

***Civilization Dialogue:
Dialogue with Islamic World after September 11th***

Conference Proceedings

*September 20th, 2002
Prepared by The Sasakawa Peace Foundation*

Venue: United Nations University

Participants

Kenichi Matsumoto:

Professor, International School of Economics and Business Administration,
Reitaku University, Chiba, Japan

Azyumardi Azra, Ph.D.:

Rector, State Institute for Islamic Studies, Jakarta, Indonesia

Mehmet Bayrakdar, Ph.D.:

Dean, the Department of Islamic Philosophy, Faculty of Religion,
Ankara University, Turkey

Masayuki Tadokoro, Ph.D.:

Professor of International Relations, Faculty of Law, Keio University,
Tokyo, Japan

John Edwin Mroz:

Founder and President, EastWest Institute, New York, USA

Ahmet Akyurek, Ph.D.:

Chairman, Annotation Development Foundation in Ankara, Turkey

Akihiko Tanaka, Ph.D.:

Director, Professor of International politics, Institute of Oriental Culture,
The University of Tokyo, Japan

Program

- 10:00 Opening Remarks
Mr. Setsuya Tabuchi, Chairman, The Sasakawa Peace Foundation
- 10:05 Session 1
“Dialogue with Islamic World after September 11th”
Chairman:
Professor Kenichi Matsumoto
Keynote Speakers:
Professor Dr. Azyumardi Azra
Professor Dr. Mehmet Bayrakdar
Professor Dr. Masayuki Tadokoro
- 11:10 Coffee Break
- 11:25 Discussion
- 12:30 Lunch
- 14:00 Session 2
“Islamic World and the Realignment of World Order after September 11th”
Chairman:
Professor Dr. Masayuki Tadokoro
Keynote Speakers:
Mr. John Edwin Mroz
Professor Dr. Ayumardi Azra
Professor Kenichi Matsumoto
Professor Dr. Mehmet Bayraktar
Dr. Ahmet Akyurek
Professor Dr. Akihiko Tanaka
- 15:30 Coffee Break
- 15:45 Free Discussion, Questions and Answers
- 16:55 Closing Remark
Mr. Akira Iriyama, President, The Sasakawa Peace Foundation
- 17:00 Closing of the Seminar

Executive Summary

One year has passed since the World Trade Center tragedy on September 11th. All of us are going through totally different experiences since that day. US troops are now deploying for mopping-up operations against terrorists in Afghanistan and using air bases in the former Soviet Republics of Central Asia. International cooperation for anti-terrorism is building up among many countries under US leadership. The socio-political situation after September 11th is rapidly changing in the Islamic world.

While some of Europeans and Americans are feeling dysphonia as well as animosity toward Islam and Muslims, many Muslims also strongly resent the policies of the US government toward the Islamic world after September 11th and its support for Israel in the conflict between Israel and Palestine. The confrontation between Euro-Americans and Muslims has gotten worse since September 11th, which Professor Samuel P. Huntington predicted in his book *The Civilization and the Remaking of World Order*. Under the circumstances it is undoubtedly difficult for Muslims and Non-Muslims mutually to understand each other's civilizations and cultures and to seek coexistence and cooperation.

In seeking to change this situation, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation has decided to increase its efforts in promoting an understanding of the Islamic world and the realignment of the world order after September 11th. This seminar on "Dialogue with Islamic World after September 11th" was organized on September 20th, 2002 in Tokyo. It focused on issues of regional and international relations, socio-economic life and geopolitics in the Islamic world and sought to facilitate an exchange of views among American, Turkish, Indonesian and Japanese specialists on the latest issues in the Islamic world after September 11th.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Setsuya Tabuchi, Chairman of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation:

Last year's attacks on September 11th left many victims behind as well as bereaved families and became a tragedy never to be forgotten. Even today there are many sad memories throughout the world. One year has passed since the terrorist attack and the state of global affairs has undergone dramatic changes.

Countries are cooperating with each other to combat terrorism on a global basis. During the Cold War we could not have imagined this cooperation occurring. The incidents of September 11th shed light on the issue of coexistence of different people with different beliefs, values systems and cultures. There has never been a time without such conflict but with globalization the world has become one international community. However, we have not been able to resolve the conflict between different cultures and civilizations.

Differing cultures, civilizations and religious beliefs must be respected and given due consideration. I believe that is the principle of multiculturalism and that has taken root in Europe and the West. However, I believe this kind of understanding exists only within the framework of nation states. We ourselves must pursue a multiculturalism that can be applied globally amongst people of differing cultures and civilizations in a peaceful manner, for that dialogue amongst civilizations is most important and the Sasakawa Peace Foundation is honored to be able to provide for that forum.

The new global order since the attack on September 11th and to understand further the evolving situation and to understand international perspectives on Islamic civilization and global civilization will be pursued through that seminar and I believe we can contribute to the dialogue.

Session 1
Dialogue with Islamic Civilization after
September 11th

Chairman:

Professor Kenichi Matsumoto

Keynote Speakers:

Professor Dr. Azyumardi Azra

Professor Dr. Mehmet Bayrakdar

Professor Dr. Masayuki Tadokoro

Professor Matsumoto: I specialize in the history of Asian culture and thought in Japan. These fields don't, in a general sense have much to do with Islam. Having said that, in 1979 the Islamic Revolution occurred in Iran. Modern history of Japan and nationalism, these had been understood in my mind as contradictory ideas. But, in that year I heard the news of the occurrence of the Islamic revolution. Modernization of the world and Japan, or modernism and nationalism and fundamentalism these three axes gave me a better perspective to understand the evolving issue. I published a book entitled *Fundamentalism*. This book doesn't



annotate Islam or the Islamic Revolution but instead I took these three concepts to understand modernization. The Reverend Khomeini praised Japan because, he said, despite modernization, the Emperor system and other age-old customs had been kept in Japan. Also, it was taken a very contradictory but an interesting perspective by President Bani-sad of Iran. They drew the same conclusion as Reverend Khomeini in praising Japan. The Emperor system has been kept in Japan while modernization has been pursued. So the old things have been kept while modernization has taken place.

Fundamentalism of Islam in a way is a common factor or expression of all civilizations at one time or another. At that time I was in the Sahara Desert. And in the midst of the desert I was reading a novel by Ghasan Ghalafani that can be translated as 'The Men of Sun'. A colleague asked me what I was reading and I said it was a novel by a Palestinian writer. Apparently she was cross. "Ghasan Ghalafani is a Palestinian writer but aren't you supporting Israel?" She became very argumentative. So that signifies the sensitivity that is attached to the Palestinian-Israeli issue. Palestinian issues, Arab issues, Israel issues, nationalism, democratization of the Arabic world, these issues have always been in my mind.

Last year we saw the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11th. The question at the time was whether the attack was by terrorists and Islamic fundamentalists. So Israel and the World Trade Center were contrasted in a sharp manner.

President Bush of the United States blamed Iraq, Iran and North Korea as the axis of evil but I believe this is a very facile argument. The civilizational dialogue was made started first by President Khatami at the United Nations. Of course, fundamentalism was taken up in his country 20 years ago, but something what transcends the concept is now being grappled with by the Iranians.

Of course all civilizations in the world are unique. Islamic civilization's role in the world will continue to be a very interesting subject. That is the reason why I was very happy when the offer came to me to chair this program.

Let me explain how we will proceed. In the first session, we have two speakers in the morning, Dr. Azra from Indonesia and Professor Bayrakdar from Turkey. Professor Tadokoro of Keio University will also join the session as a discussant.

Professor Azra: First I would like to thank the Sasakawa Peace Foundation for inviting me to speak with this very distinguished audience. It is an honor to be here.

The year 2001 had been confirmed and approved by the world as the 'Year of Dialogue among Civilizations'. The approval indicated humanity's pressing need for dialogue and mutual understanding after a century of war, turmoil, usurpation,

discrimination and terror. The approval, furthermore, reflected a hope for a brighter, more peaceful and promising future for mankind and humanity.

Ironically, and sadly, it was in that very year the world witnessed the rapid increase of radicalism and terror among nations. There were continued killings in the Middle East between the Israelis and Palestinians. Then, the catastrophe took place on September 11th, 2001 when a number of terrorists using commercial airplanes attacked the World Trade Center and Pentagon buildings respectively in New York and Washington. The tragedy has not only left some 4,000 innocent people dead, but it has also put the dialogue among civilizations in jeopardy. The terrible event seemed to justify the infamous theory of the 'clash of civilizations' that had been in public discourse since 1996.

<Civilization and September 11th>

In the wake of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center, New York, and the Pentagon headquarters in Washington DC, on September 11th, 2001, and the US subsequent military operations in Afghanistan which were successful in ousting the Taliban, the world has witnessed yet another tragedy with even far greater consequences. In its haste to find the terrorists who were responsible for the attacks, the US immediately pointed its fingers to Osama bin Laden, Al Qaeda and the Taliban. The US together with its allies launched worldwide war against terrorism and many radical Muslim groups in various countries have been targeted because they are allegedly linked with Al Qaeda. In fact President Bush has divided the world into two: either with us or with them.

At the same time, goaded by the press, the Western public flew into fits of mass hysteria. All over the Western world, mosques and Muslim community centers were attacked, and Muslims were singled out for acts of revenge by self-appointed vigilantes as well as by the police and other governmental agencies. Both governments and Muslim leaders in the Islamic world have made it clear that terrorism and terrorist attacks are against Islamic teachings. Events in the aftermath of the September 11th tragedy, however, had also stimulated Muslims in various countries to conduct mass rallies and demonstrations against the US and its allies; but they failed to halt America's heavy-handed approach to Afghanistan. As a result, a new episode of Islam's harsh encounter with the West has been taking place.

Even though US President George W. Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair, have attempted to clear the air by visiting mosques and Islamic centers and having meetings with Muslim leaders that their military operations in Afghanistan was not against Islam or Muslims as a whole, there are still strong impressions among many Muslims that the US and the West continues to show its hostility against Islam and Muslims.

Worse still, in the world of the international media, dominated by Western media, sensationalized press reports continue to reiterate the idea that the Muslim world is in a state of perpetual chaos and corruption, unable to govern itself except through the use of force or via Western supervision and aid. The fact that the demonization of Islam and Muslims is becoming more pronounced in the Western world now is hardly surprising, considering the problematic historical relations between the Western world and the world of Islam from the past till today.

Now, one year after the September 11th tragedy, Afghanistan has not been able to recover; the government in Kabul is able only to exert its authority in a minimal way, while warlords hold sway in much areas of the country. And, one year

after the tragedy, the US supported by the British will launch full-scale military operations against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. While it is still fresh in the Muslim memory of the US administration policies in Afghanistan, now President Bush seems to resort to military operations against Iraq rather than to peace.

