



Muslim Geography at the End of Dictatorship of Liberal Paradigm: Time to Reflect Upon Own Fate

Admir MULAOSMANOVIC

Abstract

The goal of writing this article is to provoke different thoughts about the ways of building the world in which we live. For the past few years, I have already shared some of the ideas that I develop here by writing it down in opinions and speaking at symposia, but I did not clearly relate the need for a change in the Muslim world, which begins with creating an equidistance towards the Eastern and Western powers like I am doing in this text. I would like to point out that the multitude of common interests of the countries of the Fertile Crescent should determine the concept of their regional cooperation as well as cooperation with others based on their respect for that very concept. It simply means that article deals positively with emergence of multipolarity advocating in the same time for centralized regional cooperation in Middle East and Nort Africa - for the beginning. As we witness the end of the hegemony of liberalism as a global enterprise, there is a need for a different kind of hegemony in areas that are integral parts of Muslim geography.

Keywords

Multipolarity, Muslim Geography, liberal paradigm, global shift, Islamic worldview

* Assoc. Prof. Dr., Balıkesir University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Sciences and Public Administration, admir@balikesir.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-7500-3156

Liberal Paradigmanın Diktatörlüğünün Sonunda Müslüman Coğrafyası: Kendi Kaderini Düşünme Zamanı

Özet

Bu makalenin amacı, yaşadığımız dünyayı inşa etme yolları hakkında farklı düşünceler uyandırmaktır. Son birkaç yıldır, burada geliştirdiğim bazı fikirleri yazılı görüşler ve sempozyumlardaki konuşmalar aracılığıyla paylaştım; ancak bu metinde olduğu gibi, Müslüman dünyasında değişim ihtiyacını açık bir şekilde ele almadım. Bu değişim, Doğu ve Batı güçlerine eşit mesafede durmayı gerektiren bir anlayışla başlamaktadır. Bereketli Hilal ülkelerinin çok sayıda ortak çıkarının, bölgesel iş birliği kavramını belirlemesi ve başkalarıyla bu kavram temelinde bir iş birliği kurması gerektiğine dikkat çekmek istiyorum. Basitçe söylemek gerekirse, bu makale çok kutupluluğun ortaya çıkışını olumlu bir şekilde ele almakta ve aynı zamanda Ortadoğu ve Kuzey Afrika'da - başlangıç olarak - merkezi bir bölgesel iş birliğini savunmaktadır. Liberalizmin küresel bir girişim olarak hegemonya döneminin sonuna tanıklık ederken, Müslüman coğrafyasının ayrılmaz parçaları olan bölgelerde farklı bir tür hegemonyaya ihtiyaç vardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Çok kutupluluk, Müslüman Coğrafyası, liberal paradigma, küresel dönüşüm, İslami dünya görüşü

Introduction

Three upcoming geo-economic and geopolitical megatrends will doubtless define the re-emergence of a Eurasian order: Firstly, the shortening of supply and value chains resulting from the digitalization of logistics and production chains, which is becoming increasingly important at the regional level, is leading to the emergence of new growth poles in Eurasia; Secondly, the emergence of new centers of economic power, especially along the southern belt of Eurasia, is fostering increased interconnectedness with and through continental Eurasia; And thirdly, the increasing geopolitical competition between different integration initiatives and powers in Eurasia will never lead to a coherent political unification but there is increasingly little solace to be taken from this for the West, which appears increasingly marginalized. (Pepe, 2019: 270-71).

It is not far from the truth to say that the whole world is trembling. Global problems are so deep that fundamental (historical long durée) relations of world great powers are dramatically changing. On the other side, their aims and intentions are still covered by mist of current geopolitical processes. That's the one of the reasons why discussions on unipolarity, multipolarity and global politics are entering every corner in the world endangering everyday life of citizens not only from psychological perspective, but also by visible initiated changes with their more and more vicious impact. Shortage of food, lack of energy sources or ambiguous efficiency of The Organization of United Nations (OUN), all of it has strong impact on world's population. Remembering "war for medical equipment" during pandemic Covid-19 in 2020, battle for vaccines during 2021, direct nations toward anxious worry how it will look like when basic foodstuff become a tool in geopolitical arena. Indeed, for certain period of time food (Ukrainian grain) became geopolitical tool in 2022, and again in the mid-2023 (Wintour, 2023).

At the first place the crisis of liberal hegemony i.e., dictatorship of liberal paradigm causes these changes by allowing hectic positioning of world powers for the future order and their influence.¹ China was strongly convinced about it in 2016 when Brexit happened and Trump, as bearer of isolationist policy

¹ The liberal paradigm in this work, without negative or positive connotations, represents a modern and contemporary worldview, which in its history contained imperialism, colonialism, secularism, interventionism, the quest for global order, an economic system and a unique concept of human rights. From the Enlightenment to today, from Locke to the neoliberal economic model of Hayek and others, this paradigm is treated as a broad worldview that aims for its own expansion and domination, so the evaluation of such an effort as hegemony is entirely appropriate.

instead of liberal universalism, became US President. Pursuit for liberal hegemony, as a main characteristic of US foreign policy during Cold War period inevitably started to pale (Doshi, 2021: 307). Currently it looks like a promising concept due to war in Ukraine and partial revitalization of NATO and Western unity, but time-consuming geopolitical battle already creates cracks in that communality while economic and financial flows are threatening to end the hegemony of US dollar as a global currency.

American militarism intertwined with concept of inalienable rights hardly works as universal value anymore. Although it is more acceptable than Russian autocracy or “socialism with Chinese characteristics for the new era” over decades it lost power and credibility. Simply because the fact that the foundation of that approach is rooted in aim to protect life even in foreign, unliberal, undemocratic environment but by time it became battle over values in which liberalism once must prevail.

It was more important to protect liberal diversity (truer is to say dictatorship of liberal paradigm) by opposing traditional virtues instead protection of life as such. The very cause of liberal hegemonial tendencies became weak. So, cultivated diversities under liberal paradigm, under umbrella of liberal universal concept, realized that they are paradigm itself. Moreover, they understand it's time to shift toward own worldview. African continent is very good example, but more of it is huge argument too (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of PRC). Even Europeans started to question their own position toward Americanization.

(...) that aversion to the unipolar global order dominated by the US and the dislike of its liberal ideological mission derive from its pursuit of a globalism that allows no room for alternatives. The collapse of socialism in 1989 gave rise to an “era of imitation” that was projected and absorbed in the East, lasting for about thirty years. During this period, all alternative ideas were set aside and expectations for autonomous and self-governing ways of life based on individual national histories, traditions, and cultural diversity were marginalized. Pluralism was given up in favor of hegemonic liberalism. The core tenet of the imposed model of imitation was very simple: adopting the Western model would speed up the process of institutional democratization and economic, social, and cultural modernization. Democratization, Europeanisation, and membership in the European and transatlantic communities were the catch words of the process, albeit overshadowed by assimilation to Americanism. (Schulze, 2020: 27).

On the other side liberal idealists had their own arguments. Liberal era is the product both of rational political agents acting strategically on the basis of conscious design, and more deep-seated processes of social and economic change, how Hyden Price argued on it. Hyden Price actually opened a huge theme for discussion, emphasized crucial elements which disclose and separate two worldviews which are central to this paper (Muslim and liberal), as he stated the following:

The three key political transformations are: the spread and consolidation of democracy (or what Kant termed 'republican governments'), which is credited with having created a 'democratic peace'; national self-determination, which is seen as providing solid foundations for governments based on popular consent and national legitimacy; and institutionalized multilateral cooperation (most notably, in the shape of the European Union), which is seen as facilitating cooperation through sharing information and reducing the element of friction in diplomacy. (Price, 2007: 20).

