INTERNATIONAL
TERRORISM
IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

A MASTER'S THESIS

By

ECE AKSOY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA
OCTOBER 2002

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

ECE AKSOY

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree
of
MASTER OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

October 2002

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of IR in International Relations.

      Dr. Paul Williams
      Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of IR in International Relations.

      Asst. Prof. Mustafa Kibaroğlu
      Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of IR in International Relations.

      Dr. Aylin Guney
      Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

      Prof. Kürsat Aydogan
      Director

ABSTRACT

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

Aksoy, Ece

MIR, Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Dr. Paul Williams

October 2002

This thesis analyzes the concept of terrorism in the age of globalization. Terrorism, which has been motivated by ideological, religious and national reasons, has added to its concern issues like inequality, injustice, dissatisfaction and antiglobalist movements, due to development and technology in the world. In order to clarify this shift in the policy, the concepts of terrorism and globalization are first explained as distinct issues. Terrorism has been globalized because of modernization, developments in technology, communication and the ease in transportation. Thus, globalization has started to serve terrorism, while with its positive effects it became helpful in the fight against terrorism. The connection of globalization to terrorism has been explained in this respect. As the previous tools of diplomacy and military measures started to lose their validity, international cooperation and law have emerged as the tool to fight against terrorism. Since terrorism is a phenomenon that cannot be totally abolished, the best way to minimize terrorism is the use of international law, with necessary organizations established to form a cooperation at the international level.

Keywords: Terrorism, Globalization, Cooperation, Law

ÖZET

KÜRESELLEŞME ÇAĞINDA ULUSLARARASI TERÖRİZM

Aksoy, Ece

Master, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Paul Williams

Ekim 2002

Bu çalışma, uluslararası terörizm olgusunu küreselleşen dünya kapsamında incelenmiştir. Tarihinde ideoloji, din, milliyetçilik gibi birçok sebepten meydana gelmiş olan terör, dünya çapındaki hızlı gelişmeler ve teknoloji nedeniyle eşitsizlik, adaletsizlik, tatminsizlik ve küreselleşme karşıtlığı gibi şekillerle ortaya çıkmaya başlamıştır. Bunun sebebini açıklamak amacıyla, terörizm ve küreselleşme öncelikle iki ayrı tanım olarak ele alınarak tanımlanmıştır. Dünyanın modernleşme, teknoloji ve ulaşımdaki kolaylıklar nedeniyle küçülmesiyle terörün de yaygınlaştığı ve küreselleştiği görülmektedir. Küreselleşme teröre kolaylık sağlamaya başlamış, diğer yandan da olumlu etkileri sayesinde önlenmesi yolunda fayda sağlamıştır. Ortaya çıkan terör-küreselleşme bağlantısı bu kapsamda incelenmiştir. Gelişen ve değişen dünyada, terörle savaş için süregelmiş olan askeri, diplomatik yollar yerine uluslararası birleşim ve hukukun önemi artmıştır. Tamamen ortadan kaldırılması mümkün olmayan terörle savaşın en önemli ayağını uluslararası alanda güçlü bir birlik tarafından hazırlanacak hukuk oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, terörizm ve küreselleşmeyi açıklayarak, aralarındaki somut ve kuvvetli bağı göstermek ve terörle savaş için küreselleşmenin de yardımıyla uluslararası bir birliğin kuruluşunun önemini vurgulamaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Terorizm, Kuresellesme, Isbirligi, Hukuk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

September 11th has become a significant day in the world history. Even though it might not be because of the casualties it inflicted or its terrifying nature, it has been the first terrorist attack that was witnessed live simultaneously all around the world. As though they were watching a movie, millions of people witnessed the disaster. It was difficult to realize what was happening at first but in a short period of time it became obvious, and the shock turned into anger and hatred. This was a good opportunity to get national and international entities to realize what terrorism really is and unite them in the fight against these terrorists.

Life has changed since that day, not only politically and economically but also emotionally. But people all became aware of the scene they watched on television. For countries that have been living with terrorism, September 11th was not a big surprise, because they had been facing such attacks for decades. Mass murder by bombings, killings of intelligentsia, threats and coercion are examples of what they have gone through. On the other hand, secure and domestically peaceful states that had no idea of how terrifying terrorism could be, especially the United States, which was the target of this attack, have been horrified with this act. Although the States seemed like the target, in fact the hidden objective was to hit the symbolic center of the globalized world. With this act, allegedly vulnerable people were struck in their homeland. This was the most important message conveyed by the events of

1

September 11th. Even the strongest and wealthiest state in this world is not secure. A country might have the most developed and wide spread intelligence services or the best weapon technology but unforeseen attackers can hit any country at any time. This is the advantage of terrorism: It is unpredictable and generally unpreventable.

Terrorism will be the main analytical focus of this thesis, which consists of four chapters and a conclusion. The research herein will pursue answers to such crucial questions as: What is terrorism and what makes terrorism so significant? What is globalization and what is the relationship between terrorism and globalization? Is terrorism a response to globalization trends that are deepening and widening the cultural and economic divide between core and periphery or the "haves" and "have-nots"? What, if anything has changed with the attacks of September 11th? Is it possible to fight against and prevent terrorism? What steps have been taken at the international level in this respect? Can international law help in the fight against terrorism? How can globalization serve to make terrorism less efficient?

These questions will be answered first within the framework of International Relations theories primarily realist, idealist and constructivist approaches. Each theory will be explained in relation to terrorism and globalization, including the introduction of institutions. The individual's role will be emphasized along with that of multinational organizations. Integration had the economic significance of states will be discussed within the context of globalization. The gap between the poor and the rich will be examined in light of the current situation of terrorism. The September 11th attacks form the key events connecting the concepts of terrorism and globalization.

The next chapter seeks to answer the question of what terrorism is, starting with its history from the 1st century Zealots to the different manifestations occurring in the latter. This era includes incidents of religiously, ideologically, nationally and anarchically motivated acts of terrorism. As current examples, September 11 and Middle East terrorism will be briefly mentioned. Then the profile and social life of the terrorist will be discussed. Modernization and democracy's effects on terrorism will be mentioned in relation to the profile. The following part will discuss the lack of a definition of terrorism and will work on a definition driving from existing explanations. Then the types of terrorism will be enumerated as a prelude to a more specific focus on international and transnational forms of terrorism as exemplars of the relationship of terrorism to globalization.

There will be a difference in the approach used to analyze terrorism and globalization. The reason for this differentiation comes from the untenability of a single definition of terrorism, which reduces terrorism to a biased and simplistic concept. Terrorism is a phenomenon that conceivably has thousands of motivations. The classic expression of ambiguity on this subject is the saying that, one's terrorist is another's freedom fighter, so there is no universal way to define, explain or discuss the problem. The two parties in terrorism are the ones who commit the act and those who are victims of this act. Globalization is the other concern in the primary framework of this paper. There may be globalists or anti-globalists, but both sides agree on certain definitional principles on which they argue and act according to their own perceptions and beliefs. Globalization thus has proponents and supporters, but there are not specific camps. Globalization is not an intended or conscious plan. There is no one person or group who applies global ideas. The people or nations that help its development act in a self-serving process.

The third chapter explaining the phenomenon of globalization will also demonstrate its link to terrorism. It will begin with an explanation of internationalism and the importance of institutions. Emphasizing the significance of technology in the development of internationalization. It will analyze globalization from different angles. In the following part, the question of whether globalization is a process or project will be resolved. Afterwards, economic aspects of globalization will be discussed. Then the consequences of globalization will be explained, including the influence of the spread of capitalist mode of production and its effect on cultural values. There will also be a discussion on whether there is continuity between Cold War and post Cold War motives for terrorism. The final part will treat the relationship between terrorism and globalization with reference to the September 11th attack.

Tools to fight terrorism will be emphasized in the following chapter. First, constructivist thought will be used to focus on the role of people and cooperation. Multilateralism and institutions will support this thought. Since there is a lack of cooperation at the international level, the concept of cooperation will be further discussed. A contradicting perspective on the use of force will then be assessed. Then law will be introduced in the framework of developing modes of cooperation. After some explanation of law's role, the use of force and crime will be explained in legal terms. Internationalization of crime, terrorism and the work made for the fight against terrorism will be emphasized citing relevant articles of the Charter of the United Nations and resolutions. Finally, the September 11th attack will be mentioned to indicate the ultimate need for international cooperation and formation of an international legal response.

The conclusion will summarize the findings of thesis. Based on the previous chapters, the positive correlation of terrorism and globalization will be highlighted. With regard to globalization movements and its inevitable technological corollaries, since terrorism cannot be fully eliminated, the best way to fight against terrorism is cooperation at the international level with legal steps taken quickly and carefully.

CHAPTER II

TERRORISM AND GLOBALIZATION WITHIN THEORIES

> *Terrorists create terror; terror creates fear and anger; fear and anger create aggression; and aggression against citizens of different ethnicity or religion creates racism and in turn, new forms of terrorism.* (Zimbardo, 2001)

This is the cruel nature of terrorism. Terrorism is directly the result of specific actions of tiny groups, but every terrorist act has its own larger context. Rarely they are committed because of justifiable causes and the initial problem is the way it is conducted. Groups of people or nations might have contradicting perspectives with others and in the search to solve these issues, they might apply to terrorist action. In the modern world, there are generally effective peaceful means to solve those problems. Yet, some groups apply violent measures and strategies, even if the underlying cause is justifiable. Every person has the right to demand and fight for freedom, personal dignity and other primary goals, but methods of fighting also matter. As long as the search for one's own rights damages or terminates the rights of others, those reasons and applications are no longer justifiable.

The problem with terrorism is that as an act of force there is no international institution to fight it or even a consensus that it should always be opposed in the first place. No government or group has been totally successful in the fight against terrorism. Terrorist groups differ obviously from governments. Terrorists have no

treaties, obligations, national citizenries or territories to consider. Although it is not possible to compare terrorists to states in all grounds, because they do not have constituencies like states, since they have power, physical force capability and supporters, they share some properties with the states. Terrorism often occurs in democratic countries, because in there, terrorists find the freedom and capability to realize their actions. Terrorism is hatred and a just world cannot be based on hatred (Sirmen, 2001). Terrorism, which has existed for centuries, has changed its scope and capacity in line with modernization trends. Due to the improvements in technology, communication, and transportation, terrorism has become similarly globalized.

The introductory chapter provided a prelude to a larger discussion of terrorism and globalization. This chapter will give a basic explanation of international relations and the theories of international relations and apply these to terrorism and globalization. The main question in this chapter centers on whether terrorism forces us to question the standard frameworks of international theory, or whether it fits within different aspects of the paradigms.

INTRODUCTION TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

International relations grew out of a dedicated desire to understand and to find ways to control world politics in order to prevent future wars. War is a central concern of international relations theory because it has been a major source of historical change, a profound determinant of all political life. As Bull (Bull, 1999 cited in Holsti, 1985:9) states:

> War appears as a basic determinant of the shape the system assumes at any time. It is war and the threat of war that help to determine whether particular states survive or are eliminated, whether they rise or decline,

> whether their frontiers remain the same or are changed, whether the people are ruled by one government or another…whether there is a balance of power…or one state becomes preponderant. War and the threat of war…are so basic that even the terms we use to describe the system- great powers and small powers, alliances and spheres of influence, balances of power and hegemony- are scarcely intelligible except in relation to war and the threat of war.

As Clausewitz phrased it, war is an act of violence and it has no limits. The aim is to leave the opponent powerless and weak. It is the continuation of politics by other means and is a political tool (Williams, 1996:210). War is a consequence of the struggle for power. Above all, power is what matters in this field. States fight against each other or unite with each other to gain power. That is why concepts like struggle, war, ultimatum, alliance and deterrence are so prominent in the field of International Relations. International politics is a game with the never-ending purpose of increasing power. The actors are states, although some transnational organizations can be mentioned as instrumentalities of the power game. According to Morgenthau (Williams, 1996:280), the duty of every state in a world in which power is a dominant concern to take appropriate measures to protect its physical, political, economic and cultural identity. He believes in the independence of politics from other fields. Conflict of interest makes politics a sui generis field vis-a-vis subjects such as economics, ethics and aesthetics.

The introduction of new actors in world politics has changed the relations and balances of power. Where there were only states, power calculations were simpler. Countries only acted in relation to the other states. Now the equation is much more complicated. Among those new entities, although transnational corporations are international organizations economically significant, international organizations are influential and worth mentioning in terms of their social and political aspects. Made

up of a number of states, international organization decisions are taken with difficulty. As their number increases the effect of international organizations is stronger at the regional and international level. According to some authors like Morgenthau, international organizations do not have an influence of their own. They deny that they are institutions of multilateral diplomacy, inherently connected to the interests of the major powers. They are arenas of power politics, not agencies for transformation of the system. They are often instruments of states, since states are the members.

THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Does terrorism force us to question the standard frameworks of international theory such as realism and neorealism, neoliberal institutions, critical theory, and constructivism, or does it fit within one or all of the paradigms in different aspects?

Theorists of international politics advance descriptive generalizations about the sources of war and the comparative effectiveness of various norms, procedures, and institutions in muting international conflict and establishing order and stability.

It will be beneficial to give an introduction to international relations theories, although all of them will not be used in this paper. In general, they can be grouped into three categories. Realism, which includes classical and neorealist approaches, accepts the state as the main actor. Self-interested states compete for power or security and their purpose is the national interest. Their instruments are economic and military power. The defect of the theory is that it does not account for international change. Idealism, which consists of pluralism, liberalism and utopianism, takes states, institutions and groups as the main actors. Taking liberalism as an example here, it is concerned with how power balances or factors are

overridden by economic and political considerations. There is the desire for prosperity and commitment to liberal values. Instruments used are the international institutions, economic exchange and promotion of democracy. As a deficiency, idealism ignores the role of power. The purpose of this school of thought is to avoid conflict and promote cooperation. Liberals believe that human nature is malleable and despite obstacles, order, justice and freedom can be achieved gradually through the creation of proper economic conditions and institutional mechanisms. This is similar to the explanation of terrorism as "have not" strategy, and improvement in the world system with the help of law could minimize terrorism. Thus, cooperation among nations is necessary to maximize the possible benefits and minimize the possible damages of interactions and interdependencies and to capture opportunities for realizing greater peace, welfare and justice (Paul and Hall, 1999:8). The constructivist group considers individuals, groups and communities to be the actors. State behavior is shaped by elite beliefs, collective norms and social identities. Discourse, idea and narratives are the means used by constructivists. As a flaw, this group is better in describing the past than in predicting the future. Constructivists think structure is made of distribution not only of material capabilities but also social relationship. Constructivism claims that people make society and society makes people. This is a continuous, two-way process.

