

**TERRORISM,  
ANTI-AMERICANISM  
&**

**JAMAAT-E-ISLAMI PAKISTAN**

**Prof. Khurshid Ahmad**

**MANSHURAT**

**TERRORISM,  
ANTI-AMERICANISM  
&  
JAMAAT-E-ISLAMI PAKISTAN**

**Prof. Khurshid Ahmad**

**MANSHURAT**

*Published by,*

***Manshurat.***

*Mansoorah, Multan Road,*

*Lahore, 54570. Pakistan.*

*Tel: (009242) 3543 4909 - 3542 5356*

*Fax: (009242) 3543 4907*

*E-mail: manshurat@hotmail.com*

*Price: Rs. 75/-*

*Code No: 01081*

**Copyright © Manshurat, 2011/1432 H**

*All Rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owners.*

*Cover design: Rashid Ilyas Mehr.*

*Printed by: The Message, Band Lahore, Pakistan.*

## Foreword

The advent of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, heralding a new millennium, was welcomed by a large number of the people world over. It was hoped that the humanity may learn from the disasters it had to wade through in the last century, make a fresh start to have its coveted rendezvous with global peace and justice. Unfortunately, these hopes have been dashed to pieces particularly as a result of the tragic events of 9/11, and the disastrous U.S. response to them. The war on terror, which was unleashed to counter terrorism, has made the world much more terror-ridden, insecure, unjust, and verging on economic collapse. The first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century would go down in history as a lost decade primarily because of flawed strategies of the USA, the only super power.

Disenchantment with the U.S. policies began immediately after the Second World War because of its hubris and hegemonistic adventures. Despite lapse of six decades, the U.S. has failed to critically review its policies vis-a-vis the rest of the world. An unending series of failures and their catastrophic consequences have failed to open its eyes. Almost all major surveys of public opinion conducted during the last decade reflect increasing grass-root disappointment about the U.S. policies and performance in different parts of the world, particularly in relation to the Palestine problem and the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and their fall out in different parts of the world. Yet there is no evidence of any major change in the direction of key U.S. policies. It seems that the hold of the Neo-cons and the Military-Industrial Complex, about whom Eisenhower had warned in his farewell address as President,

remains unshaken. America's leadership, despite change of faces, remains caught in the quagmire of policies that could not deliver.

"Terrorism" and "anti-Americanism" have become buzzwords in contemporary political discourse. It is time the intellectuals of the world challenge the hegemonistic power paradigm that has fashioned most of the U.S. policies and its responses to global challenges. The need to critically examine the causes of phenomenal rise in terrorism has become an existential imperative. It is undeniable that terrorism that was confined to a few flashpoints in the world has now expanded far and wide, becoming a global phenomenon. Humanity today is beset with terrorisms of many hues and colours perpetrated by individuals, groups, and states.

While the book market has been inundated with literature on terrorism, it is a sad fact that much of it represents the viewpoints of the power-elite responsible for escalation of terrorism. Partisan perspectives dominate. Viewpoint of the aggrieved don't get appropriate space in this discourse which is becoming more and more a monologue. Propaganda is getting an upper hand at the cost of truthful description and objective analysis. A new breed of terrorism is being promoted through print and electronic media: intellectual terrorism. It is time, this threat to intellectual and moral clarity is challenged and alternate perspective given an equal hearing. It is a welcome development at least that some voices of dissent against the conventional thinking are now being raised and alternate perspectives are beginning to get space in political discourse. Contributions based on independent research and critical analysis

of policies and strategies represent a silver lining on the intellectual horizon.

American's war on Afghanistan is being examined by researchers and analysts, from different perspectives. Viewpoints that were ignored are now beginning to be given space in the debate. It is in this context that I have responded to some of the questions that are central to the discourse.

Pakistan was coerced to fall in line with the U.S. in its war on terror as a frontline state during the regime of Pervez Musharraf. The present PPP led Government is pursuing the same policy with greater subservience. The policy of the government and the feelings and aspirations of the people are worlds apart. Western discourse is dominated by the viewpoint of U.S. policy makers and their collaborators in the countries, which have been turned into theatres of war. The viewpoints of people who disagree with the policies pursued by the rulers have mostly been neglected. This must end, particularly, because of an increasing realization that there is no military solution to the problem. Search for political solutions is the only way out of the imbroglio. U.K. based two scholars Dr. Usama Butt and Prof. Julian Schofield are engaged in research on *"The US-Pakistan and Pakistan's Foreign Relations: Geo-Politics and Strategy in 'the War of Terror'"*. Their book is expected to be published by Pluto Press in 2011. Dr. Butt posed half a dozen important questions and invited my responses to some of the key issues in relation to terrorism, anti-Americanism and the responses of the Islamic forces in Pakistan. Parts of this email-interview would be published in the book. However, I am sharing these questions and my

responses in this short book: *“Terrorism, anti-Americanism and Jamaat-e-Islami Pakistan”*.

*Prof. Khurshid Ahmed*

*1\_\_ What is the 'Islamic domestic reaction' to US-Pakistan relations, particularly the US foreign policy towards Pakistan? Does 'anti-Americanism' best describes it and if so why?*

Pakistani people are extremely unhappy, even angry, over the US policies at all the three levels — Global; relating to the Middle East, particularly the Palestinian issue; and the South Asian Region with particular reference to the Kashmir Issue, Afghanistan and Indian hegemonic role in the region. The strategic India-American relationship, as it has developed during the Bush-Obama regimes, has very serious implications for the whole region particularly for Pakistan, China and Iran.

To put things in correct perspective it may be recalled that feelings of disenchantment, disapproval and alienation from the U.S. began to explode worldwide after the World War II. The character of the "Ugly American", as it flashed out in literature in the 1960's, was not a figment of imagination. It represented an emerging reality. Fiction only gave a name and a character to a feeling widely held.

It is claimed that it was in 1985, sixteen years before the tragic events of 9/11, that two political scientists from the University of Pennsylvania, Alvin Z Rubinstein and Donald B. Smith published a collection of writings on the topic of "anti-Americanism in the Third World."<sup>1</sup> They focused on a "growing antipathy and willingness to think the worst of America" in many Third world countries, an attitude

---

1. Alvin Z. Rubinstem and Donald B. smith (ed.), *Anti-Americanism in the Third World:Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy*, New York, 1985.



they called “anti-Americanism”. Sigrid Faath has also referred to the work of a British social scientist Stephen Haseler (1986) and of a former US Ambassador Richard B. Parker (1988) both focusing on “anti-American rhetoric and acts of violence against U.S. institutions, symbols and representations” as a reaction to “the growing U.S. role in world politics”<sup>2</sup>. All these and many other analysts have described the rise of “anti-Americanism” worldover as an “unavoidable consequence” of these countries’ feeling of disappointment with U.S. foreign policies and economic activities.

This is the context in which the current phenomenon of opposition to the U.S. role in the world deserves to be considered and not in the smoke-screen of “*they hate our values*”, or that “*they are against human rights and democracy*”, or that something is *congenitally wrong with the Muslims or Islam*, that has promoted “*a culture of extremism, violence and terrorism.*”

Personally, I am not very happy about the “generous” and rather indiscriminate use of the term “anti-Americanism”. What is being described as “anti-Americanism” is a complex global phenomenon and not a typical current Pakistani or Muslim obsession. It also has many shades and dimensions. To group together a number of factors and forces under one rubric deserves to be reconsidered.

It would be incorrect to assume the existence of a widespread feeling of enmity against the U.S. and the American people as such among the Pakistani

---

2. Sigred Faath, *Anti-Americanism in the Islamic world*, London, Hurst & Co, 2006

people. The positives about the U.S. society and culture have never been denied or denigrated. All opinion polls, which bring into sharp focus widespread disapproval of U.S. policies and activities, also record appreciation for certain positive contributions of the American people and civilization. Interestingly enough, according to a Gallup survey made in 2007, while 69% of the respondents had 'very bad' or 'bad' opinion about the United States, the same persons when asked about the *people* of the U.S. only 50% described the American people as such. Those who rated U.S. people as very good or good jumped to 49%.<sup>3</sup> This aspect of the ground situation may not be ignored.

Having said so, the fundamental issue that plagues Pakistan's relationship with the U.S., particularly at the level of the Pakistani people, relates to persistent U.S. policies and practices directed towards Pakistan, Arab/Muslim world, and now towards Islam as a religion and the Islamic movements, as expressions of contemporary Islamic resurgence.