Nevertheless, the 21st century has brought a series of new opportunities to the rising powers, but also difficulties to the global authority (USA). Strategic withdrawal under the pressure of "imperial overstretch" led US foreign policy to new concept, emergence of Anglo-Saxon brotherhood and treatment of EU as a partner suitable for role of keeper of US interests toward Eurasian powers. Such a development within the vanguard of the liberal order is not promising for the EU, but could be pleasant for the US. The increased geopolitical game between different integration initiatives shouldn't result in a coherent political unification. At least not in near future. But surely it is not something that West, liberal democracies, should cheer up. There are no key benefits from it for liberal order. Instead of political unification multipolarity emerges as a disharmony, period in which new axial poles are going to be created with their own worldviews and values.

Relatively soon after the collapse of communism, it became increasingly clear that global processes did not lead to coexistence, but from certain intellectual circles the prophetically thematic clash of cultures and civilizations imposed itself as the dominant discourse. Few Muslim scholars predicted that fall realizing that communist ideology has more potential to be ruined from itself. That prediction didn't advocate for capitalism, on contrary it is also mentioned that "path of unbridled capitalism cannot be endless and all the evidence points that soon it will reach the impasse". (Hathout, 2013: 111).

However, the Muslim nations became hypersensitive to the new (regional) geopolitics and the new realities. Geopolitical game between superpower and rising powers, for the zones of influence, was dominantly played in the lands where Muslim religion and culture is at home. From Iraq over Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq again, Egypt, Syria, Libya, every country affected by Arab spring, world powers were interfered.

As a successor of previous Soviet Union, Russia had to deal with economic instability and loss of position not only at the global level but also among former allies. Russian strategists logically saw the consolidation of American power at the end of 20th Century and the expansion of NATO as part of Washington's grand plan to "surround" Russia. But surrounding was not a goal, rather it is a tool for further disintegration of Russia what former US vice president Dick Cheney (2001-2009.) explicitly confirmed (Norton, 2022).

After the collapse of the Soviet Union between the Baltic and Black Seas (former communist countries and the region where Iron Curtain was established between East and the West), a continuous chain of NATO member states was established, Moscow could no longer count on being able to extend its military power to the Adriatic Sea too. Indeed, the situation in Southeast Europe was/is linked to the Russian-US confrontation in the Caucasus and Central Asia. To all of that Russia has reacted with intensified efforts to regain an influential position in global politics.

In January 21, 2007., during a joint press conference with German Chancellor Angela Merkel in Sochi, after discussion on world order and particularly the case of Kosovo, Russian President Putin said that, in his opinion, it was “more about non-compliance with the basic principles of international law”. The Russian president, referring to Yalta conference, reminded how the great powers “divided the world” after the Second World War. “Now those who feel like Cold War winners want to divide the world to their will”, he said. However, Russia will not accept “decisions being imposed on it”. In fact, Russia was already determined to be very active in future crises (President of Russia, 2007). Soon the cases of Ukraine and Syria made this clear.

Diplomatic debates over Kosovo’s status led Putin to repeatedly announce that he would recognize the independence of seceded areas in the former Soviet republics if the West insists on Kosovo’s independence. South Ossetia and Abkhazia in Georgia, Nagorno-Karabakh in Azerbaijan and Transnistria in Moldova were mentioned. After a brief military intervention in Georgia in the summer of 2008, Moscow has fulfilled its announcements regarding the secessionist areas of its southern neighbor.

However, due to the recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, the credibility of Moscow’s frequent assurances about the necessity of strict adherence to international law was lost. After the war in Georgia, Russia’s position on Kosovo could no longer be interpreted as principled because Moscow itself deviated from the norms of international law in the Caucasus. Russia has responded to such criticism by pointing out that Russia’s actions in the Caucasus are only a “mirror” of the Western way of acting.

China on the other hand was very focused on its own goals. Consecutive strategies of displacement were created to confront US influence and dominance. China’s first strategy of displacement (1989–2008) was to quietly blunt American power over China, particularly in Asia, and it emerged, according to Doshi, “after the traumatic trifecta of Tiananmen Square, the Gulf War, and the Soviet collapse led Beijing to sharply increase its perception of US threat”. Second strategy (2008–2016), had more serious goals related to wider region - it sought to build the foundation for Chinese regional hegemony (Doshi, 2021: 157).

Launched after the Global Financial Crisis (second strategy of displacement) it led Beijing to see US power as diminished and emboldened. Surely it helped Beijing to take more confident approach. With the invocation of “great changes unseen in a century” following Brexit, Trump-Biden traumatic mandates, and the coronavirus pandemic, China already launched a third phase, one that expands its blunting and building efforts worldwide to displace the United States as the global leader (Doshi, 2021: 304).

These approaches by Russia and China gave a fruitful insight into the future of global politics. Unipolarity is over, multipolarity is new reality. The global competence between US and China about primacy means nothing for the context of emergence of multiple axial centers and their zones of influence. Muslim world within that context is seen as a region of competence, not a power with its own axis.

Moreover, the collapse of liberal internationalism, as a promise and concept of promotion of democracy and a “rules based international order” happen very quickly and with certain disbelief among scholars. But failures in liberal trademarks such as military intervention and nation-building, primarily in Afghanistan, Syria and Libya proved that liberal internationalism’s collapse has accelerated, but also the decline of Washington’s global power is real too (Ignatieff, 2021).

This article may seem too thematically diverse as it combines geopolitics, social theory and very practical experiences of regional integration. However, due to its key goal, defining this time as a momentum in which Muslim geography should initiate serious integrative processes within itself, all these topics are completely complementary because they open up precisely those areas within which the essential discussion should be conducted. If it does not open these areas, at least it intends to contribute to it.

Considering that the theoretical setting is mostly based on Bourdieu and his approach, then the thematic variety becomes meaningful because “IR literature has been open to Bourdieusian interventions as well. Symbolic power, doxa, habitus, field, capital and reflexivity are among the key Bourdieusian concepts that IR utilizes, although they are originally developed to offer a solution to the agent-structure problem in daily life or societal relations” (Ongur-Zengin, 2016).

Ukraine as a Trigger for a Global Shift

This kind of understanding and interpretation should certainly question the Russian invasion of Ukraine and what it brings to global politics. What then Ukrainian crisis is and what are contexts? Russia is imposing its concerns about Ukrainian aim toward NATO membership since 2008. It was most important reason to support former Ukrainian President Yanukovich (2010-2014) who was against it and acted pro-Russian role. Political turmoil in

Ukraine finished by successful integration of NATO aspirations in Ukrainian Constitution (2019) followed by Brussels Summit (June 2021), when NATO leaders reiterated the decision that Ukraine would become a member of the Alliance. In that same period Ukraine and NATO forces launched joint naval drills in the Black Sea (*Sea Breeze 2021*) what signaled Moscow that strong reaction is needed. It was “red line” issue for Russia (“Black Sea Drills”, 2021).

