

Security Issues in the Context of Political Violence and Terrorism of the 21st Century

Security Issues in the Context of Political Violence and Terrorism of the 21st Century

Edited by

Hasan Acar and Halil Emre Deniz

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Security Issues in the Context of Political Violence and Terrorism
of the 21st Century

Edited by Hasan Acar and Halil Emre Deniř

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2021 by Hasan Acar, Halil Emre Deniř and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6479-7

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6479-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Transformation of Security in the 21st Century and New Generation Terrorism	1
Yunus KARAAĞAÇ	
Terrorism as a Weapon of Hegemony	16
Emre BAYSOY and İrem Ece AKPINAR	
Critical Assessment of the Geneva Call’s Approach of Engaging Armed Non-State Actors	28
Mehmet Halil Mustafa BEKTAŞ	
Artificial Intelligence: Exploring the Potential in Enhancing the Safety and Security of Nuclear Reactors	41
Muhammad Ali BAIG and Hassan TARIQ	
Analysis of Developments in the Middle East in the Context of Political Violence and Radicalization	64
Hasan ACAR and Mustafa PEKCONDANOĞLU	
The Organizations Categorized as Terrorist in 21st Century Iran and Security Policies	88
Halil KANADIKIRIK and Raheb MOHAMMADI GHANBARLOU	
Turkey’s Overview of Security Issues in Syria and Iraq Since 2011	103
Ergenekon SAVRUN	
The Paradox of Islamist Terrorism in the Concept of Global Security....	127
Tacettin Gökhan ÖZÇELİK	
Borders, Terror and Immigration: The ISIS Case.....	143
Zuhal KARAKOÇ DORA	

The “Solution Process” and Trench Operations in Turkish Political Life	154
Halil Emre DENİŞ	
Terrorist Organizations Exploiting Religion within the Scope of Hybrid Warfare: The Case of FETO and DAESH.....	176
İbrahim İRDEM	
Countering Terrorism Ideologically: The Chinese Terrorism Strategy Case	195
A. İnci Sökmen ALACA	
Contributors.....	217

PREFACE

One of the biggest problems of our age is undoubtedly the problem of security. This concept, which is among the most basic needs of human beings, has become a sensitive issue in the face of the speed of technological developments.

The process of change experienced by states and societies in the modern age has made it increasingly difficult to protect public order and to ensure public security. In an era where globalization is increasing at full speed and the world is getting smaller, security threats are not only bound by the internal dynamics of the country, but also the period in which external dynamics are effective.

Although societies differ in terms of their cultural, social, administrative and economic dimensions, some global events affect the future and security of societies all over the world. Just as an event in Europe can change the future and destiny of a society in Asia, on the contrary, terrorist-like incidents in the backward parts of the world can primarily affect public order and public security in developed countries. Therefore, the government's security policy is constantly trying to adapt to the age and experience in review.

In this work, especially with the participation of the political violence and radicalization concepts of very valuable academics, public order and public safety issues threatened by terrorist organizations are discussed.

Security and terrorism in the 21st century are undoubtedly major problem areas. Today's world has prepared for us a chaotic environment where relations are blurred and it is not clear where the threat will come from. In this process, living in a peaceful environment, both as a state and a citizen, brings with it some responsibilities.

This book evaluates the concepts of security and terrorism from the perspective of today's world. In this book, there are original and qualified studies on the concepts of security and terrorism. The transformation of terrorism in the 21st century is explained. Terrorism, which generally tries

to have an effect with hybrid structures, is now being supported by advanced technology.

This book is a resource for researchers interested in Political Science, International Relations and Security studies. It is also important in terms of explaining the concepts of security and terror in relation to the global and regional relations of today's world. We hope that it will be a helpful work for researchers and academics who will work in this field, both theoretically and through current events.

Hasan ACAR

Halil Emre DENİŞ

TRANSFORMATION OF SECURITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY AND NEW GENERATION TERRORISM

YUNUS KARAAĞAÇ*

1. Introduction

The developments in the 21st century show that most things will be much different than before. The phenomenon of globalization, with its acceleration, turns into political, social, economic, cultural, environmental, and military issues. The evolution of the concepts of security and terrorism is one of its best examples. This is why the world we live in is called a “risk society”.

With the termination of the Cold War era, the ideological competition of the bipolar world system came to an end, and the one-dimensional, nuclear threat oriented security perspective started to spread out. With globalization becoming evident; there have been important developments in the fields of transportation, communication, and technology. And this has brought the terrorism mentality and the tactics and actions of terrorist organizations to an international level. Terrorist organizations that renew their strategies with ethnic and religious motives instead of ideology brought out a new generation of terrorism. As a result of this situation, the September 11 attacks showed that terrorism is a global threat.

Security perceptions of the 21st century differ from those of the Cold War in many respects. While the main security concern in the Cold War process was conventional and interstate nuclear threats, security concerns diversified after the Cold War period; new threats such as organized crime, human trafficking, and drugs and weapons trafficking have come to the fore. But the factor that radically changed perceptions of security was terrorism, which turned into an asymmetrical structure.

* Ph.D. Candidate, Istanbul Arel University, Political Science and International Relations, Istanbul, Turkey, e-mail: yu_kara@hotmail.com ORCID: 0000-0002-6466-0302.

The structure of globalized terrorism, also referred to as a new generation of terrorism, differs from the understanding of terrorism of the 20th century in the context of the tools, equipment, target, scope, and strategy used. The new generation terrorism is one of the most serious threats in our age when up-to-date innovations in technology are used, weapons of mass destruction are obtained, uncertainty and asymmetry are preferred, and civilian losses are experienced at the maximum level.

