



[itobiad], 2021, 10 (3): 2641-2659

**Terör Örgütlerinin Klasik Realizm Açısından Uluslararası
Aktörlük Durumu: Araç Olarak Kullanımları**

International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms
of Classical Realism: Their Usage as an Instrument

Armağan ÖRKİ

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İstanbul Rumeli Üniversitesi İktisadi, İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler
Fakültesi Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü
Asst. Prof. İstanbul Rumeli Univ. Faculty of Economics, Administrative and
Social Sciences, The Department of International Relations
armagan.orki@rumeli.edu.tr / ORCID: 0000-0002-6906-0031

Nurullah ARIKAN

Öğr. Görevlisi, İstanbul Rumeli Üniversitesi Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek
Yüksekokulu Acil ve Tıbbi Yardım
Lecturer, T.C. İstanbul Rumeli University, Vocational School of Health Services,
Emergency and Medical Aid
nurullah.arikan@rumeli.edu.tr / ORCID: 0000-0001-8625-8982

Mehmet Aydın TOL

Yüksek lisans Öğr., İstanbul Rumeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,
Siyaset Bilimi ve Ekonomi Yüksek lisans Öğrencisi
RA., İstanbul Rumeli University, Institute of Social Sciences, Political Science
and Economy
mehmetaydintol@hotmail.com / ORCID: 0000-0001-6405-9771

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

Makale Türü / Article Type : Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article
Geliş Tarihi / Received : 06.02.2021
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted : 14.09.2021
Yayın Tarihi / Published : 21.09.2021
Yayın Sezonu : Temmuz-Ağustos-Eylül
Pub Date Season : July-August-September

Atıf/Cite as: Örki, A. , Arıkan, N. & Tol, M. A. (2021). International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms of Classical Realism: Their Usage as an Instrument . İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi , 10 (3) , 2641-2659 . Retrieved from <http://www.itobiad.com/tr/pub/issue/64619/875519>

İntihal /Plagiarism: Bu makale, en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmiş ve intihal içermediği teyit edilmiştir. / This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and confirmed to include no plagiarism. <http://www.itobiad.com/>

Copyright © Published by Mustafa YİĞİTOĞLU Since 2012 – İstanbul / Eyup, Turkey. All rights reserved.

Terör Örgütlerinin Klasik Realizm Açısından Uluslararası Aktörlük Durumu: Araç Olarak Kullanımları

Öz

Terör örgütleri, ulusal ve uluslararası güvenliği tehdit eden, devlet dışı silahlı aktörlerden birisidir. Terör örgütlerine olan yaklaşım, özellikle 11 Eylül 2001 tarihinde gerçekleşen terör saldırılarından sonra yeni bir ivme kazanmış ve uluslararası ilişkiler ile uluslararası güvenlik çalışmalarında daha sık yer edinmeye başlamıştır.

Klasik realizm, uluslararası ilişkilerdeki vaka analizlerinde en sık başvurulan geleneksel kuramlardan birisidir. Devletin tek aktör olarak kabul edildiği klasik realizme göre, uluslararası ilişkilerde sistem anarşi üstüne kuruludur. Devletler öncelikle kendi çıkarlarına odaklanır. Gerekirse savaş açmaktan çekinmeyen devletler, çıkarları doğrultusunda hareket eder ve işbirliği mümkün değildir. Terör örgütleri de klasik realizme göre bir dış politika aracıdır. Temsili savaşlarda kullanılan bir araç olarak kullanılan terör örgütlerinin, kullanan devlet açısından bazı avantajları da bulunmaktadır. Etik ve ahlaki kuralların dış politikada önem barındırmadığını savunan klasik realizme göre, başarıya ulaşma konusunda insani değerlere uygun hareket etmenin de bir anlamı bulunmamaktadır.

Terör örgütleriyle ilgili yapılan çalışmalarda uzlaşının sağlanamadığı konular da bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan bir tanesi de, tıpkı devletler gibi uluslararası bir aktör olup olmadıkları sorusudur. Terör örgütleri, silahlı bir unsur olarak bireyleri korkutarak caydırma yeteneğine sahiptir. Hatta devletlerin iç ve dış politikalarının şekillenmesinde de rol oynayabilmektedir. Bununla birlikte, doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak destek aldıkları da bilinmektedir.

Çalışmada aranan yanıt, devletlerden yardım alarak onların kendi dış politikalarında bir araç hâlini alan terör örgütlerinin gerçek anlamda bir uluslararası aktör olarak kabul edilip edilemeyecekleridir. Doğru yanıtın bulunabilmesi için temsili savaş ve melez savaş kavramlarına kısaca değinilip devlet destekli terör ile devlet terörü kavramlarının farkına yer verilmiş ve devlet dışı aktör olarak bazı kuramlarca kabul edilen tüzel kişiliklere realistlerin yaklaşımı üstünde durulmuştur. Ana bölümdeyse soruya yanıt aranarak bir sonuca ulaşılmaya odaklanılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Klasik realizm, Uluslararası aktörlük, Terör örgütleri, Temsili savaş, Melez savaş.



