

**Answer to Question**

**True Reality of the American-Russian Accord and the Purpose of the Nuclear Summit**

(Translated)

**Question:**

It is known that the Russian air intervention in Syria occurred through the agreement of America in a dirty deal where Russia would undertake that which serves the American interests in Syria, in exchange for America turning a blind eye to the Russian occupation of Crimea, in addition to what is taking place in Eastern Ukraine... It was possible to understand from that, that there is a policy of agreement or accord between Russia and America. However, what has happened recently in respect to excluding Russia from the Nuclear Summit which Obama is coordinating in addition to the war confrontations that have taken place between Azerbaijan which is backed by America and Armenia which is backed by Russia, all of that makes this accord unstable... And the question is: What is the explanation for this?

Another question: How did this nuclear summit arise? And what is its purpose? And will it really lead to nuclear disarmament? Jazaak Allahu Khairan.

**Answer:**

**Firstly: The unstable American-Russian accord:**

1 – Putin was a former director of the KGB in the former Soviet Union and yearns for a prominent international role like the Soviet Union had previously had with America. For that reason, he agreed to undertake the criminal aggressor role in Syria for America's interests by consolidating the rule of Bashar until America finds a replacement, after he was close to falling and America feared that the vacuum would be filled by a sincere Islamic force... Putin had believed that through serving America in Syria that the problems of the southern Russian border in Ukraine and around Ukraine would be calmed. However, Syria is one matter whilst Ukraine is another altogether! That is because Russia's slipping into a war with the Muslims will make Russia taste, by the help of Allah, woe upon woe which would accompany the problems of Ukraine and what is related to it and would be like a drop in the ocean in comparison to the anger of the Muslims, and indeed tomorrow is near. This is from one angle...

From another angle, Putin had thought that America would reward him by raising the international role of Russia and make it prominent in respect to the international issues! This represents a political futility and that is because countries that are established upon the capitalist ideology do not hold any value other than that of benefit and exploiting others. For that reason, the most powerful capitalist states expend their efforts to gain dominance over the weaker capitalist states... America, Europe and Russia follow the capitalist ideology and the situation is not like it had been previously when the West followed the capitalist ideology and the Soviet Union followed the communist socialist ideology. This was when each of these two ideologies had values that clashed with one another and it was possible for them to compete with one another in respect to gaining dominance and influence where rivalry was expected... As for the major states that adopt capitalism, then the dominance amongst them remains belonging to the powerful state whilst its agreements made with other states, which adopt the same ideology, are only made to serve its interests whilst they are not rivals to it. America therefore does not accept for Europe to be a rival to it or for Russia to be a rival to it until these states reach a level of power that will enable them to struggle with it for

influence so as to be a revival to it. That is because the capitalist ideology is based upon benefit whilst the most powerful gains the greatest share.

2 – In this way Putin's assumption that by serving the interest of America in Syria that America would then calm down Russia's regional and international problems, was wrong. That has become apparently clear in two matters mentioned within the question and they are: the nuclear summit and the war between Azerbaijan and Armenia:

**A – As for the nuclear summit,** America had undertaken the preparations for the summit and its preparation in terms of its programme and working schedule in which Russia was disregarded in respect to all of that whilst it is the second ranked nuclear state in the world... The summit continued from 31/03/2016 until 01/04/2016 and within it, the US attempted to consolidate that it is the major and super power in addition to the historic leader that leads all of the world's countries where it undertakes what it deems fit in any place and at any time. This is to the extent that it did not show any concern for Russia in the case where it did not involve it in respect to the preparation of the summit despite its consideration as being the second nuclear state or power: The Kremlin confirmed that the preparation for the summit lacked coordination with Russia just as the study of the issues related to nuclear security demand joint efforts and to take into consideration the interests and positions of other parties. This is what Kremlin spokesman Dimitri Biskov said. However, he made clear in a direct manner that Moscow had faced during the preparation for the convening of the summit a lack of cooperation in relation to studying the issues and subject areas that fell within the working schedule... accompanied by a provocative media campaign undertaken by the US side. (Russia Today 31/03/2016).

