

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
MASTER OF ARTS INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

MASTER THESIS
RETHINKING SECURITY: THE CASE OF
TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

ZAINUL ABIDEEN JIBRIL

20124787

THESIS SUPERVISOR: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DR. NUR
KÖPRÜLÜ

NICOSIA

(2015)

DEDICATION

*To my father, Professor Jibril H. Yola, and to the eternal memory of my late mother,
Maryam Jibril*

ÖZ

Güvenliđi tekrar düşünmek: Ortadođu'daki terörizm durumu

Soğuk savaş sırasında güvenlikle ilgili tartışma devletlerin hayatta kalması idi. Ancak, Sovyetler Birliđi'nin çökmesinden sonra, devletlerden gelen tehditler neredeyse durgunlaştı; başkalarının yanısıra terörizm, organize suç gibi yeni tehditler, şimdi, neredeyse devletlerden gelen tehditlerin yerini aldı. Devletlere, gruplara ve devlet içindeki bireylere yönelik bu güvenlik meydan okumalarını yakalayabilmek için işte bu soğuk savaş sonrası dönem çevresinde güvenlik söylemi genişletildi ve derinleştirildi. Güvenlik kompleksleri, kapsamlı güvenlik, insan güvenlik vb şekillerini alan güvenlik söylemindeki bu yeni kayma, bu soğuk savaş sonrası dönem çevresindeki güvenlik sorunlarının analiz edilmesinde bir dereceye kadar ilgilidir. Terörizmi oluşturan Ortadođu'daki radikal müslüman grupların eylemlerinin bölgedeki devletler ve uluslararası güvenlik için güvenlik sorunu yaratmış olduđu söylenmektedir. Ortadođu'da yada dünyada terörizm yeni bir fenomen değildir ama bu belirli eylemler benzersizdir ve devletlerin meşruluđunu zayıflatma kapasitesine sahiptir. Devletlerin uluslararası sistemde düzenleyici prensip olarak hala ilgili olduđu göz önüne alındığında, savaş sonrası güvenlikle ilgili düşüncelerin pek çođu, terörizmin devletlerin güvenliđine olan güvenlik açığına kapsamamaktadır. Bu, terörizmin bölgedeki ülkelere ve dünyaya olan gerçek etkisini yakalamak için güvenlik hakkında yeniden düşünme ihtiyacını doğurdu. Bu tez, Barry Buzan tarafından doğru varsayılan, güvenliđin siyasi ve toplumsal kesimlerini teorik çerçevesi olarak kullanır. Nitel araştırma tekniđi uygulanırken, radikal müslüman grupların Ortadođu'daki devletlerin siyasi güvenliklerine olduđu kadar toplumsal güvenliklerine oluşturduđu tehlikeler açığa çıkarıldı.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Güvenlik, Terörizm, Radikal Müslüman Gruplar, Ortadođu, Soğuk Savaş Sonrası, Siyasi Güvenlik, Toplumsal Güvenlik.

ABSTRACT

Rethinking Security: the Case of Terrorism in the Middle East

Debate about security during the cold war has been about states survival. However, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, threats from states almost become quiescent; new security threats such as terrorism, organized crime among others, now, almost replaced threats from states. It is in this post-cold war environment that security discourse was broadened and deepened in order to capture these security challenges to states, groups, and individuals within the state. The new shift in security discourse which takes the forms of security complexes, comprehensive security, human security etc. are to some extent relevant in analyzing security issues in this post-cold war environment. Activities of radical Muslim groups in the Middle East which constitute terrorism is said to have created security problem for the states in the region and for international security. Terrorism in the Middle East or in the world is not a new phenomenon but this particular one is unique and has the capacity to undermine the legitimacy of states. Given that states are still relevant as the organizing principle in the international system, most of the post-cold war thinking about security does not cover terrorisms vulnerability to states security. This brought about the need to rethink about security in order to capture the true impact of terrorism to the states in the region, and to the world. This thesis utilizes political and societal sectors of security postulated by Barry Buzan as its theoretical framework. While applying qualitative research technique, the dangers posed by the radical Muslim groups to political security as well as to societal security of states in the Middle East were unraveled.

Keywords: Security, Terrorism, Radical Muslim Groups, Middle East, Post-Cold War, Political security, Societal Security.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praises and glories are for Allah (SWT) for his guidance, favor and bounties. May the peace and mercy of Allah be on our leader prophet Muhammad (SAW) and his companions and those who follow him faithfully till the Day of Judgment.

I owe special gratitude to Adamawa State University, Mubi for sponsoring me throughout this programme via TETfund fellowship.

My deepest and heartfelt gratitude is to my supervisor, Assistant Professor, Dr. Nur Köprülü, whose most generous receptions, meticulous and constructive contributions contributed immensely to the success of this work. Without her contributions, this work might not have seen the light of the day. May God bless and reward her abundantly.

My esteemed gratitude is to my parents, especially my father, Professor Jibril H. Yola, who always encourages, advices, and prays for my success. He was the initial sponsor to this programme. I appreciate their inexorable support in all aspects of my life.

My sincere appreciation goes to all the academic and non-academic staff of International Relations Department, Near East University, especially Dr. Bilge Azgin, Associate Professor Dr. Zeliha Khashman and Mrs Tijen Özügüney for their valuable and commendable helping hand towards the actualization of this dream.

I am indebted to Mallam Mahmud Jada, for encouraging me to study abroad, and also facilitating my release from my employer in order to meet up with academic activities here in Near East University. May God reward him abundantly.

I acknowledge the assistance of my colleagues in the department of Political Science and Public Administration, Adamawa State University, Mubi, especially my Head of Department, Dr. Ndaliman Alhaji Hassan, Dr. Umar Jongur and indeed all the academic and non-academic staff of the department.

Everlasting gratitude is also to my friends: Muhammad Sani Bello, Habib Sani, and Daifuru Kabir for their advice, prayers and encouragements. May God reward them individually and collectively.

I wish to express my gratitude to my siblings: Aminu, Asma'u (Ummi), Zubaida, Rumaytha, Abduljabbar, Suhaib, Zahra, Khaula, Khadija (Siyama), Shifa'a, Maryam (Nawal), Khuzaimah, and Ummu-Hani. May God guide them.

My everlasting gratitude, appreciation and prayers to those mentioned and many not mentioned but are in my memory and those lost out of my memory. May God most abundantly reward them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	ii
ÖZ.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
CHAPTER ONE	1
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Scope and limitations of the research.....	3
1.4. Methodology	4
1.5. Theoretical framework	5
1.5.1 Levels of analysis	6
1.5.2. Political Sector	7
1.5.3 Societal Sector	8
1.5.4. Perception of threat by states.....	10
1.6. Literature review	11
1.6.1 Security.....	11
1.6.2. Securitization.....	17
1.6.3. Terrorism	21
1.6.3.1. Transnational terrorism	27
1.7. Organization of research.....	28
CHAPTER TWO	30
TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST	30
2.1. Introduction	30
2.2. The roots of the current terrorism in the Middle East	31
2.3. Jama’at al Tawhid wal Jihad	36
2.4. Islamic State in Iraq and Levant.....	38
2.5. Ansar as Sunnah	39

2.6. Jabhat al Nusra li Ahl asSham.....	40
2.7. Al-Qaida in the Maghrib	41
CHAPTER THREE	43
TERRORISM AS THREAT TO POLITICAL AND SOCIETAL SECTORS OF SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST	43
3.1. Introduction	43
3.2. Terrorism and political security in the Middle East.	43
3.3. Terrorism and societal security in the Middle East.....	47
3.4. Perception of threat by states in the Middle East	51
CHAPTER FOUR.....	56
CONCLUSION.....	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY	61

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AQI	Al-Qaida in Iraq
AQIM	Al-Qaida in the Maghreb
ETA	Euskadi ta Askatasuna
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
GIA	Armed Islamic Group
GSPC	Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat
GWoT	Global War on Terrorism
IED	Improvised Explosive Device
IRA	Irish Republican Army
IS	Islamic State
ISIL	Islamic State in Iraq and Levant
ISIS	Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (Sham)
MSC	Mujahidin Shura Council
NIE	National Intelligence Estimate
PDK	Kurdistan Democratic Party
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
PUK	Patriotic Union of Kurdistan
RSCT	Regional Security Complex Theory
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
US	United States of America
VBIED	Vehicle-borne Improvised Explosive Device

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

As one of the new threats affecting the globe, terrorism which is a form of clandestine attack directed at targets that are outside a certain range of clearly military targets existed for millenniums. Its intensity and ability to inflict harm have increased in certain regions of the world. This has potentially challenged the political, economic and social stability of states and regions alike. Given the salience of the challenge terrorism pose, states around the world made it to be a core in their political agenda. Terrorism being a transnational phenomenon poses direct threat to both strong and weak states due to its intensity to undermine the authority and legitimacy of governments. Terrorism like other new security threats has impact on states that lack proper degree of socio-political cohesion. Albeit, the 9/11 terror attack in the US soil constitute a prime case, most attacks are aimed at domestic regimes in weak states. Terrorism has impact not only on the security of weak states but on strong states in the West and their interests elsewhere within the globe. The US and the West have put terrorism on their national security agenda due to its coercive effects on not only political but other sectors such as the economic and societal sectors.

In the Middle East, activities of radical Muslim groups in which case, many take the form of terrorism constitutes great challenge to all the sectors of security not to the region alone but to the world, thus creating concern for international security. Manifesting both as a form of armed uprising and terrorist attacks, their activities have affected states and identities within in many ways. Many identities ceased seeing

themselves as they used to be, because their ways are being altered by the radical Muslim groups. Many groups with different identities immigrate to other countries in order to be free from forced proselytization, or being killed. However in their new hosts, they tend to create societal problem as well. The groups mostly have Sunni Islamist ideology, and as a result of their activities, they are able to undermine the organizational stability of states, ideologies that give government's legitimacy, and even the system of governments which are in most cases secular, pan-Arabist, Baathists or even Shia-Islamist. This in essence has posed great implication for security not only for states in the Middle East but to the wider world.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The main aim of this thesis is to examine security in the light of new threats, i.e. terrorism in the 21st century. New perceptions of threats such as terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking, migration etc. forms the core of security agenda since the end of cold war. Following the September 11 attack in the United States, terrorism became the forefront of security concern globally. Although terrorism is not a new phenomenon, the 21st century terrorism is quite distinct from the terrorism of the earlier century which is transnational and leftist in making. The new evolving terror has global connection and reach. In the aftermath of September 11 terror attack, the United States and the West embarked on a vigorous war on terror campaign. This campaign led to the termination of Taliban regime in Afghanistan and Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. The aim of the campaign is to forestall future attacks from *al-Qaida* on the soil of the United States or wherever United States interest is in the world, by military means if the need arise. However, the actions in the name of global war on terror (GWOt), particularly the invasion of Iraq only facilitated the recruitment of terrorist in the region. How does the war in Iraq become catalyst for terrorism? Many researches, including a report by sixteen intelligence organizations in the United States shows that the war brought about new understanding of Islam as some Islamic scholars in Saudi Arabia and other Middle East states gave *fatwah* against the invasion and occupying of Muslim lands by foreign and Western troops. The fear of Western domination led to the growth of anti-US and anti-West sentiments among most Muslims in the Middle East. By this, Muslims were enjoined to resist the invasion possibly in a militant way, hence the radicalization of

many Muslims that never participated in any kind of insurgency, thus, they cannot be called extremists prior to the war in Iraq.

Al-Qaida was able to exploit the situation in the Middle East particularly that of Iraq, to attract new recruits and donors. In this light, *al-Qaida* merged with *al-Zarqawi's Jama'at al Tawhidwal Jihad* which later metamorphosed to Islamic State in Iraq and Sham (ISIS), Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS), Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) and now Islamic State (IS). The report by United States intelligence agency shows that Jihadists are increasing in number and geographic dispersion due to the war in Iraq thereby breeding "a deep resentment of US involvement in the Muslim world" which would inspire more fighters to continue struggling against the United States and its interest due to the perceived success of the jihadists (NIE report, 2006). **This study aims to specifically look at terrorism in the Middle East as it affects the security of states in the region and the world in general.** Given that the radical Muslim groups linked to *al-Qaida* have been creating serious political and societal problem in the region and the world, this research will first of all look at why and how the groups in the Middle East are creating such problems. This can be achieved by looking at the grievances of the groups. What are the political and societal problems they are creating for the states in the region and the globe? How do the leaders in Middle East and the world perceive the threats from the activities of the groups? How does that affect the states in the region and what implications does it have for international security?

1.3 Scope and limitations of the research

This research will be conducted based on the events that took place on the 11th of September 2001, and its aftermath, the global war on terror in the Middle East to the present.

One of the limitations to this research comes up when dealing with the applicability of the case to other regions or other security threats. It is important to note that this case may not necessarily apply or fit to similar cases in other parts of the world given the nature, history, interest, and perception of threat of the states in the Middle East. This does not mean that, this new perceived threat (terrorism) is peculiar to the Middle East.

On the contrary, some states view terrorism as a threat to their national security but may have different priorities and perception of what constitute threat to their security.

Apart from limitation of applicability, this work is also constrained by limited time and resources.

1.4. Methodology

This research will employ qualitative analysis in its operation. There is no precise meaning as to what qualitative method means. However, Van Maanen (1979) sees qualitative analysis to constitute variety of techniques which "...seeks to describe, decode, translate and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in social world"(p.520). Conventionally, qualitative method looks at verbal situations that involve series of "...phenomena relating to or involving quality or kind" (Kothari, 2004, 3). Qualitative method investigates human behaviors thereby answering questions as to why groups do certain things. Why do groups behave in this way and not in that way? It also uncovers motivational factors leading to the ways groups relate to the world outside. From the above, qualitative method is the most apt technique for investigating security in the light of new threats.

Moreover, this research will rely on secondary library research as its instrument in selecting and constructing research technique. By this, the research seeks to explore from books, journals and online data base engine such as EBSCO, JSTOR, etc, reports from think-tank organizations, newspapers, magazines, archives, reports from international media houses such as Aljazeera, BBC, CNN etc.

Nevertheless, this work will utilize new concepts of security from Barry Buzan and his colleagues. It will delve into the sectors of security, precisely, political and societal as proposed by Buzan and his colleagues. This should serve as the theoretical framework of this thesis.

1.5. Theoretical framework

Like any academic endeavor, this work is also pegged to a theoretical framework. The framework to be utilized for this thesis will be based on the works of Barry Buzan on security, especially from his books, 'People state and Fair' (1991a), 'New pattern of Global security in the 21st century' (1991b), and 'Security: A new framework for analysis' (1998).

During the cold war period, state sovereignty, integrity of its territory and its political autonomy is overwhelmingly the core of security agenda of states. Moreover, thinking of security in international relations especially in the realist and neo-realist thinking connotes the absence of external threat against states, which is believed to be the primary actor in the international system. Security here derives from power of states as they are in constant struggle in order to ensure their survival. This perception of security can be equated to aspiration for power, which is measured purely in military, economic and demographic terms. This conception of security is however narrowly founded, given that new threats to security emerged. It is important to note that, a couple of decade before the collapse of the Soviet Union, military confrontation between states began thawing and subsequently becoming quiescent. Societal, environmental and economic considerations become relevant as portrayed by their inclusion in states and international organizations political agenda. These new threats which includes terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking, migration among others, now directs towards the public. As such, the focus of security becomes broadened and deepened. Scholars have since conceptualized these changes in the form of shift in the nature of threats, actors and referents. This effort gave birth to new security concepts such as comprehensive security, security complex, human security etc. (Booth, 1991; Newman 2001; King and Murray 2001; UNDP, 1994; Krause & William, 1996).

Debate on security discussion has expanded in many ways. Some of which constitutes, the nature of threats, measures of securing stability, and the referent point of security (Terrif, Croft, James, & Morgan, 1999, 18-28). In traditional security studies, states form the core of security agenda, as a result, making the state the sole referent object of

analysis. Given the prevalence of new security threats however, individuals become relevant in security discourse. Now, states do not necessarily become the only referent object. Ball (1988) argues that ruling regimes as implied by regime security is also securitized especially when looking at states in the third world (Terrif et al 1999, 19).

Buzan however, raise the society to be equal to state while threat to state is to its sovereignty, threat to society is to its identity (Terrif et al 1999, 19). Threats to the states however emanate from three directions. The idea of the state i.e. nationalism, its physical bases i.e. population and resources, and its institutional expression which takes the form of its political system (Buzan, 1991a, 65).

