



Security and Globalization in the Context of International Terrorism¹

Nilüfer KARACASULU*

Abstract

This article examines the interconnection between security and globalization in the context of international terrorism. Security became so complex and multi-dimensional, traditional national border-setting type of security perception is not capable of recognizing new threats that transcend the national borders. Terrorism also became more challenging with globalization; thus, the fight against terrorism became a priority for all the nations. Global terror as well as other risks in the twenty first century requires cooperation for security. However, the response of states to 9/11 terrorists attacks shows that in the post-sovereign global world states remain as important agents of security. The strong states try to shape and master the impact of globalization on terrorism, but homeland security gained importance.

Keywords: Terrorism, security, globalization, international cooperation

INTRODUCTION

"An international problem such as terrorism can only be defeated by international cooperation."

Elmar Brok, Member, European Parliament²

"Terrorism is a global threat that can never be justified. A new vision of global security is needed-one that must confront terrorism, respect human rights and draw upon multilateral cooperation."

¹ The first version of this paper is presented by the title 'Global Terror in the 21st Century', at The Istanbul Conference on Democracy and Security, International Conference, Organized by the Turkish National Police, June 9-11, 2005.

² Conference Report: *Toward Worldwide Security – Building Transatlantic Agenda*, Brussels, 17 November, 2003, www.ewi.info/pdf/WSI%20web%20Comple%20Report.pdf

Sergey Ordzhorikidze, Undersecretary General and Director General, United Nations³
"We must find a solution together."

Douglas Browning Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, US Department of Homeland Security⁴

While globalization and international terrorism are matters of growing concern for the governments since the 1980s, they are also among the main topics dominating the study of international relations. Both topics has been discussed separately so widely both scholarly and in public, but as indicated by Cha there has been less studies together on security and globalization⁵ though security is a well developed field. Nevertheless, as stated by Hughes we should be cautious in applying globalization to the topic of security, since "there is a risk on various side of the debate on engaging in a *securitization* (politics of making a political issue a security issue)⁶ exercise" without deeper analysis or understanding.⁷

What is globalization? Globalization may be defined as an integration of economic, social and cultural relations across borders.⁸ Today, many articles have gone beyond simply restating basic arguments about economic globalization and discuss political globalization and security globalization.⁹ As Kay states, "globalization is best understood as the creation of a variety of transboundary mechanisms for interaction that affect and reflect the acceleration of economic, political and security interdependence."¹⁰

With its economic, political and cultural dimensions, globalization has significant effects on the state. Ian Clark says, "Globalization also needs to be understood as a number of changes within state, and not simply as a range of external forces set against it."¹¹ In despite of the decline of nation-state¹², continued strength of the state is also visible and effective in the international arena. Moreover, "globalization

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Victor D. Cha, 'Globalization and the Study of International Security', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2000, p. 391-403.

⁶ 'Securitisation' is discussed in detail by Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998.)

⁷ Christopher W. Hughes, 'Reflections on Globalization, Security and 9/11', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 15, No. 3, 2002, p. 421-433.

⁸ It is still debated whether "interdependence", 'integration' and 'globalism' merely different words for the same condition. See R.O. Keohane and J. S. Nye Jr, "Globalization: What's New? What's Not? (And so what?)", *Foreign Policy*, (spring) 2000, p. 104-19; According to Clark degrees of internationalization and interdependence may have been casually related to the advance of globalization. See Ian Clark, *Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the 20th Century*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.)

⁹ For a discussion on different dimensions of globalization see David Held , A. McGrew, 'The End of the Old Order?', *Review of International Studies*, No. 24, 1998, p. 219-243; Mustafa Aydın, 'Küreselleşme karşısında ulus devlet, ekonomi ve güvenlik', 11. Mayıs, 2005, [Http://www.panaromadergisi.com](http://www.panaromadergisi.com)

¹⁰ Sean Kay, 'Globalization, Power and Security', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No.1, 2004, p. 10

¹¹ Ian Clark, *Globalization and International Relations Theory*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) p. 52.

