SEPTEMBER 11: A NEW TYPE OF TERRORISM

MURAT KARAGÖZ

Murat Karagöz is the First Secretary at the Turkish Permanent Mission at the United Nations in New York, USA.

INTRODUCTION

Public opinion is in no doubt that the heinous assault against the United States on 11 September 2001 was 'terrorist' in nature. It was unexpected and therefore created a great shock, not only in the United States but also around the entire world. The targets, namely the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon near Washington DC, were selected consciously. The fatalities and causalities of the attacks were enormous. It was the first time since Pearl Harbor that the US territory was directly hit by an attack initiated from abroad. The weaponry used in these attacks was neither conventional, like guns or bombs, nor weapons of mass destruction; it was means of public transport.

Though some realists[1] assert that those attacks may testify to a defining moment but in no way to "the reorder of the system" following September 11, many academicians and political commentators alike seem to agree to the assessment: "the world will never be the same again."[2] What most of the academicians seem also agreed was that the attacks were directed not only against the US but also against all of humanity and civilisation; that is, against the values of freedom, democracy, human rights, good governance, etc.

As a matter of fact, the response of the modern world to these 'terrorist acts' was prompt and explicit. In the US, the overwhelming majority closed ranks behind the US President and supported his call for a 'war against terrorism'. All but few governments expressed condolences and sympathy to the US Administration and the American people, and displayed solidarity with them. Within 24 hours of the terrorist attacks, the UN General Assembly and the Security Council, under the leadership of its Secretary-General adopted two resolutions[3] unanimously, condemning these barbaric acts and voting to support actions to bring to justice those responsible and those who harboured them. Likewise, the NATO Council agreed that these attacks were covered by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty.[4] Similarly, the Organisation of American States invoked the Rio Treaty, obligating signatories to consider an attack against any member as an attack against all.

President Bush's declaration of war on terrorism in his 20 September 2001 address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, the determined speech of the US Secretary of State, Colin Powell, on 23 September 2001 calling upon the international community to make

a choice between freedom and terrorism, and President Bush's State of the Union address on 29 January 2002 triggered a hot debate on the scourge of terrorism and methods to fight it. The ongoing allied military operations in Afghanistan, the US's preparations for the second phase of the war against terrorism, including Iraq, and the sharp escalation of tension and fighting in the Middle East, first and foremost the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, have become the essential elements of this debate. Academicians and politicians have started to discuss the intricate and multifaceted causes, as well as the devastating consequences of September 11, including the definition, scope and parameters of the concept of 'terrorism'.

Actually, there was no consensus on how to define the September 11 attacks. As Anne-Marie Slaughter writes,5 for instance, President Bush described the hideous events of September 11 at the beginning as "an apparent terrorist attack on the US", however, on the next day, he called them "acts of war".

If it is war, what kind of war is it? If it is terrorism, what type of terrorism is it? Is it religious terrorism or state-sponsored terrorism? What makes the September 11 attacks different from others? Is there any political purpose? Is the perpetrators' ultimate aim to ignite a clash of civilisations, as Huntington argued, or do they have any hidden agenda?

This paper tries to elaborate on some of those questions. I take Hoffman's6 main arguments and conclusions and modestly try to build on them in the light of recent developments and events in this field. This paper does not intend to open a new theoretical debate on the very concept of terrorism.

I believe that the terrorist attacks of September 11 have fewer similarities to than differences from classic terrorism. The attacks have common denominators with almost all types of terrorism that are internationally recognised. However, they cannot be confined to the definitions of internationally recognised terrorist acts because they also have their own characteristics. Moreover, the terrorist network behind these attacks is unique in many senses. Finally, the perpetrators of these attacks have an unusual agenda, making September 11 quite different in this regard.

The first of this paper's following four sections starts with a discussion of the UN's definitions of terrorism. The next section focuses on different types of terrorism and makes a comparison between the September 11 terrorist attacks and each of these categories. This leads us to define September 11 as a new form of terrorism in the following section. The final section highlights the general characteristics of September 11 and ends with concluding remarks.

SEPTEMBER 11 AND THE DEFINITION OF TERRORISM:

A UN PERSPECTIVE ON CODIFICATION

Be it described as "globalised informal violence" like Keohane7 or as "asymmetrical war" like Freedman8, an international unanimously agreed text on the definition of terrorism does not exist,9 not even within the United Nations.

The question of a precise definition for terrorism has preoccupied the debate among states for decades. A first attempt to arrive at an internationally acceptable definition was made under the League of Nations, but the convention drafted in 1937 never came into existence. It defined terrorism as "all 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."

Nevertheless, the United Nations has long been active in the fight against international terrorism. Reflecting the determination of the international community to eliminate this threat, the UN and its agencies have developed a wide range of international legal agreements that enable the international community to act to suppress terrorism and bring those responsible to justice.

A consensus on the terminology would, however, be necessary for a single comprehensive convention on terrorism, which some countries favour in place of the present 12 conventions and protocols.10 Dating back to 1963, these agreements provide the basic legal tools to combat international terrorism in its many forms –from the seizure of aircraft to hostage-taking to the financing of terrorism. A majority of countries have ratified many of these and, with the completion of the ratification process; the most recent one came into force in April 2002. The UN General Assembly, the International Civil Aviation Organisation, the International Maritime Organisation and the International Atomic Energy Agency have developed such agreements.

