

War against terrorism or War for terrorism

Rana Eijaz Ahmad

Abstract

War against terrorism is a cliché in the twenty-first century. This paper focuses on the hypothesis that the on-going war against terrorism is in fact a war for terrorism. As it is usually considered that America is the only superpower therefore, balance of power in the world suits America. It should not go against any other nation. Contrary to this, it is waging war against weaker nations and spreading terror by killing, maiming and threatening innocent people of Afghanistan and Iraq and admonishing Iran, and South Korea. America is not ready to look into the reality even republicans have lost midterm elections held in November 2006. American foreign policy is still pursuing its designs of capturing world economic resources in the name of so-called war against terrorism. It is in fact, a war for terrorism. That is a direct corollary of American fear of becoming impoverished economically in future. It is preparing itself to have a sustainable economic development that based on fulfilling the needs and demands of the present generations without depleting the needs and demands of the future generation. Pursuing such ventures will have an impact on Asia and especially on South Asia.

The advent of twenty-first century is not good for humanity. War is the major characteristic of the modern age. Today, few words are as politically or emotionally charged as "terrorism" but it is still not clear what exactly "terrorism" is. Generally speaking, "terrorism" is the use of politically-motivated violence or terror by state or non-state actors and groups. It is a derisive and subjective term with negative connotations applied to one's enemies and opponents.

What may be "terrorism" to one could be a "freedom struggle" for the other. Interestingly, for example, the American definition of "terrorism" is "intimidation of governments" which is totally converse to the word's original meaning given in the Oxford Dictionary, i.e. "government by intimidation" into "intimidation of governments."

State terrorism, like terrorism, is also controversial and there is no generally accepted definition. Often acts that critics describe as terror, supporters defend as legitimate defence against perceived threats. Generally, the definition of terrorism does not extend to states in direct and open military conflict, if the actions of their armed forces are within the laws of war.

Despite all this descriptive uncertainties, one thing is clear that “terrorism” is not all about individuals or about a neglected country like Afghanistan or for that matter, countries like Pakistan, Iran, Iraq and North Korea which in today’s geo-political global environment arouse concern in some quarters only for “subjective” reasons.

War is an act of aggression between two or more nations. While terrorism is a relative term and every country uses it according to its perception in the contemporary world politics. If we look into the definitions of terrorism given in different sources of international politics, we can deduce that ‘terrorism is an act of aggression or violence that creates fear among innocents’ or it may be called as ‘killing, maiming, threatening and inflicting brutalities upon innocents.’ Hence, Terrorism is all about bullying and “terrifying” the weaker, and any such behaviour at the level of states.

Infact at individual level the west usually believe that terrorism is the weapon of the weaker against a stronger and a powerful enemy to have a psychological edge. It may be accepted at individual level that such and such individual commit that act of violence. Contrary to this, my hypothesis is that terrorism is an act of the stronger, as a weaker can rarely commit an act of violence due to its poor resources. This hypothesis is in the perspective of prevailing American state terrorism against the weaker nations. In the modern world, developing countries like Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and North Korea are politically and economically so unstable that they can hardly have any urge or capacity to employ terrorism for achieving their objectives. No weak or unstable country can abet or cause an act of terrorism. The fear of “fierce” retaliation in case the target of an act of terrorism is a super power is itself a strong inhibiting factor for any weak or unstable country to abet or cause any act of terrorism.

It is quiet understandable that Pakistan and Afghanistan are not able to support any terrorist activity. Afghanistan has nothing to loose while Pakistan can never afford to abet terrorism, as it is a land of skillful, talented, hardworking and peaceful people. History has a vindication in this perspective that Pakistan had never indulged in any terrorist activity since its birth. Therefore, terrorism is such an aggressive activity that mostly lies with the stronger not with the weaker. So Afghanistan and Pakistan are not under a cloud as far as terrorism or abetting terrorism are concerned owing to their impoverish political systems and meager economies. One certainly can argue that the stronger nations by their might commit aggression against the less powerful nations for which they try to justify their acts of naked aggression disguised by the civilized slogans like ‘human rights,’ ‘peace,’ ‘democracy’ etc. but collective or individual terrorism is generally resorted by those who do not have resources to do otherwise.

America and Israel along with their allies are stronger in the world not only economically and militarily but also in technological sophistications. Media is also a big weapon in their hands. The South Asia does not have a strong media that could compete with the credibility of the western media. India is the only country in the region that has a media of great influence but unfortunately, that does not represent the whole South Asia.

Put some simple questions to any sane person that who is stronger in the world. Who has quality arms in the world? Whose economy is stronger than the rest of the

world? Who is killing innocents in the world? The answer will be 'America, Israel and its allies.'

Now, it becomes easier to understand the reality of war against terrorism. After incidences like 9/11 in the U.S. and 7/7 in the U.K., the western powers are fighting a war against so-called terrorism. It is useless to know the history of terrorism as it is not appreciating aspect of human life we must concentrate upon the ongoing so-called war against terrorism and its impact on the world especially on South Asia.