International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms of Classical Realism: Their Usage as an Instrument

Abstract

Terrorist organizations are one of the non-state armed actors that threaten national and international security. The approach towards the terrorist organizations has gained a new momentum especially after the terrorist attacks which were carried out on September 11, 2001 and have started to gain a seat more frequently in international relations and international security studies.

Classical realism is one of the most frequently cited traditional theories in case studies in international relations. According to classical realism, where the state is considered the only actor, the system in international relations is based on anarchy. States focus primarily on their own interests. States that do not hesitate to open war if necessary act in their own interests, and cooperation is impossible. Terrorist organizations are also a foreign policy tool according to classical realism. Terrorist organizations, which are used as a tool used in proxy wars, also have some advantages in terms of the state that uses them. According to classical realism, which argues that ethical and moral rules are not important in foreign policy, there is no point in acting in accordance with human values in achieving success.

In studies conducted regarding terrorist organizations, there are also subjects where consensus cannot be reached. One of those is that the question of whether or not they are an international actor like states. Terrorist organizations have the ability to deter individuals by frightening them as an armed element. They can even play a role in shaping domestic and foreign policies of states. In addition to this, it is also known that they get direct or indirect support.

The main focus of this work is whether or not the terrorist organizations, which have taken the form of an instrument in the foreign policies of states by receiving aid from them, can be accepted as an international actor in the real sense. In order to find the correct answer, the concepts of proxy war and hybrid war were addressed; the difference between state sponsored terror and state terrorism was examined and the approach of realists to legal entities that are accepted by some theories as non-state actors were studied. In the main chapter, a focus was placed on drawing a conclusion by searching for an answer to the question.

Keywords: Classical realism, International actorness, Terrorist organization, Proxy war, Hybrid war.



Introduction

Terrorist organizations were studied from various perspectives, such as, military and security, social and sociological, economic, psychological, legal and political. In the literature, several sources where terrorist organizations are addressed from these perspectives can be found. There are numerous works about the role and importance that terrorist organizations have gained in international relations. However, there is no unanimity on whether or not the terrorist organizations have an independent influence on determining international relations (or international politics, international order). The scholars working on this subject have generally addressed the concept with a theory or approach and consequently determined whether or not the terrorist organizations are an international actor.

The purpose adopted in this work is to examine whether or not the terrorist organizations are an international actor from the classical realist theory perspective and to contribute to the literature regarding their usage as an instrument. In this context, the research question that is being sought to answer is: "Are terrorist organizations an international actor?" Within this scope, international actorness is defined first and then information was provided related to that. Next, the approach of classical realism towards terrorist organizations was compiled and shared and then research was conducted concerning its usage as an instrument. An answer was sought to the question of whether the terrorist organizations, which are a separate formation under non-state armed organizations, are an instrument, or whether they are the purpose and an actor influencing the instruments (international policies and foreign policy).

Concepts

Proxy war was defined as wars, which the regional states fought and at least one of them was supported by one of the two superpowers during the Cold War era (Bar-Siman-Tov, 1984, p. 263). This definition addressed only with a state focus has changed over time. In the current conditions, the view that the non-state actors can also be the "proxy" in the proxy war, dominates. In this respect, it requires at least two elements, one intervening and the other representing it; and while the intervening one has the status of being a state, the other is either a state or a non-state actor. On the other hand, Groh (2010, p. 24) and Mumford (2013, p. 40) defined the proxy wars as an output of the conflict between a state or non-state actor and a selected representative that is provided arms, trained and financed by that state or non-state actor.

Hybrid war is a term that refers to the wars where all kinds of



**International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms of Classical Realism:
Their Usage as an Instrument**

instruments can be used together (Dođru, 2017, p. 153). Hybrid war is a term, where irregular tactics and formations, random terrorist actions containing violence and other crimes are also used together with traditional war methods (Hoffman, 2007, p. 14). That is to say, conducting a cyber-war with intelligence elements, provoking a civil war by supporting terrorist organizations, subverting the economy of a competitor (or a target) by making use of the economic resources are the instruments that can be used in hybrid wars. According to Hoffman (2009, p. 38), hybrid wars do not mean that traditional war methods will be left out but they also require the states to develop new defense methods. The hybrid war term, when considered within the frame of its purpose, can be summarized as using various instruments in order to weaken and overthrow the target governments (Charap, 2015, p. 51). When the complexity of the hybrid war and its utilized instruments are considered, it is understood that every state should continuously update its defense policies and be prepared.

To summarize, it is legitimate that all proxy wars can be referred to as hybrid wars. However, not all hybrid wars have to include a characteristic of a proxy war. If the conflict between State A and State B is referred to as a hybrid war, there is no requirement to have the representatives on the front line but if there is a conflict solely conducted by the representatives, it is possible to call this a hybrid war.

