

Global Agenda and the Politics of Double Standard: War Against Terrorism or War of Terrorism?

Babayo Sule¹, Muhamad Aminu Yahaya² and Usman Sambo³

Abstract: The resurgence of global terrorism in the 21st century compelled for the adoption of war against terrorism as one of the major agenda of globalisation championed by the world powers of the US and her allies. This paper is a theoretical conceptual analysis of the double standard in the war against terrorism whereby the world dominant powers that shouldered the war against terrorism and have identified the phenomenon as a threat to global peace are also found committing atrocities globally, equivalent to or even worse than the acts of terrorists. This paper used secondary sources of data collection such as books, journals, Internet sources, and other documented sources. The data obtained were presented and discussed using thematic content analysis for discussions and findings. The paper discovered that terrorism has been specified and defined differently according to the perceptions and manipulative views of the international media and globalists whereby an act of committing grievous crimes and terror attacks from one side of the world is identified and tagged as terrorism, while the same act from another side of the world, particularly that of the global powers, is overlooked as a minor crime or posthumously rebranded in a softer terminology. Thus, the paper recommends that for a proper war against terrorism to succeed on a global scale, there is a need for justice, equality and fairness in identifying and dealing with global terrorism.

¹ *Babayo Sule*, (corresponding author) is from Department of Political Science, Faculty of Humanities Management and Social Sciences, Federal University Kashere Gombe, Gombe State, Nigeria. He can be contacted at: babayosule@gmail.com.

² *Muhammad Aminu Yahaya*, is from Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Gombe State University, Nigeria.

³ *Usman Sambo*, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences, Yobe State University, Nigeria.

There is a need for the world countries to cooperate in dealing with genuine terrorism, both domestically and internationally, irrespective of the victims and aggressors for equal treatment and justice.

Keywords: Double Standard, Global Agenda, Globalisation, Politics, Terrorism, War.

Introduction

The world is undergoing wars of terrorism and wars against terrorism, which threaten the co-existence of mankind with calamities and havocs (Al Hageel, 2002, p. 19). Terrorism has been identified as the manifestation and reaction of grievances from the aggrieved segments of society and its usage depends on how one perceives the term (Smith, 2012, p. 6). The term “terrorism” is not a new phenomenon at the global centre stage and did not manifest in the current times. History has shown that terrorism and violence has predated the current major world religions. Indeed, it is believed that the word “terror” has been in use for over 2100 years (Matusitz, 2013). Different dissenting groups, individuals, and movements were engaged in the act of terror and terrorism in several parts of the globe at different times due to political oppression, economic suppression, religious persecution, social discrimination, cultural emasculation, and many other causal factors (Norwitz, 2009:2).

Globalisation is a stage in world history in which the entire world has become unified and disentangled in terms of politics, economy and communication, with the centralisation of the Western neoliberal agenda at the centre of the argument (Heywood, 2011, p. 2). The agenda of globalisation includes the liberalisation of the economy at the global centre, promotion of liberal democracy, gender equality, eradication of poverty, war against terrorism, arms control and disarmament, and environmental safety (Heywood, 2011). Global agenda is being promoted by the great powers, particularly the US and her allies, after the demise of their rival, USSR, from the Cold War unconventional espionage (Friedman, 2000).

This paper is a critical examination of one aspect of the global agenda, which is the war against terrorism and all its ramifications, particularly

the double standard, hypocrisy, and conspiracy that are involved in it. The investigation in this paper is expected to come up with a new paradigm in the perception, usage, and clear understanding of the term “terrorism”. The champions of the war against terrorism are the US, her Western allies, and their followers in other parts of the world, including Muslim countries that have surrendered to the whims and caprices of their prejudices and distortions in the identification of what is terror, who is a terrorist, and what activities constitute as terrorism. Many writers (Robinson, 2002; Vittori, 2011; Whittaker, 2004) have tried in vain to justify Islam and Muslims as terrors and perpetrators of terrorism across the globe. However, there are other scholars (Chomsky, 1989, 2000; Mamdani, 2000; Flynt, 2004; Mamdani, 2004) who have identified the proponents of the war against terrorism as the terrors and perpetrators of terrorism themselves. Thus, this study investigates the phenomenon of terrorism from the perspectives of its definition and usage, history, incidences, and nature and level of involvement of the global actors in terrorism.

Methodology

This conceptual study used a theoretical approach in the explanation and interpretation of the context of study. A qualitative method was used in the data collection and analysis. The authors relied on secondary sources such as existing books, articles, and Internet sources for data collection. This was because of the nature of the topic is too broad, complex, conflictual, and complicated for data collection using primary sources. It was practically impossible to collect primary sources for this study, except if the topic were narrowed down to the local or national level and studied a specific group or an event. However, since this study has widened its scope to the global level, it is more appropriate to use the available data. However, this does not mean that this study is similar to previous studies or it has no contribution to knowledge. The authors have carefully identified an area of study that is not given adequate attention in its subject matter and dwelt in it as a contribution to the body of knowledge. The key contribution of this study is a perceptual deconstruction and re-interpretation of the usage of the terms “terrorism” and “terror” globally, in addition to exposing the hypocrisy, insincerity, and double standard in addressing the problem of global terrorism.

The data generated from the secondary sources are discussed, analysed, and interpreted using the qualitative method, specifically content analysis, in which the words and information generated from the secondary sources are explained and interpreted based on the understanding of the authors and the current existing knowledge on the area of study. Additionally, the theories used in this study are integrated in the discussions and findings since this paper is a conceptual theoretical research study.

The Framework of Analysis

This study adopted four theories from the international relations perspective, namely Realism, Conspiracy, the Clash of Civilisations and the Doctrine of Modern *Jahiliya*. The first theory explains the rationale behind the formation of a global world and the policing of international affairs by the US and her allies. The second theory highlights the hidden agenda behind terrorism and the war against terrorism. The third espouses the aggressive agendum of the Western scholastic position on the relationship of civilisations and the last theory interprets how and why the Muslims found themselves in the current predicament at the global intersection of civilisations and hegemonic domination.

Realism Theory of International Relations

Realism dominated the discourses of international relations from the 1940s to 1960 as a counterchallenge against Idealism. The theory emanated from American scholars as a normative approach and a policy-oriented ideology. However, despite its origin in modern times, Realism has its philosophical root in the writings of philosophers, such as Confucius in China, Kautliya in India, Niccolò Machiavelli in Italy, Thomas Hobbes in England, and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in Germany. All of the above philosophers stressed the relevance of power in domestic and international politics. The 21st century realist scholars or proponents include Reinhold Niebuhr, Nicholas J. Spykman, Frederick L. Schuman, Hans J. Morgenthau, George F. Kennan, Arnold Wolfers, Henry A. Kissinger, Raymond Aron, and Robert Strausz-Hupe (Dougherty & Pfaltzgraff, 1971, p. 64).

Realism contends that there is no basic harmony of interests among the nation-states. This is because nation-states have diverse objectives that are conflictual in nature, some of which have resulted in a war. There is a gradation of capabilities of nation-states in an international conflict and the level of capability determines or influences the outcome of the clash. The national power, including the military and non-military components, of a country shapes international relations. Due to the difficulty in achieving world peace through harmony and cooperation, other means should be adopted. According to the Realists, this proposed strategy is the balance of power, which could prevent a nation-state from attaining international hegemony. Realists also assume that morality is not applicable to political actions (Dougherty & Pfaltzgraff, 1971, p. 64).