Realism and liberalism focus on material factors like power and trade while the constructivist approach emphasizes the impact of ideas. They regard the interests and identities of states as highly malleable products of specific historical processes. They are attentive to the sources of change. While realists believe terrorism is a continuation of politics by other means, constructivists who value ideas and their impacts, think that there are other factors can bring terrorism under control. Realists,

in contrast to utopians, stress power and interest rather than ideals in international relations. Realism is basically conservative, empirical, prudent, suspicious of idealistic principles, and respectful of the lessons of history. It is more likely to produce a pessimistic than an optimistic view of international politics. At the end, war is inevitable for them, since there is always a struggle to gain power. Realists regard power as the fundamental concept in the social sciences, although they admit that power relationships are often cloaked in moral and legal terms (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1990:7). Carr criticizes utopians for their belief in cooperation. Utopians, he thinks, hide their interests under the name of international interest to make the whole world accept their own. They believe what is acceptable for them is beneficial for the others.

CONTEMPORARY WORLD SYSTEM AND POLITICS

The international system is not just a collection of independent states. Sovereignty is not a concept that is the property of a single state. It is inherently a relative concept. As James Caporaso phrases constructivist thought stresses, multilateralism as an organizing principle would focus on the constitutive principles of the states system and to draw out its implicit and sometimes hidden sociality. With respect to multilateral activity, institutionalists heavily emphasize the discursive, deliberative, and persuasive aspects of communication and argument (Ruggie, 1993: 78).

The modern world as Giddens suggests, has been shaped through the intersection of capitalism, industrialism and the nation state system. Each component, although interrelated with each other, has its own dynamics and history, and they need to be examined in unity (Keyman, 2000:69).

11

The international system is anarchic and rational choice is based on maximizing the gain of people or groups. So whatever the purpose is, terrorism is based on this benefit maximization where a group has suffered for a cause and needs a radical solution.

Critical theory, as Adorno stated, treats the scientific and technological developments that define modernization and places progress at the center of it. Thus, the developments of globalization train with modernization (Keyman, 2000:101).

No single approach can capture all the complexity of contemporary world politics. Therefore, we should be more contented with a diverse range of competing ideas rather than a single theory. Competition between theories helps reveal their strengths and weaknesses and drives refinements. In this way, strict and narrowly expressed matters are softened and are open more to advancement. As phrased by Fuat Keyman (2000:114), Cox maintains that theory should not be based on theory but rather on changing practice and empirical-historical study, which are a proving ground for concepts and hypotheses. He says that theory is always for someone and for some purpose and theory always functions in relation to those issues and problems within which it emerges as an explanatory framework. An analytical or abstract theory, which detaches itself from time and space, such as neorealism cannot account for the interpenetration between state and civil society. For this reason theory should always be time-space bound and be contingent on historical developments. Since terrorism is a complex concept it is not possible to explain and discuss the issue with only one theory of international relations. The lack of a clear universal definition of the subject is effective in this part making the concept open to subjectivity and overt bias.

Growing interdependence between states has rendered popular realist assumptions on international politics increasingly obsolete. Early 20th century saw a dangerous discrepancy between the new reality of worldwide economic interdependence and existing political structures, between increasing global integration and traditional foreign political attitudes and modes of behavior. According to Muir, "we have entered a new era, the era of interdependence; and this interdependent world is threatened with chaos because it has not learnt how to adjust its institutions and its traditions of government to the new conditions."(cited in Osiander, 1998: 415). A problem becomes international when it cannot be dealt with effectively within the boundaries of the nation. The domestic power and pressure are not strong enough. As a result costs and benefits spill over into the external arena (Ruggie, 1993:51). The capacity of multilateralism is necessary. It is not that state sovereignty is losing meaning but the multilevel environment in which it operates is changing the meaning of the concept.

The modern phenomenon of terrorism has become legitimized because it fulfills the task of open warfare, which was once the agency of change in international society. Today, instead of the conventional types of war, unconventional measures including terrorism are increasingly used. All types of nongovernmental entities are involved. Growing economic interdependence of industrial states made war both more costly and more destructive. Norman Angell (Osiander, 1998:416) feared that the combination of advanced economies and backward politics actually made war more likely. This explains the distinction between developed and underdeveloped states, and provides motives for terrorist actions. According to Zimmern, the increasing integration of the world and its component states is a result of technological innovation in terms of the increasing

13

speed and ease and hence the volume of global communications. This process of integration was inevitable. Interdependence is the rule of the modern life. The increasing fragmentation of the world is a result of the rise of the idea of national self-determination and the virulence of national feeling. (Osiander, 1998:417)

Waltz believes that a country with less than half of the economic capability of the leading producer can easily compete militarily if it adopts a status quo policy and a deterrent strategy. This is exemplified in the attacks of September 11th. Although the rival was not a state, the economic capability of the terrorist organization was less than that of the United States. Al-Qaeda used cheaper methods with good intelligence and organization in attacking the super power. The point is, although Al-Qaeda is not a state, it is competitive with states in regard to facilities and resources. The leading country cannot use its economic superiority to establish military dominance or to gain strategic advantage over its great power rivals (Waltz, 1993:42).

Military force still plays a significant role in relations between states and security still outranks other issues in foreign policy. In many areas, realist assumptions about the dominance of military force and security issues remain valid. For the last four centuries, states have established the political structure within which information flows across borders. Due to globalization, existing security issues have been challenged by the democratic issues of human rights, liberalization and integration, but the attacks against the United States shifted security matters back to the top of the agenda.

Today, the globalization of world markets, the rise of transnational networks and nongovernmental organizations, and the rapid spread of global communications technology are undermining the power of states and shifting attention away from

14

military security toward economics and social welfare. As societies around the globe become entangled in a web of economic and social connections, the costs of disrupting these ties will effectively prevent unilateral state actions, especially the use of force.

As Kissinger (cited in Keohane and Nye, 1989:3) stated:

> The traditional agenda of international affairs- the balance among major powers, the security of nations- no longer defines our perils or our possibilities…now we are entering a new era. Old international patterns are crumbling, old slogans are uninformative, old solutions are unavailing. The world has become interdependent in economics, in communications, in human aspirations.

The question is how profound the changes are. A modernist school sees telecommunications and jet travel as creating a global village and believes that burgeoning social and economic transactions are creating a world without borders. To an extent, a number of scholars see the era as one in which the state, which has been dominant in world politics for the four centuries since feudal times ended, is being overshadowed by nonterritorial actors such as multinational corporations, transnational social movements, and international organizations. As Keohane and Nye put it, "As one economist put it, the state is about through as an economic unit" (1989:3). We are still in the early stages of the information revolution. That revolution has changed the complex interdependent world, in which security and force matter less and countries are connected by multiple social and political relationships. Some aspects of the information revolution help the small, but some help the already large and powerful. The states, international organizations and also the terrorists benefit from this.

It is a familiar tactic of the privileged to throw moral discredit on the under privileged by depicting them as disturbers of the peace; and this tactic is as readily

applied internationally as within the national community (Carr, 1964:83). This realist tactic contradicts the critical theory. Critical theorists believe realism leads to quietism and an unquestioning acceptance of existing power relations. They think world politics can change and progress. There is no one reality. Contextual understanding is their main contribution to International Relations theory. The Marxist idea that humans make their own history but not under the conditions of their own choosing influenced them (Lecture Notes on International Relations Theory, 1998). Critical theorists believe there is a connection between knowledge and interest. Critical social theory represents an understanding of the world in which meaning and purpose are given by the subject within which this knowledge is concretized and put into practice. Taken from Robert Cox's views, critical theory contains a normative element in favor of a social and political order different from the prevailing order. So it is possible to take the control in one's own hands and to change the current situation with international cooperation and unity. If you do not like the environment you are in or disturbed by certain acts, it is up to you to decide and do what you can.

According to E. H. Carr, the inner meaning of the modern international crisis pertaining to the interwar years is the collapse of the whole structure of utopianism based on the concept of the harmony of interests. The international morality of the interwar years merely justified the interests of the dominant English-speaking status quo powers, the "haves" against the "have-nots". Carr, as a pragmatist, took utopians and realists to task. He saw that whereas the utopians ignore the lessons of history, the realists often read history too pessimistically. Whereas the idealist exaggerates freedom of choice, the realist exaggerates fixed causality and slips into determinism. While the idealist may confuse national self-interest with universal moral principles,

the realist runs the risk of cynicism and fails to provide any ground for purposive and meaningful action. The realist denies that human thought can modify the course of human action. Sound political theories contain elements of utopianism and realism, of power as well as moral values (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1990:7).

Carr stresses, man's behavior is in great part a product of the society in which he lives. Taking the attacks of September 11th as the example, it is possible to argue that the gap between the rich and poor has generated terrorist actions. With globalization and accessibility of almost every part of the world has increased the feeling of vulnerability and hatred among the poor.

The attack of September 11th is the first plunge into war by the poor, illiterate and hopeless parts of the world, namely "the ones at the end of the sheer drop" against the rich world (Örgün, 2001:47). According to Onuf (1989:59), social relations make or construct people into the kind of beings that they are. We make the world what it is from the raw materials that nature provides. It should be clarified at this point that poverty is not the reason of terrorism. Terrorism is usually the reaction of the unsatisfied groups to the global world since they think the developed countries are self-centered with no interest in creating a fair distribution. Terrorism is one but not the only constructed response to the observed conditions of poverty.

Although there are different types of terrorism like state sponsored, domestic or international the concern in this study is the international aspect. Faruk Örgün believes that terrorism is not a state-operated activity. It is a sub-state, transnational activity that is like a virus that can easily mutate (Warner, 2001). There is not just one way to fight terrorism. It cannot be treated as a regular and constant notion. Each time it mutates, the attitudes and the tactics of the fight ought to be reviewed. The terrorists are numerous. A state might be using terrorism for its own goals, while an

individual might be involved in such an act for personal reasons. Each entity might be a reason or actor in terrorism. The difficulty today is the huge development in every field of life.

CHAPTER III

THE CONCEPT OF TERRORISM

After September 11th, it was widely said that nothing would be the same again. But we are still living in the same world with the same danger and threat and now we are more aware of the consequences and the price of a terrorist act. By this act, terrorism showed its face to the leader of the world, for the first time. As with trade and communication, terrorism also globalized.

Terrorism is no longer a marginal problem, such as a nuisance that can be tolerated. It is a real, important and growing threat to the peace and stability of all legitimate states- that is all those states which live under the rule of law. It is an international threat. In this chapter, the historical progress of terrorism starting from the 1st century will be explained. Then the profile and the socio-cultural environment that terrorists live in will be presented. Next part will be the discussion of the definition of terrorism. Following that, the types of terrorism will be discussed with the emphasis on international and transnational terrorism.

HISTORY OF TERRORISM

Some of the earliest recorded acts of terrorism were perpetrated by the radical Zealots, a Jewish sect active in Judea during the 1st century. The Zealots resisted the Roman Empire's rule through a determined campaign involving assassination. Zealot fighters attacked their enemies wherever there were people to witness the

19

violence. The Zealots intended their actions to communicate a message to a wider target audience. Later between 1090 and 1272, an Islamic movement known as the Assassins used similar tactics in their struggle against Christian Crusaders. The Assassins embraced the same notions of self-sacrifice and suicidal martyrdom evident in some Islamic terrorist groups as of today. They regarded violence as a sacramental or divine act that ensured that its perpetrators would ascend to a glorious heaven should they perish during the task. (http://encarta.msn.com) As written in the *Almanac of Modern Terrorism*, (Shafritz, 1991:ix) some authors have attempted to draw similar parallels between modern events and historical precedent by citing the 13th century Islamic Assassins as the forerunners of modern terrorists.

Until the French Revolution, religion in fact provided the main justification for the use of terrorism. Following the execution of King Louis XVI, the Jacobins, led by Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety unleashed the process to which the term Reign of Terror refers. More than 12,000 French citizens lost their lives because they were suspected of opposing the new revolutionary regime. Unlike the mass killing of earlier history, which was carried out mostly for religious reasons, the era after the French Revolution introduced politics to terrorism, and nationalism largely supplanted religious motives. The French Revolution has proved that violence was both morally right and politically efficacious (Crenshaw, 1995:14). Before Martin Luther, citizens believed unquestioningly in the supremacy of religion. Greater demand for learning and the search for freedom were pre conditions for the events leading to the French Revolution. But the countries of the Middle East which were still motivated by religious attitudes and values, did not have the chance to make a revolution due to the stasis in their regimes: Terrorist acts originating in those states are still based on religious factors. On the other hand, the French

Revolution, motivated by Enlightment ideals, shifted the concern from religion to nationalism and democracy. Class conflict of that era of the rich bourgeoisie supported by the Church and the low level people used by bourgeoisie are similar to that of today's global world between rich and the poor groupings of people.

The situation changed, as nationalism, anarchism, Marxism and other secular political movements emerged during the 1800s to challenge divine rule by monarchs. On the other hand, religious motives were not entirely absent. Most European countries' populations revolted against Church dominated political life and created secular societies. Modern terrorism was initially antimonarchical, embraced by rebels and constitutionalists during the late stages of the French Revolution and in Russia by Narodnoya Volya. It is with left wing movements in mid to late 19th century Russia that we can more accurately attribute the roots of modern terrorism. The Russian Revolutionary group Narodnoya Volya is in many ways the prototype of many 20th century movements. In its brief, but eventful, violent struggle with tsarist authorities in the late 1870s and 1880s, this organization assassinated several government and police officials of the highest rank.

At the turn of the century a successor organization to Norodnaya Volya, the Social Revolution Party, made itself heard. While more avowedly leftist than their predecessors, the Social Revolutionaries also sought to further their agenda through assassinations of high-ranking officials. The revolutionary, antigovernment orientation of the People's Will became the model for future terrorists. The group selected targets that represented the state's oppressive instruments of power, and it embraced "propaganda by the deed," using the terrorist act to instruct. It sought thereby to educate the public about the inequities imposed on them by the state and to rally support for revolution. A member of the People's Will assassinated Tsar

Alexander II in March 1881. The assassination of the tsar later inspired a group of political radicals who met in London to discuss how to achieve worldwide revolution. Their idea was to create an Anarchist International, also called the Black International after the black flag they adopted, to coordinate and support a global terrorist campaign that would overthrow both monarchies and elected governments of democratic states. Anarchist elements also became involved in labor unrest in the United States. Sometimes these disputes turned violent as a result of anarchist provocation. In general, the period between 1880 and the outbreak of World War I saw a wave of anarchist inspired terrorist activity.

An act of terrorism involving the assassination of a royal heir is credited with triggering World War I. On June 28, 1914, a Bosnian Serb, in order to free his country from Austrian rule, murdered Austrian archduke Francis Ferdinand, who was on an official visit to Sarajevo, Bosnia. Like many contemporary state sponsors of terrorism, Serbia also provided arms, training, intelligence, and other assistance to a variety of revolutionary movements in neighboring nations. Today, many countries continue to support terrorism as a tool to further their national interests. As realists would argue, what matters is the benefit of the country, not the rights of nations or minorities.