There are different reasons for the justifications of proxy and hybrid wars. For example, with the words of Bellows (2012, p. 13), it is valuable in this respect that the USA does not easily approach military intervention in the third world countries since its experience in Vietnam. Economic reasons are the prominent driving factors. However, the pursuit for not strengthening the competitors in international law and internal politics was also found important in the tendency towards these two wars. First, states can use other options with less spending instead of spending on their own armies. The second one is the compliance with international law, especially with the crime of war and the pursuit of not being alone in international relations. The third one is that the economic and humanitarian cost of war is a trump for the competitors of governments that decide on the war, and this is not to allow this trump to be used.

In this section of the study, state terrorism which is likely to be confused sometimes, was also desired to be shortly addressed. State terrorism is outside the scope of this study and is different from state-sponsored terror. If a government supports terrorism in order to make its foreign policy applied, this is called state- sponsored terrorism (Stevens, 2005, p. 511). State terrorism, on the other hand, is the terrorism that a government applies towards its own citizens itself (Steven, 2005, p. 511).



There are different types of terrorism. For example, Saraçlı (2007, pp. 1056- 1059) addressed terrorism as national terrorism, international terrorism, transnational terrorism, state terrorism, state-sponsored terrorism, ethnic terrorism, and cyber terrorism. State-sponsored terrorism, on the other hand, is suitable to be considered together with national, international, transnational, ethnic and cyber terrorism. That is to say, ethnic terrorism can also be an example of state- sponsored terrorism.

The Problem of Actorness in International Relations

The subject of actorness in international relations has always been a concept staying away from disputes for many years without confronting a problem and the fact that only the sovereign states are the actors has been accepted (Vogler, 1999, p. 27).

International actors have been basically addressed under two separate titles: State and non-state. Terrorist organizations are also among non-state ones; such as inter-governmental organizations and multinational companies. Theories have also accepted the non-state ones as an actor that wholly or partly creates or affects global politics or they have rejected this assertion.

It is considered more appropriate to separately address the groups other than the states. It was thought that impressiveness and decisiveness levels of all of them could be different. In addition to this, sanctions and power of influence of such an organization compared to another one on the same platform can be much different. The intergovernmental organizations OPEC and NATO, international civil society organizations Greenpeace and Amnesty International, and the multinational companies, Microsoft and Shell may not be evaluated in the same way. It is accepted that a different organization may be more dominant than the other within different years in different geographies.

Intergovernmental Organizations

Organizations such as OPEC, NATO, IMF, which have been created by governments and where no sovereignty cycle exists, have been considered as an international actor by some theories. Ateş (2014, p. 127) claimed that those organizations could not be actors of the first degree, and everything from their identities to decision making, from the impact they would have to the lifetime deemed appropriate for them was in the hands of member states. In the process leading up to the 1973 oil crisis, OPEC members' actualization of the decisions they took caused them to be called cartels (Colgan, 2014, p. 600). The organization was able to



impose sanctions even partially, and brought about the change of policies.

In his study about the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Acar (2019a, 65) stated that the organization was not able to be sensitive about the problems such as Bosnia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Chechenia; the good relations of Saudi Arabia, the dominant actor in the organization, with USA created a situation against the organization and no agreement could be reached among the members with different economic conditions in terms of development. He pointed out that the intergovernmental organization did not have the power of impressiveness because of these reasons.

The idea that they are used as an instrument is still meaningful, regarding that they cannot be independent actors. Likewise, Ateş (2017, p. 33) cited that the League of Nations acted in accordance with British and French foreign policy and organizations such as UN and NATO acted in accordance with USA foreign policy, even partially. In addition, it was found that in organizations such as the League of Nations and United Nations, the states with higher power of effectiveness remained unwilling or slow when a powerful actor attacked a relatively weaker one; and thus international peace and security could not be preserved (Emiroğlu, 2006, p. 117). At this point, it should be noted that intergovernmental organizations, whether regional or international, are generally established for a single purpose. For instance, OPEC has the purpose of taking common steps with respect to the oil market among its members and takes common steps at this point. It is controversial how much sanction power this has.

International Non-Governmental Organizations

Organizations that are not inter-governmental; such as Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Greenpeace, that are non-governmental organizations, are included in this class and it is known that they are sometimes taken into consideration by some states. It was argued that non-governmental organizations are influential in determining public opinion and in policy formation, since they are focused on a small number of subjects and are generally specialized in these subjects (Clark, 1995, pp. 512-513). In addition to this, it was also cited that they have been accepted as important actors by the international society within the existing international legal order (Nowrot, 1999, p. 634).

Those who argue that international non-governmental organizations cannot be international actors point out the financial support that those organizations may receive from the states. It is obvious that some of them may have influence over local or national governments with bribes



or support but it is also thought that they can be generally directed by states where their headquarters are located or by the states of whose they need. In addition to this, the cases of affecting multinational companies or other companies have been experienced many times, even if they did not have the power of having influence over a state. For example, Greenpeace was able to make some apparel (textile) companies step back in the struggle between them.