It is apparent from the behaviour of Washington during the invitation to the summit and during it what can be described as degrading Russia to the extent of insult which led to Putin not attending. Even though the reason was America's disregard for Russia in respect to the preparation and proceedings of the conference, America's response to Putin's non-attendance was nevertheless even more cold and degrading just like the situation had been during the cold war. The White House Deputy National Security Advisor Ben Rhodes said: "Russia's decision to certainly not participate at a high level we believe is a missed opportunity for Russia above all ... Frankly, all they're doing is isolating themselves in not participating as they have in the past," (Al-Badeel site and Reuters 31/03/2016). Indeed, Obama even lowered the value of Russia and placed it in the same bracket as North Korea when he said at the conclusion of the summit: "There is still a great deal of work required to get rid of Russia's and North Korea's nuclear arsenal whilst adding "Our work has not yet come to an end as there are many nuclear materials that need to be secured on a world level"" (Al-Jazeera Net 02/04/2016). The extent of America's degradation to Russia in respect to the subject of the nuclear summit is therefore clear!

**B – As for the war between Azerbaijan and Armenia...** The battles broke out in a semi-surprising manner across the ceasefire line between Armenia and Azerbaijan in the mountainous region of Karbakh on the night of 02/04/2016... The political and military leaders were summoned to Baku for urgent meetings just as Armenia did in the case where its President Sargsyan stated: "Since the restoration of the truce in 1994, it's the most large-scale warfare, which Azerbaijan has tried to carry out". (Al-Jazeera Net 03/04/2016). It is possible to conclude that the Russian influence was stable to an extent within Armenia which hosts one of Russia's largest military bases comprising of 102 regiments of the Russian army and where approximately 5000 Russian soldiers are stationed. Russia also provides the poor Armenian state grants and loans through resources and it has extended military support to it throughout the time of the dispute with Azerbaijan in the mountainous Karbakh region, before and after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Russia was the mediator that enforced the ceasefire in 1994 between the two sides. It was to the favour of Armenia in the case where it and its followers in the Karbakh region had completely gained control over the Azeri province whilst it occupied 9% of other Azerbaijani land in the west and south of the province, and indeed even in its east. For that reason, Russia was concerned to stop this recent war... As for the role of America in this war which has erupted... then this was behind a curtain or

indeed without a curtain. Egypt Today news site published on 31/01/2016 that: The President of Azerbaijan had requested on 30/03/2016 in Washington before the US Secretary of State Kerry that Armenia withdraw “immediately” from Nagorani Qurrah Bakh, the province that the two lands have entered into a dispute around it and which America has attempted to resolve for a number of years. Kerry received the Azerbaijani President on the side lines of the international summit about nuclear security which President Barack Obama had organised on the Thursday and Friday. Aliyev said to the press in front of Kerry “We are grateful to the government of the United States for its far-reaching efforts to bring about a way of resolving the protracted dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan” and he added “The dispute must be solved upon the basis of the security council resolution that calls for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Armenian forces from our territories”. As for Kerry, then he called from his perspective to “A final solution to the frozen dispute in Nagorani Qurrah Bakh and which must be a negotiated solution”.

In the case where Azerbaijan, its oil and pipelines to the Black Sea and Turkey greatly attracted the attention of America since its independence in 1991 due to what it contains in respect to the importance of the Russian-American struggle, then the statements of the Azerbaijani president three days prior to the breakout of fighting, from Washington and in the company of the Secretary of State Kerry, all indicates in a manner that leaves no room for doubt that it is the US that has ignited the war in the Russian Caucasus backyard. This represents a threat to the Russian interests in Armenia and the Caucasus as this region is extremely sensitive to Russia... So by America making this war erupt it is directing blows of pressure in the side of Russia’s stomach...

The conclusion is that it was political futility for Putin to have thought that through his criminal and dirty deal with America regarding Syria, that he would have attained an American step to calm his regional and international problems. Rather, the limitations of the agreement will remain restricted to Syria due to Russia’s service to the American interests whilst it will not necessarily expand beyond that to other international issues. This explains the tension in the American-Russian relations in respect to the nuclear summit and the war between Azerbaijan and Armenia in spite of the calm in relations regarding Syria.