During the 1920s and 1930s, terrorism became associated more with the repressive practices employed by dictatorial regimes. It included the intimidation inflicted by the Nazi, Fascist, and Communist totalitarian regimes that respectively came to power in Germany, Italy, and the Soviet Union. The repressive means these governments employed against their citizens involved beatings, unlawful detentions, torture, so-called death squads and other forms of intimidation. Systematic terrorism arose in the Middle East in the 1930s and 1940s with the fundamentalist Muslim

Brotherhood in Egypt, and Irgun and LEHI battling the British in Palestine. Anti-colonial terrorism also was waged against the British Empire in Cyprus and Aden and against the French in Algeria by the FLN.

After World War II, terrorism reverted to its previous revolutionary associations. During the 1940s and 1950s, terrorism was used to describe the violence perpetrated by indigenous nationalist, anticolonial organizations that arose throughout Asia, Africa, and the Middle East in opposition to the contemporaneous European rule. Countries such as Israel, Kenya, Cyprus, and Algeria owe their independence at least in part to nationalist movements that used terrorism. The most significant terrorist incident of the anticolonial period was the 1946 bombing of Jerusalem's King David Hotel, by a Jewish underground group known as the Irgun Zvai Le'umi (National Military Organization). After World War II, terrorism began to be shaped to its current outlook. Publicity, the significance on the choice of the target and clearly set motives were introduced.

Since 1960s, acts of international terrorism recur with sufficient frequency for terrorism to have risen steadily on the global agenda. During the late 1960s and 1970s terrorism acquired ideological motivations. Various disenfranchised or exiled nationalist minorities embraced terrorism as a means to draw attention to their plight and generate international support for their cause. The PLO sought to create a state in what was historically known as Palestine: the land that became Israel in 1948 and the West Bank and Gaza Strip—territories occupied by Israel since the Six-Day War of 1967. A Palestinian group was responsible for the incident that is symbolically considered to mark the beginning of the current era of international terrorism. On July 22, 1968, three armed Palestinians belonging to the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) hijacked an Israeli El Al commercial flight en route

from Rome, Italy, to Tel Aviv, Israel. Although commercial planes had often been hijacked before, this was the first clearly political hijacking. The act was designed to create an international crisis and generate publicity. As a result, terrorism became globalized in the sense of gaining international attention for an act which crossed boundaries. Two years later, the PFLP staged an even more dramatic international incident, when it hijacked three commercial airliners—two American and one Swiss. The planes were flown to a remote airstrip in Jordan and blown up after the passengers were evacuated, as television cameras recorded the incident for a worldwide audience. This was the first example of a terrorist attack with a transnational character similar to the attack of September 11th. Globalization, with its aspects of communication and the power of media, served the interest of terrorists.

The murder of 11 Israeli athletes at the 1972 Olympic Games provides one of the most notorious examples of terrorists' ability to elevate their cause onto the world political agenda. Members of a Palestinian group called Black September seized the athletes. The global audience that had tuned in to watch the Olympics found themselves witnessing a grisly hostage situation that ended in a botched rescue attempt by German authorities in which both the terrorists and their captives were killed. The PLO effectively exploited the publicity generated by the Munich hostage taking. In 1974 PLO leader Yasir Arafat received an invitation to address the UN General Assembly and the UN subsequently granted special observer status to the PLO. Within a decade, the PLO, an entity not formally affiliated with any state, had formal diplomatic relations with more countries than did Israel, an established nation-state. The PLO would likely never have attained such recognition without the attention that its international terrorist campaign focused on the plight of Palestinians in refugee camps.

24

At a time of growing ethnic and nationalist awareness worldwide, other nationalist groups began to emulate the Palestinian example to increase recognition of their grievances. In Canada, a group of French-Canadian separatists, called the Front de Libération de Québec (FLQ), kidnapped James Cross, the British trade commissioner to Québec, and Pierre LaPorte, Québec's Minister of Labor, in October 1970. Although Cross was released unharmed, LaPorte was brutally murdered. Fearing more widespread unrest, Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau invoked the country's War Powers Act in Québec, which suspended civil liberties and accorded the army extraordinary powers to maintain order in the province and uproot the FLQ. The choice of a trade commissioner is significant in this act, possibly showing the reaction of the terrorists to trade and integration.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, political extremists began to form terrorist groups that opposed American intervention in Vietnam and what they claimed were the fundamental social and economic inequities of the modern capitalist liberal-democratic state. These extremists were drawn mostly from radical student organizations and left-wing movements then active in Latin America, Western Europe, and the United States. Terrorist groups such as the Baader-Meinhof Gang in Germany and the Red Brigades in Italy received training at Palestinian camps in the Middle East. Among Baader-Meinhof's most famous acts was the 1977 kidnapping and murder of Hanns Martin Schleyer, a wealthy German industrialist. As the choice of a British trade commissioner to Quebec, the choice of an industrialist shows that terrorism had changed motives from religion to those of economic and political ideology. The Red Brigades achieved their greatest notoriety for the kidnapping and execution of former Italian Premier Aldo Moro in 1978.

Right wing, or neo-fascist and neo-Nazi, terrorism movements also arose in many Western European countries and in the United States during the late 1970s in response to the violence perpetrated by left-wing organizations. However, the right-wing groups lacked the numbers and popular support that their left-wing counterparts enjoyed. Thus the violence of these right-wing groups was mostly periodic and short-lived. The three most serious incidents connected to right-wing terrorists occurred in Bologna, Italy; Munich, Germany; and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. A 1980 bombing of a crowded rail station caused the death of 84 people and wounded 180 in Bologna. The date of the bombing coincided with the opening of a trial in Bologna of right-wingers accused of a 1976 train bombing. Also in 1980 a bomb planted by a member of a neo-fascist group exploded at Munich's Oktoberfest celebration, killing 14 and injuring 215. In 1995 white supremacists carried out a truck bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, which resulted in the death of 168 people. Although they have not been as numerous as in the French Revolution, murder and mass killings for radical reasons after 1970s peaked.

Two of the most important developments in international terrorism during the 1980s were the rise in state-sponsored terrorism and the resurgence of religious terrorism. An example of an attack believed to be state-sponsored was the attempted assassination in 1981 of Pope John Paul II by a Turkish citizen who allegedly was working for the Soviet and Bulgarian secret services. Other examples include the Iranian-backed car- and truck-bombings of the American embassy and U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, in 1983, and Libya's role in the in-flight bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988.

There were many other violent terrorist groups active until the present day. Although they were very significant and strong in the 1960s, IRA and ETA started to

lose their effect after 1980s. On the contrary, Middle Eastern terrorism, especially Hamas, which has existed for decades, survives. But what changed in our time is that terrorism has gained a transnational dimension with different objectives and methods threatening the western countries. This changed the scope and limits of terrorism.

PROFILE OF TERRORISM

It is well known that one's terrorist is another's freedom fighter. Terrorists can be successfully destroyed only if public opinion, both at home and abroad, supports the authorities in regarding them as criminals rather than heroes. The profile of the terrorist is also important. He fights to change something, even at the price of ending his own life. Until facing the consequences of the act for the first time, the police, the press, the justice, the masses naming him a murderer does not change his perception and the evaluation of the acts he committed. Whatever the goal is, death seems the best way to achieve the goal. Terrorists usually use codes, not their own names. The terrorist act is symbolic carrying a message. Terror is personal and arbitrary. Terrorists wish to have the acts repeated in a serial consequence and have a violence campaign. Terror does not differentiate between the victims. They are mostly civilians, noncombatants, nonrevolutionary, neutrals, and the ones who have nothing to do with the past lives of the terrorists. The belief in the act committed is so strong that terrorists do not hesitate to kill innocent people. The aim is to shake trust in the government and invalidate its authority by creating disturbance or chaos.

The profile of terrorism has altered with the change in world politics and actors. Lately, small states which adopted war by proxy can deter big states. They can cover their deficiencies by terror when compared to the big states. The collapse

of the Soviet Union and the consequences of the end of Cold War resulted in the availability of surplus arms, the discrediting of socialist ideologies, the disintegration of totalitarian regimes, the withdrawal of superpower support to client regimes (Kaldor, 1999:4).

The fall of communist governments in Eastern Europe has ended the easy passage of terrorists from the Middle East. The Soviet Union's increasing attention to its domestic difficulties has left its Middle East allies like Syria without the assurance of Soviet protection (Beliaev, 1991:48). The new identity politics arises out of the disintegration or erosion of modern state structures, especially centralized, authoritarian states.

Terrorist organizations are not like nation states that can be vanquished in conventional war. There are no quick victories. They need good organization and planning, which take time. They live among us but not as distinct people for us to realize or destroy easily. The socio cultural area where the terrorist act is committed, is effective on the achievement of the goal of terrorism and the personality of the terrorist.

According to a research done by Ergil and Yörükoğlu (cited in Başeren, *Lecture on International Terrorism, 2002*) on the terrorist profile, people tend to sympathize with terrorism when their expectations are not realized. What hurts most is their continued inability to achieve desired outcomes. Injustice and social depression can lead to mental unbalance, making people open to radical tendencies. This does not mean that psychological stress causes terrorism. But it might be effective in the rationale or the commitment of the terrorist to his group. It is the same for poverty. Although it is not the reason to become terrorist, it is   significant

in the attitude of the person or how he perceives the wealthy world, which might result in hatred and reaction.

Lawrence Freedman points out that terrorism is generally a have-nots' strategy, and that reliance on it is often a sign of strategic failure, there being not enough strength to pursue more promising policies (Freedman, 1998:4). However, there is no rule that only the poor are terrorists. Gross Domestic Product per capita of Basques is higher than Spanish Gross Domestic Product per capita, which is a significant indicator (Başeren, 2001). Although this looks like a problem at the individual level, it is at the root of the international problem. When there is dissatisfaction, there is reaction. So no matter what the environment in which we live, developed or underdeveloped, social justice and satisfaction provide us with less crime and less terrorism. This can be done by development, welfare, equality and fair distribution.

Urbanization is part of the modern trend toward aggregation and complexity, which increases the number and accessibility of targets and methods. Modernization brings civilization and thus it provides new targets for terrorism. So there is a correlation. The city creates the audience for the armed propaganda based on fear. Audience is needed for effect. Modernization provides mobility, technological means to realize this effect.

Inequality and injustice are not all related to globalization only. The question is what made those people terrorist. Means and other causes effected the current place terrorism is. Historical reasons are also significant, and all these factors add up to the environment resulting in terrorism. Terrorism cannot be adequately explained without situating it in its particular political, social, and economic contexts. The context for terrorism does not consist entirely of objective historical factors. An

important aspect of terrorism is its social construction, which is relative to time and place, thus to historical context (Crenshaw, 1995:8).

Several factors may be relevant to the motivations behind terrorism, the socialization of the individuals who become terrorists, the quality of terrorism as both responsive and sustained behavior, its representativeness and continuity with nonviolent forms of political action, its purpose, which is to produce social change, and the availability of opportunities. The development of terrorism is related to context because it is systematic, deliberate, and sustained over time, it is not spontaneous or purely expressive, as some other forms of civil violence may be. Users of terrorism may think of themselves as bringing about a better society for all, thus acting in the interest of a collective good (Crenshaw, 1995:15). There are commonalities among instances of terrorism but each case is unique.

Terrorist actors do not just intend to threaten a certain category of people or menace the other side. They also try to deliver a message to their own side, to potential allies, or to the governments that might support, sponsor their actions (Crenshaw, 1995:599). Force, the primary facet of terrorism is not the goal of terrorism but a means. To terrorists, terrorism offers a way to impose their will and gain access to the news media in a world where real and imagined grievances are not easily heard or satisfied. According to Crenshaw, as a method, terrorism is a common form of violence. It is a tool to be employed, a means of reaching a goal, for many different types of political actors. The actor uses terror as a tool and accepts terror as an end in itself (1995:602).

Terrorism is group activity involving intimate relationships among a small number of people. Interactions among members of the group may be more important

in determining behavior than the psychological predispositions of individuals. The group operates under conditions of stress and isolation.

Most of the countries cannot see the capability and reach of terrorism, since they have no or little experience with the problem. But states are also guilty of preparing the ground for terrorist acts. Although they might not be supportive, if they do not act against the organizations they might be serving as sympathizers. Underlying motives exist for national benefit when they provide arms, territory, and legitimacy to active terrorist organizations. When a state applauds liberalism and ignores left wing movements, the latter might become the terrorist of the future. Similarly, the United States helped Afghanistan and Bin Laden for their fight against the Soviet Union, which was also their rival, then they became the target and Afghanistan hit them.

Some states accept terrorist foundations and actions to serve their political interest in the region. On the contrary, some strong and democratic states that are not in need of better status or publicity can give support to terrorism. Conversely, liberal democracies are extremely vulnerable to harassment and disruption by terrorists (Gutteridge, 1986:8). This is due to the relative ease with which the terrorist can exploit liberal democratic freedoms of travel, communication and association. The gravest internal dangers posed by terrorism to liberal democracy are the weakening of national security, the erosion of the rule of law and the undermining of government authority. Mere handfuls of terrorists can cause serious local disruptions and threats to life, and often cause expensive diversions of security forces, sometimes on such a large scale that they disturb delicate military balances.

DEFINITION OF TERRORISM

Existing for ages but still a significant threat to social, political and economic stability, progress and welfare in the world, there is still no one single definition of terrorism. The problem to fight terrorism lies here. Not having a commonly accepted definition helps the terrorist to find weak points in politics and administration of governments, thus getting away with the crime they have committed.

For years, scholars and authors have come up with many definitions of terrorism. One definition claims that terrorism is a form of political violence that falls somewhere in the middle of a continuum between war and peace. Just like war, terrorism serves a political aim; in this respect, as Clausewitz argues, it is a continuation of politics by other means. The main difference with war is the size of asymmetry, meaning that the inequality of power between two parties is huge. Another definition states that terrorism is an attack against the system and nation to get a favorable response from the system to the needs and aims of the terrorists.

Terrorism is an attempt to disrupt and discredit the processes of government. As a direct attack on the regime, it aims at producing insecurity and demoralization. Terrorism aims at creating either sympathy in a potential constituency or fear and hostility in an audience identified as the enemy.

A third definition holds that terrorism is not a philosophy or a movement, but a method of struggle: terrorism is premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine state agents, usually intended to influence an audience.

Terrorism is where politics and violence intersect in the hope of delivering power. All terrorism involves the quest for power: power to dominate and coerce, to intimidate and control, and ultimately to effect fundamental political change.

Violence or the threat of violence is thus the *sine qua non* of terrorists, who are unswervingly convinced that only through violence can their cause triumph and their long term political aims be attained (Hoffman, 1998:183).

Terrorism is the tendency to change government's and people's policies and applications by violence and fear. Terrorism is defined as an unconventional war against the governments regarded as legitimate according to the state supported standards of their time. One of the aims of terrorism is to keep this war going. To understand terrorism and the fight against terrorism, two points ought to be clarified: Terrorism is violating the law of war. Liberal democratic states cannot make a world war against terrorism by suspending democracy (Örgün, 2001:17).