An expansion of NATO’s presence in Ukraine, especially the deployment of any long-range missiles capable of striking Russian cities or defense systems is seen as a biggest threat. More than that, through development of crisis, Russia is probably trying to make Ukraine a turning point and provide even stronger support in Central and Eastern European countries by creating a wide buffer zone between East and the West. It is not without importance that states in that belt are former communist countries. Whether that means the beginning of a new Cold War, creation of new Iron Curtain, is less important. What is more significant is Russia’s aspiration to raise its own stake as a global stakeholder. Energy capacities have given Russia the opportunity to persuade European countries to listen Putin more closely.

Joint appearance of China and Russia certainly speaks of the inevitability of redefining the international order. Proponents of Yalta 2.0 are increasingly loud in advocating those problems are piling up. In addition to processes that carry tension and conflict, the multipolar world is still trying to figure out solutions that will ensure peace. That peace, it is clear, cannot be achieved by maintaining the ideological and cultural supremacy of the West. True acceptance of diversity will be a precondition for overcoming the crisis, which means that different socio-political arrangements, cultural patterns, and traditions will not be disregarded from the position of liberal hegemony. It must be accepted as such.

It seems that China would like to achieve a balance of power. For that purpose, main tool China uses is geoeconomics, the use of economic instruments (from trade and investment policy to sanctions, cyberattacks, and foreign aid) to achieve geopolitical goals.

This geoeconomic strategy harks back to Sun Tzu’s maxim: “Ultimate excellence lies not in winning every battle, but in defeating the enemy without ever fighting.” As Henry Kissinger’s On China explains, victory for Sun Tzu was “not simply the triumph of armed forces,” but “the achievement of the ultimate political objectives” that a military clash would be intended to secure: “Far better than challenging the enemy on the field of battle is . . . maneuvering him into an unfavorable position from which escape is impossible.” (Allison, 2017: 33)

What therefore Ukrainian crisis is? It is a sign of new reality, the path to new world, the emergence of new global politics and the continuity of same old problems – how world will be ruled and who is going to be in charge. All that is happening in the Sahel, and then in the area of Palestine and Israel, are an additional argument to this position.

What also can be heard is the opinion that world is directed toward emergence of two superblocks. Possible in the future, but new mega-regions at global level as a manifestation of true multipolarity are logical consequence of this period. The power, influence, and general ability of superblocks to secure well-being for population in their zones is in the fog, not clear yet. But also, does it mean real multipolarity in which world powers can determinate world politics and establish Yalta 2.0? It is more appropriate to define this transitional period as apolarity as it was argued recently among intellectuals (Drezner, 2007).

One of the main reasons for taking that argument seriously lays in incontestable growth of small and medium state importance. Global powers will have to listen to them and to please them. As Ongur-Zengin (2016) rightly argues: "Wannabe hegemons (...) are those countries whose rise into the position of international decision-makers is seen as threatening to the status quo. That said, their unique material capabilities in regard to production, demographics, etc., make them important agents for the continuation of the world order".

The Hungarian case in EU and Orban's "wayward son policy" is good example of it. Mexican rejection to participate in Summit of Americas which starts in the beginning of June is next significant case. President Andrés Manuel López Obrador was very clear that he cannot support President Biden's decision not to invite Nicaragua, Venezuela, and Cuba (Spetalnick and Graham, 2022). Both are witnessing simple fact; redefinition of powers position has started, and it will last for a certain period.

To reach balance within the region (geopolitical body) and in second step to establish balance among regions will create huge space for different types of negotiations and agreements. Along with the geoeconomics the role of diplomacy has to be increased. Anglo-Saxon world initiated these processes by creation of AUKUS, Russian Orthodox Pan-Slavism for 21st Century is ongoing process under concept of Russian World and its variants, and Chinese positioning in Eastern Hemisphere as a main power, especially in Indian Ocean (The White House, 2022).

The formation of AUKUS (Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) in response to the Chinese rise was factual evidence, primarily for Europeans, that the focus has changed and that the time for new types of alliances is coming, while strengthening of NATO in the North by accepting Finland and Sweden should give relaxed position to US ("Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson", 2023).

Others are waiting, not sure how to act and at which principles. While de-dollarization looks as an unbeatable fact many countries are approaching toward BRICS and Shanghai Cooperation like Iran, Algeria and other states (Caiyu, 2022). It is strange that nations in Muslim Geography are not able to define their interests and frame them within serious regional cooperation.

A specific response to the question situated in these paragraphs is that apolarity will not lead to anarchy. Certain disorder could appear but as a phase toward establishment of multipolar world. One would say disordered phase for ordered world. The crisis in Ukraine is developing on the principle of quick shifts but result looks very clear. That state is going to weaken more while Russia installs its wall toward NATO. But also, many other geopolitical issues are gaining additional importance. In fact, through this crisis, the outlines of the next decade can be glimpsed. Marked by the outwitting of great powers into zones where a decisive influence is sought, it has potential to be decade of political tensions and possible military conflicts all around the world. Dozens of these zones, from strategic to minor tactical significance, from North Pole to South China Sea, would shape brand new world.

In the last decade or so, through success in Syria, Eastern Ukraine (Black Sea region), recently in Kazakhstan, Russia has very directly challenged the US and their Western allies (Miller, 2022). Acting simultaneously with China in certain global processes Moscow also significantly contributed to emergence of strong opposition to liberal democracy due to prediction of the collapse of liberal internationalism. No matter how brave this prediction is, one can see “signs on the road” which are strengthening argument.

European security, in this regard, has become more vulnerable. New developments have put the European Union in front of a series of political debates but also upheavals. Migrant crisis (2015) and Brexit (2016) were a strong call to Europeans to start thinking more seriously about their own military power. Old French idea (President De Gaulle) about European Forces drove President Macron to support a joint European military project once again in 2017, while German Chancellor Merkel, in her address to the European Parliament in November 2018, said “we need to work on a vision of establishing a European army” (General Secretariat of the Council [GSOC], 2010).

That’s why Hungarian President Viktor Orban’s speech at the 32nd *Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp* in Romania (July, 2023.) is intriguing for several reasons. As someone who has for many years represented a statesman who has identity issues at the center of his occupation and leads a sovereigntist policy, he certainly represents a challenge and sometimes a hindrance to the European Union in its efforts to unify this political entity. The hegemony of liberal ideology around the world is hitting walls more and more, but even within the EU member states there are even stronger voices that oppose this type of common European policy and the definition of European values (Miniszterelnok, 2023).

This gathering, also known as the *Tusványos Festival*, aims at regional cooperation between two neighboring countries, Hungary and Romania. But Orban used this opportunity to, in addition to expressing his understanding of the problems that these two countries need to solve, emphasize his view of European problems and future global development.

Before his arrival, the Romanian host provoked him with a demarche about what he could and could not say. Historical reminiscences and territorial disputes are something what Romanians are not willing to open. That's why Orban decided to clarify what are known Western values that are uncritically adopted and not questioned, and what the host emphasized to him should be highlighted positively. "If one is involved in European politics, as I am, then today Western values mean three things: migration, LGBTQ, and war," said the Hungarian president rather sarcastically, wanting to show the dead end into which the EU and the collective West have entered (Miniszterelnok, 2023).

But all that he said, openly and without twists, was an introduction to a big topic. Due to the enormous change that is taking place, which affects the whole of humanity, the most important, according to Orban, is to define that context, so that we can even talk about the Carpathian Basin, its future and cooperation within it. The most significant thing that is happening is the change in the balance of power that China has made. To explain this, he used the paradigm of 3 world frames (tactical, strategic and historical) and gave examples of how wrong classification leads to unpredictable consequences (Merkel and migration, for example).

