Conclusion
CONCLUDING REMARKS

This world is consisting of pluralistic traditions, diverse religions and cultures and it is the hallmark of civilization in any pluralistic society. A correct understanding and appreciation for 'others' can be developed only through proper knowledge and awareness of their faith and philosophy. Consequently a harmonious relation at lingual, social, financial and political level can be achieved through admiration by one community of the contribution of other communities in the grab of democratic values and respect for human rights. The representation of Muslims in the Western media has to change and interculturalism has to replace Islamophobia. The respect for others requires certain knowledge of the other's history and culture, ways of life and other factors. The issues raised here is terrorism and its relation with Islam.

In the context of history, terrorism is not at all the monopoly of any particular religion. It is infact practiced by institutions, governments as well as by individual revolutionaries throughout history in every epoch and throughout the world to subjugate populations, assert power or create an illusion of power in order to achieve political objectives and gain control of resources. If, for the sake of argument, it may be asserted that, Muslims are not the one who initiated the heinous act of terrorism, it were Jews who firstly practiced it during 1st century, they were Sicarii Zealots.

As far as the concept of war in Islam and Jihad is concerned, they have been discussed separately as Jihad is a concept much broader than warfare. The doctrine of warfare can be derived from the Qur'an without resorting to the term Jihad at all. In Arabic language Jihad does not mean war, for war, there are other words like herb or qital. The 'concept of war' is mentioned in Qur'an, as a war fought for the cause of Allah. A Muslim's cause of war is just, noble, righteous and humanitarian. A victory in Islam is a victory for the cause of Islam, so noble and humanitarian a cause cannot be allowed to be attained through inhuman and undignified ways. Humanitarianism thus lies at the very heart of the Islamic approach to war. There was no semblance of any kind of adventurism, militarism, fanaticism, national interests, personal motives and economic compulsion in the whole affair. There is nothing to be apologetic about, a Muslim should be proud of the fact that when used his sword is meant to subdue the forces of tyranny and repression, and to bring peace and justice to mankind. And it is withheld the very moment these conditions are obtained.

But the Islamic concept of Jihad has been greatly misunderstood. It has even been deliberately misinterpreted, particularly by western writers and media, in
order to damage the image of Islam and Muslims. Whenever any terrorist act happens anywhere in the world, before proper investigation the name of any Muslims organization is attached with it. It doesn't mean to say that Muslims are completely innocent but due to continuing wave of oppression suffered by Muslims of some countries and the age long conflict rooted in the colonial age between Muslim and the west, have now been developed into proxy occupation of Muslim countries. In the name of combating terrorism, western power has shown acts of atrocities which have inflamed a section of the Muslims youth. Consequently, some of them resorted to deviant behaviour and acts inspired by extremist thinking in the name of jihad. But considering such acts as jihad did not have any sanction in Islamic Shariah.

We believe that perpetrators should be punished not because we think that their punishment will deter future acts of terrorism – but for acts as vile as to cause the death of thousands of innocent people, to go unpunished would indeed send a very dangerous message to others who might contemplate such actions in the future. But no action should be taken against any party before proven to have committed that act. But judging the heinous act of a group of people with their religion is not fair because no religion sanctions violence and terrorism.

Today, in contrast to the times of classical fuqaha, we live in an age where it is possible to conceive a permanent, sustained peace and an international order based on such peace. Further, at least theoretically no country in the world now places any hurdles in the path of Islamic missionary work in inviting people to Islam. Because of the astonishing development of the means of communication, we now have new possibilities for Islamic missionary work available to us. This vastly changed context thus leaves no basis, in reason and in the Shariah, for holding on to the old concept, according to which Muslim states should, as far as possible, avoid entering into peace treaties with other states, and instead they should wage war against them and thereby seek to bring them under the flag of Islam.

The later part of this research work concludes with assessment that in a highly media saturated environment, such as the one we live today, successful political and administrative agendas depend great deal on how well they are packaged and presented in the media. As Paranti puts it, who is and is not a terrorist in the media is a matter of politics. The use of the word 'terror or terrorist' to describe one's political opponents is done to gain the political vantage point. In this approach the heads of state build public support for policies by regularly speaking directly to the civilians and generating positive news content.
through the press – which, if done well can provide the government with what Samuel Kernell declares to be ‘near – monopoly control’ over policy and news agendas.