In the light of the above, Buzan advanced a broader understanding of security encompassing levels and sectors. The levels according to Buzan are individual, unit, international sub-system and international system level of analysis, while the sectors are: military, political, economic, societal, and environmental. These “sectors do not operate in isolation from each other. Each define a focal point within the security problematique, and a way of ordering priorities, but all are woven together in a strong web of linkage” (Buzan, 1991b, 433). Buzan was able to sufficiently define each sector with its actors and referent objects and the threats each sector is vulnerable to.

In order to give sufficient analysis of terrorism as it affects security of states in the Middle East and the world, it will be important to delve into the levels and sectors of security propounded by Buzan. For the purpose of this analysis, I will focus on three levels of analysis (i.e. unit, international subsystem and international system) and two out of the five sectors that constitute national security as postulated by Buzan. The chosen sectors are, political and societal. These sectors are enough to show the dangers posed by the activities of radical Muslim groups to states within the region and to the wider world.

1.5.1 Levels of analysis

The new understanding of security which favors broadening of the concept in the light of threats other than traditional military and political pose a great challenge to global community. Given that, several works on security illustrated this point by suggesting

different levels of analysis when dealing with security (Buzan 1991a; Buzan, Waever, & Wilde, 1998; Waever, 1993; Asberg & Wallensteen, 1998).

Buzan argues that “existential threat can only be understood in relation the particular referent object in question” (Buzan et al, 1998, 21). The referent object of security goes beyond the state to encompass other levels of analysis such as international systems, international subsystems, units, subunits and individual (Buzan et al, 1998, 6).

Since this work aims at looking at how terrorism in the Middle East constitutes threat to the states in the region and global security, it will utilize three of the levels outlined above. The chosen levels are: unit, international subsystems, and international systems.

Units according to Buzan are “actors composed of various subgroups, organizations, communities, and many individuals and specifically cohesive and independent to be differentiated from others and to have standing at higher levels” (Buzan et al, 1998, 6).

International subsystems on the other hand, are “groups of units within international system by the particular nature or intensity of their interactions with or interdependence on each other. Subsystems may be territorially coherent, in which case they are regional” (Buzan et al, 1998, 6). This work will focus on Middle East as a region.

Buzan sees international systems as “conglomerates of interacting or interdependent units that have no system level above them” (Buzan et al, 1998, 5).

1.5.2. Political Sector

Political security becomes threatened when state sovereignty becomes at stake. It is about “nonmilitary threat to sovereignty of states. In general, political security is about the organizational stability of social orders (Buzan et al, 1998, 141). From the unit level referent, political security includes the equivalence of “nonmilitary threat to political security” (Buzan et al, 1998, 141). From the system-level referents however, it is about the defense of international society or international law. Here, universal principles such as human right are securitized (Buzan et al, 1998, 141).

Buzan admits that the political sector of security is the widest of all the sectors. It also has a residual category, hence; all security may be political because threats and defenses are politically defined. According to Buzan (1998):

Thus in a sense, societal, economic, environmental and military security really mean “political-societal security”, political-economic security”, and so forth. When a threat to organizational stability of state is made as a threat to its society (identity), this is cataloged as societal security; if military security (although it is political too), and so forth. Thus, the political sector constitutes that subgroup of political threats that do not use massive military, identificational, economic or environmental means (Buzan et al, 1998, 141-142).

From the above, it is clear how difficult it is to identify political security and also how to circumscribe it from other sectors of security. However, Buzan (1991a) gave an insight on how to detangle this confusion. According to him:

Political threats are aimed at the organizational stability of the state. Their purpose may range from pressuring the government on a particular policy, through overthrowing the government, to fomenting secessionism, and disrupting the political fabric of the state so as to weaken it prior to military attack. The idea of the state, particularly its military identity and organizing ideology, and the institutions which express it are the normal target of political threats. Since the state is an essentially political entity, political threats may be as much feared as military ones. This is particularly so if the target is a weak state (Buzan et al, 1998, 142).

The idea of the state, that is its national identity, its physical base which is in the form of its population and resources, and its institutional expressions which takes the form of its political system becomes the main target of political threats (Buzan, 1991a, p65; Buzan, 1998, 142). Given that weak states suffer from both external challenges to their sovereignty and internal subversion and questioning of their ideology, they become vulnerable to threats to their political security.

As said earlier, political security characterizes the idea of the state, its physical base and the institutions developing such ideology. Other types of threats such as economic or environmental may become integral to defining political security only if they are severe to constitute political dimension especially when they threaten the geographical entity of the state, its institution or the survival of its regime (Ayoob, 1995, 9).

1.5.3 Societal Sector

Societal security is about identity, self-conception of communities and of individuals identifying themselves as members of a community ((Buzan et al, 1998, 119). What then is a society and what constitute threat to it? Buzan and Waever contend that societal security concerns situations which constitute a threat in identity terms:

On this basis, we can conclude that in the contemporary international system. Societal security concerns the ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threat. More specially, it is about the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture, association, and religious and national

identity and custom. This definition makes it difficult to give any object definition of when there is a threat to societal security (Waever et al, 1993, 25).

Societal security is “not the sum of the security of social groups” (Waever et al, 1993, 20). It is “not the security of individual parts nor is it the sum of the security of parts” (Waever et al, 1993, 20). Societal security is not the same as social security (Buzan et al, 1998, 120; Waever et al, 1993, 22). Society in this context as defined by Giddens is “a clustering of institutions combined with a feeling of common identity” (Giddens 1955 in Waever et al, 1993, 21). Societies differ from other social groups “in having a high degree of social inertia, values, and institutions in the wider sense” (Waever et al, 1993, 21).

State and societal security are sometimes coterminous especially when a society is established within the border of a state which may be independently recognized, thus clashing with the state security. Societal security discourse goes beyond the boundary of state. This is vivid when looking at European Community and the Middle East therefore suggesting a distinctive referent object to the concept of societal security (Buzan, 1998, 119; Waever et al, 1993, 27). Since societal security is about large self-sustaining identity groups, the groups may be national, religious, or even racial.

Actors have set different societal security agenda according to time and space. Buzan categorized the agenda into:

1. Migration: here communities cease being what they used to be due to influx of some people, thereby changing the composition of that society.
2. Horizontal competition: this occurs as a result of overriding cultural and linguistic influences from neighboring cultures which later change the society’s way.
3. Vertical competition occurs when people stop seeing themselves as self-sustaining due to either integration project, or a secessionist, regionalist project (Buzan et al, 1998, 121).

Apart from the above, there is a possibility of having a fourth factor i.e. depopulation, resulting from war, famine, policies of extermination or natural disaster. Depopulation only becomes a societal security concern only when it threatens the breakdown of a society (Buzan et al, 1998, 121).

Societies can react to these threats in two ways as suggested by Buzan. In the first instance, communities try moving issues to the political or military sector by putting the threat on the state agenda. In the second way, societies may choose to handle the

perceived threat through non state means which could be through a secessionist attempt but having a strategy of surviving as a distinct culture (Buzan et al, 1998, 122).

1.5.4. Perception of threat by states.

When dealing with states, threats are enough to result in violence or provoke other defensive actions based on perceptions and existing beliefs about the sources posing possible threat. A threat may become national issue, but this depends on its intensity in relations to a given timeframe (Buzan, 1991a, 134). Ayoob noted that:

Issues such as economic deprivation and environmental degradation do not automatically become part of the security calculus of third world states; they do so only when they gain enough prominence to be able to produce political outcomes that can threaten the survival or effectiveness of states and regimes. In other words, non-political issues that have the potential to endanger the wellbeing of third world states and regimes become security problems only when they are able to intrude into political arena (Ayoob, 1995, 190).

Political choice rather than objective fact play significant role in legitimately classifying issues to be of national concern (Buzan, 1991a, 115). In order to ensure the survival of states in the Middle East, issues relating to day to day life are being politicized by ruling elites. Since the ruling elites have the responsibility of meeting challenges of their states and regime security, their perception plays a key role in defining the security problem faced by them (Ayoob, 1995, 191). Going by Ayoob, anything can be securitized as threat especially if it affects or pose threat to a regime. This makes it hard to define the referent object of security, thus giving way to domestic agenda of threats (Buzan, 1991a, 104). In states that are weak, “the security of the government becomes confused with the security of states and functional interest are provided with a legitimacy which they do not merit” (Buzan, 1991a, 102).

The security agenda of states that are weak is affirmed by governments, their agencies and bureaucracies. Since power is concentrated in the hands of the ruling elite, the ruling elite are there to pursue their own interests. Thus, the ruling elite define and or manipulates for its own sake what constitute threat be it military, political, societal, economic or environmental. Therefore, any issue trying to bring about political change not wanted by the elite leads to securitization of such issues in order to gain control (Waever, 1998, 6).

1.6. Literature review

Given the topic of research, it is important to review literatures relating to security and securitization and terrorism as well. By this, the difficulty around the concept of security, contributions made by various scholars and as well its changing nature should be revealed.

1.6.1 Security

The idea of security leads us to controversies and imprecisions. This emerges from what precisely the idea of what security is, and what security discussions are. This is due to vulnerability in respect to what the issues or referent objects to accord security are. In spite of Collins' "good news that a consensus has emerged on what security studies entails (Collins, 2007, 2), the unsettling truth is that, there is divergent literature on security which only ends up confusing us as to the true meaning of the concept. By what means can there be a consensus when there is disagreements among researchers in terms of who secures, and what is to be secured; who weakens whose security and what are the issues in question? Most importantly, by what method would we be able to say that there is consensus when there is divergence even methodologically? To consider security along these lines, regarding mere survival is narrow and feeble. Therefore, the imprecision and debates could likewise be contended to emerge from the advancement of security studies. The power politics of the Cold War period contracted the idea of security around the state, and national security as the significant referent objects requiring security. However, global politics saw a shift with the ending of the Cold War which led to redefinition of the idea of security in terms of broadening and widening of its referent objects.

Stephen Walt's traditionalist approach to security is firmly rooted in realism, which posits state-centric and military realm to security. His classification of security is premised on the assumptions of the realist theory of international relations which is characterized by anarchy that is given, the primacy of states, and state survival as the character of all states in the international system. Walt contends that security studies and by extension security is thus:

the study of the threat, use and control of military force. It explores the conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways that the use of force affects individuals, states and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war (Walt, 1991, 212).

From the above definition, the military realm is privileged in the expense of other threats or potential threats. Therefore, unless other security issues like environmental, economic or social intrudes into the military jurisdiction it cannot be part of state security analysis. Furthermore, this definition has excluded the individual level as a source of insecurity while giving importance to the state as the referent object of security. Therefore, within the realm of this definition, governments cannot constitute a threat to its citizens. Following the end of the cold war however, Walt's contribution faced the problem of applicability to the new post-cold war environment, as a result, many scholars developed alternative conception to respond to this security problematique.

Wolfers thought that, "security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked" (Wolfers, 1952, 485). An important question here will be what the values are and who owns them. This could be the state, identities or societies, individual or all.

Waever pegged the concept of security to simply mean the state. "Security in other words has to be read through the lens of national security" (Waever, 1995, 49). However, the evolution of international politics has meant that 'redefining security' is thus abundant with 'not only', 'also' and 'more than' arguments' (Waever, 1995, 49). In his subsequent works, Waever and his colleagues (in Buzan et al, 1998) introduced with the incorporation of wider referent objects of security to suggest that, security consists of sectors, i.e. military, political, societal, environmental and economic sectors, which helped in widening and deepening the security discourse.

Ayoob as well argues in terms of national security. While focusing on third-world countries, he contends that national security which is a function of state building requires the state to possess more than "security hardware" (control of coercive force) but also "security software" (legitimacy and integration). He subsequently defined security. In his words: "Security or insecurity is defined in relation to vulnerabilities, both internal and external, that threaten to, or have the potential to, bring down or significantly weaken state structures, both territorial and institutional, and regimes"

(Ayoob, 1997, 130). This definition shows that exogenous threats have the capacity to threaten the state. Furthermore, it is not all security issues that are capable of having the same impact among different states over a given time frame. In essence, issues such as migration or environmental degradation are left out.

Although Ayoob like Walt excludes threats to individual and global security, he does not share in Walts commitment to anarchy as the source of behavior of states in the international system. Instead, state centrism was based on an argument that state system remains the key mode of organization. Thus, when analyzing security, statehood should not be undermined especially in the third-world states (Ayoob, 1997, 131).

Asberg and Wallesteen argue that core values, capabilities and threats corresponds to important aspects of what constitute security. These elements are fundamental to understanding the concept of security. Thus: “Core values are related to aspects of whom or what we want to be secured. Threats will tell us which the challenges and dangers are directed against these core values. And capabilities refer to the resources and actors, which can handle the threats, and thus provide security” (Asberg & Wallesteen, 1998, 169).

The principle societies, states or the international system is built upon, is instrumented on identifying core values. These core values, be it democracy, national unity, sovereignty, territorial integrity of states etc. vary from state to state. In essence, what the core values of a particular state constitute may not be the same as others. As such, if what a state considers as fundamental to its values is not well protected, that state or society collapses (Asberg & Wallesteen, 1998, 170-171). Core values such as territorial integrity and sovereignty are interlinked while others are not compatible. Although the security of states remains paramount, some values may materialize into contemporary debate.

In order to identify and asses the magnitude of threats, Aberg and Wallesteen argues of the need to distinguish between what is threatening in real sense and what is perceived as threatening. This should tell us why some threats forms the fundamental of security agenda of states while others are left inert. As some threats can be weighted without link to core values, so the values differ according to the nature of referent objects. This

makes it difficult to ascertain which threats are more dangerous than others. Nevertheless, threats can challenge many core values; military invasion for example forms threat to sovereignty and territorial integrity of states. Terrorism which is a threat for example is said to have been threatening states core values as a monopoly over the use of violence as well as security of humans where individuals forms the referent object of security.

The last aspect of what constitute security is capabilities. As argued by Asberg and Wallensteen, capabilities are important in protecting fundamental principles from threats. The major categories of security providers are the international system and the unit according to them. Although other categories such as subunits and individuals play some role in putting issues on the political agenda of states and organizations, they cannot be considered security actors as they lack the capability which is in terms of resources to provide security argued them. They also acknowledged that even though empowerment of individuals and subunit has been going on for long, there exists an asymmetry with the capabilities of states to provide security (Asberg & Wallensteen, 1998, 170-171).

Later arguments on security almost brought about disregard for states and therefore focused on individual as major referent object of security.

Klare and Thomas perceive the state actors as less able to respond to growing global problems such as financial crisis and environmental degradation owing to the fact of declining significance of state boundaries (Klare & Thomas, 1994, 3). Therefore, they advocated for a world security concept which account for global nature of contemporary problems. World security is therefore:

Distinguished by the belief that security involves more than protection against military attack...ecological, economic and demographic trends pose serious challenges to developed countries. And even the less-developed "South" where the threat of armed attack remains constant, nonmilitary trends pose equal or greater threats to people's security (Klare & Thomas, 1994, 4).

The above conception which is global can be equated with human security. Klare and Thomas assumed that global threats affecting all actors compelled them to cooperatively respond to them. However, their conception of security fall short of differentiating issues that are of security threat and otherwise. Furthermore, 'world security' allows security analyst to include whatever they perceive as security threat to international security.

Nevertheless, there is a methodological problem in this approach as the referent objects in developed and less developed states are the state and the people respectively.

Booth (1991) on the other hand, contends that security studies and by extension security is synonymous to emancipation. In his words:

Security means the absence of threats. Emancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. War and threat of war is one of those constraints, together with poverty, poor education, and political oppression and so on. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin. Emancipation not power or order produces true security. Emancipation theoretically is security (Booth, K., 1991, 319).

This definition of security located security and insecurity at individual level. Tarry argues that “such an inclusive conceptualization prevents it from being analytically meaningful, as the individual preferences of all people could not possibly be taken into account” (Tarry, 1999, 8). However, booth promotes normative values making liberty and freedom more superior to order. Thus:

Liberty is also the central value of emancipation, but emancipation implies an egalitarian conception of liberty... Integral to emancipation is the idea of the reciprocity of rights. The implication of this is the belief that ‘I am not truly free until everyone is free’...Since ‘my freedom depends on your freedom’, the process of emancipation implies the further breaking down of the barriers we perpetuate between foreign and domestic policy (Booth, 1991, 321-322).

To counter this, Tarry suggests that emancipation will only lead to the state of nature where freedom will be limited to power possessed by individual actors (Tarry, 1999, 8).