This brings us to the presence of a number of concerns and conflicts of strategic significance underscoring clash between the national interests of Pakistan and the Muslim Ummah on the one hand, and on the other, the policies pursued, even imposed by resort to "soft" and "hard" powers, by the American leaderships. There is also a widely held perception that while some of these policies may be in the pursuit of genuine U.S. global interests, yet there are

---

3. Ijaz Shafi Gilani: *The Voice of the People: Public Opinion in Pakistan 2007-2009*. Oxford University Press, 2009

quite a few that can be traced to the disproportionate influence of the Military-Industrial establishment so candidly referred to by President Dwight Eisenhower in his Farewell Address. Similarly, the perennial influence of Zionist lobby and of the emerging Indian lobby is a cause for serious concern. In brief, feelings against America are largely in reaction to

*American hegemonistic foreign, and security policies, its systematic efforts towards economic and cultural domination; and to the arrogance, hypocrisy and double standards persistently displayed by respective American leaderships and media.*

The people of Pakistan, by and large, firmly hold that American policies vis-a-vis Pakistan and the Muslim world are seriously flawed. Without denying a certain area of convergence of interests, it has to be acknowledged that there also exist vast areas of divergence, characterized by some serious conflicts between the national interests and strategic objectives of the two, the U.S. and Pakistan.

That is the reason why a large majority of the people and not merely the Islamic groups, (who definitely are in the vanguard) is opposed to the U.S. policies and presence in overt and covert forms, as also to the collaborative role of their own political leaderships, including the military establishment, with the U.S. and other foreign players. It deserves to be noted that all public opinion surveys conducted by Gallup or other U.S. or Western Organizations have consistently reported popular opposition to the U.S.

policies by an overwhelming number of people of Pakistan, ranging from 70 to 80 percent.<sup>4</sup>

It may be noted that a rare public opinion survey conducted recently by the New American Foundation in Pakistan's worst affected areas of FATA and released recently (*Daily Times* October 8, 2010) reports that 75% of the people whom the U.S. NATO and Pakistani forces are protecting from the "terrorists" are "opposed to U.S. drone attack on Pakistan side" and "that 48% of those who responded, claimed that "only innocent civilians are being killed in these attacks" while another "33 percent thought that *both* terrorists and civilians are being killed. Most eye-opening has been the response of 6 out of 10 of those persons who are opposed to terrorism and yet they say that "suicide attacks are justified against U.S. military", even 10 percent justify such attacks against the Pakistan Army<sup>5</sup>.

Although our present focus is on Pakistan in the context of the U.S. war on terror in Afghanistan, but the repugnance towards U.S. policies and activities at the popular level is an almost universal phenomenon as far as the Muslim and Third world countries are concerned. Perhaps the only exceptions are Israel and to an extent India.<sup>6</sup> Even in a number of European and South American countries similar trends are noticeable<sup>7</sup>. It deserves to be noted that

---

4. See, Gilani, *The Voices of the People*, op.cit; *IRI Index : Pakistan Public Opinion Survey*, January, 2008; *PEW Global Attitudes Project: Spring 2007 Survey*.

5. See *Daily Times*, Islamabad, Oct 8,2010 and the *Nation*, Lahore, Oct 10,2010.

6. See *PEW Global Survey* op cit.

7. See *PEW Global Survey* op cit.

even all those Muslim countries where leaderships are politically on the same page with the U.S. there exists popular disapproval of the U.S. and its policies. Countries like Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Indonesia and Turkey deserve special mention.

If this is the grass-root feeling, would it not be a saner policy to address *what lies behind this explosion* of “anti-Americanism” by probing the causes and factors that have generated this universal reaction and not be obsessed with certain pre-conceived notions about religion-centeredness of certain reactions or be lost in a maze of political clichés and rhetoric so brazenly presented as “thought” and “analysis”?

*2\_\_ How ‘Islamic’ is the ‘Islamic domestic reaction’? Does it not comprise of other factors that may have nothing to do with Islam i.e. US’s stance over India etc? Moreover, should ‘Islamic’ domestic reaction’ simply be labeled to Islamic oriented organizations? Isn’t it a widespread phenomenon including some ‘secular’ oriented organizations that use ‘Islamic’ reasons to do so?*

*3\_\_ Does Islamic ideology of Pakistan have anything to do with the ‘Islamic relationship’?*

This is a very important set of questions and reflections on the issues in focus can lead to some clues to an understanding of our political and civilizational predicament. There is no denying the fact that there is an “Islamic dimension” in relation to the Pakistani people’s reaction and response to the

U.S. policies. Ideology, whether Islamic, liberal, capitalist, socialist or whatever that may be, along with national interests and external and domestic imperatives, always plays an important role in the making of domestic and external policies. In view of the above recognition, the Islamic aspirations of the Pakistani people have a definite part in the shaping of their perceptions and responses to the U.S. policies, as also to its political and cultural adventures, globally and more specifically in Pakistan and the Muslim world. Yet that is not the whole story.

The U.S. relationships with Pakistan have a distinct flavor because of the cold war context in which they began and the part the U.S. has always played in influencing, even “manipulating”, domestic forces, both military and civil, to pursue its own agenda and interests. As such, it would be incorrect to assume that it is the ideological dimension *only* that has shaped the reaction of the Pakistani people. Moreover, the U.S. role in promoting, even, imposing on the rest of the world, a global, economic and political system, which is inherently flawed and unjust, has been a factor of critical importance. Similarly the blind U.S. support for Israel and its collaborative relationships with India have influenced Pakistani peoples’ perception of American objectives and role. There are serious apprehensions in Pakistan about the U.S. tilt towards a pro-Indian strategy in the region. People feel that in a number of areas the U.S.A., India and Israel are very much on the same page. Pakistan’s strategic relationships with China are also a factor of great relevance. The U.S. and Indian policies towards China and their collaboration to contain and encircle China also represent very important dimensions. The U.S. lack of adequate

concern for Pakistan's vital interests in the region, and particularly, in respect of the Kashmir and Water issues, has also made the U.S. a non-dependable ally in the eyes of the people of Pakistan. The cultural influences of the U.S. and its inroads into the civil society, media, education etc. are also factors which cannot be neglected. These and a host of other issues have played their role in shaping Pakistani people's perception of the U.S. role and its agenda in the region.

As far as the disappointment and anger of the Pakistani people against America is concerned I have no reservation in re-affirming that it is almost universal, across the board, and not confined to people of a particular ideological orientation. Over 80 per cent of the people regard American's role as negative, offensive, glaringly in conflict with some of Pakistan's strategic interests, and a threat to its vital assets.

A survey conducted by the World Public Opinion Organization (January 2008) reveals that only 6% of the Pakistani people think that Pak-U.S. cooperation has been to the benefit of Pakistan, 44% deem it "only in the interests of the U.S." 29% go to the extent of saying that "they have hurt the interests of Pakistan" and 72% regarded "U.S. military presence in Asia as a major threat to Pakistan" and another 12% as "a threat, although not a major one." It would not be an exaggeration to suggest that they do not look towards the U.S. as a real friend, a friend in need, whatever be the 'elopements' of the rulers and the vested interests from within Pakistan.

There had been widespread disaffection even before the devastating event of 9/11. It has increased

after that. One cannot forget the shock the people of Pakistan had in 1965 when after Indian attack on Pakistan; “our best friend” stopped all its supplies of military spares critically important for the very security of Pakistan. All economic assistance was also instantly stopped. Then came the outrageous intimidations and sanctions to deny Pakistan its nuclear research and development. Finally, the U.S. U-turn, after the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan with all its devastating consequences for Afghanistan and serious after-shocks for Pakistan. The height of this turn-about came in the form of stringent sanctions against Pakistan, followed by an unending media crusade and think-tank onslaughts to project Pakistan as a “Pariah” and a “Failed/Failing State.” Even the dates of its expected demise were not in short supply!

The situation has been aggravated by the U.S. War on Muslim lands in the wake of 9/11. There is a tsunami of Islamophobia and Pakistan-bashing. These have further imperiled these relationships.

The U.S. war on terror had always been looked upon by the people of Pakistan with suspicion — as a war with ulterior motives imposed upon Pakistan by bullying the then Pakistani leadership under threats of throwing back Pakistan into the Stone Age. The ever-increasing stream of anti-Islam outbursts flowing from the U.S. and Europe has further accentuated peoples’ sentiments against the U.S. and Western powers. That is why an overwhelming majority of Pakistanis disapproves of US policies and performance, both globally and in the region. They are extremely critical of the way the U.S. continues to pressurize Pakistani establishment, civil and military, to serve the U.S. interests and pursues with arrogance and impunity activities that violate Pakistan’s sovereignty,



independence, and honour. These soft and hard strokes threaten its stability and constitute an existential challenge.