Multinational Companies

Multinational companies, that may have policy decisiveness especially in states experiencing economic distress and those that cannot economically develop, have been accepted as an international actor from time to time. The fact that they have the ability to direct several issues in line with their own purposes allows them to affect the decision making mechanisms of some states, and to have some of those states directly accept their own wills (Ateş, 2014, p. 173). Ateş (2014, p. 129) stated that the impact of companies in the weapon and oil industry in the country is undeniable in the process of Middle Eastern policy formation of the USA.

Similar to non-governmental organizations, it is accepted that multinational companies can also affect some local or national governments. Despite this, it is also thought that they are open to manipulation. While the states constituted the first nine ranks of the list where multinational companies and states were ranked according to their incomes in a mixed manner, most of the rest (approximately 70%) consisted of the multinational companies (Babic et.al 2017, p. 27). While the USA took the first rank in the aforementioned list, the company in the tenth rank of the list was established in the USA and had its headquarters in the USA. Many multinational companies on the list had origins from the USA or the People's Republic of China.

Realism and Terrorist Organizations

The roots of classical realism begin with Thucydides in Ancient Greece and continue until Niccolò Machiavelli's book written to the ruler of the time. Even though the philosophers have changed, main views of the theory have been shaped upon similar arguments. Thomas Hobbes was effective for the theory in the 1600s and Jean-Jacques Rousseau was effective in the 1700s.

Hans J. Morgenthau is an important value in understanding classical realism in today's literature. Morgenthau explained the six principles of classical realism with examples and thus made an important



**International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms of Classical Realism:
Their Usage as an Instrument**

contribution to classical realism. Morgenthau (2014, pp. 53-58) stated that human nature was in the origin of policies in fact, increasing the power was a purpose in the decisions made, the concept of power could be understood differently over time, there was no condition of complying with ethical rules in decision making and the ethical understandings of nations could not be effective in decision making. Two points that need to be emphasized regarding the subject are as follows: The first one is that Morgenthau showed handling the foreign policy, prepared in line with national interests, in terms of power as a principle (Morgenthau, 2004, p. 5). Secondly, Morgenthau claimed that universal ethical principles and values could not have an impact in a political action (Morgenthau, 2004, p. 12).

According to the structural realists, power is an instrument used for the purpose and the purpose is survival but the purpose of classical realism is the power itself (Mearsheimer, 2006, p. 72). According to Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes and many other philosophers, the main occupation of political actions has been based on the principle of targeting and using the power and thus, competition, conflict and the war environment have been found to be natural both for national interest and the future of the state (Aydın, 2004, p. 40).

According to realism, international organizations are the instruments used by the states for their own policies (Ateş, 2017, p. 73). When interpreted according to the classical realist doctrine, terrorist organizations are not international actors, such as the intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations. When national, regional and international purposes of the states are considered, it is accepted that terrorist organizations may be used as instruments. The states may support terrorist organizations in order to weaken other states with whom they are engaged in competition (Saraçlı, 2007, p. 1066).

Terrorist Organizations

Terrorist organizations are sometimes considered as synonymous with non-state armed organizations but this is not an accurate determination. Şan (2009, p. 3) stated that, non-state armed organizations could be used for a generalization including ethnic, religious or national based rebellions, revolutionary movements and guerrilla organizations. In the continuation of his work, Şan (2009, p. 5) stated that non-state armed organizations could use both guerilla and terrorist tactics. That is to say, all of the formations expressed by terrorist organizations are non-state armed organizations. However, not every non-state armed organization is regarded as a terrorist organization. Drug cartels, specially established paramilitary groups, and companies offering private military services



are among non-state armed organizations but they are not terrorist organizations.

In some sources, there are statements and thoughts stating that there is a difference between terrorist organizations and the formations used by states or other non-state actors. A terrorist organization can be established spontaneously and then become an instrument of one state and then of another, or it can be created by the relevant units of a state from the very beginning. Therefore, this subtle meaning distinction has been ignored throughout this study.

Terrorist organizations use an excessive sense of fear to subjugate and intimidate (convince in line with their purposes) (Jaggar, 2005, p. 206). Considering bombing, suicide attacks, mortar and missile attacks, vehicle attacks, arson, aircraft hijacking, use of chemical and biological weapons, attacks in cyber space and even attacks performed with knives and similar cutting and penetrating tools in crowds, it is understood that terrorist organizations are focused on causing damage with every means that they can access. It is also known that there is no target distinction in these kinds of attacks. For instance, just like abducting children and making them a member of the organization, there is no differentiation between civilians, soldiers, women, men, children or adults in the attacks. Terrorist organizations may even target the members of other terrorist organizations in line with these purposes, even though they have similar ideologies. It has been seen in different years that two terrorist organizations with almost the same ideology and targets were conflicted in the Gazi neighbourhood of the Sultangazi district of Istanbul, in order to achieve superiority.

