

Jihad and Terrorism

An Alternative Explanation

M. Moniruzzaman, International Islamic University, Malaysia

Abstract

Jihad (Islamic holy war) is a fundamental foreign policy concept in Islam. Following the 9/11 incident, a considerable number of scholarly works in the West have squarely equated jihad with terrorism. In recent Islamic scholarship as well, the usage of the concept either tends to be avoided or is increasingly being depoliticized. The popular understanding of the concept has made it a necessary evil. This article argues that jihad is not just a war, rather it can be understood from a universal humane perspective and its philosophical moral principles can be used in greater human and social welfare.

Introduction

[1] The contemporary international relations are beset with the phenomenon of “international terrorism” widely believed to be closely associated with the Islamic concept of jihad – holy war (Booth and Tim; Ondudiwe). This phenomenon has become a global concern of international and state security. Global, regional, or inter-state relations are being reshaped surrounding policies regarding international terrorism. The concept has increasingly gained a particularistic identity within Islam due to the multiplicity of terrorist activities around the world during the past few years carried out by civilian Islamic groups such as Al-Qaeda, allegedly in the name of Islamic jihad. The identical relationship between international terrorism and Islam generated a common belief, at least in the West, that anything Islamic deems to have terrorist or violent connection. The situation is further aggravated by the fact that these groups frequently legitimize their terrorist activities by the Islamic concept of jihad. As such the concept of jihad, a most widely misunderstood one, is now squarely equated with terrorism (Phares; Bostom; Gerges; Cook).

[2] Recent Islamic scholarship also tends either to avoid the usage of the concept jihad or is increasingly de-politicizing its traditional meaning (Moten and Islam; Abu Sulayman). Similarly, Islamic political movements or parties in the Muslim countries are also consciously de-emphasizing its importance. Is jihad necessarily a terrorist dogma? What are its moral philosophies that inspire a “terrorist” agenda? The present understanding of international terrorism in relation with the concept of jihad requires a re-examination of the concept and its relevancy to the contemporary international system.

[3] The aim of this article is to analyze the concept of jihad and to offer an alternative explanation of it as understood in Islam. The central idea is that jihad is not essentially a negative concept; rather it is a universally humane and positive concept. Understanding of jihad as a holy war or the popular perception that it is essentially a militant means to combat infidels confines the concept too narrowly within a militaristic domain. Such a perception of jihad, however, is only a secondary connotation that overshadows its fundamental philosophy. The main objective of Islam is to eradicate anti-social elements that are harmful to human society. Such elements could be of various natures such as political oppression or injustice, economic exploitation, moral decadence, social crimes, administrative discrimination and corruption, environmental degradation and threats, and military brutality and oppression. Islam uses the concept of jihad as a value-based “ultimate effort” (the literal meaning of jihad) to eliminate these harmful elements in order to make human society safer and more peaceful. Jihad provides moral sanction to fight against anything unjust and threatening for human society. This is the fundamental philosophical objective of the concept of jihad. However, during the early period of Islamic expansion (622-750 CE), the term gained extensive legitimacy in military use, which remains prevalent until today.

[4] This article presents these alternative views of jihad through a number of arguments. First, the concept of jihad contains a universal humanistic philosophy that is far more important than its outer meaning of holy war. Second, the concept of jihad has emerged from the classical legalistic confinement of the past into a universal Islamic foreign policy tool in the modern Islamic discourse. And finally, the humane aspect of the concept has the potential to act as an international regime at the systemic level to fight a number of global threats.

The Popular (Mis)perception of Jihad

[5] Jihad is a concept that is understood today as equivalent to terrorism. It gives an image of ferocity, religious dogmatic frenzies, and zealot fanaticism. It is understood as an Islamic religious policy of offensive war against non-believers that inspires killing of non-Muslims in the name of God. Jihad is the moral dogmatic foundation of fundamentalist Islam.