### **Secondly: The nuclear summits and their purpose:**

1 – Throughout the Cold War, nuclear weapons played a fundamental role in the competition between the great powers and in respect to settling the security of the states. The security equation resulting from the imbalance of conventional weapons between and amongst the countries encouraged the acquisition of more conventional and nuclear weapons in an attempt to regain self-sufficiency. The US was the first nation to produce a nuclear bomb and this is what provided it with a distinctive advantage over Russia as Russia was threatened by the nuclear weapons until it possessed them and through that it was able to restore the military balance with America... Likewise, France and Britain which both felt the threat and fear from the nuclear arsenals that Russia had gained possession of and so they strove to restore some of the self-sufficiency with Russia. China which also felt weakness in the face of Russia strove and then achieved the possession of nuclear bombs. The same feelings of weakness pushed India to purchase nuclear weapons to confront the Chinese aggression and they were then followed by Pakistan in an attempt to militarily surpass India. As for the states that did not covet to have nuclear activity, then they made alliances, either with America or with the Soviet Union in order to protect themselves from the nuclear weapons. This protection came in the form of nuclear umbrellas. So for example America used to provide Europe and a number of countries in the region of the Asian Pacific Ocean a nuclear umbrella to protect them from the Soviet Union.

2 – In the period following the Cold War, nuclear deterrence paved the way for a movement for nuclear weapon disarmament. Many felt that the collapse of the Soviet Union had changed the international security environment and forever, and that the nuclear peace that was imposed as a lie after Hiroshima and Nagasaki no longer remains standing.

Globalisation, climate change, the appearance of non-state organisations and entities and the appearance of ethnic tensions in the open space left in the wake of the Soviet Union, all of that meant nuclear weapons were not disposed of, that used to be in the hands of the Soviet Union previously, in a sound manner, then it would be possible for them to fall into the wrong hands and as a result cause overwhelming harm... To confront this situation, the states which had newly acquired nuclear weapons like Ukraine and Kazakhstan quickly gave them up in exchange for regional guarantees.

3 – The new security environment has pushed two main concepts to the forefront and these are the disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In the case where America represents the only super power in the world, then the people in all parts of the world look to it and hopes that it will take hold of the reins of the initiative within the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Despite that, the governments of both Clinton and Bush did very little specifically related to that. In January 2007, previous American officials including Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, Bill Perry and Sam Nun (known as the 'Gang of Four' for nuclear deterrence) proposed that the United States devotes itself to getting rid of nuclear weapons... Despite that nuclear disarmament was not placed at the heart of the nuclear agenda schedule until Obama took over the presidency... So in 2009 Obama said when speaking from Prague in front of a crowd of 20,000 people that: (The United States is morally responsible for the work to rid the world of nuclear weapons. And he said: "The presence of thousands of nuclear weapons is the most dangerous inheritance left over from the cold war. Today the cold war has gone away however thousands of these weapons have not yet disappeared") (BBC 05/04/2009) ... After that four summits were held:

- \* The first nuclear summit 12-13/04/2010 in Washington...
- \* The second nuclear summit 26-27/03/2012 in Seoul, South Korea...
- \* The third nuclear summit 24-25/03/2014 in The Hague, Holland...
- \* The fourth nuclear summit 31/3 – 01/04/2016 in Washington...