<Islam and the West: Conflict and Accommodation>

There is little doubt that Western attitudes and perceptions of Islam and the Muslim world have not changed very much if it is not getting worse after September 11th, 2001 since Islam first became known to the Western world, or more precisely the Europeans, and the establishment of the first contacts between them and the Muslims as early as the seventh century. In the first hundred years of Islam, the extent of the physical contact reached the maximum level. Byzantium and Spain confronted the Muslims across battlefields in Eastern and Western Europe. The contact was painful for Europe for much territory was lost to Muslim forces. The 'Crusade' was the European answer to the spread of Islam.

Beginning in the early 11th century, the earliest crusaders under the Frankist knights made attempts to arrest the development of 'Mohammedanism'. The Crusade, as the word implies, was a struggle to save Christian Europe by warding off 'barbaric' Muslims. The series of bloody encounters, which took place in the numerous Crusades, which followed the first one constituted a major part of European history. Even though the Europeans had reconquered the Iberian Peninsula from the Muslims in 1492, they faced a new strong force of Muslims, that is, the Ottomans who had made their way into Southeast Europe.

Despite these harsh encounters and contacts, and apart from the fact that the Muslim allowed the European Christians to remain in the conquered territory, European understanding of Islam was minimal. In fact the Europeans launched continued propaganda to tarnish the image of Islam; this religion was held in contempt, it was condemned as false, and the Prophet Muhammad depicted as 'anti-Christ'. This attitude went on for centuries. It is only since the second half of the 20th century that this perception of Islam and the Prophet Muhammad had changed in a more accurate way. Other than these, misperception and distortion of the image of Islam and the Muslims remain strong among the Western public.

Throughout the history of relationship with Islam and the Muslims, although generally understanding and appreciation was negative, there were a number of Christian notables who tried to learn about Islam and to change the attitude of the Christians. Among them was Peter the Venerable, the Abbot of Cluny who initiated the first Latin translation of the Qur'an, Muslim legends, history and an explanation of Islamic teachings. During the Renaissance, a number of prominent Europeans also tried to acquire a better understanding of Islam.

After the Turkish defeat of Byzantium, John of Segovia pointed to the need to cope with Islam and the Muslims in other ways besides wars and conversion. He initiated a new translation of the Qur'an working together with Muslim jurists. He also proposed an international conference to exchange views between Muslims and Christians. Also during the Renaissance, Arabic and Islamic studies were initiated in many institutions, which led to a more realistic and accurate view of Islam and the Muslims; this is the origin of 'Orientalism'.

And, since the late 1970s, Orientalism has been severely criticized for remaining to have certain biases and distorted images of Islam and Muslims. As a result a new approach to Islamic and Muslim studies in order to have a more accurate

image of Islam are introduced, and the term 'Orientalism' and 'Orientalists', have tended to become a 'dirty' word; the term 'Islamic studies' and 'Islamicists' are adopted instead.

In addition to that, it is now widely recognized that various aspects of Islamic civilization had been contributed greatly to the rise of Europe and the West as a whole. The Muslims during the heyday of Islamic civilization not only preserved the Greek learning, but also made a considerable original contribution to the knowledge of nature with their researches and experiments. Various kinds of knowledge and sciences that had been developed by Muslim scientists were later transmitted to Europe.

The Muslims, therefore, with their intellectual supremacy in scientific discovery, and in physical and natural sciences prepared the ground for the European Renaissance. It is now increasingly recognized that the Western civilization owed its origins not only to the Greek, but also to the Judeo-Christian-Muslim traditions.

In the meantime the predicament of Islamic civilization began. As the great Muslim scholar, Ibn Khaldun, argued that civilizations continue to live and flourish as long as they possess the capacity to respond to ever-changing needs of humankind, otherwise they are doomed to decline. As such, civilization, as human affairs, is subject to birth, development, and demise. With the decline of Islamic civilization, Muslims have not made any significant headway. While Europe continued to progress in science and technology, the Muslim world fell prey into European colonialism and imperialism. By late 19th century, virtually the whole of Islamdom was under European domination. The liberation of the Muslim world from Western colonialism came about only after the World War II.

Now, half a century has elapsed since a great number of Muslim nations gained their independence, but most of them—if not all—are heavily dependent on Western political and economic support. There is no single Muslim country that can be classified as developed. The world today associates Islam with backwardness instead. Poverty, ignorance, and instability have become such a common feature in the Muslim nations that it is assumed this is a natural consequence of subscribing to the teachings of Islam. The Muslims themselves have done very little to help themselves; they have weakened themselves more and more by their constant feuding among themselves.

Therefore, it is the Muslims in general to be blamed mostly for their predicament. While the Islamic civilizing influence is strong among them, it is not strong enough as to turn them into an embodiment of an Islamic way of life. As such the kind of Islam as subscribed and understood by them is not really a definitive factor in their relations with others. The emphasis on piety together with exhortations and rhetoric explaining the greatness and virtues of Islam have not produced a climate for the cultivation of Islamic life necessary for the transformation of contemporary Islamic civilization.

At the same time, the number of Muslims who appear uncivilized and savage, not only by the standards of Islam but also according to the universal norms, are growing everywhere in the Muslim world. Self-indulgence, greed, and intolerance, which often lead to conflicts within and without Muslim societies, have tended to characterize Muslims societies everywhere. The failure of many Muslims to live up to the expectations of Islam has resulted in the diminution of the role of Islam as a civilizing force in society.

<The Future of Dialogue>

It is clear from above that apart from conflict and hostility between Islam and the West there has been a lot of accommodation: there is a great deal of dialogue between the two civilizations. Therefore, one should not believe in the so-called infamous theory of the ‘clash of civilizations’ as proposed by Samuel Huntington.

Dialogues are not a simple choice, but a necessity for all civilizations and cultures of the world. A profound, thoughtful, fair and frank dialogue between Western, Eastern, and Islamic civilizations undoubtedly will be very helpful and beneficial in finding the best solutions to some of the grave problems that beset the world today. The crisis of peaceful co-existence among nations, the crisis in the relationship among nations, the crisis in the relationship of man and nature, the ethical crisis that has developed in scientific research, and many more problems and crises of this nature should be among the items on the agenda of Islam, the West and East dialogues.

Dialogue is such a very desirable thing today, because it is based on freedom and freewill. Dialogue among civilizations, therefore, means equality between peoples and nations. In dialogue, no idea should be imposed on the other side: in dialogues, one should respect the independent identity, cultural identity and independent ideology of the other side. Dialogue among civilizations, then, requires listening to and hearing from other civilizations and cultures: and the importance of listening to others is by no means less than talking to others. Only in such a case, can dialogues be preliminary steps leading to peace, security, and justice.

It is important to point out, however, that the success of dialogue is also very much dependent upon various factors working at international level. For instance, in the interdependent world of today where the security of different regions is indivisible, striving towards the promotion of mutual trust and the establishment of peace are considered a universal responsibility. Cultivation of confidence among peoples of different civilizations and cultures is the first and most appropriate strategic approach to ensuring security. Therefore, creating the necessary grounds for establishing mutual trust and alleviating or reducing security concerns should be placed at the top of international relations.

The relations between the Muslim world and others is also fraught with mistrust, misunderstanding, and misconceived perceptions, part of which is rooted in history and another part of which emanates from hegemonic relationships, or a consequence of the fanning of chronic misunderstandings by hegemons. In this connection, through providing the necessary grounds for dialogue among civilizations and cultures, the way should be opened towards a fundamental understanding, which lies at the very foundation of genuine peace, which in turn is based on the realization of the rights of all nations.

Therefore, it is obvious that for peace to be lasting it should be just, fair and honorable. History shows that no peace has ever embraced success without justice and consideration for the aspirations of the people concerned. As the crisis in the Middle East has made fully clear, genuine peace can only be established through the realization of all the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. The hegemonic, racist, aggressive, and violent nature of the Israeli Zionist regime—supported by the US and many Western countries—amply manifested in the systematic and gross violation of international law, pursuit of state terrorism, seriously threatens peace and security.

In conclusion, dialogue among civilizations and cultures need peace to be realized, and once it realized, it will help to sustain peace. It would not possible to put an end to the bloody and terrifying events, such as September 11th, without basic changes in the present state of international relations, replacing it with a new paradigm such as dialogue among civilizations and cultures.

Professor Bayrakdar:

<Islam as a Religion and World-View of Peace and Dialogue>



Under such a title, I would like to speak on theme that I was asked for this conference, namely “Dialogue with Islamic Civilization after September 11th, 2001”.

Before coming to the subject, let me to express at the outset my appreciation and thanks to the Sasakawa Peace Foundation for giving me the opportunity to share my views with you, and also I would like to take this opportunity as an occasion to participate, by offering once more my deep sorrow and comfort to the families of victims, in the commemoration of this one year anniversary of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

I am going to assume three conditions for this speech.

The first one is that the origins and causes of terrorism cannot be explained through religious motives and that like other living religions, Islam as a religion and worldview has nothing to do with violence.

The second one is just what I assume to be recognition of the fact that the terrorism of today is the bitter fruit of the unjust, exclusive and oppressive international politics and economic policy that the Western super powers have been following for almost half a century.

The third assumption has to do with the goals and means for combating with terrorism. The inter-religious dialogue, which has been in existence for almost twenty-five years has not enough positive effect on the ongoing unjust politics and economics, therefore it must be reinforced by some kind of inter-political and economical dialogue or forum which will bring together not only business people and politicians but also religious leaders.

As we know all, in recent years it has become customary for the Western media to label any violence or terror as ‘Islamic terrorism’ regardless whether its perpetrators are Muslim or not. This is but prejudice and Islamophobia in its worst aspect. In fact terrorism as a global menace has no religion, no race, no country. None of the living religions, including Islam, preaches and teaches terrorism. However there are in Islam, as in other religions, those who do evil acts; but because of their evil, one cannot call their religion as terrorism. While commenting upon America’s bombardment of Afghanistan, Tony Blair, was well pointed out this in his saying, “This is not a war with Islam. It angers me, as it angers the vast majority of Muslim, to hear bin Laden and his associates described as Islamic terrorists. They are terrorists pure and simple. Islam is a peaceful and tolerant religion.”

The word Islam itself means peace, and the other most important key terms of Islam also mean peace, protection and security. The word Muslim is he who practices peace by believing in *as-Salam*, one of the attributes of God, the Being Who is the source of peace and concord and who assures peaceful existence to all beings. The

word *Mu'min* is he who has security in believing in *al-Mu'min*, which is also an attribute of God, the Being Who Shelters and protects all and bestows security in every sphere of life on all beings.