[6] This perception of jihad, however, is not recent. From the time of the Crusades during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, jihad has been understood in a polemical sense (Dajani-Shakil and Messier; Vryonis). The military offensives in the mediaeval era by the Muslim rulers against the European Christians were often labeled as jihad or holy war (Johnson; Kelsay and James). During the colonial periods, jihad was used by Islamic groups to resist the colonial domination (Rudolph 1979). After the Second World War, a number of resistant movements emerged in the Arab world to defend the cause of the Palestinian people. These movements usually legitimized armed attacks and terrorist activities by the Islamic concept

of Jihad. The most popular use of jihad was seen in the Afghan resistant movements against the Russian occupation of Afghanistan during the 1980s. From the 1990s onward, jihad became internationally known as Islamic terrorism due to Al-Qaeda's armed attacks on Western, and especially American installations and interests abroad. The historic 9/11 incident in 2001 permanently made jihad an evil international Islamic terrorist demon.

[7] However, such popular perceptions of jihad are not necessarily an accurate meaning and interpretation of the Islamic theory of jihad. These perceptions present an exaggerated perspective of jihad and completely overlook its deep-rooted philosophical perspectives. According to the Islamic understanding, jihad is not primarily a killing dogma; rather it has a universal humane philosophy that in fact inspires Muslims to fight against anti-social and anti-human forces. An exploration of such perspective of jihad might be interesting and of immense academic importance.

The Meaning of Jihad

[8] Jihad is a transliteration of an Arabic word. It is a noun derived from *jahdu* or *jahada*. Literally it means to strive or labor – employing oneself vigorously, strenuously, laboriously, diligently, studiously, sedulously, earnestly (Lane). The term came to be used in the *Qur'ān* and the *Sunnah* (the Prophetic Tradition in Islam) in association with a number of issues such as comprehensive efforts towards dedicating oneself in the cause of God, worship in inner and outer forms, engaging in the propagation of religion, and warfare (Rudolph 1996; Schleifer 1984).

[9] Because the concept of jihad is distinctly significant in Islam, it occupies a unique status in the Islamic socio-legal system (Donner). Jihad is at the core of the universal mission of an individual Muslim as well as of the Islamic Community – *Ummah* (Kolocotronis; Sachedina). So, on the one hand, it is interpreted from the individual's spiritual perspective, and on the other hand, it is explained from the perspective of communal political life (Schleifer 1983). Spiritual interpretation of jihad is expressed by the phrase *jihad kabir* (greater jihad), for it is a life-long process of an individual Muslim to remain constantly engrossed in fighting against the evil nature of his soul. A political interpretation of jihad is termed as *jihad sagir* (smaller jihad), which is a military warfare waged by the Muslims against others for various reasons. This is a smaller jihad because military warfare is temporary, conditioned by specific causes, and it can cease with victory or negotiated settlement. Furthermore, the smaller jihad is an act that can be carried out only by the state authority and not by any non-state agents. However, regardless of whether jihad is greater or smaller, it is always associated with the universal mission of an individual Muslim as well as of the political community (Abedi). Following are some religious texts that imply the universal nature of jihad:

1. Fight them until there is no persecution and the religion is God's entirely (Qur'an 2:193, 8:39).
2. And why should ye not fight in the cause of God (Allah) and of those who, being weak, are ill-treated (and oppressed)? Men, women, and children who cry: "our Lord! Rescue us from this locality, whose people are oppressors; and send for us from Thee one who will protect; and send for us from Thee one who will help (Qur'an 4:75).

3. Command what is good, and forbid what is abominable (Qur'an 3:110).
4. Every community has its devotional journeys, and the devotional journey of my community is jihad in the way of God (Prophetic Tradition).
5. Jihad is a perpetual duty and it will continue until the Day of Judgment (Prophetic Tradition).
6. The head of the affair is Islam, its central pillar is the prayer (*salat*) and its summit is the jihad (Prophetic Tradition).

[10] However, since the spiritual dimension of Jihad is personal, the political dimension of it became more pivotal in the early days of Islam. Jihad provided religious sanctions and guidance for the expansion of Islam; it provided principles of war and peace, and diplomacy and negotiation. It was the sole guiding theoretical foundation of foreign policy in Islam during the early centuries of the Islamic civilization.

