Paulo Casaca
Siegfried O. Wolf   *Editors*

Terrorism Revisited

Islamism, Political Violence and State-Sponsorship

Springer

Contemporary South Asian Studies

This book series features scientific and scholarly studies focusing on politics, economics and changing societies in South Asia. Utilizing recent theoretical and empirical advances, this series aims at providing a critical and in-depth analysis of contemporary affairs and future developments and challenges in the region. Relevant topics include, but are not limited to, democratization processes, human rights concerns, security issues, terrorism, EU-South Asia relations, regional and economic cooperation and questions related to the use of natural resources.

Contemporary South Asian Studies (CSAS) welcomes monographs and edited volumes from a variety of disciplines and approaches, such as political and social sciences, economics and cultural studies, which are accessible to both academics and interested general readers. The series is published on behalf of the South Asian Democratic Forum (Brussels), which is one of the most well-known think tanks in Europe focusing on South Asia.

Paulo Casaca · Siegfried O. Wolf
Editors

Terrorism Revisited

Islamism, Political Violence and State-Sponsorship

Editors
Paulo Casaca   Siegfried O. Wolf
South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF)   South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF)
Brussels, Belgium   Brussels, Belgium

Preface

Redefining Terrorism

Like is often the case with other evils, terrorism is not easy either to define or recognise. The importance of doing so, however, increased dramatically in the wake of a succession of monstrous acts of violence following 9/11. We dedicate the first part of the book, Chaps. 1 and 2, to the conceptual discussion of terrorism in general and to the discussion of the existence of a specific sort of contemporary terrorism.

Whereas it would be impossible to assess the hundreds of existing definitions, on purpose, we skipped references to the most tautological, optionally normative or descriptive ones. We examine a select group of legal and academic definitions—while the most authoritative authors are also the most prolific, they are not necessarily the most consistent—to get to what we think is the essence of terrorism: a disproportionate psychological impact in relation to the violence employed.

This definition entails that the core of the problem of "terrorism" is not the level of brutality which it shares with other forms of political violence but the way it impacts the mind of its ultimate victims, who are not just the ones who suffer the immediate terror; the most important target is the rest of population that is "horrified" by the act and a narrative moulded by the terrorists and by the media.

While this is a narrow definition, we will see it is the only one that makes sense of a history full of disparate experiences which cannot be demarcated by any other ethical or psychological standards or criteria. As Walter Laqueur repeatedly stressed, there is little to no common ground between the historic Russians Sofia Perovskaya and Vera Figner and our contemporaries, Ulrike Meinhof and Patricia Hearst.

Regardless of its diversity and the disparate assessments resulting from its evaluation, it is possible to identify a "pure terrorism" which seldom achieves its aims, except in some cases where it seeks to achieve very specific objectives.

While successful violent political strategies most often encompass terrorism, they are not limited to simple attacks. Terrorism may develop into guerrilla warfare,

insurgency, common criminality or a number of other forms of unconventional or even conventional warfare. It is most dangerous and prone to develop into a full-fledged war in the case of state-sponsored terrorism.

Whereas we will find that terrorism in modern times is—naturally—different from its historical predecessors, we do not think any of these changes entail a change in the "nature" of terrorism that would allow us to speak of a "new terrorism" which would be fundamentally different from older forms of terrorism.

When we consider the prospect of the use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists, we do not believe these would constitute a new form of terrorism—the use of this kind of weapons was imagined by terrorist ideologues even before they existed—but rather a combination of new technologies with a previously existing mindset. The same applies, for instance, to the use of modern means of communication or network organisational structures.

While terrorism that randomly targets populations and commits atrocities without scruples is a new reality in the Western world, it is not an entire novelty. We can clearly see this if we enlarge our spatial and temporal horizon. More to the point, the main issue is that violence of this scale seldom remains at the level of terrorism but most often develops into more methodical types of violence.

Even though many identified "suicide terrorism" as a clear sign of a new type of terrorism—it can actually be seen in quite a different way as an unscrupulous way of manipulating weaker segments of the society.

Most of the psychosociological studies of the "fundamentalist mindset" have ostensibly ignored terrorism in the past, but we think it is there that we should look for a better understanding of the violent threats we are concerned with. In "Fundamentalism and the Paranoid Gestalt", David M. Terman's approach appears as the most promising potential analytical approach to the phenomenon, although, as it stands, it is clearly insufficiently developed to perform this task.

We dedicate the most substantial part of the book to the most symbolic case studies. We analyse the Iranian new warfare model which was introduced as Khomeini rose to power; mainstream Islamic fanaticism which developed into Al-Qaeda and the Caliphate in Iraq and Syria; Pakistan's state-sponsored terrorism, which intersects the preceding one but develops on particular South Asian circumstances; the influence of anti-Semitism on Jihadism; the rise and fall of the Tamil Tigers, which applied the Jihadi strategy to a completely different ideology; and last but not least the so-called war on terror, the primary Western response to the Jihadi onslaught.

The first study, authored by Mosa Zahed, is an in-depth analysis on the evolution of Khomeini's doctrine and the long-brewing Jihadi Iranian ideology during the 1900s. It shows that terrorism is one but not necessarily the most important feature of this fanatic paranoia. While it did play a historical role in both Hitler's and Khomeini's ascension to power, terrorism was not the most decisive. However, ruthless violence stemming from state-sponsored terrorism, tyrannical suppression of opponents and external aggression are all key features of both these regimes.

The use of suicide attacks as a military tactic was reintroduced after the Second World War in the Iran-Iraq war; the Iranians in particular used child

soldiers and—later on—suicide car bombing at the Iraqi embassy in Lebanon. Afterwards, similar tactics were used in state-sponsored terrorism against US, French and Israeli interests and were soon exported to Jihadi and other terrorist groups.

Whereas Iran's Khomeini has been the main promoter of terrorism in contemporary times, it expanded upon this role with a ruthless and aggressive expansionist agenda of global reach.

The second study, authored by Daniel Brett, is dedicated to the modern fanatic movement within the main branch of Islam, which we can trace back to the Muslim Brotherhood and that developed into a plethora of Jihadi groups organised or not in Al-Qaeda and its most important offspring the Caliphate.

Although often manipulated or acting on behalf of other global players, Sunni Jihad operates according to its own distinct logic, and it is crucial to understand the three basic concepts that underwrite the ideology: *Takfir*, *Jihad* and *Hijra*.

The chapter explores the historical significance of aforementioned events and concludes by examining the likely trajectory of the competing networks, which are now engaged in the conflict in Iraq and Syria, and the potential new scenarios that will emerge. The shape of Jihadism in the future will reflect what happens in the present, particularly government responses, the nature of the security state and addressing the grievances that have often sustained Islamic extremists.

The third study, authored by Siegfried O. Wolf, analyses the phenomenon of state-sponsored terrorism in Pakistan, as it tries to adapt Jihadism to serve its national and international interests, using it as a diplomatic tool. Pakistan's flirt with Jihadism stems from its inability to pursue an alternative strategy. Although it is set in a very peculiar South Asian context, Jihadism in Pakistan is intrinsically linked with the global phenomenon, as we have seen through its support to Al-Qaeda and, most in particular, due to its nuclear capacity.

Although the Pakistani government often loses control of the Jihadi groups it created and fosters and is engaged in an ongoing battle with some of these rogue groups, it continues to sponsor terrorist organisations—mostly those that operate abroad—especially in Afghanistan and India. The study consistently argues for the need to radically change the international community's policy towards the country, at the very minimum identifying it as a major sponsor of terrorism.

The fourth study, authored by Mário Silva, is dedicated to an analysis of anti-Semitism, an essential component of contemporary fanatic movements. Whereas it draws upon the ideology of the National Socialists in the Third Reich—the 9/11 "foot-soldiers" sympathy with Hitler is well documented in the 9/11 commission report—Jihadists in general consider it fair game to dehumanise Jews and to act accordingly.

The chapter argues that there is a historical link between the export of anti-Semitism from Europe to the Greater Middle East and its development into the ideological paranoia that fed modern radical Jihadi terrorism and it is therefore essential to comprehend and combat contemporary Islamist terrorism.

The fifth study, authored by Djan Sauerborn, analyses the Tamil Tigers fanatic warfare and questions the common narrative that links modern terrorist methods

exclusively to contemporary Jihadism. While the LTTE had ties to several Jihadist groups, the movement behind this specific terrorist outlet was not built on Jihadist ideology. The study contextualises the appearance of Prabhakaran and his transformation of an ethno-nationalist problem into a tool for an extreme violent campaign. Furthermore, unlike religious fundamentalist groups that manipulate Holy Scriptures to legitimise political violence and garner public support, Prabhakaran managed himself to become the ultimate source of legitimacy.

The Tamil Tigers show how all grievances and historic legitimacy used to create Jihadi fundamentalist "paranoid gestalt" may be replaced by other completely different arguments to justify similar violent actions and strategies. Conversely, the Tamil Tigers' experience shows we must be aware of other fanatic movements which may be able to copy the extreme violence and associated rituals of Jihadism in completely different cultural and political environments.

The last study focusses on the "war on terrorism". The 9/11 national report highlights several fundamental points on the nature of the threat to the international community posed by Jihadism, but it does not fulfil its most important expectations. With the partial exception of improved internal security framework measures, we think that the "war on terror" failed to achieve its objectives, exactly because it did not properly identify the nature of the enemy responsible for the attack.

The failure to bring the vast majority of those responsible for the massive crime of 9/11 to justice—whether ideologues, organisers or supporters—is considered a serious blow to the rule of law. The study finds the current hybrid solution that is supposed to deal with the terrorist threat—which does not fall either under the national rule of law or the international legal system—to have failed completely and argues in favour of a different approach.

The appeasement of the countries that were either directly or indirectly involved in the 9/11 attack—Iran, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia—and the unwillingness to identify Jihadism as its main driver culminated in an unwarranted attack on Iraq. This ultimately destroyed the Iraqi state and allowed Iran to de facto take over the country and caused Jihadism to become a far bigger threat today than it was in 2001.

The book concludes that terrorism has been one of the primary tools used by states and other groups which are involved in unconventional warfare against the international community under the banner of Jihadism. However, it is not the only tool and not even the most important one.

In order for the international community to be able to respond to this unconventional war, it must be able to abandon the paraphernalia of euphemisms and designations which blur reality and to clearly identify its perpetrators (both state and non-state). In short, it is necessary to break with the "political psychology of appeasement". Appeasement is always a double-edged sword; the same logic which prevents to identify the wrongdoers makes innocent people pay for its blindness.

A vigorous response from the international community also supposes that justified grievances from the populations that Jihadists look to manipulate are to be answered and that the international community is not lured in going after the wrong enemy and that a broad alliance—comprising all those who are committed to

peace and tolerance—has to be established. To achieve this, social and economic cohesion at a global level is also a fundamental tool.

This book came out of the need to have a clearer understanding of the new type of political violence which affects South Asia as it does affect the whole world, generally described as "terrorism", and was only possible with the cooperation of a diverse team of authors.

We warmly thank Djan Sauerborn, like ourselves, working on behalf of the South Asia Democratic Forum; Mosa Zahed, working on behalf of ARCHumankind; and as volunteers Mário Silva, the former president of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) and a former politician and academic, and Daniel Brett, a business intelligence consultant specialised on oil-producing countries. We also thank those who gave the SADF in-house support to the book of Laura Berlingozzi, Laura Silva and Albino Costa.

This book was coordinated and copy-edited by SADF consultant Sarah De Geest, we are grateful for her commitment, comments and contributions.

Brussels, Belgium   Paulo Casaca
                                                                                Siegfried O. Wolf

Contents

About the Editors

Paulo Casaca editor of the SADF book series, is the founder and executive director of the South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF). He is also the founder of the international cooperation association ARCHumankind or the "Alliance to Renew Co-operation Among Humankind", of the "Euro Reform Initiative" and of the consultancy company on sustainable development, Lessmeansmore, Land and Energy Sustainable Systems. He was a fellow of the German Marshall Fund of the USA in the first semester of 2010. Mr. Casaca was a member of the European Parliament from 1999 to 2009 where he chaired the delegation for relations with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. He is the author of several books and reports on economics and international politics.

Siegfried O. Wolf is senior researcher (member) at the South Asia Institute (SAI), Heidelberg University, and director of research at the South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF, Brussels). He is currently a visiting fellow at the National University of Science and Technology (NUST, Islamabad) and an affiliated researcher at the Pakistan Security Research Unit (PSRU, Durham University). Formerly, he was a research fellow at IPW and Centre de Sciences Humaines (New Delhi, India). In addition to this, he worked as a consultant for the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany, and he is a member of the external expert group of the Afghanistan–Pakistan Task Force, Federal Foreign Office, Germany, and a political commentator for international media.

Part I

Reassessing Terrorism

The Conceptual Discussion on Terrorism

Paulo Casaca

1 Terrorism, What Terrorism?

"There are in fact hundreds of definitions of terrorism" so explains an expert committee report on radicalisation to the European Commission.[1] On the other side of the Atlantic, Marc Sageman, a leading US academic in the field, expresses the profession-generalised scepticism of getting to an objective, scientifically meaningful definition in the following way:

> Until recently, a large part of the literature on terrorism concentrated on definitions of terrorism, but without reaching consensus on what that definition is. Thus we have the common refrain that one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist, and the suspicion that, if the word had existed at the time, the British authorities would probably have branded our founding fathers terrorists. Of course, most people know what they mean by terrorism, but it is a little like obscenity: people believe they know it when they see it, but cannot define it. Even the United Nations does not have a definition for terrorism (Sageman, 2008, p. 15).

However, three decades before, Walter Laqueur (1977, p. 5) in the first pages of his encyclopaedic "History of Terrorism" had already predicted:

---

[1]Alonso et al. (2008, p. 6). The authors of the report quote one legal European Union definition of the term, the one adopted in the Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism (2002/475/JHA) as the "European one". The authors take the meaning of "framework decision" literally, as if this would be the only EU definition. However, it is not the only definition and it is not even the most important, because the previous Common Position 2001/931/CFSP was not repealed by the aforementioned and it remains the basis for most EU decisions on terrorism. As we shall see, both definitions are quite different. It is a tell-tale sign of the opacity of the European legal framework that not even a European expert group on the issue managed to fully understand it.

P. Casaca (✉)
South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF), Brussels, Belgium
e-mail: paulo@sadf.eu

> Elsewhere in this study I have commented on the difficulties involved in agreeing on a comprehensive definition of terrorism. Such a definition does not exist nor will it be found in the foreseeable future. To argue that terrorism cannot be studied until such a definition exists is manifestly absurd. Even now, three decades after the end of the Fascist era the controversies about its character continue but the contemporaries had to confront Fascism anyway on both the theoretical and the practical level.

And further ahead in the same book (p. 79) he also foresaw:

> Any definition of political terrorism venturing beyond noting the systematic use of murder, injury and destruction or the threat of such acts towards achieving political ends is bound to lead to endless controversies. (. . .) It can be predicted with confidence that the disputes about a comprehensive detailed definition will continue for a long time, that they will not result in a consensus and that they will make no notable contribution toward the understanding of terrorism.

Laqueur's prophecies, as we have seen, were confirmed in the subsequent four decades. In 1999, Laqueur set a way forward:

> Why is it so difficult to find a generally accepted definition [of terrorism]? Nietzsche provided part of the clue when he wrote that only things which have no history can be defined; terrorism, needless to say, has had a very long history (1999, p. 6).[2]

And indeed it has. In his writings, Laqueur (1977, 1978, 1999) takes us on a fascinating journey, speaking of the Zealot Sicarii, the Assassins—on this subject, Bernard Lewis' (1967) classic work is a must-read—the Thugs, the Read Spears, the Boxers and others up to modern terrorism with its endless variety of ideologues, deeds and groups.

And whereas this is a journey with countless paths and perspectives, the way to assess terrorism shall always include three basic criteria: motivation, legitimacy and proportionality.

Throughout history, terrorism has been perceived as a means to combat tyranny, raising the questions of whether or not terrorist violent acts can be justified by a tyrannical power, and if they can, within which boundaries.

The question of how to combat tyranny has been raised time and again, and received countless answers, covering a full spectrum of reactions: from Thomas Aquinas who considered three alternative responses: (1) a constitutional construction limiting the powers of any potential tyrant, (2) an alternative legitimate authority or (3) praying to God (Laqueur, 1978, pp. 24–25) to the contemporary Jihadi doctrines depicting democracy as tyranny and considering ends to justify all means.

---

[2]We believe these two works by Laqueur are essential to understand terrorism in a historic perspective.

2   Terrorism, Crime and Other Sorts of Violence

Part of the difficulty of defining terrorist violence is the difficulty of distinguishing it from other forms of unconventional warfare, crime or even pathological behaviour.[3]

Crenshaw (2011, p. 25) considers:

> The attractiveness of terrorism to insurgents who lack means is the reason it is often called the "weapon of the weak" and many strategic models of insurrection situate it at the first phase in the conflict. (. . .) Thornton's is the most flexible model: the insurrection is a continuum with terrorism, guerrilla activity, and conventional warfare respectively taking precedence at each stage.[4]

Other approaches offer more complex and dynamic readings of the interplay between terrorism and crime. These are the cases of the classic analyses of Hoffman (1998, p. 42), Shelley and Picarelli (2002, pp. 314–315) and Schmid (2004, p. 5). They acknowledge their similarities but also emphasise their divergent goals.

A different approach was proposed by Makarenko (2004) who uses a graphic representing a "crime-terror continuum", in the centre of which we can find a "black-hole syndrome" that can prosper both in weak and in criminal states (like Taliban's Afghanistan or North Korea).

Phillips and Kamen (2014) also pursue this analysis; however, they narrowed the scrutiny to failed states and to specific conditions where this continuum could appear. This considerably diminished the scope of the study.

Regarding terrorism and other forms of unconventional warfare, the academic world is making a similar evolution. Whereas classic analyses considered the distinction of terrorism from guerrilla or insurgency as crucial[5]; in present times, this distinction is either nuanced or simply disregarded.

---

[3]"Terrorism has long exercised a great fascination, especially at a safe distance, but it is not an easy topic for discussion and explanation. The fascination it exerts (Shelley's "tempestuous loveliness of terror") and the difficulty of interpreting it have the same roots: its unexpected, shocking and outrageous character. War, even civil war, is predictable in many ways; it occurs in the light of day and there is no mystery about the identity of the participants. Even in civil war, there are certain rules, whereas the characteristic features of terrorism are anonymity and the violation of established norms" (Laqueur, 1977, p. 3). This idea can also be found elsewhere, for instance in Crenshaw (op. cit. p. 2) Today's terrorism—mostly masterminded by leaders hidden but with publicised images and by suicidal operatives who proudly claim their actions—is far from this anonymity trait, whereas it shares its unexpected, shocking and outrageous character with other criminal and warfare activities.

[4]This is indeed the case in the classic views on terrorism and is also why these views are not helpful to understand the issues at stake. Just to mention the most well-known case of ISIS, the organisation that now considers itself the Sunni Caliphate developed exactly in this way. Should we therefore consider it now out of our radar of studies of terrorism?

[5]Laqueur even dedicated two different books to the history of the two different subjects of terrorism and guerrilla warfare (Laqueur, 1976, 1977), although he admitted later on that the differences between the two phenomena—as well as with the other two factors of criminality and

Thomas Whelan (2016) has recently published the suggestively titled article "The Capability Spectrum; Locating Terrorism in Relation to other Manifestations of Political Violence". For Whelan, the crucial element to determine acts on the political violence spectrum would be their "state challenging capacity", with highly effective groups like ISIS or the Lebanese Hezbollah at the top end of the scale and rioting activity at the bottom.

The issue has been similarly dealt with by academics specialised in warfare, however, without the attempt to construct linear or more complex types of spectra. Benz (2014) published an absorbing thesis reviewing the academic literature on "new wars". Ostensibly, the author considers "new wars" should not be confused with "new terrorism" (pp. 83–86). The blurring of classical distinctions between different forms of violence and the increase in sheer brutality are nevertheless traits shared by "new wars" and "new terrorism". After carefully considering *Benz's* analysis, we remain unconvinced of the existence of a significant demarcation between these two types of violence in respective academic fields.

Literature on terrorism generally ignores contemporary genocides such as the ones of Bangladesh, Cambodia or Rwanda[6] (Hoffman, 1998; Laqueur, 1999 or Crenshaw, 2011, for instance), which are studied in other academic fields (like the one of "new wars" we just mentioned). The grounds on which these extremely violent acts were not considered to be a matter for "studies on terrorism" are apparently that they were aimed at eliminating large groups of people (with a particular national, cultural or ethnic identity) rather than simply "horrifying" societies.

The 2014 Yazidi genocide by ISIS is a clear example of why the academic divide between these two forms of political violence is unwise and hinder rather than help us to understand reality.

---

sadist pathological behaviour—were vanishing (Laqueur, 1999, most in particular on the Algerian case, pp. 131–132). Hoffman (1998, 35–41) tries to make a clear distinction between guerrilla, insurgency and terrorism, although admitting the existence of overlaps. In later works, like his classic book on Iraqi insurgency (2006), this distinction is ever more blurred.

[6]The Chinese "cultural revolution" is the model for Cambodia's genocide, as we can understand from reading Leys' (1987, originally published in 1971) masterpiece on it. The absence of reference to this historical event by both Laqueur and Hoffman is also astonishing, as we believe it fits squarely into their vision of terrorism. We think it was one of the most important state-sponsored terrorist movements of modern times. The Cultural Revolution was supposed to be a spontaneous grassroots movement, but it was in fact masterminded by Mao Zedong and the parts of the state apparatus he controlled. Its ultimate aim was to "horrify" whoever would dare to question the wisdom and the blind devotion to the Chinese leader into paralysis. In fact, it went further than that as it tried to annihilate the Chinese elite, forcing it to hard labour in the countryside and destroying higher education, and in this sense, it can also be seen as a specific sort of "class genocide". Otherwise, acts of unprecedented violence did characterise the communist power takeover in China. The Stalinist purges (which can also be seen as a form of genocide) and the Ukrainian genocide were done directly by the state apparatus, supposedly without any attempt of using grass roots revolutionaries. In this sense, they do not share the non-state character which both Hoffman and Laqueur consider essential to constitute a terrorist act.

On 14 August 2007, four coordinated suicide bombs targeting Kahtaniya and Adnaniyah[7] caused at least 500 fatalities, marking the second deadliest terror attack at the time (Casaca, 2010, p. 16).[8]

There is a continuum between the suicide bomb attacks on the Yazidi community and the subsequent genocide by the same Jihadi group, and it makes no sense to analyse these two events as if they are of a different kind.

The ethnic cleansing—and sheer genocide in the case of tiny minorities like the Mandeans—is perhaps the most apparent feature of the Iraqi political violence. This political violence actually predates 2003, although it was only fully unleashed after this date (Casaca, 2008, 2010).

The original persecution of Syriac Christians in Iraq during the twentieth century is well-documented and inspired the original definitions of genocide that led to the international recognition of the crime. The Jewish genocide in Iraq has been described by some of its survivors[9] but we are far from understanding the full extent of the event.

In this context, we can also consider the "genocide for political motives"—coined by some academics as "politicide"—an issue dealt with extensively in a paper on the Bangladesh genocide (Casaca, 2015, pp. 5–7).[10]

There are other major terrorist attacks that have been downplayed by the majority of the academic community. Most notably, the 1981 bombing of the Iraqi embassy in Beirut, Lebanon, on 15 December 1981 that killed 66 people. The attack was prominent as it was the first time terrorists used a truck bomb. Most victims of the attack were Iraqi diplomats and other Iraqi nationals. It was claimed by the Iraqi Al Da'wa Party.[11] The historic importance of this attack can hardly be overstated, as it has been copied in similar attacks targeting USA, French and Israeli

---

[7]Although the towns were located in an Al Ba'aj Arab majority district, they housed a Yazidi majority.

[8]In a more recent field trip (December 2014) in the Iraqi Kurdish province of Dohuk, I visited several refugee camps where tens of thousands of Yazidi refugees surviving the genocide were scattered; I then developed a much deeper understanding of this extensive crisis, thanks to my host, Dr. Mirza Dinnayi. In the twenty-first century, jihadists are recreating actions already done in the nineteenth century, now targeting the Yazidi population. As was the case before, this issue has been sidelined again by the Western public opinion and the media.

[9]Edwin Shuker, a Jewish civil society activist and businessman living in London, has been an invaluable source of information in this domain.

[10]Due to the strong objection of the Soviet Union, genocides committed for political reasons were excluded from the United Nations definition of genocide. Some academics consider the neologism "politicide" to qualify genocide for political reasons, whereas others consider that the letter of the UN text is secondary to his spirit and political genocides should be considered genocides as such. Perhaps the most recent, massive and unpunished of these types of genocide has been the 1988 Iranian mass killing of all of those political dissidents in prison, the vast majority of them, adherent to the People's Mujahedin of Iran.

[11]This attack is reported in the database of the University of Chicago, https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/Results.aspx?start_yearonly=1980&end_yearonly=1981&start_year=&start_month=&start_day=&end_year=&end_month=&end_day=&country=110&asmSelect1=&dtp2=all&success=yes&casualties_type=b&casualties_max=

diplomatic and military presences in Lebanon shortly thereafter, with enormous repercussions. However, the bulk of the Western specialised literature[12] assumes the suicide attacks (using a car bomb) on the US and French diplomatic and military facilities are the first of its kind.[13]

These genocides and other emblematic terror attacks like the truck bomb on the Embassy of Iraq in Beirut share one similar feature: neither directly targeted or affected the West.[14] This potentially indicates an overall Western-centric bias in terrorism studies. It also has a second potential explanation, which we consider no less fundamental: the importance of terrorism is assessed by the horror impact it has on the targeted population rather than the violence of its actions.

As shown, the continuum of terrorism has transcended genocide, culminating in the full-fledged global war we are very much embroiled in at this moment. Crenshaw (2011) actually dedicates a third of her book to the early twentieth-century wars under the title of "Responding to terrorism", apparently echoing the US administration's motto of "war on terrorism".

To consider war, a by-product of terrorism is a clear reversal of terms and is the strongest argument against the claim that terrorism is a separate domain within the realm of political violence. Both Hoffman and Laqueur—although not in their

---

[12]Martin Kramer, "The moral logic of Hizballah" in Reich (1990, p. 141) refers to the "unprecedented wave of suicidal bombings carried out by Lebanese Shi'ites from the spring of 1983 to the summer of 1985". In the same book, p. 204, Ariel Merari "The readiness to kill and die" says: "Suicidal car-bomb attacks started in Lebanon in April 1983". Most of the other fundamental literature does not expressly say that the Hezbollah suicidal bombing operations were the first, but oversees the previous attacks. From a Western point of view and the horror they caused in the public opinion, the Hezbollah attacks were indeed the first. But this only confirms a Western point of view.

[13]Whereas the first attack was done in the name of the Iraqi Al-Dawa, the following ones were done in the name of the Islamic Jihad, one of the labels used by the Lebanese Hezbollah. The distinction in operational terms is most probably irrelevant, as all of these attacks were likely decided at the highest level of the Iranian theocracy and executed by the same operational structures on the ground. As Kramer (op. cit. p. 147 explains: "According to one lesser cleric in Hizballah, acts of "self-martyrdom" (itishhad, as opposed to suicide, intihar) "were carried out by our youth under our inspiration. Some came to consult me about acts of self-martyrdom. I explained to them that this requires a fatwa from one of the highest authorities, that is, the Imams Kh'oi or Khomeini, for a believer will do nothing without giving consideration to the principles of law." On page 155, he further explains that "Islamic decision making" is "a euphemism in Hizballah's lexicon for Iran".

[14]The "Israel—Palestine" conflict (excluding anti-Semitism) is also part of the obsession of Western analysts. Martha Crenshaw (2011, p. 7) as most of the literature presents hijackings as an innovation in the late 1960s initiated by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. In my own country, Portugal, the passenger cruise Santa Maria was hijacked with thousands of passengers on board for several days in January 1961, whereas an aircraft transporting bank notes was hijacked a few months later. Both actions were done by national oppositionists. The first United Nations convention against "offences committed on aircraft" dates from September 14, 1963. See https://treaties.un.org/doc/db/terrorism/conv1-english.pdf. Perhaps not surprisingly, Portugal appears in the list of the countries ratifying the convention, in 1964. In any circumstance, this happens considerably before the end of the 1960s.

seminal work on terrorism—focus their attention on the aftermath of terrorism in war, insurgency or geopolitics.[15]

From a conceptual point of view, the consideration of war within terrorism studies does not make sense. If genocide—most prominent among various other forms of violence—is not addressed in studies of terrorism, on what basis can full-fledged war be included in these studies?

The original Islamic fanaticism that dominates the terrorism scene since the 1970s is now dominating also warfare.

If analysed within the larger framework of political violence, terrorism becomes a single piece in a bigger puzzle.

3   The Psychology of the Bomb

Classic analysis has put the emphasis on "the philosophy of the bomb" (Laqueur, 1977), rather than on the "psychology of the bomb". However, the psychology of terrorism has also been a prolific academic domain, as we can see in a review of the professional literature directed by Randy Borum (2004). Borum is mostly sceptical on making psychopathology a criterion for understanding terrorism and concludes that:

> Mental illness is not a critical factor in explaining terrorist behavior. Also, most terrorists are not "psychopaths". There is no "terrorist personality", nor is there any accurate profile—psychologically or otherwise—of the terrorist. Histories of childhood abuse and trauma and themes of perceived injustice and humiliation often are prominent in terrorist biographies, but do not really help to explain terrorism. (p. 3)[16]

Martha Crenshaw considers rational decisions and psychopathic behaviour to be incompatible:

> There is a serious contradiction between (1) the belief that terrorists are calculating actors who will be deterred by the threat of punishment and who are engaged in the familiar occupation of "warfare" and (2) the belief that terrorists are "fanatics"—mysterious, alien, and unpredictable. These inconsistencies may make the response susceptible to emotional judgements, misperceptions, and oversimplification. Is the issue of terrorism unusual in this regard? (Crenshaw, Questions, Research and Knowledge, in Reich op. cit. p. 258)

Likewise, Martha Crenshaw is adamantly opposed to any psychopathological explanation of terrorism. In the reference classic on the subject (Reich, 1990,

---

[15]Martha Crenshaw (2011, p. 181) unequivocally distances herself from the concept of "war on terrorism" by stating: "wars are waged against adversaries, not methods". However, she develops her analysis of the "war on terrorism" under the terrorism studies perspective.

[16]The same report also concludes that "Perceived injustice, need for identity and need for belonging are common vulnerabilities among potential terrorists". However, terrorism studies have nearly unanimously rejected the thesis that terrorism is a general consequence of objectively defined injustice.

pp. 7–24), she authors a chapter expressing the view that terrorism always entails a deliberate choice and she elaborates on this in later works. Regarding the famous terrorist 2009 attack on Fort Hood she says:

> If major Hassan was mentally deranged and acted without direct assistance from Al Qaeda, the shootings would not generally be defined as terrorism (2011, p. 3).

While we should not restrict terrorism to psychopathic behaviour (aka, all terrorists are psychopaths), the claim that terrorism is "necessarily a rational decision" and a rational decision is "necessarily incompatible with psychopathic behaviour" is no less disputable. The question is not only that this point of view excludes terrorist activity conducted by assumed psychopaths, it is rather it does assume an absolute incompatibility between psychopathy and rational intention which reality does not confirm.

In relation to this approach excluding psychopathic behaviour from the terrorist field, there is also the surfacing of the theory of the so-called "lone-wolves". In this perspective, a terrorist who does not coordinate the practical outline of his plans with a wider network of terrorists should also be called something else than a terrorist.[17]

There is a clear psychological distinction to be made between a fighter who acts on his own as opposed to one who is acting within a group. As Ariel Merari ("The readiness to kill and die" in Reich, 1990, op. cit. p. 198) correctly points out: "It probably takes more courage to stay behind when one's platoon rises for assault than to charge with the others". However, we cannot conclude that attacks perpetrated by a single person necessarily have a different nature from those attacks perpetrated by a group.

A less extreme position considers "terrorism as a psychopathic phenomenon" an exception, but not an impossibility. According to Juergensmeyer (2003, p. 8):

> Although every society contains sociopaths and others who sadistically enjoy killing, it is seldom such persons who are involved in the deliberate public events that we associate with terrorism, and few terrorism studies focus exclusively on personality. The studies of the psychology of terrorism deal largely with social psychology: that is, they are concerned with the way people respond to certain group situations that make violent public acts possible.

Juergensmeyer takes a syncretic approach—which he calls a cultural approach—to the phenomenon, integrating a vast array of factors in a study

---

[17]Martha Crenshaw (2011, p. 4) recognises that it is rare to find organisations which exclusively use terrorism and hence the term "terrorist organisation" to be contentious. She quotes Abu Nidal as the single exception. However, she not only uses the term but makes of it the basis of her analysis.

which stands as one of the most remarkable for understanding the terrorism phenomenon.[18]

Laqueur ([1999], pp. 131–133) also dedicates some attention to the issue. He refers to known terrorists such as the German Ulrike Meinhof and the Pakistani Mir Aimal Kansi, as cases where there was evidence of brain damage previous to their terrorist engagements. He also mentions the abnormal high suicide rate among Russian nineteenth century terrorists. Martha Crenshaw ([2011], p. 44) does not share this opinion and quotes scientific evidence of the mental soundness of four of the members of the Meinhof group.

Laqueur considers Jim Jones the "half-crazy" (p. 95) leader of a millenarian sect with vague pro-communist tendencies (p. 89), but he does not establish any psychological profile parallel with those of the Jihadi ideologues who attained wide notoriety at the same time that Jim Jones organised his famous mass suicide.

Walter Reich, (op. cit. pp. 268–269) in the concluding remarks of the collective book he coordinated, is also dismissive of psychopathological explanations for terrorism, while quoting several authors who think otherwise.

Post (Reich, [1990], pp. 25–40) also considers that there is no evidence of "gross psychopathology" (p. 26, 29) in the terrorist profile, stating: "But although diverse personalities are attracted to the paths of terrorism, an examination of memoirs, court records, and rare interviews suggests that people with particular personality traits and tendencies are drawn disproportionately to terrorist careers".

Studies in the wake of the most recent Jihadi attacks in France, however, arrive at the opposite conclusion. Benslama ([2016], p. 27) describes the results of recent studies in French prisons revealing an average of more than 40% psychopathologies among the "radicalised" (i.e. fanatic or fundamentalist Islamist) prisoners.

Benslama—a psychopathologist by profession—considers the euphemism "radicalised" as acceptable, exactly because it allows for an individual consideration of the question. However, he recognises the negative euphemistic side of the use of the expression.

Strozier et al. ([2010]) edited a collective work which, while embracing different approaches to the issue, provides a most significant contribution to the building of the socio-psychological framework approach: "The Fundamentalist Mindset".

As the editors explain, their book builds on "*The Fundamentalism Project* that began in the late 1980s and was led by Martin Marty was the first major scholarly response to what was generally perceived in academic circles to be the astonishing rise of fundamentalism in America and the world" (Strozier & Terman, p. 3).

Most tellingly, they clarify that "The one word never mentioned in all of the five volumes of *The Fundamentalism Project* is terrorism". This statement helps explain why both academic fields (terrorism studies and the socio-psychology of fanaticism) have mostly ignored each other. The overcoming of this divide is perhaps the most important move we need to undertake.

---

[18]The famous "murderous identities" of Amin Maalouf ([1998]) are a lighter and literarily more interesting way of getting into the issue.

This works focuses on the fundamentalist mindset, and it starts with "Christian Fundamentalism" as a basis of the studied phenomenon, moving on to Jihadism and other sorts of fanaticism.

There are quite different points of view on the pathological and social dimensions of the motivation for fundamentalist terrorism among the contributors to the work. The most far-reaching of them all is perhaps the one of David M. Terman "Fundamentalism and the Paranoid Gestalt" (op. cit. pp. 47–61).

It is a remarkable work which deserves a careful reading. We emphasise the following description of the mechanics of the "group fundamentalist paranoia" (pp. 48–49):

> There is an aggrieved in-group, the group that is organized by the paranoid gestalt, and there is a feared, hated group that is seen as destructive, that is the paranoid object. The paranoid group is suspicious of the destructive's group intentions and purposes in a fashion analogous to that in the individual. The designated destructive group is the chief source of danger to the paranoid's group well-being or welfare. Even more crucially, the destructive group is the chief and determined obstacle to the achievement of the ideal state that the paranoid group is trying to establish. This ideal state is a very important element of the gestalt for the paranoid groups. It is the carrier of the moral superiority of the group, and it serves as a cohesive force binding the group together. But inextricably intertwined with the ideal state is the destructive force that opposes it, and that usually is seen to be demonic. The ideal state can be achieved only with the destruction of the destructive force, almost always the members of the destructive group. This dynamic is the source of the Manichaean worldview that is characteristic of the fundamentalist mindset. And it is often a moral imperative, indeed a moral virtue to eradicate, kill, those who want to prevent or destroy the establishment of the ideal condition; in fact that destruction itself is often seen to lead to the ideal state. The paranoid group believes itself far superior morally but far weaker in any dimension of temporal power than the destructive group. Indeed, the designated destructive group may seem to be almost omnipotent and omniscient—hence its demonic quality. It is this combination of characteristics that virtually defines the fundamentalist mindset as we see it manifested in both religious and secular contexts throughout history.

The author considers "the Nazi" as the prime example for this scheme, but he also sees parallel patterns in the French or Russian revolutions. The scheme adapts perfectly to contemporary anti-Semitism and various forms of extreme nationalism.

Regarding the most important form of contemporaneous fundamentalism—jihadism—the author tells us (p. 50):

> The paranoid Islamic group holds and is working to establish its utopian vision of the perfect world under Islamic law, Sharia. Its destructive group is the West, Christian or Jewish or both, and it is holy and sacred to try to exterminate the Western infidel. This is a classic paranoid gestalt.[19]

---

[19]Jihadism is certainly anti-Semitic. This has to do with reasons that might be different from the anti-Semitism that is widespread in the West, but it does not specially consider Christians as its main target. Yazidis, as we have seen, are a more obvious victim. All Muslim obedience that can be seen as a rival to the Jihadi domain becomes also a more obvious target. Iranian authorities, for instance, considered its Islamic opposition as the most dangerous and acted accordingly.

Terman's approach has a much bigger capacity to explain Jihadi violence (in the form of terrorism, genocide, insurgency or full war) than any other definition of terror we have seen so far. Juergensmeyer's cultural approach—which emphasises the motor role of religious ideologies in present day terrorism—considers nevertheless that "religion does not ordinarily lead to violence" (p. 10). Only in the complex set of cultural circumstances, we can see how a fusion of religion and politics leads to terror.

We have to bear in mind that a real social concern with integrity and a fundamentalist paranoid gestalt are expressed in quite similar ways; the only difference is that one is real and the other is deeply distorted.

For instance, the Jewish concern for their integrity in Europe and the Middle East is not paranoid, while Bin Laden concern for the integrity of Islam because of the presence of US troops in Saudi Arabia is paranoid. Notwithstanding, whoever will look at both claims without analysing reality will not be able to reach this conclusion.

On Terman's "fundamentalist paranoid gestalt" concept, we would however make three annotations.

1. Contrary to a widely held assumption,[20] paranoid and rational behaviour cannot be seen as mutually exclusive, in particular in the domain of socio-psychology. To mention the best-known example: Nazism paranoia co-existed with the very rational, meticulous and efficient plan to commit genocide.
2. The author understandably refers to the difficulties of extending established findings from the individual to the proposed "social paranoia" concept. Whereas he presents four individual cognitive phases of psychosis, no such attempt exists on the social level. However, the understanding of this crucial development is a necessary condition for its use.
3. The author makes no attempt to describe the different roles of different people in the same "social paranoid gestalt", as if it was not composed of different individual personalities. This is very unlikely. It is more likely that the "fundamentalist paranoid gestalt" is a complex result of several components, several of them rational.

Since the beginning of the 1980s, the academics studying fundamentalism have given more importance to the Christian than the Muslim forms of fundamentalism, only slowly adapting to the realities on the ground.[21]

The crusader or the Jihadi spirit should not necessarily be reduced to "the spirit of war on the basis of religious beliefs". As one of the most obvious examples, the

---

[20]Other than Martha Crenshaw (op. cit.), see David George review of Reich (1990) available online: https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/JCS/article/view/15027

[21]Frederick Hacker (1977) significant title "Crusaders, Criminals and Crazies" tells us much on his views on the way these three main violence archetypes from which terrorism might be understood.

Sovereign Military Order of Malta—a presently independent member state of the United Nations—is a living heir of the medieval Crusaders.

As Laqueur explains:

> Christianity had its Jihad, the Crusades, 700 years ago. But to deny the specific virulence of Islamic terrorism in our time is self-deception, an exercise in political—or ecumenical—correctness. If we ignore for the moment the tribal violence in Africa, about 80% of war and violence occurs at the present time inside and between Muslim countries, and among the myriad factions within the Muslim World. (1999, p. 277)

The Crusades were a phenomenon where a supremacist religious standing was only one piece of the puzzle. Furthermore, if we go through the analysis of contemporary terrorism in the name of Christian values, we see it is not done in accordance with the Crusader spirit.[22]

Jihad is also a complex phenomenon. As the "crusades" it meant—and still means—different things to different people. The role of its conceptualisation in present day terrorism is however central and cannot be ignored.[23]

There is no possible equivalence between the supremacist ideology of the Crusades—which ended in the letter and spirit a long time ago—and Jihadism, which was reborn in the twentieth century with a supremacist credo based on a fundamentalist reading of Islam and a fanatic guide of action. Jihadism makes up the ideological cover of the bulk of present day terrorism, while the Crusader spirit is not present and much less important in present-day Christian fundamentalism.

The Tamil Tigers—whom we study in the second part of this book—share the tendencies of extreme violence, tactics and ruthlessness of contemporary Jihadi groups. However, they do not share the ideology at all, which serves as a reminder that, while "terrorism as a set of political violent practices" usually has a clear link with a precise ideology, it is not bound by this ideology and is able to bridge geographic, cultural and religious divides.[24]

Juergensmeyer (2003, p. 7) points out that: "…the word "terrorist" is problematic. For one thing, the term makes no clear distinction between the organisers of an attack, those who carry it out and the many who support it both directly and indirectly".

Actually, we should introduce an additional layer to the network: the ideologue. He is not necessarily the organiser. Whereas in classical theory,[25] the three first layers (ideologue, organiser and perpetrator) often coincided; this is not the case in our day.

---

[22]See Laqueur (1999, pp. 107–116 or pp. 229–231) for instance, on the US brand.

[23]On contemporary Jihad, we can consult the works of Walid Phares (2005, 2007, 2008) and Kepel (2000).

[24]The link between the two most important and extreme terrorist organisations external to the jihadi sphere—Tamil Tigers and "Sendero Luminoso"—with the Iranian Jihadi outfit in Lebanon deserves, however, careful consideration.

[25]Referred to as "modern" in Laqueur terminology.

The biggest difficulty that arises here may be defining a precise and workable psychological typology of terrorists. We may well ask ourselves which categories of terrorists have been analysed by the psychology experts. To classify all those who engage in some aspect of the terrorist activity in the same way may be a tremendous error.[26]

We can envisage a "multiple spectrum model" for analysing terrorist action that encompasses criminality, other forms of informal warfare and paranoia.

The first criterion is motivation and can be organised along five basic lines: (1) ideas, (2) mindsets, (3) political power, (4) economic power and (5) social recognition. These five types of motivation do not necessarily manifest independently from one another. Absolute economic power can translate into absolute political power and vice versa. Social recognition may or may not be a pure consequence of other forms of power. Ideas might be just an ideological reading of interests in the Marxian way, but they might as well exist by themselves, independent of the "material infrastructure". Mindsets may interact with other motivations, and violence might be a "pure" means or a "pure" end in itself.

This means that, in algebraic language, we cannot transform this model into a matrix with significant spectra because of multiple cases of linear dependence.[27]

To evaluate these motivations from the perspective of the society, the fundamental criteria are, as stated, legitimacy and proportionality, both considered as dependent on particular judgements and not as absolute measures.

Martha Crenshaw's (2011) apparently shares the view of the importance of motivation. On page 3, she considers "intent or motivation" is necessary "to judge whether or not an attack represents terrorism". While she aimed at providing an "exact definition" (p. 21) of terrorism, the reading of her book does not allow us to conclude that she attained these objectives. Narodnaya Vodna, unreservedly classified as a terrorist organisation throughout the work, is recognised as a "self-consciously democratic group" (p. 46). Narodnaya Vodna's intents and motivations were in fact only the establishment of democracy in Russia.

---

[26]My anecdotal, empiric experience of contact with the USA, local authorities, displaced people and refugees from Iraq was that group survival/economic reasoning was crucial to suicide terrorism. In 2005, the quoted price of a suicidal terrorist act was 50,000 dollars, whereas 2 years afterwards it had gone down already to 10,000 dollars. The chosen ones for these activities—mostly self-conscious young males in the beginning—became in later stages those less apt or physically handicapped similar to girls who had been victims of sexual aggression. More recently, on January the 21st 2016, I had the opportunity to discuss the issue with Dr. Kamal Al Labwani, a leading Syrian democratic opposition in exile. He is convinced it is clearly possible to create profiles of the several terrorist characters: the ideologue, the ring-leader, the suicide bomber and the supporter.

[27]The efforts to move the studies of violence into the quantifiable domain—pioneered by academics such as Professor Raymond Tanter (1966)—are a promising way forward. We should remark that the mindset approach to terrorism developed here is quite different from the ideological approach as defined by Marx. Whereas for Marx, ideology reflected objective interests, the terrorist mindset comes from a distorted—even paranoid—reading of reality.

However, when analysing the ANC political violence, she takes the opposite point of view. In p. 210, she considers ANC to have rejected terrorism and in p. 212 she explains what she means by considering ANC "rejected terrorism in favour of sabotage". But sabotage, according to her own definition, (p. 3) falls into terrorism realm. Crenshaw stated (p. 2) "the dilemma is to arrive at a "neutral" definition of a method rather than a moral characterization of the enemy". Her use of the term seems however to reflect her subjective views rather than a neutral definition of a method.[28]

While the research path of the "fanatic, fundamentalist, paranoid mindset construction" to explain extreme forms of violence encompassing terrorism seems the most promising one, it has to be pursued in an interdisciplinary way. This includes field studies on the most prolific cases, such as the Iraqi–Syrian one; otherwise, most of the crucial issues may just be lost in translation from one specific academic jargon to another.

4   Terrorism: The Pure One or the One that Matters?

Ultimately, the reason why we see this paradox is due to terrorism studies ignoring the most dreadful forms of violent action, such as genocide. This seems to be an analytical choice, to evade dealing with the complexity of human political violence by concentrating on its purest form. Laqueur refers to this purest form as "systematic terror", however, he also acknowledges that (1977, p. 82):

> . . .pure terrorism has so far only succeeded in very specific circumstances (. . .) Where terrorism has been successful its aims have usually been limited and clearly defined. (. . .) Alternatively, terrorist actions succeeded because they were used within the framework of a wider strategy

In other words, either we are concerned with "pure terrorism"—that is, a phenomenon which may be crucial from several points of view, but certainly not from the point of view of effective political action—or we are concerned with meaningful political action which encompasses terrorism and has a considerable chance of success, exactly because it does not rely on terrorism alone.

To only consider "pure terrorism" may be understandable at a time when terrorism is more seen as a nuisance than a fundamental threat to our societies. Whereas Laqueur did predict the development of terrorism as an existential threat, he only thinks it becomes existential if and when terrorists master the use of weapons of mass destruction, not when terrorism becomes a core component of a powerful political strategy, which we believe is the case in our day.

As such, we reject this part of the classical approach and choose to focus on identifying comprehensive political strategies encompassing terrorism which may

---

[28]We could not find any objective base for the elaboration of the list of the terrorist organisations she presents in pages 204–205.

be threatening to our societies. That is, our analysis is not bound by the purity of terrorism. More to the point, we think our societies should rather be more concerned with "impure" forms of terrorism, most importantly the so-called "state terrorism".

Terrorism was introduced into our Western vocabulary following the terror policy of post-revolutionary France (1977, pp. 6–7). However, for Laqueur, "systematic terrorism begins in the second half of the nineteenth century and there were several quite distinct categories of it from the very beginning" (1977, p. 11).

Whereas the French terror regime could not be considered as "pure" terrorism since it was integrated in a wider political strategy, the categories that emerged in the middle of the nineteenth century can be described as such. Although diverse, this "modern terrorism"[29] had a common denominator of being used against the state, that is, exactly the opposite characteristic of terrorism as defined in 1796 in France.

Bruce Hoffman (1998) also addresses this issue and distinguishes between "terror", which could be considered the state variety, and "terrorism", which could be seen as the non-state variety when used internally (pp. 15–16). When terror is promoted externally by the state, and it is not necessarily part of an assumed violent strategy, Hoffman uses the concept of "state sponsored terrorism".

If we follow the original French Revolution definition of terror, we see it is closer to what would be better described as "tyranny" (although a specific form of tyranny, tyranny nonetheless), a concept thoroughly developed throughout history and to which Laqueur (1976, pp. 21–23) refers extensively as well. Tyranny is historically the most common justification used by those who use violent means—including terrorism—to justify resisting it.

5   Does Terrorism Necessarily Target Civilians?

As we continue to frame the discussion, we also have to consider another foundational question on terrorism: should we circumscribe terrorism to political violence characterised by "a form of warfare in which violence is directed primarily against non-combatants (usually unarmed civilians) rather than operational military and police forces or economic assets (public or private)", as Bard O'Neil suggests? (1990, p. 24).

Yonah Alexander, the author of another fundamental reference handbook on terrorism, agrees terrorism is "the use of violence against random civilian targets in order to intimidate or to create generalised pervasive fear for the purpose of achieving political goals" (1976, p. xiv).[30]

---

[29]Laqueur uses "modern terrorism" to describe nineteenth century terrorism, although he does not always use the term consistently.

[30]SADF had the privilege of being assisted by Professor Yonah Alexander in the first steps we took concerning the study of terrorism.

This perspective led to the so-called Kofi Anan terrorism definition[31]: "Any action constitutes terrorism if is intended to cause death or seriously bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act".[32]

While this is a feasible conceptual option, we have to be clear about what it entails. As we know, targeting civilians was a widespread and central strategy pursued by both sides of the belligerents during the Second World War. Should we then consider this war as a critical example of terrorism? And if we stick to this designation of "civilians" or "non-combatants", are government officials to be considered "in" or "out" of this sphere? And how to consider militant factions of political parties? How shall we consider transport, cyber or critical industrial infrastructure? And would it really make sense to consider an attack on an important businessman "terrorism", but not the stabbing of a policewoman patrolling a city street?[33]

As we are sure the reader understands by now, this abstract discussion is ineffective in dealing with our reality. It has to be pursued in a precise context of motivations, legitimacy and proportionality.

6   The Semantics of Terrorism

Another way to look at the crucial question of understanding the core issue of terrorism is the semantic one. As the Sageman reference at the beginning of this chapter explains, it is generally acknowledged that "terrorism" carries a pejorative connotation irrespective of any objective consideration, and this naturally makes the term considerably problematic to use in scientific language.

Otherwise, as George Orwell (1946, p. 146) pointed out:

> In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible. (. . .)
> Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer
> cloudy vagueness.

The scientific study of terrorism is handicapped both by its intentional pejorative use of the term and equally by the use of—now widespread—euphemisms such as "radical", "extremist" or "militant", which replaced the use of the expression "terrorist", further confusing the debate.

---

[31]See for instance: https://www.cigionline.org/articles/2005/03/annan-proposes-definition-terrorism

[32]Alexander's definition introduces an important element of precision by restricting it to random violence. Classical war strategies target infrastructures and non-combatants whom are crucial for the war effort.

[33]Martha Crenshaw (2011, p. 3) also considers the combatant/non-combatant distinction to be impracticable.

During a conference in Brussels,[34] Martha Crenshaw said her use of the expression "Jihadism" was done against the will of the US authorities[35] which consider the proper expression to be used is "violent extremism".

Martha Crenshaw states in her book that (2011, pp. 5–6):

> Radicalization, which I define as willingness to use or support violence as opposed to the peaceful pursuit of radical change, is a mix of psychological, sociological, political and economic process. It is distinct from recruitment to the ranks of an organization, although it is often assumed that the two always go together.[36]

To define radicalisation as "violent radicalisation" and as opposed to "peaceful radicalisation" does not make semantic sense, but it makes even less historical or political sense. Radicals and radicalisation are realities with long traditions, particularly in Italy or in France where a Radical Party existed since 1901 and where it has a political and social meaning which has nothing to do with terrorism (See for instance Lafaye, 2016, p. 6).

Following a systematic analysis of the French press, Professor Lafaye concluded that, since 2012, "radicalisation" has not been used in political discourse to qualify political or social issues related to political or social reforms, but only to consider religious issues, specially Islam and terrorism (Lafaye, 2016, p. 19).[37]

France and the USA are certainly not the only case in point, and elsewhere in the Western world the twisting of language on terrorism—in the press, in official publications, by political directive and most importantly, in research grant forms—is ever more commonplace, even up to a point that, maybe, only Orwell hinted at.[38]

---

[34]The conference was held at the occasion of her coming to Belgium for receiving a "Honoris Causa" Doctorate from the University of Ghent. It was held on September the 14th in the University Foundation and titled "Why is counter-terrorism so difficult".

[35]For an in-depth analysis of this policy and its widespread influence on all branches of the US government, see F.G. Gaffney and C.L. Lopez, "See No Sharia", 2016, Center for Security Policy, pp. 103–107, http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/See_No_Sharia_Final.pdf

[36]During the above-mentioned conference, Martha Crenshaw explained that the use of the term "radical" became commonplace after the 9/11 attack, but she did not give a particular importance to it. However, she considered the term was now standard and unavoidable within the profession.

[37]"Le champ sémantique de la radicalisation s'est. ainsi, au cours des dernières années, considérablement appauvri pour devenir synonyme de terrorisme islamique, dans la presse écrite". This is a euphemism for terrorism. However, as Professor Lafaye correctly points out it became the opposite—that is, a pejorative qualification—for every radicalisation process, which became a dirty expression. For instance, being a *militant*—which literally means active member—of the Italian based *Radical* Party, I can say I have an *extreme* view of these euphemisms. I think they are simultaneously insulting to radicals and condone criminal activity.

[38]A recurrent explanation for this state of affairs is that terms like "Islamic terrorism" or "Jihadism" would promote "Islamophobia". This view is highly questionable. The use of twisted language by the authorities promotes a public perception that the authorities are not telling the truth and that they have something to hide, which actually promotes islamophobia.

The euphemistic labelling of terrorism is clearly identified by academic experts such as Albert Bandura[39] ("Mechanisms of moral disengagement" in Reich, op. cit., pp. 169–172) as

> ... a convenient device for masking reprehensible activities or even conferring a respectable status on them. (p. 170)

As Bandura further explains:

> Through convoluted verbiage, destructive conduct is made benign and people who engage in it are relieved of a sense of euphemism language. Laboratory studies reveal the disinhibitory power of euphemistic language. Adults behave much more aggressively when given opportunities to assault a person when assaultive acts are given a sanitized athletic label than when they are called aggression. (p. 170)

To call a criminal, "criminal", a terrorist, "terrorist" or a jihadist, "jihadist" is therefore the scientific, correct option, whereas calling him an "extremist", a "militant" or a "radical" is inappropriate. The process of becoming a terrorist may be advantageously described—depending on circumstances—as "fanatic or criminal indoctrination" rather than "radicalisation".

Besides misrepresenting an issue which is already thorny, "terrorism" as a concept carries a vital important semantic problem. When we use the word to define an "act of violence", we are referring to what the passive subject of the action presumably experiences rather than to what the active subject does. In other words, terrorism, as a description of the phenomenon we are studying, violates the basic rule of linguistic clarity. Orwell (1946) refers to this rule—which is upheld by linguistics in general—and concludes one should always prefer the active to the passive voice!

Moreover, the expression "terrorism" fails to apprehend its general goal: "horror" rather than terror. The most important difference between terror and horror is the relation of time to the originating act. Whereas terror is a feeling in anticipation of the experience, horror is a consequence of the experience (Fine, 2015, p. 22).

In a terrorism act, terror is what the direct victims will feel, if they really will have the time to feel it. Horror is what the indirect target will feel. Here, the indirect target might be only the political leadership, as it was the case of the old targeted assassinations, or the common person, as it is the case in Jihadist contemporary attacks.

In other words, it is "horror" that makes terrorism an instrument of general impact in society, contrarily to "terror", which has a much narrower and localised impact.

However, if we are to use "horror" as the ultimate end of terrorism, we need some additional explanations. According to the Oxford dictionary,[40] horror means

---

[39]The author is a professor of Social Science in Psychology at Stanford University.

[40]Definition, see: http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/horror

"an intense feeling of fear, shock or disgust", that is, horror might mean three things that are different from one another. Disgust, or more to the point, revulsion, implies a rejection and implies an action against the horrifying act. Shock, quite to the contrary, implies paralysis and an inability to react.[41]

Still, according to the Oxford Dictionary, the term horror originates from the Latin *horrere,* which translates as "tremble" or "shudder". While it is not our intention to get into a deep linguistic discussion, it is important to point out that horror can be translated as two opposite reactions: an inability to react, a paralysis, a trembling or a shuddering (which is definitely closer to its Latin origin) or a revulsion, which combines the strong distaste with a clear rejection of the act. The discussion on "horror" cannot neglect either the attraction it implies (as Laqueur emphasised, see our page 3), an attraction, which is the basis of the significant success of our culture of horror novels.

Still, we can think of a particularly dreadful combination between "shock" and "revulsion" where the shock is fundamentally cognitive—and so the mind, rather the physics, is paralysed—and the revulsion is fundamentally physical—and so the revulsion actions are not well thought of.

So, the expression "horror" comprises a full range of different reactions, from a paralysis that fails to hinder the aggression to a revulsion that may translate into a determination to punish or annihilate the aggressor or still to a paradoxical fascination.

Martha Crenshaw (2011), perhaps the most widely reputed author in the field, addresses the importance of the aforementioned horrific impact in her concept of terrorism (p. 206)[42]:

> My analysis is based on the premise that terrorism is simply one form of political violence. The method, not the identity or ideology of the user, determines whether or not an action can be defined as terrorism. Terrorism involves the use or threat of physical harm in order to achieve a disproportionately large psychological effect. It is demonstrative or propagandistic violence without significant military value, directed against symbolic rather utilitarian targets. States as well as nonstsates may use terrorism as a political weapon, although in this case I am concerned with oppositional rather than repressive violence.

Otherwise, all archetypes of "horror" convey a more or less instinctive reaction, not a rational one. When terrorism is perpetrated by an anonymous entity, or when

---

[41]Fear is a more general term which covers the precedent expressions in a vaguer and less intense way. Intense fear might be therefore replaced by shock or revulsion.

[42]Elsewhere, Martha Crenshaw's definition of terrorism is not as concise as here. In different parts of her work, she gives different and often contradictory views on it. The author emphasises terrorism is meant to "shock, frighten, excite or outrage" but when exemplifying the impact, the author refers to air raids in the Second World War (p. 25), that is, she makes the exact contrary point from the expected. On page 23, referring to her definition of terrorism made on the basis of the study of FLN action in Algeria she considers the "revolutionary" characteristic as essential in two of the four items, but some pages later (p. 40) she acknowledges terrorists might as well be "reactionaries acting to prevent change from the top (such as the Secret Army Organisation during the Algerian war).

those who are its actors and proudly announce the authorship of terrorist actions are not their real mentors, the objective may be to fool the victims into deflecting their anger onto erroneous culprits, actually contributing to the fulfilment of the terrorist's objectives.

There is no better example of this fact that the reaction to 9/11 where the Western World was made to erroneously identify the culprit as the Iraqi regime, instead of the Iranian authorities.

The reaction of the victim is key to the success of any terrorist act. Therefore, terrorism studies should also be concerned with the reaction of the victims of the violent acts and not merely with the violent actions of the perpetrators.

7   Countless Shades of Horror

As we have seen, although terrorism has been used to describe the actions of the perpetrators of the violent act, the term actually refers to those who are the passive object of the act.

Martha Crenshaw argues the essence of terrorism is the "disproportion" between the small "use/threat of physical harm" and its large "psychological effect".

Whereas terror (for instance the "shock and awe"), as immortalised by the invasion of Iraq, is a basic and rather common objective of conventional or unconventional warfare; it is generally not the ultimate goal of the violence. In the case of the invasion of Iraq, the main strategic objective was to remove the Baath party from power.

Here, terror, through the use of large-scale violence, was aimed at paralysing the enemy forces. Still, this is the classic war equation, where the essential is your war capacity, not your capacity to achieve a "disproportionate psychological effect" and this is why it differs from terrorism.

In the insurgency which followed the invasion of Iraq, as had been the case in other insurgencies, the number one objective was not to "horrify" the allied forces into paralysis, it was to horrify the West (government, authorities, media, opinion leaders and the entire population), forcing it to leave Iraq.

Whereas there is no clear component differing the violent actions of terrorism from other unconventional warfare actions; whereas there are also no clear differences between terrorism and most of the organised violence on the use of "terror"—that is, to paralyse the enemy (ex ante) by imminent violence; there is however a clear divide between terrorism and other forms of warfare on the objective of spreading "horror" (ex post) among a target population. Whereas all forms of warfare may use violence to spread horror in a target population, when it comes to terrorism; it is the main aim of the perpetrators.

The success or the accomplishment of this objective depends not only on the violent action itself, but fundamentally on the way it will be perceived by the targeted population. This perception will depend crucially on the media, as well as on other factors, like organised propaganda from specific lobbying groups.

So, terrorism to be successful cannot fulfil its goals with violence alone. Terrorism as a meaningful political instrument measures its success on the impact on the target it aims to horrify.

Moreover, terrorism can be embedded in complex political strategies, most prominently, state sponsoring. Therefore, rather than searching for "terrorist strategies", we should try to understand the broader "political strategies" that incorporate terrorism.

As long as society is able to correctly identify the ultimate perpetrators of the terrorist act, as long as its "horror" translates into revulsion for the perpetrators and as this revulsion is rationally organised to counteract the perpetrators intentions, terrorism by itself will not attain its objectives.

However, in search of the purity of the concept, terrorism studies have favoured the study of violent actions—which are shared by many other violent activities—disregarding or paying little attention to the study of the "horrified" reaction of the targeted populations.

Even when analysts pay attention to the target population, more often than not, this is done in an overly simplistic manner. For instance, Kydd and Walter (2006, p. 58) consider that "terrorists play to two key audiences: governments whose policies they wish to influence and individuals on the terrorists' own side whose support or obedience they seek to gain".[43]

Where the authors focus on the action or inaction of governments, we should analyse the complex interactions between elected authorities, state bureaucracies, leading intellectuals, media and the society at large; where the authors fixate on the "terrorist side" we should look at the—no less complex—structure of rival or allied organisations, present and potential sympathisers, neutral or undecided actors and opponents in the domain the terrorists consider their own. This is not to mention the masterminds or third parties that may not be visible as part of the equation, but may in fact be the main player(s).

Throughout her book, Martha Crenshaw (2011) repeatedly considers the danger of over-reacting to terrorism, claiming anti-terrorism measures provoke more terrorism (for instance p. 12) whereas another set of authors[44] is concerned with the opposite phenomenon, the case where appeasement of terrorism provokes more terrorism.

We think, therefore, that terrorism studies have been playing a rather simplistic game and have been failing to address the essential issues. Rather than reacting too little or too much, one needs to carefully balance two sets of objectives: (1) not to be provoked into aggressing innocent bystanders or failing to address reasonable

---

[43]In Reich's collective work, part IV is entirely dedicated to the horror impact under the title "Responding to terrorism: Decision making and the pressures on leadership". It is a very limited approach either on the object of the impact or on the mechanisms of the impact under consideration.

[44]Perhaps the most famous in this perspective is Walter's Laqueur (2010) "The political psychology of appeasement" which does not refer to terrorism as normally considered. Other case in point is Schulman's piece we refer to in the subsequent pages.

grievances and (2) not appeasing those who are the real motors of terrorism. The worst case scenario is when one combines both errors, that is, when one simultaneously targets innocent bystanders and appease the master-minders of terrorist attacks. This was in our view the case of 9/11.

8   Appease the Devil and Shoot the Innocent?

It is possible that a society may be experiencing the very same pathological reactions to a terrorist attack that psychology, sociology and psycho-sociology already identified in other types of aggression. In other words, we should look at the studies on the reactions to other types of aggression to see whether there is a potential parallel with the "horror" that people experience in the aftermath of a terrorist attack.[45]

A popular article on the "Stockholm Syndrome" (Fabrique et al., 2007) uses a typical terrorist act (an airplane hijacking) to exemplify and analyse the syndrome. This suggests there is no reason to assume that the psychological trauma caused by a terrorist aggression is of a different nature than the one caused by any other sort of aggression.[46]

However, the issue is necessarily more complex if we want to use the mechanism, not to explain the "psychological individual trauma" of terror, but for

---

[45]A similar process is known in the profession by "Traumatic bonding", and it works along a relationship rather than a punctual act. A medical description of child abuse can be found here: http://www.johnbriere.com/stm.pdf which does not use these concepts but describes situations where the victim adapts to the aggression. For a general characterisation of the phenomenon, we can see https://victimsofpsychopaths.wordpress.com/traumatic-bonding/ Most of the existing literature on religious traumatic syndrome relates to Christian fundamentalism bluntly ignoring the fact this is a relatively benign in comparison with the much more pervasive Islamic fundamentalism. In this regard, see also Weinberg, Pedahzur and Hirsch-Hoeffler "The Challenges of Conceptualizing Terrorism" (2004). The authors highlight the lack of analysis revolving around the psychological realm in terrorism studies.

[46]Martha Crenshaw (2011) considers as "Stockholm syndrome"—that with the passage of time terrorists will feel an emotional affinity with their captives and becomes reluctant to harm them—(p. 105). Some pages later she defines it in a considerably different way: "a short-term for the hypothesis that with time hostages and their captors will become attached with each other because of the phenomenon of identification with the aggressor". In any circumstance, she considers this case to be inconsistent with the decisional conflict theory she sustains. Both Crenshaw definitions are different from the standard definition, which we can quote from the above-mentioned article (Fabrique et al., 2007, p. 11): "The term Stockholm syndrome was coined after the 1973 robbery of Kreditbanken in Stockholm, Sweden, in which two robbers held four bank employees hostage from August 23 to 28. During this time, the victims shared a vault and became very familiar with their captors—in fact, they wound up emotionally attached and even defended them after the ordeal. Today, people view Stockholm syndrome as a psychological response of a hostage or an individual in a similar situation in which the more dominant person has the power to put the victim's life in danger. Perpetrators occasionally use this advantage to get victims to comply with their demands."

understanding the "social horror impact" of aggressions which are experienced indirectly—mostly through media—but not directly.

Schulman (2009) wrote a seminal article with the suggestive title "Stockholm syndrome: Radical Islam and the European Response". The article does not deal with the level of violence that is normally associated with "terrorism" but with the other (less violent) aspects of Jihadism and its close associate, anti-Semitism. While it analyses the basic components of the "fundamentalist mindset" we referred to before, it also does not attempt to bridge the gap between standard psychological categories and corresponding social categories.

A different but related phenomenon to the "Stockholm syndrome" is the "traumatic bonding", which we believe is closer to the phenomenon Schulman refers to. Its build-up may be described in four points.

The first phase is dominated by denial, as the victim finds himself unable to face what happened and refuses to refer to the aggression itself for emotional self-protection. In a second phase, we have the dissociation process, where the victim describes the event as if it did not happen to him and as if he were watching a movie. The third phase is characterised by cognitive dissonance, which also appears as a self-preservation mechanism. Here, the truth is distorted and the aggressor's action normalised in order to diminish the pain of reality. The traumatic bonding is the last phase of the ailment, in which the victim tries to normalise his life with the aggressor. In the case of the Stockholm syndrome, he goes one step further and develops positive emotional feelings for the aggressor.

Schulman (op. cit.) uses two examples that are particularly important. The first refers to the Jihadist misogyny in Europe which translates into two occurrences. The first is the aggression of migrant Muslim women who are found to resist their diminished status under Jihadist ideology, as migrant women often want to share the privileges of native ones. The second is that native Europeans should adapt to the supposed "culture" of migrants in—what is supposed to be—a multicultural society.[47]

In a second example, he describes the dramatic rise of anti-Semitism in Europe:

> The onset of the second or Al-Aqsa intifada in Israel/Palestine meant, for Western Europe, the beginning of "a wave of Judeophobia unprecedented in scale or intensity in the post-Nazi period". The author notes ruefully that "not since World War II have anti-Jewish expressions had such currency in France among so many social groups, or met so little intellectual and political resistance as they have since the fall of 2000 (2009, p. 483)

These phenomena are indeed at the centre of the present-day main political strategy encompassing Jihadi terrorism and cannot be understood if we do not focus our attention on the process of "horrifying" the targeted population.

---

[47]In the first case: "Norwegian women must realize that we live in a multicultural society and adapt to it" (Bawer, 2007, pp. 55, 205) and in the second case: "she was slaughtered in cold blood for wanting to be—simply—a girl in a civilized nation (Wikan, 2001, p. 93)."

The West's benign reaction to displays of misogyny—such as the aforementioned reaction of a Norwegian expert, telling Norwegian women "to adapt"—is one of the most paradoxical of the appeasing reactions we have seen to political strategies attempting to "horrify" target societies into surrender.

Moreover, the use of "multiculturalism" as a basis for this reaction is a gross mystification. The "multiculturalist" real although hidden assumptions are that we should consider the Muslim culture to be necessarily misogynous and the Western (or for that matter, the Scandinavian) one as necessarily partisan of equal rights for women. Objectively, this is a pure Western supremacist ideology disguised as multiculturalism. This attitude constitutes a soft bigotry of low expectations.

To illustrate this, let us consider a filmed speech, by the former Egyptian President Gamal Nasser ridiculing the Muslim Brotherhood's demand to impose the veil on Egyptian women and was recorded in the 1950s.[48] During my childhood (in the 1960s) in rural catholic Northern Portugal, wearing a veil was still considered the norm for mature women. At the same time, a decade earlier it was possible to hear a spontaneous roar of laughter in Egypt when addressing demands to make all women wear a veil in public. This shows that head coverings are part of both pre-modern Catholic and pre-modern Muslim culture. It is nonsensical to hold back any criticism in the name of "multicultural tolerance", since there is no issue with religion but rather with modernity.[49]

To illustrate the nonsensical nature of this "bigotry", a Christian woman in Alabama was forced to take off her headscarf in her driver's licence picture because "Only Muslim women have the right to cover their hair in their driver's license photos".[50] This implies that the State becomes the interpreter of religion and it does so on a rather ignorant basis.

As such, there is no sound historical objective basis to consider veiled women as a cultural trait of Islam contrarily to Christianity. It appears we are witnessing what Eric Hobsbawm famously described as "invented traditions". There is no objective basis to consider veils as a deeply rooted civilisational symbol (and therefore it is not something we must blindly accept in the name of "multiculturalism") of Muslim women as opposed to Christian women.

