CHAPTER 4

ISLAMIC LAWS ON WAR AND PEACE

The words "terrorism" and "terrorist" have become commonplace in the media and in the speeches of politicians since 11 September 2001. Frequently these words are preceded by the adjective "Islamic". The uninformed reader might believe that terrorism is something new and something which is essentially and exclusively associated with Islam.

Terrorism is as old as human history. One of the first recorded terrorist groups were the Jewish Zealots-Sicarii who used terrorist attacks to try to undermine the Roman Empire.[1]

So, terrorism is nothing new, and neither is it peculiarly Islamic. The people of Chile remember 11 September, not as the anniversary of the terrorist attack on New York, but as the day in 1973 on which General Pinochet, with the support of the United States, overthrew their elected government and unleashed a reign of terror which resulted in 50,000 deaths. Timothy McVeigh, a white, apparently Christian, US citizen was convicted of the Oklahoma bombing in 1995. There are countless other examples of terrorist acts carried out by disaffected individuals and groups, and by states using terror against their own citizens or the people of other countries.

What of terrorism associated with Islam? Is there something in the teachings of Islam which encourages Muslims to go out and kill other people? Examining the sources of Islamic law to see what is contained in the *Quran* and *Sunnah* and how the laws and principles contained in these have been put into effect by Muslims over the years will address this question.

Jihad

First, we should have look at the concept of *jihad*, which is usually mistranslated in the West as "holy war". The Arabic root from which the word "*jihad"* is derived means to exert oneself *fi sabilallah'* – in pursuit of the God's order to "enjoin good and forbid evil". Therefore it can mean any kind of effort to promote benefit or to prevent any kind of evil.

---

1   Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Understanding the Nature, History and Sources of Terrorism," paper delivered at Georgetown University, US, April 2002.

Muslims sometimes speak of the "Greater" and the "Lesser" *jihad*, as reputedly mentioned by the Prophet in one *hadith*, when he spoke of the greater *jihad* being the struggle which each person should undertake to overcome their faults and the impulse to give way to wrongful thoughts and actions. The lesser *jihad*, he said, was to fight in an armed struggle against oppression. At an internal level, therefore, *jihad* is undertaken for self discipline and to follow a right path in life; at an external level, it is to struggle against evils in society, or an external evil threatening society, and this struggle may be taking up arms or equally, by using non-violent means.

For example, *jihad* may be undertaken for a righteous cause, perhaps to free refugee children from detention, or against political corruption. In these cases, *jihad* may be waged through a letter writing campaign, public speeches, demonstrations, contributing money and other forms of political lobbying, none of which need involve violence.

In the context of war, *jihad* may be declared by a righteous and pious ruler. If this is the case, it then becomes obligatory on each Muslim to the extent of his or her capabilities and in the light of circumstances. Unfortunately, it has not been unusual for various despots in the Muslim world to appropriate the idea of *jihad* to suit their own purposes. Saddam Hussein was a secular nationalist and by no means a pious Muslim leader, but when it suited him he proclaimed a *jihad* against his enemies. Saddam's call to *jihad* was widely ignored since he lacked any standing to make the call.

Even in war time, when *jihad* is legitimately proclaimed, it might not be necessary for the ordinary Muslim to take up arms and rush to the battlefield. In fact, some modern scholars have cautioned against this approach, arguing that an untrained man, armed with a rifle, is no contest for an enemy operating helicopter gun ships and cruise missiles, and there is no need to sacrifice one's life in vain.[2] In this case, *jihad* might be waged by the ordinary Muslim by writing letters to newspapers, attending peaceful demonstrations, giving money to the anti-war cause and prayer. In any event, *jihad* is not obligatory on non-Muslims living in an Islamic state, women, children, the disabled and old or sick men.

Jihad by force of arms may be either defensive – to defend oneself from attack – or offensive – to liberate the oppressed – but modern Islamic scholars emphasise the defensive aspects of *jihad* rather than the offensive.