The only reason for calling Islam as terrorism has to do the misunderstanding of the concept of *jihad*, joined by the idea that, as is said in Huntington's advertised clash of civilization, Islam is the real competitor and challenger of the West. All this is based on the political confrontations, conflicts and hostilities of the past between Islam and the West. But in fact from cultural, religious and civilizational points of view, Islam and the West have a lot in common with each other. Islam as a religion is the latest of the Abrahamic religions to which Christianity also belongs. Islamic and the Western civilizations have the same historical roots in terms of philosophy and science, namely Greek and Hellenistic culture. During the whole Middle Ages and early modern times. Islamic culture has been a very important influence upon the formation of the Western culture and science. Therefore Islam is to some extent an essential part of the West, and vice versa. This is, I think, a good reason to highlight and revive this amicable common face of Islam and the West, instead of speaking on the future clash of the both. Islam is not a religion of hate and revenge, neither in its dogma, nor in its moral teaching. Because of the concept of *jihad*, which is usually rendered into English as holy war or just war, Islam is often viewed as an aggressive faith. The only war that is permitted in Islam is war as self-defense and protection against aggression and oppressions; and it should be between armies and engaged in nobly on the battlefield. And the *jihad* can only be declared by a legitimate, recognized and religious authority. Even in a state of just war, the Prophet Muhammad expressly forbade killing non-combatants, women, children, religious men and old people.

These are some of the Qur'anic verses that preach the Muslim to stand for peace and justice: "Peace is better..."¹; "... If anyone slew a person unless it be for murder or for spreading mischief in the land it would be as if he slew the whole people; and if any one saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of the whole people."² "If the enemies incline to peace, incline you also to it, and the truth is in God..."³

If Islam is peaceful and democratic in its spirit, tolerant of other faiths, and egalitarian, and if it encourages the pursuit of religious freedom, then why and how some Muslims become terrorists? In fact, when we look at how so-called Muslim terrorists justify their crimes, we will see that, although they misuse some Islamic concepts such as *jihad*, their motivations are not at all Islamic. The Godfather of terror, Osama bin Laden, for example, has said, "I am not against the American people, only their government."⁴

And "when 60 Jews are killed inside Palestine (in suicide bombings in 1966), all the world gathers within seven days to criticize this action, while the death of 600,000 Iraqi children (under UN sanctions)⁵ did not receive the same reaction. Killing those Iraqi⁶ children is a Crusade against Islam. We, as Muslims, do not like

¹ The Qur'an: 4/128.

² The Qur'an: 5/32

³ The Qur'an: 8/61.

⁴ Fisk (R.): Osama bin Laden: The godfather of terror? 15 September 2001, p.1.

⁵

⁶ *ibid*, p.3.

the Iraqi regime but we think that the Iraqi people and their children are our brothers and we care about their future.”⁷

But the Americans and Europeans knowingly or unknowingly understand differently what the terrorists mean, as Robert Fisk writes: “And while Mr. Bush and perhaps Mr. Blair prepare their forces, they explain so meretriciously that this is a war for ‘democracy and liberty’, that is about men who are ‘attacking civilization’.” “America was targeted for attack”, Mr. Bush informed us on Friday, “because we are the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world.” But this is not why America was attacked. If this was an Arab-Muslim apocalypse, then it is intimately associated with events in the Middle East and with America’s stewardship of the area. Arabs, it might be added, would rather like some of that democracy and liberty and freedom that Mr. Bush has been telling them about. Instead, they get a president who wins 98 per cent in the elections (Washington’s friend, Mr. Mubarak) or a Palestinian police force, trained by the CIA, which tortures and sometimes kills its people in prison. The Syrian would also like a little of that democracy. So would the Saudis. But their effete princes are all friends of America in many cases, educated at US universities.

I will always remember how President Clinton announced that Saddam Hussein another of our grotesque inventions must be overthrown so that the people Iraq could choose their own leaders. But if that happened, it would be the first time in Middle Eastern history that Arabs have been permitted to do so. No, it is ‘our’ democracy and ‘our’ liberty and freedom that Mr. Bush and Mr. Blair are talking about, our Western sanctuary that is under attack, not the vast place of terror and injustice that the Middle East has become.

Let me illustrate what I mean. Nineteen years ago today, the greatest act of terrorism using Israel’s own definition of that very misused word in modern Middle Eastern history began. Does anyone remember the anniversary in the West? How many readers of this article will remember it? I will take a risk and say that no other British newspaper certainly no American newspaper will today recall the fact that on September 16th, 1982, Israel’s Phalangist militia allies started their three-day orgy of rape and knifing and murder in the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila that cost 1,800 lives. It followed an Israeli invasion of Lebanon designed to drive the PLO out of the country and given the green light by the then US Secretary of State, Alexander Haig which cost the lives of 17,500 Lebanese and Palestinians, almost all of them civilians. That’s probably three times the death toll in the World Trade Center. Yet I do not remember any vigils or memorial services or candle lighting in America or the West for the innocent dead of Lebanon: I don’t recall any stirring speeches about democracy or liberty. In fact, my memory is that the United States spent most of the bloody months of July and August in 1982 calling for ‘restraint’.⁸

No doubt, what happened in New York is a crime against all humanity, but I agree rather with Robert Fisk and others that its origins and causes are to be seen in the unjust international politics that the big powers have been following. Today’s terrorism that the humanity by and large complains about is the counter terrorism of the weak against the terrorism of the strong.

The truth must be here spoken: In the aftermath of the cold war, the fall of the Soviet Union and the discrediting of communism have created a ‘threat vacuum’ that has given rise to a search for new enemies. For some Americans the enemy is the

⁷ Fisk (R.): Bush Is Walking Into A Trap, 16 September 2001, pp.1-2.

⁸ The Qur’an: 7/189.

economic challenge the Japanese represents, for others it is Islam that is a rapidly growing minority in Europe and America; and as a matter of fact Islam is viewed as the only ideological alternative to the West that can cut across national boundaries. Although there is more unknown than known about the September 11th attacks in New York, we may say that this mass terrorism, which has destroyed not only the image of America but also that of Islam, is to cut off the religious and civilization dialogues between Islam and the West which has come into existence after the Second Vatican Council. And therefore, despite some Arab and Muslim terrorists as perpetrators were used in the September 11th terrorism, its real cause and agency is still unknown. What is for sure is that it has created an anti-Islamism in the West and an anti-Americanism in many parts of Islamic world.

On the other hand we do not ignore the fact that American's unjust international policy has prepared and is still preparing the ground for terrorism. The Talibans, Osama bin Laden and his associates were helped and organized in the beginning by America and the West to harass the Russians, the common enemy, who invested Afghanistan in December, 1979. And they also helped Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf War against Iran. America and its allies were at time happy to mobilize them to fight. But now America calls all these people as number one terrorists and enemies. America and its allies have declared a permanent war program against them, while saying that the target is neither Islam nor civilian Muslims. But Saddam Hussein is still living, thousands of children and innocent Iraqis died during the Gulf Wars: Osama bin Laden is still living, thousands of civilian lives were destroyed in Afghanistan as a result of the American bombings, and many of the Afghani people are on massive starvation. We see the same thing in the West's attitude towards the issues concerning the Palestine-Israel conflict. The culprits and terrorist are always Arabs, not Israelis: Israel is not to be blamed for what has been happening since 1966. Then, the fervent desire to protect civilians from harm and to have 'peace with honor' is to be questioned as to know whether it is reassuring words or facts. However America is now, I know, aware of its negative image abroad and will spend new efforts to reach out to Muslim and Arab audiences and to seek to answer 'fundamental questions' of how Americans relate to the Islamic world, as state Department Spokesman R. Boucher said at the August 27th, 2002 State Department briefing in Washington.

It is now time to rethink the new world order or globalization policy, proposed by President Bush senior and theorized by some of the American strategists and political scientists like Samuel Huntington in his *The Clash of Civilizations* and Francis Fukuyama in his *The End of History*. But in fact, the new world order as an ideology and policy has been existed, without letter and name, after the Second World War; its goal was to monopolize the governance of the world and impose the Western values and way of life upon other cultures and nations. We want to devise rather the re-beginning of history, not its end; we want the dialogue of civilizations, not their clash. We want to conserve our pluralistic cultures and civilizations with a world-view that must be based on mutual understanding and a wise ethical spirit; we do not need the mightiest nations on earth in this twenty first century, rather interdependent societies and civilizations that do not threaten each other's values and existence; for this noble aim, let us to recall what the venerable Apostle Paul writes in his letter to the Romans: "Never return evil for evil, always do good, live peaceable among all, never revenge, never avenge, rather revenge is mine, says the Lord. If your enemy hurts you, give him food, and if he is thirsty, give him drink. By doing so you will heap burning coals upon his head."

Unfortunately many of us have burning coals upon our head; in order to heap them we have nothing but dialogue. Like other religions, Islam is a religion of dialogue and it can live in peace with the East as well as with the West.

Because, according to Islam, the whole mankind is of a single soul. Therefore all men are in fact brother and sister with each other, as God says, “He it is who did create you from a single soul.”⁹ And the goal of the creation is to make mankind to know one another; not to fight against each other, as God says, “Oh Mankind! We have created you male and female and set you in the sight of God are the most pious and heedful of you.”¹⁰ Thus Islam does not make racial distinction between men. This message of the Qur’an is also emphasized by the Prophet of Islam, as he says, “Listen! You have one God as you have one father. There is no distinction between an Arab and a non-Arab. There is no preference for the black over the fair, or the fair over the black. There is distinction only in submission to God. The most virtuous among you is the most honorable in the eyes of God.”¹¹ Islam does not only teach the unity of all mankind but also the unity of all religions, since the Qur’an says, “Say: We believe in God and that which is revealed to us and which was revealed to Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Jacob and the tribes and which Moses and Jesus received and which other prophets received from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them and to Him we submit.”¹²

Therefore Islam always asks the mankind to dialogue with each other, as this is shown in the following verse of the Qur’an, “Say: People of the Book let us rally to common terms to be binding on both us and you: That we shall worship none but God alone and associate nothing else with Him or shall any of us take others as lords in place of God. And if they turn away, then say: Bear witness that to Him we submit.”¹³

While the September 11th terrorist attacks may have subjected Muslims in the United States to some harassment and hostility, the events also have paved the way for Muslim communities and societies to establish closer ties with the broader American societies. It is that true in the aftermath of September 11th, the interfaith and civilization dialogues have been increased and intensified in terms of number and quality not only in the United States and Canada but also in Europe and some Muslim countries, like Turkey, Egypt, Jordan and so on. Before coming here I myself participated in two big interfaith dialogues that were held in Turkey and Italy two weeks ago.

On the other hand Muslims have to return their face to the East and to engage also in civilization dialogue with Shintoist, Buddhist and Confucian cultures; especially Turkish Muslims living in Turkey and Central Asia; because they have a lot more in common with Japanese people than people think. Turkic and Japanese peoples have ethnic, linguistic, and cultural common roots in the very remote past of the history. And this historical background, which has to be explored, could provide for sure some advantage to establish and promote civil society and intergovernmental dialogues between Islam and the East.

