

Tribhuvan University

**Problem of Representation in Lloyd Pettiford and David Harding's
*Terrorism: The New World War***

**A Thesis Submitted to
the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English**

**By
Bhagawati Rai**

**Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

July 2009

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Miss Bhagawati Rai has completed her thesis entitled “Problem of Representation in Lloyd Pettiford and David Harding’s *Terrorism: The New World War*” under my supervision. She carried out her research from September 2008 (A.D.) to June 2009 (A.D.). I hereby recommend her thesis be submitted for viva voce.

Lecturer, Saroj Ghimire

Supervisor

Date: 2 July, 2009

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

Letter of Approval

The thesis entitled “Problem of Representation in Lloyd Pettiford and David Harding’s *Terrorism: The New World War*” submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Bhagawati Rai has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep gratitude towards Lecturer Saroj Ghimire for his scholarly guidance and encouragement. In addition to the relevant source materials, he provided valuable books and suggestion, while going through the script and correcting my mistakes. I express my sincerest gratitude to him.

The expression of gratitude would not be sufficient enough to thank Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharama, Head of the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. He advised and encouraged me on such a challenging task.

I offer my heartily thanks to my parents Man Bdr. Rai and Sita Rai and my sisters Anu, Kalpana Rai and my brother Arjun Rai and other members of my family who mentally, physically and financially helped me at every step to complete my master's degree.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends Rajendra Kumar Karki and Gandav Pandit who provided their valuable suggestion, computer help and technical support for this thesis.

Bhagawati Rai

July 2009

Abstract

The text *Terrorism: The New World War* projects Non-Europeans as “Terrorist” especially Muslims in every possible way. This research offers a timely examination of the complexities associated with the idea of terrorism and claims that the authors’ representation is biased towards Non - Europeans. America in the name of democracy has launched military operations in different countries in the name of fighting against terrorism and recently America has declared that Iraq and the West Asia including Pakistan have been the breeding ground of terrorists. Such acts of America are terroristic in themselves. Thus, in this research terrorism has been redefined not as an act of terror but as ethnic and communal violence taking place between and among different ethnic communities. This thesis also claims that Non - European nations are not the breeding ground of terrorism but the powerful Europeans have used orientalist stereotypes and images to project the ‘other’ as terrorists.

Contents

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
I. Brief History of Terrorism	1
Misrepresentation of Non-Western	9
Literature Review	11
II. The Meaning of Terrorism	15
Meaning	15
Global Terrorism	16
Terrorism as political / Cultural Violence	18
Islam and US Terror	21
III. Textual Analysis	24
Redefining Terrorism	24
There are Three Main Facts of Ethnic Groups	27
First, the Politicization of Ethnicity	27
Second, the Stylized Facts about Ethnic Violence	32
Third, the Ethnic progressive and inclusive	35
Communal Violence	40
Demands	44
IV. Conclusion	47
Works Cited	49

I. Brief History of Terrorism

"Terrorism" is not a new concept. It has been used since the beginning of recorded history. Many scholars by now have tried their best to study "terrorism", however we do not find any unanimous view among them. There are mixed opinions about "terrorism". Different theories attempts have been made to treat the word in the light of politics, religion and ethnicity. From the political perspective "terrorism" involves activities such as assassination, bombings, random killings, hijacking airplanes, kidnapping individuals, releasing harmful chemical and biological substances, or take other violent or threatening actions. It is used for political, not for military purpose and by groups too weak to mount open assaults. Terrorism reaches back to ancient Greece and has occurred throughout history. In the 20th century acts of terrorism have been associated with the Italian Red Brigade, the Irish Republican Army, the Weathermen Intifada, and Peru's Shining Path. It is a modern tool to alienate and its psychological impact on the extensive coverage by the media. Governments find terrorism difficult to prevent international agreements to tighten borders or return terrorists for trial may offer some difference. Turk, in his *Sociology of Terrorism* clarifies that "More powerful conflict parties, especially governments, generally succeed in labeling their more threatening", i.e. violent opponents as terrorists, as where attempts by opponents to label "officially sanctioned violence as state terrorism have little chance of success unless supported by powerful third parties e.g., the United Nations" (272).

Countries from Africa and the Middle East have however proved reluctant to endorse any definition of "terrorism" which fails to place such acts within the broad sweep of history and which disregards the realities of the twenty century. Due to this international community is in dilemma. firstly in assessing whether a cause is "just"

and therefore capable of remedy by political negotiation and secondly in identifying which "terrorist" organizations are capable of emerging into the legitimate political process for instance we can take communist party of Nepal Maoist (CPN-Maoist) despite a decade of outrages and violence, its representation is now integral part of constitutional reform currently underway in that country. A central aim of the Irish Republic Army (IRA)-to reunite the northern and southern countries of Ireland-was regarded as a just cause by the UK government, whilst other grievances linked to fair government in the north were accepted as negotiable. Sinn Fein, the political wing of the IRA, is now part of an elected power sharing government in Northern Ireland and the Middle East. In the vision of a Palestinian state, it is considered a just cause by all stakeholders but world leaders have so far preferred to negotiate only with the Fatah party, despite the electoral success of Hamas.

In the name of religion, there are more controversial between Muslims and Christians. Muslims religious and culture were repressed by westerner, by proposing Christianity as a superior religious. So, resist the hegemony of westerner Christianity. Muslims started Jihad to strike back to the western .Jihad ideology is shaped by the belief that Islam is being degraded and humiliated by "western" values, with particular disgust reserved for those Arab countries. So central goal of Jihad is to expel the western hegemony and other opposing elements too. Terrorism in the light of ethnicity denotes widening gulf between the majority and minority classes, all over the world the voice of the minority has been silenced in every possible way. Their peacefully attempts for their rights could not draw the attention of deaf majority classes; hence they are bound to take recourse of violence to make their age-long outcry accessible to the upper classes.

This book *Terrorism: The New World War* by Lloyd Pettiford and David Harding is inspired by the untimely demise of Richard in terrorist attack of 11 September 2001. The authors then make a departure from the very event to the effect of terrorism to the contemporary society. The book makes a case study of the terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda, ABU NIDAL ORGANIZATION (ANO), Tamil Tigers and Anti-imperialist international Brigade etc. and also depicted the attacks around the globe prepared by these groups.

This book analyst the heinous terror attacks, such as 11 September and the bomb attack on a Bali night club. It has researched the complex phenomenon of terrorism and its role play in contemporary society and the global politics, it draws concrete conclusions. The book discusses in detail some of the most infamous acts of terror perpetrates from the kidnapping and murder of Italian Prime-minister Aldo Moro, to the US-Iranian hostage crisis of 1979 as well as the biography of the major terrorist groups and individuals. It also presents a startling look at the possible future of terrorism and its impact on the western world.

Despite the powerful, simple emotions that can overcome people at times of persona, national or global tragedy the reality of terror is, also much more complicated. This book is an attempt to explore this complexity in the belief that complex problems rarely have simple answer.

