

2002-9

Dialogue with Islamic Civilization

Conference Proceedings

January 9th, 2002
The Sasakawa Peace Foundation

おまけ

矢野龍渓の
日記

2002年(平成14年)10月22日 火曜日 新 戸 神 屋

独自の思想再評価

東京 吉本隆明めぐるシンポ



吉本隆明氏

(第3種郵便物認可)

六〇年安保闘争や其闘世に大きな影響を与え、その後も独自の考察を続けている思想家の全体像を読み解く「吉本隆明をめぐるシンポジウム」が、東京工業大学の公開講座として開催された。「言語にとつて美とはなにか」「共同幻想論」「ハイ・イメージ論」「アフリカの段階について」一九六〇―九〇年代の主要著書を手掛かりに、現在の思想の地平から吉本思想を再構成する試みだ。

パネリストは明治学院大教授・加藤典洋、同・竹田青嗣、京大助教授・大沢真幸、司会が東京工業大教授・橋爪大三郎の各氏。七〇年前後に同時代としての吉本思想に親しんだ竹田、橋爪、「吉本ブーム」に反感を覚え

ていた加藤、当時小学生だった大沢。各氏の言葉に「言語にとつて美とはなにか」「共同幻想論」「ハイ・イメージ論」「アフリカの段階について」は「ヨーロッパ思想がこころを待って、使いたい回しする」戦後日本の思想界にあつて、「全部一人で、オリジナルに根本的に考えた」(竹田)ところにある。

シンポでは「関係の絶対性」「対幻想」といった独自の概念が、マルクス主義国家論や党派的な思考を超えたと高く評価された。その上で、権力を悪として「国家の廃絶」を志向する姿勢には、「国

家や権力は悪という考え方はなく、どちらの権力ならいいのかを考えなければ」(加藤)などの異論が出た。

討議が沸いたのは、ポストモダンの立場の人々から何か批判される言本が、実は「真のポストモダニスト」であるという大沢氏のユニークな論。吉本思想から「思想の相対性を乗り越える超越的な他者」の視点を取り出すものだ。他の三人からは批判されたが、大沢の参加で同世代だけの議論にならなかったことが、シンポを刺激的なものにしたことは間違いない。

強烈な個性を持った吉本隆明の思想から新たな意味をくみ出し、乗り越えようとする意気込みの伝わるシンポだった。

Foreword

Whether in Japan or around the world, one will not be able to see or discuss anything this year without thinking of Islam. Therefore, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation (SPF) has launched this seminar, "Dialogue with Islamic Civilization," the first of its kind for Japan.

Undoubtedly, the purpose and intention of this gathering was triggered by tragic terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York City and Washington, DC. However, the intention of the SPF goes beyond that tragic incident and continues the Sasakawa Peace Foundation's longstanding interest in Islam and Islamic civilization.

As part of the SPF's philosophy since its establishment in 1986, we have always sought channels to contribute to the world community. The SPF has been trying to be a catalyst to foster international mutual understanding, exchange and cooperation. In particular, since the collapse of communism, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation believes that it is imperative to create a pluralistic global order—instead of a singular convergence—for the future progress of mankind. Specifically, the SPF rejects the thesis of the "clash of civilizations." Rather, we embrace the concept of the coexistence of many cultures, religious tolerance, and living in peace between civilizations.

Recognizing these challenges, we have sought to undertake intellectual exercises to enhance understanding between civilizations and to narrow the divide between civilizations through constructive dialogues.

Following the tragic events of September 11, 2001, all of us are going through a totally different experience that is of greater tension between civilizations, as well as within. While the tragedy will still require a lot of analysis to understand what it really means, it is of utmost importance to direct our efforts in promoting and in strengthening civilizational dialogues for preserving peace and prosperity in our pluralistic global village. In facing this challenge, the SPF has decided to increase its efforts in promoting civilizational dialogues in coming months. As part of this campaign, a conference on "Dialogue with Islamic Civilization" was organized in Tokyo, on January 9, 2002. We would like express our deepest appreciation to our five distinguished speakers for making this conference a success. We also thank Douglas Steele for assisting us in putting together these proceedings. We hope these proceedings will contribute to a better understanding of Islamic civilization.

Akira Iriyama
President,
The Sasakawa Peace Foundation

Executive Summary

Whether in Japan or around the world, one will not be able to see or discuss anything this year without thinking of Islam. Therefore, The Sasakawa Peace Foundation has launched this Dialogue with Islamic Civilization, the first of its kind for Japan. While the timing of this gathering was triggered by the tragic terrorist attacks on September 11th in New York City and Washington, DC, the intention of the Foundation goes beyond those tragic incidents and reflects the Foundation's longstanding interest in Islam and Islamic civilization.

The purpose of this stage of the Dialogue was to examine the relationship, or at least the perceived relationship between Islam and terrorism as mediated, articulated and motivated by the concept of *jihad*. To this end the Foundation brought together prominent Muslim scholars from the Sunni and Shia schools of Islam as well as Japanese religious scholars and a number of informed and interested participants including members of the diplomatic corps in Japan, academics, journalists and students.

The participants sought to explain, and sometimes diverged on, the definitions of *jihad*, Islam and terrorism as well as the context of violence in the Muslim world and media portrayals of Islam and terrorism. On the Islamic side of the dialogue, as one participant put it, "There is one Islam but several interpretations and I accept that there are differences in interpretations."

Professor Hassan Hanafi asked the participants, not to justify, but to understand how young Muslims could become angry enough by powerlessness, poverty, exploitation, repression in Palestine and the negative images of Islam in Western media to use violence to counter the violence they feel is being used against them. Professor Mohaghegh Damad, an Iranian legal scholar and a Muslim cleric analyzed the status of terrorism under the *Shari'ah*, which is Islamic law. He noted that terrorism did not merely lack legal sanction, it was prohibited by several tenets of Islamic law.

A theme frequently expressed on the Japanese side of

the dialogue was the importance of learning more about the world's religions because, as one participant said, "*dialogue has to begin between people who know something about each other.*" The need to continue the dialogue and to learn more about Islam was met with agreement on the Islamic side of the dialogue as well. Towards the end of the discussion, Professor Mohaghegh Damad summarized it this way: "I give advice to my friends of Japan that you should know something about Islam because...the best way for stopping terrorism is understanding Islam and introducing factual Islam, the reality of Islam to the mass of Muslims."

**Session 1—
Islam, Terrorism and Jihad**

— Chairman: Dr. Shamsul A. B.

Speakers:

Dr. Hassan Hanafi

Dr. Seyyed Mostafa Mohaghegh Damad

Discussants:

Dr. Tetsuo Yamaori

Dr. Daizaburo Hashizume

Professor Shamsul: Islam as a religion is known, though in fragments, to most people around the world through various ways, such as, its history, rituals, architecture, or for the diversity of its practitioners or through the self-claim made by respective Muslim countries.

What is less known to the popular mind is the Islamic concept of *jihad* which involves an aspect of Islamic theology. The word *jihad* literally means effort, attempt or struggle. The struggle takes many forms, both at the individual (say, against evil) and collective (say, against an anti-Muslim group) levels.



Professor Shamsul

We have to locate terrorism, or the use of terror, in the collective context, employed as a militant strategy by a social collective, such as a group or many groups of Muslims, to achieve political goals that may not be connected to Islam, or may even be against Islam.

We also have to contextualize terrorism historically because it doesn't belong to Islam, as portrayed in the mass media recently. But, we must remind ourselves that it is not only Muslim groups that have used terrorism as a militant strategy to achieve political goals. In Russia, Lenin and Stalin used terrorism to keep the Communist State in power. In colonized countries, anti-colonialist movements used it to gain independence. In post-colonial countries terrorism has been used to further ethnic chauvinistic goals, such as in Sri Lanka.