There is now nearly a universal agreement that after September 11th not only has America begun to change but also other Muslim and non-Muslim countries. There is a wide range of opinion about what that transformation consists of. For some, the change is simply a change of perspective; for others, it is manifest in public policy,

⁹ The Qur’an: 49/13.

¹⁰ Ahmad Ibn Hanbal: Musnad, 5/41 1: and similar hadiths are available in al-Bukhari and Muslim.

¹¹ The Qur’an: 2/136.

¹² The Qur’an: 3/64.

legal rules, political debate or their daily lives. Here I am not going to speak more about the change. But we can take advantage of this change in order to build up a new humanity. Besides the ideological and political ‘new world order’ that the West has been trying to impose upon us all, there is rather a natural globalization due to the growth of population and many international activities and cooperation ranging from trade and tourism. Therefore we have to direct the march of the human history into the right path. And this can be done only by dialogue. And as I have said, since the interfaith dialogue alone is not enough for this end, it must be accompanied as political, economical and cultural dialogues. Philosophers, politicians, religious leaders and scientists have to take a role to create new concepts and paradigms for the systematization and development of such dialogues.

It would be very strange, if modern man, who aspires to colonize the moon and other planets, cannot solve the problems that confront him on earth. There is one easy way to combat terrorism, which is never discussed, that is simply to stop participating in it and achieving some approximation of what is right and just in international politics and law. This is what I regard as a welcome effort to bring morality into politics, international relations and law. Adherence to this effort will guarantee civilizations their dialogue with each other as well as laying the groundwork for their coexistence with the spirit of freedom and human conscience. Otherwise, playing the power game and authoritarianism will only lead to the continued violation of human dignity.

Professor Tadokoro: I heard two commonalities in the two presentations. The first is that the terrorist attacks of September 11th have nothing to do with Islamic teachings and I agree with this. Secondly, while the terrorist incidents of September 11th were evil, the attitude of the United States toward the Islamic world and the policy toward the Middle East can’t be appreciated. For this point I found a deep agreement between these two presenters. I also mostly agree with this point.

The third point is about the true cause of terrorism. It was attributed to the imperialism of the Western world that is as exploitative as the terrorism of September 11th. On this point I am not in full agreement with. We will have a chance to discuss the terrorist attacks themselves this afternoon so I won’t go too deep into this discussion. But if I may make one point, in my view, the matters related to politics and the relations among civilizations are two quite different things. We will have time in the afternoon for discussion about politics, so let me touch upon cultural and civilizational relations now.



I would like to make three points in this connection. My first point is that this morning we often came across the words East and West but I am not terribly comfortable with this. After the terrorist attacks of September 11th, I had a chance to talk with a French person. In Japan we always categorize the Western world as America and Europe together but that is not correct according to this French person. President Bush said, “God save America” afterwards and the terrorists said, “Allah akhbar, God is Great.” What is the difference between them? We French never refer to the God to justify foreign policy. The so-called ‘West’ includes a variety of attitudes and thoughts and it is not quite clear where is ‘West’. Even within the United States, attitudes toward the current international trends as represented by globalization

are far from uniform. There is clear resistance in Europe to globalization defined by the United States. As the inside of the West has a variety of disagreements, so does the East.

In Indonesia they have a moderate Islamic society. At the same time there are very radical governments in the Muslim world. Turkey is a member of the OECD and like Japan it started a modernization process in the early 20th century. The word Islam also implies many different meanings. When Europeans think about Islam they tend to have the image of Turkey. In America they have an image of Islam as Arab. So this very perspective of East and West somehow supports this image of a clash between the two.

My view is that the ideas of modernity and West should be separated. All the delegation today took airplanes to come over to Japan. That stands for the modernity of society. Such technology is a product of modernity but cultural traditions are also important. In the 19th Century, Japanese decided to overcome difficulties associated with modernization originated in the West under the slogan of 'Japanese spirits and Western technology'. In other words, we have been thinking being modern is not equal to being the West. The Japanese can be modern without being Western. Following this kind of idea, the modernization equals westernization or globalization equals Americanization are not necessary to adopt. Japanese can be Japanese. Europeans can be Europeans. Arabs can be Arab. But we all cannot escape from modernity.

The second point, the contrast of 'East and West' is casually referred to by Japanese people, too but when Japanese say East, it means Asia. In the Japanese mind, Islam is hardly included when they think of East. East in the previous two presentations stood for Muslim. But it is obvious that Japanese is not a Muslim nation but it is East and modern.

Whether Japaneseness and modernity can live together. In the last 150 years, this question has been repeatedly raised in a variety of ways. Japanese now are more confidence in itself as a modern society. The question itself seems to have become irrelevant as Taiwan and South Korea are now fully modernized democracies. We no longer need to question if non-Westerners can be modernized without losing its cultural identities.

Perhaps the experience of Asia shows that one can be modernized without losing one's identity and I wonder what the Asian experiences mean to the Muslim or Islamic world.

The third point is that in today's Western dominated international society, terrorism is mostly associated with so-called Islam fundamentalism and I believe that is not pleasing to the ears of participants from the Muslim world. I myself think that anything can be fundamentalism. There is Christian fundamentalism in the US. Those fundamentalists take very extreme position toward abortion, secular schools and so on. When some of those fundamentalist murdered a doctor who conducted abortion, they called themselves 'pro-life'. This looks to me a simply a murder and crime. Buddhist fundamentalism (like Hinduism) seems to be almost adjective contradiction but the *Aum Shinrikyo* cult group, who conducted poison gas attack in Tokyo, claim themselves to be Buddhists. Thus, fundamentalism can be created using any religions and believes. There is no reason to assume that Muslim is more prone to be a fundamentalist. My understanding of history is that Islam was much more liberal in the medieval age where Jews enjoyed more freedom than in Christian world.

Then why radical fundamentalism and Muslim are perceived to be associated? Perhaps it is caused by failures of modernization in the Muslim world. The failure

breeds the perception that the West is always treating the Muslim unfairly, and this perception creates strong negative reactions. Then why is it that these Muslim countries have failed in modernization? Is it just because of what the US has done or are there reasons within their Muslim's own societies? I think you must face this issue within your own societies, otherwise you will not be able to improve the situation.

Professor Matsumoto: Three points were raised. First, modernization was universal to civilization. That modernization is convenient and a must to all the countries in the world is why it is a universal. The second point is that both presenters spoke about East and West but if you think of Japan, Korea and China, we think of ourselves as the East but not as Islam. We think of ourselves as Asia. We have all modernized. How do you deem Asia and modernization?

The third point is that fundamentalism not being solely the thinking of Islam. I believe it exists in all civilizations. For example there is Jewish fundamentalism. Next, modernization has failed in Muslim countries and perhaps it is because of the imposition of modernization by western countries but there may also be reasons within the cultures.

Of course Al Qaeda is evil and goes against the teaching of Islam. However they have used the name of Islam and used the name of Islam to create a terrorist organization. Islamic countries have not guided these organizations on a correct root nor have they disassembled organizations that do not follow the teaching of Islam. So we question whether these Islamic countries have the political will to rectify the misguided terrorist organizations. I would ask our presenters to comment on these points.

Professor Azra: I am very careful to identify the response as the Bush administration rather than US policy as a whole. We know there is a lot of debate within the US



congress. Muslim is not a monolithic phenomenon, as is the West. We have to admit there are many Muslims in the Western hemisphere and in fact Islam is the fastest growing religion in the Western hemisphere. In their encounter with modernity I believe that Muslim societies do not have a problem with modernity.

There are many elements of modernity in the Muslim tradition. To seek for knowledge and to improve their lives in ways how are allowed by Islam. So improving the lives of Muslims by developing science and technology is encouraged by Muslim teachings. Beginning in the late 80s there are some Muslims who oppose this of course. The first root cause of the rise of fundamentalism is the failure of political systems in many Muslim countries.

Many Islamic countries implemented non-Islamic ideologies and in fact they are somewhat hostile to Islam. The regimes are autocratic and dictatorial. Unfortunately these regimes have been supported by the US and many western countries. Saddam Hussein, for instance. So there is political resentment from some Muslims against these autocratic regimes.

The second root cause is the failure of the modernization program because of corruption and mismanagement by the government. KKN, corruption, cronyism and nepotism created a lot of disillusionment amongst many Muslims so it has led them to think of alternatives as for instance the adoption of shariah.

The third root is economic deprivation. Most Muslim countries have failed to develop their economies. For example some rich countries in the Middle East are heavily dependent on oil and they have failed to improve their human resources.

The fourth factor is disorientation and dislocation among Muslims. Sociological changes among many Muslims as globalization increases speed. This kind of dislocation and disorientation has not only taken place among Muslims but in Europe as well. So there are factors internal to Muslim society and also at the international level.

I define two kinds of fundamentalism. Religious fundamentalism is one. The other is the phenomenon of born-again Christians in the US. This kind of fundamentalism does not necessarily lead to political fundamentalism. But among groups that commit violence it is motivated by political reasons. But we have to distinguish between the two.

Professor Bayrakdar: I would like to say few things. Today a great majority of Muslims all over the world do not understand what Islam stands for humanity in the context of this age. The real problem is thus the problem of education. They mix or mistake their cultural and historical traditions for Islam, but these are not the same. Although we live today in a culturally and religiously pluralistic community, the majority of us, who consider themselves to be educated have only the vaguest notion of what is involved in cultures and religions other than their own. It is from this kind of situation that prejudicial ideas so often arise. Without giving a proper education to your people, you cannot direct them to the right path.

Moreover many basic cultural and religious concepts that are common to the societies have not the same connotations in every society. To illustrate my point, let us take for example the very concept of religion: for the Muslims Islam as religion has much more meaning than Christianity has for the Christians. Their philosophies of religion are not the same. If you go back to the last century there were Hegelianism and Marxism in Europe as a historical and philosophical interpretations of religion. Hegel said that all struggle was for god and religions; in the interpretation of Hegel one can see the Christian concept of God according to which God became as man. As to Marx, he said that all struggle was for economic reasons; in his interpretation we see the Judaic concept of God; some sects of Judaism made God of man. Both were wrong. Because, when looking at the history of religions, they did not realize that there is a difference between religion as a minority creed and religion as a majority creed. When religion is a minority creed, it tries to use the socio-cultural milieu to change the people to inculcate its beliefs. But when it becomes established religion, it uses its beliefs to change social, political and economical orders. In today's ongoing wars and conflicts one can see easily the Judaic-Christian concept of Armageddon as cause. Then of course the conflicts and terrorism in the Middle East and America cannot be divorced from their religious roots. As I have just said, our problem is education. The educated person can no longer be ignorant of the various forces, ideological, political and social, at work in community and yet it is sad to say that education often tends towards parochialism.

