مجلة العلوم القانونية والسياسية

اسم المقال: الإرهاب باسم الإسلام وأبعاده العالمية
اسم الكاتب: م.د. سامي أحمد صالح كلاوي
رابط ثابت: https://political-encyclopedia.org/index.php/library/1076
تاريخ الاسترداد: 2026/11/01 16:32 +03

الموسوعة السياسيّة هي مبادرة أكاديمية غير هادفة للربح، تساعد الباحثين والطلاب على الوصول واستخدام وبناء مجموعات أوسع من المحتوى العلمي العربي في مجال علم السياسة واستخدامها في الأرشيف الرقمي الموثوق به لإغناء المحتوى العربي على الإنترنت.
لمزيد من المعلومات حول الموسوعة السياسيّة - Encyclopedia Political، يرجى التواصل على info@political-encyclopedia.org

استخدامكم لأرشيف مكتبة الموسوعة السياسيّة - Encyclopedia Political يعني موافقتك على شروط وأحكام الاستخدام المتاحة على الموقع https://political-encyclopedia.org/terms-of-use

تم الحصول على هذا المقال من موقع مجلة العلوم القانونية والسياسية جامعة ديالى ورفده في مكتبة الموسوعة السياسيّة مستوفياً شروط حقوق الملكية الفكريّة ومتطلبات رخصة المشاع الإبداعي التي ينضوي المقال تحتها.

Islamic-based Terrorism and its Global Dimension

الإرهاب باسم الإسلام وأبعاده العالمية

Keywords: Terrorism.

الكلمة المفتاحية : الإرهاب.

Lecturer Dr. Sami Ahmed Saleh Calawy
College of Law and Political Sciences-University of Diyala
E-mail : husseinallame@yahoo.com

م. د. سامي أحمد صالح كلاوي

كلية القانون والعلوم السياسية - جامعة ديالى

Abstract

Since the early 1990s up till the present day, the Islamic-based terrorism has been threatening the entire world. Al-Qaeda, ISIS and many other groups which carry out terrorist attacks in the name of Islam proved that they had the ability to hit in any part of this world. The factors behind the global dimension of the Islamic-based terrorism is the subject of this research.

Relying on a number of theories within the field of political science, the research suggests two assumptions about the global dimension of Islamic extremism; 1) the doctrine of jihad, and 2) the great power's rivalry on the Muslim World. with regard to the first assumption, many Islamic scholars support the offensive jihad as a means by which Islam should be spread all over the world. In regard to the second assumption, many Islamic extreme groups, such as al-Qaeda and ISIS, have been employed by great powers, especially the United States, to achieve specific goals. Accordingly, the Islamic terrorist groups have been provided with both ideological and material support required to spread terror all over the world.

1. Introduction

A few weeks ago, the Belgian capital 'Brussel', which is also called the European capital, was chocked by suicide attacks leaving tens of innocent people dead. A few months ago, the French capital, Paris, also was rocked by some attacks causing the death of tens of innocent people. Before Brussel and Paris, many other capitals and cities have chocked by such attacks which made no difference between Christians and Muslims, men and women, secular and religious, black and white, believers or infidels. The perpetrators of all those attacks were Muslims believing that carrying out such attacks are simply an implementation of orders issued by Allah and His prophet, Mohammed, who was sent as a mercy to the mankind.

Islam is not the only religion used to justify terrorist attacks against civilian and innocent people. Many other religions have been employed for killing. According to the Terrorist List, issued by the U. S. Department of State, the Jewish Kahane Chai 'Kach', the Christian 'Army of God', the Sikh Khalistan Liberation Army, and the Buddhist Power Force are terrorist groups.

However, Islamic terrorism, unlike other types of religious terrorism, is characterized, among other things, by its global dimension. Thus, the arena on which the Islamic terrorists commit their attacks is extending from the United States in the West to China in the East. This distinguishing character has its own roots in the Islamic belief itself. Both the Holy Qur'an and the teachings of the Prophet Mohammed (Sunna) stressed the universality of Islam. Further, the Qur'an and Sunna stressed that the Islamic call should be delivered to all humanity. Yet, the way by which this call must be spread has been a subject of disagreement amongst Muslim scholars since the very beginning of the Islamic call itself. While some scholars believed that Islam should be applied to all of the world's nations by all means including violence, other scholars believed that Islam is the religion of peace and mercy and accordingly it should be spread by only peaceful means. The justification of the use of violence to spread Islam among other nations resulted in the emergence of many

different extreme and terrorist groups and organizations which succeeded in spreading terror, instead of Islam, around the world.

Some of these groups were, unfortunately, used by great powers, especially the United States, to achieve specific political goals. The high level of cooperation between the Americans and al-Qaeda, against the Soviet Union, in the 1980s, and between the Americans and the so-called 'Islamic State in Iraq and Syria' (ISIS) against the Syrian regime, during the last three years are examples of employing extreme groups to achieve political goals. The global dimension of the terror carried out in the name of Islam is the subject of this research.

1. Problem Formulation

Today, no country can be sure of being far away from terrorism. Many terrorist groups, especially al-Qaeda Network and ISIS, proved that they were able to spread terror in the four corners of this world. Hence, this research attempts to answer the following question:

What are the factors which contributed to globalizing the Islamic-based terrorism?