Even in developed countries, terrorism has been used to further sectional interests such as the Oklahoma bombing in the United States, the IRA in

Northern Ireland, the Red Army in Japan and Germany and Basque separatist groups in Spain. Unfortunately, after the terrible events of September 11, terrorism is viewed as synonymous with Islam and Muslims, as a result of mass media definition. This is what I sometimes called the *CNN-ized Islam*.

In order to seek clarification and understanding of the relationship between Islam and terrorism as mediated, articulated and motivated by the concept of *jihad*, we have brought together in this meeting prominent Muslim scholars from the Sunni and Shia schools of Islam. They will elaborate on and discuss the connectedness, or non-connectedness between Islam, *jihad* and terrorism.

“Unfortunately, after the terrible events of September 11, terrorism is viewed as synonymous with Islam and Muslims, as a result of mass media definition.”

Professor Shamsul

Professor Hassan Hanafi: Linking Islam with terrorism is historically untrue. In modern times, during the decolonization period, there was a struggle of national liberation wars. While we became independent, our states were as oppressive as the old colonial powers and the struggle continued. You hear on the news that there is some violent struggle in the Arab and Muslim world—Palestine is still colonized by the Zionist



Professor Hassan Hanafi

regime, there is an internal struggle in the civil war in Lebanon, the civil war in Algeria.

Because of the mass media, Islam is all the time linked to bombing, struggling, killing, and so on. And since we are carrying the weight of history, and because in history, because of Orientalism, Islam is linked to the sword. This trilogy, Islam, *jihad* and terrorism, has become stereotyped in the mass media.

But if you go beyond modern times, Islam is linked to reason, science, knowledge, urbanism, to humanism, to communitarianism, to progress. During Classical Islam, which in Western Orientalism they call Medieval Islam, we built the whole Mediterranean basin. Arabic medicine, Islamic medicine, was taught until the 17th century in Palermo, Sicily and Cordoba. We had a huge translation from the Islamic sciences through Hebrew or directly into Latin. We were behind the modern Western Enlightenment. If you read the late Scholastics of Medieval Christian philosophy, Abelard and Thomas Aquinas, Siger of Brabant were disciples of the Muslims who put rationalism in the West and gave the West its new scientists. If we take Descartes and Cartesianism and the doubt and certainty we find a lot of parallelism with Al-Ghazari. This is also Islam, but nobody is speaking about it. It is not in the mass media but it is in the books.

What we have now has been inherited just from modern times. The Russian invasion of Chechnya, and before that of Afghanistan, the Serbian aggression on Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. And if you have some idea about the oppression of Muslims in Burma and Thailand then you can say that the Muslims are victims of terrorism. Muslims are not only the source of terrorism but also the victims but when they begin to fight, the accusation comes against the Muslims rather than against those who are practicing aggression on the Muslims.

As to the notion of terrorism, usually in the western mass media, they conceive terrorism unilaterally. Someone is terrorizing the other. But

terrorism is so complex. It is a double phenomenon, a complex phenomenon.

There is a distinction between individual terrorism and collective or state terrorism. In every society you can find some individuals committing terrorism. In the United States, you have some young boy who takes a machine gun and shoots up a school. This is individual terrorism that can be understandable because of lack of education, of madness and lack of loyalty. But what cannot be understood is state terrorism.

When terrorism becomes state policy, as for example what America is doing, not only to the Muslim world but also to Latin America and to Africa. In the unipolar system, since the end of the Socialist bloc in 1991, America has become the only norm of truth, the only criterion of truth, the only agent of truth. America's judging, condemning has become a certain form of state terrorism. America is playing the role of the police agent for the whole world. She decides on Yugoslavia, she decides on Afghanistan, on Iran, on Sudan, Lebanon and Somalia. She goes beyond the United Nations, without even having an international mandate by the United Nations. This is the most horrible state terrorism. The most powerful state is playing the role of the judge against the poorest state. What is Afghanistan? What is Somalia? Sudan? They have the lowest national incomes on earth. The most powerful country is attacking the weakest, most poor country. This is a type of a state terrorism in the name of modernity, in the name of the free world.

The first distinction we have to make is between individual terrorism, which can be localized, accidentalized and understood, and state terrorism can never be tolerated because here you have thousands and thousands of innocent victims—children, women and old people.

A second distinction can be drawn between oppressive terrorism and liberating terrorism. Sometimes terrorism begins and there is no way you can defend yourself except by using a counter-

terrorism. The first terrorism is an oppressive one. But what we feel, what we are subject to and incapable of doing anything about. And if you resist and oppose such terrorism, the second terrorism, which is a reaction, is called terrorism. But the first is never called terrorism. The person who is victimized, if he cries, then is a terrorist. But those who are committing terrorism, making him cry, it is not called terrorism.

A third distinction is between visible terrorism and invisible terrorism. We in the Arab world and the Muslim world are living in a world where there is invisible terrorism that we are subjected to. An educational system which we have not chosen. An economic policy which we have not chosen. An international policy which we have not chosen. They do not take your opinion on anything. Policies have been imposed on you by the power elites, by the ruling party.

A mass media in which you do not have a say is brainwashing you twenty-four-hours-a-day. This is the terrorism of a world in which I am not a factor. And since I am incapable of protesting, then sometimes there are eruptions here and there to express my anger and protest against this invisible terrorism. In the first one, no one is accused of terrorism but in the second we are accusing the victim of being a terrorist while those who are committing an injustice we are not accusing them of terrorism.

A final distinction is between historical terrorism and the present terrorism. What does historical terrorism mean? If you read the history of Islam in the books, you find many stereotyped images done by Orientalists where Islam is linked to backwardness, to a primitive mentality, to color and race, to poverty, to petrodollars, to the Ugly Arab in London, to the harem, to sexism, combined with the Turkish time, to the Ottoman Empire, with divorce, with low status.

If a young Muslim is raised seeing all these negative images of Islam, taught in books, shown in the Western mass media, he gets angry. After all, we are all images. We do not know Japan, but we

know the image of Japan. The image sometimes is the substitute to the thing itself. This is historical terrorism. My image has been falsified in history. Then if I would like to protest these fall images, if I would like to liberate myself from these oppressive images, then I am called a terrorist. If I am against Eurocentrism, if I am against the monopoly of culture by Europe and the U.S.A., if I would like to make a better image of myself, I am not allowed and what we call the present terrorism is a natural reaction against the historical terrorism.

Look at the monolithic images of terrorism linked to Islam. Who still remembers that there is terrorism in Ireland? Here you have Catholics against Protestants, bombing and killing for two or three decades, perhaps three or four centuries. But no one is speaking in the mass media about Christian terrorism, about the Hindu Tamils, the Sikhs, and the Hindus in Kashmir, Judaism and the Jews and the Zionists in Palestine. These are not terrorism when the images focus only on Islam while ignoring

Christianity and Judaism. Who is speaking of the Inquisition where people were burned alive in the 15th century? And who were the victims? The Muslims and the Jews when the

“If somebody is practicing terrorism in the west, it is terrorism. But if a Western man practices terrorism inside or outside Europe, it is not terrorism.”

Professor Hassan Hanafi

Muslims lived in Spain. There is a lot of religious and racial terrorism but who is mentioning the Basque problem? Corsica, Cyprus, Armenia and separatist movements all around the world and no one is mentioning them as terrorism? Who is mentioning the terrorism, which Muslims are the victims of France and in Germany? The new Nazis in Germany are burning Muslims alive and they would like to purify Germany from the intruders, the outsiders.

There are about three million Muslims living in Germany and they are subject to the new Nazi terror and the same thing can be said in France with the rise of the right-winger Jean Marie Le Pen.

Finally, terrorism is a judgment based on a double standard. If something happens in New York and Washington, it is terrorism. But the same thing happens in Palestine, it is happening everywhere in the world and no one is moving. If somebody is practicing terrorism in the west, it is terrorism. But if a Western man practices terrorism inside or outside Europe, it is not terrorism.