The latest revelations about the real thinking of the U.S. leadership and policy -makers about Pakistan and its civil and military leaderships, as portrayed in Bob Woodward's latest book — *Obama's Wars*<sup>8</sup> are shocking to say the least. It seems that in the heart of their heart the top leadership in America does not look upon Pakistan as a friend and an ally. Instead it looks upon it as a suspect, nay even as a 'cancer', "an epicenter of terrorism" and a "matter of greater concern than even Afghanistan". If this is so, then Pakistan is looked upon as a problem, and not as a partner in working out a solution to the problem.

These outbursts have hurt the people of Pakistan deeply and eroded whatever was left of any faith in and respect of the U.S. It would be a misnomer to call this relationship as friendly, based on trust and mutuality of interests, and leading to a "strategic partnership". There is huge trust-deficit between the U.S. Government and the Government of Pakistan, its civil and military establishments, as also the people of Pakistan. The people feel humiliated and let down. This is bound to generate further resentment, distrust and distance. It may be given whatever name one may like — "anti-Americanism" or else!

Islamic identity is the basis of Pakistan and over 95 percent of the population is Muslim. It is committed to shape its lives on the basis of Islam which provides

---

8. Bob Woodward, *Obama's Wars : The Inside Story*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 2010.

guidance for all walks of life, individual and collective. Islam does not divide life into secular and sacred, private and public, state and religion. This ideological dimension has a very important role in the making of all domestic and international policies and relationships. This is natural.

Religion has always played a very important role in the public domain. This is not exclusive to the Muslim people. Despite all claims about separation of state and religion in the Western world, USA included, religion remains a powerful force even in the Political or Public spheres. Sammuel Huntington's last book ***Who Are We: The Challenges to America's National Identity*** focuses on certain aspects of American life that are ignored under the smoke-screen of modernity. Huntington insists that America is a Christian country and the "principal theme of this book is the continuing centrality of Anglo-Protestant culture to American national identity."<sup>9</sup>

There is no reason to regard Pakistan's situation as something exceptional. Several U.S. opinion surveys throw light on the role played by religion in respect of different issues in America's public life. The recent furore about the so-called "Grand Zero Mosque" — in fact a Cultural Centre and an Inter-Faith Project with a Prayer Hall two blocks (some 200 meters) away from the site of the destroyed Trade Centre, the venue of terrorist attack in which some 3000 persons belonging to 40 nationalities, including

---

9. Sammuel P. Huntington', *Who Are We: The challenges to America's National Identity*. Simon & Schuster, New York, 2004, p.30. See also Kelvin Phillips, *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil and Borrowed Money in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Viking, 2006.

at least 60 Muslims, were killed is one more example of the religious discrimination in the most advanced and powerful democracy of the world. A PEW Survey (June 2008) giving America's religious profile, claims that "religion is a vital force in the private and public lives of most Americans and helps mould the country's social and political attitudes". The survey is based on interviews with over 36,000 people. Its results show that "Politics and religion in the United States are intertwined. Religion is highly relevant to understanding politics in the U.S. as religion is closely linked to political ideology"<sup>10</sup> It may be worthwhile to recall that a Gallup USA Poll of February 2006, shows that 45% of the American people say that the Bible should be "a source" and 9% believe that it should be "*the only source*" of law in the U.S. According to this survey 42% of Americans want religious leaders to have "direct role in writing a constitution"<sup>11</sup>

The Gallup surveys about the Muslim world show that about 9 out of 10 Muslims in Pakistan and most of the Muslim countries want *Shariah* to be 'the' source or at least 'one' source of law in their respective countries. Despite serious differences in the quantitative as well as qualitative ingredients of the religious, political and cultural landscapes of America and the Muslim world, some of the similarities and to a certain degree, commonality of key problems cannot be ignored. As far as the current trends towards extremism and terrorism are concerned it is worthwhile to recall what Esposito and Mogahed have to say in their conclusion: "The real

---

10. See DAWN 25 June 2008

11. John L. Esposito and Dalia Mogahed Who Speaks for Islam? What a Billion Muslims Really Think? Oxford University Press, New York, 2007.

differences between those who condone terrorist acts and all others is about *politics not piety*".<sup>12</sup>

4\_\_ *How would you describe the pre-Afghan Jihad 'Islamic domestic reaction' & the post-Afghan Jihad 'reaction' leading to 9/11 and does the post-Afghan Jihad reaction differ from post 9/11 'Islamic reactions'?*

This question is based on certain assumptions, to which I find it difficult to subscribe.

The terrorist attack of 9/11 was a crime against humanity. But the way the US responded to 9/11 is no less than a crime, a blunder and a global catastrophe. This heinous attack was not treated as a criminal act, to be handled within the framework of criminal justice system and due process of law, as was done even by the U.S. itself in the cases of the earlier New York Trade Centre attack of 1993, the Oklahoma terrorist attack in which 168 Americans were killed and the attack on the naval ship *U.S. Cole* in Yemen waters (October, 2000). Instead a legal fiction of "War on America" was concocted, and the world thrown into the fires of global confrontation, leading to invasions of Afghanistan, Iraq and even parts of Pakistan. None of the 19 terrorists supposed to be involved in the 9/11 episode were Afghanies, Iraqis or Pakistanis, yet in the name of "fighting terrorism" and "elimination of safe havens" Afghanistan and Iraq were invaded resulting in merciless killing of hundreds of thousands of people, destruction of huge populations and properties on a horrendous scale, and creation of new

---

12. Ibid, p.74

legions of terrorists, making the world a much more insecure place for all.

The demonization of Islam and Muslims in general and of Arabs and Pakistanis in particular, is another heinous product of this multidimensional Neo-Crusade.

I do not see a direct link between the pre-Afghan Jihad and post-Afghan Jihad, as also their alleged nexus with any 'Islamic domestic reaction'. The so-called link between 9/11 and 'post-Afghan Jihad' reaction is a hypothesis and a surmise. The phenomenon is much more complex, having multiple dimensions and a much longer history than 9/11. Simplistic generalizations and politically motivated formulations cannot help in understanding the real situation. The issue is primarily *political* and *strategic*, even though there may be a lot of religious gloss and rhetoric. The 9/11 remains a mystery and the US leadership has failed to hold a really independent inquiry to let the world, and for that matter their own people, understand the whole truth, highlighting the real factors and forces behind that outrageous crime against humanity. It has also failed to identify *all* forces responsible for its perpetration, as well as those whose failure made it possible including the seventeen odd U.S. intelligence agencies, its immigration and civil aviation authorities and its military and security establishment. There are standing instructions to the U.S. air force to immediately intercept any plane that deviate from its clearly laid out traffic path. There is no record of any interception even though the tragic drama took some two hours to unfold!

The world is therefore intrigued why the U.S. leadership has not faced squarely the real questions and issues of responsibility, domestic and international. Even the 9/11 Commission regrets that all the information they asked for was not shared with them. No heads have rolled because of the failures of the U.S. establishment. The devastating questions raised about the attack on Pentagon and the inexplicable collapse of a third unattached building, WTC have been conveniently ignored.<sup>13</sup>

Afghanistan and Iraq have been devastated and the entire Muslim world and the U.S. and global economy have suffered because of the post 9/11 policies of the United States and its allies.<sup>14</sup> There is an urgent need to find out the truth behind 9/11 in all its dimensions, and the consequences of policies the U.S. adopted allegedly in response to that horrendous and tragic event. *It is a big question whether the world has suffered more by 9/11 tragedy or by the U.S. response to 9/11!* Both have been catastrophic.

Muslim and Third world intellectuals are not alone in this yearnings for the truth. Powerful voices have also begun to be raised from within the U.S.A. and Europe. Over a hundred intellectuals, scientists, engineers and researches are engaged in chasing some of the unanswered questions and over a dozen

- 
13. See David Ray Griffin, *9/11 Contradictions*, Aries Books, Gloucestershire, U.K. 2008; Ian Hen shell, *9.11 : The New Evidences* Robinson, London 2007; Thierry Meyssan, *9/11 : The Big Lie*, Carnot, London, 2002; David Ray Griffin, *The New Pearl Harbour*, Aries Books, Gloucestershire, 2004
  14. Joseph E. Stiglitz and Linda J. Bilmas, *The Three Trillion Dollar War : The True Cost of the Iraq Conflict*, Allen Lane, London, 2008

websites are galore with explorative excursions into the truth behind 9/11 and yet it remains, to borrow the famous phrase of Winston Churchill: “a riddle, wrapped in mystery, inside an enigma!”