The doctrine of anarchy and power politics advocated by the Realists have been countered later by the neo-Realist, Kenneth Waltz, who made a reversal of their postulations and, instead, suggested that despite national interest, power politics, and capabilities, nation-states still share similar interests and features in terms of the search for peace, value, and dignity of mankind (Waltz, 2001, p. 7). To this end, Waltz suggested a looser version of Realism in which power politics can be minimised and harmony be introduced to combine the two approaches together (Donnelly, 2005, p. 35). It should be emphasised that Waltz (2001) did not dismiss the essence of power in the interactions of nation-states in modern times. He only suggested for an integrated approach that will see the lesser use of power where possible as a means of achieving peace and harmony in the international system.

From the above assumptions, it can be understood that Realism has shaped the essence of the supremacy and imposition of the global agenda by the US and her victorious allies from the Cold War after it secured international hegemony. Realists believe that international politics is about national interest and a nation-state with superior power should use it to gain her goals at all cost. The promotion of the global agenda, particularly the war against terrorism, can be perceived from the viewpoint of Realism assumptions. Without superior power and hegemony, the US and her allies could not launch the global war against terrorism, especially when terrorist activities take place presumably in far-away countries that might not affect the US and her allies. Indeed, the occurrence of attacks in US soil and recently in European countries

have been attributed to the exportation of the war against terrorism to the lands of the aggrieved insurgents, which in turn prompted retaliation and the expansion of global terrorist networks (Mamdani, 2000; Al Hageel, 2002). Furthermore, if the identified terrorists possessed an equal power to that of the champions of the war against terrorism, the war would not have been operating by now in a conventional manner. It would have been similar to a Cold War or peaceful negotiation.

Conspiracy Theory

Conspiracy theories are subjects of conspiracy themselves. It is an intellectual discourse with two clear distinctive contradictory views: those who agree and believe in the conspiracies and those who reject all the supposed conspiracies. Irrespective of one's persuasion in the matter, it cannot be denied that subterranean and clandestine plots, plans, activities, and global agenda are at stake. Some of them surfaced long after they have occurred, some were exposed before the D-day, and others escaped unnoticed. One of these conspiracies that is debated thoroughly by scholars is the conspiracy of the 9/11 World Trade Centre attacks and the aftermath, which is the war against terrorism. Many scholars from all schools of thought and from all parts of the world have made attempts in presenting compelling evidences to prove that the 9/11 and many other terror attacks were domestic and inside jobs; these scholars include Americans such as Noam Chomsky and Larry Flynt, David Icke, Mahmood Mamdani, and others.

One of the leading writers in conspiracy theory is David Icke. In his numerous works such as *Who Rules the World*, *The Biggest Secret* (1998), *Children of the Matrix* (2001), *The Reptilians*, and many others, Icke reveals how a secret group of people planned the perfect means of ruling the world and controlling the global economy and politics. He emphasised that these groups can kill in whatever manner to achieve their desire, including sponsoring terrorism or war of terrorism.

Some sets of theories emerged after the 9/11 attacks in the US to debunk or establish the disconnect between the purported sponsor of the attack, Osama bin Laden, and to link the terror attack with an insider job. One of these works is that of Tobias and Foxman (2003), which highlight a global network of anti-Semitic conspiracy theorists

who blame Jews and Israel for the 9/11 terrorist attacks. North (1986) believed that there is a conspiracy to create a new world order and that must be achieved using a planned conspiracy. Allen (1971) stressed the fact that conspiracies exist at the global level, but none dare call it as such because they would be ridiculed and all their attempts to establish facts would be viewed in error by a hidden hand in the attempt to block the populace from the reality on clandestine plans. Thus, the above efforts by Allen (1971) was to establish the existence of conspiracies in contradiction to the champions of anti-conspiracy theorists who deny any clandestine plan to rule the world or sponsor any evil in an obscured way.

A more elaborate explanation of conspiracy theories is the one presented by Dubay (2006) in what he termed as “false flag” conspiracy theories. He stated that events such as the First World War, the Second World War, the Pearl Harbour attack, Operation Northwoods, the Vietnam War, the Oklahoma City bombing, and 9/11 attacks were all designed internally by some hideous covert individuals who are determined to steer the world in accordance with their whims and caprices. All the above submissions are efforts in establishing evidence towards the existence and activities of conspirators despite numerous attempts to debunk and disabuse the minds of those who believe in such events. Other writers have come closer to the establishment of conspiracy theories but are more vulgar and factual in their approach. Those who have established a clear connection between terrorism and anti-terror agents include Chomsky (2000) and Mamdani (2004).

The Clash of Civilisations

The thesis presented by Samuel P. Huntington in 1996 on the “Clash of Civilisations” set the foundation for intellectual arguments on the global scale on the conflicting nature of the world order and world peace. Huntington (1996) argued that the future of world conflicts would not be based on politics, economy, and military but on the clash of civilisations, which would cause major threats to world peace and the only way to ensure peace and avoid war globally is an international order based on civilisations.

Huntington (1996) further argued that the world order has been shaped and guarded by different civilisations periodically from the emergence of powerful kingdoms in the history of the world. He concluded his discourse on the notion that the two contemporary major civilisations — the Eastern and Western civilisations — will seek domination on a global scale and the clashes between them will lead to war, conflicts, chaos, and threat to international peace. The Eastern civilisation, specifically the Arab/Islamic civilisation, challenges Western (American/European) civilisation on many aspects and in many perspectives. Since the two major civilisations contradict each other to some extent, there are tendencies for serious clashes. While Kissinger (2015) agrees with Huntington's submission and still sees relevance in it, Nefeily (2009) dismisses any clash as amoral, uncultured, and a weird assumption that will never lead to global harmony and cooperation. Instead, he settles for dialogue of civilisations, which he believes can close the gap and harmonise the differences.

Based on the above assumptions and postulations, this study realised that some of the alleged terror attacks on the Western world that are perceived to have emanated from Eastern terrorists is a clear manifestation of the predicted clash by Huntington (1996). The Western world intruded on the Muslim world and generated the foundation for the crises in modern times with their colonial exploitation. This argument can be traced back to the Golden Age of Islam (7th century C.E.) when the spread of Islam affected the West through preaching, trade merchants, and conquest. Western retaliation through the Crusades (10th century C.E.) led to the conquest and domination of the East by the West. The last effort to outwit each other came in the early 19th century when the West colonised the Eastern world. The economic and political asymmetrical arrangement fostered by the West aggrieved the Eastern world. The superior firepower of the West and the weaknesses of the East currently could not allow for a conventional confrontation. The organised terror attacks allegedly committed by Easterners on the West is a reaction against the perceived threats and injustice of the world order perpetrated by the West. It is the continuation of the clash through other means, as suggested by Huntington (1996).

The Doctrine of the Modern Jahili Society

In his famous work, *Milestones*, Sayyid Qutb (1990), one of the founding fathers of the Islamic Brotherhood movement in Egypt, established the fact that contemporary Muslim societies are living in a *jahili* form of society, one that is more pronounced than the pre-Islamic Arabian *jahiliyyah*. He argued that fornication, adultery, alcoholism, gambling, usury, divorce, and other forms of sins that were practised during the *jahiliyyah* period have re-surfaced among the more formidable and more advanced Muslim *ummah* in Muslim societies.

Qutb (1990) emphasised that the contact of the Muslim world with Western civilisation succeeded in bringing more harm than good. This was because the Muslim world became emasculated by Western culture due to embracing Western economy and some Western political ideas such as Marxism and Darwinism. He further argued that Western civilisation could not rescue the West itself from social malaise, social stagnation, and moral corruption, much less other affected civilisations.

In contrast to Huntington's (1996) view, Qutb (1990) posited that there will not be any clash of cultures, civilisations, or conflicts between the East and the West. The West had already started adopting Eastern values, particularly the Islamic financial system. Qutb (1990) believed that the solution to the dilemma of the Muslim world is easy, specific, readily available, and precise; it is none other than reverting to pure Islamic teachings and Islamic socioeconomic, political, and cultural settings. Since other civilisations, such as the West, are turning to Islam for a solution due to the failure of their own civilisations, it would be more feasible if Muslims were to also refer back to their root, retrace their footsteps, and reorganise their society based on the pure principles of Islam. Failure to do so will throw the Muslim *ummah* and its civilisation into a jeopardy where dangerous movements, ideas, and a *jahili* living style will dominate the Muslim world.

