

# ***Iqbal and Islamic Concept of Construction***

*By*

*Shoaib Ahmed*

---

Art of construction reflects and interprets the glorious route of Nation. By the fortune of this Art we approach individually and collectively willingly taste of the sense of prettiness with awareness about knowledge and practically ascents of Art and Skill.

Art of construction manifest prosperity, welfare Human goodness of Nations evHolutioning the stages of development. History secures and states the stories of nation's exaltation and decline by the fortune of Art of Construction.

The masterpieces of constructed buildings are crystal clear evidences of their nation's Circumstances and leisurely Gloriousness. Which are lessonable and challengeable for sub sequent generations as well as persons of attainment where intelligent , eloquent and learned wisdom-men interpret the past through prose and verse of their

- 33) Nick Mathiason and Faisal Islam, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.4, No.2. 1998.
- 34) Clive Arches, *International Organizations*. London. Rout ledge, 2001, 3<sup>rd</sup> Evel, 115-117.
- 35) Wilkinson Rordes, *Multilateralism and World Trade Organization: The Architecture and Extension of International Trade Regulations*, London. Rout ledge, 2000. P 69.
- 36) The WTO an International Organization, opcit., P.32.
- 37) Mahbub ul Haq, Opcit., p. 74-75
- 38) M. Haq, *Reflections on Human Developments*. New York. Oxford University Press, 1995. p.83.
- 39) A.R. Khan, *Globalization, Liberalization and Equitable growth*, Pakistan Development Review lesson from Contemporary, Asian Experience, Vol.26. pp.915-928.
- 40) Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi, *Developing countries and Uruguay Round agreement, general of Economic cooperation among Islamic Countries*, Vol.15. pp.91-112.
- 41) F. Battaler, *The case of regional integration among developing countries in for its support by Aid Donor community*. Paper presented at U.N. forum on South Asian cooperation.
- 42) W.T.O, opcit.,P.60.

- 22) Jonathan Michie and Edward Elgar, *The hand book of Globalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. Revised Ed. 2002, Page 16.
- 23) Mahbub ul Haq, *Human development in South Asia 2003*, Oxford University Press. London, 2004. Page. 78.
- 24) *Guy De Jonquieres, Network Guerrillas, Financial Times, London, 30<sup>th</sup> April, 1998.*
- 25) *Philip Curtain, The Atlantic Slave Trade, Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969. Page 126.*
- 26) Gwin Prins. *The World Today*. Newsweek. December 2003.
- 27) By Jonathan Michie Is Sainsbury Professor Of Management At Birkbeck College. *European Journal of International Relations*. Vol.3. and No.2, 1997.
- 28) Daily Times 24<sup>th</sup> March 2002.
- 29) *The World Trade Review*, Islamabad. Issue No. 5. Vol.4. February 2004.
- 30) Khalej Times December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2003.
- 31) The Observer. 1 January 2004.
- 32) Daily Dawn, 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2004.

- 12) Richard Stubbs. *Political Economy and Changing Global order*. Oxford. Oxford University Press 1999. Page 83-84.
- 13) Robert Gilpin, *Global Political Economy*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2001, Page 63.
- 14) Noam Chomsky. *Profit Over People*, Vanguard. Lahore. 2004. Page 91.
- 15) Peter Drucker (eds), IMF/World Bank/WTO, Note Books for Study and Research, (Amsterdam International Institute for Research and Education), 1995.
- 16) Volker Bornschier & Christopher Chase Dumm *Transnational Porations and underdevelopments West Port*. Page, 14.
- 17) Peter Eillets (Ed) *The conscience of the World: The Infurence of non-govermental organizatins*. Washington DC: Brookings Institute. 1996, P, 42.
- 18) Ronen Palan. (Ed) *Global Political Economy*. Cambridge University Press. 2000. Page 93.
- 19) John Buylis and Steve Smith. *Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. 2001, Page 43.
- 20) Wilkison Rorden. *Multilaterlism and WTO*. London Routledge Publication, 2000. P.52.
- 21) Daily Times. London. February 21, 1994.

## *Bibliography*

- 1) Howard D. Mehlinger Krainit Mathew eds, *Globalization and the challenges of the new century*, Bloomngton, Indiana University Press 2000, Page 71<sup>1</sup>.
- 2) Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization a critical Introduction*, Basingste, Palgrave, 2000, Page 14.
- 3) Strange Susan, *Casino Capitalism*, Oxford university, Basil Blackwell, 1986, P.165.
- 4) Strange Susan, *States and Markets*, London Print Publishers 1994, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. P.23.
- 5) Ian Ronland, *The politics of Global Atmosphere change*, Manchester University Press, 1995, Page 43.
- 6) Gwin Prins, *The World Today*, News Week, 2003.
- 7) Q.A Hoogvelt, *Globalization and Post Coloial World*, Pasing Stoke, Palgrave 2001, Page 35.
- 8) Malcolin Wates, *Globalization*, London. Rout ledge 1995, P.58, 59.
- 9) Ibid, Page 61-63.
- 10) Koekman Bernard and Michael Kostechi, *The political Economy of the World trading system*, Oxford University Press, 2001, 2<sup>nd</sup>, page 95.
- 11) John Modeley, *Big Business, Poor peoples: The Impacts of Transitional cooperation's in the world poor*, London 2ed Bovles 1999, Page 150.