¹² Susan Strange, 'The Erosion of the State', *Current History*, Vol. 96, No. 613, 1997, p. 365-369; Kenichi Ohmae, *The End of Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*, (London: Harper Collins, 1995;) Susan Strange, *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in The World Economy* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.)

is more significant for its erosion of the internal/external divide than for its erosion of state capacity.”¹³

In the post-cold war era, we are tempted to replace the East-West divide by ‘fragmentation versus globalization’ division, where globalization is viewed as good and fragmentation as evil. However, both Guehenno and Clark mention that these two concepts are linked to each other and co-exist rather than in opposition.¹⁴ Furthermore, economic, military and political globalization and fragmentation are observable within the states as well as between the states.¹⁵

Looking to the security side of the globalization analysis, security became so complex and multi-dimensional, traditional national border-setting type of security perception is not capable of recognizing new threats that transcend the national borders. In this context, international terrorism became one of the main concerns with its highly complicated characteristics.¹⁶ Thus, globalized world has to face an immediate threat: international terrorism. This problem has been recognized not only by one nation, but also in the era of globalization when the nations became much more connected and interdependent, it became a threat to international security. Some of the states have witnessed terrorist threats since many years. Nevertheless, though these states have already known the pains of terrorism, it became more a concern of many other states with September 11, 2001 (9/11) terrorist attacks in the United States. This a turning point for all the nations to see the threat of terrorism. Almost a new awareness has started, because everybody saw its damages while a lot of people have died or injured, and unfortunately while terrorist declared their success. Terrorism became the main topic on the top agenda for many nations and institutions. Today, global terror is a giant problem for all humanity. September 11 gave a message that the target was the main leader of globalization, the United States. The World Trade Center as one target in the United States symbolized economic dimension of globalization, while Pentagon symbolized the political and military dimension. In other words, terrorism has put globalization among its targets.

The main argument in this paper is that terrorism became more challenging at the age of globalization; thus, the fight against terrorism became a priority for all the nations. This study first considers broader changes in the context of international security. It also emphasizes the impact of globalization on international security. This review is given to show how the security is broadened and why the traditional security perception is not capable of recognizing new threats that transcend the national borders. In this context, international terrorism also acquired new characteristics. In the second section, the changing nature and content of terrorism has been analyzed through its motivations, methods and strategies. In the third section, the analysis considers recent measures taken by the states to meet the challenges raised by the

¹³ Ian Clark, ‘Beyond the Great Divide: Globalization and the Theory of International Relations’, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 4, 1998, p. 480; see for detailed discussion Clark, *Globalization and International Relations...*

¹⁴ Jean-Marie Guehenno, ‘Globalization and Fragmentation’, in *Globalization, Power and Democracy*, Marc F. Plattner (ed.), (Baltimore, USA: John Hopkins University Press,) p. 14-27; Clark, *Globalization and Fragmentation....*

¹⁵ See for detailed discussion Clark, *Globalization and Fragmentation....*

¹⁶ Çağrı Erhan, ‘Küreselleşme Döneminin Tehditleriyle Mücadele’, Stradigma.com <http://www.teror.gen.tr/turkce/makaleler/kureselesme.html> (12.09.2003)

developments discussed in the first and second sections. One issue is discussed in detail: the rise of international terrorism and the response of institutions and the US government to increasing international terror with its new characteristics and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It is concluded that terrorism as well as other risks in the twenty first century requires international cooperation for global security. However, the response of the states to 9/11 terrorist attacks provides interesting points about the relationship between globalization and terrorism. In the *post-sovereign globalized world* the states remain as important agents of security. The strong states try to shape and master the impact of globalization on terrorism. Yet, homeland security gained importance.