Sir Nanina Stephen, former High Court Judge and Governor General of Australia, has raised some pertinent questions in a contribution relating to 9/11. He says: “The enormity of the attacks on New York and Washington no doubt account for the term war, but to dignify them as acts of war is to give them more than their due. They are simply terrorist acts and should be dealt with as international crimes rather than as matters of warfare”.<sup>15</sup> Panel of jurists working on behalf of the International Commission of Jurists, Geneva, has also challenged the indiscriminate use of the war paradigm for the so-called ‘War on Terror’.

Serious questions about the U.S. response and its results are being raised and cannot be ignored for long. May I join with Prof. John Mueller, Professor of Political Science, University of Ohio, USA who has posed the pertinent question:

*“What is the greater threat: Terrorism or our reaction against it? A threat that is real but likely to prove to be of limited scope has been massively perhaps even forcefully, inflated to produce widespread and unjustified anxiety. This process has then led to wasteful even self-parodic expenditure and policy over-reaction, ones that not only very often do more harm, and cost more*

15. Nanina Stephen, *Terrorism and Justice : Moral Arguments in a Threatened World*, Melbourne University Press, 2003

*money, than anything the terrorists have accomplished but play into their hand”.*<sup>16</sup>

5\_\_ *Is it fair to summarise JI’s current policies as ‘anti-Americanism’ and if no then why not?*

It is incorrect to describe Jamaat-e-Islami’s policy as embodiments of simple “anti-Americanism”: We have always stood for friendly relationships with all countries of the world including United States of America. As an Ideological Movement we are concerned about the welfare of the entire humanity and we do not divide mankind simply into friends and foes. We treat the entire human family as our own and our effort is to share with all members of this family the *Truth* that has been revealed by our Creator for the guidance of the entire human race. Our attitude is that of a doctor who fights with the disease and not the patient — whose life and health he in fact strives to save, even when he is using the surgeon’s knife.

*Having said so, we are strongly critical of a number of policies and strategies that the successive US Governments have pursued, and which in our view, have been devoid of justice, morality and fair-play. Our opposition is directed at the imperialistic and hegemonistic policies of a super power and the wrongs this has inflicted on the Muslims and other people of the world. As I have said earlier our opposition is to the US polices, both at the global level and in relation to*

---

16. John Mueller, *Overblown*, Free Press, New York, 2006.



*the major Muslim issues relating to Palestine, Kashmir and others. If this is construed as 'anti-Americanism', the choice is of those who have coined this term. We do not hate any people and believe in striving for the establishment of a Just World Order in which all have fair opportunity to live according to their own lights and values. We believe in genuine and authentic pluralism.*

The Amir, Jamaat-e-Islami, Mawlana Mawdudi in his Public Address on the occasion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> All-Pakistan Conference held in Karachi in November 1951 said:

*"In the domain of foreign relations the other problem that has become the object of interest, for us and the rest of the world, is the world-wide tussle that is going on between the Anglo-American bloc and the Communist bloc. It is the cold war which holds within its bosom the approaching shadows of a third world war. I want to declare without the least hesitation that in our eyes none of the parties to this international conflict is on the right. Both are equally wrong and wrong-mongers. Our sympathies are with none. We do not hold any brief for any one. What we want is that God may give us enough power to steer clear from the scylla and chrybdis of these blocs. In view of the principles of truth and justice and in view of the best interest of this country we hold that the best course for us is to avoid any alignment with these warring camps."*

Pakistan's drift towards the United States had become quite apparent in 1953, and at last, in 1954, Pakistan entered into a Military Pact with America which, according to the almost official biographer of Gen. Muhammad Ayub Khan, Lt. Col. Mahmood Ahmad, materialized only because the Military leaders of America had full confidence in the then Commander-in-Chief, General Muhammad Ayub Khan. Lt. Col. Mahmood Ahmad writes:

*"The United States' Military Aid was made possible through the initiative and efforts of General Ayub. The idea was born in his mind and it was through his negotiations with American political and military leaders that the United States Government invited Pakistan to enter into a Mutual Defence Pact."*<sup>17</sup>

The stand of the Jamaa't-e-Islami was expressed by its Central Executive Council which in its meeting held in June 1953 adopted a detailed resolution on Foreign Policy. In this resolution it declared:

*"The need of the hour is to protect Pakistan from getting entangled in the power tussle that has been produced by the conflict of the two blocs in which the world stands divided. Every attempt should be made to keep Pakistan away from this tension by adopting a respectable, independent and thoughtful foreign policy. All our efforts should be concentrated on building a strong,*

---

17. Mahmud Ahmad, My Chief, 1960, Pp 73-74

*viable and prosperous society within the country so that we may be able to pursue an Independent policy.*

*"Furthermore, Pakistan should also be safeguarded against the economic penetration of the Imperialist Powers, whose new game on the chessboard of world politics is economic infiltration and control. Pakistan must not enter into any economic pact with any of these powers which may make our- economy dependent on their assistance with the result that the fruits of the labours of our people and of the coming generations may stand pledged with them and we may also be confronted with a sorry situation like the one that prevails in many Asian countries. The history of such relationships, past and present, suggests only one lesson: Foreign capital has very seldom helped economic development; on the contrary, it has often forged new economic and political chains and has paved the way for political servitude.*

The same approach to the whole issue was repeated in the resolution of Executive Council adopted in its meeting held in March 1954. And when the Military Pact was finally entered into on 19th May 1954, the Executive Council gave its comments in a detailed resolution passed in June 1954:

*"Everybody knows that the Jamaat has never criticized the country's foreign policy in a way*

*that may weaken our position in the International circles. We are extremely eager to strengthen our armed forces but the Military Pact signed in Karachi on 19th May 1954 is such that we would fail in our duty if we do not express our honest and considered opinion thereon. It is our honest view that this agreement infringes our freedom and contains within it the germs that can threaten our beloved ideology and culture."*

In November 1955, on the occasion of the Third All-Pakistan Conference, the Western bloc was criticized for its anti-Muslim policy and the Muslim countries were warned against becoming passive camp followers of any of the world powers. The same policy was reiterated on the occasion of the Fourth All-Pakistan Conference held in February 1957. And finally in the Manifesto of the Jamaat adopted by the Central Executive Council in December 1957 a detailed statement about Jamaat's thinking on foreign policy was made.

The Manifesto was launched in view of the first national elections expected to be held in 1958/1959 which were sabotaged because of the imposition of Martial Law in October 1958. However, first national elections were held in December 1970. Relevant section (Section 12) of the 1970 Manifesto spells out in detail the major outlines of a foreign policy that the JI wants for Pakistan:

## **"XII. Foreign Policy**

The fundamental principles and objectives of our Foreign Policy are as follows:

- (1) Pakistan is an Ideological State, therefore its foreign policy too, like its internal policies, must necessarily be based upon and reflect its Ideology and aim at the fulfillment of the ideals envisaged by it. The inherent requirement of our ideology is that we should stand as upholders of truth and justice in this world; we should oppose injustice and tyranny wherever it may be; we should ourselves adhere to the path of righteousness, and persuade others to do so; we should scrupulously honour our own promises, pacts and commitments and induce others to do the same.
  
- (2) We stand for international peace and shall leave no stone unturned to achieve this end. But in our view mere absence of a state of war does not amount to the existence of a state of peace. What we mean by a "state of peace" is that an atmosphere of international justice should prevail in the world, that all nations and countries (big or small) enjoy unhindered the right and opportunities of development and that no one should transgress the lawful rights of others nor stand in the way of their peaceful pursuits for progress.
  
- (3) We believe that Imperialism is a negation of international justice and it is one of the root-causes of international conflict. We hold that whatever shape and form it may assume and whichever side —East or West—it may come from, it is equally and totally condemnable. We

shall try our best to bring this to an end. Our sympathy and support will always be with nations who are or may be the victims of imperialist oppression. The oppressed Muslim communities in various parts of the world will be the objects of special concern for us because we have double bond of kinship with them—one of Islam and the other of humanity. We wish to establish and maintain a relationship of friendly cooperation with all nations of the world. But we are not prepared to enter into -any such relationship or alliance that may be repugnant to our Ideology or offends against our just national interests or infringes our freedom and independence. Nor are we prepared to accept the position that our friendship with a nation, howsoever mighty and helpful to us in the international field, should imply or result in the import of its ideology and culture or that we should fling our doors wide open for the spread of its way of life.