Misrepresentation of Non-Western

For non-western, it is not a startling that western misrepresentation about them in any possible ways, among them especially Muslims, they have represented the Muslims as terrorist, well know from the event of 11 September, which generic misrepresentation of Muslims throughout the western world. Muslims are accused of terrorism or attacks occurring all over the world and projected them as terrorist. The

most prominent notable is that the western accused non-west as a breeding ground of terrorism though it is crystal clear at the underlying level the root of terrorism can be traced back in the western country, but at the surface level tag the non-west as a breeding ground of terrorism. They do so by creating discourse as they are powerful. They represent the non-west to meet their vested interest dismissing the realities of non-west, hence it is nothing but misrepresentation for instance, the United States was among those who supporting Saddam Hussein as a stabilizing force within Iraq against Shia Muslims and Kurdish nationalists and regionally against the Ayatollahs and Shia Iraq. Thus it was that the United States has sided with brutal military dictatorships in places such as El Salvador and Indonesia. Thus it was that the United States helped found the so-called university of terrorism, along with one Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan, as the Mujahaddin, fought the Soviet Union. Hence they are still trying to be blind with the realities and projected non-western as a breeding ground of terrorism.

In *Terrorism: The New World War* the authors depict biasness from the events of 11 September and Bali nightclub and project non-west as “terrorist”.

In this research my effort is to unmask authors’ biasness about the terrorism along with misrepresentation of non-west as terrorist. The colonial conflict can clearly be seen when the authors put much emphasis and attention to the event of 11 September ignores the similar ensuing event at Afghanistan. Though the innocent people lose their lives twice as many people as the 11 September attack itself the authors remain silence as for this. Why the authors do remains silent? And also authors’ portrait terrorist as criminal by focusing on the event of 11 September and Bali nightclub. They pretend as blind to ignore the events of others countries. Authors

further projected terrorist as criminal and say rights do not arise from wrongs. Why do they say so? Though one person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter.

Literature Review

Terrorism: The New World War basically deals with the much debated and controversial issue of 'terrorism'. So, ever since the publication of the book, it has gravitated the attention of many scholars and critics all over the world. The book has received mixed views from the critics and scholars. The attempts have been made to approach the book from feminist, human rights, marginal perspectives etc.

J. Ann Tickner offers a feminist analysis on the event of September 11, 2001 along with its aftermath in "Feminist Perspectives on 9/11". She says:

The conduct of war is a largely male activity on both sides but Meena, the founder of RAWA, exhorts women to fight too. Nevertheless, gender is a powerful legitimization of war and national security. Our acceptance of a "remuscultured" society during times of war and uncertainty rises considerably. And the powers of gendered expectations and identifications have real consequences for women and for men, consequences that are frequently ignored by conventional account of war and civilizational clashes. (336)

Conor Gearty talks about the impact of human rights law on the debate about liberty and security following 11 September in his "11 September 2001, Counter-terrorism, and the Human Rights Act". He states:

It is clear that the events of 11 September 2001 have posed a major challenge to the philosophical and political integrity of the Human Rights Act. September 11 has exposed this idea to attack on two fronts

by a pair of very different ideological enemies; there has been the challenge of politicized religious faith. (18)

Thus, he consider how the provisions of the Human Rights Act have influenced the formulation and interpretation and anti-terrorism laws, and examines the role of the judiciary in adjudicating on disputes between the individual and the state.

Joanne M.Hall in the same manner deals with the issue of marginalization in his *Marginalization and Symbolic Violence in a World of Differences: War and Parallels to Nursing Practice*. He further states:

The marginalization of person and cultures based on their designation by the current US administration, and as interpreted through mainstream media, as actual or potential 'terrorist'. A parallel situation in nursing is discussed, beginning with nursing's own marginality, related to the dynamics of symbolic violence. (41)

George Leaman deals with the issue of misrepresentation of Iraq in his *Iraq, American Empire, and the War on Terrorism*, he adds:

It is abundantly clear that the administration of George W.Bush, supported by its ally in London, misrepresented its case for war with Iraq in an effort to win support from the American public, the US congress, and the U.N. Security Council. Iraq did not present a grave military threat to the United States or Britain; it was not connected with the 9/11 atrocities; and it did not have a massive stock pile of biological or chemical weapons. Yet planning for the removal of Saddam Hussein and the occupation of Iraq began immediately after Bush's inauguration, and misleading and apparently false statements

about the Iraq threat to the United State were made by George W. Bush. (234)

Christopher Greenwood in his “International Law and the War against Terrorism”, he states:

Any analysis of international law and the 'war against terrorism' following the events of 11 September 2001 needs to start with recognition of the fact that the terrorist atrocities perpetrated in the United States on that date were plainly illegal. On that, international lawyers the world over agreed. Whatever lay behind those terrible events, there was no legal justification for them and none has been offered. Yet the consensus about the illegality of the terrorist attacks did not lead to a similar consensus about the legal questions raised by the US reaction to them. The legality of the United States' resort to force against Al-Qaida and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, of the conducts of the hostilities which followed, and of the status and treatment of prisoners held by the United State at the naval base at Guantanamo Bay have all been matters of controversy. (301)

Colm Campbell and Ita Connolly talk about the legal discourses in their “Making War on Terror, Global Lessons from Northern Ireland”. They say:

Dominant legal discourses on the 'war on terror' proceed from an assumption that a revised legal regime, loosening restrictions on security agencies, will yield consequential anti-terrorist benefits. One stream invokes the rhetoric of the 'rule of law' and human rights, while arguing that formerly taboo subjects, such as loosening prohibition on torture or inhuman treatment, need to be revisited. The other,

associated with the 'Bush doctrine', manifests a more ambiguous attitude to the rule of law, stressing the need for pre-existing international and domestic legal norms to yield to the exigencies of executive action, which may entail claims of extra-ordinary law making powers. (935)

Thus, it becomes clear that this book has been responded from various perspectives.

My newness in this research is that Non-Europeans are not “Terrorist” but they are freedom fighters, who fought for their rights, to out come from the repressive Europeans.

II. The Meaning of Terrorism

Meaning

In a simple word terrorism is a violence action in order to achieve political aims or to compel a government to act. The term terrorism has many meanings for policymakers or public. There is no unanimous definition of terrorism, what is terrorism? The subject of terrorism has connotation of danger about it. The term has actually become an insult. Defining a person or group or nation as terrorist implies a moral judgment, which has led to the greatest problem of definition. Many have used terrorism and claimed to be fighting in the name of freedom. The debate on the definition of terrorism has been whether the groups are themselves freedom fighters or terrorists. The weak argue that the strong always condemns them as terrorist and they also condemn the state, they are fighting as terrorists in their suppression of the innocent.

Terrorism is not a given in the real world but it is instead an interpretation of events and their presumed cause. And these interpretations are not unbiased attempts to depict truth but rather conscious efforts to manipulate perceptions to promote certain interests at the expense of other. List of terrorist organizations and individuals, supporters and sponsors are the result of policy decision regarding the potential costs and benefits of including or excluding specific parties on such list. And in some cases, terrorism has been a means to carry on a conflict without the adversary, realizing the nature of the threat, mistaking terrorism for criminal activity. Because of these characteristics, terrorism has become increasing common among those pursuing extreme goals though out the world. But despite its popularity, terrorism can be a nebulous concept even within the U.S. government, agencies responsible for different function in our current fight against terrorism use different definitions.

The strategy of terrorism is to commit violence that draws the attention of the local populace. The government and world of their cause. They raise out their voices to accessible their rights in front of them, which had been suppressed by that so-called orientalist.

Hence from the past time to present, rebel groups and the governments have used cruelty and force to eliminate enemies to spread fear and pain and to achieve political, religious and other ideological goals regarding to these activities, they are consider as terrorists and such terrorists act are to political and cultural. Due to political and inequalities their created mass violence around the world.