GLOBALIZATION AND SECURITY

We are used to think security in terms of military threats and arising beyond the borders of one's own country. Traditionally national security is understood as "the acquisition, deployment and use of military force to achieve national goals"¹⁷ Stephen Walt's traditionalist perspective articulates a position that is state-centric and restricts the application of security to threats in the military realm.¹⁸ With reconceptualization of security, there are two dimensions: broadening, i.e., consideration of nonmilitary security threats such as environmental scarcity and degradation, spread of disease, overpopulation, refugee movements, terrorism; and deepening, i.e., consideration of the security of individuals and groups rather than focusing narrowly on external threats to states such as ethnic conflict, civil war, environmental threats and survival of individuals.¹⁹ During the Cold War we have been looking at the traditional security. However, as mentioned by Aydın, in the 1970's and the 1980's the concern over the economic and environmental problems, and in the 1990's the concern over the "identity" and "transnational crimes", and in the 2000's the concern over the energy, cyber and social security as well as terrorism have broadened the meaning of security.²⁰ Already, in the 1980's Buzan has mentioned about new security domains beside military such as social, economic, political and environmental.²¹ Thus, discussion on the broadening of security has started towards other domains even before the end of the Cold War era, indicating that we cannot only focus on military issues, which is also well noted by the Copenhagen School.

Yet, it is not easy to separate the agenda of discussions on broadening of security from globalization of security. As stated by Clark "part of the broadening of the concept of security can be and has been attributed to the effects of globalization."²² Furthermore, as Cha states globalization widens the scope of security.²³ Globaliza-

¹⁷ David Held and A. McGrew, 'The End of the Old Order?', *Review of International Studies*, No. 24, 1998, p. 219-243.

¹⁸ Stephen Walt, 'The Renaissance of Security Studies', *International Studies Quarterly*, No. 35, 1991, p. 211-239.

¹⁹ For some of these discussions see, Seyom Brown, 'World Interests and Changing Dimensions of Security', in Michael Klare and Yogesh Chandrani (eds), *World Security: Challenges for a New Century*, (1994, New York: St. Martin's.) p. 1-17; Buzan, Weaver and Wilde, *Security*.

²⁰ Aydın, "Küreselleşme karşısında..."

²¹ Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: an Agenda for International Security Studies in the post Cold-War Era*, (New York, 1991) (2nd edition)

²² Clark, *Globalization and International...*, p. 109.

²³ Cha, 'Globalization and the Study.....'

tion of transformation, communication, information, technology and economy catalyze some of the dangers such as global warming, ozone depletion, acid rain, environmental problems as well as terrorism. The danger of terrorism is clearly seen in the September 11 terrorist attacks. Cha also, indicates that as the scope of threats are widening with globalization, the targets are becoming individuals rather than the states.²⁴

Furthermore, in the post Cold War era, the role of states decrease and change in international relations while the role of multinational companies, financial institutions and nongovernmental organizations increase with globalization. The changes are not limited to the financial and economic spheres. Globalization changes the "very nature of states and political communities." Thus, the distinction between international and domestic affairs decrease and "transnational solidarities" appear.²⁵

We have recognized that globalization challenges international relations and strategy, because with globalization separation between domestic (internal) and international (external) politics as well as the distinction between internal and external security is decreasing.²⁶ Domestic issues transform to a foreign issue or vice versa. The local issues are becoming global issues such as the poverty in Africa. In addition, as noted in the SIPRI Year Book 2005, all 19 major armed conflicts in 2004 were intra-state, but have regional and international dimensions. In this sense, it challenges the classification of security as internal and external. In this context, we are entering a new phase. Thus, globalization process has certain effects on the international security agenda, although it is considered that it is difficult to conclude as to how globalization increases or decreases the degree of security.²⁷

With globalization there is not only declining capacity of the state in traditional security, but also within the state there are changes. Thus, there is a change in "the very nature of states" not simply of its setting.²⁸ According to Guehenno "the nature of threats" is also changing with globalization, and "the threat is no longer another competing community, but rather the internal weakening of communities."²⁹ In this context, first of all we have to emphasize civil conflicts as the distinction between civil/international conflict decreases.³⁰ For example, the civil wars such as in Yugoslavia and Africa were severe threatening the world-which countries were slow to respond. However, with globalization we cannot ignore what happens in faraway and we cannot ignore the civil conflicts.³¹