- (4) We want to keep Pakistan altogether out of the conflicts of the Great Powers and their blocs and as such, we would withdraw from Pacts like SEATO and CENTO. The Foreign Policy of Pakistan, in our opinion, should be completely independent and in accordance with our own interests and principles.
- (5) The implementation of the right of self-determination by means of a fair and just plebiscite in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, just settlement of the Farakka Dam issue and fair treatment with Muslim minority in India, are

the three pre-requisites of normalization of good neighbourly relationship with India. We will adopt all possible measures and tap all available resources for the solution of these problems.

(6) We wish to establish closest ties with the Islamic world. We shall try our best to unite the Muslim countries on the basis of Islam and persuade them to formulate and adopt a common programme at least in respect of the following points:

- a. Revival of Islamic culture and defense of the world of Islam against the onslaughts of un-Islamic ideologies and cultures.
- b. Adoption of a common and balanced educational policy and close educational cooperation amongst all the Muslim countries.
- c. A joint and concerted effort for the establishment and development of heavy mechanical and armaments industries in the Muslim countries so as to make the Muslim world self-sufficient in this respect.
- d. Adoption of the Arabic language as the lingua franca of the Muslims.

- e. Setting up of an International Court of Justice for adjudication of disputes amongst the Muslim countries on the lines of the International Court of Justice at Hague.
- f. Provision of maximum facilities for International travel between the Muslim countries.
- g. Arrangements to keep the Muslim countries abreast with the conditions and affairs of one another.
- h. Measures to promote and expand trade and commerce amongst the Muslim countries.
- i. Efforts to lend support to the Muslims of Africa.
- j. Protection of Muslim minorities in various non-Muslim countries against violence and oppression.”

It is hoped that JI's position on these issues is understood in the light of its official statements and practical efforts to pursue them.

*6\_\_ Why does JI and other leading religious factions including JUI, Ahle-Hadith groups etc, are now extremely 'anti-American' whilst they*



*lent 'full support' to the CIA and ISI backed Afghan Jihad two decades earlier? Is it fair to call JI and other Islamic oriented parties 'opportunists'?*

This question is also based on certain assumptions which I would submit are not correct. Our differences with the U.S. policies go back to the 1950s as indicated in my response to Question No.5. There has never been any *structured* or *unstructured* cooperation or collaboration with the U.S. or its agencies including the CIA in *any* period of our existence, past or present. Yes there have been issues on which there was apparent convergence of opinions and concerns, but never any formal or informal bilateral understanding or participation from our side with any U.S. state or intelligence agency in Pakistan or abroad. Transparent contact and dialogue have always been welcome with all governments of the world and international NGOs and forums, but never any covert cooperation or co-participation at any level.

As far as the period of Afghan Jihad (1979-1989) is concerned the facts are very different from some of the popular or contrived perceptions.

The fact is that the Islamic Movement within Afghanistan was resisting the oppression to which the people of Afghanistan were being subjected by its Secular and Socialist rulers and their political or ideological camp-followers. Throughout the 1960's and 1970's Islamic workers were killed and detained in large numbers. The first *shaheed* was Minhajuddin, a student leader of the Islamic Movement in

Afghanistan.<sup>18</sup> Afghanistan was ruled by a succession of repressive regimes, subjecting people who didn't toe the party line of the rulers, to crude repression and highhandedness.

Direct Russian occupation in December 1979 changed the scenario. It resulted in the emergence of a National Resistance Movement in Afghanistan, spearheaded by Islamic forces and supported by the people of Pakistan and the Muslim world in general and Islamic Organizations in particular. The U.S.'s role in Afghanistan began almost 18 months after the actual Soviet invasion and occupation. Immediate U.S. reaction was confined to diplomatic rhetoric and boycott of the Moscow Olympics! Afghan resistance was indigenous, supported by Pakistan and the Muslim people. Once the US realized the potential of this resistance, it did carve out a role for itself. But it would be a travesty of truth to suggest that it was a CIA sponsored movement.

This is not to deny that as resistance progressed American and European involvements increased and in the final stages the US support, particularly availability of stinger missiles, played an important role. This happened because of the convergence of interests in certain crucial areas, yet there was no total convergence as also became evident the moment Russian hold on Afghanistan began to collapse. Our interest was in the independence and stability of Afghanistan, the U.S. interest was to confine the Soviet game on the chessboard of politics.

---

18. For records sake it is being clarified that the Islamic movement organizations have operated independently, with no formal organizational or constitutional link.

It is important that the U.S. never had any presence on the Afghan soil during the entire tenure of Afghan Jihad (1979-89). To the best of my knowledge and belief, there was no direct relationship/dealings even between key jihadist groups and the U.S. The contact was through Pakistan Government and its agencies. The U.S. foot-prints stopped in Pakistan, as the Pakistan authorities never agreed to direct link between Afghan Jihadi groups and the U.S. Pakistan used its leverage prudently and the Afghan Jihadi leadership also preferred it that way. There were two parallel support channels, one of the Pakistan Government, which included all the U.S. input, and the other a parallel and independent stream of cooperation between the Jihadis and the Islamic Movements and Muslim peoples groups from all over the world. It is on record that at least one of the leaders of a key Islamic Group point-blank refused to meet President Reagan who had invited the Jehadi Leadership to a White House reception, when this leadership visited the U.N. General Assembly during the Afghan Jihad in mid 1980's. I would therefore submit that it were the Pakistani Government and its agencies that played the key role, alongwith their role as conduit. Some Arab countries, particularly Saudi Arabia, was very active. Pakistan and Saudi Governments were directly involved with the U.S. and the West.

The Islamic movements, particularly the Jamaat-e-Islami, never played the role of a conduit between the Islamic forces of Afghanistan and the U.S. or its agencies. The Jamaat-e-Islami and all Islamic groups were playing on their own wicket. They supported a just Afghan/Muslim cause and their struggle to seek liberation from foreign occupation. It was not very

dissimilar to the global support given to the anti-fascist forces in Italy in 1930's or to liberation struggles in Africa and Asia in 1950's and 1960's. The JI was never directly or indirectly involved in any covert or overt activity sponsored by the U.S. or even those of the Pakistani agencies. The support of the people of Pakistan and the Islamic movements was on a matter of principle and also with the conviction that this was in Pakistan's and Muslim Ummah's own national interests. Yes, it is correct that many forces operated in the same space. But they were not hands-in-glove with each other. Each pursued its own path, in the service of its own objectives. Each resorted to methods and pursued modalities according to one's own preferences, motives, perspectives and resources. Iqbal has beautifully captured a similar dilemma in a single couplet:

پرواز ہے دونوں کی اسی ایک فضا میں

کرگس کا جہار اور ہے شاہین کا جہار اور

Falcon and the vulture!  
They fly in the same space,  
Yet, each has its own distinct personality  
and objectives,  
They represent worlds apart!

Islamic organizations supported that struggle and have no regrets about what they did. There was no element of any "opportunism" whatsoever. It is also an established fact that the Jamaat and its workers made heavy sacrifices to serve a just and noble cause. They helped the struggle to the best of their capacity and resources but did not benefit from it materially. Their record is, *Alhamdulillah*, without

blemish. They acted with political clarity, moral integrity and financial transparency. They didn't go for any worldly rewards.

Pakistan and the Muslim people have paid a very high price for that heroic and principled role. It should not be difficult to see how the matrix of politics changed with the prospects of Russian retreat and the approaching success of the Jihadi struggle. After the Iranian Revolution the success of another Islamic struggle in a country with Muslim mainstream majority was too much to digest. New strategies were forged to deny the Afghan people the fruits of their struggle. And the Jihadi leadership, as also the political leaderships of Pakistan and some Arab countries, who had a positive role in the Afghan Jihad, failed to see this game. They could not devise a new strategy to meet the new challenge. That is why most of the gains of the Afghan Jihad were reaped by the US which emerged as the only Super Power. Eastern European and Central Asian states gained freedom. Yet the poor Afghans got bogged down in a civil war and Pakistan was subjected to fierce economic sanctions on the pretext of proliferation!