Concerning the concept of East and West, it is obvious that by them we do not mean geographical space; rather they are used here to denote two distinct worlds in terms of mentality and world-view. Of course Islam has no space and time dimension; but the Muslims are Eastern in both senses: geography and mentality.

Professor Matsumoto: I have listened to two reports this morning, one from Indonesia and one from Turkey. These two countries are rather successful among Muslim countries. Neither country is at the center of the orthodox Muslim world. Is that why they have succeeded in modernization? Well, non-Orthodox Muslim country you might disagree with such a labeling of your countries.

Saudi, Taliban, etc, they are rather behind in secularization and modernization. What do you think, Professor Azra?

Professor Azra: Southeast Asian Islam has been regarded as marginal vis-à-vis the core of Islam, the Middle East. Geographically speaking of course it is marginal if we take the fact that Islam we initially developed in the Middle East. But in terms of Islamic teachings I don't think Middle Eastern Islam is better than Southeast Asian Islam. You can find good Muslims in the Middle East and Indonesia and you can find bad Muslims in both. Many Southeast Asians also believe in supranational practices but you can find these practices in the Middle East. In fact the notorious Wahabi movement came to the forefront and became radical because of the fact that many Muslims in Arabia at that time believed in the so-called holy man. The Wahabi wanted Muslims to return to the pure Islam as practiced by the prophet. They used force and that is the problem with Wahabi. There are others who want Muslims to return to the pure practice of the prophet but they do it through teaching.

In the Middle Eastern Islam, it is a male dominated patriarchal society. In Southeast Asia, because of sociological and cultural factors, it is not a male dominated society. Women are relatively free in their lives. There is no big problem for Indonesia to accept women to be a president. Of course there are groups, little groups but Southeast Asian Islam has a historical precedent for accepting women as rulers, leaders. In the Acehese sultanate in the 7th century we had four queens.

Professor Matsumoto: And, what do you think Professor Bayrakdar?

Professor Bayrakdar: According to Islam, when you become a Muslim, you are, and should be, at the center and at the periphery at the same time. Being a Muslim you represent the essence of Islam in your mind and heart as well as in your social life, wherever you go you are Muslim. And with Islam each individual is responsible for the condition of his or her own soul. Everyone stands equal before God and the Shariah.

There are of course some Muslim countries, such as Saudi Arabia, who claim to represent the center of Islam. But no, that is not so. None of them is better than the other. If you look at the Qur'an and the sayings of the Prophet, you cannot see sayings justifying the kingships such as they have now in Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries. These kinds of historical traditions, kingships, are against the teachings of Islam according to me. Yet they say we are following the shariah; they do not follow the shariah. They mostly associate only Islam with a handful of tyrants, supposing that Islam teaches a passive submission Japan or America is to some extent closer to than many Arab and Muslim countries. There are no human rights in the Arab countries. There have been failures of democracy in Indonesia or in Turkey, but nevertheless, their regime is better than a kingship.

We have to understand the rationality of Islam in order to judge who represents the center and who, the periphery. It is true that in many Muslim countries, including Turkey, do not implement the Islamic principles; and the Muslims have some problems with authorities on their practicing Islam and they have not enough

religious freedom, but these countries are better, in the sense that people have a lot of civil rights. In short, when we all can recognize the rationality of Islam, we will come back to the center altogether. Because Islam can cope with the rationality and truth of ration, science and modernity.

Professor Matsumoto: Let me summarize. In the external world, who the West and Muslim world and how they encounter each other is a less important problem, rather, the change within Islam. The practice, following tradition should be incorporated within the solution of the problem. Within the Islamic world they might need a dialogue with Muslim societies.

Professor Tadokoro: I believe that the important message is that the Muslim world is changing dramatically. The Islamic society has various issues that need to be dealt with, but they cannot eliminate globalization.

Professor Bayraktar: As I have said earlier, if you study theoretically Islamic and Western values, you will not find many differences. But when you look at how they practice them in daily life, you could find a big difference between the East and the West. Let us take the concept of justice as an example; everyone recognizes terrorism as an unjust activity. But when in December 1987 the United Nations General Assembly passed a very strong resolution against terrorism, calling on every state to fight against it in every possible way. It passed unanimously. Honduras abstained. Two votes against; The US and Israel. Why did they vote against it, the reason is not too far to see; in fact there is more than one reasons that everybody knows. Justice is the same for every man, everywhere. As a man, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, everyone can recognize whether he is wrong or right. The religion of our inside, human nature, can teach us what right is. All religions say us the same thing about justice, but sometimes we can misuse it by mistake and sometimes we do it intentionally.

Professor Azra: As to this point about the perception among Muslims and modernization, at the level of values there is no big difference between Islamic values and Western values, between modernity and modernism. There is no problem between Islam and modernity if modernity also means a respect for human beings and respect for other people's rights.

But we have to admit that modernity originally came from Europe and among some Muslims modernity is associated with Europe. Some Muslims believe that modernity will lead to secularism and separation of religion and that secularism will lead to suppression of religion. In the US there is a separation of religion and politics but that does not mean that religion is suppressed by the state. In fact, religion is carried out without support or suppression by the state. There is a misperception among some Muslim people that secularization in the US means that religions have been marginalized.

Many Muslims have a superficial understanding of modernization. They take it as coca colonization, or McDonalization or MTVization. But KFCization has nothing to do with modernity. It is only superficial. Globalization and modernization are not identical with popular culture.

Professor Matsumoto: The misconception amongst Muslims has to be resolved through education. Modernization is not equal to westernization. Such misconception

must be taught through education. Terrorism exists amongst some Muslims but education must be part of the answer to terrorism.

Professor Tadokoro: Modernity in itself is a large concept that could be discussed endlessly. Amongst some Japanese and Asians, there are those who believe that modernization has made headway in Asia but has failed in the Islamic countries because there is a fundamental confusion about modernization in the Muslim world. Some others say there must be other causes. But on a deep level, modernity and Islamic values do not contradict.

Having said that, even during Japan's modernization process, the Japanese encountered many problems reconciling Japanese and Western values, so the contradiction and confusion among Muslims comes as no surprise. Where is there anything unique to Muslim countries? Many countries failed in modernization. Didn't they?

Terrorists and fundamentalists are obviously misusing the name of Islam, in engaging their various activities. But the only way to rectify the situation is through the efforts of the Islamic society, itself.

Session 2
***Islamic World and the realignment of World
Order after September 11th***

Chairman:

Professor Dr. Masayuki Tadokoro

Keynote Speakers:

Mr. John Edwin Mroz

Professor Dr. Ayumardi Azra

Professor Kenichi Matsumoto

Professor Dr. Mehmet Bayraktar

Dr. Ahmet Akyurek

Professor Dr. Akihiko Tanaka

Mr. Mroz: I want to thank Mr. Akira Iriyama and the Sasakawa Peace Foundation for this important meeting. Although I just came from Washington, I do not represent the Bush administration and I won't pretend to speak for them.

First of all, I should say that I have a 21 year-old son who is Palestinian and we have brought him up to be proud of his heritage. He speaks some Arabic.

I see Japan as a pillar of the West. Without Japan there is no West.

I would like to talk about my country and some things we have learned since September 11th. September 11th was for the American people an important wake up signal. We learned how ignorant we are about Islam.

That Islam is not monolithic and there are Muslim worlds. We weren't even that cognizant of the Islamic population within our own country. The good part is that there has been a tremendous learning curve.

Second, people have come to realize that a lot of the extremisms that we felt on September 11th were things that we helped to feed. Our obsession with fighting the Soviet Union led us to help groups like Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and helped them become stronger than they really were.

Third, we have learned that we have to use the power we have to deal with primary conflicts. It is only now that the majority of the American people are aware of and support the creation of a Palestinian state. I think you will see the full clout of the peace process over the coming years. I have told my son that within three years we will see a Palestinian state alongside Israel.

Jerusalem will be the capital of both states, and the city will not be divided. They will be able to come to a solution much easier than most of us think.

Another thing September 11th opened our eyes to was the proliferation of global criminal networks smuggling, white-collar crimes, weapons, financial embezzlement. The role of these non-state actors has been known but we did not really have an understanding of how deeply pervasive and interactive they have become.

Let us hope that the kinds of issues identified above will lead to a permanent change in the ways we think about the world we live in.

I will now focus on two specific issues that people don't like to talk about. Let me speak as an American citizen who is deeply concerned about the state of the world. The first point is to pick up on what we heard earlier today from other speakers about the lack of democracy in most Muslim countries. Let's be honest. The US, as well as many other powerful nations, had a nice thing going. In essence, it constituted a great bargain that the US had with many key Islamic states. The Islamic government in questions would support internal and regional stability, in return for which, the US would support the status quo. The agreement was really to avoid the D word, the democracy word. The bottom line was that when dealing with Islamic countries, my country and many others were happy to treat Islamic countries differently than other states. Why are we treating the Islamic states differently? Is it impossible for Islamic states to be democratic? What about Turkey?

People realize that we have been living for decades in a negative environment that we have helped to foster. Seventy per cent of Iran's population is under 30. It is a similar situation in Algeria. And no jobs are being created. There is a big debate that



we have to decide. It is increasingly difficult for Western decision makers to follow the traditional formula. The dilemma is clear. We have depended on many of these regimes for energy and/or geo-strategic support. By reintroducing the 'D' word, do we destabilize these very interests? What's interesting is that the debate has become public, such as policy planning head, Richard Haas, for example, recently publicly urged that the time had come to start standing up to these cases.

The second issue has to do with 'threats'. How does the international community define threats in a way that allows for practical actions. President Bush declared war on terrorism as well as on those who seek or harbor chemical, biological or nuclear weapons with the intention of threatening other states. Even now, my country is in the process of changing its strategic doctrine to one of preemption.

Condoleezza Rice explained a frustration recently to me at a dinner. On the one hand, everybody likes to attack the US both for what it does and what it does not do. At the same time, every week have a half dozen of the same people complaining come to the White House to insist that the US intervene in one issue or another. Unfortunately, we do live in a uni-polar world. I can attest to you that the average US citizen doesn't like the role of being the world's policeman, but September 11th has introduced sufficient confusion about what kind of a world order is possible. What is the alternative. It's not Europe. It doesn't appear to be Asia.

We don't have all the answers. It is difficult for me to answer my son when he asks why Bush doesn't want Arafat as a leader of the Palestinian state. I don't know how to answer that.

I used to be enamored by the dialogue of civilizations. But it seems to me that we have to go beyond that. We are beginning to get into the threat to civilization, all of our civilizations.

Let's imagine that in the next two years we see a democratic Iran, and a Palestinian state with democratic institutions that together with Turkey serves as a model to others.

All of us have to work harder because this is not an academic discussion. It is about a world that is genuinely hurting and is genuinely dangerous.