The opposing concepts of security and terrorism are not static; they continue their transformation and take positions according to the conditions of the time. This study was prepared to analyze the phenomenon of new generation terrorism and the understanding of modern security.

2. Method

The literature review method was preferred in this study. The periodic transformation of the concept of security has been examined and a comparison between the old generation terrorism and the new generation terrorism has been made. The hypothesis is based on the globalization of terrorism as the main factor in the transformation of the security phenomenon. The actions of the new generation of terrorism were evaluated through the Al-Qaeda and ISIS organizations.

In this study, answers to the following questions were sought:

- In which dimensions did the transformation of security take place?
- What are the differences between old and new generation terrorism?
- What differences did globalization cause in terrorist acts?

3. Globalization and Security Conceptually

The history of the globalization phenomenon goes back to the Geographical Discoveries. The intercontinental journey of capitalism has initiated political, social, economic, and cultural interactions. The Geographical Discoveries, the first wave of globalization, followed by the Industrial Revolution deeply affected international, political, and economic relations. Developments in transportation and communications technology in the 1970s accelerated globalization. The end of the Cold War put into action the last wave of globalization.

Globalization is defined as the compression of time and space (Harvey 1989, 8), or a world where boundaries disappear (Ohmae 1992, 14).

Globalization is the interplay of technology, economic resources, and information sharing (Wells, Shuey, Kiely 2001, 4). The world has become a global village with globalization.

These statements reflect the impact of globalization on developments in communications, transportation, technology, and economy. But globalization has radically changed the traditional understanding of security. As the borders started to disappear, terrorism at the national level evolved to an international dimension and terrorist organizations have begun to easily reach out to new technologies. At this point, it is necessary to make a conceptual definition of security.

Security is one of the most basic human needs that have remained important from primitive human communities to the present day. Security is derived from the Latin word “*securitas*” etymologically. It means no threats (Wolfers 1952, 484-485). Security is expressed as states’ and societies’ quest to survive threats and their ability to maintain their independent identities and functional integrity against competing forces (Buzan, 1991, 433). Security is the absence of threat and liberation (Booth 1991, 319). Security is the ability to protect oneself from attacks that may come from outside (Luciani 1989, 151). Likewise, security; maintaining life is the development, freedom, and protection of identity (Wæver 2007, 67).

Security is the most basic value, and when it is lost, everything that it has is lost. So people, and especially states, try their best to destroy the elements that threaten their security (Morgan 2006, 1). Security is an important phenomenon for all living things, especially individual and collective people. It involves the elimination of a potential threat (Piwowarski 2020, 6). As a result, security is to live in the face of an existential threat and the protection of owned values (Buzan, Wæver, Wilde 1998, 27; Baldwin 1997, 11).

4. Historical Transformation of Security Approaches

The 1648 Westphalia order became a turning point in the nation-state regime. Since then, the understanding of the state and state security has become the most determining factor of the international system. Power and security were at the forefront (Hopkinson and Lindley-French 2017).

With the French Revolution of 1789, the understanding of power and security was accepted as regime security, and terrorist acts were carried

out by fear and oppression on the opponents of the revolution. The security perception has been synchronized with the idea of nationalism and the nation-state. On the other hand, in order not to separate and disperse the ideas of nationalism, empires used security as a precaution to protect the “status quo” (Karaağaç 2020a, 6). In the period between the 17th and 20th centuries, security served as a key for the survival of the states, and state security was prioritized over human and social security. Basic transformations in security approaches started with the First and Second World Wars.

The idea that security was handled only in the context of state security and that security should be ensured with conventional armed forces turned into a collective defense and total war approach in the First and Second World Wars (Ebeğbulem 2011, 24). Besides, new war tactics and weapon types also affected the transformation of security in these wars. For example, in the First World War; new combat vehicles such as aircraft, tanks, and submarines, and toxic gas were used (Fitzgerald 2008, 612). In the Second World War, “Blitzkrieg-Lightning War Tactics”¹ and nuclear bombs shook perceptions of security. The use of nuclear bombs by the US in Hiroshima and Nagasaki ended the Second World War and caused the beginning of the Cold War period, which lasted about 45 years (Karaağaç 2018, 111).

The process covering the period between 1945 and 1991 was defined as the “Cold War” between the blocs. Security was structured for the protection of the free world and the socialist system during this period when the western bloc was represented by the US-NATO, and the eastern bloc was represented by the USSR-Warsaw Pact (Kissinger 1994, 423-445; Jervis 2001, 36-60). The nuclear threat was seen as the main security hazard of this period, and the deterrence strategy was at the top of the system’s security (Wohlstetter 1959, 211-234).

A possible nuclear war situation directed the United States and the Soviet Union towards the “Mutual Assurance Destruction” (MAD) strategy, and system security perceptions of nuclear development were indexed. As of the nuclear period, the main purpose of military institutions was not to win

¹ It is a combat tactic based on the simultaneous deployment of armored motorized and parachute units to the weakest points detected on the enemy front (Hart 2007). This tactic, although conceptualized by the British Sir Basil Liddell Hart, was adopted not by the British General Staff but by the German General Staff and was exercised by Adolf Hitler.

the war but to prevent it: with the use of the atomic bomb, the side that achieves the victory has lost its importance (Brodie 1978, 65). In this direction, the USA and the USSR deterred each other from a hot war.

Ensuring security during the Cold War was based on the development and dissemination of nuclear weapons. Besides, the production of defense vehicles such as strategic bombing aircraft with the use of long-range weapons was given priority (CRS 2020).

As a result, the two great World Wars in the 20th century and the Cold War period that followed made the concept of security even more important within the scope of the national interest. US-USSR competition and nuclear strife left states and societies to worry about the emerging of a third world war (Griffiths, O'Callaghan, Roach 2008, 40-43).