Jihad: From Legal-Military to Universal Foreign Policy Tool

[11] Despite the Qur'an being the ultimate source of Jihad, it does not lay down a detail doctrine of it. According to Khadduri's classification, a comprehensive development of the complete doctrine of jihad took place during the eighth and ninth centuries, starting about a hundred year after the Qur'an was revealed. This was the time when the prominent Islamic schools of thought were developed (Hanafi School 699-768; Maliki School 781-796; Shafi'i School 768-820; and Hanbali School 780-855) and completed comprehensive and detailed outlines of jihad. As these schools of thought were primarily legalistic in nature, the doctrine of jihad in their hands remained essentially legalistic.

[12] In Islamic philosophy the ultimate objective of Islam is to establish the supremacy of God's word and eliminate any challenge to it. The classical schools of thought took jihad as a means to achieve this objective. As such, the early jurists classified jihad into two legal types: individual obligation (*fard al 'ain*) and collective obligation (*fard al kifayah*) (al Zuhaili). Individual obligation of jihad was interpreted from the perspective of a total war where every citizen irrespective of sex, age, or marital status was to join in the military service. This type of jihad, which can be called a total war, was particularly prescribed in a situation of foreign attack on the state (Ibn Qudamah). The collective obligation of jihad was interpreted as carrying out the routine duties of military service by the professional armed forces on behalf of the citizens. Both these types of jihad are under the authority of the state.

[13] A number of observations can be made on the classical doctrine of jihad. First, jihad in the classical doctrine is more than declaration of, or waging a war. Jihad rather refers to a complete military science involving detailed military tactics, use and prohibitions of weaponry, pre-war logistic and defensive mechanism, rules of engagement, the rights of civilians and military personnel, the rights of prisoners of war, and pre-war or post-war negotiation, and truce and peace treaties.

[14] Second, the classical doctrine made a bipolar classification of the world into *dar al-islam* and *dar al-harb*. *Dar al-islam* (territory of Islam) refers to regions that were under the control of the Islamic authority, and *dar al-harb* (territory of war) was other regions against which waging war was permitted. Such a bipolar classification of the world was certainly influenced

by both the religious understanding of the universal mission of the Muslim community, and the patterns of international interactions of the time. The Muslims understood that their universal mission was to propagate Islam to every nation, and they could engage in war with nations who stopped this mission. However, war was not an invention of Islam for doing so, rather it was a means used by nations at that time for various reasons. Furthermore, war in propagating Islam was not declared unilaterally, but rather was used in response to the declaration of war or active resistance by the nations in the territory of war. Therefore, the Muslim territories perceived the non-Muslim territories as potential threats to Islam, which led Muslims to consider the latter as the territory of war.

[15] Third, in the classical doctrine, jihad is often used instead of other military terms such as *harb* (war) and *qital* (fighting/war). The Qur'an used the term jihad mostly when it referred to comprehensive non-military efforts to uphold the word of God, to ensure social justice, and to resist injustice and evil. Only in few instances the Qur'an uses jihad, *harb*, and *qital* in reference to Muslims active combat against non-Muslims. But the Qur'an never uses the term jihad when it refers to military activities carried out by non-Muslims. In such cases it uses either *harb* or *qital*. This difference in using the term is because Muslims wage wars for a nonmaterial and higher purpose of establishing social justice and the supremacy of God's rule, while non-Muslims wage wars to challenge God's rule.