2. Method of Research

Two methods of research are well known in the field of social and political sciences; quantitative and qualitative methods. While the quantitative research employs numeric data and used to test already formed hypotheses on the basis of these data, qualitative research is primarily exploratory research. It is used to gain an understanding of underlying reasons, opinions, and motivations. It provides insights into the problem or helps to develop ideas or hypotheses for potential quantitative research. Or, as it put by Carl Auerbach, qualitative research is a research that involves analyzing and interpreting texts and interviews in order to discover meaningful descriptive patterns of a particular phenomenon (Auerbach, 2003: 3). In accordance with this definition, this research is regarded as a qualitative one as long as it attempts to explore the doctrine of Islamic jihad and its global

dimension and to gain a comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon.

Due to the fact that, in the Western mind, jihad has always been associated with terrorism, the research starts with introducing many academic definitions of the term terrorism and then determining the most suitable one for answering the already raised question about the Islamic jihad. Then, the research makes clear difference between secular and religious terrorism in order to understand the factors which are responsible for the emergence and strength of the Islamic-based terrorism.

The research suggests two assumptions about the spread of the Islamic-based terrorism around the world; the ideological fanaticism and the great powers' rivalry over the Muslim World. These two assumptions were discussed with two separate parts of the research. Several theories within the field of social and political sciences are used to clarify many aspects of the problematic phenomenon. Finally, all of the parts are summed up to give a comprehensive conclusion about the Islamic-based terrorism and its global dimension.

3. Defining Terrorism

Terrorism is one of the most controversial concepts within the field of social and political sciences. It is nearly impossible to define terrorism, as Dipak Gupta (2005: 16) argued. This difficulty is due to the fact that different political actors have different definitions of terrorism. Thus, what is regarded as terrorist in one point of view it is a fighter for freedom in another. Or as Brain Jenkins put it: "Terrorism can mean just what those, who use the term (not the terrorists), want it to mean – almost any violent act by any opponent" (Gal-Or, 1985: 1).

For some, terrorism is an offense, but for others, it is an activity assigned by God. For some, it is a distinctive act of maintaining power pride, but for others, it is a justified action against oppression. For some, it is an attack on the peace and security, but for others, it is a quest for identity(1). That is why, many different definitions of terrorism have been suggested by many different actors, and each

definition reflects the ideological and political affiliation and interests of the defining actor.

The U.S. State Department defines terrorism as the "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience."[2] This definition says nothing about the state terrorism.

In 1994, the United Nations General Assembly held a three-day meeting to discuss the phenomenon of terrorism. After these three days, the Assembly failed to reach a consensus on defining terrorism, and instead of defining terrorism the Assembly condemned any:
"Criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them"[3].

This resolution also failed in suggesting a precise and comprehensive approach of terrorism. One of the questions, which could be arisen about this definition, is: what is meant by a 'group of persons' or 'particular persons'? and what is the criteria by means of which these categories are determined?

The search for an official agreed definition usually stumbles on two issues. The first is whether any definition should include states' use of armed forces against civilians. The second is whether to regard peoples' armed struggle against foreign occupation as a kind of terrorism.

In regard to the first issue, including state terrorism in the definition of terrorism would condemn many of the world's governments for being brutal against their own civilian people and other nations. Thus, according to Rummel R. J. (1996) around 170 million people were killed by governments in the twentieth century, not including 34 million dead in battle. Stalin, Mao, and Hitler were the biggest killers (42 million, 37 million, 20 million killed, respectively), with Pol Pot's killing of 2 million Cambodians coming

in only seventh in the pantheon of killers. By comparison, killing by non-state groups is minuscule. Rummel estimates that 500,000 had been killed in the twentieth century by terrorists, guerrillas, and other non-state groups. State terrorism is thus greater by a ratio of about 260 to 1. Worldwide, Myers (2001) counts 2,527 victims of terrorism in all of the 1990s. Three thousand terrorist victims on September 11 is thus a big increment in the killing done by terrorists, yet this does not change the scale of the comparison. State terrorism is by far the greater danger.[(4)]

While in regard to the second issue, some of the world's governments support the right of peoples to resist occupation. This support is based on Article 51 of the UN Charter, which states, "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of collective or individual self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security". Other governments deny this right and regard it as an act of terrorism.

The scholars within the field of social science are also disagree with the term of terrorism. Walter Laqueur has produced the simplest definition of terrorism. According to Laqueur, "Terrorism is the illegitimate use of force to achieve political objectives". Despite the simplicity of this definition, it involves far too many types of activities. It also avoids a definitional problem with terrorism by shifting the definition problems to a determination of what legitimate use of force is and what is not.

The question that could be raised about Laqueur's definition is: who determines whether the use of force is legitimate or illegitimate? Every government claims that it is the only actor, which can use force to apply the law on its society. Or as (Lutz, 2004: 9) notes: "Governments provide definitions, but they are often self-serving at least to some degree. Opponents of the government are defined as terrorists while irregular allies of the government fail to meet the definitional standards as terrorists". In return, every dissident group claims that it fights for legitimate rights. Consequently, the

disagreement regarding the legitimacy of the use of force leads to disagreement with the terrorist actor.

Bruce Hoffman defined terrorism as "The deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change. All terrorist acts involve violence or the threat of violence. Terrorism is specifically designed to have far-reaching psychological effects beyond the immediate victim(s) or object of the terrorist attack. It is meant to instill fear within, and thereby intimidate, a wider 'target audience' that might include a rival ethnic or religious group, an entire country, a national government or political party, or public opinion in general" (Hoffman, 1998: 43-44). Like the American State Department, Hoffman did not refer to the state terrorism but he did not exclude it either. He leaved the door open for more than a single interpretation.
According to Alex Schmidt (1988: 28).

"Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual, group or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby - in contrast to assassination - the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat- and violence-based communication processes between terrorist (organization), (imperiled) victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target (audience(s)), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought".