The phenomenon of security, which developed as the maximization of nuclear and military power during the Cold War, acted on the realist axis. Threat perception is generally handled as one dimensional (nuclear threat). Since the Cold War period ended legally and factually, security perceptions have changed completely, and the scope and content of security have expanded with globalization (Karaağaç 2020a, 7).

The post-Cold War process defined by the “End of History” (Fukuyama 1989) gave the image of a globalized international system. Developments in the communications, transportation, and technology sectors, on the other hand, accelerated interaction between states and communities. However, as a result of globalization and inter-bloc fragmentation, the scope and number of ethnic and religious conflicts have increased and new security threats have appeared (Mearsheimer 1990; Brown 1993, 7).

With the end of the Cold War, problems such as ethnic and religious conflicts, xenophobia, human and weapons smuggling, and economic inequality have changed perceptions of security (Bilgin 2003, 207). The new understanding of security has expanded and deepened to three levels and five sectors. The three levels include individual, state, and international security. The five sectors constitute military, political, social, economic, and environmental security (Buzan 2008). Therefore, the one-dimensional military security concept has started to transform (Krause and Williams 1997, XII). The main factor in the transformation of security was terrorism, which has evolved into an international dimension.

The bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993, the Sarin gas attack (Olson 1999, 513) by Aum Shinrikyo in Tokyo in 1995, and the 1996

Oklahoma City and 1998 East Africa attacks were signs of a new phase of terrorism (Olivier, Hoffman, Paz, Simon, Benjamin 2000, 156). Samuel Huntington's (1993) "Clash of Civilizations" theory attempted to explain the post-Cold War terrorist acts carried out on an ethnic and religious basis. The September 11, 2001, Al-Qaeda attacks were a turning point in global terrorism and new security approaches.

The use of aircraft as missiles, as a weapon against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, considered to be a symbol of globalization, caused the death of about 3000 people (Murphy 2002, 237), and terrorist acts against the superpower showed that uncertainty and asymmetry are the main security threat. Donald Rumsfeld, who was the U.S. Secretary of Defense at the time said "The main issue in this century; is to protect our nation against the unknown, unseen and unexpected" (Rumsfeld 2002).

On September 20, 2001, US President Bush, in his speech to Congress declared: "The fight against terrorism will begin with the Al Qaeda terrorist organization, but it will not end with it. The war will continue until all terrorist organizations are identified and destroyed" (The White House 2001). Besides, the United States enacted its pre-emptive war strategy, also known as the "Bush Doctrine", against countries it considers to be a major threat to its security.

5. Terror, Terrorism, New Generation Terrorism

Terrorism, which etymologically derives from the Latin word "terrere", means to fear, to terrify. The first terrorist activities in history were carried out by the Jewish Sicarii in the 70s BC against the Roman state, but the organization of terrorist acts first came into being with the Assassins of Hasan Sabbah (Karaağaç 2019, 231). In its current sense, terrorism has been used to draw attention to the period of oppression and fear against anti-evolutionists since the French Revolution of 1789 (Bien 1990, 779).

There are international conventions that regulate terrorist acts such as airplane hijacking, hostage-taking, and human hijacking. But there is no consensus on how to define terror and terrorism (Mazari 2008, 84). A freedom fighter for one state can be a terrorist for another state (Lindberg 2010, 1). Accordingly, one state can use terrorism as a tool to break another state's power, take revenge on it, deter it, and interfere with its internal affairs (Ganor 2015, 73).

Terrorist acts are carried out to provoke and radicalize the relationship between the state and society. The main purpose of terrorist organizations is to distance the masses from the state (Hoffman and McCormick 2004, 246). As a result, terrorism is illegal acts carried out through oppression and violence.

Terrorism differs from other violent strategies in that it contains systematic and deliberate elements besides illegality (Netanyahu 2001, 8). Terrorism, to meet political demands, is the systematic application of murder or annihilation actions or threats for this purpose to intimidate individuals, society, or governments (Wilkinson 1977, 49).

According to another definition, terrorism is the calculated use or threat of violence on political, ideological, or religious grounds (Joint Publication 1-02, 2016). The main purpose of terrorism is not to destroy the symbolic target but to influence the masses (MCWP 3-35.3, 1998, 7-3). Terrorism is a threat of politically motivated power or violence (Weinberg, Pedahzur, Hirsch-Hoefler 2004, 786). This violence or threat of violence is generally directed towards civilian targets. Terrorism is also a strategy of violence that is planned, calculated, and implemented systematically to establish sovereignty in the absence of authority (Hoffman 2006, 23).

The background of terrorism is social division caused by ethnic, religious, sectarian, and linguistic differences (Reynal-Querol 2002, 29). Terrorists are not generally crazy or schizophrenic, but healthy and intelligent people (Weinberg 1992). The purpose of terrorists is based on controlling regime and policy change, land change, and social issues (Kydd and Walter 2006, 52).

Terrorism, acting on a regional scale until the end of the Cold War era, has reached the international level by crossing borders with the end of the ideological polarization. The phenomenon of globalizing terrorism has turned into a new dimension with the September 11 terrorist attacks. This dimension is expressed as new generation terrorism.

After the September 11 attacks, the following expression was used to describe the 21st century: "Age of Terrorism" (Chomsky 2015, 1). New generation terrorism has some features that are different from the phenomenon of terrorism. The first is that terrorists move across borders. The second is that they operate in loosely organized networks, unlike strong hierarchical structures (Crenshaw 2000, 411). The third feature is that they act largely with religious impulses rather than political and

nationalist ideologies. Fourth, they have the inventory that will allow them to kill as many people as possible, including weapons of mass destruction. Finally, they do not show any sensitivity in the selection of the victims and aim at maximum death (Duyvesteyn 2004, 443). In other words, new generation terrorism doesn't sit at the table; it wants to destroy the table, and everyone who sits at the table (Morgan 2004, 31).