The second threat in the age of globalization is the evolution of terrorism, especially the WMD terrorism. It is not possible to apply the traditional deterrence strat-

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Guehenno, 'The Impact of...', p. 7

²⁶ Jean Marie Guehenno, 'The Post-Cold War World: Globalization and the International System' *Journal of Democracy*, Vol 10, No. 1, 1999, p. 22-35; Jean Marie Guehenno, 'The Impact of Globalization on Strategy', *Survival*, Vol. 40, No. 4, 1998-99, p. 5-19

²⁷ See Clark, *Globalization and International...*, p. 108-126.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 108.

²⁹ Gueheeno, 'The impact of...', p. 10.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 9.

³¹ Ibid., p. 10-11.

egy against this threat because of its non-territorial nature, so the pre-emptive or the preventive strategy is preferred.³²

Moreover, there are other implications of globalization for security³³ though there is "uncertainty about whether security prospects are improving or deteriorating."³⁴ Especially the difficulty lies in evaluating the precise effects of globalization on the international security, because of the fact that the impact of globalization varies from region to region and is determined to a large extent by the state's capacity to adapt to change and thus to meet the specific challenges presented by the process of globalization.³⁵ Thus, it is not easy to generalize stabilizing or destabilizing effects of globalization on the international security.

First of all, globalization denotes that nation-state can no longer control non-physical security aspects, such as protection of information and technology assets.³⁶ According to Kay, the more you protect your information and technology, the stronger you are.³⁷ For example, to have a giant military power without protecting your information technology is meaningless. Nevertheless, one of the challenges posed by globalization is that individual states can no longer control the movement of technology and information. Furthermore, since the arms industry mostly held by private sectors, it causes the transnationalization of defense production and reduces the state control over these productions. Moreover, as noted by Cha, there is transnationalization of threats, as the individual states can no longer control the pollution, disease, technology and information transfer as well as terrorism alone. Transnationalization has blurred the division between internal and external security, so the states can no longer ignore the effects of globalization in forming their security policies.³⁸

Second, in the age of globalization, the emergence of information based-economies reduces the importance of national industries. For example, the increased foreign direct investment in local economies by the multinational companies decreases the state control on domestic economy and makes them more vulnerable to international crisis and intervention, which is threatening their economic security.³⁹ The states are more sensitive to security and military developments in other regions due to increasing financial, trade and economic relations.⁴⁰

³² Ibid., p. 11-12.

³³ Clark has divided arguments about the implications of globalization for security into four groups. First of all he mentions 'the detachment of security from territoriality.' Second argument is "security is increasingly structured into global networks." Third argument is "the creation by globalization of a new security agenda." Lastly, Clark mentions "the diminished capacity of the state to provide security for its citizens." Clark questions some points of these arguments. See for detailed discussion Clark, *Globalization and International Relations...*, p. 114- 123.

³⁴ Clark mentions that there are both positive and negative approaches on this issue. Positive side indicates about increasing cooperation and multilateralism while negative side indicates about increasing tension and conflict. See Clark, *Globalization and International Relations...*, p. 110.

³⁵ Aydın, 'Küreselleşme karşısında...'

³⁶ Cha, 'Globalization and the Study...'

³⁷ Kay, 'Globalization, Power...'

³⁸ Cha, 'Globalization and the Study...'

³⁹ Goksel, 'Globalization and the State'.

⁴⁰ Held and McGrew, 'The End of...', p. 230 ; Cha, 'Globalization and the Study...'