---

2   Sheikh Faisal Mawlawi, Deputy Chairman of European Council for Fatwa and Research, *fatwa* given 18 March 2003 in relation to the US-led war on Iraq.

War and peace in the *Quran*

Looking at the *Quran*, the primary source of Islamic law, we can find verses to the effect that:

1. Conflict should be avoided if possible:

    But turn away from them and say "Peace!" (43:89)

    But if the enemies incline towards peace, do you also incline towards peace. And trust in Allah! For He is the one who hears and knows all things. (8:61)

    … take not life which Allah has made sacred, except by way of justice and law: thus He commands you that you may learn wisdom. (6:151)

    … If anyone killed a person not in retaliation for murder or for his spreading evil in the land, it would be as if he killed the whole of mankind. And if anyone saved a life, it would be as if he saved the whole of mankind (5:32).

2. Permission is given to fight in self-defence:

    To those against whom war is made, permission is given to fight, because they are wronged; and verily Allah is most powerful for their aid. They are those who have been expelled from their homes in defiance of right – (for no cause) except that they did say "Our Lord is Allah". Did not Allah check one set of people by means of another, there would surely have been pulled down monasteries, churches, synagogues and mosques, in which the name of Allah is commemorated in abundant measure. Allah will certainly aid those who aid His (cause) for verily Allah is full of strength, exalted in might. (22:39-40)

3. Fighting is not to be desired, but taking no action in the face of oppression, may be a worse choice:

    Tumult and oppression are worse than slaughter. (2:217)

4. Muslims have a duty to assist other Muslims who are the victims of aggression:

    And what is the matter with you that you do not fight in the cause of Allah and for those weak, ill-treated and oppressed among men, women and children whose only cry is: "Our Lord, rescue us from this town whose people are oppressors, and raise for us, from you, one who will protect, and raise for us, from you one who will help" (4:75)

5. It is prohibited to fight those with whom you have a treaty or those who wish to make peace:

    Except those who join a group between whom and you there is a treaty (of peace) or those who approach you with hearts restraining them from fighting you as well as fighting their own people. If God had pleased, He could have given them power over you, and they would have fought you. Therefore if they withdraw from you and fight you not, and send you (guarantees of peace) then God has opened no way for you (to fight them) (4:90)

6. Prisoners of war should be treated well:

> Therefore, when you meet the unbelievers (in battle), smite at their necks. At length, when you have thoroughly subdued them, bind a bond firmly (on them): thereafter (is the time for) either generosity or ransom. (47:4)

> O Apostle, say to those who are captives in your hands: "If Allah finds any good in your hearts, He will give you something better than what has been taken from you, and He will forgive you: for Allah is oft-forgiving, most merciful." (8:70)

> And they (the believers) feed, for the love of Allah, the indigent, the orphan and the captive. (76:8)

The *Quran* does not require Muslims to "turn the other cheek" when attacked, but it does require them not to exceed the limits of proper conduct of war, when war is justified.

Rules from the *Sunnah*

Turning to the *Sunnah*, further guidance is found in the Prophet's words and example.

On the commencement of war:

> Do not wish for an encounter with the enemy; Pray to Allah to grant you security; but when you (have to) encounter them, exercise patience, and you should know that Paradise is under the shadow of the swords.[3]

Consideration for the soldiers:

> The person mounted on a weak beast is the *amir* (leader) of the caravan …

(That is, the army should move at a pace which would allow the weakest to keep up.[4])

On the conduct of war:

> Do not kill any old person, any child, or any woman.[5]
> Do not kill the monks in monasteries; do not kill the people who are sitting in places of worship.[6]
> Do not attack a wounded person; No prisoner should be put to the sword.

The Prophet prohibited the killing of anyone who is tied or in captivity:[7]

---

3   *Muslim*, vol 3, 4313.