[16] However, the Islamic jurists increasingly preferred to use *qital* instead of jihad. For instance, two of the most classical Islamic texts, *al Umm* (Al Shafi'i) and *al-Mabsut* (Al Sarakhsi), used the term jihad most of the time implying *qital*. This can be explained from three perspectives. First, during the initial period of expansion of Islam, it faced persistent security threats from strong powers such as the Byzantine Empire that led to increased warfare and the routinization of military engagement. And the basic principles of military engagement in the systemic practice of inter-power relations during that time were characterized by expansion, resistance, domination, and subjugation. So, Islamic jihad in this situation became more militaristic. Second, the Byzantine Empire not only considered Islam as a rising political threat but also depicted Islam as misguided heresy and the enemy of Christianity, the struggle against which was a religious responsibility of the Christians (Vasiliev). This fostered a warlike mentality in the Muslim world. And finally, the Islamic territories were also facing internal security threats from rebellious Muslim groups against whom military actions were necessary. Therefore, under such circumstances jihad toned with moral-ideological purpose was replaced with *qital* toned with active combat.

[17] An important aspect of the Islamic concept of jihad is whether it is offensive or defensive. Many argue that jihad is essentially an offensive and hawkish policy that led to numerous wars in history and is still generating terrorist groups and movements in Muslim countries. An-Na'im claims that the classical theory of jihad developed in "an extremely harsh and violent environment, where the use of force in intercommunal relations was the unquestioned norm. It was simply conceptually incoherent and practically impossible for Shariah regulation of intercommunal (international) relations to have been based on principles of peaceful coexistence . . ." (166).

[18] However, other scholars argue that jihad is essentially defensive. For instance, Abu Sulayman argues that this is the basic position of the Hanafi school of thought. The theory

and scope of jihad was further curtailed by Indian scholars such as Sayyed Ahmad Berlawi, Shah Ismail, Shah Abdul Hayy, and Sayyed Ahmad Khan, and by Egyptian scholars such as Sheikh Mahmud Shaltut, Muhammad Abdu, and Rashid Rida. Not only did all of them reduced jihad into a defensive policy, but some of them also went so far as to “drastically restricted the scope of jihad duty . . . limited this to defense against religious oppression impairing the pillars of Islam . . . thereby excluding it from all other kinds of political oppression. Thus they introduced a separation between the religious and political spheres . . .” (Rudolph 1979: 125).

[19] Yet such a severe reduction of jihad into a non-political, non-military, and non-violent concept is further reduced by contemporary scholars to even abolishing it altogether. This drastic departure from all the previous interpretations of jihad is pioneered by a leading revisionist Islamic thinker, Abdul Hamid Abu Sulayman. He is the first Islamic thinker who conducted an extensive and rigorous study on the Islamic theories of foreign policy in light of the modern theories and system of international relations. In his work *The Islamic Theory of International Relations: New Directions for Islamic Methodology and Thought*, Abu Sulayman sharply criticized the classical Islamic theory of jihad and international relations as essentially legalistic and influenced by the existing rules of engagement of war and peace during the seventh and eighth century. According to him, the classical Islamic bipolar worldview of *dar al-islam* and *dar al-harb* is no longer appropriate in today’s international systemic context, which is based on cooperation and peace. Therefore, Abu Sulayman holds the view of “abandonment of war as the basis of foreign relations” and “the adoption of diplomatic reciprocity and alliances with non-Muslim states, and the principle of positive neutrality” (133). To him, jihad is an insignificant part of the entire Islamic system of foreign policy; it was a purely defensive, need-based, and temporary issue.

[20] Such an attempt to reconstruct Islamic foreign policy in defensive terms risks making jihad obsolete as an important concept in Islam. All the more, such a possibility is being strengthened by the post 9-11 Western military as well as intellectual offensive against the Muslim world and particularly Islamic intellectual movements. Western sensitivities to the concept of jihad went so far as to make Muslims in general and intellectuals in particular cautiously avoid using the term at all. Does that mean jihad as a fundamental universal mission of the Islamic ideology has lost its validity? Is jihad becoming obsolete?

[21] In contrast to eliminating jihad, it can be explained and understood from a totally different perspective. In such an explanation jihad can be perceived as less militant, terrorist, and offensive, and more ideological, humane, and universal. This is because as the earlier theory of jihad was developed in the context of the practical political and international system of the time, so it can be reinterpreted according to the existing international system of today. In such a reinterpretation, the basic values of jihad and Islamic foreign policies remain unaltered, but the form of its application takes a different shape.