Third, the advancement of communication technologies created vital effects on certain dynamics. For example, during the Kosovo conflict, after the broadcasting of mass deportation and casualties on the television broadcasts, the conflicts became impossible to ignore creating international public pressure for intervention. On the other hand, this might be also dangerous in some cases; as Kay states if there is control on the information and media technology, powerless can become powerful.⁴¹

Fourth, as the nature and strategy of war have changed, the security threats became more difficult to measure, monitor or tackle with the globalization process. Agents of threat can be state, but can also be non-state groups and individuals, such as ethnic militias, cults, organized crime and terrorism. Similarly, as stated by Cha, extremist, fundamentalist groups, terrorists, criminals, and drug smugglers were enhanced by the globalization of technology and information.⁴²

Fifth, globalization makes it easy for the states to reach to the weapons of mass destruction and other technologies, thus the states might pose threats that are asymmetrical and disproportionate to their size.⁴³ Today the term widely used is the *asymmetrical strategy (asymmetric power)* by which a smaller power would attempt to defeat the largest powers in the globalized international system by striking against its perceived vulnerabilities.⁴⁴ Similar to Cha, Kay notes that the technological dynamics of globalization makes asymmetrical power especially dangerous with the use of WMD. Thus, globalization can give a chance to the strong states to enhance their powers, however, it also gives a chance for the weaker ones to challenge powerful ones. Put another way, the asymmetrical power provides alternatives for small or weak states to challenge more powerful states. Furthermore, the technological dynamics of globalization such as the proliferation of WMD makes the asymmetrical power more dangerous.⁴⁵

Finally, globalization process widened the support for terrorism. As globalization created negative consequences and marginalization of some groups and global social and economic inequalities, terrorism gained more support from many marginalized people in different nations, and became more global. As stated by Kronin frustrated populations are against the US-led globalization.⁴⁶ Especially people at the lower end of the social and economic spectrum realized that they cannot have equal shares in the global world, their demands are not recognized by the strong nations and started to show reactions. These reactions became threatening as they have started to give support to terrorism against globalization. According to Kronin, the ones left behind or threatened by the US-led globalization increasingly felt the need to assert their identity against the forces of homogeneity threatening by terrorism.⁴⁷ Furthermore, the terrorists groups while fighting against globalization also benefit

⁴¹ Kay, 'Globalization, Power...', p.16.

⁴² Cha, 'Globalization and the Study...'

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., *Contending Theories of International Relations: A comprehensive Survey*, (2001, New York: Longman.)

⁴⁵ Kay, 'Globalization, Power...' Erhan, 'Küreselleşme Döneminin...'

⁴⁶ Audrey Kurth Kronin, 'Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism', *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 3, (winter) 2002/03, p. 30-58.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 52

from its consequences.⁴⁸ Using the technological advances in communication, these groups can easily contact and operate. Regardless of its agents being an individual-an individual terrorist or a terrorist group, today terrorism threatens the entire- globalized world.

MOTIVATIONS, METHODS AND STRATEGIES OF POST-MODERN TERRORISM

The most meaningful examination of the impact of globalization to international security is examined by reference to specific issue: the growth of international terrorism-especially with the spread of technologies. *Postmodern terrorism* as called by Laqueur beyond the traditional terrorism we have known became the greatest security threat as the terrorists' motivations, strategies and weapons have changed in the last 30 years compared to traditional terrorism.⁴⁹ Thus, while terrorism is an age-old phenomenon, the new elements of terrorism challenge the states.

The term terrorism has no precise or widely accepted definition.⁵⁰ Laqueur defines terrorism as "the substrate 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."⁵¹ Terrorism can also be defined as acts of violence committed against innocent persons or noncombats that are intended to achieve political ends through fear and intimidation. Laqueur and Beck emphasize that with the global terrorism or *post-modern terrorism* as named by Laqueur⁵², new concepts, terms and definitions may have to be developed for new realities since studies suggest that there are changes in traditional terrorist acts, motivations, strategy, means, weapons and aims.⁵³

According to Medd and Goldstein⁵⁴, the terrorist motivations in the 1970's were political, but in the 1980's besides politically motivated terrorism, religiously and economically motivated terrorism is observed, and this situation has continued during the 1990's. Also, Chalk, Kartha and Kronin emphasize the religious terrorism in the 1990's.⁵⁵ According to Laqueur, extreme right groups have replaced the terrorism of leftist and anarchic groups. In addition, ethnically motivated terrorism has increased.⁵⁶ Today, the global terrorists might be very small groups or even individuals.

