 'Quantitative aspects of a socio-liberal theory of world development'. *Economic Papers*, Warsaw School of Economics, Research Institute for Developing Countries, 23: 64 – 167.
- Tausch A. (1991a), *'Russlands Tretmuehle. Kapitalistisches Weltsystem, lange Zyklen und die neue Instabilitaet im Osten'* Eberhard, Munich.
- Tausch A. (1991b), *'Jenseits der Weltgesellschaftstheorien. Sozialtransformationen und der Paradigmenwechsel in der Entwicklungsforschung'* Munich: Eberhard.
- Tausch A. (1993a), *'Produktivkraft soziale Gerechtigkeit? Europa und die Lektionen des pazifischen Modells'* Munich. Eberhard.
- Tausch A. (1993b, with Fred Prager as co-author), *'Towards a Socio - Liberal Theory of World Development'* Basingstoke and New York: Macmillan/St. Martin's Press.
- Tausch A. (1997), *'Schwierige Heimkehr. Sozialpolitik, Migration, Transformation und die Osterweiterung der Europaeischen Union'* Munich: Eberhard.
- Tausch A. (1998a) *'Transnational Integration and National Disintegration.'* Electronic publication at the World Systems Archive Working Paper Series (Coordinator: Christopher K. Chase-Dunn, Johns Hopkins University), <http://csf.colorado.edu/wsystems/archive/papers.htm>
- Tausch A. (2001a) 'Mature Economy' in *'Routledge Encyclopedia of Political Economy'* London: Routledge.
- Tausch A. (2001b) *'Sozial- und gesundheitspolitische Aspekte der EU-Erweiterung'* Band 48, Schriftenreihe des Zentrums für europäische Studien, Jean Monnet Lehrstuhl für europäische Studien, Universität Trier <http://www.uni-trier.de/zes/bd48.html>
- Tausch A. (2003) (Editor) *'Three Pillars of Wisdom: A Reader on Globalization, World Bank Pension Models and Welfare Society'*. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science

- Tausch A. (2003a) *'The European Union: global challenge or global governance? 14 world system hypotheses and two scenarios on the future of the Union'* In: G. Kohler and E. J. Chaves (Eds.) *'Globalization. Critical Perspectives'* Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers
- Tausch A. (2003b) *'Social Cohesion, Sustainable Development and Turkey's Accession to the European Union. Implications from a Global Model'*. *Alternatives. Turkish Journal of International Relations*, 2, 1, 2003: 1 – 43, available at <http://www.alternativesjournal.net/tausch.pdf>
- Tausch A. and Gernot Kohler (2001) *Global Keynesianism: Unequal exchange and global exploitation*. Huntington NY, Nova Science.
- Tausch A. and Peter Herrmann (2001) *Globalization and European Integration*. Huntington NY, Nova Science.
- Tibi B. (1973), *'Militär und Sozialismus in der Dritten Welt : allgemeine Theorien und Regionalstudien über arabische Länder'*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp
- Tibi B. (1985), *'Der Islam und das Problem der kulturellen Bewältigung sozialen Wandels'* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991.
- Tibi B. (1992), 'Kreuzzug oder Dialog? Der Westen und die arabo - islamische Welt nach dem Golfkrieg' in *'Kreuzzug oder Dialog. Die Zukunft der Nord - Sued - Beziehungen'* (Matthies V. (Ed.)), pp. 107 - 120, Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolger.
- Tibi B. (2001), *'Kreuzzug und Djihad. Der Islam und die christliche Welt'*. München: Goldmann Taschenbuchausgabe.
- UNDP (1998) *'Overcoming Human Poverty'*. UN New York, UNDP
- UNDP (1998) *'The Shrinking State'* UN New York, UNDP
- United Nations Development Programme (current issues), *'Human Development Report'* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- United Nations Development Programme, Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (2002) *'Arab Human Development Report 2002. Creating Opportunities for Future Generations'* Cairo and New York: United Nations Development Programme Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS).
- United Nations Development Programme, Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (1999), *'Human Development Report for Central and Eastern Europe and the CIS'* New York: UNDP.
- Williamson J (1998), *'Real Wages and Relative Factor Prices in the Third World 1820 - 1940: The Mediterranean Basin'*. Discussion Paper 1842, Harvard Institute of Economic Research; <http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/jwilliam/papers/>
- Williamson J. (1996), *'Globalization, Convergence and History'* *The Journal of Economic History*, 56, 2: 277 - 306.
- Williamson J. (1997) *'Globalization and Inequalities, Past and Present'* *The World Bank Research Observer*, 12, 2, August: 117-135.
- Williamson J. A. (1998), Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Internet site (with link-up to the data base on wages in the world periphery 1820-1940): <http://www.economics.harvard.edu/~jwilliam/>