Global Terrorism

Today's age is the age of globalization, so all the countries-big or small-are linked intricately together. The ideological and cultural products become rampant through out the world through the mass Medias. Thus, it is clear that all the countries are chained such a way that any disturbance in any country is likely to affect the others. Amid such world scenario, terrorism is a global concept launched by USA against Iran and Afghanistan following the devastating attack on WTC on 11 September 2001, after the attack the United States of America launched military operation, the Muslims country got badly affected. They could not get economic and others aids that they had been getting. This further affected the other Non-Muslims countries. The USA soon makes the argument of other countries-suppressed the Muslims countries in every possible way in the name of eliminating terrorism .The USA even did no hesitate to violate the basis human rights of the Muslims. Regarding this Turk in his "*Sociology of Terrorism*" says:

Once underway, campaigns of terrorism and related political violence tend to gain momentum. Inspired by the ideological messages, the

charisma of leaders, the potential for material or status gains or whatever else attracts them others are likely to join. Particularly in non-democratic societies, conflicts are likely to proceed along fault lines reflecting class, ethnic, racial, or religious divisions. If such conflicts persist, years of reciprocal violence tend to result in its institutionalization, so that individual caught up in the conflict may have no real comprehension of why they go on attacking one another - the classic feud. (280)

They see themselves as having fight for "us " against "them" they combat for their rights against colonial domination but due to the new age means the age of globalization mass neighboring countries are slaughter when two countries starts combat. We can easily acquire the example of US and Muslims country - due to dispute of these two countries. US impede to proved economic helps or others things to others Non-Muslims countries. And also in the name of social control of terrorism US declared a war on terrorism immediately following the catastrophic attack of 11 September, 2001, not only US but also governments and millions people throughout the world agreed that international terrorism had to be stooped. But it has become obvious that "the devil is in the details".

The extraordinary threat of modern terrorism has been mirrored by extraordinary counter measures for instances-the US government adopted two fateful policies. The first was the decision to dilute or abrogate established legal restraints on governmental power and the second was the decision to launch an essential unilateral invasion of Iraq, that imply in the name of social control on terrorism US unswervingly took the sovereignty of third world country.

Terrorism as political / Cultural Violence

Political and cultural inequalities are the main source of collective violence. At the time of colonial period, colonizers had political suppressed colonized rights, especially third world countries. As a results terrorism came out with a new look as freedom fighter but the so-called orientalist project them as terrorist, which unswervingly condemn them as criminal not as freedom fighters. Black in his “The Geometry of Terrorism” clarifies that –“Terrorism arises only when a grievance has a social geometry distant enough and a physical geometry close enough for mass violence against civilians” (21).

African and Asian countries were ruled by European notions such as Great Britain, France and Holland during colonial period these colonized countries later demands the right of social geometry for terrorism: an inter collective and upward direction that crossed long social distances, including vertical, cultural, relational and functional distances, yet because few European civilians lived in the colonies, close enough to kill, terrorism was mostly absent. Millions lived in Europe but for all practical purposes were too far away to attack. How could African tribesman or Asian peasants go to kill civilians? It was largely impossible. No civilians, no terrorism.

A lack of European civilians made terrorism difficult, if not impossible in European colonial instead, anti- colonial violence primarily involved guerrilla warfare and other government- oriented aggression. Terrorism occurred only where large numbers of enemy civilians lived in the colonial society –uncommon but not unknown, colonial Algeria, for e.g.- had ideal physical and social geometry for terrorism.

Political is the only way which proliferated country to the height of progress, but due to the some dire politicians political indicates as a dirty game and causes it, it

turns society/country in to mass violence. When political becomes political violence obvious there created hierarchy as results violence closely followed the spread of early civilization, from ancient time to present, rebel groups, and governments have used cruelty and force to eliminate enemies to spread fear and panic, and to achieve, political, religions and other ideological goals.

Turk in his "*Sociology of Terrorism*" considers that "Differing sociological perspectives encourage contrasting views of political violence. Insofar as functionalism assumes that order and peace are normal, violence is an aberration, a presumably temporary deviation from the normal state of human social life. Even archaic versions of functionalism (e.g. Germanic "Combat Theories") arguing that war is necessary to sustain national identity and strength do not imply acceptance of nongovernmental violence, especially assaults on public order and authority, as other than deviant behavior. More liberal and critical theories tend to posit that violence is an understandable response to oppression and exploitation, the last resort of the deprived and desperate. Whether reflecting anarchist objections to regimentation, communist or socialist critiques of capitalism, or simply liberal objections to excessive "possessive individualism", critical theories presume that political and/or economic inequalities are the sources of collective violence" (273).

Political violence is directly or indirectly allied with culture violence. A Nation is formed of large community of people who share a common history, culture and language living in a particular territory under one government. In other words it can be said that Nation is a collection of individuals united in supporting a perceived interest. However, it is not sue that a nation is formed of only a large community sharing common history, culture and language of course a nation is formed of different groups sharing, the common politics but uncommon culture and language. In

course of history, there can be different communities of people with uncommon characteristics. In this sense; there can be different ethnic groups of which a nation is formed. Most states consist of numerous significant ethnic groups, yet such nations usually face demands from ethnic groups that remained unfulfilled. As a result cultural violence sprouts/generates and like the rational action approaches, cultureless approaches seek to show that even apparently senseless ethnic violence “makes sense” in certain contexts, yet while they claim to discover a “logic” to ethnic and ethno religious violence and reject representations of it as chaotic, random, meaningless, irrational, or purely emotive, culturalists claim that such violence make sense not in instrumental terms but in terms of its meaningful relations to or resonance with other elements of the culturally defined context they have emphasized the cultural and historical rather than social psychology grounding of ethnic fear. A literature has emerged on the construction of fearful Hindu beliefs about Muslims in India, of Sinhalese beliefs about Tamils in Srilanka and of Serbian beliefs about Croats in disintegrating. Once such ethnically focused fear is in place, ethnic violence no longer seems random or meaningless but all too horrifying meaningful.

The paradigmatic instances of ethnic violence are large events, extended in place and time. Moreover, they are composite and causally heterogenous, consisting not of an assemblage of causally identical unit instances of ethnic violence but of a number of different types of actions, processes, occurrences, and events for e.g.:- it is evident from the case literature that in Srilanka “ethnic violence” consists of episodic riots on the one hand and more continuous low level terrorism, on the other hand, all occurring against the back ground of the “cultural violence” perpetrated by a series of ethnocratic Sinhalese governments. Not only do the riots, terrorism and state violence involve sharply opposed mechanism and dynamics but within each category there is

also a great deal of causal heterogeneity. Thus an ethnic riot typically involves at one level deliberate manipulation and organization by a small number of instigators but also other levels, turbulent currents of crowd behavior governed by powerful emotions and compelling collective representations requiring social psychological and cultural modes of analysis. In short the political and cultural inequality is the sole cause of terrorism.

Islam and US Terror

To talk about Islam and US there was no any perfect relationship between them for years. Both country had been fighting to capture one country and suppressed weaker one, it persists for years as a result there were many negative attitude sprouts out for each other's which never wipe up due to the proliferated their negative impact one's ready to distort others ideology. A year earlier throughout the Arab world on relations between Islam and the west. West to overcome its "Unthinkable prejudices" about Islam and its customs and laws.