Conversely, we cannot claim that the cultural nature of Western society is defined by equal opportunities for women. While Norway was one of the first countries in the world to give women the right to vote—the most obvious symbol of equal rights or of its absence—it only did so in 1913, a mere century ago. It also

---

[48]Nasser's Speech 1953, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TX4RK8bj2W0

[49]Here, we agree with a large set of authors who consider present day terrorism as a result of resistance to modernity, as for instance Jurgensmeyer, op. cit. who considers new terrorism as "postmodern" exactly because it is defined as a reaction to modernity (pp. 228–232) and others as Zafirovski (2013) and Neumann (2009).

[50]Muslims can wear headscarves for Alabama IDs. A Christian woman sues so she can, too, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2016/08/31/muslims-can-wear-headscarves-for-alabama-ids-a-christian-woman-sues-so-she-can-too/

upheld other discriminatory measures against women far longer than other European countries.[51]

We conclude therefore that there is no "relative cultural" movement regarding women's rights depending on religion. Modernity has penetrated the world at different paces. Most of the Muslim countries are still further away from modernity or have been thrown back when they dared to do otherwise. But there is nothing intrinsically anti-modernist in this particular culture compared with others.

When it comes to dealing with Islam, we may be facing misuse of the term "multiculturalism"—which expresses values of tolerance, openness and respect for the other—to cover a logic of appeasement towards reactionary mindsets. An abuse which, most surprisingly, comes from the very same people who claim to be against any sort of supremacist ideology, including racism or misogyny, but that are willingly ignoring their principles when analysing Muslim communities.

In this sense they fall prey to the trap of identity politics. Whereas in a humanist society every member is first and foremost a person, the identitary political school[52] focuses on one's primary identity, be it "black or white", "Christian or Muslim", "homosexual or straight" etc. In this context, the persons who happen to be Muslim do not see their universal rights respected, but are seen as necessarily subject to a "Muslim identity" defined by Jihadi ideologues.

We think that this paradoxical reaction cannot be understood if we consider it as rational. Parallel to the investigation of the "fundamentalist paranoid gestalt", we need socio-psychologists to study and explain the "appeasing paranoid gestalt" which interacts with the first and fuels it.

Otherwise, we may also understand this reaction in line with the above-mentioned "fascination for horror". In a biographic note on Henri Michaux,[53] Simon Leys (2014, pp. 15–47) gives us a remarkable study of this poet's apparent fascination with the Maoist Cultural Revolution, which is in line with the French 1970s elite's fascination with it.[54] For Leys, Michaux's positive reading of the event comes from the need he felt (in the winter of his life) not to antagonise a

---

[51]When I worked as a student during summer in a Norwegian farm, back in the 1970s, I was most impressed to realise Norwegian law provided male primogenital succession rights on farming land, a situation which was corrected afterwards. At that time, it was already unconceivable to see gender discrimination in inheritance law in my own country, Portugal.

[52]In French, the expression used is "communitarian", an expression which also translates well the essence of the movement.

[53]First published in "Le Magazine littéraire" January 2007.

[54]The French public radio "France Culture" organised a remarkable debate on the issue which is available in the net http://www.franceculture.fr/emissions/une-vie-une-oeuvre/mister-ryckmans-et-docteur-leys-1935-2014# showing how the whole of the French-speaking elite silenced and insulted Simon Leys for the very simple fact he had revealed the horror of the Maoist Cultural Revolution, whereas the French-speaking elite was fascinated by its supposed virtues. Simon Leys's (born Pierre Rickmans) book (Leys, 1987), first published in 1971, is a masterpiece and chronicles historical events which were totally misunderstood at the time.

different culture and stems fundamentally from the superiority complex he attributes to the "French" character in opposition to the "Belgian" one.[55] Schulman (op. cit.) implicitly considers misogyny and anti-Semitism to be an immediate consequence of immigration of Muslim communities to Europe. This point of view is gaining traction in Western public opinion, as we can see in recent election results. It is however rejected by the bulk of Western intelligentsia who call it "populism".

The awkward fascination with, or at the very least, the way in which leading segments of Western society indulge these "horrifying" realities is not a new phenomenon. It was typical of the Russian intelligentsia of the end of the nineteenth century[56] or the French intelligentsia of the 1970s (Leys, 1987, 2014, op. cit.).

Returning our attention from the reaction of a the Norwegian expert on "radical Islam" to the misogyny of Jihadism,[57] it is doubtful we can envisage it as the result of "Stockholm syndrome" or even attribute it to the "traumatic bonding" phenomenon, but rather as part of the insufficiently studied socio-pathological phenomenon of appeasement or "appeasing paranoid gestalt".

In any circumstance, it is illogical and defies existing evidence to attribute these phenomena to Muslim migration in the West rather than to the way the Western intelligentsia reacts to it. Furthermore, to identify the migration of the Muslim population as the single cause of anti-Semitism is to mystify and ignore its parallel deep-rooted tradition in the West. Anti-Semitism in European countries with no significant Muslim migration—such as Hungary[58]—has virtually exploded lately, providing essential nuance to Schulman's reasoning.

The underlying assumption which allows this view to persist is that we should consider misogyny and anti-Semitism in Muslim countries as "their problem" and concentrate on the Western world's real or supposed virtues. This view ignores globalisation or considers globalisation a phenomenon we can compartmentalise, chopping off the nasty inconvenient pieces and keeping the good ones. This is indeed demagogy![59]

What empowers this growing wave of political demagoguery in the West in recent years is the inability or unwillingness of the Western intelligentsia to make an objective reading of Jihadism and to develop a winning strategy to confront it.

---

[55]Whereas the author's specific logic might not be independent of the way he, as a French-speaking Belgium born, was outrageously mistreated by the French-speaking elite; it works for understanding the general Western twisted logic towards other cultural realities.

[56]See Laqueur (1977, op. cit., pp. 156–157).

[57]The author's original terminology is followed here.

[58]Among the innumerous literature on the issue, we can recommend the following report: http://www.ceji.org/anti-semitism-in-hungary-jobbik-in-parliament

[59]The use of demagogy is preferred to the use of populism. Whereas there is a clear-cut difference between democracy and demagogy, the difference between the substantive popular and the adjective populist is not that straightforward. Similarly, we prefer Jihadi to Islamist, although we acknowledge Jihad is not an easy expression to use either.

The more our intelligentsia drowns in sophistry and euphemisms and refuses to confront reality, the more demagogic political projects will be embraced by the general public.

At this stage, it is important to notice that both prevailing approaches—either to accept or condone misogyny, anti-Semitism or other attitudes like homophobia in the name of "multiculturalism", or demand the end of migration in the name of the protection of Western cultural values—have a significant similar result: they strengthen the position of the "fundamentalist paranoid gestalt" of Jihadism that claims misogyny, anti-Semitism or homophobia are cultural, religious or civilisational distinctive traits of Muslim identity. Muslims, if they do not want to betray Islam, should therefore stick to Jihadism.

9   Terrorism Revisited

As a linguistic expression, "terrorism" is often used as an insult or hidden behind euphemisms, but the importance of the phenomenon it refers to justifies a renewed effort of conceptualisation.

Terrorism—understood as a set of violent acts or threats of violent acts—has assumed different forms throughout history and is not clearly separated from other types of violence like unconventional warfare, crime in general or psychopathological violence. The immense effort spent on defining the violent action is not commensurate with the relevance of doing so. As any form of violence, terrorism has to be judged by its motivation, legitimacy and proportionality.

It is possible to restrict the definition of terrorism to acts that are not clearly attributable to a government; this is a conventional choice and is not incoherent. Furthermore, if we do not accept this convention we would ultimately replace a clear concept such as "tyranny" by another one which is less precise. Therefore, we think the best option is to keep this convention.

Otherwise, the creation of other absolute criteria to define terrorism generally remains elusive. We think the only scientifically meaningful and coherent definition of terrorism revolves around Martha Crenshaw quoted words:

"Terrorism involves the use or threat of physical harm in order to achieve a disproportionately large psychological effect".

As we established, "terror" is a reaction to an incoming act of violence; it is an ex ante phenomenon. Sometimes violence is aimed at pure elimination rather than "terror", but most acts of violence aim at terrorising a target into paralysis. Sometimes, the threat of violence is sufficient to obtain the desired result of surrender.

On the other hand, "horror" is a reaction to an act of violence; it is an ex post phenomenon. Violence, in general, and war, in particular, often aim at horrifying a target population that largely exceeds the one directly impacted by the act of violence. What we shall refer to as "terrorism" is typified exactly by aiming at horrifying—in the sense of paralysing, shocking or fascinating—one or several target populations.

Terrorism's success depends crucially on the "horrifying" impact's ability to promote a political strategy. Horror covers a wide range of possible reactions, not necessarily the ones expected by the terrorist. As far as the political strategic objectives of the terrorist are seen as less costly than the possible impact of the terrorist acts, or otherwise, as far as they may be understood as reasonable and legitimate, the terrorist act will have a bigger chance of success.

If the "horror" it inspires in the target population translates into shock and paralysis, terrorism may be successful, whereas if it translates into revulsion followed by a rational strategy to destroy the terrorist cause, it may fail.

Most likely, the terrorist act can only be understood in the context of a broader political strategy that encompasses terrorism but is not bound by it.

Terrorism, in its pure form, is rarely successful. However, its danger increases dramatically when it is part of a political strategy that encompasses it but is not bound by it. More important than terrorism is the "fundamentalist paranoid gestalt" that produces it. We shall therefore focus our attention on this phenomenon.

References

Alonso, R., Bjorgo, T., Porta, D. D., Coolsaet, R., Khosrokhavar, F., Lohlker, R., Ranstorp, M., Reinares, F., & Schmido, A. (2008). *Radicalisation processes leading to acts of terrorism. A concise report prepared by the European Commission's expert group on violent radicalisation.* European Commission. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/20080500_cscp_report_vries.pdf

Bandura, A. (1990). Mechanisms of moral disengagement. In W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind.* Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press with Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bawer, B. (2007). *While Europe slept: How radical islam is destroying the west from within* (Reprint ed.). New York: Anchor.

Benslama, F. (2016). *Un furieux désir de sacrifice Le surmusulman* (1st ed.). Paris: Seuil.

Benz, Sophia. (2014). *Same or different? Comparing the context of non-state and state-based internal fighting.* 2014 ECPR General Conference.

Borum, R. (2004). *Psychology of terrorism.* Tampa: University of South Florida. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1570&context=mhlp_facpub

Casaca, P. (2008). *The hidden invasion of Iraq.* London: Acacias.

Casaca, P, Shanab, J. A., & Batal, K. (2010, February). *Tolerance, peace and democracy in Iraq what role for the international community?* Commission to study the organisation of peace. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.paulocasaca.com/files/A%20Green%20Ray%20over%20Iraq%20full(1).pdf

Crenshaw, M. (1990). The logic of terrorism: Terrorist behaviour as a product of strategic choice. In W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind.* Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press with Johns Hopkins University Press.

Crenshaw, M. (2011). *Explaining terrorism: Causes, processes and consequences.* New York: Routledge.

Fabrique, N., et al. (2007). Understanding Stockholm syndrome. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 76*(7), 10–16.

Fine, J. (2015). *Political violence in judaism, christianity, and islam: From holy war to modern terror.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gaffney Jr., F. J., & Lopez, C. M. (2016). *See no sharia: "Countering violent extremism" and the disarming of America's first line of defense*. Washington, DC: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Hacker, F. J. (1977). *Crusaders, criminals, crazies: Terror and terrorism in our time* (1st ed.). New York: WW Norton.

Hoffman, B. (1998). *Inside terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Juergensmeyer, M. (2003). *Terror in the mind of god: The global rise of religious violence*. California: University of California Press.

Kepel, G. (2000). *Jihad. Expansion et déclin de l'islamisme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Kramer, M. (1990). The moral logic of Hizballah. In W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press with Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kydd, H., & Walter, B. (2006). The strategies of terrorism. *International Security, 31*(1), 49–80.

Lafaye Guibet, C., & Brochard, P. (2016). La Radicalisation Vue par La Presse: Fluctuation D'une Représentation. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, *130,* 1–24.

Laqueur, W. (1976). *Guerrilla warfare: A historical and critical study*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Laqueur, W. (1977). *A history of terrorism*. New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction.

Laqueur, W. (1999). *The new terrorism: Fanaticism and the arms of mass destruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laqueur, W., & Alexander, Y. (1978). *The terrorism reader*. New York: A Meridian Book.

Lewis, B. (1967). *The assassins: A radical sect in islam*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Leys, S. (1987). *Les Habits Neufs Du Président Mao*. Ivrea. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Les_Habits_neufs_du_pr%C3%A9sident_Mao

Leys, S. (2014). *Le Studio de L'inutilité. Champs, essais*. Paris: Flammarion.

Maalouf, A. (1998). *Les identités meurtrières (Murderous Identities)* (p. 189). Paris: Grasset.

Makarenko, T. (2004). The crime-terror continuum: Tracing the interplay between transnational organized crime and terrorism. *Global Crime, 6*(1), 129–145.

Neumann, P. (2009). *Old & new terrorism. Late modernity, globalization and the transformation of political violence*. Cambridge: Polity. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php/pot/article/view/69/html

O'Neill, B. (1990). *Insurgency and terrorism: Inside modern revolutionary warfare*. Dulles, VA: Brassey's.

Orwell, G. (1946). Politics and the english language. In S. Orwell & I. Angus (Eds.), *Collected essays, journalism and letters of George Orwell* (Vol. 4). New York: Harcourt.

Phares, W. (2005). *Future jihad: Terrorist strategies against America*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Phares, W. (2007). *The war of ideas: Jihadism against democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Phares, W. (2008). *The confrontation: Winning the war against future jihad*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Phillips, M., & Kamen, E. (2014). Entering the black hole: The Taliban, terrorism, and organised crime. *Journal of Terrorism Research, 5*(3). Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://jtr.st-andrews.ac.uk/articles/10.15664/jtr.945/

Reich, W. (1990). *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Sageman, M. (2008). *Leaderless jihad: Terror networks in the twenty-first century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schmid, A. (2004). Links between terrorism and drug trafficking: A case of 'narco-terrorism'? *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 5 September 2004.

Schulman, A. (2009). Stockholm syndrome: Radical islam and the European response. *Human Rights Review*, *10*(469). Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12142-009-0118-2

Shelley, L., & Picarelli, J. (2002). Methods not motives: Implications of the convergence of international organized crime and terrorism. *Police Practice and Research, 3*(4), 305–318.

Strozier, C. B., Terman, D. M., & Jones, J. W. (2010). *The fundamentalist mindset*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weinberg, L. (2004). The challenges of conceptualizing terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 16*(4), 777–794.

Whelan, T. (2016). The capability spectrum; locating terrorism in relation to other manifestations of political violence. *Journal of Terrorism Research, 7*(1). Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://jtr.st-andrews.ac.uk/articles/10.15664/jtr.1083/

Wikan, U. (2001). *Generous betrayal: Politics of culture in the new Europe* (1st ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zafirovski, M., & Rodeheaver, D. G.. (2013). Modernity and terrorism: From anti-modernity to modern global terror. Studies in critical social sciences. Leiden Brill. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/books/9789004242883

New Terrorism

Paulo Casaca

1 The Perception of "New Terrorism"

The idea that there is a new, modern, contemporary or post-modern terrorism necessarily different from older versions of the phenomenon started making its way in the late 1990s.

Among those who tackled the question, Walter Laqueur (1999) coined the expression "new terrorism", Bruce Hoffman (1998) used both "contemporary terrorism" and "modern terrorism" and Kepel (2000) was one of the first authors using the term "jihad" to indicate a new sort of terrorism. Gearson (2002) was perhaps the most prolific as he established a distinction between modern terrorism (1970s–1980s), superterrorism (1990s–2000s) and post-modern terrorism (after 9/11); he also foresaw a "new age of terrorism".

What these authors have in common is the perception that terrorism dramatically changed sometime between the 1960s and the beginning of the twenty-first century, but they agree on little else.

Some authors situate the beginning of the "new era of terrorism" in the 1960s, more precisely in 1967. For instance, Ensalaco (2012, p. 2) states:

> The contemporary era of terror began after Israel's victory in the 6 days war in 1967.

This is also the departing point of view of Bruce Hoffman (1998, p. 62):

> . . .the foundations were laid for the transformation of terrorism in the late 1960s from a primarily localized phenomenon into a problem of global proportions.

P. Casaca (✉)
South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF), Brussels, Belgium
e-mail: paulo@sadf.eu

In one of his most striking analyses on the diversity of terrorism, Walter Laqueur (1977, p. 128) chooses Sofia Perovskaya and Vera Figner of Narodnaya Volya from the late nineteenth century and late-twentieth-century terrorist icons Ulrike Meinhof and Patty Hearst to exemplify how terrorism can cover a wide range of motivations: "Idealism, social conscience or hatred of foreign oppression" on the nineteenth century and "free-floating aggression, boredom and mental confusion" on the twentieth.

Laqueur's remarks defining new terrorism, like the ones of Hoffman, are crucial for us to understand the times we are living in, but they do not provide a consistent definition of a different sort of terrorism. Otherwise, Laqueur repeatedly warns of a "future terrorism" based on weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), but he hardly makes an attempt to create a concept of "new terrorism" out of it. On the contrary, his historical analysis shows that the use of WMDs has been a consistent obsession of terrorist ideologues and, therefore, that the will to use these apocalyptic weapons is not at all new.

Martha Crenshaw (2011, pp. 51–66) dismisses both Hoffman's and Laqueur's attempts to define a concept of "new terrorism"—as well as the attempts of several others—in her chapter entitled "'Old' vs 'new' terrorism".[1]

As she rightly points out:

> What is needed in the argument for a new terrorism is careful specification of the concept of a new terrorism and the distinction between new and old. First, what are the specific definitional attributes of the new terrorism? How are they different from those of the old? Second a satisfactory theoretical framework needs to clarify which groups or practices belong in which category and explain how these cases satisfy the requirements of the definition.
>
> My contention is that the departure from the past is not as pronounced as many accounts make it out to be. Today's terrorism is not a fundamentally or qualitatively new phenomenon but grounded in an evolving historical context. (p. 53)

Her methodical review of the issue is perhaps the clearest one we have come across and provides a useful framework to consider the issue.

2   The Transcendental Perspective

Crenshaw argues against considering fanaticism as a pervasive characteristic of new terrorism (2011):

> First, the *ends* of the 'new' terrorism are presumed to be both unlimited and nonnegotiable. These aims are considered largely incomprehensible and amorphous. From the perspective

---

[1]Martha Crenshaw gives several examples of contradictions of both author's remarks in different parts of their texts when referring to a new sort of terrorism opposing an old sort of terrorism. Crenshaw's case is made in a clear way and she proves that none of them provided a consistent proposal for defining a new sort of terrorism.

of the new terrorism school of thought, the goals of new terrorists are derived exclusively from religious doctrines that emphasize transformational and apocalyptic beliefs, usually associated with Islam although they are assumed to be present in all monotheistic religions. Millenarianism is a key belief. Walter Laqueur for example, characterizes the 'new terrorists' as religious fanatics who suffers from delusion and persecution mania. As his views indicate, some confusion exists over levels of analysis, since it is not clear whether it is individual motivation or group purpose that is being described. (p. 54)

Crenshaw rightly criticises those who favour the psychological interpretation of the motives for terrorism, for being unable to clearly distinguish between the individual and group motivation. This is a major weakness of the argument as it has been developed so far, as we pointed out in the preceding chapter.

However, she chose a bad example to characterise what she calls "new terrorism school of thought".[2] Laqueur in 2003 showed a better understanding of fanaticism as a core characteristic of the "paranoid gestalt", and he distances himself from his previous definition of "new terrorism":

A workable definition has been provided by Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf, more than any other modern leader Hitler invoked fanaticism as an essential element of the Nazi movement. (2003, p. 25)

Crenshaw's critique assumes that a terrorist movement is driven either by tangible objectives or by a fanatic appeal. This is certainly her point of view and arguably is also the point of view of a majority of analysts[3]; however, this is not the case of all, and most in particular, it is not the case of Walter Laqueur.

A close look at the most emblematic terrorist attacks of modern times does not confirm this widespread vision of a new nihilist terrorist age.

Hezbollah attacks in Lebanon on the US, French and Israeli diplomatic and military facilities had a clear and identifiable objective (expelling the targeted forces from Lebanon), an objective which was accomplished. The Al Qaeda terror campaign—and most particularly, its 9/11 attack—mimicked these objectives for the entire Muslim world and for Saudi Arabia in particular. Al Qaeda and its affiliated and splinter organisations actually went beyond that, establishing administered zones in Nigeria, Yemen, Syria and Iraq.

In both cases, though, they had realistic and practicable objectives—more precise in one case than in the other—not intangible unachievable fantasies. The proof that they were realistic was that, at least partially, they were achieved.

It is true, however, that after achieving its announced objective, Hezbollah immediately raised a new one. This apparently confirms the unlimited character of the terrorist objectives.

---

[2]Speaking of "new terrorism" as a "school of thought" seems quite far-fetched.

[3]For the remainder of this section, we will focus on those who characterise "new terrorism" as fanatically driven as opposed to have tangible objectives.

In the case of the USA, Hezbollah continued its terror campaign, mostly through kidnappings, demanding weaponry. Hezbollah was quite successful in this regard, as it managed to get weapons to Iran in exchange for the release of US hostages during the well-known "Iran-Contra affair".

France was also the target of a subsequent terror campaign through bomb attacks on French soil and kidnapping of French nationals. Again, the terror campaign was successful, as Hezbollah compelled France to extradite Iranian dissidents—allowing for their persecution (UPI, 14-01-1988).

With regard to Israel, its withdrawal from Lebanon did not lead to any durable peace but quite on the contrary. Hezbollah increased the number of terrorist attacks on Israeli territory until skirmishes spiralled into full-fledged wars.

Some say Hezbollah eventually stopped their terror campaign after 1986, or after 1994, if we are to include the famous AMIA bombings in Argentina. For example, Atran (2010) argues that: "Hezbollah ceased suicide bombings and attacks on civilians (outside of open war) by the 1990s". To validate this narrative, some Western analysts have been inclined to exclude Israel from their analysis of Hezbollah's activity, as if there would be any objective reason that would allow them to consider terrorist attacks in Israel as different from others.

Nowadays, the intensity and recurrence of Hezbollah terror attacks on other Western targets certainly diminished, although they have not altogether disappeared.[4]

However, Hezbollah increased its armed presence and continues its violent actions virtually all over the world—most notably now in Syria—with virtually no opposition from the West. This has perhaps been the most tangible gain from their previous terrorist campaigns.

Moreover, Hezbollah[5] was instrumental in passing on the technology and ideology of suicide bombing to Al Qaeda and, at the very least, inspired terrorist organisations like the Tamil Tigers.[6] From Latin America to Thailand and Nigeria, Hezbollah continues to expand its armed presence, which is—incomprehensibly—met with deafening silence on the part of the West.[7]

---

[4]See, for instance, terror attacks in Bulgaria and Cyprus in 2013 and 2015: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-21342192 and http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-cyprus-security-idUKKBN0OV2DN201 50615

[5]Wright (2006, pp. 172–175) provides perhaps the most detailed description of the strong cooperation deal passed between Hezbollah and Al Qaeda.

[6]For instance, see Hoffman (1998, p. 141) or Crenshaw (2007, p. 137). The issue is further developed in their book chapters on the Tamil Tigers.

[7]See, for instance, According to Todd Huntley, "Balancing Self-Defense and Mission Accomplishment in International Intervention: Challenges in Drawing and Implementing Rules of Engagement", Maryland Journal of International Law, Vol. 29, p. 106, footnote 150) a Background Briefing by Senior Administration Officials On Iran, the IRGC, and Hezbollah's was titled.

Increased Terrorist Activity Worldwide, U.S. Dep't of State (May 31, 2013) and was previously available at http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2013/05/210145.htm

More important than this is the well-established fact that—as we have seen in the previous chapter—Hezbollah is not an independent organisation; it is fully integrated in the Iranian theocratic command structure.

Iranian authorities sometimes decide to keep an attack anonymous, as was the case for the 1997 Khobar tower terrorist attack in Saudi Arabia.[8] On other occasions they committed attacks quoting empty acronyms like "Islamic Jihad", as was the case for the most important terrorist attacks in Lebanon against the USA and France. Similarly, they used satellite organisations in Iraq or elsewhere to claim the attacks. Occasionally they assumed authorship, as they finally did in the case of the Iran hostage crisis in 1979–1981.

We can therefore observe that each time the target of a terrorist action agrees to meet their demands, a new demand appears, and this can be seen as actions that are either "unlimited" or "non-negotiable", but this is a misperception. A full acceptance of terror demands is simply understood by the Iranian theocracy mind-set as a will to concede further terrorist demands.

This behaviour is neither "fanatic" nor irrational. Western public opinion appears to have difficulties understanding the objectives and the negotiation techniques of the terrorists.

Otherwise, the converse may also be true. Apparently, the accidental shooting of Iran Air Flight 655 by the US Navy on 3 July 1988 was a decisive factor that led the theocratic leadership to end its war with Iraq.[9] It did not occur to the Iranian leaders that the US authorities were telling the truth when they alleged the shooting had been accidental. Instead they understood the shooting as a resolve of US authorities to use standard terror tactics covered by the same sort of disingenuous theatrical declarations typical of jihadi leaders to achieve their goals.

The case of Al Qaeda is also interesting in this regard, because it also disproves the assertion that "new terrorism" is characterised by fanatic behaviour. Contrarily to Hezbollah, Al Qaeda is an autonomous organisation; although it does have strong ties to state sponsors.[10] In this regard, Al Qaeda follows the model set by the "Abu Nidal" group—although in a more globalised and now franchised way—successfully adapting to modern times. Al Qaeda can never be understood without state sponsoring. As we know, the organisation's seeds came out of the Western sponsoring of jihad against the Soviet Union, and the group was supported by, and

---

[8]For an in-depth analysis, see Crenshaw (2011, pp. 145–148) or Wright (2006, p. 239).

[9]For instance, see Fayazmanesh (2008, p. 42) or Axworthy (2013, p. 277).

[10]See here Wright (2006, pp. 249–250) for the successful negotiations of Al Qaeda with Pakistan to promote the jihad in Kashmir and for the unsuccessful negotiations with Iraq (op. cit., pp. 295–296). On the Al Qaeda-Iran negotiations to launch the Iraqi branch of Al Qaeda, the best source is Brisard (2005).

cooperated in different times with (at least), the Afghan Taliban,[11] Sudan,[12] Pakistan[13] and Iran.[14]

While Al Qaeda has not been as successful as Hezbollah, it has attained significant achievements, as we can see by the disengagement of the USA from the Arabic peninsula, its primary core objective.

Crenshaw provides a detailed analysis of the dissimulation techniques and the lengthy negotiations of Al Qaeda and its Taliban sponsors at the time of the 9/11 attacks and shows they cannot be seen as fanatic (2011, pp. 158–163).

The Western tendency to characterise this terrorism single-mindedly as "fanatic", aiming at intangible unlimited and non-negotiable objectives, is a testimony of the West's lack of understanding and does not adequately portray the logic of the terrorist actors.

Other than "fanatic", new terrorism is specifically characterised as "religious". This assertion is also intensively criticised by Martha Crenshaw (op. cit.).

It is not simple to define "religious" terrorism. On the one hand, we have the so-called "ethno-religious" terrorism, where religion can be perceived more as a cultural or ethnic distinction factor than as the motive for violent acts. On the other hand, we have the so-called Christian-inspired fundamentalism promoting terrorist campaigns against women's health reproduction clinics. This type of terrorism may be perceived as purely religious, as it does not appear as an ideological cover-up for a political power project. Exactly for this reason, it appears as less threatening from the political point of view.

Jihadism, however, is clearly linked with a project to attain political power. The Muslim Brotherhood and all related organisations shared the explicit goal of the re-edification of the lost caliphate. The Iranian-inspired jihadism developed around the claim that the clergy should rule in the name of God (aka the theory of velayat-e faqih).

However, the "velayat-e faqih" has no distinguishable roots in Islam or, for that matter, Shia Islam tradition. The "caliphate" dreamt up by Sunni jihadists, likewise, has little or nothing to do with its historical predecessors. In his recent book, "Caliphate: The History of an Idea", Kennedy (2016) makes this point in an unquestionable way. Both the Shia and Sunni claims are "invented traditions" where the myth of the past serves only to obscure their present ambitions.

Far more important than the religious ideology or the use of terrorist tactics are the extreme violent strategies to achieve absolute power. From this perspective, the

---

[11]For instance, see Roggio, B. (2010). "Taliban cooperation with Al Qaeda 'is at the highest limits'"—Siraj Haqqani. *The Long War Journal*. [online] Available at http://www.longwarjournal.org/archives/2010/04/taliban_cooperation.php [accessed 18 October 2016].

[12]Vidino, L, 2006. The Arrival of Islamic Fundamentalism in Sudan. The Fletcher School Online Journal for issues related to Southwest Asia and Islamic Civilization, [online]. Fall 2006, pp. 1–12. Available at http://fletcher.tufts.edu/~/media/Fletcher/Microsites/al%20Nakhlah/archives/2006/vidino_fall.pdf [accessed 18 October 2016].

[13]For instance, see Byman (2007, pp. 128–131).

[14]For instance, see Joscelyn, T. (2007, pp. 56–63).

constitution of the Islamic states in Iran and in Iraq, later extended to Syria, likens jihadism to the Bolshevik or the Nazi power takeover strategies.[15]

Martha Crenshaw (2011) has two major objections to the consideration of new terrorism as "religious", the first is procedural and the second is substantive.

In procedural terms, Crenshaw (2011, p. 53) argues:

> The National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism's Terrorism Knowledge Base (TKB) which is based on event data collected by the Rand Corporation since 1968, lists 130 groups in the category of religious terrorism. Of these 130 cases, 124 are linked to descriptive group profiles, which indicate that only fifty-four of the cases are labelled as exclusively religious.

Whereas religious terrorism was nearly unheard of before 1968,[16] it is remarkable that so many organisations could be listed in the database quoted by the author. However, she considers other evidence of the enormous surge of religious terrorism in recent times—such as the transformation of the Moro Liberation Front into the Moro Islamic Liberation Front or the creation of the Al Aqsa Martyr Brigade by Fatah—as proof of their intrinsically non-religious nature (Crenshaw, 2011, p. 57).

Crenshaw's implicit argument is that only groups that have "pure religious credentials" should be considered religious. We may add a couple of nuances to this argument. The first is that it is inherently difficult to distinguish theological matters from political ambitions to decide what is truly or not truly religious. The second is that religious terrorism is only politically relevant as far as it is not purely religious, that is, as far as it is driven by political power objectives.

Regarding Timothy McVeigh, it is in fact difficult to consider his terrorism as "religious terrorism", as his references to Christianism are secondary in his assumed predications (see, for instance, Grozier, pp. 127–128).

---

[15]The Bolshevik political violence was far more brutal than the violence of its "terrorist" predecessors. If we just remember one of the most symbolic examples—the failed attempt to the life of Grand Duke Alexandrovich in 1905 where terrorists cancelled the attempt in order not to endanger the Grand Duke's children (Hoffman, 1998, p. 6)—we can see the difference regarding the Bolsheviks whom under the instructions of Lenin assassinated the entire royal family, including women and children. However, this second act is not technically an act of terrorism, contrarily to the first. This example should be sufficient for us to understand how erroneous it is our use of "terrorism" as the absolute evil. Otherwise, as Laqueur (2003, p. 13) reminds us, the terrorist assassination in 1922 of *the* German Foreign Minister (who happened to be Jewish) was an act precursor of the Nazi takeover.

[16]Hoffman (1998, p. 85) considers that:

... only two of the sixty-four groups active in 1980 could be classified as predominantly religious in character and motivation: the Iranian-backed Shi'a organizations al-Dawa and the Committee for Safeguarding the Islamic Revolution.

This view ignores most of the lengthy and documented jihadi terror history prior to this date. It neglects all the terrorist activities of the Muslim Brotherhood, Muslim Brotherhood splinter groups or Shia-Iranian-affiliated groups, which were very important already before 1980. Once again, this betrays a Western-biased point of view. However, as an indicator, it points into the pertinent direction.

The second set of Crenshaw's arguments is more relevant, as she quotes two very important terrorist groups (the Sendero Luminoso and the Tamil Tigers) to oppose the claims that present-day terrorism is religious in nature.

The Sendero Luminoso was created in 1980—a time in which modern religious terrorist ideology and organisation was spreading quickly—and yet it is clearly a Maoist and non-religious terrorist group. As the author correctly explains (p. 56), Sendero Luminoso was in no way less fanatic, its ambitions no less intangible and its proclamations no less absurd than the ones of his religious contemporaries. Actually, the same logic applies to the Mao Zedong movement and his Cambodian followers.[17]

This clearly shows that religious terrorism is not necessarily more intangible, fanatic and non-negotiating or shows less concrete objectives than other forms of terrorism. It also argues that, whereas it is unquestionable that modern day terrorism has been dominated by professed religious objectives, it does not mean that this applies to every single terrorist group.

The Tamil Tigers are an even more important example. Whereas they can be classified as an "ethno-terrorist" group, they cannot be considered a religious organisation. However, their methods perfectly reflect—and to some extent, excelled—in all crucial aspects of modern religious terrorism: sheer brutality, suicide bombing and apparently intangible objectives.[18]

The Tamil Tigers are a clear example of a terrorist group which limits the scope of the modern religious concept. Their actions show that the very same endless brutality which appears as "cosmic", "millenarian" or simply "jihadist" can very well exist outside the religious box.

The Tamil Tigers prove it is possible to replicate the extreme violent logic of jihadism in other types of terrorism. That said, the proclaimed religious motivations of the majority of contemporary terrorism are unquestionable. Within the sphere of religious terrorism, jihadism is the most important form, not only because of the daunting number of deaths but also due to its unparalleled political achievements.

3   Perspectives on Suicide Terrorism

Martha Crenshaw does not specifically address the issue of "suicide terrorism" in her case against "new terrorism", which is quite surprising for two reasons. The first is that "suicide terrorism" is the strongest argument made in favour of creating the category of

---

[17]From 2014 onwards the Peruvian press has been pointing to a close association between Hezbollah and the Sendero Luminoso. See, for instance, https://nacionyanawara.lamula.pe/2016/10/19/hizbola-islamista-o-sendero-luminoso/yanawara/. As it happened in the past with Al Qaeda and the Tamil Tigers, it is therefore likely that the Iranian authorities are aiming at using this and other domestic terrorist groups for their own expansionist agenda.

[18]See our following chapter on the Tamil Tigers.

"new terrorism", and actually, it is also the clearest symbol of its claimed "transcendental" character. The second is that Crenshaw is the author of the most comprehensive review on "suicide terrorism" (Crenshaw, 2007, pp. 133–162). While the author does provide us with updated analysis, she does not take into consideration Hoffman's (1998, pp. 131–171 and Hoffman and McCormick, 2004) and Laqueur's (2003, pp. 71–97) contributions. Furthermore, her emphasis seems to be more on the diversity of forms assumed by the phenomenon rather than on the search for its specific significance.[19]

In a nutshell, the strongest argument for considering "suicide terrorism" the most defining characteristic of "new terrorism" is a historical one. In the period ranging from the Second World War (and its Japanese kamikaze pilots) to the Islamic Revolution of Iran (and its use of kamikaze children), no mass-scale suicidal terrorism movement existed.[20] Furthermore, in a more controversial assertion, this line of reasoning considers the use of "human bombs" to represent a new type of suicide, where death is inescapable for the terrorist, contrary to other types of attacks like regular assassination attempts.[21]

Before considering the technicalities of the debate, it is useful to reflect on one of the most striking but yet puzzling observations of Walter Laqueur (1999, p. 91) concerning his approach to "new terrorism":

> The kind of person engaging in terrorism in 1880 would not understand the terrorist of the 1980s who had no compunction about killing not only a businessman but his secretary and the members of his family as well. Furthermore, there is a basic difference between Europe and America and the parts of the globe where human lives count for little. The case of Nezar Hindawi is not atypical. Born in Jordan in 1954, he sent his pregnant fiancée with, unbeknownst to her, a parcel of Semtex hidden in a computer to board an Israeli plane from London to Tel Aviv. The planned explosion would have taken place over southern Europe, killing all 375 passengers [. . .].

In this terrorist act, a promised $250,000 bounty would have been the motive. No specific religious motivation seemed to have played a role. However, Laqueur (op. cit., p. 92) concludes by saying:

> The culture they [mercenaries like Hindawi] live in, the combination of nationalism and religion, gives them the legitimation for acting out their cruelty.

Walter Laqueur downplays the relative importance of "suicide terrorism" in contemporary times in comparison with older kinds of terrorism. He considers:

---

[19]Acosta and Childs (2013) was published after this review. Merari (2010) was also published after the review, but his writings on the issue in Reich (1990, pp. 192–207) were not taken in consideration either.

[20]Several religious cults such as the one of Jim Jones engaged in mass suicide operations, but we cannot call them terrorist or even consider them mainly in the realm of political violence.

[21]The issue is far more complex and has been discussed at length in the literature.

In brief, it is difficult to think of terrorist movements that have not engaged in suicide missions. Virtually all attacks against leading public figures in countries that have capital punishment are suicide missions. The attacks have to be carried out at close range, the intended victims are usually well-protected and consequently, the chances for the assassin to make a getaway are small or nonexistent. (op. cit., p. 141)

Laqueur's subsequent writings on the issue, more specifically his chapter on Suicide Terrorism (2003, pp. 71–97), are perhaps the most important we came across. However, we don't follow him completely on his assumption of perfect rationality in terror attacks that might result in your own death. In our view, contrarily to what the author supports, suicide bombing can hardly be seen as synonymous to other sorts of assassination (even in case death penalty is compulsory for this crime). In the case of suicide bombing, the automatic mechanism triggers death in a way that is incomparable to other types of assassination attempts, where death is not automatically triggered. However, it is true that automatic mechanisms fail, and this has happened during several suicide bombing attempts.

The decision to engage in suicide bombing may be a more or less voluntary act.[22] This was already the case in the Japanese kamikaze campaign. The decision mechanism may be more or less individual and family or group related, whereas the motivation may not be purely transcendental but accompanied by incentives of financial and social recognition.[23]

In any case, Laqueur's observations on "new terrorism" versus "suicide terrorism" are crucial to overcome two stereotyped approaches to the "suicide terrorism" phenomenon.

The first is that whereas common sense sees "martyrdom", Laqueur correctly perceives selfishness. Those who are invited to commit suicide are mainly weak parts of the society such as children, women, female victims of sexual assault, handicapped people or easy to manipulate characters; the ideologues and masterminds have clearly no intention to commit suicide!

If we consider the strategists in our discussion of terrorists, Laqueur's point of view makes perfect sense; the novelty is that terrorists are no longer willing to sacrifice themselves as they did in the past. On the contrary, they have no moral qualms using third parties—mostly fragile individuals—as cannon fodder.

The second is that whereas general wisdom may find religious transcendental motivations and down to earth material financial to be in conflict, Laqueur correctly perceives a combination of the two. Religion and monetary enrichment are not necessarily antonymic. In Christianity, for instance, side by side with the well-known Franciscan tradition, we have some protestant ethics that glorify the acquisition of wealth, provided some religious constraints are followed.

As far as some forms of murder are seen as transcendentally blessed, to earn money out of them may be seen as compatible with crime. Moreover, to earn money

---

[22]Merari (1990) makes a clear explanation of the issue.

[23]Anecdotal evidence from Iran, Israel, Iraq, Lebanon and Syria confirms a complex picture for the individual, group and family motivations of the suicidal act.

from murder may even be seen as a transcendental sign that the murder is blessed. Although this can only be seen with revulsion by non-psychopathic minds, we should consider this is compatible with mind-sets dominated by paranoia.

Although they arrive at this conclusion for different reasons, neither Laqueur nor Crenshaw considers "suicide terrorism" to be a characteristic of "new terrorism".

As is often the case in terrorism studies, researchers struggle to agree on a correct definition of the phenomenon. If we think of the terrorists as the instruments used in terrorist operations, we should conclude there has been a spike in suicide terrorism. If we define suicide terrorism as the willingness of the terrorist ideologues to sacrifice their own lives for the sake of their ideas, the answer is the opposite: suicide terrorism is in regression.

More to the point, the consideration of "terrorism" as separated from the general political violence framework only manages to considerably blur our understanding of the phenomenon. The first suicide bomber honoured in the Iranian jihadi propaganda died in the war with Iraq, whereas the subsequent attacks in Lebanon targeted civilian and military authorities and—according to the strictest terrorism definitions—should not qualify as terrorism. However, they certainly paved the way for the subsequent dissemination and standardisation of the practice focussing on targeting civilians.

What was seen as the epoch of suicide bombing, may therefore be better understood as a period in which consecutive phases of a brutalisation process of political violence unfolded.

4   New Terrorism or New World?

Other than distinctive elements of this "new terrorism" era, such as fanaticism, religion and suicide, there are still other factors being considered.

Some authors argue that terrorism's increased lethality is a consequence of new organisational and networking patterns. Terrorist groups would now be more diffuse in structure and would use sleeper cells and amateur terrorists, becoming more complex. The lack of a discernible organisational structure with a distinguishable chain of command would enable these groups to avoid easy identification and detection.

Marques Guedes (2007), who did an in-depth study of Al Qaeda, claims the organisation is a complete novelty. He emphasises its capacity and organisational innovation but otherwise fails to make the case for why it should be seen as significantly different from other organisations such as the Muslim Brotherhood. Neumann (2009) also tries to make the case for "new terrorism" based on organisational factors, comparing the IRA, a national organisation, with Al Qaeda, a global organisation. If one would compare communist organisations in general, and the Maoist movement in particular, with Al Qaeda, we doubt the perceived crucial differences would still be found.

Studies of terrorist organisations have shown their plasticity and adaptability to changing conditions, ultimately recurring to the improvisation of isolated elements as has always been the case.

Martha Crenshaw (2011, pp. 62–63) also dismisses analyses that argue a new type of terrorist organisation is the sign of a different type of terrorism.

New terrorism is also often perceived as a reaction against modernity. This reaction is usually associated with the extreme right, and this observation is a strong argument to perceive "new terrorism" more in unison with the "extreme right" than as a religious movement. However, it seems clear to us that any reaction against modernity is certainly not a novel concept, and as such, we do not see how it could justify a characterisation of a "new era in terrorism".

Some other authors (see, for instance, Ashtana, 2010, p. 9) attribute the increased destructive capacity of terrorism to globalisation. After all, due to its global reach to technology and communication, terrorist weaponry is getting smaller, easier and more powerful. With the dramatic progress in communications and information processing, groups have greater opportunities to divert non-weapon technologies, namely, cell phones, the Internet and publicly available websites—all off-the-shelf technologies—to destructive ends.

Fundamentally, we see that terrorism is now fully dependent on modern instruments. But aren't we all dependent on these instruments as well? If "new terrorism" would not make use of these modern instruments, there would be perhaps a justified case to consider this as its specific characteristic, but otherwise, it is difficult to understand why we should consider the natural adaptation of terrorism to the time we live in as a justification for establishing a new category of terrorism.

This should also apply to Laqueur's (1999) vision of the future of terrorism as dominated by weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Actually, it is Laqueur (op. cit., pp. 49–53) himself who shows that the ideologues of terrorism often considered apocalyptic scenarios in the past and imagined the use of weapons of mass destruction before they existed. Can we be surprised that present-day terrorists dream of using WMDs when one no longer needs to imagine them but just to think of ways to get hold of them? Instead of making the case for a "new terrorism", we think these approaches are making the case for a new world.[24]

The issue may therefore be stated in the opposite way, contrasting it with the argument used by Laqueur. Whereas we live in a far more technologically advanced world, social phenomena did not change much or at the very least did not change at the same pace. The same invariant murdering mentality is now far more lethal with modern weapons than it used to be with primitive weapons. So, the issue here is not "new terrorism"; it is "old terrorism" plus available new technical instruments to implement it.

---

[24]Crenshaw (2011) dismisses the idea of WMD as a new sort of terrorism. See, namely, pp. 8 and 51.

Finally, we have the argument of the mass brutality of the so-called new terrorism compared with its older versions. This view, widespread among terrorism studies experts, is also challenged by Crenshaw (2011, pp. 59–62), although we find her arguments not as convincing as on other topics. There are plenty of examples, such as the terrorist acts during the Algerian civil war, which can appear equally as destructive as jihadi attacks in the West. However, the question is: is that the most sensible comparison? If we were to compare the war in Algeria with the war in Syria—a comparison that seems more appropriate—we definitely find there has been an increase in brutality.

From a Western viewpoint, it certainly makes more sense to compare the Weathermen, RAF, Action Directe or the *Brigate Rosse*, etc. with present-day jihadism, and in this perspective, the increase in brutality is undisputable. From this we conclude that the same brutality which was widespread in other specific forms of political violence is now also present in terrorism.

Once again, the best way to approach the issue may be to analyse it in the framework of political violence, rather than focussing on terrorism and sometimes terrorism in a very Western perspective. If we look at political violence as a whole, Crenshaw's argument might be seen as valid, as the twentieth century provided brutality in scale not yet matched in our times. If we are looking at terrorism acts only, the brutality of terrorism is clearly a hallmark of new terrorism.

We can rightly observe that terrorism is now more brutal than it was in the past, but while doing so, we have to take in consideration it also became more indistinguishable from other types of crimes or political violence, as we discussed in the first chapter. If we put these two observations in perspective, we can more accurately observe that the borders between the violent actions of terrorism and other forms of violence became less clear. As a consequence of this, the brutality we saw elsewhere is now also widespread in terrorism.

In sum, we found Crenshaw's arguments to be valid for the most part. That is, we definitely find concrete and specific elements to characterise the terrorism we face today, such as the dominance of the religious factor, the reaction against modernity, the massive use of suicide bombings and the increase in brutality of terrorist operations, along with many other factors which are simply a reflection of our modern society. However, none of these factors provide a solid foundation to make the case for a new and distinct type of terrorism which is conceptually different from old forms of terrorism.

5   The Drawbacks of the Framework of Counterterrorism

The first international framework for counterterrorism was drafted within the Society of the Nations in the "Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism" signed 16 November 1937 (Society of the Nations, 1937).

Although it was never ratified and enforced, it sets a clear picture of how the issue was seen back then. The "acts of terrorism" are defined as follows (article 1, paragraph 2):

> criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons, or a group of persons, or the general public.

This definition conceives terrorism from the point of view of its intended psychologic impact; that only acts against states are considered and, furthermore, that these acts shall be considered criminal.

To fully comprehend this definition, we have to consider what is written in the first paragraph of the article preceding the definition of "acts of terrorism":

> The High contracting parties, reaffirming the principal of international law in virtue of which it is the duty of every State to refrain from any act designed to encourage terrorist activities directed against another State and to prevent the acts in which such activities take shape, undertake as hereinafter provided to prevent and punish activities of this nature and to collaborate for this purpose.

The convention aimed at preventing what we would nowadays refer to as "international terrorism" and—as is clear from the text—is fundamentally concerned with attacks directed against heads of state. It intended to ensure the criminalisation of acts linked with cross-border terrorism targeting monarchs and high-level officials, which was still the standard sort of terrorist attack at the time.[25] The convention also explicitly criminalises conspiracy—under specific circumstances—incitement and assistance to terrorist acts.

After the Second World War, the term terrorism fell into disuse for two reasons: the Nazis abused it to the point that it described whoever tried to resist them and the widespread use of the term against liberation movements in the 1950s and 1960s.[26] From 1963 onwards, counterterrorism conventions were agreed on a case-by-case basis by the United Nations (Rupérez, 2007, p. 14), starting with "acts committed on board aircraft" but skipping the term "terrorism".

The word terrorism enters into the UN formal vocabulary through a proposal of the UN Secretary General in 1972 following the Munich Olympic Games terrorist attack (Rupérez, 2007, p. 14) but will encounter strong resistance that ultimately prevented the UN from reaching a consensual definition. Mr. Rupérez considers a first period from 1972 up to 1989 where:

---

[25]According to the United Nations Office at the Geneva Library, https://www.wdl.org/en/item/11579/, "The French government had proposed, following the assassination by Croatian and Macedonian separatists of King Alexander I of Yugoslavia in Marseilles in 1934, that the League adopt a convention on terrorism. The text of the convention was drafted at the Conference for the Repression of Terrorism, which took place at the League of Nations headquarters in Geneva on November 1–16, 1937". Crenshaw (2011, p. 21), using an indirect source, assumes however this convention to have been linked with anarchist terrorism.

[26]Hoffman (1998, pp. 23–24) refers to the arguments put forward by the "Third World" delegates during the discussions in the United Nations on terrorism following the Olympic Games terrorist attacks in Munich in 1972. According to Crenshaw (2011, pp. 21–22), the same is true regarding academic studies where the studies addressing "internal warfare" or "internal war" were more popular than terrorism.

there was a clear disagreement within the membership as to whether terrorism should be prevented through cooperation in suppressing its manifestations or removal of its root causes. (p. 15)

After 1993, terrorism was considered on its own, "reflecting broader agreement that the existence of root causes did not justify terrorist acts" (Rupérez, 2007, p. 15).

In 2005, Kofi Annan endorsed[27] a definition on terrorism, focussed on those who target and kill civilians and non-combatants for political purposes. Mr. Annan's proposal had precedents within the United Nations. For instance, the UN General Assembly Resolution 49/60 (adopted on 9 December 1994), entitled "Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism", described terrorism as:

Criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them.

Another UN panel, on 17 March 2005,[28] considerably expanded on the Annan formula, described terrorism as any act:

intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act.

However, from 1996 onwards, the driving force behind the international legislation on terrorism passed from the UN to the USA, namely, through the "Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996" (US Congress, 1996).

Whereas during most of the Cold War, the threats against the USA could overwhelmingly be read in the context of looming confrontation with the Soviet Union and could be translated by accusations of subversion, aggression, sabotage or infiltration. A new "terrorist threat"—not attributable, at least not in essence, to the geopolitical rivalries—started to develop from the late 1960s onwards.

From the end of the 1970s, this new type of violence—which resembles the League of Nations' definition for terrorism—targets high-profile US dignitaries throughout the world, including several ambassadors and other high-ranking US diplomats. US legislation evolves in the framework of classic international law to counter this violence by creating lists of state sponsors of terrorism and using extraterritorial legislation to punish international crimes.

The 1996 legislation—well-known for its habeas corpus limitations—is quite significant as it sets two major lines of action on counterterrorism that are still the

---

[27]However member states were unable to reach a consensus (see Part 1, Chapter "The Conceptual Discussion on Terrorism"). For a more in-depth review, see: http://belfercenter.hks.harvard.edu/publication/1623/kofi_annans_legacy_on_counterterrorism.html

[28]Diaz-Paniagua, Carlos Fernando (2008), Negotiating Terrorism: The Negotiation Dynamics of Four UN Counter-terrorism Treaties, 1997–2005, Volume 1, UMI: New York.

most important in our day. It provides means to keep presumed foreign terrorist fighters out of the USA, and it generates a new legal sphere in between the classic national and international domains, applying financial restrictions to non-state actors.

The first line of action has characterised counterterrorism policies worldwide ever since. In many cases, states have not only taken measures to prevent potential terrorists from entering the national territory but have actively promoted their migration to Third World countries and tried to prevent their return.

This approach seems to be an application of the well-known "not in my back-yard" paradigm to counterterrorism, focussing only on local impact. This attitude also leads states not to persecute terrorists on their own soil in an attempt to avoid retaliation.

The other novelty of the 1996 legislation—the creation of a hybrid domain between the national and the international law—was no less important in shaping the "counterterrorism" state of affairs.

From the pure intellectual point of view, the use of hybrid legal frameworks can be understood as an answer to a perceived dilemma: how to consider individuals and organisations that fall somewhere in between a private criminal organisation and a quasi-state (or even hidden-state) mechanism.

In other words, the USA would be confronted with a tantalising inability to reconcile the rights of citizens under national criminal law and the rights of nations in an international legal framework.

The list of proscribed foreign terrorist organisations, drawn up by the US state department in accordance with the 1996 Act, would formally be approved on 2 October 1997, and it would soon be followed by similar lists, first in Western countries and then elsewhere in the world as well as in the United Nations.

The US national strategy for counterterrorism was greatly reinforced after 9/11, with the Patriot Act of 2001 and the Homeland Security Act of 2002. Both of them focus on fighting terrorism at home.

Regarding the treatment of foreign organisations and US noncitizens engaged in criminal actions against the USA, the presidency issued a military order—authorised by Congress—for the "Detention, Treatment, and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in the War Against Terrorism".[29] This act was supposed to provide a more efficient mechanism to persecute terrorist-related activity but was never able to fulfil these aims, with the USA embroiled in endless constitutional and political disputes which effectively prevented justice to be served.

In the end, neither UN nor the USA managed to arrive at a consensual definition of terrorism; within the USA, various agencies and departments currently employ their own definitions.

Worse than this, added confusion further complicated the debate. Whereas the initial approach of the League of Nations was to ensure that terrorism acts—more

---

[29]See http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011113-27.html

accurately, international terrorism acts—would be tried under national law, now terrorism started to be considered simultaneously as an international transgression, as well as a crime on its own.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has a wide scope for the definition of terrorism as "the unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence against individuals or property in an attempt to coerce or intimidate governments or societies to achieve political, religious or ideological objectives".[30] It is likely that this definition is merely a tool to define defence operations under the guise of antiterrorism, not a basis for criminal law.

On the other hand, we may find definitions drafted as international conventions with very wide definitions which can have extensive implications for national criminal frameworks. For instance, the "Convention on Combating International Terrorism" adopted by the OIC in 1999 also includes a broad definition of terrorism as:

> any act of violence or threat thereof notwithstanding its motives or intentions perpetrated to carry out an individual or collective criminal plan with the aim of terrorising people or threatening to harm them or imperilling their lives, honour, freedoms, security or rights or exposing the environment or any facility or public or private property to hazards or occupying or seizing them, or endangering a national resource, or international facilities, or threatening the stability, territorial integrity, political unity or sovereignty of independent State.[31]

The European Union (EU) approach is both wider and more ambivalent and stands on two legal acts, the Common Position 2001/931/CFSP and Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combatting terrorism.[32] The Common Position defines the approach of the EU to terrorism and requires member states to conform their national policies in accordance with the act (article 15 TEU). It is the standard legal basis for the vast majority of the EU decisions on terrorism and assumes acts that aim to (i) seriously intimidate a population or (ii) unduly compel a government or an international organisation to perform or abstain from performing any act, which can fall in the realm of the definition of terrorism regardless of their violent character or of their actual consequences.

The point is made by Walter Laqueur (2003, p. 234):

---

[30]This is the most recent definition we have seen and can be consulted here under point 7a: http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/topics_pdf/20160905_160905-mc-concept-ct.pdf

[31]OIC, Convention of The Organisation of the Islamic Conference on Combating International Terrorism, 1999, URL: http://www.oic-oci.org/english/convenion/terrorism_convention.htm

[32]Common Position 2001/931/CFSP http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:344:0093:0096:EN:PDF and European Commission, Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism, *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 164/3, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=%20CELEX:32002F0475&from=EN. The framework agreement was amended in 2008, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:32008F0919. An official synopsis is available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV%3Al33168

> The European Union proposed a draft according to which terrorism was considered an act aimed at seriously altering or destroying the political , economic, and social structure by member countries , a rather clumsy attempt of definition because a social revolution could be peaceful as well as violent.

Actually, there is no need to reach a "social revolution"; the wording of the Common Position can label as terrorism all sorts of illegal unrest actions such as wildcat strikes or road interruptions, which are rather common actions in Brussels.

This vagueness was then corrected in the Framework Decision of 2002, which has a stronger legal base and implications for national criminal codes, leaving to the national authorities the choice of form and methods and therefore does not entail direct effect (34 TEU). The corrections to the formulation of the terrorism definition, however, were not duplicated in the former, which continues not only in force but is extensively used in EU and ECJ decisions on terrorism.

The EU legislation on terrorism has otherwise been very prolific, adding terrorism to the list of other crimes. Every crime committed in the terrorism realm can therefore become a different crime from the original one. The 2008 revision of the framework legislation criminalised "the newly introduced offences of public provocation, recruitment and training to terrorism" and introduced the "criminalisation of acts committed by so-called 'lone actors'".[33]

The EU has an even more complex hybrid approach to terrorism than the USA. Whereas the intended purpose of the hybrid solution was to respond to crimes committed by people or institutions that did not fully fit descriptions in the national or the international legal frameworks, we very much doubt it achieved this goal.

As we have seen, terrorism, from the point of view of the "act", itself cannot be distinguished from any other criminal activity; we can consider terrorism as an aggravating circumstance. For instance, the same way a physical aggression can be subject to an aggravating penalty if it is committed with racial prejudice, it can as well be subject to an aggravating penalty if it is committed with religious prejudice.[34] The same might apply if we consider the essence of the objective of terrorism, that is, to influence or destroy an authority or affect public opinion. For instance, a physical aggression committed in order to scare a community may be considered to be an aggravating factor in relation to a standard physical aggression committed for stealing property. The purpose is different, but the act is not.

However, if we were to consider these different types of aggression as different types of crime, we would only be contributing to the legal confusion, not to a better means to combat this or any type of crime.

The EU counterterrorism framework is further adding to the confusion by mixing national and international legal frameworks. Take, for instance, the case of Yassin Abdullah Kadi, included in a European terrorist list via a European Council regulation which actually applied a UN decision.[35]

---

[33]Quoted from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV%3Al33168

[34]Actually, when religious supremacist crimes are far outstripping the importance of the racial supremacist crimes, it is quite weird this has not been done yet.

[35]See case details at http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=67611&doclang=en

From the point of view of international law, the regulation in question—Council Regulation (EC) No 881/2002 of 27 May 2002—might have made sense, as it imposed material sanctions for terrorism-related offences in a decision taken by traditional diplomatic mechanisms.

However, from the point of view of criminal law, the decision was unacceptable. The defendant had been condemned in secret, for facts which remained secret, preventing his self-defence. Here, the most astonishing fact was that we had to wait for 2008 and for the European Court of Justice (ECJ) to abrogate the regulation as far as Yassin Abdullah Kadi was concerned. Moreover, if the defendant was an accomplice to terrorist acts, freezing his assets as legislated in the above-mentioned regulation was less than proportional to the crimes he was accused of. In any circumstance, no proper justice could have been served.

The pertinent question is: why was there a need of a specific complex legal framework on terrorism that, in the end, only hindered counterterrorism efforts?

One could argue that "to finance terrorism" is a crime technically equal to the crime of financing drug trafficking or any other illicit activity. Why should we create a different legal framework to tackle it? The idea was illogical to start with, but it is disappointing to see that nothing has been done so far to remedy the situation.

Terrorism is not specified in terms of the violence it uses; it distinguishes itself on two very important points: (1) its horrific impact and (2) its rationale.

The "horrific impact" of a specific crime, other than the nature of the crime, depends on the way the crime is perceived by the target. This will crucially depend on the way the information on the crime is disseminated and on the psychological reaction of the target (both the intended indirect victims and the direct victim(s) of the act).

Otherwise, as in any sort of crime, it is fundamental to understand its rationale. A street gang has very different dynamic and motives than a drug cartel or the perpetrator of a crime of passion, notwithstanding the fact they may eventually commit exactly the same crime. As any crime prevention authority knows, it is fundamental to understand the specific and different rationale of the actor to understand its crimes and ultimately to prevent future ones.

The same logic applies to terrorism. The dynamics and motivation of an ecologist tempted to use violence to deter those who he perceives as "ecocides", the socially conscious student drawn to violently aggress those who are perceived as "capitalist exploiters" and the youngster indoctrinated to think that religion mandates him to kill are clearly motivated by different rationales.

Needless to say, distinguishing between specific types of behaviour is especially important if the impact is a hundred or a thousand times bigger than the other.

No reasonable person would think that an antiterrorist expert should be prohibited from naming different criminal rationales and should rather limit himself to mix them altogether as "radical", "violent extremist" or "militant" behaviours.

That is, counterterrorism should be specifically and fundamentally concerned with what is known as "information war", with the psychological reactions of the target and most importantly with the specific rationale of terrorist actors.

But actually we have seen the reverse; these topics are nearly taboo in Western counterterrorism frameworks. While there have been significant efforts to classify terrorism as a specific type of crime, ultimately this merely hindered action against terrorism.

Before proceeding to a more detailed analysis of this state of affairs, we shall address present-day terrorism through the lens of the following case studies.

References

Acosta, B., & Childs, S. (2013). Illuminating the global suicide-attack network. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 36*, 49–76.

Asthana, N. C., & Nirmal, A. (2010). *Terrorism and anti-terrorist operations*. New Delhi: Raj.

BBC. (2013, February 5). *Hezbollah linked to Burgas bus bombing in Bulgaria*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-21342192

Byman, D. (2007). *Deadly connections: States that sponsor terrorism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. (1937, November 16). Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://www.wdl.org/en/item/11579/

Crenshaw, M. (2007). Explaining suicide terrorism—A review essay. *Security Studies, 16*(1), 133–162.

Crenshaw, M. (2011). Explaining terrorism: Causes, processes and consequences. New York: Routledge. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://www.routledge.com/products/9780415780513

Diaz-Paniagua, C. F. (2008). *Negotiating terrorism: The negotiation dynamics of four UN counter-terrorism treaties, 1997–2005* (Vol. 1). New York: UMI.

Ensalaco, M. (2012). *Middle eastern terrorism: From black September to September 11*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

European Commission. (2001, December 27). Common Position 2001/931/CFSP. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:344:0093:0096:EN:PDF

European Commission. (2002, June 13). *Council framework decision on combating terrorism*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=%20CELEX:32002F0475&from=EN

European Commission. (2008). Amendment to Council Framework Decision on combating terrorism. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:32008F0919. An official synopsis is available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV%3Al33168

European Court of Justice. (2008, September 3). Kadi v Council and Commission. C-402/05P. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=67611&doclang=en

Foreign Terrorist Organizations. (2017). *U.S. Department of State*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm

Gearson, J. (2002). The nature of modern terrorism. *The Political Quarterly, 73*(August), 7–24.

Hezbollah Islamista O Sendero Luminoso? (2017). Retrieved May 2, 2017, from https://nacionyanawara.lamula.pe/2016/10/19/hizbola-islamista-o-sendero-luminoso/yanawara/

Hoffman, B. (1998). *Inside terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hoffman, B., & McCormick, G. (2004). Terrorism, signaling, and suicide attack. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 27*, 243–281.

Huntley, T. C.. (2014). Balancing self-defense and mission accomplishment in international intervention: Challenges in drawing and implementing rules of engagement. *Maryland Journal of International Law, 29*, 83 Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1614&context=mjil

Joscelyn, T. (2007). Iran's proxy war against America. In *National security studies*. Upland, CA: The Claremont Institute.

Kennedy, H. (2016). *Caliphate: The history of an idea*. New York: Basic Books.

Kepel, G. (2000). *Jihad. Expansion et déclin de l'islamisme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Laqueur, W. (1977). *A history of terrorism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Laqueur, W. (1990). Foreword. In W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press with Johns Hopkins University Press.

Laqueur, W. (1999). *The new terrorism: Fanaticism and the arms of mass destruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laqueur, W. (2003). *No end to war: Terrorism in the twenty-first century*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Marques Guedes, A. (2007). *Ligacoes Perigosas*. Coimbra: Almedina.

Merari, A. (1990). The readiness to kill and die: Suicidal terrorism in the middle east. In W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism: Psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press with Johns Hopkins University Press.

Merari, A. (2010). *Driven to death: Psychological and social aspects of suicide terrorism*. Oxford: OUP.

Neumann, P. (2009). *Old & new terrorism. Late modernity, globalization and the transformation of political violence*. Cambridge: Polity.

OIC. (1999). *Convention of the organisation of the islamic conference on combating international terrorism*.

Reuters. (2015, June 15). *Cyprus likely thwarted Hezbollah bomb plot, foreign minister says*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-cyprus-security-idUKKBN0OV2DN20150615

Roggio, B. (2010). Taliban cooperation with Al Qaeda 'is at the highest limits'—Siraj Haqqani. *The Long War Journal*.

Rupérez, J. (2007). The United Nations in the fight against terrorism. *Research Material Series, 71*(March), 14–23.

Vidino Lorenzo. (2006). The arrival of islamic fundamentalism in Sudan. *The Fletcher school online journal for issues related to southwest Asia and islamic civilization*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://fletcher.tufts.edu/~/media/Fletcher/Microsites/al%20Nakhlah/archives/2006/vidino_fall.pdf

Vidino, L. (2006, November 1). Aims and methods of Europe's muslim brotherhood. *The Hudson Institute*. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from http://www.hudson.org/research/9776-aims-and-methods-of-europe-s-muslim-brotherhood

White House Archives. (2001, November 13). *President issues military order detention, treatment, and trial of certain non-citizens in the war against terrorism*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011113-27.html

Wright, L. (2006). *The looming tower: Al-Qaeda and the road to 9/11*. New York: Vintage.

Wu, X. (Anne). (2016, December 13), *Kofi Annan's legacy on counterterrorism, belfer center Harvard Kennedy School*. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from http://www.belfercenter.org/publication/kofi-annans-legacy-counterterrorism

Part II

Case Studies

The Evolution and Ascension of Iran's Terror Apparatus

Mosa Zahed

1 Introduction

During the twentieth century, Iran experienced countless political upheavals, with the revolution of 1979 marking one of the defining moments of the era due to the colossal impact it had on the destiny of Iranian society, the region and the world. Despite the fact that the revolution ultimately resulted in the establishment of a theocracy, notorious for its contempt of human rights at home and abroad, the spirit behind this important historical event was essentially derived from a popular democratic movement—contrary to Ruhollah Khomeini's brand of Islamic funda-mentalism and authoritarianism—and guided by the aspiration of a progressive initiative that aimed to establish freedom, democracy and the rule of law in Iran.

Many only realised the cruel nature of Khomeini and his adherents after they effectively consolidated power in 1979 and institutionalised a brutal practice against those who resisted the Islamist regime. However, the struggle between modernism and Islamic fundamentalism in Iran was already raging in the early years of the twentieth century, long before the revolution of 1979, when the constitutional movement had gained momentum and was poised to carry out its programme of reform, generating unease among Iran's religious establishment as their traditional positions in society were put in jeopardy.

In an era where the majority of Shia clergy actively opposed the constitutional movement and effectively aligned themselves with the monarchy in order to form a robust front to maintain the status quo, Khomeini's views on politics and religion gained momentum. His early publications already reveal the zealotry and vicious-ness that came to light as a consequence of invaluable efforts of Ahmad Kasravi and his adherents—who were ardent supporters of constitutionalism and

M. Zahed (✉)
Middle East Forum for Development (MEFD), London, UK
e-mail: mosazahed@me-fd.org

secularism—whose work led Khomeini to unfold the extremist reactionary ideology from his earlier writings.

This chapter will show how, as a direct result of Khomeini's doctrine, an Islamic fundamentalist terrorist organisation was incorporated in the state apparatus, which would ultimately set the stage for the formation of an Islamic Republic, governed by Islamic jurists, which would subsequently make suppression at home and terrorism abroad official state policy.

Moreover, this chapter will highlight the systematic recruitment of children during the Iran–Iraq war in the 1980s as Khomeini meticulously generated a culture of martyrdom through the use of religious symbolism, laying the foundation for suicide attacks to be carried out on frontlines by children and other volunteers who were indoctrinated by this credo.

Attention will be paid to how this poisonous doctrine was exported by the Khomeinist regime to its terrorist proxies in the region, who ushered terrorism into a new era by using the culture of martyrdom as the ideological framework to carry out suicide bombings. Finally, we shall see how the Islamic Republic's state sponsorship of terrorism enabled a terrorist group like Al-Qaeda to evolve and perpetrate one of the deadliest terrorist attacks in world history.

2   *Fada'iyan-e Islam*: Devotees of Islam

Subsequent to the fall of the Abbasid dynasty, the third Islamic caliphate, in 1258 AD and with the establishment of a Mongol state in Iran, state policy toward non-Muslim minorities was affected enormously. Whereas the Abbasid rulers forced minorities, such as Christians and Jews, to pay *jizya*, or poll tax, in return for protection of life and property, and restricted them in their daily lives by formulating discriminatory regulations, the Mongol rule traditionally did not recognise a specific religion and significantly improved the position of non-Muslim minorities following their invasion of Iran (Savory, 2003, p. 436).

During this new era, Jews, Christians and non-Sunni Muslims, such as adherents of the Shia branch of Islam, thrived and gained cumulative influence in society (Savory, 2003, p. 439). However, the prospering of non-Muslim minorities came to a halt when Ghazan Khan claimed the throne as the Ilkhanid ruler of Iran in 1295 AD and converted to Islam in order to legitimise his rule, given the fact that the majority of his subjects were Muslims (Savory, 2003, p. 437).

The accession of Ghazan Khan, who changed his name to Mahmud following his conversion to Islam, saw Islam become the official religion of the Ilkhanid state, marking the end of four decades of religious freedom for non-Muslim minorities in Iran (Savory, 2003, p. 438). Nevertheless, the spread of Shiism, under the guise of Sufism, continued in Iran during the fourteenth and fifteenth century (Savory, 2003, p. 439) and was ultimately declared the official religion of the new Safavid state by Shah Ismail I in 1501.

The Shia *ulema*—religious scholars—gained significance in the Safavid Empire as they served as an instrument of the state in order to impose Shiism on the general public, which naturally solidified the alliance between the monarchy and the *ulema*, yielding substantial influence and material benefits for the latter throughout the following two centuries. The *ulema* were enabled to establish themselves as a powerful class in the Safavid Empire and persecuted adherents of other religions and Islamic sects, including Shiites who believed in a different interpretation of Islam, with the backing of the Safavid rulers (BBC, 07-09-2009).

However, when the Hotaki-led Afghan army laid siege to the capital of the Safavid Empire in 1722 in Isfahan, resulting in the city's fall, the Shia *ulema* lost their privileged positions, only to be restored again in the nineteenth century under the rule of the first Qajar Shahs (Axworthy, 2013, p. 21). During the Qajar dynasty, which was founded by Agha Mohammad Khan Qajar in 1794, the *Usuli* school of thought gained momentum in Iran against the *Akhbari* theological position (Axworthy, 2013, p. 21).

The *Akhbari* doctrine emphasises that the *Quran* and the *hadith*—a collection of written traditions of the sayings and daily practices (*sunna*) of Prophet Mohammad—would suffice for guidance and leaving little room to manoeuvre for *ijtihad*, the interpretation process of Islamic law based on reason. On the other hand, the *Usuli* doctrine underscores the importance of reinterpretation of Islamic law given the developmental process that each generation goes through and further argued that *ijtihad* could only be exercised by trained *ulema* who would carry the title of *mojtahed* and to whom people could declare their loyalty.