Contemporary Interpretation of Jihad

[22] The modern Islamic intellectual tradition has taken a different route in reinterpreting the Islamic theory of foreign policy based on jihad that transcends the traditional setting. In this tradition, the basic concentration is not on the law of war and peace but universal principles of relations between Muslim and non-Muslim states. In the classical tradition, jihad was

considered to be the core of inter-state relations, but in the contemporary tradition it is considered only a distant sub-category in broader foreign policy principles. In this direction, Abu Sulayman has made an impressive contribution by identifying universal principles of Islamic foreign policies. These basic principles are: unity of God and Creation (*tawhid*); justice (*‘adh*); peace, mutual support, and cooperation; jihad (*self-exertion*); respect and fulfillment of commitments. These principles are to be based on another set of basic values: no aggression (*‘udwan*), no tyranny (*tughyan*), no corruption (*fasad*), and no excesses (*israf*).

[23] In this new interpretation of Islamic foreign policies, Abu Sulayman has taken a pacifist and defensive stand regarding the concept of jihad, though he includes combat on the battlefield as one of many aspects of jihad. He states:

... jihad is the Muslim’s striving to fulfill his every responsibility and to serve the Islamic cause and principles in a manner consistent with the Islamic framework. It is not to be taken to mean warfare alone. Jihad in this sense is the active expression of the Islamic commitment, responsibility, and sense of duty whenever it is required in practical life (136).

[24] Such an interpretation of the concept refers to the universal and humane objectives of jihad beyond combat activities. It indicates that the underlying and primary objective of jihad is human welfare and not warfare. Abu Sulayman’s new interpretation shows that the Islamic concept of jihad has the potential to contribute enormously in the international system.

[25] The above discussion indicates that the modernist interpretation of the traditional theory of jihad in the framework of universal foreign policy principles and values omits the possibility of the obsolescence of jihad. In other words, the new theory has attempted to upgrade jihad into systemic rules of engagement outlining normative principles, rules, and values in international interactions.

[26] Indeed, the universal objectives and values of the theory of jihad appear to be highly relevant in the contemporary international system. Today’s world is a global society. In this world an immense level of interactions and interdependency require standard rules and regulations at the global level that are binding upon various actors in the international system. Such rules and regulations are called international regimes. In the post-Cold War world, international regimes are becoming supranational “governance without government” and their importance is becoming paramount (Crawford). The underlying universal values of jihad can be interpreted from the perspective of the theory of international regime as well.

[27] International regimes are understood as “implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given area of international relations” (Krasner: 2) In a more elaborate way “regimes are rules of the game agreed upon by actors in international arena (usually nation states) and delimiting, for these actors, the range of legitimate or admissible behaviour in a specified context of activity” (Rittberger: xii). Regimes are created either by mutual understandings among the nations or by prescriptive imposition by dominant powers (Haggard). A most handy example of international regimes is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Regimes like NPT include other issues such as international trade, environmental conservation, pollution control, human rights, international terrorism, and Intellectual Property Rights. All

signatories to such regimes are bound to follow agreed upon rules relating to the issues. The concept of jihad similarly can be adopted as an international regime because of the universal principles, rules, and values that it prescribes for international interactions.

[28] The universal and moral regimes of jihad are useful to challenge a number of global issues. The twenty-first century world is beset with widespread problems, some of which are local in origin but global in reach, and some of which are global in nature. The World Order Models Project (WOMP), in its report *On Humane Governance* (Folk) indicated that human society is suffering from ideological confusion, socio-economic and political injustice, unnecessary and unjust wars, poverty, crimes, and ecological disaster. To address these problems, the report suggested a “humane governance” that “emphasizes people centered criteria of success as measured by decline of poverty, violence and pollution and by increasing adherence to human rights and constitutional practices.”