What does *jihad* mean? Etymologically, *jihad* means 'the struggle,' but it does not say against whom.

Life is a struggle. *Jihad* means I have to struggle against the self like in Buddhism where I have to dominate my passions, my desires, in order to have myself, autonomous and free. *It-jihad*, which is from the same term, means the intellectual effort as a source of law. The Islamic law can be deduced from the Quran, from the Sunnah, which is the sayings of the Prophet, or from the consensus of the community or from the individual effort to understand. This is from the same root as *jihad*, which is *it-jihad*. *Jihad* has nothing to do with aggression. It has something to do with self-control, with intellectual work. But it has nothing to do with violent behavior against the other.

In the case when Muslims are kicked out of their homes, in cases where Muslims are subjected to external aggression such as being killed, exterminated, when some injustice is done then there is a right to self-defense. So *jihad* is a self-defensive war once you are attacked. It is what is called in the Medieval legal system 'the Just War.'

The Just War means that if you are the subject of an attack, and this is the international definition of a just war. When the Nazis occupied the whole of Europe, when the Colonial powers occupied parts of Africa and Asia, all the national wars were done in the name of the Just War.

Jihad can also be against internal oppression.

Once I have used all the peaceful devices, which means giving advice, admonishing in mosques, preaching, writing in the mass media, denouncing all forms of injustice, corruption and dictatorship, and going to court, and if I am not successful in my peaceful devices and the ruler is still stubborn then here a *jihad* can be done from within against internal repression. Again, *jihad* can be understood as a historical force.

When we understand Islam in the old days, there were the two big empires, Persia and Rome. Persia was tired, Rome was tired and both were colliding and Islam came as a third force based on equality, non-aggression and justice between all colors and races in the name of the Islamic universal code of justice. These are the historical circumstances of Islam's beginning. But nowadays these historical circumstances are not there. We are before a big power. The second pole is no more the Soviet Union but we have China, Japan, Central Asia, Malaysia and Indonesia. We have a new pole which is forming but I do not think Islam is presenting a third power in international relations to justify what is called a third power coming to inherit the two colliding powers.

So *jihad* has been linked, unjustly, to modern practices that are the expressions of injustice, political, economic and social, but not at all as an old law that existed in the past, given the ancient historical circumstance.

Professor Mohaghegh Damad: The *Shari'ah* does not explicitly contemplate the concept of international terrorism. However, Islamic jurisprudence does consider the separate, definitions that comprise terror-violence. That is first, violence, coercive conduct; second,

"International terrorism is unquestionably illegal under the Shari'ah."
Professor Mohaghegh Damad



Professor Mohaghegh Damad

an element of internationalism; and third, a politically motivated objective. In particular, the *Shari'ah* presents four fundamental doctrines that bear directly upon the legality of international terror-violence: International Covenant, *Jihad*, Neutrality, and Forbidden Acts of War.

These four doctrines, together, point to a recognizable series of conclusions, the most important of which is a strong condemnation of random acts of terror-violence. International terrorism is unquestionably illegal under the *Shari'ah*.

International Covenants

Multilateral treaties, compacts and covenants have long been the international community's legal method of choice for combating terror-violence. Significantly, the legitimate authority of treaties over an Islamic state is also sanctioned by the *Shari'ah*. This means that every Islamic state that has entered into an anti-terrorist compact is committed under Islamic law to honor that agreement.

It also suggests that the potential for successful future uses of such multilateral conventions is very promising, provided that the Islamic nations prove to be willing to so commit themselves.

International compacts, treaties and covenants are strictly binding under Islamic law. In spite of the established Muslim view that the world is divided into two spheres, the *dar-al Islam* (the abode of Islam) and the *dar al-Harb* (the abode of war), the *Shari'ah* sanctions both recognition of and negotiation with non-Islamic states. And the Quran itself provides several exhortations of cooperation among peoples. Indeed, Muslim jurists have ruled

that international covenants acceded to by Islamic states, have become part of Islamic law.

Once a Muslim state signs a treaty with a non-Muslim state, it is generally bound to it for a renewable period of up to ten years although the Hanafi and Maliki schools hold that the duration should last no longer than three or four years, absent duress or a complex release of absolute necessity. The state political ruler may delegate the treaty-making power to an army commander, and not even a declaration of war against a co-signing party may void the treaty. To breach a covenant is to besmirch one's own honor.

As such, the significance of *Shari'ah* treaty law to terror-violence is two-fold. First, the *Shari'ah* authorizes a state to enter into a multilateral convention which would bind each nation to the specific counter-terrorist agreement it has signed, including the provisions for punishing and extraditing the terrorists located within the jurisdiction of that signatory county. Second, because of Islamic law's strong general sanction of international covenants, the *Shari'ah* would render authoritative any future global compact that addresses a fuller range of terror-violence.

Potentially, the current anti-hijacking, diplomatic inviolability, anti-hostage taking and anti-nuclear sabotage conventions may be replaced by a single, multilateral compact. Such a convention, should it be ratified by the Islamic states, would thereby incorporate a specific code of anti-terrorism law in the *Shari'ah* itself.

War and the Law of Jihad

For propaganda reasons, most terrorists themselves shun the term terrorism. It is far more acceptable to characterize a terrorist incident as manifestation of a just, defensive war than to call that same occurrence an act of violence against unarmed civilians. If a terrorist organization hijacks an airplane or bombs a busy market place, the same episode can be, and usually is, presented as either an act of terror (the victimized nation's position) or a justly motivated deed in an actual,

ongoing military conflict (the terrorists' position). In other words, according to the interpretation of the terrorist, terrorism is war, and civilian targets represent an active front. For argument's sake, accept for the moment the terrorists' position: terrorism is war, civilian targets are soldiers. Even if terror-violence really is a military attack, and even if civilian victims truly are combatants in an enemy army, the *Shari'ah* would still condemn such acts.

Islamic law places strict limitations upon a state's exercise of military force. The Western notion that Islam encourages or contributes to the current violent upheaval in the Middle East is absolutely inaccurate. The *Shari'ah* does not counsel aggression.

Islamic jurisprudence holds that all wars are illegal except for the *jihad*—the holy war to spread the worship of Allah. Literally, the word *jihad* does not mean fighting or war at all. A translation truer to the original Arabic word would be effort, attempt or exertion as in the exertion of all a person's efforts to overcome evil. It is not a duty that necessarily requires soldiers or even organized physical fighting. The great jurist Shafi explained that *jihad* is more of a communal obligation to confront the *dar al-Harb* influence in daily life. It is a form of eternal, philosophical conflict, that the scholar Sarkhsi understood as a responsibility enjoined permanently until the end of time. *Jihad* is a duty to preserve Islam, an honorable, purposeful struggle rather than an uncontrolled, violent act of destruction. Participation in the *jihad*, the preservation of Islam, ensures the believer a place in Paradise.

Nor is there any compulsion, at least upon Jews and Christians, to accept Islam, or for Muslim to force their belief upon others. On the contrary, the revered Jurist Abu Hanifa advocated tolerance, permitting war only when the *dar al-Harb* offensively confronted the *dar al-Islam*. In one noted historical instance, the legal theorist Ash Shaybani openly and vigorously denounced the

ruler of the Eighth Century Arab Empire for an attack against a Christian city because the Christians had not attacked first, and this act of unprovoked violence amounted to an unnecessary spilling of blood.

Indeed, one of the most important and most frequently misunderstood aspects of Islamic law is the concept of *jihad* as a defensive war. Although Shafi had earlier made no distinction between an offensive or defensive struggle in the exertion of Allah will¹, the scholar Ibn Taymiya decreed at the time of the Crusades when the *dar al-Islam* was struggling for its very survival, and could hardly be expected to actively convert the invading *dar al-Harb* that *jihad* was to be a defense, or protection, of Islam. Absent pressing necessity to insure the vitality of Islam, or to punish those who would destroy it, military attacks by a Muslim state were to be adjudged secular war², and hence illegal.