The event of 9/11 is historic and shocking because there was a change in the direction in which the guns pointed. It wounded the American psyche and shook their confidence in the supremacy of their power. Consequently it radically changed the direction of the US not only in the sphere of foreign policy, but also enormously impacted the domestic front. In the aftermath of the 9/11, the search for the enemy began. Even a cursory glance at the US media after 9/11 leaves no doubt that Islam and Muslim world were portrayed as the main threat to the western civilization and culture. Although no sufficient evidence has so far been presented to feel sure that Osama bi Laden is responsible for the tragic death of thousands of Americans, but western media is using Sept 11 event to capitalize its political gain and putting the issue of security matters on top is a big step ahead. By doing so, they try to justify the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq without any good reason to fight the imagined enemy.

Earlier the U.S government had also done the same, in the name of anti-communism, invade other countries. From Hitler’s Germany to Hiroshima, to Vietnam, to Iraq, it has been long history of US unmitigated disaster and unfortunately most of those people who were killed, were in the name of saving democracy and freedom. In Hiroshima – Nagasaki it killed hundreds of thousands of people, in Vietnam it killed unarmed peasants working in their fields to destroy communism. Now in the absence of any communist power, the US and UK ruling establishments deceive people by their deceptive rhetoric of ‘democratic values’ and liberating people of corrupt and ruthless dictatorship. What kind of liberty it wants - liberty for people or liberty for American ruling establishment to loot and exploit poorer nations? Sounding warning to other nations, that ‘you are either us or against us’ or you are with the terrorist, he has made it very clear to anyone who is not ‘with them’ that America will harm them in every way that it can. The ‘War on Terror’, Mr. Bush told to reporters would be a monumental struggle between good and evil. From the outset, the President had no doubt that ‘good will prevail’. But what exactly does he mean when he says ‘with us’ does it mean as his words suggested the unopposed acceptance of the rightness of their whole way of life? But Muslims must remain critical of all aspects of the American way of life that are in opposition to the will of Allah.

But it seems that unless the American government and its allies did not search out the real causes of this deep animosity toward America and removed it,
than it is naive to think that it will be possible to stop those who would be willing
to use violence for getting their own rights. Terrorism can never be stopped until
injustice in all of its forms is stopped.

At this critical point in human history, the United States of America must
make a crucial choice. It may choose to exercise its unprecedented military and
economic power in an orgy of vengeance, relentlessly to crush the helpless
'Enemies' both real and imagined, reveling in its role as the world's sole remaining
superpower, and continue ignoring the genuine concern of millions around the
world who believes its cruel self-serving policies have been responsible for the
intolerable suffering of the world's poor and powerless, or America, it can choose
to honor the memory of those who died so tragically because of using its great
power and influence and should mark that moment of madness, as the beginning
of the creation of world of peace, love and justice.

Moreover, it may be argued that if America and the world's other
governments in their completely justified, very necessary and much overdue
"war against terrorism" will also commit part of this long and difficult struggle
to the creation of a good, right and just society. If they do so in a way that
follows the accepted standards of justice, and if they harm no innocent citizens
of any nation in the process, then it should be expected that they will receive
the full and continued support of virtually every Muslim in the world.

To summarize, three concluding remarks can be made:

First, although much has been written on Islam and terrorism but real
dialogue is possible only in the presence of mutual knowledge and acceptance of
cultural and religious values. Accepting others must means accepting them as
members of community without necessarily any loss of their unique identity.

Second, there are many steps that can be taken to help increasing
understanding between Islam and West. The media should need to take a more
balanced and more understanding position. They need to resist temptation to pass
judgment, to slip into old-style Orientalist prejudices. They must also avoid the
trap of using loaded words like 'fundamentalism' which cloud judgment and
create prejudice. The western media must look at Islam objectively, even with
some empathy, and not respond to events in Muslim area with constant aggression
and hostility. It is also crucial that they should not impose their own intellectual
frame on Islam.

Lastly, it is the need of the hour to reconcile in order to create a better and
more peaceful world, to share the world's resources more equally and to help the
unprivileged.