His speech proves, like a Putin's speech before invasion on Ukraine in February 2022 that changes are crucial and global. At the first place Brexit then secondly, challenges to US supremacy in Indo-Pacific region, mostly in South China Sea distracted relations among NATO member states. Trump's foreign policy and unconventional approach has only deepened misunderstandings, while the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan (2021) has thickened questionnaires over the heads of allies. Moreover, serious controversy during and after July Coup D'Etat in Turkey (2016) clearly prove that something is wrong.

Talking about the changed focus, i.e., the growth of a new central region of the world, it is more than clear how the Indian Ocean becomes what the Mediterranean Sea was in antiquity and the Middle Ages, and the Atlantic Ocean in the New Age. Because of the resources, demographics, and general potency of this area to which gravitates approximately 5 billion people, the future, whatever it is, is turned there.

Muslim Geography and Its Worldview

Muslim societies and states experienced a series of disappointments, transformations, and new beginnings during the twentieth century. The disintegration and disappearance of universal empires, that is, the promotion of the idea of nationalism throughout 19th Century, brought great problems to the whole world. Nevertheless, the social and political processes that took place in the countries of Islam during the collapse of the Ottoman state and the imperialist invasion interfered with the very meaning of the collective identification of Muslims.

Stunned primarily by British and French political ideas, and then by American ones, Muslim elites began to attribute their own disorientation to the incompatibility of the idea of Islam with modern times. This led to the growth of Arab nationalism, the strengthening of secularism and ultimately socialism and liberalism as a path leading to progress. Following the developed world, not only in matters related to the progress of science and technology, but also in the ideological shaping of one's own societies, has begun to appear to Muslims as an irreplaceable concept. Discussing that impact on Muslim societies Hallaq said

New European courts, exogenous legal codes, new European schools, and conceptually foreign European administrative and other institutions came to displace almost every sphere that the Sharī'a, Sūfism, and their related institutions had occupied. The effect of these "reforms" was not merely to displace the Sharī'a and the "traditional" institutions of Islam, nor was it just to secularize them; it was to create a new subject, one who would see the world through the lens of the modern state and the nation. (Hallaq, 2019, p. 5)

It was this desire that framed a new view of the world that placed Islam, certainly over time, as an undesirable guest in its own home. When that "unwanted guest" began to regain his own position, sometimes by unnecessary and undesirable ways, he began to be treated as a threat, both inside and outside the home. At the beginning of 21st Century that attack reached a peak but also it opened so many discussions about Islam, its position within Muslim states and the future of Islam as an integrative force.

But, two hundred years of being an object has made almost the entire Muslim world lost in modern trends. Because of such development, surly negative once for Muslims, call for the back to the roots, to the fundamental principles appeared from time to time all over Muslim geography. This call made possible appearance of so-called Islamic fundamentalism which by its various characteristics and phenomena provided possibility to be treated ambiguously.

If one wants to understand the necessity of the Islamic Renaissance - the return to the basics of Islamic teaching about man and his role and purpose, and not on the principle of not enough clear insights of this topic, Islamic fundamentalism should be viewed as any other conservative approach. This view and attitude toward Islam, a view of the possibilities of social change, has been generally accepted and interpreted by many scholars over the time and today it appears as a publicly accepted and scientifically grounded. One of the most consistent authors, Mario Nobile, said

By denying Western and materialist standards of social values (imposed by both capitalism and socialism), Islamic fundamentalism seeks to isolate itself from the 'corruption of time' by immersing itself in its own past. However, in today's interdependent world, such isolation is impossible. That is why Islamic fundamentalism must strive to rule the world, choose the advantage of its worldview and respond by all means to the political and civilizational challenges of other ideologies, which threaten the very essence of Islam (Mulaosmanović, 2013: 21).

The image of 'Islamists', a modern term used to denigrate Islamic political thinkers and people critical of the achievements of Western democracy and former Eastern socialism (new autocratic Eurasian concept of rule), is not an image they create of themselves but is the same in the context of world geopolitical and strategic concepts. To say it sarcastically, thanks to world socio-political processes in the 20th century and social movements in the Islamic world, the concept of 'return to basics / return to the roots' has been transformed into a 'call to return to darkness' and made socially unacceptable. Interdependent world turned Islamic Puritanism to a very dubious action so that the 'struggle to return to basics' was replaced by Machiavellian notions of politics, thus distorting and abandoning the original idea.

No doubt that Muslims have to dismiss the trail of radicalization and Machiavellianism. But primarily Muslims have to deal with one general disadvantage they witness on every level in their societies. It is a lack of confidence. The hegemony of liberalism has subjugated the Muslim peoples and their elites to their own concept of diversity which is acceptable only within this hegemony. Getting out of this framework for Muslims is a prerequisite for creating the necessary common approaches (common foreign policy and mutual security) as an important tool for establishment of equal otherness.

The questions are rising when one is defining possible socio-political transformation of larger region based on spiritual call. But the current affairs, especially Israel's genocidal attack on Gaza, are strongest advocates for re-emergence of "The Civilization of ethics". As a civilization of ethics, Islamic civilization in its core builds its relationship to the world, to those who are its subjects as well as to those who represent any otherness, on the premise of fairness whose value is measured in the hereafter. Fulfilment of personal and societal mission lies in revival of tradition on which civilization was based and this idea of ethical reversion was framed in cosmological terms. God created the world as a hierarchical chain of being, his knowledge—by which he designed the world—being the most supreme (Hallaq, 2013:13).

Human stewardship (khalifah) over the material and social world thus consisted of the duty to "discover" the range and depth of this knowledge and then to apply it to their environment. But how to discover that depth if the environment is not built on a typology that supports its extraction? How to delimit space and create social structures within which relationships based on this primordial calling will grow? Justice and ethics strongly correlate in Muslim worldview, liberal, progressive one has its fulfilment within the positive outcomes of corporations. It differs utterly.

For this reason, the theoretical basis and "a potential possibility" has to be created. Going straight into the subject which essentially deals with future of Muslim Geography or at least pretends to deal with it, the definition which states that worldview is a coherent set of presuppositions and beliefs that

every person has which shape how we make sense of the world and everything in it, is accepted as a starting point. Existence of any other coherent set, any other worldview imposed on person, creates serious gaps and unjust challenges on individuals. In the context of society, it creates trauma, drama and at the end brings instability, uncertainty and lack of confidence, and this is something what Muslims are still going through.

Although the term worldview can be replaced by Bamiyah's concept of lifeworlds due to its truly striking insights, it will suffice for this paper to indicate that this issue needs further thought. Given that Bamiyeh emphasizes that lifeworlds must be distinguished from power structures, which are discussed in part in this article, then worldview remains a unifying concept within which systems also exist (Bamiyah, 2019: 7).

In this work worldview is also seen as a framework for two Bourdieuesian variables, habitus - perception as basic function of our way of being-in-the world and doxa - a set of unquestioned beliefs by which aspects of the world are grasped as "natural", taken for granted. Above mentioned perception is not "a deliberate taking up of a position; it is the background from which all acts stand out, and is presupposed by them". In a fact, it is the pre-reflective, sensuous contact with the world, the guide of our everyday practical orientations by distinguishing between "what is and is not 'for us'" (Ristić, 2023).