4   Al-Mawardi, (trans Dr Asadullah Yate), *Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyyah*, p 57.

5   Reported by Abu Dawud, quoted in "Human Rights in Islam: Rights of Enemies in War," <www.jamaat.org/islam/HumanRightsEnemies.html>; *Bukhari* vol 4, no 258; *Muslim* vol 3, 4319, 4320.

6   Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, quoted in above article.

The Companions said: "The Prophet has prohibited us from mutilating the corpses of the enemies, and returned the corpses after battle."[8]

The Prophet has prohibited the believers from loot and plunder. He said: "Do not destroy the villages and towns, do not spoil the cultivated fields and gardens, and do not slaughter the cattle."[9]

The Prophet is also reported as saying: "Forbid your army from wreaking havoc for no army wreaks havoc, but that Allah casts fear into their hearts; forbid your army from purloining the booty for surely no army defrauds but that Allah will have them conquered by common foot-soldiers; forbid your army from fornication, for surely no army fornicates but that Allah brings a plague on them."[10]

The Prophet personally conducted many military campaigns, but from all accounts he was a reluctant fighter. Often he tried to settle disputes by non-violent means or sought to bring fighting to an end as soon as possible.[11] When the Prophet captured Mecca from his bitter enemies, the pagan *Quraysh*, he forbade killing and looting, and allowed the population to go in peace.

The example of the "rightly guided" Caliphs

The first Caliph, Abu Bakr, succeeded the Prophet as leader of the Muslims. His advice to Yazid bin Abu Sufyan who was setting off to Syria in charge of an army, set out the code of conduct for Muslim armies:[12]

> When you travel, do not drive your comrades so much that they get tired on the journey. Do not be angry upon your people and consult them in your affairs. Do justice and keep them away from tyranny and oppression, because a community that engages in tyranny does not prosper, nor do they win victory over their enemies. When you become victorious over your enemies, do not kill their children, old people and women. Do not go even close to their date palms, nor burn their harvest, nor cut their fruit bearing trees. Do not break the promise once you have made it, and do not break the terms of treaty once you have entered into it. You will meet on your way people in the monasteries, the monks

---

7 See <www.jamaat.org/islam/HumanRightsEnemies.html>.

8 Bukhari; Abu Dawud, quoted in <www.jamaat.org/islam/HumanRights Enemies.html>.

9 Bukhari, Abu Dawud, quoted in <www.jamaat.org/islam/HumanRights Enemies.html>.

10 Reported by Abban ibn Othman and quoted in Al-Mawardi, *al-Akham as-Sultaniyyah*, p 68.

11 Sohail H Hashmi, "Interpreting the Islamic Ethics of War and Peace – Conceptions of War and Peace in the Sunna," <www.ecla.org/articles/contemporary_issues/article. hashmi_sohail_h_1.html>.

12 Quoted in Abdur Rahman i Doi p 445 from Al-'Ajuz, *Manahij al-Shari'ah al-islamiyyah* vol 1, p 345.

engaged in the worship of Allah, leave them alone and do not disperse them. Let them please themselves and do not destroy their monasteries, and do not kill them. May the peace of Allah be upon you.

When Caliph Omar received the surrender of Jerusalem from the Byzantines, he negotiated a treaty with the inhabitants, one of the terms of which were that they were to have complete security for their churches which were not to be occupied by the Muslims or destroyed.

The opinions of the medieval jurists

During the years of expansion of the empires of the Muslims, considerable consideration was given to the rules of war by the jurists, and not surprisingly, there were various differences of opinion between them. In their legal treatises they expressed opinions on such matters as the treatment of prisoners of war, the types of weapons which might be allowed, what types of damage might legitimately be inflicted on combatants and their property and similar issues.

Al-Mawadi's work, *Al-Akham as-Sultaniyyah*[13] (The Laws of Islamic Governance) from the 11th century CE devoted a chapter to rules of *jihad*. Some of these rules related to the organisation of the army, and the duties of the commander and some to the division of captured booty and the rules of conduct of warfare.