In addition to these documents, there are also other instruments that may be relevant to particular circumstances, such as bilateral extradition treaties, the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the 1963 Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. Moreover, there are now a number of important UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on international terrorism dealing with specific incidents.

The lack of agreement on a definition of terrorism has been a major obstacle to meaningful international countermeasures. Cynics have often commented that one state's 'terrorist' is another state's 'freedom fighter'.11 In fact, this debate still constitutes the main deadlock to

the finalisation of the Comprehensive Convention on the Elimination of Terrorism, one of two draft multilateral agreements that are currently being negotiated at the Legal Committee of the General Assembly.12

General Assembly resolution A/RES/51/210, adopted in 1999, on the measures to eliminate international terrorism included some important elements on the definition of terrorism. For example:

"1   Strongly condemns all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomsoever committed;

2   Reiterates that 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 other nature that may be invoked to justify them."

A comprehensive definition of terrorism in the UN, on which academic consensus seemed to have emerged, was, however, developed by a terrorism expert A. P. Schmid to the then United Nations Crime Branch in 1988. It reads as follows:

"Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-)clandestine individual, group or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby –in contrast to assassination– the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat- and violence-based communication processes between terrorist (organization), (imperiled) victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target (audience(s)), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought."13

In the UN's history, again Schmid proposed the shortest legal definition of terrorism. In 1992, he suggested in a report for the same Branch that it might be a good idea to take the existing consensus on what constitutes a war crime as a point of departure.   If the core of war crimes –deliberate attacks on civilians, hostage taking and the killing of prisoners– is extended to peacetime, we could simply define acts of terrorism as peacetime equivalents of war crimes.

On the other hand, the Declaration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism, which the General Assembly adopted in 1994, and the Declaration to supplement the 1994 Declaration, adopted in 1996, condemn all acts and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomever committed, and urge all states to take national and international measures to eliminate international terrorism.

The Security Council –as the principal international organ dealing with international peace and security– has also long been involved in the fight against terrorism. Immediately after the September 11 attacks, in Resolution 1368 (2001), it condemned in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks against the United States and called on all states to work together urgently to bring the perpetrators to justice. By Resolution 1333 (2000), it demanded that Afghanistan's Taliban authorities act swiftly to close all camps where terrorists are trained. By Resolution 1269 (1999),   it unequivocally condemned all acts of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, and called on member states to adopt specific measures. By Resolution 1267 (1999), it demanded that the Taliban turn over Osama bin Laden to appropriate authorities so that he could be brought to justice. Furthermore, the Council adopted on 28 September 2001, Resolution 1373 (2001) on terrorism, a substantial text that, inter alia, created a Counter Terrorism Committee with the participation of 15 Council members.

For its part, the General Assembly, the day after the September 11 attacks, strongly condemned the heinous acts of terrorism and called for urgent action to enhance international co-operation to prevent and eradicate acts of terrorism.

As the Chief-Executive of the United Nations, the Secretary-General, addressing the General Assembly, stressed that all nations of the world must be united in their solidarity with the victims of terrorism, as well as in their determination to take action, both against the terrorists themselves and against all those who give them any kind of shelter, assistance or encouragement.

SEPTEMBER 11 AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF TERRORISM

As in the case of a definition of terrorism, there is no single classification of terrorism. Hoffman14 talks about ethno-nationalist or separatist terrorism, religious terrorism and state-sponsored terrorism. Eqbal Ahmad15 identifies five types of terrorism: state terrorism, religious terrorism (Catholics and Protestants, Sunnis and Shiites killing each other), criminal terrorism, political terrorism, and oppositional terrorism. The Council on Foreign Relations discusses at least six different sorts of terrorism:16 nationalist, religious, state-sponsored, left-wing, right-wing and anarchist.

There are also groupings based on different characteristics of terrorists who want to use weapons of mass destruction. Laqueur prefers to talk about six types of terrorists:17 the first category consists of deranged individuals; the second, apocalyptic religious or religious-nationalist groups who believe the end is near for a sinful world; the third covers fanatical nationalist groups consumed by hatred against another national group in their midst or in a neighbouring country; the fourth consists of terrorist groups engaged in a long struggle without evident success and without much hope of it; the fifth embraces terrorists acting on behalf of a state or even criminal terrorist groups and who may calculate that the damage caused and the number of victims would be devastating but still limited. The final category includes small groups of individuals who suffer from one delusion or another and have personal grievances rather than political ones.

Here is a comparison between September 11and different types of terrorism:

A) September 11 and Nationalist Terrorism

Nationalist terrorists seek to form a separate state for their own national group, often by drawing attention to a fight for 'national liberation' that they think the world has ignored. This sort of terrorism has been among the most successful at winning international sympathy and concessions. Experts say that nationalist terror groups have tended to calibrate their use of violence, using enough to rivet world attention but not so much that they alienate supporters abroad or members of their base community. Nationalist terrorism can be difficult to define since many groups accused of the practice insist that they are not terrorists but freedom fighters.

Based on this definition, it would be erroneous to call the September 11 attacks nationalist terrorism. It is clear that Al Qaeda does not have a particular nationality and neither is its ultimate goal a national one. As the prime suspect for September 11, Osama bin Laden, a jihadist, simply believes the restored world would recreate the early seventh-eight century Caliphate when, in his distorted understanding of Islamic history, a righteous leader ruled over an undivided umma (community of believers),18 achieving a perfect unity of religious and political authority over the lands of Islam.   So, it is naturally different from any national liberation movement.