The concept of habitus should explain the paradox that human behavior can be oriented towards some goals, without being aware of it, that is, it serves to explain the "coincidence of social and mental structures". In the same way that a new epistemology was created within Muslim Geography during the 19th Century, a return to tradition should contribute to the revival of epistemology which vanished during colossal destruction of this system described as a structural genocide because it was the annihilation of an entire apparatus of knowledge understood as both a system and a particular way of living in the world (Hallaq, 2019: 7).

That unique form of psychoepistemology, one that entailed not only a way of learning and passing down knowledge, but also a deliberate way of living reflectively and of acting. New epistemology brought death of a that particular habitus, of a particular way of honing the self within a shared environment, with its own doxa and fairly unique assumptions (Hallaq, 2019: 7-8). Habitus can thus be understood as a type of "driving principle", that which "produces practices" (Ristić, 2023).

Social theory deals with habitual practices, socialization, perceptual schemes, typification, "stock of knowledge", the background etc. as explanatory tools. All of them are giving sense and clear pictures for understanding of social determinism as a natural consequence of repetition of rituals, existence of solid social structures and a clear, firm legal framework.

The cohabitation of these elements in time and space, in a longer time frame, is designed by doxa. It conveys the natural attitude in which the social world is a self-evident, taken for granted reality and therefore, accepted as unproblematic (Vakalopoulos, 2023). Doxa and habitus meet at the place where the worldview unites both as our learned and subconscious conditioning. Perhaps this kind of determinism can be understood as training, but it is only a superficial understanding of things. Reflexivity as one of the phenomena of "the living worldview" is viewed through its expediency. The civilization of ethics, this kind of worldview, gives a reflex to help others, to do good deeds and to defend those who are attacked. This means that reflexivity fulfils in the fundamental ideas of justice and fairness.

Practical Approaches

The common foreign policy strategy of a particular multilateral organization depends on several key elements. Most important is an existing mutual worldview that is the bearer of the fundamental orientations of the population inhabiting the countries that are members of such organization. For the orientations to be clear, there must be principles that determine both internal and external relations. In this sense it can be said that Muslims have an advantage because they have a clear outline of these relations given in the main sources (*Qur'an and Sunnah*). Nevertheless, a serious deviation from the given directions of action and acceptance of the contradictory, often opposite values to which societies have reached are visible.

The basic problem for the absence of a common foreign policy strategy lies in the fact that there is no coherent advocacy in this regard. Defining the interest shaped by the principles (*Quran, Sunnah and mutual interests*) will inevitably lead to a political conflict with, above all, the liberal paradigm that lulled political thought of the Muslim intellectual elite. However odd it could be, *Khal-dunian* social cohesion (*assabiyah*) is theoretical foundation for reappearance of Muslim communality (Sušić, 1975). However, as Ongur-Sezgin (2016) realized "Turkey's new turn to be a proactive interest-seeker, especially in the Middle East, can be considered a deviation or a hiatus in its foreign policy habitus" and as such represents positive and possible game-changer move which can influence the core area of Muslim Geography.

Described as a group solidarity or feeling *assabiyah* also has outgrown tribal or ethnic frame. It has to be explained through wider concept of Ummah as imagined community with own values, rules and interests. Realizing that global politics will count with global players Muslims are called to take serious steps toward creation of common institutions and agencies to secure more effective approach on the basis of mutual understanding.

The result of blind acceptance of foreign concepts is an absence of interest in seeking answers for Muslim countries within its own paradigm. It led to

a very strange state, Islamic social and political thought became apatride (stateless) within the Muslim public, and outside of it began to be treated as a threat, as mentioned above.

Certainly, one of the reasons for this position of Islam in Muslim societies is also the cessation of thought which could offer answers to the challenges of modernism. Supposedly Muslims until Napoleon's arrival in Egypt were still convinced that they were the rulers of the world. Facing the military power of the French brought them into reality. The real problem is that they did not learn the necessary lesson from that knowledge, but they showed total weakness before that power, but also before the power that came after it (English, American, etc.).

In addition to the already mentioned escape from "the corruption of time" that has all the features of spiritual puritanism, this relationship also separated Muslims from following the currents in the new industrial age. This meant that Muslims ceased to be competitive in the world that had emerged. Spiritual puritanism among learned men, their escape from "corruption of time" didn't help to Muslim masses. They were left to confront it without clear directions.

But, the beginning of the 21st century has changed this situation. The Muslim world, at least its core area, as much as burdened with a multitude of challenges, obstacles and threats has in part managed to make up for this weakness that has lasted for two hundred years. What is left, to ennoble this Muslim upliftment with the true idea of Islam. Muslims need to be a community that leads, not follows, otherwise they do not fulfill one of the basic Islamic intentions.

The non-existent security network among Islamic countries with emphasized reasons why it is urgently needed to be established is also crucial topic. On the basis of military conflicts in Syria, Libya, Afghanistan, Yemen and Sudan is clear that mutual forces (not only because of needs of Islamic countries but for the global stability) would stabilize whole region. Also, it could provide better development of the political processes within Muslim geography and focus on common interest of Muslim nations. As such mutual forces do not have potential to prevent conflicts and secure peaceful environment, but also to be turning point in Muslim understanding of its importance in globalized world. Integrative factors among nations of Fertile Crescent are many. One of necessities which require high attention is connected to security.

The most of conflicts and military campaigns in 21st Century are happening in lands and regions of Muslim geography. The main actors, who are most often conducting proxy wars, are powers who are following their own agenda and interests in last more than 100 years. NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) with its presence in the Middle East for almost 70 years (Turkey is a member since 1952.) but also former colonial powers (Great Britain, France,

Italy) and USSR reshaped the region during First World War by various interventions and treaties (The Hussein-McMahon Correspondence 1915-6, the Sykes-Picot Agreement 1916, and the Balfour Declaration, 1917).

All these developments, even if some of them were not deliberately prepared to minimize Muslim coherence and divide previously homogenous cultural entity had exactly that result. And it is confusing and intellectually questionable that different authors are advocating for Westphalian model to Middle East what contradicts negative developments in last two centuries delivered by that Westernized approach (Milton et al., 2019). The first and most significant stumbling block is conditional sovereignty, which the authors take as a positive example of the Treaty of Westphalia that can be transferred to the Middle East. The Muslim worldview actually has a clear image of sovereignty. It does not belong to man nor subject to negotiation by various parties, but is absolutely God's (Hallaq, 2013: 49). The prerequisite is to follow, not to create.

Centennial history teaches that intermediation of global powers created worsen political, social and even religious conditions, while newly established Muslim states economically and technologically became dependent. Core-periphery system where Western dominance increased from decade to decade almost perfectly was introduced there. New states and different types of regimes had characteristics of "penetrated system" with Galtung's two mechanisms; the core created and left behind client elites and classes which have an interest in dependent relations, and regional states were linked to the core, in feudal-like north-south relations, while horizontal (south-south) relations were shattered (Galtung, 1971).

Intermediation by global powers at the beginning of 21st Century and opening of so called "War on Terror" proved this dependency and inter-Muslim disintegration. During 70's and 80's emergence of the frustration of identity by the arbitrary imposition of borders gave birth to the main ideology of protest, Westerners recognized it and named it wrongly as political Islam. Universal values of Islam have had a strength to gather opposition across borders to constitute influential movements, but within governmental bodies these ideas were rejected and mostly proclaimed as an enemy of the state and society. That gap between so-called political Islam (or Islamism) and Muslim states created deepest social and political fall of the region in its modern history.