Professor Tadokoro: Earlier I said that Mr. Mroz is our only participant from the United States. I do not need to qualify this by saying that he does not represent the United States government. Within the US, there are many views on this subject. I think that he did a very good job of representing the diverse opinions in the U.S. Let me introduce the next speaker, Professor Akyurek. His focus is in economics and development.

Dr. Akyurek: When I got the invitation, I thought I would be the only speaker. I thought it would be at the staff level, so I prepared my paper and speech for about four hours. Then they told me there would be another speaker so I decreased my speech to two hours. Then I learned that it would be twenty minutes. Then I decided to skip all of my speech and create a new speech on the spot.

I am a professor of genetics and statistics. I play with numbers, but I have been pulled into development work. I became, or am trying to become, a specialist now in the field of development. I got a question: "Are you ready for Iraq?" Well, we try.

Two years ago I was trying to tell my European partners that we should start to have a dialogue among religions because I thought that future wars would be because of religious segregation. They laughed and said there is already a lot of

dialogue. But a lot of the dialogue was in fact really only a monologue, especially by the Christians.

First I would like to talk about my organization, the Anatolian Development Foundation (ADF). The main reason we were established in 1981 was that there was an earthquake in eastern Turkey. After the establishment of the foundation, we had another earthquake. Now we are working on disaster relief, refugees, IDPs (internally displaced persons), etc. Then suddenly we were confronted with Afghan refugees in the 1980s. There were only 300 families at that time, not more. After that, other refugees started coming from Bosnia, Northern Iraq, and so on.



Who supported us during our assistance to refugees? Our European partner organizations. Believe it or not, Christian organizations, Caritas, Diakonie, etc. We are also cooperating with the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) and the EU (European Union), OSCE (Organization for Security and Economic Cooperation) and also with IOM (International Organization for Migration). So we carry out our activities mostly with the support we get from these organizations.

Our main involvement with refugees was after the incident in Northern Iraq. After the chemical bombing in 1988, there were about 90,000 refugees who were severely affected. As ADF, we supplied them with medicine, clothing, additional food and a tent hospital. Shortly afterwards, the Gulf War broke out. We had 460,000 refugees on the border. Unfortunately the UNHCR arrived late. I asked Ms. Sadako Ogata at the UNHCR where they had been. She thought for about 30 seconds and said that they were not there and accepted that they had been very late in arriving.

After the refugees returned to Northern Iraq, we continued to help them. In the meantime, we had a terrorist organization in Turkey, the PKK or the Kurdistan Workers' Party, which we fought against for fifteen years. Even European countries supported this terrorist organization. We tried to warn Europe that their support to the arms supply in the region would turn against them some day. As you might already know, Turkey received about 26,000 refugees from Bosnia after the conflict in the region in 1992. Then, Kosovar refugees arrived in Turkey, about 10,000 people. We also provided assistance to Chechnyan refugees. Although there were about 400,000 displaced people, we were able to provide help to only about 160,000 of them because the Russian government blocked entry to aid efforts.

After the September 11th incident, we entered Afghanistan right away. The Taliban thought they were very strong but we reached an agreement with the Taliban. Even the Turkish government was excited and the authorities contacted me. We did not help the Taliban army but only the women and children. We formed an aid consortium in Europe for assistance to displaced Afghans and the vulnerable groups inside Afghanistan. We established a branch office in Islamabad. At the moment, we have active offices in Islamabad, Kabul and Tehran. Next week we will be opening an office in Kandahar.

In 1992, I participated in a meeting in New York concerning conflicts. Mr. Butros Gali, General Secretary of the United Nations, reported that they were expecting 1,500 conflicts in the near future. Just five years later, Ms. Sadako Ogata at the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Geneva said that they were expecting 3,000 conflicts in the world within the next five years. In just five years, the

estimated number of conflicts had doubled. I am also pessimistic about this. Why do we have these conflicts? Is the reason really religion? When we think of some conflicts, we realize, for instance, that they exist merely due to inherited hostility, as in the case of Greece and Turkey, the situation in former Yugoslavia, or the hostility between Pakistan and India. Maybe we have to rewrite all the history books in the world, so as not to teach our children how brave we were and how terrible our enemies are. Cultural, ethnic, religious and many other reasons are other causes of conflict on a worldwide level.

In India there are about 19 official languages. During my stay in India, I was told that there are about 300 spoken languages in India. Religion might also be a conflict agent. For example, I would like to propose here that the Sasakawa Peace Foundation and other organizations communicate with the intellectuals of those countries and understand the interpretations of the Qur'an. The Qur'an cannot change but interpretations can.

This, though, is not enough. Other countries should do the same. Many Americans do not know what Islam is. They think Muslims are only terrorists. Another major conflict agent is the nature of economic power relations. Unfortunately, the rich exploit the poor. The poor exploit the poorer. Isn't this so? I think it is. The rich must learn to help more. Political parties are another agent of conflict. Regional conflicts are also agents. Another important factor of conflict is militarization. In the USA, 8 out of 20 biggest industries are weaponry. For example, how much do you think the Gulf states spent on weapons after the Gulf War? 612 billion US dollars, excluding Iraq! Who sold these weapons? The USA, Russia, England, France and Germany! Are these familiar to you? Yes.

There is also debate that in some of these Western countries, decision-making powers in the fields of militarization, energy, and the media are in the hands of the same group of people. This is also very dangerous. People are questioning this when Mr. Bush talks about Saddam. Does the USA really want to fight against Saddam and terrorism, or is it so that people will need to buy weapons in the case of a war in the region? This honest question has to be asked.

Why do we create these conflicts? Well, because we are humans. We are all selfish and self-interested, unfortunately. You cannot overcome it completely but you can reduce it using social factors. What do people really want? A good life and praise for their identity.

Conflicts are always there. So I would like to talk about NGOs (non-governmental organizations) and conflict creation. In Japan, like other parts of the world, NGOs are becoming very popular. But you have to understand that sometimes NGOs are being misused. Many NGOs that are being declared as terrorist NGOs today did not begin as such. They started out as innocent organizations. I would like to tell my colleagues who are trying to start NGOs that I would like them to learn.

NGOs need money. Governments want to work with NGOs, but instead of an interest in cooperating like equal partners, they are interested in manipulating them. Every NGO states that they are independent, but you would be surprised that in Europe, the biggest NGOs get 90 or 95 per cent of their funding from their respective governments. So some of these NGOs in poor countries are looking for outside funding. When other country governments know that this NGO is looking for funding, they can easily get into these NGOs and literally buy them. They do not do this directly, but instead use other NGOs. For example, if France wants to swear to Turkey, they have some programs on the radio. The next day, the Turkish government protests but the French government says, "What can we do? We are a free country."

First, NGOs have to have a solid, concrete income to resist being pushed or pulled by outside game players.

One more thing. In terms of terrorist organizations during and after the cold war, it used to be the case that you were either on the side of Russia/China or the USA. What was the nature of terrorist organizations then and what is it now? During the cold war they were very professional organizations, including the Japanese Red Army, German Red Army, Italian Red Brigades, and ETA. They had cell organizations that were centrally administered. They wanted to make big noise rather than actually kill. They also killed but their priority was making noise. They wanted to make themselves heard to the international community.

Now, terrorism has changed. Terrorist activities are very much decentralized with loose connections with the central administration. They are now more destructive with their new warfare technology. They are now extremely hard to control. You may capture Osama bin Laden, but that will not solve the problem. There are hundreds and thousands of Osama bin Ladens behind the organization.

I traveled all over Afghanistan. Although we heard in Western news how terrible the Taliban was, you do not hear that in Afghanistan. "Since for so many years Taliban was the only administration, we lived in peace" was the comment of most Afghans. They added, "before, we were killing each other. When the Taliban came, they stopped the bloodshed. They were not very good, but it was better than in the past." We were not expecting this. We were expecting to hear how bad the Taliban was. Then, the question comes, when we talk about the Northern Alliance, do we know that they are any different from the Taliban? In what respect? When I entered the schools in Peshawar and Jalalabad, I saw that education in schools were 100 percent Islamic lessons. Everything was based on religion. All of us, our job now is to teach these people.

We have to recognize who our real enemy is. Turkey, being a secular state, can be a very good example. We have a lot of problems but we are fighting with these problems. People in Afghanistan and these parts of the world do not know what secularism is.

Professor Matsumoto: So the conflict religion like Chechnya in Russia, if conflict continues and refugees escape into Russian territory or other countries. Under the name of immigration or refugees many people are pouring into the US and Europe. For Europe the problem of immigration and terrorism hasn't been solved yet but rather a flood of refugees who have not been familiarized with the cultural tradition of Western Europe. That can create problem. For example, twenty percent of refugees who recently came to Holland cannot speak Dutch.

Mr. Haider and the liberal party in Austria hold that refugees should be sent back to their own countries. So one year after the terrorist attack on September 11th, rather than eliminating the terrorism, the number of refugees or Muslims who cannot speak their original language and cultural practice continue to exist in their countries.

In the last few years, 11 European countries changed their governments from left to right. So, if the attack on Afghanistan, or the crisis in the gulf area will continue, refugees will be on the increase to the US and Europe.

The reform is conducted along with the policy of the US. If we look at the Asian countries, many are suffering poverty and are left behind in terms of development. The US rationalizes that as the delay of democratization. However the development of Asian countries has progressed rapidly.

So once countries get richer, they people will request more equal rights to participate in politics and that naturally will accelerate the development of democracy. Dr. Huntington said that Muslim countries are quite different and stand against Western countries. So, the separation between Asia and Muslims... somehow we focus on economic development towards democracy.

As of the instance of September 11th, the threatened terror was the terroristic acts themselves and all countries would agree with the US. But now that view no longer exists.

Professor Tadokoro: Thank you very much for succinctly articulating these complex issues. What is interesting from our point of view is that when we consider the characteristics of disputes, they are no longer nation-to-nation disputes. Traditionally, when international political scholars considered disputes, we considered national interest or military power. We used to have debates over that but the lecture that we just heard talks about social unfairness and the levels of education amongst people, justice and consciousness of the people. If we don't keep all these different levels in perspective, it is impossible to resolve modern day disputes.

Traditionally, international political scholars used to look at international social violence as something to be contained within national boundaries. But now, it is not just nations that are engaging in such violence. Terrorist organizations are not nations so if we don't look at all the levels of society, we cannot understand today's international violence. I found this to be an important point in Dr. Akyurek's talk. He gave a concrete example of conflict creation by NGOs where an NGO can sometimes exacerbate a dispute. This is not something that is probably often discussed here in Japan.

Professor Matsumoto: A very passionate presentation that I appreciate. I found some common aspects and also some very different aspects. By focusing on the similarity and differences I will summarize. Professor Ahmet and Mr. Mroz put the biggest threat, what is the biggest threat. Immediately after September 11th the single answer would have been terrorists and most countries would have been happy to support the US in its struggle. But earlier than we expected the Taliban and Al Qaeda government was forced out. But the US says the fight will be continued. Now we ask what Iraq has done as the center of terrorism but the answer is not quite clear.