After appreciating the meanings of war and terrorism, it becomes very trouble-free for every normal person to realize that war against terrorism is not against terrorism but it is a war for terrorism that based on monopolization of world economic resources by America and its allies and then delivering those resources according to the heart of the west.

Benjamin R. Barber writes in his celebrated treatise *Jihad VS. McWorld* in these words, "When other domains wrest sovereignty away from the state, whether they are religious or economic, the result is kind of totalitarian coordination-in the Middle Ages it was theocratic; in this age of McWorld it is economic."¹

Today increasing population and manufacturing of sophisticated weapons of mass destruction have increased the competition among nations for gaining economic resources. There are fewer resources and more competitors. After the disintegration of Soviet Union in 1991, America started thinking that it was the only power in the world and announced its New world Order for its dominance.

In 1989, Berlin Wall was demolished. The East and the West Germany were reunited officially in 1990. That was the first sign of division of centre of power in the world community after the end of Cold War. In 1990s nuclear detonation by India pronounced it another power in the process. Pakistan also joined the nuclear club by following suit. China is emerging as an economic giant. Iran is going to be nuclear very soon. Japan is a technological hub in the world.

Therefore, in such circumstances American dream of dominance in the community of nations seems doubtful. The centre of power has been divided among America, Australia, Brazil, Britain, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, and revived Russia. The world has become uni-multipolar rather unipolar.

The phenomenon of globalization is serving as a catalyst for monopolization of economic resources for industrialized world. Economic globalization has started a never-ending competition in the world. Hoffmann says, "Economic globalization has caused inequality among states as well as within countries."² Therefore, such inequalities are creating deprivations among few states and provoking them against the dominant powers in the world.³ In this perspective, we believe that this war for terrorism is preplanned; America initially used Saddam Hussein for entering in the Middle East. Saddam waged war against Kuwait and America came for unconditional support and compelled Iraq to withdraw its forces from Kuwait. In the twenty first century, America has decided to stay in the Middle East for controlling political geography of the region for a considerable time.

Owing to its hegemonic designs, America waged war against 'cyber terrorism' in 2001, sensing a threat of being impoverished in future. The U.S. so-called war against terrorism is in fact a source of bullying the weaker nations of the world. In the absence of any central force and futility of the U.N. in prevailing circumstances has pushed the modern world in to a kind of a state of nature. Barber quotes Leviathan and says, "for there is no international state and thus no guarantor or discoverer of an international good. The international disorder remains a kind of state of nature among nations and it is marked by a "war of all against all."⁴

Therefore, contemporary world is experiencing the state of nature where South Asia is the most vulnerable region. Pakistan and Afghanistan are nations that are politically and economically unstable since their birth. Afghanistan has been a buffer state between ancient Czar of Russia and England in the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century, America used it for the collapse of Russia. In the twenty first century America is utilizing the same to control China, Iran, the Middle East, Central Asia, Pakistan and India under the umbrella of NATO forces. In Afghanistan, out of 18000 troops of NATO American troops are almost 17000. This is increasing day by day to stay longer in the region as Afghanistan has given a base to America in the North of Kabul. So it is crystal clear that who is controlling the region.

As far as war against terrorism is concerned, it may be a justification for America to live in the region. America is the creator of Taliban and its blue-eyed boy Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan during Russian intervention in 1980s. It may be using its subjects (Osama Bin Laden, Mullah Umer and AlQaida) for the fulfillment of its dream for controlling the maximum economic fruits of the world. It is in fact not a war against terrorism but a war for terrorism in which American hegemony is the final destiny.

The Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States has published that is giving very poor information about the collapse of World Trade Centre and debacle of Pentagon. In an article published in 2004, named as *Whitewash as Public Service: How The 9/11 Commission Report defrauds the nation*, Harpers Magazine writer Benjamin DeMott wrote,

"The plain, sad reality — I report this following four full days studying the work — is that The 9/11 Commission Report, despite the vast quantity of labor behind it, is a cheat and a fraud. It stands as a series of evasive maneuvers that infantilize the audience, transform candor into iniquity, and conceal realities that demand immediate inspection and confrontation . . . At the core of all these failures lies a deep wariness of earnest, well-informed public debate."⁵

Therefore, it is clear that report was itself vague and based on subjectivity. In the same way, report by Iraq study group is again full of misconceptions and even explaining the helplessness of Americans. It says "The situation in Iraq is grave and deteriorating. There is no path that can guarantee success, but the prospects can be improved."⁶ This is how this report starts. It also exposes the fakeness and vagueness in the final findings.