Hoffman connects this type of terrorism with the developments of the post-colonial era. In the historical background of the anti-colonial struggles of the 1950s, he argues, the relationship that today exists between Sinn Fein and the paramilitary Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland has a historical parallel in the ethnarchy and the paramilitary National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters (EOKA) of Cyprus forty-five years ago, with the Greek-Cypriot leader,

Archbishop Makarios, playing the role Sinn Fein's leader, Gerry Adams, performs today.19 I do not see any such prospective role for bin Laden for obvious reasons.

Included in this general description is the tendency to calibrate the use of force. However, one cannot challenge the very basic fact that the September 11 attacks were designed to cause casualties on a massive scale. This target, unfortunately, was achieved.

As far as being successful at winning international sympathy and concessions is concerned, I have complex views. I admit to a certain extent that the anti-colonial terrorism campaigns such as those conducted by EOKA, Front for National Liberation (FLN, in Algeria) or the Palestinian Liberation Organisation demonstrated that terrorism does 'work'. There is, however, an explicit contrary example: the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK), which sought to create an independent Kurdish state from part of Turkey. The PKK's policy collapsed in the late 1990s through the determined policies of successive Turkish governments and the Turkish security forces' capture of the PKK's chieftain. From the perspective of success in realising its ultimate aim, Al Qaeda cannot be considered in this category, although its leader and his collaborators find an undeniable sympathy for the way they have manipulated grievances and symbols.

B) September 11 and Religious Terrorism

Religious terrorists seek to use violence to further what they see as divinely commanded purposes, often targeting broad categories of foes in an attempt to bring about sweeping changes. Religious terrorists come from all major faiths, as well as from small cults. Because religious terrorists are concerned not with rallying a constituency of fellow nationalists or ideologues but with pursuing their own vision of the divine will, they lack one of the major constraints that historically has limited the scope of terror attacks.

For Hoffman, religious terrorism tends to be more lethal than secular terrorism because of the radically different value systems, mechanisms of legitimisation and justification, concepts of morality, and Manichean worldviews that directly affect the 'holy' terrorists' motivation. For the religious terrorist, violence is a sacramental act or divine duty, executed in direct response to some theological demand or imperative and justified by scripture. Religion therefore functions as a legitimising force, specifically sanctioning widespread and large-scale violence against almost an open-ended category of opponents (i.e., all peoples who are not members of the religious terrorists' religion or cult). This explains why clerical sanction is so important for religious terrorists and why religious figures are often required to 'bless' (i.e., approve) terrorist operations before they are executed.20

This description obviously covers, but is not confined to Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda network. Religious terrorist groups include, the Palestinian Sunni Muslim organisation Hamas, the Lebanese Shi'ite group Hizbollah, the radical Jewish groups affiliated with the late Rabbi Meir Kahane, the Israeli extremists Baruch Goldstein (who machine-gunned Muslim worshipers in a Hebron mosque in 1994) and Yigal Amir (who assassinated Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in 1995), some American white-supremacist militias and the Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan.

Almost every expert who deals with terrorism claims that this type of terrorism is growing swiftly. Hoffman notes that in 1995 (the most recent year for which such statistics were available), nearly half of the 56 known, active international terrorist groups were religiously motivated.21

Al Qaeda grew out of an Islamic religious movement called Salafiyya –a name derived from al-Salaf al-Salih, the venerable forefathers, which refers to the generation of the Prophet Mohammed and his companions. Salafis regard the Islam that most Muslims practice today as polluted by idolatry; they seek to reform Islam by emulating the first generation of Muslims, whose pristine society they consider to have best reflected God's wishes for humans. The Wahhabi ideology of the Saudi state, for example, and the religious doctrines of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and a host of voluntary religious organisations around the Islamic world are all Salafi.22 Of all branches of Islamic adherence, Wahhabism, to which bin Laden belongs, is the least tolerant toward Christians, Jews and non-Sunni Muslims. In fact, it considers Shi'ite Islam to be blasphemous. Bin Laden's statements are confirmation enough of this intolerance and demonstrates his hateful and violent worldview towards Western civilisation, in general, and the US as its leader, in particular.

Osama bin Laden is in the vanguard of fundamental Islamic terrorism. The September 11 attacks he masterminded and his associates perpetrated demonstrated the sheer magnitude of the growing lethality of religiously motivated terrorism. But, however incomplete, it is incorrect to identify it solely with religious terrorism in the traditional sense, since there are distinct commonalities with other types as well.

C) September 11 and State-Sponsored Terrorism

This type of terrorism is a contemporary phenomenon, in rise and persistence. State-sponsored terrorism describes a situation where a government gives active and often clandestine support, encouragement and assistance to a terrorist group. Radical states sponsor terrorist groups as a deliberate foreign policy tool –as Hoffman puts it, as "a cost-effective way of waging war covertly, through the use of surrogate warriors or 'guns for hire'."23 With

enhanced resources at their disposal, state-sponsored terrorist groups are often capable of carrying out more deadly attacks than other terrorists, including aerial bombings.