Due to the prevalence of wars, conflicts, hunger, famine and abuses going on around the world, resulting from the end of the Cold War, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) became concerned by the horrendous happenings and came up with an understanding that has wider referent objects and issues of security. Therefore the UNDP noted that:

With dark shadows of the Cold War receding, one can now see that many conflicts are within nations rather than between nations. For most people, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. Will they and their families have enough to eat? Will they lose their jobs? Will their streets and neighbourhood be safe from crime? Will their religion or ethnic origin target them for persecution? In the final analysis human security is a child who did not die, a disease that did not spread, a job that was not cut, an ethnic tension that did not explode in violence; a dissident who was not silenced. Human security is not a concern with weapons – it is a concern with human life and dignity (UNDP, 1994, 22).

King and Murray (2000) define human security as a panel of key issues, including well-being, poverty, health, education, political freedom, and democracy. Each issue is

assigned an indicator. A person living on less than \$365 per capita per year can be said to be in a state of absolute poverty. Education is measured by average years spent by a person while schooling; less than 6 years in school suggests that such an individual is poor. Health security on the other hand is measured on a scale of zero to one; where zero means death and one means full health. To them, an individual is said to be in the state of generalized poverty if he weighs less than 0.25. Democracy domain of security is suggested by the right of an individual to vote in an election at least. Political freedom on the other hand is measured by freedom house's measures of societal security (King & Murray, 2000, 601). In their view, no issue is more important than any of the issues mentioned; if an individual fall below a pacified threshold in any of the issues, that individual can be said to be in a state of generalized poverty. In their words, "individual's human security as his or her expectation of years of life without experiencing the state of generalized poverty. Population security, then, is an aggregation of individuals' human security" (King & Murray, 2000, 592).

Alkire on the other hand offers a working definition of security. She contends that "the objective of human security is to safeguard the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats in a way that is consistent with long term human fulfilment" (Alkire, 2003, 2). Alkire disassemble her definition into five key components (i.e. "safeguard", "vital core", "all human lives", "critical" and "pervasive threats") in order to examine them separately with the view of making her conceptualization clearer.

James offers a definition of human security which encompass both liberal notion of freedom and military which is almost absent in previous conceptualizations. He gave an alternative definition to human security below:

Human security can be defined as one of the foundational conditions of being human, including both (1) the sustainable protection and provision of the material conditions for meeting the embodied needs of people, and (2) the protection of the variable existential conditions for maintaining a dignified life. Within this definition it then makes sense that the core focus of human-security endeavours should be on the most vulnerable. It makes sense that risk management should be most responsive to immediate events or processes that have both an extensive and intensive impact in producing material and existential vulnerabilities of people in general or a category of persons across a particular locale (James, 2014, 87).

From the foregoing, one will be able to see at least in brief the controversies and changes surrounding the concept and definition of security. The aim here is not to privilege any particular definition or offer an alternative to the definitions offered above due to their

lapses. However, it paves way for an argument over objectivity and subjectivity around the concept of security especially when applying it. Buzan et al (1998) postulated that there is no objective security; instead security is socially constructed in a way which is subjective in accordance with the preference of political leaders, actors or institutions. Balzacq's argument on the other hand favors objectivity of the concept. For him, "some security problems are the attributes of the development itself. In short, threats are not only institutional; some of them can actually wreck entire political communities regardless of the use of language" (Balzacq, 2011, 12-13). In other words there are threats and security issues that are out there, external and independent of the actors labelling them so. For example, terrorism, organized crime and range of other issues raised by the UNDP above are serious security issues in the Middle East and globally notwithstanding the opinion of the leaders and political actors. It is important to note is that threats to a large extent are labeled security issues by leaders through the processes of securitization. This concept of securitization has become central in the security discourse as a result of newly emerging security issues owing to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

1.6.2. Securitization

Since Barry Buzan and his colleagues brought advancement to the security studies through the idea of "securitization" and "desecuritization" (Buzan, 1993, Waever, 1995, Buzan et al, 1998), it has pulled in both positive and negative remarks. Essentially, the works of Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde etc. which was "christened" by Mcsweeny (1996) as "Copenhagen School" becomes popular for shifting the paradigm of security studies. It moved security discourse from the traditional realist-neorealist point of view to encompass other referent objects. The Copenhagen school has no doubt brought several security threats into focus. While arguing on securitization, Williams contends that:

In securitization theory, 'security' is treated not as an objective condition but as the outcome of a specific social process: the social construction of security issues (who or what is being secured, and from what) is analysed by examining the 'securitizing speech-acts' through which threats become represented and recognized (Williams, 2003; 513).

There are no security issues in themselves but only issues that are constructed to be such by actors known as “securitizing actors” through a process known as speech act. As Waever who postulated the concept puts it:

With the help of language theory, we can regard “security” as a speech act. In this usage, security is not of interest as a sign that refers to something more real; the utterance itself is the act. By saying it, something is done (as in betting, giving a promise, naming a ship). By uttering ‘security’ a state-representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever means are necessary to block it (Waever, 1995, 55).

However, this does not mean that the securitization process is subjective. In the view of the Copenhagen school, securitization is an inter-subjective process owing to the role audience could play in speech act. Although ‘securitization concept’ contributed immensely to security studies, it is not riddled without loopholes. One is that it is plagued with internal contradictions. In “People, State and Fear” for example, Buzan focused his attention on the state as the sole referent object of security (Buzan, 1991). Waever acknowledges that “the concept of security refers to the state” (Waever, 1995, p.49). Buzan et al (1998), while arguing for deepening and widening of security studies to include various referent objects of security still gave primacy to state as a referent object. Likewise in *Regions and Power*, Buzan and Waever explained theories about the structure of contemporary global security. They proposed that there are neorealist, globalist and regionalist viewpoints (Buzan & Waever, 2003 6-75). In corroboration with Lake and Morgan, they are convinced “that in the post-Cold War world, the regional level stands more on its own as the locus of conflict cooperation for states and as the level of analysis for scholars seeking to explore contemporary security affairs” (Buzan & Waever, 2003, 10). Through the Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT), the state was privileged as the focus of security analysis even while promoting the expansion of security discourse. What then is the essence of the RSCT? In their words:

The central idea in Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT) is that, since most threats travel more easily over short distances than long ones, security interdependence is normally into regionally based clusters - security complexes. Process of securitization and thus the degree of security interdependence are more intense between actors inside such complexes than they are between actors inside the complex and outside of it” (Buzan & Waever, 2003, 4)

Regional security complex is seen by them as “a set of units whose major processes of securitization, de-securitization, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot be reasonably analyzed or resolved apart from one another” (Buzan & Waever, 2003, 44). Waever further sheds more light on the idea of Regional Security Complex to

“suggests an analytical scheme for structuring analysis of how security concerns tie together in a regional formation” where geographical nearness is an important factor (Waever, 2004, 18). The concepts of amity and enmity, which are fundamental to RSCT was utilized by Buzan and Waever to demonstrate the relationship among states in given geographical entity. While explaining how amity and enmity work among states, Buzan contends that: “By amity I mean relationships ranging from genuine friendship to expectations of protection or support. By enmity I mean relationships set by suspicion and fear” (Buzan, 1991a, 189-90). Nevertheless, they posited that four variables define the structure of regional security complex: polarity, anarchic structure, boundary, and social construction (Buzan & Waever, 2003, 53).

Furthermore, Waever (1993) left no one in doubt as what is to be secured. For him, societies and identities are objective realities needing security. However, if this is the focus of their argument, we will be left with the question as to what will be the place of other values of that same society. Are they now treated as irrelevant? (McSweeney, 1996, 83). This innovation on security studies which started with ‘People, State and Fear’, to which according to Booth many authors ‘have been writing footnotes’ has also in more recent publications attracted many critics (Booth, 1991, 317).

According to Buzan and Waever, an “issue is securitized only if, and when the audience accepts it as such” (Buzan et al, 1998, 25). This becomes likely if there are two conditions which are internal and external. Accepting the security argument means that securitization is successful, and the issue moves out of normal politics into the realm of security and thereby claims a right to use the means available to it to block it (Waever, 1995, p. 55). Thus securitization as captured by the Copenhagen school is:

the staging of existential issues in politics to lift them above politics. In security discourse, an issue is dramatized and presented as an issue of supreme priority; thus, by labeling it as security, an agent claims a need and a right to treat it by extraordinary means (Buzan et al., 1998, 26).

However, if the issue failed to scale through the audiences consent, it will remain within normal politics. The audience may actively reject the security claim (which is possibly evidenced by a decline in the social capital of the securitizing actor) or may passively castoff the security move by simply disregarding it. However, Leonard & Kaunert (2011) revealed the lack of clarity as to who constitutes the audience in the speech-act

process as postulated by the Copenhagen school. In other words, a securitizing actor will have to make an argument about an issue in such a way that it will find resonance with an audience. But the character and composition of this audience were left unclarified. In their words:

The role of the audience in securitization processes remains significantly undertheorised in the Copenhagen School's formulation of securitization theory. Although Buzan, Waever and de Wilde emphasise that securitization is an *intersubjective* process, in which the audience seemingly plays a crucial role, this concept remains rather vague and under-specified. How it could be operationalised in empirical studies is also far from clear (Leonard & Kaunert, 2011, 50).

Balzacq reformulated securitization theory to emphasize social constructivist elements narrowed in the initial focus of securitization theory on the self-referential speech act (Balzacq, 2005). By modifying and extending the traditional Copenhagen's School securitization approach, Balzacq argues that securitization as outlined by Waever does not provide sufficient leverage for examining real world security. In his words:

A speech act view of security does not provide adequate grounding upon which to examine security practices in 'real situations'. For instance, many security utterances counter the 'rule of sincerity' and, the intrinsic power attributed to 'security' overlooks the objective context in which security agents are situated (Balzacq, 2005, 171).

Balzacq's approach which is more inclined to social constructivist perspectives focuses on the formal structure of the security speech act which suggests a permanent practice contrasting the social constructivist approach of the Copenhagen School. However, Balzacq reformulated securitization from speech act to strategic practice, emphasizing on three aspects: the importance of power in the securitization act, the context-dependence of securitization, and the audience-centered nature of effective securitization (Balzacq, 2005, 171).

Essentially, the Copenhagen School neglects the social context within which the securitization process happens. However, Stritzel gives importance to securitization process as a singular event and the "broader discursive contexts from which both the securitizing actor and the performative force of the articulated speech act/text gain their power" (Stritzel, 2007, 360). Like Balzacq, he reformulated securitization into a three-way methodical framework based on the social and discourse context, the performative force of the threat claim/texts, and the positional power of the securitizing actors.

McDonald similarly contends that, "the question of why particular representations resonate with relevant constituencies is under-theorized in this framework" (McDonald,

2008, 564). In fact, McDonald goes far to claim that the part of encouraging conditions are so under theorized as to stay outside securitization theory. Alan Collins, while investigating the relationship between security discourses emerging over choices in regard to instructional language in Malaysia, highlights administrative quality as a paramount element driving securitization (Collins, 2005). Lautsen and Waever certainly indicated the part of religion in molding securitization moves when they examine the routes in which religion is used as a referent object for securitization moves (Lautsen&Waever, 2000). Ralf Emmers focused on institutional standards inside ASEAN and additionally institutional idleness to clarify why securitization moves have not delivered the normal security reactions to transnational crimes (Emmers, 2003). Vuori while applying the theory of securitization to non-democratic regimes contends that:

Even tyrants need people to do their bidding, and loyal actors and subjects are important in totalitarian systems. In the long term, purely coercive rule is impossible and brutal oppression can turn into a disadvantage for the oppressor. Even authoritarian regimes have to legitimize their use of extraordinary measures, and security is a strong legitimator even in nondemocratic political systems...However, we can say that all societies have 'rules'. These 'rules' are products of historical and social contingencies, as are the referents objects and threats in security. When security logic and rhetoric is utilized to legitimate the breaking of these rules, we have a case of securitization (Vuori, 2008, 68-69).

He further argued that “audiences depend on the function the securitization act is intended to serve” (Vuori, 2008, 72). Drawing on Austin, Vuori submits that illocutionary discourse acts like securitization are performed as per truly, socially and socially unexpected conditions (Vuori, 2008, 73).

1.6.3. Terrorism

Terrorism is frequently seen to constitute political risk, in light of the fact that terrorists generally harbor political objectives. In the same vein, it constitutes asymmetrical risk of having uncertainty resulting as a result of the utilization of unconventional violence. Despite the fact that it may have been previously possible to distinguish the motives of terrorists, it is difficult to recognize which terrorist acts have political, religious, monetary, or even mental connotations.

The word “terrorism” according to encyclopedia.com dates from the Reign of Terror (1793–94) during the French Revolution, despite the fact that the term has several other

meanings in the twentieth century. Also, etymonline.com traces the semantic importance of the statement “fear” to originate from the French *le terreur* which could mean “great fear,” or further, from the Latin *terror* which means “great fear, dread” (verb *terrere* – to “fill with fear or frighten”).

Before going further, one needs to comprehend the true nature of terrorism. Terrorism, like many phenomena has never been easy to understand. In fact, like the concept of security, huge controversy lies within the concept. This controversy informed Moten’s title ‘Contested concept, conflicting perspectives and shattering consequences’ (Moten, 2010) for examination of the intense debate on the definition and phenomenon of terrorism. Moyano earlier contends the existence of numerous diverse, regularly opposing, methodologies to terrorism and scholars have not acknowledged the existence of an extensive and broad definition (Moyano, 1995, 3). Therefore, it bodes well to start this investigation with a definition of the phenomenon of terrorism. Having examined the extant literature on the concept, Moten noted, in 2010, that there is no agreed definition of terrorism and that there seems to be no possibility of an agreed upon definition to come in the near future. This is possible as he argues that “definitions [of terrorism] are colored by political ideology, location and perspective” (Moten, 2010, 36). Similarly, Badey contends that there is a ‘definitional dilemma’ regarding the concept of terrorism, given that its existing definitions have fallen into two categories of the ‘academic and political’. Alex P. Schmid in 1988 gave a definition which till date has influence on the concept of terrorism. Schmid, considered terrorism as “an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual group or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby the direct targets of violence are not the main targets” (Badey in Moten, 2010, 37). Although this has satisfied the academic definition of terrorism, it was argued that the academic definitions of terrorism are too complex as they aim at facilitating “the inclusion of numerous diverse incidents into a data base [of terrorism]” (Moten, 2010, 37). However, the most accepted definition among scholars has been criticized for being “too encompassing to be operationally useful and too jargon loaded for theoretical hypothesis” (Schmid & Jongman, 2005, 10). Moreover, the academic definition fails to

distinguish between state sponsored terrorism and those carried out by groups or individuals.

Political definitions popular within governmental circles as Badey notes, constitutes the definition offered by the US Department of State in 1983 which is till date relevant. In his words, “terrorism means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents usually intended to influence an audience” (Moten, 2010, 37). In a similar vein, the British government has defined terrorism as “the use, or threat, of action which is violent, damaging or disrupting, and is intended to influence the government or intimidate the public and is for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause” (Moten, 2010, 37). There is state bias in both definitions, as they do not take into consideration a state to commit violence against its own citizens and suggested that only non-state actors can commit acts of terror (Moten, 2010, 38). This conception only permits states and governments to call anybody who opposes them or their policies a terrorist.

Moyano describes terrorism as “the use or threat of use of violence to achieve political objectives, when such violence is intended to control a population through fear or coerce a government into granting certain concessions” (Moyano, 1995, 3). Although she recognizes the existence of difference between threat of use of violence and genuine utilization of violence, she doesn't clarify in what way the threat of violence is a terrorist act.

Terrorists need to encumber a sufficient number of individuals, and by doing so forces a government (however not just governments) to meet their demands; or to rebuff some government officials; or basically to attract regard for themselves.

Essentially, Walter Laqueur defines terrorism as “the substate application of violence or threatened violence intended to sow panic in a society, to weaken or even overthrow the incumbents, and to bring about political change” (Laqueur, 1994, 24). But, shouldn't we think about state sponsored terrorism? However, states themselves submit to terrorist acts; for instance, terrorism was utilized by Bolsheviks in Soviet Russia or by Saddam

Hussein in Iraq. To a greater extent, states may commit terrorism against states like the US in the case of invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Alexander, Kyle, & McCahster classified terrorism by virtue of its objectives and origin. For them, the goal of restorationist terrorists is to restore an elite group restricted from power with a specific end goal of increasing control. Furthermore anarchist goal is to dismantle all institutionalized settings because in their view, authority relationship is superfluous and illegitimate. The target of egalitarian insurgency is the imposition of a system characterized by equality and structures that are centrally controlled in order to mobilize people and change the social structure as well as radically transform a given political community. While that of pluralists is to uproot the political system for individual liberty and freedom to prevail. The traditionalists on the other hand are characterized by primordial values rooted in ancestral and religious ties. Like the pluralists, their aim is also to displace the political system. There are likewise the reformist, secessionist, preservationist and nationalist groups whose aim is to gain autonomy and reallocate resources, secession reformation, and national liberation respectively (Alexander, Kyle, & McCahster, 2003, 3). Military actions are covertly utilized to achieve their aims.