Here we have an historical analysis to know about powerful nations' behaviour when they were stronger than the others were. What America is doing today for ruling over the world was done by Muslims in 640s A.D. Hazrat Umar's (RA) generals

conquered Azerbaijan, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Khurasan, Kirman, Palestine, Seistan, and Syria, and included them into the Muslim empire.⁷ If you ask any non Muslim about those conquests he may pronounce them a cruel act of history. Since non Muslims have their own perception.

Empirical analysis discloses that in the third century Alexander the great conquered the world, in the fifth century Roman and Byzantine Empires came into existence, in the sixth century Muslims ruled over the world until the thirteenth century. Changaiz Khan and Mongols emerged in the thirteenth century and ruled for three centuries. In the sixteenth century Spanish rose in the world, the seventeenth century was of Dutch conquerors, the nineteenth century was of British Empire and in the twentieth century Zionism conquered the world through its multinational corporations. Consequently, the twenty first century can be considered a sharing between capitalism and Zionism.

These details give us a valid point that any nation when had power in the form of religion, economy, politics, or culture at any stage of history that did make conquests and made itself prosperous and dominant. Being a Muslim we can say that Muslim ventures were based on morality, while, the contemporary western ventures are based on selective morality. Since, the people of the west are not convinced with the notion of war against terrorism. Midterm elections of Senate held in America at the end of 2006 in which donkey defeated elephant is a categorical proof of peoples' disliking for war against terrorism.

Ruling over the world is an unfulfilled dream of America. We know that American perception about ruling over the world has always been in doldrums owing to some miscalculations on the part of American policy makers. First, military can never install democracy in the world. It is a wild goose chase to establish democracy through uniformed men and with weapons of mass destruction. This will only earn hatred and enmity from the local people. Second 'megalothymia'⁸ (to consider itself superior from others) on the part of America has made it mad for ruling over the world without any moral norms. That is a big hurdle, America is facing today. Morality is the only mean to win hearts and to rule over the world. American failures in Granada, Panama, Vietnam, Afghanistan and now in Iraq are due to its immoral deeds.

If current war stands for 'wisdom against radicalism,' it can be predicted that at the end of the twenty-first century American may start thinking rationally and logically as Islam is the fastest growing religion in America after 9/11. Therefore, I hope that this process of Islamization will go on in America that can bring them home to think wisely rather wildly. May be one can believe that it is a height of optimism or living in fool's paradise. What I believe that it is better to live in fool's paradise than to live in a world where "war of all against all" is going on, recalling Thomas Hobbes' Leviathan, in which he wrote about three hundred years back that "quest for power after power that ceaseth only in death."⁹ Therefore, we can say that so-called war against terrorism is infact an American war for terrorism.

American War for Terrorism and its Impact on South Asia

American war for terrorism is a sorry state of affairs for international community. It will have serious impact in the world specifically upon Asia. Asian continent is the

biggest continent and have different types of nations. These states are dominant with sub-state actors and some consociational groups those are very much involved in fighting against American interests in these nations. As America is fighting for its so called national interests and intend to live in the region through its vassal states. American base in the North of Afghanistan is serving American purpose to an extent. Afghanistan is at the junction of Middle East, Central Asia and South Asia and share a very small border with China. Therefore, strategically Afghanistan is the best country for America to linger on its stay in the region. Politically, economically and militarily war-ridden country suits best to America and its allies to control Asian powers. The presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan under the umbrella of North Atlantic Treaty Organization's forces gives a justification to American troops that they are not intervening in the internal affairs of Afghanistan but fighting in Afghanistan against Taliban for installing real democracy and sustaining its staggering economy.

This presence consequently, will have a big blow to the political and economic systems of Asian and especially South Asian countries as countries in this region are very weak that have certain vertical and horizontal cleavages. Consequently, American troop's presence in the region will enhance political and economic instability in Asia and South Asia and ultimately it will deteriorate cultural and environmental concerns.

Conclusion

War for terrorism is infact another name of monopolization of resources, labour, and capital of the world by traditional societies with the assistance of Multinational Corporations, International Financial Institutions, and World Trade Organization. America has become a puppet in the hands of Jewish lobby that is holding the strings of American government. American economy and politics is categorically dominated by Jewish lobby and it always uses the superpower according to its objective of profit maximization. America does have its vital interests in waging war for terrorism to sustain its economic development for future generations that is a right of any sovereign state but it should be observed with morality not with selective morality.

End Notes

¹ Benjamin R. Barber, *Jihad VS. McWorld* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1996).

² S. Hoffmann, "Clash of Globalizations," *Foreign Affairs*, 2002, 108, Cited in James M. Lutz and Brenda J. Lutz, *Global Terrorism* (London: Routledge, 2004), 17.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., 32

⁵ <http://www.harpers.org/archive/2004/10/0080234>. Website visited on 10-04-07.

⁶ Iraq Study Group Report

⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_conquests_of_Umar's_era. Website visited on 07-03-07

⁸ Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Avon Books Inc., 1998).

⁹ Barber, *Jihad VS. McWorld*, 32.