4 – The purpose of the American policy in respect to what has been called nuclear disarmament, in accordance to its plan, is not the actual disarmament of the nuclear weapon from all of the states but rather it aims to disarm the other states whilst it alone keeps and holds on to the nuclear weapon. If it is unable to do that then the most that it is able to do in accordance to its plans is to reduce the nuclear weaponry stockpile of the nuclear states by a specific proportion whilst it dictates that proportion. Because its stockpile of nuclear weapons is the highest then by specifying a proportion to be applied upon the nuclear states, the stockpile of other states will decrease making what they possess ineffective when compared to America's stockpile. For that reason, the final or concluding statements of these four nuclear conferences are loose and do not contain within them any textual reference that indicates to an actual or real nuclear disarmament in the world. This appears clearly within the concluding statements and if we were to take the concluding statement of the fourth summit, which is the most prominent of the summits, we will find that it does not go beyond presenting general texts that are non-binding and which lack seriousness in respect to nuclear weapon disarmament. In the final statement the following was mentioned (The states participating in the fourth Nuclear Security Summit in Washington reiterated their commitment towards nuclear disarmament and to put a limit to its proliferation whilst affirming the peaceful use of nuclear power... And the summit warned in its concluding statement that "The threat of nuclear and radioactive terrorism still remains one of the greatest challenges that international security confronts and that the threat is continuously evolving" ... The world leaders reiterated their commitment to prevent nuclear weapons reaching the hands of extremists however they warned that the threat is "continuously evolving" ... And the leaders said in the joint statement within the nuclear security summit that Washington hosted: "There is still more work designated to be undertaken to prevent active non-governmental elements from obtaining nuclear or other radioactive materials which can be used for dirty purposes" ... And the leaders added in their statement "We

reiterate once again our commitment to our shared goals for nuclear disarmament and non-nuclear proliferation in addition to the peaceful use for nuclear energy.” And they followed with “We are committed to strengthening a peaceful and stable international environment through limiting the danger of nuclear terrorism and strengthening nuclear security” ... And the fourth nuclear security summit that kicked off yesterday on Thursday and that was to examine the ways of strengthening the security measures for nuclear materials and preventing their falling into the hands of terrorists, and that was through the participation of the leaders of 50 states and organisations) (Today News site OAS Washington 02/04/2016)  
**End.**

Through pondering over this statement, it cannot be seen within it any practical text for international disarmament. Indeed, it didn't even mention anything about the Jewish state being in possession of a stockpile of nuclear weapons within a region that is free of nuclear weapon. That is whilst they continue to say that the realisation of real nuclear security begins from the serious work to create regions free of weapons of mass destruction! And so it can be seen in this way that the intent behind these summits is not the actual disarmament of nuclear and radioactive weapons from the world. Rather its purpose is America nuclear control in international affairs... Obama confirmed that in his statements about the conference in respect to America wanting to seize control over nuclear weapons and control them: “The American president Barack Obama: “There is still a large amount of nuclear and radioactive materials in all parts of the world which are in need of being secured. The global stockpile of plutonium is continuously increasing whilst the nuclear stockpiles are expanding in some lands. And there could be small tactical nuclear weapons that are compromised to be stolen”. And Obama made clear that his country will undertake its role to protect the nuclear materials until other countries improve their security measures and transparency.” (Euronews News 02/04/2016). “And the American President Barack Obama in a press conference after the end of the summit on Saturday said that there is a large quantity of nuclear materials around the world that require to be secured alongside a global growth of plutonium stores... And Obama considered that there still remains a lot of work that needs to be done to reduce the nuclear stockpiles of Russia and North Korea, saying that South America has become free of nuclear materials and that 14 countries, including Taiwan, Libya and Vietnam, that have gotten rid of enriched uranium and plutonium. (Al-Jazeera 02/04/2016).

Therefore, in this way America wants from these summits to seize nuclear weaponry so that it can be in dominant control over it. Whereas regarding convened conferences, it makes them under its disposal and so it invites whom it wishes and excludes whom it wishes, and it provokes or insults whom it wishes whilst regarding itself as being the master of the world. And that is for no other reason than it doesn't find a state of any significance to stand up to it!

Moreover, the situation of America in respect to the states that bow and surrender to it will remain as such until the dawn of the Khilafah. And at that time the power and force of Islam will come at them from where they have not anticipated whilst those who have acted criminally will be turned upon their heels and will never attain goodness.

﴿سَيُصِيبُ الَّذِينَ أَجْرَمُوا صَغَارٌ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ وَعَذَابٌ شَدِيدٌ بِمَا كَانُوا يَمْكُرُونَ﴾

**“There will afflict those who committed crimes debasement before Allah and severe punishment for what they used to conspire” [Al-An'aam 124].**

2<sup>nd</sup> Rajab 1437 AH

Corresponding to 09/04/2016 CE