The Middle East example especially in Iraq during the US invasion can be best portrayed as a restorationist and traditionalist in nature as it is intended to restore an elite group opposing the occupation of the US, and can also be linked to religious and ancestral ties. It has combined urban conspiratorial and extended insurgency techniques, intended to make conditions where the leaders forced on Iraq by the United States is compelled to blow up and lose credibility.

The methods applied are acts of urban terror against population, infrastructure, and security services, as well as guerilla attacks against conventional military forces (IEDs, ambushes) in rural areas. Demonstrations and propaganda events are supporting methods to influence national, regional, and international opinion to justify violence against the ruling authority and to discredit the Coalition (Alexander, C. et al, 2003, 5).

The search for a consensus definition remains a Herculean task, even at intergovernmental level. For instance, the United Nations has not been successful in finalizing the 'Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism', the drafting of which began years before the 9/11 terrorist attack in the U.S., despite increased global

attention to the threat posed by terrorism in the wake of those attacks. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation insisted that armed liberation struggles for self-determination be excluded from the definition of terrorism. It is against this backdrop that the UN excludes such as terrorism. Consequently, the Chairman of the UN's Ad Hoc Committee on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism reported on 4 November 2011 an 'impasse' reached on defining terrorism at their meetings, and expressed the need for more time to reflect on a consensus definition.

To some extent, the above definitions are valid; however they do not depict or explain the true nature of terrorism. Instead, they list its features and attempt to discover the connections existing between the features. Notwithstanding the absence of an extensive and broadly acknowledged definition, there is an understanding concerning three features of terrorism. To start with, the clearest feature is the utilization of violence. Given the existence of different kinds of violence in the world, defining terrorism essentially by its violence appears to be inadequate. The prevalence of violence practically all over and all the time makes it necessary to have an approach that would be able to differentiate it from terrorism.

The second feature that distinguishes terrorism from other forms of violence is its political connotation, i.e., the political objectives that lie behind all terrorist acts. Practically, in any case, it is difficult to unequivocally peg a specific terrorist act as strictly political in its objectives. A case in point would be that of a terrorist executing a policymaker, or exploding his house, does not naturally imply that there was a political objective behind such act. The truth is that the act could be criminal, identified with money, or even vengeance related to their private relations. While terrorists generally claim responsibility to their actions, the September 11, 2001 attack demonstrated that this is not generally the situation, either. In an instance that nobody claims responsibility, who then can express that the objective was simply political? Besides, by what means can one clarify millenarian or agnostic demonstrations of brutality submitted by a doomsday faction? Such groups may have nothing to do with politics, at any rate in its standard significance, however they can submit to terrorist acts.

Thirdly, a feature of terrorism, which is more helpful for recognizing terrorism than the two said above, is that it is directed towards innocent populace. Terrorists regards their target which is primarily the people as not essentially innocent because they see them as supporting a regime or other non-political entity they target.

The fundamental issue identified with terrorism is the way; it is to a great degree hard to differentiate from other forms of violence, for example, freedom fighting, organized crime or guerrilla war. We are left with a question as to why it is necessary to distinguish terrorism from other kinds of violence. Despite the fact that it appears legitimate to recognize terror from freedom fighting, particularly in totalitarian system of government, there is no compelling reason to separate it from organized crime or guerrilla war. Paying little heed to their objectives and motives, criminals, ought to need to consent to the same tenets of law as other people. Furthermore, with respect even to freedom fighters, one is left with a question of whether their use of violence is justifiable and who should justify their act?

As said earlier, terrorism is not a new phenomenon. It has been known for a considerable long period of time, hundreds of years, or indeed centuries. Terrorism has picked up expanding consideration since the mid-1970s, as the world got accustomed to it – over a generally brief time – as a technique for picking up “political” objectives utilized by such gatherings as the Irish Republican Army (IRA), the *Euskadi ta Askatasuna* (ETA), the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Red Brigades, and a lot of people, numerous different groups. September 11, in any case, represented a defining moment, as the first time in history this common technique for coercion happened in the US which is seen as the world’s super power.

Inexplicably, in spite of the fact that terrorism is by all accounts the most uneven danger of all, it is simply a regular manifestation of rivalry between a “stronger” and a “weaker” party, despite the time and spot. Just like security, the issue is not in the definition, but instead in the understanding of the way of terrorism, and what is much more vital, of the political of specific individuals or gatherings of individuals. Terrorism is nothing other than “a method of gaining goals.” Both its clear political perspective, and the degree to which it targets innocent individuals are very subjective, yet this does not change the

way; that it is a violent strategy, which should be punished paying little attention to its motives.

1.6.3.1. Transnational terrorism

Terrorism is said to be transnational when it transcend national borders given “the foreign ties of its perpetrators, the nature of its institutional or human victims, the target of its demands or the exclusion of its logistics” (Enders & Sandler, 1999, 149). Transnational terrorism has been closely linked to religious extremism.

Rapoport, in his analysis suggests that transnational terrorism evolved through three other waves of transnational terrorism prior to current wave of terrorism. The first wave, from 1880s to 1920s captured the anarchist wave that reigned in Europe. This form of terrorism was motivated by the concept of anarchism. This wave was characterized by assassination of monarchs, prime ministers and presidents as representatives of the state. The second wave which is characterized by anti-colonialism was informed by struggle of national self-determination against European colonialism. In the period between 1920s and 1960’s, nationalist embarked on violent struggle against the imperial powers by targeting state officials including the police, soldiers, judges and their family members. This form of terror occurred in the colonized states of Africa, Asia and Europe (Rapoport, 2004, 53). ‘New left wave’ against the backdrop of perceived injustice in the global system emerged in the 1960s. Violent groups such as the American Weather Underground, the West German Red Army Faction, the Italian Red Brigade, the Japanese Red Army, and the French Action Directe rose to champion the cause of the periphery world. This terror took the form of plane hijacking, hostage taking, and assassinations. (Rapoport, 2004; Kiras, 2011). Rapport points out that religious terrorism represent the fourth which is the predominant wave of international terrorism in the present era given that the terrorist are significantly driven by religious extremism. Although he made mention that other religions have their own share of terrorist outburst, he argues that “Islam is at the heart of the [current] wave” (Rapoport, 2004, 53). “The Iranian ‘Islamic Revolution’ of 1979 was a watershed event” in the current wave of terrorism (Kiras, 2011, 368). Other important events that led to maturation of the current wave of terrorism in the same year include the invasion of Grand Mosque in Mecca,

Saudi Arabia and the Islamic revolutionary war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. Through the evolution of this kind of terrorisms, suicide bombing emerged one of the strategies employed by terrorists. This metamorphosed in terms of magnitude and violence, as seen in the deadly 2001 9/11 attack on the US.

The difficulty around the changing nature of security was illustrated with contributions from various scholars. In the traditionalist conception of security, states are the only referent objects of security. New security issues owing to the collapse of the Soviet Union have no doubt impacted in widening and deepening the referent objects of security. The new threats are labelled as security issues through an inter-subjective processes known as securitization. As the original contribution of the Copenhagen school, this concept gained currency among different scholars and researchers on security studies. These contributions were also shown in this chapter. Since the case study has to do with the activities of Muslim groups which is ultimately seen as terrorism, the controversy as well the difficulty around the concept was shown with contributions from different scholars.

1.7. Organization of research

This thesis consists of four chapters. The first chapter is the organizational part. In this chapter, the outline of the purpose of this research will be stated. The methodology used; the scope and limitations to the study and the theoretical framework and literature review is outlined in this chapter

Chapter two will delve into the history of terrorism in the Middle East. What are the roots of current terrorism? By this, it will look at radical Muslim groups such as *Jama'at al Tawhid wal Jihad*, *Jabhat an Nusra li Ahli ash Sham*, the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant, *Ansar al Sunna*, *Ansar ash Shariah*, AQIM etc.

Chapter three is the analysis chapter. It will try linking the theoretical framework discussed in chapter one with the case study. In the end of the chapter, a link between terrorism and the chosen sectors (i.e. Political and Societal) as well as its impact on global security should be established.

Chapter four will summarize the findings of the research received from applying theoretical framework to the case stated, evaluate the findings and offer some recommendations for further research.

In the next chapter, the roots of terrorism and the evolution of some selected Muslim groups shall be dealt with.

CHAPTER TWO

TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

2.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to look at the history of terrorism in the Middle East. Since this thesis aims to look at how terrorism affects the security of states in the region and the world in general, it will be of great importance to trace the origin of the current terror in the region. To elucidate some important points, it is important first and foremost to locate where the Middle East is and the states that comprise the Middle East. Why and how has this terrorism we are now witnessing in the Middle East started? What are the groups and their grievances?

By definition, the Middle East comprises states around the southern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, reaching out from Morocco to the Arabian Peninsula and Iran and in some definitions it includes states beyond. The Near East is a name given to the central part of the region by some Western historians and geographers tending to classify the “Orient” into three. The Near East encompasses states that are very close to Europe, stretching out from the Mediterranean Sea to the Persian Gulf. The Middle East stretches from the Persian Gulf to Southeast Asia. The Far East on the other hand consists of states facing the Pacific Ocean (Britannica Encyclopedia).

Prior to the Second World War, the use of the term started changing meaning. By the mid-twentieth century a typical meaning of the Middle East enclosed the states or domains of Turkey, Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, Israel, the West Bank, the Gaza

Strip, Jordan, Egypt, Sudan, Libya, and the different states and regions of Arabia proper (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Yemen, Oman, Bahrain, Qatar, and the Trucial States, or Trucial Oman [now United Arab Emirates]). (Britannica Encyclopedia). In some definitions, North African nations of Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco are included in the definition of Middle East.

Since the aim of this chapter and this thesis by extension is not to look at individual states as the above definition suggest, but to look at terrorism in some of the states and how that affect the security of the states, the region and the globe in general, this definition is suggested to set a caveat as to what the Middle East is according to this research.

2.2. The roots of the current terrorism in the Middle East.

The reasons for the inception of terrorism in the Middle East are mind boggling. Albeit one can indicate the grievances of the groups, simple explanation to the reason does not exist. Huntington argues in terms of “clash of civilization” between the west and Islam. In his words:

...the most pervasive, important and dangerous conflicts will not be between social classes, rich and poor, or other economically defined groups, but between people belonging to different cultural entities. Tribal wars and ethnic conflicts will occur within civilizations... And the most dangerous cultural conflicts are those along the fault lines between civilizations... For forty-five years the Iron Curtain was the central dividing line in Europe. That line has moved several hundred miles east. It is now the line separating peoples of Western Christianity, on the one hand, from Muslim and Orthodox peoples on the other (Huntington, 1996, 28).

However, the reasons for the current terrorism should go beyond Huntington’s “clash of civilization” thesis because the thesis did not take into consideration other reasons scholars give which are though perplexing. Issues such as, the Palestinian issue; colonial legacies; the political economy of the Middle East; the control of hydrocarbon deposit in the ME; the policies of states in relations to the groups and the groups in relations to the state; pro West regimes installed in the Middle East; neocolonialism, to mention but a few, could individually or collectively result to the use of asymmetric tactics by alienated groups. Like the Basque and Irish Republican Army (IRA), groups in the Middle East can be classified together to some degree in that they both fit to minorities that are striving against the oppression of states, though the Basque and IRA have different histories. The phenomenon of state sponsored terrorism is also in the list of

terrorist activities. Some states either overtly or covertly support terrorism against other states or groups within states. The United States pointed fingers at various states, including Syria, Iran, Libya, and Afghanistan among others. However, the US has every now and again been blamed for supporting terrorism as well. It has supported terrorism both at state and sub-state level in ensuring its apparent interest in the Middle East, Africa, South America and Asia.

Many Muslims living under authoritarian regimes that repress openness is said to be another reason for the growth of anti-west in the Middle East. Likewise, American support for Egypt and Saudi Arabia has created widespread resentment. Telhami (2001) contends that the insurgent groups in the Middle East “are anti-Western because the governments they oppose are pro-Western.” (Telhami, in Douglas & Wentz, 5).

Persecution of Palestinians by the state of Israel and the enormous support Israel get from the United States further complicated issues. It has been contended by many researchers and experts in the Middle East that the United States skewed policies in the region lead to resentment towards the west, US and their interest. A case in point was in May, 1998, when Bin Laden was questioned by a columnist named John Miller of ABC explains why he attacks America. In his words:

For over half a century, Muslims in Palestine have been slaughtered and assaulted and robbed of their honor and of their property. Their houses have been blasted, their crops destroyed... This is my message to the American people: to look for a serious government that looks out for their interests and does not attack other people's lands, or other people's honor. And my word to American journalists is not to ask why we did that but ask what their government has done that forced us to defend ourselves... So we tell the Americans as people, and we tell the mothers of soldiers and American mothers in general that if they value their lives and the lives of their children, to find a patriotic government that will look after their interests and not the interests of the Jews (Bin Laden in Miller J., 1998).

The massacre of Palestinians by the Jewish state of Israelis, torture and summary execution of detainees, killing of political adversaries, the shelling of refugee camps and the wars launched by Israel against its Arab neighbors, all depend on American unconditional support. Since 1949, the US government has offered Israel sum of the \$121,190.804 as aid as of April 2014 (Sharp, 2014). Currently, Israel receives \$3 billion annually in the form of US Foreign Military Financing (FMF) (FMF Account summary, 2014).

The Palestinians and some Arab countries have witnessed unrelenting terrorism from the state of Israel. When the Zionist assumed control of Palestine, hundreds of thousand people were made to flee their homes through an act of terror. Among those occasions were the sadistic massacre of 254 Palestinians which included a number of the old men, ladies and children (Duke, 2001).

Intervention in regional disputes by big powers in gulf war and in Kosovo, Bosnia and Chechenia led some groups which are sub-state in the developing countries and the Middle East to utilize low intensity measures to fight their causes while facing disproportionate military might (Gonor,).

Moreover, the inception of terrorism in the Middle East has something to do with al-Qaida and its success under the leadership of Osama bin Laden. The Al-Qaeda which Osama Bin Laden founded was said to have established and financed terrorism worldwide. Al-Qaida came into being in 1990 claimed the United States government. bin Laden was said to take part in *Jihad* against the United States, the West and their allies. This is so because bin Laden perceived the presence of Western army following the 1991 Gulf War in the holy lands of Saudi Arabia as faulty and is determined to cleanse Saudi Arabia and the Muslim lands free from Western domination. The organization has mutual ties with the Taliban government in Afghanistan. As such, the al-Qaida has influence in the Afghanistan government and society as they have been providing the Afghani government with financial, material and even military support. The end result is that the government allowed them to operate their training camps in Afghanistan.

Al-Qaida has carried out various attacks around the globe, among which are the slaughtering of 18 American soldiers in Somalia in 1993, the killing of 5 American soldiers and 2 Indians and leaving about 60 wounded in a car bomb attack in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia on November 13, 1995, coordinated US embassy bombings in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar-es-Salam, Tanzania in August 1998 resulting to the killings of two hundred and twenty four and leaving over five thousand people injured, the USS COLE attack on October 12, 2000 left 17 American sailors killed, and 39 injured, the

September 11 attack which claimed the lives of about 3000 was said to be carried out by bin Laden, though he denied responsibility to the attack etc.

The relationship that existed between United States and bin Laden and Afghanistan in the past is said to be a factor in promoting terrorism in the Middle East. In the 70's When the US was fighting the Soviet Union it recruited, funded, and even trained the *mujahedeen* of which bin Laden was part of to fight the Soviet against having influence in Afghanistan. The then president of the US termed them as morally equivalent to the Americas founding fathers. Not long after bin Laden graduated with a degree in Business organization in 1979, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan; Bin laden left his business to commit his fortune to funding, recruitment, and training of volunteers who are mostly of Arab nationality to promote the US cause against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

The American support for Afghani *mujahedeen* began six months before the soviet invaded Afghanistan. President carter signed the classified first directive which authorized aid to the mujahedeen on 3rd July 1978. The "presidential finding" authorized the "CIA support for insurgent propaganda and other psychological operations to entail the provision of radio access to the Afghan population through third-country facilities and America's supplying of non-military aid to include a half a million dollars in cash" (Tadman, 2013, 42). Carter's directive paved way for the "Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to take a leading role inside Afghanistan six months before the Soviets invaded this geopolitically important country" (Tadman, 2013, 32). The implication is that it assisted the *mujahedeen* through supplying of light weapons, intelligence, services, financial support, training the *mujahedeen* etc. With help from the United States, the *mujahedeen* chased out Soviet Union forces out of Afghanistan.