In this issue Prince Charles talks in his "Hindu-Christian Communal Violence a question Mark to India's Secularizes":

What he called the west's debt to the culture of Islam and distanced moderate Muslims from militants" Extremism is no more the monopoly of Islam than it is the monopoly of other religious, including Christianity. (22)

In recent years whole negative views of the United States have increased sharply. A key fact contributing to these is that the United States is perceived as unconstrained in its use of military force by the system of international rules and institutions that the US itself took the lead in establishing in the post war period, it directly affected the Muslims world. The Muslims world is of particular interest as it

is a major source of violence against the US. It is also an area of the world with particularly negative feelings toward the US. These negative feelings toward the US have an important impact on the US effort to deal with Al-Qaeda and its related groups. In this context there are two groups, one who argued that what is important is not that people in the region like the US, but that they fear it. When forced to make a choice between US and Al-Qaeda, it is surmised this fear will increase the likelihood that people in the region will choose the US and another has argued that negative feelings toward the US drive Muslims into the arms of Al-Qaeda; that people in Muslim countries are so angry at the US that this leads them to actively support Al-Qaeda in its fight against America.

For decades, polls in the Muslim world and the statements of Muslim leaders have shown a variety of resentments about US policies. Muslims share the worldwide view that the US does not live up to its own ideals of international law and democracy. There have also been specific complaints that the US favors Israel over Palestinians and the Arab world as a whole, that the US exploits the Middle East for its oil and that it hypocritically supports non-democratic governments that accommodate its interests. These attitudes persist. (Kull 2)

Though the US has presented itself as a most authoritative, but it is mortified when the US got a great catastrophe on 9-11. After these events the US is perceived as believing that it was attacked by Islam itself and as having declared war on Islam. The US negative attitude towards Islam is apparently known through their deeds- military for they have used to constrain the Muslim world. People repeatedly brought up the fact that President Bush's use of the term "crusade" and cited this as evidence of these underlying intentions. The US decided whether to expand its military presence in a region clearly there are many factors that need to be taken into account. The impact on

public opinion is only one. But the impact on public opinion can have significant consequences on the ground as we are seeing vividly in Iraq today. When the US acts on its own initiative without multilateral approval, these public feelings are also apt to be highly focused at the US itself.

It is also not easy to judge in advance what those public reactions will be, though it is easy to formulate what sound like plausible assumptions. When, the US greatly expanded its military footprint in the Muslims world after 9-11, some assumed that his expansion would not intimidate the general population, that people would perceive it as targeted against a highly circumscribed enemy that did not include them. But the population does not perceive the target of US military presence as separate from them. Rather the target is widely seen as the religion with which they deeply identify.

Even though US claim themselves to be the people of justice, fairness and freedom, but it is only a out show they did opposed to it which apparently be evidence for the critical situation which Muslims are now facing in US. US hatred towards Muslims are crossed the boundary of it limitation with aggression-which may reach the point of killing-shots, being fired at mosques, women with hijaab being harassed in the streets, assault against Muslims student in schools and universities, persecution of some Muslims employees in their work places all because of the recent events in which some Muslim persons are being accused of causing explosions in the capital and elsewhere. It is badly inserted in the mind of US that every violent, explosion, assault and so on, have created by the Non-west chiefly Muslims against them.

But now there is also a new feeling about the US that has emerged in the wake of 9-11. This is not so much an intensification of negative feelings toward US as much as a new perception of American intentions. There now seems to be a perception that the US has entered into a war against Islam itself.

III. Textual Analysis

Redefining Terrorism

In colonial period, colonizers suppressed colonized was apparent to everyone, even they had been grasped their state and made them as foreigners in their own homeland. Supplement of those colonized starts war against colonizers, they fight for egalitarian and they called themselves as freedom fighter but freedom fighter has been projected as terrorism by so-called orientalist. Though colonizers called them terrorist but they are freedom fighter in the eye of colonized. They are freedom fighter in the senses who fight for their nation to eradicated foreigners who entry in their home-land and made them unknown.

Colonizers have been believed that whom they ruled are terrorists not freedom fighters and even they indicated that country as terrorism areas, as their violence actions across the border of colonized; then they start off war against colonizers, and then later terrorism had been redefined by them from various perspectives like orient, ethnic strife and communal violence.

Orientalism is the term popularized by Edward Said in which he examines the processes by which the orient was and continues to be constructed by European thinking. The orient has been surrogated and even undergrounds itself to prove the western superiority. As a historical, it has established a series of binary oppositions between east and west.

Said in his "Orientalism" attempts that "As much as the west itself the orient is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the west" (37). Responding less to the reality, as the orientalism were moved more by consuming passion than by the reality.

Orientalism as a textual construct does not only deal with a correspondence between orientalism and orient, but also with the internal consistency of orientalism and its idea about the orient. Orientalism not only includes the orientalist's view towards Eastern's ideas, culture and histories but inseparably. It has configurations of power for it generates power. So, the relationship between the occident and the orient is a relation a power, of domination, of varying complex hegemony. The east was orientalized not because it was oriental, but it could be made oriental by the western power, the idea of orientalism is a collective notion for identifying Europeans against all those Non-Europeans: The idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison to all the inferior Non-Europeans and their cultures provides. These missions openly joined the expansion of Europe Trading Societies, learned societies, geographical exploration funds, translation funds, the implantations in schools, missions, consular office; factories to the political conquests were aided by orientalism. Now no oriental can escape the forces placed around him.

Orient is not the orient as it is, but the orient as it has been orientalized beginning in the 1920s, the response to empire and imperialism has been dialectical on the one hand, the orient gained its political independence from the western empires and the other confronted a new configuration of imperial powers: the US and USSR. Unable to recognize its orient in the third world, orientalism faced a challenging and politically armed orient. The National Liberation Movement in the ex-colonial orient brought havoc in orientalist conceptions of passive, fatalistic, subject races. However the 20th century has provoked intrinsic change in and for the orient. As the hegemony of orientalism transverses the line of orient, consequence of this, orient stands against them, in such a way that the orientalist

projected them as terrorists, but orient good to say themselves as a freedom fighter. In orients view they are not terrorist but they define that they are the one who fight for their rights.

Ethnic violence also knows as ethnic terrorism and it refers to violence that is predominantly framed rhetorically by causes and issues related to ethnic hatred, though ethnic violence is more commonly related to political violence, and often the terms are interchangeable in a local context where reference to ethnicity is considered minimal or improper.

Work on ethnic violence has emerged from two largely non-interesting literatures: studies of ethnic conflict and studies of political violence. Only recently have the former begun to attend to the dynamics of violence and the latter to the dynamics of ethnicization. All over the world there attempts questions about ethnic people and their marginalised, which is the burning issue in political strife. In recent years, to be sure a pronounced “Ethnic Turn” has occurred in the study of political violence.

Ethnic violence had been aroused from the “Racial Discrimination” it is also known as a “Racist Terrorism” is a form of ethnic violence which is typically dominated by overt forms of racism and xenophobic reactionism. This form typically involves attacks on minorities, and hold and association with right-wing extremism.

Racial supremacist groups such as Neo-Nazis often dominate the perception of and ethnic terrorist; though other violent actors associated with ethnic supremacist qualify. The term “Ethnic Group” is define in various perception but in ordinary English usage, the term “Ethnic Group” is typically used to refer to group larger than family in which membership is reckoned primarily by a descent

rule, that is, one is or can be member of an ethnic group if one's parents were also judged members. There are some groups that meet this criterion but that intuition may reject as "Ethnic" such as clans, classical Indian castes, or European nobility. But even in these cases analysts often recognize a "Family Resemblance" to ethnic groups based on the use of descent as the basis for membership but they are more "Religious" in one context, for instance, we can recognize in the United State protestants and Catholics are religious rather than ethnic group because membership is reckoned by profession of faith rather than descent, one can become a member of either group by conversion. Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland can thus reasonably be described as ethnic group despite common language, appearance, many customs, and genetic ancestry. This contrast also make clear that ethnic distinction are not a matter of biology but rather are convention determine by politics and history.