Hoffman argues that acts of violence terrorists secretly working for governments perpetrate are relatively inexpensive and, if executed properly, a potentially risk-free means of anonymously attacking stronger enemies and thereby avoiding the threat of international punishment or reprisal.

The US State Department says Iran is the primary state-sponsor of terrorism today. It also accuses Cuba, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan and Syria of sponsoring terrorism. In the same source, the state-sponsored terrorist groups mentioned include Hizbollah (backed by Iran), the Abu Nidal Organisation (now backed by Iraq) and the Japanese Red Army (which often worked on contracts for Libya).

One important early case was the Iranian government's use of supposedly independent young militants to seize hostages at the American embassy in Tehran in 1979. The shipment of Iranian-sourced arms on the vessel Karine-A to the Palestinian Authority and the Iraqi government's rewarding of Palestinian suicide bombers' families could be considered in this regard.

One might ask the question whether Al Qaeda is a state-sponsored terrorist group. Some experts saw Taliban rule in Afghanistan as a new type of state-sponsored terrorism, although Afghanistan is not on the US State Department's list of 'states of concern'. Since the Taliban worked so closely with Al Qaeda while in power, some experts considered Taliban-ruled Afghanistan to be a state that, to some degree was itself run by a terrorist group. Morse24 says that before September 11 the Saudi government, one of the two states that officially recognised the Taliban, supplied 100 thousand barrels of oil a day to Afghanistan. A significant portion of income generated thereby is believed to have been allocated to Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda.

D) September 11 and Left-wing Terrorism

Left-wing terrorists are out to destroy capitalism and replace it with a communist or socialist regime. Because they perceive most civilians as suffering under capitalist exploitation, left-wing terrorists have sometimes limited their use of violence to avoid hurting the victims they were out to save. Instead, left-wing terrorists sometimes focus on tactics such as kidnapping tycoons or symbolically bombing monuments.

Germany's Baader-Meinhof Group, the Japanese Red Army, America's Weathermen of the 1970s, Greece's 17 November group and Italy's Red Brigades are primary examples of left-wing terrorist groups.

Laqueur contends that the sudden resurgence of left-wing terrorism in the late 1960s and 1970s had an unfortunate impact on terrorism studies. The news media, along with some academics, tended to take slogans of contemporary terrorists at face value while ignoring terrorism's lengthy history as well as its despicable nature. This led them to see terrorism as a new and unprecedented phenomenon; something that was essentially a response to injustice. If political, social, and economic justice could be achieved, the argument ran, there would be no terrorism, and so the way to deal with it was to address its root causes –i.e., the grievances, stresses and frustrations that lay behind the violence. Seen in this light, terrorists were fanatical believers driven to despair by intolerable conditions. They were poor and oppressed; their inspiration was deeply ideological.25

One might think that, from the perspective of the September 11 perpetrators, today's world was subjugated by injustice and that they felt desperate and isolated. At first glance, this appears similar to left-wing terrorist motives. Yet, the cause of the September 11 hijackers, Atta, Al-Shehhi and their associates, was neither secular nor national. They did not care for social and economic issues. They used violence excessively, indiscriminately and in a most brutal way.

E) September 11 and Right-wing Terrorism

Right-wing terrorism has often been characterised as the least discriminating, most senseless type of contemporary political violence. It has earned this reputation mostly as a result of seemingly mindless 'street' violence and unsophisticated attacks that in recent years have increasingly targeted immigrants, refugees, guest workers and other foreigners in many European countries, especially in eastern Germany and other former communist-bloc states. Their ends are hardly clear. Essentially, their ostensible goal is the destruction of the liberal-democratic state to clear the way for a renascent National Socialist (Nazi) or fascist one. The majority of right-wing groups do not espouse any specific programme or reform, preferring to hide behind vague slogans of strident nationalism, the need for racial purity and re-assertion of governmental strength. Like other terrorist organisations, the more sophisticated right-wing groups also seek targets that are likely to advance their cause.26 Right-wing terrorists frequently attack immigrants and refugees from the developing world and are racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic.

Although nationalist-separatist terrorism continues with undiminished fervour in various parts of the world, it is a fact that terrorism from the left has sharply declined while terrorism from the extreme right has increased.

To what extent can September 11 be considered right-wing terrorism?

Though Osama bin Laden and his associates are purportedly seeking the 'purity' of Islam and their targets in New York and in Washington DC were supposedly to advance their cause, their goal is not to establish a fascist state, but rather to unite the umma. They do not use violence against immigrants or refugees, but against people that they arbitrarily and unauthoritatively define as infidels and heretics in the path of Allah. Furthermore, unlike the majority of right-wing groups, Osama bin Laden and his terrorist network have a political agenda, which is discussed below.

F) September 11 and Anarchist Terrorism

From the 1870s until about 1920, anarchist terrorism was a major global phenomenon. Revolutionaries seeking to overthrow established governments launched a wave of bombings and assassinated a series of heads of state; one such victim was the 25th President of the US, William McKinley, who, among the four assassinated US presidents, was killed in 1901 by a young Hungarian refugee influenced by anarchist sentiments.