Qutb (1990) was right in his discourse because the failure to adhere to the strict teachings and pure practice of Islamic principles in the Muslim society has led to dangerous movements and organisations that are classified today as terror groups and other related terms. Despite all the provocations from the West against the Muslim world, an organised instruction in Islamic teachings and principles may handle the issue perfectly and in a sublime manner than reacting through violence

and a clandestine sponsor of global terror network by both misguided Muslims and external conspirators.

The Theories in Perspective

Glancing through the telescopic view of the above four theories or frameworks of analysis, one can see that all of them can plausibly explain the context and focus of this study. For instance, Realism postulates that international relations and international politics is all about national goals and national interest and this can be achieved using power and other available means. The justification of this is Mamdani's submission that the Cold War between the US and the USSR from the 1940s to 1980s compelled the US to create modern terrorism. When it comes to conspiracy theory, even though there are controversies and rebuttals of the existence of conspiracies by some section of intellectuals, the compelling volumes of evidence speak otherwise. Even the 9/11 attacks and other attacks before and since are perceived in this way by many people. Muslims were used as a scapegoat in an attempt to win a silent war of civilisation, as postulated by the clash of civilisations theory by Huntington (1996). This is because the main threat and an obstacle to the unchallenged ascendancy and supremacy of Western hegemony is the East, specifically the Muslim world, which failed to disappear despite all the internal and external dominations and challenges. It is applicable in the context of this study because if Qutb's (1990) assumptions have some truth to them, then the Muslim world cannot afford to be in a deep ocean of sin and *jahili* life as it faces all sorts of conspiracies against Islam, including sponsorship of terrorism.

Thus, this theoretical paper uses the above four theories in the analysis and discussion of the findings thoroughly. The four theories, going by the above interpretations, are interwoven and disentangled, with each of them overlapping one another in explanation and the context of analysis and interpretation.

Literature Review

In this section, an attempt was made in the critical examination and explanation of the subject matter of study using the available scholastic

views. The literature is discussed in thematic forms, which consists of detailed explanations of the global agenda, terrorism, terror, types of terrorism, forms of terrorism, and a brief overview of global terrorism in perspective, in addition to a succinct discussion of the term “civilisation”.

Global Agenda and Global Politics

Globalisation is believed to have been the era in which the entire world transformed into a single global unit with interconnectivity through digital communication and fast movement of goods and services across the globe in a rapid manner that was never witnessed in the history of mankind (Heywood, 2011, p. 6). Globalisation, just as other stages of world politics and rivalry, came with its own positive and negative aspects. It is believed that globalisation was ushered in by the agenda of the “New World Order” (NWO) that is championed by some globalists who believe that the world economy, politics, culture, and structure require new settings and new order. The NWO is believed to have been the sublime arrangement of world powers since more than 100 years ago to transform the entire world into a single unit with one politics, one economy and one agenda (Wells, 1940). Kissinger (2015, p. 12) argued that the NWO is the replica of the Westphalian system adopted by the Western world for hundreds of years before the modern time, which is based on a balance of power and checks and balances. In the history of the world, the Westphalian system of maintaining peace has been re-emerging in the present time where a unique agenda was put in place, either advertently or inadvertently, for the peaceful co-existence of mankind (Kissinger, 2015, p. 22).

In the current era, the global agenda has been identified mainly to have included the liberalisation of the economy, liberal democracy, human rights advocacy, arms control and disarmament, gender sensitivity, environmental control, eradication of poverty and disease, global security, and war against terrorism (Sule, 2005, p. 67). On closer scrutiny, one can view that this agenda is purposed with good intention towards the survival, wellbeing, peaceful co-existence, and progress of mankind. However, the arguments and different view of this study demonstrates that the agenda is pursued with double standard, hypocrisy, and deception. One of the above agenda that is taken as the focus of this study is the war against terrorism, which has been thoroughly

investigated in this study to determine how genuine, how decisive, how successful, and to what extent it is successful. The overall discussions and analysis of this study is presented in the following pages.

What is Terrorism?

Terrorism is a term that is difficult to define or conceptualise, especially when one considers its ambiguity in usage and the parties that are involved. There are different perceptions, understanding, identification, sentiments, and meanings that are attached to the term across the world. The main reason for the difficulty in defining terrorism is political interest because many people perceive the term with vested interest by identifying or attaching its meaning to selected perpetrators (Nathanson, 2010, p. 25). The word “terrorism” was first coined during the French Revolution when a group of rebels called the Jacobins adopted the term to reflect their own actions. It was believed that the Revolution was carried out under the Reign of Terror, a campaign that claimed between 16,000 and 40,000 lives in the period of a year. In another view, similar to the above, the term terrorism was first used to refer to Robespierre and his colleagues in the popular committee known as the ‘Appalling Court’ involving the followers of Jacob Baradaï who freely identified themselves with the terms to refer to their activities (Al Hageel, 2002, p. 67). The Reign of Terror was thus seen as the consequence of the French Government. In modern times, terrorism refers to the killing of innocent people by non-state actors for diverse reasons. This definition is a clear manifestation of an attempt to conceal the fact that the state and its actors are engaged in terrorism of different kinds, which renders the definition as being incomplete, selfish, biased, and hypocritical in approach.

In a study by Simon (1994), it is found that there are currently more than 200 definitions of terrorism used by different sections in the world. The same study also reported that there are 212 discovered definitions of terrorism across the world. 90 of the total definitions are continuously used by governments and other related institutions. Terrorism has been viewed as any actual or threatened attack on innocent defenceless civilians, and obviously against soldiers, the police and politicians (Webel & Arnaldi, 2012, p. 11).

The most challenging issue in defining terrorism is acceptance. Many scholars (Naik, 2006; Deflem, 2004; Nathanson, 2010; Vittori, 2011; Whittaker, 2004; Chomsky, 1989) saw this difficulty. This is because the term is applied differently in equal circumstances and on different individuals and groups, even if the actions are identical in nature. It may be agreed that any act that threatens the peace, psychology and wellbeing of unarmed innocent people is an act of terror if it is perpetrated deliberately to instil fear. It is better to focus more on who is a terror than what is terrorism for it is an ambiguous and ambivalent term that is perceived and interpreted by the psychology of the interpreter, his culture, faith, and history. Terrorism can be perpetrated by a state against state, state against citizens, citizens against state, citizens against citizens, military coups, revolution and guerrilla warfare (Merari, 2007). However, this section will conclude with a well-rounded definition of terrorism given by Hoffman (1998) and Al Hageel (2002). Hoffman (1998, p. 6) described terrorism as an act of

Ineluctably political aim and motives, violent or, equally important, threatens violence, designed to have far-reaching psychological repercussions beyond the immediate victim or target, conducted by an individual or an organisation with an identifiable chain of command or conspiratorial cell structure, and perpetrated by a sub-national group or non-state entity.

Al Hageel (2002) defined terrorism in Arabic language with reference to “fear and horror”. He further argued that its linguistic definition is

To use violence and threats through different means and methods such as assassination, mutilation, torture, appal and violence to secure some political ends and these political ends could be attempting to spread panic and fear to achieve political objectives (p. 70).

Who is a Terror?

The term “terror” originated from the Latin word *terrere*, which means to frighten or tremble. It is a synonym for fear, panic, anxiety, and discomfort. The word “terror” has been in use for over 2100 years,

beginning in ancient Rome to symbolise the coming of the Cimbri killers in 105 B.C. (https://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/51172_ch_1.pdf). A terror is a politically inclined individual who uses violence to threaten or expose the lives and properties of individuals to danger. The act is directed towards individuals, institutions, countries, and objects. It is an act carried out to gain popularity and public sympathy using crime as a prime weapon (Al Hageel, 2002, p. 77).