Unlike the US State department and Hoffman, Schmidt did not exclude the fact that governments and other state actors could carry out terrorist attacks against civilian and innocent people. To whatever extent, this definition is of a good use for every research, because it includes governments as well as terrorist actors. Two disadvantages, however, can be remarked in Schmidt's definition.

First, it includes the criminal reasons. Second, it does not make difference between combat and noncombat people.

Involving criminal reasons in the definition of terrorism will make the subject very wide and complicated, and it will require more psychological explanations than religious or political. Thus, the attempt made by John Hinckley to assassinate the American president Ronald Reagan in 1981, for instance, cannot be considered as a terrorist act because the motivation of Hinckley was to impress the actress Jodie Foster. Hinckley was not motivated by political or ideological goals but by a profound personal quest (killing the president to impress his screen idol) (Hoffman, 1998: 42). Nor could the kidnappings of civilians for gaining financial ransoms, or the use of fear to extort money from businesses be considered as a terrorist act. Any use of force against civilians cannot be considered as an act of terrorism if it is not politically motivated.

Similarly, including combat people in the definition will complicate the subject. Terrorism, as noted by Jessica Stern (1999: 11) aims at noncombatants. "This is what makes it different from fighting in war". Furthermore, considering fighting combat people as terrorist attacks will lead to the conclusion that all of the armed movements that have fought for the independence and freedom of their countries are terrorist.

However, despite its disadvantages, I will conclude that Schmidt's definition of terrorism satisfies the demands of this research because it contains three main elements of the phenomenon of 'terrorism':

1. *The use of violence against randomly chosen population.*
2. *The political motivation.*
3. *The inclusion of the state terrorism.*

4. Religious Terrorism

While the secular terrorists carry out their attacks in the name of nation, freedom, independence, social classes and alike, the religious terrorists carry out their attacks in the name of God. Some religious terrorists however attempt to achieve similar goals to that of

the seculars but their ultimate goal is to satisfy God and gain his awards in the Heaven.

As argued by Bruce Hoffman, the connection between religion and terrorism is not new. More than two thousand years ago, the first acts of what we now describe as 'terrorism' were perpetrated by religious fanatics (Hoffman, 1998: 88). Or as Daniel Price put it: Wars and violence in the name of God began in the Hebrew Bible and continue today with al-Qaeda and the murder of abortion providers (Price, 2012: 2). Today, the lion's share of the terrorist acts carried out around the world belongs to religiously extremist groups and individuals. These groups and individuals are motivated by other factors than those of the secular terrorism.

Unlike the secularists, religious fundamentalists, from whom many are terrorists, exercise a monopoly on reality. They do so because they believe that their religion is dictated by an infallible and almighty God, and consequently it is completely true, while all other ideologies are false or incomplete. Monopolizing reality is a common characteristic of all fundamentalists of all universal religions, especially Judaism, Christianity and Islam. For such people, the absolutely rightness of their 'Holy Books' is unquestionable. Or as Dawkins Richards put it "Fundamentalists know they are right because they have read the truth in a Holy Book and they know, in advance, that nothing will budge them from their belief. The truth of the Holy Book is an axiom, as it is not the end product of a process of reasoning. The Book is true, and if the evidence seems to contradict it, it is the evidence that must be thrown out, not the Book. When a science book is wrong, somebody eventually discovers the mistake and it is corrected in subsequent books. That conspicuously does not happen with Holy Books"[(5)].

Further, to be a true believer, one must fulfill all of God's orders revealed in the holy books. Consequently, fighting people who do not believe in what God has dictated is simply a fight for God, in God's name, a divine duty and sacramental act of the believers. That is why, it is not a surprise to see some fundamentalists acting as terrorists. Yigal Amir, the young Jewish extremist who assassinated

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in 1995 provided a good example of what could be called God-ordered terrorism. After he was captured, Amir told the police "I have no regrets. I acted alone and on orders from God" (Hoffman, 1999: 87).

Similarly, the fanatic Hindu 'Nathuram' who assassinated Mahatma Gandhi in 1948 told the reporters that he was not sorry for killing Gandhi but would explain his reasons in court. Nathuram was totally convinced that Gandhi deserved death because the 'concessions' he made to the Muslims of India. Thirty-six years later, India's Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, met a fate similar to that of the Mahatma Gandhi. She was assassinated by a fanatic Sikh who served as one of her guards. The assassination came as a response to an invasion ordered by Gandhi to the Golden Temple, which is regarded as the holiest shrine of the Sikh. After being captured, the assassin, Beant Singh, said: 'I have done what I had to do. You do what you want to do' (Moeller, 2004: 178).

The attack carried out by the American Christian activist Michael Bray against seven abortion facilities in Delaware in 1994 could be another example of such a God-ordered terrorism. Bray believed that "a little violence is a small price to pay for the possibility of fulfilling God's law and establishing His kingdom on earth" (Juergensmeyer, 2001: 30).

Dr. Rantisi, a former leader of the Palestinian extreme organization 'Hamas' provided an example of Islamic God-ordered terrorism. Dr. Rantisi pointed out that the religious legitimacy for the act of self-martyrdom came from a religious decree 'fatwa' issued by a mufti in the Gulf emirates (Juergensmeyer, 2001: 77). These different examples stress that the God-ordered terrorism is not confined to a single religion or sect. It is, rather, a common characteristic of many different religious sects and groups.