Terrorist activities are (Euroforum, 2002:30):

> Intentional acts, which may seriously damage a country or an international organization, intimidating a population, compelling a Government or an international organization to perform or abstain from performing any act, seriously destabilizing or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organization.

As written in the *Euroforum Study Guide*, this is the common definition of terrorism reached by the ministers of justice and home affairs of the EU countries recently in an important piece of the anti-terrorism package promoted after the terrorist attacks in the US. Thus the definition of terrorist becomes "a structured group of more than two persons, established over a period of time and acting in concert to commit terrorist acts." (Euroforum, 2002:30).

Terrorism is an attractive strategy to the groups of different ideological persuasions who challenge the state's authority. Groups who want to dramatize a cause, to demoralize the government, to gain popular support, to provoke regime violence, to inspire followers, or to dominate a wider resistance movement, who are

33

weak in regard to the regime, and who are impatient to act, often find terrorism a reasonable choice. This is especially so when conditions are favorable, providing opportunities and making terrorism a simple and rapid option, with immediate and visible payoffs. Technology, communication, and transportation extremely helped in this way in the conditions for terrorists. Terrorism is often described as mindless violence, senseless violence, or irrational violence. If we put aside the actions of a few authentic lunatics, terrorism is seldom mindless or irrational. There is a theory to terrorism, and it often works.

A view argues that terrorism is the violation of principles of human dignity, democracy, freedom and respect of human rights. According to this conceptualization, most popular among the great powers, states recognized by international society have the right to protect their territorial integrity and national sovereignty.

One final definition will be given to clarify the concept for the following parts of this thesis. After these many definitions, author believes that, in its simplistic manner, terrorism is the use of fear with physical and psychological force to achieve a particular political purpose by reaching a large audience.

TYPES OF TERRORISM

After getting a clear idea of what terrorism is, it is necessary to examine the types. Although there exist many categorizations with many variants, the type that will be used and analyzed in this paper will be political terrorism, especially of the international or transnational variant. The focus will be on political terrorism of an international/transnational character, how it interrelates or interacts with

globalization and why countries might seek to respond with means ranging from military force to international legal instruments.

That extremist groups resort to terrorism in order to acquire political influence does not mean that all groups have equally precise objectives or that the relationship between means and ends is perfectly clear to an outside observer. Terrorist activity takes on a variety of different forms, and some of them are interdependent. There is no clear distinction between the types because some acts may involve two forms of terrorism. Also some types that are of domestic concern might have international origins or sources as well.

One commonly used distinction is between terrorism from below and terrorism from above, in other words the terrorism of private groups and that of states. Private terrorist groups receiving assistance usually have lives of their own with goals and objectives distinct from those of the foreign governments which are sponsoring or secretly promoting their operations. In the case of terrorism from above, it is mostly a state sponsored terrorism within state borders.

A second widely used distinction in analyzing terrorism is that between its domestic and international varieties. Domestic terrorism refers to situations in which all the relevant participants which are terrorist groups, victims and audience reside in or have grievances focused on the same country. During the 1970s the Italian Red Brigades committed its acts of violence in Italy against other Italians to win support of an audience of working-class Italians for the cause of revolution against the state. International terrorism refers to situations where there is some mix of nationalities in the terrorist group, its victims, the intended audience and the location of its activities.

Terrorism is commonly typed as nationalist, ideological, religious, single-issue oriented, and state-sponsored international terrorism. Nationalists seek political

self-determination. They may wage their struggle in the territory they seek to liberate and from bases abroad. Groups pursuing ethnic-separatist or nationalist aims have also used terrorism. Terrorists commonly use it, since they lack formal armies and are usually brutally opposed by the state. Their objectives are not revolutionary in the sense discussed above, but instead involve the carving of an independent nation out of a region which is currently part of another. It may sometimes involve the desire to replace the control exercised by one state over a territory with that of another.

Sub-revolutionary terrorism may be defined as the threat and or employment of extra normal forms of political violence, with the objective of effecting various changes in the structural functional aspects of the particular political system. The goal is to bring about certain changes within the body politic, not to abolish it in favor of a complete system change. Primarily, groups or movements indigenous to the particular political system employ such means, though similar elements beyond the system's geographical boundaries may also rely on such means.

Ideological terrorists profess a desire to change the whole nature of the existing political, social and economic system. They have proved less durable than the well-established nationalist groups and are highly prone to internal splits. A particular ideology superior to the other in the evolutionary world generates fundamentalist tendencies among its followers, who seek to propagate their ideas through the medium of terrorist violence.

Revolutionary terrorism may be defined as the threat and or employment of extra normal forms of political violence, in varying degrees, with the objective of successfully effecting a complete revolutionary change within the political system. Such means may be employed by revolutionary elements indigenous to the particular political system or by similar groups acting outside of the geographical boundaries of

the system. Terrorism is commonly linked to groups whose aims are revolutionary in the sense they wish to bring about a radical redistribution of wealth, power and status in a society. Such groups usually profess a commitment to Marxism, variously defined, and seek to bring about an end to capitalism and the advent of a dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolutionary goal is intended to bring an end to the exploitation of one segment of society, the working class and achieve its redemption by pushing that society to a new and more equitable stage of development. (Weinberg, 1989:13).

Certain religious groups employ international terrorism to undermine and ultimately overthrow a prevailing religious order which they regard as corrupt and evil. While terrorism can be expressed as the continuation of politics by other means, having mostly political reasons, terrorism can be a by-product of fundamentalism giving rise to different types (Seghal, 1996:14). Religious terrorism emanates from some fanatic groups who take it upon themselves to pronounce the superiority of their religion over all the rest on the earth. The propagators are devoid of logic, rationale or reason and would not listen to it either. They thwart all efforts aimed at objective analysis of world religions, including their own, and promote an extreme form of cult in which religious co-existence on equal basis is ruled out. This form of terrorism seeks to coerce followers of other religions into the acceptance of supremacy of their religion. Any challenge, in any form is not tolerated and terrorist violence resorted to wipe it out. On a smaller scale, single-issue fanatics are obsessed with the desire to change a specific policy or practice within the target society.

In state terrorism, a state may be accused of provoking, equipping directly or indirectly or inspiring groups or organizations to resort to terrorism. The state may itself resort to terrorist behavior to establish and reinforce its authority and suppress

37

an insurgency in the country. This form is alleged to be used by military and communist regimes. Use of extra force and custodial deaths are often cited as examples of state terrorism. State sponsors may use their own directly recruited and controlled terror squads or may choose to work through proxies and client movements. They almost invariably work covertly in such support in order plausibly to deny any involvement (Freedman, 1998:39).

Establishment terrorism may be defined as the threat and or employment of extra normal forms of political violence, by an established political system, against both external and internal opposition. Specifically such means may be employed by an established political system against other nation states and groups external to the particular political system, as well as internally to repress various forms of domestic opposition and unrest and or to move the populace to comply with programs, goals of the state.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

While international terrorism is conducted by people controlled by a sovereign state, transnational terrorism which is terrorism practiced by autonomous nonstate actors but not necessarily with the support of sympathetic states (Seghal, 1996:5). Transnational terrorism is essentially political in character with an additional dimension of transcending of national boundaries. It is an extremely subtle and most powerful form of terrorism operating with remote controls. The promoters of this terrorism have access to huge funds, weaponry and shelter. Their gangs operate in country A during the night and have their breakfast in country B in the morning and may be in country C to spend the night. Advances in science and technology have made the most sophisticated and fast moving means available for

promoting terrorism in any part of the world with controls operating from long distances across the continents. This type of terrorism may have a commercial dimension as well. Narcotic operators have a vast network of terrorism across the borders of different countries to push through their commercial activities. As Paul Wilkinson argued, (Seghal, 1996:4) terrorism is inherently international in character, so that, paradoxically, the more individual states improve their national measures to combat international terrorism, the more it becomes attractive for the terrorist to cross national frontiers. Transnational terrorism comprises those terrorist incidents that have clear international consequences: incidents in which terrorists go abroad to strike their targets, stay at home but select victims because of their connections to a foreign state or attack international lines of commerce.

According to Freedman (1998:41), the reason for the increase in international terrorism is because the general geostrategic situation favors unconventional war. The balance of terror and the fact that all major states wish to avoid an escalation of violence that could lead to a possible nuclear conflict are important factors. Most states are afraid of protracted and expensive conventional conflicts which might escalate. Unconventional war becomes more attractive.

There are senses in which international relations are challenged by transnational terrorism. It violently interrupts or threatens the conduct of international life. It seems to undermine the rule of international society according to which states enjoy the monopoly of the legitimate use of force. When undertaken or sponsored or encouraged by states themselves, it seems to threaten the system of reciprocal restraint which underpins their own existence. Besides separate terrorist groups pursuing their separate purposes there is also coordination among the groups in some kind of "terror international", threatening the security of the system as a

whole. As Brian Jenkins has suggested recent technological developments allowing mass travel, instant communication and readily usable weaponry have produced a situation in which complex social systems are more vulnerable to terrorism than in any previous period, and more attention is paid to it because of this vulnerability. Paul Wilkinson maintains that there is general agreement that terrorism measured in numbers of attacks, people killed and the growth of movements around the world is on the increase (Freedman, 1998:3).

Transnational terrorism is forced to rely on international transport system to reach targets and on global media to provide publicity and communication of political demands. Therefore, we need to turn to an examination of whether globalization supplies not only the means, but also the substantive causes of modern terrorism.

Some western democracies have little or no direct experience of terrorism; thus, they cannot see the importance of the problem. The need for improved international cooperation is growing. Today, mostly terrorism is inherently international and even transnational in character due to technological developments and interdependence. The more individual states improve their national measures, the more it becomes attractive for the terrorists to cross frontiers to escape justice, to secure arms, ammunition and money, and to collaborate with fellow terrorists. Therefore, we need to turn to an examination of whether globalization supplies not only the means, but also the substantive causes of modern terrorism.

CHAPTER IV

LIVING IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

The success of terrorism rests on its strength in communication, transportation, intelligence and finance. Globalization has been the main contributor to development and improvement in these fields. Without globalization, the picture would be more like as it was before the 1960s. If the world was not globalized, bombings, kidnappings and other kinds of terrorist acts would still exist, but without the same opportunities, they would not be as internationally effective or significant as they are today. Globalization has promoted the development of terrorism. Besides all its positive aspects, globalization could be the growth and coordination of terrorism's supporters especially with the help of Internet. In this chapter, globalization will be analyzed to trace how it correlates with the current phase of terrorism associated with the events of September 11th. The purpose of this part will be to show that there is a strong relationship between globalization and terrorism.

Internationalism involves agreement among nation-states. National interests have to be shared or sacrificed for an international organization to work. The new political institutions pluralize sovereignty. As Rosenau describes it, global governance consists of governance without government of regulatory mechanisms in a sphere of activity which function effectively even though they are not endowed

with formal authority (cited in Nash, 2000:55). This requirement puts an inherent limit on internationalism.

Moreover many analysts who believe nongovernmental institutions and trends are the wave of the future, and political officials and observers who hope that multilateralism can ride that wave, are suddenly faced after September 11 with the resurrection of the state, that old agent and protector of interventionism and imperialism (LaFeber, 2002:2). Transnational organizations are designed to facilitate the pursuit of a single interest within many national units. The international organization requires accord among nations, while the transnational organization requires access to nations.

Yet, changes in technology have threatened states' sovereign control in many areas. In some cases technology has facilitated disembodied transnational movements such as radio transmissions and capital flows. In other cases technology has diminished the importance of geographic location by either reducing transportation costs or standardizing capital equipment. The challenge we face is the unlimited access of information by people and every kind of entity, and the ability to use them for any purpose. Terrorists benefit from this as well with the help of globalization. A world very partially unified by technology still has no collective consciousness or collective solidarity. What states are unwilling to do the world market cannot do all by itself, especially in engendering a sense of world citizenship.

WHAT IS GLOBALIZATION?

Globalization consists of all politically related developments sweeping the global arena, including global diffusion of military capabilities, the worldwide

expansion of telecommunications, and the increasingly unequal distribution of international wealth. Terrorism uses all these.

Globalization embraces technology, ecology, movies, health, fast food and other consumer goods, and it is transdisciplinary, involving not exclusively the social sciences but also the natural sciences, the humanistic sciences and professional fields such as architecture, law and medicine.

Although there might be groups against the concept or the tools of globalization, the citizens of the world are constrained to live by its rules for the foreseeable future. According to Faruk Örgün, globalization, like industrialization, is an inevitable fact of human life. As globalization accelerates, anti-globalist movements are also increasing. Humanity went through a lot of pain in the transformation from the feudal period to industrial period. Today the world of poor is as close to the world of rich as the switch of a television and as far from it in material terms as the other galaxies. The world has never been divided into two this rigidly, and it was never this difficult to close the gap (Örgün, 2001:46).

Globalization mostly has been perceived as the freeing of the international movement of goods and especially investment, accelerating and increasing in volume and a technological revolution paralleling this acceleration and growth. Globalization is actually a complex and multilayered concept and social phenomenon. In principle, it does not claim more than its geographic property: people and places in the world are becoming more extensively and densely connected to each other as a consequence of increasing transnational flows of capitals, goods, information, ideas and people (Kalb, 2000:1). Giddens sees globalization as the outcome of the dynamism of modernity which involves what he calls the disembedding of social relations in time-space distanciation and the reflexive appropriation of knowledge

43

(Nash, 2000:65). According to Emre Kongar, the sources that caused globalization are the revolution of communication and information technology, the disintegration of the Soviet Republic and the end of Cold War. And the end of Cold War accelerated this progress.

Mehmet Ali Civelek distinguishes between three meanings of globalization. It is a historical phenomenon, meaning a new era where the political and economic system of the Cold War era vanished. According to those who accept this definition, globalization means the change of the balance of power among the superpowers in favor of the United States. The second meaning of globalization comprises a number of related developments like liberalization of the market, privatization, government non-intervention in the economy, increasing international investment and integration of the world commercial market. Supporters of this belief do not accept globalization as a historical new era. In contrary, the only thing that changes is the speed of this formation. According to a third definition, globalization is the technological and social revolution which symbolizes the transformation from industrial to post-industrial capitalism. Globalization is a new phenomenon that shows itself in the social as well as economic areas. Thus, the integration of production and technology across national borders, the move to expertise in the labor market, interdependence—the world taking the steps to become one market—all define the globalization phenomena (Civelek, 2001:162).

Globalization also has three dimensions. First is economic globalization, which results from recent revolutions in technology, information, trade, foreign investment, and international business. The main actors are companies, investors, banks, private services industries, states and international organizations. This present form of capitalism poses a central dilemma between efficiency and fairness. The

44

specialization and integration of firms make it possible to increase aggregate wealth but the logic of pure capitalism does not favor social justice. Cultural globalization stems from the technological revolution and economic globalization which together foster the flow of cultural goods. The key choice is between homogenization and diversity. The result is both a disenchantment of the world and a reaction against uniformity. Political globalization is a product of the other two.