Some experts see signs of a new interest in anarchist violence rising out of the recent wave of protests against globalisation. This is particularly valid for the European Union. In February 2001, a Europol seminar on counter-terrorism held in Madrid agreed on a Spanish, Portuguese, Greek and Italian proposal to set up a joint team to investigate anarchist terrorism. It appears that after the events in Genoa in July 2001, Europol may have set up an analysis file on anarchist terrorism, which in turn fed through into the EU Situation Report27 issued on terrorism. Examples of anarchist terrorism in Europe today are to be found almost solely in Italy and to a lesser extent in Spain.

From this perspective, one might wonder whether September 11 fits into this category. To a very limited extent, maybe. But bin Laden's cause is not social equity; he is not some distorted reflection of the anti-globalisation movement, although despair, inequity and corruption are slogans making up his camouflage. One should remember that the very bleakest offshoot of Islamic extremism, which Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda represent, indiscriminately targets not only Westerners but also fellow Muslims, regardless of how much they are globalised. In fact, it is the phenomenon of globalisation that has spread terrorism around the world.

SEPTEMBER 11 AS A NEW FORM OF TERRORISM

'New terrorism' is not a young coinage. As a term, it gained usage in the last decade.

Simon and Benjamin assert that the old paradigm of predominantly state-sponsored terrorism has been joined by a new, religiously motivated terrorism that neither relies on the support of sovereign states nor is constrained by restraints on violence that state sponsors have observed or placed on their proxies. Its harbingers include the 1993 World Trade Center bombing in New York,   the 1995 sarin gas attack in the Tokyo subway, and the 1998 East Africa bombings. In the effort to inflict damage on a grand scale, say the authors, some practitioners of new terrorism seek to acquire weapons of mass destruction.[28]

Experts argue that this vastly more threatening new terrorism aims to produce casualties on a massive scale. Although the new terrorism stems from a welter of causes, and cannot be considered the invention of any single individual, the face of this phenomenon belongs to Osama bin Laden, who has organised a network of operatives in more than 50 countries.

Tucker says that the new terrorism is reputedly distinguished from the old by its unique structure, a new kind of recruit and its different attitude toward violence. The new structure is a network, facilitated by information technology; the new personnel are amateurs, who often come together in ad hoc or transitory groupings; and the new attitude is an increased willingness to cause mass casualties –a willingness to go as far as using chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons. For him, this network, unlike a hierarchy, cannot be destroyed by decapitation.[29] This brings to mind the question of deployed cells and whether Al Qaeda will survive after Osama bin Laden.

Roy places his arguments in the centre of Islamic radicalism and says that new radicals belong to religious, internationalist and "nomadic" networks. He characterises recent radical movements with three factors. First, they are ideologically very conservative, struggling for the total implementation of Shari'ah, and do not care for social and economic issues as did the Islamists. They are closer to Saudi Wahhabism than to the left-influenced revolutionary Islam of Khomeini. Second, their only strategic agenda is to wage jihad to reconstitute the "Muslim community" (ummah) beyond national and ethnic divides (hence their support for the various jihad at the periphery of the Muslim world –Kashmir, The Philippines, Chechnya, Uzbekistan, Bosnia and so forth). In this sense, they are genuinely global. Third, and quite logically, they recruit among uprooted cosmopolite, "de-territorialised" militants, themselves a social product of globalisation: many migrated to find employment or educational opportunities. They travel easily and change their citizenship. In their use of English, computers, satellite telephones and other technology, they are an authentic product of the modern, globalised world. Their battlefield is the whole world from New Jersey to The Philippines.[30]

What Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda represent is certainly this new type of terrorism. It has common denominators with almost all the classical types of terrorism summarised above, yet it also has its own characteristics. Before elaborating on the general characteristics of September 11, however, it might be useful to touch upon the political agenda of Osama bin Laden –an agenda that distinguishes him and Al Qaeda from the other terrorist movements.

In counter-terrorist doctrines, some academicians consider Osama bin Laden an exemplar of the 'war paradigm'. For them, this paradigm holds that terrorist acts arise when weaker parties cannot challenge an adversary directly and thus turn to asymmetric methods whereby they overcome their comparative disadvantages and in fact, gain the upper hand. A war paradigm implies taking a strategic, campaign-oriented view of violence that makes no specific call for concessions from, or other demands upon, the opponent.[31]

This reminds us of the tactical[32] and strategic goals of Osama bin Laden. Doran argues that polarising the Islamic world between the umma and the regimes allied with the United States would help achieve bin Laden's primary goal: furthering the cause of Islamic revolution within the Muslim world itself, in the Arab lands especially and above all in Saudi Arabia. He has no intention of defeating America. War with the US was not a goal in and of itself but rather an instrument designed to help his brand of extremist Islam survive and flourish among the believers. Bin Laden calls America "the Hubal[33] of the age", he suggests that it is the primary focus of idol worship and that it is polluting the Kaaba, a symbol of Islamic purity. His imagery has a double resonance: it portrays American culture as a font of idolatry while rejecting the American military presence on the Arabian peninsula. The peninsula is, by definition, the Holy Land of Islam; a place barred to infidels (though it was the same Wahhabis that collaborated with the British against the Muslim Turks).

In bin Laden's imagery, the leaders of the Arab and Islamic worlds today are hypocrites and idol worshippers cowering behind America, the Hubal of the age. His sword jabs simultaneously at the United States and the governments allied with it. His attack was designed to force those governments to choose: "You are either with the idol worshipping enemies of God or you are with true believers."