According to Mr. Mroz, the terror has the nature of the dominant administration. The view of the US to promote democratization, the US will impose the chance of assistance. Here I can see differences between Mr. Mroz and Dr. Akyurek. A year after September 11th we see the problem of conflict all over the world that has been increasing all over the world.

Professor Tadokoro: Modern disputes can no longer be considered in terms of nation vs. nation, military vs. military, or regime vs. regime. While you cannot call military power useless, America feels that military power cannot be used against terrorist groups. There is also a need to promote democracy. By combining democratization and aid, they want to create more stable governments. That is the kind of approach the US is thinking about.

On the other hand, Dr. Akyurek points out that political pressure to change political systems may not be the correct road to proceed on. Perhaps it is also necessary to work on fundamental issues such as social problems and economic problems. Having made this point, I would now like to ask Professor Azra's opinion.

Professor Azra: I think the dilemma of the US is getting worse, if the war against terrorism cannot be won and is at the same time at the expense of democracy. Among government circles in Washington they try to avoid the D word, democracy. The War against Terrorism we can understand but if at the expense of democracy it will not only be a heavier burden on the US but also lead to greater resentment against the US in many countries, especially in the Muslim world. I think that one of the most important cures for terrorism is to address political and economic issues. Especially among Muslim countries.

As far as politics is concerned, democracy should be strengthened. The problem is the 'threat of democracy'. If democracy were provided freely in Muslim countries, the fundamentalists would take power. This is the 'threat of democracy', for example, in Algeria. If democracy were given freely in Algeria and the fundamentalists would take power. I don't believe that it be a case in all Muslim countries. We should provide democracy and give Muslims, including fundamentalists, a chance to implement and learn about democracy.

Otherwise, the global war against terrorisms cannot be controlled and this will lead to three developments in Muslim countries. First, the spread of autocracy in Muslim countries. Autocratic regimes would conduct whatever measures against any possible threats. It could also lead to political instability if the regimes take too much a friendly attitude to the US. This can be a reason for militant or radical Islamic groups to undermine the government. This happened in Indonesia when Megawati was accused of helping the US. Third, it could lead to widespread human rights abuses.

We should take this into consideration. We need to address the problem of terrorism but also to understand how to handle democracy and not make democracy a victim in our war against terrorism.

Second, about the role of NGOs in society. The role of NGOs in Muslim society should be strengthened.

Professor Tadokoro: When thinking about this issue, I think it is important to consider not just the problems within the Islamic world but problems in the world as a whole. What I found interesting in the talk was the idea that if you try to democratize from the outside, and do so without taking the civil values of the Islamic world into consideration, the legitimacy of the regime is weakened and leaves people with the impression that they have a puppet government. I found this dilemma to be very interesting.

Mr. Mroz: These discussions show us that a clash of civilizations is not necessary. In the period right after September 11th, stereotypes were common. Everyone said that Palestinian suicide bombers were simply religious fanatics, but it isn't so. The majority comes from the dismal slums of Gaza and other overcrowded cities with no prospects for an economic or social future, nor with any resolution of the conflict they face with the Israelis. That is the grist out of which rises suicide bombers.

At my institute, I saw another level of this. In the Balkans, there is an area where Bosnia, Montenegro and Croatia come together. Local people did some of the worst killing. Not outsiders. Locals. Now, some of the local religious leaders are working together on trans-frontier cooperation with my organization in ways that would be unthinkable one year ago.

So much of what we have been brought up to believe could be different. Before September 11th, many strategic analysts were talking about China as a threat, and you don't hear that anymore.

Fighting terrorism is not enough. We certainly need to fight terrorism, but we must give as much emphasis to supporting democratization and nation building. Thankfully, things do change. Take my country as an example. America, like everyone else, is learning, too. We live in an increasingly complex and dangerous world. People now understand that we have certain responsibilities. For example, today more than eighty-five percent of Americans agree that it is our responsibility to stay and rebuild Afghanistan. Two years ago, you could not have found five per cent who would have shared that belief.

Maybe when the Sasakawa Peace Foundation does its next event in this series, they could take the title to another level. We need to change the way we view the world based upon the lessons September 11th has taught us.

Professor Tadokoro: We are going to have questions and comments from Professor Tanaka, and following that we will have questions from the floor.

Professor Tanaka: I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment after the talks by the previous speakers. I am a little bit puzzled over the title of today's talks, 'Dialogue with Islamic Civilization after September 11th' and 'Islamic World and the Realignment of World Order after September 11th'. I do not mean to criticize the organizer, but after listening to today's discussion I am beginning to wonder how much all of this has to do with just Islam.

I have several points to make. First, Dr. Akyurek spoke about various components of conflicts, but I am not sure which of them are related specifically to Islam. Refugee problems and terrorist problems are not unique to Islam. Professor Matsumoto talked about Islamic immigration to Europe, but the fact that immigrants cause social problems does not mean that all the migrants are Islamic. As Dr. Akyurek said, conflicts are always connected to history. Conflicts often cannot be resolved because of historical circumstances and this is something that we too feel in Northeast Asia every day.

How then are Islam and the world order related to each other? The more that we look at individual cases, the more we can see the difficulty of each of the problems. If Mr. Mroz and Dr. Akyurek would like to comment on this, I would appreciate their opinions. It has been said that as a result, there has been a rise of anti-Americanism, but anti-Americanism is not a phenomenon unique to Islam. It exists in Japan and on the Korean Peninsula.

The second point I would like to bring up is the problem related to democracy. As Mr. Mroz said in regard to American foreign policy, the US is facing a dilemma because they have had to support non-democratic regimes in the Islamic world. This problem of supporting non-democratic regimes is also not unique to the Islamic world because the US has supported very undemocratic regimes in South America, South Vietnam, Taiwan and South Korea. Presently, for those living in Northeast Asia, there is the question, which is also this week's big news topic, of how to deal with a country like North Korea. We don't believe that North Korea will become democratic tomorrow. This is a deep-rooted problem. We are trying to deal with a country like North Korea, which will not become a democracy tomorrow, but these are dilemmas unique to democratic countries.

Unlike the US or Japan, a dictatorship does not care whom they have relations with. Even though America stresses the importance of democracy, it assists undemocratic regimes when deemed necessary. One characteristic of a democratic country is to have a demand for consistency. Therefore, these kinds of situations become dilemmas for democratic countries. Whether the undemocratic countries that democracies deal with are Islamic or not, however, is not essential.



As a whole, what is it about Islam that is a problem or challenge to the entire world? What is it about Islam that would lead us to organize this kind of symposium? So far all the problems we have discussed are not unique to Islam. However, we need to have a dialogue with the Islamic world.

Here today we are having this seminar entitled 'Dialogue with Islamic World after September 11th'. In Japan, we experienced terrorist activities by *Aum Shinrikyo* in 1995, but after that did we have a conference on post-1995 Buddhism and the reconstruction of the world order? Buddhists may not be happy with us calling *Aum Shinrikyo* a Buddhist organization, but the beliefs of *Aum* comprises elements of Tibetan Buddhism, Hinduism and Shintoism. We didn't think about having such a symposium on that theme. Perhaps the reason we are having this seminar is that if you look at the Muslim world today, there are more instances of conflict in comparison to other areas of the world. The foundation for economic, however, is perhaps weaker there than in other parts of the world. In the background of all this, the levels of literacy and education in Muslim countries are perhaps lower than in other parts of the world.

There are social problems in the Muslim countries that are unrelated to the teachings of Islam. Why then are we discussing this theme today of dialogue and reconstruction of the world order after September 11th? What in Islam has prompted us to have themes like the ones we have today?

If we look back at the long historic span, there was a time up to the 15th and 16th centuries when the Islamic civilization had the fewest conflicts and the highest levels of education and was the most economically developed in the world. We are looking at Islam now as a civilization that is troubled, but if we look at it from these other aspects, we cannot say it is inferior in any way. It is clear that there was a time when Islamic civilization, compared to other civilizations, experienced a period of greatness.

I am not saying that it doesn't make sense to have dialogues amongst civilizations. Dialogue with the Islamic world is no less important to me than dialogue with other civilizations. At the institution where I work, there are 30 staff members and about seven of them are studying countries with a majority Muslims population. Denying the importance of dialogue with the Islamic world would be denying the importance of my workplace. However, when we talk about dialogue, I get the impression that Islam is seen as the problem. Perhaps there is a modern need to look at Islam as a problem, but rather than looking at Islam as a problem, if we are to have a dialogue with a great civilization that has these great teachings and philosophy, rather than seeing it as a problem, I think it would be a more constructive way to discuss Islam's contributions to the reconstruction of the world order.

Professor Tadokoro: Thank you very much Professor Tanaka. Professor Tanaka was not here this morning. The issue of terrorism is not necessarily linked to the Muslim problem, or necessarily linked to the conflict between East and West in the way that we may have been discussing. Having said that, the reason why we discuss these issues is that if the problems within Muslim society are fundamentally linked to the nature of Islam then the link should be found at the deepest levels of these discussions. I myself do not have the answer. The current problem in Muslim society may not be essentially related to religion.

Now we can take some questions and comments from the audience and then have our discussants comment on them.

Free Discussion, Question & Answer

Audience 1: I recently had the chance to spend three weeks in Iran. One thing I saw was that portraits of Mohammed are sold in bookshops. In Sunni society this is just unthinkable because it was prohibited to materialize the shape or image of the Prophet. I purchased a picture and brought it back. It is a picture of the boyhood of Mohammed. As Professor Tanaka pointed out, looking at Islamic civilization as one continuous body is rather misleading. It is based on one concept but they created a diversified social life. As a social reality, Muslim is a plural concept. Having that understanding we can develop our discussion and see the specific Muslim society and look at how to cooperate and live with them.

In Iran, the Khatami administration holds this civilization dialogue as a major column of its foreign policy. So the dialogue is actually proposed as the foreign policy of Iran. Of course, we can take it as a strategy to counter their isolation. Inter-civilization dialogue as a foreign policy emerges as an interesting discussion. What is happening there is that they promote dialogue not only with but also amongst Armenians, Jewish, Zoroastrians and others.

I found a center for religious studies where scholars who receive Western education, particularly religious scholars, receive education not on Islam but on religions from all over the world.

Muslim, Christianity, Shintoism, Confucianism, Judaism and Zoroastrianism are among the seven religions given an equal stance. This is the activity I saw at this religious center. So the inter-civilization dialogue is not just a face of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs but is the first step to make Iranian society into a democratic one. In the national diet in Iran, representatives of the minority groups have equal rights especially with respect to communal issues. I got the impression that the society of Iran is now at a turning point.