New generation terrorism reflects the image of being ready for massacres without any discrimination. Also, the fact that everyone has the opportunity to access portable but extremely destructive weapons in the internet age facilitates serious consequences (Hobsbawm 2008). One of the main distinguishing points of new generation terrorism is that it acts together with ideological, ethnic, and religious instincts as well as political goals (Bremer 2001, 24). As a result, the security approaches of the 21st century are determined by new generation terrorism which is based on uncertainty, sudden attacks, and asymmetrical actions. Terrorism is seen as the biggest threat in the field of international security (Awan, Spiller, and Whiting 2019, 65).

6. Terrorist Organizations and Terrorist Acts in the 21st Century

Looking at the terrorist acts and terrorist organizations in the 21st century; factors such as maximum violence, network-centered structuring, the potential of having chemical-biological-nuclear weapons, cyber terrorism, lone wolf actions, brutality embellished with religious motifs, and suicide bombings are prominent (Lynch and Ryder 2012, 264). Therefore, we can state that terrorism and terrorist organizations, which benefited from the effects of globalization with the end of the Cold War period, have undergone major systemic, operational, and impact-based transformations, especially since the September 11 attacks.

We can evaluate the transformation of terrorist organizations and terrorist acts through the Al-Qaeda and ISIS organizations. Al-Qaeda and ISIS are the most typical representatives of the terror wave with religious motifs. They carry out their terrorist acts under the name of holiness (Rapoport 2002). Also, these organizations act based on a loose network, without a strict hierarchy. In most of the actions, lone wolf tactics are used (Karaağaç 2020b, 179-185). Lone wolf terrorism is an act of violence that has no official ties to the terrorist organization but is inspired by an extreme ideology (Karasek 2010, 407).

The internet and cyberspace, which are among the innovations of globalization, are the main sources which feed new generation terrorism (Michael 2013, 41). Identity hiding features, having significant information, and low cost are the reasons why the internet is preferred by terrorists. Also, access to bomb-making instructions, the provision of weapons of mass destruction, the ease of access to models such as action tactics reflect the reasons for the new generation terrorist organizations benefiting from what is called the deep internet (Zeman, Bren, Urban 2017, 186). This aspect of the internet is symbolized as “Al-Qaeda University” (Rogan 2006, 27).

Also, organizations such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS announce terrorist acts through platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube. The main goal in the preference of social media is to influence millions of people and make organizational propaganda for the procurement of staff. Images of wild executions performed with religious rituals and religious-themed videos published to encourage suicide bombings are the tactics used by Al-Qaeda and ISIS for the new generation of terrorist acts.

New generation terrorist organizations engage in all kinds of smuggling activities, mainly the drugs trade, to provide modern technology weapons, propaganda, logistics, and educational financing (Smith 2017, 147). Terrorist organizations, which provide their financial infrastructure with the facilities enabled by globalization, carry out transboundary, international actions without interruption.

One of the most important features of new generation terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS is that they have foreign terrorist fighters and homegrown terrorists. Foreign terrorist fighters are far away from the conflict zones and, in line with ideology or religious partnership, highlight those who go to the terrorist organizations and participate in terrorist activities there (Hegghammer 2010, 53-94). In the occupation of the USSR in 1979, Afghanistan became a turning point in foreign terrorist fighters. The formation process of Al-Qaeda is based on Arab-Afghans who came to support the Afghan mujahideen (Burnett and Whyte 2005, 3).

Homegrown terrorists are people who are citizens of Western countries and carry out terrorist activities in the countries where they were born and raised after being influenced by terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda or ISIS (Wilner and Dubouloz 2010, 34). Homegrown terrorists, who are sympathizers of radical terrorist organizations, generally prefer lone wolf terrorist tactics.

Terrorist acts that occurred regionally in the Cold War era started to take place between countries with new generation terrorism, so terrorism became one of the most important threats to the global system. For example, it was determined that ISIS carried out terrorist activities in 56 different countries as of 2018 (START 2019).

One of the distinguishing features of the new generation of terrorism is that the actions take place with the target of maximum death and maximum harm. Targets are chosen randomly, not symbolically (Spencer 2011, 462). In terrorist acts, suicide bombing is at the forefront. New generation terrorist organizations with religious motifs direct their militants to suicide protests with martyrdom and heavenly good news propaganda. The aim is to kill a large number of civilians through suicide attacks in crowded places.

7. Conclusion

Individuals, societies, and states have worked to lead safe lives from the earliest period of history. This is because security is the most important phenomenon for living beings and states. The concept of terror and terrorism has been one of the historical enemies of living in trust. Terrorism has existed throughout history. Terrorism, which has a history of 2,000 years, has been at the forefront of security perceptions of the periods of modernization and globalization. The concepts of security and terrorism, which are each other's antithesis, are dynamic phenomena that are open to transformation.

The concept of security is addressed based on state and regime security along with the nation-state process. Throughout the Cold War period, military threats were often given priority to ensure state security. One-dimensional advancing security approaches, such as the nuclear threat and the security of the state, have taken on a multidimensional appearance with the end of the Cold War era and the acceleration of globalization.

Security has deepened towards human and system security alongside state security. Military security approaches have expanded towards political, economic, social, and environmental security. The most fundamental factor of this multidimensionality has been terrorism, which has risen to the international level. With the end of ideological polarization, centers of ethnic and religious conflict spread around the world, and with the September 11 attacks, the new generation terrorism became the main problem of the global system.