After the gulf war in 1990, the relationship between Bin laden and the US thawed because the American troops were put into Saudi Arabia after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Osama bin Laden denounced the contamination of the Prophets country by the Western troops, through agitation against the West and the Saudi Monarch.

Osama bin Laden was said to be behind the September 11 attack in the United States of America. Following the terror attack, the US responded with 'global war on terror'

campaign against regimes said to be harboring terrorists. This culminated into termination of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and Saddam Hussein in Iraq. This action as many researchers observe led to the fear of Western domination which in turn led to the growth of anti-US and anti-West sentiments among most Muslims in the Middle East. Muslims were enjoined by Islamic scholars to resist the invasion possibly in a militant way, hence the radicalization of many Muslims that never participated in any kind of insurgency prior to the US invasion. *Al-Qaida* exploited the situation in the Middle East particularly that of the Iraq war, to attract new recruits and donors. In this light, *al-Qaida* merged with *al-Zarqawi's Jama'at al Tawhid wal Jihad* which later metamorphosed to Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and now Islamic State.

Apart from the atrocities of the US in the Middle East, they have participated in terrorist activities elsewhere. What do people say about the over 150,000 persons exterminated in Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bomb attack? Shouldn't something be said about the Vietnam War which resulted into dispassion, injuring and poisoning of food? Overnight villages were turned into concentration camps and over a million were coercively disposed. The list of America atrocities around the globe is endless and in actual act we might never be able to know them all.

Now that the genesis of the current terrorism in the Middle East is given, it is important to delve into some of the radical Muslim groups that the war bred.

Following the invasion of Iraq, by the US, insurgency began and lasted throughout the Iraq war. In the early stage of the war, the insurgents in Iraq mainly targeted coalition forces and later the security forces in Iraq because they are seen as allies to the occupiers (Goodman & Gonzales, 2007). However, when civil war erupted in 2006, attacks were intensified to include Iraq police, military forces and the government of Iraq. Following the withdrawal of American troops in 2011, there was a renewed terrorist attack.

The radicals in Iraq have been made out of a different blend of volunteer militias, foreign fighters, all-Iraqi units or mixtures opposing the American invasion the post-2003 Iraqi government. Amid the stature of the Iraq War in 2006 to 2008, the conflict consists of both clashes against the coalition forces, and sectarian violence among ethnic and religious groups. The groups engaged in an asymmetric warfare and war of attrition

against the American forces and the stooge government they installed, while directing coercive strategies against opponents or groups. Sectarian divides in Iraq seems to be the major dynamic of insurgency in the country as support for insurgents varies from different sections of the population.

Among them are: *Jama'at al Tawhid wal Jihad* which now metamorphosed to IS and *Ansar as Sunna*

2.3. Jama'at al Tawhid wal Jihad

This was a militant organization based in the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan. The group was created by Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi in 1999. The Kingdom of Jordan was considered un-Islamic by the organization and therefore, it intends to overthrow the regime. This was a mission it was unable to achieve. However, following the invasion of Iraq in 2003 by the US, the group diversified its actions to include Iraq, in order to engage and fight coalition forces and their allies in Iraq.

On 17th October, 2004 al-Zarqawi pledged allegiance to bin Laden's al-Qaida. From then, the group changed its name to become *Tanzim Qaidat al-Jihad fi bilad al Rafidayn* (Al-Qaida in Iraq (AQI)). (Pool, 2004). From then the goals of AQI was to: force the withdrawal of coalition force in Iraq; dislodge the interim government in Iraq; eliminate collaborators with the occupiers; exterminate Shiites; and establish an Islamic state (Abu Mohammed, 2005).

In order to achieve the stated objectives, the AQI relied on suicide bombings while also maintaining conventional and guerilla tactics in ambushing coalition forces and Iraq security forces helping the occupation. AQI also targeted Iraq interim government officials, humanitarian workers, United Nations staffs, foreign civilian contractors, Shiites among others (Gary, 2004). In 2005, when the al-Qaeda Central saw the activities of the AQI as alienating the Sunnis and its long term goal of establishing a Caliphate, al-Zawahiri was advised via two letters from the Alqaeda deputy and its senior dialogue and operations head to turndown violence and imposition of Shari'ah.

The AQI leader declared an "all-out-war" on Shiites in response to offensive by the US soldiers in Tal Afar in 2005 (Aljazeera). Following this announcement, the group conducted about a dozen bomb attacks in Baghdad which left about 160 people dead and

570 wounded (International Herald Tribune, 2005). These attacks were believed to be the cause of sectarian violence in Iraq because the attack on Shiite sites led to retaliatory attacks on Sunni mosques in Iraq and brought the country to a brink of violent anarchy in 2007 (DeYong & Pincus, 2007). However, in 2005, when the al-Qaeda Central saw the activities of the AQI as alienating the Sunnis and its long-term goal of establishing a Caliphate, al-Zarqawi was advised via two letters from the Al-Qaida's deputy and its senior dialogue and operations head to turn down violence and imposition of Shari'ah.

In an attempt to unify the Sunni insurgents in Iraq due to its loss of support in the Sunni community and within the insurgency itself, the AQI created the Mujaheden Shura Council (MSC). The MSC aims at new Sunni nationalist and secular groups but the attempt failed due to the group's violent tactics against civilians (Jim, 2007).

AQI together with MSC and *Jund al Sahaba* were merged to become Islamic State in Iraq (ISI). The Islamic State in Iraq's plan was to seize power in the Western and Central parts of Iraq and to turn it into a Sunni Islamic enclave (Uzi, 2007). The US became concerned with the strength and support the ISI was gaining and decided to arm some Sunni dissidents to fight the Islamic State in Iraq instead of Americans (Ewen, 2007). This worked well for the Americans as Sunni dissidents in Baghdad and other central Iraqi hotspots were secured. The group admitted it was in a state of extraordinary crisis.

When the US soldiers started pulling out of Iraq in 2009, ISI rebounded in strength and began launching attacks on government offices with the intention of crippling the new government formed. This however marked a shift in its earlier strategy of sectarianism in which it targeted the Shiites. On 19th of April, 2010, the leaders of ISI (Abu Omar al-Baghdadi and Abu Ayyub al Masri) were killed following a joint US-Iraq raid close to Tikrit (Tim, 2014).

Abubakar al-Baghdadi became the leader of the group in the 16th of May 2010. His appointment enlivened the group's leadership and by July 2012, al-Baghdadi issued an audio statement announcing the group's return to its former stronghold which the US and Sunni allies drove them away prior to US troops withdrawal (Associated Press, 2012). He also stated that there will be new offensive (breaking the walls) in Iraq which will

free its imprisoned members. Following a simultaneous attack on Abu Ghraib and Taji Prisons in July 2013, the group succeeded in freeing more than 500 prisoners (Reuters).

Islamic State in Iraq utilized the situation in Syria and sent a number of fighters. This effort culminated into the creation of an organization known as *Jabhat al Nusra li Ahl asSham* in January 2012 (Abouzaid, 2014). The group created in Syria has wide support from the Syrians opposition. This makes it one of the strong groups in Syrian (Abouzaid, 2014).

2.4. Islamic State in Iraq and Levant

It was following its remarkable success of *Jabhat al Nusra li Ahl asSham* (JN) that al-Baghdadi, the leader of ISI released an audio statement announcing a merger between Islamic State in Iraq and *Jabhat al Nusra li Ahl asSham* to form what is known as Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) or Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) in April 2013 (MEMRI, 2013). The ISIL launched an offensive in 2014 driving away Iraqi government army out of key western cities of Fallujah, Ramadi and Mosul, while in Raqqa governorate of Syria ISIL is fighting both the government and rebel factions among them the *Jabhat al Nusra*. As ISIL advanced, it utilized social media to publicize videos and images that showed ISIL executing many captured Iraqi soldiers. The group keeps making advance to near the Iraqi autonomous region of Kurdistan until in August, when it was halted by the combined airstrikes from US and fierce resistance from the Kurdish *peshmerga*. ISIL was able to establish zones of control in northern and eastern part of Syria. This is what prompted Sarah Birke to conclude that “ISIS has changed the course of the Syrian war. It has forced the mainstream Syrian opposition to fight on two fronts. It has obstructed aid getting into Syria, and news getting out.” (Birke, 2013). Since then, ISIL has evolved as one of the main Jihadi organizations fighting government forces in Iraq and Syria. The presence of this dreaded organization was felt especially with the role it played in the battle for the control of an airbase close to Aleppo. With the help of two Chechen suicide bombers being the initiators of the first strike ISIL came out victoriously after battling the Syrian forces for 10 months to successfully take over the Menagh airbase. Consequently, this made ISIL one of the

leading opposition groups in Syria. It is important to note that ISIS member's allegiance was given to ISI commander and not al-Qaida central (TRAC).

Later in June 2014, renamed itself to Islamic State and established a caliphate over the territories it captured in both Iraq and Syria and al-Baghdadi is declared the caliph of all Muslims not only in their captured territories but all over the globe (Euronews, 2014). ISILs claims to universal leadership of the Muslims were rejected by many Muslim groups.

Unlike the al-Qaida and its affiliates, the ISIL controls vast territory in Syria (up to 35% according to Alarabiya news channel) and Iraq. ISIL rejects nationalism and aims to remove secular governments and replace them with a pan-Islamic caliphate (Moore, 2014). The ISIL established an Islamic Caliphate with working institutions like any working government in the areas they control and have the plan of extending that to cover the Levant (i.e. Jordan, Israel, Palestine, Southern Turkey and Cyprus) and in the future they plan to extend to Europe, the Balkan region, South East Asian countries, Maghreb, the gulf states, Yemen, Egypt, Sudan and Somalia (Moore, 2014)

2.5. Ansar as Sunnah

Ansar as Sunnah is an Iraqi insurgent group which was established in September 2003 as an umbrella organization of *Ansar al Islam* who fled to Iran following an Iraq-US force joint operation in 2003(Khalil, 2007).

The founding declaration of the group was that "Jihad in Iraq has become an individual duty of every Muslim after the infidel enemy attacked the land of Islam" (Gregory, 2008). The Ansar's mission like the AQI and many other insurgent groups is to fight and send the coalition forces out of Iraq. Furthermore, the group wants to establish an Islamic country which is free from external influence of the West.

Like other insurgent groups in Iraq, it utilizes suicide bombings, assassination and ambushing to target coalition forces, political parties, Iraq government and security forces. In February 2004, it carried out an attack on the headquarters of the PUK and KDP political parties. This attack left 109 people killed including Iraq's deputy prime minister. They have also assassinated a Shiite cleric who was an assistant to Ayatollah al

Sistani in 2005. This shows that like the AQI, the Ansar is also sectarian. They also aimed at eliminating the Shiites.

The group changed its name to *Ansar al Islam* via a statement issued by its leader. The message states that: “Given our responsibility in maintaining the principles of Islam, the unity of Muslims and to deal with existential issues, that shall determine our survival; we have decided to continue our work under the name *Ansar al Islam* organization” (Gregory, 2008).

2.6. Jabhat al Nusra li Ahl asSham

This group is also known as the Nusra front was established in 2011 when ISI sent Abu Muhammad al-Julaini to Syria to establish and organize a terrorist cell. It aims at fighting Bashar al-Asads regime. The group made itself known to the public in Syria via a video statement in January 2012. The group made allegiance to al-Qaida leader, al Zawahiri and has received funding from ISI (Australian National Security, 2013).

The mission of the Nusra front is to get rid of Assad and create a Sunni Islamic state in Syria. The group learned lessons from the AQI’s experience in Iraq and avoided beheadings, indiscriminate civilian casualties, sectarian violence etc. which results in loss of support for AQI in Iraq. However, one of the group’s objectives is to expel the *alawite* minority from Syria. It made mention that: “the blessed operation will continue until the land of Syria is purified from the filth of the musayris (Alawites) and the Sunnis are relieved of their oppression” (Reuters, 2012).

The Nusra front like ISI utilized Improvised Explosive Devices (IED), suicide bombings, kidnappings, execution of Syrian forces, sniper and small arm attacks etc. the Nusra front also attacked groups and individuals supporting the regime of Asad (Gordon & Barnard, 2012).

In 2013, when al-Baghdadi unilaterally proclaimed a merger between AQI and Nusra front, the group brazenly rejected the merger while acknowledging the support it received from AQI from its onset (Thomas, 2013). Meanwhile, the group renewed its pledge to al-Qaida. However, some of the members of the Nusra front defected to ISIS. This defection furthers the already existing tension between the groups. As a result, the

two groups fought each other and by March 2014, more than 3000 fighters were killed (Stanford University).

The group remain one of the most prominent insurgent groups in Syria despite the fact of the presence of an internal problem it faces, its losses to ISIL, and its status as a target by US air strike, the group continued its fight against government forces, ISIL and Hezbollah (Stanford University).

2.7. Al-Qaida in the Maghrib

AQIM can be traced to the Armed Islamic Group (GIA) which is a guerilla movement opposed to the secular leadership in Algeria back in the 1990s. Following the French backed military annulment of the second round of parliamentary elections held in 1992 in which the Islamic Salvation Front was poised to win, the insurgency began. GIA commanders become concerned about the brutal tactics of beheading which were alienating their people and as a result broke away to form the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GSPC) in 1998.

By vowing to continue its rebellion without killing civilians, the GSPC drew wide support from the Algerian populace. However, in early 2000, counter terrorism campaign implemented by the Algerian security services and government amnesty in 2005 threw the GSPC into disarray. In order to regain its relevance, the group decided to align with al-Qaida in September 2006. Ayman al-Zawahiri, al-Qaeda's leader, announced the union on September 11, 2006, and GSPC rebranded itself as AQIM in January 2007 (Boudali, 2007).

According to West Point Combating Terrorism Center, the objectives of AQIM is to overthrow governments of Algeria, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia because they are seen as apostates and to establish an Islamic government based on sharia. Furthermore, AQIM declared France and Spain as its target. In particular, France has a colonial history in the region and continues supporting governments the AQIM sees as enemies.

In order to achieve its stated objectives, AQIM utilizes guerilla style attack, suicide bombings of military, government, and civilians and assassinations. Tourists, aid workers, diplomats etc. are often kidnapped and sometimes executed. The group raises

its funds from kidnappings and arm trafficking according to the US state department. Kidnappings also facilitate exchange of prisoners and as well discourage multinational cooperation's from investing in the region.

The West utilises propaganda through its powerful media, technological advancement and economic development to promote its hegemony in the Middle East and the third world in general. Reactions of some Muslims in the Middle East to Western domination, imperialism, neo-colonialism, and exploitation in the name of 'global war on terror' are regarded as terrorism, radicalism, fundamentalism to say the least. In the Middle East, some of the insurgent groups are seen as nationalists' movement striving against the domination of the West. This is because the policies and projects of the West in Iraq and other Middle Eastern countries do not in any way favor them.

Going by traditionalist definition of security, these cases of radical Muslim groups can be said to be left out of security agenda of states. Although comprehensive security discourse captures the activates of these Muslim groups, as affecting human security, Buzan's sectors of security can be said to be the most apt method of unravelling the threats from the activities of these Muslim groups which is in the form of terrorism because it covers both the state and sub-state dimensions of threats.

In the next chapter, I will discuss how terrorism affects the political and societal sectors of security of Middle East states and the world in general.

CHAPTER THREE

TERRORISM AS THREAT TO POLITICAL AND SOCIETAL SECTORS OF SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

3.1. Introduction

In order to analyze the threat posed by terrorism to national security, a link need to be established between terrorism and the two of the five chosen sectors of security i.e. political and societal sectors of security as postulated by Barry Buzan.