Another essential character of the religious terrorism is the objectives of the terrorists. While the secular terrorists use terrorism as a means to achieve political ends on the earth, most of the religious terrorists carry out terror actions to satisfy God and then to

win access to Heaven. Thus, religious terrorism is almost an end by itself.

Religious terrorism, however, varied with the ideological and political orientations of the terrorist groups and organizations. Thus, the Islamic al-Qaeda or ISIS cannot be compared to the Jewish Gush Emunim (Bloc of the Faithful). Nor can the Christian Army of God be compared to the Sikh Khalistan Liberation Army. Moreover, the time and place in which religious terrorist groups exist and act play an essential role in determining the strategies and tactics of these groups. That is, the strategy and tactic of the Islamic terrorist group Assassins, which occurred between 1090 and 1273 is quite different from that of the Japanese religious group Aum Shinrikyo, which occurred in the 1990s of the previous century.

However, the main difference between the Islamic-based terrorism on one hand and other kinds of religious-based terrorism on the other hand is the global dimension of the terror carried out in the name of Islam. In this research, I will suggest that two factors are mostly responsible for the global spread of Islamic terrorism; 1) the ideological fanaticism, 2) the rivalry of the great powers over the Muslim World.

In the following pages, I will discuss the effects of these two factors in details.

4.1. Ideological Fanaticism

Unlike most, if not all, of the world's religions, Islam makes no difference between religion and politics. Islam, as Ayatollah Khomeini described it "is politics or it is nothing"(6). The prophet of Islam, Mohammed, unlike all of the prophets who have proceeded him, put the foundation of an Islamic state in Medina, the city to which he emigrated from Mecca where he and his followers have been repressed. In Medina, Mohammed governed a place and people, dispensed justice, collected taxes, commanded armies, waged war and made peace (Lewis, 2003: 5). By the end of the seventh century the caliphs who ruled in the name of Islam put control over territories extending from the east of France to the west of China. This

expansionist policy was inspired and justified by the belief that the Islamic mission is a universal one and should be delivered to all of people all over the world. This belief is expressed in a number of Qur'anic verses and prophetic sayings. The Qur'anic verse (21: 107), for instance, states: "We sent thee not, but as a Mercy for all creatures.". Similarly, the verse (34: 28) states: "We have not sent thee but as a universal (Messenger) to men, giving them glad tidings, and warning them (against sin), but most men understand not." The verse (25: 1) also states "Blessed is He who sent down the criterion to His servant, that it may be an admonition to all creatures".

The Prophet Mohammed himself confirmed the Qur'anic verses which referred to the universality of the Islamic call. Al-Bukhari in his Sahih (Book 7, hadith 331)[(7)], and Muslim in his Sahih (Book 5, hadith 521)[(8)] mentioned the prophet Mohammed's saying: "Every Prophet used to be sent to his nation only but I have been sent to all mankind". However, it is not the universality of the Islamic call which has been a subject of controversy amongst the Islamic groups and scholars but the way by which this call should be brought to all mankind.

Since the early phases of the Islamic history up till the present day, a disagreement has been occurred amongst the Muslim scholars regarding the use of military force in exporting Islam to territories and nations outside the Arab Peninsula. A number of scholars believe that Islam must be spread by peaceful ways. Those scholars based their position on Qur'anic verses denouncing violence and prompting tolerance. Such verses are called 'mercy verses'. One of these verse (2:256), for example, states: "Let there be no compulsion in religion". Another verse (16: 125) says: "Invite (all) to the Way of thy Lord with wisdom and beautiful preaching; and argue with them in ways that are best and most gracious: for thy Lord knoweth best, who have strayed from His Path, and who receive guidance". A larger number of scholars believed that Islam should be exported to wherever it was possible regardless the means by which this process took place. These scholars found support for their position in what came to be known 'sword verses'. The verse (2: 244), for instance, is

an example of 'sword verses'. This verse states: "Then fight in the cause of Allah, and know that Allah Heareth and knoweth all things". Similarly, the verse (3: 142) states: "Did ye think that ye would enter Heaven without Allah testing those of you who fought hard (In His Cause) and remained steadfast?". The verse (9: 123) could also be interpreted as a call for violence. It states "O ye who believe! Fight the unbelievers who gird you about, and let them find firmness in you: and know that Allah is with those who fear Him". However, the clearest verse which called for jihad, (almost translated as 'holy war'), to spread Islam to other nations was the verse (9: 29), which ordered the Muslims to: "Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the religion of Truth, (even if they are) of the People of the Book, until they pay the Jizya with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued." This verse could be used by the Islamic extremists as a declaration of war against all of the non-Muslims in this world, especially the People of Book (i.e. the Jews and Christians).

This outward contradiction between the 'sword verses' on one hand and the 'mercy verses' on the other hand opens a wide door for controversy interpretations of the Qur'an and then leads to the emergence of many different ideological and political schools and groups inside Islam. While the moderate groups use 'mercy verses' and mild interpretation of the Qur'an to justify their peaceful tolerant activities, especially the relationship with the non-Muslims, the extreme groups use 'sword verses' and tough interpretation of the Qur'an to justify violence and terrorist attacks against their enemies.
Today, Jihad is the dominating Qur'anic doctrine used to justify Islamic-based violence and terrorism. As argued by Reuven Firestone, the semantic meaning of the Arabic term jihad has no relation to holy war or even war in general. It derives, rather from the root j.h.d., the meaning of which is to strive, exert oneself, or take extraordinary pains. The word jihad is a verbal noun of the third Arabic form of the root jahada, which is defined classically as "exerting one's utmost power, efforts, endeavors, or ability in

contending with an object of disapprobation" (Firestone, 1999: 15). Bernard Lewis also argues that it may come as something of a surprise that classic Arabic usage has no term corresponding to holy war despite there is a word for war, harb, and a word for holy, muqaddas (Lewis, 1991: 71).