Use of Terrorist Organizations as Instruments

Historical dimension of terrorist organizations dates back to hundreds of years ago. However, it has also undergone a change over the years. For instance, the actions named cyber-crimes are among the weapons of terrorist organizations that can be regarded as being relatively new. When the causes of terrorism were examined, they were gathered under the subheadings of social psychological factors, ideological factors and environmental factors (Viotti and Kauppi, 2014, pp. 341-343). While it seems unlikely to accept or reject all of these factors, it is also necessary to accept the idea that terrorists and their organizations can be used as instruments. The use of terrorist organizations as an instrument in order to achieve political goals with minimum political loss has been understood in some cases.



**International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms of Classical Realism:
Their Usage as an Instrument**

There may be various economic, social, political and/or psychological reasons for the establishment of terrorist organizations. These reasons actually allow us to understand the answers to be given to the questions of why a person would become a member of a terrorist organization or would lean towards it. On the other hand, one of the reasons for the establishment or existence of terrorist organizations is that they will serve for the interests of at least one state. Similarly, when the purposes of terrorism or the terrorist organizations, economic or political goals may be found in sources. Regardless of the purpose of the terrorist organization, it is actually more convenient to interpret it as the reason for the presence of the member of that organization. The purposes announced by terrorist organizations are apparently different, but they may differ in the other dimension.

Although it is left as a secondary purpose, another purpose that can be taken to the last place in the literature should be considered as weakening the country or countries at the target. Terrorist organizations serve for the interests of at least one state, even if they do not receive direct support from any state or the support they receive is ended. Since each state is in competition in international relations, the attempt of the organization "A" to weaken the state "B" would be for the benefit of the state "C" with the most optimistic prediction.

The fact that the impressiveness of a part of the methods preferred by the states as instruments in the foreign policy is limited and a part of them (economic and political) is found as costly, paved the way for considering different options. The fact that different diplomacies such as dual or soft power, are away from producing fast results, or that the channels such as economic sanctions, external assistance or war are costly and their effects may result differently from what is expected, cause that lower cost solutions are generated for the states.

Terrorist organizations can be shown among the options that can be used as an instrument for the purposes of states and that would incur less cost for the state using terrorism. It was also reported that some states used terrorism for their permanence during the Cold War (Abdurahmanli, 2019, p. 100). At this point, it is useful to draw attention to the difference between the terrorist organization and the terrorist. In the simplest meaning, the terrorists have been described as people who are not satisfied with the social contract they are subject to, or with the order of power in the anarchic world (Zahra, 2011, p. 65). When this definition is assumed as valid, the terrorist organization used as an instrument of a country is expected to make propaganda over the mass deemed appropriate for itself, lead them to complain about the current situation and have itself accepted as an option for solution. In another words, terrorist organizations are the instruments utilized by the states and



terrorists are the instruments utilized by the terrorist organizations. While it is a truth that terrorist organizations are not the only instruments in foreign policy, it is another truth that terrorist organizations need the terrorists.

State Sponsored Terrorism

Support to the terror is provided to certain terrorist organizations with aid such as weapons, money, training, safe places (Byman, 2020, p. 7). State-sponsored terrorism was defined as part of the works conducted in order to obtain long-term interests, and it was pointed out that no responsibility arises due to the lack of organic ties with the terrorist organization (Kasımoğlu, 2010, p. 39).

It is accepted that there is at least one state or government that is considered as the supporter of many terrorist organizations in the past century, not only those active in Turkey or in the region where Turkey is located. Examples, such as the Hezbollah of Iran and Lebanon, Libya and the Interim Irish Republican Army, Syria and Japanese Red Army, were listed by Byman (2005, p. 1).

Especially regarding the support provided by states, Şan Akça (2009, pp. 594-595) drew the attention to five possibilities. The first three hypotheses were more convenient to be generalized: The support given by a state for its own enemy, the support given by the relatively weak state with the logic of balancing against the state considered as a rival, and the support given by the relatively powerful state with the logic of retaliation against its rival. The other two hypotheses were the support given by a state in resisting its rivals in case of not using its internal sources and the support given when a state does not have a reliable partner against its rival. The common point for all five possibilities (or situations) was that terrorist organizations referred to as non-state armed groups in the referred study could be somehow be used as an instrument. Moreover, the aforementioned hypotheses are suitable to be accepted as justification for the supporting states.

Abdullah Öcalan, who assumed so-called leadership of PKK for a long time, stated that the states such as Germany, Belgium, France; with whom Turkey was in cooperation in NATO, including Armenia, Greece and Serbia, provided direct or indirect support to the terrorist organization (Demirel, 2005, pp. 225-232). Demir (2008, pp. 68-69) conveyed other statements confirming this by using different sources. In addition, it is also impossible for a terrorist organization to survive without receiving psychological, political, logistical and military support from a state (Acar, 2019c, pp. 1463-1464).