3.2. Terrorism and political security in the Middle East.

Since political security is the equivalent of non-military threat security of states, threats to this sector comes in when the idea of the state, its physical base and the institutions developing political ideology becomes at stake. In order to elucidate some points, it becomes a necessity to break the above assumption into questions. How do terrorist activities carried out by radical groups in the Middle East threaten the idea and institutional expression of states? How does it affect the physical base of state in the Middle East? Buzan suggests that after subtracting issues that fall into military, environmental, or economic realm of security, one will be left with ideas of what political institutions are. Typically, the ideas that hold states together are nationalism and political ideology. Threatening such ideas therefore destabilizes the political order of states. The activities of radical Muslim groups in the Middle East have no doubt threatens states, given that the groups have parallel ideologies with the states in the Middle East. While most of the states in the Middle East are nationalist and secular in

the ideology chosen for them by their ruling elites, that of the groups are typically Islamic, anti-secular that has no regard for state borders; in other words, it is transnational. Therefore, there seems to be a clash of political ideologies within the Middle East. Questioning the ideas legitimating an established structure of government, defecting from the established identity of a state (which constitutes a threat to a state's territorial integrity) and or questioning a states right to autonomy constitute threat to political stability of established orders. Political threats are in the form of either total or partial denial of sovereign equality or subversion of legitimacy or both. The activities of the radical Muslim groups in the Middle East have no doubt threaten the autonomy of the states, given that they have already taken part of Iraq and Syria, establishing what they call a caliphate, and are not relenting on taking over the Levant (the rest of Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Israel) and the rest of the Middle East, even with the airstrikes by US, supported by the GCC countries and Jordan. They also have the plan to export their ideology to the rest of the world in the future. Therefore, the territorial integrity of the counties is now at stake.

The activities of Muslim groups which is seen as terrorism is well believed to have been creating security problem for the states and the region. Many answers could be given as to why these groups are unrelenting in creating such problems. It is well known that prior to US invasion of Iraq; radical Muslim groups connected to *al-Qaida* are very limited in number and activities. There was no AQI, or Ansar or Nusra front or the ISIL. The invasion is the immediate cause of this problem. When the US left Iraq, they left it with weak institutions and a system that was unable to include and unite the sectarian division of the country. Instead, the system marginalized the Sunnis; among them are former Baathists military of Saddam Hussein's regime, appeal for these radical Muslim groups become eminent. The Kurdish people were frustrated. In environment where chaos and great suffering becomes the order of the day, and that such is tied to the ruling regime or an outside imperial power, groups like these are likely to emerge and flourish. Such is the case of Iraq, Syria, Libya and most of the countries where terrorism is utilized around the globe.

The announcement of a caliphate by ISIL should not be seen as a mere empty rhetoric. No doubt the ISIL control territories within Syria and Iraq. However, the declaration of

this caliphate raises the question as to the extent to which the ISIL can act like a state? Unlike other groups, the ISIL has a clearly demarcated border which is an essential feature of state. This altered the 1916 Skyes-Picot agreement by Britain and France. The ISIL do not see itself as a terrorist organization but a state. No doubt it has established a holistic system of governance, pursuing duties like any working system. It has institutions of religious affairs, judiciary, education, and security. ISIL also participate in humanitarian and infrastructural projects etc. (Caris & Reynolds. 2014, 4). By establishing these institutions, the ISIL indicates its intent of creating lasting institutions in the territories it governs. Whether seen as a state or a non-state actor, the ISIL and by extension other *al-Qaida* linked groups constitute threat to the states in the region and the world.

The ISIL has no doubt posed security challenge to the Middle East and the international states alike. This threat challenges the stability of states and integrity of territories within the Middle East and the globe in general given its discourse of liberating Jerusalem and as well extending their influence to the Levant. Within the region, in Iraq, the establishment of ISIL could be said to have furthered the autonomy of the Kurdish region although the Kurdish are willing to give chance to unification of Iraq, it seems the Iraqi state has failed in uniting or cementing the different sectarian and ethnic divides existing within the state. This lack of commitment on the part of the government, may lead to total alteration of the artificially created borders of the Middle East via Skyes-Picot agreement of 1916.

Nothing makes the threat from these organizations more conspicuous than the ideological difference of the groups with that of the states in the Middle East. While the groups are pursuing and exporting a version of Sunni Islamist ideology, the states are more inclined to nationalist, pan-Arabist, secular, anti-Islamic or even Shia Islamic (in the case of Iran) ideologies which are seen by the Muslim groups as threatening the values of an ideal Islamic state or society. Should these groups achieve their at least goals within the Middle East, there would be the possibility of making the states in the Middle East falling under an Islamic caliphate. This goal is seen from the system level as distorting the internationally accepted political principles.

Due to the fear from the vulnerability of this threat, the world acted to this development by establishing an international coalition against the Islamic State with Jordan, the Gulf States participating in airstrikes against the group's target. Turkey has also allowed the Iraqi Kurdistan *Peshmerga* to use its territory as a route to gain access to Kobani in order to fight the incursion of ISIL (Pizzi, 2014). Moreover, even though the Iraqi government is not willing to send units to fight the ISIL as long as its Shiite dominated is secured, the ISIL has been facing resistance from other Sunni groups. Furthermore, in the Shia and Kurdish region, the ISIL may not be able to maintain its supremacy given that they lack legitimacy from both the states and its population. Even in the Sunni dominated areas where the ISIL gained popularity due to fear and ideological reasons as many see and thought of ISIL as reviving the Sunni ideology are now not supporting it. As such, this combined pushback and resistance plus the international coalition against ISIL would at least subdue the group and perhaps lead to its downfall of ISIL in Iraq.

Syria's commitment and cooperation in the US-led military operation against the ISIL and other *al-Qaida* affiliated groups has shown that partnership was forged between the Syrian government and the international anti-terrorism coalition. In essence, the prospect of survival of the regime in Syria can be said to have been bolstered by its cooperation and accepting intervention while fighting these groups alongside the international coalition. This has also further sustains the geopolitical influence of Iran given that its narrative has been that of fight against terrorism and regime change in Syria will mean the rise of groups with ideologies that are considered extreme by the west. However, Iran's role in creating Shiite front against radical Sunni Muslim groups could be said to only fuel sectarianism not only in Iraq and Syria but elsewhere in the region.

The US sees the creation of a caliphate by al-Baghdadi as a means of achieving victory for the sake of Islam. Baghdadi proclaimed that "So, take up arms, take up arms, soldiers of the Islamic State! And fight, fight". The IS aims to wage war and avenge against unbelievers until they submit themselves or be destroyed. Although the IS views the non-Islamic world as enemies, regimes they considered as stooges to the West also are part of its enemies, its primary target is the US and Russia. Nothing depicts this more than the well concerned execution on battle field inflicting maximum damage on its enemies (Filger, 2014). Controlling up to 16 provinces in both Iraq and Syria, the IS

adheres to global jihadi principle. However, the US intelligence view the IS as an army on the move beyond a terrorist group due to its swift communication facilities, its incredible command and control system (Baghci, 2014).

By designating al-Nusra as a terrorist group, even though it had not attacked or targeted US interest or homeland suggests that the US sees it as a threat even though many saw this designation as supporting or even strengthening the Assad's regime (Nicholas, 2013). Consequently, this could legitimize its cause among global jihadi supporters. Within the Middle East, the Nusra front has posed threat to first of all the Syrian government given that its ideology and what it seeks to establish after the fall of the regime is in clash with the current ideology. This has undermined the ideas establishing ideologies for the state of Syria and as well the institutions of the state. Lebanon has also fallen into the threats of the Nusra front given that Hezbollah sent troops to fight the groups fighting the Assad's regime. As a result Nusra sent warning to Hezbollah stating that it would regret its actions in Syria. This warning constitutes threat not just to Hezbollah but the Lebanese state which is a consociational arrangement between the sectarian groups in Lebanon. Muslim groups from Syria actively targeted and battled Lebanese troops and Hezbollah forces along its borders. In August for example, al-Nusra and ISIL overran the border town of Aarsal taking 27 Lebanese police as hostage while executing three of them. There is now tension within Lebanon as the sectarian groups have different views of the Syrian insurgency. While the Sunnis support what is happening in Syria, the Shiites back the Syrian government (al-Arabiya, 2014). This action by the groups constitutes the case of subversion, thus affecting the political stability of Lebanon.

3.3. Terrorism and societal security in the Middle East

Given that identity is the organizing principle of societal sector of security, insecurity is said to exist when tribes, nations, race, clans, religions (with its variations) define a development or its potentiality as a threat to its survival. The fall of regimes lead to creation of regimes with no well accepted national vision to the religious, tribal, and ethnic groups already existing in the Middle East. Some of these identity groups sort to impose their will through terrorism. Terrorism which is a threat to individuals and

groups threatens the existence of societies, thus constituting societal security issues. When groups are subjected to forced proselytism, they tend to either accept and convert or migrate to other neighboring states in order to seek for asylum or shelter. Normally, the states or societies within the host states may have different belief, demographic character and ways as the immigrants. This cross border activity in turn leads to vertical competition in the host community, as the hosts now fears of their identity changing given the sociology of migration. Groups that decided not to migrate are forced to change their ways to be in accordance with that of the Muslim groups or if they refused, they may be subjected to policies of extermination. This policy in turn threatens the survival of group's identity or the groups itself. Normally these identity groups facing challenge from the Muslim groups will try to protect themselves since the government has failed in protecting the life of its citizens.

The fall of Saddam in Iraq left Iraq with leadership that has no vision that is well accepted by the minority identity groupings. The Shiites feel they now have the government; Sunnis were left out of the new government, even the Christians that were incorporated in the Saddam regime felt they were left out, while the Kurdish felt frustrated. This happened because the Iraqiness of these groupings was shattered by the new government. The Kurds do not feel they share any national ideas or myth with the Arabs and other identity groups within Iraq; the same thing with the Sunni Arabs and other minorities. Failure of the ruling elite to offer a genuine representation and national vision irrespective of sect or ethnicity led groups affiliated to al-Qaida and the ISIL to fill this vacuum.

In Syria, the Assad's government at first incorporated the Sunni majority, the Christians and Kurds etc. to his regime in all spheres of socio-economic and political life. However, failure of the regime to meet the need of the Syrians led to, at first peaceful protest. The government responded in a repressive way thereby turning the whole thing violent. Iran and Hezbollah sent arms and armies to bolster Assad's regime (Saul & Hafezi, 2014) simply due to close affinity in faith with the *alewites* that has been ruling Syria for long. This only complicated the whole issue and turned the protest into sectarian. As in Iraq, this vacuum created led ISIL to establish a Caliphate in its captured areas of Syria. As murderous and dangerous as ISIL is, it has yet offered a chance to feel

like a citizen (Cambanis, 2014). Unlike in previous models in which citizens are passive or have no role to play, citizens that abide by their rules have active role under the ISIL (Hamid, 2014 in Cambanis 2014). When moderate Muslim Brotherhood that were excluded in the previous regime assumed power following the so called Arab spring, they engaged in an exclusive kind of politics which concentrates power in the hands of the Islamist (Aljazeera, 2013) and sidelines the Egyptian military that has been hitherto strong and relevant in Egyptian politics. A consensus with other identities would have saved Mursi's government. Consequently, the military decided to take over power through the barrel of guns leading to insurgency in the country. In Tunisia, there still lies some difference between the secularist left and the Islamism *ennahda* on what it means to be a Tunisian. Gadhafi's demise left Libya to descend into violence with the *al-Qaida* affiliated *Ansar ash Sharia* declaring an Islamic emirate in Benghazi (Alarabiya, 2014)

The Yazidis in Iraq have suffered from the hands of insurgents due to their belief, which gives significance to the worship of the fallen angel. This importance they attached to Melek Tawus gave them a reputation for being the worshipers of the devil. This infamy, in a country gripped by extremism is made life threatening. Since the US invasion of Iraq, hundreds of the Yazidis were killed by vehicle born improvised explosive device (VBIED) with number of death reaching more than 700 according to the Iraq Red Crescent (Berlinger, 2014). Recently, when ISIL captured the stronghold of the Yazidis, tens of thousands were forced to flee to mount Sinjar and later to the Kurdish administered region of Iraq. The policy of the ISIL which exterminates groups that do not succumb to its interpretation of Islam forced the Yazidis to flee to Mount Sinjar with no food or water, which subsequently led to the death of 40 children do hunger and dehydration as per reports by the UNICEF (Mohammed, 2014). A report by the UN suggest that the Yazidis killed by ISIL were around 5000 men and about 7000 women were abducted and sold in to slavery (Hopkins, 2014). This action by ISIL and other groups threatens the survival of the Yazidis in Iraq. According to Cale (2014)

The rise of Islamic fundamentalism more broadly has pushed thousands of Yazidis to seek asylum in Europe, According to some estimates, 70,000 people or about 15% of the Yazidi population in Iraq fled the country. For a religion that does not accept converts and strongly discourages exogamy, the assimilation of the Yazidi faith in Europe threatens the faiths continued existence (Cale in Jalabi, R. 11, August, 2014).

The Turkmen, making majority of the city of Tal-Afar were as well caught in the civil strife between Sunni and Shiites in Iraq. In 2007, a suicide attack believed to be carried out by AQI killed 150 Turkmen. In the recent advance by ISIL, the Shiite Turkmen villages were not spared the gruesome horror, as they were forced to leave their enclaves. Taylor (2014) reported that “the ISIS rampage is part of a long pattern of attacks by armed Sunni extremist on Turkmen and other minorities...the killings bombings and pillaging threatens to displace entire communities, possibly forever” (HRW, 2014). The ISIL destroyed Shia places of worships and shrines. Following the onslaught 90% of Tal Afar has fled (HRW, 2014).

Al-Qaida affiliated groups and the ISIL has so far executed almost a thousand Christians in Iraq while forcing many to flee to other countries (WND, 2014). The guardian London has estimated the number of Christians to be around 12 million in the Middle East as at July 2014. However, there is drastic decrease in their number since ISIL took over their almost half of Iraq including Mosul, which is the home of Christians for up to 2000 years in Iraq. As these groups continue making advances, Christians were persecuted in Iraq, Syria, Egypt and even Libya. In Syria, the groups threaten to kill the Christians if they do not join them in the fight against the Assad regime. In Egypt, the Coptics were targeted by even the so called moderates and other al-Qaida affiliated groups (WND, 2014). In Iraq, the Christians were asked to convert or pay religious tax and or leave or they be killed. Their places of worship were turned to prayer places by ISIL (Murray, 2014; Hawramy, 2014). Since they are overpowered, the Christians were forced to flee Mosul to the valley of Ninevah and the Kurdish region since they are not willing to go by the demand made by the ISIL. There is a sharp decrease in the number of Christians in Iraq since the beginning of the onslaught unleashed by these groups. The Christians in Iraq were approximately 500,000 but this number declined to 200,000 as a result of the activities of these groups (Berlinger, 2004).

In Syria, ISIL have been killing Alewites, Shiites, and Christians in mass number. They were forced to convert or risk beheadings. And in February, ISIL announced that Christians in Raqqa, Syria must convert, pay tax, or face death just as it later did in the captured territories of Iraq (Levs, 2014). Religious leaders of any group opposing their

ideology were targeted. This according to the UN lead to the murder of tens of Sunni clerics in Iraq who encouraged their follower to reject ISIL

As a result of the atrocities of these *al-Qaida* affiliated groups in the Middle East, many people of different identities immigrated to neighboring countries. Some may end up staying there permanently thus causing tension for their hosts as it affects the societal security - the identity groups. For example, the Sunnis immigrating to neighboring Lebanon are said to have settled in the Shia dominated areas which has affected the character of its demography. According to Abdel Majed Saleh, a Shiite parliament member in Lebanon:

there is fear that the number of Syrians will increase and they will end up staying forever... We took in the Palestinians on the basis that it would be 10 or 15 days, one month, two months; 64 years later, the Palestinians are only increasing. The fear is that Lebanon's demographics will be shaken... it is our right to be cautious (IRIN, 2014).

Saleh was referring to Christians becoming more of a minority, and the possibility of influx of Sunni Jihadists and Syrian opposition figures who may have a security related agenda in Lebanon (IRIN, 2014).

3.4. Perception of threat by states in the Middle East

Given the commitment of states to conventions and treaties currently existing, direct military confrontation from sovereign states to sovereign state is almost obsolete. However, the activities of radical Muslim groups in the Middle East becomes more dangerous than the threat or fear of threat from states, thereby limiting sovereignty and undermining territorial integrity of states. Nothing depicts this as the perception and vulnerability of threats that is coming from within. The states in the Middle East cooperated and participated in one way or the other, in the war on terror campaign that was embarked by the US and the west due to how they perceive threat from terrorism following the September 11 attack in the US. While prior to the US invasion, the regime in Iraq sees terrorism as a threat to its security, the US on the other hand viewed Iraq as supporting and harboring terrorists. In fact, during Saddam Hussein's regime, Iraq was concerned with its security given that it's secular, Baathist, anti-Islamic ideology is not in line with that of the radical Muslim groups. One of the major tenets of radical Muslim group's ideology is that secular regimes have oppressed the believers and plagued Islam into chaos, therefore, their goals for very long has been to oust regimes they consider as

secularist and dangerously executing Muslim leaders. However, the toppling of Saddam comes in with purging of the Baathists state apparatus which was dominated by the Sunni minority. The army in which many of them constitute the Sunni minority was disbanded, leaving many frustrated and jobless. Due to their lack of relevance and influence in the new Shia dominated and US backed political establishment, many of former Saddam's soldiers joined insurgents against the occupation of Iraq, thus enlivening and strengthening al-Qaida affiliated groups. Though the newly instituted government saw the threat of these groups, it was unable to fight the war simply due to the fact that it became party to the whole situation, given the character of the government's composition and the governments favoring of the Shiites over other groups that constitute the country.