Rulings about warfare are also contained in other classical texts, such as An Nawawi's *Minhaj et Talibin* (a classical text of the Shafii school), dealt with, among other things, the treatment of prisoners of war. It stated:

> Of the enemy fighters taken prisoner, the *amir* may decide, according to circum-stances whether to:
> - Kill them
> - Give them their liberty
> - Exchange them for Muslim prisoners of war
> - Release them for a ransom
> - Reduce them to slavery

According to Shaybani, Abu Hanifa permitted the use of catapults and flooding to defeat the enemy, and allowed other methods which had been frowned on by other jurists.[14] New enemies and new ways of waging war were reflected in new interpretations of the traditional rules. This process continues.

---

13   Translated by Dr Asadullah Yate, 1996.

14   Sohail H Hashmi, "Interpreting the Islamic Ethics of War and Peace – The Conduct of War," <www.ecla.org/articles/contemporary_issues/article.hashmi_sohail_h_1. html>.

The concept of *dar ul-Islam* and *dar ul-harb*

The medieval jurists saw the world as being divided into two areas – the abode of Islam (*dar ul-Islam*) and the abode of war (*dar ul-harb*) and devised numerous rules regarding the conduct of Muslims outside the Islamic territories and the position of non-Muslims within it. Muslims were under an obligation, they believed, to propagate Islam by continuously struggling to ensure that its message reached all people within the known world. This would preferably be done peacefully, but if this was not possible, military means could be employed. The idea of the world being divided into these two categories is not supported by anything in the *Quran* and *Sunnah*, and had little basis in fact, since the Islamic realm itself quickly split into a number of different states, which quarrelled frequently among themselves.

The jurist Ibn Khaldun in his *Muqaddima* said that there were four categories of war: two illegitimate (those arising from desire for plunder and those which consisted of petty squabbles between rival peoples)[15] and two legitimate – *jihad* and *harb* (war).

Jihad was considered by the Sunni jurists of this era as being primarily an offensive struggle to increase the Islamic realm, though not to covert non-believers by force since this is explicitly forbidden in the *Quran*.[16] The Muslim ruler should first invite the non-Muslims to allow the peaceful preaching of Islam. If this offer was refused, the non-Muslim ruler was invited to allow the incorporation of his territory into the Islamic state as a protected community (*dhimmi*), and allowed peacefully to follow its own religion and religious laws, subject to payment of a tax, the *jizya*, in return for protection. If the non-Muslim ruler refused, the Muslim ruler was permitted to wage war against the non-Muslims. Wars which were waged for purposes other than the spread of Islam were categorised as *harb*.[17]

The idea of the world being divided into the two monolithic entities of *dar ul-Islam* and *dar ul-harb* is no longer accepted by modern Islamic thinkers. Times and circumstances have changed, and the concept of *jihad* today empha-sises the defence of the Muslim world against those who would attack it. These can include, in the opinion of some, local secular despots who maintain an illegitimate rule by ruthlessly putting down any opposition, and western powers who use their military and economic superiority to exploit the people of Muslim countries. There are some, often labelled 'fundamentalists,' who still follow the old concepts, and feel obliged to struggle continuously for the re-

---

15   Quarrels among Muslim groups were called *fitna.*

16   *Quran*, 2:256.

17   Sohail H Hashmi, "Interpreting the Islamic Ethics of War and Peace – The Grounds for War", <www.ecla.org/articles/contemporary_issues/article.hashmi_sohail_h_1. html>.

establishment of the idealised Islamic state by violent means if necessary. They are a small minority[18] but they get more than their share of attention.

War and peace in Islamic history

From the time of the Prophet's death until approximately the 17th century, various Muslim rulers were busy expanding their empires, often through warfare. There are accounts of battles in which the conduct of both rulers and soldiers fell far short of the Islamic ideal. There were also accounts of outstanding magnanimity.