A terror is a person who causes fear or terrorism on his target victim. This include thieves, rapists, and all antisocial elements of society. Indeed, a policeman is a terror to the robber since he will panic at the sight of the policeman (Naik, 2006, p. 2). Nathanson (2010) supported this view by Naik (2006) that the word “terror” is diametrically opposed, depending on who carries out the act because while it is seen as an immoral act, other actions can be viewed as morally justified, just as in the above example of the policeman. A terror is a sick person who has the background of a sick culture and mass hatred towards violence (Kressel, 1996, p. 2). A terror is a deviant with special characteristics, such as expression of grievances, and a tendency towards aggression, such as harming an individual, killing, assaults, and other dangerous motives (Black, 2004, p. 9).

A terror is branded as a destructive dementia, an evil-minded person who wreaks havoc on innocent civilians (Whittaker, 2004, p. 14). Chomsky (1989) perceived a terror as a product of a culture of committing crime, irrespective of the perpetrator and the victim. In another view, Hughes (2002) identified a terror as any person who organises a clandestine plan to injure any unknown target, be it a political figure, an institution, a state, or any hated section of society. The ego and identity of a person determines his tendency towards inflicting harm on others in society and this is a psychological approach that is used to identify a behaviour that is terror-motive in nature (Arena & Arrigo, 2007, p. 14).

From the above definitions, it can be summed up that a terror is not an identity that is related to any religion, race, geography or origin. It is an act that, if carried out regardless of the political or social affiliation of the culprits, will inculcate fear and panic on the mind of the target and it is applicable to all within the context of this study.

Types of Terrorism

Al Hageel (2002, p. 196) identified four different types of terrorism, as follows:

1. **Terrorism of Colonialism:** this is occupation of natives' lands and enslaving them using force and violence, which was perpetrated by Western colonisers. The three centuries of colonial rule witnessed terrible terrorist incidences by the colonialists on the occupied nations, which led to the killings of millions of people. These colonialists included Britain, France, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and others.
2. **Terrorism exercised by Tyrannical Powers:** this is a type of terrorism carried out by world powers who perpetrated injuries and killings on their subjects, both domestic and international, due to excessive use of power, as in the cases of Fascism, Nazism, Communism, and Capitalism.
3. **Terrorism of Settlers:** this is an act of terror undertaken by those who settled and occupied in a native land and displaced, enslaved, and terrorised the natives with killings, imprisonment and other dreadful crimes. A good example of this is the Israeli terrorism in the occupied land of Palestine.
4. **Terrorism of Racial Organisation:** this is a hate crime that is committed by one race against another, such as the case of the Bosnian Muslims in the former Yugoslavia, Hindus against Muslims in India and Kashmir, Russian atrocities in the Chechen Republic, Buddhist aggression against Muslims in Burma, the aggression of the Catholic-majority Filipino government towards the minority Muslims and the recent Chinese government crackdown on Uyghur Muslims.

Forms of Terrorism

Al Hageel (2002, p. 85) identified four major forms of terrorism, as follows:

1. **Political Terrorism:** this includes colonialism, racial discrimination, aggression of strong states against weaker states, interference in the

national sovereignty of other countries, foreign occupation, and the use of violence against a certain section of society or state, which will result in migration and domination.

2. Economic Terrorism: this consists of exploitative and asymmetric international trade agreements, exploitation, and domination of national resources by foreign imperialists and imposition of detrimental economic policies.
3. Social Terrorism: this includes violation of human rights, deprivation, starvation, poverty, diseases, illiteracy, and oppression of a nation by international laws or a section of the nation that is oppressed by racial discrimination or abuse.
4. Cultural Terrorism: this is the forceful imposition of one culture upon another and the emasculation of peoples' cultures and societal norms through domination and propaganda as well as indoctrination, which will penetrate the adulterated culture gradually but vehemently and lead to distortions and social prejudices.

History of Terrorism

This study classifies the history of terrorism into four major periods, as follows:

1. Ancient Times: the first known record of terrorism in the ancient world is the one inflicted upon the occupied people of Mosul in the present-day Iraq by Assurnasirpal II, the King of Assyria (885-860 B.C.). This was followed by a series of assassination of Roman kings, beginning with Julius Caesar in 44 B.C. Other Roman emperors who suffered violent deaths include Caligula and Galba, the latter of whom was killed by German freedom fighters in 9 C.E (Whittaker, 2004, p. 20; Chaliand & Blin, 2007, p. 10). An early terrorist group was the Sicarii (67-73 C.E), a fundamentalist religiously-affiliated sect that fought the Roman occupation of Palestine and Jerusalem. Another terror group that emerged was the Assassins (originally called the Hashashins, an Arabic word for assassination) in the 11th century, a religious resistant movement against the Saladin (Salahuddin Al-Ayyubi). From the 13th to 19th centuries, the Thugs of India emerged from among the worshippers

of the Hindu goddess, Kali, the destroyer. These Thugs strangled sacrificial victims, robbed them, mutilated them and even buried them alive, all in the name of offer to the Kali. Their acts were estimated to have cost 20,000 lives annually.

2. Modern Time: The French Revolution in the 1790s is viewed as the root of modern terrorism. The perpetrators, who had a political motive, employed fear and murder to suppress opposition, which claimed the lives of thousands in the process (Whittaker, 2004, p. 31). The French Revolution coined the idea of modern terror though the emergence of mass violence and totalitarianism (Chaliand & Blin, 2007, p. 95). In this era, the French Revolution gave birth to the word “terrorism” and modern terror in world history.
3. Cold War: it is believed that the Cold War rivalry between the US and USSR was the decisive factor in producing contemporary global terrorism. Mamdani (2000) argued that the US created modern terror through the CIA during the Cold War era with the arming of the Taliban in Afghanistan to fight USSR. The unused weapons and strategy after the war were then targeted towards the US and her allies in the post-Cold War period after a political fallout. Flynt (2004) supported the above view that the root of modern terrorism was initiated and financed by the US after equipping the then-President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, with biological weapons to destroy Iran and later Afghanistan to fight her enemy, which is the USSR. Al Qaeda and other terrorist networks were created, financed, and supported by the US during the Cold War rivalry (Flynt, 2004, p. 223).
4. The 9/11 and post-9/11 era: terrorism in modern times began to make headlines in the 1970s and became more pronounced in the 1980s. The main feature that characterised terrorism in this era is the identification and stigmatisation of one particular group with the act, which is Muslims and Islam. Terrorism in this era reached its pinnacle when on 11th September 2001, Al Qaeda was alleged to have attacked the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon in Washington D.C., US. It is believed from the statistics that about 5000 people were killed, which was more than the death toll by the terrorist Irish Republican Army in 35 years (https://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/51172_ch_1.pdf). The US

President, George Bush Jr., declared war against terrorism in 2001 and since then, the terror attacks traced to Muslim groups and Al-Qaeda intensified in many parts of America, Europe, and other places in the world. Other dangerous terror groups emerged, such as ISIS in Iraq and Syria, Al-Shabab in Somalia that has been operating since 1990s but became formidable in the post-9/11, Mujahideens in Mali, Boko Haram in Nigeria, Niger, Chad, and Cameroon, and AQIM or Al-Qaeda in the North Africa.