Throughout the centuries, the *Usuli* doctrine always recognised a *marja-e taqlid* (authorities to be followed) as the highest-ranking authorities in Twelver Shia. They emerge in each generation, normally one or two, among the whole body of *mojtahed* and serve as a supreme guide to other *ulema* and Muslims in their religious affairs (Axworthy, 2013, p. 21). Additional titles, such as *hojjatoleslam* ("proof of Islam") and *ayatollah* ("sign of God"), ensued in the nineteenth century in the religious hierarchy of Shiism in order to distinguish between the clerics as a result of an influx of ambitious young men who aspired to become *mojtahed* in an era where the *ulema* succeeded in restoring their social order and authority, independent from the fragile monarchy (Axworthy, 2013, p. 21).

Subsequent to the death of Nassereddin Shah of the Qajar state in 1896 and the accession of his son, Mozafaredin Shah, Iran witnessed a period of press freedom and freedom of assembly which resulted in the establishment of various associations and an increase in political and press-related activities. This new era supported new ideas and values which successfully disseminated across Iran, spurring debate between those who aimed to modernise the society and rid the country of authoritarianism and those who opposed modernity and advocated for traditional Islam.

The process of critical thinking enabled the members of society to increase public awareness on major developments in Europe and ultimately led to a general consensus in the initial years of the twentieth century that Iran required a constitution that

would limit the authoritarian rule of the monarch and establish the rule of law. The constitutional revolution (1905–1911) was initially backed by the *ulema*, as their authority was recognised in the constitution drafted in 1906 following the first assembly of the *Majles,* parliament, and Shiism was declared the official religion of Iran (Axworthy, 2013, p. 28).

However, in the following 2 years, the *ulema* grew unhappy with legislation that aimed to push democratic reforms (including judicial reforms) as these would jeopardise their traditional role in society and—more importantly—affect their wealth and land. Thus, the majority of *ulema* began to oppose the constitutional movement and its agenda for reform and initiated a campaign, which was led by Sheikh Fazlollah Nuri, in order to safeguard their interest.

Nuri was a fierce opponent of modernisation and fundamental freedoms which affected Iran's political structures and society and argued that "the foundation of the Quran is based on not having the freedom of writing and saying [anything you want]" (Parsine, 2012). He believed that absolute freedom is improper and emphasised that "such a statement is considered in its entirety blasphemous in Islam" (Parsine, 2012). Sheikh Fazlollah Nuri further demonstrated his contempt for fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of speech, and suggested that "if you want my opinion, remove the word freedom [from debates] as it will ultimately dishonour us" (Parsine, 2012).

Nuri's reactionary views are clearly exemplified in his statement concerning the major developments in Iran subsequent to the accession of Mozafaredin Shah:

> Today, your senses and perceptions have changed, so much so that you read newspapers. Now you relish socialising with Westerners and atheists. Shame on you, Muslims, for thinking that reading these newspapers have been a source of your progress and perception, for spending your wife and children's money on newspapers, and for dissociating yourselves from Islam and the *ulema* to the point that it seems as if you have never shared the same faith as theirs. (Mohaddessin, 1993, p. 10)

In order to prevent the constitutionalists from achieving their objectives, Sheikh Fazlollah Nuri and his followers sided with the monarchy, in the hope of safeguarding the existing state of affairs, and denounced the *Majles* as illegitimate (Axworthy, 2013, p. 29). Ruhollah Khomeini, the future founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran, would later refer to Sheikh Fazlollah Nuri as a role model. Some *ulema*, albeit a minority, adhered to democratic principles and aspired a parliamentary government that would bestow democracy on the Iranian people. *Ulema* such as Seyyed Mohammad Tabataba'i, Seyyed Abdullah Behbahani and Seyyed Jamal od-Din Va'iz argued that a constitutional government and the right to popular suffrage wouldn't contradict Islam (Mohaddessin, 1993, p. 11).

The prominent Iranian historian and linguist Ahmad Kasravi was a strong supporter of Iran's constitutional movement and considered the constitutional revolution the most important event in the country's history. Kasravi, who was born in September of 1890 in the city of Tabriz, north-western Iran, initially reluctantly followed in the footsteps of his father and ancestors by joining the community of

ulema as a clergyman, but abandoned that profession soon afterwards due to his uncompromising liberal views on religion and open-mindedness in reforming Shia Islam, which religious leaders could barely tolerate (Jazayery, 1973, p. 190).

Kasravi, like many others of his generation, became aware of and was intrigued by the developments in Europe even though he did nurture anticolonial and anticapitalist sentiments and identified Europe (or the West in general) as the actor which aimed to promote those very concepts (Parvin, 2006). Subsequent to ending his clergy career, Ahmad Kasravi briefly taught Arabic at a secondary school in Tabriz prior to his next assignment at the Ministry of Justice, a career path which lasted more than a decade (Jazayery, 1973, p. 191). He subsequently briefly served as District Attorney for Tehran and was ultimately appointed President of Courts of First Instance of the city, where he in 1929 famously returned a verdict against the Royal Court in favour of a group of peasants (Jazayery, 1973, p. 191).

Ahmad Kasravi wrote political and historical articles for newspapers of the constitutional movement and Iran's Democratic Party. From approximately 1933, he demonstrated a particular interest in contemporary Iranian society and was poised to write about its shortcomings and deficiencies (Parvin, 2006). To this end, in the 1930s and early 1940s, he published articles in his research and cultural magazine, *Payman*, criticising Iranian poets and Sufis and targeted superstitions and religious beliefs in Shiism and Islam.

He authored various books, including his masterpiece *Tarikh-e Mashrute-ye Iran*, History of the Iranian Constitutional Revolution, and *Sheikh Safi va Tabarash*, Sheikh Safi and his ancestry.[1] Kasravi particularly caused outrage among religious leaders through his book *Shi'igari*, Shia-mongering, which was published in 1943 and heavily criticises Shia Islam. In this book, Kasravi states his objections to the sixth Shia Imam, Ja'far Sadegh, who is considered to be infallible by Twelver Shia and condemns Shia practices and rituals, such as *Taqiyya* (dissimulation) weeping and mourning sessions and pilgrimages to various tombs during which pilgrims petition the Imams with their needs and requests (Kia, 2014, p. 5).

Kasravi also repudiates in *Shi'igari* the belief in the Twelfth Imam and the Shia narrative that he disappeared as a child and his promised return as the Mahdi (Kia, 2014, p. 5). Due to the caused outrage among clergymen following the publication of *Shi'igari*, the book was banned and thus Kasravi changed the title to *Bekhanand va davari konand*, Let them read and pass judgement, and republished it (Kia, 2014, p. 10). As *Shi'igari* was widely read among Iranians, one of Kasravi's followers, Ali Akbar Hakamizadeh, who like Kasravi was a former mullah subsequently published in 1943 *Asrare Hezar Sale*, The Secrets of a Thousand Years. The 36-page piece by Hakamizadeh contains criticism, although not as effective and provocative as Kasravi's *Shi'igari*, against the *ulema*, who he blames for encouraging superstitious practices among their adherents (Kia, 2014, p. 10). Among the clergymen, one critic in particular stood out with his fierce condemnation of Ahmad Kasravi and his work

---

[1]This title made him the first author in Iran's history who would disclose that the Safavid dynasty was not descended from the prophet Mohammed.

as he considered his efforts an attack against the religious establishment of Iran. Ruhollah Musavi Khomeini, the future leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who was still unknown during this era as a mid-level cleric, felt the urge to respond to the publications of Kasravi and Hakamizadeh, which had effectively shaken the pillars of Shiism, by drafting a 300-page piece in 1943 titled *Kashf al-Asrar*, Unveiling of Secrets. In his response, Khomeini condemns those who promote Islamic reformism and secularists. Even though Kasravi and Hakamizadeh are not specifically mentioned in this book by name, it is clear that Khomeini is targeting them in his writings. The following excerpt is from *Kashf al-Asrar*:

> Our faithful believers, our honourable brothers, our Persian-speaking friend, our courageous youth! Read these manifestations of crime, these shameful publications, these kernels of division and animosity, these invitations to Zoroastrianism [. . .] these condemnations of our sacred religion, and try to do something; with a national uprising, with a religious uprising [. . .] with a strong will, with an iron fist, rid the earth of the seeds of these dishonourable, shameless beings [. . .] We are condemned in the court of our religion, we are disgraced in the view of the prophet of Islam. Yes! Rise up courageously and honourably, so that the arrogant do not make you surrender. (Behdad, 2004, p. 74)

Khomeini further emphasises in *Kashf al-Asrar* that those who attack Islam are *mofsed fi al-arz*, corrupt on earth, and that "the scholars. . .who see themselves as guardians of the faith, the Quran and the religious sacred beliefs, to shatter the teeth of these jerks with their iron fists and to crush their heads under their courageous feet" (Behdad, 2004, pp. 74–75). Moreover, Khomeini underscores that an Islamic government would "execute these offenders in front of the supporters of the faith" (Behdad, 2004, p. 75). In 1944, Khomeini wrote an open letter to the *ulema* and people titled *Bekhanid va be kar bandid*, Read and act upon it, as a direct response to Kasravi's *Bekhanand va davari konand* (BBC Farsi, 2012).[2]

In the letter, Khomeini explains that "Selfishness and the abandoning of an uprising for God has led us to this dark era in which the world dominates us and Islamic countries are influenced by others" (BBC Farsi, 2012). He further stressed that the Islamic faith and institutions are threatened by immoral behaviour and corruption in society and thus called on all Islamic clergymen and scholars to unite and rise up for God. In an apparent reference to Ahmad Kasravi, Khomeini emphasises in his letter that "Everyone has seen the books of this scum from Tabriz who has reviled your creed entirely and, at the centre of Shiism, insulted Imam Sadegh and the Hidden Imam—may my soul be sacrificed to him—and not a word has been issued by anyone of you. What is your excuse today in the court of God? What is this weakness and misery that has engulfed you [clergymen]?" (BBC Farsi, 2012).

Khomeini's call for the annihilation of the "corrupt on earth" did not go unheeded. The 22-year-old theology student, Mojtaba Navvab Safavi, who was in Iraq to pursue his religious studies at the Najaf Seminary read Kasravi's *Shi'igari*.

---

[2]BBC Farsi: "Letter of Ayatollah Khomeini; 'Read and act upon it'" http://www.bbc.com/persian/iran/2012/03/120311_l44_kasravi_khomeini_letter.shtml (23-07-2016).

Armed and inspired by Khomeini's *Kashf al-Asrar*, he decided to return to Iran with the financial support from Seyyed Asadollah Madani[3] in order to found the *Fada'iyan-e Islam*, Devotees of Islam, an Islamic fundamentalist terrorist organisation incorporated in 1945, with the sole aim of executing the very instructions of Khomeini. Following the formation of *Fada'iyan-e Islam*, Navvab Safavi issued the following statement:

> We are alive and God, the revengeful, is alert. The blood of the destitute has long been dripping from the fingers of the selfish pleasure seekers, who are hiding, each with a different name and in a different colour, behind the black curtains of oppression, thievery and crime. Once in a while the divine retribution puts them in their place, but the rest of them do not learn a lesson. . .Damn you! You traitors, imposters, oppressors! You deceitful hypocrites! We are free, noble and alert. We are knowledgeable, believers in God and fearless. (Behdad, 2004, p. 76)

Navvab Safavi further emphasises that this declaration is an attack on those who damage:

> the foundation of the faith and the Quranic knowledge in the name of religion. . .have no mercy on the privation of the poor, throw dirt on the blessed blood of Hossein (peace on him). . .make deals with robber barons and know of the degenerated morality of the youth of today and of their disgust from religion when they sow the seeds [of ruin and division]. (Behdad, 2004, p. 76)

Ahmad Kasravi would be the first *mofsed fi al-arz* to be targeted on Navvab Safavi's hit list, and the latter didn't waste much time before starting his preparations for the operation. After having purchased a gun, Navvab Safavi made personally on 28 April 1945 a failed attempt on Kasravi's life (Behdad, 2004, p. 75). However, on 11 March 1946, a second attempt was made, and this time the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* struck successfully. As Ahmad Kasravi was going into court in order to defend himself against blasphemy charges that were raised by religious fundamentalists, he was brutally assassinated by Seyyed Hossein Emami and Seyyed Ali Mohammad Emami, two followers of Navvab Safavi (Behdad, 2004, p. 75).

The clergymen's terror apparatus proved to be effective, and as its modus operandi revolved around honouring Khomeini's call for the destruction of those who criticise Islam, *Fada'iyan-e Islam* commenced a major wave of terrorism in Iran from 1946 onwards. Among the leading Iranian intellectuals and politicians who would become victims of their terrorism were Abdol-Hossein Hazhir, court minister and former prime minister, who was assassinated by Seyyed Hossein Emami on 4 November 1949[4]; Abdol-Hamid Zangeneh, education and culture minister, who was assassinated by

---

[3]Seyed Asadollah Madani would serve in the Assembly of Experts 35 years later in order to draft the constitution of the Islamic Republic and was appointed by Khomeini as the *Imam Jomeh*, leader of the Friday prayer, of Tabriz.

[4]Seyyed Hossein Emami was the terrorist who also assassinated Ahmad Kasravi on 11 March 1946. Emami was arrested following the killing of Kasravi and subsequently released, escaping punishment, when the *ulema* intervened as they strongly supported Navvab Safavi and his newly

Nosratollah Ghumi on 19 March 1951; and Prime Minister Ali Razmara, who was assassinated by Khalil Tahmasebi on 7 March 1951 (Norouzi & Norouzi, 2011).

There were also operations which were conducted unsuccessfully by *Fada'iyan-e Islam*. On 16 February 1952, Dr. Hossein Fatemi, the foreign minister in Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadegh's cabinet from 1951 to 1953, was targeted by Mehdi Abdi-Khodaei, but survived the attack (Norouzi & Norouzi, 2011). On 17 November 1955, another of the Shah's court ministers, Hossein Ala, was targeted by Mozaffar-Ali Zolghadr, a member of the *Fada'iyan-e Islam*, but survived the assassination attempt (Norouzi & Norouzi, 2011). Navvab Safavi and his followers were ultimately arrested and condemned to death by a military court. On 18 January 1956, they were all executed by a firing squad, and even while it marked the end of *Fada'iyan-e Islam's* wave of terrorism, it evidently did not mean the demise of terrorism instigated by Islamic fanaticism.

3   Khomeini During the Pre-Revolution Era

Much of what would become official state policy following the revolution of 1979, which resulted in the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran, was indeed already, to some extent, spelt out in Khomeini's *Kashf al-Asrar*. In the new Islamic Republic, there would be no place for criticism against the clerical elite and the rituals and practices of Shia Islam, as critics would be considered *mohareb*, enemies of God, and be automatically condemned to death. Even though Khomeini criticised Reza Shah in his early writings for closing down Islamic institutions, expropriating religious endowments and promoting Western culture, he did not go as far as to call for the monarchy to be overthrown (Abrahamian, 1993, p. 7).

In fact, in his early writings, Khomeini repeatedly reaffirmed his allegiance to the throne and argued that Shia clergy never opposed the state "as such" and that "bad order was better than no order at all", a position that would remain unchanged throughout the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s (Abrahamian, 1993, p. 7). Even in 1963, when Khomeini clashed with Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, accusing him among other things of supporting women's suffrage and capitulating to the United States (USA) by exempting American military personnel from Iranian laws, he did not call for a revolution or for the overthrow of the Pahlavi monarchy (Abrahamian, 1993, p. 7).

The view that the West has of Khomeini, has been fundamentally distorted as they have mainly described him as being the teacher in Qom throughout the 1940s and 1950s and argued that he upheld the "quietist approach", a viewpoint

---

founded terrorist organisation. Subsequent to the assassination of Hazhir, Emami was arrested and executed.

in Shia Islam which stipulates that clergymen should stay away from politics. For instance, Kepel (2006, p. 40) argues in this regard that, prior to the 1960s, "Khomeini himself had been a teacher in Qum, one of the holy cities of the Shiites; he had always held aloof from the political fray, preferring to write conservative doctrinal tracts". Harmon (2005, p. 24) also focuses on how Khomeini, the "Muslim scholar", taught from the 1930s to the 1960s at the *madreseh* (Islamic school) Faizieh at Qom and describes him as "an excellent instructor" who "developed a large following of students who remembered and respected him long after they heard his lectures". Harmon then continues to portray Khomeini as a clergyman who had social justice at heart throughout his life and therefore eventually fell out with the Pahlavi monarchy due to the latter's corrupt regime, effectively departing from the Shia quietist approach by participating in political matters (Harmon, 2005, p. 25).

Kepel's argument is factually inaccurate as Khomeini's *Kashf al-Asrar*, his first ever known political tract, was published long before the 1960s in which he already propounds the idea of an Islamic State governed by *sharia* law and administered by the mullahs. Unlike Kepel, Harmon dedicates a few lines to *Kashf al-Asrar* in his work, presenting it as a piece in which Khomeini "…bluntly condemned the behaviour and policies of the recently deposed shah" and further argues that "Khomeini considered the elder shah an intolerable dictator who was antagonising the Muslim leadership" (Harmon, 2005, p. 36). Harmon's statement clearly indicates that he has mostly missed the meaning of *Kashf al-Asrar*, as the book is essentially a direct response to those secularists and intellectuals who criticised the clerical establishment.

Harmon, who goes to great lengths describing Khomeini's life and intentions throughout the chapters, fails to address the repulsive and significant parts of *Kashf al-Asrar* in which Khomeini calls upon all Muslims to kill those who criticise Islam. Moreover, Harmon emphasises that during Ayatollah Borujerdi's tenure as Shia *marja* from 1944 until his death in 1961, Khomeini shied away from political activity as Borujerdi discouraged *mullahs* from engaging in politics (Harmon, 2005, p. 25).

This statement is in stark contradiction with reality, given the fact that Khomeini supported the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* and their terrorism campaign in the 1950s, which aimed to establish an Islamic State in Iran that would implement *sharia* law. Khomeini's close affiliation with the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* was clearly at display when he—against the wishes of the clerical establishment which sought to distance itself from the Islamic fundamentalist group—initiated a personal campaign aiming to overturn the death sentence of Navvab Safavi, the group's founder and leader (Coughlin, 2009, p. 87).

Moreover, Khomeini was close to Ayatollah Seyyed Abolqassem Kashani, the fundamentalist clergyman who was involved with *Fada'iyan-e Islam* since its creation in 1945 and who became speaker of *Majles* subsequent to his return to Iran from exile in 1950. Khomeini frequently visited Kashani's home and expressed admiration for his courage and determination in ignoring Borujerdi's quietist

approach by engaging in political affairs. Similar to Khomeini, Kashani despised liberalism and believed in a government that upheld and respected *sharia* law.

However, when Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh became prime minister in 1951, Ayatollah Kashani and his fundamentalist faction joined Mossadegh's National Front coalition. Given the fact that the National Front was largely comprised of members with a secularist orientation who pursued a civic nationalist agenda, the alliance with Kashani and his fanatical adherents would soon crumble. The aspiration of Mossadegh's cabinet to pass a bill in *Majles* which would grant women the right to vote and its refusal to ban alcohol and to offer amnesty to imprisoned members of the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* terrorist organisation were some clear indicators to Kashani and the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* that Mossadegh and his cabinet were not willing to compromise their liberal values in favour of the agenda of Islamic fundamentalists.

Kashani ultimately turned against Mossadegh and effectively sought the help of the British Secret Intelligence Service (SIS) in order to carry out the 1953 coup d'état against the government. Wilber's detailed account of the coup would later disclose the determinant role of the clergy in the covert operation (The George Washington University, 2000) which restored Shah's tyranny and installed General Fazlollah Zahedi as the new prime minister. Similar to the era of the late Sheikh Fazlollah Nuri who opposed the constitutional movement in the early years of the twentieth century, Kashani and his gang of Islamic fundamentalists realised all too well that Mossadegh's future Iran would not have a place for their fanaticism and thus sided with the monarchical tyranny in order to prevent the secularists from prevailing. Khomeini would later recall:

> In those same years in the 1950s, I told the Aqa [Kashani] that Mossadeq would be slapped in the face. And it did not take long before he was slapped. Had he survived, he would have slapped Islam. (Mohaddessin, 1993, p. 11)

Khomeini's remark unmistakably expresses gratification with the coup d'état against Mossadegh's nationalist and democratic government and indicates that he wholeheartedly supported the conspiracy.

Khomeini's involvement with *Fada'iyan-e Islam* early on revealed his conviction that violence and brutality were justified in order to pursue the establishment of an Islamic State. Even though the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* ceased their terrorism campaign following the execution of their leader in 1956, their members patiently awaited the rise of a new leader who would effectively utilise their lethal skills.

It wouldn't take long before Khomeini suggested and supported the formation of *Hezb-e Motalefeh Islami,* Islamic Coalition Party, in 1963. The Coalition established an armed wing called *Hezbollah* (Party of God). This would be the precursor of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps which was founded in 1979; the Lebanese *Hezbollah*, created in the 1980s; and an immense string of other *Hezbollah* terrorist groups across the world.

The *Hezbollah* of 1960s in Iran was made up of former members of *Fada'iyan-e Islam*. Following Khomeini's exile to Turkey by a signed decree of the liberal Iranian Prime Minister Hassan-Ali Mansur in November 1964, the terrorist group immediately plotted Mansur's killing in response to his order and in 1965 successfully assassinated him.

Hashemi Rafsanjani, who would later become president of Khomeini's Islamic Republic, was involved in the assassination plot. In Turkey, Khomeini assumed the role of a traditional *marja* as Ayatollah Borujerdi's death in 1961 had created a vacuum within the Shia hierarchy which enabled him to claim the leadership of Iran's Shia community. After having spent 11 months in Turkey, Ankara became disturbed by Khomeini's activities and expelled him in 1965 to Iraq where he would spend the next 13 years of his life in the city of Najaf.

Iraq's Shia establishment was not enthused by Khomeini's presence due to the notoriety he had gained through his radical teachings and support for terrorism over the years; he was therefore isolated by the country's senior religious leaders. However, while at Najaf, Khomeini was able to befriend Mohammed Baqir al-Sadr, the ideological founder of *Hizb al-Da'wa al-Islāmiyya*, Islamic Call Party, who similar to Khomeini believed in the establishment of a global Islamic State through terrorism. Some of the founding members of *Hizb al-Da'wa al-Islāmiyya* were indeed former members of Navvab Safavi's *Fada'iyan-e Islam* in Iraq, which Khomeini supported unreservedly (Coughlin, 2009, p. 22). Moreover, Khomeini enormously benefited from support from Iraqi President Abdul Salam Arif, who had welcomed Khomeini to Iraq and assisted him in setting up an Iranian opposition radio station in Najaf which ran under Khomeini's directorship (Asharq al-Awsat, 2009), effectively enabling the Ayatollah to pursue his fundamentalist objectives in Iran. Abdul Salam Arif, who consolidated power following a military coup in 1963, immediately initiated a Pinochet-style slaughter of thousands of Iraqi Communists (Coughlin, 2009, p. 117). Iraq's clerical establishment supported Arif's hideous crimes, as the former considered the communists to represent an existential threat to the role of clergy in society, and thus issued a *fatwa*, a religious decree, forbidding adherents of Shia Islam from joining the Iraqi Communist Party.

In January 1970, Khomeini commenced lectures in Najaf, which were ultimately published in a book titled *Velayat-e Faqih: Hokumat-e Islami,* Governance of the Islamic jurist: Islamic government. During these lectures, Khomeini first contradicts his early work and statements and targets all forms of monarchy, arguing that "Islam proclaims monarchy and hereditary succession wrong and invalid" and branded it as a "sinister" and "evil system" (Khomeini, 1970, p. 10). Khomeini further elaborates on his objective to establish an Islamic state, stressing to Muslims "that it is your duty to establish an Islamic government" underscoring that the mullahs should play an active role in politics "so that our youth do not picture the *akhunds* [mullahs] as sitting in some corner in Najaf or Qum, studying the questions of menstruation and parturition instead of concerning themselves with politics, and draw the conclusion that religion must be separate from politics" (Khomeini, 1970, p. 16).

Khomeini poses the following question during his lectures in order to justify the establishment of his envisioned Islamic state:

> From the time of the Lesser Occultation[5] down to the present (a period of more than twelve centuries that may continue for hundreds of millennia if it is not appropriate for the Occulted Imam to manifest himself), is it proper that the laws of Islam be cast aside and remain unexecuted, so that everyone acts as he pleases and anarchy prevails? (Khomeini, 1970, p. 19)

Like Sheikh Fazlollah Nuri, Khomeini argued that the only rightful rulers of an Islamic State are the clergymen who have a claim to the leadership directly from Prophet Mohammad through the Imams (Shevlin, 1998, p. 365), propounding the idea of *velayat-e faqih*, governance of the Islamic jurist.

He emphasised that "The true rulers are the *Fuqaha* [Islamic jurists] themselves, and rulership ought officially to be theirs...If they come together, they could establish a government of universal justice in the world" (Khomeini, 1970, p. 32). Khomeini further asserts that the authority of the *faqih* is the same as that of Prophet Mohammad and the Imams, arguing that *velayat-e faqih* "is a rational and extrinsic matter" and that the *faqih's* role revolves around applying the "penal provisions of Islam" and that there can't be any distinction in this regard between Prophet Mohammad, the Imams and the *faqih* (Khomeini, 1970, p. 63).

Subsequent to the collapse of the Pahlavi monarchy and the founding of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1979, Khomeini's concept of *velayat-e faqih* became the basis of the country's new Constitution which provides sweeping powers to the *faqih*, on who, according to article 5 of the Constitution, "During the Occultation of the Wali al-Asr [Mahdi] (may God hasten his reappearance), the wilayah [governance] and leadership of the Ummah [the entire community of Muslims]" devolves upon.[6]

The *faqih* or Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic, according to article 110 of the Constitution, has the following duties and powers:

1. Delineation of the general policies of the Islamic Republic of Iran after consultation with the Nation's Exigency Council.
2. Supervision over the proper execution of the general policies of the system.
3. Issuing decrees for national referenda.
4. Assuming supreme command of the armed forces.
5. Declaration of war and peace, and the mobilisation of the armed forces.
6. Appointment, dismissal, and acceptance of resignation of: the fuqaha' on the Guardian Council, the supreme judicial authority of the country, the head of the

---

[5]Khomeini refers to Mahdi, the twelfth and last Imam in Twelver Shia Islam, who is a descendant of the Prophet and believed to have disappeared after he was born and expected to return one day in order to establish justice and peace across the globe.

[6]*Islamic Republic of Iran Constitution, General Principles, Article 5*, http://www.iranonline.com/iran/iran-info/government/constitution-1.html (04-08-2016).

radio and television network of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the chief of the joint staff, the chief commander of the Islamic Revolution Guards Corps, the supreme commanders of the armed forces.

7. Resolving differences between the three wings of the armed forces and regulation of their relations.

8. Resolving the problems, which cannot be solved by conventional methods, through the Nation's Exigency Council.

9. Signing the decree formalising the election of the President of the Republic by the people. The suitability of candidates for the Presidency of the Republic, with respect to the qualifications specified in the Constitution, must be confirmed before elections take place by the Guardian Council; and, in the case of the first term [of the Presidency], by the leadership.

10. Dismissal of the President of the Republic, with due regard for the interests of the country, after the Supreme Court holds him guilty of the violation of his constitutional duties, or after a vote of the Islamic Consultative Assembly testifying to his incompetence on the basis of article 89 of the Constitution.

11. Pardoning or reducing the sentences of convicts, within the framework of Islamic criteria, on a recommendation [to that effect] from the Head of judicial power. The Leader may delegate part of his duties and powers to another person.[7]

Article 110 clearly shows that all the important affairs of the state are determined by the *faqih*, and with Khomeini installed as the Supreme Leader, the mullahs consolidated their power, effectively neutralising any political opposition against theocratic rule. If pre-1979 revolution Khomeini had to rely on the monarchy in order to safeguard the interest of the clerical elite and persecute those who advocated for a constitutional government, secularism or Islamic reformism, he now had all the means at his disposal, independent from any authority, in order to commence his brutal reign of terror. Furthermore, the Khomeinist Constitution confirms its disregard for the territorial integrity principle of international law as it stipulates the formation of a global Islamic state. Article 11 states:

> In accordance with the sacred verse of the Qu'ran ('This your community is a single community, and I am your Lord, so worship Me' [21:92]), all Muslims form a single nation, and the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has the duty of formulating its general policies with a view to cultivating the friendship and unity of all Muslim peoples, and it must constantly strive to bring about the political, economic, and cultural unity of the Islamic world.[8]

---

[7]*Islamic Republic of Iran Constitution, The Leader or Leadership Council, Article 110,* http://www.iranonline.com/iran/iran-info/government/constitution-8.html (04-08-2016).

[8]*Islamic Republic of Iran Constitution, General principles, Article 11,* http://www.iranonline.com/iran/iran-info/government/constitution-1.html (04-08-2016).

4   Guardians of the Islamic Revolution

Many members and supporters of the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* terrorist group went on to join Khomeini's government. Mehdi Abdi-Khodaei, who conducted a failed terrorist operation in 1952 targeting Mossadegh's foreign affairs minister, served as a deputy in the first *Majles* following the 1979 revolution (Norouzi & Norouzi, 2011). Seyyed Asadollah Madani, who provided financial support for Navvab Safavi's travel back to Iran from Iraq in order to found the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* and to assassinate Ahmad Kasravi, became a member of the Assembly of Experts with the responsibility of drafting the Khomeinist Constitution (Behdad, 2004, p. 75). Madani was also appointed by Khomeini as Imam *Jomeh* (Friday prayer leader) of Tabriz (Behdad, 2004, p. 75).

Another notorious figure who would play an essential role in the newly established Islamic Republic was Ayatollah Sadegh Khalkhali, also known as the "hanging judge" or the "butcher of the revolution", who revived the *Fada'iyan-e Islam* terrorist group during the last days of the Pahlavi monarchy and was subsequently in charge of weeding out "counter revolutionaries". Khalkhali, who acted as a prosecutor, judge and jury in his Islamic Revolutionary Court, which evidently did not uphold the defendant's rights to a fair trial and due process, ordered the execution of 2000 members of the Shah's regime in 1979 alone and executed hundreds of diplomats, academics and politicians (The Independent, 2003).

Khalkhali justified his methods and those of the Khomeinist establishment by arguing that "If they [defendants] were guilty, they will go to hell and if they were innocent, they will go to heaven" (The Independent, 2003). Khalkhali's zealotry and wickedness were clearly signified when he charged a defendant with being the son of a usurer and ordered his execution. The defendant protested "What does my father's crime have to do with me?" to which Khalkhali replied "Usury is *haram* [sin] and so is the seed of usury. Kill him! Next" (The Independent, 2003).

Khalkhali's reign of terror against the Iranian people served as a stark warning to those who did not comply with the new rules and regulations governing the Islamic Republic. His savagery, which was put on display by the authorities, was meant to strike fear and horror into Iran's society in order to ultimately subject them to Khomeini's Islamic State; this exercise of terror against the population was derived straight from Khomeini's playbook. The hanging judge emphasised to the French daily newspaper *Le Figaro* in the year 2000, after it was pointed out to him that he could face the international courts of justice for his crimes, that "If I did anything wrong, Ayatollah Khomeini would have told me. I only ever did what he asked" (The Independent, 2003).

Khomeini needed more than just a "revolutionary" judge in order to enforce his ideals and ensure that dissent against theocratic rule was effectively crushed. In addition, he was eager to rapidly implement article 11 of the Constitution, which stipulates the export of his brand of Islamic revolution for the formation of a global Islamic state. This required a force indoctrinated with his religious and political beliefs that would operate loyally under his command.

To this end, in 1979 Khomeini formed *Sepah Pasdaran Enghelabe Eslami*, Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, an ideological force which operates independently of the regular armed forces, consisting of naval, air and ground troops. The Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) states in its articles of association that it is "an institution commanded by the Supreme Leader and aims to guard the Islamic revolution of Iran and its achievements and continuously strives to achieve the divine ideals and expand the sovereignty of God's law according to the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran...".[9]

In order to complete these objectives, the IRGC's paramilitary unit of volunteers, *Sazman-e Basij-e Mostazafin* (Organisation for Mobilisation of the Oppressed), or *Basij*, serves as an instrument to violently and brutally repress those who rise up against Khomeinism at home; abroad, the IRGC relies on the *Qods* (Jerusalem) Force, its paramilitary arm, which has developed throughout the years into a formidable force and is responsible for exporting the Islamic Revolution and facilitating terrorist activities, including the formation of pro-Iranian terrorist groups in the Middle East and elsewhere across the globe.

5 Khomeini's Culture of Martyrdom-Seeking Ushered Terrorism into a New Era

Terrorism was ushered into a new era following the establishment of the Islamic Republic in 1979, marking a shift from political terrorism—until then mainly utilised by extremists on the left and right and members of various nationalist groups—to religious terrorism which would in subsequent years demonstrate, through suicide bombings, its pure contempt for human life due to its indiscriminate and disproportionately violent nature.

The Khomeini regime played a pivotal role in developing religious terrorism by institutionalising a culture of martyrdom using religious symbolism, which was effectively utilised during the Iran–Iraq war in the 1980s. The Ayatollahs deceitfully framed the war as the embodiment of the Battle of Karbala which reportedly transpired on 10 October 680 in present-day Iraq between the grandson of the Prophet Mohammad, Hossein ibn Ali, and the Umayyad caliph, Yazid I (Kennedy, 2015, p. 77).

Hossein and his party of 72 were ultimately slaughtered by Yazid's forces, and thus the Battle of Karbala became central to Shiism and is for this reason commemorated every year by Shia Muslims on *Ashura* (day of remembrance). According to the traditional Shia narrative, Hossein and his adherents were aware that they faced certain death on their way to Kufa (present-day Iraq) to challenge Yazid's tyranny in order to ultimately restore justice for the people but that this inevitability did not stop them as they were resolute in paying the ultimate price for a noble cause.

---

[9]Constitution of the IRGC, http://rc.majlis.ir/fa/law/show/90595 (18-08-2016).

Khomeini disclosed the significance of the *Ashura* commemorations for his culture of martyrdom by emphasising that:

> These mourning sessions [*Ashura* commemorations] have developed young men and youths who voluntarily go to the war fronts seeking martyrdom and feel unhappy if they don't achieve it. These Ashura mourning gatherings develop such mothers who urge their sons to go to the war fronts and if they do not return, the mothers wish they had more sons to send or say we have other sons to send to the war fronts. (Davis, 2004, p. 49)

Moreover, as fear of death served as a potential barrier to his fundamentalist agenda, Khomeini reminded Iran's population: "Seeing that a cruel ruler is over the people, his holiness [Hossein ibn Ali] clearly stated one must rise and oppose that and halt the infliction of cruelty alone, if he must, or with many like-minded men, even if it means fighting a multitude, an army" (Davis, 2004, p. 52). Khomeini undeniably exploited the story of the Prophet's grandson on various occasions and cunningly managed to utilise the spirit that Iran's predominantly Shia population cherished toward Hossein in order to effectively engineer a culture of martyrdom within a religious context for the purpose of pursuing his nihilistic objectives.

The Ayatollah did not waste any opportunity to promote and glorify his doctrine of death and destruction and used radio, television, media outlets and sermons during Friday prayers as a platform to disseminate his fanatical mind-set. During a meeting with women in Ahvaz, Khomeini underscored that: "As you can see, our youth want to die as martyrs. Today, when I was standing here, a young man shouted: 'please, pray to God that I should become a martyr'" (Surdykowska, 2012, p. 107).

On 13 October 1983, during his sermon at the Friday prayers in Tehran Khomeini stated: "O Creator. Cause us to be among the people of Karbala" (Mitchell, 2012, p. 59), specifying that every extra day spent on this world is one too many. In fact, Khomeini revealed how achieving martyrdom is in itself an objective that needs to be actively pursued and glorified by the Muslim community when he stated that martyrdom: "for the cause of God was... the ultimate perfection a human being could attain" (Mitchell, 2012, p. 59).

Mohammad Hossein Fahmideh, the 13-year-old boy from *Qom* who blew himself up under an Iraqi tank in order to prevent enemy troops from advancing in the city of Khorramshahr, serves as the personification of Khomeini's culture of martyrdom. Subsequent to Fahmideh's deed, Khomeini glorified his act by stating that: "Our leader is that 12-year old child who with his small heart, far greater than hundreds of our tongues and pens, threw himself under the enemy's tank with a grenade in hand and destroyed it, and thus drank the nectar of martyrdom" (IRDC, n.d.).

Determined to take advantage of Fahmideh's death in every respect, the Iranian regime dubbed the date of his death as "the day of student *Basij*", an occasion used to persuade other children to follow in Fahmideh's footsteps. Thousands of new members, many of them children as young as 12, were subsequently recruited for the IRGC's paramilitary unit of volunteers (*Basij*) in order to replicate Mohammad Hossein Fahmideh's suicide assault against Iraqi troops. Poorly trained and ill-equipped *Basijis*, who were completely indoctrinated by Khomeini's culture of

martyrdom, were marched to their deaths on a collective suicide mission, clearing minefields and serving as cannon fodder in order to enable the more experienced and fanatical IRGC to advance against Iraqi forces.

These children were brainwashed by the clerical establishment and were effectively convinced that they were sinners who would only find redemption once they signed up for suicidal missions and ultimately achieved martyrdom in order to be granted access to paradise. Mehrdad Azizollahi's video testimony, a 14-year-old who joined the suicide brigades and ultimately lost his life, affirms this shocking reality. In an excerpt of an interview he said:

> In the name of God, the all beneficent, the all merciful. My Lord! Open my breast for me, and make my affair easy for me, and remove the hitch from my tongue [so that] they may understand my discourse. With my salute to the Imam of the Epoch [Imam Mahdi] and to his rightful lieutenant—the beating heart of the downtrodden peoples of the world, Imam Khomeini as well as the martyrs of the path of justice and truth, and the wounded and maimed. My name is Mehrdad Azizollahi, dispatched from Isfahan. I am 14 years old. **What motivated me to come to the war zone were the stories of those brothers who had been here before me.** When they would come and describe it to me, they would talk of all the good qualities the front lines have, that whoever goes becomes constructed in every respect and that all one's impurities, and sins, and transgressions become extinguished. **I came to the front, so that perhaps I could help in the path of God, and for my sins to become erased**... (Shia Institute, 2014)

The *Basijis* who engaged in these suicide assaults wore red and yellow headbands displaying slogans in praise of *Allah* (God) and Khomeini. Their readiness to die on their quest for martyrdom terrified the Iraqi troops who witnessed waves of children triggering landmines as they walked across the field or attempting to reach the Iraqi lines in order to blow themselves up. An Iraqi officer describes in detail the effects of the suicide assaults on him and his men:

> They chant 'Allahu Akbar' and they keep coming, and we keep shooting, sweeping our 50 millimetre machine guns around like sickles. **My men are eighteen, nineteen, just a few years older than these kids. I've seen them crying**, and at times the officers have had to kick them back to their guns. Once we had Iranian kids on bikes cycling toward us, and my men all started laughing, and then these kids started lobbing their hand grenades and we stopped laughing and started shooting. (Karsh, 2009, p. 202)

The suicide attacks became an essential component of Iran's strategy against Iraq during the war, given the latter's vastly superior military arsenal. Thus, Khomeini's Ministry of Education was trusted with the imperative task of indoctrinating and forcefully recruiting children in order to ensure that the flow of these "disposable soldiers", as then commander of the IRGC Mohsen Rezai dubbed them, was not disrupted (Tuscaloosa News, 1988). Quotas were enforced at schools across Iran, coercing each high school to provide 40 students and 10 teachers for Khomeini's war effort (Tuscaloosa News, 1988).

The current Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic, Ali Khamenei, remarked that children were recruited for glorious martyrdom and deviously stated that "the youngsters cry and beg to be sent to the front lines" (Tuscaloosa News, 1988). As

Khomeini's culture of martyrdom proved to be successful in stimulating suicide assaults at the battlefront, the Iranian regime exported this lethal prototype beyond Iran's territorial borders, fully equipping its terrorist proxies abroad with a fundamentalist ideology and enabling them to carry out suicide bombings against targets deemed to form a threat to Khomeini's brand of Islamic revolution.

The Iranian-backed Iraqi Shia Islamist group, *Hizb al-Da'wa al-Islāmiyya*, was Tehran's first terrorist proxy that successfully conducted the first massive suicide bomb attack in contemporary history on 15 December 1981 in Beirut, targeting the Iraqi embassy. The suicide bomber drove a car loaded with approximately 100 kg of explosives in to the embassy building, killing 66 people, including Iraq's ambassador to Lebanon. The bombing bore all the hallmarks of Khomeini's culture of martyrdom, as the terrorist deliberately died while perpetrating the attack, furthermore echoing the modus operandi of the suicide assaults conducted by the *Basijis* at the frontlines. Importantly, the suicide bomb attack against the Iraqi embassy in Beirut set the precedent for religious terrorism and inspired subsequent suicide bombings with the objective to kill on a mass scale by Iran's terrorist proxies in a similar fashion.

Among the deadliest suicide bombings were those conducted by the Lebanese *Hezbollah*, Tehran's main Shia terrorist proxy that was founded by Khomeini in 1982 and is responsible for exporting Khomeini's Islamic revolution in order to accomplish the formation of a global Islamic State. The most deadly suicide bombings by *Hezbollah* include the April 1983 suicide bomb attack against the US embassy in Beirut, killing 66 people; the October 1983 Beirut barracks bombings, during which two *Hezbollah* suicide terrorists separately targeted two buildings housing US and French military, killing 241 US servicemen and 58 French paratroopers; the 1992 suicide bomb attack against the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires, killing 23 people; and the 1994 suicide bomb attack targeting a Jewish community centre in Buenos Aires, killing 85 people. The sophisticated delivery mechanisms utilised in all of these lethal bombings were powerful suicide truck or car bombs.

6   Khomeini's Islamic Republic Is the Leading State Sponsor of Terrorism

Suicide bombings were not the only form of terrorism utilised by Khomeini's Islamic Republic. Following the revolution, the mullahs' regime immediately commenced a wave of global assassinations, starting with the killing of the 34-year-old nephew of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, Shahriar Shafiq, in December 1979 in Paris. As he was visiting his mother, Princess Ashraf Pahlavi, a masked gunman shot him point-blank in the head. Ayatollah Khalkhali, who had sentenced all the members of the Pahlavi family to death in absentia, claimed responsibility for the attack by stating that it was carried out by a death squad of his *Fada'iyan-e Islam*, the Islamic fundamentalist group which he headed then (UPI, 1979). Khalkhali further chillingly remarked that "if we cannot arrest them, we will

assassinate them", exemplifying what was awaiting those who went into exile in the hope to escape the claws of the Islamic Republic (Robertson, 2012, p. 127).

True to its word, the Khomeinist regime began to utilise government ministries, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Intelligence and Security, in order to orchestrate and facilitate terrorist operations abroad. On 21 July 1980, David Theodore Belfield, a 29-year-old African-American who had converted to Islam and renamed himself Dawud Salahuddin, was at the Iran Interest Section of the Algerian Embassy in Washington, DC where he worked as a security guard, orchestrating his terrorist operation which he would carry out the next day on Khomeini's behalf. After acquiring and test-firing his Browning semi-automatic pistol, Salahuddin made his way on 22 July 1980 to Ali Akbar Tabatabi's home in Bethesda, Maryland. Tabatabai was a former press attaché at the Iranian Embassy in Washington who vehemently opposed Ayatollah Khomeini and founded the Iran Freedom Foundation in order to campaign for a secular democracy in his homeland. By pretending to be a mailman who carried two packages for Tabatabai, Dawud Salahuddin shot and killed him (The New Yorker, 2002).

After having accomplished his objective, Salahuddin immediately boarded a plane to Geneva, Switzerland, where he took refuge at the Iranian Consulate and ultimately travelled to Iran on 31 July 1980 where he lived ever since, effectively avoiding criminal prosecution in the United States for the assassination of Ali Akbar Tabatabai (The New Yorker, 2002). Moreover, Salahuddin was congratulated by Khomeini himself for successfully carrying out the operation (Robertson, 2012, p. 127). Meanwhile in Tehran, Ayatollah Khalkhali proved to be unstoppable as he further tried and sentenced to death in absentia General Gholam Ali Oveisi, a Shah loyalist, and Shapour Bakhtiar, the Shah's liberal-minded last prime minister, declaring that "any Iranian who kills one of these people in foreign countries is considered an agent executing a court order" (Robertson, 2012, p. 127).

On 7 February 1984, General Oveisi and his brother were subsequently assassinated as they were leaving the general's house in the 16th arrondissement of Paris when a gunman shot them both in the head (The New York Times, 08-02-1984). In July 1980, a failed attempt was made on Shapour Bakhtiar's life in the Parisian suburb of Neuilly-sur-Seine by Khomeini's hit squad comprising of five terrorists, including Anis Naccache, the former lieutenant of the Venezuelan terrorist Ilich Ramírez Sánchez (aka Carlos the Jackal), who was also in charge of the operation (The Wall Street Journal, 2015).

The failed terrorist attack resulted in the deaths of Shapour Bakhtiar's neighbour and a police officer. In 1982, Naccache and three other terrorists were convicted of murder and issued life sentences, while the fifth terrorist was to serve a 20-year sentence (The Wall Street Journal, 2015). Only Naccache attended his trial, as the other four did not recognise the court's legitimacy, during which he disclosed that the operation was set in motion by a decree of the Islamic Revolutionary Court in Tehran (PBS, 2011).

Following the convictions of Naccache and his Khomeinist death squad, the Iranian regime resorted to its chief and most effective weapon—terrorism—in order

to safeguard their immediate release. To this end, Paris was struck by various bomb attacks in 1985 and 1986, resulting in the deaths of 13 people and 255 injuries (PBS, 2011). The Iran affiliated Committee of Solidarity with Arab and Middle East Political Prisoners (CSPPA) claimed responsibility for the bombings and demanded the release of Anis Naccache and his fellow assassins (PBS, 2011).

French investigators would later discover that Wahid Gordji, a translator at the embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran, coordinated the CSPPA bombing campaign but were unable to arrest him as he was given refuge at the Iranian embassy in Paris (PBS, 2011). In July 1987, a diplomatic standoff ensued over the issues between Iran and France. On 29 November of that year, the government of Prime Minister Jacques Chirac ultimately allowed Wahid Gordji to return to Iran after the Lebanese *Hezbollah* released two French hostages who were kidnapped in Beirut during the spring of 1985 (Chicago Tribune, 1987).

The move drew condemnation from the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States as it set a dangerous precedent affecting other countries' attempts to recover their hostages. Chirac subsequently hinted that diplomatic relations with Iran, which were severed in July 1987, could be restored if the remaining French hostages were released by the Lebanese *Hezbollah* (Chicago Tribune, 1987). Additionally, in an attempt to appease the Ayatollahs, on 7 December 1987 the French government arrested 26 members of the *Mojahedin-e Khalq* (MEK), the Iranian opposition movement that campaigns against Khomeini's Islamic Republic, declaring that they formed a threat to public security (Chicago Tribune, 1987). Seventeen of these detained MEK members were expelled to Gabon despite the fact that all had French residence permits and the majority had obtained refugee status (Chicago Tribune, 1987). The French government ultimately honoured the demands of Tehran by pardoning Anis Naccache and his death squad in 1990, putting them on a plane back to Iran (BBC, 2002).

The Ayatollahs, emboldened by the weak French response to their terrorism campaign, were determined to send another hit squad to Paris in order to finish the job which Naccache and his men failed to carry out satisfactorily. Following the death of Khomeini in June 1989, the mullahs had formed a "Special Affairs Committee" headed by Ali Khamenei, the new Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic. The Committee, which most of the time met at the Turquoise Palace of the former Shah, comprised of Rafsanjani, president at the time; Mohammad Reyshahri, who was the minister of intelligence during the time of the 1988 massacre of political prisoners; Ali Fallahian, deputy and successor of Reyshahri; Mohsen Rezai, IRGC leader at the time; Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Velayati; the late notorious Ayatollah Khazali; and Ali Larijani, Speaker of the *Majles* (Robertson, 2012, pp. 125–126). During the meetings of the Special Affairs Committee, its members would discuss who to add to the hit list, and once the blessing of the Supreme Leader was given, they would determine which committee member would be responsible for carrying out the operation (Robertson, 2012, p. 126).

Ali Fallahian, the minister of intelligence, would be effectively directing all the death squads and terrorist operations abroad, and he would make sure to orchestrate them in such fashion that it would inflict maximum horror on the Iranian diaspora.

On 6 August 1991, Khomeini's agents struck again, this time successfully, when three terrorists under the command of *Vezarat-e Ettela'at va Amniyat-e Keshvar* (VEVAK), Ministry of Intelligence and Security, entered Shapour Bakhtiar's home which was supposedly protected by an around-the-clock security detail provided by the French government in the Parisian suburb of Suresnes.

The assassins strangled and stabbed the former prime minister and his secretary to death, using Bakhtiar's own kitchen knives, and subsequently left his property without any difficulties (France24, 2010). Two of the assassins involved in the killing, Ali Vakili Rad and Mohammad Azadi, were highly trained *Qods* Force operatives and had travelled from Iran to France on fake passports which were issued to them by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic (Robertson, 2012, p. 131). They rendezvoused prior to the murder in France with the third assassin, Farydoun Boyerahmadi (Rempel, 1994). Following the chilling assassination of Bakhtiar, Vakili Rad and Mohammad Azadi travelled to Geneva, Switzerland, where they split up and checked into separate hotels in order not to raise suspicion (Rempel, 1994).

The plan was to meet their diplomatic contacts outside the Iran Air offices who would subsequently board them on a plane back to Iran. Mohammad Azadi made it successfully to the appointment and was immediately moved back to Tehran, while Vakili Rad got lost and as a result arrived late at the meeting point (Rempel, 1994). As Vakili Rad was left wandering the banks of Lake Geneva, he was ultimately arrested by Swiss law enforcement and extradited to France where he was sentenced to life imprisonment (France24, 2010). The French investigation to Shapour Bakhtiar's assassination would ultimately lay bare the mullahs' worldwide intelligence and terrorism network that stretches from Europe to the United States, using its diplomatic embassies in order to facilitate its global terrorists to accomplish their objectives.

Between 1989 and 1996, the Special Affairs Committee assassinated more than 160 Iranian dissidents across the globe (Robertson, 2012). Among them were influential Iranian opposition figures such as Dr. Abdul-Rahman Ghassemlou, Secretary General of the Democratic Party of Iranian Kurdistan (PDKI), who was assassinated in 1989 in Vienna by emissaries of the Islamic Republic and Dr. Kazem Rajavi, who was assassinated in 1990 as he was driving to his home in Geneva when assassins sprayed his car with machine gun bullets and shot him from point-blank range.

Instead of prosecuting the suspects responsible for the murder of Ghassemlou, the Austrian authorities chose to appease the Iranian regime and allowed them to leave the country in return for a lucrative arms deal with Tehran (Robertson, 2012, p. 128). Furthermore, two of Dr. Kazem Rajavi's assassins were ultimately arrested in Paris but were not extradited to Switzerland for prosecution and instead put on a plane back to Tehran as the French government feared reprisals from Iran (Robertson, 2012, p. 130). This repulsive policy of appeasement by European countries toward a brutal religious dictatorship demonstrates to the Ayatollahs that they can assassinate their opponents abroad with impunity and encouraged them to carry on utilising terrorism on European soil.

The subsequent deadly terrorist attack on 17 September 1992 at the Mykonos Restaurant in Berlin, which was sanctioned by a written authorisation of Ali Khamenei himself and which specifically targeted PDKI leaders, affirms this.

7   The Iran–Al-Qaeda Connection

Cooperation between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Al-Qaeda dates back to the early 1990s, when operatives from both sides met on several occasions in Khartoum during the "Popular Arab and Islamic Conference". The conference was hosted by Sudanese political leader of the National Islamic Front, Hassan al Turabi, whose main impetus was to achieve Shia-Sunni reconciliation in order to generate one Islamic front to target the interests of the United States and its allies (The 9/11 Commission, 2004, p. 61) and was attended by various Islamist extremist groups, including the Lebanese *Hezbollah*. Osama Bin Laden, who was particularly moved by Imad Mughniyeh's work (the 1983 Beirut bombings mastermind), was poised to facilitate an environment for his operatives to acquire the necessary skills of simultaneously utilising powerful suicide truck bombs in future terrorist operations, similar to those that killed 241 US servicemen and 58 French paratroopers in Beirut.

Turabi's efforts proved to be productive, and Bin Laden's wishes were granted, as the initiative of the most notorious Islamist extremists assembly in Khartoum solidified an informal agreement between Al-Qaeda and Iran that ultimately enabled top Al-Qaeda operatives and trainers to travel to the Islamic Republic for training in high explosives (The 9/11 Commission, 2004, p. 61). In 1991, Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, then president of Iran, additionally pledged to deliver $300 million in weapons to Sudan, dubbing the country "the vanguard of the Islamic revolution in the African continent" and ultimately sent hundreds of IRGC–*Qods* Force operatives to the African state in order to provide training to members of Al-Qaeda (Vidino, 2006, p. 4).

Furthermore, in 1993, Al-Qaeda operatives travelled to Bekaa Valley in Lebanon in order to receive training in explosives and direct assistance from *Hezbollah*, setting the stage for the deadly 1998 suicide bombings targeting the US embassies in Dar es Salaam and Nairobi (Bates, 2011). Both bombings utilised trucks loaded with high explosives as a delivery mechanism and were carried out simultaneously, resulting in the deaths of 224 people. The attacks evidently demonstrated that training provided by the Islamic Republic and *Hezbollah* to Bin Laden's operatives was highly effective and that without the material aid and support from Tehran, Al-Qaeda would not have been able to effectively carry out its suicide operations in Africa.

The Iran–Al-Qaeda alliance would only intensify in subsequent years and ultimately generate one of the deadliest terrorist attacks on American soil in US history, when on 11 September 2001 nineteen Al-Qaeda operatives struck in New York City and Washington, DC, using passenger airliners and killing 2974 people. Iran's involvement was pivotal in materialising these deadly terrorist attacks which brought down the Twin Towers, damaged the Pentagon building and caused one

airliner to crash in Pennsylvania, as passengers courageously struggled with the hijackers and successfully prevented them from achieving their objectives.

Two defectors from the Iranian intelligence would later testify during a federal lawsuit in Manhattan that the Iranian regime had "foreknowledge of the 9/11 attacks" and one claimed that Tehran was involved in planning the operations (The New York Times, 2011). In December 2011, Judge George Daniels of the Southern District of New York, who oversaw the case, ultimately ruled that Iran's terrorist proxy Hezbollah and officials within the higher echelon of the Islamic Republic's establishment, including Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, former head of MOIS Ali Fallahian and deputy commander of the IRGC General Mohammad Baqir Dhu'll-Qader, had provided material and direct support to Al-Qaeda, enabling the terrorist group to carry out the 9/11 terrorist attacks (Asharq al-Awsat, 2016). In another lawsuit more recently in March 2016, Judge Daniels reaffirmed his ruling and elaborated that:

> The Islamic Republic of Iran provided material support or resources [...] to Al-Qaeda generally. Such material support or resources took the form of, inter alia, planning, funding, facilitation of the hijackers' travel and training, and logistics, and included the provision of services, money, lodging, training, expert advice or assistance, safe houses, false documentation or identification, and/or transportation. (Asharq al-Awsat, 2016)

Subsequent to the US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, Iran became a safe haven for senior Al-Qaeda leaders and its notorious operatives. Long before Judge Daniel's ruling, German intelligence had already comprehensively documented Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's activities and movements in Iran, the future chief of Al-Qaeda in Iraq, thereby revealing Iran's extensive support for Al-Qaeda. Those intelligence reports were ultimately leaked and in late 2005 published by the German magazine *Cicero*, disclosing how Al-Qaeda uses Iran as a base for its operations and revealing the Islamic Republic's commitment to the group's objectives.

According to this crucial dossier, al-Zarqawi spent months inside Iran where he re-established his terrorist network under the wings of the IRGC–*Qods* Force, using real Iranian passports with various aliases in order to be able to travel freely (Joscelyn, 2007, p. 62). Moreover, Al-Zarqawi was able to set up training camps and safe houses in the Iranian cities of Zahedan, Isfahan and Tehran where he and his adherents orchestrated future terrorist operations in Iraq, which would target civilians and coalition forces with unprecedented brutality (Joscelyn, 2007, p. 63).

The Iran–Al-Qaeda conundrum more recently surfaced in the media again after US intelligence agencies declassified 113 handwritten messages by Osama Bin Laden in which he revealed that Iran is "the chief pathway for our money, men, communiqué, and hostages" (Al Arabiya, 2016). This revelation defies previous statements of some analysts and officials within the intelligence community, who alleged that Iran does not support Al-Qaeda operatives on its own soil. Furthermore, Washington's recent revelation of a comprehensive Al-Qaeda terrorist network inside Iran, which is run by three senior members of the organisation who are in

charge of orchestrating operations, fundraising and facilitating the movement of money and operatives from South Asia and the Middle East, reaffirms Bin Laden's statement regarding the Islamic Republic's value to him and his men (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2016).

8   Conclusion

Ayatollah Khomeini, founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran, was not the quintessential clergyman who merely focused on dealing with issues concerning Islamic jurisprudence. Throughout the years, Khomeini has clearly shown his aspirations of establishing an Islamic State that would implement his brand of Islamic fundamentalism, which he believed to also be applicable universally. The Ayatollah proved to be eager in resorting to violence in order to achieve his objectives. His ruthlessness and brutality would come to define the Islamic Republic following the revolution of 1979. It is imperative to comprehend the origins of the current regime in Tehran and it's uncompromising and coldblooded nature that continues to fuel the terror apparatus to this day, in order to be able to espouse an effective counter strategy to confront the mullahs' policy of death and destruction. Some mainstream authors, who provided accounts regarding the rise of Khomeini to power, tend to ignore or downplay Khomeini's zealotry, which was evident in his early writings and eventually paved the way for the formation of Iran's first Islamic terrorist organisation that would effectively target Iranian intellectuals and opposition. These distorted narratives underpin a policy of conciliation and appeasement which has been embraced by the international community vis-à-vis the religious dictatorship in Iran for the past three decades. Given these experiences, Iran's theocracy has been heartened to maintain its sponsorship of terrorism beyond its territorial borders and facilitated the development of other terrorist organisations, effectively jeopardising global peace and security.

References

Abrahamian, E. (1993). *Khomeinism: Essays on the Islamic Republic*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Anderson, J. (1988, January 17). Children fight for Khomeini. *Tuscaloosa News*, p. 40.

Astier, H. (2002, July 25). Mystery lingers over French hostage saga. *BBC News*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/2150233.stm

Axworthy, M. (2013). *Revolutionary Iran. A history of the Islamic Republic*. London: Allen Lane.

Bakhtiar, H. (2015, August 9). Obama's sanctions gift to an assassin for Iran. *The Wall Street Journal*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from https://www.wsj.com/articles/obamas-sanctions-gift-to-an-assassin-for-iran-1439158939

Bates, J. D. (2011). *Civil Action No. 08-1361 (JDB)*. Washington, DC: United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

BBC. (2009). Religions—'Islam: Safavid Empire (1501–1722)'. Bbc.co.uk. N.p. (Web, February 12, 2017).

Behdad, S. (2004). Utopia of assassins: Navvab Safavi and the Fada'ian-e Eslam in prerevolutionary Iran. In R. Jahanbegloo (Ed.), *Iran: Between tradition and modernity*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Braude, J. (2016, March 17). New York federal judge finds Iran provided material support for 9/11 attacks. *Asharq Al-Awsat*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://english.aawsat.com/2016/03/article55348592/six-exclusive-documents-indict-iran-hezbollah-for-911-attacks

Constitution of the IRGC. Accessed August 18, 2016, from http://rc.majlis.ir/fa/law/show/90595

Coughlin, C. (2009). *Khomeini's ghost*. London: Pan Macmillan.

Darwish, A. (2003, November 29). Ayatollah Sadeq Khalkhali. *The Independent*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/ayatollah-sadeq-khalkhali-37544.html

Davis, J. (2004). *Martyrs: Innocence, vengeance, and despair in the Middle East*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Geist, D. (2011, August 6). "A darker horizon": The assassination of Shapour Bakhtiar. *PBS*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/tehranbureau/2011/08/a-darker-horizon-the-assassination-of-shapour-bakhtiar.html

Harmon, D. (2005). *Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini*. Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House.

Islamic Republic of Iran Constitution, General principles, Article 5. Accessed August 4, 2016, from http://www.iranonline.com/iran/iran-info/government/constitution-1.html

Islamic Republic of Iran Constitution, General principles, Article 11. Accessed August 4, 2016, from http://www.iranonline.com/iran/iran-info/government/constitution-1.html

Islamic Republic of Iran Constitution, The leader or leadership council, Article 110. Accessed August 4, 2016, from http://www.iranonline.com/iran/iran-info/government/constitution-8.html

Islamic Revolution Document Center. (n.d.). *The martyrdom of Mohammad Hossein Fahmideh, the 13-year old student*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://old.irdc.ir/en/calendar/387/default.aspx

Jacinto, L. (2010, May 19). Ali Vakili Rad: The perfect murder and an imperfect getaway. *France24*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://www.france24.com/en/20100518-ali-vakili-rad-perfect-murder-imperfect-getaway-shapour-bakhtiar

Jazayery, M. (1973). Ahmad Kasravi and the controversy over Persian poetry. 1. Kasravi's analysis of Persian poetry. *International Journal of Middle East Studies, 4*(2), 190–203.

Joscelyn, T. (2007). Iran's proxy war against America. *National Security Studies: The Claremont Institute*. Accessed September 28, 2016, from http://www.aina.org/reports/ipwaa.pdf#page=62

Karsh, E. (2009). Ahmed and Samir, Iranian boy soldiers. In R. O'Neill (Ed.), *I am Soldier: War stories from the ancient world to the 20th century*. Osprey Publishing.

Kennedy, H. (2015). *The prophet and the age of the caliphates: The Islamic near east from the sixth to the eleventh century* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Kepel, G. (2006). *Jihad: The trail of political Islam* (4th ed.). London: I.B. Tauris.

Khomeini, R. (1970). *Governance of the Jurist (Velayat-e Faqeeh): Islamic Government*. Tehran: The Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works (International Affairs Division).

Khomeini: From Ataturk avenue to the Holy City of Najaf. *Asharq Al-Awsat*, 2009, February 27. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://english.aawsat.com/2009/02/article55255802/khomeini-from-ataturk-avenue-to-the-holy-city-of-najaf

Kia, C. (2014). The scum of Tabriz: Ahmad Kasravi and the impulse to reform islam. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, 41*(4), 498–516.

Lakzayi, S. (2012, April 9). The conflict between constitutional scholars on "the freedom of speech". *Parsine*. Accessed February 12, 2017, from http://www.parsine.com/fa/news/60254/%D8%AC%D8%AF%D8%A7%D9%84-%D8%A8%DB%8C%D9%86-%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%85%D8%A7%DB%8C-%D8%AF%D9%88%D8%B1%D9%87%D9%94-%D9%85%D8%B4%D8%B1%D9%88%D8%B7%D9%87-%D8%A8%D8%B1-%D8%B3%D8%B1-%D8%A2%D8%B2%D8%A7%D8%AF%DB%8C-%D8%A8%DB%8C%D8%A7%D9%86-%D9%88-%D9%82%D9%84%D9%85

Letter of Ayatollah Khomeini; "Read and act upon it". *BBC Farsi*, 2012, March 11. Accessed July 23, 2016, from http://www.bbc.com/persian/iran/2012/03/120311_l44_kasravi_khomeini_letter.shtml

Message from Bin Laden's son exposes "Iran's revival of al-Qaeda". *Al Arabiya*, 2016, July 26. Accessed February 13, 2017, from https://english.alarabiya.net/en/perspective/analysis/2016/07/26/Message-from-Bin-Laden-s-son-exposes-Iran-s-attempt-to-revive-al-Qaeda-.html

Mitchell, J. (2012). *Promoting peace, inciting violence: The role of religion and media*. New York: Routledge.

Mohaddessin, M. (1993). *Islamic fundamentalism. The new global threat*. Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. (2004). *The 9/11 Commission report*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Norouzi, E., & Norouzi, A. (2011, January 13). Iran's decade of assassinations: 1946–1955. *The Mossadegh Project*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://www.mohammadmossadegh.com/news/irans-decade-of-assassinations/

Nundy, J. (1987, December 13). Iran dealings label France a paper tiger. *Chicago Tribune*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1987-12-13/news/8704020484_1_french-hostages-wahid-gordji-le-monde

Parvin, N. (2006, July 20). Ahmad Kasravi. *BBC Farsi*. Accessed February 12, 2017, from http://www.bbc.com/persian/worldnews/story/2006/07/060720_mv-constitution-prvn-kasravi.shtml

Rempel, W. (1994, November 3). Web of Iranian spies, assassins revealed. *Rempel Stories*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://williamrempel.com/iranian-secret-agents/

Robertson, G. (2012). *Mullahs without mercy: Human rights and nuclear weapons*. Croydon: CPI Group.

Savory, R. (2003). Relations between the Safavid State and its Non-Muslim Minorities 1. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, 14*(4), 435–458.

Shevlin, N. (1998). Velayat-e Faqih in the constitution of Iran: The implementation of theocracy. Journal of Constitutional Law, *1*, 358–382.

Shia Institute. (2014, January 13). *Interview with Shahid Mehrdad Azizollahi; Child soldier during Iran-Iraq War*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o3tHYGB7MVA&list=PLI467ySwObOp34WxxLWtorsmRh1c0YtQF

Silverman, I. (2002, August 5). An American terrorist. *The New Yorker*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2002/08/05/an-american-terrorist

Surdykowska, S. (2012). *Martyrdom and ecstasy: Emotion training in Iranian culture*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

The George Washington University. (2000). *The secret CIA history of the Iran coup, 1953*. Washington, DC: The National Security Archive.

U.S. Department of the Treasury. (2016). *Treasury designates three senior Al-Qaida members*. Washington, DC: Press Center. Accessed February 13, 2017, from https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Pages/jl0523.aspx

UPI. (1979, December 8). Shah's nephew assassinated by "death squad". *Middlesboro Daily News*, p. 1.

Vidino, L. (2006, Fall). The arrival of Islamic fundamentalism in Sudan. Al Nakhlah, 53–66.

Vinocur, J. (1984, February 8). Exiled Iranian general is killed with brother by gunmen in Paris. *The New York times*. Accessed May 4, 2017, from http://www.nytimes.com/1984/02/08/world/exiled-iranian-general-is-killed-with-brother-by-gunmen-in-paris.html

Weiser, B., & Shane, S. (2011, May 19). Court filings assert Iran had link to 9/11 attacks. *The New York Times*. Accessed February 13, 2017, from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/20/world/middleeast/20terror.html?_r=2

Evolution and Rise of Contemporary Jihadism: From the Muslim Brotherhood to IS

Daniel Brett

1 Introduction

From a notion of Muslim exceptionalism and the rejection of outside influence, particularly in the form of European imperialism, Islamism evolved various strains. Although the restoration of the caliphate is the goal of pan-Islamic ideologues, the Islamic State (IS) group is the result of evolution of thought within jihadist circles. In terms of ideology, it pursues an understanding of three basic concepts to their extreme conclusion: takfir, jihad and hijra.

Invoking takfir is a declaration that someone has left Islam, a process that traditionally required a high standard of proof but evolved into a political objection to rulers and morphed into an ideology of genocide. Jihad has been a central concept in Islam, primarily concerned with the inner spiritual struggle but also in defending Muslims through armed conflict against aggressors, a theme that jihadists have used to justify their political violence. Hijra references Muhammad's migration from Mecca, where the first Muslims were in conflict with the local community, to Medina, where they were welcomed. In the jihadist context, this has come to mean fleeing the un-Islamic world for the purposes of jihad. In the context of IS, the three concepts enable the jihadists to determine who is a Muslim, the goal of jihad and the call to all righteous Muslims to obey the call of jihad in defence of the caliphate.

The development of these concepts and their application is the product of debate within jihadism, and political Islamism generally, as it addresses challenges and opportunities to advance the caliphate. The cycle of co-option of Islamists and aspects of their agenda when they are politically expedient and violent repression when they seek to assert their beliefs have resulted in two main outcomes. Firstly, co-optation—particularly when non-Islamist political currents remain marginalised and persecuted—has worked to legitimise the Islamist

D. Brett (✉)
Royal Asiatic Society (RAS), London, UK
e-mail: danielbrettdotcom@gmail.com

narrative and bolstered popular mobilisation around the cause. Secondly, the repression that often follows has caused further antagonism between the Islamists and the established order out of which new strategies evolve and, in turn, inform ideology.

This has informed the strategic considerations and ideological thrust of modern political Islamism since its inception. In response to developments, the question of whether to focus on the near enemy (secular Arab government) or the far enemy (the USA and Israel) has been a long-standing ideological and strategic consideration. A similar debate concerns the treatment of Shi'ites and the whole issue of takfir, which is not universally accepted among jihadists. The reason why IS arose is related to how these questions were addressed over generations of evolution in jihadism and is the focus of this chapter.

2   Jihad: From Anti-Imperialism to Anti-Semitism

The Muslim Brotherhood emerged from a period of socio-economic crisis in Egypt, but came to inspire the full breadth of Sunni Islamist groups. Although its goal is the revival of the caliphate, the means by which it seeks to achieve this aim have been fluid, ranging from political engagement and electoralism to revolutionary violence and jihad.

The Muslim Brotherhood's ideology of Islamic revival was not new but part of a continuity of Islamic agitators who had influenced Egyptian society. Arguably the most influential on the emergence of political Islam in Egypt was Jamal al-Din al-Afghani, a Persian Islamic revivalist who had fuelled popular opposition against the Ottoman Viceroy Ismail Pasha. During his 8-year stay in Egypt, Al-Afghani developed his critique of European imperialism by aligning Islam with the political aspirations of Muslim groups who rejected European control. The end of the Ottoman Empire in 1924 spurred interest in the development of Islamic political ideologies, which became Al-Afghani's legacy in Egypt.

The Brotherhood's founder Hassan al-Banna grew up in a conservative, rural area of Egypt. In 1923 he moved to the capital Cairo where he witnessed what he regarded as a depraved materialistic existence with endemic gambling, prostitution and alcoholism, contrary to Islamic values and his own upbringing. He blamed this on the ideas of Egypt's secular liberation movement which he saw as harmful to the country's future. He also witnessed the stark contrast between the luxurious lifestyles of Europeans who dominated economic life, particularly in the Suez Canal zone, and the impoverished lives of the natives. Through personal experience, he saw the need to address these injustices through the lens of religious revival.

The Muslim Brotherhood was founded in 1928 in the town of Ismailia on the banks of the Suez Canal, where the British based their military operations and managed the Suez Canal. This was the meeting point of civilisations and a crux point in the functioning of the British Empire and the global economy. Yet, instead of ousting the British and taking control of this strategic asset for the benefit of his

compatriots, Al-Banna advanced an ideology that looked to premodernity and took the internationalist and universalist outlook associated with Al-Afghani to start a mass movement. This movement rejected the secular nationalism associated with Ataturk, which Al-Banna saw as a malign influence within Egyptian society, particularly associated with the creation of secular universities.