Procedural constraints, too, serve to check the *jihad*. Technically, the Imam (the head of state, chief jurist and leader in prayer) must be the one to declare *jihad* and only after he has attempted to negotiate a peaceful surrender. This presents a major obstacle to *jihad*, because, after the fall of the Abbasid caliphs, the Imam is no longer the sole legitimate authority. Independent rulers (amirs, sultans, etc.) must now seek the approval of the *ulama* (scholars) in order to declare a legal war. The scholars, for their part, are instructed, according to the ordinance of the jurist-philosopher, Al-Farabi³, to deny permission for:

Wars motivated by the Ruler's personal advantage such as lust for power, honor or glory.

Wars of conquest waged by the Ruler for the subordination of peoples other than the people of the city over which he presides.

Wars of retribution, the object of which can be achieved by means other than force

Wars leading to the killing of innocent men for no reason other than the Ruler's pleasure propensity of pleasure for killing.

Acts of war are the drastic exceptions, not the encouraged rule; fighting is a "social anomaly" or a "social disease."⁴

According to Farabi, just wars are as follows:

Wars in the defense of the city against foreign attacks

Wars to assert valid claims against a foreign people who failed to honor the city's rights.

Wars against foreign people who refused to accept a public order considered by the city to be best and most suitable for them.

Wars against a foreign people whose place (status) in the world is considered by the city to be that of servitude (slavery) as the best most suitable for them.

Farabi, making a distinction between the Virtuous City and other cities on the basis of the concept of the general good, held that only the Ruler of the Virtuous City is competent to proclaim just war; all other rulers, motivated by lust and other mundane propensities, are incompetent to wage just wars.

Presenting the philosophic notion of the *bellum justum*, Farabi maintained that only the Imam has the legitimate authority to proclaim a just war. All other wars, presumably waged by chiefs without legitimate authority, must be considered unjust.⁵

The result is that incidents of terror "violence" even if understood as part of a "war" against actual "combatants" will rarely if ever, meet the legal requirements specified by the *Shari'ah*. If such acts are really "war," as many terrorists

assert, then they most occur within the context of a *jihad* in order to be valid, for all other wars have been forbidden.

Moreover, if these incidents of force are to take place within the context of a *jihad*, they should be defensive, steeped in tolerance and preceded by peaceful alternatives, and be consistent with all procedural constraints. Every act of political violence—whether characterized by as "war" or as "terrorism"—must pass each standard of *jihad*. The *Shari'ah* condemns all other acts of military violence.

Neutrality

Strictly speaking, the *Shari'ah* does not encourage neutrality. The *dar al-islam* and *dar al-harb* are considered intractably opposed. Muslims are duty bound, absent a treaty, to defend Islam, and are continually exhorted to bring non-believers into the Prophet's fold. However, Muslim jurists have tempered the technical duty to expand Islam with a practical acceptance of the status quo. For the most part, Muslims have been excused for their difficulties in converting the rest of the world.⁵

The reasons are largely historical. Over the past millennium, as the military power of the Muslim states has declined and the European's influence has risen—diminishing the likelihood of a successful conversion of the *dar al-Harb*—the *dar al-Islam* has accordingly ended the policy armed expansion which marked the first three hundred years of Islam.

The *Shari'ah* has adapted to a fairly peaceful coexistence with non-Muslim states, provided that the non-believing states respect *dar al-Islam's* sovereignty. While some schools of legal thought (particularly the Hanafis) continued to rely upon what had become the judicial fiction of a world divided in two, the Shafi'is came to recognize a quasi third-world, referred to as the *dar al sulh* (abode of peace) or *dar alahd* (abode of covenant).

This neutral status is technically a temporary one; the objective of Islam remains the expansion of the Prophet's teachings. But so long as a *dar al-Harb*

exists, in other words, so long as there are non-Muslim nations, a *dar al-sulh* or *dar al ahd* may exist as well. If only temporarily, the status of neutrality is afforded legal recognition.

Even when this tenuous peace dissolves into open war, the *Shari'ah* still counsels the Muslim to embrace a less hostile course. The belligerent's message-bearer is to be treated with respect and courtesy at all times; prisoner exchanges are sanctioned; and doctors and nurses may be taken as prisoners, but must not be harmed. The Muslim government may even allow its citizens to trade and transact business with the enemy, although Malik frowned on the practice and Abu Yusef offered the qualification of prohibiting dealings of war goods. But during war time as well as peace, the treaty making authority of the *dar al-Harb* must be strictly honored.

Indeed for all of Islam's unwillingness to openly condone neutrality, there is implicit approval within the *Shari'ah* for a policy of non-action. The Quran states: "Had Allah willed, He could have given [disbelievers] power over you so that assuredly they would have fought you. So, if they remain regarding you [*itazalukum*] and wage not war against you, Allah alloweth you no say against them."

A *Hadith* (a saying attributed to the Prophet Muhammad) adds: "Many a pious Muslim remained neutral during the war between 'Aliy and Muawiyah." Yet another *Shari'ah* provision exhorts:

Excepting those of the idolaters with whom ye [Muslims] have a treaty, and who have since abated nothing of your rights no have been supported any one against you [As for these], fulfill their treaty to them till term. Lo! Allah loveth those who keep their duty [unto Him].

According to the most technical historical interpretation, only Ethiopia has been traditionally

regarded as a genuinely "neutral" state, because of its protection of early adherents to Islam, Muhammad rewarded examples of neutrality do exist, however. During the Muslim confrontation with Cyprus in 646, it was agreed "that the Muslims would not attack the people of Cyprus but at the same time they would not defend them if any other power attacked them."

Similarly, at the time of the third Caliph, Uthman, an accord was struck with Nubia stating:

You O Nubians, are assured of the protection of Allah and His Messenger, Muhammad, the Prophet. That we shall not wage war against you, nor prepare for war against you, nor attack you so long as you observed the conditions of treaty between us and you. But it will not be incumbent upon the Muslims to drive away any anemy [sic] who may encounter you, nor to prevent him from you, between the limits of the territory or "Ulwa and Aswan."

Moreover, Qais-ibn-Sad, a Governor of Egypt in A.D. 656, championed the rights of neutral peoples by replying to the fourth Caliph, Aliy: "I wonder, commander of the Faithful, how couldst thou order me to fight against a people who are keep aloof from three and are giving three a free hand to fight the enemy."

Ultimately, the *Shari'ah* notion of neutrality will not produce any conclusive determination in the struggle to control international terrorism. Certainly, for the terrorists themselves, the concept will be inapplicable. For these men and women, terror-violence is an active war; hostilities have already commenced, and the victims are in some way combatants themselves. Moreover, for those sovereign states that desire to aid the terrorists, and who share in the idea that the objects of terrorviolence really are the enemies of Islam, there is no need to refer to neutrality, either. Islam has never required its adherents to turn the other cheek while portions of the population are perceived to be

in genuine danger.

However, for those sovereign nations that do not concur in the terrorists' assessment that the terror-victims are in some way "instigators," or that these non-combatants somehow constitute soldiers in an "enemy army," a closer analysis of *Shari'ah* neutrality will be of value.

That doctrine, while not explicitly declared in Islamic jurisprudence, is nonetheless implicitly evident in both its legal and historical manifestations. As such, neutrality might well serve as a viable rationalization for moderate countries troubled by terrorist organizations attempting to enlist those states' support.

The duty of loyalty may still weigh heavily upon these nations, but the burden of the law should provide an effective counter-weight.