[29] Today, these problems have taken a global shape. Particularly, some of the most important global concerns such as international terrorism, global environmental degradation, poverty, and the violation of human rights are generating a host of international regimes to redress these problems. The Rio Earth Summit of 1992, the Kyoto Protocol of 1997, and the Bali Earth Conference of 2007 are some global attempts to devise global environmental regimes. The World Food Summit Plan of Action of 1996 and the Microcredit Summit of 1997 are examples of global regimes aimed at fighting widespread poverty. The “global war” on terror following the 9/11 incident led to devising anti-terrorism regimes at the global level. And the European Declaration of Human Rights is an example of further strengthening the human rights regimes.

[30] In such a quest for global regimes to fight environmental disaster, international terrorism, poverty, and human rights violations, the principles and values of jihad can be considered a useful resource. Below, we discuss the universal regimes of jihad that can effectively address three principle global problems: environmental degradation, human rights abuse, and international terrorism.

Universal Humane Interpretation of Jihad

[31] The contemporary interpretations of jihad can easily provide some grounds for it to be incorporated in the international political system in order to exploit its humane potentials to fight against many of the global crises outlined above. Instead of emphasizing the negative image of jihad created by deviant Islamic groups, its universal humane appeal can be more useful in many respects. Below, we outline a number of such possible explorations of the usefulness of the spirit of jihad.

Eco-Political Jihad

[32] Eco-politics or earth politics is now a global movement (Weizsacker; Luke; Chaloupka; Giddens). Continuous environmental degradation and the depletion of natural resources have led to the emergence of sustainable development, reforestation, wild-life preservation, anti-pollution, and environmental politics. Indeed, recent recurrent cycles of drought and flooding all over the world, global warming, depletion of the ozone layer, and melting of the polar ice are now known to be the direct consequences of the indiscriminate use of natural resources and unfriendly industrialization of the environment. Such actions have led to what

Giddens calls “manufactured risk” (4, 10) and “manufactured uncertainty” (10, 93). To fight such manufactured risks and uncertainty, new concepts such as Green politics or Green International Political Economy are on the rise globally.

[33] Islamic universal values and principles regarding environmental conservation are direct and clear. Islam puts great emphasis on the conservation of natural resources and the careful and calculated use of it. Its moral regimes strongly recommend people to refrain from wastage, extravagance, and wasteful or excessive use of natural resources. Furthermore, Islam considers indiscriminate and unwise use of natural resources as sinful. The Qur’an reads, “The spendthrifts are the brethren of Satan, and Satan is ungrateful to his Lord, rebellious against Him” (17:27). The Qur’an also directly holds men responsible for the disastrous consequences of destroying the global environment. According to the Qur’an, outbreak of disaster in the ocean and on the land is a consequence of human deeds, in order for them to feel the taste of their deeds, so that they retreat (30:41). Such universal moral regimes can be taken as guiding principles of global environmental jihad to protect and preserve the global environment.

Humanist (Human Rights) Jihad

[34] The existing international regimes on human rights are concerned with any type of oppression, violation of human rights, tyranny, or dictatorial rule. Democratization, rule of law, and respect for fundamental human rights have become global political and humanist regimes so much so that injustice anywhere is considered injustice everywhere. Likewise, since the regime of jihad is based on universal justice, it concerns domestic as well as international violation of human rights. The Islamic concepts of *tughyan* (aggression) and *zulm* (injustice, violation of rights) are instrumental in the regard of human rights. *Tughyan* and *zulm* are two basic evils according to Islam that the Qur’an vehemently condemns. The concept of *zulm* denotes anything that violates human rights, and is considered so anti-social that the Qur’an seriously condemns it as many as 289 times. *Zulm* can be violation of ones’ belief or belief system, freedom, religious affiliation, or political choice (Hossain and Cragg).

[35] The humanist jihad would fight against tyranny, oppression, and the violation of human rights at the global level. The regime of jihad is under moral obligation to voice out every abuse of human rights and against all types of tyranny and oppression anywhere in human society. The Qur’an clearly states:

And why should ye not fight in the cause of God (Allah) and of those who, being weak, are ill-treated (and oppressed)? Men, women, and children who cry: “our Lord! Rescue us from this locality, whose people are oppressors; and send for us from Thee one who will protect; and send for us from Thee one who will help (4:75).