In view of the vulnerability of the treats from the activities of Muslim Groups, the Iraqi national assembly implemented an anti-terrorism law in 2005. However, this law was widely criticized by the Sunni Muslims, because its article 4 which states that "anyone who committed, as a main perpetrator or a participant, a terrorist act, along with anyone who incites, plans, finances or assists terrorists to commit such a crime" and "anyone who intentionally covers any terrorist act or harbor a terrorist with the concealment" constitutes death sentence and life imprisonment respectively. The Sunnis in Iraq alleged that the law given its skewed invocation by the judiciary was used by Maliki against his Sunni opponents (Abdel Sadah, 2013). Moreover, Abadi, the newly appointed prime minister, in his first press conference states that "I am not ready in the future to send units from the south to fight in Mosul and Anbar. I want the people of Mosul to liberate Mosul, the people of Anbar to liberate Anbar...and I will support them" (Abadi in Kadhim, 2014). His refusal to send units from the south may reflect the general sentiment in the south and "the resentment of Shia communities who refuse to continue sacrificing the lives of their sons to defend predominantly hostile provinces" (Kadhim, 2014) shows that there is no commitment to the Iraqi nation. This may mean that, the new government is not committed to defend Sunni territories of Iraq as long as Shia dominated territories are protected by the Shiite militia. This in essence has depicted the existence of a shift in the political discourse of the Shiites in Iraq, as they now see Iraq

as an entity running between Baghdad and Basra, and, as well it is protected, the rest of Iraq is not their concern.

In Tunisia like in Iraq, the government saw terrorism as threatening its national security and as a result, anti-terrorism laws were enacted during ben Ali's regime in 2003. However, the laws were used to target sometimes non-violent opposition figures and dissidents. As a trusted ally to the US in the GWOT, the regime used it to strengthen and consolidate its power within Tunisia and legitimacy abroad according to UN report. The war on terror campaign by Tunisia comes into question if one looks at the role its security apparatus played while collaborating with the CIA to transport suspected terrorists through Tunis and also its utilization of intimidation tactics to repress domestic challengers to ben Ali (Lynch, 2011).

Although the Algerian government is a party to the rise of insurgency following the banning of Islamic party that won election in 1991, it was among the first to condemn the September 11 attacks in the US. For many years Algeria has seen terrorism as constituting both political and societal problem both within and outside its territory thereby been calling for the creation of an international mechanism to fight it. This call was a result of its experience with Muslim groups in which over 200,000 were killed and a collateral damage of over \$30 billion (Berkouk, 2009). Although Algeria and US have not been good friends, the war on terror led to rapprochement between the two countries even though they share different conception to terrorism. To Algiers, Hamas is not a terrorist organization while to Washington it is. Notwithstanding this, and in view of the threat groups pose not to only its sovereignty, the Algerian government engaged in both bilateral and multilateral effort to combat this threat. Unlike in Iraq, the ruling elites are determined to defend its territorial integrity. Abdulmalek Sellal, the Algerian PM reasserts the states commitment to vigorously fight terrorism. In his words, "our troops were put on alert in the south and the boarders with a mission to defend the countries territorial integrity" (Racelma, 2013).

With Raqqa now the capital of the Islamic state in Iraq and Levant, no doubts the threat it poses to the political, societal but economic, and even environmental levels of security within the borders of Syria and the entire Middle East and the world in general. Assad

sees the threat and is now cooperating with the world in the fight on terror. Like other Middle East countries, Syria also enacted laws on counter-terrorism. However, the human right watch alleged that the special courts established for the trial of terrorists was instead used to stifle dissidents and activist that are against the regime in Syria (HRW, June 25, 2013).

Jordan like Algeria is one of the countries that warn against the grave dangers of terrorism not just to its security but to the region and the world in general. Given that its founder, King Abdullah I and two of its PMs were lost to terrorism (Mayas, 2009, 63-64), it participated in formulating agreements on counter terrorism at both regional and international levels. Jordan is known for condemnation of any act of terrorism. As a threat to its national security, the kingdom of Jordan remains committed to zero-tolerance with regard to any activity that would harm its national security. In the light of the above, the Jordanian government continued its fight against terrorist and not giving chances for its territory to serve as a base for terrorist activities no matter who their target is.

Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirate now see the threat form these radical Muslim groups especially from the advance made by ISIL and ultimately due to international condemnation of the beheading and other mayhem unleashed by the group. These countries are bound by the shared fear of Iran which has a Shiite ideology, its non-status quo nature and its support for regimes that have Shiites as their heads. Therefore, they fear the Shia ideology dominating the region. This could however be the main reason why these countries support, sponsor or remain indifferent to the activities of these radical Sunni groups. However, their action or inaction backfires when ISIL announced the establishment of an Islamic state and as well renouncing the recognition of any ruler or state in the region. Given the threat now posed by ISIL, these countries collaborate with the US to fight the newly established Islamic state. President Obama while announcing the anti-Islamic state coalition airstrikes in Syria noted that it was with the support of five Arab countries making the strikes “not American fight alone” (Schulberg, 2014).

Looking at how these countries perceive threats from terrorism, it can be said that countries perception to vulnerability from a security threat varies due to ideological differences. While countries in the gulf do not really take the activities of the Sunni Muslim groups as very important to their national security agenda, perhaps due to similarity in the their ideologies, other regimes that are secular, or has conflicting political ideologies with the Muslim groups perceives terrorism as detrimental to their national security. Even with this, one may say that the states in the Middle East are more concerned with the survival of the elite ruling regimes. For them political security is equivalent to regime survival.

This chapter answered the posed research question and concluded that activities of the Muslim groups in the form of terrorism do pose threat to the political and societal sector of the states in the Middle East and the world in general. Traditional thinking about security suggests that this is not a threat since threats only comes from states. However, this new thinking has shown that treats from within states can even affect other states in the globe irrespective of their geographical proximity.

In the next chapter, which is the conclusion, summary of the research would be offered. Its significance as well as recommendations for further research would be offered.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

New security threats have no doubt change the way countries view security. While during the cold war security of states is the primary, in the post-cold war security environment, threats such as terrorism, drug trafficking, organized crime, etc. become relevant to the security of states. In this 21st century and, in the Middle East, activities of radical Muslim groups constitute what is generally believed to be terrorism. GWoT embarked by the United State and its ally has great impact in the Middle East as it fuelled terrorism. It was through this action in the name of GWoT that *al-Qaida* utilized the situation to affiliate itself with Muslim groups in Iraq while gaining both legitimacy and support among Muslims who saw the invasion as a form of neocolonialism, domination or even exploitation or annexation of Muslim lands by the west. This led Muslims and groups to become radicalized thereby resorting to terrorism in order to alley their grievances; with liberating Iraq and the Middle East from Western domination as their discourse. Since then, groups such as *Ansar as Sunna*, AQI, and later ISIL, *Jabhat al Nusrah*, Al-Qaida in the Arab Peninsular, AQIM, among others have been causing serious security problem not for the states in the region but for the world in general.

Ordinarily, during the cold war period, many theories of security do not take into account threats from within as really a security problem for governments. Walts, security argument has to do with military and state survival which becomes irrelevant in the post-cold war environment However, owing to the prevalence of new evolving

security problems in the post-cold war environment, scholars in the field of security began widening and deepening security discourse in order to capture the threats from these new security challenges. Vast literature covering security and securitization does not cover the true magnitude of societal and political security. Like Walt, Ayoobs excluded global security in his analysis but his argument is that states are still the primary mode of organization in the international system. He acknowledges that vulnerabilities that can threaten states can be both internal and external. This in essence has left out threats terrorism pose to global security. Asberg and Wallesteen to some extent gave less importance to sub-units and individuals as security providers. The activities of radical Muslim groups which carries the form of terrorism is said to have threatened the core value of sovereignty and territorial integrity of states as the monopoly over the use of violence. What about the societal aspect of security? This is left out in their analysis. In Booth however, security is synonymous to emancipation, and that, security and insecurity is located at individual levels. The activities of radical Muslim groups may be seen as groups trying to liberate themselves “from those physical and human constraints” but through a violent means. Booths argument suggests that one is only free if all are free. However, it is hard to attain this freedom and liberty, which is relative and subjective. What is freedom for one person or group may not be freedom others. Klare and Thomas human security has a global outlook to contemporary security problem but states actors are relegated due to the fact that, their belief is that; states cannot handle new security threats such as environmental and financial crises. Given that the referent object of security in the developing world is the people, this theory cannot be effectively used to analyze the real threats from the activities of radical Muslim groups to the states in the Middle East. Moreover, all the human security debates explored (UNDP 994; Alkire 2003; King and Murray 2001 etc.), however, can be said to have less regard for the states, as actions towards curbing new security issues in themselves ruin the sovereignty of states. Furthermore, the securitization and the desecurization thesis only led to desecurization in the case of GWOt campaign led by President Bush of the US. He was able to securitize the threat from terrorism through an act of speech and the audience accepted it. However, the termination of Iraqi regime with its implication led to desecuritization within the American public and some states in

the globe. The current happening of the Charlie Hebdo led world leaders to march on the street of Paris. This aims to re-securitize the threats from terrorism. However, this thesis as well fails to depict the real threat of terrorism as leaders tend to securitize it leaving more dangerous threats to national security.

Since states are still relevant in the international system, debates on security that encompass the state and as well other referent objects is the most appropriate in analyzing threats of terrorism to states in the Middle East. Therefore, in order to capture how terrorism affects the national security of states in the Middle East and the globe, this thesis employed two of the five sectors as well as three of the levels of analyzing security propounded by Barry Buzan. Although, environmental, economic and military are important in making a more valid analysis, some of the threats may fall under the political. However, political and societal sectors help in examining the real threats posed by terrorism to national security of states. These two sectors are as well very important for any state that has different identities and tendency to conflicting ideologies with that of the states. To some extent, in the Middle East, identities were not threatened from within as is now; ideologies of these groups as well were not strong as they are now. Threat to societal and political sectors of security is enough to tear any country or in this case, the region apart and wreak havoc to the established order of states in the world, given the diverse identities and different political ideologies existing within the Middle East.

In the political level, which is about the ideologies that give states and governments legitimacy, organizational stability has affected the stability of states within the Middle East and the globe in general; given the Muslim groups discourse of liberating at least the Middle East from this domination. The ideological divergence of the states and that of the groups has automatically questioned the states legitimacy to rule. The annexation of vast territory within the states of Syria and Iraq has further showed that the groups, especially ISIL has denied legitimacy to the states within which it created its own caliphate. Within the region, activities of the groups have strengthened the geopolitical position of some states over others. This is believed to have strengthened sectarian strife between the Sunni and Shiite Muslim identities in the region. While in the international system level, the groups tend to affect the established orders.

On the societal plane, the activities of Muslim groups have created problems for the identities in the Middle East, as many identities feel they are threatened through the policies of extermination or forced proselytization carried out by the radical Muslim groups especially the ISIL. These policies which cause identities to feel their ways are threatened forced them to migrate to other neighboring states. In their host communities, there seems to be fear that the immigrants can have impact on the identities in the future, thereby affecting the demographic character of such states. This is capable of causing imbalance in their adopted system of governance. Moreover, some of these migrants such as the Yazidis felt they are going to be assimilated to the ways of the Europeans for the simple fact that, their religion does not accept converts and strongly discourages exogamy. This in essence has threatened the faith as an identity to continue existing.

Though the ruling elites saw the threat from terrorism, they manipulate threats to their favor, thereby; securitizing what they think is threatening their regimes survival. It was concluded that at least based on actions and commitments of leaders to combat this new security challenge, terrorism pose security challenge to both the political and societal sectors of security.

While to some extent the theory applied was able to depict security challenges in the light of terrorism, some difficulties were faced while applying the theory. Firstly, sorting out what threat pose what to what referent object was not easy as many political threats were overlapping the societal and vice versa. However, this should not be a case because Buzan noted that “the sectors do not operate in isolation from each other. Each define a focal point within the security problematique, and a way of ordering priorities, but are woven together in a strong web of linkage” (Buzan, 1991b, 433). Secondly, the results from this analysis does not depict the true dangers posed by terrorism to the security of states given that it was only applied to the two of the five sectors of security advanced by Barry Buzan. The military, economic and environmental sectors as well as some of the human aspects of security are left out while analyzing the case.

The above conclusion suggests that this study is not exhaustive. Therefore, there are areas for further researches. First of all analyzing the threats posed by terrorism to each of the states within the Middle East or some states affected by terrorist activities from Muslim

groups such as Nigeria (with *Boko Haram* overrunning some of its territories), Uzbekistan (struggling with the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan), Pakistan, and Kenya (battling the *Shabab*) would provide a more comprehensive test of the theory used. Based on the above, the theory utilized may be expanded to comprise the three left out sectors of security (i.e. economic, environmental, and military) or even be modified to include other human aspects of security. Moreover, further application of quantitative analysis would no doubt yield a more acceptable result.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdel Sadah, A. 2013. **Iraq in Crisis Over Terror Death-Penalty Law**,
<http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/01/irp-terrorism-sadah-w-arabic-version.html#> [06.12.2014].
- Abouzeid, Rania. 2014. **Jihad Next Door**.
http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2014/06/al-qaeda-iraq-syria-108214_Page2.html#.VG5MTvk1h0s [10.11.2014].
- Abu Muhammad (2005). **Later dated July 2005. Office of the director national intelligence**,
https://web.archive.org/web/20110522153638/http://www.dni.gov/press_releases/letter_in_english.pdf [15.12.2014].
- Alarabiya 2014. **Benghazi declared ‘Islamic emirate’ by militants**,
<http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/middle-east/2014/07/31/Libya-s-Ansar-al-Sharia-declares-Islamic-state-in-Benghazi.html> [06.12.2014].
- Alarabiya. 2014. **Syria al-Qaeda chief threatens Lebanon over Hezbollah role**,
<http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/middle-east/2014/11/05/Syria-Qaeda-chief-threatens-Lebanon-over-Hezbollah-role-.html> [06.12.2014].
- Aljazeera. 2005. **Al Zarqawi Declares War on Iraqi Shias**,
<http://www.aljazeera.com/archive/2005/09/200849143727698709.html>
 [12.11.2014].
- Al-Salhy, Suadad. 2013. **Al-Qaeda Says it Freed 500 Inmates in Iraq Jail-break**.
<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/07/23/us-iraq-violence-alqaeda-idUSBRE96M0C720130723> [12.11.2014].
- Asberg, Carl J., Wallenstein Peter. 1998. **Preventing Violent Conflict: Past Records and Future Challenges**. ed. Department of Peace and Conflict Research: Uppsala University
- Associated Press. 2013. **Al Qaeda: we’re Returning to Old Iraq Stronghold**.
<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4258888,00.html> [13.11.2014].
- Ayoob, Mohammed. 1995. **The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict and the International System**. Boulder: Lynne Rienner
- Ayoob, Mohammed. 1997. “Defining Security: A subaltern realist perspective”.
Critical Security Studies, ed. Krause, Keith, Williams Michael C.
 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota press: 121-146

- Baghci, Proloy. 2014. **The Islamic State: A New Threat From Middle East**, http://www.litterareport.com/_st5d44ee6f2c3f71b73125876103c8f6c4 [08.12.2014].
- Balzacq, Thierry. 2005. "Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context", **European Journal of International Relations**. c.11 s.2: 171-201.
- Balzacq, Thierry. 2011. "A Theory of Securitization: Origins, Core Assumptions and Variants". **Securitization Theory: How Security Problems emerge and dissolve**" ed. Balzacq, Thierry. London: Routledge.
- Baylis, John, Smith Steve, Owens Patricia. 2011. **The Globalization of World Politics: an introduction to international relations**. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Berkouk, Mhand. 2009. **U.S.–Algerian Security Cooperation and the War on Terror**. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2009/06/17/u.s.-algerian-security-cooperation-and-war-on-terror> [01.12.2014].
- Berlinger, Joshua. 2014 **Who are the religious and ethnic groups under threat from ISIS?** <http://edition.cnn.com/2014/08/08/world/meast/iraq-ethnic-groups-under-threat-isis/> [10.12.2014].
- Birke, Sarah. 2013. **How al-Qaeda Changed the Syrian War** <http://www.nybooks.com/blogs/nyrblog/2013/dec/27/how-al-qaeda-changed-syrian-war/> [15.12.2014].
- Blair, Charles. P. 2014. **ISIS: The unsurprising surprise that is sweeping Iraq**, <http://thebulletin.org/isis-unsurprising-surprise-sweeping-iraq7251> [15.12.2014].
- Booth, Ken. 1991. "Security and Emancipation". **Review of International Studies**. c. 17 s. 4: 313-326
- Booth, Ken. 1991. "Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice". **International Affairs**. c. 67 s. 3: 527-545
- Buzan, Barry, Wæver Ole. 2003. **Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, Barry. 1991a. **People, States & Fear**. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Buzan, Barry. 1991b. "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-first Century". **International Affairs**. c. 67 s. 3: 431-451.
- Buzan, Barry, Wæver Ole, de Wilde Jaap. 1998. **Security: A New Framework for Analysis**. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Canbanis, T. 2014. **The Surprising Appeal of ISIS**. **Boston Global**, <http://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2014/06/28/the-surprising-appeal-isis/19YwC0GVPQ3i4eBXt1o0hI/story.html> [10.12.2014].
- Caris, Charles, Reynolds Samuel. 2014. "ISIS Governance in Syria. Middle East Security Report 22". **Institute for the study of War**.