Declaration of war calls, on the one hand, for unity in the face of external aggression and demands an end to internecine warfare, and on the other, it calls in essence for revolution in Saudi Arabia.[34] It clearly demonstrates the internal war among the believers. Thus, bin Laden's strategic goal could be summarised as overthrowing the secular regimes in the Arab world and installing purely Islamic governments. Officially, he is committed to a world-wide Islamic state but, for now, he focuses on eradicating infidels from Islamic lands.

Eqbal Ahmad approaches this matter by exploring the word 'jihad.' He says, 'jihad', which has been translated a thousand times as "holy war", is not quite that. 'jihad' in Arabic means "to struggle".   It could be violent or non-violent struggle. There are two forms,   the 'small jihad' and the 'big jihad'. The 'small jihad' involves external violence. The 'big jihad' involves a struggle within oneself.35

For radical Islam, which serves as a melting pot for Salafiyya doctrine, Taqfir and Wahhabism, anti-Westernism is important, but it is certainly not its only specific feature. Most of the violence exercised by radical Islamists is directed neither against Westerners nor 'Zionists', but against other Arabs or Muslims. The jihad has turned inward as the radicals have come to believe that the evil at home has to be eradicated before the infidels abroad can be destroyed.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SEPTEMBER 11

In today's world, with modern technology and means of communication, the targets have also been globalised. Therefore, the globalisation of violence is a parallel outcome of what we call globalisation of the economy and culture in the world as a whole. We cannot expect everything else to be globalised and violence not. In fact, the expansion of terrorism's global reach is an instance of globalisation.

Keohane asserts that often, globalism and globalisation have been defined narrowly as economic integration on a global scale; but whatever appeal such a definition may have had, it has surely disappeared after September 11. To adopt it would be to imply that "globalised informal violence" (Keohane substitutes this phrase for "terrorism"), which takes advantage of modern technologies of communication, transportation, explosives and, potentially, biology, somehow threatens to hinder or reduce the level of globalism. Keohane believes that globalised informal violence strengthens one dimension of globalism –the networks through which means of violence flow– while potentially weakening globalism along other dimensions, such as economic and social exchange.36

The general characteristics of the September 11 terrorist acts could be summarised as follows:37

1.   Leaving aside Pearl Harbor, the United States, for the first time in its history, has become the target of a foreign attack at home. Therefore, September 11 created a deep shock in the entire American nation. Thus, the very phenomenon of globalism,   by means of

globalised terrorism, destroyed the sense of security hitherto enjoyed by Americans in their homeland.

2.   Taking into account the assistance provided by US Governments to the Mujahidin, one can easily argue that the masterminds and perpetrators of September 11 were in fact, at least inadvertently created by the US itself. Bin Laden, who once was a collaborator of the US, felt betrayed by the growing US presence in the Middle East, and committed revenge.

3.   September 11 used a faction of Islam (radical Sunni Islam and Wahhabism) as an ideology. This may result in the reassessment of Islam in the Arab World and other Islamic countries, in particular in totalitarian Islamic states.

4.   The Arab-Israeli conflict is referred to as one of the underlying reasons of September 11. As such, it is expected that the international community will attach particular importance to efforts aimed at finding a just, lasting and a comprehensive solution to the Middle East question.

5.   The suicide crash of two hijacked planes into the Twin Towers not only destroyed the Towers, but was also a blow to the American lifestyle, which the Towers symbolised to many Americans.

6.   September 11 has not only demonstrated that people can commit themselves to suicide missions, but that the means of public transportation can be easily converted into terrorist weaponry. A new era has been opened for the safety of all means of transportation and communication in the modern world.

7.   The September 11 attacks were accomplished by using open information. In the future, some restrictions and limitations on individuals' access to this type of information may be imposed. Suffice to say that official documents on how to make anthrax were until recently available on the Internet from government sources.

8.   On September 11, aircraft were used as a means of terror. Without doubt, this will lead to the emergence of a new era in travel restrictions as well as in airport and airline security.

9.   The September 11 terror acts have clearly shown the difficulty of controlling individual and organised terror. Since the global control of terror acts and organisations is quite difficult, the nation-state model will continue to be relevant. It is also fair to expect that the support some countries give to local separatist movements will have to be curtailed.

10.   The determination of the US and its allies in fighting terrorism may trigger a response from terrorist networks. Anthrax cases could be considered in this regard. It would be wrong to ignore the possibility that this could escalate to war. In fact, Osama bin Laden asserts that he has weapons of mass destruction.

11.   Last, but certainly not least, September 11 has given the US the opportunity to attempt to hold the international order under its leadership and according to American priorities. It would be, therefore, appropriate to consider the fight against terrorism as a long-lasting action and not to exclude its possible expansion to other phases. Iraq is the most recent example.

CONCLUSION

Terrorism does not have a clear-cut and internationally recognised definition. Yet, there is a broad consensus on its various aspects. Violence is a sine qua non for terrorism. It is lethal. In the political sense, terrorism is an assault on civil order. It would be misleading to try to define terrorism only from one perspective. It is a multidisciplinary subject. It is as much a historical and political phenomenon as a sociological and psychological one.

Its motives can differ, as can the counter-measures. Terrorism does not appear in one form. Therefore, one might talk about different types of terrorism. Today, the most distinct feature of terrorism is its globalised nature. As a matter of fact, it has become more dangerous.