Although some Islamic classic literatures distinguished between 'greater jihad', by which meant the struggle against individual instincts and inclinations, and 'lesser jihad' by which meant the struggle against the unbelievers, the term is often used to refer to the armed struggle against the non-Muslims, especially in the West. The 'smaller jihad' is also classified into two categories; defensive and offensive. While the defensive jihad refers to the fight against any invasion of any Islamic territories, the offensive jihad is the fight to spread Islam in non-Muslim territories or communities. This classification has always been a subject of disagreement among Islamic creeds and groups. Thus, the Shi'a scholars, for example, distinguish between 'absolute verses and conditional verses' and then between absolute commands and conditional commands given by God for jihad. Based on this approach, the Shi'a clerics argue that jihad is legitimate only if some conditions are available. Amongst these conditions is the intention of the other side to attack the Muslims, or that it creates a barrier against the call of Islam. Or likewise, in the case of a people subject to the oppression and tyranny of a group from amongst themselves, Islam says that we must fight those tyrants so as to deliver the oppressed from the claws of tyranny. This has been expressed in the Qur'an (4: 75) "Why is it that you do not fight in the way of God and the way of deprived?". Similarly, the Qur'anic verse (2: 190) which says: "Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah loveth not transgressors" is a conditional verse joining the legitimate of jihad to the case of an aggression committed by the enemy (Mutahhari, 2010: 13-14). Furthermore, the Shiites believe that only the 'mujtahids' (the most senior religious scholars) have the authority to declare a defensive jihad, and only the 12th or the 'hidden' Imam Mahdi',

whom the Shiites believe he did not die when he disappeared 1,100 years ago, can declare an offensive jihad.

Most of the Sunni scholars, in contrast, believe that the jihad-verses are absolute and so long the Muslims have the ability to fight the non-Muslims for the cause of Islam, they must not stop fighting until the entire world becomes under the rule of Islam.(9) The former leader of al-Qaeda, Osama bin Laden, was very clear in expressing this doctrine. In an interview with al-Jazeera correspondent in Afghanistan, bin Laden declared, "In any country, where the jihad's components are available, the Muslims should start jihad against the infidels" (Latif, 2000:128). Based on this approach of jihad, the Sunni scholars divide the world into two parts; the House of Islam 'dar al-Islam', where Muslims rule and the law of Islam vails; and the House of War 'dar al-Harb', comprising the rest of the world. The war between these two parts cannot be terminated by a peace, but only by a final victory (Lewis, 1991: 73).

The Sunnis, however, are divided into many schools. Wahhabism is the most extremist one of them. The most distinguishing character of this school is the intolerance towards other religions and even Muslim creeds with which it disagrees. Or as it is noted by Curtin Winsor Jr., a Special Emissary to the Middle East at the outset of the Reagan administration, "What sets Wahhabism apart from other Sunni Islamist movements is its historical obsession with purging Sufis, Shiites, and other Muslims who do not conform to its twisted interpretation of Islamic scripture"(10). Furthermore, Mohammed Ayoob argued that it was the synthesis of the twain-Wahhabi social and cultural conservatism, and Qutbist(11) political radicalism that produced the militant variety of Wahhabist political Islam that eventually (produced) al-Qaeda(12). Moreover, a report of the Congressional Research Service written by Christopher Blanchard concluded that Saudi funding of mosques, madrasas, and charities, some of which have been linked to terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda, has raised concern that Wahhabi Islam has been used by militants who tailor this ideology to suit their political goals and who rely on Saudi donations to support their aspirations(13).

ISIS spreading terror all over the world is not more than a product of the Saudi Wahhabism. Or, as Karen Armstrong put it: "Although ISIS is certainly an Islamic movement, it is neither typical nor mired in the distant past, because its roots are in Wahhabism, a form of Islam practiced in Saudi Arabia that developed only in the 18th century"[(14)]. Finally, a few days ago (March 29, 2016), The Telegraph wrote: "In July 2013, Wahhabism was identified by the European Parliament in Strasbourg as the main source of global terrorism. Wahhabism has become increasingly influential, partly because of Saudi money and partly because of Saudi Arabia's central influence as protector of Mecca. The US State Department has estimated that over the past four decades Riyadh has invested more than $10bn (£6bn) into charitable foundations in an attempt to replace mainstream Sunni Islam with the harsh intolerance of its Wahhabism. EU intelligence experts estimate that 15 to 20 per cent of this has been diverted to al-Qaida and other violent jihadists".

In the light of these facts, one can conclude that the bloody attacks carried out by the terrorist groups which are affiliated with extreme Islamic ideologies, especially the Wahhabi organization 'al-Qaeda' and its inheritor 'ISIS', against civilian targets in the West and East makes of the 'Islamic' terrorism a global phenomenon.

New York, Washington, London, Paris, Madrid, Brussel, Casablanca, Cairo, Baghdad, Istanbul, Lahore, Bombay, Bali, and many other capitals and cities have been attacked by terrorists whose declared objects was to fight for Allah's sake. Spreading terror around the world became a distinguishing character of the terrorism committed in the name of Islam. Other types of religious terrorism have almost confined their terrorist activities to specific geographic locations. Thus, neither the 'American Christ', for instance, nor the Japanese 'Aum Shinrikyo' have carried out terrorist attacks outside the United States or Japan. Nor did the Jewish 'Gush Emunim' or the Sikh 'Khalistan Liberation Army' carry out terrorist attacks in Europe or the United States.