The Reasons for States to Support Terrorism

In the light of the assumptions, hypotheses and suggestions addressed in the previous subsection and by making use of the literature, it can be clarified why states tend to support a terrorist organization in line with the arguments of classical realism. While only one reason may be valid as a reason for a state to support a terrorist organization, more than one or all of them may also be valid.

Wars have economic consequences. Although the war is won, there are also negative impacts for the country's economy. While a state considers supporting terrorism to reduce the economic risks, terrorist organizations may also seek to reduce their own costs. At this point, cyber terrorism has moved to a current dimension. Cyber terrorism is much cheaper than traditional terrorist actions (Erdem, 2019, p. 192). In addition, cyber terrorist actions are also suitable to be carried out by the relevant state units. For example, it can be secretly performed that in the act of "A" towards "B", it pretends to be the terrorist organization named "C" or supports "C". Since it does not have a physical dimension, it is possible to minimize both the economic cost and legal responsibility. Not with the development of technology, but the instruments were also used approximately a hundred years ago in order to reduce costs and achieve international targets. For example, Dashnak was supported by the U.K., to achieve the interests over the Ottomans, the Tsardom of Russia and Iran (Qajar Dynasty) (Avci, 2012, pp. 93- 94).

Whether the state wins or loses in wars, there may be changes in the decision of voters, both for economic reasons and with the influence of other factors. This creates a risk that lawmakers or enforcers should take. Accordingly, it becomes a realistic argument that the terrorist organizations are used as a political instrument specifically to the countries referred to within the liberal democracy. Another detail that draws attention specifically to Europe is the change in the approach towards terrorism and terrorists after September 11, 2001. It is interesting that, the interest towards anti-Islam and anti-immigrant movements has increased, and the way for xenophobia in the extreme right wing has been paved (Yüksel Çendek, 2017, p. 266).

The fact that a state does not officially actualize the support that it would give to a terrorist organization, prevents the bond between them. Even though the actions performed by the terrorist organization are against international laws, they do not cause the state directly or indirectly supporting it to be faced with any sanctions. Accordingly, as stated by Ayhan (2015, p. 139), terrorist organizations are used against their enemies in line with the policies of states.



Are the Terrorist Organizations an International Actor?

Terrorist organizations have been evaluated differently by different theories and opinions, there have been opposing views regarding whether or not they are an international actor. The differences of opinion on whether or not the non-state actors are decisive actors in international relations (in the system, structure, order or policies) have continued when terrorist organizations were at stake. Terrorist organizations have been divided into two, nationally and globally, and it was stated that global terrorist organizations that threaten more than one state, which are the subject of this study, could be considered as international actors (Ateş, 2004, p. 138). The case that any terrorist organization, even globally, has an interest relationship with an international actor (such as the state) is a reason to push it from being an actor to be an instrument.

There are different methods that states can use to achieve their goals and interests over other states. Although these methods are sometimes called international sanctions in the field of implementation, it would be more correct to call them coercions. Coercion methods and international sanctions do not always have to be in accordance with international law. Although some methods have been accepted in international law, there are also methods employed, overtly or secretly, directly or indirectly. One of those methods is the terrorist organizations.

Although the targets of some of the terrorist organizations, that are addressed nationally and globally and the actor status of which is discussed, is directed towards a state, it was stated by Ateş (2004, p. 139) that their effectiveness could be international. Ateş (2004, p. 139) examined the PKK example and stated that the terrorist organization had the target of establishing an independent state in Turkey but it could continue its activities (education, finance etc.) in different states. Also specifically to PKK, it was pointed out that the terrorist organization was supported by more than one global power and in some cases, the name PYD was preferred instead of PKK (Acar, 2019b, pp. 127-128).

Among the reasons for the existence of terrorist organizations, social, economic, political and psychological factors have been frequently mentioned. On the other hand, it has been deemed necessary to draw attention to the usability of terrorism as an instrument regarding the reason of formation or survival. For example, among the reasons for the formation of PKK, DHKP-C, MLKP, FETÖ/PDY, Daesh/ISIL, Al-Qaeda and similar terrorist organizations, classical causes can easily be listed in a general way. On the other hand, it is also essential for national and



international security to focus on the characteristics of being used as an instrument or the reasons for not intervening or even being supported.

Deterring the Supporting State Instead of the Terrorist Organization

Gündoğdu (2016, pp. 6-7) mentioned the existence of the methods of indirect deterrence, deterrence by denial and deterrence by punishment in deterring terrorism and mentioned that the former could deter the supporting states and financiers. It should also be noted that indirect methods can be deterrents, since they also cover the acts performed towards other things valued by the terrorists (such as their families) (Kroenig and Pavel, 2012, p. 27). In addition, it was also stated that military methods have been effective in deterring the states when used together with diplomatic and economic means but they have not been deterrent over non-state armed actors (Elbahy, 2019, p. 49).