WHEN DID GLOBALIZATION BEGIN?

All parts of the world are characterized by a combination of integration and fragmentation even though the tendencies to integration are greater in the north and the tendencies to fragmentation may be greater in the south and east (Kaldor, 1999:11). The divide between North and South is not a new phenomenon. Globalization has existed for ages. Some argue that there is nothing new about the present phase of globalization, from its inception, capitalism was always a global phenomenon. It accelerated with decolonization and especially with the end of Cold War. But there is no consensus on when globalization has begun.

Globalization includes formations like the unification of Turks. There have been pauses in the process of globalization. There have been hindrances in the continuity of globalization due to changes in politics of states. As an example, during the Cold War the relationship between East and West Germany banned. Some authors hold that globalization started on a small scale anywhere from 100 to 500 years ago and reached unprecedented rates in recent decades (Scholte, 2000:19).

Proponents of an "all change" thesis do not look beyond the current generation and presume that globalization is entirely a recent historical turn. At another extreme, proponents of "all continuity" argument highlight antecedents to

contemporary developments and assume that these earlier manifestations of globality had a level of prominence and intensity similar to that witnessed today (Scholte, 2000:62). Accelerated globalization of recent decades can in some respects be linked to reduced warfare, to greater material prosperity and to cultural innovation. On the other hand, the rise of supraterritoriality can also be linked to more destructive military capabilities, to persistent poverty, to greater financial instability. The problems have in the main resulted not from globalization but from the particular courses of globalization that we have taken to date (Scholte, 2000:208).

The globalization of the 1980s and 1990s is a qualitatively new phenomenon which can be explained as a consequence of the revolution in information technologies and dramatic improvements in communication and data processing (Kaldor, 1999:3) During the 1980s and 1990s, a new type of organized violence has developed, especially in Africa and Eastern Europe, which is one of the current globalized era. Mary Kaldor describes this type of violence as new war (1999:1). The new wars have to be understood in the context of the process known as globalization, in which she means the intensification of global interconnectedness, political, economic, military and cultural. The goals of the new wars are about identity politics in contrast to the geopolitical or ideological goals of earlier wars (Kaldor, 1999:6). The strategic goal of these wars is population expulsion through various means such as mass killing, forcible resettlement, range of political, psychological and economic techniques of intimidation.

DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF GLOBALIZATION

Globalization is both a description and a prescription. It serves as both an explanation and an ideology that currently dominates thinking, policymaking and

political practice. It identifies a complex of changes produced by the dynamics of capitalist development as well as the diffusion of values and cultural practices associated with this development.

According to Mohammed Ayoob, proponents of globalization, free economy and global society overestimate technological and similar developments, and underestimate the resilience of the state. There is a dichotomy between human security and state security. However, human security cannot be separated from state security. He believes that the focus of security should move from the state to human security. Ayoob thinks the gap between have and have-nots increased by the creation of winners and losers among and inside nations. Globalization has created winners and losers where the losers do not have a capacity. According to neoliberal thought, globalization has changed the position of state in the international level. The role of the state is being decreased due to globalization. What matters is the fair distribution of resources, intervention to punish states, and penetrating into vulnerable states to correct them. Thus, as the state loses power, individuals are more insecure.

Human security is dependent on state security. The change of a state's position does not affect human security because no entity other than the state is capable of providing security to humans. Non-state bodies are not bound by the obligations states have, so the pressure on the non-state organizations to provide security for people is not great. They are not as powerful as states, at least in the contemporary world. A realist assumption holds that individual security is linked to that of the state. As Politi has noted (Ifantis, 2002:110), individual security and international stability are increasingly intertwined and a security threat is anything that hampers any relevant organization in ensuring individual security.

It has been suggested that the process of contemporary globalization, in its most general form, has as its basic characteristic a tension between universalism and particularism. On the one hand, there is Francis Fukuyama's the end of history thesis, which holds that a universalization of liberal market ideology, along with the globalization of multinational capitalism, marked the dissolution of differences into the sameness, that is, an emergence of cultural homogenization. On the other hand, conflicting particularism, nationalist or ethnic, began to dictate the mode of articulation of political practices and ideological /discursive forms in global relations, that is cultural heterogenization. Arjun Appadurai suggested that the central problem of today's global interactions is the tension between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization (Keyman, 2000:165).

Globalization from the beginning of its existence has been a multidefinitional concept. Depending on the perspective, it is expressed as a project or a process. All of these give way to different types of argument. The first age of globalization began in the mid-nineteenth century and expanded until World War I. The second phase began with the new technologies of the 1970s and the American triumphalism of the late 1980s and 1990s, and then lasted until the September 11th attacks. For both generations of imperialists, the globalization process turned out to be crucial. It gave them the tools and reach to shape and reshape other societies, but it simultaneously destabilized important parts of the globe by widening the gaps between rich and poor, while ironically providing better communications so those gaps became glaringly apparent to the poor (LaFeber, 2002:2).

Most scholars see it as a set of interrelated processes inscribed within the structures of the operating system based on capitalist modes of global production. Others conceive of it not in structural terms but as the outcome of a consciously

pursued strategy, the political project of a transnational capitalist class and formed on the basis of an institutional structure set up to serve and advance the interests of this class (Petras, 2001:11).

Kenneth Booth believes globalization is an uneven project. It is dynamic and unstoppable but its effects are not equally distributed (Booth, 2002). Project seems to connote the idea that globalization is conscious or intentional projection of political, economic and cultural hegemonic influence onto weaker actors. Process is not very different from the idea of complex interdependence. It indicates the spread of markets, corporations and cultural influence in multiple directions. This can be either threatening to states or beneficial to them, but often it is both, depending on which aspect of globalization you choose to look at (Williams, 2002). According to Rosenau, globalization refers to processes, to sequences that unfold either in the mind or in behavior as people and organizations attempt to achieve their goals. Globalization is not only an objective trend but also constitutes or is constituted by subjective processes. It is a mental or intersubjective framework that is implicated both in the exercise of power and in scholarship that informs or is critical of public policy. Ayoob thinks a dichotomy of project and process cannot be made for globalization. Successful process comes from project. But it might be possible to say that globalization is a progressive project.

The secret weapon of the Al-Qaeda is the use of its exploitation of the civil values about which people care most, the protection of privacy, the celebration of free association and speech, and the cultivation of a multiethnic democracy. The hidden target of terrorist organizations is globalizations as well as liberalism. The full integration of the world economy supposes that borders are meant to be freely crossed, and aliens and citizens will converge in their practical privileges (Mittelman,

1996:8). The organization is against globalization as a project where there is the use of the poor by the rich. On the other hand, terrorist organization benefits from globalization as a process.

Just as with capitalism, which has identifiable variants, there is no single, unified form of globalization. Globalization is the fullest degree of international or global growth of market capitalism. States have needs, desires and wants whose realization results in the establishment of arrangements, the Hobbesian social contract or the Smithian division of labor. Despite these differences, states interact to maximize the given power and economic interests and these interactions give rise to an international order as an expression of the reproduction of either the established contractual arrangement such as international regimes, or the functioning of the division of labor such as the world capitalist economy.

According to Mehmet Ali Civelek (2001:165), the ones who add political values to globalization believe economic liberalization would automatically bring democratization. But it is thought that the developments of communication and information revolution either strengthen the democracy or create a multichanneled monopoly. Although political values and communication developments may not look related, the endpoint of democracy is what matters. Seen as an economic movement, it is not possible to ignore the political aspect, so it makes sense to relate economy to liberal democracy. On the other hand, it can be debated whether democracy is improved or harmed by communication and information.

CAPITALIST SIDE OF GLOBALIZATION

The political economy of global capitalism proves to be useful as it offers a convincing analysis of the fact that the basic rules of capitalist mode of production,

the uneven and unequal economic development on a world scale, continues to be one of the shaping forces of international relations.

The concrete manifestations of the idea of globalization includes significant changes in the form of production with the end of organized capitalism and the emergence of flexible accumulation, in the increased gaps between state sovereignty and global world economy, in the intensification of time-space compression through communication and informational technologies, and the emergence of overlapping cultures, crosscurrents, cross talks with the increasing inability of western modernity to distantiate itself from its former colonies. That results in the inability to establish a geographical distance between the privileged modern self and its post colonial other. Globalization should not be regarded as a new stage in the development and diffusion of modernity (Keyman, 2000:16).

A production based understanding of capitalism is necessary to delineate the way in which unequal and uneven development at the world scale remains one of the basic characteristics of the process of globalization and marks the capitalist nature of global modernity. This capitalist nature of global modernity and the spread of production have a negative effect on social and cultural values. Especially the internationalization of certain brands overcame national or smaller products. Like the spread of English language to foreign speaking boundaries, which suppressed mother languages in micro community languages, the chain of hamburger restaurants undermined traditional food in most places. Cultural and social values are inevitably challenged by the capitalist production.

We can say capitalist globalization is paradoxical. It can be said that, globalization is mainly a policy where the rich countries paint and decorate globalization to make the underdeveloped and developing countries get attracted and

fall into trap of the beautiful picture of globalizations and take their place in that policy. It is accepted as the last phase of the market economy (Civelek, 2001:165).

On the evolving integrated world markets, workers in the rich countries are confronted with increasing competition from other countries and capital owners can move their wealth easily to wherever the returns are expected to be the highest (Kalb, 2000:151). Global production and mobility of capital are united in the operations of multinational corporations. We are now living in one borderless world where the national and global divisions that once existed are progressively disappearing in favor of free exchange and cooperation to the common good of all humanity.

It is argued that individual and collective security is dependent on our ability to confront the new challenges. Among the new factors that transcend boundaries and threaten to erode national cohesion, the most perilous are the new risks, drug trafficking, transnational organized crime, nuclear smuggling, refugee movements, uncontrolled and illegal immigration, environmental risks and international terrorism.

Open, democratic, pluralist societies and open markets make trans-sovereign threats possible. Drug smuggling illegally uses the same international financial networks that free trade and capitalist economic policies create.

RESULTS OF GLOBALIZATION

The most simplistic and commonly accepted result of globalization, at the phase we are in, is a polarized and divided world. It is a world with highly developed and highly underdeveloped countries at the extremes. Emre Kongar believes the results of globalization would create a smaller world, where rich would be getting richer while poor would be getting poorer, and there would be the higher existence of

concepts like human rights and democracy and the limitation of the sovereignty of the nation state. One problem grew from globalization's inability to solve highly dangerous problems of poverty in certain parts of the world from which the terrorists came. It could produce wealth, but it could not necessarily distribute it more equitably or with the necessary intelligence (LaFeber, 2002:11). Kofi Annan has said poor are not the victims of globalization but they remained outside. As Sertaç Başeren has stated, underdeveloped countries say that the rich left them behind, that is why the developed have to finance their development. That is the fact, whether or not it was not intentional to leave them on the underdeveloped side. Öniş thinks some states respond better to challenges of globalization. The negative effects of globalization on the distribution of wealth, the digital gap between states, regions and classes created parallel to the spread of computer technology, caused the birth and strengthening of counter-arguments to globalization (Civelek, 2002:175). Even though economic growth obscured these problems, recession now increases their saliency.

Many commentators have argued that the process brings a worldwide synchronization. Globalization has harmonized and unified often crushing traditional ways of life when they have deviated from the dominant pattern. Other diagnosis have linked globalization with enduring or even increased cultural diversity. Through glocalization, global news reports, global products, global social movements, and the like take different forms and make different impacts depending on local particularities. Others argue globalization has promoted fragmentation, with a growth of substate identity politics like ethno-nationalism and indigenous peoples' movements (Scholte, 2000:23).

There is a basic and fundamental truth at the heart of the notion of globalization, namely that states must live within a larger environment which pushes them to change and rationalize their operations. A detailed consideration of most of the economic evidence shows that trading interchanges are heavily centered in the North, as are patterns of investment, with the economic challenge from the South if anything losing some salience over the most recent years (John and Hall, 1999:403).

THE LINK BETWEEN GLOBALIZATION AND TERRORISM

Like terrorism, it is difficult to define globalization. It has many reasons and those reasons make globalizations what it is. It is the unified, developed system we live in. It is what we see around us. Free market, technology, political and social relations are the roots of its existence.

In the less globalized Cold War era, there was a balance in world politics. While the policies were shaped by security concerns, deterrence and equality of powers resulted in a vulnerable balance. Having no other important external problems, states could look inside and work on improving their internal welfare. Unlike the conservative communist bloc, western states worked on the improvements in democracy, humanity, prosperity, law and sciences. During that time, important political and social steps were taken like the establishment of international and regional organizations, freer trade and transactions, and improving the conditions for their people. While these developments were helped by globalization, paradoxically after September 11th attacks, globalization started to limit these enhancements. Security concerns again occupied first rank in policies of governments. Now that the balance is broken, there are emerging powers, though the United States seems to be left as the only superpower. The increase of terrorist organizations of international or

54

transnational nature, the idea of politics by other means is placed on a larger scale and security became more of a concern. With this increase of terrorist organizations, these emerging powers can shift to any wave of political or social belief. After the Cold War, with the acceleration of globalization and the emergence of unconventional warfare, terrorism is more likely to increase in the future.

The general strategic situation favors unconventional war. The balance of nuclear terror and the fact that all major states wish to avoid an escalation of violence that could lead to a possible nuclear conflict are important factors. Most states today are afraid even of protracted and expensive conventional conflicts which might escalate. Unconventional war becomes relatively more attractive. In terms of cost effectiveness it may seem the best coercive means of achieving political diplomatic objectives (Freedman, 1998:41). States either explicitly or implicitly support some terrorist movements. In case of explicit support, that is terrorism from above to below.

Terrorist networks utilized the approaches of nongovernmental organizations and privatization, as exploiting globalization. Terrorism goes beyond the national boundaries. It is a global entity. When it is likely to face a problem, terrorists can move their business to another country for a better opportunity, just as the multinationals do (Roy, 2001:75). Nonstate entities are free to move in the international arena. In the age before globalization, where the borders were more strictly set, relations and freedom of movements were limited, the economy was more or less controlled by the government, and nonstate entities were weak. But globalization has provided new opportunities to the non-governmental organizations. Being outside of state's zone of obligatory pressure, they function as private enterprises. They have their own economic, administrative and strategic planning.

They have their own distinct capacities and goals. Terrorists, as an example of these nonstate entities, benefited from globalization. Thus the grievances they cause are more costly and easily applied. The enlargement of the scope and the capacity of every entity to reach anywhere in the world increased the attention of the audience and the amount of casualty caused. Unfortunately, in the new world, terror got globalized before the democracies that depend on human rights did. As the world is globalized, terrorist acts which were directed to freedom relations of certain states, now targets the liberal democratic, globalized world, namely the developed countries.