What was seen as a good cooperative effort is creation of Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) established in 1981., a year after Iranian Revolution what partly is answering on question of main reason behind that political move among Gulf countries. In 2001, the GCC Supreme Council set the following goals: Customs union in January 2003, Common market by 2007, Common currency by 2010 and finally transformation to Gulf Union in 2011. Most of these goals are not implemented.

On the other side, strategic military cooperation was set in 1982 when the GCC defense ministers agreed on the creation of Peninsula Shield Force (PSF), what was seen as “one of the oldest decisions in the field of military cooperation” (Saidy, 2014). The collaboration among gulf countries continued (Joint Defense Agreement, 2000; Joint Defense Council and a Military Committee) but without clear vision how to overcome authority disputes and especially how to be enlarged (on which basis). What was clear is that GCC tried to set up military structure which will be in line with NATO operations and true ally. Other organizations such as Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) or Arab Maghreb Union (*Ittiḥād al-Maghrib al-‘Arabī*) do not pay attention to this crucial problem of Muslim geography. But, promising thing about all these efforts is existence of mutual deliberation and building of joint concepts. In that sense, security and military cooperation has to come as an idea worth to work on.

Integrative Examples

Mutual forces should have a mandate to prevent escalation of fights and establish peaceful environment for negotiations and talks. Possible pattern that could be used is EU *The Common Security and Defense Policy* (CSDP) concept in the fields of defense and crisis management (Lisbon Treaty from 2009). This is also a main component of the EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Of course, the idea of a common defense policy for Europe dates back to 1948 when the Treaty of Brussels was signed (the UK, France, and the Benelux) but real implementation started by integration of so-called “Petersberg Tasks” in the 1999 Treaty of Amsterdam (European Union [EU], 2021). When the “Global Strategy for the European Union’s Foreign and Security Policy” was presented in June 2016 it was quite clear that the foundation for further development of CSDP was laid, and it represented comprehensive package of measures in the areas of security and defense (EU, 2021).

So, the similar concept could be implemented with one important obstacle on its way. Nonexistent political body for states of Muslim geography such as European Union is serious problem for Muslim states if the idea is to embrace most of them under this umbrella. It means that different organizations (Arab Maghreb Union, the Cooperation Council of Turkic-Speaking States, GCC etc.) should be prepared to sign agreements about military and defense cooperation, many multilateral and bilateral treaties also have to be implemented and so on. If state apparatuses cannot react positively and proactively, societies should do their tasks. Intellectuals should develop scholarly approach.

In last two decades world witnessed wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Arab Spring with its bad developments in Libya, Syria, Egypt. Wars in Yemen, Sudan, Mali are also parts of deterrent force which is dominantly used against Muslims by the Muslims. Mostly these conflicts are managed and controlled by interference from outside. Russia, NATO, EU or even particular interests of global

powers are taking significant "piece of cake" in these horrifying events. While Western World is living prosperous period at home, their interference abroad is creating chaos.

To beat that dependency, peace keeping, humanitarian action, rescue mission, crisis management within Muslim geography has to rely on its on synergy. Surely, under of the assumption of existence of mutual agreement, this kind of maneuver would be beneficial for everyone because of conceptual reciprocity. What is meant by conceptual reciprocity is possibility that mutual forces would react to any country in same manner to establish desired goal – peace and stability.

On the global level for Muslims is of high importance to compete as a block. Covering land between great political entities, East and the West, Muslim states have to find successful model to prevent foreign interference and to secure internal cohesion. It has to be based on common market, mutual currency and cultural connectivity. But before it, since Muslim world is bleeding, *conditio sine qua non*, is joint operations with mandate to secure and protect Muslim lands, lives and property.

To conclude with thinking of Russian philosopher Alexander Dugin. In his *Fourth Political Theory* he stated that "Tradition (religion, hierarchy, family) and its values (...) overthrown at the dawn of modernity" by all three political theories (fascism, communism, liberalism) which were conceived as artificial ideological constructions by people who comprehended, in various ways, 'the death of God' (Friedrich Nietzsche), the 'disenchantment of the world' (Max Weber), and the 'end of the sacred' (Dugin, 2012). According to Dugin post-liberal world will be painted by the return of the theology as a basis of fourth political theory.

This question for Muslims is not about First, Fourth or Zero Political Theory. The question is do they recognize sign of the times and work for betterment of Muslim world on the core principles. The alternative model of a conservative future/a conservative tomorrow, as Dugin said, is based on the principles of vitality, roots, constants, and eternity. Some of these principles are Muslim's too. Muslim political theory was and it should be founded on it, and political actions have to be created from it. Tomorrow's multipolar world could be more brutal if above mention signs will not be considered as a call for action.

The social sciences in the West have gone far ahead of the rest of the world in at least two segments. In the first case, it is about the freedom of scholars in theorizing all social phenomena, trying to find frameworks and establish forms and variables within human experience. In the second, these theories become the basis for the construction of methodological procedures by which its premises are tried in reality.

That approach can be understood in the context of the dominance of the liberal paradigm and the Westerners constant search for new and better solutions. Another reason could be the rejection of authority, mostly traditional church organizations and especially during postmodern period. Instead of faith and a value system that was valid for a long-time, individual freedom became a prerequisite for all other issues. It was the combination of theoretical patterns and positivist sociometric methodology that gave impulses to social changes. The aim is to create new relations and new mankind, improved by people, through people's experience and based on people's materialistic understanding of the world.

That theorizing became also significant for the concept of internal security. Different kind of questions demanded different type of theory (explanatory, normative or interpretative), therefore overbridging the whole area by precise research intention was of the highest importance. As a result of these concerns the core question emanated trying to explain the emergence and dynamics of cooperation on internal security issues in the European Union (Bossong and Rhinard, 2016).

Internal security cooperation had a starting point in 1975 with the establishment of the TREVI cooperation.² One of the main reasons for that action was belief that Europeans should be more effective and better prepared for the threats if they face them together. But they didn't look for an ordinary security, Europeans wanted to establish internal security strategy which reflects the values and priorities they share. In that sense, the concept must be understood as a wide and comprehensive concept which straddles multiple sectors in order to address these major threats which have a direct impact on the lives safety and well-being of citizens (GSOC, 2010). For Scandinavian researcher that Pan-European police cooperation is described as taking place in informal networks and through practices which are not officially recognized but created by police agencies as a 'necessary' answer to the new challenges and threats of the border-free Europe (Ekengren, 2008).

The consolidation of a security model, based on the principles and values of the EU was a necessity. It means that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the rule of law, democracy, dialogue, tolerance, transparency and solidarity are unavoidable axels of the concept. In this context EU internal security means protecting both people and the values. The challenge wasn't easy because European Union entered the 21st century with around

² TREVI was an intergovernmental network, established outside of the then-European Community legal framework, of national officials from ministries of justice and interior created by the European Council Summit in Rome, Italy in December 1975. It is sometimes noted that TREVI stands for Terrorisme, Radicalisme, Extrémisme et Violence Internationale. It was ended when cooperation was integrated into the so-called Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) pillar of the EU when the Treaty of Maastricht came into force in 1992.

500 million people across the 27 countries with possibility of enlargement. Therefore, security through essential significance for multiple sectors became a key factor in ensuring a high quality of life in European society. Secondly, protecting EU critical infrastructure is also an important task. The definition of internal security is not simple while the goals are quite comprehensive.