Geneva Accord sowed the seeds of a major discord. The leaders of Afghan Jihadi Organizations failed to deliver in the final phase of the struggle. That is a very sad story. The result was that Afghanistan was thrown into civil war. Political power was parcelled between different war lords. The country was heading towards chaos. The U.S. had changed its role. The NATO leadership began scare-mongering about an emerging green threat to take the position of the red one. Political changes within Pakistan also impacted new developments in the region, particularly Afghanistan. As a result of that the

international and Pakistan-Afghanistan scenarios changed, paving the way for the emergence of new forces and stake-holders.

Taliban emerged in that context. They established law and order and gave the Afghan people simple and quick justice, according to their own mix of *shariah* and *Pakhtoonwalis* (traditional Pushtoon code). They marginalized the war lords and almost de-weaponized the country. They were able to establish their writ on 90% of the country without much bloodshed. They also eliminated poppy cultivation and drug traffic. But their vision of Islam was limited and they lacked knowledge and expertise to run a modern state and bring about socio-economic development in keeping with the needs of the modern age. They also failed to evolve a national consensus and ignored the golden principle of taking all stake-holders on board, particularly the non-Pushtoons who made up around forty percent of the population. They departed from the successful strategy pursued by the Durrani dynasty that ruled Afghanistan during the last two centuries. It was a major blunder.

Jamaat-e-Islami had no role in their ascent to power or in the making and operation of their policies or governance. Direct contact during the period they were in power was almost non-existent. They distanced themselves from the major Jehadi groups and from those who had supported them in the 1980's. The nature of relationship between the Islamic forces in Pakistan and the new regime in Afghanistan changed, even though some informal contacts continued. We had contact with their ambassador or were open to visitors from our brotherly country but relationships remained cool and somewhat minimal. We, however, adopted a balanced attitude towards

them. It is on record that the Jamaat appreciated their positive achievements, yet it expressed its reservations on issues it didn't agree. We had publicly expressed our discomfort over their limited view of religion, neglect of education particularly of girls and absence of a national consensus approach to governance of the state. Our journals and leaders gave open brotherly advice in discussions on those and related issues. My own writings are part of the record. However, the Jamaat's good wishes for Afghanistan and its people never diminished. We looked towards them as part of our Islamic fraternity, the Ummah, whatever be our agreements and disagreements on matter of policy. It is also to be noted that Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and UAE had officially recognized their regime and had diplomatic relations with them. The JI supported that. The United States was also engaged with them throughout this period, involved in serious political and economic negotiations. This continued till May 2001, when the U.S. leadership had made up its mind to intervene in Afghanistan. Niaz A. Naeik, a former Pakistan Foreign Secretary, is on record that in a high level consultation in Germany in July 2001, in which he was a participant, impending U.S. intervention in Afghanistan, was everybody's conclusion.

The Jamaat has opposed from day one the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan and Musharraf regime's criminal involvement in the U.S. war on terror. This has compromised Pakistan's sovereignty and independence and has crippled its economy. Thousands of Pakistanis — both civilians and personnel of the Armed Forces — have lost their lives, many more injured and crippled. Afghan refugees' problem (over three million) remains

unsolved. The issue of internally displaced persons has raised its head, involving over a million persons. Pakistan has suffered, according to a Ministry of Finance study, a net economic loss of over 43 billion U.S. dollars because of its involvement in this U.S. misadventure. The country has been thrown back by decades, over and above the huge losses in terms of loss of life, property, honour and liberty.

*7\_\_ How has the 'war on terror' affected in the dynamics of the 'Islamic domestic reaction' towards the US and finally, what future dynamics can you predict?*

“War on Terror” was a war that was imposed on Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. The US chose the theaters of war as well as its dynamics and modalities. The fact is that the US has lost this war both in Iraq and Afghanistan although it is difficult to foresee an easy withdrawal because of America’s strategic objectives as well as grand illusions. Yet history is against the U.S. and NATO adventure. Pakistan too, unfortunately because of its role, is faced with the greatest predicament of its history. And yet, it is being forced to expand its role and get more and more enmeshed in the quagmire.

The United States has no other option but to ultimately withdraw from Afghanistan, as it had to from the Vietnam. In our view, Pakistan must revisit its entire policy of involvement in the U.S. war on terror — the sooner it is done the better. This is what the Pakistan’s Parliament has unanimously resolved through its Resolution of 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2008 which



contains the outlines of a viable strategy to come out of the quagmire. The present writer had a role in the drafting of this resolution as a member of the Parliamentary Committee on National Security.

The text of the Resolution is given below:

This in-camera joint session of Parliament has noted with great concern that extremism, militancy and terrorism in all forms and manifestations pose a grave danger to the stability and integrity of the nation-state. It was recalled that in the past the dictatorial regimes pursued policies aimed at perpetuating their own power at the cost of national interest. This House, having considered the issue thoroughly and at great length is of the view that in terms of framing laws, building institutions; protecting our citizens from violence, eradication of terror at its roots, re-building our economy and developing opportunities for the disadvantaged, we all commit to the following:-

1. That we need an urgent review of our national security strategy and revisit the methodology of combating terrorism in order to restore peace and stability to Pakistan and the region through an independent foreign policy.
2. The challenge of militancy and extremism must be met through developing a consensus and dialogue with all genuine stakeholders.
3. The nation stands united to combat this growing menace, with a strong public message

condemning all forms and manifestations of terrorism, including the spread of sectarian hatred and violence, with a firm resolve to combat it and to address its root causes.

4. That Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity shall be safeguarded. The nation stands united against any incursions and invasions of the homeland, and calls upon the government to deal with it effectively.

5. That Pakistan's territory shall not be used for any kind of attacks on other countries and all foreign fighters, if found, shall be expelled from our soil.

6. That dialogue must now be the highest priority, as a principal instrument of conflict management and resolution. Dialogue will be encouraged with all those elements willing to abide by the Constitution of Pakistan and rule of law.

7. That the development of troubled zones, particularly the tribal areas, and NWFP (Khabar Pukhtoonkha), must also be pursued through all possible ways and legitimate means to create genuine stakeholders in peace. New economic opportunities shall be created in order to bring the less privileged areas at par with the rest of Pakistan.

8. That a political dialogue with the people of Balochistan, the redressal of grievances and redistribution of resources shall be enhanced and accelerated.

9. That the state shall maintain the rule of law, and that when it has to intervene to protect the lives of its citizens, caution must be exercised to avoid casualties of non-combatants in conflict zones.

10. That the federation must be strengthened through the process of democratic pluralism, social justice, religious values and tolerance, and equitable resource sharing between the provinces as enshrined in the Constitution of 1973.

11. That the state shall establish its writ in the troubled zones, and confidence building mechanisms by using customary and local communities (jirga) and that the military will be replaced as early as possible by civilian law enforcement agencies with enhanced capacity and a sustainable political system achieved through a consultative process.

12. That Pakistan's strategic interests be protected by developing stakes in regional peace and trade, both on the western and eastern borders.

13. That mechanisms for internal security be institutionalized by; paying compensation for victims of violence; and rehabilitate those displaced from their homes as soon as possible; that spill-over effects of terrorism be contained throughout the country and that public consensus be built against terrorism through media and religious participation.

14. That a Special Committee of Parliament be constituted to periodically review, provide guidelines and monitor the implementation of the principles framed and roadmap given in this Resolution. This House authorizes the Speaker to constitute the said Committee in consultation with the parliamentary leaders of both Houses. The Committee will frame its own rules upon meeting.

In our view this represents the voice of the people. There is *no military solution* to the problem, in Afghanistan, in Pakistan, or anywhere in the world. Such problems can be resolved only *politically* and by addressing the real issues involved and causes responsible for the conflict situations, and not otherwise.

Before I conclude let me briefly state Jamaat-e-Islami's position on the entire issue of terrorism.

Without engaging in a discussion on the definition of terrorism, which is a very complex, confused and elusive concept, I would like to state that terrorism and liberation struggles against foreign occupation have to be treated differently.

Similarly, use of violence is a multidimensional phenomenon. All forms and expressions of use of force must not be grouped together under the rubric of terrorism. The problem is multi-dimensional and has to be tackled in a much more disaggregative manner, to treat each and every form and variety of use of violence separately, in a realistic manner, keeping in view the specifics of each situation. Similarly it is very objectionable to treat 'radicalism',

'extremism' and 'terrorism' as one and the same phenomenon.

Jamaat-e-Islami has supported liberation struggles in general and the Muslim people's struggles for liberation and their right of self-determination in particular. However, we firmly believe that a liberation struggle should primarily and essentially be waged through political and non-violent means, within the parameters of law, morality and public discourse. Even when a stage comes when foreign occupation and state repression make it inevitable for the resistance movement to pay back the occupying forces in their own coins — despite all assymetry of power, those moral imperatives must be respected that a Muslim liberation struggle is expected to follow as *Shariah*-imperatives. Islamic injunctions about belligerents and non-belligerents must be strictly and scrupulously observed.