Sultan Saladin, who retook Jerusalem from the Crusaders in 1187, was renowned for his chivalry, even among his Crusader enemies. When the Crusader army took Jerusalem, they slaughtered the inhabitants, Christians, Muslims and Jews, leaving 40,000 dead.[19] When Saladin entered Jerusalem, he allowed Orthodox Christians to stay and keep their church property and he allowed the Jews to return. The Latin Christians were allowed to ransom themselves and those who could not do so were enslaved or set free. Only the Knights Templar, the fighters, were executed.

Likewise the Turkish Sultan, Mehmet II, did not allow the inhabitants of Constantinople to be slaughtered or ill treated when he captured the city in 1453 CE. The Mughal emperor Akbar on some occasions increased his territories by peaceful negotiation, but on another occasion he ordered a massacre in which 30,000 Hindus were killed.[20]

It is not possible to say that, in the course of history, Muslim leaders and their soldiers always adhered to Islamic ethics in fighting battles, any more than Christian leaders and armies have always followed the principles of the "just war" expounded by Christian religious leaders. However, on balance, it appears that the behaviour of Muslim leaders was no worse and possibly somewhat better than that of the enemies they fought.

Contemporary *fatawa*

Recent events in the Middle East, and particularly the US-led war against Iraq, have resulted in a number of new *fatawa* relating to behaviour in the course of

---

18 Less than 0.5% of the Muslim population in Europe, according to Tariq Ramadan; see *To be a European Muslim*, (1999) p 343. Numbers are arguably greater in countries such as Pakistan and those of the Middle East, but they would still constitute a small minority of the population.

19 Karen Armstrong, "The curse of the infidel," http://middleeastinfo.org/article 1050.html>.

20 Lucille Schulberg, *Historic India*, (1964) p 173.

war. Since there is no central authority in Islam for the making of rules or religious edicts, there are some differences of opinion among scholars.

As one example, some interesting rulings were made on 18 March 2003 by Sheikh Faisal Mawlawi, the Deputy Chairman of the European Council for Fatwa and Research in answer to questions from respondents in relation to the war in Iraq. The Sheikh held:

1. Removing dictatorship is religiously required, but most scholars agree that military power should not be used for this purpose so as to avoid chaos and sedition among Muslims. (He went on to express doubts about the motives of the Americans and suggested several other US motives not in the interests of the Iraqi people).

2. It is the responsibility of all Muslims to help their Iraqi brethren once Iraq is attacked by the US. This help may be rendered through prayer, condemnation of the attack, financial backing, and boycott of US products. They can also join peaceful demonstrations and should ask their governments to reject American troops on their soil and the use of their lands as a launching point of troops against Iraq.

3. Muslim soldiers in the US, UK or Australian forces are prohibited from fighting against fellow Muslims in Iraq. They are also totally prohibited from fighting in any aggressive war against any country. They are not permitted to initiate fighting against others.

4. Burning oil wells is forbidden because it would cause destruction in the land and this is only permissible if it is the only means through which victory can be achieved.

5. Muslims are not allowed to initiate the use of chemical weapons which result in great damage to the environment and horrible loss of innocent souls. But if the American forces initiate the use of chemical weapons, it is permitted to retaliate using them.

6. Muslim rulers should refuse to have foreign military bases on their soil. Attack on such existing bases by the governments of those countries should not be encouraged as this may this will lead to internal struggle between the rulers and their people, and serve the interests of the invaders. But if attacking these bases will not lead to internal strife, it is an individual obligation (*fard 'ayn*) on every Muslim who is able to do so.

7. It is an individual obligation on every Muslim from other countries travel to Iraq to help defend it if they able to do so but people should not do so unless they have military training and are able to make an effective contribution. Muslims who are citizens of the US or other aggressor country, are nevertheless bound by their treaties with these countries, and are exempted from fighting with the Iraqi people.