New generation terrorism and terrorist organizations have largely diverged from the traditional understanding of terrorism. New generation terrorist organizations that are structured with loose networks, attach great importance to technology and communication innovations. Instead of symbolic actions, actions targeting random and maximum death are preferred. This is acting autonomously without state support. As in the case of ISIS, terrorist organizations have characteristics similar to the state. These are foreign terrorist fighters and homegrown terrorists from the basic philosophy of the new generation of terrorism. Acts of terrorism usually take place using the lone wolf method, thus preventing the act of terrorism. Besides, the new generation of terrorism uses social media tools such as YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook to reach the whole world at the same time.

As a result, new generation terrorism is wide enough to be active everywhere, hidden enough not to be detected anywhere, and effective enough to penetrate everyone with its influence and propaganda, affecting the individual-state-system model, especially security.

References

- Awan, Imran, Spiller, Keith and Whiting, Andrew. 2019. *Terrorism in the Classroom: Security, Surveillance and a Public Duty to Act*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baldwin, David, A. 1997. "The Concept of Security". *Review of International Studies* Vol. 23 No. 1, 5-26.
- Bien, David, D. 1990. "François Furet, the Terror, and 1789". *French Historical Studies* Vol. 16 No. 4, 777-783.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2003. "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security". *International Studies Review* Vol. 5 No. 2, 203-222.
- Booth, Ken. 1991. "Security and Emancipation". *Review of International Studies* Vol. 17 No. 4, 313-326.
- Bremer, Paul, L. 2001. "A New Strategy for The New Face of Terrorism". *The National Interest*. Special Issue No. 5, 23-30.
- Brodie, Bernard. 1978. "The Development of Nuclear Strategy". *International Security* Vol. 2 No. 4, 65-83.
- Brown, Michael. 1993. *Ethnic Conflict and International Security*. Sussex: Princeton University Press.
- Burnett, Jon and Whyte, David. 2005. "Embedded Expertise and the New Terrorism". *Journal for Crime, Conflict and the Media* Vol. 1 No. 4, 1-18.

- Buzan, Barry. 1991. "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-first Century." *International Affairs* Vol. 67 No. 3, 431-451.
- Buzan, Barry, Wæver, Ole, de Wilde, Jaap. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Buzan, Barry. 2008. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. UK: ECPR Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2015. *Pirates and Emperors, Old and New: International Terrorism in the Real World*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Crenshaw, Martha. 2000. "The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century". *Political Psychology* Vol. 21 No. 2, 405-420.
- CRS. 2020. "U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues". Congressional Research Service, April 27, 2020. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL33640.pdf>.
- Duyvesteyn, Isabelle. 2004. "How New Is the New Terrorism?" *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* Vol. 27 No. 5, 439-454.
- Ebegbulem, Joseph C. 2011. "The Failure of Collective Security in the Post World Wars I and II International System". *Transcience* Vol. 2 No. 2, 23-29.
- Fitzgerald, Gerard J. 2008. "Chemical Warfare and Medical Response During World War I". *American Journal of Public Health* Vol. 98 No. 4, 611-625.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1989. "The End of History". *The National Interest* Vol. 16, 3-18.
- Ganor, Boaz. 2015. *Global Alert: The Rationality of Modern Islamist Terrorism and the Challenge to the Liberal Democratic World*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Griffiths, Martin, O'Callaghan, Terry, Roach, Steven C. 2008. *International Relations: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Hart, Liddell, B. H. 2007. *History of the Second World War*. US: Konecky & Konecky.
- Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hegghammer, Thomas. 2010. "The Rise of Muslim Foreign Fighters: Islam and the Globalization of Jihad". *International Security* Vol. 35 No. 3, 53-94.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 2008. *Globalisation, Democracy and Terrorism*. UK: Little, Brown.
- Hoffman, Bruce and McCormick, Gordon, H. 2004. "Terrorism, Signaling, and Suicide Attack". *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* Vol. 27, 243-281.
- Hoffman, Bruce. 2006. *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Hopkinson, William and Lindley-French, Julian. 2017. *The New Geopolitics of Terror*. UK: Routledge.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations". *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 72 No. 3, 22-49.
- Jervis, Robert. 2001. "Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma?" *Journal of Cold War Studies* Vol. 3 No. 1, 36-60.
- Joint Publication 1-02. 2016. *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*. Washington: Department of Defense.
- Karaağaç, Yunus. 2018. *Geçmişten Geleceğe İstihbarat*. İstanbul: İskenderiye Publications.
- Karaağaç, Yunus. 2019. "Terörizmle Mücadele Yöntemleri: İngiltere ve Kolombiya Örneği". *Eurasian Journal of Researches in Social and Economics* Vol. 6 No. 1, 231-242.
- Karaağaç, Yunus. 2020a. "Küresel Terör ve 21. Yüzyılda Güvenlik Politikaları". In *Küresel Terör ve Güvenlik Politikaları*, edited by Hasan Acar, 1-19. Ankara: Nobel.
- Karaağaç, Yunus. 2020b. "Yeni Tehdit Algılamaları Işığında Yalnız Kurt Terörizmi ve Sosyal Medya İlişkisi". In *Güvenlik, Teknoloji ve Yeni Tehditler*, edited by Ali Burak Darıcılı, 175-192. Ankara: Nobel.
- Karasek, Piotr. 2010. "Social Media Intelligence as a Tool for Immigration and National Security Purposes". *Internal Security Review* Vol. 19 No. 8, 405-415.
- Kissinger, Henry, A. 1994. *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Krause, Keith and Williams, Michael C. 1997. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kydd, Andrew H. and Walter, Barbara F. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism". *International Security* Vol. 31 No. 1, 48-80.
- Lindberg, Miryam. 2010. "Understanding Terrorism in the Twenty-first Century". *Grupo de Estudios Estratégicos GEES* No. 7561, 1-30.
- Luciani, Giacomo. 1989. "The Economic Content of Security". *Journal of Public Policy* Vol. 8 No. 2, 151-173.
- Lynch, Orla and Ryder, Christopher. 2012. "Deadliness, Organisational Change and Suicide Attacks: Understanding the Assumptions Inherent in the Use of the Term New Terrorism". *Critical Studies on Terrorism* Vol. 5 No. 2, 257-275.
- Mazari, Shreen. M. 2008. "Analysis on the Future of Terrorism". *Defence Against Terrorism Review* Vol. 1 No. 1, 79-100.
- MCWP 3-35.3. 1998. *Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain*. Washington: Department of the Navy.
- Mearsheimer, John. 1990. "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War". *International Security* Vol. 15 No. 1, 5-56.