### **Weaker countries are forced to join WTO.**

Weaker countries do feel that it's better to be in the WTO system than to be outside it. That's why the list of Countries negotiating membership includes both large and small trading nations. The reasons are positive rather than negative. They lie in the WTO's key principles, such as non-discrimination and transparency. By joining the WTO, even a small country automatically enjoys the benefits that all WTO members grant. And small countries have won dispute cases against rich countries. They would not have been able to do so outside the WTO. For this, governments would need more resources, a serious problem for small countries. In bilateral negotiations smaller countries are weaker. By joining the WTO, small countries can also increase their bargaining power by forming alliances with other countries that have common interests<sup>42</sup>.

*As far as the Impacts of Globalization are concerned the states, or more properly governments, are central in this activity. They must be careful to see that the state should not be helpless in these globalized days. Globalization does not imply that governments are at the Marcy of big powers. This so called globalization driving global society toward a low-wage, low growth, high profit future with increasing polarization and social disintegration. These global institutions are now called defacto world governments that operates secretly without and accountability. The social and economic realities are totally different from the doctrines drafted by these global institutions (I. M. world World Bank, WTO). Actually they are inducing hopelessness, resignation and despair among nations.*

competition when trade barriers are lowered. Some survive by becoming more competitive. Others don't<sup>11</sup>.

### **Small Countries are powerless in WTO.**

In recent years, developing countries have become considerably more active in WTO. The process of negotiations, submitting an unprecedented number of proposals in the agriculture talks, chalked out some results for farmers of poor countries. IN short, poor countries have every authority to challenge the decision of W T O although smaller countries would have been powerless to act against their more powerful trading partners .

### **W T O is the tool of powerful lobbies**

The WTO system offers governments a means to reduce the influence of narrow vested interests. This is a natural result of the "rounds" type of negotiation (i.e. negotiations that encompass a broad range of sectors). The outcome of a trade round has to be a balance of interests. Governments can find it easier to reject pressure of big powers by arguing that it had to accept the overall package in the interests of the country. A related misunderstanding is about the WTO's membership. The WTO is an organization of governments. The private sector, non-governmental organizations and other lobbying groups do not participate in WTO activities except in special events such as seminars and symposiums. They can only exert their influence on WTO decisions through their governments.

## *W T O's Opinion*

*Let's start some common misunderstandings about WTO, assumed by infected governments in the perspective of WTO itself.*

### **The WTO dictates policy.**

The WTO does not tell governments how to conduct their trade policies. Rather, it's a "member-driven" organization. That means: the rules of the WTO system are agreements resulting from negotiations among member governments. The rules are ratified by members' parliaments. The decisions, taken in the WTO are virtually all made by consensus among all members. In other words, decisions taken in the WTO are negotiated, accountable and democratic.

### **The WTO destroys jobs, worsens poverty.**

W T O has stable trade boosts economic growth. It has the potential to create jobs, it can help to reduce poverty, and frequently it does both. The biggest beneficiary is the country that lowers its own trade barriers. The countries exporting to it also gain, but less. In many cases, workers in export sectors enjoy higher pay and greater job security. However, producers and their workers who were previously protected clearly faced new



Japan and Switzerland, is keen to secure some gains in exchange for concessions. It will have a discussion on agriculture good consumption. "This is an exercise in futility, the countries who want to launch are in a minority. Malaysian trade minister Rafidh Aziz told to a news conference. W T O sources said that possible compromises on investment, competition and two other issues - rules to prevent governments from favouring their own firms in procurement deals and the need to cut the red tape that stifles trade - were being explored. However, there is a little sign today that developing countries are prepared to abandon their hardline stance on the so-called "new issues"<sup>39</sup>.

Above are the three columns views that were published in different times, encompass the thinking of most of the intellectuals and their anxiety towards Globalization. The latest development in attaining the Globalization is the ministerial meeting held in Cancun on 14<sup>th</sup> of September 2003, which dramatically collapsed. It was failing to come to any agreement on rules to govern world trade. The reason was that rich countries failed to reduce farm subsidies to their farmer but developing countries successfully blocked the controversial expansion of the WTO into areas such as investment by clubbing together to form a new alliance against rich countries. Rich countries will try to get their way to trap the poor countries at WTO, by brokering their deals on an individual or regional basis. The real Example for understanding rich countries intention is NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement, involving Mexico, US and Canada)<sup>40</sup>.

It is thought that a trade deal between Europe and South Africa requires South Africa to import 83 per cent of agricultural products without any duty. But only 60 per cent of its goods receive the same treatment into Europe. With huge anti-globalization protests expected tomorrow, the scene was set for a tense struggle both inside and outside the conference hall in the seaside resort on the shores of the Caribbean in 2003<sup>38</sup>.

Developing nations maintained pressure on the west on three fronts: a demand for better access for their agricultural products, a new deal for poor cotton farmers in west Africa, and the shelving of the EU's demand for complicated new negotiations on global investment and competition rules. Talks on agriculture, products consumption a growing number of developing countries refused to accept a draft heavily based on the positions of the EU and US. W T O sources said, the sings of Flexibility getting popularity. They admitted that meaningful negotiations had yet begun.

Meanwhile, the group of 21 members a coalition of developing countries headed by Brazil, China and India instead that WTO must give extra clout in the discussions on agriculture. Meanwhile, an even bigger group of almost 70 western countries opposed those plans to open discussions on a global investment and competitions treaty. They have rejected the link that the EU is making between progress on a new framework for investment and cutting farm subsidies on the other hand. Brussels, supported by