The JI thinks that the people of Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine and Kashmir have a right to struggle against foreign occupation to seek their liberation from foreign yoke. Our sympathies are with the indigenous national resistance movements in these parts of the world. Having said so, it must be clearly stated that JI is an ideological movement and follows its own clearly laid out strategy for change in the country in which it is operating. A few observations are being made to set the record straight.

Jama'at-e-Islami, which was established in August, 1941, is a comprehensive ideological movement to strive to establish the Islamic order (*deen*) in individual and public realms and to guide the Muslims of the South Asian subcontinent, in particular, to carve out an

Islamic future for themselves. Since its inception, the Jamaat made it very clear that it is neither a “religious” party in the narrow and commonly understood sense of the word, nor is it just a *political* party as defined in the contemporary grammar of politics. It is an ideological movement based on the principle that the whole of human life is to be organized according to a comprehensive and universal code of moral conduct, laid out in the Quran and Sunnah — the original sources of guidance in Islam.

In order to strive for the establishment of this New Order, the Jamaat has clearly spelled out a road-map. It aims at moral and societal change affecting all areas of human life: faith and thought, morals and habits, education and training, culture and civilization, art and architecture, rituals and social life, family and society, economic matters, politics and state affairs, international relations and linkages.

The Jamaat believes that the roots of man’s problem lie in faith and morality. Contemporary civilizational crisis, global as well as the one that afflicts the Muslim world, is to be traced to loss of vision and moral degeneration. The real causes of the rampant malaise are to be found in the disruption of faith and deviations from the Divine Guidance. The Jamaat firmly believes that deliverance of the human beings is possible only if the society is organized on the principle of belief in and obedience to Allah, the Creator and Master and Nourisher of the Universe and all that is in it. For this, the

guidance of the prophets should be accepted as final authority — which is available in perfect form today only in the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), as embodied in the Quran and the Prophet 's Sunnah (sayings and acts of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him)). All aspects of human life, individual and social, private and public, have to be organized in the light of this guidance and its application to the problems and challenges faced by every people in their own time and situation.

The whole struggle, which is described as “establishing *al-Deen*”, is the prime objective of the Jamaat and has been made part of its constitution: Article 4, thus says:

*“The ideal and the prime objective of the whole struggle of Jama‘at-e-Islami Pakistan is to practically establish ‘Deen’ (Allah’s sovereignty or enforcement of the Islamic way of life) and to ultimately seek the pleasure and approval of Allah and success in the Hereafter.”*

This ideal has been further explained in the party constitution as follows:

*“To establish ‘Deen’ does not mean setting up some particular aspect or component, but the whole ‘Deen’ — may it relate to individual, or the society and whether it concerns prayers, fasting, pilgrimage (Hajj) and Zakat, or deals with economy, society, culture and politics. No segment of Islam is unimportant; its whole body*

*is important as an organic whole. A truly faithful Muslim will not divide and apportion Islam but do his or her best to embrace and enforce it in toto. The teachings that deal with the individual be acted upon by a person individually. And for the part that cannot be established without a collective entity, an organized struggle has to be launched to establish the system.*

**Jama'at's Strategy:** For the realization of the above objective, the Jamaat has a detailed and well-integrated plan of action. This consists of four major components:

- 1. Reformation and Reconstruction of Thought:** The first major point of this program is a clear exposition of the teachings of Islam which is shorn of all false ideas and purged of all unhealthy accretions accumulated over the years. The exposition of Islam in the contemporary context should be geared to showing how and what steps are needed to develop a sound, healthy and just order of life. This would necessitate stocktaking both of the Muslim heritage and of modern civilization, followed by a careful distinction between what is healthy and to be preserved and what needs to be changed and reformed. So far as the teachings of the Quran and Sunnah are concerned, they are eternally binding and should thus be followed by the Muslims in all periods of history. Yet their application will take place in every period and every part of the world in the context of



the society, circumstances and resources of the time.

The Jamaat welcomes innovative thoughts and models yet it is also fully aware of the hazards and pitfalls of modernism, which may become a disruptive force if it ventures to mould Islam into patterns alien to its principles, values and ethos, patterns imported from outside without reference to their relevance or repugnance to Islamic norms and ideals. *Ijtihad* represents a principle of movement *within* the framework of Islam: Islamic methodology to face new situations without violating its norms, laws and values. While emphasizing the need for gracefully accepting what is useful, no matter from whatever quarter, Jamaat's literature spells out the parameters within which change is expected to take place within the Islamic framework. Continuity and flexibility represent two essential dimensions. They are, however, linked together and represent *one integrated process* so as to accommodate fresh ideas and pursue authentic process in a dynamic world, without ignoring our own sources and traditions.

2. **Reaching the Right Persons — *their Organization and Training***: The second item of the Jamaat's program is to reach out to the persons who seek to pursue the path of righteousness and are inclined to work for the establishment of the Islamic Order. Such persons are identified and brought together into an organized movement. An effort is also made to help such people develop a clear outlook, to purify their lives and cultivate the qualities of good moral character. It is only after a group of people, which combines true

Islamic vision and character side by side with intellectual competence and the skills needed to run the affairs of the world, emerges on the stage of human history, consolidate its strength and resources, and strives in a systematic manner, that God will cause a just world order to be established.

3. **Social Reforms:** The third point of the program consists of striving to bring about societal change: reform and reconstruction in the light of Islamic teachings. The idea is that people who are dedicated to the cause of Islam, or at least have an Islamic orientation and a concern for the well-being of the human society, should take the initiative and expend their time, effort and resources to bring about maximum healthy change and improvement within all sections of the society. This programme of societal reform is quite a comprehensive one. It seeks to lay heavy emphasis on education: that the basic teachings of Islam should be communicated to the common people, arrangements made for adults, in particular for women's education and training to create enlightenment at all levels and bring about human development to meet the multifarious demands of the society and the Ummah. In the area of social life, the emphasis is to build public pressure to safeguard people from being subjected to injustice and tyranny; fostering cooperation among people so as to ensure healthy conditions of living; identify the needy in the

society — orphans, widows, disabled, poor students — and arrange for their assistance. Inspired by Islamic ideals, the objective is to foster social change leading to the religious, moral, social and material welfare of the people and to move towards creating social conditions which are conducive to the total transformation of human life.

4. **Political Change:** Along with the program of intellectual development, moral regeneration and societal change, the Jamaat seeks to change the leadership in the society, particularly to change the hands that govern the society and state. Need for a new intellectual, economic and political leadership is central to this strategy. Power has to be harnessed in the service of the moral and social change that is integral to the Islamic vision.

How to bring about this change? Human development and change through democratic and electoral process is the answer. The Jamaat believes that this change of leadership should be brought about through constitutional processes in accordance with the will of the people as expressed through independent and transparent elections. The Jamaat is convinced that democratic structure and processes are an integral part of governance and working of a modern Islamic state.

The Jamaat has always stood for promoting and strengthening democratic institutions and traditions.

The constitution of the Jamaat-e-Islami (Article 5) lays down its approach and permanent method of work in very clear terms:

- (1) Before deciding on an issue or taking an action, it will seek first the guidance of Allah and His Messenger (peace be upon him) on the matter. All other considerations will be taken as of secondary importance in so far Islam allows them.
- (2) For obtaining its objectives and ideals, the Jamaat shall never seek means and methods that are repugnant to truth and fairplay or that may cause mischief on earth.
- (3) The Jamaat shall pursue democratic and constitutional means in achieving its desired objective of reformation and revolution that is to seek awakening of people's mind and uplift of their character through advice, exhortation, and dissemination of ideas and mobilize public opinion, for those changes that the Jamaat aspires for.
- (4) The Jamaat shall not follow the methodology of secret societies or covert organizations for the realization of its goal; instead, it shall pursue its activities in an open and transparent manner.

The Jamaat's Manifesto is also very explicit on these issues:

*“That is why Jamaat-e-Islami is trying to bring about a change in the system of government by democratic, peaceful and constitutional means so as to convert Pakistan into a state that positively upholds and conforms to the Islamic way of life as set out in the Holy Quran and Sunnah — i.e. establishment of a democratic state in the real sense of the term, wherein governments will be formed and changed through fair and free elections and nobody may come to or remain in power without a genuine popular sanction”*

Jamaat-e-Islami is opposed to any effort to resort to force to promote faith or political objectives. Ideological discourse is our way. “There is no compulsion in religion”, (al-Quran:2:256), is the cornerstone of our policy.