- Morgan, Matthew, J. 2004. "The Origins of the New Terrorism". *Parameters* Vol. 34 No. 1, 29-43.
- Morgan, Patrick M. 2006. *International Security: Problems and Solutions*. Washington: CQ Press.
- Murphy, Sean D. 2002. "Terrorist Attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon". *The American Journal of International Law* Vol. 96 No. 1, 237-255.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2001. *Fighting Terrorism: How Democracies Can Defeat the International Terrorist Network*. New York: Farrar, Straus And Giroux.
- Ohmae, Kenichi. 1992. *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Global Marketplace*. London: Harper Collins.
- Olivier, R., Hoffman, B., Paz, R., Simon, S., Benjamin, D. 2000. "America and the New Terrorism: An Exchange". *Survival* Vol. 42 No. 2, 156-172.
- Olson, K. B. 1999. "Aum Shinrikyo: Once and Future Threat?". *Emerging Infectious Diseases* Vol. 5 No. 4, 513-516.
- Piwowarski, Juliusz. 2020. "Three Energy Streams of Security Culture—A Theoretical Research Model in Security Sciences". In *Security and Defence in Europe*, edited by J. Martin Ramirez and Jerzy Biziewski, 3-22. Switzerland: Springer.
- Rapoport, David, C. 2002. "The Four Waves of Rebel Terror and September 11". *Anthropoetics* Vol. VIII No. 1, Summer 2002. <http://anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap0801/terror/>.
- Reynal-Querol, Marta. 2002. "Ethnicity, Political Systems and Civil Wars". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* Vol. 46 No. 1, 29-54.
- Rogan, Hanna. 2006. "Jihadism Online—A Study of How Al-Qaida and Radical Islamist Groups Use the Internet for Terrorist Purposes". Norwegian Defence Research Establishment. No. 2006/00915, 1-36.
- Rumsfeld, Donald, H. 2002. "Transforming the Military". Foreign Affairs, May-June, Accessed 09.06.2020. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2002-05-01/transforming-military>.
- Smith, Paul J. 2007. "Terrorism Finance: Global Responses to The Terrorism Money Trail". In *Countering Terrorism and Insurgency in the 21st Century*, edited by James. J. F. Forest, 142-162. Westport: Praeger Security International.
- Spencer, Alexander. 2011. "Sic(k) of the 'New Terrorism' Debate? A Response to Our Critics". *Critical Studies on Terrorism* Vol. 4 No. 3, 459-467.

- START. 2019. "Global Terrorism in 2018". University of Maryland, Accessed 11.06.2020. https://www.start.umd.edu/pubs/START_GTD_Terrorismin2018Overview_FactSheet_Oct2019.pdf.
- The White House. 2001. "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People". Accessed 09.06.2020. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>.
- Wæver, Ole. 2007. "Securitization and Desecuritization". In *International Security*, edited by Barry Buzan, 66-98. London: SAGE Publications.
- Weinberg, Carroll. A. 1992. "Terrorists and terrorism: Have we reached a crossroads?" *Mind and Human Interaction* Vol. 3 No. 3, 77-82.
- Weinberg, Leonard, Pedahzur, Ami, Hirsch-Hoefler, Sivan. 2004. "The Challenges of Conceptualizing Terrorism". *Terrorism and Political Violence* Vol. 16 No. 4, 777-794.
- Wells, Gary J., Shuey, Robert, and Kiely, Ray. 2001. *Globalization*. UK: Nova Science Publishers.
- Wilkinson, Paul. 1977. *Terrorism and The Liberal State*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Wilner, Alex S. and Dubouloz, Claire-Jehanne. 2010. "Homegrown Terrorism and Transformative Learning: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Understanding Radicalization". *Global Change, Peace & Security* Vol. 22 No. 1, 33-51.
- Wohlstetter, Albert. 1959. "The Delicate Balance of Terror". *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 37 No. 2, 211-234.
- Wolfers, Arnold. 1952. "National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol". *Political Science Quarterly* Vol. 67 No. 4, 481-502.
- Zeman, Tomas, Bren, Jan, Urban, Rudolf. 2017. "Role of the Internet in Lone Wolf Terrorism". *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* Vol. 7 No. 2, 185-192.

TERRORISM AS A WEAPON OF HEGEMONY

EMRE BAYSOY*
İREM ECE AKPINAR**

1. Introduction

The first thing that someone who starts to study the subject of terrorism will notice is that, although terrorism is on the front burner in politics, there is huge confusion and disagreement on the subject. This is because of the classical “terrorist or ‘freedom’ fighter” discussion. In other words, there is no objective perspective to terrorism and each party considers the issue according to its own interests. Still, there are some definitions of terrorism which are reliable and objective. In the simplest words, terrorism is the systematic use of (all kinds of) violence to generate fear in a society with the aim of destroying or converting that society’s political structure, which is the state. In other words, terrorism can be defined as the use of violence to come into power by frustrating people and making people feel that they are unprotected (Zafer 2007, 27; Keleş and Ünsal 1982, 3). Adding to that, it is systematic violence for political aims by putting people under pressure (Zafer 2007, 27; Bayraktar 1982, 158, Baysoy 2011, 98). No matter which ideology or discourse, every terrorist organization tries to erode the sense of unity in a political society. In essence, terrorist organizations attack the identity of a society and its constitutional structure (Baysoy 2011, 98).