Concept and Dimensions of Civilisation

Civilisation is a concept that has been extrapolated by various historians, scholars, and analysts as well as religious commentators and interpreters. It simply denotes a culture, process of development, history, heritage, and positive contributions of a given society, religious group, kingdom, and empire in the history of the world (Kissinger, 2015). Civilisation, in Huntington's view (1996), is a history, culture, and by-product of a given empire that dominated global politics for several years. He further argued that it is a subject of debate and clash between the contending competing civilisations in modern times, particularly with specific reference to the Eastern (Arabic/Islamic) and Western civilisations. However, in a contrary view, Nefeily (2009) countered Huntington's view that competing civilisations do not require clash or confrontation. Rather, it is dialogue that is most necessary in the quest towards achieving global peace, harmony, and security.

Joseph (2012) emphasised that civilisation is a history that is discovered by archaeological exercises and discoveries that establish a linkage between the people's past and the present. Civilisation is considered as the period or foundation in which humanity learned to shape its environment through cultivation, metal works, and modern shelter and continues in its organisation and innovations so that mankind can be better and organised (Coppens, 2013). Civilisation is a phenomenon that is shaped by the environment, culture, history, interactions, and values of a given society, in addition to faith or religion, as in the case of Islamic civilisation (AlKhateeb, 2014). Civilisation is viewed as the mirror in which one can view the ancient world and their historical activities and, in the same way, establish a link with the current societies and the influences of their activities and relationship (Beard,

2018). The undertaking conditions of societal policy, interconnectivity, culture, and businesses are the factors that led to cultural interactions across the world and among nation-states and civilisations historically and contemporarily, which is referred to as civilisation (Saran, 2018). Read and Alexander (2019) predicted and warned sternly that the current civilisation will collapse because it has a terminal issue of climate instability. However, Read et al. (2019) postulated that one positive aspect of this civilisation is that it will sow a seed of its inheritance and that it will somehow manage and transform itself in the future.

The above scholastic views indicate that civilisation is simply a process and a set of activities and values that a society, a faith or an empire provide to the world and is a dominant heritage that is identifiable and related to that particular society or faith. This is the reason why Huntington (1996) suggested that the introduction and innovation of science and technology by the Western world established it as the best civilisation ever in the history of the world. That is what Nefeily (2009) disputed Huntington through the identification of the interpolation of the Islamic culture and civilisation in the Western world and its permanent contribution to the Age of Renaissance. Either way, civilisation will continue to flourish from different societies and faith, provided that the world continues to exist. The desire for political and economic supremacy internationally will also set different civilisations against each other, as presented by Huntington (1996) and Kissinger (2015).

Discussion and Analysis

In this study, efforts were made to establish the connect between the global champions of the war against terrorism and the root of terror attacks factually and also to disconnect the stigmatisation that “all terrorists are Muslims but, not all Muslims are terrorists”, which is a modern maxim used to shift the entire blame of terrorism on Islam deliberately with undue course to history and reality. It should be considered that in the discussion and analysis, this study found that there was a connection between terrorists and their movement in modern times with the NWO agents or the champions of the global agenda, including the war against terrorism. Furthermore, this study made a good attempt in identifying some direct wars of terrorism perpetrated by the advocates of anti-

terrorism themselves. It has been established that there are currently acts of terror that are taking place in the territories of the global fighters against terrorism that are ignored by the public, shielded by the media, and protected by the propagandists. This study further disclaimed and deconstructed the position that Muslims are the actors behind global terrorism in contemporary times. While not disputing the fact that some established evidences pointed towards some misguided unscrupulous Muslims who misinterpreted the concept and applicability of *jihad* in theory and practice, thereby making a mockery and evil of Islam before its enemies in the name of “Holy War”, the true teachings of Islam debunked their position, as reiterated by several scholars, and their actions cannot be misinterpreted to refer to the position of Islam or Muslims across the world. All these are discussed in the following sections.

Cold War and the Root of Modern Terrorism

One of the arguments that labelled the current war against terrorism as a double standard is the nature in which modern terrorism was created by the US and her allies during the Cold War between the US and the USSR, as supported by abundant evidence. For instance, Flynt (2004) narrated that,

In a world that gets its news from television, if there's no camera around when it happened, it didn't happen. That's one of the reasons why Americans don't know much about the rest of the world. The fact that the public wasn't paying attention is how, in the 1980s, Reagan and Bush the First could arm Osama so he could fight Russians in Afghanistan, and then, when Osama turned those arms against us, Bush II could express single-minded explanations like 'these people hate freedom'. Same with the US arming Saddam against the Iranians, ignoring him when he used poison gas against the Kurds, then suddenly deciding that he is the lynch pin on the axis of evil and we have to take him out (pp. 176-177).

Going by the above view, one can establish that if the root of modern terrorism emanated from Osama Bin Laden and his Al Qaeda network, then the US is the direct sponsor of modern terrorism in our contemporary world. So, what is the US and her allies now fighting if

not for their double standard and hypocritical deception of the world? Furthermore, the theories used in this study can be visible here. In the first place, Realism postulates that national interest and the use of power to achieve national objectives is the main principle of international relations. The US and her allies might have armed Osama bin Laden to fight the USSR and Saddam Hussein to weaken the neighbouring Iran for national interest. In the second instance, the conspiracy theories reveal that there are clandestine plans across the globe by some powers to establish the NWO and to disguise the sponsors of terrorism indirectly through the arming and financing of Osama by the US. In the third instance, the clash of civilisations by Huntington (1996) is visible in the Cold War between the US and USSR, which led to proxy wars and arming of terror groups that, in turn, created conflicts across the globe. In the fourth instance, the Doctrine of Jahiliya by Sayyid Qutb (2000) is applicable in the context of the emergence of Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda that were sponsored by the US, and the war between Iraq and Iran. If the Muslim world adhered to the strict teachings of Islam universally, there may not be such conspiracies and communal clashes among the Muslim *ummah* that would lead to war and allow the enemies to intervene. In another similar view,

The Reagan administration privatised war in the course of recruiting, training and organising a global network of Islamic fighters against the Soviet Union. To take one example, the University of Nebraska received a \$50 million grant from USAID to produce children's textbooks. Here is a question from a 3rd grade Mathematics book, presumably for 9-year-old: 'One group of Mujahideen attack 50 Russian soldiers. 20 Russians are killed. How many Russians fled?' The 4th grade Mathematics book follows with this question: 'The speed of a Kalashnikov bullet is 800 metres per second. If a Russian is at a distance of 3200 metres from a Mujahideen and that Mujahideen aims at the Russian's head, how many seconds will it take for the bullet to strike the Russian in the forehead? (Mamdani, 2004, p. 16).

The above quotation reveals how the US sponsored the Taliban government and the headquarters of the so-called Al Qaeda in the 1980s due to Cold War rivalry with the Russians. From a theoretical perspective, Realism puts forth that international politics is entirely

about national interest and balance of power is achievable through all capable means that are available. The use of Afghanistan to fight a proxy war with the USSR was understood along this line. In the second instance, the conspiratorial move to sponsor Afghanistan and its educational system to brainwash the Afghans into fighting the US's enemy is part of a wider global conspiracy that is unravelling in our modern time. In the third instance, even though the clash of civilisations propounded by Huntington (1996) focused on the East and West, it can also be applied to the clash between capitalism and communism that led to the creation of modern terrorism. In the fourth instance, Qutb (2000) believed that the Muslim world is living in a form of *jahili* that is more formidable than the pre-Islamic Arabian *jahiliyyah* and that has led to the erosion of Islamic values, to the extent that Afghani Muslims would unknowingly rely on the US for the creation of a future terror group. The Cold War has been recognised as the pretext for the emergence of modern terrorism by other scholars, especially because,

During the Cold War years, the standard pretext for terror and aggression was communism, a highly flexible notion, as the victims recognised. Against the background of large-scale aggression and terror, actions that would be considered major crimes if perpetrated by others are mere footnotes: for example, the murder of 80 Lebanese in the worst terrorist atrocity of 1985, at the peak of fury about 'international terrorism', a CIA- initiated car-bombing targeting a Muslim leader. Or the destruction of half the pharmaceutical supplies of a poor African country (Sudan) in 1998, with a death toll that is unknown, and uninvestigated: Washington blocked a UN inquiry. The bombing was legitimate, the editors of the New York Times explained, because the US has the right to use military force against factories and training camps where terrorist attacks against American targets are being prepared. The reaction would presumably be different if, say, Islamic terrorists were to destroy half the pharmaceutical supplies in the US, Israel or some other favoured states (Chomsky, 2000, p. 10).