Islamic-based terrorism inspires the Western countries, especially the United States, to react aggressively and then to complicate the relationships between the Muslim world and the West. Moreover, the global dimension of the 'Islamic' terrorism carries a seriously damage to the relations between the Islamic communities in the West and the Western governments and populations. That is because many Western citizens started to identify all of the Muslims living in the West as extremists and even terrorists.

4.2 The Super Powers' Rivalry

Another key factor which contributed to the rise of the Islamic-based terrorism on the global level is the rivalry among the super powers over the so-called Third World, particularly under the Cold War. During that period, both the Soviet Union and the United States sought to gain clients of their own and weaken those of their opponents. Thus, while the Soviets supported terrorist organizations, such as the Italian Red Brigades and the German Red Army Faction, the American supported the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda. In the Middle East, for instance, the United States sought to constrain Nasser's influence and circumscribe Soviet activity. To achieve this goal, it explored the possibility of using religion to highlight both communism's atheism and the affinity between the United States and the Middle East. In addition to brokering alliances with the fundamentalist regime in Saudi Arabia, the U.S. government began to consider a relationship with Islamist movements such as the Muslim Brotherhood (Vidino, 2013: 9).

Other Western countries have also opened wide doors for Muslim fundamentalists who, according to the Westerners, could prevent the diffusion of the Communist ideology in the Muslim World. As noted by (Vidino, 2011: 6), the arrival of the first Brothers to Europe and North America was hardly the first phase of a concerted and arcane plot of the Muslim Brotherhood to Islamize the West, as it is sometimes portrayed. The Brothers' student groupings evolved into organizations seeking to fulfill the religious needs of the West's rapidly growing communities. The Muslim populations and their

mosques often structured as multi-purpose community centers attracted large numbers of worshippers. Following Hassan al Banna's organizational model, they established youth and women branches, schools and other Islamic institutions. A few decades later, many of the Muslim mosques in the West turned into factories for fundamentalists and terrorists. Or as Vidino put it; the Western pessimists accuse the Brothers of being modern-day Trojan horses, engaged in a sort of stealth subversion aimed at weakening Western society from within, patiently laying the foundations for its replacement with an Islamic order (Vidino, 2011: 15-16).

The United States also openly supported Sarekat Islam against Sukarno in Indonesia, and supported the Jamaat-e-Islami terror group against Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto in Pakistan. Last but certainly not least, there is al-Qaeda. However, the hugest Western, especially American, support to al-Qaeda network during the 1980s of the previous century, played a crucial role in the creation of the most horrible terrorist organization the world has ever seen. Former British Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook, told the House of Commons that Al Qaeda was unquestionably a product of Western intelligence agencies. Mr. Cook explained that Al Qaeda, which literally means an abbreviation of "the database" in Arabic, was originally the computer database of the thousands of Islamist extremists, who were trained by the CIA and funded by the Saudis, in order to defeat the Russians in Afghanistan(15). A BBC News article mentioned that "...Bin Laden left Saudi Arabia in 1979 to fight against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Afghan jihad was backed with American dollars and had the blessing of the governments of Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. He received security training from the CIA itself."(16) This huge support made of al-Qaeda the most powerful global terrorist organization and paved its way for carrying terrorist attacks in the four corners of the world.

The triumph of al-Qaeda over the Soviet Union in Afghanistan provided the organization with a great self-confidence and belief that it could defeat any global power regardless its military ability. It also provided the 'mujahedeen' with skills and experience (in the use of

firearms and explosives) to large numbers of non-Afghan militants. Moreover, as noted by Paul Pillar, the Afghan War provided the fighters of many different nationalities the ultimate extremist networking opportunity. The connections thus established, and the influence that certain leaders established over followers from different lands, were reflected in later transnational terrorist organizations (Pillar, 2003: 66). On account of that, al-Qaeda became a global terrorist organization possessing the abilities to spread terror around the world.

Paradoxically, the organization did not hesitate to attack its creator, the United States, just ten months after the collapse of the pro-Soviet regime in Afghanistan. Thus, on October 4, 1993, six people were killed and more than 1000 injured by a 500kg bomb planted in the car park of the World Trade Center in New York. The attacks of September 11, 2001, however, was the worst ever attacks on US soil killed about 3000 people(17).

Al-Qaeda justified its attacks against the United States by the same logic it used to justify its jihad against the Soviet Union. The organization regarded the American military existence on the Muslim soil, especially the Arab Peninsula, the land of two holy sanctuaries, as an occupation of a Muslim land by an infidel power. In February 1998, al-Qaeda's leader, Osama bin Laden and five fundamentalist figures issued a fatwa (religious opinion) of jihad in which they declare: "Killing the Americans and their allies, civilians and military, is an individual duty for every Muslim who can carry it out in any country where it proves possible, in order to liberate Al-Aqsa Mosque and the holy sanctuary (Mecca) from their grip, and to the point that their armies leave all Muslim territory, defeated and unable to threaten any Muslim" (Keppel, 2005: 55). Regardless how much the leaders of al-Qaeda were serious in their claim, there is no doubt that the terrorist organization spilled much blood in the name of Islam and Muslim sacred objects.

Today's struggle over the future of Syria, is to some extent, similar to that of Afghanistan. In order to defeat the pro-Russian regime in Syria, the United States and its Western allies offered a

significant help to the Syrian oppositions including terrorist factions. The birth and strength of the terrorist group 'Islamic State in Iraq and Syria' (ISIS) was much obligated to the Americans and their regional allies, such as Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Qatar.