(...) In the EU, internal security coexists in the institutional lexicon, past and present, alongside 'Justice and Home Affairs', 'Third Pillar', 'Police and Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters', and the 'Area of Freedom, Security and Justice'.³ Our pragmatic definition of internal security corresponds most closely with the latter term, officially used to denote the collection of policies focused on security, rights, and the free movement of people. Concretely, this means border security, police matters, customs questions, and criminal justice. Some issues, such as civil protection, are not formally part of the EU's AFSJ but clearly seem to be part of any definition of internal security (Bassong and Rhinard, 2016: 5).

To upgrade TREVI cooperation to the next level, the European Union adopted the European security strategy (2003), which looked at the external aspect of it. In February 2010, the Council complemented the European security strategy by adopting the internal security strategy approved by the European Council in March 2010. These documents and actions are core for the creation of the European security model (GSOC, 2010).

The Lisbon Treaty and the Stockholm program enable the EU to take ambitious steps in developing Europe as an area of justice, freedom and security. The strategy was focused on common threats and challenges; EU's common internal security policy and the principles and European security model. The principles and guidelines of the European security model derive from the Treaties of the Union and set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights. Clearly that fundamental rights, international protection, the rule of law and privacy, transparency and accountability, tolerance, respect and freedom of expression, solidarity etc., are core principles. But mutual trust surpasses all as a key principle for successful cooperation.

No need to go into the details of The Model trying to explain how it is organized, what kind of mechanisms are established, how intelligences are conducting their protocols, which analytical tools are used or which security policies are effective or ineffective, the status of operational cooperation. All these questions are elaborated by professionals. What is interesting are the principles, reasons behind those principles and rational stronghold mutual for Europeans. Moreover, it is highly important to detect why Muslim geography cannot be so rational and act in principle and by the principles.

³ The 'first pillar' of the EU refers to Treaty of Rome-based activities ('Community' activities such as trade, the common market, etc.), the 'second pillar' to the Common Foreign and Security Policy (and now the European Security and Defence Policy), and the 'third pillar' to cooperation in Justice and Home Affairs.

Within seven years (from end of 2003 till the beginning of 2010) European Union developed two important documents related to security of that intra-governmental organization. First was the European external security strategy, while in February 2010 the European Council complemented it by adopting the internal security strategy. As explained in introduction of document a firm commitment to continuing to make progress in justice, freedom and security through a European security model and improvement of cooperation and solidarity between Member States is crux of the matter. The concept of internal security, as mentioned, straddles multiple sectors to address major threats which have a direct impact on the lives, safety, and well-being of European citizens.

Security is a key factor for insurance of a high quality of life in European society, but also it means protection of freedom and democracy, core values of European Union, so strategy reflects Europe's shared vision of future not only of European continent but worldwide. This approach could be highly beneficiary for Muslim states in their efforts to create framework for mutual action. Parsing core values among Muslim nations should lead to awareness of high level of communality. In that sense elaboration of how mutual values can interact with internal security within Muslim Geography is an essential task for Muslim scholars.

EU member states had its own dilemma from the beginning. One of the most important issues was and still is a question of sovereignty. National state and its agencies versus intergovernmental organization which is trying to encompass them under one umbrella is a battle that continue to provoke Europeans. For Muslim Geography that question is even more provoking. Thinking for example about MENA region one cannot imagine that it can be one area where border control will be abolished or centralized intelligence office will be established. The most possible answer is that national states do not want to lose their sovereignty.

This European unification tell that the first lesson for Muslims is related to the European matured awareness of the senselessness of constant conflict. Let's not forget that the European continent is actually a continent of war. All these differences, all these aspirations for power led the European ethnic groups and nations towards religious, political and any other intolerance.

The second lesson is related to political thought. Europeans managed to overcome all these above-mentioned differences and incorporate them into a unique worldview. On the basis of democratic traditions, the value system, financial and economic relations, cultural matrices and educational approaches were created. Legal *acquis* too. The problem of the relationship between the national state and the supranational structure still exists, but the construction of the European internal security model is a great witness that this is also being successfully overcome.

Muslim nations could and should learn the first lesson, the advantage of unity, much more easily than Europeans. It is not that they did not fight each other nor that there are no significant tensions today, but there is a very important advantage. In historical experience, Muslims have positive examples of unity, and the EU, with its development, only further shows them that this is the path they should return to.

Therefore, Muslims can re-start that entire process on pre-defined general relations. If the view of the world is essentially created by the Quranic discourse, then the issues of financial, economic or political relations seek only technical solutions because they are already given. The value system is as it was from the time of the Prophet (s.a.w.s). until the collapse of the Islamic order at the beginning of the 20th century. Cultural matrices based on Monotheism as well as the educational system too. The difficult question that interferes with the creation of a common space of internal security and appears in recent discussions, the question of sovereignty, is actually completely insignificant.

The Islamic worldview very clearly defines the Sovereign. It is God, Malik ul Mulk, The Owner of Absolute Sovereignty. It is not a people or nation-state. By accepting and implementing this fundamental truth, any argument against the creation of a wide, unified security interior space breaks out. To put it simply and directly, a common will that leads to common goals is prerequisite.

Instead of functionalist, constructivist or any other theory, Islamic practice fulfils all what is necessary. How effectively Hallaq underlined "It is a foundational principle in Taha's philosophy that praxis has primacy over theoretical knowledge ..." (Hallaq, 2019: 42). Of course, sociometry is a must, but it should not give more or less data to prove the correctness of certain ideas about the way societies should go. That sociometry should reveal areas where more investment and attention must be paid.

Conclusion

As it is emphasized, this article tries to provoke a different way of thinking about the world, relations in it and ways to harmonize relations on a global level with true diversity. This can be achieved by accepting the existence of different worldviews in their fullness. The Islamic world, narrowed between the need for reform and the lack of a methodological pattern to remain its own while homogenizing the broad Muslim areas, experienced decadences and declines that it has not yet managed to explain to itself.

One of the reasons for this state of affairs is the lack of self-confidence, as a reaction to a period of decline or uncertainty in recovery methods, is less important. The state as such is unacceptable and requires immediate confirmation and determination of oneself in the world.

As much as the focus is on meta systems, meta regions and meta narratives, change actually begins in man and through man. As Abdurahman Taha explained, for the essential reform and construction of the Muslim worldview we need a new concept of human, other and different characteristics than those imposed by Modernity through the dominance of liberal ideology.

A new concept of the human thus demands new forms of acculturation, education, and upbringing. The forms in this new configuration take it for granted that the subject is formed by humility, modesty, and gratitude, all of which are not mere nouns and derivative descriptors, but effectively performative as technologies of the self, or, as Taha would have it, "of the soul." They are not, in yet other words, mere qualities that we may preach or admire, but they rather stand as constitutive of a world of values in which the subject is born and nurtured, systemically, systematically, and constitutionally. Humility is never timidity or meekness, nor is its servility or obsequiousness (Hallaq, 2019: 267-68).

It is clear that the disappearance of the hegemony/dictatorship of the liberal paradigm calls for the growth of a new and different hegemony. In order to arrive at a new concept of human and assuming responsibility for living in the world, the basis of this is not "anthropocentrism or secular humanism, nor just speech, theory and knowledge, but practice, habituation, psychoepistemology, and habitus, all at once" (Hallaq, 2019: 268). For an individual to grow up who will take on this kind of responsibility, the new hegemony cannot escape Althusser's ideological and Foucauldian disciplinary techniques that will create ways of habituation.