The above submission exposed the double standard in the war against terrorism and justified the theoretical underpinnings of this study in all their ramifications. The first theory, which is Realism, suggested that national interest is the dominant theme in international relations that is

pursued using power and national strength at all cost. The US perpetrated terror, as evidenced above, and justified its actions in which any such attacks by unfavoured groups would be tagged as “terrorism”. In the second theory, the conspiracy of attacking and terrorising a perceived enemy by the powerful US and her allies is the same way in which terror groups are sponsored and shielded when they satisfy the interest of the US. In the third theory, the clash of civilisations is palpable where the global hegemonic powers of capitalism and communism are engaged in the clash of economic and political ideas of civilisations, leading to the sponsor of splinter covert groups. In the fourth theory, the neglect of the pure principles and teachings of Islam threw the Muslim *ummah* into the abyss of doom and retrogression globally, which gave impetus for the creation of terrorism, stigmatisation, and conspiracy by the enemies of the Muslim world.

War of Terrorism by Global Hegemonic Powers

The 9/11 attacks set the foundation for the current and renewed declaration of the war against terrorism on the global scale. However, from the first declaration of the war against terrorism, a double standard and hypocrisy of the highest order ensued. For instance, some of the worst crimes of the late 20th century could have been ended swiftly by the powers that declare the war against terrorism, but they ignored the war. A good example is the colonial exploitation and subjugation in which millions of innocent people were killed, millions more were exported as slaves, native land resources were plundered, and forced labour and exploitation were perpetrated by the colonial rule of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Holland, and Belgium across Africa, Asia, and South America (Chomsky, 2000).

The imperial interests for domination and exploitation of the world economy compelled them to fight the First World War, which was believed to have cost approximately 20 million lives, and the Second World War, which claimed around 40 million lives. More than 400, 000 innocent people died from the atomic bombs dropped by the US in the two Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki alone in the Second World War. In the same period, the anti-Semitic movement in Germany under Hitler’s Nazism claimed six million Jews in the process (Naik, 2006). All these havocs that wrecked mankind on a global scale were

unprecedented in the history of the world and were overlooked with impunity, relegated in a hypocritical and double standard manner.

War on terrorism can take many dimensions, as observed by Chomsky (2000) above. Many large-scale atrocities in the 20th century could have been averted if the so-called champions of the war against terrorism acted proactively. For instance, the Balkan crisis in the former Yugoslavia where Bosnian Muslims were tortured, murdered, raped, unsettled, and persecuted by the Serbian Christians and claimed around 350, 000 lives were ignored by the great powers (Chomsky, 2000, p. 34). In East Timor of Indonesia, more than one million corpses were recorded in the massacre by the Indonesian government, which was supervised and supported by the US in the process (Chomsky, 2000, p. 52). In Colombia, the US provided military aid worth USD\$300 million to the Colombian government to support the massacre of unarmed peasants by the paramilitary terrorist group. A report found Washington D.C. guilty of terrorism in Colombia (Chomsky, 2004, p. 66). Other atrocities involving the active collaboration or participation of the US from the 1970s to 1990s include Cuba, Laos, Cambodia, Nicaragua, Vietnam, and Sudan (Chomsky, 2000).

Since the recent declaration of the war against terrorism after the 9/11 attacks, the US has killed more innocent victims than the total number of those killed by terrorism across the world. A study confirmed that the US has killed more than 20 million people in 37 victim nations since the Second World War. It also revealed that the US military forces were directly responsible for about 10 to 15 million deaths during the Korean and Vietnam Wars and the two Iraq Wars, including Indochina (Cambodia and Laos). In the recent wars, it is estimated that the US killed between nine and 14 million people in Afghanistan, Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, East Timor, Guatemala, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Sudan (www.globalresearch.ca/us-has-killed-more-than-20-million-people-in-37-victimnations-since-world-war-ii/5492051). *The Guardian* reported that the Iraq War has claimed more than 1.5 lives from 2001 to 2018; 48 percent of the victims were children and 34 percent were women civilians, both of whom were killed by US soldiers (www.theguardian.com/world/2018/mar/19/iraq). In another separate report, it is estimated that civilian casualties in the US war in Afghanistan reached 170,000 and the estimated cost of war reached between USD\$31 and USD\$60 billion, which invited sharp

criticisms, both nationally in the US and internationally. In addition, it is estimated that the death toll in the Syrian proxy war currently fought between the US and Russia is around 470,000, with more than 3.4 million refugees living in under terrible conditions (ipfs.io/ipfs/QmXoyvizjW3WknFiJnKLwHCnL72vedxjQkDDP1mXWo6uco/wiki/casualties_of_the_Syrian_civil_war.html).

The above statistics of the war against terrorism by the US and her allies indicate that the theories adopted in this study are a plausible explanation of the context of this study. For example, the first theory, Realism, stresses that international relations are all about national interest and power display and this accurately describes how the US is terrorising weaker countries and identifying any interest that is against the US as a terrorist attack, even when the scale of their destruction is higher. In the second theory, the conspiracies of deception and double standard concerning the direct and indirect sponsorship of wars on a global scale by the US and other great powers reveal that there is an ongoing hidden agenda beyond the superficial level. In the third theory, the clash of civilisations prophesied the emergence of a conflict between the East and West and that has been the exact current reality of global politics whereby Eastern countries are targeted for external attacks and aggression, either directly or by identifying them as terrorist havens. In the last theory, Qutb (2000) revealed that the neglect of Islamic teachings in the Muslim world has led to the emergence of a *jahili* system that is worse than the former *jahiliyyah* experience. This has become the genesis of the decline in relevance of the Muslim *ummah* and unless and until they resort to the pure teachings of Islam, their enemy will continue to win, as witnessed in the attacks in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

Double Standard in the Identification of the War against Terrorism

Mamdani (2000, 2004) argued that the stigmatisation and double standard involved in the war against terrorism is the root cause of its failure. In the first place, while there are many terror groups in the US, in European countries, in Asia, and South America and from various religions, ethnicity, and race, Muslims were singly identified and classified as terrorists on the global level. According to Mamdani (2000), Muslims themselves are classified into “good Muslim” and “bad Muslim” and

Islam is categorised into “political Islam” and “fundamentalist Islam”. All these classifications are tantamount to the choice of the Western world in determining who is a friend of the US and her allies and who is her enemy among the Muslims. A Muslim who relinquishes his/her culture and religious teachings is a friend and a “good Muslim” and vice versa. Studies reveal the existence of powerful terrorist groups creating lethal havoc in the US and other parts of the world and from other religions, apart from Islam, but were neglected and not covered by the media and propagandists of the war against terrorism.