\* Associate Visiting Professor of Political Science, Innsbruck University. In his official functions, Dr. Tausch is Ministerial Counselor in the Federal Ministry for Social Security, Generations, and Consumer Protection, Republic of Austria. He served as an Austrian diplomat abroad. The present article reflects his own personal opinions and not necessarily those of the Austrian Government. Academic homepage: <http://www.mylitsearch.org/mbrz/10134373>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> [http://r0.unctad.org/wir/contents/wir02\\_dl.htm](http://r0.unctad.org/wir/contents/wir02_dl.htm)

<sup>2</sup> The total UTIP sample of countries with available data comprised: Algeria; Argentina; Australia; Austria; Bangladesh; Belgium; Bolivia; Brazil; Canada; Chile; China; Colombia; Costa Rica; Cuba; Czechoslovakia; Dominican Republic; Denmark; Ecuador; Egypt; Finland; France; Germany; Ghana; Greece; Guatemala; Haiti; Honduras; Hong Kong; Hungary; Iceland; India; Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Jamaica; Japan; Jordan; Korea; Kuwait; Macau; Madagascar; Malaysia; Mexico; Mexico; Netherland; New Zealand; Nicaragua; Nigeria; Norway; Pakistan; Peru; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; El Salvador; Singapore; South Africa; Spain; Sri Lanka; Sweden; Taiwan; Turkey; United Kingdom; United States; United States; Uruguay;

---

USSR; Venezuela; Zimbabwe. Thus the following members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference were covered by the data: Algeria; Bangladesh; Egypt; Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Jordan; Kuwait; Malaysia; Nigeria; Pakistan; Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Charity

<sup>4</sup> It is important to remember that the world of Islam provided a safe heaven of refuge for Spain's Sephardic Jewry, which was expelled in 1492, ending the coexistence between the three monotheistic religions that existed in Spain before under Muslim rule. For an excellent brief summary in Djudeo-Espanyol, written by the director of the 'Ladino' broadcasts of Kol Israel, Israel's state radio, Moshe Shaul, under the title: *LA KONVIVENSIA ENTRE LAS TRES KULTURAS EN ESPANYA. ENSHEMPLO I MODELO PARA MUESTROS DIAS* on these issues, see also: <http://www.shamash.org/listarchives/sefarad/konvnnsa.txt>. The author of the present afterword hopes and believes that – in the end – this vision of coexistence between the world religions will prove stronger than the negative visions so prevalent nowadays.

<sup>5</sup> See also: <http://www.rferl.org/nca/features/2003/01/24012003172118.asp>

<sup>6</sup> The present author would like to recall here two articles about the speeches of H.E. Iranian President Ali Mohammad *Hojjat ol-Eslam* KHATAMI during his visits to Europe: *Orient und Okzident in Weimar. Die Rede des iranischen Präsidenten Mohammed Khatami in Weimar am 12.7.2000* (Quelle: *Botschaft der I.R. Iran, Bonn*) at: [http://www.jahrbuch2000.studien-von-zeitfragen.net/Dokimasia/De\\_Pace\\_Fidei/Khatami-Diwan/khatami-diwan.html](http://www.jahrbuch2000.studien-von-zeitfragen.net/Dokimasia/De_Pace_Fidei/Khatami-Diwan/khatami-diwan.html) as well as the comment *Orient und Okzident in Weimar: »In der Welt des Menschen gibt es kein absolutes Anderssein«* by David Hartstein at: [http://www.jahrbuch2000.studien-von-zeitfragen.net/Dokimasia/De\\_Pace\\_Fidei/de\\_pace\\_fidei.html](http://www.jahrbuch2000.studien-von-zeitfragen.net/Dokimasia/De_Pace_Fidei/de_pace_fidei.html)