There are Three Main Facts of Ethnic Groups

First, the Politicization of Ethnicity

Ethnicity is socially relevant when people notice and condition their actions on ethnic distinctions in everyday life. Ethnicity is politicized when political coalitions are organized along ethnic lines, or when access to political or economic benefits depends on ethnicity. Ethnicity can be socially relevant in a country without it being much politicized, and the degree to which ethnicity is politicized can vary across countries and over time.

Ethnic is socially relevant in all but a few countries whose citizens have come to believe that they highly ethnically homogenous such as Ireland, Iceland, Korea, and Lesotho. In most countries, citizens consider that there are multiple ethnic groups, and in some they largely agree on what the main ethnic groups are.

For example, in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Republics ethnicity was officially classified and enumerated by the state, which seems to have yielded a high degree of consensus on the category systems. By contrast, in many countries, such as the United States and India, there is less agreement on how to think about what the “ethnic groups” are all though everyone agrees that they exist. In the U.S., for example, the current census categories include White, African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American and Pacific Islanders. But why not separate out Arab Americans, Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, Peruvian Americans, German Americans, Scottish Americans, and so on? This sort of problem is almost infinitely worse for India and very bad for many countries, rendering it difficult to make more than quite subjective estimates of the number of ethnic groups in many countries.

Traditionally political cleavages in Latin America were understood in terms of class rather than ethnicity, despite ample “raw material” for ethnic politics in the form of socially relevant ethnic distinctions in most countries (indigenous versus mestizo versus whites, and in some cases intra-indigenous ethnic distinctions). It is an interesting question why Latin American countries have seen so little politicization of ethnicity in the form of political parties and movements, especially when political and economic benefits have long been allocated along ethnic lines in many countries of the region. Middle Eastern and North African countries with marked linguistic or religious heterogeneity such as Cyprus, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq, and Iran have experienced political mobilization along ethnic lines, while in many countries in this region politics among Arabs is structured by clan and tribal distinctions.

The politicization of ethnicity also varies a great deal over time. In the broadest terms, a large literature on the origins of nationalism observes that until the last hundred to two hundred years, ethnic groups were not seen as natural bases for political mobilization or political authority. As Breuilly notes, “In the 14th century Dante could write an essay identifying and extolling an Italian language and nation without ever imagining that this group should have anything to do with politics. Indeed, he also wrote an essay arguing for a universal monarchy in which it never occurs to him that the monarchy should have any national basis or tasks”. In 17th and 18th century Europe, religion and class were the most politicized social cleavages and except in a few places religions was not simply a marker for ethnicity. Moreover, ethnic distinctions were not politicized in pre- and early-modern Europe despite the fact that European countries were far more ethnically fractionalized in that period, at least if measured by linguistic diversity. During the 19th century, national homogenization projects pursued by European States via school systems and militaries paralleled a secular increase in the politicization of nationality understood in ethnic terms. The success of nationalist is doctrine is now so complete that almost no one questions whether cultural groups form the proper basis for political community.

On one view ,described as “primordialist”, no explanation is need for why ethnicity often forms the basis for political mobilization or discrimination .Ethnic groups are naturally political, either because they have biology roots or because they are so deeply set in history and culture as to be unchangeable “givens” of social and political life. In other words, primordialist assumes that certain ethnic categories are always socially relevant, and that political relevance follows automatically from social relevance. The main objection to primordialist arguments

is that they can't make sense of variation in the politicization of ethnicity over time and space.

In political economy work, ethnic groups are sometimes treated as an extreme form of interest group whose members share enduring common preferences over all publicise. Rabushka and Sheplse (1972) pioneered this approach, arguing that democracy is infeasible in an ethnically divided society because polarized ethnic preferences will lead to "ethnic outbidding" and polarized policies, which in turn makes ethnic groups unwilling to share power through elections. Alesina, Baqir and Easterly (1999) argue that ethnic groups have different preferences over types of public goods, and that such diversity leads to lower aggregate provision. Fearon (1998) shows that if minority and majority ethnic groups in a new state anticipate having conflicting preferences over some public policies, then the majority may have trouble credibly committing to a compromise policy that both sides would prefer to a violent conflict.

In such models, ethnic politicization follows in part from an assumption about the polarization and stability of ethnic preferences. This may be reasonable in the short run for particular cases, but it is dubious as a general proposition. It is also questionable whether, in many cases, ethnic groups disagree that much about the types of public goods that should be provided. In multiethnic Africa, for instance, schools, roads, health care, and access to government jobs are universally desired. Ethnic conflict arises when ethnic coalitions form to gain a greater share of commonly desired goods, which is hard to explain in models where "the action" comes from assumptions about conflicting preferences over types of goods.

In contrast to primordialist arguments, "modernists" see ethnic groups as political coalitions formed to advance the economic interests of members (or

leaders). Variation in the politicization of ethnicity is then explained by an argument about when it makes economic sense to organize a coalition along ethnic lines.

Initiated by Bates, another line of research argues that ethnicity can provide an attractive basis for coalition formation in purely distributional conflicts over political goods. Bates argues that African ethnic groups – as opposed to the much more local, pre-colonial formation of “tribes” – developed as political coalitions for gaining access to the “goods of modernity” dispensed by the colonial and post-colonial states. In “Drawing on Riker”, Bates proposes that “ethnic groups are, in short, a form of minimum winning coalition, large enough to secure benefits in the competition for spoils but also small enough to maximize the per capita value of these benefits” (8).

Changes in political boundaries of the level of elections can change the size of a minimum winning coalition; this approach can help to explain both situational and temporal shifts in ethnic politicization. Such arguments need to explain when and why political coalitions form along ethnic rather than some other lines, such as class, religion, region, district, or political ideology. Bates made two suggestions. First, shared language and culture make it easier for political entrepreneurs to mobilize “intragroup” rather than across ethnic groups. Second, ethnic and colonial administrative boundaries tended to coincide, and modern goods like schools, electricity, and water projects tend to benefit people in a particular location. Lobbying for these goods along ethnic lines was thus natural.

Surely both arguments are often a part of the story, but neither ties the constitutive feature of ethnic groups-membership by a descent rule-to the reason for ethnic coalition formation. There are many cases of ethnic politicization

between groups with a common language and much common culture, and of ethnic politicization behind leaders who could barely speak the ethnic group's language. And if coalition formation is simply a means to obtain spatially distributed goods, then why should ethnic as opposed to other, possibly arbitrary criteria define the optimal geographic coalition? In fact, we often observe ethnic politicization within administrative districts with highly mixed ethnic populations.

Chandra in her "Explanation for the politicization of ethnicity" argues that "Ethnic coalitions are favoured in the electoral politics of "patronage democracies" (that is, democracies with large, pork-ridden state sectors) because voters find it easier to code the beneficiaries of patronage by ethnicity than by other social categories, as the information is more readily available" (9). She suggests that as a result politicians can most easily develop a reputation as a provider by distributing patronage goods along ethnic lines.

Finally, a number of authors have noted that violence can have powerful effects on the politicization of ethnicity. Violent attacks made along ethnic lines have often caused rapid and extreme ethnic polarization in societies in which ethnicity had not been much politicized.