Terror of any kind is difficult to cope with. After the effects of globalization and the capabilities it provided, terrorism's effect has become obvious. Cyber terror following nuclear, biological and chemical terror will be the new nightmare of the world. Also, before September 11th, terrorists had mostly clear objectives and targets, in that each time they were willing to give their names to get the desired attention. After September 11th, however, there was no clear announcement of responsibility. Before, organizations were mostly from one nation or group, but the transnationality after globalization increased the ground for search and identification. Now the enemy is not as clear as it was before. Before there was no confusion as to who committed terrorist acts, but September 11th changed this (Örgün, 2001:108). International terrorism is not a result of globalization. Globalization has positive impacts like technology and intelligence to help the fight.

The September 11th terror made it clear that terrorism due to globalization is a more significant threat, not only in terms of its consequences but also by the resources. This act can be seen as the most significant event to affect the new world order after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The changes in the balances of power and the

differentiation in international relations caused the shift from conventional to unconventional war. The psychological warfare, which emerged as a must of the Cold War, and low-density warfare, which emerged as the inevitable consequence of psychological warfare, gained a global saliency with this attack on the United States (Örgün, 2001:12).

Many basic values built gradually by humanity like freedom, democracy, law and human rights are in danger of diminishing due to the need of security. These were highly valued during the Cold War and also in any era loading op to that time. After September 11, security took the lead in the national concerns of states with the advances in terrorism and globalization. Positive trends in the freedom of movement, the rising importance of human rights and the application of law have been arrested by the events of September 11th. That date showed that the differing ranks of security did not matter in different states expressed on the budget spent on weaponry. The United States was probably the country that gave the most importance and spent the most on security issues, and the US was a symbol of freedom, democracy and liberalization. Due to these open and equal opportunities of the United States, the terrorists realized their attack using ordinary vehicles of travel. Thus, those basic values that are integral to democracy are in danger of being diminished. As the world citizens, they were free to travel and transport goods and money. Now they are all banned from these rights. To prevent any further act, suspects or some regular people will be followed, investigated or researched. This is a limitation of the freedom and values people had before September 11th. While humanity enters to a new era, the revolution of communication and information technology will take its place on the scene as one of the biggest nightmare and also the savior.

CHAPTER V

THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

The concepts of terrorism and globalization having been discussed and the link between the two explained, the fight against terrorism in the globalized world will be analyzed in this chapter. First there will be an introduction to cooperation and institutions. Then the possible ways to fight terrorism will be expressed. In the context of the weakness of cooperation law will be introduced. The importance of cooperation in the fight against terrorism will be explained, citing present law and regulations.

The fight against terrorism is difficult. The biggest problem is that it cannot be totally eliminated. It might change in form, but it will survive because there will be groups unsatisfied with politics, economics or the system at all times. If it cannot be terminated, the only way to fight terrorism is to minimize its effects. It is a long-term process and steps should be taken carefully and quickly. The citizens should be aware of the happenings and be able to react to them. Public voice is important in politics. As the constituents of legitimate political entities, citizens need to show how they think and feel through the people they vote for and put in charge. Organizations of any kind have the same responsibility as the citizens. When dealing with an issue such as terrorism, regardless of the transnational, international or non-governmental nature of the organization, the common desire to struggle against a common enemy

would help unity. As non-state institutions, nongovernmental organizations make up a bigger share of public voice. The states, as the sole actors of the realist thought, have enforcement power. While citizens and organizations can be influential and powerful with their agenda-setting capability, states have the capacity to enforce the agenda items. The most effective tool in the fight against terrorism is cooperation at the international level. Having the strongest position, states should have a common ground on which to base the ideas and to discuss options, in order to be able to act together in consensus.

TOOLS IN THE FIGHT

Besides cooperative legal tools, there are other means to fight terrorism. Diplomacy and the resort to physical force can be tried before other means used or with legal and cooperative ways. Diplomacy is the most difficult one and can present dilemmas. First, since terrorists mostly do not have nations or an exact location, finding them is hard. They strive to keep their basis and identities secret. Waiting to get an answer to their demands and not getting it coerce them to apply tactics of terrorism. And as a result, they might not be interested in negotiations. Even if they do, a dilemma appears for the statesmen because dealing with a terrorist leader or a terrorist group might be seen as accepting the terrorist organization as legitimate.

On the other hand, physical force is the most applied strategy to deal with terrorist acts. When one inflicts damage, the immediate reaction is to strike back. The target can be destroyed, the terrorist killed or the leader captured but that is never the solution. These groups are well organized and they have many members. The death of one or tens is not the end. They can quickly reorganize and move ahead, even recruit more people if they find it necessary. Even though a military response seems

like a solution, it is not useful in the long term. These problems leave the ground to the use of cooperation and law for an effective and certain solution. Its negative aspects are the need for a long time frame and the absence of solid international cooperation at the time. Thus, international politics is still a realm of self-help where states face security dilemmas and force plays a considerable role.

Keeping the realist emphasis on the state to one side, it is more meaningful to switch to the constructivist thought when talking about cooperation and a common understanding among nations. As given by the constructivist belief, shared knowledge, things that shape identities and interests are reproduced products of communication between actors involved. It is not possible to arrive at a perfect definition of any problem by a process of deductive logic but by using deliberation and collective reasoning to persuade and teach others. They believe intersubjective understandings emerge as social facts that constitute the interests, identity of social actors, and regulate their behavior. Thus the voice of citizens, organizations affecting the policies of states, or the personalities making decision in the states shape definitions of the interests and products. The way people live and the norms which constitute the society, make up the laws. In a circular way, people make the society what it is with their habits, rules, norms and beliefs, and the society rules the people shaped by their will (Onuf, 1998:59).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COOPERATION AND LAW

Even though legal, diplomatic, political and economic actions are by no means a proven panacea for state-sponsored terrorism and the terrorism of non-state actors, if carried out in concert, they could substantially reduce international terrorism. At least they do not increase the risk of international war (Freedman,

1998:54). This is to strengthen the effect of nonmilitary ways to fight terrorism. International relations and trade paved the way to ultimate and mutual relations among nations. When you have good economic ties with a state and benefit from that, you would not be willing to destroy that relationship. In a political unification like the European Union, your gains are higher than from unilateralism or isolation. Adding these up, integration and increased relations help cooperation. This might take us to the concept of democratic peace. In that theory it is believed that democracies do not go to war with each other because of the pacific union. It is more likely for democracies to fight with nondemocratic states due to international imprudence (*Lecture Notes on International Relations Theory*, 1998). The reason for this is the cultural norms of non-violent dispute settlement and an institutional structure that allows time for negotiation. When two or more actors have mutual gains, they prefer to preserve it war would be costly to both sides. Cooperation in diplomacy, politics, economy and justice might make the attacker think twice before committing an act of war.

The focus of the new institutionalism has been on cooperation and international institutions in a generic sense, with international regimes and formal organizations sometimes conceived as specific institutional subsets. Keohane has defined institutions as persistent and connected set of rules, formal and informal, that prescribe behavioral roles, constrain activity and shape expectations. Drawing on Gramsci's critical discourse of modern society, in which the concept of hegemony functions as the key to exploring the production and reproduction of order, Cox tries to account for world order. What he believes is central to any understanding of the dialectical interplay between internal and external forces. In order to understand the creation of world order it is necessary to focus on the relationship between social

61

forces and states or on the state/civil society complex as the basic entity of international relations. Thus, multilateral orders are strengthened if they fit more closely with the domestic political profiles of the dominant powers.

Differences in domestic structures determine the variation in the policy impact of transnational actors. Domestic structures mediate, filter and refract the efforts by transnational actors and alliances of them to influence policies in the various issue areas. The more centralized the political system, the fewer access points transnational actors have to penetrate the institutions of the target state. For Cowhey (Ruggie, 1993:463), domestic structures, and in particular electoral systems, serve as signals to the other actors that the leading power is serious about living up to its commitments. The maintenance of consensus and credibility is crucial for overcoming the impediments that otherwise would hamper cooperative efforts. In drawing on the insights of the principal agent literature and organization theory, Cowhey stresses issues of transparency and legitimacy as crucial ingredients of multilateral order.

Knowledge-based or normative principle-based transnational and transgovernmental issue networks seen to have a major impact on the global diffusion of values, norms and ideas in such diverse issue areas as human rights, international security or the global environment. But there is no reason to assume that transnational relations regularly promote good causes. Transnational terrorism poses a serious threat to internal stability in many countries, while some scholars have identified Islamic fundamentalism, another transnational social movement, as a major source of future interstate conflicts. According to the constructivist approach, in all politics, domestic and international, actors reproduce or alter systems through their practices. Any given international system does not exist because of immutable

structures, rather, the very structures are dependent for their reproduction on the practices of the actors. Fundamental change of the international system occurs when actors change the rules and norms constitutive of international interaction (Ruggie, 1993:216).

Thomas Friedman (Friedman, 2001:3) best expresses the lack of cooperation and its results as:

> The bad guys work together, but we don't. The terrorist groups are a global organization. They know how to cooperate and stay focused on their military objectives. We have not. Some people didn't want to share intelligence. We can defeat them, but only if we learn to cooperate globally as effectively as they do.

The difficulty in the fight lies in the structure of the organization of the terrorist groups. They are not ordinary states or nations. Charles Kegley states that terrorism is not the war for which national militaries have trained. They are not bound by the rules by which states are bound. There are no massed armor formations pouring across a central front, no divisions on the march, no scramble of fighter aircraft. It is rather a hundred wars waged by elusive and ruthless foes (Kegley, 1990:27). As a result, even the military response might not be enough.

Cooperation not only means agreement between the states but also the multilateral use of all means to fight terrorism at the international level. Diplomacy should be used up to a certain point to explain the causes of actions to the world and the terrorists and to condemn them with means of embargo, sanctions or expulsion of diplomatic figures. Military should be involved when necessary, but these two tools should interact and help the achievement of international cooperation.

James Caporoso states (cited in Ruggie, 1993:77), according to methodological individualist theories, such as neorealism, cooperation is an outgrowth of individual desires, capacities and choices. Cooperation is instrumental.

63

States and their identities are instrumentally defined as separate from the institutions of international society. As Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall point out, this has important consequences: the predominance of neorealism in contemporary international relations theory, with its focus on the conscious choices of self interested actors, has meant that the story of international institutions and order is currently being told overwhelmingly in terms of the strategic problem of constructing cooperation under anarchy rather than in terms of a more normatively enriched international society, albeit an essentially anarchical one (Bull, 1997).

Agreeing on a definition is the first step in enhancing cooperation. It does not have to be a perfect or wide-ranging description, it just has to encompass certain acts which contravene international community rules, thus opening the way to punishment. Without a definition, the concept of terrorism is so obscure that that the terrorists easily get away with the crimes they have committed. International cooperation would be strengthened and institutionalized with a definition. To act effectively against terrorism, people should be well informed. This means good intelligence and good analysis. Also cooperation in policing and judiciary, exchange of data and intelligence, and political solidarity are vital instruments. On issues that encompass a variety of governmental needs and functions like terrorism the government should speak with one voice.

Gutteridge stresses the importance of the previously mentioned citizenry by saying that ordinary citizens are themselves a priceless asset in combating terrorism, if only they can be mobilized to help the government and security forces (1986:25). As expressed by Yüksel İnan, all acts of terrorism constitute a heavy breach of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual. (*The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations 1980-1981*, 1986:75). Looking from the pacific point of

view, the cure of terrorism seems to be in human rights, representative democracy, which accepts the supremacy of law and protects these rights, secularism, as a prior condition of democracy, an equitable distribution of wealth and a social state which provides for such a distribution. By contrast, according to Freedman, what defeats terrorism in the end is slow, patient police work: foiling plots, defusing bombs, arresting and trying culprits, diplomatic expulsions and the like, supplemented by economic or other boycotts of an offending state. Booth and Paul believe terrorism is a long-term challenge and needs to resort to military force. This violent response should be in proper proportion.

As stated before, physical force alone is insufficient**:** there remains a need for more use of political persuasion to deprive potential terrorists of a motivation to carry out their acts in the first place. There is need to remind potential terrorists and their sympathizers that there are other means of pursuing their objects (Freedman, 1998:20). Paralleling this observation, Tamer Erdoğan thinks that deterrence by way of taking security measures never prevents terrorism; rather, the best way to fight terrorism is by furthering social justice (Erdoğan, 2001:278). Gutteridge actually believes that both strategies are necessary to counter terrorism successfully: a conventional militarized war can contain and reduce terrorist violence, while a politico-psychological war can help to secure the popular consent and support, which must, at any rate, be the foundation of effective modern democratic government. That power can only be destroyed or emasculated when there is international recognition of its gravity and international action by the united forces of civilization to bring it under control. The way to combat terrorism is not to retaliate with greater violence. Although the lives taken deserve an equal exaction, it turns out to be a cycle where the general population loses. There ought to be peaceful measures to

limit the violence. The tools to be used for the limitation of violence might be power, patience, good strategy and diplomacy.

The logical next step would be international law. Rules and sanctions are needed to strengthen the force of any consensus definition of terrorism and most importantly provide means of justice and punishment. The basis of law is the codification of the norms existing in the society. According to Sertaç Başeren, law tells the relations of today, not historical happenings. Law, as stated by Blakesley (1991:1), is an attempt to curb and channel the use of force so that people and nations will settle their differences by means other than resort to violence. Law, to use a phrase of Abraham Lincoln, is the faith that right makes might. Legal requirements are the most obvious justification of coercion.

In any armed conflict including one against terrorism, it is important to distinguish between the legality of resorting to force and the legality of the way in which such force is used. In strict legal terms, the law relating to the right to resort to the use of force and the law governing the actual use of force in war are separate.

Modern international law legitimizes the use of armed force in two cases: to counter aggression for reasons of self defense and to oppose grave violations of certain norms of international law with collective sanctions authorized by the United Nations Security Council. International law doctrines undertake to justify other uses of armed force (Damrosch, 1991:232). Lori Fisler Damrosch and David Scheffer believe that, in view of the dangers and costs that the use of force poses for the international community, it is important to explore and develop every imaginable means of preventing or resolving potential or actual international conflicts—certainly judicial procedures are among the most salient of these possible techniques (Damrosch, 1991:270).

Crime is a commission of an act or act of omission that violates the law and is punishable by the state. Crimes are considered injurious to society or the community, as distinguished from torts and breach of contract. As defined by law, a crime includes both the act and the intent to commit the act. Criminal intent involves an intellectual apprehension of factual elements of the act or acts commanded or enjoined by the law. It is usually inferred from the apparently voluntary commission of an overt act. Criminal liability is relieved in the case of insanity. Legal minors are also relieved of criminal liability, as are persons subjected to coercion or duress to such a degree as to render the commission of criminal acts involuntary. In most countries, crimes are defined and punished pursuant to statutes. Punishments may include death, imprisonment, exile, fines, forfeiture of property, removal from public office, and disqualification from holding such office.