Garikai Chengu, a research scholar at Harvard University, argued that there are essentially three wars being waged in Syria: one between the government and the rebels, another between Iran and Saudi Arabia, and yet another war between America and Russia. It is the third, neo-Cold War battle made U.S. foreign policy makers decide to take the risk of arming Islamist rebels in Syria, because Syrian President, Bashar al-Assad, is a key Russian ally. Rather embarrassingly, many of these Syrian rebels have now turned out to be ISIS thugs, who are openly brandishing American-made M16 Assault rifles[(18)].

Accordingly, it could be concluded that the rivalry, amongst the super powers, and the American foreign policy related to this rivalry, played an essential role in the rise and strength of global terrorist organizations, such as the Muslim Brotherhood, al-Qaeda and ISIS. These organizations, which carry out terrorist attacks in the name of Islam, provided the Islamic-based terrorism with a remarkable international dimension.

5. Conclusion

Terrorism is one of the terms on which an agreement could not be reached due to the fact that defining terrorism is dependent on the ideological and political orientations of the defining actor. However, the most acceptable definition of terrorism is that it is the use, or the threat, of use of violence against civilian and innocent people in order to achieve political goals.

Terrorism can be divided into two categories; secular and religious. While the secular terrorism refers to the violence used by organizations, groups, and individuals motivated by secular ideologies, the religious terrorism is the violence used by organizations, groups and individuals motivated by religious teachings and doctrines. Moreover, while the perpetrators of secular

terrorism seek to be rewarded on the Earth, the perpetrators of religious terrorists seek to be rewarded by God on Heaven after they have fulfilled God's will on the Earth. Accordingly, religious terrorism could be an end itself meanwhile the secular terrorism is a means to achieve some ends.

The Islamic-based terrorism differs from other types of religious terrorism in many aspects, the most important of them is its international dimension. Thus, many Islamic terrorist groups operate outside their own territories. Two main factors are responsible for the international character of Islamic terrorism; the ideological fanaticism and the great powers' rivalry over the Muslim World.

In regard to the first factor, the Muslims believe that their religion is a universal one and the Prophet Mohammed was not sent just to a single nation but to the entire humanity. Further, they believe that the Islamic call should be spread all over the world. Yet, the Muslim scholars have always been disagreed over the means by which the Islamic call should be delivered to the rest of the world. The majority of them believe that Islam should be spread by all possible means including the use of military force. These scholars divided the world into two parts; 'dar al-Islam' (House of Islam) which is ruled by Muslim governors, and 'dar al-harb' (House of War) which is ruled by non-Muslims. The war between these two parts must not be settled until the Muslims achieve final victory and put the entire world under their control. Other Muslim scholars believe that the Islamic call can only be spread by peaceful means, and jihad can only be a defensive fight. Offensive jihad can be declared by only infallible imams. While most of the Sunni scholars adopt the first opinion, the most of the Shiites adopt the second one. Consequently, most of the Islamic terrorist organizations and groups which operate outside their own territory, such as al-Qaeda and ISIS, are affiliated with extreme Sunni ideologies.

As the great powers' rivalry, under the Cold War, the United States and other Western powers have always used Islamic terrorist organizations and groups to fight Communism and put an end to the Soviet expansion in the Muslim World. The significant American and

Western support to al-Qaeda in the 1980s made of this organization a powerful global terrorist actor. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the collapse of the pro-Soviet regime in Afghanistan, the guns of al-Qaeda turned towards the United States and its allies around the world.

Today, it seems that the Americans have not learnt too much from al-Qaeda's lesson in Afghanistan. Thus, they made the same mistake by supporting the armed oppositions to al-Asad's regime in Syria. Many Islamic terrorist groups make use of this support by putting hand over large quantities of the weapons sent to the Syrian rebels. Moreover, the Americans did not make any serious attempts to prevent ISIS from seizing many cities and towns in Iraq and Syria, and put control over important energy sources in both countries. This policy helped ISIS to export its extreme version of Islam to many regions around the world, including the West. The terrorist group claimed the responsibility for the terrorist attacks of France in November 2015 and Belgium in March 2016. So it is the fanatic ideology of the Islamic terrorist groups and the Western intentional or unintentional support are the main responsible factors for the strength of the Islamic-based terrorism on the global level.

References

(1) *Acharya, Upendra D., 'War on Terror or Terror Wars: The Problem in Defining Terrorism', Denver Journal of International Law and Policy, Fall 2009.*

(2) *U.S. State Department, Patterns of Global Terrorism, 2001, xvi. United States Code, Title 22, Section 2656f (d) uses the identical definition of terrorism.*

(3) *United Nations Declaration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism annex to UN General Assembly resolution 49/60,"Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism", of December 9, 1994.*

(4) *Myers, D. G. (2001). Do we fear the right things? American Psychological Society Observer,14, 3, 31.*

(5) *Dawkins Richard, 'Why I Am Hostile Toward Religion', Beliefnet, http://www.beliefnet.com/Faiths/Secular-Philosophies/Why-I-Am-Hostile-Toward-Religion.aspx.*

(6) *Quoted in (Lewis. 2003: 7).*

(7) *Sahih al-Bukhari, available at: http://sunnah.com/bukhari.*

(8) *Sahih Muslim, available at: http://sunnah.com/muslim.*

(9) *'What is Jihadism?', BBC World News Report, December 11, 2014.*

(10) *Curtin Winsor, Jr. 'Saudi Arabia, Wahhabism and the Spread of Sunni Theofascism', Mideast Monitor, Vol. 2. No. 1, June/July 2007.*