8. Even if Americans deliberately seek to harm Iraqi civilians and kill them or inflict great suffering on them, Muslims are not permitted to initiate killing civilians or to retaliate using a more destructive or aggressive tool. Acts of retaliation are not proper. The goal should be to guide Americans to the straight path and not to kill them.

9. In general Muslims are not permitted to leave the country as refugees because it will result in the country being handed over to the invaders, but a Muslim may leave the country if he or she is not able to do anything to help his brothers and sisters or the country or to resist the enemy.

Suicide bombing

As a general rule, suicide is prohibited in Islam. There is a *hadith* concerning suicide, as follows:

> He who kills himself with anything, Allah will torment him with that in the fire of Hell.[21]

Those who seek to defend suicide bombing do so under the principles of martyrdom and necessity. A person killed defending his country on the battlefield is a martyr and, in religious terms, his sacrifice of his life in fighting the enemy is for the benefit of his people. A martyr is given special burial rites – and it is believed that they can be assured of entry into Paradise in recompense for their sacrifice.

Some acts which are normally prohibited may be permitted under the principle of necessity. It is argued by those suffering oppression that when a defender is faced with overwhelming and unequal force on the part of an invader, and there is no other reasonable means of repelling the invader, methods such as suicide bombing are allowable.

This argument has been raised in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian war and in the case of the US invasion of Iraq. In both cases, the occupiers have had an overwhelming military advantage, huge quantities of modern armaments and the ability to deploy them from the air, and in the US case, from naval vessels offshore. The defenders, on the other hand, have had few arms, no aircraft, and virtually no conventional means of defence. Therefore, it is argued, the only way in which they can effectively strike against the occupying army is by guerrilla warfare – including suicide bombing.

The majority of Muslim opinion which regards suicide bombing as a legitimate means against military targets, rejects its use against enemy civilians. They argue that it is legitimate to kill Israeli or US soldiers by suicide bombing but not to target Israeli civilians.

---

21 Sahih, *Muslim*, vol 1, no 203.

A minority argue that as the Israeli Defence Force routinely kills Palestinian civilians, Palestinians have a right to retaliate in kind.

The use of weapons of mass destruction

Professor Sohail Hashmi says that, so far, there has been no systematic work by Muslim scholars on the ethical issues surrounding the use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, despite the fact that several Muslim states possess at least some of these weapons.[22] There is general agreement that nuclear weapons should only be used as a deterrent and a second strike weapon. Contemporary scholars argue that since the enemies of Islam possess such weapons, Muslim countries are justified in acquiring them also.

The roots of Islamic terrorism

"Why do they hate us?" George Bush asked after 11 September. He attributed hatred of the US in the Muslim world to hatred of freedom, democracy and other attributes for which the US supposedly stands. Others in the US and elsewhere simply attribute terrorism to a blind fanatical hatred which they say is implicit in Islam which is "a very wicked and violent religion".[23]

Both these views are wrong. Most Muslims would love to share the freedom and democracy and the economic advantages which the citizens of the US enjoy. One of the roots of Muslim anger is that they say the US refuses to allow them to attain these advantages, and instead props up corrupt regimes in Muslim countries which suppress opposition and act in the interest of the US, rather than in the interest of its own citizens. With regard to intrinsic Islamic fanaticism, we can see from the above examination of the sources of Islamic law, that this is not the case.

In the "war on terror", much effort has been expended on combating the symptoms of the problem, but there has been almost no attempt to tackle the real causes. The Muslim world believes that it has many genuine grievances, which if addressed, would deny the real terrorists their recruiting base. These grievances include:

1. *The Israeli occupation of Palestine* – The creation of the modern state of Israel in 1948 resulted in the forcible dispossession of the Palestinians and no successful attempt has been made to create a stable Palestinian state or to offer just compensation. The past 50 years have seen an ongoing and

---

22 Sohail H.Hashmi, "Interpreting the Islamic Ethics of War and Peace – The Conduct of War," <www.ecla.org/articles/contemporary_issues/article.hashmi_sohail_h_1. html>.