The Pirates, Vikings and Teutonic Knights were ancient terror groups that were active for thousands of years and were not identified with any particular religion; they operated before the resurgence of Islam in the Arabian Peninsula (Underwood, 2009, p. 17). The Italian Red Brigades operated between 1964 and 1986 and committed harmful acts of terror in the country (Smith, 2009, p. 28). The Irish Republican Army has been in existence for more than 60 years and has been attacking government buildings, innocent people, and other public places for many decades in an attempt for political liberation (Hoyt, 2009, p. 59). Valla and Comcowich (2009, p. 177) argued that domestic terrorism in the US may be forgotten or overlooked by the media but it is not gone. They further argued that terrorism in the US soil is as strong as Al Qaeda and their havoc can match that of Al Qaeda because they are using sophisticated methods of attacks, including chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction and targeting public buildings and other places of worship. Maggio (2009, p. 193) further analysed that the Armed Street Gangs in the US are terrorist groups that are still operating with a potential threat equal to that of external terrorism. Another terrorist group in operation in America is the Virginia Paintball Jihad Cell synonymous with the above groups (Emerson, 2009:205). Another terror group in the US is a Christian movement called the American Christian Apocalypticism, which attacks abortion clinics, places of worship, and other public gathering places in the name of religious extremism (Demy, 2009, p. 229).

In a study conducted by *The Independent* newspaper that was released on 23rd June 2017, it was discovered that the majority of those who attacked the US are not Muslims. The study concluded that most of the designated terrorist attacks are right-wing extremists, not Muslims. A joint report by The Nation Institute’s Investigative Fund, a non-profit

media centre, and the Centre for Investigative Reporting examined about 201 designated terrorism incidents in the US from 2008 to 2016. The results revealed that the so-called right-wing extremists attacked twice more than what was linked to Islamist domestic terrorism. The report identified only 63 incidents that were linked to Islamic terrorism, incidences such as the San Bernardino shootings and Boston Marathon, among others. At the same time, right-wing extremists, often referred to as white supremacists, were responsible for 115 attacks within the same period. The report concluded that Donald Trump's obsession with radical Islamic terrorism is irrational (Sampathkumar, 2017).

The above selected cited examples prove that terrorism has been given stigma, certain groups are identified and isolated as terrorists, while other groups with obvious terror motives are deliberately ignored for political reasons and the double standard nature of the NWO. The theories applied in this study are justified. The Realism theory of international relations emphasises on the use of power and balance of terror to secure national interest and the champions of the war against terrorism can go to any extent to advance their national interest at the expenses of other weaker countries. This gave impetus for the conspiratorial theory of using or sponsoring violence and terror abroad, such as in Afghanistan, to justify the attacks later after the interest is exhausted. In the case of the clash of civilisations between the East and West, the reaction of the perceived Muslim terrorists has been justified from the perspective of the terror inflicted on the East by the West during colonial domination, oppression, subjugation, and exploitation. If the atrocities of the colonial exploiters have not been identified as terrorism, then the identity of the terrorists is enshrouded in double standard and hypocrisy. Lastly, based on Sayyid Qutb's (2000) the Doctrine of Jahiliya, the Muslims found themselves in the dilemma of stigmatisation and terrorism due to abandoning the pure teachings and principles of Islam, which previously succeeded in upholding the image and dignity of Muslims globally during the Golden Age of Islam. Abandoning the Islamic values relegated Muslim societies into the current malaise of identity, political relevance, economic prosperity, and even peace and security in their respective countries.

Media and Global Conspiracy in the War against Terrorism

Media propaganda is a contributory factor in the war against terrorism by the US and her allies. According to Chossudovsky (2005), “the propaganda apparatus feeds disinformation into the news chain deliberately.” Their main objective is to fabricate an enemy by making terror warnings appear genuine and presenting terror groups as “enemies of America.” The campaign for the war against terrorism then becomes a media consensus. Despite being independent of the military intelligence apparatus, the corporate media becomes an instrument of manipulation in the global totalitarian system (Chossudovsky, 2005).

The champions of the war against terrorism are the direct or indirect owners of the corporate media and big media houses across the globe. Their strategy of suppressing the presentation of the truth and realities of the war against terrorism or even the term “terrorism” itself, is to terminate at will any journalist who reported them or to deter journalists from presenting the truth. Another method is to sanction and block media outlets from showing or presenting facts as they are. This was how the US media was blocked from a genuine reporting of the 9/11 attacks (Baldwin, 2018).

The above view was earlier critically espoused by Schechter (2003) when he opined that a merger occurred between the Western media and the Pentagon, upon which the media was trained for war propaganda. In his view, the military-media merger succeeded in producing the war against terrorism on a global scale and it prepared the audience to accept what was presented. On the eve of the US war against Iraq, the United Nations and its inspectors were discredited by a massive onslaught and a campaign of calumny from the media in the US. From March 2003 to 24th March 2003, 15 bungled stories were presented by the media, suggesting that Iraq was defeated and Saddam was killed. A diversionary story was also created about journalists being the targets of the enemy. This created public sympathy and mass gullibility in accepting news from the media as a sacred truth. The looting of Baghdad was deliberately ignored by the media and, instead, journalists being murdered became the central story. Indeed, the television coverage of the Iraq War was a deception and a media conspiracy that presented half-truths and half-lies to the viewers (Schechter, 2003).

The terror conspiracy is promoted and advanced on a global scale through the terror deception by the Western/US media, which decides who is a terror and who is not based on the ideology of the champions of the war against terrorism (Marrs, 2012). Mamdani (2005) supported the above view that political Islam was projected in the West under the guise of the war against terrorism to select “our guys and the despise”. The media is found to be supporting the war against terrorism through the well-chosen eloquent language of persuasion. For instance, on the eve of the Iraq War, MSNBC, NBC and Fox News had pre-prepared answers that were tagged as “Operation Iraqi Freedom” (Goodman & Goodman, 2004). Similarly, during the Iraq War, the BBC, a British media outlet, was found to have covered stories of Iraqi looting instead of projecting the plights of the journalists’ abuse (Schechter, 2003). Keith (1997) opined that the Western media is the mind-controlled assassin of our time. The power of misinformation is an old poison in a new bottle, which continues unabated through media lies, myths, and deceptions (Foxman, 2007). The Iraq War is a specific case of how the media failed US citizens and the world at large due to the special watchdogs for the suppression of dissent, concentration on bias, and introduction of sceptic test to prevent a balanced coverage (Dadge, 2006). In the Nigerian experience of terrorism, the media, especially in the southern part of the country, and international media outlets that are covering the terrorist events emphasise on describing the attacks as being perpetrated by Islamic terrorists. This is even when many non-Muslims and Southerners were caught or apprehended several times in the process of instilling terror in mosques, churches, and other places, as observed by Isaiah (2011).

Conclusion

This study concludes that terrorism as a term is not a new concept or phenomenon in the world but has become more pronounced since the 9/11 terror attacks. Muslims are stigmatised as terrorists and are identified with terrorism in the modern era even though the establishment of the foundation for modern terrorism during the Cold War was spearheaded by the US and her allies. Domestic terrorism and other atrocities committed by those who claim to have declared war against terrorism is worse than actual terrorism itself. The most

aggravating aspect is the hypocrisy, double standard, and deception that heralded the war against terrorism, which made the war unsuccessful and even provoked hostilities by many sections in the world. In order to successfully eradicate all forms of terrorism, or at least minimise them, the following measures are suggested:

1. A harmonious and sincere position should be taken on all armed groups across the world, irrespective of religious, national, racial, and linguistic affiliation;
2. World powers must desist from their unnecessary external aggression and the sovereignty of weaker states must be respected;
3. Muslims must resort to the pure teachings of Islam and Islamic principles in their daily dealings to extricate themselves from the social malaise of jahili life; and
4. A neutral body or international agency should be established to independently carry out war against terrorism and keep check of the hegemonic powers to avoid war and ensure collective global peace and security.