Forbidden Acts

A final doctrine of the *Shari'ah* or rather, a composite of several concepts of Islamic jurisprudence reveal an additional set of forbidden acts that relate directly to international terrorism. Specifically, Islamic law provides for extensive protections of diplomats, of an enemy's real or personal property.

Regardless of how noble a terrorist's political ends may be, the *Shari'ah* will not excuse any illegal violent means.

First, Muslim jurists hold the rights of diplomats to be inviolable. Kidnappings or assassinations of foreign envoys have historically been prohibited by Islam; the representatives of the Byzantines, and Muhammad himself entertained and even bestowed gifts upon visiting ambassadors. Not only are the foreign representatives to be protected from all physical harm, they are to be accorded freedom of worship and exemption from import duties.

The *Shari'ah* also offers several restrictions upon the taking of hostages. People may be seized and held during wartime, but they should be exchanged for Muslim hostages (or released unilaterally, as a gesture of good will), and may not be killed except in direct retaliation for the "treacherous murder" of

Muslim prisoners. Captured spies, however, are not afforded such protection.

The jurist Abu-Yusef counseled death for all those who refused conversion, and imprisonment or even torture for those who did not choose to embrace Islam. But, according to Ash Shaybani, espionage was less significant than robbery and, so long as the guilty party is a citizen of a Muslim state, certainly no grounds for death. In any event, all uses of hostages as "Ahuman shields" are explicitly prohibited; that is, no prisoner may be used to shield the captor during an enemy attack.

Respect for human life and personal property is a fundamental principle of the *Shari'ah*. No noncombatant may be killed, unless purposefully used to shield the enemy, or unintentionally fired upon during a night-time or distant catapult attack. Fields are not to be unnecessarily spoiled, and forests may not be needlessly destroyed.

Most importantly, even combatants themselves are afforded certain fundamental protections at all times. Sexual molestation is strictly forbidden as is mutilation, decapitation, burning to death, or any needless massacre. In a sweeping prohibition traced to the first caliph, Abu Bakr, all "excess and wickedness" must be zealously avoided. The fundamental, unifying precept is fair treatment of all persons, even in wartime. As Muhammad himself commanded: "A Fairness is prescribed by Allah in every matter; so if you kill, kill in a fair way."

That legal charge is perhaps Islam's most enduring expression on terror-violence. The *Shari'ah* may be used to condemn international terrorism—at least indirectly in its principles on international conventions, war, neutrality and forbidden acts. But the crisis of terror-violence continues. In fact, there are few practical, effective restraints available when a person is perpetrating an act of terror-violence.

Nevertheless, the tenets of Islamic jurisprudence are relevant to efforts to combat international terrorism.

First, from a purely emotional standpoint, there may be some consolation in knowing that a terrorist who has seized a hostage, murdered an ambassador, or blown apart an airplane may not legitimize that act of violence on the basis of some higher, religious authority. Muslims who commit an act of terror-violence often punctuate their action by shouting "Allah-hu Akhbar!" that is, "God is great!" But the *Shari'ah* may not be used to excuse every act of international terrorism. Islamic law condemns terror-violence, and a terrorist who invokes that law may be legally wrong.⁶



Professor Yamaori

Professor Yamaori: On the evening of September 11, President Bush quoted the Psalm of the Old Testament, the words of King David, "Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil for you are with me."⁷ Ten years ago during the Gulf War, the Old Testament was also used. President Hussein invaded Kuwait and the multinational forces went into Kuwait. At that time, American soldiers carried a copy of the 91st Psalms. The words printed there were the words of Moses that said specifically that "God is our stronghold and that God will step upon the poisonous snake and protect us."⁸

The poisonous snakes meant the pagans and during the Gulf War specifically it meant the Muslims and during the Gulf War it was used to target the Muslims. Therefore, the word *jihad* from the Muslims would naturally come out. The Old Testament and the Quran, these two religious opposition and the awareness of this opposition was at the bottom of the Gulf War philosophy and of the

New York terrorist incident.

I do not think the Gulf War and September 11th were the clash of civilizations nor a religious war, but instead, there are economic and political and military factors that were the causes of these incidents. But, when we look deep

down, I feel there is a religious conflict at the very bottom. At the end of World War II, in North Africa when the British and Nazi soldiers fought, when the British soldiers fought, they read also from the very words of Moses I have talked about so it goes deep down. We cannot relate terrorism purely to religious causes, but we must not forget what is also at the back of all this, the bottom of all these struggles and conflicts.

The second point that I want to talk about is the current situation in Jerusalem. In October 1995, I visited Israel for the first time. I wanted to look at the road that Jesus walked upon. The distance was about 150 kilometers. In Jerusalem, King Solomon built a temple in 1000 B.C. but today only one piece of that wall exists today and every day the Jews go to pray at that wall of sorrow. In the middle of all this, there is the holy space of Islam, that golden dome. Next to these is the hill of Golgotha and the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. There is a peaceful coexistence between these three places that is really wonderful and awesome to the eye. Should the coexistence break apart, it would be something terrible.

The Jerusalem issue, the Palestinian problem, the September 11th incident, the speech President Bush gave, the Gulf War, when we think back on all these things we can see that Jerusalem, where three great religions of the world coexist, is threatened. For that peaceful coexistence to continue, what can we

" We cannot relate terrorism purely to religious causes, but we must not forget what is also at the back of all this, the bottom of all these struggles and conflicts."

Professor Yamaori

do? Perhaps we in the Far East cannot do anything and we should leave it up to the people of the Islamic world, or the Jews or the Christians to take the leadership on how we can keep that peaceful coexistence forever.

It was about fifty years ago that India, which was a British colony, became independent. It was because of this that India and Pakistan became totally separated. This is not simply a religious conflict but there are also other important elements.

When the separation happened, they separated politics and religion in India, but in Pakistan they did not separate religion and politics. Professor Huntington at Harvard says that the 21st century will be the age of the clash of civilizations and there has been a lot of debate surrounding this. But I feel that it will be a clash between countries where politics and religion are separated and countries where they are converged. After independence, Islam and Hinduism coexisted and in Pakistan, it is the same, to some extent. When the conflict occurred in the political situation the thinking of Mahatma Gandhi was totally non-violent. In Pakistan, the founder, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, thought religion and politics must be converged.

As already mentioned this morning, there are many examples of terrorism today beyond the Muslim world. But the Islamic religion, or the *jihad* that has been stereotyped, could maybe be coming from the converged relationship between religion and politics. Maybe that is the reason that there is a stereotyped image that *jihad* equals terrorism.

When we think about the non-violence of Gandhi, it is something we need to take to our hearts today. It is not only a passive peace movement that Gandhi promoted. Gandhi said that he would rather fight than be a coward but his philosophy was truly non-violent. He even accepted the threat of assassination by preaching this non-violence. We, in Japan, where we practice multiple religions, should make some comments on how we can eliminate violence.

Professor Hashizume: Professor Hassan Hanafi explained to us that there are many forms of terrorism



Professor Hashizume

and Professor Mohaghegh Damad said that *jihad* and terrorism are different and that under Islamic law there is no sanction for terrorism.

Terrorism is not equal to violence. Also, malgovernance is different from terrorism. Terrorism is not equal to the

suffering of people from poverty. In the U.S., terrorism is denounced but in that context, humans are killed and they are focusing on a certain form of people getting killed. The criticism of terrorism occurs and that is often associated with the following argument "that while thousands of people were killed in the World Trade Center, tens of thousands more people were killed in many parts of the world," they say. There are, they say, more pains and sufferings larger than international terrorism in many parts of the world.

This argument is the result of relativism in discussing this problem. In the United States, this sort of relativism is not allowed and they simply criticize terrorism as an absolute evil. The Americans, or perhaps in the English language there are many ways to describe killing people. In Japanese, we have only one word, *korosu* , but that can be translated in to at least two ways kill or murder in English.