The paper emphasizes one concept that could play a significant role in the re-modelling of the Islamic world through emergence of new hegemony. It is the Khaldunian *assabiya*. As a Amr Sabet observed "it is significant to note that *assabiyya* comes from the root Arabic word *asb* which means the nerve or the command center of something. It refers, that is, to the ability to exercise will power, the foundation of any genuine Islamic politics" (Sabet, 2008: 10). And precisely this concept of *assabiyya* as a command center that will define techniques based on Islamic tradition, and which will ensure the emergence of a new concept of human from which the Islamic worldview as a player in a multipolar world should grow, is a favorable beginning of renewal.

References

- Allison, G. (2017) *Destinated for War. Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap?* New York-Boston, USA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
- Bamyeh A. M. (2019) *Lifeworlds of Islam: The Pragmatics of a Religion*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University
- Black Sea Drills Showcase Strong NATO-Ukraine Defense Ties. (2021, July 10) Retrieved from https://www.voanews.com/a/europe_black-sea-drills-showcase-strong-nato-ukraine-defense-ties/6208087.html

- Bossong R. and Rhinard M. (2016). Introduction. Alternative Perspectives on Internal Security Cooperation in the European Union: Setting the Scene. In Bossong R. and Rhinard M. *Theorizing Internal Security Cooperation in the European Union* (pp. 3-27). Oxford University Press
- Caiyu, L. (2022, August 1) BRICS becomes appealing to more countries as Algeria signals interest in joining group: experts. *Global Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202208/1271945.shtml>
- Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson: "The United States is using Ukraine to reestablish its hegemony over Europe". (2023, June 1) Retrieved from <https://lemediaen442.fr/le-colonel-lawrence-wilkerson-les-etats-unis-utilisent-lukraine-pour-retablir-leur-hegemonie-sur-leurope/>
- Doshi, R. (2021) *The Long Game. China's Grand Strategy to Displace American Order*. Oxford University Press
- Drezner W. D. (2007) Are we moving towards apolarity? *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2007/01/31/are-we-moving-towards-apolarity/>
- Dugin, A. (2012) *Fourth Political Theory*. Moscow, RU: Eurasian Movt
- Ekengren, M. (2008). The interface of external and internal security in the EU and in Nordic policies. The Broader Dimensions of Security. In Fluri P. and Spence D. *The European Union and Security Sector Reform* (pp. 151-172). London, UK: John Harper Publishing
- European Union. (2021) *The shaping of a Common Security and Defense Policy*. Retrieved from https://eeas.europa.eu/topics/common-security-and-defence-policy-csdp/5388/shaping-of-a-common-security-and-defence-policy_en
- Galtung, J. (1971) A Structural Theory of Imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research* 8(2), 81-117
- General Secretariat of the Council. (2010) *Internal security strategy for the European Union. Towards a European security model*. Retrieved from <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/30753/qc3010313enc.pdf>
- Hallaq, B. W. (2013) *Impossible State, Islam, Politics, and Modernity's Moral Predicament*. New York, USA: Columbia University Press
- Hallaq, B. W. (2019) *Reforming Modernity. Ethics and the New Human in the Philosophy of Abdurrahman Taha*. New York, USA: Columbia University Press
- Hathout, H. (2013) *Čitanje muslimaskog uma*. Sarajevo, BiH: Dobra knjiga
- Hyde-Price, A. (2007) *European security in the Twenty-first century. The challenge of multipolarity* London, UK: Routledge
- Ignatieff, M. (2021) The Collapse of Liberal Internationalism. What went wrong, and where to go from here. *Persuasion*. Retrieved from <https://www.persuasion.community/p/the-collapse-of-liberal-internationalism>
- Miller, C. (2022, February 25) Why Is Putin at War Again? Because He Keeps Winning. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/25/opinion/putin-war-russia-military.html>
- Milton, P. Axworthy, M. and Simms, B. (2019) *Towards a Westphalia for the Middle East*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2021) *China and Africa in the New Era. A Partnership of Equals*. Retrieved from https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjdt_665385/2649_665393/202111/t20211126_10453904.html

- Miniszterelnök. (2023) *Speech by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán at the 32nd Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp* Retrieved from <https://miniszterelnok.hu/en/speech-by-prime-minister-viktor-orban-at-the-32nd-balvanyos-summer-free-university-and-student-camp/>
- Mulaosmanović, A. (2013) *Iskušenje opstanka. Izetbegovićevih deset godina 1990–2000*. Sarajevo, BiH: Dobra Knjiga
- Norton, B. (2022) Ex VP Dick Cheney confirmed US goal is to break up Russia, not just USSR. *Geopolitical Economy*. Retrieved from <https://geopoliticaleconomy.com/2022/02/01/dick-cheney-us-goal-break-up-russia/>
- Ongur, O. H. Zengin, H. (2016) Transforming Habitus of the Foreign Policy: A Bourdieusian Analysis of Turkey as an Emerging Middle Power, *Rising Powers Quarterly* 1 (2), 117-133.
- Pepe, M. J. (2019) Beyond China: The return of the Eurasian order. In Schulze W. P. (ed.), *Multipolarity. The promise of disharmony* (pp. 255-276). Campus Verlag Frankfurt/New York
- President of Russia. (2007) *Press Conference following Talks with German Chancellor Angela Merkel* Retrieved from <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24008>
- Ristić, D. (2023) Burdijeova teoretizacija habitusa. In Mladenović, I. Zarić, Z. i Urošević, M. (eds.) *Pjer Burdije: radikalna misao i praxis* (pp. 85-102). Beograd, RS: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju-Univerzitet u Beogradu
- Sabet, G. E. Amr. (2008) *Islam and the Political. Theory, Governance and International Relations*. London, England: Pluto Press
- Saidy, B. (2014, October 14) *GCC's defense cooperation: Moving towards unity*. Retrieved from <https://www.fpri.org/article/2014/10/gccs-defense-cooperation-moving-towards-unity/>
- Schulze, W. P. (2020) European comprehensive collective security. Missed opportunities in a rapidly changing international environment. In Peter W. Schulze, Winfried Veit (eds.) *Ukraine in the crosshairs of geopolitical power play* (pp.22-40). Campus Verlag Frankfurt/New York
- Spetalnick, M. and Graham, D. (2022, June 7) U.S. bars Cuba, Venezuela from Americas summit; Mexican leader sits out. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/us-excludes-cuba-venezuela-nicaragua-americas-summit-sources-2022-06-06/>
- Sušić, H. (1975) Društveni i politički značaj 'asabiyye', *Politička misao* 4, 71-81.
- The White House. (2022) *Fact Sheet: Implementation of the Australia – United Kingdom – United States Partnership (AUKUS)*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/04/05/fact-sheet-implementation-of-the-australia-united-kingdom-united-states-partnership-aukus/>
- Vakalopoulos, K. (2023) Shedding Some (More) Light in Bourdieu's Habitus and Doxa: A Socio-Phenomenological Approach. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 53, 255–270.
- Wintour, P. (2023, July 20) What was the Black Sea grain deal and why did it collapse? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2023/jul/20/what-was-the-black-sea-grain-deal-and-why-did-it-collapse>