References

- AlKhateeb, S. (2014). *Lost Islamic History: Reclaiming Muslim Civilisation from the Past*. United Kingdom: C. Hurst & Publishers Co. Ltd.
- Allen, G. (1971). *None Dare Call it Conspiracy*. United States: Congressman.
- Al Hageel, S.A. (2002). *The Virtual Position of Islam on Extremism and Terrorism*. Riyadh: King Fahad National Library Cataloguing Publication Data.
- Arena, M.P. & Arrigo, B.A. (2007). *The Terrorist Identity: Explaining the Terrorist Threat*. New York: New York University Press.
- Baldwin, T. (2018). *Ctl Alt Delete: How Politics and the Media Crashed Our Democracy*. London: Hurst & Company.
- Beard, M. (2018). *Civilisations: How Do We Look: The Eye of Faith*. London: Profile Books.
- Black, D. (2004) Terrorism and Social Control in Deflem, M. (Ed.) *Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: Criminological Perspective*. Netherlands: Elsevier.

- Chaliand, G. & Blin, A. (2007). "Introduction". In Chaliand, G. & Blin, A. (Eds.) *The History of Terrorism: From Antiquity to Al Qaeda*, pp. 1-11. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1989). *The Culture of Terrorism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). *Rogue States: The Rue of Force in World Affairs*. London: Pluto Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2004). "Wars of Terror". *New Political Science*. 25:1(1-17).
- Coppens, C. (2013). *The Lost Civilisation Enigma*. United States: New Page Books.
- Chossudovsky, M. (2005). *America's War on Terrorism*. Canada: Centre for Research on Globalisation.
- Dadge, D. (2006). *The War on Iraq and Why the Media Failed Us*. London: Praeger.
- Deflem, M. (2004). "Introduction: Towards a Criminological Sociology of Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism". In Deflem, M. (Ed.) *Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: Criminological Perspective*. Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Demy, T. (2009). "Arming for Armageddon: Myths and Motivation of Violence of American Christian Apocalypticism". In Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp. 229-239. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Donnelly, J. (2005). "Realism". In Burchill, S. Linklater, A. Devetak, R. Donnelly, J. Paterson, Reus-Smith, C. & True, J. (2001) *Theories of International Relations*. New York: Macmillan Palgrave.
- Dougherty, J.E. & Pfaltzgraff, R.L. (1971). *Contending Theories of International Relations*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Dubay, E. (2006). *The Atlantean Conspiracy*. <http://www.atlanteanconspiracy.com/>.
- Emerson, S. (2009). "Prosecuting Home-Grown Extremists: Case Study of the Virginia Paintball Jihad Cell". In Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp. 219-228. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Flynt, L. (2004). *Sex, Lies and Politics: The Naked Truth About Bush, Democracy and The War on Terror*. London: Bookmarque.
- Foxman, A.H. (2007). *The Deadliest Lies: The Israel Lobby and The Myth of Jewish Control*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Friedman, T.L. (2000). *Understanding Globalisation: The Lexus and the Olive Branch*. New York: First Anchor Books.

- Goodman, A. & Goodman, D. (2004). *The Exception to the Rulers: Exposing America's War Profiteers, the Media that Love them and the Crackdown on Our Rights*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Heywood, A. (2011). *Global Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoyt, T.D. (2009). "Adapting to a Changing Environment: The Irish Republican Army as An Armed Group". In Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp. 205-218. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- https://www.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/51172_ch_1.pdf
- [https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/war_in_Afghanistan_\(2001-present\)](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/war_in_Afghanistan_(2001-present))
- Hughes, B. (2002). *The Secret Terrorists*. Florida: Truth Triumph.
- Huntington, S.P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- ipfs.io/ipfs/QmXoyvizjW3WknFiJnKLwHCnL72vedxjQkDDP1mXWo6uco/wiki/casualties_of_the_Syrian_civil_war.html
- Isaiah, S.N. (2011). "Is There More Than Meet the Eyes" in Leadership Newspapers October 2011 Issue at <http://www.leadership.news.org>.
- Joseph, F. (2012). "Archeological Scandals". In Pye, M. & Dalley, K. (Eds.) *Lost Civilisation and Secrets of the Past*, pp. 1-42. Canada: New Page Books.
- Kissinger, H. (2015). *New World Order*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kressel, N.J. (1996). *Mass Hate: The Global Rise of Genocide and Terrorism*. New York: Springer.
- Maggio, E.J. (2009). The Threats of Armed Street Gangs in America in Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp. 193-204. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Mamdani, M. (2000). *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, Cold War and the Root of Terror*. Washington: Oxford.
- Mamdani, M. (2004). *Contemporary Political Terror: Its Origins in the Late Cold War*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Zaria.
- Marrs, J. (2012). *The Terror Conspiracy Deception, 9/11 and the Loss of Liberty*. New York: Harper Collins e-book.
- Merari, A. (2007). "Terrorism as a Strategy of Insurgency". In Chaliand, G. & Blin, A. (Eds.) *The History of Terrorism: From Antiquity to Al Qaeda*, p. 12-50. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Naik, Z. (2006). *Islam and Terrorism*. New Delhi: International Institute for Islamic Thought.

- Nathanson, S. (2010). *Terrorism and the Ethics of War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nefeily, S.A. (2009). *It is 'Dialogue' Not 'Clash' that We Need: A Study of the Topic from an Islamic Point of View*. Cairo: Darul Nashiri Al Jami'ah.
- North, G. (1986). *Conspiracy, A Biblical View*. Washington: Dominion Press.
- Norwitz, J.H. (2009). "Introduction". In Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp. 1-17. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Qutb, S. (1990). *Milestones*. Cairo: Pyramid Publishers.
- Read, R. & Alexander, S. (2019). *This Civilisation is Finished: Conversations on the End of Empire, and What Lies Beyond*. Melbourne: Simplicity Institute.
- Robinson, A. (2002). *Bin Laden: Behind the Mask of the Terrorists*. New York: Arcade Publishing.
- Sampathkumar, M. (2017). Majority of Terrorists Who Have Attacked America are not Muslims, New Study Finds. *Independent Newspaper*. Friday 23 June 2017 21:46.
- Saran, S. (2018). "Introduction". In Saran, S. (Ed.) *Cultural and Civilisational Links Between India and Southeast Asia*, pp. 1-16. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schechter, D. (2003). *Embedded Weapons of Mass Deception: How the Media Failed to Cover the War on Iraq*. Ontario: COLDDTYPE.NET.
- Simon, R. (1994). *What is Globalisation?* Kellogg Institute: The Helen Kellogg Institute For International Studies.
- Smith, P.J. (2009). "The Italian Red Brigade". In Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp. 28-41. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Smith, P. (2012). Violence and Terrorism: The Two Constants. *Journal of International Relations Research*. 1, p. 6.
- Sule, B. (2005). African States and Globalisation: The Socioeconomic Status of Africa In this New World Order. Degree Thesis submitted to the Department of Political Science, University of Maiduguri (Unpublished).
- Tobias, G.A. & Foxman, A.H. (2003). *Unravelling Anti-Semitic 9/11 Conspiracy Theories*. New York: Growitz Institute.
- Underwood, P.T. (2009). "Pirates, Vikings and Teutonic Knights". In Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp.17-27. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.

- Valla, E.J. & Comcowich, G. (2009). "Domestic Terrorism: Forgotten but not Gone". In Norwitz, J.H. (Ed.) *Pirates, Terrorists and Warlords: The History, Influence, and Future of Armed Groups Around the World*, pp. 177-192. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Vittori, J. (2011). *Terrorists Financing and Resourcing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Waltz, K.N. (2001). Structural Realism After the Cold War. *International Security*. 25(1), 5-41.
- Webel, C.P. & Arnaldi, J.A. (2012). The Global War on Terrorism: How Ethical and Effective. *Journal of International Relations Research*. 1, p.8-18.
- Well, H.G. (1940). *The New World Order*. New York: Freedom Press.
- Whittaker, D.J. (2004). *Terrorists and Terrorism in the Contemporary World*. London: Routledge.
- www.globalresearch.ca/us-has-killed-more-than-20-million-people-in-37-victim-nations-since-world-war-ii/5492051