Unless the act of which a defendant is accused is expressly defined by statute as a crime, no indictment or conviction for the commission of such an act can be legally sustained. This provision is important in establishing the difference between government by law and arbitrary or dictatorial government. Crimes now usually include acts, such as murder, so offensive to morals as to be obviously criminal; as violations of specific regulatory statutes, such as traffic violations, that ordinarily would not be punishable in the absence of statutory enactments prohibiting the commission of such acts. The internationalization of crime has been characterized by new methods of offending. Like murder, terrorism takes away the right to life. It is illegal and violent. It does not give people a choice but to see the world as a war arena. Every terrorist act has reasons, which may be justified but what is unjust is the method used. According to national and international law, taking life is a crime during peacetime, but has exceptions as in the case of self-protection. Even if we

accept terrorism as a crime or not, in its simplistic form, since killing is a crime, terrorist act is illegal and unjust. The terrorists might have good valid reasons to react to or protest, but murder cannot be justified. This provides the ground in legal and political aspect to combat terrorism.

The importance of defining this concept comes in its differentiation from the definitions of ordinary crime. Terrorism is different from wartime violence. It is also different from simple murder, which is certainly an act of crime. But wartime events are of another concern. Killing enemy combatants during war is similar to killing an attacker, an act for which there is justification, but during war, one may not intentionally kill noncombatants or even capture former combatants. Noncombatants were never attackers and captured combatants are no longer attackers, so they may not be summarily killed. If this is true during war, it should be true during peacetime. According to Charles Blakesley, one of the best protections against terrorism is a consistent policy that condemns this common core of violence and that clearly refuses to participate in or promote it. One of the means of establishing consistent policy and of protecting humanity against criminal terror violence is to penalize the conduct (Blakesley, 1991:34). Punishment is important because there should be left no room for the terrorist to get away with the crime committed.

The internationalization of anti terrorism by means of greater legal collaboration among states should result in terrorism's global suppression. As Higgins cited from Judge Guillaume, terrorist acts should be criminalized in every country. Criminal procedures should be revised accordingly; courts' territorial jurisdiction should be more readily recognized, even when non-nationals carry out attacks outside their home territory. And finally, terrorists should be arrested, prosecuted and tried (Higgins, 1997:31).

OBSTACLES TO COOPERATION

International cooperation is not so easy to achieve. Some states mobilize against other states. Biggest obstacle to cooperation is intelligence sharing. Intelligence sharing is politicized, it is the most sensitive asset. National security is most immune. When there are secrets at the individual level, it is not possible to find out who works undercover or has learnt which information. Everything can be secret. It is known that keeping aside cooperation at the international level, cooperation at the national level is difficult in intelligence. The biggest obstacle to gathering information is the secrecy of identity of the people in this area (Kibaroğlu, 2001:36).

Everybody condemns terrorism but there is no common understanding. Diversional views are necessary for success but a definition of a limited number of states is not enough.

LEGAL RULES AND CONVENTIONS

The closing decades of the 20th century witnessed a proliferation of national measures to combat terrorism. Initiatives ranged from the negotiation of new treaties, the imposition of economic and political sanctions, and the use of military strikes, to alterations in immigrant procedures, the tightening of criminal law, and improvements in aviation security.

As stated by Yüksel İnan, the first steps towards international cooperation among states were taken by the United Nations (*The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations 1980-1981*, 1986:7). Additional organizations were later formed or became functional for this purpose. The UN General Assembly approved the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations

and Cooperation Among States in Accordance with the Charter of United Nations on 24 October 1970. It states that every state has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts, when the acts referred to involve a threat or use of force (Freedman, 1998:12).

As the European Union has summarized, terrorist offenses are divided into several categories: hostage taking; seizure of aircraft; supply or use of weapons; causing extensive destruction to a government or public facility, a transport system and an infrastructure facility, including an information system; disrupting the supply of water; and participating in the activities of a terrorist group, including supplying information, material resources and funding with knowledge of the fact that such participation will contribute to the criminal activities of the group. The ministers of justice and home affairs adjusted the definition of terrorism to omit demonstrations or anti-globalization actions. The Union also agreed on sanctions for terrorist acts, providing that the leader of a terrorist group will be punished with a jail term of fifteen years maximum and that a member can get eight years (Euroforum, 2002:36).

At odds with the ideas supported in this paper, in 1972, the General Assembly established an Ad Hoc Committee on Terrorism. According to this organ, terrorism cannot be defined by sole reference to the acts committed. Purpose or motive is obviously a key element in our understanding of terrorism (Higgins, 1997:15); yet, it is not likely that purposes or motives can be identified very precisely or consensually in many cases. A report of the Secretary General of 2 November 1972 on Resolution 3034 XIXVII set up a special committee on international terrorism, which produced two reports in 1973 and 1979. The reports were not accepted because most of the

Third World and Soviet Bloc countries rejected a formal definition of terrorism, possibly because a clear definition and an open way to punishment did not match their interests. In that group there were countries that still applied terrorism from above, who had fought against colonialism by terrorism and who were still fighting for national liberation purposes. Fortunately this lack of a definition did not undermine the efforts of the United Nations, who played the most significant role in the fight against terrorism.

The 1977 Geneva Protocol II was based on the assumption that when there is a conflict between a state's armed forces and organized armed groups under responsible command exercise control over a part of its territory and carry out sustained and concerted military operations. The protocol expressly does not apply to situations of internal disturbance and tension.

Entitled Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression, Chapter VII of the UN Charter is crucial in this respect. Article 39 states that the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and shall make recommendations to maintain or restore international peace and security. Article 40 provides that, in order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making recommendations or decisions on measures spelled out in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures, as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Other articles elaborate on the scope of specific measures to be carried out. Article 41 states that the Security Council may decide what measures, not involving the use of armed force, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures, including complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. If these less violent measures prove inadequate, Article 42 authorizes the Security Council to take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include shows of force, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Related articles pertain to burden sharing. Article 43 stipulates that all UN member states are to make available to the Security Council armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Article 44 says that when the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces. As written in Article 45, in order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall reserve immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. Article 48 holds that the action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

As covered in Article 51, self-defense is centrally important. As expressed in this article, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security, nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. Terrorism is kept out of the scope of self-defense. But since the definition of self-defense depends on the national perceptions, it causes a problem in distinguishing self-defense from terrorism. In order to be accepted as self-defense the action should be free of any terrorist act or motive.

The Strasbourg Convention of 27 January 1977 succeeded in defining terrorism. The convention does not contain a definition of terrorism per se, but enumerates a larger list of terrorist acts (Higgins, 1997:32). The 1971 Organization of American States Convention and the 1977 European Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism took the important steps of removing or restricting the political offense exception, addressing what is perceived to be a major impediment to the extradition of terrorists. Article 2 of the Organization of American States requires that the listed offences of kidnapping, murder and other assaults on the life or personal integrity of those whom the State has to give special protection according to international law, as well as extortion in connection with those crimes shall be considered common crimes of international significance regardless of motive (Higgins, 1997:53). In 1974, United Nations General Assembly adopted the

Resolution on the definition of aggression. Article 1 states that aggression is the use of armed force by a state against sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the UN Charter. On December 9[th,] 1985, the United Nations General Assembly adopted for the first time a condemnation of terrorism in all forms. The General Assembly in Resolution 40/ 61 condemns as criminal all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whoever committed (Freedman, 1998:13).

The opening paragraph of the Declaration on Terrorism issued on 6 May 1986 by the leaders of the G-7 countries states that (Freedman, 1998:8):

> We the heads of state or government of seven major democracies and the representatives of the European Community, strongly reaffirm our condemnation of international terrorism in all its forms, of its accomplices and of those, including governments, who sponsor or support it. Terrorism has no justification. It spreads only by use of contemptible means, ignoring the values of human life, freedom and dignity. It must be fought relentlessly and without compromise.

The 1989 Resolution recognizes that the establishment of a generally agreed-upon definition of international terrorism could enhance the effectiveness of the struggle against terrorism. It calls upon all states to fulfill their obligations under international law to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in other states, or acquiescing in or encouraging activities within their territory directed towards the commission of such acts.

Further treaties made for the fight against terrorism are: International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings on January 9, 1998, G-7 Declaration on Terrorism on June 27, 1996, Israel-Lebanon Cease-Fire Understanding on April 26, 1996, Summit of Peacemakers, Sharm el-Sheikh, final statement made on March 13, 1996, Baguio Communique on February 21, 1996,

Ottawa Ministerial Declaration on Countering Terrorism on December 12, 1995, Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purposes of Detection on March 1, 1991, Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation on March 10, 1988, Protocol for the Supression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf on March 10, 1988, Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials on March 3, 1980, Convention Against the Taking of Hostages on December 18, 1979, Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons on December 14, 1973, Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation on September 23, 1971, Hague Convention on the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft on December 16, 1970, Tokyo Convention on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft on September 14, 1963.

As Faruk Örgün predicted, the attack made on the United States will change certain things in the international arena. Time will show the size of this change but important headlines already started to come up (Örgün, 2001:7).

Before the world, there is a new era, instead of a new page. The most important title of this period is terror and the international fight with terrorism. To some observers, the September 11th attack can only be regarded as an entirely new phenomenon falling wholly outside the existing framework of international law with its emphasis on horizontal relations between states and vertical relations between state and individual. If the world community supports the military action taken by the American government against the terrorist organizations who committed the act but also against the states who support terrorism, this will bring important cooperative strength to the fight against international terrorism (Örgün, 2001:77).

NATO said the attack shall be regarded as an action covered by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty which states that an armed attack against one or more of the Allies in Europe or North America shall be considered as an attack against them all. UN Resolution 1368 expressed the determination to combat by all means threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. Resolution number 1373 imposed a requirement on all states to take various measures against the perpetrators and states suspected of assisting them. Later the Security Council adopted a Declaration on the Global Effort to Counter Terrorism, which was based on the characterization of international terrorism as a threat to international peace and security. The most recent steps taken in the fight against terrorism also came from the United Nations. In the fall of 2001, the Security Council unanimously adopted wide-ranging antiterrorism resolution and called for suppressing financing and improving international cooperation in Resolution number 1373 approved in 2001. It also created a Committee to monitor implementation. Security Council resolution number 1373 stated that all states should afford one another the greatest measure of assistance in relations to criminal investigation of terrorist offences. The second one, Resolution 1377 of year 2001is made by the Security Council on 12 November 2001 calls on all states to intensify efforts to eliminate international terrorism. It was adopted unanimously.

In spite of all these resolutions, at the global level, the response to international terrorism has been weak. There have been many obstacles to effective international cooperation, whether through United Nations resolutions or through other general measures. The East-West ideological conflict resulted in mutual recrimination and accusation by the superpowers, and many states in the post-Cold War era still resist any international move which would either reduce their scope for

using international terrorism as a weapon or thwart what they see as legitimate armed struggles. As Freedman believes, it is likely to be some time before the international community as a whole translates the rhetoric of recent United Nations resolutions against terrorism into effective enforcement measures (Freedman, 1998:48).

Barry Posen thinks that liberal internationalists seem much more interested in the process by which the campaign against terrorism is conducted. The United Nations must be involved at every step. Resort to law must take precedence over tactical advantage. Terrorists must be treated like criminals, not enemies: police should apprehend them and courts should try them. Military action should occur rarely if at all, and it should always be carried out with precision. A state that sponsors terrorism, such as Afghanistan, should be diplomatically isolated, condemned at the UN, subjected to an arms embargo and economically sanctioned in any way that does not harm the general populace. The United States should join the international criminal court, and as a token of its good intentions, sign most of the treaties it has stayed not yet committed to. This approach preserves a world role for the United States but, given the determination of the adversary and the foibles of other countries, seems doomed to failure (Posen, 2001:15).

As Gutteridge (1986:52)specifies:

> We should keep our democratic systems in good political and economical repair. An independent judiciary is a prerequisite for the maintenance of the rule of law and the constitution and a vital ally of the elected government and legislature in ensuring democratic control and accountability.

Thus without exception the legal fight against terrorism will be based on solid ground and there will be no place left for the terrorists to use to their advantage. If there exists any deficiency or even an open-ended statement, terrorists would use these to realize their own objectives. Although this would still be illegal and

illegitimate, it would be difficult to support and prove the deficiency. To prevent such events, the best way is to support the democratic states to develop an independent judiciary.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, after the introduction chapter, the concepts of terrorism and globalization within the framework and theories of international relations have been introduced. Then specializing in terrorism, the concept starting from its history, its different types and definitions have been explained. Then focusing on the second concept, globalization with its phases and definition has been analyzed. The objective here was to clarify the concepts before providing the link. The next part focused on the fight against terrorism by using the tools of international cooperation and law as the most important and effective ones.

The emphasis was on the concept of terrorism as an act of force and its consequences in the modern world. The purpose of this paper was to discuss and analyze the highly debated concept of terrorism, to explain the rationale behind it, to trace its consequences, and to analyze the extent to which modern forms of terrorism can be regarded as a phenomena effected by globalization and to suggest a way to counter modern terrorism with the help of international law and cooperation and bring new perspectives to the relationship of terrorism and globalization as a result. Terrorism is a phenomenon that cannot be vanished but minimized, and the aim here is to discuss terrorism and the ways to minimize it.

Terrorism, the primary focus of this paper was discussed, first, as a concept in its own right. There was an introduction to international relations and its theories todraw the lines of the discussion on terrorism. Some theories of international relations have been used to place thoughts on a solid ground. Among other theories realism and constructivism take a bigger share in explaining terrorism and globalization. Realism, which views the world as a war arena because of the endless conflict for power, claims terrorism is the continuation of politics by other means. Being state centric, realism ignores other entities in national and international relations. On the contrary, constructivism claims every social event is the product of communication between actors involved. Emphasizing every level of being, constructivism believes in the power of human to construct the world around. It seeks to find the reasons of terrorism and puts cooperation as a tool to fight against it. The second part consisted of the history of terrorism, its definition, its types, and the phases it went through, including the present one.

In the following section, additional concepts and attitudes were introduced to help the analysis of terrorism. Among those, the first to be discussed was the introduction of globalization with its history, its current phase, its reasons and most importantly its relation to terrorism. The last part was significant because that relationship of terrorism and globalization is one of the main arguments in this paper, which has triggered the current events and is helping to drive today's terrorism, was explained. Then the legal aspect of terrorism was discussed. Since the fight against terrorism is also analyzed this paper, international law as an anti-terrorism tool was explained in terms of the laws and resolutions regarding the issue and the attitude towards terrorism at the international level was discussed with documents. As a tool

of international cooperation, international law, which is a must to fight against terrorism, made up a big part of this paper along with globalization.