23 The Rev Franklin Graham, a evangelical Christian preacher, reportedly close to President Bush.

violent struggle between the Israelis and the Palestinians. The US, in parti-cular, has offered support to Israel and has both vetoed UN resolutions critical of Israel and effectively ignored Israel's breaking of UN resolutions. The US' support of Israel in such circumstances, parallel with its criticism of Iraq, is seen as hypocritical by the Muslim world.

2. *The "Moro" separatist movement in the Philippines* – The modern Muslim separatist movement originated in the 1960s. The Spanish conquerors had never managed to subdue the Muslims of the southern Philippines comp-letely, and they continue to struggle for independence from the Christian north, which they see as exploiting their land and denying them autonomy. In the 1972-1980 war between Muslim separatists and the Philippines military at least 50,000 people were killed and one million internal refugees created.[24] The struggle has continued without any end in sight, but it is really a struggle with nationalism rather than religion at its core.

3. *Kashmir* – After India and Pakistan were partitioned in 1947, the Hindu maharajah of Kashmir elected to have Kashmir join India, despite its overwhelmingly Muslim majority population which were opposed to this move. The United Nations ordered a referendum on the matter which was never held. Kashmiri separatists, allegedly armed and supported by Pakistan, have been fighting ever since for their independence from India, and many would apparently prefer independence from Pakistan also. This dispute also has its roots in nationalism, although it is flavoured by religious differences.

4. *Chechnya* – When the Soviet Union broke up, many of the former republics gained their independence from Russia. The Chechens also wanted independence but the Russian government refused. In the course of Russian military action to prevent Chechen independence, the capital city of Grozny has been reduced to rubble, at least 15,000 Chechen civilians have been killed[25] and thousands have fled as refugees to neighbouring countries. Despite the use of chemical weapons, the Chechen resistance continues, resorting to guerrilla warfare and terrorism.

5. *Bosnia and Kosovo* – In the Serbian attack on Bosnia, the West's initially placed an arms embargo on the warring parties. However, the Muslim population was virtually unarmed, while the strong well-armed Serbian army continued to be supplied by its traditional allies in Russia. As a result, in the eyes of the Muslim world, Muslims were slaughtered while the West

---

24 Thomas McKenna, "Murdered or Martyred? Popular Evaluations of Violent Death in the Muslim Separatist Movement in the Philippines," in Jeffrey A Sluka (ed), *Death Squad. The Anthropology of State Terror*, 2000.

25 Tariq Ali, *The Clash of Fundamentalisms*, 2002, p xxii.

stood by. There were those in the Muslim world who believe that the West's hesitation to intervene in Bosnia and Kosovo was part of a deliberate strategy to eliminate a Muslim presence from Europe. The EU's reluctance to allow Turkey to join the European Union also reinforces this perception.

6. *Afghanistan* – The US bombing of Afghanistan in retaliation for 11 September was a source of great anger in the Muslim world, although few mourned the displacement of the Taliban. The fact that Afghanistan has not been rebuilt as promised, and remains a dangerous, unstable and impoverished country, has not helped dispel this anger.

7. *Iraq* – Despite the acknowledged evils of Saddam Hussein's regime, Muslim doubts as to the motivations of the US-led attack on Iraq, and the 13 years of sanctions imposed on Iraq which resulted in the deaths of 500,000 Iraqi children under the age of five[26] and possibly more than one million deaths in total,[27] fuelled Muslim anger against the US and its allies. The post-war shambles in Iraq has also increased anti-Western fervour and the threat of terrorism against Western targets.

---

26 UNICEF, "Iraq survey shows "humanitarian emergency", 12 August 1999, quoted in Tariq Ali, *The Clash of Fundamentalisms*, 2002, p 146.

27 Estimate of former UN Humanitarian Coordinator for Iraq, Denis Halliday, quoted in Tariq Ali, op cit.