Rather than seek to advance personal religious piety, as many Islamic scholars had taught, Al-Banna sought to inspire Islamic reform through social movements under a singular religious leadership with a view to the restitution of the caliphate, which had been defeated by European militaries and Turkish secular nationalism. Al-Banna's work focused on education and institution building, which he believed would lead to the triumph of Islam over supposedly corrupt Western values. Yet, it was also more than simply re-establishing a transnational government, as the Brotherhood recognised the failures of Ottoman Islamism which subjugated its Arab provinces. Moreover, like Al-Afghani, Al-Banna sought to utilise the achievements of European civilisation in science, governance and economics to advance the Islamic project (Euben & Zaman, 2009, pp. 49–78).

The Muslim Brotherhood was not founded to fight for political emancipation nor was it concerned specifically with alleviation of material suffering, even as it carried out social welfare and education programmes among the poor. Instead, it offered a narrative that compelled followers to abide by Islam in this world for emancipation in the afterlife. In his *Letter to a Muslim Student*, Al-Banna wrote not merely that the material life was irrelevant but that its attractions were innately un-Islamic:

> In the delights of life and pleasures of the world, you will see that which inclines the heart, impresses the mind, attracts the eye and bewilders those whose spirits are weak. Do not let these seduce you away from virtue and cause you to forget the Hereafter [. . .] Be aware my dearest brother that in the sight of Allah (swt) all these pleasures weigh not even the wing of a gnat and lead neither to honor nor virtue. They are nothing but the manifestations of whims and pitfalls of seduction. So be careful not to let Satan deceive you, otherwise you will plunge into the abyss of sin and corruption [. . .]. (Al-Banna, 1995)

Corruption and sinfulness are therefore not simply linked to political injustice or oppression but spiritual alienation from Islam. Moreover, there is the explicit threat that playing a part in the material world, estranged from Islamic values, would entail eternal damnation. Islamisation of Muslim society, Al-Banna felt, would naturally lead to the evolution of a caliphate.

Al-Banna spoke of the individual's spiritual life was linked with a civilisational struggle and enjoined his followers to reject all that is non-Islamic:

> All pleasures brought by contemporary civilization will result in nothing other than pain. A pain that will overwhelm their enticement and remove their sweetness. So avoid the worldly aspects of these people; do not let it take over your command and deceive you, if you are to be among the successors. (Al-Banna, 1995)

Like universalist ideologies of liberalism and communism, he set about developing a grand narrative to build a global Islamic order and the mindset to achieve this. For him, it was not enough just to build a single government in the Islamic world to supplant Western colonialism, but it was necessary to return to the Islamic values of the first four caliphs of the seventh century with jurisprudence based on shariah. To achieve this, he saw the obligation of jihad as fundamental and sought to involve the Brotherhood in attacking all those who transgressed Islamic values, a proto-takfiri attitude.

It was the Brotherhood's encounter with the Palestinian movement that led to its direct involvement in waging jihad against the "far enemy". Palestinian nationalism was not its concern since the Muslim Brotherhood did not recognise nations. It was merely a vehicle of struggle. In 1936, the Brotherhood conducted propaganda campaigns on behalf of the mufti of Jerusalem during the Palestinian revolt with some members joining attacks on Jewish settlements. As mufti, Amin al-Husseini received funds and was said to sympathise with Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. This ideological convergence would, in turn, expand Islamic jihad from Islamic anti-imperialism to encompass specifically anti-Jewish objectives. This development would inform the Muslim Brotherhood's ideology as it developed its political strategy and widen the movement into Jordan, Syria, Sudan and beyond.

Anti-semitism, paramilitarism and authoritarianism along with his support for the mufti brought Al-Banna close to the Nazis, a move that would put the Muslim Brotherhood on a more overtly political and revolutionary path. The Brotherhood's relationship with Palestinian cause as part of its drive towards creating a pan-Islamic State invoked notions of an "end times" conflict between Muslims and Jews. This was later enshrined in the Hamas Covenant, which exhorts followers to kill Jews (Article 7) and defines itself as "the spearhead and the vanguard of the circle of struggle against World Zionism [. . .] Islamic groups all over the Arab world should also do the same, since they are best equipped for their future role in the fight against the warmongering Jews" (Article 32).

During the Second World War, Al-Banna's association with Axis powers put him in conflict with the pro-British authorities who banished him from Cairo, an event that prompted Al-Banna to add the clandestine "Special Apparatus" paramilitary wing to the Brotherhood. This built on the paramilitary-style scout movement, the Jawwala (Rover Scouts), the Muslim Brotherhood had created in the mid-1930s as the vanguard for Islamic revolution. By registering with the Egyptian National Boy Scout movement, the Jawwala survived the banning of paramilitary groups amid the clashes between the fascist-inspired Green Shirts and Blue Shirts associated with the Young Egypt and Wafd Parties. From among the Jawwala came the Kata'ib. (Battalions), which were the basis for the Special Apparatus that would form the group's nascent military structure, a model that future Islamist groups would expand into terrorist operations.

3   After Al-Banna: The Development of Takfir

A number of factors contributed to the exponential rise of the Brotherhood after the war: its development of welfare and education services at a time when living standards had been adversely affected by war; its involvement in the Palestinian cause; the decline of its main rival, the Wafd, due to wartime co-operation with the British; and Al-Banna's anti-communist stance drew the Brotherhood close to King Faruq and allowed considerable room for organisational development (Rubin, p. 40).

During the tumult of the post-war years, the Brotherhood became increasingly militant. From its early years, violence was meted out against Jews and Christians. Theatres and restaurants were attacked. Members assassinated bureaucrats, businessmen, intellectuals and politicians, including liberal monarchist Prime Minister Mahmud Fahmi al-Nuqrashi who had ordered the organisation be banned. In retaliation for al-Nuqrashi's murder in 1948, Al-Banna was assassinated some weeks later.

The Muslim Brotherhood also played a role in the 1952 coup against the monarchy, with the Special Apparatus membership including Anwar Sadat and, possibly, Gamal Abdel Nasser (Rubin, p. 41). Although the coup led to the banning of all political parties, the Brotherhood was allowed to continue as an organisation; it was outlawed from 1954 to 2011. However, the relationship between the new regime and the Brotherhood became strained as each had a different vision of Egypt.

Sadat convinced Al-Banna to bring together the secular Free Officers Association, which had the military might to stage a coup, and the Muslim Brotherhood, which had the grassroots mobilisation to legitimise the takeover. A military coup would be more decisive in achieving the goal of Egyptian self-rule. Following the coup, the Muslim Brotherhood was offered a ministerial post dedicated to religious endowments and the post of mufti of Egypt. However, Al-Banna soon realised that the Nasser regime, which was led by the secular Muslim and Coptic-dominated Free Officers, was an obstacle to the goal of creating an Islamic State. The Brotherhood then set about destabilising the regime with the tacit support of the British, with whom they had common ground in opposing Nasser.

The Brotherhood insisted on the implementation of shariah and the development of an Islamic State, which the Nasser regime refused to accept. Having been militarised and politicised by its experience in Palestine and subjected to persecution under the monarchy, the Muslim Brotherhood was not inclined to compromise with those who exploited its mass movement only to betray its ideals. Consequently, the organisation turned against the government, demanding a return to civilian rule. It attempted to assassinate Nasser in 1954, which boosted the ruler's popularity and justified his ensuing brutal repression of the organisation.

One imprisoned senior member, Sayyid Qutb, began writing influential tracts that built on Al-Banna's Islamist vision, giving it a more radical twist that would become the ideological basis for future jihadist groups. He was influenced by the works of Indian Islamist Maulana Abul A'la Maududi, the founder of the Jamaat-e-Islami,

who saw the Muslim world as existing in a state of jahiliyya.[1] Yet, whereas Maududi sought to work within the system and use legal means to advance Islamic revival, Qutb believed anything other than shariah amounted to apostasy.

From his cell, Qutb wrote the highly influential work *Milestones*, which elaborated on the concept of jahiliyya in the modern world. Qutb stated:

> Anyone who serves someone other than Allah in this sense is outside Allah's religion, although he may claim to profess this religion. The Prophet T clearly stated that, according to the *Shariáh*, 'to obey' is 'to worship'. Taking this meaning of worship, when the Jews and Christians 'disobeyed' Allah, they became like those who 'associate others with Allah'. (Qutb, 2006, p. 69)

A Muslim has to submit to al-hakimiyya[2] and reject all worldly authority, including "residual influences in his mind and in the minds of those around him" in a jihad that "continues until the Day of Resurrection". Anything other than submission to al-hakimiyya is rejection of Allah and jahiliyya. The seeds of takfiri thought were set out clearly:

> The people ought to know that Islam means to accept the creed "*La ilaha illa Allah*" in its deepest sense, which is this: that every aspect of life should be under the sovereignty of Allah, and those who rebel against Allah's sovereignty and usurp it for themselves should be opposed; that this belief should be accepted by their hearts and minds and should be applied in their ways of living and in their practices. (Qutb, 2006, p. 48)

Qutb's writings were revolutionary in that they rejected all worldly political authority and compelled Muslims to challenge the ignorance and idolatry of modern civilisation through jihad. Although Al-Banna and Maududi had also advocated jihad and shariah, this was conditioned by pragmatism and the desire to instil Islamic values in civic organisation with a view to the natural evolution towards a caliphate. Al-Banna was more willing to fight colonial authorities than the Egyptian state. On the other hand, Qutb called for a war against corruption in the Muslim world.

Qutb's ideas—Qutbism—found favour among the Brotherhood members who felt betrayed by Nasser and found themselves brutally persecuted. A gradualist approach was no longer satisfactory while secular civilian authorities thwarted their ambitions, even when their organisation was conducted peacefully in the civic space. With the Egyptian state little different from the British proxy, the angry and despairing followers of the post-Al-Banna Brotherhood turned to more violent means against post-colonial secular Arab governments.

While Qutbism was controversial within the Brotherhood and many senior leaders and traditional members criticised the new creed, it gained popularity not just within Egypt but across the Muslim world. The Egyptian authorities responded with another round of brutal persecution in 1965, alleging that the Brotherhood was

---

[1]The state of ignorance of Allah.

[2]Total sovereignty of Allah.

planning a coup. They rearrested Qutb, who had been released the previous year, subjected him to a show trial and executed him in 1966. This merely added to his popularity as a martyr and confirmed the sense of victimhood that Qutb played on in *Milestones*.

Meanwhile, the dispersal of the Brotherhood to neighbouring Saudi Arabia due to Nasser's persecution, where its intellectuals became embedded within the Saudi education system, infused the movement with Wahhabi ideology. The cross-fertilisation between Wahhabi fanaticism and the Muslim Brotherhood's political engagement set the stage for a more violent form of jihadism.

4   The Islamic Revival

The turn towards Islamic radicalism in the Muslim Brotherhood converged with a new set of political realities. Egypt was humiliated in the 1967 Six-Day War in which it lost the Sinai Peninsula, while the Suez Canal—an important revenue earner for the regime—was blocked. The Nasser regime's defeat was followed by its leader's death in 1970. Shortly thereafter, Anwar Sadat came to power with a pledge to introduce shariah. His leaning towards Islamism was a means by which he sought to consolidate power, similar to the Nasser's and Sadat's strategy to co-opt the Muslim Brotherhood during the 1952 coup to bolster the Free Officers.

Sadat launched a war with Israel in 1973 to regain the Suez Canal to restore the legitimacy and revenues Nasser lost in 1967. Although the Yom Kippur War was ultimately a stalemate with both sides winning and losing territory along the Suez Canal, Sadat was able to restore some national pride and confidence in the regime. Sadat freed Muslim Brotherhood prisoners and, as part of a policy of infitah (openness), in 1976 political parties were free to operate in a limited move towards political liberalisation. His abandonment of Nasserism was accompanied by Egypt's move from Soviet to US patronage.

However, the Islamist movement was turning into a very different beast compared to the one led by Al-Banna. Unfettered by state repression, embittered by their experience under Nasser and enthused by Qutb, the 1970s was a time when a new generation of radicals emerged, interpreting and imposing the takfiri ideology of Qutbism. The Gama'at Islamiyya (Islamic groups) was organised on university campuses, actively enforcing shariah on campus and purging universities of their secular and left-wing student associations. Although university authorities protested, there was no action by Sadat's regime as the Gama'at was removing a potential source of organised opposition.

As in the 1950s under Nasser, Sadat was to abandon his Islamist pretence and engage in US-brokered talks with Menachem Begin in which both would determine the boundaries of Palestinian autonomy and coexistence with Israel as well as peace between Egypt and the Jewish state with the return of the Sinai Peninsula to Egypt. The Palestinians were excluded from the talks, and the agreements did not settle the issue of Jerusalem or the return of refugees. Arab governments almost completely condemned the Accords, prompting Egypt's 10-year expulsion from the Arab

League. For the Islamists and for many Egyptians who had been fed a diet of anti-Israel, anti-Jewish propaganda, Sadat's rapprochement with Israel was treasonous and his address to the Israeli Knesset was reviled. Sadat's popularity plummeted, and, like his predecessor in the 1960s, he resorted to massive and indiscriminate repression of both Islamists and leftists.

The repression led to a new stage of Islamic radicalisation that would lead directly to the eventual formation of Al-Qaeda. A new and even more radical ideologue emerged in the form of Muhammad Faraj, who filled the vacuum left by Jama'et al.-Muslimin with Tanzim al-Jihad, also known as the Egyptian Islamic Jihad (EIJ). Embracing the concept of takfir, the EIJ determined that Sadat was no longer a believer and was, rather, a new pharaoh.

Faraj published *Al-Farida Al-Ghaiba* (The Absent Obligation), referring to jihad, which would become the manual for the takfiri jihad movement, ultimately inspiring Al-Qaeda. Taking Qutb's ideas to the next level, Faraj insisted that jihad was the sixth pillar of Islam, alongside the profession of faith, prayer, paying alms, fasting and pilgrimage. He wrote: "establishing the Islamic State is obligatory upon them [Muslims] . . . if the state can only be established by fighting, then it is compulsory on us to fight". The battlefield of jihad was all around the true Muslim, not just in Jerusalem. Faraj wrote: "Fighting the enemy that is near to us comes before that which is far" (Faraj, 2000, p. 50). The enemy is defined as those who do not rule by shariah and as such Egypt was described as Dar-al Harb—in a state of war with Islam.

The EIJ merged with Gama'at Islamiyya whose amir, the Al-Azhar graduate Sheikh Omar Abdel-Rahman, became its spiritual guide. Abdel-Rahman issued a fatwa endorsing Sadat's assassination in 1981, which was carried out by an EIJ militant. The assassination did not lead to the mass uprising EIJ had hoped but rather to imprisonment and execution of the EIJ leadership. Among the members who were arrested in the ensuing government crackdown was Ayman Zawahiri, a physician who successfully appealed against his sentence and was set free. Like most mid-ranking members of the EIJ, Zawahiri fled to Pakistan and Afghanistan where the group was reconstituted, further radicalised and brought under his authoritarian leadership to conduct massacres.

5   The Causes and Legacy of the Great Mosque Siege

Zawahiri was only one part of a jihadist partnership that would later on form Al-Qaeda. Although the Muslim Brotherhood and Qutb's revolutionary thought played a role in the formation of Al-Qaeda's ideology, it was the reform movement in Nejd—Wahhabism—and the violent fanaticism that it inspired that forge the basis of Osama Bin Laden's ideology. Yet, Wahhabism would have remained confined to the Saudi desert if it had not been for an event often overlooked in the study of the evolution of contemporary jihadism: the 1979 Siege of Mecca.

At the turn of the new Islamic century, 1400, Bedouin tribesmen led by Juhayman al-Otaybi took control of the sacred focal point of Islam, the Kaaba,

and declared the coming of the Mahdi, the figure in Islamic eschatology who will redeem Islam. Such proclamations have been made by many figures through Islamic history, often for political purposes, but the Juhayman revolt was the most audacious. The event shook the Saudi monarchy and influenced its ideological approach towards religion, both within the Kingdom and abroad.

The revolt was rooted in the mid-eighteenth-century teachings of Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab, who sought to return the Bedouin to the pure faith of early Islam. Wahhab preached against the reversion to pre-Islamic pagan practices among many Bedouin, as well as the rejection of European cultural influences and the bidaa or heretical innovation of Islam that had accumulated over Islam's first millennium. Instead, Wahhab preached an austere lifestyle free of materialism. His ideas found favour among the simple Bedouin, giving them a sense of pride in their desert customs and lifestyle which were so reviled by urban Muslims. Wahhab also preached jihad against European influence and those within Islam, particularly Shia, who had abandoned the true religion. Moreover, Sunnis themselves could be regarded as infidels that were the legitimate targets for extermination, an idea that later informed the concept of takfir in Qutb's thought.

The combination of zeal among the Wahhabi clergy and the military prowess of the Al Saud laid the foundations of the Saudi state, although those foundations of tribal identity and religious puritanism have never been entirely stable and secure. Before the formation of the modern Saudi state, similar partnership had produced two previous Saudi states which were ultimately crushed.

In 1802, Saudi Wahhabis raided and plundered Karbala and massacred Shi'ites and before moving on to seize Mecca, where they imposed their austere religious interpretation before the Ottomans took back control and executed the Saudi tribal leader. It took another century before the Al Saud rose again, headed by Abdelaziz who took control of Riyadh in 1902 and extended his power over the Nejd.

In order to affirm social control, from 1911, Al Saud directed the Bedouin to join permanent settlements—hijras, reminiscent of Muhammad's hijra to Medina—through religious encouragement, financial incentives and coercion[3] (Steinberg, 2005). The hijras failed to thrive, largely due to the Bedouins' inability to farm. Instead, the Bedouin were largely used by Ibn Saud and the Wahhabi ulema as the military backbone to the emerging Saudi state. The Wahhabi transformed the Bedouin from an unreliable and scattered nomadic group into an efficient fighting force, based on the doctrines of hijra, takfir and jihad. The men of the hijras came together to form the Ikhwan, which became the emergent Saudi state's Praetorian Guard. The Ikhwan helped Abdelaziz control over much of the Arabian Peninsula through brutal terror but avoiding conflict with the British Empire and the countries it protected in the Gulf.

---

[3]Mohammad's hijra saw his abandonment of pagan Mecca to join the true Muslims of Medina. The use of the term gave religious justification for the Bedouin's abandonment of the ways of the desert to a "purer" Islamic way of life in permanent settlements. This appeared to contradict the resentment towards town folk among the nomads that Wahhab had used to enthuse religious fervour among the Bedouin.

When Abdelaziz ordered the end of jihad and refused to permit raids and slaughter of Shi'ites in the East, the royal family soon found themselves at odds with the Ikhwan. Having lost their earnings from plunder, the Wahhabi tribesmen resented the introduction of modern communications and transportation by European infidels (Vassiliev, 2000, p. 272). In the mid-1920s, they decided to resume their plunder with attacks on Iraq and Kuwait, which prompted retaliation from the British with the Royal Air Force (RAF) bombing their camps. The Saudi royal armies finished off the lightly armed Ikhwan with machine guns and left the hijras impoverished.

The presence of Americans following a deal between President Roosevelt and Abdelaziz antagonised the Wahhabi ulema. In the 1940s, the Wahhabi scholar Abd al-Aziz Bin Baz, who was to play a major role in the development of the Saudi jihadist mindset, issued a fatwa that it is "illicit to employ a non-Muslim servant, a non-Muslim driver, or a non-Muslim worker in the Arabian Gulf, for the Prophet . . . commanded all Jews and Christians be expelled, and that only Muslims remain" (Valentine, 2015, p. 160).

The statement prompted Abdelaziz to jail Bin Baz for opposing royal policies, suggesting that attacking the ruling family risked undermining the Islamic foundations of the Saudi state and providing opportunities for atheism, secularism and communism (Trofimov, 2007, p. 20). While Bin Baz never again issued public fatwas that contradicted the monarch's policies, the sentiment was keenly felt by Saudis brought up in the Wahhabi tradition, including Juhayman.

The subservience of Wahhabism to Saudi royalty, which controlled the two holy sites of Mecca and Medina, would be a recurring point of friction between the conservative tribes and the establishment. Yet, the interplay between royal politics and the Wahhabi ulema indicated the continuing power of the religious establishment. Indeed, Crown Prince Faisal utilised his power base within the ulema and the Sudairi Seven[4] to oust King Saud in 1964.

Prince Faisal sought to build his own power base among the Wahhabi ulema. On succeeding King Saud in 1964, King Faisal attempted to contain Wahhabism by positioning himself as a pan-Islamic ruler, even welcoming the Muslim Brotherhood into the Kingdom and providing them with jobs as scholars in the universities. In doing so, Faisal would situate himself as an opponent of Nasserite pan-Arabism, but also ensure the cross-fertilisation of Wahhabi and Muslim Brotherhood ideologies. He established the Muslim World League, a non-profit religious organisation based in Mecca, to counter pan-Arabism, socialism and communism and to promote Islamism. A largely apolitical organisation, it would focus on education, humanitarian aid and publishing to spread Wahhabi ideology throughout the Islamic world. In 1972, the Saudis established the World Assembly of Muslim Youth (WAMY), which directly confronted communism and pan-Arabism,

---

[4]The Sudairi Seven are the sons of King Abdulaziz and Hussa bint Ahmed Al Sudairi, a member of the Al Sudairis, a powerful Wahhabi clan in Nejd. The Sudairi Seven have controlled the security establishment, and two have been appointed king—Fahd (1982–2005) and Salman (2015).

distributing the works of Muslim Brotherhood ideologues such as Sayyid Qutb, laying the basis of what would become global jihadist movements (Commins, 2009, pp. 104–129). Yet, while adopting the ideology of pan-Islamism, Faisal confronted Wahhabi orthodoxy by banning slavery, permitting the education of women and introducing television. One of Faisal's nephews was killed when he led an armed attack on one of the new television stations in 1966 in a fundamentalist revolt against a medium which he regarded as breaching Islamic laws.

The rapid modernisation of Saudi Arabia, a country where illiteracy was high, required an influx of foreign workers, many of them non-Muslim. Yet, the contradiction between Faisal's professed Islamic credentials and the rapid changes in Saudi society prompted considerable unease. In the end, Faisal was assassinated by one of his nephews (the brother of the nephew who was killed in the uprising against television). Meanwhile, the prosperity generated by Saudi Arabia's oil boom was failing to reach the Bedouin settlements. These settlements were still a principle source of recruits to the National Guard, the successor of the Ikhwan and far more imbued with Wahhabi orthodoxy than the conventional military.

It was in the hijra of Sbala, the scene of the battle, that Juhayman would be born. The young Saudi grew up in a country that was fast transforming due to the establishment of the oil industry from 1938. And it was from among these National Guard recruits that Juhayman brought together the militants who would storm the Grand Mosque and hold out against the full military might of the Saudi armed forces.

Amid the country's modernisation, Saudi Islamism was split between pragmatists or Sahwa led by the Wahhabi elite and less numerous and lower-class rejectionists, among whom Juhayman gained his following. Juhayman rose to a senior position within the al-Jama'a al-Salafiyya al-Muhtasiba (JSM), whose spiritual guide or murshid was Bin Baz. Designed to counter the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood, the JSM was a proselytising organisation that sought to purify Wahhabism. Most of its members were young single Saudi men from marginalised and lower socio-economic backgrounds along with some followers of non-Saudi origin who also suffered discrimination (Hegghammer & Lacroix, 2007, p. 107).

JSM's puritanical ideology was similar to the Muslim Brotherhood: Islam had become corrupted by bidaa and needed to return to its austere origins. However, while it sought to remove all forms of idolatry in Medina—including smashing pictures and mirrors—it avoided the Muslim Brotherhood's revolutionary political narrative. The JSM's literalist interpretation, rooted in the works of Al-Albani, created an extreme form of conservatism. Ultimately, the group split in 1977 with the historical leaders leaving and a majority rallied around the hardline Juhayman, who became its leader; Bin Baz had already ceased being murshid by then. JSM members then began to refer to themselves as the Ikhwan, conjuring up the spirit of the Wahhabi tribesmen who had revolted against King Abdelaziz.

Shortly after Juhayman became leader, the group attracted the concern of the Saudi security forces who arrested many of the Ikhwan, while Juhayman found refuge in the desert where his tribal alliances were strong. From his desert refuge, he produced pamphlets and cassette tapes, and articles were published in the leftist

Kuwaiti newspaper *al-Talia*. In his letter "The State, Allegiance and Obedience", Juhayman accused the Saudi regime of "making religion a means to guarantee their worldly interests, putting an end to jihad, paying allegiance to the Christians (America) and bringing over Muslims evil and corruption" (Hegghammer & Lacroix, 2007, p. 111).

As the Al Saud were not descendants of Muhammad's tribe, any bayah (religious oath of allegiance to a leader) was invalid and obedience was therefore not obligatory. Juhayman saw that the Muslim Brotherhood followers who had sought refuge in Saudi Arabia were free to criticise the Egyptian regime, but the Saudi government was above criticism even as the gap between Islamic theory and Saudi reality grew (Trofimov, p. 30). However, he stopped short of pronouncing takfir on the Saudi rulers or the ulema.

Nevertheless, 25 leading members of the group were arrested on the orders of Interior Minister Prince Nayef, a full brother of Crown Prince Fahd. The movement may have been crushed then and there if it had not been for the intervention of Bin Baz, who insisted the men were pious Muslims and requested their release. Juhayman and his supporters regarded the release as vindication of their beliefs, both by the ulema and Allah. From then, Juhayman was able to shift up a gear in winning supporters while his men armed themselves for the revolutionary attempt to not merely take control of Saudi Arabia but sought to take leadership of the Islamic world.

Central to his ideology was the coming of the Mahdi, who he identified in his companion Mohammed al-Qahtani. According to Juhayman, Al-Qahtani had many of the attributes of the Mahdi: his appearance, name and familial lineage. The messianic turn under Juhayman led to another split, creating a unified core of around 300 dedicated militants, intent on seizing the Great Mosque. The Great Mosque siege began on 20 November 1979, marking the first day of a new Islamic century—1400. In accordance with tradition, the militants consecrated their Mahdi between the black stone corner of the Kaaba and Ibrahim's station of prayer. Thousands of hostages were taken and the militants held out for 2 weeks, utilising their knowledge acquired while serving in the National Guard to defend the mosque from the superior fire power of the Saudi military.

The siege had embarrassed the Saudi establishment and had prompted rumours fuelled by Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini of an Israeli or US occupation of Mecca, leading to riots in Pakistan and the storming of the US embassy. Coupled with a simultaneous and unrelated Shia uprising in the Eastern Province, the Saudi establishment felt weak and following failed attempts by the military to take back control of the Great Mosque. It resorted to utilising the services of French special forces, the Groupe d'Intervention de la Gendamerie Nationale (GIGN), which had been set up in the wake of the Munich Olympics Siege of 1972. The Siege ended in a bloodbath, Al-Qahtani was killed in the battle (proving that he could not be the Mahdi) and Juhayman was arrested and executed.

However, it required a specific fatwa from the ulema for Saudi forces to enter the Great Mosque, for armed conflict is forbidden in this sacred space. The Saudi rulers turned to Bin Baz for authorisation to use force against the radical Wahhabi group

that the cleric had founded. Rather than clamp down on the ideology that supported Juhayman, Bin Baz's intervention sought to affirm and institutionalise its religious fervour, minus the messianic message. This decision would have profound consequences on the development of jihadism.

In return for supporting armed action in the Great Mosque and continued acquiescence with the Saudi political establishment, Bin Baz sought a reversal of the liberalising efforts that had accompanied the economic development of Saudi Arabia. The Wahhabi ulema received a massive increase in funding for missionary organisations and religious universities. Women were removed from television broadcasts, and employment of women was severely restricted. The Committee to Promote Virtue and Prevent Vice was allowed to enter Western enclaves to enforce Islamic morality and implemented a crackdown on alcohol (Trofimov, pp. 241–242).

The Juhayman revolt itself was to have an impact on the evolution of Al-Qaeda ideology. While radical Islamists did not recognise the declaration of the Mahdi, there was sympathy for Juhayman's sincere piety. If a pious man, regardless of how misguided he may be, can be issued with a fatwa decreeing he could be killed in the Great Mosque, then jihadists concluded that by extension killing Americans was also permissible.

The House of Saud's reliance on Wahhabi clerics at a time when it faced an existential crisis merely fuelled the growth of radical jihadist ideology. Although Bin Baz and the elite Wahhabi clerics were discredited in the eyes of the jihadists, petrodollars flowed into Wahhabi outreach and advanced their ideology throughout the world. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan provided the perfect opportunity to focus domestic attention on the "far enemy" and away from the ruling elite.

6   Afghanistan and the Afghan Arabs

Immediately following the Great Mosque Siege, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in support of their puppet ruler Babrak Karmal. The country's deeply conservative hill tribes responded with violent reprisals, raising their own mujahidin to fight a holy war against the communists. It was in the cauldron of Afghanistan's conflict that the USA sought to regain the years of humiliation and declining influence brought about by Vietnam and the overthrow of the Shah of Iran. Under Ronald Reagan, the USA sought to establish simple a narrative of good and evil. Reagan's simple-mindedness and the notion of the messianic, God-given role of the USA had some similarity with the Wahhabi zeal that the Saudi elite was seeking to divert away from itself and onto foreign enemies.

While the Saudi Wahhabi elite saw an opportunity for religious colonialism, the USA saw an opportunity to sink the Soviets into a conflict that would drain its resources and resolve. Both achieved their ends; the Wahhabi involvement led to the creation of the Taliban, and Afghanistan helped to destroy the Soviet Union. Yet, in doing so, the Saudis and the Americans created theatre of conflict in which

Zawahiri and Bin Laden would build their movement and threaten both governments as well as the stability of Pakistan.

It was uncontroversial to describe this as a defensive jihad against an infidel usurper in the same mould as the defence of the Palestinians. The legitimacy of the conflict and the moral justification—even compulsion—to support the Afghan resistance were supported by a multitude of fatwas by Islamic scholars, including Al-Azhar. This prompted many Arabs to join the Afghan mujahidin, drawn to Peshawar in Pakistan where the Pakistani authorities organised the opposition, identifying those groups deserving of US and Saudi financial patronage—all of them Islamist. Although they were not a significant fighting force, they earned the moniker "Afghan Arabs" and would distil the ideological basis for the global jihad that would emerge in the wake of the Soviet withdrawal. Zawahiri wrote:

> The Muslims youths in Afghanistan waged a war to liberate Muslim land under purely Islamic slogans, a very vital matter, for many of the liberation battles in our Muslim world had used composite slogans that mixed nationalism with Islam... In Afghanistan the picture was perfectly clear: A Muslim nation carrying out jihad under the banner of Islam, versus a foreign enemy that was an infidel aggressor back by a corrupt, apostate regime at home... This clarity was also beneficial in refuting the ambiguities raised by many people professing to carry out our Islamist work but who escaped from the arena of jihad on the pretext that there was no arena in which the distinction between the Muslims and their enemies was obvious. (McDermott, 2005, p. 102)

Yet, it required an "infidel superpower" to sustain the jihad. Ruled by a corrupt oligarchy, Pakistan would serve as the middleman for covert US support. The USA could not acknowledge direct contact with the anti-Soviet mujahidin, so the CIA utilised the services of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). Saudi Arabia would match every dollar allocated by the CIA, leading to a massive flow of arms, ammunition and equipment through the "Afghan Pipeline". Saudis exported hundreds of missionaries and volunteer fighters and billions of dollars in funding. As a result, the ISI became Pakistan's most Islamic institution and its most powerful government body.

The Muslim Brotherhood had been present in Afghanistan since the 1940s, and the Egyptian Kamal Sananiri played a key role as a facilitator in the conflict, securing a Saudi-based logistical support network for the fighters and recruiting Palestinian Brotherhood member Sheikh Abdullah Azzam (Pargeter, p. 190). Sananiri was tortured and killed by the Soviet regime, and Azzam was left to build on the network, setting up offices throughout the world, including the USA.

Although he would fall out with the Brotherhood, Azzam became an iconic figure among Afghan Arabs. He criticised the Brotherhood's elitism, reluctance to fight and opportunism, a criticism that Zawahiri would take up in order to stress his differences with the Brotherhood network. Azzam wrote:

> Every principle needs a vanguard to carry it forward and [to] put up with heavy tasks and enormous sacrifices. This vanguard constitutes the strong foundation (al qaeda al-sulbah) for the expected society. (Gunaratna, 2003, p. 3)

A son of a wealthy construction magnate (who had built the Great Mosque structure Juhayman had stormed), Osama Bin Laden answered Azzam's call, having been moved by the works of Qutb. He established the Maktab al-Khidamat (MAK, Office of Services) around which the jihad would develop an ideological and organisational apparatus. The MAK would become the charitable front for Al-Qaeda. Although its volunteers had little impact on the overall mujahidin effort and fell short of Azzam's vision, it presented an international Islamic alliance for jihad, the equivalent of the International Brigades that fought in the Spanish Civil War. Yet, the withdrawal of the Soviets left a guerrilla training infrastructure with no war to fight.

It is clear that the Afghanistan war had a significant effect on Bin Laden's thought. In an interview with CNN, he said:

> I have benefited so greatly from the jihad in Afghanistan that it would have been impossible for me to gain such a benefit from any other chance... What we benefited from the most was [that] the glory and myth of the superpower was destroyed not only in my mind, but also in [the minds] of all Muslims. (Bergen, 2002, p. 61)

For Bin Laden, Afghanistan's civil war demonstrated that Qutb's vision could be realised. If the mujahidin could oust the Soviet Union from Afghanistan guided by faith and with only rudimentary means, there was a real prospect that the Muslim world could be "purified" and achieve self-determination through jihad.

Azzam had envisaged using the MAK to continue the struggle for a pure Islamic government in Afghanistan, but Bin Laden and Zawahiri sought to establish a caliphate. The Egyptian Islamic jihad in particular saw Afghanistan not as an end in itself but as a demonstration to Muslims that they could oust militarily superior opponents, and as such the international network should support similar struggles. The disagreement was solved by Azzam's assassination in 1989, which some had blamed on Bin Laden or Zawahiri, although the CIA, Mossad and Iran's intelligence agency VEVAK were also accused.

For the jihadists, the primary targets had been the rulers and occupiers who had corrupted the Muslim world. However, just 2 years after the Soviet withdrawal, the jihadists perceived a far more menacing threat that would eclipse their struggle in Afghanistan: the Gulf War.

7 The Gulf War and the Jihad Against America

Although pan-Arabism had been in decline since 1967, Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait in 1991 marked the end of pan-Arab pretence. It also marked a new era, in which inter-Arab, regional and Arab-Western security arrangements would emerge to stabilise the Gulf. The collapse of the Soviet Union meant that the Arab world was the exclusive sphere of influence of the USA, a fact that was confirmed by the Gulf War.

The jihadists openly broke from the Wahhabi elite and condemned Saudi Arabia's ruling political and religious classes for allowing the presence of Western troops on Muslim Holy Land. Bin Laden's offer of raising mujahidin to expel Saddam's forces from Kuwait had been rebuffed by the Saudis, who invited thousands of troops—among whom were American Jewish servicemen—to set up bases in the Kingdom. For Bin Laden, the perceived "infidel occupation" of his homeland would be an enduring obsession, with his 2004 message "Depose the Tyrants" offering the most blistering denunciation of the Saudi ruling class, accusing them of being controlled by the "Zionist-Crusader Alliance" (Lawrence, 2005, pp. 245–275).

The compromise reached following the Juhayman revolt meant that Bin Baz would remain loyal to Al Saud, including issuing fatwas permitting the presence of US troops. However, for Bin Laden, the Saudi-US military alliance was the principal grievance that prompted him to denounce Bin Baz in his open letter to the cleric, issued towards the end of 1994, "on the Invalidity of his Fatwa on Peace with the Jews". On the permission to allow "Crusader" forces into "the land of the Two Holy Places", Bin Laden wrote that "this insulted the honour of the Ummah, sullied its dignity, and defiled its holy places, on the grounds of assisting the infidel in a case of necessity, disregarding the restrictions on assistance and the rules on necessity expressed in Islamic law" (Bin Laden, 1994).

Bin Laden drew attention to Bin Baz's contradictions: his support for jihad against Jews, while allowing their oppressors into the most sacred of Muslim lands. Bin Baz would go on to confuse and offend the sensibilities of those who he had incited by issuing a fatwa in 2002 that placed Israel in the category of *dar al-ahd* (covenant states) rather than *dar al-harb* (war states), thereby allowing Crown Prince Abdullah to offer a peace treaty with Israel in the Arab Summit meeting in Beirut (Hilal, 2008). For the proponents of a caliphate, Bin Baz's religious justifications to support a New World Order dominated by the USA—including appeasing Israel—was the ultimate treachery.

For Bin Laden, the need for a vanguard for international jihad was clear, but he offered no vision of a system that would follow revolution, and he never indicated that he sought to acquire power for himself. As its Arabic name suggests, Al-Qaeda was literally to be the "base" for global jihad. The form Al-Qaeda would take was highly decentralised with a high degree of autonomy for its agents, who would act locally against oppression and for Muslim self-determination. The goal of restoring the caliphate was still the ultimate goal but to be determined by Muslim society. However, Bin Laden's goals transcended past jihadist movements, which had focused on Israel and the "near enemy" of governments in Muslim countries. His target was Western governments who he saw as ultimately responsible for the problems in the Muslim world, particularly the USA in the unipolar New World Order.

It is unclear when exactly Al-Qaeda's name and organisation fully took shape. The name could derive from the guesthouse that housed Arab recruits to the Afghan mujahidin, Sijill al-Qaeda (Register of the Base), where Bin Laden stayed in 1980 (Lawrence, 2005, p. xii). The nascent network began operations with direct attacks

on US personnel in Yemen in the 1992 Yemen hotel attacks, which were intended to kill US marines involved in Operation Restore Hope in Somalia. Bin Laden established links with the forces loyal to General Mohamed Farrah Aidid who had challenged the UN presence in Somalia and claimed to have aided the bloody resistance to US forces in the 1993 Battle of Mogadishu. Although Bin Laden's network was still finding its feet, the Yemen hotel attacks prompted the US marines to avoid Aden, and the Battle of Mogadishu led to the US withdrawal from Somalia. Al-Qaeda saw the retreat as evidence that they could not only deal the same blow to the USA as the Afghan mujahidin had done to the Soviets, but the Americans were a far weaker enemy.

The first serious action by the network was the 1993 World Trade Center attack. It utilised the MAK and training camps in Peshawar that had been formed to recruit and train the US-backed mujahidin. The attack was facilitated by the Egyptian "Blind Sheikh" Omar Abdel-Rahman, alleged leader of Al-Gama'a al-Islamiyya who had assumed control of MAK and had preached jihad in mosques in New York. The attack was masterminded and carried out by mujahidin bomb-maker Ramzi Yousef, from Kuwait. Yousef sent a letter to the press from the "fifth battalion of the Liberation Army" demanding a cessation of military and diplomatic links with Israel and non-interference in the domestic affairs of Middle Eastern countries. It threatened to carry out attacks by more than 150 suicide bombers if its demands were not met. The group did not exist, nor did the suicide attackers and the fertiliser bomb failed to bring down the South Tower, as Yousef had hoped. While the CIA dismissed the attack, it was the advent of a new evolution in jihadism.

Following the first World Trade Center attack, Al-Qaeda would continue to develop over the 1990s in line with the process of globalisation, which involved the development of economy, travel, technology, media and communications. International travel, the World Wide Web and global banking institutions were leveraged for the purpose of jihad. The interconnectedness of the world brought the attention of a plethora of struggles faced by Muslims: Chechnya, Bosnia, Kosovo, Sudan, the Philippines and Kashmir. Bin Laden was able to knit them together and the network that emerged under his direction was able to spread jihadist ideology, training and operational tactics to a range of local Islamist struggles. Although his Taliban hosts had banned television and all graven images, Bin Laden distributed cassettes and videos of lectures across the world in an effort to rouse the Muslim masses.

The years following the Soviet withdrawal and Azzam's death saw Bin Laden search for an adequate base of operations from which to direct the international jihad. He returned to Saudi Arabia and failed to insert his jihadists into the Soviet client state of South Yemen, so he turned to Sudan which was and still is run by the local affiliate of the Muslim Brotherhood. His wealth could go far in Sudan, enabling him to buy up farms and property and build roads. He acquired a monopoly on the trade in major cash crops, acquired a stake in a bank, ran the country's largest construction company and developed a business empire that would form the basis of his jihadist operations (McDermott, 2005, p. 157).

In 1996, under US pressure, Sudan forced Bin Laden to leave, and he relocated to Jalalabad in Afghanistan, which by that time had come under the control of the

Taliban, which had proven to be a more effective ruling force than the collection of fighting corrupt warlords that had emerged from the Mujahidin. Bin Laden invested in Taliban training camps in return for sanctuary, helping them to consolidate their control over most of Afghanistan. From there, he issued his "Declaration of War Against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places", aiming to remove the USA from Muslim lands. Referring to the continued US presence in the Middle East and the existence of Israel, he wrote:

> It should not be hidden from you that the people of Islam had suffered from aggression, iniquity and injustice imposed on them by the Zionist-Crusaders alliance and their collaborators... The latest and the greatest of these aggressions, incurred by the Muslims since the death of the Prophet is the occupation of the land of the two Holy Places . . . by the armies of the American Crusaders and their allies. (Bin Laden, 1996)

In 1998, he set up the World Islamic Front with Zawahiri, stating that:

> To kill Americans and their allies—civilians and military—is an individual duty incumbent upon every Muslim in all countries, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the Holy Mosque from their grip, so that their armies leave all the territory of Islam, defeated, broken, and unable to threaten any Muslim. (Lawrence, 2005, p. 61)

The 9/11 attacks that followed the 1998 embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam used rudimentary means to hijack airliners. Al-Qaeda set a new political narrative in the West that would define foreign policy and alter the relationship between state and citizen under the guise of counterterrorism. The devastating attack on the USA served to advance the Al-Qaeda "brand" across the Muslim world but at the same time created obstacles to its organisational coherence.

The US-led forces responded to 9/11 by occupying Afghanistan and Iraq and removing the zones of operation—where it was safe for jihadists to mobilise, train and create their new order. Al-Qaeda was reduced to small bands of men, dispersed in isolated pockets, cut off from its financial sources and hounded by drone attacks. It had also been denounced by Wahhabi clerics, and its most capable leaders, such as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, were incarcerated. Al-Qaeda was reduced to living under "house arrest" in Iran, protected by the Shia theocracy. In May 2011, the USA located and assassinated Bin Laden, who was replaced as leader by Zawahiri, who commanded less respect and loyalty.

8   The Destruction of Iraq and the Rise of Zarqawi

Mindful that the USA would strike back at Afghanistan, Bin Laden had prepared a bolt hole for jihadists, an area of Iraqi Kurdistan that was beyond the control of the Saddam regime and ruled by a little known jihadist group, Ansar al-Islam (Partisans of Islam). The uneasy alliance between Ansar al-Islam would lay the basis for the creation of the Islamic State and was overseen by the former Jordanian street thug Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

Zarqawi was a disciple of Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi, an Islamist scholar who had been strongly influenced by Juhayman's movement in Saudi Arabia. Al-Maqdisi was connected to the group via Abdel-Latif Al-Derbas (Abu Haza'a), a Kuwaiti national; the wives of Al-Maqdisi and Al-Derbas were sisters. Al-Derbas had been involved in Juhayman's revolt in Mecca and spent several years in a Saudi prison before his release and return to Kuwait.

Al-Maqdisi expanded on Juhayman's first letter, "Removing the Confusion over the Sect of He Whom God Has Made a Leader Unto the People", to elucidate the concept of *al-wala wel bara* (loyalty and renunciation). This concept requires Muslims to renounce and oppose any ruler who does not abide by shariah or introduces innovations. This became a cornerstone of jihadist thinking (Kazimi, 2005, pp. 61–62). Maqdisi also determined that all who were part of the political system—Muslim and non-Muslim—are kufr (disbelievers) (Brissard, 2005). The hardline approach put him at odds with parts of the Muslim Brotherhood and a large portion of Salafists who, either for strategic, ideological or ethical reasons, sought to work within political systems rather than overthrow them. Zarqawi had forged a partnership with Al-Maqdisi in prison in Jordan where both were sentenced for 15 years for possession of bombs. Al-Maqdisi would emerge among the Islamist prisoners as an ideological leader, while Zarqawi was his violent enforcer.

Zarqawi was a different beast to the jihadist leaders of the past. In spite of his mentoring by Al-Maqdisi, his ideas were sketchy and lacked the Islamic reasoning that had been employed by Islamists to develop their ideology. His pronouncements of takfir and willingness to back them up with extreme violence, particularly his genocidal policies against the Shia and other non-Sunni religious groups, would prove to be too extreme for both his former mentor Al-Maqdisi and Bin Laden.

After an amnesty led to his release, Zarqawi returned to Peshawar in 1999 in order to form a jihadist army and sought the assistance of Al-Qaeda, setting up a training centre called Tawhid wal-Jihad (Monotheism and Jihad). However, he did not pledge bayah to Bin Laden, insisting instead that recruits to his organisation should pledge bayah to him. He would go on to lead a succession of jihadist groups, the first being Jund al-Islam (Soldiers of Islam), which was founded in September 2001—the same month as the 9/11 attacks—from the merger of two Kurdish jihadist groups under the auspices of Al-Qaeda. Jund al-Islam was renamed Ansar al-Islam and fought an armed campaign to control several villages in territory controlled by the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK). The group also established a chemical and biological weapons laboratory in Khurmal, Halabja.

Welcoming the Tawhid wal-Jihad militants escaping the US-led assault on the Taliban, Ansar al-Islam ran its territory through extreme brutality that would go on to be the hallmark of Islamic State (IS). The group declared an Islamic government, led by the Kurdish Islamist Mullah Krekar, although Zarqawi was the real power. Gender segregation, strict dress codes and a ban on music, television and tobacco were enforced through extreme punishments, while opponents were dismembered, disfigured and decapitated.

Iran intervened to impose a truce between the PUK and Ansar al-Islam, enabling Zarqawi to sustain his rule. Yet, Saddam was blamed by the USA for the group's

presence in Iraq and its alleged manufacture of ricin poison, even though Iran had more influence in the region than Baghdad due to the US-enforced no-fly zone. Ansar al-Islam's presence was cited as one of the reasons for the US-led occupation of Iraq. Yet, the Iraq War would unleash the group and give it a raison d'être in the political situation that emerged.

A state of chaos followed the 2003 invasion, compounded by the USA's disastrous decision to disband the Iraqi Army and implementing a policy of "de-Baathification" of the Iraqi state. This was modelled on the denazification of Germany following the Second World War; although Bremer appeared not to learn from history, West Germany dropped the programme in order to retain a functioning civil service, issuing an amnesty for nearly 800,000 former Nazis. The intention was to remove all potential opposition to the new order from remnants of the old. To the contrary, Paul Bremer, the head of the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) ruled Iraq as a feudal monarch.

With ruthless incompetence, Bremer used his dictatorial powers to issue a decree sacking all Baath party members, leaving much of the public sector without a workforce, including tens of thousands of teachers who had merely joined the party to keep their jobs. Subsequently Bremer dismissed the entire military, turning thousands of soldiers from generals to privates, nearly all of whom were Sunni. More than 700,000 Iraqis lost their jobs and livelihood as a result of Bremer's decrees.

Western double standards were revealed: the creation and abandonment of the Afghan mujahidin, extraordinary rendition, internment and torture at Guantánamo Bay and the atrocities in Abu Ghraib prison all served Al-Qaeda's purposes. The West's professed values were worthless, and the entire operation was deemed a Crusader war against Muslims and Islam. One of those who would experience the West's double standards was Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi, who spent 11 months in US custody in 2004 for his leading role in Jamaat Jaish Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamaah (JJASJ)—the Army of the Sunni People Group—which operated in Samarra, Diyala and Baghdad and was one of the forerunners of IS.

The power vacuum created by Bremer was filled by Iran-based sectarian Shia parties, who wreaked revenge on those they saw as responsible for their persecution. The Baathists and jihadists found they had much in common; they both favoured rule through terror. The Iraqi Baathists had already undergone a transformation of their own. Saddam had become more sectarian following the 1991 Gulf War and utilised Sunni tribes, mainly from Tikrit, as a bulwark for his dictatorship against the Shia, who had risen up against him. Sectarian conflict appeared inevitable and was a development in which Al-Qaeda would evolve, eventually spawning IS. This change involved a morphing of terrorism into an insurgent guerrilla movement, going beyond the notion that Al-Qaeda as an inspiration for jihad to a position as an active vanguard for the revival of the caliphate. In its fight against the USA in Iraq, it would emulate the Afghan mujahidin.

A crucial treatise in the transformation of Al-Qaeda was published in 2004, indicating how its affiliates should rule with a view to creating the caliphate, entitled *The Management of Savagery* and written by Abu Bakr Naji. The term

applies to the assumed chaotic interim period in which the old order diminishes before the new order, the caliphate, is formed and consolidated. This thinking built on the aspirations of previous pan-Islamist movements such as the Muslim Brotherhood by providing an exact, if untested, method to realise the caliphate based on past mistakes (Naji, 2006).

According to *The Management of Savagery*, in this stage, the jihadists would be required to eliminate spies and hypocrites and enforce compliance with the new rulers through a regime of terror. It would seek to establish the rudiments of statehood with the imposition of security, establishing borders, administrating the population and creating a fighting society based on shariah. Regional commands would be established that would eventually grow and become a united state. Naji called these regions of savagery, which needed Islamic administration (Naji, 2006, p. 39).

In relation to the enemies of the nascent Islamic State, the rulers of the new order would seek to polarise and provoke opinion against it in order to fulfil their ideological narrative of good and evil. By drawing enemies into the arena of jihad, the jihadists would be able to exhaust them and break their will.

Zarqawi adopted this template in his drive to radically increase the level of violence, creating Al-Qaeda in the Land of the Two Rivers, also known as Al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), and finally—apparently half-heartedly—declaring bayah to Bin Laden. Suicide bombings and attacks on Shia were the hallmarks of AQI, and Syria became the main smuggling route for the group. The Assad regime, like so many other governments, thought it could harness the jihadists for its own goals and facilitated Zarqawi as a weapon against the US-imposed order (Neumann, 2014). A hallmark of the group was the use of the Internet to broadcast beheadings and terrorist attacks which, for jihadists, were more exciting than the turgid video sermons released by Bin Laden and Zawahiri. Zarqawi would also embed within the organisation a rigid dogma of takfir, which from Qutb until then had largely been directed at rulers but he used for the purpose of genocidal sectarianism, the removal of rivals and, most importantly, the power of terror in asymmetric conflict.

9   The Betrayal of the Sunni Awakening

Zarqawi's killing by US forces in 2006 was followed in 2007 by a "surge" against AQI directed by US General David Petraeus, who encouraged Sunni Arab tribes. Many of these tribes had been involved in the anti-US insurgency, to join in defending the government of Nouri al-Maliki—a member of the Iranian-backed Dawa Party—and establishing order. The US mobilisation was part of the Sunni Awakening or Sons of Iraq. The Awakening came with the promise that Al-Qaeda would be vanished, the Sunnis would be safe and the militants would be reintegrated with the Iraqi Army. The surge appeared to be a success.

While Al-Qaeda was temporarily rolled back, Zarqawi's death did not end the jihadist terror he had unleashed but made him a heroic martyr of resistance among jihadists. His death was used by Zawahiri who called on AQI to create an Islamic

State, and, within a few months of Zarqawi's death, a coalition of jihadist groups, including AQI, formed the Islamic State of Iraq (ISI). Zawahiri's orders closely resembled the doctrines set out in the book which had inspired Zarqawi. ISI did not stray from Zarqawi's brutal methods with a rapid rise of terror but also forged the structures outlined in *The Management of Savagery* (Naji, 2006, pp. 40–44). It was within the group's shariah structures that Al-Baghdadi rose up to become leader.

ISI would not have emerged so strongly if Maliki had not betrayed the Awakening movement and reverted to Shia sectarianism and demagoguery, taking direct control of the armed forces and the interior ministry. Maliki's subsequent actions confirmed in the minds of many disillusioned Sunnis that, at the very least, they needed protection from the government, and some were won over to ISI's takfiri jihadist ideology. Only a third of the Sons of Iraq militias had been conscripted into the military, Sunni commanders were purged from the armed forces and power was concentrated in the hands of the Shia Islamists. As he sank into paranoia, Maliki led an assault on the tribes of the Awakening movement and the Sons of Iraq militias, fearing they were a fifth column that would overthrow him even though they continued to come under attack from ISI jihadists.

In 2010, Maliki's coalition came second in the general election, losing to the secular, non-sectarian Iraqiya List bolstered by Sunni Arab voters in Anbar and Nineveh who used the election as an opportunity to voice their anger. Iraqiya was led by Ayad Allawi, a Shia ex-Baathist who Shia Islamists regarded with deep distrust. Instead of standing down, Maliki mobilised Shia groups outside his coalition behind his premiership in order to form the largest parliamentary power bloc, fearing a Baathist takeover. Sunnis were muscled out of the political system, and Iraqiya was marginalised. In 2011, Maliki ran an anti-Baathist campaign that targeted Sunnis and Iraqiya, leading to the arrest of its leaders.

The day after the USA, which had been the lynchpin of the dysfunctional political system, left Iraq, Maliki ordered the arrest of his Sunni vice president Tariq Hashimi on charges of terrorism. The move led to a boycott of parliament by Sunni leaders. Meanwhile, the former Awakening militants were being radicalised by Maliki's sectarianism. Non-violent protests by Sunnis, with support from some secular Arab Shi'ites who also held grievances about Maliki, were suppressed and Shia death squads were created. The Sunnis who had helped the Prime Minister defeat Al-Qaeda were forced to take up arms, fearing their government and thinking they had no option but to support the jihadist insurgency.

At the same time, Maliki was resorting to ever more brutal means of repression; the Middle East was in the grip of the Arab Spring revolutionary movement that sought to challenge the injustices and corruption of authoritarian Arab governments. The revolts were led by disparate and inchoate social forces forged on Facebook that had failed to coalesce into mature movements, a factor exploited by Islamist groups—principally the Muslim Brotherhood—that had no initial role in the uprisings.

While many of these uprisings turned violent, the Syrian Civil War was the most vicious and gave Baghdadi's ISI an opportunity to expand his operations by sending Abu Mohammad al-Julani to Syria to form Jabhat al-Nusra. Within months,

al-Nusra had utilised its superiority in arms, finance and knowledge of insurgency to become the biggest Islamist force in the region with tactics closely aligned with those of AQI/ISI. Yet, unlike ISI, it was forging alliances with anti-Assad secular forces and taking on a more administrative function. The tactics diverged, but both organisations grew in the specific operational circumstances they found themselves in.

In April 2013, Baghdadi ordered their merger to form the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Shams (ISIS), an act that did not receive the assent of al-Julani or Zawahiri and put Baghdadi on a collision course with Al-Qaeda. He had come to realise that this movement would have more potential under his operational direction than under the auspices of a leader in another continent and publicly made it clear he would defy Zawahiri's order to reverse the merger. ISIS attracted fighters from al-Nusra and adopted a far more unyielding approach to controlling territory, including military confrontations with rival jihadist and secularist opposition groups.

The Sunni Arab tribes who had been alienated by Maliki became crucial to the expansion of territorial control, and many former Awakening militia fighters had been won over by ISIS's sectarianism as a reaction to Maliki's Shia chauvinism. This led to the fall of Mosul in June 2014, a city of 1.5 million people, and the seizing of massive amounts of military hardware donated by the USA and looting massive cash reserves from the banks as the Iraqi forces melted away. This victory with an internal revenue generation capacity ensured that ISIS was able to consolidate power without any outside support.

Sweeping across lands on either side of the Iraq-Syria border and with rudimentary power structures in place, statehood was a natural development. It was in Mosul that Baghdadi announced the reconstitution of the caliphate, the Islamic State. It was here that Baghdadi called on Muslims around the world to do hijra, to come to the defence of Islam and fulfil their spiritual duty to jihad, that "absent obligation" Faraj wrote about (Faraj, 2000), building the international Islamic army Azzam sought to create, declaring takfir on enemy regimes and civilians in the mode of Qutb and his protégés and to establish what al-Banna had begun the journey 86 years before with the creation of the Muslim Brotherhood.

IS appeared to be following *The Management of Savagery* to the letter, utilising the brutal tactics of Zarqawi while harnessing the power of social media as well as producing slick snuff films reminiscent of video games. When the USA attacked, IS would respond by what *The Management of Savagery* would call "paying the price"—videos showing the beheading of Western hostages, a method first used by Zarqawi (Naji, 2006, p. 67). Just as the treatise ordered, IS established wilayats (provinces) around the world where regional groups from Nigeria to Indonesia would declare bayah to Baghdadi.

However, this caliphate lacked even the support of most jihadist groups, let alone the ulema and the ummah, and it would develop such extreme methods that even al-Nusra—now separated from Al-Qaeda, albeit for strategic reasons—would come to be regarded as "moderate Islamists". Violence appeared to be an end in itself, and even its foreign jihadists began deserting. At the time of writing, IS was in retreat,

and a plethora of rival powers had assembled to oust IS from Mosul. The group appeared to be heading for inevitable defeat, however long it will take. Past experience suggests that the defeat of IS as a de facto state, if not a terrorist network, will not be the last jihadist movement and that the evolution will continue, conditioned by current trends and unknowable future circumstances.

10   Conclusion

The entire notion of caliphate is antagonistic towards secular political systems and is intrinsically revolutionary, whether expressed through electoralism or armed insurgency, of which jihadism is a part. Yet, political Islamism emerged amid a failure of those systems to address the material and social circumstances that many Muslims were experiencing. Amid the milieu of social and economic tensions, Islamism arose as a result of the imposition of these "apparently" alien structures by outside powers, whether the monarchies favoured by the British, the secular nationalists adopted and encouraged by the Soviets or the cookie-cutter liberal democracy the USA attempted to transplant in countries it occupied. The narrative of the caliphate—pan-Islamic unity—appealed to those who were alienated by these systems and evolved into a political movement in the Muslim Brotherhood, which took its organisational inspiration from European fascism.

However, it was the hypocrisy and cynicism of governments that sought to harness and encourage Islamism that fuelled the evolution of jihadism, from post-colonial Egypt to King Fahd's Saudi Arabia to the US-backed Afghan mujahidin to the mishaps of the US occupation of Iraq. Yet, governments continue to believe in the folly that Islamists can be partners if they play within the system of electoral politics, even if they are ideologically wedded to overthrowing these systems. The history of modern jihadism is the history of negligent, short-sighted policy-making by Arab and Western governments.

Towards the end of 2004, Al-Qaeda strategist Abu Musab Al-Suri published *The Global Islamic Resistance Call*, a military treatise that critiqued Al-Qaeda's strategy. The Syrian jihadist had grown disillusioned with Bin Laden's 9/11 tactic, which he saw as ultimately a major setback for the cause and set the conditions for the destruction of Taliban rule. Al-Suri stated that "the outcome [of the 9/11 attacks] as I see it, was to put a catastrophic end to the jihadi current which started in the early 1960s" (Lia, 2009, p. 314). Al-Qaeda had provoked an attack that destroyed Taliban rule by a country that it could not defeat. The same fate is likely to befall the IS.

While the caliphate will continue to be a vague concept at the end of history for movements such as the Muslim Brotherhood, the defeat of IS will lead to the next evolution in jihadist thought and method. Post-IS jihadism is already with us, going back to the methods of Al-Qaeda but this time without a centralised command. Al-Suri proposed a distributed network model of decentralised resistance formed by blind cells or even individuals and small groups acting merely through inspiration to take on leaderless jihad. His call to jihad seeks to use small-scale attacks in the

West as a means to destabilise and undermine certainty in everyday life. This is already happening.

On 14 July 2016, a 19-tonne truck driven by Mohamed Lahouaiej-Bouhlel ploughed into crowds celebrating Bastille Day in Nice, France, killing 86 people. He was not known as a practising Muslim and led a life that would have marked him out for capital punishment in the Islamic State. His radicalisation was brief and crude, his education in terrorism was rudimentary and his use of a truck as a weapon for massacre disrupted the West's sense of security in ordinary spaces. Increasingly, inspired lone wolves are carrying out attacks using the simplest of instruments in the most everyday situations.

Although there was no obvious operational control over the Nice attack, IS claimed responsibility and declared that "the crusader countries know that no matter how much they enforce their security measures and procedures, it will not stop the mujahidin from striking" (Birnbaum & McAuley, 2016).

IS has bestowed on jihadism the methods of extreme violence and the utilisation of social media, and now with the caliphate vanquished again, the vision of the future is solely focus on chaos. Like the Juhayman revolt, the cause that will grow out of IS will not seek statehood; its goal is apocalypse and the fulfilment of prophesy.

References

Al-Banna, H. (1995). *Letter to a muslim student*. Leicester, UK: The Islamic Foundation/FOSIS.

Bergen, P. L. (2002). *Holy War, Inc.: Inside the secret world of Osama bin Laden*. New York: Free Press.

Bin Laden, O. (1994). *Open letter to Shaykh Bin Baz on the invalidity of his fatwa on peace with the Jews*. Translated by the CTC at West Point Military Academy, published by Wikisource. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Open_Letter_to_Shaykh_Bin_Baz_on_the_Invalidity_of_his_Fatwa_on_Peace_with_the_Jews

Bin Laden, O. (1996). *Declaration of war against the Americans occupying the land of the two holy places*. London: Azzam.

Birnbaum, M., & McAuley, J. (2016, July 16). *Attacker in nice is said to have radicalized 'very rapidly'*. Washington Post. Accessed November 16, 2016, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/islamic-state-claims-responsibility-for-france-attack-in-nice/2016/07/16/4327456e-4ab9-11e6-8dac-0c6e4accc5b1_story.html

Brissard, J.-C. (2005). *Zarqawi: The new face of Al-Qaeda*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Commins, D. D. (2009). *The Wahhabi mission and Saudi Arabia* (pp. 104–129). London: I.B. Tauris.

Euben, R., & Zaman, M. Q. (Eds.). (2009). *Princeton readings in Islamist thought: Texts and contexts from al-Banna to Bin Laden* (chapters 2 and 5). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Faraj, M. A. S. (2000). *The absent obligation*. Birmingham, UK: Maktabah Al Ansaar.

Gunaratna, R. (2003). *Inside Al Qaeda: Global network of terror*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hegghammer, T., & Lacroix, S. (2007). Rejectionist Islamism in Saudi Arabia: The story of Juhayman al-'Utaybi revisited. *International Journal of Middle East Studies, 39*, 103–122.

Hilal, A. A. (2008). The foreign policies of Arab States the challenge of globalization. In AUC Forum for International Affairs (Ed.), (New Rev. Ed., 3rd ed.) (pp. 343–396). Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.

Kazimi, N. (2005). A virulent ideology in mutation: Zarqawi upstages Maqdisi. In H. Fradkin et al. (Eds.), *Current trends in Islamist ideology* (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: Hudson Institute.

Lawrence, B. (Ed.). (2005). *Messages to the world: The statements of Osama bin Laden* (James Howarth Trans.). London: Verso.

Lia, B. (2009). *Architect of global Jihad: The life of al-Qa'ida strategist Abu Mus'ab al-Suri*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDermott, T. (2005). *Perfect soldiers: The 9/11 Hijackers, who they were and why they did it*. Politico's.

Naji, A. B. (2006). *The management of savagery: The most critical stage through which the Umma Will Pass* (McCants, William Trans.). John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University. Accessed March 2017, from https://azelin.files.wordpress.com/2010/08/abu-bakr-naji-the-management-of-savagery-the-most-critical-stage-through-which-the-umma-will-pass.pdf

Neumann, P. (2014, April 3). Suspects into collaborators. *London Review of Books, 36*(7), 19–21.

Qutb, S. (2006). *Milestones* (al-Mehri, A.B., ed.). Birmingham: Maktabah.

Steinberg, G. (2005). The Wahhabi Ulama and the Saudi state: 1745 to the present. In P. Aarts & G. Nonneman (Eds.), *Saudi Arabia in the balance*. London: Hurst and Company.

Trofimov, Y. (2007). *The siege of Mecca: The forgotten uprising in islam's holiest shrine*. London: Penguin.

Valentine, S. R. (2015). *Force and fanaticism: Wahhabism in Saudi Arabia and beyond*. Oxford: OUP.

Vassiliev, A. (2000). *The history of Saudi Arabia*. New York: New York University Press.

Pakistan and State-Sponsored Terrorism in South Asia

Siegfried O. Wolf

1 Introduction

Since the 9/11 attacks on the USA, Pakistan has come to be perceived as the world's epicentre of jihadist activities (Murphy, 2013: 1). As articulated by Ayesha Jalal: 'while not all Pakistanis are terrorists, most acts of terrorism in the contemporary world carry the Pakistani paw print' (Jalal, 2011: 7). Greig (2016: 23) states that virtually every terrorist incident since the attack on the twin towers in New York has some connection with Pakistan. Either the terrorist is a Pakistani citizen, of Pakistani origin, or has supporters and contacts in Pakistan. Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that targets of US drone strikes in Pakistan include Arabs, Uzbeks, Uighurs, Chechens, and many other ethnic groups and nationalities from outside the AfPak region. Pakistan is not on the US list of governments involved in state-sponsored terrorism, but the 'charge sheet' against the South Asian country is a long one (Byman, 2005a, 2005b; Inkster, 2012: 168). Along with Iran, Pakistan is one of the most active sponsors of terrorism worldwide (Byman, 2005a: 155). International experts confirm that the country is not only flirting with (militant) Jihadism but has also been using terrorism as an instrument of state policy for decades (Greig, 2016: 22). Moreover, these claims are backed by Pakistani elites themselves. For example, former President Asif Zardari publicly admitted that the country deliberately created and nurtured terrorist groups, such as *Lashkar-e-Taiba* (LeT) and *Jaish-e-Mohammed* (JeM), as a policy to achieve short-term tactical objectives (Nelson, 2009).

Having said this, the chapter will put forward the following arguments: First, it argues that state terrorism should be included in the study of terrorism, making the case that only non-state actors employ terrorism (Hoffman, 2006: 40) has to be rejected because 'states can be terrorists too' (Jackson, Murphy, & Poynting, 2010a,

S.O. Wolf (✉)
South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF), Brussels, Belgium
e-mail: siegfried.wolf@sadf.eu

2010b: 6). It defines terrorism as a political strategy that can be utilized by any actor, whether individuals, organized groups or loose networks, domestic and international organizations, strong and weak states, theocratic authoritarian states as well as liberal ones (Jackson, Jarvis, Gunning, & Breen-Smyth, 2011). As such, government security sector agents can use acts of terror 'to aid in repressing dissent and intelligence or military organizations perform acts of terror designed to further a state's policy or diplomatic efforts abroad' (Terrorism-Research, n.d.).

Second, in order to understand state terrorism, one must primarily follow an actor-centred approach. In doing so, the distinction between non-state terrorism and state terrorism becomes clear: the latter one 'is committed by the state and to the benefit of the state' (Claridge, 1996: 52).

Third, the phenomenon of state terrorism in Pakistan stems from severe defects in the country's political-administrative system in general and the unhealthy civil-military relations in particular. These structural issues prevent the consolidation of any type of democratic reform or governance. More so, they pave the way for an uncontrolled (illegitimate) use of force and many types/forms of state terrorism.

Lastly, recently Pakistan was forced to clamp down on home-grown terrorist groups (Prasad, 2015). The chapter argues that Pakistan acts only against militant groups that developed an anti-Pakistan agenda; terrorist organizations that mainly focus on Afghanistan and India are mostly spared. Even if the Pakistani security agents at some point implemented measures against these groups, they were mostly ineffective and of a temporary nature, aimed at accommodating the international community. Despite the fact that it faces numerous insurgencies, armed confrontations and sectarian violence all over the country,[1] it seems that Pakistan is not willing to provoke militant groups that do not target the government and its people, like LeT or the Haqqani Network (HQN) (Tankel, 2011; Wolf, 2016a, 2016b); any substantial action against pro-Pakistani terror groups would create instability. Furthermore, the government and military remain convinced that terror groups can be useful assets against India (Tankel, 2011). As such, conservative segments among Pakistan's security establishment appear convinced that ending involvement with state terrorism would benefit India and Afghanistan, leaving Pakistan to deal with the negative consequences, fighting and dismantling its former allies (Tankel, 2011).

2   A Praetorian State: The Role of the Military in Pakistan Politics

Pakistan, which has been ruled by military forces since the 1970s, is considered to be a classic example of a *praetorian* state (Kukreja, 1991; Perlmutter, 1977; Shah, 2003). Unsurprisingly, most analysts agree that Pakistan's political system is

---

[1]For example, Federally Administered Tribal Areas/FATA, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa/KPK, Balochistan, Punjab and Karachi.

dysfunctional. Since its independence in 1947, the country oscillated various types of military rulers, political authoritarianism and some semi-democratic intermezzos. Since the end of British colonial rule in 1947, Pakistan has seen the emergence of a strong military allied with the country's bureaucracy. As a result of numerous perceived internal and external threats and challenges,[2] bureaucrats have been sidelined over time. Under the popular elected Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (1971–1977), civilian government powers were somewhat restored, but this was just another form of power-sharing between civilians (this time elected ones) and the armed forces (Rais, 1989). As the army grew in strength and size, the development of the political system became characterized by a lack of institutional control/capacity and chronic governmental instability (Nawaz, 2008: xxviii). This trend contributed to an imbalance of power and favoured the armed forces while simultaneously weakening civilian power in the political decision-making process. The succeeding regime of General Zia-ul-Haq (1977–1988)[3] embodied the ultimate institutionalized dominance[4] of the military in politics (Burki & Baxter, 1991), exemplified by the unconventional transition to civilian rule between 1988 and 1999 which led to a situation in which civilian officials were barely able to preserve any influence amidst overwhelming military power (Shafqat, 1997). While at the end of this period, it seemed that civilian officials under Nawaz Sharif (1997–1999) were able to change the rules of the game; ultimately the military carried out a putsch and remained in power from 1999 until 2008. Today, the country appears to be witnessing the rise of civilian rule, but the military has crucial influence in all political decision-making areas, especially those perceived as essential for the country's internal and external security.[5]

In sum, the country's army perceives itself as the sole guardian of national sovereignty and moral integrity, the chief initiator of the national agenda and the main arbiter of conflicts that exist in the social and political sphere. Throughout the years, the military became so deeply entrenched in all levels of the Pakistani state that they do not depend on any formal prerogatives to exercise influence over the

---

[2]For example, territorial dispute over Kashmir with India and a contested border with Afghanistan claiming parts of Pakistan's territory, socio-economic problems, an under-institutionalized political society (there was no constitution until 1956, and general elections did not occur until 1970), over-bureaucratization of state and politics and unstable civilian governments.

[3]General Zia usurped power through a military coup on 5 July 1977 by unconstitutionally overthrowing the civilian government of Bhutto.

[4]There has been a tendency for the military to institutionalize its political role (especially under Zia-ul-Haq and Pervez Musharraf) featured by three criteria: (1) the abandonment of former personalized forms of exercising political influence (Ayub Khan 1958–1962 and partly Yahya Khan 1962–1971); (2) the (informal) induction of broader sections of the armed forces into the political system to run the affairs of state; and (3) the constitutional entrenchment of a political role for the armed forces, e.g. the introduction of the Eighth Amendment.