Japan so far supports Iran while the US tries to stand against Iran. Japan is cooperating with Iran, especially on oil production. That is the Japanese stance. Here now in Japan, matters of Islam, religion and society should be discussed in detail and in a practical manner.

Professor Tadokoro: Thank you for that discussion on present-day Iran. What was just described really brings home that we should have a clear picture of what the situation is and not just rely on the information concerning the Islamic world or the Arab world from the perspectives of the US and Europe. We need to go and see what the situation is for ourselves.

We would like to take ten minutes for each speaker who made a presentation to respond to some points that have been raised and then we will accept questions from the floor. Mr. Mroz, would you like to start?

Mr. Mroz: Thank you. First of all, one of these things these discussions help us understand is that the idea that the Clash of Civilizations is inevitable is just wrong and can be prevented. I think Professor Tanaka's question about whether much of what we are discussing today is unique to Islam is a positive point. I think there are a lot of stereotypes which, certainly in the period right after September 11th, became commonplace. I know that in many places in Europe and the US I heard politicians say that Palestinian suicide bombers all were religious fanatics. The fact was that some of them in the beginning were but that is absolutely not true about all of them. Most of them were making political statements. Young people with no futures and no hopes and who saw no other alternatives but to do something like that.

I also realize the need on how much more we need to educate each other. It came up this morning very effectively. I mentioned at this meeting earlier today about Palestinian and Israeli high-level people meeting outside London. There were also some neighboring states represented and one very senior person from Egypt asked a question near the end that struck me very much. He asked the Christian and Jewish members “In your religions would it be allowed for me to go into one of your churches?” The answer was of course and he said “But I am not a believer” but the answer was of course he could go in. It was very striking that here were three faiths that share so much but so much has been taken out of stock.

At my institute, I saw another level of this. In the Balkans there is an area where Bosnia, Montenegro and Croatia come together. In this area five years ago, local people did some of the worst killing. Not outsiders. Local people killed local people. Now, some of the local religious leaders are working together with my organization.

So much of what we have been brought up to believe could be different. Before September 11th, many strategic analysts were viewing China as the major threat but you don’t hear that anymore. What you then were hearing about was Islam but that is changing and you are hearing about these global networks of criminals and terrorists and drug lords. This to me is a healthy evolution because the problem is not Islam.

I think we all agree that fighting terrorism is not enough. We need to do it but we also need to be supportive of opening Islamic societies to democratization and modernization and nation building. We never saw nation building as our job. In Afghanistan we now have a different realization. More than eighty-five percent of Americans say it is our responsibility to stay as long as it takes to rebuild a modern nation in Afghanistan. Two years ago if you had said that even five percent of Americans would support that I would not believe it. There is a question raised earlier about the ‘democracy threat’ for example in Algeria. I think it is quite clear to many of us that the French and others miscalculated very badly and it would have been interesting to watch what would have happened if that process had unfolded.

All of these things have difficulties and dangers and political instability can come from many other reasons. For example, if there is regime change in Iraq and Iraq begins to produce five million barrels of oil a day then prices are going to plummet and an awful lot of regimes of oil producing states are going to find themselves in great trouble. That is a different kind of instability than we have been talking about.

Maybe when the Sasakawa Peace Foundation does its next event in this series, it will take the discussion and even the title of it to another level. I lost a lot of friends on September 11th in the World Trade Center towers and my daughter’s two best friends lost their mothers so this is very real to me but we all need to put this behind us and learn from it and change the way we view the world and act based upon the lessons that it taught us.

Dr. Akyurek: When you have sixty pages of comments and try to compress them, you say some things and cannot say others. We will be hearing the same things for years, again and again. I do not think it is useless but I do not want to repeat it. In my opinion, this Islamic dialogue has been too much exaggerated. Terrorism is terrorism. If you don’t accept Islamic terrorism, why Islamic dialogue about terrorism? Are they trying to create an enemy out of Islam? You might want to talk about Korea and Japan, but what does this have to do with Islam? I think the main solution must be found in

democracy, which must be supported by economic, social and political work. Democracy cannot feed hungry villages. They need food and economic activity. Greeks or Romans invented democracy but they thought it was a terrible regime so they got out of it. Democracy needs a careful definition and meaning in order to function as a good regime.

I don't want to sound like I am against globalization. I am one hundred percent for it, but with a difference. I believe that humans are by nature selfish. Whether you are a capitalist or not, you need capital for development. You have no choice.

NGOs used to be very popular in the Muslim world. When I was talking about NGOs, it sounded like I was stressing the negative points, but it was only because we don't have enough time. NGOs can be used in both ways, negative and positive.

The essence of the problem is who is going to use NGOs and religion and for what purposes? Osama bin Laden had 5,000 militants. He was kicked out of Afghanistan and went to Libya but had to return to Afghanistan. So what would these 5,000 militants do? Some went back to their homes but what do you expect from these people? Killing. I am very pessimistic. This might happen again.

Audience 2: I would like to congratulate the Sasakawa Peace Foundation and the East West Institute for providing a forum for this frank and open discussion. I would like to pose this question to Mr. Mroz. You have said that the US has learned many positive things since September 11th. However, as a Muslim I cannot help but feel that if President Bush carries out attacks on Iraq, it would cause great resentment in the Muslim world. Not because we love Saddam, but because of the casualties to the women and children. It is sad to hear and see that despite the opinion of the world community, your President wants to go ahead and attack Iraq. Attacking Iraq is not the solution. There are other options we can think of.

Audience 3: I have one comment after hearing the discussion between the distinguished speakers. Japanese and people in the West, after visiting two or three Muslim countries, seem to get the impression that there are many Islams, when in fact, there are not. Why do people have the impression that there are many Islams? There is only one Islam. We have to take Islam in its historical perspective. When Islam came in to being and how it developed? Let us take the case of Islam in Indonesia, Malaysia, Southeast Asia, Saudi Arabia or North Africa. We see that Islamic societies are a merging not only of Islamic culture but also other pre-Islamic cultures that still exist. When Islam came, they made a kind of mixture. When some people who are not used to Islam see this mixture, they see it as a contradiction within Islam. As a matter of fact, it is not.

Another point is that when we talk about why Islamic societies do not work, well, we have to put it in perspective. Until the breakup of the Ottoman Empire, there were no borders for centuries. After World War II, many countries became independent. Those states are still under formation. They are not mature enough to provide democracy, in the shape that people here are talking about, and form economic policies required for development.

We are witnessing within Islamic societies a clash between the state and Islam. Islam was a state, a whole project. There is a clash between Islam and the states that are still immature and under construction.

Audience 4: The biggest challenge for us today is the lack of information. I often watch CNN but most of the information we obtain is through American or Western media organizations and for them Islam equals terrorism. Here at this moment we are enjoying face-to-face communication. For most Japanese, information is obtained from the mass media but for most Japanese media organizations their knowledge about Islam is limited and Western knowledge about Islam is biased. How then can we obtain accurate and sufficient information?

Audience 5: After September 11th we were told that Osama bin Laden was the culprit and that he and his organization must be destroyed and it would be done in a week's time. Many things were done and many millions of refugees were created in Afghanistan. Before that, Iraq was attacked and many people died and many children were damaged by, what do you call it? Depleted uranium? Now we are told that Iraq is the reason and that Iraq must be attacked. My question is who is next?

Audience 6: I am a bit amused because the world seems to have discovered terrorism on September 11th. I was born in Kashmir and had my childhood in Kashmir. We have known terrorism for more than 50 years. For me, what is most surprising is that we have never called it Islamic terrorism. We call it militancy. Now something happens on September 11th. People lost their lives but so have we for fifty years. But to dub that as Islamic terrorism because the people involved in it were Muslims is wrong. It is so superficial and stupid. If we even need a dialogue, as if it was that we would discover something from Muslims, if we talk about terrorism should we bring in Islam? If we are going to say that the antidote is democracy, well I live in the biggest democracy in the world but I see state terrorism.

Kashmir is an example of state terrorism and non-state terrorism coexisting. I am not here for US bashings but look at US 'interventions' in Panama, Nicaragua and other countries. I do not seem them as 'interventions' but instead as terrorisms. Let us analyze the phrase 'War on Terrorism'. You first describe a phenomenon called terrorism and say we must have a war on that. Your implication is that terrorism is unjustified but war is justified, therefore a war on Iraq is justified. What is the difference between these things? War on terrorisms meets terrorism with terrorism. Both meet killing with killing. I think we need to get away from stereotyping.

Mr. Iriyama: I am Iriyama, President of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation. Professor Tanaka raised a very sharp point, and others from the audience have raised a few questions about the title of today's subject. I would like to make it clear.

About seven years ago we were brought to be interested in the theme or concept of Islam. Our objective wasn't: "There is an exotic and strange culture out there. Why don't we dissect it and present it to educate the people in Japan." Rather, what inspired our interest was the fact that there are a billion people living in the Islam civilization. They are born in it, live in it and die in it. Just the fact that there are a billion people following the teachings of Islam we wanted to examine the implications to the non-Muslim world, of course, including Japan. That was our original question and is the background of the reason we decided to take up today's issue of 'dialogue with Islam'.

At the moment we are interested in the aspects of 'Hinduism' that are mysterious to Japanese people. From now on we plan to take a deeper look at 'what Hinduism is' and the 'relationship between Hinduism and the Japanese people'.

Audience 7: Why does the US, not just Bush, believe that Saddam has to go out?

Mr. Mroz: First, regarding the question about why the US—and it is not just President Bush—believe that Saddam Hussein has to go and that Iraq has to be dealt with. There are several levels of this. We are not talking about personalities. We are talking about weapons of mass destruction. Hussein has large arsenals of weapons of mass destruction and has demonstrated a propensity to use them against his own people in neighboring countries. Saddam Hussein and others like him will continue until the death toll is not 3,000 like on September 11th but 30,000 or 300,000. If we don't have the courage to act together, we will be turning on the news to hear of 30,000 or 300,000 dead or dying and not just in New York but in Paris, Tokyo, London, Cairo, Istanbul or Jakarta.

As for our Pakistani colleague who asked, "Who is next for the US to attack, and where does it end?" In Chechnya, there have been Al Qaeda camps for some time and every one knows it. The Pankisi Gorge of Georgia is a major supply route for Chechens in their fight against Russia. Is that something that should be ignored?

The bottom line is that there are dedicated groups who for political, ideological or religious reasons seek to disrupt stability. These elements have to be dealt with. On the other hand, the international community must come to grips with legitimate concerns and grievances.

Professor Bayrakdar: In yesterday's *Japan Times* there is an article about the 'stupidest religion'. A French writer is saying this about Islam. With this kind of attitude, we are going to have a very difficult time. The US must open not only its own eyes but also the eyes of the world as well. We must eliminate all terrorism. One says terrorists, the other says freedom fighters. As for who will be next after Iraq, we are here now to prevent there from being a next country.