September 11 was neither the first nor the last terrorist act. Neither is the US the only country in history that has been subjected to such a sheer magnitude of violence. Turkey, for instance, is one of the very few nations that has faced multidimensional terrorist assaults in the last 30 years: in the 1970s, Armenian terrorism clearly targeted Turkey and its interests; in the same years, left- and right-wing of terrorism disrupted Turkish society; ethnic-separatist terrorism emerged in the 1980s; and, in the 1990s, religious terrorism struck at the secular and democratic order.

However, September 11 was in many ways unique.   It encompasses particular elements from all types of terrorism. Classical terrorism might fall short of describing September 11. Therefore, this paper considers September 11 to be 'new terrorism'. It is terrorism with radical religious motivations and aims to produce casualties on a massive scale. It is indiscriminate in selecting targets.

Terrorism has no geography, and no religion. The September 11 terror acts were persecuted by Islamist radicals who reject the Western way of life and Western values, revolt against modernity in general and call for jihad. Yet, these phenomena are by no means totally alien to Western civilisation. The concept of crusade, after all, is not Islamic: Christianity has also carried out holy wars. European fascism was also a revolt against the West, the Enlightenment and humanism.

Terrorism is an evolving process, rather than a static paradigm. A look at the ground that has been covered in this evolution from the reign of terror of the Jacobins in post-revolutionary France, to Al Qaeda and September 11 speaks for itself. Thus, even this 'new terrorism' can be expected to become outdated in time. That is the challenge we will continue to face in our struggle against this menace.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu Khalil, As'ad, Bin Laden, Islam and 'America's New War on Terrorism', New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002.

Ahmad, Eqbal, Terrorism Theirs & Ours, New York: Open Media Pamphlet Series, 2001.

Clausewitz, Carl von, On War, London: Woodsworth Editions Limited, 1997.

Doran, Michael Scott, 'Somebody Else's Civil War', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 81, No. 1, January-February 2002.

Elliot, Michael, 'Retaliation', Time, special issue, 24 September 2001.

Freedman, Lawrence, 'The Third World War?', Survival, Vol. 43, No. 4, winter 2001.

Freedman, Thomas, 'A Memo from Osama', New York Times, 26 June 2001.

Gompert, David C., 'The Day After: An Assessment', Survival, Vol. 43, No. 4, winter 2001.

Hoffman, Bruce, Inside Terrorism, New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Hoge, James F. and Gideon Rose (eds.), How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Book, 2001.

Howard, Michael, 'What's in a Name?', Foreign Affairs, Vol. 81, No. 1, January-February 2002.

Huntington, Samuel P., The Clash of Civilizations: Remaking World Order, New York: Touchstone, 1996.

Huntington, Samuel P., 'The Age of Muslim Wars', Newsweek, 17 December 2001.

Jacquard, Roland, In the Name of Osama Bin Laden: Global Terrorism and the bin Laden Brotherhood, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.

Jürgensmeyer, Mark, Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001.

Keohane, Robert O., 'The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and 'The Liberalism of Fear'', Social Science Research Council-September 11 Essays, fall 2001.

Kennedy, David M., 'It's Been Dark Before', New York Times, 28 October 2001.

Kongar, Emre, Küresel Terör ve Türkiye - Küreselleşme, Huntington, 11 Eylül, Remzi Kitabevi, 2001.

Laqueur, Walter, The New Terrorism, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Lesser, Ian O., Bruce Hoffman, John Arquilla, David Ronfeldt, Michaele Zanini, Countering the New Terrorism, Washington DC: RAND Publications, 1999.

Lewis, Bernard, The Multiple Identities of the Middle East, New York: Schocken Books, 1998.

Lewis, Bernard, What Went Wrong? Western Impact and Middle Eastern Response, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

McGeary, Johanna and Biema, David van, 'Inside the Conspiracy', Time, special issue, 24 September 2001.

National Interest, The Terror, Washington DC: National Interest, 2001.

Parenti, Michael, The Terrorism Trap: September 11 and Beyond, San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2002.

Roy, Olivier, Bruce Hoffman, Reuven Paz, Steven Simon and Daniel Benjamin, 'America and the New Terrorism: An Exchange', Survival, Vol. 42, No. 2, summer 2000.

Roy, Olivier, 'Neo-Fundamentalism', Social Science Research Council-September 11 Essays, fall 2001.

Silvers, Robert B. and Epstein, Barbara (eds.), Striking Terror: America's New War, New York: New York Review Book, 2002.

Simon, Steven and Benjamin, Daniel, 'America and the New Terrorism', Survival, Vol. 42, No.1, spring 2000.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie, 'A Defining Moment in the Parsing of War', Washington Post, 16 September 2001.

Smith, Neil, 'Global Executioner: Scales of Terror', Social Science Research Council-September 11 Essays, fall 2001.

Steel, Ronald, 'The Weak at War with the Strong', New York Times, 14 September 2001.

Talbott, Strobe and Chanda, Nayan (eds.), The Age of Terror. New York: Basic Books, 2001.

Tucker, David, 'What is New about the New Terrorism and How Dangerous is It?', Terrorism and Political Violence, Vol. 13. No. 3, autumn 2001.

Woodward, Susan. 'On War and Peace-Building: Unfinished Legacy of the 1990s'. Social Science Research Council-September 11 Essays, fall 2001.