One of the methods employed by Israel in the process of fight against Lebanese Hezbollah, which has been accepted as a terrorist organization by some countries, constituted an example suitable to this subject. Israel threatened Syrian interests by shooting the radars of Syria in Lebanon, which was seen as its protector, and Hezbollah was restricted even temporarily (Bar, 2007, p. 470). During the process reflected as "October 1998 Crisis" in literature, Turkey tried to prevent the support of Syria towards the PKK Terrorist Organization through diplomatic channels first, and then considered the war option and achieved to lead Syria to back off, thanks to several factors (Gökcan, 2018, pp. 190-192).

It is also possible that terrorist organizations may take action or cause harm in the countries where they are supported. For example, PKK, which has received the support of Syria for many years, is currently carrying out separatist actions against the Syrian administration. Another example can be shown with the Taliban and Al-Qaeda. Küçükşahin (2006, p. 19) mentioned that terrorism was managed by the USA until the attack performed on the USA on September 11, 2001, but then it was seen as a threat. USA based on this attack in its military intervention both towards Afghanistan and Iraq and argued that it exercised its right of self-defense (Saraçlı, 2007, p. 1071). Supporting terrorist organizations for different reasons may somehow harm the supporters. The most concrete example of this is the threat posed by the PKK presence in Syria to the unitary structure of Syria. The USA example is slightly different and is suitable to be discussed as a separate topic. There are also claims that it has strengthened its presence in the Middle East and Central Asia on the excuse of the terrorist organization supported by the USA against the USSR.

Conclusion



The main actor in international relations is the state. In the meantime, multinational companies, intergovernmental organizations, international non- governmental organizations and terrorist organizations also have an impact on some states. Moreover, a part of them are more powerful in economic or military terms compared to many states. On the other hand, the argument of classical realism that they are open to be directed by powerful states and can be used as instruments, is also valuable data. Considering the terrorist organizations, it is understood that they are used for several reasons for targets in foreign policy.

Terrorist organizations have been addressed in different classes. Aside from the history or the meaning of the word terrorism, the impression of the effect it has shown today is that they cannot survive without external support. Even the acceptance of this determination connects the existence of a terrorist organization itself to the support of a state.

When the argument of realists that terrorist organizations cannot be an international actor is accepted, which is the view accepted in this study, stopping external support is important in the fight against terrorism. States are deterrent with several foreign policy instruments and there have been several examples of action towards deterring the states supporting terrorist organizations. In short, it has been concluded that terrorist organizations cannot be considered an international organization. Terrorist organizations should be considered as a tool by states to use foreign policy.

References

- Abdurrahmanli, E. (2019). Terrorisms Growth Along With The Globalization Case. *Anadolu Akademi Social Sciences Journal*, 1(1), 93-118.
- Acar, M. (2019a). Uluslararası Bir Aktör Olarak İslam İşbirliği Teşkilatı. *Barış Araştırmaları ve Çatışma Çözümleri Dergisi*, 7(1): 51-68.
- Acar, Ü. (2019b). The Use of Terrorist Organizations in the Sharing War. *Van Yüzcüncü Yıl University The Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, Issue: 46, 117-137.
- Acar, Ü. (2019c). Subcontractor of the New World Order: Terrorist Organizations. *Academic Journal of History and Idea*, 6(3): 1450-1474.
- Ateş, D. (2014). *Uluslararası Politika: Dünyayı Anlamak ve Anlatmak*, Dora, Bursa.



**International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms of Classical Realism:
Their Usage as an Instrument**

Ateş, D. (2017). *Uluslararası Örgütler: Devletlerin Örgütlenme Mantiği*, Dora, Bursa.

Avcı, H. E. (2012). As an Example of the Terrorist Organization Supported by the Foreign Countries: Dashnakutiun (1890-1922). *International Journal of Security and Terrorism*, 3(1): 89-101.

Aydın, M. (2004). The Realist Theory of the International Relations: Origin, Scope, Critique. *International Relations*, 1(1): 33-60.

Ayhan, H. (2015). The Terror Concept and Approach of United Nations on Terrorism after 2001 in the Framework of Security Council and General Assembly. *Journal of Security Strategies*, 11(21): 117-147.

Babic, M. - Fichtner, J. - Heemskerk, E. M. (2017). States versus Corporations: Rethinking the Power of Business in International Politics. *The International Spectator*, 52(4): 20-43.

Bar, S. (2007). Deterring Nonstate Terrorist Groups: The Case of Hizballah. *Comparative Strategy*, 26(5): 469-493.

Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (1984). The Strategy of War by Proxy. *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol: 19, 263-273.

Bellows, T. J. (2012). Proxy War in Indochina. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 7(1): 13-30.

Byman, D. (2005). *Deadly Connections: States that Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press.