Second, the Stylized Facts about Ethnic Violence

Many different sorts of violent events may be referred to as "ethnic", from bar fights to hate crimes to riots to civil wars. Generally speaking, a violent attack might be described as "ethnic" if either (a) it is motivated by animosity towards ethnic others; (b) the victims are chosen by ethnic criteria; or (c) the attack is made in the name of an ethnic group.

Compared to the myriad opportunities for conflict between contiguous ethnic dyads in the world's numerous multiethnic states, low-level societal ethnic

violence is extremely rare. Fearon and Laitin (1996) state that “since World War II, the vast majority of ethnic killing has come from either state oppression or fighting between a state and an armed group intending to represent an ethnic group” (5). Of the 709 minority ethnic groups in Fearon’s (2003) list, at least 100 (14%) had members engaged in significant rebellion against the state on behalf of the group at some time between 1945 and 1998. In the 1990s alone, almost one-in-ten of these ethnic minorities engaged in significant violent conflict with the state. More than one quarter of the relatively few ethnic minorities (greater than 1% of country population) in Asia and North Africa/Middle East were involved in significant violence, whereas only one-in-ten of the many minorities in sub-Saharan Africa were. Across countries, there is no correlation between percentage of ethnic groups experiencing violence with the state and the number or fractionalization of ethnic groups in the country.

Cross-national statistical studies find surprisingly few differences between the determinants of civil war onset in general, versus “ethnic” civil wars in particular. Once one controls for per capita income, neither civil wars nor ethnic civil wars are significantly more frequent in more ethnically diverse countries; nor are they more likely when there is an ethnic majority and a large ethnic minority. Both ethnic and non-ethnic civil wars have occurred more often in countries that are large, poor, recently independent, or oil-rich. Ethnic wars may tend to last longer than others on average, though this is probably due to the fact that they are more often fought as guerrilla wars.

James D. Fearon in his “Ethnic Mobilization and Ethnic Violence” maintains that “Conflicts along ethnic lines are more likely to turn violent than are conflicts along ideological and other political cleavages. He suggests that because ethnic

brethren are understood as metaphorical family members, ethnic conflicts engage intense emotions and a sense of existential threat. Killing May then appear a more a reasonable and justified reaction” (10).

While many authors have proposed explanations for ethnic violence, Horowitz’s argument is one of relatively few in which ethnicity per se does explanatory work. For example, consider a country in which two of more ethnic groups are already mobilize and can be treated as “unitary actors” because they have leaderships acting for them. Then the usual rationalist explanations for violent conflict are potentially available – bargaining failure due to private information, and problems of credible commitment. In these cases the only thing “ethnic” about the explanation is the type of actors and possibly what they are bargaining over.

Thus, Cetinyan models ethnic groups as represented by unitary actors who bargain over the terms of the minority’s treatment in the state. If the minority group has private information about its willingness to fight, the majority group may demand too much, leading to a violent fight. Cetinyan stresses that this implies that while observable measures of the balance of power between two ethnic groups might predict the terms of a bargain they reach, they should not predict the probability of violence (since a weaker minority will simply face tougher demands).

A majority ethnic group may not be able to credibly commit to a regional autonomy deal or constitution that would protect minority rights in the future. Ethnic war may occur when the minority anticipates that its ability to fight for a better deal will decline in the future. It might be argued that ethnicity per se appears here in the implicit assumption that political coalitions and preferences over public policies will, in the future, continue to divide along ethnic lines. If

there were salient cross-cutting cleavages, then being in the minority today would not imply being in the minority next year. Still, in some countries party affiliations can be practically “ethnic” in their intensity and durability through time (e.g., Colombia).

Laitin and Fearon and Laitin observe that would-be insurgent groups often hope that their attacks on the state will provoke harsh, indiscriminate retaliation that will increase anger against the state and thus support for their cause. Moreover, this expectation often appears justified. The Bush administration’s response to Al Qaeda’s 9/11 attacks, especially in Iraq, may be a case in point; if so, it is none of many. While various arguments can be made (including those just sketched), it remains a puzzle why people do not more consistently blame the insurgents for bringing the government down on their heads. Kalyvas (1999a, 1999b) suggests that rebel and government attacks politicize highly local, often personal grievances and feuds that are unconnected to the larger ethnic or ideological struggle. In his analysis, what may appear as “ethnic” or “ideological” violence mislabels what is better understood as the arming and escalation of village-level feuds and grudges.

Third, the Ethnic progressive and inclusive

Poverty, long-term unemployment, social and spatial segregation, political and social marginalisation is burning issues for the transitional societies of IPA countries in general, yet they affect with particular strength vulnerable ethnic groups. Ethnic diversity and divides have become outstanding characteristics of the Western Balkan region, thus posing new dilemma and challenges to the countries in their quest for political and economic stability, additionally fuelled by the prospect of European integration. The need to build cohesive societies based on

ethnic reconciliation, non-discrimination, equal opportunities and cultural diversity is for the IPA countries both a national challenge and a requirement for fulfilling the criteria for EU membership.

Viewed from this standpoint, educational deficits and underachievement, as well as skill gaps among vulnerable ethnic groups in the Western Balkan region emerge as one of the effects, but also – in the longer run – a major cause for unemployment, low incomes and/or other multiple deprivations in life, i.e. for social exclusion. Education and training present therefore a key challenge to sustainable and effective inclusive policies in the ethnically diverse Western Balkan countries and territories that deserve special attention and concern.

As a response to this challenge ETF committed itself, in its support to the Western Balkan countries, to emphasize the potential of education and training for fighting social exclusion in culturally heterogeneous societies, as well as to facilitate the policy discussions of national stakeholders in these countries on the relevant skills needed for developing and implementing long-term, sustainable strategic policy approaches and measures in the field.

The objective of the project is to enhance the capacity of national stakeholders in the Western Balkan countries to address the social exclusion of disadvantaged ethnic communities through designing and implementing inclusive and ethnically sensitive education and training measures and actions.

The ETF policy support is consistent with the demands of the EU for putting the fight with poverty and discrimination in the forefront of accession reforms in the region.

Establishment of the experts group consisting of stakeholders from the Western Balkan countries (mixed profile of academics, policy makers and

practitioners coming from either public institutions or NGOs), representatives of international organizations active in the area and representatives of the European Commission (DG Enlargement, DG EAC and DG Employment). The experts' group discussions have provided different perspectives by bringing in-depth experience and knowledge of the region and by providing advice for contextualizing and tailoring ETF project's activities and outcomes, so that they could better fit countries' considerations and realities.

The 2007 mapping and analysis of the experience of some EU Member States and Western Balkan countries, in implementing education and training measures aimed at inclusion of socially excluded vulnerable ethnic groups. To contribute to the further enhancement of the policy discussion and policy learning in social inclusion of vulnerable ethnic groups through education and training with and among IPA country stakeholders and their EU and international partners.

Throughout the first half of 2008, regional and national workshops were organised to disseminate the findings of the study aiming at policy discussions and capacity building for national stakeholders of all the countries involved. The key policy discussions were focused on (I) access, participation and retention of ethnic groups in education, (II) access and participation of ethnic groups in training and (III) education and training in support of good inter-ethnic relations.

Building capacity of national actors in a policy learning context (2008). Rural minorities lag behind rural Whites and urban minorities on many crucial economic and social measures. This report examines rural black, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian and Pacific Islander populations and their economic well-being in the 1980's, an economically difficult decade for rural areas. Results show minimal minority progress as measured by changes in occupation, income, and

poverty rates. However, the type and speed of progress was quite different among minority groups and between men and women of the same minority group. Results showed considerable diversity among groups in the characteristics that were associated with poor economic outcomes.