[5]In this context, terrorism, foreign policy regarding India and Afghanistan, the Kashmir issue, nuclear policy and issues which relate to their corporate interests like defence budget, procurements and business activities (Siddiqa, 2003, 2009) are primarily controlled by the military.

political decision-making process or to secure their interests. There is no 'civilian supremacy', meaning that elected civilians exercise no control over the countries' security forces[6] (Wolf, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e). This observation is important, as civilian control over the armed forces must be understood as a sine qua non for democracy (Croissant, Kuehn, Chambers, & Wolf, 2010). In consequence, the lack of civilian control limits not only the powers of elected administrations but also creates anomalies regarding the electoral regime, political liberties, political participation and horizontal accountability. Therefore, Pakistan can be classified as a 'defective democracy'—which is only partly free (Freedom House, 2016)—given the powers of the military and intelligence services and their influence over the civilian government, allowing them to manoeuvre, develop and implement an independent policy of state terrorism.

3   The 'Unholy Triangular Nexus': Islamization and the Principal-Agent Relations Between Military and Terrorists

One can state that Islam as a religion is not necessarily the dominant factor contributing to the high level of Jihadi terrorism in Pakistan (Murphy & Malik, 2009: 24). Rather, it seems that Islam has been blatantly misused as an 'instrument of policy implementation', not only by influential non-state actors but also by government agencies to achieve certain societal and political goals. According to Malik (2011: 42), most rulers in Islamabad have sought to use Islam to enhance their legitimacy, undermine political opposition and increase their authority in state and society. Pakistan's first foray into Islamization was the incorporation of the *Objectives Resolution* of 1949 into the constitution,[7] which recognized the ultimate sovereignty was vested in *Allah Almighty* (Cheema, 2012: 878). In other words, the concept of 'sovereignty of the people' got substituted by the notion of 'divine sovereignty' (Delvoie, 1995: 128). The article does not clarify the role Islam should play in Pakistan's state structure, so there is much room for debate, and this provided opportunities for the government to enact numerous controversial constitutional amendments and legislative measures.

The first concrete steps towards the Islamization of the country were taken by Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto during the rule of the Pakistan People's Party/ PPP (Hassan, 1985: 263). As he faced tremendous social unrest and political opposition (foremost the 'Movement for the Restoration of Democracy'), Bhutto

---

[6]Understood as regular and paramilitary forces as well as intelligence agencies.

[7]During Pakistan's constitutional history, three constitutions got promulgated, in 1956, 1962 and 1973. In all three constitutional drafts, the Objectives Resolution (also known as the 'Aims and Objectives of the Constitution') was adopted as the preamble (Khan 2010: 57).

announced 'Islamic' reforms,[8] declaring Friday instead of Sunday as the weekly public holiday, prohibiting gambling and horse racing and outlawing alcohol consumption (Hassan, 1985: 263; Keddie, 1987: 40). Furthermore, he declared that the Ahmadiyya sect was non-Muslim (Keddie, 1987: 40). Unlike his predecessors (especially Muhammad Ali Jinnah,[9] who envisioned a secular state building and is known as the 'father of the nation'), he introduced remarkably 'emotive religious phrases' like *Musawat-i-Muhammadi* (the equality of Muhammad) and *Islami Musawat* (Islamic equality) into his political rhetoric. The Islamization initiatives by Bhutto's government were 'essentially reactive' (Hassan, 1985: 263) and served three primary goals. First was to keep critics of his socialist inspired politics and his economic policies at bay. Second, he attempted to use Islam to erase his image of being part of the Westernized ruling intelligentsia (Keddie, 1987: 40), who were perceived as morally depraved and corrupt. Third was to restore some of the symbolic facets of Islam and to address some 'technical-religious' aspects, like establishing facilities to enable people to fulfil their religious duties[10] (Hassan, 1985: 263). Previous military rulers Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan were primarily focused and were building up the army's capacities, keeping East Pakistan under tight control and going to war with India. While Bhutto's 'Islamization policy' did not have much impact on Pakistan's state and society, it is clear Islamization was not solely an instrument to address the needs of the people, but rather an instrument to consolidate the party's power.

After the introduction of Islam as a political instrument, General Zia-ul-Haq—after carrying out a coup d'état against Bhutto—naturally adopted Islamization as a core constituent of his political agenda. As a devout Muslim, who sympathised with hard-line religious groups and nurtured the jihadist ideology (Haqqani, 2005: 131), Zia's Islamization programme differed from Bhutto's and previous rulers such as Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan. He conducted the first systematic campaign to transform the country into a 'true orthodox Islamic State and Society' (Hassan, 1985: 264; Murphy & Malik, 2009: 24). Under Zia-ul-Haq, a close alliance emerged between the military and orthodox Sunnis.

To achieve a 'total Islamization of society' and to operationalize his programme, he launched numerous measures:

---

[8]The election manifesto of 1977 of the PPP also included the party's commitment to (1) make the teaching of the Qur'an an integral part of general education; (2) restore to the mosque its traditional place of eminence as a centre of the community; (3) establish a federal Ulema Academy to educate imams and khatibs of mosques; (4) make the shrines of the venerated saints centres of Islamic learnings; (5) increase hajj facilities; and (6) strengthen the Islamic Research Institute at Islamabad 'Pakistan People's Party Manifesto' (The Pakistan Times [25 January 1977] quoted in Hassan, 1985: 263–264).

[9]Jinnah's vision of Pakistan was of a state composed principally of Muslims but essentially secular and democratic in its constitution and political institutions (Delvoie, 1995).

[10]Bhutto pushed the establishment of the Federal Ulema Academy to educate imams and khatibs of mosques, increased hajj facilities and strengthened the Islamic Research Institute at Islamabad (Hassan, 1985: 264).

First, he reinstituted the vanguard role of the Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology in the formulation of Islamization policies (Hassan, 1985: 269) and set up another crucial institution: the Federal Advisory Council (Majlis-i-Shura). This council was 'to create conditions in which the country could attain a democratic, Islamic polity' (Hassan, 1985: 269).

Second, Zia promulgated four Hudood Ordinances (Islamic punishments),[11] calling for the revision of Pakistan's criminal law system (Kennedy, 1988: 307). They included statutory provisions such as the application of classical shariah punishments for crimes of theft, adultery and dacoity (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 29) and clearly discriminated against women and religious minorities (Cheema, 2012: 879). Additionally, new sections were adopted, prescribing life imprisonment/death for blasphemy against the Holy Prophet and the Quran (Malik, 2011: 42).

Third, besides the modification of the penal code (introducing the Hudood ordinances), the Zia administration aimed to redefine the role of the legal system and restructure it. He attempted to reorganize Pakistan's higher judiciary (Kennedy, 1988: 308), Islamize all laws and reform the existing court system (Hassan, 1985: 265). This resulted in the establishment of the Federal Shariat Court (FSC) and the Shariat Appellate Bench of the Supreme Court (Cheema, 2012: 879). Finally, to ensure the acceptance and legitimacy of the Islamization programme, Zia co-opted the ulema (scholars) to aid with the reform of the judicial process and formulation of new laws (Hassan, 1985: 265).

Fourth, individuals known for their strong commitment to an Islamic order and/or association with religious political parties were appointed to key government positions. Within this programme, Islamic fundamentalists could effectively influence and control the state and society (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 29).

Fifth, the overall goal was to subordinate all economic processes to Islamic rules and standards of behaviour (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 31). The reorganization of the economic system in accordance with Islamic guidelines had two main aims: the equitable distribution of wealth and the establishment of a welfare state. These included the abolition of (usurious) interests, the abolition of monopolies, the limited property rights and the banking system and decreed that the financing of all entities and individuals had to be done on an Islamic basis (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 31; Hassan, 1985: 267). They also reorganized the tax system; the most remarkable was the introduction of *Zakat* and *Ushr*. *Zakat*, which originally referred to the concept of transferring a certain amount of surplus wealth to poorer sections of society, is a welfare tax (some critics calls it compulsory alms-giving) the government imposed on financially able Muslims to make an annual contribution to a particular social cause (Malik, 2011: 101). *Ushr* is an agricultural tax which imposes an obligatory charge on farm (crop) production.

---

[11]One ordinance is also known as *hadd* (singular form of Islamic punishment). Each of four *hadd* constituting the *Hudood* (literally boundaries) ordinances refers to one specific offence: *intoxication, theft, zina* (adultery/fornication), and *qazf* (slander or false accusation) (Malik, 2011: 42).

Sixth, education was Islamized, requiring a redefinition of educational objectives to ensure Islamic standards (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 30; Murphy & Malik, 2009: 24). The government made Islamic religious education compulsory for all Muslim students (Hassan, 1985: 270) and promoted 'Islamic mentality'; it administered a revision of the entire curricula and all textbooks. This was important for Zia, since these textbooks would undermine the role of secularists in the foundation of the Pakistani state and distorted the historical trajectories, exaggerating the significance of Islamic fundamentalists (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 31). The administration also declared Urdu an official language (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 30), replacing English as the medium of instruction in schools and colleges (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 30). As a result of Zia's policies, the country witnessed a massive growth of *Madaris* (Islamic seminaries), as Saudi funds were channelled into the education system (Murphy & Malik, 2009: 24). Subsequently, an 'Islamic mentality' and other aspects of Islamic studies (such as Arabic language) became integral aspects of education. In addition to the traditional Islamic educational bodies, the government also attempted to subjugate the higher education system to Islamic guidance. For this purpose, an Islamic University was set up in Islamabad, and most universities and colleges established Islamic Studies Faculty in universities and colleges (Hassan, 1985: 267). Additionally, they established separate, full-fledged universities for female students.

Seventh, religious institutions were put under the direct patronage (meaning oversight) of the state (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 30); this was done to ensure that the institutions were propagating 'religious teaching and enforcing respect and compulsory observance of the principal religious obligations and ensuring that religious practices were followed and obligations carried out' (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 30).

Eighth, Islamization was promoted by government-supported media (Murphy & Malik, 2009: 24); according to Zia, the primary role of the mass media is to promote the teaching of Islam, the Islamic ideology and an Islamic outlook. In order to ensure homogeneity, new codes were introduced to control and censor films, the press and broadcasting institutions (radio and television) (Hassan, 1985: 265).

Ninth, the reorganization of cultural institutions was another centrepiece in Zia's Islamization programme, aimed at reforming customs and traditions, the eradication of social evils (drug use and abuse, short weighting, profiteering, hoarding, adulteration, bribery, nudity, prostitution and other forms of vulgarity). Again, the overall goal was to promote an 'Islamic way of life' (Hassan, 1985: 265).

Tenth, 'attempts were also made to Islamize the armed forces' (Murphy & Malik, 2009: 25); to this purpose, Islamic teaching was incorporated into the military curriculum for recruits. Furthermore, military organizations had to follow increasingly religious guidelines, and the promotion of officers to higher ranks was largely based on religious conviction (the more conservative, the better), rather than merit or years of service. Islamic clerics (mullahs) belonging to the conservative *Deobandi* stream in Islam and radicalized groups like *Jamaat-i-Islami* were appointed to work with the soldiers. This paved the way for radical, militant jihadist thinking into the country's security forces and influenced not only the new generation (post-independence, post-secular British educated officers' corps) of young

officers but the rank and file too. Approximately 25–30% of officers developed a fundamentalist mindset (Murphy & Malik, 2009: 25).

The Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) played a crucial role in training, recruiting and financing the Afghan mujahideen[12] (Haqqani, 2005: 141–142). This laid the foundation for the future alliance of Islamic clerics and the military. For the security forces, the Islamic clerics and support for conservative and radicalized Islamic thinkers were important factors in providing an ideological justification for the dominant role in the country's political arena. For the radicalized Islamic clerics, the backing of the soldiers was necessary to provide them with the means to penetrate all facets of Pakistani society (Murphy & Malik, 2009: 25).

To sum up, there are no doubts that Zia-ul-Haq spearheaded the process of Islamization in Pakistan. After his term ended, his successors continued the process. For example, Benazir Bhutto started by appeasing the Islamic fundamentalist and performed symbolic religious gestures. Also, during her tenures as prime minister, Pakistan increased its support to the Taliban in Afghanistan and contributed to their territorial gains.

> Nawaz Sharif, who headed the *Islami Jamhoori Ittehad* (the Islamic Democratic Alliance) and was Zia-ul-Haq's protégé during the 1980's, sought *Sharia* rule to enhance his control. Musharraf, in turn, compromised with the *Muttahida Majlis-e-Amal*, a religious coalition in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa/KPK (at that time known as North-West Frontier Province/NWFP) to comply with their wishes to create effective religious laws (the *Nizam-e-Adl*) (Malik, 2011: 42).

Despite the fact that Musharraf described Pakistan as a modern Islamic state based on a moderate, tolerant interpretation of Islam, he insisted that Pakistan is an 'Islamic' state and was not willing to abolish the Hudood and Blasphemy laws (Ahmed, 2009).

Zia-ul Haq's Islamization helped strengthen Pakistan's relations with conservative Muslim countries, and it created a political environment conducive to the implementation of comprehensive political strategy of state terrorism. Zia moved the country into the 'orbit' of Muslim countries that are well known for their engagement in state terrorism, including partners such as Saudi Arabia, Iran and Libya. In this context, Pakistan's involvement in the Afghan terror crisis also provided a boost to state-sponsored Islamization by exclaiming 'Islam to be in danger' (Chopra & Chada, 2009: 33). The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan helped solidify Zia's regime in two ways: First, it provided the Pakistani military and intelligence with an opportunity to cultivate a pro-jihad climate and facilitate

---

[12]The ISI was established in 1948 by a British army officer, and headquarters are located in Islamabad. The ISI and the Intelligence Bureau (IB) are the two main intelligence agencies in Pakistan. IB is controlled by the Ministry of the Interior, and the ISI is part of the Ministry of Defence. ISI responsibilities include the collection of foreign and domestic intelligence and coordination of the intelligence functions of the three military services. ISI plays a key role in politics and decision-making of Pakistan. It is one of the most powerful institutions in Pakistan (Hussain, 2010: 190; 249–250; Mitra et al., 2006: 300).

popular support for the Afghan mujahideen (Cheema, 2012). Second, it strengthened and justified the linkage between 'mosque and military' (Haqqani, 2005), in turn supporting and accelerating the push towards Islamic fundamentalism in Pakistan (Murphy & Malik, 2009: 25).

4 The Concept of State-Sponsored Terrorism

By all accounts, state terrorism is one of the greatest sources of human suffering and destruction and the single greatest challenge to societal security today (Jackson et al., 2010a, 2010b: 1). This chapter defines state terrorism as the intentional use or threat of violence by state agents or their proxies against individuals or groups who are victimized for the purpose of intimidating or frightening a broader audience'. The direct victims of the violence are therefore not the main targets, but are merely instrumental to the primary goal of frightening people who are intimidated by the communicative power of violence. The final goal of the violence is specific political or political-economic achievements, as opposed to religious or criminal goals (Jackson et al., 2010a, 2010b: 3).

4.1 Indicators for State Terrorism

Despite the fact that there is no consensus on what defines state terrorism,[13] several experts identify some key characteristics/indicators for state terrorism:

First, state terrorism is substantive (Blakeley, 2009: 30). This means there must be the threat of violence or the actual use of violence (McAllister & Schmid, 2011: 204) and implies an explicit connection between the state and the terrorist attack. More concretely, there must be a deliberate act of violence against the individuals that the state must protect or a threat of such an action if an environment of fear has already been established through preceding acts of violence (Blakeley, 2009: 30).

Second, the act of state terrorism must be perpetrated by actors on behalf of/in conjunction with the state. This means that state terrorism is committed by agents (official representatives) of the state, or by proxies (principals) who operate with the resources of the state (Blakeley, 2009: 30; McAllister & Schmid, 2011: 204). In other words, perpetrators of state terrorism can be from inside (especially military, intelligence services, policy and other security personnel[14]) as well as outside the state apparatus (Jackson et al., 2011). Basically, agents and principals are acting as either one of the behalf of the state or with the state's approval, either tacitly or

---

[13]Despite the above descript different dimensions, in the following discourse, the term state terrorism will be sued synonymously with 'governmental or state terror', 'state involvement in terror' and 'state sponsorship of terrorism'.

[14]Actually each employee or functionaries acting in their official capacity as representatives of a regime/government can be considered as a potential perpetrator of state terrorism (Jackson et al., 2011).

explicitly (Jackson et al., 2011). In this context, actions by state employees (usually security sector agents and the judiciary) in an unofficial capacity (personnel off-duty or on leave) but with tacit approval (Terrorism-Research, n.d.) are included in the scope of state terrorism. Subsequently, principals as well as agents can be involved in a variety of private non-state groups or operate as individuals carrying out acts of terrorism. These include private security actors (PSAs) subcontracted by the private military companies (PMCs), private security companies (PSCs), private militias, death squads, vigilantes, paramilitary organizations, mobs, gangs, non-state terrorist groups and other informal actors like lone assassins (Blakeley, 2009, p. 30; Jackson et al., 2011).

Third, according to Nagengast (1994), state terrorism is 'the policy of using acts inspiring great fear as a method of ruling' (Nagengast, 1994). As such, the act or threat of violence is intended to induce extreme fear among the target as well as the observers who identify with that victim (Blakeley, 2009: 30). In order to spread fear effectively, conducting public acts is an important instrument in the success of state terrorism. In this context, violence is not solely geared towards the eradication of enemies of the state, but as a means to produce fear (Schmid, 2011: 204).

Fourth, state terrorism must be understood as a strategy of political violence containing a clear political motive (Zalman, 2014), namely, the desire to change or to preserve the status quo. As such, the political objective can be conservative or revolutionary, to maintain a regime or create a new one (Jackson et al., 2011). Here, the target audience is 'forced to consider changing their behaviour in some way' (Blakeley, 2009: 30; Jackson et al., 2011). As such, state terrorism is not just political in nature but also intends to communicate a message to a wider group (audience) than the immediate victim(s) for the purpose of influencing their behaviour (Claridge, 1996: 52). Additionally, state terrorism is not meant to address personal needs or desires of decision-makers (McAllister & Schmid, 2011: 204).

Fifth, state terrorism is usually planned and implemented in secret ('clandestine state terrorism'), especially in nations where the government uses terror to maintain power and control. Clandestine (secret) state terrorism is a form of covert action that consists of direct participation by state agents in acts of terrorism (Stohl & Lopez, 1988: 4). However, state terror also takes overt forms. Secrecy, which is naturally accompanied by unpredictability (Kushner, 2003: xxiii, 345), offers governments the opportunity to deny involvement or responsibility and ignorance of or downplaying of state terrorism. Furthermore, secrecy offers governments and their agencies the option to disguise their participation in terrorism which exonerates them from having to change constitutional, legal and judicial processes justifying these activities (Terrorism-Research, n.d.). However, in some cases perpetrators of state terrorism do not act in complete secrecy; this quasi-secrecy is deliberate and ensures a high degree of unpredictability of state terrorism as to generate even more fear (Kushner, 2003: 345).

Sixth, state terrorism is systematically organized (Bushnell, Shlapentokh, Vanderpool, & Jeyaratnam, 1991; Claridge, 1996: 52) and should be seen as 'a concerted campaign of violence and not a mosaic of random and unrelated events'

(McAllister & Schmid, 2011: 204) or as 'spasmodic, random acts of sanguinary terror' (Wilkinson, 1982: 312).

Seventh, state terrorism is usually marked by an extraordinary brutality. This is supposed to generate such a high level of fear among its targets and those operating in a similar environment, filling those who identify with the victims with despair and persuading them to obey, or comply (Bushnell et al., 1991). Furthermore, not all acts of repression/use of violence are illegal, nor are they necessarily qualified as terrorism. However, when state action is excessive (extraordinary brutal) but also used against unarmed (innocent) civilians, it qualifies as terrorism.

Eighth, the intentional targeting of civilians is a significant feature of both 'non-state' and 'state' terrorism. As such, victims of state terrorism are unarmed or unorganized and therefore unable to deal with or withstand the aggression (McAllister & Schmid, 2011: 204). In many cases, members of political opposition and critical writers and thinkers (especially journalists, bloggers and academics) are targets of state terrorism (Kushner, 2003: 228). Against this backdrop, the state may have multiple objectives: to eliminate opponents while simultaneously sending a message too other current or future critics (Jackson et al., 2010a, 2010b: 4). In other words, 'the ultimate target is not necessarily the actual victim of aggression, but a wider audience of potential victims' (McAllister & Schmid, 2011: 204).

4.2 Forms of State Terrorism

As outlined above, governments use terrorism both domestically and across state boundaries, involving a large repertoire of repressive tactics. In practice, state and non-state actors employ similar strategies and use violence in near-identical ways (Jackson et al., 2011: 5). Basically, the range of state terrorism (including sponsorship) covers the following broad types: hosting, military support, financial assistance, endorsement, repression, intimidation and human rights abuses. These types can be found in activities such as providing financial and material (arms and explosives) supplies and services (transactions and purchases), training facilities and expertise, safe havens (bases for operations), providing falsified documents (like for personal identification—passports, internal identification documents), extension of diplomatic protection and services (diplomatic passports, the use of embassies and other protected grounds and diplomatic pouches to transport weapons or explosives), immunity from extradition, intelligence-gathering/sharing and lending ideological support to perpetrators of terrorism (Bushnell et al., 1991; Jackson et al., 2011: 5; Kushner, 2003: 346; McAllister & Schmid, 2011: 204–205; Terrorism-Research, n.d.). Other state terrorist-related activities are changes to legal codes ('constitutional engineering') in order to permit or encourage terrorist activities, the use of extra-legal powers such as martial law, state of emergency, destruction of private property, suppression of the media, suppression of political parties, excessive use of force during arrests, orchestrated physical attacks during opposition party rallies, beatings and physical assaults directed towards individual opponents, threats and reprisals against the families of political opponents, arbitrary

arrests and incarceration without trial, police raids without warrant, forced exile or domestic house arrest, extrajudicial killing (like targeted killings of political opponents), kidnapping, hijacking, execution of prisoners without trial or after fake show trial, disappearances (secret individual abductions followed by torture and murder) and premeditated massacres of opposition group. For example, mobs were led by paid provocateurs or mass terror for the purpose of 'ethnic cleansing' (such as genocide and the use of concentration camps).

5 Pakistan and State-Sponsored Terrorism

This section elaborates on the different ways in which Pakistan uses terrorism in the context of foreign policy (*context and initial conditions*). It analyses the way in which the military and civilian leadership of the country are involved in state terrorism and which kinds of concrete activities can be identified on the basis of the aforementioned *indicators of state terrorism*.

5.1 Case Study 1: East Pakistan (Bangladesh)

5.1.1 The Context and Initial Conditions

After the formation of Pakistan in 1947, East Pakistan (Bengal) and West Pakistan were separated by about 2000 km of Indian territory. The inhabitants of East Pakistan (Bengalis) were a relatively homogenous group with an own cultural and religious identity ('Bengali Culture'). As such, Bengalis had little in common with the ethnic groups in West Pakistan, especially with communities of the Punjabis and Sindhis (Murphy, 2013: 70; Murphy & Tamana, 2010: 52). Another major difference was the language, with Urdu being the main state-supported language in West Pakistan and Bengali the suppressed language of East Pakistan (Mitra, Wolf, & Schoettli, 2006: 53–54). This inequality, followed by a proposal to make Urdu the sole language of Pakistan, was met with widespread outrage in the east and resulted in an ethnolinguistic movement demanding that Bengali was given the status of official state language (Choudhury, 1972: 242; Upadhyay, 2003). The movement, which was met with violent oppression, morphed into a struggle for liberation and independence that began on 26 March 1971 and led to the establishment of the independent state of Bangladesh on 16 December 1971 (Choudhury, 1972: 242). Since their independence from the British empire in 1947, the Bengali-speaking inhabitants of East Pakistan had felt they were, in effect, a colony once more, this time under the auspice of Punjabi-dominated West Pakistan (Choudhury, 1972: 244; Murphy, 2013: 70). According to the Bengalis, the West Pakistani elite, who also exclusively ran the governmental affairs of East Pakistan, were acting like an 'oppressive colonial power'. As a result, the Bengalis, who constitute the majority of the country's population, were underrepresented in the country's political-administrative, bureaucratic institutions or in the military (Murphy, 2013: 70). Consequently, all significant decisions were made by West Pakistan

(Lieven, 2011: 124). This phenomenon was aggravated by the fact that all crucial government and military infrastructure was situated in the western part of the country. Apart from the language grievances, the Bengalis were subjected to ruthless, systematic exploitation. Most export products, the main commodity being jute, were produced in the east, but allocation of earnings bore no relation to the contribution (Choudhury, 1972: 245; Mitra et al., 2006: 53). Furthermore, most foreign aid was directed at East Pakistan, but the bulk of this financial assistance was used for development projects[15] in the Punjab province of West Pakistan (Murphy, 2013: 70).

The event that prompted the struggle for independence was the 1970s rejection of the general election[16] results; these would have resulted in the political representation of the east by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and his Awami League (AL). His victory meant representation of the leading political force in East but also would have resulted in more influence in all of Pakistan (Mitra et al., 2006: 54; Murphy, 2013: 70).[17] However, the military and civilian elite in Islamabad were unwilling to accept a national government ruled by East Pakistani representatives. In the end, the Bengali leadership responded by launching a 'civil disobedience and non-cooperation movement'. As West Pakistan ordered a military crackdown in the east, this set the scene for the Bangladesh war of independence. During the war, the military brutally cracked down on critics of West Pakistan; any dissent was considered an act of treason (Murphy, 2013: 71). In this context, it is important to note that West Pakistan's attitude towards the Bengali people was extraordinarily crude and racist, referring to their darker-skinned countrymen as 'black bastards' and 'mosquitoes (macchars) who need to be swatted' (TIME, 1971) and the actions taken by Pakistan's security agents ought to be perceived as 'one of the most horrific examples of state terrorism in the twentieth century' (Murphy, 2013: 71).

5.1.2   Indicators

In the case of East Pakistan (Bangladesh), aforementioned indicators support the case that West Pakistan was involved in state terrorism as it looked to suppress the independence movement of the Bengali people.

---

[15]For example, the Indus River Basin Project.

[16]This was the first 'free and fair' election on universal suffrage held in Pakistan, as promised by the then military dictator General Yahya Khan after took over in 1969 (Bose, 2005).

[17]Held on 12 December 1970, the election was contested by the major parties of each wing, the Bangladesh Awami League (AL) of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, dominant in the east, and the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, dominant in the west. The AL having taken 162 of the 313 seats in the Pakistan parliament was the winner. Consequently, it was expected that the AL, whose leader was advocating a new constitution on the basis of his Six-Point Programme which would greatly limit the power of West Pakistan, would form the government (Mitra et al., 2006: 54; Murphy, 2013: 70).

Intentional Target Killings of Civilians

The primary aim of terrorist activities by the government of West Pakistan was to eliminate the leadership of the Bengali independence movement and to terrorize its population in order to beat them into submission (Murphy, 2013: 72). The most crucial element of this campaign was the targeted killing of Bengali intellectuals that formed the organizational backbone of the movement, including regular (Bengali) soldiers of the East Bengal Regiment, the East Pakistan Rifles, police and paramilitary Ansars and mujahids; religious (non-Muslim) minorities, especially Hindus; members and volunteers/supporters of the Awami League, down to the lowest rank; university and college students; and intelligentsia, academics, professors, writers and independent thinkers (Blood, 2002; Bose, 2005; Mascarenhas, 1971: 116–117; Muhith, 1992: 236).

Systematically Organized

The use of violence by West Pakistan in East Pakistan was without a doubt well organized and prepared (Muhith, 1992: 235). This is evident from various military campaigns carried out by West Pakistan's army, namely, Operation *Blitz*, Operation *Searchlight* and Operation *Search and Destroy* (Murphy, 2013: 71–73). In the words of Bass: 'Pakistan's crackdown on the Bengalis was not routine or small-scale killing, not something that could be dismissed as business as usual, but a colossal and systematic onslaught' (Bass, 2013: 11).

Political Motive

There are concrete political motives that underpin terrorist activities, such as the will to maintain power over East Pakistan, to ensure the territorial integrity of the country and to maintain control of a hostile civilian population of 75 million Bengalis (Murphy, 2013: 72). In this context, other concrete-operational goals were the eradication of Bengali language and culture, termination of current and future opposition elements and expulsion of those who were anti-Islam and pro-India.

On Behalf of or in Conjunction with the State

There is no doubt that the terrorist actions by Pakistan security forces and local collaborators were taken on behalf of West Pakistan.

Secrecy

Evidently, major military campaigns like *Operation Searchlight* or *Operation Search and Destroy* were overt actions resulting in large-scale destruction of property, massacres and genocide, which could not have been carried out in secret. However, the government of West Pakistan made substantial efforts to block or at least control the flow of information on the atrocities and war crimes committed by its military forces and supporters. For example, there was very little information available in West Pakistan on their government's military action in East Pakistan (Mascarenhas, 1971: 116–117). Furthermore, there are serious indications that Pakistan, through its western allies (first and foremost the USA), put pressure on

international observers 'not to report the full story' of the Bengali genocide. US Consul General Archer Blood reported on these alarming and dramatic events (Bass, 2013). In his last cable on 6 April 1971, the so-called Blood Telegram, he denounced the complicity of US President Nixon and Henry Kissinger in the mass murder of Bengalis; Islamabad had successfully negotiated[18] the US silence, leading them to ignore the horrifying events in East Pakistan. As a result of these revelations, he was recalled from his post immediately (Bass, 2013; Wolf, 2013). Secrecy was meant to hide actions of state terrorism, to create a myth of Indian guided Bengali separatism in an attempt to destabilize Pakistan and to portray the Bengalis as the initial perpetrators of terrorism. Islamabad emphasized that West Pakistan's military actions were merely a response to attacks on non-Bengalis and West Pakistani security forces and facilities (Bass, 2013; Mascarenhas, 1971: 90–110; Wolf, 2013).

Ethnic Cleansing by the State

Another important aim of the military operations was the ethnic cleansing of Hindu population in the east, based on the claim that Hindus were corrupting the Bengali Muslims and were acting as the 'fifth column' of India; in its approach, Pakistan did not differentiate between 'hostile Indians' and 'East Pakistani Hindus' (Bose, 2005; Murphy, 2013: 72). Subsequently the Hindus were subjected targeted violence such as the killing of male Hindus (women and children suffered a multitude of cruelties and maltreatment) and forced expulsion from East Pakistan into India, and some had their possessions looted (Bose, 2005; Mascarenhas, 1971: 111–117). This process of ethnic cleansing and discrimination led to an exodus of around 10 million Bengalis, mostly Hindus, into India.

Build-Up and Support/Sponsorship of Non-state Terrorist Groups (Death Squads)

In order to violently suppress the independence movement and to increase the efficacy of targeted killings, West Pakistan relied primarily on enlisted soldiers and paramilitary troops. In addition to this, the army leadership organized a group called the Razakars; these were armed militias drawn mainly from Urdu-speaking Muslims who had migrated from Bihar to East Pakistan after the partition (Murphy, 2013: 72). In this context, it is important to note that West Pakistani military and Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) worked closely with the *Jamaat-i-Islami* as most of the Razakars were associated with this organization. The cooperation between Razakars and Pakistani security agents was such that Islamabad recognized the Razakars as official members of the Pakistani army (Howenstein, 2008: 14; Murphy, 2013: 72). *Al-Badr* ('the moon') and the *Al-Shams* ('the sun') were additional militias made up of local collaborators under the command of the ISI

---

[18]Apparently, the silence of Mr. Nixon was the trade-off for Pakistan's help to arrange the US-China rapprochement which resulted in the 1972 visit of President Nixon to China (Wolf, 2013).

to terrorise the Bengali people. Like the Razakars, *Al-Badr* and *Al-Shams* were groups of Bengali loyalists organized by the Pakistani army to function as death squads (Bose, 2005).

Massacres and Genocide

In order to secure the territory (both urban and rural areas) and to undermine any (potential) resistance, West Pakistan conducted a programme of 'pacification' which led to numerous large-scale massacres, like the ones at Akhira, Bakhrabad, Burunga, Chuknagar, Jathibhanga, Jinjira, Karai Kadipur, Shankharipara and Dhaka University (among others). One particularly crude example is how countless people were shot for violating curfew, despite the fact that the curfew had not been publicly announced (Mascarenhas, 1971). According to the Bangladeshi authorities, 3 million people were killed by terrorist activities; this can be readily described as genocide.

Extraordinary Brutality and Spreading Fear

All actions of West Pakistan's security agents and their East Pakistani affiliates were carried out with extraordinary brutality in order to spread fear more effectively. Torture, mutilation, rape, the use of arson, destruction of property and arrests without warrants were all common practice (Bose, 2005; Murphy & Tamana, 2010: 54). Furthermore, the use of heavy weapon systems, like tanks and artillery, in civilian neighbourhoods equally showed the level of brutality and intimidation (Bose, 2005; Murphy, 2013: 72).

5.2   Case Study 2: Afghanistan

5.2.1   The Context and Initial Conditions

The Afghanistan-Pakistan nexus is one of the most significant South Asian hotspots. Despite the fact that both countries share common culture, religion and civilization, their bilateral relations have always been tense and antagonistic. This should be seen in light of specific historic circumstances, such as the non-acceptance of the Durand Line as common border (Wolf, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e). Despite some temporary improvements, deep mistrust, suspicion, resentment and bitterness between Kabul and Islamabad persisted and continues to contribute to a political deadlock. This may come as a surprise to some, as Pakistan claims that one of its major interests is to work towards a unified, peaceful and friendly Afghanistan (Rais, 2008: 183; Shams, 2014). It seems that this 'three-in-one strategy', proclaimed by Islamabad as the cornerstone of its Afghan policy, has been eroded by competing interests, poor implementation and mutual misperception. Instead of building a friendly and constructive relationship, the two neighbours continuously blame each other for interfering in their respective internal affairs and hampering social, economic and political development. Afghanistan accuses its eastern neighbour of supporting militant opposition forces in order to destabilize the regime (Bajoria & Kaplan, 2011), whereas Pakistan is

blaming Kabul of reinforcing insurgencies in its resource-rich border province Balochistan and holds it responsible for the deterioration of the security situation in its Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), especially in North and South Waziristan. These fears in particular gain momentum because Pakistani security circles are convinced that Afghanistan is hosting India's 'Research and Analysis Wing' (RAW) intelligence service (Bajoria, 2008). Pakistan accuses India of using Afghan territory to support separatism in Balochistan province[19] (Khan, 2015), to improve their own capabilities in the areas of intelligence gathering on Pakistan and to be able to carry out activities on Pakistani territory. As none of the Afghan regimes officially recognized the Durand Line as an international border, this further complicates the bilateral relationship. Territorial claims to the Pashtun regions of Pakistan or at least autonomy for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa/KPK (populated by the Pashtun) in order to create 'Pashtunistan'[20] are just another part of the Afghan dispute with Islamabad that can be traced back to colonial times.[21] Against the backdrop of rising AfPak antagonism, Kabul decided to cooperate with New Delhi as British colonial rule came to an end (Roy, 2004: 150); this led to close diplomatic relations but also to security (military[22]) cooperation (Roy, 2004: 150).[23]

There is little doubt that Pakistan played, and is still playing, a major role in Afghanistan's political development, as it continues to increase its involvement in

---

[19]Islamabad feels threatened by India's large diplomatic presence and also questions the motives of Indian substantial assistance and aid towards Afghanistan, 'as New Delhi does not frequently provide economic assistance, much less a billion dollars' worth' (Levine, 2010: 3). In this light, India's reconstruction and development efforts in the so-called Pashtun belt, which is close to the border, are seen as promoting separatists within Pakistan, e.g. Balochistan. Pakistan believes that India uses its consular services as intelligence bases which provide cover for the Indian intelligence agency (RAW) to run operations against Pakistan, e.g. circulating false currency and running training camps for Afghans to carry out destructive activities, and to initiate and support separatist rebellions in Balochistan. In this context, Pakistanis also accuse the Kabul government that it uses the Ministry of Tribal Affairs and the Afghan intelligence service to cooperate with India to finance and arm the separatist Balochistan Liberation Army (Gundu & Schaffer, 2008: 1).

[20]'In 1947, the Pakhtun Khudayi Khidmatgaran movement, guided by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and based in the KPK (than North West Frontier Province/NWFP), joined hands with the Indian Congress (INC) and then opted for independence, or at least autonomy within Pakistan' (Roy, 2004: 159).

[21]In this context, it is interesting to mention that Afghanistan was the only country not to vote in favour of the admission of Pakistan into the United Nations (UN) after achieving independence in 1947 (Roy, 2004: 150).

[22]For example, 'Afghan officers were send to India for training' (Roy, 2004: 150).

[23]In this context Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation signed in 1971 was of special concern for Pakistan. From the early 1950s and throughout the Cold War, India and the Soviet Union maintained close co-operative ties. India's policy of non-alignment enabled it to accept Soviet aid in the sectors of industrial development, defence production and arms purchases as well as foreign aid from the USA, particularly for food. The 1971 treaty between Moscow and New Delhi was especially supposed to counterbalance the emerging Pakistan-China-US triangle (Mitra et al., 2006: 148).

the country's internal affairs (Wolf, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e). It is important to note that since its independence, there is no major change in Pakistan's policies on Afghanistan. In other words, military and civilian governments in Islamabad tend to follow the same patterns when it comes to their dealings with Kabul and is mostly aimed at increasing their leverage within the country. In order to do so, the ISI persistently pushes for an Islamist government (Haqqani, 2005: 222) through different proxies.

Pakistan's mingling in Afghanistan dates back to the 1980s, when the ISI engineered attacks against the forces of the Soviet Union, using Afghan proxies, motivating them with calls to jihad and providing them with supplies (especially weapons) and money (Greig, 2016: 22). However, after the withdrawal of the 'Red Army', the ISI was not willing to end its engagement and started to build up the Taliban network as a permanent proxy to take part and influence the subsequent civil war. Nowadays, Pakistan continues to use the Taliban and other militant groups as 'strategic assets' and a means of maintaining its influence, especially after the withdrawal of American troops. After the fall of the Taliban regime in 2001, Peter Tomsen claims that 'it took about three and a half years for the ISI to rebuild the Taliban and other radical units and send them back into Afghanistan' (Tomsen, 2011). Some say Pakistan uses the deeply fragmented and anarchical state of Afghan society to undermine the peace process as this could lead to an unfavourable situation for Islamabad. Besides their continuous support for the Afghan Taliban, it appears that Pakistan shows a tremendous amount of goodwill towards the HQN and other militant groups as long as they focus their efforts on Afghanistan and spare Pakistan.

Military and ISI have used these militants selectively, promoting those who further the country's security agenda and cracking down on those who don't. 'The same goes for al-Qaeda and other foreign fighters' (Gall, 2016). 'The military used a strategy of divide and rule, encouraging splits in the militant groups to weaken and control them, he said' (Gall, 2011). However, this persistent involvement of Pakistan in cross-border terrorism led to the resurgence of the Taliban and destroyed chances of sustainable peace and reconciliation but also led to an increase in terrorist attacks in recent years.

5.2.2   Indicators of State-Sponsored Terrorism

On Behalf of or in Conjunction with the State
There is clear evidence of Pakistan's activities in Afghanistan and the remarkable level of cooperation between Pakistani military/ISI and groups listed as terrorist organizations; there is also evidence that these groups operate on behalf of Pakistani security agents. In this context one can conclude that the ISI was a crucial factor motivating jihadists to serve Pakistan's interests in Afghanistan. A former director general of the ISI openly acknowledges that 'religious forces have always aligned themselves with the military's view with regard to the defence budget (and) the Kashmir and Afghanistan policies' (Hussain, 2010: 188). Furthermore, he stated that

'the Islamist groups could be considered a kind of irregular paramilitary formation with clandestine links to the Pakistani security agencies' (Hussain, 2010: 188).

Basically, the Pakistani government exercised oversight and control indirectly through non-governmental influence and through the large informal network of madrasas or political-religious groups (especially Sunni sectarian, militant organizations, like Jamaat-i-Islami). Gall points out that 'behind the curtain', the ISI is the driving force and 'the madrasas are a cover, a camouflage' (Gall, 2014b). Over time, the militant Sunni activists developed close ties with Islamist groups in Afghanistan in their bid to challenge the government (cf. Nasr, 2004: 91); there is no doubt that this phenomenon was facilitated by Pakistan's intelligence. In this context, the madrasas played an important role in the resurgence of the Taliban (Gall, 2014a, 2014b).

In a more direct way, the ISI (in conjunction with the military) provided protection, training, strategic planning and equipment and channelled financial resources from outside the region via Pakistan to their affiliates in Afghanistan (Gall, 2011; Grare, 2009: 26; Nasr, 2004: 92). Consequently, militant Islamists and their followers in Afghanistan received continuous support from Pakistan. One remarkable example is the attack on the Indian Embassy in Kabul on 7 July 2008 that killed 58, including 2 top officials, and left over 140 injured (Walsh, 2010). The US officials say they believe the embassy attack was carried out by members of HQN (Mazzetti & Schmitt, 2008). However, some senior observers are convinced that 'the embassy bombing was no operation by rogue ISI agents acting on their own. It was sanctioned and monitored by the most senior officials in Pakistani intelligence' (Gall, 2014a: 188). Furthermore, the attack on the embassy 'revealed the clearest evidence of ISI complicity in its planning and execution' (Gall, 2014a). In other words, the attack on the Indian Embassy was carried out by the HQN but on behalf of Pakistani state agencies.

Creating and Using Fear

To generate fear, jihadist attacks focus on places of high symbolic value in Kabul like the attack on the Indian Embassy in 2008, the one on the Ministry of Justice in 2009 or the 2016 attack at the diplomatic area of Kabul (Rahimi & Gall, 2009; Shams, 2016; ToI, 2014). The preferred methods are I.E.D. and suicide bombers, and several Afghan sources are stressing that 'the trail of organizing, financing and recruiting the bombers who have carried out a rising number of suicide attacks in Afghanistan traces back to Pakistan' and 'every single bomber or I.E.D. in one way or another is linked to Pakistan', meaning they either receive their training or payment[24] there (Gall, 2006a, 2006b; Gall, 2014a: 187–188; Mazzetti & Schmitt, 2008; Rahimi & Gall, 2009).

Moreover, they openly engage in military operations as was the case with the overrun and temporary occupation of Kunduz on 28 September 2015 (Wolf, 2015a,

---

[24]For example, there are reports that the families of potential suicide bombers would receive the payment of $ 1400 when they accomplished their mission (Gall, 2006a, 2006b).

2015b, 2015c). This event is noteworthy for several reasons: it not only marks the continuation of the 2014 Taliban offensive (the 'official' end of the Taliban infighting), it also shows they are able to conduct major activities in the north of the country, which is the traditional stronghold of anti-Taliban forces. Part of the Taliban agenda, starting the 'battle of Kunduz', was to create public awareness of its own military strength in order to recall collective memories about the Taliban regime and instill more fear into society (Wolf, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c).

Political Motives

To start, Pakistan looks to undercut Iranian (*Shia*) influence in the region (Roy, 2004: 151) and 'to ensure that Afghanistan remains in the Sunni Islamist camp' (Gall, 2016). In this context, the political and military leadership 'hoped to secure a leading position for Pakistan in the Muslim world' (Tomsen, 2011). Pakistan was inspired by the idea of a 'great design' and wants to forge a broader Islamist bloc of Pakistan, Kashmir, Afghanistan and eventually including Central Asian States, to balance against archrival India (Tomsen, 2011).

Also, Pakistan considers Afghanistan part of its 'backyard' (Gall, 2016) and looks to transform its neighbour into a 'protectorate state' (Dorronsoro, 2004: 17). In order for this to work, Pakistan needs to contain Afghan power (Mazzetti & Schmitt, 2008) and install a 'Pakistan-friendly government' in Kabul, which would act as its 'junior partner' (Roy, 2004: 151). Moreover, activities in Afghanistan make up perceived and/or claimed threats towards Pakistan (Ahmed, 2014: 84); in this way Pakistan legitimized direct military rule or indirect influence in the political decision-making process. Pakistan also wants to gain leverage in Afghanistan to open up the Central Asian States (CAS) to Pakistani influence (Dorronsoro, 2004: 170). In order to achieve this, the ISI has started to train ethnic minorities of northern Afghan descent alongside its standard makeup of Pashtuns (Gall, 2016), living in the southeast of the country. The ousting of the Taliban regime and the institutional weaknesses and lack of military capabilities of the succeeding governments in Kabul created a tremendous power vacuum. Pakistan wants to avoid at all costs that this vacuum is filled by another regional actor, especially India. Any Afghan government enjoying the support of non-Afghan, non-Pakistani compliant (friendly) elements are considered a threat to Pakistan's territorial integrity, sovereignty and security.

While historically, India and Afghanistan share close political, cultural and economic ties, 'India maintains an active intelligence network in Afghanistan, all of which has drawn suspicion from Pakistani officials' (Mazzetti & Schmitt, 2008). Against this backdrop, Pakistan wants to weaken/break the traditional Kabul-Delhi axis. In other words, Pakistan seeks to neutralize a perceived existential threat of possible Indian inroads in Afghanistan (Greig, 2016: 22). Pakistan perceives 'Afghanistan as a part of a threatening Indian pincer movement' (Gundu & Schaffer, 2008: 1). In order to counter this perceived threat, Pakistan's ISI has been seen to support several terrorist attacks on Indian personnel and facilities in Afghanistan, in effort to compel India to reduce its presence in the area (Fair, 2015). Pakistan fears that India will use its presence in Afghanistan to support

subnationalism and militancy on Pakistani soil, especially in the troubled Balochistan province. Pakistan's 'terror policy' is aimed at creating frictions among the different socio-political and ethnic groups to undermine the creation of a unified Afghanistan. Such developments are not in the interests of Islamabad, as a strong government in Kabul would most likely not be as compliant as Pakistan's security establishments wish to gain 'strategic depth' in its western neighbourhood.

Secrecy

Meanwhile, Pakistan continues to deny harbouring domestic, regional and international terrorist groups, while emphasizing that it is a victim of terrorism itself (Gall, 2016). In this context, Pakistanis are stating that there is no 'infiltration problem' of fighters from their country into neighbouring countries and the government 'insists that the roots of the Taliban insurgency lie in Afghanistan' (Gall, 2006a).

By continuously denying involvement, Pakistani civilian and military leadership have always been able to claim 'plausible deniability' when it comes to their role in Afghanistan (Roy, 2004: 149). In order to maintain this façade and to keep the government's covert support an 'official secret', the ISI has threatened and/or harassed local and international journalists (Gall, 2014a, 2014b).

Against this backdrop, it is interesting to mention that despite its hostility, the country's leadership never faced serious pressure from the international community regarding its activities in Afghanistan (Roy, 2004: 149). The USA has not really spoken out against Pakistan, nor has it changed its policy towards a government that was exporting terrorism, other than temporarily freezing and/or reducing financial support (Gall, 2014b). This is surprising, as Afghan officials and several international observers alike (including US military or foreign diplomats[25] familiar with the peculiar security dynamics of the Afghanistan-Pakistan region) persistently point out Pakistan's role in cross-border terrorism (Alexander, 2011; Gall, 2014a). Also, Pakistan's support for the mujahideen and later for the Taliban until 9/11 is well known and documented (Rashid, 1998). While it did so under the guise of covert operations by the ISI (Dorronsoro, 2004: 170), among international analysts, there is no doubt that the support for Taliban and other terror groups like HQN continued after the fall of the Taliban regime in 2001. For example, Pakistan continued to nurture the jihadists in FATA in order to continue its activities in Afghanistan. While Islamabad claims to have ceased its support (Gall & Khan, 2006), the fact that Osama bin Laden and Mullah Omar escaped and resided in Pakistan after the fall of the Taliban regime at the very least proves their passive involvement. Some analysts claim that there is evidence that the Lt. Gen. Ahmed Shuja Pasha, Director General ISI, knew of Bin Laden's presence in

---

[25]For example, the statements and/or writings of US General David *H. Petraeus*, journalist Carlotta Gall or Canadian diplomat Alexander Chris are remarkable. Nevertheless, regarding Alexander Chris, Pakistan's state sponsorship of terrorism is happening. But 'it's covert. It's been denied. Not even Western analysts agree that it's happening on the scale we know it to be happening' (Harris, 2014).

Abbottabad (Gall, 2014b). Furthermore, the fact that after the beginning of the international community's military engagement in Afghanistan, top terrorist leaders like Sirajuddin Haqqani (HQN), Mullah Akhtar Muhammad Mansour (than leader of the Taliban[26]) or al-Qaeda's leader Ayman al-Zawahiri were able to freely move around and/or live openly in Pakistan as they conducted their business and continued to gather followers (Gall, 2016) is another strong indication that Pakistan supports terrorism.

Systematically

Pakistan's security sector agencies, especially the ISI, have a long record of intervening in a number of conflicts abroad and managing international mujahideen forces (Gall, 2016). Since the late 1970s and early 1980s, Pakistan started to adopt a direct active approach to influence the political developments in Afghanistan (Roy, 2004: 150–151). Starting by granting asylum and shelter to militant Islamists (and their followers) and opposing the Afghan government (monarchy) like Ahmad Shah Massoud or Gulbuddin Hekmatyar then, later on, these men became protégés of Pakistani intelligence (Gall, 2006a, 2006b). This initial support for the Islamist movement which opposed and fought the monarchy in Afghanistan and later supporting the mujahideen against the Soviet occupation evolved in support for the Taliban. This support gained momentum after the dropout of the Soviet forces from Afghanistan and the subsequent civil war. Today, besides its ongoing support for the Afghan Taliban, it appears that Pakistan continues to nurture a broad range of jihadist groups—with a special interest in promoting the Haqqani Network (HQN)—as part of its three-and-a-half decade strategy of using proxies in Afghanistan to advance their interests (Gall, 2011). The HQN is perceived by some analysts as the most influential branch of the Taliban (Gall, 2016).[27] The group enjoys safe havens on Pakistani soil as it conducts operations against American, international and Afghan targets (Gall, 2016). Furthermore, it seems that the military and ISI provided shelter, training, financial support, logistical support and equipment to HQN but also systematically leaked information that tipped militants to surveillance efforts by Western intelligence services (Mazzetti & Schmitt, 2008). More specifically, the ISI is accused of providing terrorists with details about the US campaign against them, in some cases allowing militants to avoid American drone strikes in Pakistan's tribal areas (Mazzetti & Schmitt, 2008). The fact that the USA did not inform Pakistani security sector agents about the planned action against Osama bin Laden shows they are wary of intelligence exchanges between ISI and the terrorists.

---

[26]Assassinated by a US drone attack in 2016.

[27]The HQN seem to be not only an ally of the Taliban but also increasingly a dominant factor within the Taliban movement. More concrete, HQN was able to gain crucial leverage among the Taliban leadership structure. For example, Sirajuddin Haqqani, the current group chief of HQN, was selected in 2015 during an intense leadership struggle as deputy leader of the Taliban in Afghanistan (Mashal, 2016).

Extraordinary Brutality

There is clear evidence that most of the terrorist attacks in Afghanistan are carried out by non-Afghans (Gall, 2006a, 2006b). Pakistan also supported terrorists of Pakistani origin or terrorists from outside the region, like al-Qaeda. In this context, one should mention that the military establishment (from Zia-ul-Haq onwards) capitalized on the growing sectarian conflict and violence (Jalalzai, 1999; Nasr, 2004) between Shia and Sunni communities, using it as tool for domestic control and foreign policy. In this context, several highly radicalized Sunni groups emerged, like *Jamaat Ulema-e-Ahl-e-Hadith* (Society of the Ulema of the People of the Hadith), *Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan* (SSP) or *Lashkar-e-Jhangvi* (L-e-J).[28] These forces have, at times, been used by the Pakistani military and intelligence not only for domestic but also for foreign policy purposes (Grare, 2009: 27). As these groups have no family ties or emotional links with the Afghan population, they are more ruthless than local militants and qualified them to conduct activities that Pakistani state actors could not openly conduct themselves (cf. Grare, 2009: 27).

There is also a remarkable interaction with criminal networks, especially the Afghan drug cartels (Gall & Khan, 2006). The illegal drug trade relies on the goodwill of Pakistan's security sector agents, and participation of criminals in sectarian clashes leads to a further increase in brutality as they are more willing to attack religious places and are known for being more willing and able to kill (Nasr, 2004: 95–96).

Another indication for the extraordinary brutality is the increase in suicide bomb attacks (and I.E.D.s) which is a rather new phenomenon that Afghanistan imported from Pakistan during the last decade (Gall, 2006a, 2006b). Furthermore, there is a 'clear escalation in the bombers' ambitions' (Gall, 2006a, 2006b); besides the 'usual roadside bombs', the jihadists are aiming more and more for multiple, well-coordinated attacks on high-profile targets to achieve maximum damage and publicity.

Intentional Targeting of Civilians

Due to the ethnic and religious dimensions, civilians in Afghanistan have always been targets of Islamist militants (Gall, 2006a, 2006b). To promote Jihad and to establish a radical Islamic state, the main goal of the terrorists was to destroy the moderate, pluralistic state and society that flourished before the 1978 communist coup (Tomsen, 2011). Therefore, since the late 1980s, Pakistan supported Islamist groups as they systematically and continuously assassinated moderate (anti-Taliban) Afghan tribal leaders, politicians and members of the civil society promoting a more secular constitution, pluralism and liberal democratic norms and values (Tomsen, 2011, 2013). It is interesting to note that moderate Afghans not

---

[28]The Shia (minority) community was identified as a threat by the than military regime of Zia-ul-Haq. In order to contain or even eradicate their influence, the dictator decided to support the build-up of radicalized Sunni (the religious majority in Pakistan) groups (Grare, 2009: 26; Nasr, 2004: 92). This anti-Shia policy was continued by all following governments in Pakistan.

only got killed in their own country, but in Pakistan too, where the terrorists could actually act freely without being charged or convicted (Tomsen, 2011).

In order to increase the level of fear among the population, the terrorists focus on moderate Afghans, foreigners and Afghans working for foreign entities. For example, assailants attacked and killed nine civilians in the Serena Hotel in Kabul, including AFP reporter Sardar Ahmad, his wife and two of their three children (Cambell, 2014; Fatah, 2014). In this context, one can state that 'attacking journalists is a time-tested Pakistan ISI method used to intimidate the media into silence' (Fatah, 2014). There are numerous cases of such attacks in Pakistan, especially in the troubled province of Balochistan, and an increasing number of attacks on journalists and political observers in Afghanistan. Other recent examples are the attacks on Pulitzer Prize-winning German photojournalist Anja Niedringhaus and Canadian AP reporter Kathy Gannon.[29] Assailants also intentionally targeted civilians in the above-mentioned 2008 attack on the Indian and US embassies in Kabul on 13 September 2011 (The Guardian, 2011).[30] In sum, besides targeting those who promote moderate thinking and act upon it, the intention of these attackers was to create fear among two groups, among civilians in general and among Indian citizens in particular.

Diplomacy and Protection for Terror Groups

Basically, cross-border militants receive all kinds of protection, immunity and specific diplomatic support. In order to justify large-scale protection of militants and sectarian activists, Pakistani authorities like to emphasize that groups and individuals inspired by sectarianism (especially those operating in Afghanistan) enjoy entrenched support from societal elements and subsequently 'they are hard-pressed to contend with organizations that operate in the name of Islam and claim to be defending its interests' (cf. Nasr, 2004: 96). Along this rationale, Pakistan's state agencies are stressing that action against sectarian actors 'is seen as harassment of the true servants of the faith, and, as such, faces resistance from local communities' (cf. Nasr, 2004: 96) in an attempt to justify their support for militants by a 'claimed affection' for the terrorists. Based on this rationale, military and ISI were able to officially turn a blind eye towards the presence of cross-border (sectarian) terrorists in their country and—as already described above—actively support them. Pakistani authorities offer certain militants safe havens, and with the help of China, they grant these groups (and individuals), diplomatic protection. For example, China blocked UN efforts to sanction JeM chief Masood Azhar under United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1267.[31]

---

[29]Canadian AP reporter Kathy Gannon got severely wounded during this attack, but Anja Niedringhaus got killed. The two women were travelling on the countryside to cover the election campaign in rural areas of the country (Fatah, 2014).

[30]The attack on the Embassy was a combined attack including ISAF headquarter.

[31]Regarding this resolution, UB member states are required to enforce travel bans, freeze assets and put arms embargos on persons and entities if they have proven links with al-Qaeda. See also: https://www.un.org/sc/suborg/en/sanctions/1267

In addition, since sectarianism is an 'Islamic' issue', sectarian-motivated terrorists have had the tacit support of all larger political parties at the national level like the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) and Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N). Also, Imran Khan's Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf, the third largest political party in the country, has a 'remarkable soft spot' for religious fundamentalist views. Of course, the jihadists had the support of the Islamist parties too. Pakistan's major political parties routinely use their influence to keep Sunni sectarian militants from being prosecuted to placate the pro-Islamist constituency (Nasr, 2004: 96). With this in mind, it should not come as a surprise that these sectarian militants 'are often freed from jail with small bribes, and have received preferential treatment at the hands of the authorities' (Nasr, 2004: 96).

5.3   Case Study 3: India

5.3.1   The Context and Initial Conditions

Since its independence in 1947, India has faced violent resistance, ranging from left-wing guerrillas and fundamentalist Islamic terrorists to internal ethnic insurgencies. The insurgencies in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) have caused the bulk of casualties. Many of the terrorists were either sent directly by Pakistan or its intelligence services had a hand in it. Moreover, Pakistan and India engaged in four major wars and countless border violations and skirmishes. Since the end of the Soviet invasion, Afghanistan increasingly turned into the battlefield of a proxy war between Pakistan and India (Greig, 2016: 22). Generally, Pakistan is involved in three different types of state terrorism in India.

First, it supports insurgency/separatist movements all over India; Zia-ul-Haq already started to build up closer ties with some of India's aggrieved neighbours. Haqqani (2005: 270) points out that this is part of Pakistan's strategy to encircle India. To accomplish this, the ISI is creating covert bases and networks and facilitates various operations in Nepal, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka which provide Islamabad with the opportunity to monitor and assist insurgency movements on the territory of its arch enemy. Furthermore, since 1985 Pakistan established a 'special relationship' with Burma's military junta, aimed at creating covert operational bases in countries surrounding India (Haqqani, 2005: 270).

Second, the government also supports cross-border terrorism from Pakistani-based terror groups and militant organizations operating from other Indian neighbours to carry out violent activities on Indian soil, like in Kashmir or India's northeast. It also supports domestic terrorism in the form of Indian-based terror groups. The next section analyses some examples.

Jammu and Kashmir (J&K)

Often described as 'the unfinished business of Partition', Kashmir is the main point of contention in India-Pakistan relations. For India, a Muslim-majority state of J&K symbolises the secular nation state, and for Pakistan an Indian-administered Kashmir represents the incompleteness of Pakistan, representing their opposing visions of state

and nationhood. The territorial dispute has its roots in the immediate aftermath of independence, when the Hindu maharajah of Kashmir failed to decide whether to join India or Pakistan. In the end India granted assistance against an armed uprising of local tribesman, on the condition that the maharajah signed the Instrument of Accession to the Republic of India. Thus, the Kashmir dispute was born, closely followed by the first Indo-Pakistani war of 1947–1948 when Pakistani forces tried to regain control of Kashmir. The war ended with the establishment of a 740-kilometre ceasefire line which, for a while, was patrolled by UNMOGIP and which has been the de facto border ever since.[32] During a second war in 1965, Pakistan tried and failed to instigate mass uprisings in Kashmir, and the ceasefire line was upheld. In 1971, the third Indo-Pakistan war, though not fought over Kashmir, produced the Simla Agreement of 1972, which turned the ceasefire line into the Line of Control (LoC). Today, the border remains contested as is evident from regular fights and skirmishes. The latest major armed confrontation took place in the Kargil sector of the LoC in 1999,[33] followed by numerous cross-border skirmishes which reached their current peak in the so-called surgical strikes in 2016.[34] While armed conflict is an overt confrontation and has changed little about the border, bilateral peace talks also failed. Pakistan has continued to fund, arm train and otherwise support a host of Kashmiri political organizations, specifically terrorist groups, in order to destabilize the Indian administration (Byman, 2005a: 155).

Punjab: Khalistan Movement

The term Khalistan, which means 'Land of the Pure', refers to an autonomous state of the Sikhs. Deteriorating centre-Punjab relations prompted the Akali Dal[35] to

---

[32]Leaving about 65% of the former princely state under Indian administration (Ladakh, Valley of Kashmir, Jammu) and about 35% under Pakistani administration (Northern Areas, Azad Kashmir), armed Indian and Pakistani forces are separated by just a few metres.

[33]The Kargil conflict, which took place in 1999 between India and Pakistan shortly after the Lahore summit between the countries' then Prime Ministers, resulted in the death of 524 Indian soldiers and left 1363 wounded on the Indian side. This was the first conventional war since India and Pakistan nuclear powers. The effort to seize territory on the Indian side of the Line of Control (LoC) around Kargil in the state of J&K was the brainchild of Pakistan's Chief of Army Staff, Gen. Pervez Musharraf. It is speculated that while Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif was informed, he may not have known the details about the operation. The mediating role played by US President Clinton enhanced the influence of the USA in South Asia (Tellis et al., 2001).

[34]The 'surgical strikes' are military operation by India against terrorist facilities on the Pakistani-controlled side of the 'Line of Control', the currently de facto, acting border between both countries.

[35]Akali Dal (Eternal Party), also known as Shiromani Akali Dal, is a regional political party claiming to represent India's Sikhs. It describes itself as a moderate Sikh party and is controlled by the dominant Jat Sikh farming community of Punjab. Founded in 1920 as a political-religious movement, the Akali Dal sought to promote the political voice of Sikhs in issues pertaining to their interests, in particular to return the control of gurdwaras (Sikh temples) to the orthodox Sikh religious community, and to promote a return to the roots of the Sikh religion. Following partition and the reorganization of the states after independence, the charismatic Akali Dal leader, Master Tara Singh, launched the 'Punjabi Suba Agitation' to form a state in which Sikhs would be a

mobilize the Sikh peasantry in a major campaign for Punjab's autonomy in 1980. More extreme elements even demanded the establishment of an independent Sikh nation of Khalistan. Threatened by demands for the constitutional recognition of Sikhs as a separate 'nation' and the declaration of Amritsar as a 'holy city', the central government responded with a campaign aimed at breaking up the Akali Dal. One of the ways in which it accomplished this was by supporting dissenting voices within the Sikh community, leading Congress to support Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale[36] as a counterweight. The Khalistan movement lasted throughout the 1980s, propelled by the anti-Sikh violence that followed the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in 1984 and the imposition of draconian judicial and antiterrorist measures by the government. By the early 1990s, although a core of militants remained committed to Khalistan, the ideological coherence and moral purpose of the movement had faded with the escalation in violence, mounting civilian casualties and economic destruction that a decade of instability had caused. Much of the support for Khalistan came from an expatriate Sikh community in the form of lobbying international organizations and raising awareness and funds for the campaign. However, during the 1980s and 1990s, the Pakistani government also provided material and diplomatic support to Sikh terrorists in India's Punjab (Prasad, 2015). Despite their backing, Pakistan was cautious in its support for the Sikh militants as their claim for Khalistan also included Pakistan's part of the Punjab. Nevertheless, the Khalistan movement offered a 'temporary opportunity' to open an additional front against India from within (Prasad, 2015) and was therefore supported by Pakistan in various ways, sheltering Khalistan terrorists, facilitating contacts between Islamic terrorist groups and Khalistan separatists (Fair, 2015), helping to unite various Khalistan terrorist groups[37] and forming an alliance between Khalistan terrorists and Pakistan's Jihadi groups such as LeT, Harkat-ul-Mujahideen, Jaish-e-Mohammed, Hizb-ul-Mujahideen and Harkat-ul-Jihad (Khan, 2009; Sheghal, 2015). As such, Pakistan's anti-India operations in Punjab are now being handled by the LeT with the help of Khalistan terror groups in consultation with the ISI (Sheghal, 2015).

---

majority. In 1966 Prime Minister Indira Gandhi granted the demand and out of the state of Punjab formed a Sikh-majority Punjab, with the Hindu-majority areas divided between Haryana and Himachal Pradesh (Mitra et al., 2006: 6).

[36]A Sikh priest, or sant, Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale became a political leader and charismatic militant, leading the pro-Khalistan movement of the 1980s. Initially courted by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, the support for Bhindranwale was meant to cut into the sphere of influence of the Akali Dal, the main rival to Congress in the state of Punjab. Bhindranwale's iconic stature, combined with growing violence and terror in the state as well as speculation of a Pakistani hand, began to worry the central government, which decided to take action in 1984. In an attack code-named Operation Blue Star, the Indian army-stormed Amritsar's Golden Temple, in whose precincts Bhindranwale and his followers had taken sanctuary. During the operation Bhindranwale was killed (Mitra et al., 2006: 61).

[37]Babbar Khalsa International (BKI), Indian Sikh Youth Federation (ISYF), Khalistan Zindabad Force (KZF) and Khalistan Tiger Force (KTF).

2001 Indian Parliament Attack

On 13 December 2001, nine Pakistani-based terrorists carried out an attack at the Indian Parliament in New Delhi, killing 14 and injuring 22 (BBC, 2001). Just 2 months earlier, jihadis attacked the J&K State Assembly, killing 38 (Swami, 2001). There is a likely correlation between these two terrorist attacks and the attempts to restart the peace process between India and Pakistan at the Agra Summit in July 2001 (Pande, 2016). Furthermore, in both incidents there are severe claims that the ISI was at least involved in training and arming the terrorists (Filkins, 2016). This claim is supported by the fact that the perpetrators of the New Delhi attack were fighters from LeT and JeM, (PTI, 2001) two organizations who maintain close links with the ISI (Vishnu, 2001).

At the time of the attack, more than 100 members of the parliament and other important politicians were inside the parliament (Rediff, 2001). The attack was not only an assault on a political-institutional building but on the heart of democracy and the sovereignty of the people of India (PTI, 2001). Following the attack, the relations between New Delhi and Islamabad deteriorated once more, and the subsequent build-up of troops along their respective borders in 2002 led to international concern about another India-Pakistan war (BBC, 2001).

2008 Mumbai Attacks

In November 2008, ten members of *Lashkar-e-Taiba* (Army of the Pure or LeT), an Islamic militant anti-Indian organization based in Pakistan, carried out a series of 12 simultaneous and well-coordinated terrorist attacks across Mumbai. It was the worst terrorist incident in India's history, lasted 4 days, claimed over 170 lives and left more than 300 people injured (Tankel, 2011). It is interesting to mention that this assault occurred only 2 months after Pakistan's newly elected leader, President Asif Zardari, made a series of peaceful overtures to New Delhi for the first time in 9 years (Filkins, 2016). There is evidence that ISI officials provided direct support to the attackers (Filkins, 2016).

2015 Gurdaspur Attacks

On 27 July 2015, three Pakistan-based terrorists opened fire on a bus,[38] a roadside diner, and then attacked a police station in Dina Nagar located in the Gurdaspur district of Punjab (Singh, 2015). The attackers, dressed in army uniforms, murdered seven (four police men including a superintendent and three civilians) and injured several people during a 12-hour gunfight until they were shot by Indian security forces[39] (Gopal, 2015). Afterwards, five bombs were found at the Amritsar-Pathankot line on a rail bridge near Parmanand Railway Station, five kilometres

---

[38]The bus had 75 passengers, several of whom were injured. Due to the cunning, the immediate reaction of the driver was he was able to move the bus out of the side of the attack and brought the insured passenger to a hospital nearby.

[39]The counterterrorism assault was carried out by the Army and NSG under the lead of the Punjab police.

from the attack site (Dhaliwal, 2015). The explosives were detected and neutralized just before a passenger train was supposed to cross the bridge. It was the first high-profile terrorist attack in Punjab since the mid-1990s and the end of militant Khalistan movement in Punjab. There are clear indications that this insurgency was backed by Pakistan; according to official Indian statements, Punjab (allegedly) didn't experience a single infiltration attempt during the 1996–2006 period. However, today it seems that Punjab faces more cross-border infiltrations than J&K (Joshi, 2015a, 2015b). A major reason for militants to target Punjab is to show that terrorists are willing and able to extend their operations beyond the border area and challenge India's more secure areas (Joshi, 2015a, 2015b).

According to Indian authorities, there are clear similarities between the attacks in Punjab and in J&K (Sharma, 2015). In both states, Pakistan played a substantial role in most if not all of the terrorist activities. Both J&K and Punjab attacks were carried out by Pakistan-based terrorist groups like LeT. Also, the attackers infiltrated India via Pakistan (Swami, 2015a, 2015b) and tended to use the frontline posts of Pakistan Rangers on the international border as launch pads for terrorist activities. These front-line posts are functioning as an alternative route to push terrorists into the Indian Territory (BBC, 2015). However, in Pakistan the terror groups also enjoy shelter and receive training and equipment; this is evident from the fact that the terrorists were well equipped with two GPS receivers and sufficient weapons and ammunition for extensive combat; moreover, they carried a night vision device (NVD) of US origin (Sharma, 2015), and US authorities confirmed that it belonged to the US Government and was likely stolen or misplaced on the Afghan battlefield (Sehgal, 2015). Furthermore, the terrorists were carrying two Chinese-made grenades (TI, 2015), most likely obtained with the help and/or knowledge of the ISI. The fact that a 60 mm mortar was part of the terrorist equipment also points to Pakistani state sponsorship (Unnithan, 2015), as this type of mortar is an artillery piece that has been frequently used by Pakistani rangers to target Indian posts and villages along the LoC[40] in J&K. Moreover, there are serious assumptions regarding collaborations between terrorists and cross-border drug cartels (Joshi, 2015a, 2015b), who potentially provide terrorists with critical information on where vulnerable border points[41] and soft Indian targets (such as under-equipped police stations) are located. While the 553 kilometre border, India-Pakistan border at the Gurdaspur-Jammu sector, is protected with an electric fence, there are several gaps in the long porous, long, zigzagging border caused by the Ravi river and season calamities, especially during the monsoon season.[42] Besides being an 'easy, soft target', Gurdaspur has important historical and symbolic significance for nationalist and jihadist propaganda in Pakistan. The partition of colonial British India and the delimitation of the new frontiers were to a

---

[40]The de facto international border between Pakistan and India.

[41]Major vulnerabilities are large gaps torn by monsoon floods in the electrified fencing which runs along the India-Pakistan border in Punjab (Swami 2015a, 2015b).

[42]A dense fog in winters makes border surveillance an added challenge.

great extent based on religious affinities on the district level (Mitra et al., 2006: 328). However, in the case of Gurdaspur, the partition took place on the sub-district level. Basically, Gurdaspur district had four tehsils: Gurdaspur, Batala, Shakargarh and Pathankot; Shakargarh was allocated to Pakistan, and the other three tehsils became a part of India. In this context, Pakistan likes to emphasize that the Gurdaspur district was given to India despite its Muslim majority in order to provide India with land access to Kashmir, allowing for the acquisition of this region. However, Pakistan conveniently forgets that these three sub-districts were likely allocated to India instead of Pakistan due to the large population of Sikhs; moreover, they fail to acknowledge that Pathankot tehsil[43] has an absolute Hindu majority (Fair, 2015). The Pakistani military perceives the British decision to move Gurdaspur to India as 'original sin' and uses it to legitimate the ongoing terrorist attacks in the districts of Gurdaspur and Pathankot.