(11) *This term is derived from Sayyid Qutb, the Egyptian Islamic theorist and the leading member of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood in the 1950s and 1960s.*

(12) *Ayoob, Mohammed, 'Political Islam: Image and Reality', World Policy Journal, Vol.11, No. 3, Fall 2004.*

(13) *Christopher M. Blanchard, 'The Islamic Traditions of Wahhabism and Salafiyya', Congressional Research Service, January 28, 2008.*

(14) *Armstrong, Karen, 'Wahhabism to ISIS: how Saudi Arabia exported the main source of global terrorism", Middle East, November 27, 2014.*
(15) *Garikai Chengu, 'America Created Al-Qaeda and the ISIS Terror Group', Global Research, September 19, 2014.*
(16) *'CIA created al-Qaeda and gave $3 BILLION to Osama bin Laden', BBC News, September 18, 2001. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/155236.stm.*
(17) *Timeline: al-Qaeda, BBC News, August 7, 2008.*
(18) *Garikai Chengu, 'America Created Al-Qaeda and the ISIS Terror Group', Global Research, September 19, 2014.*

Bibliography

1. *The Holy Qur'an, Translated by Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Wordsworth Editions, UK 2000*
2. *Alex P. Schmid & A.J. Jongman 'Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature', North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam 1988.*
3. *Auerbach Carl F. & Louise B. Silverstein, 'An Introduction to Coding and Analysis', New York University Press, 2003*
4. *Firestone Reuven, 'Jihad: The Origin of Holy War in Islam', Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.*
5. *Gal-Or Noemi (1985), 'International Cooperation to Suppress Terrorism', Croom Helm, London.*
6. *Hoffman, Bruce. 'Inside Terrorism', Columbia University Press, New York, 1998.*
7. *Ismael, Jamal Abdul Latif. 'Bin Laden wal Jazeera wa Ana', The Islamic Informational Observatory, London, 2000*
8. *James M. Lutz, 'Global Terrorism', Routledge, London 2004*
9. *Juergensmeyer Mark, 'Terror in the Mind of God', University of California Press, 2001*
10. *Kepel Gilles and Millelli, Jean-Pierre. 'Al Qaeda in its Own Words', Harvard College, USA 2008.*
11. *Laqueur, W. (1987), 'The Age of Terrorism', Boston: Little, Brown.*
12. *Lewis, Bernard, 'The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror', Weidenfeld & Nicolsen, U.K. 2003.*
13. *Lewis, Bernard, 'The Political Language of Islam', The University of Chicago, 1991.*
14. *Mutahhari, Ayatullah Murtaza, 'Al-Jihad: The Holy War in Islam and its Legitimacy in the Qur'an', Era of Appearance Foundation, Iran 2010.*
15. *Pillar, Paul R., 'Terrorism, the United States and the World Order' in Rhodes and Mansbach, 'Global Politics in a Changing World', 2nd. Ed. Haughton Mifflin Company, U. S. 2003*

16. *Price E. Daniel, 'Sacred Terror: How Faith Becomes Lethal', Praeger, CA. 2012.*
17. *Rummel, R. J., 'Death by government', New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers, NJ. 1996*
18. *Stern, Jessica, 'The Ultimate Terrorist', Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.*
19. *Susan D. Moeller, 'Compassion Fatigue: How the Media Sell Disease, Famine, War and Death', Routledge, UK 2004*
20. *Vidino Lorenzo, 'The West and the Muslim Brotherhood after the Arab Spring', Al Mesbar Studies & Research Center, Dubai, 2013.*
21. *Vidino, Lorenzo, 'The Muslim Brotherhood in the West: evolution and Western policies', International Centre for the Study of Radicalization and Political Violence (ICSR), London 2011.*

الإرهاب باسم الإسلام وأبعاده العالمية

م. د. سامي أحمد صالح كلاوي
كلية القانون والعلوم السياسية - جامعة ديالى

ملخص البحث

منذ مطلع تسعينيات القرن الماضي وحتى اليوم، يمثل الإرهاب باسم الإسلام تهديداً للعالم بأسره. وقد اثبت تنظيما القاعدة و "الدولة الإسلامية" وغيرهما من المنظمات الإرهابية ذات الصبغة الإسلامية القدرة على ضرب أهدافها في كل انحاء العالم. ويتمحور هذا البحث حول البعد العالمي للإرهاب باسم الإسلام، والعوامل التي ساهمت في نشأته وتقويته.

ويسعى البحث، وبالاعتماد على مجموعة من النظريات في حقل العلوم السياسية، إلى تطوير فرضيتين حول البعد العالمي للتطرف الإسلامي؛ أولاهما عقيدة الجهاد في الإسلام، وثانيهما التنافس بين القوى العظمى على مقدرات العالم الإسلامي. وتذهب الفرضية الأولى إلى أن العديد من الفقهاء والمفكرين المسلمين تبنوا عقيدة الجهاد الهجومي كوسيلة لنشر الإسلام في كل انحاء العالم. أما الفرضية الثانية فتذهب إلى أن بعض القوى العظمى وخصوصاً الولايات المتحدة الأميركية وظفت ودعمت بعض الحركات الإسلامية كالقاعدة وتنظيم "الدولة الإسلامية" لتحقيق أهداف سياسية محددة. وبذلك تكون هذه الحركات قد حصلت على ما تريد من دعم فكري ومادي كبيرين ساهما الى حد كبير في بروزها كحركات فعّالة وخطرة على المستوى العالمي.