- Coles, Isabel. 2012. **Militant Group Claims Suicide Bombings in Syria**.
<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/21/us-syria-blast-claim-idUSBRE84K0AT20120521> [12.11.2014].
- Collins, Allan. 2007. **Contemporary Security Studies**. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Cook, Steven A. 2014. **Washington Can't Solve the Identity Crisis in Middle East Nations**, <http://www.cfr.org/middle-east-and-north-africa/washington-cant-solve-identity-crisis-middle-east-nations/p33349> [21.12.2014].
- Crimi, Frank. 2012. **Ethnic Cleansing of Syrian Christians**,
<http://www.frontpagemag.com/2012/frank-crimi/ethnic-cleansing-of-syrian-christians/> [06.12.2014].
- DeYong, Karen, Pincus Walter. 2007. **Al Qaeda in Iraq may not be threat here**,
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/17/AR2007031701373.html> [12.11.2014].
- Douglas, Erica, Wentz Nichelle. **Terrorism in the Middle East: A Clash of Cultures**,
<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:q7zyrrwAF4sJ:web.stanford.edu/class/e297a/Terrorism%2520in%2520the%2520Middle%2520East%2520-%2520A%2520Clash%2520of%2520Cultures.doc+%&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=cy> [05.11.2014].
- Duke, David. 2001. **Will Anyone Dare to Ask Why?**,
https://www.stormfront.org/0901/duke_dare.htm [09.11.2014].
- Enders, Walter, Sandler Todd 2009. "Transnational Terrorism in the Post-Cold War Era". **International Studies Quarterly**. c. 43 s. 1: 145-167
- Euronews. 2014. **ISIL Renames Itself 'Islamic State' and Declares Caliphate in a Captured Territory**, <http://www.euronews.com/2014/06/30/isil-renames-itself-islamic-state-and-declares-caliphate-in-captured-territory/> [12.11.2014].
- Ewen, MacAskill. 2007. **US arms Sunni Dissidents in Risky Bid to contain al-Qaida fighters in Iraq**.
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/jun/12/usa.iraq> [13.11.2014].
- Filger, Sheldon. 2014. **Does the Islamic State (aka ISIS and ISIL) Pose a Threat to America?**, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/does-the-islamic-state-ak_b_5852132.html [06.12.2014].
- Foreign Military Financing Account Summary,
<http://www.state.gov/t/pm/ppa/sat/c14560.htm> [12.11.2014].
- Gary, Gambill. 2004. "Abu Musa'b al Zaraqawi: A Biographical Sketch". **Terrorism Monitor**. c. 2 s. 24
http://www.jamestown.org/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=27304
 [12.11.2014].

- Goodman, Amy. 2007. **Meeting Resistance: New Doc Follows Iraqis Fighting U.S. Occupation of Their Country**
http://www.democracynow.org/2007/10/18/meeting_resistance_new_doc_follows_iraqi [17.11.2014].
- Gordon, Michael, Barnard Anne. 2012. **US Places Militant Syrian Rebel Group on List of Terrorist Organizations**,
<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/11/world/middleeast/us-designates-syrian-al-nusra-front-as-terrorist-group.html> [12.11.2014].
- Gregory, Kathryn. 2008. **Ansar al-Islam (Iraq, Islamists/Kurdish Separatists), Ansar al-Sunnah**, <http://www.cfr.org/iraq/ansar-al-islam-iraq-islamistskurdish-separatists-ansar-al-sunnah/p9237> [16.11.2014].
- Hawramy, Fazel. 2014. **‘They are savages,’ say Christians forced to flee Mosul by ISIS**, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jul/24/iraqi-christians-mosul-isis-convert-islam-or-be-executed> [16.12.2014].
- Hopkins, Steve. 2014. **Full horror of the Yazidis who didn’t escape Mount Sinjar: UN confirms 5,000 men were executed and 7,000 women are now kept as sex slaves**, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2792552/full-horror-yazidis-didn-t-escape-mount-sinjar-confirms-5-000-men-executed-7-000-women-kept-sex-slaves.html#ixzz3MRkhaUEH> [12.12.2014].
- Human Rights Watch. 2014. **Iraq: ISIS Kidnaps Shia Turkmen, Destroys Shrines Pillaging, Threats in Capture of Villages near Mosul**,
<http://www.hrw.org/news/2014/06/27/iraq-isis-kidnaps-shia-turkmen-destroys-shrines> [16.12.2014].
- Huntington, Samuel. P. 1996. **The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order**. New York: Simon and Schuster
- International Herald Tribune 2005. **Another Wave of Bombings hit Iraq**,
www.ihrt.com/articles/2005/09/15/africa/web.0915iraq.php [12.11.2014].
- IRIN. 2014. **Syrian refugees head to Lebanon’s Shia south**,
<http://www.irinnews.org/fr/report/97355/syrian-refugees-head-to-lebanon-s-shia-south> [21.12.2014].
- Jalabi, Raya. 2014. **Who Are The Yazidis And Why Is ISIS Hunting Them? The guardian**, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/aug/07/who-yazidi-isis-iraq-religion-ethnicity-mountains> [11.12.2014].
- James, Paul. 2014. “Human Security as a Left-over of Military Security, or as Integral to the Human Condition”. **Human Security and Japan’s Triple Disaster**. ed. Bacon, Paul, Hobson Christopher. London: Routledge
- Jim, Muir. 2007. **US Pits Iraqi Sunni against al Qaeda**,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/6740683.stm> [12.11.2014].
- Kadhim, Abbas. 2014. **What Is Iraqi Prime Minister-Designate Haider Al-Abadi’s Plan for Iraq?**, <http://www.fpi.sais-jhu.edu/#!What-Is-Iraqi-Prime->

MinisterDesignate-Haider-AlAbadi%E2%80%99s-Plan-for-Iraq/c1ujz/BBEB8B78-8FFE-423A-B8E3-922F2814BA8A [12.11.2014].

Khalid, Lydia. 2007. **The Hidden Hand of Iran in the Resurgence of Ansar al-Islam.**

http://www.jamestown.org/programs/tm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=4213&no_cache=1#.VG5VaPk1h0s [12.11.2014].

King, Gary, Murray, Christopher. 2002. "Rethinking Human Security". **Political Science Quarterly**: c. 116 s. 4: 585-610

Kiras, James.D. 2011. "Terrorism and Globalization". **Globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relation**" 5th ed. Baylis, John, Smith Steve, Owens Patricia. New York: Oxford University Press. 366-380

Klare, Michael T., Thomas Donald C. 1994. **World security: Challenges for a new century.** New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kothari, Cartik. R. 2004. **Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques.** New Delhi: New Age International Publishers Limited.

Krause, Keith, Williams, Michael C. 1996. "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods". **Mershon International Studies Review**. c. 40 s. 2: 229-254.

Laqueur, Walter. 1996. "Postmodern Terrorism: New Rules for an Old Game." **Foreign Affairs**, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/52432/walter-laqueur/postmodern-terrorism-new-rules-for-an-old-game> [17.10.2014].

Leonard, Sarah, Kaunert Christian. 2011, "Reconceptualising the Audience in Securitization Theory". **Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve** ed. Balzacq, Thierry. London: Routledge.

Levs, Josh. 2014. **Will Anyone Stop ISIS?** <http://edition.cnn.com/2014/08/07/world/meast/stopping-isis/index.html> [13.12.2014].

Liepman, Andrew, Nichiporuk Brian, Killmeyer Jason. 2014. Alternative Futures for Syria: Regional Implications and Challenges for the United States. **RAND Corporation**, www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE129.html [13.12.2014].

McDonald, Matt. 2008. "Securitization and the Construction of Security". **European Journal of International Relations**. c. 14 s. 4: 563-589.

Mcsweeney, Benjamin. 1998. "Durkheim and the Copenhagen School: A Response to Buzan and Waever". **Review of International Studies**. c. 24 s. 1: 137-140.

MEMRI. 2013. **ISI confirms that Jabhat Al Nusra is its Extension in Syria, Declares 'Islamic State of Iraq and Al-Sham' As New Name of Merged Group**, <http://www.memrijtm.org/isi-confirms-that-jabhat-al-nusra-is-its-extension-in-syria-declares-islamic-state-of-iraq-and-al-sham-as-new-name-of-merged-group.html> [14.11.2014].

"Middle East". **Britannica Encyclopedia Online Edition**, <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/381192/Middle-East> [13.11.2014].

- Mohammed, Layla. 2014. **UNICEF: 40 Yazidi children died due to violence, displacement & dehydration**, <http://www.iraqinews.com/features/0-children-of-yezidi-community-died-due-to-violence-displacement-amp-dehydration-says-unicef/> [5.12.2014].
- Moten, Abdulrashid R, 2010. "Understanding terrorism: Contested concept, conflicting perspectives and shattering consequences". **Intellectual Discourse**, c. 18 s. 1: 35-63.
- Moyano, M. J. 1995. **Argentina's Lost Patrol, Armed Struggle, 1969-1979**. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Murray, Douglas. 2014. **Why Are We Abandoning the Middle East's Christians to ISIS?** <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9397482/christians-are-being-driven-out-of-the-middle-east/> [13.12.2014].
- Newman, Edward. 2001. "Human Security and Constructivism". **International Studies Perspectives**. c. 2 s. 3: 239-251.
- Nicholas Demas, 2013. **The Ideological War in the Middle East No One Is Talking About**, <http://mic.com/articles/57827/the-ideological-war-in-the-middle-east-no-one-is-talking-about> [13.12.2014].
- National Intelligence Estimate. 2006. **Trends in Global Terrorism: Implications for the United States**, <http://www.nytimes.com/packages/html/politics/nie20060926.pdf> [17.8.2014].
- Nye, Joseph. S., Lynn-Jones Sean. 1988. "International Security Studies: A Report of a Conference on the State of the Field". **International Security**, c. 12 s. 4: 5-27.
- Pizzi, Michael. 2014. **US Support, Turkish tolerance for Syrian Kurds adds to regional Confusion**, <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/10/20/turkey-kurds-assad.html> [17.12.2014].
- Pool, Jeffery. 2004. **Zarqawi's Pledge of Allegiance to Al-Qaeda: From Mu'asker Al-Battar**, http://www.jamestown.org/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=27305#.VG4i9fk1h0s [12.11.2014].
- Racelma, Kaci. 2013. **Algeria: New Chapter in War Against Terrorism**, <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/01/algeria-war-against-terrorism.html> [8.12.2014].
- Rappaport, David C. 2004. "The four waves of modern terrorism". **Attacking Terrorism: Elements of Grand Strategy** ed. Cronin, Audrey K., Ludes James M. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Saul, Jonathan, Hafezi Parisa. 2014. **Iran boosts military support in Syria to bolster Assad**, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/02/21/us-syria-crisis-iran-idUSBREA1K09U20140221> [20.12.2014].
- Schulberg, Jessica. 2014. **Five Arab Countries Are Supporting Obama's Strikes in Syria. What's Their Strategy?**

- <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/119552/five-arab-countries-support-obamas-airstrikes-syria-heres-why> [14.12.2014].
- Sharp, Jeremy. 2014. **US Foreign Aid to Israel, Congressional research report** <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf> [5.10.2014].
- Stanford University. 2014. **Mapping Militant Organizations: Jabhat al Nusra.** <http://web.stanford.edu/group/mappingmilitants/cgi-bin/groups/view/493> [17.11.2014].
- Stone, Marianne. 2009. Security According to Buzan: A Comprehensive Security Analysis. **Security Discussion Papers Series 1**, http://geest.msh-paris.fr/IMG/pdf/Security_for_Buzan.mp3.pdf [5.5.2014].
- Stritzel, Holger. 2007. "Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond". **European Journal of International Relations**, c. 13 s. 3: 357-383.
- Tadman, Kyle. 2013. "An American Provocation: U.S. Foreign Policy during the Soviet-Afghanistan War". **Western Illinois Historical Review**. c. 5: 31-65
- Tarry, Sarah.** 1999. "Deepening and widening: an analysis of security definitions in the 1990s". **Journal of Military and Strategic Studies**. 1-13
- Telhami, Shibley. 2001. **American Foreign Policy towards the Muslim World.** <http://www.brookings.edu/views/interviews/telhami/20010921.htm> [9.11.2014].
- Terriff, Terry, Croft Stuart, James Lucy, Morgan Patrick. 2001. **Security Studies Today.** Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Terrorism**, <http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/terrorism.aspx> [5.10.2014].
- Terrorism**, <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=terrorism> [5.10.2014].
- Thomas, Joscelyn. 2013. **AlQaeda in Iraq, Al Nusra Front Emerged as Rebranded Single Entity.** http://www.longwarjournal.org/archives/2013/04/the_emir_of_al_qaeda.php [12.11.2014].
- Tim, Arango. 2014. **Top Qaeda Leaders in Iraq Killed in Raid.** http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/20/world/middleeast/20baghdad.html?_r=0 [13.11.2014].
- UNDP. 1994. **Human Development Report,** http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nosta_ts.pdf [10.8.2014].
- Uzi, Mahnaimi. 2007. **Al-Qaeda planning Militant Islamic State within Iraq.** <http://web.archive.org/web/20110524071632/http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/iraq/article1782088.ece> [12.11.2014].
- Van Maanen, John. 1979." Reclaiming Qualitative Methods for Organizational Research: A Preface". **Administrative Science Quarterly**, c. 24 s. 4: 520-526
- Vuori, Joshua A. 2008 "Illocutionary logic and strands of Securitization: Applying the theory of Securitization to the study of Non-democratic Political Orders". **European Journal of International Relations**, c. 14, s. 1: 65-99.

- Wæver, Ole, Buzan Barry, Kelstrup Morten, Lemaitre Pierre. 1993. **Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe**. London: Printer Publishers Ltd.
- Wæver, Ole. 1998. "Securitization and Desecuritization". **On Security** ed. Lipschutz Ronnie D. New York: Colombia University Press
- Wæver, Ole, 2004. **Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen – new schools in security theory and their origins between core and periphery**. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Montreal.
- Walt, Stephen M. 1991. "The renaissance of Security Studies". **International Studies Quarterly**. c. 35 s. 2: 211-239
- Williams, Michael C. (2003). "Words Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics". **International Studies Quarterly**. c. 47 s. 4: 511-531.
- WND. 2014. **ISIS declares Christians No.1 Enemy**, <http://www.wnd.com/2014/10/isis-document-ids-christians-as-enemy-no-1/> [17.12.2014].
- Wolfers, Arnold. 1952. "National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol". **Political Science Quarterly**. c. 67 s. 4: 481-502.
- Zachary, Laub, Masters Jonathan. 2014. **Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM)**, <http://www.cfr.org/terrorist-organizations-and-networks/al-qaeda-islamic-maghreb-aqim/p12717> [12.11.2014].
- Zelin, Aaron Y. 2012. "The Rise of Al Qaeda in Syria". **Foreign Policy**, <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/the-rise-of-al-qaeda-in-syria> [15.12.2014].