2016 Pathankot Attack

The terrorist attack on the Pathankot Air Force Station is the second major 'made-in-Pakistan' attack to take place in Punjab within 6 months (BBC, 2015), of the Gurdaspur attack. On 2 January 2016, heavily armed attackers of the Islamist militant group JeM, dressed in Indian uniforms (TIE, 2015) stormed the base in Pathankot and killed eight (seven security forces and one civilian). In a multitude of attacks that lasted until 5 January, all six attackers were hunted down and eliminated. In the aftermath of the attack, investigators found evidence linking the attackers to Pakistan. Most notably, the United Jihad Council claimed responsibility for the attack, a coalition of Pakistani-based terror groups formed by the ISI. JeM is part of this platform. Moreover, similar to the circumstances surrounding the Gurdaspur attacks, assailants were carrying grenade launchers, 52 mm mortars, AK rifles and a GPS device. This kind of sophisticated equipment can be seen as an indication that the terrorists were well connected and most likely received support from ISI. Against this backdrop, one should mention that Pathankot is located on the trijunction of Punjab, J&K and Himachal Pradesh and has a large army cantonment and an air base, all of which are high-value targets for Pakistani terrorists (BBC, 2015). The Gurdaspur-Pathankot-Jammu highway runs almost parallel to the India-Pakistan border, at some points as close as 5 km (HT, 2015), and is therefore a preferred target for Pakistani-based terrorists due to geographical closeness and the presence of a large number of defence installations, including cantonments, air force base and ammunition dumps (Swami, 2015a, 2015b).

It is interesting to point out that the next day, terrorists attacked the Indian consulate in *Mazar-e-Sharif*, in northern Afghanistan (Pande, 2016). This demonstrates how closely the terrorist attacks are coordinated, which is another indicator that ISI played a role in facilitating these attacks. Furthermore,

---

[43]Today, Pathankot is an Indian district in its own right after it got carved out from Gurdaspur district in 2011.

coordination points to the extensive terrorist network and its cross-border cooperation facilitated by Pakistan.

5.3.2   Indicators for State Terrorism

Act on Behalf of or in Conjunction with the State

It is important to note that Pakistan did not only use 'non-state actors' but also soldiers on leave for terrorist activities. Nevertheless, these soldiers are getting orders and as such they are also acting on behalf of the state. The Pakistani state is known to create informal alliances with and between terrorist organizations and occasionally unites them. One example is the United Jihad Council (UJC), into a coalition of militant terror groups, fighting the Indian administration in J&K. The UJC was brought together by the ISI in 1994 (Tiefer, 2016). UJC militants persistently organize and/or join public gatherings, publish materials and recruit new men inside 'Azad Kashmir'.[44] The groups not only receive training and equipment from Pakistan but also receive instructions from the ISI.

Creating/Using Fear

The fact that irregular forces or military personnel on leave don't wear their own uniforms means they don't have to comply with the rules of engagement, are not bound by diplomacy and do not have to follow the protocols of war. Due to the absence of any restriction and accountability, they can easily integrate in the societies of Afghanistan and India and attack at any time. As such, they can create extraordinary fear among those who feel they can fall victim to these assailants at any random time. While generally speaking, terrorists don't tend to identify themselves through uniforms or other symbols, they often wear uniforms of their target groups or state authorities. This doubles their efficacy producing fear, once from the attacks itself, while it also undermines the trust in state authorities, generating distrust among the people. In this context, one should mention the so-called green-on-green/green-on-blue attacks where both the attackers and victims are soldiers. In many cases terrorists were able to convince regular soldier to collaborate or to infiltrate the security forces, carrying out attacks and producing even more fear.

One likely target is highway NH 44, as it is not only used for the movement of troops but also by a large number of Hindu pilgrims to the Amarnath shrine in

---

[44]Azad Kashmir (Free Kashmir), together with the Northern Areas, constitutes almost one-third of the former princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, under Pakistan administration since the Indo-Pakistan war of 1947. Pakistan has divided these areas into two parts: 13,300 sq. km as a nominally autonomous state of Azad Kashmir and 72,496 sq. km incorporated into Pakistan as the Northern Areas and administered as a de facto dependency. Azad Kashmir, with Muzaffarabad as its capital, has a mountainous terrain and a population of more than 4.3 million. The politics of economically underdeveloped Azad Kashmir have mostly been influenced and dominated by prevalent trends in the political and military echelons of Pakistan (PDDM, 2013; Mitra et al., 2006: 18).

Kashmir[45]; this adds to the level of fear people feel. By attacking one of the most important places of worship, Muslim terrorists are trying to enhance communalism and conflicts between different religious communities and to revive the traumatic collective memories of the bloody partition of British India into Majority Hindu India and Majority Muslim Pakistan in 1947 (BBC, 2015). During the partition communal riots rocked the subcontinent, causing more than 1 million deaths, especially during the massive population exchange in 1947. Since then, riots have largely been the result of intercommunity tensions and have erupted intermittently across India (Mitra et al., 2006: 154). For similar reasons, Pakistani support for Sikh fundamentalists generates tensions between the communities of the Sikhs and the Hindus.

Another dramatic dimension of fear is Pakistan playing the 'nuclear card'. In seeking cover from Indian retaliation, the government relies on its nuclear weapons (Fair, 2015), using the threat of nuclear weapons as a deterrent (Rashid, 2008: 41). Moreover, Pakistan is creating a deliberate atmosphere of unpredictability about when and how it would use such weapons (Rashid, 2008: 41–42), enhancing overall confusion and fear.

Political Motive

From a Pakistani perspective, there are a multitude of reasons to conduct, support and sponsor state terrorism in J&K, Gurdaspur-Pathankot belt, Mumbai and other places in India.

1) One of Pakistan's main foreign policy goals is 'cutting India down to size' (Haqqani, 2005: 268) in terms of international reputation, military and political power as well as its territory. Regarding the territory, it looks to achieve control over the Indian-administered state of J&K and to change the status quo through terrorism. Furthermore, it continuously attempts to revive the militant Khalistan movement (Fair, 2015) to boost separatism within India's territory. Ideally this separatism spread to other troubled areas like India's North East. Additionally, through terrorist attacks Pakistan is tempting India into an impudent military response and is shaking trust of international investors, to harm India's economic growth. As such, Pakistan wants to undermine India's plans 'to ratify the status quo and get on with the business of being a rising power' (Fair, 2015).

2) Pakistan's terrorist activities aim to destabilize India, challenge its territorial integrity but also seek to target the fundament of India's statehood, governance and political identity as a democracy. The attacks on the J&K State Assembly and on the Indian Parliament 2001 are the clearest examples of this goal.

3) Pakistan's security establishment does not want to work towards peace and actively boycotts normalizing relations with India as the army has no incentive to improve relations with India (Fair, 2015); in contrast, there is a keen interest

---

[45]The temple (cave) forms a crucial constituent of Hinduism and is considered to be one of the holiest shrines in Hinduism BBC (2002).

to maintain the notion of New Delhi's 'existential threat scenario' for several reasons; it allows and justifies the extraordinary defence budget despite the overall scarcity of state resources and allows the armed forces to interfere in politics with near impunity (Greig, 2016: 26). Additionally, it justifies the military's desire to protect the corporate interests of the armed forces (Siddiqa, 2009: 2003), especially the socio-economic domains and privileges or MILBUS.[46]

In sum, terrorist attacks in Mumbai, Delhi, Gurdaspur and Pathankot must be seen as an indication that Pakistan is not interested in peace. However, some optimistic voices are saying that, due to Pakistan's troubled economy and limited financial resources, there might be a growing awareness among the military about the 'power of the purse'. This may lead to the conviction that improving trade and economic relations with India is a priority and a terror-free environment would be a precondition for that. Against this background, participation in negotiations with New Delhi like the Composite Dialogue serves as Islamabad's 'double strategy' or 'two-track policy' (Haqqani, 2005: 267). On one hand, it serves to not completely alienate the international community, keeping the aid and foreign-direct investments flow going. On the other hand, it gives India the illusion of a potential rapprochement while at the same time carrying out military activities like the Kargil Offensive 1999 (Tellis, Fair, & Medby, 2001) and/or supporting terrorist groups attacking India (Gurdaspur, 2015; Pathankot, 2016). Both took place in the wake of Indian rapprochement initiatives. In this context, one has to state that the Pakistan's civil authorities do not have any room to manoeuvre when it comes to foreign policy, especially relating to India.

4) Pakistan looks to achieve military and economic parity with India. However, despite extensive aid from the USA and China in the last decades and due to the tremendous asymmetries in available economic and financial resources, it was impossible for Pakistan to achieve the parity (Pande, 2016). Furthermore, after experiencing defeat in three wars and one major armed confrontation (Kargil, 1999), Pakistan identifies the use of terrorists as its best bet to balance the asymmetry in the military and economic capabilities. Against this backdrop, Pakistan's aim in J&K is to deal maximum damage to Indian military forces, undermine the current administration with minimum resources and limit consequences for Islamabad (Ebadi, 2014). As such, the attacks on Gurdaspur and Pathankot are significant; both (Gurdaspur and Pathankot) are parts of the NH 44, the 'only lifeline between J&K and the rest of India' (BBC, 2015). Therefore, destabilizing and damaging this route complicate India's military presence in J&K.

---

[46]The term MILBUS describes 'operations involving all levels of the armed forces'. These range from corporations owned by the military as an institution, to welfare foundations belonging to different services and to enterprises run at the unit level and individual soldiers who use their positions for private economic gain (Siddiqa, 2009: 4).

5) Pakistan's overall goal is to destabilize its eastern neighbour, to undermine India's hegemonic position in South Asia and ultimately to obstruct India's (Fair, 2015) and Asia's global rise. To achieve this, Pakistan looks to portray India as a repressive state that is unable to provide a secure domestic environment; it emphasizes New Delhi's use of excessive use of force to suppress subnationalism and political opposition in its periphery and tempts India to violently retaliate and damage its international reputation.

6) Pakistan wants to undermine any form of substantial rapprochement and cooperation between China and India; it perceives increasing ties between New Delhi and Beijing as a challenge to the China-Pakistan friendship.

7) Pakistan draws the attention of international community to the Kashmir conflict and looks to address the Kashmir conflict on a multinational level, whereas India aims to engage on a bilateral level. However, the policy to support global terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda and to import global jihad into South Asia has a terrible backlash. Not only turned these groups against the Pakistani state, they also target its closest ally, China. This is evident from the fact that these groups continuously use Pakistani soil as launch pad for anti-Chinese activities in Pakistan (CPEC for example), but also target China's western Xinjiang province which is now more and more affected by a Muslim insurgency.

8) There are clear signs that Pakistan wants to revive the Khalistan movement and sees 'Punjab as a new theatre of terrorism' (Fair, 2015). The major reason for this is that many of the terrorist groups turned against the Pakistani state and in order to contain or minimise this threat to their own people, the security establishment is trying to refocus their attacks on India (Fair, 2015).

9) Pakistan's conservative security circles are convinced that it is in India's core interest to eliminate its statehood, sovereignty and integrity and to absorb the Pakistani territories. Pakistani strategic thinkers focus on the arguments of conservative Hindu nationalists, who describe the Partition of British India as 'Vivisection of Mother India'. As such, Pakistan is persistently blaming India for any and every political disturbance and violent conflict within its borders, especially those in Balochistan and Karachi. These claims are used to justify their policy of inciting terrorist activities in the Indian-administered J&K, Punjab or in the North East of the country. The rationale is that, in order to reduce 'alleged' Indian influence and activities on its soil and to make up for the imbalance of military force, Pakistan is forced to use terrorist organization as proxies in India to create enough internal domestic tensions to keep India focused on these internal problems. As such, facilitating terror in India would also help contain New Delhi's influence in Afghanistan (Pande, 2016).

Secrecy

The fact that Pakistan is sponsoring terrorism is no longer a secret; due to its distorted world view and subsequent justifications, it considers terrorism a form of legitimate self-defence and a way to promote its interests; both civilian (former

President Zardari) and military (former COAS[47] and President Pervez Musharraf) retired elites acknowledge the country's involvement in state terrorism (Ebadi, 2014). However, Pakistani officials (serving military top echelon and official civilian leadership) continue to deny and downplay any links with terrorist organizations in general and terrorist activities in particular. Due to the secret nature of these relations, Islamabad can distance itself from any accountability for the actions of the jihadists (Ebadi, 2014). Furthermore, as they deny links to terror groups, they hope to avoid censure by the international community (Greig, 2016: 22). In this context, the strategy of downplaying the phenomenon of state sponsorship is often used as an instrument in Pakistani diplomacy. Two of the most well-known and audacious examples of Pakistan's denial are the decade-long presence of al-Qaeda chief Osama bin Laden (Ahmedabad) and Mullah Omar (Karachi) in Pakistan. It is quite disturbing that for several years, the 'king of terrorists' Osama bin Laden was residing quite comfortably in a modern, peaceful and large compound in the army stronghold of Ahmedabad, in the neighbourhood of the local police, the Intelligence Bureau (IB) and ISI offices, a walking distance from Pakistan Military Academy at Kakul (Hoodbhoy, 2011). For similar reasons, it is also hard to believe that the ISI and the army were not aware that Mullah Omar, the spiritual leader of the Taliban, relocated to Karachi after his escape from Afghanistan. The fact that ISI kept his death in a Karachi hospital a secret as long as possible (PTI, 2016) can be seen as another indication that the agency was very much aware of his whereabouts. In sum, in a security state like Pakistan, it is more or less impossible that two of the most-wanted terrorists would be able to establish a hideout without the knowledge and support of Pakistani security agencies.

Systematically

Pakistan has a long record of establishing, nurturing and protecting extremist jihadist networks with the potential to export terrorism overseas. This fact—as mentioned above—was confirmed by the former President Zardari, substantiating the claims that Pakistan-trained terrorist groups are operating in India, Kashmir and Afghanistan (Ebadi, 2014). For decades, Pakistani officials supported terrorist organizations and their activities; they provided these groups with operational support like shelter, funding, training facilities, military support and intelligence support (Ebadi, 2014). The fact that such activities endured under most military and civilian governments is an indication that these were part of a systematic and concrete political strategy. Especially in the case of India, one can see a clear and systematic agenda of state-supported terrorism. Here, Pakistan's conservative elements persistently encourage militants based in Punjab province to carry out attacks in Punjab and J&K. Consequently, Pakistani jihadists routinely cross the border into Indian territories to attack and sabotage peaceful relations (Filkins, 2016).

---

[47]COAS, Chief of Army Staff.

Extraordinary Brutality

The kinds of weapons the terrorists used during the Gurdaspur and Pathankot can be seen as a symbol for the extraordinary brutality the attackers had in mind. For example, 52 mm mortars are not commonly used in terrorist attacks. It indicates that the terrorists were aiming for maximum destruction and loss of human life. Additionally, the fact that Pakistani terrorists also used suicide bombers—for example, during the attack on the Indian Parliament in 2001 (BBC, 2001)—shows the willingness of the attackers to use the utmost level of violence to achieve their goals.

Intentional Targeting of Civilians

Overall, terrorists pursue a dual strategy of targeting military personal and facilities, political-administrative institutions, as well as public areas and civilians. However, their attacks seem tied to specific areas of operation; in Punjab (a border province) it seems that terrorists primarily target security forces and, wherever possible, civilians. Many of the assaults against police and armed forces were concentrated on off-guard (BBC, 2015) 'weaker' police border stations. These attacks required substantial planning and were executed in collaboration with drug traffickers and ISI. In contrast, in Mumbai, the assailants specifically targeted[48] members of the Indian elite, Westerners and Jews (Tankel, 2011). In New Delhi, the capital city, the attackers targeted politicians and political-administrative institutions, like the Indian National Parliament, due to their high symbolic value.

Diplomacy and Protection for Terror Groups

Doubtless, Pakistan continues to offer protection and diplomatic support to terrorist groups, carrying out attacks all over India and in Afghanistan. In this context, it is obvious that Islamabad uses its close relationship with its 'all-weather-friend' China; on several occasions China blocked or stalled Indian attempts to sanction Pakistan-based terrorism (Panda, 2015). For example, in 2015, China used its veto power to block India's attempts to question Pakistan at the UN Sanctions Committee on the release of Zaki-ur-Rehman Lakhvi[49] who was a commander stationed in *LeT* and is known to be one of the masterminds behind the 2008 Mumbai attack.

In May 2015, Beijing blocked India's attempt to sanction Syed Salahuddin,[50] the leader of a Pakistan-based terrorist proxy, the *Hizb-ul-Mujahideen*, the largest terrorist organization operating in J&K. Prior to the 2008 Mumbai attacks, China systematically blocked New Delhi's attempts to obtain sanctions against Pakistan-

---

[48]LeT were attacking two world-class hotels, a café popular with foreign tourists, one of the busiest railway stations in the country and a community centre run by the Jewish Chabad organization.

[49]Lakhvi was released on bail by a Pakistani court in April 2015 (Panda, 2015).

[50]'Salahuddin's original name is Mohammed Yusuf Shah, who hails from Soibugh area of Budgam district in central Kashmir'.

based individual terrorists and organizations operating on India's soil.[51] On the organizational level, Chinese diplomats stopped UN sanctions against the *Al-Akhtar Trust* (a front for JeM, yet another Pakistani terrorist proxy) and *Al-Rashid Trust* (a Pakistani Deobandi terrorist group active in J&K, among other places). It is also important to note, despite the fact these two groups support and finance terrorist activities in Pakistan and Afghanistan (especially LeT), Islamabad tolerates their presence on its territory.[52] Another example in which China provided diplomatic cover for Pakistan-funded terrorist proxies, through the power of a United Nations Security Council veto, is their move to block UN sanctions against Masood Azhar, the founder of the anti-Indian militant group JeM. This organization was responsible for the 2001 attack on the Indian parliament in New Delhi and numerous other incidents (Joshi, 2015a, 2015b).

Moreover, the continued support that groups—like *Jamaat-ud-Dawah* (JuD)—receive from Pakistan's security sector agents obfuscates UN sanctions. As mentioned above, the Pakistani army and ISI still believe that they can use terror groups to advance domestic or foreign policy objectives (Joshi, 2015a, 2015b). The fact that JuD is allowed to hold its annual meetings in Pakistan can be seen as a clear proof of state protection.

Another argument to support the case for state-sponsored terrorism in Pakistan relates to the way in which it treated its western 'allies' in the war against terror. For example, the 'Kunduz Airlift Incident' in which it evacuated cornered terrorists (Karlekar, 2012: 206) and the fact that it hid two of the world's most wanted terrorists—former al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden and former supreme leader of the Taliban, Mullah Omar—further solidify the case against Pakistan (Ebadi, 2014). Specifically, during the 'Kunduz Airlift', it demonstrated the importance of terrorist cells for the Pakistani government, protecting them from any form of attack. The 'Spirit of Kunduz' persists until this day and is exemplified by Pakistan's continued policy of protecting its 'allied terrorists'. One of the most remarkable examples is the strong support for LeT. Despite heavy US pressure on Islamabad to act against this group, they made sure that the organizational structures and personal lives of most of them remain 'relatively secure' (Tankel, 2011).

---

[51]For example, China blocked the listings of members of LeT and its parent organization JuD, namely, Zaki-ur-Rehman Lakhvi, JuD leader Hafiz Muhammad Saeed, chief of finance Haji Muhammad Ashraf and Saudi-based financier and one of JuD's founding members, Mahmoud Bahaziq.

[52]Regarding UN reports, Al-Akhtar Trust maintains regional offices in the Pakistani cites of Bahawalpur, Bahawalnagar, Gilgit, Islamabad, Mirpur Khas and Tando-Jan-Mohammad, as well as in Spin Boldak in Afghanistan. Al-Rashid Trust is primarily focusing on Afghanistan and conducts activities in Herat Jalalabad, Kabul, Kandahar and Mazar Sharif (Roggio, 2008).

6 Pakistan's Counterterrorism Strategy: Ambiguity and Double-Standard Game

In an effort to maintain amicable relations with Washington, Pakistan finally turned against al-Qaeda, Taliban and its affiliates. However, as this chapter has shown, Pakistan's strategy 'has been to make a show of cooperation with the American fight against terrorism while covertly abetting and even coordinating Taliban, Kashmiri and foreign al-Qaeda-linked militants. The linchpin in this two-pronged and at times apparently oppositional strategy is the ISI' (Gall, 2014b).

Having said this, Pakistan's campaign against above-mentioned terrorist groups 'remain fitful at best' (Byman, 2005b: 125). The U.S. Department of State (2014) 'Reports on Terrorism' shows the Pakistani military undertook operations against groups and conducted attacks within Pakistan such as *Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan* (TTP), but did not take action against other groups such as LeT or HQN. Moreover, Pakistan's conservative generals maintain that it is in Pakistan's national interest to take sides with the Taliban, saying that they 'cannot be alienated by Pakistan' (Rashid, 2008: 50). The ISI sends a clear message to the US and UN, announcing that Pakistan will continue to support the Taliban, even as the UN attempts to seek a politically viable solution in Afghanistan and continue to actively support jihadist organizations, for example, by allowing rallies (while banning other political demonstrations) of several 100,000 of people and showing unambiguous support for the Taliban, 'in defiance of UN sanctions' against the group (Rashid, 2008: 53).

The Afghan Taliban and HQN leadership continue to find a safe haven in Pakistan, and although Pakistan military operations disrupted their actions, it did not directly target them. As such, these organizations maintain bases and operate in the Afghan border region (FATA). For a long time, the military did not do much to combat terrorist organization in that area until international pressure and domestic criticism prompted a major operation: *Zarb-e-Azb*. As attacks by the Taliban continue, one must question the efficacy and success of this military campaign. Some claim that Pakistan is still unwilling to adopt a comprehensive counterterrorism approach, the fact that Pakistan is not taking any serious action to eradicate terrorist groups at its border with India, emphasizes the ambiguity in its counterterrorism activities. Also, Pakistan continues to provide the Taliban with a centre for strategic thinking and planning (*Quetta Shura*). In the words of a former British senior officer in Afghanistan, 'the thinking piece of the Taliban is out of Quetta in Pakistan. It's the major headquarters' and they use the Pakistani city close to the Afghan border 'to run a series of networks in Afghanistan' (Walsh, 2006). Pakistan openly lends its territory to carry out attacks against NATO troops in Afghanistan.

To conclude, in the words of Charles Tiefer: 'The same Pakistani ISI which supports the coalition that launched this attack against India, supports the Haqqanis against the U.S. in Afghanistan' (Tiefer, 2016). The hardline elements within the army and ISI are clearly still in control, blocking any change in the country's mindset and obfuscating liberal reforms and changes in foreign policy (Rashid, 2008: 51). To this day, cooperation with Islamic fundamentalists and terrorists remains the preferred modus operandi of the Pakistani government.

7   Final Thoughts

Due to the continuous attacks by Pakistani-based terrorists in Afghanistan and India with the support of Islamabad, one must conclude that the perspective of the Pakistani military-intelligence establishment has not changed. The conviction among the country's founding generation that 'Hindu India' and its leaders will never accept a 'Muslim Pakistan' continues to linger in the mindset of its rulers, who believe India wants to reverse the Partition and dominate Pakistan once again (Fair, 2015). As such, Pakistan identifies Afghanistan and India as severe threats. The only tenable solution in their mind is the use of Jihad, they consider this to be the most effective and efficient lever of foreign policy and national defence (Pande, 2016). Subsequently, 'Pakistan has outsourced terrorism in support of its national goals to militant jihadi groups, which were able and willing to undertake recruitment, training, and operations against entities and powers perceived as threats, even while offering Pakistan a fig leaf of deniability' (Greig, 2016: 28).

The attempts by Pakistani leadership to convince the international community, especially the USA, that it is seriously abandoning state-sponsored terrorism, are merely a strategy for whitewashing their actions. Despite far-reaching new economic opportunities offered by the Chinese government that could potentially provide the country with much-needed economic and social boost, Pakistan continues to provide support to terrorist groups.

'The reality however, is that Pakistan is unwilling to change its policy on the use of jihadi groups and their ideology even as it tries to reassure the international community that it is ready for a drastic transformation. All it seeks to do is to speak the right words and use the right body language and implement enough cosmetic changes that will convince the U.S. that Pakistan is serious about giving up its decades old sponsorship of terrorism' (Pande, 2016). Pakistan almost faced UN charges under the George H.W. Bush presidency (Tomsen, 2011), and in 1993, Clinton's administration put Pakistan on a watch list of state sponsors of terrorism due to the ISI's open involvement in training Kashmiri terrorists. In order to appease Washington, the army moved the training camps out of Kashmir, relocating them to Taliban-controlled areas in Afghanistan (Rashid, 2008, 41) where anti-American terrorists and Kashmiri jihadists trained together (Haqqani, 2005: 242; The 9/11 Commission, 2004: 124). Washington then withdrew its name from the list of state sponsors of terrorism; later on, their dependence on Pakistan's collaboration assured that the USA did not readd Pakistan to the list (Joshi, 2015a, 2015b).

As the USA withdrew the bulk of the international combat troops and started to build up Afghan security forces, Islamabad lost its significance as a strategic partner from a military point of view. In other words, Pakistan has to realize that continued use of state terrorism will most likely result in a more concrete international response (Joshi, 2015a, 2015b). It should recognize 'that terrorist organizations are not reliable allies for states' (Prasad, 2015); even after many years of informal but deeply rooting alliance, in the end they turned against the Pakistani state and society. To avoid that groups like the HQN or LeT turn against them, the

government and ISI try to appease them by continuing support and protection (Gall, 2006a, 2006b, 2014a). This approach could be described as a combined strategy of appeasement and containment, with the main goal to prevent terrorist attacks against Pakistan (Yusuf, 2014a, 2014b: 35). Overall, this is unfortunate; Pakistan's policy poses a challenge to security and stability in the region and presents a huge risk for its own people. The country's political and military leadership are unwilling to fully break the patterns of involvement with state terrorism despite the fact that the country's security agents are losing control of many of these groups (the long-lasting relationship with LeT is an exception to this). The tremendous losses of human life that result from this rising lack of control, the economic losses and overall deplorable quality of life in Pakistan are inconceivable.

It is time that the international community acknowledges that Pakistan is a 'big part of the problem' and not a credible partner when it comes to solving the problem of jihadism and cross-border terrorism in the region (Harris, 2014).

References

Ahmed, I. (2009). The spectre of Islamic fundamentalism over Pakistan. In R. Jetly (Ed.), *Pakistan in regional and global politics* (pp. 150–181). New Delhi: Routledge.

Alexander, C. (2011). *The long way back: Afghanistan's quest for peace*. New York: HarperCollins.

Bajoria, J. (2008, November 7). RAW: India's external intelligence agency, CFR Backgrounders, Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Accessed May 5, 2017, from http://www.cfr.org/india/raw-indias-external-intelligence-agency/p17707

Bajoria, J., & Kaplan, E. (2011, May 4). The IS and terrorism. Behind the accusations. Council on Foreign Relations. Accessed May 5, 2017, from http://www.cfr.org/pakistan/isi-terrorism-behind-accusations/p11644

Bass, G. J. (2013). *The blood telegram: Nixon, Kissinger, and a forgotten genocide*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

BBC. (2001, December 13). *2001: Suicide attack on Indian parliament*. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/december/13/newsid_3695000/3695057.stm

BBC. (2002, August 6). *The pilgrimage to Amarnath*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/2176165.stm

BBC. (2015, July 27). *Gurdaspur attack: Ten killed in Indian police station siege*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-33671593

Blakeley, R. (2009). *State terrorism and neoliberalism: The north in the south*. London: Routledge.

Blood, A. (2002). *The cruel birth of Bangladesh: Memoirs of an American diplomat*. Dhaka: The University Press.

Bose, S. (2005). Anatomy of violence analysis of civil war in East Pakistan in 1971. *Economic and Political Weekly*, India.

Burki, S. J., & Baxter, C. (1991). *Pakistan under the military. Eleven years of Zia ul-Haq*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Bushnell, P., Shlapentokh, V., Vanderpool, C., & Jeyaratnam, S. (Eds.). (1991). *The organized terror: The case of violent internal repression*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Byman, D. (2005a). *Deadly connections: States that sponsor terrorism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byman, D. (2005b). Passive sponsors of terrorism. *Survival, 47*(4), 117–144.

Cambell, C. (2014, March 21). AFP reporter Sardar Ahmad killed in Kabul. *Time Magazine*. Accessed June 14, 2016, from http://www.torontosun.com/2014/04/08/speaking-frankly-about-pakistan

Cheema, M. H. (2012). Beyond beliefs: Deconstructing the dominant narratives of the Islamization of Pakistan's law. *The American Journal of Comparative Law, 60*(4), 875–917.

Chopra, S., & Chada, K. L. (2009). *Islamic fundamentalism, Pakistan and the muslim world*. New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers.

Choudhury, G. W. (1972). Bangladesh: Why it happened. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs), 48*(2), 242–249.

Claridge, D. (1996). State terrorism? Applying a definitional model. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 8*(3), 47–63.

Croissant, A., Kuehn, D., Chambers, P. W., & Wolf, S. O. (2010). Beyond the fallacy of coupism: Conceptualizing civilian control of the military in emerging democracies. *Democratization, 17*(5), 950–975.

Delvoie, L. A. (1995). The Islamization of Pakistan's foreign policy. *International Journal, 51*(1), 126–147. Africa's Prospects (Winter, 1995/1996).

Dhaliwal, R. (2015, July 27). Courageous railway trackman saves 270 lives. *The Tribune*. Accessed June 14, 2016, from www.tribuneindia.com/news/punjab/community/courageous-railway-trackman-saves-270-lives/112285.html

Dorronsoro, G. (2004). Pakistan and the Taliban. In C. Jaffrelot (Ed.), *Pakistan nationalism without a nation* (pp. 161–178). New Delhi: Manohar.

Ebadi, Y. (2014, August 5). State-sponsored terrorism in Pakistan. *Republic of the East*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from https://russia-eastern-republic.com/2014/08/05/state-sponsored-terrorism-in-pakistan/

Fair, C. C. (2015, April 8). Pakistan tests Modi's mettle with Gurdaspur terror attack. *The world post*. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/c-christine-fair/pakistan-modi-gurdaspur_b_7926308.html

Fatah, T. (2014, April 8). Speaking frankly about Pakistan. *Toronto Sun*. Accessed June 13, 2016, from http://www.torontosun.com/2014/04/08/speaking-frankly-about-pakistan

Filkins, D. (2016, January 15). The Pakistani dystopia. *The New Yorker*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/the-pakistani-dystopia?intcid=mod-lates

Freedom House. (2016). *Freedom in the world – Pakistan (2015)*. Accessed January 28, 2016, from https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2016

Gall, C. (2006a, November 13). Pakistan link seen in Afghan suicide attacks. *The New York Times*. Accessed June 9, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/13/world/asia/14afghancnd.html?pagewanted=all

Gall, C. (2006b, February 15). Afghan suicide bombings, tied to Taliban, point to Pakistan. *The New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/15/international/asia/15afghan.html?pagewanted=print&mtrref=www.google.de&gwh=128DF0B9AE4CB2F6A3BD7010C541C50B&gwt=pay

Gall, C. (2011, July 3). Pakistani military still cultivates militant groups, a former fighter says. *The New York Times*. Accessed June 11, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/01/world/asia/haqqani-militants-act-like-pakistans-protected-partners.html

Gall, C. (2014a). *The wrong enemy: America in Afghanistan, 2001–2014*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Gall, C. (2014b, March 19). What Pakistan knew about Bin Laden. *The New York Times*. Accessed June 10, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/23/magazine/what-pakistan-knew-about-bin-laden.html

Gall, C. (2016, February 6). Pakistan's hand in the rise of international jihad. *The New York Times*. Accessed June 9, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/07/opinion/sunday/pakistans-hand-in-the-rise-of-international-jihad.html

Gall, C., & Khan, I. (2006, December 11). Taliban and allies tighten grip in Northern Pakistan. Accessed June 12, 2016, from http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9503E1D91431F932A25751C1A9609C8B63&pagewanted=all

Gopal, N. (2015, July 28). 7 killed in Gurdaspur terror strike after 12-hour firefight. *The Indian Express*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/anti-terror-operation-in-gurdaspur-ends-all-terrorists-killed/

Grare, F. (2009). *Reforming the Intelligence agencies in Pakistan's transitional democracy*. Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Accessed June 7, 2016, from http://carnegieendowment.org/2009/03/06/reforming-intelligence-agencies-in-pakistan-s-transitional-democracy/2k4r

Greig, J.A. (2016). Riding the Tiger. The threat to Pakistan from Terrorism. In R. Kalia (Ed.), Pakistan's political labyrinths: Military, society and terror (pp. 22–39). New Delhi: Routledge.

Gundu, R. K., & Schaffer, T. C. (2008, April 3). *India and Pakistan in Afghanistan: Hostile sports*. Center for Strategic & International Studies (CISI). Accessed April 14, 2016, from http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/sam117.pdf

Haqqani, H. (2005). *Pakistan: Between mosque and military*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.

Harris, K. (2014, April 1). Pakistan a state sponsor of terrorism, Chris Alexander says. *cbcnews*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/pakistan-a-state-sponsor-of-terrorism-chris-alexander-says-1.2593584

Hassan, R. (1985). Islamization: An analysis of religious, political and social change in Pakistan. *Middle Eastern Studies*, *21*(3), 263–284.

Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hoodbhoy, P. (2011, May 3). The curious case of Osama bin Laden. *The Express Tribune*. Accessed June 14, 2016, from http://tribune.com.pk/story/160658/the-curious-case-of-osama-bin-laden/

Howenstein, N. (2008). *The Jihadi Terrain in Pakistan: An Introduction to the Sunni Jihadi Groups in Pakistan and Kashmir*. Research Report 1. Pakistan Security Research Unit (PRSU), University of Bradford, Bradford. Accessed June 13, 2016, from https://bradscholars.brad.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/10454/2224/resrep1.pdf?sequence=1

HT. (2015, July 28). Why Pathankot-Jammu highway is vulnerable to terror attacks. *Hindustan Times* (HT). Accessed July 28, 2015, from http://images.google.de/imgres?imgurl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.hindustantimes.com%2FImages%2Fpopup%2F2015%2F7%2Fhighwayofterror.jpg&imgrefurl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.hindustantimes.com%2Findia%2Fwhy-pathankot-jammu-highway-is-vulnerable-to-terror-attacks%2Fstory-OUmr8Z1MK6JmOCeLyf0I8O.html&h=644&w=640&tbnid=mSbeZMBfJf2j4M%3A&docid=ra0K4iggZ6LpzM&ei=mREuV-qjOejIgAb77bjgDg&tbm=isch&iact=rc&uact=3&dur=543&page=1&start=0&ndsp=15&ved=0ahUKEwiq1Mygq8jMAhVoJMAKHfs2DuwQMwghKAIwAg&bih=535&biw=1216

Hussain, R. (2010). *Pakistan and the emergence of Islamic militancy in Afghanistan*. Burlington, US: Ashgate.

Inkster, N. (2012). The enigma of Pakistan. *Surival, 52*(2), 167–178.

Jackson, R., Jarvis, L., Gunning, J., & Breen-Smyth, M. (2011). *Terrorism: A critical introduction*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillian.

Jackson, R., Murphy, E., & Poynting, S. (Eds.). (2010a). *Contemporary state terrorism theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Jackson, R., Murphy, E., & Poynting, S. (2010b). Introduction: Terrorism, the state and the study of political terror. In R. Jackson, E. Murphy, & S. Poynting (Eds.), *Contemporary state terrorism theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Jalal, A. (2011). The past as present. In M. Lodhi (Ed.), *Pakistan: Beyond the 'Crisis' state*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jalalzai, M. K. (1999). *Sectarian violence in Pakistan and Afghanistan*. Lahore: System Books.

Joshi, R. (2015a, June 26). Should Pakistan be designated a state sponsor of terror? *The Diplomat*. Accessed May 16, 2015, from http://thediplomat.com/2015/06/should-pakistan-be-designated-a-state-sponsor-of-terror/

Joshi, S. (2015b, August 3). India's Gurdaspur terrorist attack: Location, timing and method. *The Interpreter*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from www.lowyinterpreter.org/post/2015/08/03/Indias-Gurdaspur-terrorist-attack-Location-timing-and-method.aspx

Karlekar, H. (2012). *Endgame in Afghanistan: For whom the dice rolls*. New Delhi: Sage.

Keddie, N. (1987). *Pakistan's movement against Islamization*. MERIP Middle East Report, No. 148, pp. 40–41.

Kennedy, C. H. (1988). Islamization in Pakistan: Implementation of the Hudood ordinances. *Asian Survey, 28*(3), 307–316.

Khan, M. A. (2009, January 9). India's sikh militants forming ties with Lashkar-e-Taiba and Pakistani intelligence. *Terrorism Monitor, 7*(1). Accessed May 16, 2016, from www.jamestown.org/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=34319#.Vzi3wZGLTIW

Khan, H. (2010). *Constitutional and political history of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Khan, M. I. (2015, May 6). What lies behind Pakistani charges of Indian 'Terrorism'. *BBC News*. Accessed May 15, 2015, from http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-32604137

Kukreja, V. (1991). *Civil-military relations in South Asia. Pakistan, Bangladesh and India*. New Delhi: Sage.

Kushner, H. W. (2003). *Encyclopedia of terrorism*. New Delhi: Sage.

Levine, A. (2010). *Competing for Kabul: Conflicting agendas in South Asia*. The Center for Advanced Defense Studies and Conflict Studies Program. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://www.scribd.com/doc/44762632/Competing-for-Kabul-Conflicting-Agendas-in-South-Asia-by-Amy-Levine

Lieven, A. (2011). *Pakistan. A hard country*. London: Allen Lane.

Malik, A. (2011). *Political survival. Beyond ideology*. New York: Routledge.

Mascarenhas, A. (1971). *The rape of Bangladesh*. Delhi: Vikas Publications.

Mashal, M. (2016, May 7). Haqqanis steering deadlier Taliban in Afghanistan, officials say. *The New York Times*. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/08/world/asia/haqqanis-steering-deadlier-taliban-in-afghanistan-officials-say.html?_r=0

Mazzetti, M., & Schmitt, E. (2008, August 1). Pakistanis aided attack in Kabul, U.S. officials say. *The New York Times*. Accessed June 11, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/01/world/asia/01pstan.html

McAllister, B., & Schmid, A. P. (2011). Theories of terrorism. In A. P. Schmid (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of terrorism research* (pp. 201–271). London: Routledge.

Mitra, S. K., Wolf, S. O., & Schoettli, J. (2006). *A political and economic dictionary of South Asia*. London: Routledge.

Muhith, A. M. A. (1992). *Bangladesh: Emergence of a nation*. Dhaka: University Press.

Murphy, E. (2013). *The making of terrorism in Pakistan. Historical and social roots of extremism*. London: Routledge.

Murphy, E., & Malik, A. R. (2009). Pakistan Jihad: The making of religious terrorism. *IPRI Journal, IX*(2), 17–31.

Murphy, E., & Tamana, A. (2010). State terrorism and the military in Pakistan. In R. Jackson, E. Murphy, & S. Poynting (Eds.), *Contemporary state terrorism theory and practice* (pp. 48–67). London: Routledge.

Nagengast, C. (1994). Violence, terror and the crisis of the state. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 23*, 109–136.

Nasr, S. V. R. (2004). Islam, the state and the rise of sectarian militancy in Pakistan. In C. Jaffrelot (Ed.), *Pakistan nationalism without a nation?* (pp. 85–114). New Delhi: Manohar.

Nawaz, S. (2008). *Crossed swords: Pakistan, its army, and the wars within*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Nelson, D. (2009, July 8). Pakistani president Asif Zardari admits creating terrorist groups. *The Telegraph*. Accessed May 14, 2016, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/pakistan/5779916/Pakistani-president-Asif-Zardari-admits-creating-terrorist-groups.html

Panda, A. (2015, June 25). Why China Snubbed India on a Pakistan-based terrorist at the UNN. *The Dipomat*. Accessed May 5, 2017, from http://thediplomat.com/2015/06/why-china-snubbed-india-on-a-pakistan-based-terrorist-at-the-un/

Pande, A. (2016, January 6). *Pakistan: Change but no change*. Hudson Institute. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://www.southasiaathudson.org/blog/2016/1/6/pakistan-change-but-no-change

PDDM. (2013). *Azad Jammu & Kashmir, at a glance 2013*. Planning & Development Department Muzaffarabad. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://pndajk.gov.pk/Documents/AJK%20at%20a%20glance%202013%20final.pdf

Perlmutter, A. (1977). *The military in politics in modern times. On professionals, praetorians, and revolutionary soldiers*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Prasad, H. (2015). State-sponsored terrorism: A non-solution for India's relationship with Pakistan. *International Affairs Review (IAR)*. George Washington University. Accessed February 10, 2016, from http://www.iar-gwu.org/content/state-sponsored-terrorism-non-solution-india%E2%80%99s-relationship-pakistan

PTI. (2001, December 14). Govt blames LeT for Parliament attack. *Rediff, asks Pak to restrain terrorist outfits*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from www.rediff.com/news/2001/dec/14parl12.htm

PTI. (2016, January 10). ISI hid news of Mullah Omar's death. *Deccan Chronicle*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.deccanchronicle.com/150817/world-neighbours/article/isi-hid-mullah-omar%E2%80%99s-death

Rahimi, S., & Gall, C. (2009). Pakistan accused of link to Kabul attacks. *The New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/20/world/asia/20afghan.html

Rais, R. B. (1989). Pakistan in 1988: From command to conciliation. *Asian Survey, 29*(2), 199–206.

Rais, R. B. (2008). *Recovering the frontier state: War, ethnicity, and state in Afghanistan*. Plymonth, UK: Lexington Books.

Rashid, A. (1998). Pakistan and Taliban. In W. Maley (Ed.), *Fundamentalism reborn? Afghanistan and the Taliban* (pp. 72–89). London: C. Hurst.

Rashid, A. (2008, July 9). *India's difficult mission in Afghanistan*. Centre for Strategic and International Studies. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://csis.org/blog/india%E2%80%99s-difficult-mission-afghanistan

Rediff. (2001, December 13). *Terrorists attack Parliament; five intruders, six cops killed*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from www.rediff.com/news/2001/dec/13parl1.htm

Roggio, B. (2008, December 11). UN declares Jamaat-ud-Dawa a terrorist front group. *The Long War Journal*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.longwarjournal.org/archives/2008/12/un_declares_jamaatud.php

Roy, O. (2004). The Taliban: A strategic tool for Pakistan. In C. Jaffrelot (Ed.), *Pakistan nationalism without a nation?* (pp. 149–159). New Delhi: Manohar.

Schmid, A. P. (Ed.). (2011). *The Routledge handbook of terrorism research*. London: Routledge.

Sehgal, M. (2015, August 11). Gurdaspur attack: US says its night-vision device stolen from Afghanistan. *India Today*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/gurdaspur-terror-attack-us-confirms-it-owns-night-vision-device/1/457661.html

Shafqat, S. (1997). *Civil-military relations in Pakistan. From Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to Benazir Bhutto*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Shah, A. (2003). Pakistan's 'Armoured' democracy. *Journal of Democracy, 14*(4), 26–40.

Shams, S. (2014, November 14). Can Afghan president Ghani mend ties with Pakistan? *Deutsche Welle*. Interview with Dr. Siegfried O. Wolf. http://www.dw.com/en/can-afghan-president-ghani-mend-ties-with-pakistan/a-18063651

Shams, S. (2016, April 25). The Pakistan-Haqqani nexus and Kabul's misgivings. *Deutsche Welle*. Accessed June 16, 2016, from http://www.dw.com/en/the-pakistan-haqqani-nexus-and-kabuls-misgivings/a-19213031

Sharma, A. (2015, July 29). Why the Pakistan fidayeen fixed Punjab in their crosshairs. *The Indian Express*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://indianexpress.com/article/explained/why-the-pakistan-fidayeen-fixed-punjab-in-their-crosshairs/

Sheghal, M. (2015, August 14). Gurdaspur attack: ISI unites Sikh terrorists and LeT. *India Today*. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/isi-unites-sikh-terrorists-and-let/1/458497.html

Siddiqa, A. (2003). Pakistan's arms procurement and military buildup, 1979–99. In search of a policy. Lahore: Sang-E-Meel Publications.

Siddiqa, A. (2009). *Military Inc. inside Pakistan's military economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Singh, J. (2015, July 28). Terror attack in Gurdaspur; SP among seven killed. *The Tribune*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from www.tribuneindia.com/news/terror-attack-in-gurdaspur-sp-among-seven-killed/111963.html

Stohl, M., & Lopez, G. A. (Eds.). (1988). *Terrible beyond endurance? The foreign policy of state terrorism*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Swami, P. (2001, October 13–26). An audacious strike. *Frontline, 18*(21). Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.frontline.in/static/html/fl1821/18210200.htm

Swami, P. (2015a, July 29). Gurdaspur attack: GPS reveals terrorists crossed border 5 km from site of attack. *The Indian Express*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/gurdaspur-terror-attack-gps-reveals-terrorists-crossed-border-5-km-from-site-of-attack/

Swami, P. (2015b, July 28). Gurdaspur terror attack: GPS shows terror team from Pakistan, got help from drug cartel too. *The Indian Express*. Accessed Mai 16, 2016, from http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/gurdaspur-terror-attack-gps-shows-terror-team-from-pakistan-got-drug-cartel-help-too/

Tankel, S. (2011). *Storming the world stage: The story of Lashkar-e-Taiba*. Columbia: University Press.

Tellis, A. J., Fair, C. C., & Medby, J. J. (2001). *Limited conflicts under the nuclear umbrella. Indian and Pakistani lessons from the kargil crisis*. RAND National Security Research Division. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1450.html

Terrorism-Research. (n.d.). *State sponsored terrorism*. Accessed January 30, 2016, from http://www.terrorism-research.com/state/

The 9–11 Commission. (2004). *The 9/11 commission report*. The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/report/911Report.pdf

The Guardian (2011, September 13). US embassy in Kabul under attack. Accessed May 5, 2017, from https://www.theguardian.com/world/blog/2011/sep/13/us-embassy-under-attack

TI. (2015, July 27). As it happened: Terror attack in Punjab. *The Times of India*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Terror-attack-in-Punjab/liveblog/48231051.cms

TIE. (2015, January 5). July Pathankot attack: Sixth terrorist neutralised, combing operations to end tomorrow. *The Times of India*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-news-india/live-force-attack-at-pathankot-air-force-base-2-terrorist-killed/

Tiefer, C. (2016, January 3). Terrorist attack on Pathankot, India: Very bad, but, U.S. will promote peace talks by Modi Anyway. *Forbes*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.forbes.com/sites/charlestiefer/2016/01/03/terrorist-attack-on-pathankot-india-very-bad-but-u-s-will-promote-peace-talks-by-modi-anyway/#2f8a1e862a0b

TIME. (1971). Good soldier Yahya Khan. *Time, 98*(5), 32–33.

ToI. (2014, March 23). 2008 Indian embassy attack in Kabul sanctioned by ISI, new book claims. *The Times of India (ToI)*. http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/2008-Indian-embassy-attack-in-Kabul-sanctioned-by-ISI-new-book-claims/articleshow/32545791.cms

Tomsen, P. (2011). *Pakistan: With friends like these...* World Policy Institute. Accessed June 13, 2016, from http://www.worldpolicy.org/journal/fall2011/pakistan

Tomsen, P. (2013). *The wars of Afghanistan: Messianic terrorism, tribal conflicts, and the failures of great powers*. New York: PublicAffairs.

U.S. Department of State. (2014). Country reports on terrorism (2014). Report, Bureau of Counterterrorism. Accessed February 7, 2016, from http://go.usa.gov/3dE3X

Unnithan, S. (2015, July 31). Mortar recovered from Gurdaspur terrorists puzzles analysts. *India Today*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/mortar-recovered-from-gurdaspur-terrorists-puzzles-analysts/1/455409.html

Upadhyay, R. (2003). *Urdu controversy - is dividing the nation further*. Paper No. 675, South Asia Analysis Group, India. Accessed February 5, 2016, from http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/paper675

Vishnu, J. T. (2001, December 17). ISI supervised parliament attack. Main coordinator of Jaish, two others arrested. *The Tribune*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from www.tribuneindia.com/2001/20011217/main1.htm

Walsh, D. (2006, May 19). Pakistan sheltering Taliban, says British officer. *The Guardian*. Accessed May 16, 2016, from http://www.theguardian.com/world/2006/may/19/pakistan.alqaida

Walsh, D. (2010, July 25). Afghanistan war logs: Clandestine aid for Taliban bears Pakistan's fingerprints. *The New York Times*. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jul/25/pakistan-isi-accused-taliban-afghanistan

Wilkinson, P. (1982). The laws of war and terrorism. In D. C. Rapoport & Y. Alexander (Eds.), *The morality of terrorism: Religious and secular justifications*. New York: Pergamon.

Wolf, S. O. (2012a, May 18). *Civilian control and democratic transition: Pakistan's unequal equation*. Pakistan Security Research Unit (PSRU), Research Report 2, University of Bradford, United Kingdom. Accessed May 14, 2016, from https://www.dur.ac.uk/psru/reports/

Wolf, S. O. (2012b, May 4). In search of Pythagoras. India-Afghanistan-Pakistan: A triangle under stress. *The Independent*. Dhaka: Bangladesh. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://crossasia-repository.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/2810/

Wolf, S. O. (2012c, April 27). India in Afghanistan – Looking for the right approach. *The Independent, Friday Features*. Dhaka: Bangladesh. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://crossasia-repository.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/2808/

Wolf, S. O. (2012d, April 20). Trapped in old patterns? The future of Pakistan-Afghanistan relations. *The Independent*. Dhaka: Bangladesh. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://crossasia-repository.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/2820/

Wolf, S. O. (2012e). India-Afghanistan relations: Towards a more robust engagement? *FPRC Journal, 9* (Focus: India and South Asia, Foreign Policy Research Centre, New Delhi, India, 144–186). Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://www.fprc.in/pdf/J-9.pdf

Wolf, S. O. (2013, May 29). The international context of Bangladesh liberation war. *The Independent*. Accessed May 15, 2016, from http://crossasia-repository.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/2858

Wolf, S. O. (2015a, October 19). From FATA to Kunduz: The Pakistani Taliban's new northwards orientation. *International Security Observer*. Brussels, Belgium. Accessed June 14, 2016, from http://securityobserver.org/from-fata-to-kunduz-the-pakistani-talibans-new-northwards-orientation/

Wolf, S. O. (2015b, October 16). *Kunduz – beyond the battleground*. Afghanistan: e-international relations. Accessed June 14, 2016, from http://www.e-ir.info/2015/10/16/kunduz-beyond-the-battleground/

Wolf, S. O. (2015c, October 8). *The battle over Kunduz and its implications*. New York, USA: IndraStra Global. Accessed June 14, 2016, from http://www.indrastra.com/2015/10/FEATURED-Battle-Over-Kunduz-and-its-Implications-by-Dr-Siegfried-O-Wolf-299.html

Wolf, S. O. (2016a, May 11). Pakistan and terrorism: China-Pakistan economic corridor as critical juncture? *E-international relations*. Accessed May 14, 2016, from http://www.e-ir.info/2016/05/11/pakistan-and-terrorism-china-pakistan-economic-corridor-as-critical-juncture/

Wolf, S. O. (2016b, May 10). The fallacy of state Rhetoric: Pakistan, Haqqani Network and terror in Afghanistan. *SADF Focus*. No. 19, South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF). Brussels. Accessed May 14, 2016, from http://sadf.eu/new/blog/sadf-focus-n-13-fallacy-state-rhetoric-pakistan-haqqani-network-terror-afghanistan/

Yusuf, M. (Ed.). (2014a). *Pakistan's counterterrorism challenge*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Yusuf, M. (2014b). Pakistan's militancy challenge: From where, to what? In M. Yusuf (Ed.), *Pakistan's counterterrorism challenge* (pp. 15–46). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Zalman, A. (2014). *State terrorism - a definition of state terrorism.* Accessed January 30, 2016, from http://terrorism.about.com/od/whatisterroris1/a/StateTerrorism.htm

Antisemitism and the Global Jihad

Mario Silva

1 Introduction

In the contemporary world environment, with the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL/ISIS—Daesh), Hamas, Hezbollah, al-Qaeda, and other jihadi groups, antisemitism is once again a prominent part of the political and societal mainstream and continues to feed hostility and resentment towards Jews. Moreover, antisemitism has again become an important tool of terrorist propaganda to rally domestic and foreign recruits. With the ever increasing impact of social media, terrorist groups have successfully adapted and used these tools in their efforts to reach a vast audience of potential recruits. The genocidal expressions of antisemitism, which have been at the core of al-Qaeda's ideology for decades, have now been adopted by ISIS.

Nation states, as designed by Western societies and governments following the end of the First World War, are gradually starting to crumble in the Middle East and in some instances, such as Iraq, they are being demolished by the so-called Islamic State. The West had assumed that with the fall of Saddam Hussein, the forces of neo-liberalism would spread throughout the Middle East and beyond. Gone were the dictators; democracy and modernity were to follow. Instead, what has emerged is barbarism mixed with Wahhabi-style Islamic ideology.

The narratives depicting Jews as the enemies of humanity and the abhorrent, but commonplace, call for their extermination are currently propelled by ISIS which perceives both Jews and Israel as the global enemy, which must be eliminated; this militant antisemitism is embedded in their ideological propaganda. Similar to the National Socialists in the Third Reich, Jihadists of every tendency consider it fair game to dehumanize Jews, a process that—according to their declarations—would not apply to most other "non-believers."

M. Silva (✉)
Ryerson University, Toronto, Canada
e-mail: mario@mariosilva.ca

157

Islam and radical Islam (or Islamism) are not the same thing. Radical Islam is an ideology practiced by a minority of Muslims and is fuelled by international terrorism. Modern radical Islam was founded by Hassan al-Banna in Egypt in 1928 (the Muslim Brotherhood) and advocates hatred of the West and Israel.

More than a decade after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the USA, ideological Jew hatred continues and has grown over the years to channel hatred of Israel as a state to encourage attacks against all Jews.

This chapter argues that there is a historical link between the export of antisemitism from Europe to the Greater Middle East and its development into the ideological paranoia that feeds modern radical Jihadi terrorism and that this is essential to comprehend reality and in order to effectively combat contemporary Islamist terrorism.

2   Nexus Between Wahhabi Ideology and ISIS: Exporting Terrorism

The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, commonly known as ISIS or Daesh—notoriously known in the West as ISIS, is a Salafi jihadist militant group that follows a fundamentalist Wahhabi doctrine of Islam. ISIS is a predominantly Sunni jihadist group, seeking to implant civil strife in Iraq and the Levant (a region spanning from southern Turkey to Egypt and including Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and Jordan) with the aim of permanently establishing a caliphate—a unitary, transnational Islamic state based on the principles of Sharia and proclaimed a worldwide caliphate with terrorist Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi as its caliph in June 2014.

The roots of ISIS are mired in Wahhabism, Saudi Arabia's dominant faith. Wahhabism can be understood as a rigid form of Islam that adopts a literal interpretation of the Quran. Strict Wahhabis believe that all those who don't adhere to their form of Islam are heathens and enemies. According to Mia Yamani (an anthropologist specializing in the study of Saudi society), it is the political system that promotes such ideology and gives the people the excuse and the platform to proceed to express themselves in Islamic language to suit their purposes and political ends (Frontline, 2014).

ISIS, like the Wahhabi ideology, aims to submit conquered people. Moreover, akin to Ibn Saud's and Abd al-Wahhab's idea of martyrdom in the name of jihad, as it granted martyrs immediate entry into paradise; ISIS lures radicalized youth using the same bait. The modus operandi of the ISIS terror network bears stark resemblance to the Wahhabi movement and ideology. In the nineteenth century, Wahhabis massacred thousands of Shiites, including women and children, and today ISIS carries out atrocities against the non-Islamic believers (after accusing them of apostasy) and legitimizes their death, confiscation of their property, and

enslavement of their women (Crooke, 2014). In this context, Samer Abboud (an academic specializing in Middle East studies) remarks:

> Wahhabi doctrine, which lies at the core of ISIS' worldview, is one that fosters sectarian hatred, violence, and extreme social conservatism, and emanates from the West's second-most strategic ally in the region, Saudi Arabia. This doctrine has provided the ideological background for ISIS' leadership, its core fighters, and adherents and provides the ideational structure for the new Islamic society ISIS purports to want to create. It is precisely this doctrine that has given rise to the kind of iniquitous practices of ISIS and which has fostered such extreme violence against civilians in Syria, Iraq, and beyond (Abbou, 2015).

ISIS uses the symbolism of the Black Standard with the Seal of the Prophet Muhammad and the phrase, "There is no God but Allah, Muhammad is the messenger of Allah," in effect this is a copy of a flag flown by Muhammad in Islamic tradition (Gander, 2015).

ISIS territory is governed as a theocracy by a strict Salafist doctrine, adhering to an extreme interpretation of Islam and the purification of Islamic society with the final undertaking of jihad against the conquest of Israel.

Although ISIS is certainly an Islamic movement, it is neither typical nor mired in the distant past, because its roots are in Wahhabism, a form of Islam practised in Saudi Arabia that developed only in the eighteenth century. Although, Wahhabism claims that it is a return to the roots of Islam during the time of Muhammed and would therefore be as old as the religion.

It is well known that the Saudi ruling class applauds ISIS staunch Salafi piety and opposition to Shi'ism. The founder of Wahhabism, Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1703–1791), is the inspiration for the modern day extremists. He opposed Sufism and Shi'ism as heretical innovations and rejected any structure that would be perceived as idolatry. Likewise, he reinterpreted, and many Muslims would say distorted, the Quranic messages. His ideas were adopted as a political force by the Saud clan who were happy to adopt jihad through violent conquest. With the discovery of oil, Saudi Arabia has become a key American ally in the region, and following the Iranian Revolution, the US State Department has not seriously opposed the Saudis' project of spreading Wahhabism throughout the Muslim world to counter the rise in Shia influence, thus gravely undermining Islam's traditional pluralism.

Saudi financial resources and male citizens have supported fighters in Bosnia, Chechnya, and Afghanistan, which turned into al-Qaeda camps motivated by Saudi-born Osama Bin Laden's propaganda machine and who was eventually responsible for the atrocities of 9/11 and beyond—all influenced by Wahhabism.

Many of jihadi recruits are not well versed in Islam and are easily motivated by the traditional teaching of Wahhabi Islam with its hatred towards Western democracy and values and the aim of reinstating a caliphate. While the USA and Canada are reluctant to label the threat posed by Wahhabism, the European Parliament explicitly identified Wahhabism as the main source of global terrorism in 2013.

3   ISIS Propaganda and Social Media

ISIS makes its mark on the international stage by circulating videos showing the beheadings of captured soldiers, journalists, and civilians, as well as the destruction of precious cultural heritage sites. It's the first terrorist group born of the digital age; they know the power of social media and have demonstrated a high level of sophistication in the way they portray propaganda videos.

One facet that magnifies the threat of ISIS compared to any other previous terrorist group is its extensive and meticulously planned use of social media platforms to lure recruits as well as to disseminate its ideology. The Islamic State made the most of its reach by taking advantage of a variety of platforms: social media networks such as Twitter and Facebook, peer-to-peer messaging apps like Telegram and Surespot and content-sharing systems like JustPaste.it. The Islamic State became familiar with the power of digital media when its ruthless predecessor, Jordanian jihadist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, learned the effectiveness of uploading coarse videos of his atrocities to the Internet (Koerner, 2016).

According to "Documenting the Virtual Caliphate," an October 2015 report by the Quilliam Foundation, the organization releases on average 38 new items per day—20-minute videos, full-length documentaries, photo essays, audio clips, and pamphlets—in languages ranging from Russian to Bengali. The report mentions that economic activity, social events, unwavering law and order, and pro-active, pristine "religious" fervor form the foundations of the Islamic State's civilian appeal. In this way, the group attracts supporters based on ideological and political appeal. Besides civilian life, the propagandists go to great lengths to portray their military, variously depicting it in stasis or during offensive operations. There are few occasions upon which its defensive war is documented, something that is logical from their perspective given the need to perpetuate the aura of supremacy and momentum (Winter, 2015).

On the Internet, the Islamic State regularly publishes an English-language magazine called *Dabiq* that appeals to potential recruits and promotes the values of the organization. *Dabiq*'s sixth issue praised individual attacks on various Western countries including the USA, Canada, Australia, and France. In its fourth issue, the magazine included images of individuals in business suits walking on a sidewalk with the caption "Crusader Civilians" (Anti-Defamation League, 2015a, b, c).

The Anti-Defamation League, in its report titled "Home-Grown Islamic Extremism in 2014: The Rise of ISIS & Sustained Online Recruitment," mentions that Twitter is the main platform of choice for ISIS. The report outlines that:

> Official ISIS accounts are augmented by supporters, some of whom seem to have quasi-official status. These supporters both share official propaganda and contribute to the barrage of online voices supporting terrorist ideology. Some supporters add personal details about their experiences in the group—information that adds to the authenticity of their narratives by providing concrete experiences. Supporters can also download an app called "Dawn of Glad Tidings" as a way of receiving information from ISIS directly on their smart phone. When they do so, ISIS also gains the ability to post tweets from users' Twitter accounts—which, therefore, become de-facto ISIS propaganda outlets (Anti-Defamation League, 2015a, b, c, p. 10).

4   Jihad War Against the Jew

Modern Islamism borrows much of the same language of hatred towards the Jewish people that is found in fascist and Nazi material. In many respects, antisemitism has shifted from Europe to multiple areas across the Arab world.

In July 2014, a Twitter post by ISIS supporters called for a holocaust against the Jews. A graphic posted on the Twitter account of @ISIS_Conquests's read:

> The Real Zionist Holocaust is Predicted in the Hadiths! The Hour [resurrection] will not take place until the Muslims fight the Jews and the Muslims kill them, and the tree will say: "Oh, Muslim, servant of God, there is a Jew behind me, kill him! THE PROMISED Holocaust" (Algemeiner, 2014).

It may be mentioned here that antisemitism has played a major part in ISIS recruitment. A speech posted on the Internet identifies Jews with evil and declares:

> O ummah of Islam, indeed the world today has been divided into two camps and two trenches, with no third camp present: The camp of Islam and faith, and the camp of kufr (disbelief) and hypocrisy—the camp of the Muslims and the mujahidin everywhere, and the camp of the jews, the crusaders, their allies, and with them the rest of the nations and religions of kufr, all being led by America and Russia, and being mobilized by the jew...standing in the face of tyranny, against the treacherous rulers—the agents of the crusaders and the atheists, and the guards of the jews (Georges, 2015, p. 12).

The visceral hatred of Jews that the radicalized group derives from the Surah and Hadith, with quotes such as "Jews are those who are cursed and transformed into apes and swine," "Be apes—despised and hated by all," "... despised and disgraced!" (Surah 2:165, 5:60, 7:166), and "The hour will not come until Muslims fight and kill the Jews and the Jews will hide behind trees and rocks, and these trees and rocks will cry out saying, 'O Muslim, slave of Allah, this Jew is hiding behind me, come and kill him'" (Hadith No. 5203) (Blankley, 2015).

This hadith has over time proven popular with Islamic extremists of all hues ranging from ISIS to Hamas. In December 2011, a Gaza Friday sermon, which aired on Hamas Al-Aqsa TV, quotes the previously mentioned verse from the Hadith "They will say: 'oh Muslim, oh servant of Allah, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him'. Soon you will hear the stones and trees crying 'Allah Akbar,' saying: 'oh Muslim, oh servant of Allah, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him'" (MEMRI, 2011).

5   Source of Fear: European Jewry

In January 2016, Martin Schulz, president of the European Parliament minced no words in stating that European Jews were living in a persistent state of fear, and to him, it was unacceptable that Jews were "reluctant to wear their traditional clothes and display religious symbols in public because of fear of reprisals and aggression."

Schulz further stated that, "It is saddening when Jewish people consider leaving Europe because they no longer feel safe" (Sanchez, 2016).

Similar views were echoed by French President Francois Hollande, in reaction to the public debate in the Marseille Jewish community on whether Jews should hide their kippahs following the stabbings of several Jews. Hollande remarked: "Intolerable that in our country citizens should feel so upset and under assault because of their religious choice that they would conclude that they have to hide" (JTA, 2016).

In a similar vein, the president of the World Jewish Organization, Ronald Lauder, believes that European Jews today are living in the same troubled times and face the same level of threat, as existed in the 1930s. Mr. Lauder, who has led the World Jewish Congress since 2007, pointed to the fact that Jews make up just 1% of France's population, yet were victim to half the country's racist attacks. He also noted that anti-Semitic attacks have not only doubled in France in the past year, but also in the UK and Austria (Drury, 2015).

Such concerns are not unfounded. It is estimated that roughly 8000 French Jews, a record number, have moved to Israel since the attack on the offices of the *Charlie Hebdo* magazine and a Jewish supermarket in Paris in January 2015 (Sanchez, 2016). In the "Findings of the Third Survey of European Jewish Leaders"[1] it was revealed that 40% of respondents maintained that antisemitism poses a serious threat to the future of Jewish life in their country. The results matched other surveys that also showed increasing concern among Jews with respect to antisemitism, following the increase in hate crimes in Western Europe after 2000 in connection with Israel and jihadist attacks on Jewish targets, beginning with the 2012 murder of three children and a rabbi at a Jewish school in Toulouse, France. In 2013, nearly one-third of the 5847 European Jewish respondents to an EU survey stated they "seriously considered emigrating" because of antisemitism (Times of Israel, 2016).

France's 475,000 Jews represent less than 1% of the country's population. Yet, last year, according to the French Interior Ministry, 51% of all racist attacks targeted Jews (Goldberg, 2015). The emergence of far-right thinking in Europe today distinguishes itself from its historical counterparts in that it merges old European forms of antisemitism with Muslim Judeophobia and can be found, especially, in Europe's disenfranchised Muslim immigrant communities, which are themselves harassed by right-wing hooligans.

In January, at a ceremony marking the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz death camp, the American businessman Ronald Lauder, who serves as the president of the World Jewish Congress, spoke of the slow-motion exodus of European Jews (Goldberg, 2015).

A 2013 survey conducted by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights found that 60% of Sweden's Jews fear being publicly identified as Jewish (Goldberg, 2015).

---

[1]Conducted by the International Centre for Community Development of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, and administered online to 314 respondents in 32 countries.

Anti-Semitic crimes in Britain rose 25.7% in 2015, the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism recently revealed—and a pact between Islamists and the Left is fueling the hate.

The year 2015 remains the worst on record for antisemitism in the UK, as reported by the Campaign Against Anti-Semitism's National Anti-Semitic Crime Audit. Overall, violent anti-Semitic crime jumped 50.8%, with 16.9% of anti-Semitic crimes being violent in 2014, and 20.3% of anti-Semitic crimes being violent in 2015 (Greenfield, 2016).

6   Antisemitism: A Brief History

Antisemitism is a multifaceted form of prejudice, which connotes religious, racial, economic, and political manifestations. In the simplest terms, antisemitism may be understood as certain pre-ordained perceptions of the Jewish community, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. According to the European Parliamentary Working Group on Anti-Semitism:

> Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities... Anti-Semitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for "why things go wrong." It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits (EPWG on Antisemitism, 2016).

Professor David Berger, the former President of the Association for Jewish Studies, notes that antisemitism means either of the following:

> (1) hostility toward Jews as a group which results from no legitimate cause or greatly exceeds any reasonable, ethical response to genuine provocation; or (2) a pejorative perception of Jewish physical or moral traits which is either utterly groundless or a result of irrational generalization and exaggeration (Berger, 2010, p. 3).

The term antisemitism was originally coined in Germany by Wilhelm Marr, who was the founder of the Antisemiten-Liga in 1879.[2] However, hostility against Jews is not a strictly modern phenomenon. In ancient times, Jews were subject to criticism because of their different customs and lifestyle. In the ancient Greco-Roman world, religious differences were the primary basis for antisemitism. In the Hellenistic Age, for instance, Jews' social segregation and their refusal to acknowledge the gods worshiped by other peoples aroused resentment among some pagans, particularly from the first century BCE to the first century CE (Daniel, 1979). When Christ was crucified by Pontius Pilate, the rivalry between Jews and Christians

---

[2]Online Etymology Dictionary (2016), Anti-Semitism. http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=anti-Semitism. Accessed 16 Oct 2016.

reflected not only religious but also political connotations and Jews were regarded as sinners (Laqueur, 2006, p. 47).

In medieval times (from the eleventh to the fourteenth century), Jews were widely persecuted as "barely human," "Christ-killers," and "Devils." Forced to live in all-Jewish ghettos, they were accused of poisoning rivers and wells during times of disease. Some were tortured and executed for supposedly abducting and killing Christian children to drink their blood or to use it in baking matzoh, a charge known as the "blood lib" (Anti-Defamation League, 2001; Chazan, 2010).

In the eighteenth century, with the decreasing influence of Christ during the Age of Enlightenment, religiously based hatred of "Jewishness" gave way to non-religious criticism: Judaism was attacked as an outdated belief that blocked human progress and once again, Jewish separatism was targeted. Berger writes that there were areas of Europe, most notably in the east, where the commitment to traditional forms of Christianity retained its full force into the nineteenth century and beyond. Even in the West, large sectors of the early modern population remained immune to the impact of Enlightenment and Secularism, so that old-style hostility towards Jews could continue to flourish (Berger, 2010).

The worst form of antisemitism was witnessed in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s during the Holocaust. With the Nazi rise to power in 1933, the party ordered anti-Jewish economic boycotts, staged book burnings, and enacted discriminatory anti-Jewish legislation. In 1935, the Nuremberg Laws racially defined Jews by "blood" and ordered the total separation of so-called "Aryans" and "non-Aryans," thereby legalizing a racist hierarchy. On the night of November 9, 1938, Nazis destroyed synagogues and the shop windows of Jewish-owned stores throughout Germany and Austria (an event now known as the "Kristallnacht," "pogromnacht," or "Night of Broken Glass"). This event marked a transition to an era of destruction, in which genocide would become the singular focus of Nazi antisemitism (Burleigh, 1991).

In the half-century since World War II, public antisemitism has become much less visible in the Western world. But while parts of Europe remain caught up in racial unrest, the Middle East, under the aegis of radical Islam, is home to the most virulent form of antisemitism in the world today.

7   Antisemitism and the Battle Against Global Jihad

While the study of antisemitism largely focuses on the conflict between Christianity and Judaism, an often overlooked aspect is the toxic thought pervading radicalized Islam against the Jews and, in particular, towards the state of Israel. This antisemitism is fuelled by an interpretation of the negative stereotypes against the Jewish community in Islamic religious texts such as the Quran and is reflected in its worst form as Jihadi violence against the Jewish community across the world. Similar to the National Socialists of the Third Reich, Jihadis consider Jews as fair game, in a dehumanizing process that—according to their declarations—would not apply to most of the other so-called "non-believers."