This study aims to challenge the idea that considers terrorism as a “weapon of the weak” by focusing on the basic characteristics of terrorism and terrorist organizations. Moreover, this study tries to highlight why such a notion is dangerous and harmful while fighting against terrorism. Rather than being the weapon of the weak, starting from ancient times, terrorism

* Asst. Prof. Dr., Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü ebaysoy@nku.edu.tr, ORCID iD-
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2876-2360>.

** Scientist and Project Specialist, i.ece.akpinar@gmail.com, ORCID iD-
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5302-2893>.

was the weapon of the powerful and the strategy of a hegemony. First of all, terrorists fight against a state which has been the most developed organization of humanity throughout history. In order to have such an assertive claim, terrorism needs extraordinary tools and leverages. From the organizational dimension to the financial dimension, terrorists need resources. Terrorists need money for existence, operation and survival. That is why it can be said that terrorism is an extremely expensive act and this fact reveals its nature and characteristics. The main scope of this study is to underline how some definitions and considerations of terrorism serve to legitimize and justify terrorism and how these false definitions help terrorism to be a tool for hegemony.

2. Concepts of Terror and Terrorism

Although concepts of terror and terrorism are used interchangeably, terror is a long-lasting state of fear and horror whereas terrorism is the strategy that aims to generate fear systematically (Çiçek 2007, 36; Baysoy 2011, 110). The term terror comes from the Latin word “terrere” which means “generate fear, to horrify and to frustrate” (Gül 2012, 4). Terror is “an act of threatening or enforcing people to impose certain ideas and behaviors by frustrating and intimidating them” (Bozdemir 1981 in Çora 2008, 18). It can be said that the main difference between the concepts of terror and terrorism is that where terror can be applied to any situation which generates fear, terrorism is generating fear systematically for specific political purposes with the use of violence. Terrorism aims to destroy and/or convert the political structure of any political society (Dülger 2007, 55). Adding to that, terrorism tries to create a feeling of being a potential victim through manipulation with fear and frustration (Zafer 2007, 28).

The first attempt to define terrorism internationally started in the 1920s, but the first usage of the term emerged at the conferences held in Brussels in 1930 (Saul 2008b, 22). In that era terrorism was defined as “*the intentional usage of means to harm one’s or people’s life, freedom or physical integrity or to public or state property to create a general danger*” (Saul 2008b, 22). The League of Nations made attempts to define terrorism as a crime between the years 1934 and 1937 (Saul 2008b, 24). Meeting at the conference in Geneva in November 1937, states reached many agreements on the concept of terrorism. One of the most important topics at this interstate conference held in November was related to the “Prevention and Elimination of Terrorism”. At the conference, the states signed the Geneva Convention in a final decision. They briefly explained

the concept of terrorism as follows: Against any state, attacks and organization to overthrow the government of that state militants targeting innocent civilians are described as a terrorist attack (Öktem 2011, 15). However, there is no precise and widely accepted definition by governments even today. This is because terrorism is an issue related to the state that it is targeting. Hence, after the September 11 attacks, the General Assembly of the United Nations endorsed states to describe terrorism unilaterally according to their domestic law (Saul 2008a, 49; Baysoy 2011, 110).

Although there are many definitions of terrorism, some general features are:

- Terrorism is an act of political violence.
- It is an organized movement.
- It aims to achieve a specific purpose.
- It is against the state, authority and political regime.
- It can be performed individually or by a group.

Table 1. The common elements of 109 different definitions of terrorism

Element	Rate (%)
Violence and use of force	83,5
Having political aims	65
Creating fear and insecurity at public	51
Threatening	47
Having no relation between the victim and the target	37,5
Intentional, systematical, planned and organized acts	22
Resistance strategy and tactics	30,5

Resource: Schmid and Jungmann 1983, 5 in Gül 2012, 10.

All these definitions and common features show that terrorism is an extreme activity that requires vast resources both in terms of its activities and its effects. The most important element of terrorism is violence. Terrorist organizations, in line with their ideology, see the term "armed propaganda" as an important tool in achieving the goals they set. Terrorist acts are an attempt to change the current constitutional order:

Terrorism can be defined as the use of systematic violence to cause societal fear, pressure, and fatigue with the aim of attaining a political goal. Terrorist activities either attempt to transform a regime or target certain policies implemented by governments in order to incite change. Accordingly, terrorism by engaging in a fear-oriented relationship with society, intends to attain power. By attaining this power and by becoming a political actor, the terrorist aims to ultimately subvert the political structure. Terrorism tries to legitimize its cause by proving the ineffectiveness of security precautions in solving the 'problem' while trying to instill an understanding that socio-cultural and political steps must be taken in the direction of the terrorist organization's aims and views. In effect, this causes a de-sensitization of a nation's values and allows 'normalization' of terrorist demands which in turn leads to an acceptance of the proclaimed aims and views over time. So in order to prevent such an outcome; it is vital for a nation-state to deal with terrorism, first and foremost as an issue of security. (Baysoy 2011, 112)

It can be claimed that even its etymology, and its name "terror", gives an advantage to terrorism. It aims to achieve its goals by creating and generating fear. Maybe one way to fight against terrorism is to call it or name it something else. This definition or term may contain dimensions like the exploitation of values, hypocrisy, and murder and its character of being a public enemy. A new term may help to conceptualize terrorism in a precise way and may also help to describe its nature to people.