Let us go through these words one by one going from less to more criminal. If someone dies in an accident, that can be translated as "to be killed" in English. This is a fault without intent, although people die.

Next comes killing in war. This crime is not particularly grave because both parties have the

opportunity to kill each other and the killings happen amongst belligerents. Execution or capital punishment is a little similar because, again while it is killing a person, the deceased has some reason to be killed and the executioner killed while fulfilling his obligation.

Next comes suicide. The person dies but the killing is by him or herself so there is no felony.

Next comes murder. For example, the robber kills his victim, the husband kills his wife and so on.

“In the Bible, there are no other passages that justify the war against terrorism.”

Professor Hashizume

While this is not good, still it does not involve random killing. The worst form of killing is terrorism or massacre because a large number of people are killed indiscriminately and without reason. This, in Christian thinking, is the worst form of killing.

The worst form of killing should be prevented, Christians say, by resorting to the relatively better forms of killing. In this way, they try to justify many incidents. The background of this is in the Ten Commandments, where Moses says “Thou Shalt Not Kill.” In the New Testament, Jesus says pray for those who persecute you and he didn’t say to kill. Also in the New Testament, Paul said obey all authority and did not tell the followers of Christ to rebel against the authorities. In the Bible, there are no other passages that justify the war against terrorism.

I once read a thesis written by Martin Luther in which he said that all occupations are noble and sacred. Then, a German soldier asked Martin Luther whether his profession was noble and allowed by God. Luther answered that the soldier’s profession is noble and sacred and that while the soldier may be a Christian and therefore might not be justified for him to fight back, if one’s neighbor is under attack it would be good and noble to go to the aid of the neighbor.

“Love thy neighbor,” Jesus said.

Under such logic, governments and soldiers, meaning the Christian leaders assumed the sacred responsibility to defend their people and the states have the responsibility to punish those who broke the law and the state has the obligation to resort to violence to eliminate international terrorism.

That is the background against which the Americans condemn terrorism but is that acceptable? It is a matter to be discussed.

Questions and Answers

1: I would like to make an observation on the presentation by Dr. Yamaori. Many issues may look religious but have political undertones while many political issues have religious undertones. As Professor Yamaori said, many issues that look political have religious underpinnings. But he went on to talk about Pakistan and I need to make some clarifications. Classifying Pakistan as a religious or theocratic state is just not true. Nationalism in Pakistan is as valid and as justifiable and forceful as any nationalism in the world. Under British colonialism, British India was not just one Indian nation. It was a vast subcontinent of nearly one billion people with different cultures, ethnic backgrounds and religions. There were 400 small states and principalities and 500 different languages. You can call it one civilization but not one nation.

When the British left, the question arose as to who should be the successor state. As had happened over the last 100 years, there was the emergence of two nations, Muslim and Hindus, separated not just by religion but historical experience, culture, ancestry and concentration in different areas.

When peoples, culture, experience and so on are different, their politics naturally become different. The question is not religion but how to assert ones national identity so as to protect your political rights in opposition to a majority that had shown its hostility to the minority. One of the reasons for this

hostility was the fact that a Muslim minority had ruled a Hindu majority for seven centuries.

Even in the present day Pakistan, religion does not dominate education and the economy. You have seen how we responded to the events of September 11th, there have been very sporadic and minor protests against the government’s policies. If Pakistan were a theocratic state, Musharraf would have been toppled in a week but he has enjoyed solid support from the people because the people support these policies which have nothing to do with religion.

2: At present, we have a unilateralism exercised by the U.S.A. We have globalism with the U.S. playing a central role and that kind of globalization is a problem for the world. Having said that, Professor Hassan Hanafi said something that I would like to share my thoughts on and about which I do not fully agree. Professor Hassan Hanafi talked about visible and invisible terrorism and that terrorism that is invisible must be attached but only victims of visible terrorism are defined as victims.

As I see it we have globalism exercised by the United States of America, pressure exerted by the United States. This, he says, is invisible terrorism.

If Professor Hassan Hanafi thinks individuals and groups could exercise [against invisible terrorism] this cannot be shared or understood by non-Islamic states. True, the United States is conducting terrorism at the state level, but if state terrorism is being exercised by the United States it must have justifiable reasons and background and of course, that is open to discussion here. I do not say that all military actions taken by the U.S. can be justified but when you say you can react, conduct violence against invisible terrorism using military force, I would like to be convinced because that is very difficult for the non-Islamic state to understand.

3: Professor Hassan Hanafi said that against the world of Islam too often a negative image is used. Why has that negative image been used to depict Islam?

The second question has to do with *jihad*. Professor Hassan Hanafi defined it in English as struggle or effort but struggle has a negative connotation. Effort may have a more positive connotation. How can a negative connotation and a more positive connotation be used to explain one word, *jihad*? Who condones *jihad*? Who authorizes *jihad*? Who defines a *jihad*? Can the activists themselves announce it as a *jihad*? Is that enough or does it require another authority?

4: To approach to a good result from this meeting, we have to find a common mode between Islamic civilization and American government and something called bin Ladinist Islam. I believe that Muslims want peace and security for all the people of the world. In the case of September 11th, I want to say that the American government wants peace, security and welfare just for Americans.

This is the policy of the government of the Americans. Bin Ladinists want peace and security just for Muslims by fighting against the groups who they want to overcome. I understand that the Japanese and government of Japan want to serve others and want peace for others first and then for themselves.

Professor Yamaori: Regarding Islam as a religion and the Islamic sphere, we in Japan tend to look at terrorism and Islam with a negative view. The reason for that is the absence of the separation of politics and religion, because of the convergence of religion and politics. After World War II, Japan very loyally separated religion and politics. In the public sphere in Japan, in public education we have averted all specific religious education. As a Japanese, in a country where religion and politics are very closely related, from a country where religion and politics are very closely related to form national politics and also diplomatic politics, it seems to us in Japan that is a very normal phenomenon to separate religion and politics.

Ambassador, you said that Pakistan is not a convergence of religion and politics but when we look at ourselves in Japan, coming from a situation where we have totally separated politics and religion, we feel that there is a convergence of religion and politics. And when there is a terrorist incident, we immediately think that terrorism equals Islam.

Professor Hassan Hanafi: As a phenomenologist analyzing experiences, I, who belong to the Muslim world, feel the invisible terrorism all the time. There are powerful states and weak states, poor and rich, central and peripheral states and I belong to the poor, the weak and the peripheral. I feel terrorized. I do not own the same power in shaping the mass media, I am not part of shaping the new world order, I am a part of the wretched of the earth. Maybe in Japan you do not. But I do. Please understand us.

In Palestine, we are incapable of doing anything about people who are killed every day in their struggle for liberation. Five percent of the world is consuming 75 percent of world wealth. This is invisible terrorism. America is deciding peace and war. Maybe because in Japan, you feel that you are the center of Asia, you are powerful, you are high tech. Sometimes, in front of Japanese technology we feel this invisible terrorism. Because this is a monolithic technology and you cannot compete with the Mitsubishis, Sanyos, Toyotas, terrorism is there. Once there is no equal partnership, on all levels, cultural, political, economic, technological, there is an imbalance.

After the end of the bipolar world, we are feeling that in this global system, that globalization is a part of the invisible terrorism. You are asking me to end my national state, to end my national independence, to end the protection of my national goods in the name of globalization and I am not capable of competing. How can I compete against the car industries of the U.S.A. and Japan?

We see that the U.S.A. is practicing state terrorism against Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, and maybe India, Somalia, threatening Iran, Lebanon, Syria, Sudan. How can I protect myself against this state terrorism? The U.S.A. is defining the norm of

terrorism. Refusing completely to make an international conference to make what terrorism is, to define a distinction between terrorism and resistance. The Palestinian people are resisting the occupation of the Zionist state, the Kashmiris would like to apply the UN resolution concerning self-rule and auto-determination against the Indian occupation and it is an international right. France resisted the Nazi occupation, the Americans resisted the British occupation. Then why can national liberation movements now be classified as terrorism?