The roots of modern Islamic antisemitism can be traced to Arabic-language service broadcasts by the German shortwave transmitter in Zeesen between 1939 and 1945, and the role of Haj Amin el-Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem, who was the first to translate European antisemitism into an Islamic context. El-Husseini's efforts went a long way to promote Islamic anti-Zionism and provided a religious rationale for hatred of Jews. Anyone who failed to accept his guidelines would be denounced by name in the mosque during Friday prayers, excluded from the rites of marriage and burial, or physically threatened. The Mufti implemented this policy along with his most prominent Palestinian ally of the time, the Islamic fundamentalist Izz al-Din al-Qassam, whose name is borne by Hamas's suicide-bombing units. Al-Qassam was the first sheikh in modern times who, in 1931 in the Haifa region, set up a movement that united the ideology of a devout return to the original Islam of the seventh century with the practice of militant jihad against the infidel (Küntzel, 2005).

Modern radical Islam was founded by Sunni Muslim Hassan al-Banna in Egypt in 1928 (the Muslim Brotherhood) and advocates hatred of the West and Israel. The Muslim Brotherhood portrayed the Jew as the demonic enemy of Islam and organized anti-Jewish demonstrations in Egypt with slogans such as "Jews get out of Egypt and Palestine" and "Down with the Jews." In November 1945, one of the worst pogroms against Jews was carried out in Egypt. Houses were ransacked, synagogues torched, specifically targeting the Jewish population (Greenfield, 2012).

"*Our Struggle Against the Jews*," written in the 1950s by one of the most important Muslim Brotherhood ideologues, Sayyid Qutb, has become a must-read for extremists in the region. The book is extremely popular in Saudi Arabia and Iran (Sawad, 2016).

The virulent hatred of Jews continues today in Egypt and in the Middle East. Contemporary Islamic religious figures are completely unapologetic of the Jihad against the Jewish community and more often than not justify the killing of Jews by radicalized Islamic jihadists. Yusuf Al Qaradawi, one of the Muslim world's most prominent theologians, remarked:

> There is no dialogue between us and the Jews except by the sword and the rifle. Oh Allah, take your enemies, the enemies of Islam. Oh Allah, take the Jews, the treacherous aggressors. Oh Allah, take this profligate, cunning, arrogant band of people... Oh Allah, do not spare a single one of them. Oh Allah, count their numbers, and kill them, down to the very last one. Throughout history, Allah has imposed upon the Jews people who would punish them for their corruption...The last punishment was carried out by [Adolf] Hitler. By means of all the things he did to them—even though they exaggerated this issue—he managed to put them in their place. This was divine punishment for them...Allah Willing, the next time will be at the hand of the believers [Muslims] (Sawad, 2016).

It is this very ideology that the terrorist organization ISIS professes when it calls for a second Holocaust and a total extermination of Jews. Even though radical Islam is the ideology of only a minority of Muslims it has fuelled international terrorism.

Following the Mumbai massacre of 2008, in which a series of 12 coordinated shootings and bombings were carried out by Pakistani jihadists, to the attack at the offices of satirical magazine *Charlie Hebdo* which killed 11 people, to the 2015 massacre in Paris which resulted in more carnage by Islamic extremists—the international community needs to take action against these threats.

These incidents coincide with a sharp rise in antisemitism, including many attacks on Jewish institutions.

This growing concern for the safety and well-being of Jewish communities was addressed in a series of editorial articles by Abraham H. Foxman, president of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), who asserts in the Miami Herald:

> The future may have very little to do with French Jewry. It will depend heavily on whether the French government and society can fully integrate their Muslim citizens. If they do there still will be some violent extremists, but the dynamic in society could change and make it more hospitable for Jews. If Muslims are not more fully integrated in society, terrorist attacks against Jews will grow, as will the extreme right National Front party, which has a history of anti-Semitism and stridently anti-immigrant rhetoric. Neither will be good for the Jews of France (Anti-Defamation League, 2015a, b, c).

Furthermore, to confront these issues, the ADL argues that Europe needs to directly confront the challenge of radical Islam:

> The attacks on *Charlie Hebdo* and on a kosher store are linked by the perpetrators' ideology, not just their acquaintance. Islamic extremism is a common enemy of Jews and democratic states. That message needs to be heard and internalized by governments and mainstream society. Anti-Semitism is at the core of Islamic extremist ideology, interwoven with its hatred of basic democratic freedoms, and continues to motivate adherents around the world. The packaging of anti-Semitic narratives has radicalized followers and influenced numerous international and domestic extremists with tragic results (Anti-Defamation League, 2015a, b, c).

8   Nuclear Weapons, Terrorism, and Existential Threat

The regimes in Saudi Arabia and Iran, both sources of extremism, are two of the world's leading state sponsors of terrorism through their theological interpretation of the Quran and their financial and operational support for groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, al-Qaeda, and others. The Muslim world is in the middle of a sectarian battle between Sunni and Shia, which has led both Saudi Arabia and Iran to lend their support to various warring factions and governments in the region. This proxy war between Shia Iran and Sunni Saudi Arabia for control of the Middle East and beyond has created havoc and spawned extremism and terrorists. Nuclear weapons in the hands of the Iranian regime will be catastrophic as it will undoubtedly lead to Saudi Arabia seeking similar weapons, and it could conceivably acquire them through its relations with Pakistan. These two repressive regimes

could create further security threats by potentially sharing nuclear technology with extremist groups.

Since the overthrow of the Shah of Iran in 1979, Iran has been run by a theocratic and autocratic Shia Islamist regime. Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the country's powerful Supreme Leader, has violently suppressed internal dissent and retains ultimate authority over all matters of social and political life. During his presidency from 2005 to 2013, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad became notorious for promoting Holocaust denial and extremist views that called for Israel to be "wiped from the earth" (Anti-Defamation League, 2015a, b, c).

When Saddam Hussein was overthrown by the USA and its allies in 2003, the Iranian regime assisted the insurgent Shiite population to take control. The Iranian regime is also backing Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia is arming the rebel forces in Syria and Iraq.

9 Global Threat on the Jewish Communities

9.1 Attacks in Europe

European Jews have been going into exile in rapidly increasing numbers over recent months. Thousands are moving to Israel, the UK, and the USA, seeking safety to raise their families without fear and threat.

David Saperstein, US ambassador at large for International Religious Freedom at the State Department, stated: "there is increasing violence in Europe [. . .] verbal and physical attacks that we never thought we'd see again after World War II [. . .] Governments voice anti-Semitic views [. . .] and question Israel's right to exist" (Barber, 2016).

There have been a multitude of attacks on the Jewish community in Europe, all perpetrated by anti-Semitic ideology. An incident in May 2012 seems to have been the tipping point for violence against Jews, when a gunman killed seven people—including a teacher and three children—at a Jewish school in Toulouse, France. Also, a shooting at the Jewish Museum in Brussels in May 2014, a month before the most recent Gaza conflict erupted, killed four people and was seemingly sparked by a new anti-Semitic wave among Muslims in Europe.

There were instances of anti-Semitic violence which spread across Europe, including an attack on a Paris synagogue on July 13, 2014, during which worshippers were stuck inside while thousands outside were protesting and attacking the synagogue. While the incident was condemned by the French Prime Minister, only 2 weeks later 400 protesters attacked another synagogue and Jewish-owned businesses in Sarcelles, north of Paris. On July 26, 2014, a pro-Palestinian demonstration in Galeries Lafayette turned into an anti-Semitic demonstration with attackers shouting slogans such as "MORT AUX JUIFS! MORT AUX JUIFS!" "Death to the Jews!" (Brenner, 2015).

Jean Marc Illouz, a former senior French television correspondent, noted that:

> You see people are thinking of anti-Semitism in terms of World War II and coming from the French. . .It has nothing to do with the French. It has nothing to do with the mainstream Muslim French thinking. It has to do with imported terrorism (Beardsley, 2015).

A significant number of the violent anti-Semitic attacks in Europe were perpetrated by Muslims; the murders of four Jews in Toulouse in 2012 by Mohammed Merah (Anti-Defamation League, 2015a, b, c), the 1982 attack on the Jewish Goldenberg restaurant in Paris that was carried out by Arab terrorists, the kidnapping and murder of the French citizen Ilan Halimi in 2006 by a Muslim gang, and the anti-Semitic riots in Norway in 2009 are but a few examples of this phenomenon (The Jerusalem Post, 2015). Robert Bernstein, founder of Human Rights Watch, says that antisemitism is "deeply ingrained and institutionalized" in "Arab nations in modern times."

Synagogues have been burned and Jewish schools have come under attack, not only in France, but all across Europe, especially in Germany or any other country where Jews have settled. There has been a considerable amount of violence against Jews all over the world by radical Muslims. As previously noted, France's 475,000 Jews represent less than 1% of the country's population. Yet in 2014, according to the French Interior Ministry, 51% of all racist attacks targeted Jews. The statistics in other countries, including the UK, are similarly dismal. In 2014, Jews in Europe were murdered, raped, beaten, stalked, chased, harassed, spat on, and insulted for being Jewish. In the Swedish town of Malmö, acts of antisemitism are common (Goldberg, 2015). In 2014, in Germany, there were 1596 recorded hate crimes against Jewish people, compared to 1275 in the previous year, reversing a long-term trend of declining incidents.

However, according to a leading antisemitism scholar, detailed data on Muslim antisemitism in Western Europe is very limited; the few existing studies all point in one direction; namely, that anti-Jewish prejudice is prevalent particularly among conservative Muslims. In Copenhagen, all main assaults on Jews were perpetrated by Muslims. In Malmö, Sweden's third largest city, most of the perpetrators of physical and verbal attacks on Jews were Muslims. In 2009, during Israel's "Operation Cast Lead" in Gaza, the largest anti-Semitic riots in Norway's history took place in Oslo. All participants were Muslim. Attackers wounded a Christian who attended a pro-Israel demonstration and threw life-threatening projectiles at the demonstrators (Gerstenfled, 2013).

According to the Kantor Centre for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry at Tel Aviv University, there were 410 instances of violent antisemitism recorded across the globe, which was a 46% decline from the corresponding figure of 2014. However, it may be noted here that the center attributes this decline solely to the increasing security mechanism put in place after the Charlie Hebdo attacks and mentions that "institutional anti-Semitism" and "slander against the Jewish People as a whole" remained unchanged (Rimmerman, 2016).

As noted previously, the so-called "Jihad against Jews" finds its justification in some sections of Islamic religious texts, and those pertinent sections have been used as justification for the recurring objective of exterminating Jews globally, in particular in the recent decades. Militant Islam has been tirelessly calling for the elimination of Jews globally. On February 23, 1998, *Al-Quds al-Arabi*, an Arabic newspaper published in London, printed the full text of a "Declaration of the World Islamic Front for Jihad Against the Jews and the Crusaders" and mentioned that to kill Americans and their allies (Jews), both civil and military, is the individual duty of every Muslim who is able, in any country where this is possible (Lewis, 1998). This section documents some of the major attacks on Jews that have taken place across the globe in the past few years.

9.2   Attack on the Al-Ghriba Synagogue in Tunisia in 2002

In April 2002, a truck with explosives detonated in front of the Ghriba Synagogue in Tunisia, killing 19 and injuring more than 30. The blast near the historic El Ghriba synagogue on Djerba, an island off the south-eastern Tunisian coast, specifically targeted Jews (CNN, 2002). Initially, there was reluctance on the part of the investigative authorities to attribute this as a terrorist attack, but a fortnight later, Klaus Ulrich Kersten, head of the Bundeskriminalamt (the BKA), admitted that al-Qaeda was indeed responsible for the attack. Al-Qaeda's involvement was confirmed when, several days after the explosion, a fax arrived in the offices of two Arabic newspapers in Pakistan confirming the identity of the truck driver as Nizar Nawar, a drifter and one-time smuggler nicknamed "Sword of the Faith, the Tunisian." The fax bore the seal of the Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Sites, the same al-Qaeda affiliate group that claimed responsibility for killing 224 people in the US embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998. The Tanzanian attack had also been carried out using a truck, though much bigger in size. A copy of Nawar's will, signed on July 5, 2000, was also sent. It called on his family to contribute to the holy war, jihad, "with their souls and money" (The Guardian, 2002). Moreover, in a "speech" broadcasted by the al-Jazeera TV network in Qatar, Osama bin Laden's official spokesman (who introduced himself as Sulaiman abu Ghaith) claimed that al-Qaeda carried out the attack on Djerba, explaining:

> A youth could not see his brothers in Palestine butchered and murdered (while) he saw Jews cavorting in Djerba. So this spirit of jihad surged and he carried out this successful operation, may God accept it (Davidsson, 2012).

In 2009, a French court sentenced German al-Qaeda militant, Christian Ganczarski, a convert to Islam, to 18 years' imprisonment for the Al-Ghriba Synagogue attack. The court also sentenced Walid Nouar, the brother of the suicide bomber, to 12 years in prison for his part in the attack on the synagogue in Djerba (BBC, 2009).

9.3   Execution of the Jewish US Journalist Daniel Pearl in Pakistan

Daniel Pearl, a reporter for the *Wall Street Journal*, was kidnapped and killed in 2002 by his captors. Pearl was kidnapped on January 23, 2002 in Karachi, Pakistan. Four days later, a group calling themselves the National Movement for the Restoration of Pakistani Sovereignty, sent an e-mail with pictures of the 38-year-old Pearl in chains. One of the pictures showed him with a gun to his head. In another message, the captors threatened to kill Mr. Pearl within 24 hours if their demands were not met. Pearl was then barbarically put to death, and a video recording of his gruesome murder was put online. In addition to showing violent footage of Pearl's death, the video also showed Pearl discussing his Jewish heritage and making propaganda statements, apparently under duress. The tape began with the correspondent saying: "My name is Daniel Pearl. I'm a Jewish-American. My father is Jewish, my mother is Jewish. I am a Jew." In the video, Pearl also recounted numerous family visits to Israel and noted that a street in a town in Israel was named after his great-grandfather, who was one of the founders of the town (Habib, 2013).

The manner in which the recording of the heinous murder was made put an end to any doubts on Pearl being murdered primarily because he was an American; clearly his murder resulted from him being Jewish. This was one of the most heinous anti-Semitic attacks on any individual in recent years.

Ahmad Omar Sheikh was the mastermind of the kidnapping and set the trap which lured Pearl to his captors. He put the reporter in contact with a man who he pretended would introduce him to an extremist Muslim leader whom Pearl wished to interview. Ahmad Omar Saeed Sheikh has been sentenced by a Pakistani court to be hanged for orchestrating Pearl's kidnapping while three other co-conspirators are currently in prison. Even the identity of the man who actually beheaded the journalist is probably known; he is a top al-Qaeda terrorist, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, believed to be a key organizer of the 9/11 attacks. Levy Stark in his famous book *Who Killed Daniel Pearl* describes how deeply antisemitism is ingrained in Pakistan's radical Islamic society. Levy writes:

> In fact, I think about all I have been told about the virulent antisemitism of the Pakistanis and about this second piece of advice: Don't speak about it. Ever. There are anti-Semites who, as is often the case, have never seen a Jew in their lives and will not put two and two together when they hear your name. So silence, OK? Never respond to questions or provocations. With India in your past and, on top of that, being Jewish—it's a lot for one man, so don't mention either, no matter what (Levy, 2014, p. 15).

Levy then minces no words in labeling Pakistan as a hub of militant Islam and anti-Semitic ideology:

> I assert that Pakistan is the biggest rogue of all the rogue states of today. I assert that what is taking form there, between Islamabad and Karachi, is a black hole compared to which Saddam Hussein's Baghdad was an obsolete weapons dump. The stench of apocalypse hangs over those cities; I am convinced that Danny smelled that stench (Levy, 2014, p. 215).

9.4   Attack on Israeli-Owned Hotels in Kenya

On November 28, 2002, in the Kenyan City of Mombasa, suicide bombers detonated their explosives on the doors of an Israeli-owned hotel, killing more than a dozen people (Bennet, 2002). Al-Qaeda was behind the attack, which had all the elements of antisemitism. Suleiman Abu Gaith issued a statement on an Islamic website affiliated to al-Qaeda: "The Jewish crusader coalition will not be safe anymore from the fighters attack" (Fighel, 2014, p. 430). Many intelligence analysts believed Mombasa was one of al-Qaeda's East African bases. Leaders in the coastal area, with its significant Muslim population, proclaim sympathy for the plight of the Palestinian people and oppose many policies of the Israeli government. In addition, prior to the November 2002 attacks, several governments issued strong warnings to their citizens to avoid travel to Kenya, and Mombasa specifically, due to the possibility of terrorist attacks (Bennet, 2002).

9.5   Attack on Jewish Community Centre in Mumbai

During the terrorist attack on Mumbai on November 26, 2011, the city was taken virtual hostage by a small number of Islamic militants who had crossed over from Pakistan via the sea route. One of their targets of attack was the Nariman Building, which housed the Orthodox Chabad-Lubavitch retreat, a Jewish Community Centre. Investigations revealed that Israeli hostages killed by Islamic terrorists during the attacks on Mumbai were tortured by their captors before they were bound together and killed (McElroy, 2008). According to the conversation recorded by Indian intelligence, the group leader of the attackers stated that targeting and killing the Jews was the most important part of their mission. Irrespective of whether the other attacks failed or not, the Chabad House operation to kill Jews must succeed. Attacking the Jewish community center that also serves as an ultra-Orthodox synagogue would also send a message to Jews around the world the terrorist group maintained. "When you kill one [Jew]… it is worth more than killing 50 people" was the voice of the Pakistani commander heard over the cell phone as he urged the Jihadists who had taken over the ultra-Orthodox Chabad House in Mumbai on the evening of November 26 (Fatah, 2010, p. 16).

10   Jihad Against Jews and Israel

These are some of the gruesome incidents of terror that show how antisemitism plays a vital role in radical and militant Islamic ideology. As mentioned above, the killing of a Jew is a matter of celebration for the Jihadists. Any discussion on antisemitism and targeted killing of Jews is incomplete without a discussion on the global Jihad launched against Israel. The seminal work titled, "Shackled Warrior: Israel and the Global Jihad" by Caroline Glick, includes a detailed analysis of how the goal of Jihadi ideology, under the guise of the Palestinian cause, is a

premeditated mass murder of Jews. It outlines how in anything—from schoolrooms to mosques to daily papers to art studios—Palestinians teach, preach, write, and paint we can find praise of genocide (Glick, 2008). The collusion of Hamas with al-Qaeda under the Taliban and a Zarqawi video calling for toppling the Hashemites and the destruction of Jerusalem should put rest to any doubt about antisemitism being an important component of the global Jihad (Keyes, 2004).

According to Martin Kramer, modern antisemitism in Muslim lands was a result of diffusion of European racial theories. Arab nationalist leaders found support and then refuge in Berlin, and Arabic translations of "*Mein Kampf*" and the "*Protocols of the Elders of Zion*" enjoyed their widest circulation (Kramer, 1994, pp. 38–42).

In the 1970s, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad emerged, with the aim of re-establishing a sovereign, Islamic Palestinian state with the geographic borders of the pre-1948 Mandatory Palestine. This philosophy advocates the destruction of Israel through violent means and approaches the Arab–Israeli conflict as an ideological war, not a territorial dispute. The Jihadists see violence as the only path to remove Israel from the Middle East and reject any two-state arrangement in which Israel and Palestine coexist.

In 2008, a study by Council for Foreign Relations listed the attacks on Palestinian Jihadist groups on Israel in the past two decades:

- August 1987, the commander of the Israeli military police in the Gaza Strip, shot and killed;
- December 1993, Israeli reservist David Mashrati shot and killed aboard a bus;
- April 1994, a car bomb killed nine people and injured 50 others aboard a public bus;
- January 1995, a suicide bomb killed 18 soldiers and one civilian near Netanya;
- March 1996, a suicide bomb at a Tel Aviv shopping mall killed 13 and injured 75 more;
- June 2001, a suicide bomb killed 21 people in a Tel Aviv nightclub;
- June 2002, a suicide attack at the Meggido Junction killed 18 and injured 50;
- October 2003, a suicide bomber at a Haifa restaurant killed 22 and injured 60;
- October 2005, a bomb at a Hadera market killed five people;
- April 2006, a suicide attack in Tel Aviv killed 11;
- January 2007, a suicide attack at an Eliat bakery killed three. Both the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades and the PIJ claim responsibility (Fletcher, 2008).

A survey, carried out by the Ramallah-based Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research and published on April 4, 2016, found that 60% of Palestinians supported "armed attacks against Israeli civilians inside Israel," while 65% believed escalating the current wave of violence into an armed "intifada" would assist Palestinian national aspirations in a way that negotiations could not. A plurality also believed that armed action was the most effective way to establish a Palestinian state (Spencer, 2016).

More recently, ISIS has expressed its full support for the Palestinian Jihad against Israel. According to video footage released by the ISIS office in Mosul,

an ISIS commander is congratulating some Palestinians for attacking Jews. The commander is heard saying:

> Oh mujahedeen, we call on you to prepare yourselves spiritually and materially to strike terror and fear into the hearts of the Jews. . . . Know that the soldiers of Islam are fighting here in Iraq, Syria, Khorasan, and West Africa, but their sights are set on Bayt Al-Maqdis [Jerusalem] (Mora, 2015).

Thus, the strengthening of global jihad elements and their identification with global Jihad presents the Jews and Israel with not just a mere security or a political threat, but one that is existential in nature. This global pogrom continues to brutalize and terrify Jews around the world.

11   Antisemitism and Terrorism: How the West Must Fight Both

A study done by Benjamin Kerstein, an Israeli-American writer, compares antisemitism among communities in many nations and notes the creation of a silent exodus, a de facto expulsion, an ethnic cleansing in slow motion (Kerstein, 2014). However, it is regrettable that the international community is more or less reluctant to speak out against the plight of ongoing Jihad against the Jews and the state of Israel. Moreover, hate speech and comments on the Internet targeting the Jewish community are ubiquitous. It is estimated that 95% of the comments on threads that were blocked or moderated on French sites were anti-Israel (Benhamou, 2014). Moreover, anti-Israel positioning often transforms to antisemitism.

In January 2015, the United Nations General Assembly held its first-ever informal meeting on the growth of worldwide antisemitism after a request from 37 nations. The Joint Statement following the meeting read:

> Anti-Semitism is a manifestation of racism, xenophobia and religious intolerance. In recent years, we have witnessed increased incidents of hatred, intolerance, discrimination and violence against individuals based on their religion or belief. Sadly these acts have also targeted institutions including schools, cultural centres and places of worship. The Jewish Community has been particularly targeted (Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2015).

The General Assembly called for nations to implement the following measures to combat the rising tide of antisemitism:

1. Declare their categorical rejection of antisemitism
2. Encourage political leaders, public figures, and educators to publicly and vocally condemn anti-Semitic incidents and consider designating government officials to monitor and address all forms of discrimination based on religion or belief, including antisemitism
3. Review their national legislation and ensure appropriate mechanisms for combating discrimination based on religion or belief, including antisemitism

4. Promote opportunities for educational initiatives and teacher training programs that provide young people with education on the subject of antisemitism
5. Monitor crimes, including those anti-Semitic in nature, and effectively investigate them in a prompt and impartial manner with the aim of prosecuting those responsible;
6. Strengthen dialogue within civil society to promote mutual respect, tolerance, and understanding between different communities (Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2015).

The General Assembly concluded its statement with the words of the French philosopher Bernard Henri Levy:

> When you go after the Jews, insisted an early opponent of the Nazis, it is like a first line crumbling under an invisible volley that eventually will hit the rest of us as it draws closer. A world without Jews indeed would not be a world. A world in which the Jews once again would become the scapegoats for all people's fears and frustrations would be a world in which free people could not breathe easy and the enslaved would be even more enslaved (Levy, 2015).

Gunther Jikeli[3] notes that combating Islamist ideology and understanding the Islamism/antisemitism nexus is critical in the battle against terrorism and antisemitism; adding that a review of terrorist acts over the last three decades shows a sharp rise in their number "justified by an Islamist-Jihadist ideology, the perpetrators' interpretation of "true" Islam." He further notes that most indicators suggest that Jihadist terror attacks are likely to increase worldwide in the next few years, particularly in Africa and Western Europe but in the USA as well.

A country that is familiar with this type of terrorism is Israel, and if the West is serious about fighting this kind of terrorism, it must increase security measures, particularly at airports and other large public venues to levels similar to those currently existing in Israel.

Developing an understanding of what the battle against terrorism is truly about is equally important, and the West must fight the ideology as well which is being spread by both Iran and Saudi Arabia, the twin pillars of Jihadi indoctrination. As Professor Bassam Tibi at Göttingen University notes:

> the fight against terrorism can only be successful if its ideology is confronted...However, journalists and politicians do not even agree on the terminology to describe this threat. Some omit any reference to Islamism and even terrorism experts and experts of Jihadism

---

[3]Dr. Günther Jikeli is the author of European Muslim Antisemitism. Why Young Urban Males Say They Don't Like Jews (Indiana University Press 2015) and, most recently, of an important chapter on "A Framework for Assessing Antisemitism: Three Case Studies (Dieudonné, Erdoğan, and Hamas)." In Deciphering the New Antisemitism, edited by Alvin H. Rosenfeld. He is the Visiting Assistant Professor and Justin M. Druck Family Scholar at the Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism, Robert A. and Sandra S. Borns Jewish Studies Program at Indiana University and a senior ISGAP research fellow).

often lack an understanding of the anti-Semitic ideology that is a core element of the radical nature and irrationality of Islamism (Tibi, 2012, 2013, pp. 21–46).

Furthermore, Professor Jikeli notes:

> Many commentators rationalize and effectively justify terrorism by subscribing to the portrayal of the perpetrator as angry underdog, protesting injustice on a global scale rather than pinpointing the Islamist and radical anti-Semitic worldview at the core of Jihadist ideology. Suicide attacks as strategic warfare have become a key and celebrated element of Jihadism, as well as a highly effective tool in spreading terror. Despite scriptural passages from the Quran forbidding both suicide and the killing of innocent civilians, Islamists find ways to justify its use (Jikeli, 2016).

Iran's Supreme Leader and head of Shia Islamists, Ayatollah Khomeini, sent young men into minefields in the Iran–Iraq war in 1982 calling them "soldiers of God" who would have access to paradise, as would those who killed the "enemies of Islam" (Rubenstein, 2011). The call for martyrdom was evident in the attacks in Lebanon and at the July 18, 1994 attack at the Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina (AMIA; Argentine Israelite Mutual Association) where 85 people were murdered and hundreds more were injured. Strikingly, Argentina is home to one of the largest Jewish communities in Latin America, and this was one of the deadliest bombings ever to occur in that country.

The bombing resembled the attack on the Israeli embassy that killed 29 people in Buenos Aires in March 1992, for which Hezbollah, the Iranian-backed Shiite "Party of God," claimed responsibility (Kramer, 1994, pp. 38–42).

As Martin Kramer noted:

> The choice of a Jewish target was no mistake. It came as the culmination of a shift in the thinking of many Muslim fundamentalists. Today they are in thrall to the idea that Jews everywhere, in league with Israel, are behind a sinister plot to destroy Islam. The battle-ground is anywhere Jews are organized to assist and aid in this plot. This is a new concept even for Islamic fundamentalism, and it represents an especially virulent form of anti-Semitism, one so widespread and potentially violent that it could eclipse all other forms of anti-Semitism over the next decade (Kramer, 1994).

Unfortunately, the Islamic fundamentalist position has now been thoroughly penetrated by classic European antisemitism, in large part due to the support of religious clerics trained in Saudi Arabia and Iran. There was a time when the people of the Book—Jews and Christians alike—lived in many parts of the Muslim world in relative security. Today, the Jewish communities have all but disappeared in the Muslim world and soon the same will happen to the Christian communities, effectively erasing millennia of history.

Support for acts of terrorism and suicide attacks are a minority position within the Muslim world, but there is research that indicates that support for terror attacks is higher among younger Muslim populations (Jikeli, 2016). In a recent article, Fareed Zakaria notes that:

In fact, the enemy is radical Islam; an ideology that has spread over the past four decades—for a variety of reasons—and now infects alienated young men and women across the Muslim world. The fight against it must at its core be against the ideology itself. And that can be done only by Muslims—they alone can purge their faith of this extremism. After a slow start, several important efforts are underway, perhaps more than people realize. The West can help by encouraging these forces of reform, allying with them and partnering in efforts to modernize their societies. But that is much less satisfying than hurling invectives, calling for bans on Muslims and advocating carpet bombing (Zakaria, 2015).

12   Conclusion

If the West is serious about confronting terrorism, it must stop supporting repressive regimes that oppress their people. Saudi Arabia has a gender apartheid system in place, and both the Saudi and Iranian regimes have religious police to enforce strict religious dress codes for women. Both these regimes, like ISIS, see man-made laws and Western democracy as evil and provide a template for extremists to view the conflict in simplistic terms of good versus evil. Attacks against Israel are in part due to Israel's embrace of Western democracy as well as the prevailing Islamist perception that Israel and its allies in the West are opponents of Islam. This perception that Islamic values are under attack by non-Muslims is largely perpetuated by Wahhabis in Saudi Arabia, Iran's Supreme Leader, and their Salafist partners throughout the Muslim world.

If the international community is serious about fighting terrorism, it must also fight against antisemitism. Thus, far the global response to combating antisemitism has been dismal, weak, and ineffective. Unfortunately, too few world leaders manage to see that antisemitism is spreading and is being used to indoctrinate more Jihadist recruits.

References

Abbou, S. (2015). The only way to take on ISIS is to take on Wahhabi doctrine. *Mondoweiss*. Retrieved October 15, 2016, from http://mondoweiss.net/2015/11/isis-wahhabi-doctrine/

Algemeiner. (2014). ISIS threatens to commit another holocaust against Jews. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.algemeiner.com/2014/07/08/isis-threatens-to-commit-another-holocaust-against-jews/#

Anti-Defamation League. (2001). What is anti-semitism. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://archive.adl.org/hate-patrol/antisemitism.html#.V06vZb4TeO4

Anti-Defamation League. (2015a). Home-grown Islamic extremism in 2014: The rise of ISIS & Sustained Online Recruitment. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.adl.org/assets/pdf/combating-hate/homegrown-islamic-extremism-in-2014-the-rise-of-isis-and-sustained-online-recruitment.pdf

Anti-Defamation League. (2015b). Global anti-semitism: Selected incidents around the world in 2012. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.adl.org/anti-semitism/international/c/global-antisemitism-2015.html?referrer=https://ca.search.yahoo.com/#.WAQ2cOArLDc

Anti-Defamation League. (2015c). International anti-semitism. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.adl.org/anti-semitism/international/c/2015-heinous-as-attack.html#.Vzn3VpErLDc

Barber, B. (2016). Muslim migrants fan European anti-semitism. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ben-barber/muslim-migrants-fan-europ_b_9395896.html

BBC. (2009, February 5). Two jailed over Tunisia bombing. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7873543.stm

Beardsley, E. (2015). For many French Jews, anti-semitism has a clear source. *NPR*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2015/01/22/379119380/for-many-french-jews-anti-semitism-has-a-clear-source

Benhamou, L. (2014, July 21). French online forums overflow with anti-Jewish hate. *The Times of Israel*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.timesofisrael.com/french-online-forums-overflow-with-anti-jewish-hate/#ixzz38ZeC8IKj

Bennet, J. (2002, November 28). In Kenya, 3 suicide bombers attack hotel owned by Israelis; missiles fired at passenger jet. *New York Times*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/2002/11/28/international/middleeast/in-kenya-3-suicide-bombers-attack-hotel-owned-by.html?_r=0

Berger, D. (2010). Anti-semitism: An overview. In D. Berger (Ed.), *History and hate: The dimensions of anti-semitism*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Blankley, B. (2015, January 28). Nazi holocaust: Incomparable to Muhammad's plan for Jews. *Patheos*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.patheos.com/blogs/hedgerow/2015/01/nazi-holocaust-incomparable-to-muhammads-plan-for-jews/

Brenner, M. (2015). The troubling question in the French Jewish community: Is it time to leave? *Vanity Fair*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2015/07/anti-semitism-france-hostage-hyper-cacher-kosher-market

Burleigh, M. (1991). *The racial state: Germany 1933–1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chazan, R. (2010). Medieval anti-semitism. In D. Berger (Ed.), *History and hate: The dimensions of anti-semitism*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

CNN. (2002, April 12). Tunisia synagogue blast kills 5. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://edition.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/africa/04/11/tunisia.blast/index.html?related

Crooke, A. (2014). You can't understand ISIS if you don't know the history of Wahhabism in Saudi Arabia. Retrieved October 15, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alastair-crooke/isis-wahhabism-saudi-arabia_b_5717157.html

Daniel, J. L. (1979). Anti-semitism in the Hellenistic-roman period. *Journal of Biblical Literature, 98*(1), 45–65.

Davidsson, E. (2012). The bombing at the Ghriba synagogue in Djerba, 2002. http://www.aldeilis.net/bpb/djerba.html

Drury, F. (2015). European Jews are 'living in fear like in the 1930s' claims world Jewish Congress leader, as he calls on US to condemn 'evil' anti-semitism. *Mail Online*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3011722/European-Jews-living-fear-like-1930s-claims-World-Jewish-Congress-leader-calls-U-S-condemn-evil-anti-semitism.html

European Parliament Working Group on Anti-Semitism. (2016). Working definition of anti-semitism. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.antisem.eu/projects/eumc-working-definition-of-antisemitism/

Fatah, T. (2010). *The Jew is not my enemy: Unveiling the myths that fuel Muslim anti-semitism*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Fighel, J. (2014). The Mombassa attacks of November 28, 2002. In B. Hoffman & F. Reinares (Eds.), *The evolution of the global terrorist threat: From 9/11 to Osama bin Laden's death*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fletcher. 2008. Palestinian Islamic Jihad, backgrounder, *Council for Foreign Relations, USA*.

Frontline. (2014). *Analysis Wahhabism*. Retrieved October 15, 2016, from http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/saudi/analyses/wahhabism.html

Gander, K. (2015, July 6). Isis flag: What do the words mean and what are its origins? *The Independent*. Retrieved October 18, 2016, from http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/isis-flag-what-do-the-words-mean-and-what-are-its-origins-10369601.html

Georges, A. (2015). ISIS rhetoric for the creation of the Ummah. *Trends Institution*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://trendsinstitution.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/ISIS-rhetoric-for-the-creation-of-the-Ummah.pdf

Gerstenfeld, M. (2013, February 19). Muslim anti-semitism in Western Europe, the Jerusalem post. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/Muslim-anti-Semitism-in-Western-Europe

Glick, C. B. (2008). *Shackled warrior: Israel and the global Jihad*. Jerusalem: Gefen Publishing House.

Goldberg, J. (2015). Is it time for the Jews to leave Europe. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/04/is-it-time-for-the-jews-to-leave-europe/386279/

Greenfield, D. (2012). A brief history of Muslim brotherhood antisemitism. *FrontPage Mag*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.frontpagemag.com/point/149250/brief-history-muslim-brotherhood-antisemitism-daniel-greenfield

Greenfield, D. (2016). Violent anti-semitism crimes in UK increase 50%. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from Frontpagemag.com; http://www.frontpagemag.com/point/262689/violent-anti-semitic-crimes-uk-increase-50-daniel-greenfield

Habib, N. (2013, March 19). Pakistan arrests man in Daniel Pearl's slaying. *CNN*. http://edition.cnn.com/2013/03/19/world/asia/pakistan-daniel-pearl-arrest/

Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2015, 22 January). UN General Assembly: Joint Statement against antisemitism.

Jikeli, G. (2016, 21 April). *Flashpoint 23*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://isgap.org/flashpoint/islamist-terrorism-and-antisemitism/

JTA. (2016). *It's 'intolerable' Jews now live in fear, French President says*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://forward.com/news/breaking-news/329911/its-intolerable-jews-now-live-in-fear-french-president-says/

Kerstein, B. (2014). The Global Pogrom. *The Tower Magazine*, Issue 17. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.thetower.org/article/the-global-pogrom/

Keyes, D. (2004, November 8). Will a Gaza 'Hamas-stan' become a future Al-Qaeda sanctuary? *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs*, Vol. 4, No. 7. https://jcpa.org/article/will-a-gaza-hamas-stan-become-a-future-al-qaeda-sanctuary-2/

Koerner, B. (2016, April). Why ISIS is winning social media war. *The Wired*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.wired.com/2016/03/isis-winning-social-media-war-heres-beat/

Kramer, M. (1994, October). The Jihad against the Jews, Commentary, pp 38–42. http://martinkramer.org/sandbox/reader/archives/the-jihad-against-the-jews/

Küntzel, M. (2005, Spring). National socialism and anti-semitism in the Arab world. *Jewish Political Studies Review*. http://www.matthiaskuentzel.de/contents/national-socialism-and-anti-semitism-in-the-arab-world

Laqueur, W. (2006). *The changing face of anti-Semitism: From ancient times to the present day*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levy, B. H. (2014). *Who killed Daniel Pearl*. South Yarra: Hardie Grant Books.

Levy, B.H. (2015, January 22). Statement at the UNGA, New York. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.un.org/pga/220115_statement-bhl/

Lewis, B. (1998, November). License to kill. Osama bin Ladin's Declaration of Jihad. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://swissdefenceleague.wordpress.com/2012/04/14/declaration-of-the-world-islamic-front-for-jihad-against-the-jews-and-the-crusaders/

Mc Elroy, D. (2008, December 1). Mumbai attacks: Jews tortured before being executed during hostage crisis. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/india/3539171/Mumbai-attacks-Jews-tortured-before-executed-during-hostage-crisis.html

MEMRI. (2011). *Hamas Preacher in Gaza Sermon cites anti-semitic Hadith and calls: Death to the Jews and to America*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/0/5895.htm

Mora, E. (2015). *ISIS trying to co-opt Palestinian Jihad against Israel as part of its own cause*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.breitbart.com/national-security/2015/10/24/isis-trying-co-opt-palestinian-jihad-israel-part-cause/

Rimmerman, R. (2016, May 5). Anti-semitic violence dropped, defamation rose. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from Ynetnews.Com; http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4799310,00.html

Rubenstein, R. (2011). *Jihad and genocide*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sanchez, R. (2016, January 27). Europe's Jews are 'living in fear', warns head of EU parliament. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/12125214/Europes-Jews-are-living-in-fear-warns-head-of-EU-parliament.html

Sawad, H. (2016). *Looming black shadow: The rise of terrorist states and the new generation of al-Qaeda*. Gurgaon: Partridge.

Spencer, R. (2016, April 11). 60% of "Palestinians" support jihad attacks against Israeli civilians. *Jihad Watch*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://www.jihadwatch.org/2016/04/60-of-palestinian-support-jihad-attacks-against-israeli-civilians

The Guardian. (2002, September 4). *Deadly attack keeps world on alert*. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/sep/04/september11.usa

The Jerusalem Post. (2015, June 17). Muslim anti-semitism in Western Europe. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.jpost.com/Diaspora/European-anti-Semitism-has-reached-unprecedented-levels-442615

Tibi, B. (2012). *Islamism and Islam*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tibi, B. (2013). From Sayyid Qutb to Hamas: The Middle East conflict and the Islamization of antisemitism. In Charles Asher Small (Ed.) *Global antisemitism: A crisis of modernity* (Vol. IV). New York: Institute for the Study of Global antisemitism and Policy.

Times of Israel. (2016). *40% of Europe's Jewish leaders say anti-Semitism a threat to Jewish life*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from http://www.timesofisrael.com/poll-european-jewish-leaders-increasingly-fear-anti-semitism/

Winter, C. (2015). *Documenting the virtual caliphate*. London: Quillam Foundation. http://www.quilliaminternational.com/documenting-the-virtual-caliphate/.

Zakaria, F. (2015, December 17). *Washington Post*. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from https://fareedzakaria.com/2015/12/17/i-called-it-radical-islam-so-what/

Political Violence Revisited: The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam

Djan Sauerborn

1   Introduction

The terror and atrocities carried out by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka resulted in one of the most devastating, lengthy and sophisticated political violence campaigns the world has ever witnessed. The LTTE undermined and torpedoed a strenuous, yet overall peaceful and democratic Tamil movement, that addressed social, ethnic and political grievances and plunged the country into a three decade long civil war. Not only did they thwart initiatives lead by political Tamil figures, they also targeted and killed individuals, who were trying to find democratic solutions aimed at restabilising social cohesion and trust between the various ethnic groups of the Island state. This process of wiping out intra-Tamil opposition was a key pillar of the LTTE's strategy to position itself as the sole voice of Tamil distress locally as well as globally (Roberts, 2007, p. 16).

The case of the Tamil Tigers led by its leader the megalomaniac, albeit charismatic Velupillai Prabhakaran is intriguing for several reasons. For example, it is one of the few non-Islamist terror outlets that not only used suicide terrorism but also revolutionised the practice itself. This chapter seeks to answer questions revolving around the nature, strategy, modus operandi, ideology and goals of the LTTE and its impact on Sri Lanka, the region and the world.

With a few exceptions,[1] it has mostly been distorted, fundamentalist interpretations of Islam that have been able to mobilise and persuade individuals to engage in suicide attacks. This begs the question, how did a predominantly secular ideology instil Tamils with the willingness to gleefully sacrifice themselves

---

[1]The Kurdistan Freedom Hawks (TAK) are one of these exceptions. In 2016, this Kurdish separatist insurgency claimed responsibility for suicide attacks that killed over 140 in Turkey.

D. Sauerborn (✉)
South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF), Berlin, Germany
e-mail: djan@sadf.eu

for a separate Tamil state and their leader Prabhakaran? (Pape, 2005) What were the root causes of this bloody and protracted civil war? How was it possible for a relatively small group such as the LTTE to stay at war with the Armed Forces of Sri Lanka and from 1987 to 1989 also with Indian troops? How did the LTTE manage to garner international support and manipulate public perception? There are so many labels that are used to describe the LTTE: terrorist group, insurgency, ethno-nationalist movement, guerrilla group etc. While this chapter does not seek to indefinitely answer this topological question, it will make evident that the LTTE truly was a hybrid entity that used various methods and was extremely flexible in its approach towards achieving its ultimate goal of creating an independent state of Tamil Eelam.

2   Historical Grievances and the Path to Conflict

Social, economic and political grievances of the Tamils and Sinhalese can be traced back to the colonial period, but also have more nascent roots in post-independence policies and legislation (see Laqueur, 1999; Mitra, Wolf, & Schöttli, 2006; Roberts, 2007). Although this chapter will not dwell on this issue extensively, it is important to note that the religious, ethnic and linguistic cleavages between Tamils and Sinhalese are not as unambiguous as they are often presented. The polarisation and demarcation were much more the result of political power struggles and campaigns to entrench and expand representation. This process of "othering" was, as the anthropologist SJ Tambiah highlights, a phenomenon of the second half of the twentieth century and does not have extensive historical precedents in Sri Lanka (see Tambiah, 1986). For example, there are Tamil-speaking Muslims who do not identify as Tamils, and whereas Sinhalese are predominantly Buddhists, and Tamils are mostly Hindu; there is also a significant Christian minority within both groups (Bloom, 2005, p. 47).

However, it is quite evident that the modus operandi of colonial rule created the foundation, which made it easier for nationalists in both camps to build and instrumentalise narratives of exclusivity and homogeneity and to mobilise followers (see Roberts, 2007).

Economic activities under British rule were predominantly undertaken in the heartland and the East of then Ceylon. Since the Tamil community mostly occupied the North and East of the island, access to the economy was limited. This led to a large influx of Tamils to British educational facilities, which in turn made them favourable candidates for the civil service. Since Tamils in the civil service had to learn English, they also had easier access to high paying employment opportunities in the medical, legal and private sector. Furthermore, the Crown decided to incorporate large numbers of Tamils from India into the agricultural working force. Thus British decision-making processes as well as their economic endeavours led to a *status quo* where Tamils dominated the mid-tier bureaucracy, which was perceived as favouritism by the majority Sinhalese population (Bloom, 2005, p. 48).

In the last four decades of colonial rule, the British introduced various new constitutions trying to appease the demand for more representation. This paved the way for conflict between the Sinhalese and Tamil populations over the issue of representation. While the Tamil Congress (TC) favoured a 50:50 formula, the Sinhalese majority rejected this solution and demanded proportional representation (Samaranayake, 2007, p. 173).

Thus, the geographical reality of Sri Lanka's ethnic distribution, combined with economic realities on the ground, led to lopsided Tamil representation in the bureaucracy and sowed the seed for post-independence discontent, friction and conflict between Tamils and Sinhalese.

After independence and the formulation of Sri Lanka's first Constitution, the Sinhalese political leadership intended to reverse the advantages enjoyed by the Tamil population during colonial rule, and Tamil political parties tried to combat what they perceived as "majoritarianism" (deVotta, 2009, p. 1025ff). One of the key milestones that exacerbated tension was the introduction of the "Sinhala Only Act" in 1956, which replaced English with Sinhala as the official language of then Ceylon, which clearly was to the disadvantage of Tamils, since they were mostly fluent in Tamil and English and was therefore perceived as an attempt by Sinhalese Nationalists to push Tamils out of the bureaucratic apparatus (Hashim, 2010, p. 6). The impact of the "Sinhala Only Act" very quickly became evident. In 1949, 41% of individuals recruited for government positions were Tamil and 54% were Sinhalese. Just 14 years later, the number of Tamil government recruits dropped to 7% and the number of Sinhalese rose to 92% (Bloom, 2005, p. 51). Furthermore communal quotas for university admission were introduced in the early 1970s aimed at increasing the number of Sinhalese students who were allowed to enter Science and Medical Schools with lower scores than Tamil students (Hashim, 2010, p. 7; Imtiyaz & Stavis, 2008, p. 139). Finally, the Constitution of 1972 "conferred a special status on Buddhism in both the state and public sectors" (Imtiyaz & Stavis, 2008, p. 139). The divide between the Tamils and Sinhalese (although it has to be highlighted that several Sinhalese parties in the opposition did not favour changes made by respective governments in power) is one of perceived relative deprivation and positive discrimination. While these policies, laws and acts created real grievances in the Tamil community, the methods of addressing and combatting them, which will become evident in subsequent chapters, became increasingly violent and disruptive, ultimately resulting in fully fledged political violence perpetrated by the LTTE.

3   Spiral of Violence and the Birth of the LTTE

Political decision-making processes and ensuing reactions increasingly led to protests, clashes, small-scale pogroms, riots and sectarian violence. While initial Tamil resistance against constitutional amendments and policies propelling positive discrimination laws and acts was characterised by peaceful protest and predominantly legal political activities, violence escalated over the following decades.

> The Tamil response went through several stages and phases. It began with exertion of peaceful political pressure in the mid 1950s, moving on to episodes of civil disobedience in the early 1960s, and then to incidents of violence in the 1970s. The violence then graduated from sporadic incidents to more systematic attacks directed against state property, the police and security forces. It culminated in dangerous threat to the integrity of postcolonial Sri Lanka by the early 1980s. (de Silva, 2000, pp. 381–382)

It is a common misconception that calls for a separate Tamil homeland, militancy and political violence started with the LTTE. There were several similar organisations that emerged before the founding of the LTTE: Hoffman and McCormick count 36 in total (Hoffman & McCormick, 2004, p. 257). The turning point from predominantly peaceful dissent to a willingness to take up arms came when the Tamil United Front (TUF) and the Federal Party (FP) merged and created the Tamil United Liberation Front (TULF) in 1976. That same year, TULF, which believed that the political system had failed Sri Lankan Tamils, drafted the *Vaddukoddia* Resolution demanding the creation of an independent, sovereign, socialist Tamil homeland Eelam. Furthermore, the revolution insisted that all Tamils on the Island State should protect the homeland, if necessary with force. Nearly all Political Tamil Parties welcomed and endorsed this resolution (Gregg, 2014, p. 86).

The LTTE were also not the first militant organisation to assassinate pro-government Tamils, Tamils that believed in democratic, parliamentary methods of resistance or Sinhalese who sympathised with Tamil grievances. In 1975, Chetti Thanabalasingham, founder of the The Tamil New Tigers (TNT) and Mentor of the young Prabhakaran, ordered the killing of Alfred Duraiyappah, the Major of Jaffna (Hoffman & McCormick, 2004, p. 258). Many years later, Prabhakaran publicly declared that he had been one of the three masked shooters. This public act of strength was the beginning of his ascendance, an ascendance inevitably tied to the creation of the LTTE.

> The killing stunned Sri Lanka. It was the first political assassination in the increasingly turbulent Tamil areas. Until that day most Sri Lankans had thought that the sense of injustice felt by Tamils and articulated by Tamil Leadership was probably exaggerated. Duriappah's killing brought home the realization that the malaise was more serious than they had realized. Young Tamils were now ready to kill even high profile personalities [...] The murder accomplished two things for Prabhakaran-it increased his stake an established him as a cold-blooded man who could kill. In the underground world both these attributes reinforce his already growing reputation. (Swamy, 2004, p. 34)

While low-scale militancy and sporadic attacks started in 1973, the era of sophistication and large-scale operations was ushered in when Prabhakaran restructured the TNT after Thanabalasingham's arrest and founded the LTTE in 1976 (Laqueur, 1999, p. 192). The elections in 1977 brought with them a shift of power to the United National Party (UNP) spearheaded by J.R. Jayawardene. Increasing sectarian violence and the fear of Tamil separatism initiated a period of reforms that culminated in the drafting of a new constitution in 1978 (Mitra et al., 2006, p. 357).

Jayawardene promised to embrace all members of society and promulgated the start of a new epoch in Sri Lanka's history known as *dharmishta* or righteous society (ibid). The new constitution included provisions that were aimed at empowering and promoting the Tamil language and providing district councils with more political clout. In addition, the UNO promised to amend university admission policies that had disenfranchised several Tamil students, thus providing militant groups with fresh recruits. (Gregg, 2014, p. 86) Riots in 1977 (which left several dozen Tamils dead and thousands homeless), an LTTE raid that killed 14 police officers and the bombing of an Air Ceylon aircraft, highlighted the fact that the pathway towards societal reconciliation had been blocked (Gregg, 2014, p. 86). Prabhakaran instrumentalised this period and started turning the LTTE "into an elite, ruthlessly efficient and highly professional fighting force" capable of striking vulnerable and symbolic targets that further stifled attempts on both sides to re-establish political and social cohesion (Hoffman & McCormick, 2004, p. 258).

By 1983, the LTTE had managed to gain prominence and traction, but most importantly support amongst the Tamil population. They were able to outmanoeuvre and surge past other Tamil groups such as TULF and TUF, thus positioning themselves as the sole righteous and capable proponent of establishing Tamil Eelam. The "Black July" of 1983, triggered by an LTTE ambush that killed 13 soldiers, resulted in fully fledged riots and left thousands of Tamils dead (Bloom, 2005, p. 52). These riots marked the beginning of civil war in Sri Lanka and in contrast to former violent clashes, left an indelible mark in the social consciousness of Sri Lanka's society (Bloom, 2005, p. 52).

4   Modus Operandi of LTTE Political Violence

The Tamil Tigers were more than what is commonly, albeit often falsely, referred to as a terror group. Instilling terror and horror into the minds of their adversaries was an important tool of the broader political violence campaign, but there was much more to Tamil activities. Neil de Votta (2009, p. 1023) encapsulates the multifaceted nature of the LTTE:

> At its apogee between the mid-1990s and 2006, the LTTE controlled nearly one-quarter of Sri Lanka's territory; comprised an army of over 20,000 with redoubtable conventional capabilities; commanded a navy with speedboats and nearly a dozen ships for ferrying weapons and supplies, as well as rudimentary submarine capabilities and an experienced sea cadre; and operated a nascent air force whose bombing raids embarrassed the government and caused the island widespread angst. The group also re- sorted to asymmetrical warfare using suicide forces known as the "Black Tigers". The LTTE's supporters in the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora collected millions of dollars yearly through businesses, front organizations, extortion, and voluntary contributions to help finance the organization. Equally impressive was how the LTTE engaged in a state-building enterprise that projected de facto nationhood and transformed Tamil cultural mores even in diaspora communities

While Anton Balasingham, a well-spoken and well-educated "Marist-Leninist turned extreme nationalist", was the LTTE's ideological kingpin, Prabhakaran "was the undisputed military leader" (Laqueur, 1999, p. 192). However, As Van de Voorde (2007, p. 185) points out it is extremely difficult to pinpoint the exact nature of LTTE's ideology:

> The fundamental ideological beliefs and political actions of the LTTE cannot be defined in a one-dimensional way. Whereas a crude description would fit the LTTE strictly a dichotomous revolutionary vs. reactionary or left-wing vs. right-wing framework, it is important to note that such reductionist labels do not apply to the Tail Tigers. The LTTE is strengthened by a fanatical sense of unity within the group and the zealous personal devotion of its members who eagerly and in a "sense of share fate…compete for the honour of a glorious death"

This section will further elaborate on de Votta's and Van de Voorde's depictions of the LTTE and provide examples that highlight and embody, the scope, methods, strategies, ideology, success and structure of Prabhakaran's disciples. This is followed by a more elaborate analysis of Prabhakaran and his omnipresence and omnipotence as the head of the LTTE.

The strategy of stifling and silencing other Tamil groups that either opposed the approach of LTTE or were viewed by Prabhakaran as rivals, continued after the "Black July" of 1983. When India, a host to 60 million Tamils, attempted to act as a mediator in the Conflict in 1985, some militant Tamil outlets such as the Tamil Eelam Liberation Organisation (TELO), who had received support from New Delhi, decided to pursue a more peaceful solution (see Swamy, 1994). This shift in strategy by the TELO was unacceptable to the LTTE as it opened up the door to peace talks and this was diametrically opposed to Prabhakaran's vision of obtaining statehood. In 1986, the LTTE launched attacks that killed TELO's leader Sri Sabaratnam and 150 recruits. This operation maimed TELO and was a warning to all other Tamil groups that intended to seek a resolution to the nascent civil war by laying down arms and (re)joining peace talks (Furtado, 2008, pp. 77–78).

In 1989, the LTTE murdered two leaders of TULF who were urging for a negotiated settlement to the conflict in the Northern Peninsular (Subramanian, 1999). Throughout the span of the civil war, the LTTE repeatedly assassinated TULF Members of Parliament and in 1999 a suicide bomber killed the Vice President of TULF Dr. Neelan Tiruchelvam, an "eminent intellectual and constitutional expert and liberal democrat" (Sambandan, 1999). By killing Tamils that were committed to finding peaceful solutions and utilising the democratic tools at their disposal to put an end to civil war and the ethnic crisis, the LTTE made it very clear that cooperation meant treason, and that treason meant death. Furthermore, it created a *status quo* where the LTTE was "the only game in town" for young Tamils who wanted to join independence movements.

Rigorous training, a comprehensive military structure,[2] advanced propaganda techniques,[3] as well as very elaborate and criminal financing and trade schemes,[4] allowed a relatively small number of 5000–10,000 LTTE militants to wage war against a 250,000 odd strong Sri Lankan Army and between 1987 and 1989 a 100,000 Indian Peace Keeping Forces (see Bloom, 2005; Pape, 2005; Swamy, 2010).

> The Tamil Tigers, in their long fight against the ethnic minority, have shown inventiveness and extraordinary persistence. Mention has been made of the indoctrination of young Tigers in a spirit of national fanaticism, spiritualism, sexual ascesis, and a cult of suicide. They have been waging a guerrilla war based on the Chinese and Cuban pattern. (Laqueur, 1999, p. 193)

LTTE attacks did not merely focus on military facilities such as camps and training grounds, but expanded to economic, civilian and cultural targets as well (Simonsen & Spindlove, 2000, p. 221). These attacks include the "Aranthawala Massacre" where in 1987, 20 LTTE gunmen killed 29 Buddhist priests and two civilians on a bus in Ampara district (Lawrence, 2000, p. 172), the assault on Bandaranaike international airport where LTTE cadres destroyed several civilian aircrafts in 2001 (Brown, 2001) or the killing of over 250 Tamil Muslims in the small fishing village of Palliyathidal in 1992 (Hosken, 2009). The goal was to disrupt all realms of society, forcing the government to enter peace talks, which were then used to re-arm and regroup and eventually break ceasefire agreements to engage in a modus operandi of shock and awe that was not only built around using overwhelming power and spectacular displays of force[5] (see that could overwhelm the adversary militarily) but also the ability to disrupt society at large, creating a constant notion of paralysis and helplessness (Swamy, 2010).

After outlining and describing the vast outreach and range of LTTE activities that include terror—although not fully satisfying—we conclude that the Tamil

---

[2]"The structure of the LTTE is twofold and consists of a highly organised, quasi-professional military branch and a secondary political branch. A Central Governing Committee administers both wings and is in charge of organising and commanding the LTTE's subdivisions" (Van de Voorde, 2007, p. 185).

[3]"Tamil Propaganda has been far more astute than government propaganda, and the Tigers have established a foreign service of their own with representations in 38 countries, issuing daily news bulletins and running their own illegal radio station in Sri Lanka. Use is widely made of the Internet and video clips, which are distributed to leading media in foreign countries" (Laqueur 1999, p. 194).

[4]"From the outset, the LTTE made optimum use of its access to the sea. First of all, it served as a means of transporting narcotics from the GoldenCrescent and the Golden Triangle to Europe. Narcotics provided the main source of income until it was superseded by external donor support and now by infrastructured taxes, highway tolls and other levies. Access to both sides of the Indian Ocean made smuggling weapons easier. The weapons came from India (before the 1987 accord) and then South East Asia-Myanmar, Thailand, and Cambodia" (Bloom, 2005, pp. 57–58).

[5]In 1996 four thousand Tamil Tigers overran a military base northeast of Colombo, killing 1200 men of the Sri Lankan Army (Laqueur, 1999, p. 193).

Tigers fit the definition of Insurgencies presented by Béres and Beraczkai (2009, p. 92):

> Insurgencies have a great mass base and use terrorist action principally as one weapon among others with the main aim to construct a counter-state. An insurgency is an armed political movement aimed at the overthrow of a constituted government, or separation from it through use of subversion and armed conflict. It is a politico-military struggle aimed to weaken government control while increasing insurgent control

As mentioned above, this definition can only partially be applied to the case of the LTTE. From a technical, goal-seeking perspective, it does grasp the contours of the Tamil Tigers. However, since the definition is extremely broad, it does not allow explanations regarding fanatic behaviour or the use of suicide terrorism. Laqueur (1999, p. 196) summarises the problem with grasping the rationale of suicide attacks in the Sri Lankan case:

> The virulence of Tamil terrorism and its proclivity to suicide terrorism cannot be blamed on social and political circumstances. While it is true that their treatment by Sinhalese majority has often been unjust, only feverish imagination can refer to it as "genocide". Learning from bitter experience and its own mistakes, the Colombo government has made far-reaching concessions to the Tamils over the years, and Tamils have been represented in prominent positions in the government [...] Hate is not directed against a foreign occupant or members of a religion distasteful to the Tamils, and the difference in language alone cannot explain the deep division, especially since the central government has made Tamil its second official language. Rather, there is veritable "cult of martyrs" among the Tamil. [...] While there is Tamil solidarity in Tamil Nadu, there is no intense fanaticism equal to that found in Sri Lanka, nor has there been a movement for separatism in Tamil Nadu. Therefore, in the final analysis, there is no satisfactory explanation for the Tamil Tigers and their fanaticism.

5   Apex of Fanaticism: The Black Tigers

Suicide attacks played a pivotal, narrative-changing role in the Sri Lankan civil war. Not only the number[6] of suicide attacks launched by the LTTE but also their success was unprecedented (Pape, 2005). They were the only group to ever assassinate high profile politicians such as Former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, President of Sri Lanka Ranasinghe Premadasa or Foreign Affairs Minister Lakshman Kadirgamar to name a few.[7] The Black Tigers' accuracy and success enabled the LTTE to shape the contours of the conflict, wipe out or cripple political

---

[6]For a complete list of LTTE suicide attacks please visit: South Asia Terrorism Portal-Suicide attacks by LTTE http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/shrilanka/database/data_suicide_killings.htm

[7]For a complete list please visit: South Asia Terrorism Portal-Prominent Political Leaders Assasinated by the LTTE http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/shrilanka/database/leaders_assassinated_byLTTE.htm

parties by killing party leaders and force the government into ceasefire negotiations that were in turn used by the LTTE to regroup and re-arm (Bloom, 2005).[8]

Suicide bombers were the elite of the elite within the LTTE. Unlike most groups that use suicide bombing as part of their operational portfolio, the LTTE professionalised the process by training, vetting and separating the Black Tigers from other LTTE fighters, thus establishing a special unit (Crenshaw, 2007). The elite hit squad of the LTTE was responsible for more than 50% of suicide attacks carried out across the globe and were perceived to be the most "ruthless, the most disciplined" (Gunaratna quoted by Waldman, 2003). Although other terrorist entities in the Middle East, Turkey and Chechnya in some instances deployed women to carry out suicide missions, it is interesting to note that over half of the black tigers were female[9] (Reuter, 2004, p. 160). Reuter (2004, pp. 164–165) argues that the reasons are grounded in practical and pragmatic realities on the battlefield, where men of fighting age are needed in combat operations and where women are less suspicious and more capable of concealing explosives.[10]

Swamy (2010, p. xix) summarises the deadly force of the Black Tigers and its utility for Prabhakaran:

> [...] The LTTE had an elite corps of suicide bombers known as Black Tigers. Whenever, Prabhakaran wished, he could dispatch one or more of them to extinguish a foe of Tamil Eelam, real or perceived, Sinhalese or Tamil, Sri Lankan or Indian. The LTTE'S ability to kill any person, in the military or the government, inevitably dented the state's counter-insurgency, making Prabhakaran look exactly like his childhood comic hero-the Phantom, the masked jungle hero who could never be vanquished.

Suicide operations carried by the Black Tigers helped sustain, nourish and deepen a rural and urban campaign of political violence. Regarding the rural realm, suicide attacks were primarily focused on hitting Sri Lankan armed forces, mostly as "part of a larger operational plan involving guerrilla and semi-conventional forces" (Hoffman & McCormick, 2004, p. 261). The modus operandi in urban areas differed substantially, as attacks primarily focused on critical economic and political infrastructure as well as high ranking political figures and military and intelligence officers. Most of these attacks caused a large numbers of civilian causalities,

---

[8]An example for the ability of the LTTE to wipe out entire political parties is embodied by its campaign against the United National Part (UNP) between 1991 and 1994. In these 3 years, Black Tigers managed to kill Gamini Dissanayake, the UNP's presidential candidate and over 50 of its members including cabinet members and appointees as well as the general secretary of the party (Bloom, 2005, p. 64).

[9]It is interesting to note however that Swamy (2010) states that of 273 Black Tigers killed, only 74 were women.

[10]Bloom (2005, p. 64) makes highlights a distinction made for male and female suicide bombers. While the men were commonly referred to as the "Black Tigers", women were often named "Bird of Freedom". Furthermore, the LTTE in preparation of suicide attacks used children between 14 and 17 to act as spies, couriers and suppliers and in some case as front-line soldiers. As Bloom (ibid. p. 65) correctly points out this was and is a direct violation of International Law.

although the LTTE never claimed responsibility for attacks on non-military targets (Hoffman & McCormick, 2004, p. 261). Not claiming responsibility for the deaths of civilians was essential for LTTE's strategic approach, since it allowed them to uphold and sell a narrative that depicts the struggle as legitimate and the Sri Lankan government as the perpetrator of violence and suffering.[11]

> Despite the rebels countless acts of indiscriminate violence, often against innocent civilians, the Tamil Tigers somehow preserved the reputation of an underdog, and thus attracted a certain amount of sympathy from the outside world (Laqueur, 1999, p. 193)

Another standout feature of the Black Tigers was its "Black Sea Tigers" division, which carried out naval suicide missions. In most cases, small, mobile and fast speedboats would be filled to the brim with explosives and then rammed into Sri Lankan naval vessels (Swamy, 2010, p. 102).

This chapter will not attempt to conduct an analysis of individual motivations for joining the LTTE or the Black Tigers, for this is an endeavour best suited for (criminal) psychology or psychiatry. In the words of Martha Crenshaw (2007, p. 157)

> Individuals are motivated differently. There is no single pattern. The organization that recruits and directs the suicide bomber remains the most important agent

The next section of this chapter will focus on the methods of recruitment, of fostering grievances and exploiting them, but above all it will analyse and dissect the role of Prabhakaran. What will become evident is that the movement, the organisation, the LTTE was Prabhakaran and that it was he who managed to recruit, but above all secure and maintain absolute unwavering loyalty, from hundreds of men and women willing to kill and die on his command.

6 Prabhakaran: King of Tigers

In her chapter on Sri Lanka from her book Dying to Kill (2005), Bloom highlights potential personal motivations of men and women, but also children, willing to die for an idea. Motivations range from hopelessness, perceived grievances, lost family members to notions of wanting to achieve freedom for future generations or simply to teach Sri Lankan troops a lesson.

It may be impossible to detangle or pinpoint a personal, psychological reason for the willingness to commit a suicide attack or post-hoc to try to decipher why an individual was willing or able to overcome the primal instinct to survive. However, it is possible to analyse the structure in play, the symbols, rituals, narratives that exploit the plethora of psychological factors, thus creating a system that instrumentalises individual

---

[11]The LTTE never claimed responsibility for the deaths of Former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in 1991 or the President of Sri Lanka Ranasinghe Premadasa in 1993.

frustration, anger, pride, sorrow, hate etc. for violent political purposes. This system revolved around absolute loyalty and dedication to Prabhakaran (Swamy, 2010). The allure of Prabhakaran in this regard was twofold: creating and promoting a narrative of freedom that required self-sacrifice, a vision in which death was essential in achieving a separate homeland on the hand and on the other hand creating a "pantheon of martyrs" (Bloom, 2005, p. 64). This "pantheon of martyrs" in reality was more like a "panopticon of martyrs": a prison without physical bars, but whose members were manipulated by Prabhakaran, under constant evaluation and—above all—surveillance.

Hoffman and McCormick (2004, pp. 259–260) summarise Prabhakaran's omnipotence, grip on power, the obedience of his followers and his central role for making the Tigers roar:

> Prabhakaran's real genius, however, was in fabricating a historical narrative for the LTTE and the Tamil people that was tailored to support suicide terrorism [...] as illustrated by Prabhakaran's own words quoted earlier, was the belief that extreme sacrifices would have to be made to secure an independent future for the Tamil nation. The cornerstone of the LTTE's self-identity became the principle of self-sacrifice and, ultimately, self-martyrdom, for the greater good of the Tamil race. This principle is today reflected in the Tamil word, *thatkodai* (to give yourself), which is used in lieu of the word *thatkolai* (suicide) to describe the group's suicide operations. In the words of S. Thamilchelvam, the political head of the LTTE, these operations are regarded by the movement's suicide cadre as a "gift of the self", a "self-gift", an "oath to the nation", that is offered in the name of Tamil Eelam. "[...] This subjugation of individual will is evidenced by the degree of control that the LTTE exert over the personal affairs of its rank and file. Sexual contact or relationships among unmarried cadre, for example, are strictly forbidden and harshly punished. LTTE cadre may only marry once they have reached a specific age determined by Prabhakaran and then only with their commanders' approval. Prabhakaran's pivotal role and un-challenged influence over the organization is reinforced in a daily ceremony in which cadre pledge allegiance to Prabhakaran the man, rather than to the organization or to the Tamil people or their homeland. These and similar internal policies have further contributed to the group's carefully cultivated "brand" image as an elite fighting force.

The annual "Hero's Day Speech" was one of the rare public appearances Prabhakaran made and one of the few opportunities that allows qualitative under-standing of the message he intended to convey to his followers and the world. On every 27th of November from 1989 onwards, Prabhakaran used this symbolic opportunity to promote his vision of Tamil struggle and maintain his grasp on power. *Maaveerar Naal* (Great Heroes Day) is held on the day the first LTTE cadre–Lt. Shankar–died in combat (Swamy, 2004). A further public showing manifested itself on every July 5th starting in 1992. This day is known as "Black Tiger Day". It is no coincidence that July 5th was also the date of the first suicide attack committed by LTTE Captain Miller, who rammed a truck filled to the brim with explosives into a military camp in the North of Sri Lanka (Hashim, 2010, p. 13).

In both instances, the death of a LTTE member[12] and the celebration thereof is the alpha and omega of the annual speeches. They serve as a constant reminder to

---

[12]All LTTE members wore a necklace with a Cyanide capsule around their neck. In case of capture, they were expected to commit suicide.

the Tamils that self-sacrifice is the foundation of the struggle and martyrdom the gateway to freedom. In 1993, in one of his first Hero's Day Speeches,[13] Prabhakaran announced:

> Today, we cherish in our hearts the memories of our heroes who have transformed our nation from the conditions of bondage and servitude into a realm of liberty where a fierce struggle for liberation is being fought. It is our martyrs who have internationalised our inalienable right to a homeland with the dictum that 'our land belongs to us'. Heroes Day is not a day of mourning nor a day of weeping and lamentation. It is a day of national resurgence, a day we pledge and commit ourselves to the emancipation of our nation. Our heroes have sacrificed their lives for a just cause. Their demise does not constitute an ordinary event of death. Rather, their death signifies a profound spiritual aspiration for national freedom. Our martyrs die in the arena of struggle with the intense passion for the freedom of their people, for the liberation of their homeland and therefore the death of every martyr constitutes a brave act of enunciation of freedom. From the tombs of the dead martyrs who lie in rest in the womb of our soil rises the cry for freedom. This cry for freedom is the articulation of the will and determination of more than 6000 martyrs which underlie the motive force behind our struggle. (Eelam View, 2012)

The image of a potent, all-encompassing leader, who takes care and nourishes his kin and turns them into his own personal, invincible, fearless and triumphant, but also deeply humane vanguard is embodied by his "Black Tigers Speech" the same year:

> I have groomed my weak brethren into a strong weapon called Black Tigers. The Black tigers constitute the armor of self-defense for our ethnic group and also serve to remove barriers coming in the way of our struggle. They are balls of fire smashing the military prowess of the enemy with sheer determination. The Black Tigers are different and are also unique human beings. They possess an iron will, yet their hearts are very soft [. . .] The Black Tigers have cast aside fear from their roots[. . .] They keep eagerly waiting for the day the would die [. . .] This is the era of the Black Tigers. No force on earth can suppress the fierce uprising of the Tamils who seek freedom. (Prabhkaran quoted by Swamy, 2004, p. 250)

An in-depth look into all "Hero Day Speeches" reveals interesting insights regarding the question of the secular nature of the LTTE. First of all, it is interesting to note that the speeches contain virtually no religious references, and when Prabhakaran chooses to highlight religion in his speeches it was to describe the Sinhalese and not Tamils:

> The Sinhala nation is refusing to broaden its thinking and take a new approach. The Sinhala nation remains misled by the mythical ideology of the Mahavamsa and remains trapped in the chauvinistic sentiments thus created. Unable to free itself from this mindset, it has adopted Sinhala Buddhist chauvinistic notions as its dominant national philosophy. This notion is spread in its schools, universities and even its media. The domination of this Sinhala Buddhist chauvinism is preventing its students, intellectuals, and writers from stepping out of and thinking free from its domination. (SATP, Heroes Day Speech, 2006)

---

[13]For a full list of translated speeches from 1992 to 2008, please see: Leader V Prabakaran's Heros day speech 1992–2008 English Translation. https://velupillaiprabhakaran.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/leader-v-prabakarans-heros-day-speech-1992-2008-english-translation/

But to view Prabhakaran as a purely secular leader is not accurate; as he instrumentalised or built several shrines, sites, rituals, images that have religious roots in order to further his agenda of hero and martyr remembrance. His orders to use cemeteries for fallen soldiers instead of cremating the dead (the common Hindu practice where LTTE members could be visited post-mortem) aimed at establishing a physical entity that promoted the cause, but also to mimic the practices of regular armies, because Prabhakaran always opposed the "terrorist" label and wanted his movement to be added to the annals of Freedom Movements (see Natali, 2008).