[36] Such a universal perception of human rights in Islam is certainly in line with the ethos of modern global political and human rights regimes. So, the humanist jihad can be a powerful incentive to protect and ensure human rights globally.

Jihad against International Terrorism

[37] International terrorism has become the strongest threat to national and international peace and security. It has furthered social instability, individual insecurity, and risks. As a result, global war on terrorism is now a global concern.

[38] Islam vehemently opposes any type of terrorism, and especially those that create social insecurity and risks. There are two fundamental Qur'anic terms, *fasad* and *fitnah*, that comprehensively include all types of terrorist actions. *Fasad* may simply mean deliberate disruption of law and order. One of the major concerns of the Qur'an is to produce and maintain a socio-political system that will check, control, and possibly eliminate all types of *fasad* and *fitnah* (chaos and civil disarray) in order to ensure peace, stability, and law and order in society. Therefore, *fasad* and *fitnah* are even considered worse than murderous acts. The Qur'an states: "chaos is worse than murderous act" (2:217).

[39] *Fasad* and *Fitnah* can be both domestic and international terrorism and anti-social activities. Domestic activities might include extortion, mass murder, and other anti-state activities. At the international level, this may include organized or syndicate crime and international drug and human trafficking. There are many non-state Islamic groups such as Al-Qaeda that use violence and terror in the name of jihad. Both traditional and modernist Islamic thinkers agree that such violence and terrorist activities by non-state actors are illegitimate. That is why the traditional thinkers have endorsed state-led jihad (war) against even Muslim rebellions or separatist groups or those who simply create social instability. Using the same criterion, modern international terrorism by non-state actors whether by Muslims in the name of jihad or by others for any reason can be considered illegitimate. Therefore, terrorist activities by Islamic or other non-state actors fall under the category of *fasad* that is obnoxious in Islam.

[40] Also added to international terrorism are the problems of ethnic violence and ethnic cleansing and global endemics like AIDS. Furthermore, an increasing number of social crimes originating from various sources threatens every nation's law and order and jeopardizes peaceful relations between states. In today's globalized societies, every major incident affects each society, and no society is immune from the gravity of organized crimes, corruption, lawlessness, civil disarray, ethnic tensions, violence, and terrorism. Clearly, the universal values of Islamic jihad are designed to eliminate these anti-social elements and to maintain peace and stability in the society. Therefore, the universal principles and values of Islamic jihad can be utilized to fight any types of terrorist activities at national and international levels.

Conclusion

[41] Jihad has become a misunderstood concept today due to deviant use of it by deviant Islamic groups. Jihad contains a universal humane philosophy aimed more at human welfare than social warfare. Jihad is the manifestation of the individual and collective universal mission in Islam. At the individual level, it manifests in persistent control of the self against evil desires. At the collective level, it manifests in the implementation of the fundamental principles and values of justice, cooperation, non-aggression, and fights against abuse of human rights, social disturbance, and terrorism. Jihad can be understood and used in a

positive sense and its universal moral philosophy and principals can be utilized to greater social and global benefits.

Bibliography

Abedi, Mehdi, and Gary Legenhausen, editors

- 1986 *Jihad and Shihadat: Struggle and Martyrdom in Islam*. Houston: The Institute of Research and Islamic Studies.

Abu Sulayman, Abdul Hamid

- 1987 *The Islamic Theory of International Relations: New Directions for Islamic Methodology and Thought*. Maryland: International Institute of Islamic Thought.

Al Zuhaili, Wahbat

- 1985 *Al Fiqh al Islami wa Adillatuhu*, Volume 6. Second Edition Damascus: Dar al Fikr.

Al Sarakhsi, Shams al Din

- 1986 *Kitab al-Mabsut*, Volume 5. Beirut: Dar al Ma'arifah.

Al Shafi'i, Muhammad Ibn Idris

- n.d. *Al Umm*. 2 Volumes. Beirut: Dar al Ma'arifah.