Finally, regarding the negative image of the Muslim world. I think it is unfair to judge the Muslim world against the French Enlightenment, against modern times in Europe. The Muslim world is coming out of its Mediaeval times, the Ottoman Empire, colonization, decolonization. We are trying to build new states. The nation-states which have been built have problems inside for freedom, democracy, social justice and so on.

We are still an unstable society. Compare us to Europe at the beginning of the Reformation and the Renaissance, Martin Luther. Here the comparison would be fair in two similar historical moments. Comparing Islam nowadays to the West, or to the East, that would be anachronism.

“The Muslim world is coming out of its Mediaeval times, the Ottoman Empire, colonization, decolonization. We are trying to build new states. The nation-states which have been built have problems inside for freedom, democracy, social justice and so on.”

Professor Hassan Hanafi

Concerning the translation of *jihad*, struggle is not negative. Struggle with the self, struggle with my passions, my desires. It is the essence of Buddhism, self-control. Anyone who understands *jihad* in Islam will know that it is a double way, meaning struggle against external aggression by attacking the individual or state which has the right of self defense under international law, as well as against internal repression after using the peaceful means that I have described.

Finally, concerning Osama bin Ladin. After the end of the Soviet Union and the bipolar system, everyone on earth feels that the worlds international relations are unhealthy, imbalanced. Concerning the incapacity of the Muslim world to rescue the Palestinians and Jerusalem, everyone had the feeling and the desire of a challenge to the U.S.A.—rightly or wrongly. I am challenging the U.S.A. on the intellectual level. I do not know why in Japan you are not challenging the U.S.A.? Maybe you are challenging on the technological level, on the car industry, on the surplus. But for us, it is not enough.

I am challenging U.S.A. on the intellectual level. Osama bin Ladin on the subconscious level, in the psychoanalysis, he may represent a certain kind of challenge, a coming of Asia. Asia which maybe a future, a second pole, China, Japan, Central Asia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Arabian Peninsula. America is jumping over Asia, over Europe, to have a foothold in the new Afghanistan. Under the pretext of Afghanistan to abort this new, second, coming pole.

And finally, who created Osama bin Ladin? It is America, during the Soviet invasion, supporting him, giving him weapons. And once he succeeded in destroying and ending the Soviet occupation, then he felt that the Great Satan is U.S.A. He switched the enemy from the Soviet Union to U.S.A.

Peace with security. We need peace with justice. We need some justice in Palestine, in Kashmir, in the state of our economy and so on. We need peace linked with justice in order to feel secure. America has power but without justice.

Regarding Pakistan, we are all the victims of the Western model, secularism. That in order to make some progress we must make a distinction between the old and the new. There is no progress without discontinuity with the past. This is fine, it is Europe, it worked well or badly there and it is not for me to judge.

Then there is the Asian model. Japan, Korea, the juxtaposition model. The old beside the new. You are completely rational, secular, scientific from Monday to Friday. But on Saturday and Sunday, in your private life, you go to the Buddhist or, the Shinto temple and you practice the most traditional life. I do not want to judge it, right or wrong.

But we in the Muslim world have a third model, the continuous model. The new coming of the old. Christianity is a new reading of Judaism. Islam is a new reading of Christianity and Judaism. And here, you cannot make a distinction between religion and politics. Islam has a political theory, which is democracy. It has an economic theory, which is socialism. It has an international relations theory concerning the equality of all nations and diversity and pluralism. Is this religion or politics?

I think in Japan, the cooperative value system based on loyalty, sacrifice, work, dedication and work ethic, is it Buddhism or is it secularism? The separation between what is called religion in Islam and what is called politics is a myth. It is a secular Western myth that does not exist either in Asia or in Africa.

Finally, in Palestine, the Palestinians and the left in Israel would like to have a state where Jews, Christians and Muslims live in equality. Judaism, Christianity and Islam all come from Abraham and if we can de-westernize this idea of the nation-state where my identity comes from borders. My identity in Judaism, Islam is coming from believing in one God and practicing one ethical code. If we can return back to the old Mosaic Torah and to the old Islamic law. No coercion religion. The mutual respect of rights and duties, this is what we want to live in. Not an Israel based on Zionism, racialism, and oppression.

Professor Mohaghegh Damad: I generally agree with Dr. Hanafi but I would like to add a point.

Unfortunately, nowadays, the idea of terrorism is relating to the legend of Islam? Is it right? True? No. In the Western countries at times, not all but sometimes, we see articles in newspapers where they want to relate terrorism to Islam, to Islamic thought. As an Islamic teacher, I want to defend this idea that we should separate Islamic thought from the idea of terrorism. We should agree that in the

“We should live side by side with other countries and the Quran and does not let us kill other peoples without its permission.”
Professor Mohaghegh Damad

Quran there are a lot of verses about jihad and advice to Muslims to kill the enemies of the Muslims. But, we should agree and accept that in ancient history, some empires, such as the Ottoman Empire, took advantage of these verses to overcome other states. We accept all of this. As well, we should acknowledge that today, there are two interpretations of the Quranic verses on *jihad*.

One interpretation belongs to intellectuals, scholars and writers. And the other interpretation belongs to orthodox and fundamentalists. And sometimes, this second interpretation is an instrument in the hands of the person who wants to kill others and who want to overcome other countries.

The first interpretation is mine. Intellectual thinkers living inside Islamic countries. We should live side by side with other countries and the Quran and does not let us kill other peoples without its permission.

But, do we condemn international terrorism or not? According to me, yes. We have four titles. The first title is international covenant, *jihad* and law of war, the third neutrality and the fourth is the acts forbidden to every Muslim who enters *jihad*. The Muslim is not free to commit some forbidden acts.

For all Muslims living inside Islamic countries that are adhering to international covenants, then under the rules of Islamic jurisprudence there is no permission to attack. We should distinguish between Islam and terrorism.

Professor Hashizume: Professor Yamaori talked of the separation and unity of politics and religion. Many Japanese say they denounce terrorism and while there is anger against terrorism, is not the same as the anger as that of the Americans.

The Japanese understand how the Americans feel but at the same time, the Japanese recognize many forms of injustice and inequality in many parts of the world and that many people who are labeled as terrorists are in a dire situation.

So, in a way the Japanese are sympathetic to some degree with the people who are labeled as terrorists but I have some problem with such an attitude held by the Japanese. In my opinion, politics and religion are not strictly separated in Japan.

After the Meiji Restoration, Japan was a theocratic state centered around the Emperor. Japan tried to be strong and as a non-Christian nation, Japan declared war against the United States. Not resorting to terror-

ism but instead to war to try to change the world. But Japan's attempt failed and eventually, made another start to share the values with the United States. But of course not everything can be in agreement with the United States and as we see with the Aum Shinrikyo cult and the students' movements in the

“The Japanese understand how the Americans feel but at the same time, the Japanese recognize many forms of injustice and inequality in many parts of the world and that many people who are labeled as terrorists are in a dire situation.”

Professor Hashizume

'60s and '70s we see some resentment against the United States and of course, the situation still remains the same.

Questions and Answers

5: As individuals, who we are is shaped by what we read, see and hear. For example, throughout Japan, since September 11, how many of us have been bombarded by what we see on TV. What we see is and what we hear on TV gives a negative image of Islam. They tend to relate terrorism to Islam. CNN or Fox or whatever channels you view, even Japanese TV tends to pick up what CNN news reporters says without any commentary at all. Hence the tendency to believe what the CNN reporters say.