Killing of innocent people, whatever be their religion, cast, creed, colour, nationality, or political dispensation, is forbidden in Islam. Killing one innocent person has been described by the Quran as killing of the entire human race. (Al-Quran: 5:32). Suicide is forbidden in Islam, what to say of suicide attacks, resulting in killings of innocent people. We condemn terrorism in *all* its forms and manifestations causing loss of innocent lives and property in the name of pursuit of political, sectarian, ethnic or any such objective. Life, honour and property of all human beings, are sacrosanct and all members of a civilized society must respect the rule of law and resolve political issues through the political process. Justice and compassion (*‘adl-wa-ihsan*) are the prime objectives of an Islamic society and state. Every crime should be dealt with through the due process of law.

No one is above the law and no one has a right to take law in ones' own hands. This is the basis of any civilized society and we are committed to it as an Islamic imperative. That is why, we condemn terrorism in all its forms — individual, group or state.

State is as much bound by law as others; even more so, because state's authority to use force is strictly subject to law and principles and norms of justice. State terrorism is more reprehensible because of the states' superior power and the organized and disciplined character of its organs and agencies. State authorities are expected to be even more disciplined and respectful of law — and accountable for what they do in the name of the writ of the state. If it is illegal for ordinary people to resort to force and violence to resolve civil, political, intellectual or ideological disputes, it is equally illegal for the state, its organs and agencies to use force against its own people beyond what is authorized and justified by the law, and within the precincts of law and morality. Any deviation from law must also be dealt within the framework of law. If state resorts to illegal means to respond to violation of law and tries to seek military solutions to political problems, these too must be treated as acts of terrorism and crimes under the law.

In the light of this discussion we believe that as individuals and groups must keep their political movements within the framework of law, state and its agencies must also operate within the parameters of law, justice, morality and the principles of proportionality.

Fundamental issues that lie at the root of the present day wave of resort to violence can be resolved only by pursuing political processes with

sincerity, prudence and perseverance. Reaction cannot be tackled without the action and its consequences. It is only through the political process, and not by brute military power that human society can be saved from terrorism and what goes in the name of counter-terrorism. Engagement and dialogue is the answer.

American war on terrorism has only promoted terrorism in more heinous and destructive forms and led to its escalation in all corners of the world.

I would be concluding my observations by sharing a few insights that are coming from some of the Western intellectuals and statesmen. This represents a breath of fresh air. Academics and policy makers in all parts of the world, should reflect on these aspects with sincerity and seriousness.

The works of Robert Pape, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago who has analyzed almost all reported cases of suicide-bombing during the last three decades deserve special mention. His earlier work that covers the period 1980-2003 brings into sharp focus the political nature of the struggle behind the current blood-bath in many parts of the world. His conclusion is:

*“The data shows that there is little connection between suicide terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism, or any one of the world's religions. In fact, the leading instigators of suicide attacks are the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka — a Marxists-Leninist group whose members are from Hindu families but who are adamantly opposed to religion. This group committed 76 of*

*the 315 incidents, more suicide attacks than HAMAS.*

*“Rather, what nearly all suicide terrorist attacks have in common is a specific secular and strategic goal; to compel modern democracies to withdraw military force from territory that the terrorists consider to be their homeland. Religion is rarely the root cause, although it is often used as a tool by terrorist organizations in recruiting and in other efforts in service of the broader strategic objective.”<sup>19</sup>*

His latest work, *Cutting the Fuse: The Explosion of Global Suicide Terrorism and How to Stop it?* is expected to be published in the last quarter of 2010. His message based on research spread over the last six years, re-affirms his earlier thesis. In a recent interview he provides a realistic clue to an appropriate strategy to protect the world from the menace of terrorism:

*“We have lots of evidence now that when you put a foreign military presence in, it triggers suicide terrorism campaign .... and that when the foreign forces leave, it takes away almost 100 percent of the terrorist campaign.”<sup>20</sup>*

---

19. Robert A. Pape, *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*, by Random House, New York, 2005

20. Laure Rosen, “Suicide Terrorism Linked to Military Occupation”, Politico reproduced in Pakistan Today, Lahore, 14 October, 2010.



Andrew J. Bacevich, Professor of History and International Relations, Boston University has in an article published in the *Christian Science Monitor* said:

*“The war in Afghanistan is worth fighting only if it can be justified in terms of some legal strategic purpose. No such justification exists ... .. Nine years after President Bush launched his global “War on Terror”, there is no evidence to suggest that the use of armed forces on a large scale over a protracted period of time will redress that threat. If anything, the past decade shows is that the occupation of Islamic countries by Western forces, in fact, serves to exacerbate antagonism towards the West.*

*“Fighting on in Afghanistan (and expanding Western military operation in Pakistan) creates the pretence of powerful activity where none exists”.*

*So the “War on Terror” takes its place ... .. as one more monument to Washington’s folly and feckless-ness? Simply trying harder next year won’t produce a result any different from this year.”<sup>21</sup>*

These are no longer lone voices. The critique of the current U.S. and Western approach to the entire phenomenon of “terrorism and “anti-Americanism” and their force-based strategies to combat them is

---

21. Reproduced in *Pakistan Today*, Lahore, October 15, 2010

becoming more vocal and widespread. How soon and how much it would influence the policies of the only super power and its allies is difficult to predict. But it may be worthwhile to recollect what a former U.S. Secretary of Defence and one of the chief architects of the U.S. Vietnam policy, Robert S. McNamara, has to say in his memoirs:

*“We failed then — as we have since — to recognize the limitations of modern, high-technology military equipment, forces and doctrine in confronting unconventional, highly motivated people’s movements. We failed as well to adapt our military tactics to the task of winning the hearts and minds of people from a totally different culture. Where our own security is not directly at stake, our judgment of what is in another people’s or country’s best interest should be put to the test of open discussion in international forums.”*

*“We do not have the God-given right to shape every nation in our own image or as we choose. .... We must recognize that the consequences of large-scale military operations — particularly in this age of highly sophisticated and destructive weapons — are inherently difficult to predict and to control. Therefore, they must be avoided, excepting only when our nation’s security is clearly and directly threatened...,” .....*

*“Never deploy military means in pursuit of indeterminate ends. These are the lessons of Vietnam. Pray God we learn them!”*

McNamara shares these reflections of a guilty conscience almost two decades after the U.S. military adventure that devastated Vietnam and Cambodia, involving loss of over 58,000 U.S. troops and over half a million Vietnamese: huge human, economic and political costs. He tried in his memoirs published in 1995, to warn the American leaderships and people and invited them to derive right lessons from that tragedy. He said "I want Americans to understand why we made the mistakes we did and learn from them".

Have the American leaderships, and for that matter, any others, big or small, learned any lesson from that and other similar tragedies?

Bismarck, the founder of modern Germany, is reported to have said that "only fools learn from their own mistakes; I learn from the mistakes of others." Perhaps today we are confronted with a predicament wherein many of us neither learn from the mistakes of others, nor from their own. So help us God!

**T**he people of Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine and Kashmir have a right to struggle against foreign occupation to seek their liberation from foreign yoke. Our sympathies are with the indigenous national resistance movements in these parts of the world. Having said so, it must be clearly stated that Jammat-e-Islami is an ideological movement and follows its own clearly laid out strategy for change in the country in which it is operating.[Page:46]

**K**illing of innocent people, whatever be their religion, cast, creed, colour, nationality, or political dispensation, is forbidden in Islam. Killing one innocent person has been described by the Quran as killing of the entire human race. (Al-Quran: 5:32). Suicide is forbidden in Islam, what to say of suicide attacks, resulting in killings of innocent people. We condemn terrorism in *all* its forms and manifestations causing loss of innocent lives and property in the name of pursuit of political, sectarian, ethnic or any such objective. Life, honour and property of all human beings, are sacrosanct and all members of a civilized society must respect the rule of law and resolve political issues through the political process. Justice and compassion ('*adl-wa-ihsan*') are the prime objectives of an Islamic society and state. Every crime should be dealt with through the due process of law. No one is above the law and no one has a right to take law in ones' own hands. This is the basis of any civilized society and we are committed to it as an Islamic imperative. That is why, we condemn terrorism in all its forms individual, group or state.[Page:54]