Byman, D. (2020). Understanding, and Misunderstanding, State Sponsorship of Terrorism, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2020.1738682>

Charap, S. (2015). The Ghost of Hybrid War. *Survival*, 57(6): 51-58.

Clark, A. M. (1995). Non-Governmental Organizations and Their Influence on International Society. *Journal of International Affairs*, 48(2): 507-525.

Colgan, J D. (2014). The Emperor Has No Clothes: The Limits of OPEC in the Global Oil Market. *International Organization*, 68(3): 599-632.

Demir, C. K. (2008). The PKK in the Context of Terrorist Organizations and Learning Organizations. *International Relations*, 5(19): 57-88.

Demirel, E. (2005). *PKK ve Ayaklanmalar*, IQ Yayıncılık.

Doğru, A. (2017). Hybrid Warfare, DAESH and Turkey's Stance. *Journal of Crises and Political Research*, 1(2), 130-161.

Elbahy, R. (2019). Deterring Violent Non-state Actors: Dilemmas and Implications. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*, 1(1): 43-54.



Emiroğlu, H. (2006). Uluslararası Siyasal Örgütlenme Modeli Oluşumunun Tarihsel Süreci ve Birleşmiş Milletler Örgütü (1941-1990). *Journal of Security Strategies*, 2(4), 103-136.

Erdem, T. (2019). Cyber International Politics in Digital Age: Cyber Terrorism vs. Cyber Diplomacy, Eds. Sibel Turan, Latif Pınar. Security in Contemporary World: Theories and Issues. (185-202) Siyasal Kitabevi, Ankara.

Gökcan, Ö. (2018). A Breaking Point in Turkey-Syria Relations: October 1998 Crisis or in other Words "Undeclared War". *Journal of Academic Inquiries*, 13(1): 169-198.

Groh, T. L. (2010). *War on the Cheap? Assessing the Costs and Benefits of Proxy War*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Georgetown University, Washington.

Gündoğdu, E. (2016). Deterrence Theory in International Relations. *International Journal of Political Science and Urban Studies*, 4(2): 1-22.

Kroenig, M. - Pavel, B. (2012). How to Deter Terrorism. *The Washington Quarterly*, 35(2): 21-36.

Hoffman, F. G. (2007). *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars*, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, Virginia.

Hoffman, F. G. (2009). Hybrid Warfare and Challenges. *Joint Force Quarterly*, 52(1): 34-39.

Jaggar, A. M. (2005). What Is Terrorism, Why Is It Wrong, and Could It Ever Be Morally Permissible?. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 36(2): 202-217.

Kasımoğlu, H. (2010). *Globalization of Terrorism and EU Transition on the Policy of Fighting Against Terrorism*, (Unpublished Graduate Thesis). Bilecik University, Bilecik.

Küçükşahin, A. (2006). Güvenlik Bağlamında, Risk ve Tehdit Kavramları Arasındaki Farklar Nelerdir ve Nasıl Belirlenmelidir?. *Journal of Security Strategies*, 2(4): 7-40.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2006). Structural Realism, Eds. Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, Steve Smith. *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. (71-88) Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Morgenthau, H. J. (2004). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Peking University Press, Beijing.

Morgenthau, H. J. (2014). A Realist Theory of International Politics, Eds. Colin Elman – Michael A. Jensen. *Realism Reader*. (53-59) Routledge.



**International Actorness Status of Terrorist Organizations in Terms of Classical Realism:
Their Usage as an Instrument**

- Mumford, A. (2013). Proxy Warfare and the Future of Conflict. *The RUSI Journal*, 158(2): 40-46.
- Nowrot, K. (1999). Legal Consequences of Globalization: The Status of Non-Governmental Organizations under International Law. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 6(2), 579-645.
- Saraçlı, M. (2007). Uluslararası Hukukta Terörizm. *Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University Faculty of Law Review*, 11(1): 1049-1078.
- Stevens, M. J. (2005). What is Terrorism and Can Psychology Do Anything to Prevent It?. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, Vol: 23, 507-526.
- Şan Akça, B. (2009). Supporting Non-State Armed Groups: A Resort to Illegality?. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 32(4): 589-613.
- Şan, B. (2009). *Non-state Violence, Supporters, and Targets: State Support of Non-state Armed Groups as a Selection Process*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of California Davis.
- Viotti, P. R. – Kauppi, M. V. (2014). *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Dünya Siyaseti*, Translated. Ayşe Özbay Erozan, Nobel, Ankara.
- Vogler, J. (1999). The European Union as an Actor in International Environmental Politics. *Environmental Politics*, 8(3): 24-48.
- Yüksel Çendek, S. (2017). Avrupa’da İslam’ın Güvenlikleştirilmesi, Eds. Sibel Turan, Nergiz Özkural Köroğlu. *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Güvenlik Kuramları ve Sorunlarına Temel Yaklaşımlar*. (254-269) Transnational Press London.
- Zahra, N. (2011). Terrorism, Realism and the State. *Pakistan Horizon*, 64(1): 61-74.