In this section, the questions asked in the introduction will be briefly answered, as the thesis served to explain them on a wide scope. There will be suggested recommendations for achieving a terror-free world. In relation to this set of recommendations, there will be an account of how globalization can be made to serve in the fight against terrorism. The main argument in the thesis is that terrorism has become more efficient, easier and more dangerous with the help of globalization and terrorism cannot be eliminated totally but can be minimized with the help of international cooperation and international law.

Unlike war, it is not possible to end or resolve terrorism through negotiation. You do not have the ability to communicate with the terrorists unless you accept those people or organization as legal and worth the communication. Terrorists are ambitious and stubborn people. You cannot convince them to give up because they are totally convinced of the righteousness of their cause. They have the will and the power. They do not give up anything, even if it means their death. When you do not communicate with them, you jeopardize your power, policies and people. On the other hand if you accept them, then you will be victimized by their future demands, threat, intimidation and terrorization. This can never be a win-win situation and most of the time you are the going to be the losing side.

The enemy you fight is neither legitimate nor logical as you are. It is like disease without a cure. In order to find the cure, you need to detect the symptoms carefully. But this disease cannot be cured because the patient is not in your hands. You cannot fight against something that you do not see. Being ready to sacrifice his life for beliefs, it is not possible to fight such a figure that sees his passion above his

life. A terrorist may be wounded or die in his terrorist act, but he has nevertheless committed his highly visible act, caught the world's attention and inflicted damage.

Terrorism is the use of fear with physical and psychological force to achieve a particular purpose aiming to reach an audience for a strong effect. Terrorism is a significant phenomenon. It is unexpected, unique in form and realization, and mostly inevitable. Terrorists are smart and mostly experienced people. They plan well, with good intelligence and careful calculation. They find the vulnerable spot to hurt others with diligence. Even though a target may not be huge or the act result in massive destruction, the terrorist will have chosen a significant and visible spot. These are the problems that people are faced with. Unfortunately, the age of globalization has helped terrorists enormously. There can be multiple attitudes towards globalization. One might not accept the concept or its phases but you cannot ignore the recent changes, especially in the last century. For the purpose of mediating and not calling it globalization we can list that differences of our time; technological development, free flow of information, free movement of people, goods and money, higher amounts of interaction between states, people and organizations, improved communication, transportation, rapid money transactions. Seeing this profile with the capabilities of the terrorist, and the benefit globalization has provided to terrorists, it is difficult to fight against terrorism.

There is a positive relationship between terrorism and globalization. Current acts of terrorism are a response to globalization trends. The spread of culture, liberalism, production and motives of democracy of the developed countries resulted in frustration in the underdeveloped countries. The flow of information served both poles, helped the developed countries to extend their areas of influence, and caused the underdeveloped countries to see how wealthy people lived, resulting in

dissatisfaction and hatred. Globalization has triggered terrorism and made the fight even more difficult. The most important weapon to fight terrorism is international cooperation and law. But to successfully implement this, a more equal, wealthy, transparent world is needed. It can only be achieved with a fair globalization of the world.

It was expected that there would be a lot of changes in many areas of life after September 11th. Scholars and authors predicted the world would finally unite and act against terrorism after what they had witnessed. But it has almost been a year since the attacks. The rhetoric "nothing is going to be the same after September 11th" is used less each day. After the pain and grief has been lessened and people accepted what has happened, life got back on track again. Daily matters became more important to people than what happened to the United States on that day, once the chaos and shock settled down.

The danger lies here. If people, governments and organizations get used to such acts and keep ignoring terrorism, it will only become stronger and more costly. This awareness should be kept alive and reminded to everyone the costs of what has happened. This is what needs to be done if every terrorist act is to be addressed and fought relevantly. The significance of September 11th was its magnitude, target, and the shared terror through out the world as a result of the live broadcast, which shook the consciousness of the world order and resulted in a surge of disgust. What remains after September 11th is a limitation of human rights and freedom, which is being implemented for the sole purpose of dealing with the threat of terrorism and containing it.

Globalization has positive implications to ordinary life and it can serve to downsize the casualties and problems terrorism causes. A lot of people feel

83

threatened by the inequality of international order. Armament should not be the only means of sovereignty. Economy at the international level ought to be transparent, and accountable. If not, there will be a new world disorder. It is wrong if power is separated from law and justice. Stability is impossible unless poverty and weakness are resolved. It appears that the belief of "an eye for an eye" is what counts today. The reasons are not questioned. So they choose to terminate the creator.

It is an attainable fight against terrorism and it is possible to prevent it to a certain point. There will always be people and groups not satisfied with the way they live, governed or treated. There will be discrimination and inequality in the modern world. So it will not be possible to prevent terrorism totally. The concern is to find the right tools to fight against terrorism and minimize the problems and losses it causes. Steps have been taken at the international level to fight terrorism. But they were just the beginning. The awareness should be kept alive to make the system work against terrorism. The immediate anxiety and ambition have lost acceleration, but the meetings, editing of resolutions and the cooperative work should be continued. International law can help the fight against terrorism but the world needs a law revolution. Starting with a definition including the past and possible future acts of terrorism and establish necessary organizations to try and punish terrorists. By assigning a good meaning to terrorism and its acts, it will be possible to move towards the right direction in the fight against terrorism.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ak, Aynur. 1995. *Uluslararası Terörizm* (International Terrorism). Ankara

Alexander, Yonah. 1992. *International Terrorism: Political and Legal Documents.* Boston. M. Nijhoff Dordrecht.

Altuğ, Yılmaz. 1989. *Terörizm: Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını* (Terrorism:Yesterday,Today, Tomorrow). Ankara. T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı

Ayoob, Mohammed. 15-16 June 2002. Seminar on *Globalization, State and Security*

Bamyeh, Mohammed A. 2000. *The Ends of Globalization.* Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.

Başeren, Sertaç. Fall 2001. *Lecture Notes on International Terrorism.* Ankara University

Beliaev, I. V. 1991. *Common Ground on Terrorism: Soviet-American Cooperation Against the Politics of Terrorism*. New York. W.W. Norton

Blakesley, Christopher L. 1992. *Terrorism, Drugs, International Law, and The Protection of Human Liberty.* Transnational Publishers

Booth, Kenneth. 15-16 June 2002. *Seminar on Globalization, State and Security*

Carr, E. H. 1946. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations.* London. Macmillan.

Chomsky, Noam. 2002. *11 Eylül* (September 11th). Istanbul. Om

Civelek, Mehmet Ali. 2001. *Küreselleşme ve Terör* (Globalization and Terror)*.* Ankara*:* Ütopya Yayınları

Clark, Ian. 1999. *Globalization and International Relations Theory.* Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Combs, Cindy. 1997. *Terrorism in The Twenty-First Century.* New Jersey. Prentice Hall

Crenshaw, Martha. 1995. *Terrorism in Context.* Pennsylvania, USA. The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Damrosch, Lori F. 1991. *Law and Force in The New International Order.* Boulder. Westview Press

Dougherty, James E. and Pfaltzgraff, Robert L. 1990. *Contending Theories of International Relations.* New York. HarperCollins Publishers.

Doyle, Michael W. 1997. *New Thinking in International Relations Theory*. Colorado. Westview Press Boulder.

Erdoğan, Tamer. 2001. *11 Eylül: Bir Saldırının Yankıları* (September 11th: The Echoes of An Attack)*.* Istanbul.YKY

Ergil, Doğu. Fall 2001. *Lecture Given in Bilkent University on International Terrorism*

Euroforum Study Guide. 2002.

Ferguson, Niall. 20 September 2001. "The War on Terror is Not New," *Foreign Affairs*.

Freedman, Lawrence et al. 1998. *Terrorism and International Order*. London. Routledge.

Friedman, Thomas. 2001. "The Big Terrible," *Foreign Affair*.

Guelke, Adrian. 1995. *The Age of Terrorism and The International Political System.* New York. Tauris Publishers.

Gutteridge, William. 1986. *The New Terrorism.* London. Mansell Publishing Ltd.

Higgins, Rosalyn. 1997. *Terrorism and International Law*. London. Routledge

Hoffman, Bruce. 1998. *Inside Terrorism.* London. Victor Gollancz

Hoffman, Stanley. Jul August 2002. *Clash of Globalizations*. Foreign Affairs.

Holliday, Ian. 2002. "When is a Cause Just*?" Review of International Studies*. (28)

Howard, Michael. January/February 2002. *What's In a Name? How to Fight Terrorism.*

Hanle, Donald. 1989. *Terrorism the Newest Face of Warfare* . Washington. Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers.

Heymann, Philip B. Winter 2001. *"*Dealing With Terrorism, An Overview," *International Security* 26 (3).

Holsti, K. J.1985. *The Dividing Principle: Hegemony and Diversity in International Relations Theory*. Boston. Allen& Unwin.

Holsti, K.J. 1991. *Change in The International System: Essays on The Theory and Practice.* Aldershot. E. Elgar Pub.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1973. "Transnational Organizations in World Politics," *World Politics* 25 (3).

Ifantis, Kostas. 2002. "Understanding International Politics After the September 11 Terrorist Attacks: A Note on the New Security Paradigm*," Perceptions.*

Jervis, Robert. 2002. "An Interim Assessment of September 11: What Has Changed and What Has Not?" *Political Science Quarterly* 117 (1).

Kalb, Don et al. 2000. The *Ends of Globalization. Bringing Society Back In*. USA. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Kaldor, Mary. 1999. *New & Old Wars. Organized Violence in a Global Era.* UK. Polity Press.

Kegley, Charles W. 1990. *International Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Controls*. New York. St. Martin's

Keohane, Robert O. and Nye, Joseph S. 1989. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition.* New York. HarperCollins Publishers.

Keohane, Robert O. and Nye, Joseph S. 1998. "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age," *Foreign Affairs.* 77 (5).

Keyman, E. Fuat. 1997. *Globalization, State, Identity/Difference : Toward a Critical Social Theory of International Relations* . New Jersey. Humanities Press.

Kibaroğlu, Mustafa. 2001. "11 Eylül Sonrasında Strateji, Tehdit ve Caydırıcılık," (Strategy, Threat and Deterrence After September 11th) *Foreign Policy*.

Kongar, Emre.2001. *Küresel Terör ve Türkiye. Küreselleşme, Huntington, 11 Eylül.* (Global terror and Turkey. Globalization, Huntington, September 11th) Istanbul. Remzi Kitabevi.

LaFeber, Walter. 2002. "The Post September 11 Debate Over Empire, Globalization and Fragmentation," *Political Science Quarterly* 117 (1).

Laqueur, Walter. 1977. *Terrorism*. London. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Leacock, Charles Clifton. 2001. *"Internationalization of Crime," International Law and Politics* (34).

Lecture Notes on International Relations Theory. September/November 1998. Bilkent University.

Mittelman, James H. 1996. *Globalization: Critical Reflections*. Colorado. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Mittelman, James H. 2002. „Globalization: An Ascendant Paradigm," *International Studies Perspectives* (3).

Morgenthau, Hans. 1985. *Politics Among Nations*. New York. Alfred Knopf.

Moxon-Browne, Edward. 1994. *European Terrorism*. New York. G. K. Hall & Co

Nash, Kate. 2000. *Contemporary Political Sociology. Globalization, Politics and Power*. Blackwell Publishers.

Netanyahu, Binyamin. 1995. *Fighting Terrorism : How Democracies can Defeat Domestic and International Terrorists*. New York. Farrar Straus Giroux.

Onuf, Michael. *Constructivism: A User's Manual.*

Osiander, Andreas. 1998. "Rereading Early Twentieth Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisitied," *International Studies Quarterly* (42).

Örgün, Faruk. 2001. *Küresel Terör (Global Terror)*. Istanbul. Okumuş Adam.

Paul, T. V. 1999. *International Order and the Future of World Politics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Petras, James and Veltmeyer, Henry. 2001. *Globalization Unmasked.* Fernwood Publishing Ltd.

Posen, Barry. Winter 2001. "The Struggle Against Terrorism," *International Security* 6 (3).

Reich, Walter. 1990. *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1995. *Bringing Transnational Relations Back in : Non-state Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. Cambridge.Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, Adam. Spring 2002. "Counter-terrorism, Armed Force and Laws of War," *Survival* (44).

Rosenau, James N. 1995. *Thinking Theory Thoroughly : Coherent Approaches to an Incoherent World.* Colorado. Westview Press.

Roy, Arundhati. 29 September 2001. *The Algebra of Infinite Justice.* The Guardian.

Ruggie, John Gerard. 1993 *Multilateralism Matters : The Theory and Praxis of An Institutional Form.* New York. Columbia University Press.

Safire, William. September 2001. *Bush's Mideast Charade*. New York Times.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction.* New York. St. Martin's Press

Schmidt, Brian C. 1998. *Lessons From the Past.* Massachusettes. Blackwell Publishers.

Seghal, B.P.Singh. 1996 *Global Terrorism: Socio-politico and Legal Dimensions.* New Delhi. Deep and Deep Pub.

Seyrek, Nihat. 2002. *Terörizm ve Uluslararası Yönü (*Terrorism and its International Aspect*).* Ankara

Shafritz, Jay M. 1991. *Almanac of Modern Terrorism.* New York . Facts on File

Sirmen, Ali. 14 September 2001. Cumhuriyet.

Slater, Robert O. 1988. *Current Perspectives on International Terrorism.* London. Macmillan Pr.

The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations 1980-1981. 1986. Ankara. A. Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi ve Basın-Yayın Yüksekokulu Basımevi.

Tuğtan, Mehmet Ali. 2001. "Terörün Evrimi ve Devletler Sistemi," *Foreign Policy.*

Tacar, Pulat Y. 1999. *Terör ve Demokrasi* (Terror and Democracy*).* Ankara. Bilgi Yayinevi.

Waltz, Kenneth. Fall 1993. "The Emerging Structure of International Politics," *International Security* 18 (2).

Warner**,** Daniel . 21 September 2001. *For the West, a War on Terrorism Makes No Sense.* International Herald Tribune.

Wedgewood, Ruth. "The Law's Response to September 11," *Roundtable.*

Weinberg, Leonard and Davis, Paul. 1989. *Introduction to Political Terrorism.* McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Williams, Howard. 1996. *Uluslararasi İlişkiler ve Siyaset Teorisi Üzerine bir Derleme* (An Essay on International Relations and Political Theory). Ankara. Siyasal Kitabevi.

Williams, Howard. 1992. *International Relations in Political Theory.* Open University Press.   Milton Keynes.

Williams, Paul. 2002. *Discussions on International Terrorism in the Globalized Age.*

Zimbardo, Philip. 2001. "Faceless Terrorism as Creative Evil or Opposing Terrorism by Understanding the Human Capacity for Evil," *http://www.cyberpsych.org/colectivopsicologia/terror/faceless.htm*

http://www.encarta.com

http://www.ict.org.il

http://www.state.gov/www/global/terrorism

http://www.terrorism.com/index.shtml

http://www.un.org/terrorism

http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2001/sc7158.doc.htm

http://www.undcp.org/terrorism_definitions.html

http://www.usis.usemb.se/terror/index.html