More than 500 rural countries have had poverty levels of 20 percent or more in each census from 1960 through 1990. Rural minorities tend to be geographically clustered in rural countries with the poorest economic outlook. In two-thirds of these countries, the high poverty incidence reflects inadequate income among Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Alaskan native residents. Poverty rates have dropped substantially in countries where most of the poor are Blacks, but much less progress is found in Hispanic and American Indian areas. Poverty increased over the decade for rural children, particularly minorities. The increase in rural child poverty was largely due to the sharp rise in families headed by women, accompanied by an increasingly high poverty rate for these families. In 1989, half of rural black children, 43 percent of rural Native American children and 38 percent of rural Hispanic children were poor, compared with 16 percent of rural White children.

Minorities, with the exception of many Asian groups, are disadvantaged in rural labor markets. Compared with Whites, they are more likely to have been jobless in the previous year or, if they worked, to have worked part-time or part-year. Minority earnings are lower than average in rural areas and this gap increased between 1979 and 1989. Native American men have extremely high rates of joblessness (21 percent) and little full-time work. Hispanic men are hampered by poor English ability and a concentration in agriculture-much more so than Hispanic women. Black men appear to face pay discrimination not found for other groups of

for Black women. All of these problems tended to be more pronounced at the end of the 1980's than at the beginning.

Neither Black men nor Black women in the rural South, where more than 90 percent of all rural blacks live, enjoyed significant improvement in occupational status during the 1980's a marked contrast to earlier periods. Blacks were half as likely to work in white-collar jobs as Whites and twice as likely to work in service occupations. Racial differences in educational attainment and industry type explain only part of the occupational structure.

Despite some increases in education among rural minority groups during the 1980's, they remain over-represented among those lacking a high school diploma. They are less likely than other rural workers to have the education necessary to yield stable or increasing earnings. College completion rose only among Hispanic and Native American women, and then only slightly.

Unemployment rates were higher in 1990 than in 1980 for Blacks, especially those with lower levels of education. Due to limited job opportunities at lower skill levels, young adults who did not graduate from high school had the highest unemployment rates.

Concentrated largely in the Southwest, Hispanics had the greatest numerical growth of all minority groups in rural areas in the last decade. Poverty increased for rural Hispanics, a trend partly related to the combined effect of continuing immigration, lack of English language proficiency, and concentration in agricultural employment.

The geographically isolated rural areas in which many American Indians live offer mainly low-wage manufacturing and consumer services jobs. Rapid but uneven economic development on and near reservations in the 1980's has not

always led to improvements in labor market opportunities. American Indians continue to be overrepresented in lower paying jobs and face high unemployment.

People of Asian and Pacific Islands origin are the smallest racial minority group in rural and small town areas, but had the most rapid rate of increase, growing by 42 percent from 1980 to 1990. More than a fourth lived in Hawaii. With the exception of those from Indochina, their status in education, occupation, and income was higher than that of the general population.

These conclusions about minority situations are sufficiently clear and distinctive that they will apply throughout the 1990's. This is the most comprehensive information available on rural minorities until results of the next population census become available, well after 2000.

Communal Violence

Communal Violence refers to a situation where violence is perpetrated across ethnic lines, and victims are chosen based upon ethnic group membership. The term communal violence is commonly used in South Asia, to describes those incidents where conflict between ethnic communities result in massacres.

Communal violence as seen in South Asia, Typically takes the form of mutual aggression in which members of all involved ethnic groups both perpetrate violence and serve as its victims. "Genocide" is a sub-category of communal violence, in which the participating ethnic groups can be assigned mutually exclusive roles as either perpetrates, or victims of violence.

Recently the terms genocide and ethnic cleansing have been applied to events in Rwanda and the former Republic of Yugoslavia whenever similar atrocities are committed in South Asia, however the term "communalism", is used. It is assumed in popular discourse in the west, that religious conflict is endemic to

the sub-continent, and that “communal “ disturbances in Ayodhya, Mumbai and Gujarat, far from being organized, are manifestation of ancient, almost primordial animosities.

For this matter Anders Bforn Hansen’s in his “Manifestation of Violence” he states that “The case of partition in the Punjab as an example not of communalism but of ethnic cleansing and genocide. The partition of the Punjab province of the British Empire into two new successor states, India and Pakistan, caused one of the greatest convulsions in human history as almost ten million people, a third of the total population of the pre-partition Punjab, moved either side of the Radcliffe line. An estimated 500,000 died in the carnage that swept through the province during the summer and fall of 1947” (233). Making it “one of the most violent processing of ethnic cleansing in recent history”.

Communal violence overt through the political power struggle between two party for instance Muslims league and Congress, and the development of communal violence, that violence immediately preceded partition was sharply distinct from the communal violence that has prevailed in colonial and post colonial India, the one exception perhaps being the 1984 anti-Sikh violence in Delhi. The pre-partition violence differed from traditional communal violence in three important respects, they are:

It was dominated by national discourses and issues of state formation.

It spread beyond urban boundaries to engulf rural areas.

It entered the private arena by inflicting sexual violence on a massive scale.

One of the heinous crime of communal violence occurred in Dec 1988 in Kolar. The Rashtriya Swayem Sevak Sangha (RSS) was celebrating the birthday centenary of late Hedigewar, founder of RSS, everywhere in the Nation. They had planned to celebrate the same in Kolar on 11-12-1988. The preparation of the celebration started as early as a month back which included torch light procession, selling of RSS flag, writing slogans on walls etc.

People were gathered and procession started. The procession went into the market where most of the shops are owned by Muslims. As the procession was coming out of the market, a provocating announcement was made through the loud speakers saying that some of the volunteers were beaten by Muslims. This was the beginning of the violence the volunteers of RSS rushed to the Muslims shops and started beating, stoning them, looting and burning their shops. We also heard that undesirable elements like goondas and lumpen politicians too played their part mean while provocation rumours started spreading through out the city. By the time the procession approached Ammavar Petta circle the incidents of rioting had already spread in Cottonpete, Katarir Palya, Kurubarapet, etc. the attacks and counter-attacks went unabated for a week. Due to these many Muslims abandon their villages.

Like these misdemeanour occurred in many countries in the name of community. It is good to have communal feelings and fight for their rights, but for the sake of their community they started communal violence and accused another community for this violence, actually to cover their fault. For example, in Orissa there were killed 23 persons, who had been linked with a Hindu radical group. Some these victims actively trying to re-convert Christians to Hinduism. A letter left at the scene claimed that Maoist rebels had carried out the attack. But later

Federal investigation agrees that Maoist were to blame, but many Hindus blame Christians.

It is apparent to all over the world that the communal violence between Muslims and Hindus is a fact in India, but from time to time Christians too. Hindu –Christian’s communal violence becomes a question mark to India’s secularism. Communal violence is the burning issue throughout the countries; it includes Dalits and Adivasis too, which is the recent issue. A fact finding team consisting of various Dalits and Adivasi leaders, women’s movement leaders and Human Rights activities and Advocates of repute has visited places of incidents violence – Brahmanigaon, Godapur, Pirangia, Babingya and Ratanaga on the 30 Dec. 2007. Team had discussion with the direct and indirect victims of human rights violations, groups facing allegation of instigation of violence as well as local, district and state level officials made the following observations.