There is so much intended and unintended confusion about the definition of terrorism. That is why in order to separate the dimensions of terrorism there is a need for a prism.

Table 2. Characteristics of terrorism

Terrorism is not a doctrine or systematic idea, it is a strategy.
Terrorism creates a scenario to justify terror acts.
Terrorism pledges a new order and future.
Terrorism is a part of international politics therefore it cannot live without external support.
Terrorism develops and lives with propaganda. It is propaganda in itself.
Terrorism is an organized act that brings an alternative to state authority.
Financial aid is a necessary requirement of terror. That is why it smuggles drugs and weapons with robbery.
Terrorism may occur with justifications like the search for rights, an order and founding a state. It can either be one justification or a combination of these in different correlations.
Terrorism occurs as conscious and intentional acts.
Terrorism, uses violence as an aim. It creates frustration with horror and fear. It is tyrannical, brutal and without rules.
Terrorism is sometimes a proxy of one or more other forces.
Terrorism creates and uses its own language.
Terrorism usually has a political aim.
The acts of terrorism require an organizational effort. All these acts are not individual but with the participation of a group.

Resource: Gül 2012, 27-28.

As seen from the specifications of terrorism, it has many faces and dimensions from the organizational level to the financial level; from the national level to the international level. Once more it is worth noting that in order to operate in a such a wide spectrum of domains, it is necessary to have power. Weak groups do not have links to international crime groups, weaponry and drug trafficking. Terrorism is dependent on illegal activities and it should cooperate with organized crime groups (<https://www>.

[unodc.org/e4j/en/organized-crime/module-16/key-issues/terrorism-and-trafficking-in-weapons.html](https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/organized-crime/module-16/key-issues/terrorism-and-trafficking-in-weapons.html)):

Weapons in general, and firearms in particular, are of vital importance for terrorist groups. In certain areas of the world, where countries impose strict regulations on firearms, terrorists are looking for alternative methods to perpetrate their attacks, such as vehicles and knives. In others, where terrorist organizations need to control people and territories, firearms are essential to them. Therefore, cutting the flow of firearms and ammunitions will highly reduce the capacity of terrorist groups to exert power and control since the alternative methods to the use of firearms can hardly be applied at large scale. The relationship and potential links between terrorism and organized crime in respect to the illicit financing, sourcing and trafficking in weapons, and the extent to which terrorists engage in such behaviour directly or work alongside organized criminal groups indirectly, has received a growing attention in recent years (see e.g. Flemish Peace Institute, 2018). Terrorists are increasingly using automatic weapons to perpetrate attacks and there is a growing concern that organized criminal groups are supplying terrorists with weapons. (<https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/organized-crime/module-16/key-issues/terrorism-and-trafficking-in-weapons.html>)

Regarding the fact that terrorism needs money and a network to gain access to weapons, sometimes terrorists conduct firearm trafficking directly:

Although it is worth reminding that the crime of firearms trafficking is not always or necessarily committed by an organized criminal group, the ability of terrorists to access firearms means that the potential linkage between organized crime and terrorism is crucial. In addition, some of the available research points towards the facts that some individuals linked to terrorist offences are brought up in a criminal environment and retain long term links and associations with criminal contacts following radicalization. (Europol, 2016 <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/organized-crime/module-16/key-issues/terrorism-and-trafficking-in-weapons.html>)

As can be seen from the quotations, terrorism is organically related with illegal activities and crimes such as firearm trafficking.¹

¹ For more information on the linkage between terrorism and firearm trafficking, see Mumcu, Uğur, 2006, *Silah Kaçakçılığı ve Terör*. Ankara.

3. Terrorism is the Weapon of the Strong

Terrorism is not a sociological phenomenon. It is a crime that has political and economic dimensions. Every society has its own contradictions and injustices. However, terrorism legitimizes itself by the abuse of those contradictions and conflicts. If terrorism is considered as a social phenomenon that is related with injustice or fairness, then this attitude immediately legitimizes terrorism and terrorists. Considering terrorism as a social phenomenon inherits the idea that there is a problem and this problem shows itself by violence. It can be said that if something is named as a problem then the human mind automatically assumes that there should be a solution. And this provides a ground for terrorism to manipulate the society.

Terrorism is against the state. However, the state is the most complex and developed institution of humankind. The most developed states are the ones that provide freedom and security to their people. Although terrorism can be accepted as a modern phenomenon, it has existed at least since ancient times. When we look at the history of terrorism, terrorists were far from being powerless groups. The first terrorist groups, the Zealots and Sicarii, were highly professional and able to attack the Roman Empire and its high ranked bureaucrats (Güral 1999, 20 in Gül 2012, 12). They were radical fanatics who systematically tried to erode the power of Rome (Onay 2009, 21-24). Without getting into the details, it is enough to think that a long-lasting confrontation with the most powerful empire of that time required vast resources. It should be noted that especially the Sicarii were not only against the Roman Empire; they were against all state forms and authorities although they were strongly authoritarian in their structure. This shows that terrorism in essence has been against the state structure starting from ancient times through to modern times. The notion of being against the state is one of terrorism's distinct features.

The Assassins are another example. They existed from 1090 to 1275 and they not only terrorized ordinary people but they assassinated statesmen like Nizamülmülk who was the grand vizier of the Seljuk Empire. It is important to underline the fact that Nizamülmülk was not an ordinary vizier. He was a statesman with an intellectual mind and the author of the book *Siyasetname* which is about how to govern a state. It can be argued that *Siyasetname* (Book of Government) is still relevant and full of precious advice to statesmen even today. The assassination of Nizamülmülk once again shows that terrorist groups like the Assassins are against all forms and all kinds of states. The Assassins weakened the