Zinn, Howard, Terrorism and War, New York: Seven Stories Press, 2001.

---

1   Howard Lentner's presentation on 17 April 2002 at The Graduate Center of the City University of New York.

2   Susan Woodward, 'On War and Peace Building: Unfinished Legacy of the 1990s', Social Science Research Council: September 11 Essays, fall 2001.

3   UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/56/1 and UN Security Council Resolution 1368 (2001)

4   North Atlantic Council Statement of 12 September 2001.

5   Anne-Marie Slaughter, 'A Defining Moment in the Parsing of War', Washington Post, 16 September 2001.

6   Bruce Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

7   Robert O. Keohane, 'The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics and   'The Liberalism of Fear'', Social Science Research Council: September 11 Essays, fall 2001.

8   Lawrence Freedman, 'The Third World War?', Survival, 43, No. 4, winter 2001, pp. 61-88.

9   Eqbal Ahmad gives an interesting explanation for this phenomenon. He argues that officials do not define terrorism because definitions involve a commitment to analysis, comprehension and adherence to some norms of consistency. Terrorism: Theirs and Ours, 'Foreword' and 'Interview' by David Barsamian, New York: Open Media Pamphlet Series, 2001, p. 13. Nietzsche says that only things, which have no history, can be defined. Walter Laqueur, referring to Nietzsche, writes that terrorism, needless to say, has had a very long history, The New Terrorism, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999, p.6.

10   For the whole list of multilateral UN documents, search http://untreaty.un.org

11   For historical background to this debate, see Hoffman, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

12   The other one is the Convention on the Prevention of Nuclear Terrorism. India proposed the draft text of the Comprehensive Convention on the Elimination of Terrorism. It is aimed to prevent all terrorist acts, including those already adopted international conventions and protocols do not cover.

13   http://www.odccp.org/odccp/terrorism_definitions.html

14   Hoffman, op. cit.

15   Ahmad, op. cit.

16   For details see Council on Foreign Relations at: www.terrorismanswers.com

17   Laqueur, op. cit.

18   For Bernard Lewis umma seems to mean no more than a group of people, however defined-by descent,   by language, by creed, by conduct, or other. With the advent of Islam, the umma of the Arabs became the umma of Muhammad, a religiously defined community from which unbelieving Arabs were excluded, and which non-Arabs could join by conversion. In Persian and Turkish, which adopted the term umma along with many other Koranic terms, the word retained a purely religious connotation, and is little used at the present time.

19   Hoffman, op. cit., p. 60.

20   Ian O. Lesser, Bruce Hoffman, John Arquilla, David Ronfeldt, Michele Zanini, Countering the New Terrorism, 'Foreword' by Michael Jenkins, Washington DC: RAND publication, 1999, p. 19.

21   Hoffman, op. cit., p. 93.

22   Michael Scott Doran, 'Somebody Else's Civil War', Foreign Affairs, 81, No. 1, January-February 2002,   pp. 22-42.

23   Hoffman, op. cit.

24   Presentation by Edward L. Morse on 1 May 2002 at The Graduate Center of the City University of New York on 'The International Political Economy – Oil'.

25   Walter Laqueur, 'Left, Right and Beyond' in James F. Hoge Jun. and Gideon Rose (eds.), How Did This Happen? Terrorism and The New War, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Book, 2001, pp. 71-82.

26   Hoffman, op. cit., pp. 164-165.

27   The report says that "anarchist terrorism" could be a symptom of the possible "resurrection of left wing terrorism" and refers to a series of terrorist attacks "in the southern part of the Union". In fact, all the incidents referred to were in Italy and the report claims that these examples could spark the return of EU-wide "left wing and anarchist terrorism". Investigations into a device that exploded in July 2001 outside the Palazzo di Giustizia in Venice after the G8 summit, included under the heading 'anarchist terrorism', are ongoing.

28   Steven Simon and Daniel Benjamin, 'America and the New Terrorism', Survival, Vol. 42, No. 1,   spring 2000, pp. 59-75.

29   David Tucker, 'What is New about New Terrorism and How Dangerous Is It?', Terrorism and Political Violence, Vol. 13, No. 3, autumn 2001, pp. 1-14.

30   Olivier Roy, Bruce Hoffman, Reuven Paz, Steven Simon and Daniel Benjamin, 'America and the New Terrorism: An Exchange', Survival, Vol. 42, No. 2, summer 2000, pp. 156-172.

31   Lesser, Hoffman, Arquilla, Ronfeldt, and Zanini, op. cit., p. 69.

32   Carl von Clausewitz says in On War, "According to our classification, tactics is the theory of the use of the military forces in combat. Strategy is the theory of the use of combats for the object of the War".

33   An oracular deity whose statue —in human form and made of red carneol— stood in the Ka'ba until Muhammad destroyed it in 8 AH/630 CE. Until that moment, it had received numerous offerings from pilgrims. He gave oracles through seven arrows. Hubal was the tutelary deity of Mecca (Koran 17:83).

34   Doran, op. cit.

35   Ahmad, op. cit., p. 22.

36   Keohane, op. cit.

37   Emre Kongar, Küresel Terör ve Türkiye - Küreselleşme, Huntington, 11 Eylül , Istanbul, Remzi Yayınevi, December 2001.