An-Na'im, Abdullahi Ahmed

- 2002 "Upholding international legality against Islamic and American Jihad." In *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*. Edited by Ken Booth and Tim Dunne. New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Booth, Ken, and Tim Dunne, editors

- 2002 *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*. New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Bostom, Andrew G.

- 2005 *The Legacy of Jihad: Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims*. Amherst: Prometheus.

Chaloupka, William

- 1993 "Cynical Nature: Politics and Culture after the Demise of the Natural." *Alternatives* 18, 2: 141-69.

Cook, David

- 2005 *Understanding Jihad*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Crawford, Robert M. A.

- 1996 *Regime Theory in the Post-Cold War World: Rethinking Neoliberal Approaches to International Relations*. Brookfield: Dartmouth.

Dajani-Shakil, Hadia, and Ronald A. Messier, editors

1991 *The Jihad and its Time*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Donner, Reed M.

1991 "The Sources of Islamic Conception of War." In *Just War and Jihad: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives on War and Peace in Western and Islamic Traditions*. Edited by John Kelsay and James Turner Johnson. New York: Greenwood.

Folk, Richard.

1995 *On Humane Governance: Toward a New Global Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gerges, Fawaz A.

2005 *The Far Enemy: Why Jihad Went Global*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giddens, Anthony

1994 *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Haggard, Stephen and Beth A Simmons.

1987 "Theories of International Regimes." *International Organization* 41, 3: 491-517

Hossain, Muhammad Kamil, and Kenneth Cragg

1959 "The Meaning of Zulm in the Qur'an." *The Muslim World* 49, 3: 196-212.

Ibn Qudamah

n.d. *Al Mughni*, Volume 8. Beirut: 'Alam Al Kutub.

Johnson, James Turner

1990 *Cross, Crescent and Sword: The Justification and Limitation of War in Western and Islamic Traditions*. New York: Greenwood.

Kelsay, John, and James Turner Johnson, editors

1991 *Just War and Jihad: Historical and Theoretical Perspectives on War and Peace in Western and Islamic Traditions*. New York: Greenwood.

Kolokotronis, Jamilah

1990 *Islamic Jihad: An Historical Perspective*. Indianapolis: American Trust Publications.

Khadduri, Majid

1955 *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Krasner, S. D.

1983 *International Regimes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lane, Edward W.

1865 *An Arabic English Lexicon*. Book I, Part 2. London: Williams and Norgate.

Luke, Timothy W.

1996 "Liberal Society and Cyborg Subjectivity: The Politics of Environments, Bodies, and Nature." *Alternatives* 21, 1: 1-30.

Moten, Abdul Rashid, and Syed Serajul Islam

2006 *Introduction to Political Science*. Second Edition. Singapore: Thomson.

Ondudiwe, I. D.

2001 *The Globalization of Terrorism*. Hampshire: Ashgate.

Phares, Walid

2005 *Future Jihad: Terrorist Strategies against America*. New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Rittberger, Volker, editor

1993 *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Rudolph, Peter

1979 *Islam and Colonialism: the Doctrine of Jihad in Modern History*. The Hague: Mouton.

1996 *Jihad in Classical and Modern Islam*. Princeton: Markus Wiener.

Sachedina, Abdulaziz A.

1990 "The Development of Jihad in Islamic Revelation and History." In *Cross, Crescent and Sword: The Justification and Limitation of War in Western and Islamic Traditions*. Edited by James Turner Johnson. New York, Londo: Greenwood.

Schleifer, S. Abdullah

1983 "Understanding Jihad: Definition and Methodology." *Islamic Quarterly* 27, 1: 121.

1984 "Jihad: Sacred Struggle in Islam." *Islamic Quarterly* 28, 3: 145.

Vasiliev, A. A.

1978 *History of the Byzantine Empire 324-1453*, Volume 1. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Vryonis, Speros, Jr.

1971 *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Weizsacker, Ernst Ulrich von

1994 *Earth Politics*. London: Zed Books.