The overall context in which draw the attention of the Dalits and Adivasis who are still facing untouchability, discrimination and atrocities especially as they struggle for their rights and entitlements for land, access to natural resources, livelihood, employment and to market in general. This is in addition to their struggle for dignity and self respect. Very few cases catch the attention of the media causing a public outcry in the state and slowly disappear into the everyday reality of Dalits. Many cases just pass by in the state without the attention of the administration and law. People are very often breaching the law and order without any actions being taken by the state.

Current violence needs to be understood from the above perspective. Within this there are two separate issues. One is the violence in Brahmanigaon on the Pana community, mostly Christians which is violence against them as they

come out of traditional form of exclusion and discrimination and their assertion for dignity and right to development. Second is the issue of demand by Panas of a few Blocks in Kandhamal district, for inclusion in Kui tribe and therefore be eligible for them to maintain status. These two separate issues were mobilised to whip up religious and fundamental passions, giving this a communal colour resulting in large-scale violence on Pano Christians, and Pano Hindus, and other Adivasi communities.

Thus it is a big blow on the development of Dalit communities as they are opposing suppression and exclusion and all forms of violence against them. Even in the context of Nepal, it's similar as above context. As the formation of New Nepal all the communities are inclusion, and have declared egalitarian to every community. Especially Dalits and Adivasis made some demands for their security and right, it mentions are below.

Demands

They demands to, provide security to the victims of violence to return to homes from the forest and ensure impartiality in damage assessment relief and rehabilitation. State should address untouchability and discrimination, ensure access to markets to Dalits and other vulnerable communities and ensure right to development and dignity. Take immediate action on all the case registered so far while at the same time care to be taken false cases to be weeded.

Compensation of some amount to the families of the dead and also to injured persons must be given as per the guide lines. Compensation to the homes, institution and property damaged caused of violence of fundamentalists must be provided as per the guide lines set out in the National Human Rights commission. Direct the magistrate in the affected areas to take Suo Motto action against accused

and monitor the compensation process to the victims. Enquiry and action must be taken against General Police for misleading the nations by repeatedly making statements of normal situation while the affected areas were totally in control. Recommend to set up state minority commission etc.

Thus the communal violence a raised from the minority they try to accessible their voice to the government for their security and right. In reviewing emerging work in anthropology, political science, and demarcated field or sub field of social scientific inquiry addressing ethnic violence, no well-defined body of literature on the ethnic violence, no agreed-upon set of key questions or problems, no established research programs. The problems are not that there is no agreement on how things are to be explained: it is that there is no agreement on which is to be explained or whether there is a single set of Phenomena to explain. Rather than confronting competing theories or explanations, we confront alternative ways of posing questions, alternative approaches to or “Take” on ethnic violence. Alternative ways of conceptualizing the Phenomenon and of situating it in the context of wider theoretical debates. In consequence, this review specify the contours and attempts a critical assessment of and emergent rather than a fully formed a literature.

What are we talking about when we talk about ethnic violence? The answer is by no means obvious despite its seemingly palpable core; violence is itself an ambiguous and elastic concept. Ambiguities involved in characterizing or classifying violence as ethnic are even greater. Although these ambiguities have yet to receive-and cannot receive here-the full exploration they deserve, a few summery points can be made below.

From the past, present or future violence as ethnic is not only an analytical but practical matter. Violence regularly accompanied by social struggles to define its meaning and specify its causes, the outcomes of which-for example: the labeling of an event as a pogrom, a riot, or a rebellion may have important consequences (Brass 1996).

Coding practices are influenced heavily by prevailing interpretive frames but today, the ethnic frame is immediately and widely available and legitimate, it impose itself on, or at least suggests itself to, actors and analysts alike, this generates a coding bias in the ethnic direction. Ethnic bias in framing may lead us to overestimate the incidence of ethnic violence by unjustifiably seeing ethnicity at work everywhere and there by artifactually multiplying instances of “Ethnic Violence”.

With these caveats in mind, we define ethnic violence on first approximation as violence perpetrated across ethnic lines, in which at least one party a state, and in which the putative ethnic difference is coded by perpetrators, targets, influential third parties, or analysts as having been integral rather than incident the violence that is, in which the violence is coded as having been meaningfully oriented in some way to the different ethnicity of the target.

Above definition allows us to exclude the violence between Germans and Frenchmen on the Marne in 1914. Similarly, it allows us to exclude the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy, since the shooting was not interpreted in ethno-religious terms as a catholic being shoot by a Muslim. But the definition hardly allows us to define a focused domain of research. A great profusion of work only a fraction of which is engaged by most contemporary analysts of ethnic violence-is related in one way or another to ethnic violence.

IV. Conclusion

Critical analysis of the text depicts the burning issue of “Terrorism”, how it takes by different peoples of the countries. Throughout the text, it is somewhat difficult to understand the global terrorism/gang because authors have been represented only from Western’s views.

This shows the authors biases, their biased representation becomes manifest through their portrait of Non-Europeans as the “Terrorist”. The authors biased in this text while revise with the issue of terrorism because they blamed Non-Europeans especially the Muslims for the terrorist attack on W.T.C. in 11 September, 2001. Though in Afghanistan many people have been killed after the attack on W.T.C in 11 September due to the aggressive US air campaign over Afghanistan. Such disregard by the US for the lives of Non-Americans can be taken as evidence to depict US as regarded by many, as the world’s biggest terrorist. And to create more and more people prepared to commit outrages against it as their only means of expression in a world without political choice. But still authors have closed their eye to the reality about the US act as terrorists, even after the US heinous attack over Afghanistan.

My attempt in this thesis is to go beyond the parochial concept of the authors as for terrorism. In fact terrorism has many shade of meaning. It is understood in different ways by different ethnic groups like African Americans, Hispanics, Dalits, Adivasis, American Indians, and South Asian etc. To prove my points, I used the methodology tools developed by Edward Said – his “Notion of Orientalism”.

My finding in this thesis is that terrorism can be seen in multiple ways, not merely the act of violence. It is rather a way or means of resistance against the domination of powerful European countries over poor and helpless Non – European countries. As Non- European countries are poor and helpless. They cannot strike back

at the advance European countries, so these countries resort to the violence to show their protest and suppressed feeling. In this sense the very act of violence becomes necessary for their existence.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Brass, Paul R. *Theft of an Idol*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Breuilly, John. *Nationalism and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Cetinyan, Rupen. *Intrastate Ethnic Relations: The Role of Private Information and Uncertainty*. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburgh press, 2001.
- Chandra, Kanchan. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Head Counts in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Combs, C. *Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Cornell, Bradford and Ivo Welch. "Culture, Information, and Screening Discrimination." *Journal of Political Economy* 104.3 (1997): 542-71.
- Fearon, James D. "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization* 49.3 (1995): 379 – 414.
- Gearty, Conor. "11 September 2001, Counter-Terrorism and the Human Rights Acts." *Journal of Law and Society* 32.1(2005): pp. 18-33.
- Hoffman, B. *Inside Terrorism*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1998.
- Horowitz, Donald L. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985.
- Howard, L. *Terrorism: Roots, Impact, Responses*. New York: Praeger, 1992.
- Kalyvas, Stathis N. *Violence in Civil War: Is Discrimination between Ethnic and Non-Ethnic Cleavages Useful?* ". Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999b.
- Turk Austin T. *Sociology of Terrorism*. California: University of California Press, 2004.

Yashar, Deborah J. "Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America." *World Politics* 12.3(1999): 76 – 104.

Young, Crawford. *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin press, 1976.

Scruton, R. *Dictionary of Political Thought*. London: Macmillan, 1983.