Terrorism is not something that it is new. The American president welcomed the leader of the IRA with open arms but they do not see that as a terrorist act. Ariel Sharon, perpetrator of Sabra, was welcomed by President Bush. Why is that not a terrorist act. Why do not we relate that as terrorism? The case of the Oklahoma bombing instigated by Tim McVeigh. He is not Muslim but yet when the incident first happened, everybody in America related it as an act committed by a Muslim. America never apologized for saying that yet the whole world accepted it.

Everyone accepted what is happening in Sudan as portrayed by the media as Muslims killing Christians but that isn't really happening there. We can have lots of dialogues with Islamic civilizations around the world for umpteen years but I doubt it will be very successful if it is not done through a media initiative because what we see everyday in our living rooms is what we perceive as the truth. We tend to believe that the reporters are telling the truth? Why are we here talking about this?

6: The American definition of terrorism is murder of innocent people by intention, but Professor Hassan Hanafi's definition is so different. How do

we break through the difference of these two definitions of terrorism and what practical role can Japan take? We are trying to make great effort as a partner of the U.S.

7: What did post-war Japan learn from the failure of the unity of state and religion. Unless you have a basic understanding of Christianity, you cannot begin to understand European music or art and European history. I think there is much need in post-war education in Japan for more education about religions.

8: I am studying about the Aum sect incident. When that happened, the Aum sect said that they were a sect of Buddhism but general Buddhist scholars and Buddhists said it was a murderous group and not a Buddhist sect. The most moderate sect of Buddhism is Zen.

The Aum sect is based on Tibetan Buddhism which says that in order to attain enlightenment it condones murder and killing. That does not say that Buddhists are a group of killers but the Aum sect holds a belief in a certain sort of Buddhist that does condone killing. In the Quran, we do come across the need to kill the infidel but does that justify calling Islam a terrorist religion?

One may say Islam and the Quran denies terrorism but that does not explain it all because in the Quran there are passages that condone killing and doing away with infidels.

Professor Mohaghegh Damad: The Quran advised to the Muslim some fundamental rules of Islam. For example, the Quran advised to the Muslim to avoid killing, that all Muslims should be merciful. We can see a lot of verses in the Quran that advise us of this. But ultimately, in the history of Islam, from the beginning until now, we see some occasions that we can relate to the person, not to the religion as for example, during the Ottoman Empire. There are a lot of occasions that I cannot accept as Islamic culture, Islamic thought.

Islamic thought advises mercy, to consider covenants, contracts and advises all Muslims that you can recognize Muslims from non-Muslims because the Muslim will consider contracts, covenants, mercy, friendship, peacefulness, morality and ethics and so on. The Ottoman Empire during 400 years there were some practical actions that I cannot interpret as Islamic.

Professor Yamaori: Regarding the separation of religion and politics. Before World War II we had something of a theocratic nation. After World War II we eliminated all elements of religion from public sphere and we really went to an extreme in that respect.

Of course, it is out of the question to teach a specific religion in Japan. We must look at political, cultural and social phenomena and see that behind them there are religious elements intermingled in different ways. The history of mankind is always entwined with religion. This is what we have to teach.

Fifty years after World War II, in 1995, the Aum cult rose to our view and Japanese society was really stunned at this. This Aum cult showed the basic characteristic of religion. Hardly anybody was aware of the religious element here. There are two elements of religion. One is to save but the other is that it can become a weapon. The terrorism incident in the United States, we must refer to that as well. In the beginning, the mass media referred to it as suicidal terrorism. But about two or three days after September 11, the word suicide disappeared because suicide has a very strong religious meaning in Japan.

Before 1972, suicidal terrorism was not the norm for Arab extremists. From about 1972 or '74, this changed drastically. Before 1972 there was no such thing as suicidal terrorism in the Islamic world and they were always to return after terrorist activities.

When we look at ourselves in Japanese history, between the 15th and 16th centuries, Japan went through a period of religious wars. We can call this religious terrorism or religious suicidal terrorism war. The agent was the believers.

Japan is called a Buddhist country but we had a radical religious state in the 15th and 16th centuries. In the civil activity, called the uprising, these forces fought against Oda Nobunaga and at end of the war, a banner went up on the battlefield saying having fought and to die, we all go to paradise. But if you are a coward and do not fight, you go to hell.

Based upon the slogan, so much energy was spent in religious war during the 15th–16th centuries. This was clearly a religious, a religious terrorist war and there was an element of suicide as well. After World War II, these things have never been touched upon in Japanese education.

Professor Hashizume: Regarding the World Trade Center, which was attacked by an airplane—the Americans at that time thought immediately of Pearl Harbor. For the Japanese, we were very surprised by this and put in an awkward situation. When you look at this, Pearl Harbor was a military action and was not related to terrorism but the American reaction was the same this time and at Pearl Harbor. They are trying to catch Osama bin Ladin and they are chasing.

The Commander at Pearl Harbor, Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto was traveling over the Philippines by airplane and he was attacked by a special airplane and he died. As a military tactic, this was not a very intellectual way of doing it because the Americans had decoded the Japanese signals.

Professor Hassan Hanafi: About visible and invisible terrorism, the invisible is the cause and the visible is the effect. The visible is power, the invisible is the injustice. Remember that this happened after the Durban conference on slavery. The whole world was in one direction that America had to apologize for the 40 million Africans who were hunted as animals and driven to Louisiana as slaves to build the so-called New World. As if the world did not exist before the white man Columbus came to America.

America and Israel both went out and America

refused to apologize. At least the Japanese apologized to the South Koreans, and they are ready to apologize for any pitfalls that Japan made during the Second World War to the Asian continent. America even refused to equate Zionism with racialism after what we see in Palestine.

The invisible terrorism, is the World Trade Center, the power of economics, the Pentagon, the military-industrial complex, the White House. They [the terrorists on September 11] did not destroy a hospital, did not destroy a school, did not destroy a club. But [instead they destroyed] the symbols of power in the modern world. Without justifying, I am trying to understand. Now, we are all afraid of the invisible terrorism. Who is next after Afghanistan?

Syria? Iraq? Lebanon? Sudan? Somalia? Iran? Who?

America would like to destroy Asia. They would like to put some fire between India and Pakistan to get rid of the two nuclear powers in order to be the big superpower in Asia.

In every culture there is a cult of martyrdom. The Buddhist monk who burned himself in Vietnam to protest against the American aggression, was it bad? Or was it a high act of heroism? The *hara kiri* in Japan. In Islam, we also have the cult of martyrdom. The Palestinian who has lost everything, hunted, has nothing to lose. Is it bad?

Do not undermine the cult of self-sacrifice. The Algerians during the resistance war against the French, the ladies [wearing explosives] going to the shops where the French soldiers were and making these act of heroism. Do we call that terrorism?

Do not believe that I am justifying killing. Life in Islam is the fairest value. Who kills one man is as if he killed all of humanity. This is an Islamic Hadith before Immanuel Kant. If you kill in one bombing 6000 in U.S.A., America kills over 40 million in Africa.

Everyone knows the five pillars of Islam regarding rituals but there are another five pillars of Islamic law; life, reason, dignity, honor, universal

truth, social justice and so on.

Regarding the verses in the Quran about killing the infidels, that is absolutely wrong. This is a stereotyping in the media. In the Quran there is what we call abrogation. There are early verses and late verses. The law is deduced from the late verses. In the early verses Islam was in struggle with the idol worshipers but once Islam was victorious, no coercion in religion. You can believe whatever you want and there is no such thing as fidel and infidel, Christian and Jew. Even an idol worshiper is part of the Ummah.

I think what we need to take is the invisible terrorism in the Muslim world, and perhaps also India, for those who have suffered from colonialism and are owed the highest debt.

Some justice has to be done for the Afro-Asian world. The money, the wealth of the center is coming from the periphery. We need the abolition of debts for the African states. We need also a certain kind of reworking of the land in Africa by those who took greenery.