6.1   The Global Outreach of the LTTE

From its onset until its operational demise in 2009, the LTTE has always been successful at generating international sympathy for its campaign. The impact and scope is summarised below by Christine Fair (2004):

> The LTTE uses its global infrastructure to develop and maintain political and diplomatic support within host countries. LTTE lobbying efforts were tremendously successful in cultivating state support for their movements in world capitals during the 1980s and 1990s. Until recently the LTTE was able to develop political sympathy for its cause by mobilizing media and "grass-roots" and other political organizations over the issue of Tamil rights and the abuse of those rights by the Sri Lankan government [...] The Tamil diaspora has also expanded the LTTE's range of contacts for weapons procurement. Perhaps one of the most important aspects of the diaspora network is that it has brought the LTTE into closer contact with other insurgent groups. For example, the LTTE has established ideological, financial, and technological linkages with the various Khalistani-oriented Sikhs, the Kashmiri separatists, and other militant organizations[14] (pp. 33–34)

Furthermore, Prabhakaran and his Tamil Tigers received training from overseas, as well as logistic and material support from rogue states, insurgent groups and terror organisations. But the LTTE did not merely rely on external support, it also used the international community as a way to engage in criminal activities, which generated considerate amounts of revenue, as Van de Voorde (2007) highlights:

> Since the Indo-Sri Lankan Peace Accord of 1987, arms and ammunition procurement activities have stemmed from Northeastern and Southeastern Asia (especially China, North Korea, Cambodia, Thailand, Hong Kong, Vietnam, and Burma), Southwestern Asia (Afghan pipeline), former Soviet Republics (mainly Ukraine), Southeast Europe and the Middle Eastern region (Greece, Turkey, Bulgaria, Cyprus, and Lebanon), and Africa (usually Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and South Africa).[15] Sri Lankan authorities, foreign governments, as well as national and international law enforcement agencies have repeatedly expressed their concern regarding how the LTTE 'derives much of its considerable funds from crime-related activities in many countries' (Whittaker, 2001, p. 80), most notably organized crime. Today the LTTE is actively represented in about 40 countries.

---

[14]For a list of international LTTE front organisations, please see: Fair (2004, p. 33).

[15]In 2007, a smuggling vessel containing North Korean weapons (mostly automatic rifles) was intercepted by the Sri Lankan Navy while entering its waters illegally.

Throughout India and South Asia, the strength of the LTTE has intensified by way of ideological, economic, and technological ties to other insurgent groups.

An assessment of the Tigers' foreign activities is not complete without mentioning India's somewhat ambivalent role throughout the 30 year-long LTTE legacy. After the failed intervention of the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) between 1987 and 1989 that sought to bring peace to the Island State and following the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi in 1991, the Indian government focused fully on combatting the LTTE (Fair, 2004, p. 33). However, in the 1970s and 1980s, the nascent years of the LTTE, the Research and Analysis Wing (RAW), India's primary foreign intelligence agency, as well as officials in Tamil Nadu had supported the LTTE with regard to logistics and training on Indian soil (Fair, 2004, p. 33), most likely to appease Tamils in Tamil Nadu (Laqueur, 1999, p. 193).

Norway tried to function as a neutral peace mediator between the LTTE and the Sri Lankan government, most notably at the turn of the century. While both Prabhakaran and the Sri Lankan polity accepted Norway to fulfil this role, regrettably it was not able to initiate and secure durable ceasefires or peace agreements (see Sørbø, Goodhand, Klem, Nissen, & Selbervik, 2011). Prabhakaran often mentioned Norway's exceptional role in his public speeches and praised the small country's efforts to bring lasting peace to Sri Lanka, but in reality ceasefires and peace talks were instrumentalised by the LTTE to re-arm, regroup and re-assert itself on the battlefield. While Norway might have had good intentions "it was powerless to prevent the drift back to war and resulting humanitarian disaster" (Sørbø et al., 2011, p. 132).

While the LTTE global outreach nurtured its domestic political violence, it also relied on intimidation and extortion of the Tamil diaspora. One of the large misconceptions revolving Tamil Tiger activities is that they were able to rely on unwavering support from all Tamils in Sri Lanka as well as the large expatriate hubs in Canada, the UK and other Western countries. The personal accounts of a Tamil community activist exemplify the extent of Prabhakaran's "with us or against us" mentality:

Ninety percent of the people, even if they don't support the LTTE, they are scared. The killing doesn't just happen back home in Sri Lanka. It happens in Paris, in Canada. They burned the library, they broke the legs of DBS Jeyaraj. They tried to stop the CBTC radio from organizing. A journalist was killed in Paris. The threat is not only in Sri Lanka. It's everywhere, all over the world. (HRW, 2006, p. 1)

While the LTTE conducted most of its spectacular attacks on Sri Lankan soil, it would have never been able to sustain operations without global financing, drug-trafficking and propaganda machinery. The manipulation of public perception was a sine qua non, an integral and essential part of Prabhakaran's strategic portfolio of maintaining public support, of entrenching the victim versus perpetrator narrative.

6.2   Conclusion

Unlike various fanatic and fundamentalist religious groups that instrumentalise and politicise holy scriptures to legitimise political violence and garner public support, Prabhakaran managed to turn himself into a sacral entity. As the self-proclaimed omnipotent guardian of Tamil Eelam, he managed to instil many young Tamils with a sense of irrefutable and unabashed loyalty to the king of Tigers. However, scarce public speeches that aimed at venerating suicide bombers and fallen cadres, erecting statues, building places of remembrance in their names or hosting a last supper with those willing to die for their leader demonstrate that the Prabhakaran strongly relied on symbolism reminiscent of other groups engaged in political violence. Propelling and promoting a cult of martyrs, a morally pure and devote group of self-sacrificing freedom fighters, as a core element of his strategic portfolio strengthened his grip on power and secured widespread support both domestically and internationally. Those who were not willing to follow, either because they believed in gradual, and thus sustainable change within the political system, or because they were able opposed to the never-ending violence, were either sidelined, threatened or killed. He demanded absolute loyalty and obedience and he accepted no Tamil voices but that of the LTTE, thus his voice. Creating the notion of righteous freedom fighters forced into a battle with a much larger, oppressive and fundamentally evil actor is a very common phenomenon of movements engaged in fanaticism, terror and political violence. As Laqueur (2004, p. 93) points out, however, there are some very distinct factors in its approach that make the LTTE unique:

> But there are also certain important differences between the suicide terrorists of the LTTE and the Muslim bombers. The LTTE assassinated a fair number of leading enemy political figures, and most of their attacks were directed against military and police targets. They proudly counted the number of suicide attacks in order to commemorate them, but the attacks against civilian targets were not included in their count. The Tigers considered attacks against civilian aims "terrorist" in character, and even if they committed such acts they wanted to be remembered as soldiers in a national liberation army. (Source)

Indeed, Prabhakaran was well aware that the more his group was regarded a terrorist entity, the more his support on the global scale would erode. In one of the two only interviews ever given by Prabhakaran he was asked by an "India Today" reporter what being labelled a terrorist meant to him:

> India Today: "What do you say to Jayewardene calling you a terrorist?"

> Prabhakaran: "We are not the terrorists. We are the representatives of people who want to get out of the clutches of state terrorism". (Prabhu, 2009)

While the colonial heritage set the stage for subsequent ethnic tensions and several policies and laws further decreased chances of a swift and socially cohesive way

forward for the country, it was Prabhakaran who exploited the fragile *status quo* and exploited frustration and grievances for his campaign of political violence.

Eventually, three key events initiated the downfall of the LTTE. First, the 9/11 attacks that changed the way the USA and to a certain extent the West viewed the Tigers, shifting from apathy or in some cases even sympathy to a more robust and resolute stance. Second, the break-up of the LTTE in 2004, when Karuna Amman split from the LTTE, thus stifling the Tigers ability to wage war on Colombo. And finally, the appointment of General Fonseka in 2005, who modernised the army adapting his troops to Guerrilla warfare (Swamy, 2010).

In 2009, after more than 30 years, the LTTE was finally beaten and Prabhakaran killed. This chapter has tried to point out that, due to its plethora of intricacies, the LTTE deserves a special place in the annals of terrorism research. Even in its downfall it presented a special case scenario as Swamy (2010, p. 177) summarises:

> For well over a quarter century, it looked like Velupillai Prabhakaran could never be vanquished. Since its birth in 1976, his LTTE had grown from a rag-tag outfit to one of the world's deadliest insurgent groups commanding thousands of fighters. At one time, the Tamil tigers presided over a third of Sri Lanka's land area and two thirds of its coastline as they ran a de facto state. [...] Dri Lanka's decisive victory over the LTTE is the biggest success story in the world of anti-terrorism. It is in sharp contrast to the dragging military campaign the US leads against the Taliban or Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It also outshines the collapse of the Maoist Shining Path movement in Peru.

References

Béres, J., & Beraczkai, A. (2009). Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE): Terrorism or insurgency? *Academic and Applied Research in Military Science, 8*(1), 91–106.

Bloom, M. (2005). *Dying to kill*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, D. (2001, July 24). The deadly tigers of Sri Lanka. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/jul/24/srilanka

Chawla, P. (2009, May 19). Exclusive interview with Prabhakaran. *India Today*. http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/Exclusive+interview+with+Prabhakaran/1/42871.html

Crenshaw, M. (2007, March). Explaining suicide terrorism: A review essay. *Security Studies, 16*(1), 133–162.

De Silva, K. M. (Ed.). (2000). *Conflict & violence in south Asia: Bangladesh, India, Pakistan & Sri Lanka*. Kandy: International Centre for Ethnic Studies/Clingendael Institute.

DeVotta, N. (2009, December). The liberation tigers of Tamil Eelam and the lost quest for separatism in Sri Lanka. *Asian Survey, 49*(6), 1021–1051.

Fair, C. (2004). *Urban battle fields of south Asia: Lessons learned from Sri Lanka, India, and Pakistan*. RAND. http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG210.pdf

Furtado, C. S. (2008). *Inter-rebel group dynamics: Cooperation or competition – The case of south Asia*. University of Illinois. https://books.google.de/books?id=bRnF9mCzUO4C&pg=PA78&lpg=PA78&dq=LTTE+vs+TELO&source=bl&ots=gTJW_ipJ8z&sig=_koWe1HyFm8S3eusfdWpuRYqpfA&hl=de&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiZkdLT49fPAhUGWhQKHa33C5AQ6AEISTAJ#v=onepage&q=LTTE%20vs%20TELO&f=false

Gregg, H. S. (2014). *The path to salvation: Religious violence from the Crusaders to Jihad*. Nebraska: Potomac Books.

Hashim, A. (2010, Spring). Lions and tigers in paradise: Terrorism and insurgency and the state's response in Sri Lanka. *Defence Against Terrorism Review, 3*(1), 1–24.

"Heroes" day speech by LTTE Chief Velupillai Prabhakaran-2006. *South Asia terrorism portal*. Accessed October 17, 2016, from http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/shrilanka/document/papers/29nov2006.htm

Hoffman, B., & McCormick, G. H. (2004). Terrorism, signaling, and suicide attack. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 27*(4), 243–281.

Hosken, A. (2009, August 3). Sri Lanka's forgotten massacre. *BBC*. http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid_8180000/8180963.stm

Human Rights Watch. (2006). *Funding the "Final War": LTTE intimidation and extortion in the Tamil diaspora*. https://www.hrw.org/reports/2006/ltte0306/ltte0306webwcover.pdf

Imtiyaz, A. R. M., & Stavis, B. (2008). Ethno-political conflict in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Third World Studies, 25*(2), 135–152.

Laqueur, W. (1999). *The new terrorism: Fanaticism and the arms of mass destruction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Laqueur, W. (2004). *No end to war: Terrorism in the twenty-first century*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Lawrence, P. (2000). Violence, suffering, Amman: The work of oraces in Sri Lanka's eastern war zone. In *Violence and subjectivity* (pp. 171–204). Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Leader V Prabakarans heroes day speech 1993-Maha Veerar Naal address-National Heroes Day 27 November 1993. *Eelam View*. November 7, 2012.

Mitra, S., Wolf, S., & Schöttli, J. (2006). *Sri Lanka, political development: A political and economic dictionary of south Asia*. London: Routledge.

Natali, C. (2008, September). Building cemeteries, constructing identities: Funerary practices and nationalist discourse among the Tamil tigers of Sri Lanka. *Contemporary South Asia, 16*(3), 287–301.

Pape, R. (2005). *Dying to win: The strategic logic of growing suicide terrorism*. New York: Random House.

Prominent political leaders assasinated by the LTTE. *South Asia terrorism portal*. Accessed October 14, 2016, from http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/shrilanka/database/leaders_assassinated_byLTTE.htm

Reuter, C. (2004). *My life as a weapon: A modern history of suicide bombing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Roberts, M. (2007, November). Blunders in Tigerland: Pape's muddles on suicide bombers in Sri Lanka. *Heidelberg Papers in South Asian and Comparative Politics, 32*.

Samaranayake, G. (2007, April). Political terrorism of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka. *Journal of South Asian Studies, 30*(1), 171–183.

Sambandan, V. S. (1999, August 14). Peace-maker as terrorist target. *Frontline*, *16*(17). http://www.frontline.in/static/html/fl1617/16170970.htm

Simonsen, C. E., & Spindlove, J. R. (2000). *Terrorism today: The past, the players, the future*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sørbø, G., Goodhand, J., Klem, B., Nissen, A. E., & Selbervik, H. (2011, September). *Pawns of peace: Evaluation of Norwegian peace efforts in Sri Lanka, 1997–2009*. Oslo: Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation. https://www.oecd.org/countries/srilanka/49035074.pdf

Standford University. (2013, August 3). Tamil Eelam liberation organization. *Mapping Militant Organizations*. http://web.stanford.edu/group/mappingmilitants/cgi-bin/groups/view/503.

Subramanian, T. S. (1999, August 14). Chronicle of murders. *Frontline*, *16*(17). http://www.frontline.in/static/html/fl1617/16171020.htm

Suicide attacks by LTTE. South Asia terrorism portal. Accessed October 14, 2016, from http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/shrilanka/database/data_suicide_killings.htm

Swamy, M. R. N. (1994). *Tigers of Lanka*. Colombo: Vijitha Yapa Publications.

Swamy, M. R. N. (2004). *Inside an elusive mind*. Colombo: Vijitha Yapa Publications.

Swamy, M. R. N. (2010). *The tiger vanquished: LTTE's story*. New Delhi: Sage.

Tambiah, S. J. (1986). *Sri Lanka: Ethnic fratricide and the dismantling of democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Van de Voorde, C. (2007). Sri Lankan terrorism: Assessing and responding to the threat of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). *Police Practice and Research, 6*(2), 181–199.

Waldman, A. (2003, January 14). Masters of suicide bombing: Tamil guerrillas of Sri Lanka. *New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/14/world/masters-of-suicide-bombing-tamil-guerrillas-of-sri-lanka.html?_r=0

Whittaker, D.-J. (2001). *The terrorism reader*. New York: Routledge.

The War on Terror

Paulo Casaca

1   In the Wake of 9/11

Thucydides famously explained that democracy does not guarantee self-critical capacity (Rosen & Farrel, 1993, p. 84). Still, we think that from this point of view, as Aristotle and many others thought—most famously, Churchill—democracy compares well to its existing alternatives.

Whereas present day China and Russia are unable to cope with any attempt to critically appraise their Maoist or Stalinist heritages,[1] the US national report on "9/11" is a product of a political system capable of making a self-critical analysis.

The bulk of the self-criticism is directed to the functioning of the state and efficiency and communication between different bodies. This resulted in a massive overhaul of the state apparatus, creating the Department of Homeland Security that grew into one of the most significant in the country. But even in this point (this idea we have criticised earlier that attentions should be focused on each one's backyard), the report keeps a remarkable self-critical tone:

> …9/11 has taught us that terrorism against American interests "over there" should be regarded just as we regard terrorism "over here". In this sense, the American homeland is the planet[2] (p. 362).

---

[1]See, for instance, the following recent articles http://www.economist.com/news/china/21706511-china-still-struggles-stuff-great-helmsman-underground-abide-mao (accessed on 17/03/2017) and http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21708881-mr-putin-not-setting-about-it-best-way-take-care-russia (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[2]During a conference in Brussels on 14 September 2016, "Why counterterrorism is so difficult" Professor Martha Crenshaw presented the first difficulty as "the rarity of terrorist acts". From her subsequent explanation, one could understand she was referring either "only" to the USA or "only" to

P. Casaca (✉)
South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF), Brussels, Belgium
e-mail: paulo@sadf.eu

It harshly criticises the departmental leaders' and politician's failures to communicate, to act, to transmit and to plan:

> Imagination is not a gift usually associated with bureaucracies. For example, before Pearl Harbor the U.S. government had excellent intelligence that a Japanese attack was coming, especially after peace talks stalemated at the end of November 1941. These were days, one historian notes, of "excruciating uncertainty". The most likely targets were judged to be in Southeast Asia. An attack was coming, but "officials were at a loss to know where the blow would fall or what more might be done to prevent it". In retrospect, available intercepts pointed to Japanese examination of Hawaii as a possible target. But, another historian observes, "in face a clear warning, alert measures bowed to routine".

> It is therefore crucial to find a way of routinizing, even bureaucratizing, the exercise of imagination (p. 344).

The report also quotes several instances of warnings, recommendations and analyses which were not taken into account or were lost in bureaucratic tangles[3] and summarises the issue in the words of the former national counterterrorism coordinator, Richard Clarke—who addressed Condoleezza Rice just a week before 9/11:

> . . . are we serious about dealing with the al Qida threat?. . . Is al Qida a big deal? (p. 343).

Still, according to the report:

> We return to the issue of proportion—and imagination. Even Clarke's note challenging Rice to imagine the day after the attack posits a strike that kills "hundreds" of Americans. He did not write "thousands" (pp. 343–344).

Contrarily to what the report implies, we do not think the problem is a lack of imagination. Bureaucracies are not meant to be imaginative, and bureaucracies are crucial, but not the driving wheel of a democratic society, public opinion is.

One of the most striking episodes relates to the "Phoenix Memo" from a FBI agent in Phoenix, dated July 2001,

> . . . advising of the "possibility of a coordinated effort by Usama Bin Ladin" to send students to the United States to attend civil aviation schools. The agent based his theory on the "inordinate number of individuals of investigative interest" attending such schools in Arizona.

> [. . .]

> Members of the Usama Bin Ladin unit and the Radical Fundamentalist unit at FBI headquarters were addressees, but they did not even see the memo until after September 11 (p. 272).

---

the West, as if terrorist activity in someone else's backyard would be none of our business. We therefore doubt that the global nature of the phenomenon has been perennially included in our mindset.

[3]Most in particular, in the chapter entitled "Evolution and rise of contemporary jihadism: from the Muslim Brotherhood to IS".

Further to these two FBI units (one on Bin Laden and another on radical fundamentalism), the CIA had a Bin Laden unit that began operations in 1996 (p. 109). Despite the existence of at least three units dedicated to the same goal, interagency communication was near non-existent and cooperative mechanisms dysfunctional.

Otherwise, as the report observes (p. 343):

> It is hard now to recapture the conventional wisdom before 9/11. For example, a New York Times article in April 1999 sought to debunk claims that Bin Laden was a terrorist leader, with the headline "U.S. Hard Put to Find Proof Bin Laden Directed Attacks".

Nearly a decade after Bin Laden and his jihadist associates were actively plotting against the USA, broadcasting their efforts on US television interviews and issuing fatwas in the Western press, the mainstream US media were sending a message of paralysis into the administration.

Unsurprisingly, after 9/11, the Taliban argued they would take action against Bin Laden if the US administration provided them with evidence, openly using the argument mentioned in the New York Times article.

The report provides a detailed description of the resistance of both the Clinton and the Bush administrations to act resolutely in the face of mounting evidence of eminent danger to the US national security. Again, we think the main problem is not one of bureaucratic malfunctioning, it is to be found at the level of the public opinion and consists of a widespread appeasement syndrome.

While the 9/11 report is a precious exercise in self-criticism and self-analysis, it is a political document in a democratic society and one should not be surprised to find compromise valuations in some instances.

The assessment of counterterrorism in chapter "The evolution and ascension of Iran's terror apparatus" of the report covers most government departments and does not spare either the Congress or the White House. Notwithstanding, in its review of the State Department (pp. 93–95), it does not mention what the department's main formal task is regarding counterterrorism: to establish and monitor the list of designated persons and organisations. Therefore, it does not assess the criteria used to assemble the 1997 list of designated terrorist groups.

The list of proscribed foreign terrorist organisations by the US State Department did not include the two most important entities responsible for the deadly attacks against the USA: the Islamic Republic of Iran—which nearly simultaneously with the passage of the act promoted the Khobar Towers attack of June 1996 and killed 19 US military officers, wounded 372 American citizens and injured 200 - non-Americans (Crenshaw, 2011, pp. 145–148)—and the Al-Qaeda gang.[4]

---

[4]The Islamic Republic of Iran was already on the original list of states sponsoring terrorism which meant important penalties to its interests, but was otherwise spared the much more stringent consequences of being included entirely or partially as a designated foreign terrorist organisation. Years later, the US authorities placed sections of the Iranian revolutionary guards on the designated foreign terrorist organisations list.

Regarding Al-Qaeda, if ever there had been lack of judicial evidence of its criminal responsibility, Osama Bin Laden was kind enough to overcome it only some months before the first list of terrorist organisations was formally approved by the State Department (October the 2nd 1997):

> In March 1997, in an interview with CNN, for example, he [Osama bin Laden] declared a jihad against the United States, ostensibly as a response to U.S. support for Israel, its military presence in Saudi Arabia, and its "aggressive intervention against Muslims in the whole World" (Crenshaw, 2011, p. 149).

Otherwise, no Iraqi organisation affiliated with the Iranian authorities was included in the list, in spite of the wide recognition of their terrorist character and their repeated terrorist attacks against the USA.[5]

However, the State Department included in the terror list the main opposition organisation to the Iranian authorities, the People's Mujahedin Organisation of Iran (PMOI), undoubtedly as a premium to the Iranian theocracy. This means that parts of US counterterrorism policy were used as an instrument to appease terrorists.[6]

Many other Western countries followed the USA in listing the PMOI as a terrorist organisation, which damaged the organisation and seriously hindered a key source of opposition to the government of Iran. The last delisting of the PMOI as a terrorist organisation was only obtained after lengthy and energy consuming juridical battles fought all over the Western world up until 2011.[7]

Despite the absence of references to the issue of the designated terrorist organisations, the 9/11 report takes a highly critical stance on the US diplomatic

---

[5]Hoffman (1998, p. 85) identifies both Iranian-backed organisations Al Dawa and the "Committee for Safeguard the Islamic Revolution" as the earliest religious terrorist organisations, already active in 1980. Casaca, 2008, identified direct explicit threats of the Iranian Iraqi satellite organisations to the USA that were simply ignored. The Lebanese Hezbollah was in fact the only peripheral organisation to the Iranian theocracy included in the list. The European Union, as has been the case in nearly every move, did not dare, at the time, to go as far as to place Hezbollah in its own terrorist lists. Otherwise, the organisation who directly assumed the protection of Al-Qaeda—the Afghan Taliban—was never blacklisted by the US authorities, see for instance http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[6]See http://articles.latimes.com/1997/oct/09/news/mn-40874 (accessed on 17/03/2017); see also United States of America Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 109th Congress, First Session, Volume 151, Part 6, April 21, 2005 to May 5, 2005, pp. 8084–8085.

[7]People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran, Petitioner v. United States Department of State and Hillary Rodham Clinton, In her capacity as Secretary of State, Respondents, United States Court of Appeals for the district of Columbia circuit, 16 July 2010; see also https://www.asil.org/insights/volume/16/issue/34/us-court-issues-writ-mandamus-effectively-removing-organization-terror (accessed on 17/03/2017); see also United States of America Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 112th Congress, First Session, Volume 157, Part 10, September 13, 2011 to October 5, 2011 p. 14070; see also http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-dc-circuit/1531607.html (accessed on 17/03/2017); http://uk.reuters.com/article/idUKLQ200287 (accessed on 17/03/2017) and https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/538297/20160715-Proscription-website-update.pdf (accessed on 17/03/2017).

role in counterterrorism, painting a picture of an historical drift from the 1950s onwards:

> The Commission asked Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage in 2004 why the State Department had so long pursued what seemed, and ultimately proved, to be a hopeless effort to persuade the Taliban regime in Afghanistan to deport Bin Ladin. Armitage replied: "We do what the State Department does, we don't go out and fly bombers, we don't do things like that [;] we do our part in these things".

> Fifty years earlier, the person in Armitage's position would not have spoken of the Department of State as having such a limited role (p. 93).

> (...)

> In the 1960s and 1970s, the State Department managed counterterrorism policy. It was the official channel for communication with the governments presumed to be behind the terrorists. Moreover, since terrorist incidents of this period usually ended in negotiations, an ambassador or other embassy official was the logical person to represent U.S. interests (p. 94).

> (...)

> [Under President Reagan] the department continued to be dominated by regional bureau for which terrorism was not a first-order concern (p. 95).

> (...)

> The coordinator under Secretary Madeleine Albright told the Commission that his job was seen as a minor one within the department (p. 95).

> (...)

> After it was discovered that Abdel Rahman, the Blind Sheikh, had come and gone almost at will, State initiated significant reforms to its watchlist and visa-processing policies. (...) Still, as will be seen later, the system had many holes (p. 95).

Regarding the "Blind Sheikh" and the first attack on the World Trade Center, the report could have gone further in analysing the blatant failure of the refugee policy at the time.

Egyptian counterterrorism policy at the end of the 1980s encouraged of jihadists to leave the country, namely to continue jihad in Afghanistan. According to Laqueur (2003, p. 46), perhaps 6000–8000 terrorists were "indeed encouraged" to go to Afghanistan, including al-Zawahiri, the present leader of Al-Qaeda. Actually, more Al-Qaeda fighters were based in Pakistan than in Afghanistan (Laqueur 2003, p. 57).

Terrorists did not leave Egypt only for Afghanistan or Pakistan. According to Laqueur (2003, p. 36), the "Blind Sheikh" abandoned Egypt in 1990, obtaining political asylum in the USA. While the 9/11 Congressional report (2004, p. 72)

acknowledges that another accomplice, Ramzi Yousef, obtained political asylum in the USA; it does not mention the statute of the "Blind Sheikh".

Sheik Omar Abdel-Rahman developed an extensive terrorist curriculum in Egypt (Laqueur, 2003, p. 36), the country where the Muslim Brotherhood was born and which has been one of the major cradles for Islamic fanatic terrorism ever since.

The "Blind Sheikh" and the 1993 plotters were linked to bin Laden's "charity", the Maktab al-Khidamat, the same group that would eventually develop into Al-Qaeda and carried out the 9/11 attacks. Whereas it is already surprising this had not been understood before 9/11; it is even more so the issue did not make its way to the 9/11 report.

Another significant example of the prevailing misunderstanding of Jihadism is the fact that the US foreign service agents severely underestimated the threat bin Laden posed to US security. The report (p. 110) states that:

> Sudan's minister of defense, Fatih Erwa, has claimed that Sudan offered to hand Bin Ladin over to the United States. The Commission has found no credible evidence that this was so. Ambassador Carney had instructions only to push the Sudanese to expel Bin Ladin. Ambassador Carney had no legal basis to ask more from the Sudanese since, at the time, there was no indictment outstanding.

The same events, as described by Martha Crenshaw (2011, pp. 148–149), read as follows:

> Sudan was reportedly willing to turn him over to the United States, but the Justice Department lacked the evidence to mount a trial. In order to build regional support for efforts to induce Sudan to expel him, the United States circulated a dossier accusing Bin Laden of training the Somalis who attacked U.S. forces in 1993, a role he was pleased to acknowledge.

There is actually no contradiction between the facts as described by Crenshaw and the 9/11 report, just some euphemistic sophistry in the way the report is drafted on this particular issue. The US authorities were clearly embarrassed that they refused to take hold of Bin Laden when they had the chance.

It is no coincidence that the US judiciary was paralysed in 1996 by a lack of evidence, that the New York Times would still claim in 1999 that there was no evidence against bin Laden and that the Taliban kept this same line of argument till the US intervention in Afghanistan. Notwithstanding, the evidence was strong enough in 1993 that the very same US authorities felt confident risking their international credibility circulating a dossier in diplomatic circles on the danger posed by the criminal activity of Osama bin Laden.[8]

---

[8]The international deal that led to the relocation of Al-Qaeda into Afghanistan is described with some detail by Wright (2007). In reality, Taliban's Afghanistan was masterminded by Pakistan, and Pakistan was the real negotiator on the delocalisation of Al-Qaeda, as well as its main contractor, as Al-Qaeda was supposed to be used in the Kashmiri Jihad against India.

This very peculiar relation between the domestic and the international rule of law as perceived by Western democracies, and in this case, the USA, is the second most important reason for failure in the struggle against this sort of informal warfare.

Still, according to the 9/11 report:

> The chief of the bin Laden station (...) saw Bin Ladin's move to Afghanistan as a stroke of luck (p. 210).

Bin Laden and his jihadist accomplices indeed considered their move to Afghanistan a struck of luck. As Laqueur (2003, p. 39) explains:

> By that time [1997] the leading members of Jihad had moved to Afghanistan. al-Zawahiri, who served there with bin Laden, writes that the chance to transfer their activities to Afghanistan was a golden opportunity because in Egypt they had always been closely watched by state security. He quotes a friend, el Banshiri, a former military commander of el Jihad, who said that he felt as if a 100 years had been added to his life when he came to Afghanistan.

It is doubtful that Al-Qaeda's actions would have amounted to the deadly sequence of terrorist acts culminating in 9/11 without the opportunity provided to them by relocating to Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Otherwise, the 1995 Oklahoma terrorist attack—technically, a copy of the 1993 attack by a home-grown terrorist—should have set our alarm bells ringing on the possibility that the USA could be vulnerable to terrorist attacks inspired by Islamic fanaticism.

While the 9/11 report provides a far-reaching description of the jihadist threat:

> We learned about an enemy who is sophisticated, patient, disciplined, and lethal. The enemy rallies broad support in the Arab and Muslim world by demanding redress of political grievances, but its hostility towards us and our values are limitless. Its purpose is to rid the world of religious and political pluralism, the plebiscite, and equal rights for women. It makes no distinction from military and civilian targets. *Collateral damage* is not in its lexicon[9] (p. xvi).

The implicit promise of this opening statement was not fulfilled in the report or elsewhere and this central issue was lost in the debates on what legal action to take, the rule of law, and the "war on terror", a euphemistic way to avoid the clear identification of the enemy.

---

[9]The assessment is only partly correct as it quotes a "broad support" to its enemies in the "Arab and Muslim world" but fails to identify its friends and allies in this world or, indeed, to identify the singularities of the several "worlds" in this "Arab and Muslim world".

2   The Guantanamo Syndrome

In 1996, the USA felt paralysed by its tantalising inability to reconcile the rights of its citizens under national criminal law and the national security policy under the international legal framework. This inability has apparently endured up to the present day and is clearly reflected on the Guantanamo fiasco. This difficulty was further amplified by jihadi concealment tactics.

The use of hybrid legal frameworks can be understood in the context of the following dilemma: how to consider individuals and organisations which are acting somewhere in between a private criminal organisation and a quasi-state or hidden-state mechanisms?

The result, to say the least, was not brilliant, as neither justice nor the fight against Jihadism were served by this hybrid solution.

Counterterrorism policy was greatly reinforced after 9/11, with the Patriot Act and the creation of Homeland Security, mainly focusing on internal security.

Regarding the treatment of foreign organisations and US non-citizens engaged in criminal acts against the USA, under the authorisation of Congress, the Presidency issued a military order for the "Detention, Treatment, and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in the War Against Terrorism".[10]

Whereas some of these individuals have been tried and sentenced in US Courts for their crimes linked to terrorism (for instance, Zacarias Moussaoui), the vast majority of those who were held in connection with these acts have not and many were eventually liberated without trial. Their statute has been the subject of a long and confusing dispute.

As recently as October 2016, no trials had taken place in Guantanamo, the main prison where defendants have been kept. According to the Associated Press, prosecutors had asked a judge:

> to allow public testimony at Guantanamo Bay this fall from some people who had family members killed in the Sept. 11 terrorist attack, saying otherwise they may not live long enough to be heard.[11]

Many of the suspects held in Guantanamo were released without trial, only to immediately resume their criminal activity.[12] Some others were used as leverage in

---

[10]See   http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011113-27.html (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[11]See   http://bigstory.ap.org/article/2aef2bda129649b1a307151af13606b2/testimony-families-911-victims-sought-guantanamo (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[12]See the official report of the US National Intelligence here https://www.dni.gov/index.php/newsroom/reports-publications/reports-publications-2016/item/1628-summary-of-the-reengagement-of-detainees-formerly-held-at-guantanamo-bay-cuba (accessed on 17/03/2017).

hostage trade operations,[13] while some others were simply held because they were sold by third parties or the terrorist themselves and had no ties to terrorism.[14]

Osama bin Laden was eventually caught by the US forces in his hideout in Pakistan, but was killed on the spot because the US authorities did not wish to try him for his crimes, either because they did not trust their own legal system or—most likely—because they were losing the war of ideas and unable to confront the destructive ideology of jihadism. One way or the other, this further fed the image of a "war on terror" that only employs secret operations and avoids the rule of law and public scrutiny.

Guantanamo had been the chosen location for US authorities to detain the perpetrators and criminals associated with the 9/11 massacre as it was outside of US territory and so wholly or partially outside the jurisdiction of the US Supreme Court. Many of the operations used to capture the defendants were clandestine and involved covert cooperation of US allies. Some of these supposed allies—like Pakistan—were later discovered to be unreliable partners in the endeavour of justice. Further to this, the US authorities allowed the use of interrogation techniques which can only be described as torture.[15]

Whoever reviews the Western media reports on the issue will certainly be shocked to see how the persecution of the culprits of one of the worst crimes of our time was turned upside down, with those seeking justice portrayed as trying to shun the rule of law, using covert operations and engaging in inhuman behaviour, even torture, while Guantanamo inmates are portrayed as a solid bunch of innocent victims.[16]

The situation reached peak absurdity as the "closing of Guantanamo" became the strongest public outcry, demanded by virtually all human rights organisation and was eventually promised by then-President Obama. Moreover, closing Guantanamo was never meant to bring justice to those responsible for heinous crimes against humanity like 9/11, but actually the reverse: to ensure the impunity for these criminals.

In our day, the Western public opinion nearly unanimously agrees that not closing Guantanamo is one of the biggest failures of the current Obama administration, not because of the failure to make justice to the victims of 9/11 or for the release of criminal defendants without trial, but because a few of the Guantanamo defendants were not yet released.

Parallel to this state of affairs, public opinion became overwhelmed with narratives portraying the entire 9/11 episode or its most significant parts as

---

[13]Namely those high level Taliban operatives traded against a former US military.

[14]See   http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/specialseries/2015/12/uighur-guantanamo-22-151206112137598.html (accessed on 17/03/2017). Actually, as the most important 'supposed' ally in the struggle against terrorism was Pakistan, the country sheltering Osama bin Laden, this is hardly surprising.

[15]See for instance https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2014/dec/09/cia-torture-report-released (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[16]See for instance, http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/03/18/the-dark-ages (accessed on 17/03/2017).

inventions, distortions or actually conspiracies from secret demoniac actors within the West meant to justify aggression, islamophobia, oil or power grab in the Middle East or somewhere else in the World.

Most interestingly, some propaganda coming from the jihadists and from states sponsors manages to praise massacre and to accuse the West of engineering it in the same breath.

If we bear in mind that terrorism is fundamentally psychological manipulation, violence being just a small part of the equation, we realise to what point 9/11 has been a success for their perpetrators and a defeat for the West.

Laqueur's work (2003) boasts an impressive collection of reactions to 9/11 which are rationally or paranoid anti-American, coming from appeasers and anti-Western ideologues alike, spanning the entire political and the geographic spectrum. These reactions congratulate the criminals and the crime or find disparate justifications for it, often reversing the terms of reality.[17]

However, we think the main problem is elsewhere. The West's defensive and apologetic attitude for whatever measure taken to persecute those responsible for the attack greatly contributed to this backwards reality. After all, if 9/11 had been as portrayed, why would the authorities hide their efforts to arrest the culprits and shun the rule of law by circumventing the jurisdiction of its own Supreme Court?

The idea of setting up an appropriate "rule of law" framework somewhere in between the existing national criminal law and international law is interesting and worth pursuing if a set of complementary issues are successfully dealt with, most notably:

1. Such an exercise must aim at defining what is not yet clearly defined, such as: the jurisdiction applying on transnational operations, acts of violence not covered by existing criminal codes and internationally recognised acts of war, the personality of organisations, quasi-states or semi-states or, indeed, shared criminal ideologies like Jihadism.
2. The exercise should not redefine what has already been defined in a new framework overlapping with existing ones, adding to a lack of legal clarity.
3. Although respecting the separation of powers, the exercise must reach a minimum consensus between the main branches of state power as well as at the international level between democracies.

If the parties' intention to pursue their goal along this line of reasoning does not exist, the never ending discussion on an "ideal" rule of law to deal with a

---

[17]Laqueur adresses these issues in chapters "Political Violence revisited: The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam" and "The War on Terror"; the two chapters are titled, respectively, "The far right" and "Anti-Americanism" as if the far right would be less anti-American than the far left, a point of view that the description of Laqueur does not confirm at all. The widespread reference to Marxism as a source of "Anti-Americanism" is particularly difficult to understand, as Karl Marx admiration and praising of the USA was remarkable, (admittedly, differently from most of his followers) either in his writings or in his actions.

transnational, semi-state set of violent actors and actions animated by a murderous ideology—most problematically when swift action is needed—will only translate into paralysis.

Actually, there are reasons to believe that the permanent engagement in this discussion is a way to avoid facing reality and take action.

3 A Misdirected War

As Crenshaw (2011 p. 181) rightly points out: wars are not waged against methods, but against adversaries, and terrorism is a method. The issue, however, clearly extends beyond a mere semantic error.

The failure of the USA and other western powers to publically identify the culprits of the 9/11 massacre, their associates, sponsors, facilitators and—above anything else—their ideology is a consequence of the trauma it provoked. At the very least, it shows the development of the first stage of a traumatic bonding we referred to in the first chapter where "the victim refuses to refer to the aggression itself for emotional self-protection".

The entire situation and its development falls in the realm of "The Political Psychology of Appeasement", paraphrasing the masterpiece of Laqueur (1980). As Laqueur explains in the preface to his 2016 reedition of the work (2016, p. xi):

> By 2010 terrorism had virtually become an Islamist monopoly. But since much effort (and often also prestige) had been invested in theories about the origin of terrorism, it took a long time to realize this.

Laqueur's original work and its reedition confirms his instinctive feeling of the central role of the phenomenon of appeasement, but his book, however interesting, goes no further than articulating the crucial role of appeasement.

As he reminds us (Laqueur, 1980, 2016, p. 120)

> . . . there is a word to describe such easy rationalizations for accepting the view of reality which our enemies offer us. That word is appeasement.

As he also concedes, appeasement cannot always be seen as irrational or, indeed, inadequate:

> Appeasement has been practiced since time immemorial in relations among nations and states, principally by small and weak countries against their powerful neighbors. Sometimes the practice has met with success, sometimes not, depending always on the general situation and the appetites and ambitions of the powerful neighbors in question (op. cit. p. 120).

Appeasement was used with a positive connotation up to the Second World War:

> Even at the time of the Munich agreement, the London *Times* could write: "The policy of international appeasement must of course be pressed forward" (op. cit. p. 120).

Appeasement as a national policy got negative connotations during and after the Second World War. However, most significantly, even this classic understanding, common to the Western political elites, is now being challenged. As a recent press article of the Atlantic on US Foreign Policy argues:

> The president believes that Churchillian rhetoric and, more to the point, Churchillian habits of thought, helped bring his predecessor, George W. Bush, to ruinous war in Iraq.[18]

To accuse Churchill of being the symbol of warmongering rhetoric is only a twisted way of rehabilitating appeasement, both in the spirit and literally.

We believe the "war on terror" meant the refusal to identify the 9/11 attackers, namely the jihadists, the states that sponsored them and their ideology, replacing them by an ill-defined concept that blurred rather than clarified the situation.

At a first level of analysis, this meant the refusal to acknowledge the disaster of past policies of accommodating jihadists. If this policy could be rationalised up until the fall of the Soviet Union, after its fall this was no longer possible. The diverse Jihadist tendencies openly declared that "after the Soviet Union, the time had come to go for the USA". The message was loud and clear but the West chose not to hear it.

How could the USA all throughout the 1990s have accommodated official Islamist sponsors as Iran or Pakistan, or for that matter, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which was also unwilling to confront its clergy and several members of the royal family for their criminal action?

As such, one could argue that the very first reason for the appeasement policy was a will to avoid any self-criticism. The famous newly declassified 28 pages of the 9/11 Commission[19] are entitled: "Finding, Discussion and Narrative regarding certain sensitive national security matters" but refer almost exclusively to multiple links between the perpetrators of 9/11 and officials of Saudi Arabia at every level.

The embarrassing reality uncovered by these pages is that the Saudi authorities appeased the jihadist ideology, and the USA in turn appeased Saudi Arabia to the point that this information was only declassified 15 years after the facts. After all, there had been a close cooperation between them up until the fall of the Soviet Union, namely with regard to the Afghan jihad.

Neither Saudi Arabia nor the USA were able to thoroughly confront their past, though for quite different reasons: Saudi Arabia's foundation has been built on the

---

[18]Jeffrey Goldberg, "The Obama Doctrine" http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/04/the-obama-doctrine/471525/ (accessed on 17/03/2017). For further analysis, see ARCHumankind policy brief 3; http://www.archumankind.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/20161019.Dangerous.liasons.JPC_.pdf (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[19]We consulted it in Voice of America, http://docs.voanews.eu/en-US/2016/07/15/7c46eb0b-4e0b-4f4d-81da-32e6fbc43c0f.pdf (accessed on 17/03/2017).

same fanatic reading of Islam and it faces existential challenges to denounce jihadism; the USA on the other hand merely needed to reassess a strategic political option.

Saudi Arabia faces the most difficult exercise combatting the Jihadism which aims to destroy the monarchy without denouncing the fundamentalist creed which the state of Saudi Arabia was founded. One could hardly conceive a more difficult modernisation challenge.

Still, there is an enormous difference between a monarchy, such as Saudi Arabia, that co-opted the clergy to obtain power, and a theocracy, like the Iranian one, with a totalitarian power model. To confuse the two amounts to confuse Poland and Germany on the eve of the Second World War.

The second reality the West did not want to see was the role of Pakistan in 9/11. While the Taliban in Afghanistan was openly protecting Al-Qaeda, Pakistan was protecting the Taliban. The idea of bringing Al-Qaeda to the region was also a Pakistani project, or at the very least, an idea to which Pakistan was a major contributor.

It is baffling that US strategists could possibly think that Pakistan would be their number one ally in the "war on terror". Even as there were doubts on the level of engagement of Pakistan with the actual plot of 9/11, there could be no doubt that it actively engaged with and supported Jihadists.

While the 9/11 report does not refer to the list of terrorist states, the issue is dealt with on pages 122–123 and 182–183.

[in 1998] State Department counterterrorism coordinator advised Secretary Albright to designate Pakistan as a state sponsor of terrorism, noting that despite high-level Pakistani assurances, the country's military intelligence service continued "activities in support of international terrorism" by supporting attacks on civilian targets in Kashmir (p. 122).

(. . .)

In October, an NSC counterterrorism official noted that Pakistan's pro-Taliban military intelligence service had been training Kashmiri jihadists in one of the camps hit by U.S. missiles, [Al Qaeda camps targeted as a retaliation for the attacks on US Embassies] leading to the death of Pakistanis.

Secretary Albright did not only reject the counterterrorism recommendation on 5 August 1998 (9/11 report, p. 123), she expressed regret as they were unable to give more incentives to Pakistan and to ensure cooperation:

We did not have a strong hand to play with the Pakistanis. Because of the sanctions required by U.S. laws, we had few carrots to offer (Congressional Inquiry Commission, p. 183).

Apparently, it never occurred to Secretary Albright that this sort of attitude could only be read as an incentive for Pakistani continued support to terrorism as a means to get more "carrots".

This sort of irrational attitude was not confined to President Clinton's administration; it only increased in subsequent administrations, in spite of all evidence of

continued and increased Pakistani support to international terrorism, including 9/11 and sheltering Osama Bin Laden in Abotabad.

Pakistan occasionally captured secondary figures in the terrorist networks and organised some punctual armed operations targeting jihadists gone astray. This was apparently good enough for the West to concede extensive support to the Pakistani authorities, including the military support which Pakistan gladly used in support of Jihad, namely in Kashmir.

The capture of Osama bin Laden near the Pakistani military academy of Abbottabad, the way in which Pakistan persecuted those suspected of collaboration with bin Laden capturers,[20] all the while ignoring those who were directly responsible for his shelter, could not have been more telling on the complicity of the effective powers of this country with this criminal organisation.

But otherwise, the fact that the capture of Osama bin Laden in Pakistan did not change US foreign policy regarding Pakistan could also not be more eloquent on the fact that this was hardly a surprise for the USA. This absurd situation is beyond rational understanding and can only be explained by a far-reaching policy of appeasement.

The US policy on Afghanistan was doomed to fail. It was not built on the demise of the Jihadist ideology that destroyed the country, but quite the contrary; it tolerated the continuation of most of fanatic Islamist practices of the Taliban, even if promoted by other organisations with Jihadi leanings. The open and unchallenged continuation of extreme Islamic practices and propaganda in Afghanistan[21] hindered a victory against Jihadism. Even from the military point of view, the situation was paradoxical, as the Taliban, as well as other allied Jihadist organisations, were allowed to regroup and take shelter in Pakistan, the country that was supposed to be the number one ally of the war against terrorism.

The Taliban were never included in the US terrorist list and for several years now they have been treated as a civilised political group; the West even pressed Afghanistan to make peace with them, inasmuch as their military power is increasing.

Unless we achieve a rapid and swift change of policy in the West, the Taliban will return to power, either due to militarily victory or because they co-opted the remaining Afghan establishment.[22] And so, the first battle the West engaged in, in the name of the "war against terror", will at long last be lost.

The second battle of this war, the invasion of Iraq, was even less reasonable. Whereas the Atlantic article quoted above (describing President Obama's criticism of the invasion) captures most of the spirit of the public opinion, the issue is

---

[20]See: http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/15/world/asia/15policy.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[21]See SADF Policy Brief on the issue: http://sadf.eu/new/blog/combatting-jihadism-in-afghanistan/ (accessed on 17/03/2017).

[22]India has a different policy, but it is unlikely it will have the capacity only by itself to reverse the present trend.

however different. We believe that the main issue was not the bellicose mindset, but the appeasement in the wake of 9/11.

The connection was not between Saddam Hussein's regime and Al-Qaeda; quite to the contrary, there was an intimate connection between those wanting to destroy Iraq and the jihadist organisations.

Previously I have made the case that the 2003 US invasion of Iraq resulted in the "hidden invasion of Iraq" by the Iranian jihadists, which, as we saw in chapter "Terrorism revisited", were closely engaging with Al-Qaeda (Casaca, 2008).

The 9/11 report—dated 2002, predating the invasion of Iraq—has enough material to show that the real link of 9/11 was with Iran, not with Iraq, most particularly in the subtitle "Assistance from Hezbollah and Iran to Al Qaeda" (p. 240) where we can read the following:

> . . . we have evidence suggesting that 8 to 10 of the Saudi "muscle" operatives travelled into or out of Iran between October 2000 and February 2001 (p. 240).

> (. . .)

> In sum, there is strong evidence that Iran facilitated the transit of Al Qaeda members into and out of Afghanistan before 9/11, and that some of these were future hijackers. There also is circumstantial evidence that senior Hezbollah operatives were closely tracking the travel of these future 9/11 hijackers.

> (. . .)

> After 9/11, Iran and Hezbollah wished to conceal any past evidence of cooperation with Sunni terrorists associated with Al Qaeda.

> (. . .)

> We believe this topic requires further investigation by the U.S. government.

The report clearly states there is no evidence linking Iraq to the 9/11 plotters, namely in the following passages:

> [After the 1993 attack] No further intelligence came in about terrorist acts planned by Iraq (p. 98).

> (. . .)

> On November 4, 1998, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York unsealed its indictment of bin Ladin. (. . .) The indictment also charged that al Qaeda had allied itself with Sudan, Iran, and Hezbollah. The original sealed indictment had added that al Qaeda had "reached an understanding with the government of Iraq".

> (. . .)

> This language about al Qaeda's "understanding" with Iraq had been dropped, however, when a superseding indictment was filled in November 1998 (p. 128).

Regarding the alleged meeting between Mohamed Atta and an Iraqi intelligence officer analysed in the report (pp. 228–229), the conclusion is clear:

> The available evidence does not support the original Czech report of an Atta-Ani meeting (p. 229).

Apparently, the reason that this meeting is mentioned in the 9/11 report was that the Iraqi intelligence official was under US custody, most likely in the wake of a concealed US–Czech operation. The reality is that countless stories of this kind—focussing instead on Saddam Hussein's active search for nuclear weapons—circulated widely in Western diplomatic circles, all of them proving to be fake.[23]

The 9/11 report only hints at a link between Iraq and 9/11 in a specific passage (p. 61). Although admitting that "Bin Ladin had in fact been sponsoring anti-Saddam Islamists in Iraqi Kurdistan" (at the time, a no-man's land in the Kurdish border of Iran and Iraq), it concludes by saying "There are indications that by then [2001] the Iraqi regime tolerated and may even have helped Ansar al Islam against the common Kurdish enemy".

None of the evidence points in this direction, but quite on the contrary, to the support of Iran for "Jundal-al-Islam"—an organisation created on 1 September 2001 in close connection with the planning of the post-9/11—which developed later into "Ansar-al-Islam".[24]

The USA invaded Iraq, worried that the next phase for terrorism would likely entail the use of weapons of mass destruction—quite a reasonable assumption—and that Iraq was plotting its development, what we know now, was a crude fabrication.

As the 9/11 report explains in detail in "Phase two and the question of Iraq" (pp. 334–338), the lobbying for an armed action against Iraq was already intense and Paul Wolfowitz was its most strident advocate within the administration.

The question is: Why did the authorities in the West never investigate the real source of all these fabricated or overhyped reports? This is particularly important as several of these stories have obvious links to Tehran, and Iran has come out the winner of the invasion of Iraq.

This scenario was not anticipated by anyone, not even Laqueur, one of the sharpest analysts in the field of terrorism (Laqueur, 1999, p. 183):

---

[23]Casaca, 2008 follows several of them. A critical story of this kind was the one of Curveball made public in several press reports, as for instance, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iraq/9936180/Iraq-anniversary-war-intelligence-was-a-lie-BBC-Panorama-documentary-to-say.html (accessed on 17/03/2017) or https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/15/defector-admits-wmd-lies-iraq-war (accessed on 17/03/2017). The highest Portuguese authority at the time of the decision of the invasion of Iraq told me he relied fundamentally on German intelligence, and the German intelligence, as was later understood, relied heavily on this charlatan known as Curveball. One of the most astonishing facts on these bogus stories on Iraq is that they mostly made their way from European intelligence services to the USA.

[24]See Broussard, 2005, namely pp. 146 and 164.

What if the Iranians overstepped themselves and invaded a neighbouring country or openly threatened other countries? There is little doubt that if this happened, a major destabilizing campaign would be launched against Iran or even military action taken.

As we know, quite the opposite has happened, the West has opened the door of Iraq to Iran and keeps quiet as the Iranian regime covertly invades Syria and Yemen and ignores the "finlandisation" of Lebanon.

The entire invasion of Iraq was conducted in a disastrous way, enhancing all the negative elements favouring to the development of the "jihadist paranoid gestalt". The West naively accepted the Iranian narrative of Iraq: a country where a Shia majority was oppressed by a Sunni minority—and where identity politics supposedly is the norm. According to this narrative, there is no Iraqi citizenship, but just a collection of Shias, Sunnis and Kurds; the latter are rarely identified by their dominant creed, and those who could not fit in any of the former three groups are being squarely ignored.[25]

Iraqis organised by the Iranian revolutionary guards or other parts of the Iranian state apparatus were allowed to freely roam the country, organise death squads, form terrorist groups and engage in other types of organised crime. Moreover, the entire Iraqi civil service, including the army, was dismissed and reappointed on a case by case basis.

As an Iranian refugee in Iraq, Hussein Madani told me in 2005: "I am now living through the second Islamic revolution I went through in my life, and the difference is that this one is even more brutal than the one I saw in my own country".[26]

All sorts of Jihadi terrorist groups prospered and multiplied in this ideal political cocktail and eventually merged under the leadership of Zarqawi in the "Jama'at al-Tawhid wal-Jihad",[27] also known as Al-Qaeda in Mesopotamia. However, the West's concern with Saddam Hussein and Baathism clouded its ability to understand this reality. Only once jihadists took control of large parts of the country did the West wake up to reality.

In the meantime, in a considerably more discreet (but no less deadly) way, Jihadi organisations under the control of Iran infiltrated the state and conducted terrorist campaigns all over the country. Apart from the areas controlled by Kurdish forces, Iraq was torn apart by ethnic cleansing, sectarian conflicts, fanaticism and common criminality. While it was crippled by millions of internally displaced people, refugees and hundreds of thousands of victims, the country became a major Jihadi factory.

The pro-Iranian policy was reversed by President George W. Bush in 2007, in the context of the so-called "surge". The new policy supported the only remaining political institutions which had not been destroyed in Iraq, the tribes, so they could

---

[25]In a gross demonstration of ignorance of the realities on the ground, this view also condoned the so-called federalisation of Iraq, ignoring the intense intermingling of ethnic and religious groups from the South to the North of the country.

[26]On the first of September 2013, Hossein Madani was assassinated in camp Ashraf together with other dozens Iranian refugees by an Iraqi special operation corps acting as an informal death squad.

[27]This is the name of Zarqawi's old organisation in Jordan.

defend themselves against jihadist groups, a policy personified by General John R. Allen, who was—at the time—Deputy Commanding General in the Al Anbar province, Iraq.[28] Under this policy, the first Islamic State in Iraq proclaimed in October 2006 crumbled and allowed for some hope for the future of the country.

However, this policy was suspended, and the Iraqi tribes were abandoned from 2009 onwards, and the West supported Prime Minister Maliki, a long-term associate of the Iranian theocracy, setting the stage for subsequent disastrous events.

Contrary to what has become conventional wisdom, the Iraqi fiasco was not only—or primarily—the result of the Western military intervention. It resulted from the erroneous policy, which favoured the development of jihadism and hindered all factors that could have stopped it.

To prove this, one must only consider the repetition of the Iraqi scenario in Syria, where a similar but even more brutal events unfolded 8 years after the Iraq crisis in spite of the absence of Western military presence or any sign of Western policy for the country.

In both Iraq and in Syria, the Iranian theocracy promoted its affiliated Jihadist organisations, but also favoured the development of Jihadi organisations among the Muslim Sunni population in a first phase. This development of Jihadism among the Sunni population allowed for the elimination of civil society intelligentsia and subsequently allowed the Iranian forces to promote a brutal ethnic cleansing of hostile populations in the name of the "war on terror".

The populations targeted by the Iranian expansionism are therefore victimised twice: they will be expelled from their land, and their society will be highly contaminated with Jihadist indoctrination. Those who will fall in with the "jihadist paranoid gestalt" will then be used to destabilise other neighbouring states—and most in particular, the Gulf States—and the West, as they come to these regions as refugees.

In the meantime, in Syria, Iran forged an international army of mercenaries with members from Lebanon, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Palestine and Iraq, which will be quite useful for future operations in their respective native countries.[29]

In sum, the "war on terror" allowed those who use terrorism to develop these policies and engage in even more threatening forms of aggression.

---

[28]Among the press reports on this, we can consult, for instance, http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-generals-allen-idUSBRE8AD03O20121114 (accessed on 17/03/2017), From April the 5th 2004, date of my first trip to Iraq, I made public appeals for the West to engage with Iraqi tribes as the most reasonable policy to be followed.

[29]See: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3718583/Leaked-intelligence-dossier-reveals-location-secret-Iranian-spymasters-HQ-Syria-codenamed-GLASSHOUSE-Iran-fighters-ground-Assad.html (accessed on 17/03/2017).

References

'28 Pages' from 9/11 Congressional Inquiry. (2016). *Scribd*. Retrieved November 29, 2017, from https://www.scribd.com/document/318416358/28-Pages-from-9-11-Congressional-Inquiry

Banyan: Abide with Mao. (2016, September 10). *The Economist*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.economist.com/news/china/21706511-china-still-struggles-stuff-great-helmsman-underground-abide-mao

Casaca, P. (2008). *The hidden invasion of Iraq*. London: Acacias.

Combatting Jihadism in Afghanistan. (2015, November 26). *SADF*. Policy brief. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://sadf.eu/new/blog/combatting-jihadism-in-afghanistan/

Congress of the United States. (2013, January 29). Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://docs.voanews.eu/en-US/2016/07/15/7c46eb0b-4e0b-4f4d-81da-32e6fbc43c0f.pdf

Crenshaw, M. (2011). Explaining terrorism: Causes, processes and consequences. New York: Routledge. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://www.routledge.com/products/9780415780513

Dangerous liaisons. The US and Iran: The complex game of lobbying and information in an open society. (2016, October 20). *Archumankind*. Policy brief.

Defector admits to WMD lies that triggered Iraq War. (2011, February 15). *The guardian*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/feb/15/defector-admits-wmd-lies-iraq-war

EU takes Iran opposition group off terror list. (2009, January 26). *Reuters*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://uk.reuters.com/article/idUKLQ200287

Exclusive leaked intelligence of secret Iran HQ in Syria. (2016, August 30). *Mail online*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3718583/Leaked-intelligence-dossier-reveals-location-secret-Iranian-spymasters-HQ-Syria-codenamed-GLASSHOUSE-Iran-fighters-ground-Assad.html

Foreign Terrorist Organizations. (2017). *U.S. department of state*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm

Goldberg, Jeffrey. (2016, April). The Obama doctrine. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/04/the-obama-doctrine/471525/

Hoffman, B. (1998). *Inside terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Investigation of 'Warrior Monk' general allen surprises acquaintances. (2012, November 14). *Reuters*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-generals-allen-idUSBRE8AD03O20121114

Iraq Anniversary: War Intelligence 'Was a Lie' BBC Panorama documentary to say. (2013, March 17). *Telegraph*, Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iraq/9936180/Iraq-anniversary-war-intelligence-was-a-lie-BBC-Panorama-documentary-to-say.html

Kempster, Norman. (1997, October 9). U.S. designates 30 groups as terrorists. *Los Angeles times*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://articles.latimes.com/1997/oct/09/news/mn-40874

Laqueur, W. (1980). *The political psychology of appeasement: Finlandization and other unpopular essays* (1st ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Laqueur, W. (2003). *No end to war: Terrorism in the twenty-first century*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Laqueur, W. (2016). *The political psychology of appeasement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Pakistan arrests C.I.A. informants in Bin Laden Raid. (2011, June 14). *The New York times*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/15/world/asia/15policy.html

Past and future: Take care of Russia. (2016, October 22). *The economist*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21708881-mr-putin-not-setting-about-it-best-way-take-care-russia

People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran, Petitioner v. (2010, July 16). United States Department of State and Hillary Rodham Clinton. In her capacity as secretary of state, respondents, United States court of appeals for the district of Columbia circuit. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-dc-circuit/1531607.html

Proscribed Terrorist Groups or Organisations – GOV.UK. (2017). Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/proscribed-terror-groups-or-organisations–2

Rosen, R. M., & Farrell, J. (1993). *Nomodeiktes: Greek studies in honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Senate Report on CIA Torture Claims Spy Agency Lied about 'Ineffective' Program. (2014, December 9). *The Guardian*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2014/dec/09/cia-torture-report-released

Testimony from Families of 9/11 Victims Sought at Guantanamo. (2017). *The Big Story*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://bigstory.ap.org/article/2aef2bda129649b1a307151af13606b2/testimony-families-911-victims-sought-guantanamo

The 9/11 Commission Report: Final report of the National Commission on terrorist attacks upon the United States. (2004). Norton.

The Dark Ages. (2017). *The New Yorker*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/03/18/the-dark-ages

The Guantanamo 22. (2017). *Al Jazeera*. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/specialseries/2015/12/uighur-guantanamo-22-151206112137598.html

United States of America Congressional Record. (2005). Proceedings and Debates of the 109th Congress, First Session, Volume 151, Part 6, April 21, 2005 to May 5, 2005, pp. 8084–8085.

United States of America Congressional Record. (2011). Proceedings and Debates of the 112th Congress, First Session, Volume 157, Part 10, September 13, 2011 to October 5, 2011 p. 14070.

White House Archives. (2001, November 13). President issues military order detention, treatment, and trial of certain non-citizens in the war against terrorism. Retrieved May 5, 2017, from https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011113-27.html

Wright, L. (2007). *The looming tower: Al-Qaeda and the road to 9/11* (Reprint ed.). New York: Vintage.

Conclusions: How to Face the Present Fanatic Threat?

Paulo Casaca

Indeed, terrorism has been perceived in countless ways and has meant many different things at different places and times. If we are to focus on a meaningful political scientific appraisal of terrorism, it may better be apprehended through the words authored by Martha Crenshaw we quoted (Chapter 1, p. 15): "Terrorism involves the use or threat of physical harm in order to achieve a disproportionately large psychological effect".

Counterterrorism policies, therefore, need to address in priority the media transmission tools of the violence to the target population as well as the individual and mass psychological impact of the violent acts.

In its pure form, terrorism has rarely been successful, in particular when used against authoritarian entities (Laqueur, Chapter I.1, p. 11). However, terrorism seldom manifests in its purest form and frequently morphs into guerrilla and other unconventional warfare methods as well as crime or fully fledged war, most in particular, when it becomes state sponsored terrorism, in a way Laqueur was predicting in March 1976[1]: "[when terrorism has sanctuaries in a foreign country and a strong support from a neighbouring power] political terrorism turns into surrogate warfare and changes its character, and then there is always the danger that it may lead to real full-scale war".

In the 1970s in Afghanistan, terrorism developed into a full-scale war (Tomsen, 2011), exactly for the reasons exposed by Laqueur. The defeat of the Soviet Union

---

[1]First published in "The futility of Terrorism" and consulted in (Laqueur, 2016, p. 99).

P. Casaca (✉)
South Asia Democratic Forum (SADF), Brussels, Belgium
e-mail: paulo@sadf.eu

was not the end of this war, but rather the beginning of the attack on the United States. As Khomeini explained in 1979, the Soviet Union was the "Lesser Satan"[2] and the time was ripe for going after the "Great Satan".[3]

The September eleven attack can hardly be seen as terrorism—as its psychological harm was not disproportionately large in relation to its physical harm—and may better be perceived as the start of a non-conventional war through non-conventional mechanisms. Since 9/11—and possibly before these events—the West has been confronted with war rather than terrorism but attempted to conceal this reality with euphemistic language.

Jihadism—under different acronyms, alliances, ideological variants and sponsorships—has been expanding across the Greater Middle East, South Asia and Africa, perpetrating attacks around the world. It is important to note that terrorism is only one of the methods used to spread and sustain their violent ideology.

It is a fundamentalist ideology based on a paranoid group Manichaean perception of a conspiracy. This conspiracy's founding element is most often attributed to Judaism (like in Nazism). It has been appropriated by states as a source of inspiration for local or global expansionist agendas as well as by a cloud of terrorist actors.

Its attraction capacity is considerable and has won praise or inspired an endless number of players across the traditional extreme right-left spectrum as well as ethno-nationalist ones, such as the Tamil Tigers, which have nothing in common with the original ideology.

The most important step for confronting the threat is to recognise it as such, and this has not been the case for three basic reasons.

First of all, "realpolitik" does not recognise ideologies, only interests, and therefore does not recognise ideology as an enemy. So the West supported the Afghan Jihad with the same peace of mind that Russia is now supporting it, adapting to interests and not recognising the danger posed by the underlying ideologies.

Russia's recent support to the Afghan Taliban, the use of its client Jihadi chieftain in Chechnya—Ramzan Kadyrov—to wage war in Syria, or most importantly its strategic alliance with Iran are good examples of the same logic, which we believe will be self-defeating, like the Western support to Afghan Jihad was.

Secondly, we shall consider the political psychology of appeasement which stems from the refusal to face reality. This is done by blurring the nature of Islamic fanaticism into a cocktail of disparate realities; the standard use of euphemisms where the terrorist becomes the radical and the war is reduced to terrorism or still by denying the role of the ideology and attributing jihadism to a range of "justifiable" grievances (such as poverty, economic, ethnic or religious discrimination).

---

[2]See article in Farsi, published on the website of "Tabnak" which is affiliated with former IRGC commander Mohsen Rezaei, titled: "Four behind the scenes reasons concerning the expansion of ties between Iran and Russia", goo.gl/mqhoUf.

[3]See article in Farsi: "Imam Khomeini: America is the Great Satan in this revolution", goo.gl/BZ5L5r.

It then adapts to the enemy by normalising its claims or even assuming them as their own. The phenomenon usually starts with an anti-Semitism agenda and, in more advanced stages, goes on to mandate the acceptance of Jihadi prescriptions as an act of "multiculturalism".

In an attempt to downplay reality, the establishment refused to acknowledge the eminent threat of 9/11 up to the very last moment and—in its aftermath—immediately started to devalue its importance, stating it was a stand-alone event.

Last but not least, an unjustified amalgamation of the attackers takes place. Those involved are religious or ethnic groups, such as Muslims, Arabs, migrants or all of them together, fanaticism being an innate characteristic of each or all of them.

However, this amalgamation has been one of the core objectives of fanatic terrorist attacks since its early days. Whereas jihadists are usually a fringe movement, it is very useful to have a strong voice from the outside explaining that, after all, they are not a minority, but the true representatives of these diverse and vast populations.

The worst case scenario unfolds when all of those characteristics are mixed together, as was the case in the aftermath of 9/11: realpolitik prevented the understanding of the crucial role of the jihadist ideology; the real culprits of the attack—Iran, Pakistan or Saudi Arabia—were appeased; the Iraqis in particular and Arabs in general became the scapegoats and were identified as if they were necessarily part of the network of jihadists. This increased its appeal and paved the way for Jihadism to grow to massive proportions in the region.

As I previously suggested, the first step to facing the fanatic threat is therefore to look at it "as is" and stop pretending it does not exist. To combat it, we must confront the ideas that underpin the ideology. The issue of setting borders between what is perceived as the right to free speech and what is criminal incitement and indoctrination is an important one, but it is not the ultimate one. Wherever the border is set—and we have to accept that freedom is not perceived homogeneously, even in the West—the essential point is to engage in the war of ideas against Jihadism, never allowing its development to go unanswered.

The dividing line between Jihadism and the normal practice of a religion cannot be set uniquely on its immediate relation with violence, contrarily to what Western "anti-radicalisation" doctrine believes.

The average law-abiding citizen is not necessarily a pacifist opposed to the use of violence under any circumstance. However, if one preaches that women have to submit to men, that whoever does not share one's religious beliefs is an infidel, inferior or does not deserve to live, that peace is synonymous with one religion belief to dominate the world, one is a Jihadist. These beliefs, regardless of whether one preaches violence directly, are paving the way to fanatic violence.

The use of euphemisms like "radicalisation" is actually a doubled-edged sword: it seeks excuses for fanaticism in the same way it criminalises all natural, youthful indeed radical, ideas. The use of euphemisms seriously distorts reality, it compartmentalises what can only be understood in one piece and amalgamates what needs to be differentiated.

The war of ideas takes place at all levels of society, in mosques, at social events, in academia, on social media and traditional media. A classic study by Robin Simcox (2009) shows that, in the United Kingdom, the penetration of Jihadism in the academic world has not only been tolerated but actually encouraged. Most likely, similar situations exist elsewhere.

First of all, appeasement invariably starts with a tolerance of anti-Semitism, the pervasive notion that Jews are "to be blamed for all evil" or "deserve persecution" for their part in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. This is a notion as erroneous and criminal now as it was in the times of Nazism, and it will inevitably lead to similar results.

The same applies to war outside the Western borders. To intervene militarily in Iraq or Afghanistan but at the same time to allow the ideology of jihadism to spread—sometimes even ignorantly sponsoring it, for example by segregating Iraqis according to religious affiliation—is absurd and counterproductive.

Secondly, it is fundamental not to fall into the jihadi trap amalgamating all jihadists with a given population. The fact that the West is willing to turn a blind eye to Iranian militias and its involvement in ethnic cleansing significantly boosted the spread of Jihadism in Iraq. The same attitude persists with regard to Iranian led militias and their policy in Syria. Unsurprisingly, this also translates in a rise in jihadi extremism among the population.

Jihadism can only reach its goals if it manages to muster sufficient support among the Muslim population. A perceived war on Arabs or Muslims, or indifference to their massacre—for example in Syria or Iraq—can only increase their chances.

Thirdly, military action is no substitute for the failure of the two other strategic pillars and can only work if it complements them. General John Allen proved in 2007 that a military force which confronts and not appeases terrorist masterminds and engages the populations can prevail, if only one allows it to develop in a consistent way, which unfortunately was not the case as it was reversed at the end of 2008.

A military strategy has to identify the states that sponsor Jihadism—be it terrorism or other forms of unconventional warfare—as their main enemy and act accordingly. The state promotion (or even toleration) of Jihadism has to be seen as the red line and acted upon accordingly.

A broad alliance of free and democratic countries ready to join forces and combat this "contemporary evil" is a key factor for success. This alliance should span across all continents and shall be open to all participants, on the basis of a clear set of humanitarian principles.

Addressing real grievances in the Arab world is a second priority. The ethnic cleansing in Iraq and Syria attained monumental proportions. The West's benevolent indifference to crimes against humanity or even condoning them in the name of the "war against terror" is unacceptable. A realistic peace plan that addresses all justified plights is essential.

Most importantly, the international community has to find a new impetus, energy and vision to achieve global cohesion. The overall dissatisfaction with the negative side effects of globalisation that only favour a few has to be addressed.

References

Four behind the scenes reasons concerning the expansion of ties between Iran and Russia (farzi).
    Tabnak. Availble at goo.gl/mqhoUf.
Imam Khomeini: America is the Great Satan in this revolution (farzi). Available at goo.gl/BZ5L5r.
Laqueur, W. (2016). *A history of terrorism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.