⁴⁸ Beck, 'The Silence of Words...'; Kronin, 'Behind the Curve'

⁴⁹ John Deutsch, 'Terrorism,' *Foreign Policy*, No. 108, 1997, p. 10-24; Medd and Goldstein, "International Terrorism..."; Laqueur, "Postmodern Terrorism"

⁵⁰ Walter Laqueur, 'Postmodern Terrorism', in *The new Global Terrorism* by Charles W. Kegley, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003, p. 151-160; Roger Medd and Frank Goldstein, 'International Terrorism on the Eve of a New Millenium,' *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol 20, No. 3, 1997, p. 281-318. Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.)

⁵¹ Laqueur, "Postmodern Terrorism", p. 151.

⁵² Ibid.; Walter Laqueur, "Post Modern Terrorism", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 5, 1996, p.24-36.

⁵³ Laqueur, 'Postmodern Terrorism'; Ulrich Beck, 'Terror and Solidarity' in *Re-ordering the World: The Long-term Implications of September 11th*, (ed.) (Mark Leonard, 2002, London: Foreign Policy Center), p. 112-119; Ulrich Beck, 'The Silence of Words: On Terror and War,' *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 34, No. 3, 2003, p. 255-267.

⁵⁴ Medd and Goldstein, 'International Terrorism...'

⁵⁵ Peter Chalk, *West-European Terrorism and Counter Terrorism: 'The Evolving Dynamic'*, (1996, London: Mac Millan); Tara Kartha, 'Transnational Terrorism and Radical Extremism,' *Asian Journal on Terrorism and International Affairs*, Vol. 2, No. 5, 1999, p. 33-57; Kronin, 'Behind the Curve...'

⁵⁶ Laqueur, 'Postmodern Terrorism'

The state-sponsored terrorism and the individual terrorist are both flourishing.⁵⁷ Kronin emphasizes that by the late 1990's there is growing target of Americans.

In the 1970's hijacking, kidnapping, bombing, taking hostages were the most common methods used by terrorists, in the 1980's besides these methods chemical weapons started to be used, in the 1990's beyond these conventional methods, two other threats are seen. First is that terrorists started to acquire the WMD, and second is with the increasing use of Internet "information warfare" has emerged.⁵⁸ The use of WMD by terrorist increases their potential harm.⁵⁹ Terrorists have gained access to destructive technology by the information revolution and technological change. Thus, the new global terror uses technology in communication and knowledge-based technological developments, such as television, mobile phones, Internet and satellite.⁶⁰ Even some of them have their own television and radio channels. In addition, these groups can easily save their money in international banks with safe havens and can transfer it all over the world. Thus, as its destructive potential increase through technological advances, the global terrorism has become more dangerous, though the number of attacks has decreased by the late 1990s.⁶¹ Besides, the increase in the number of suicide attacking is radical and dangerous since it is very difficult to take caution for.⁶²

Looking at the strategies of terrorist groups, the terrorist groups have both political and terrorist wings, so they have the opportunity to disassociate political leadership from practicing terrorists if something goes wrong. Their operations also have changed their targets- widened their targets from political and economic elites of a nation to financial centers, media, energy infrastructure, etc.⁶³ Rather than attacking a specific target the global terrorists started more indiscriminate killing against the civilians.⁶⁴ Today, it is difficult to trace the terrorists, since the new global terror acts decentralized and deterritorial.⁶⁵ Furthermore, the terrorists are interested in publicity and violence, and they do get a lot of publicity in the recent years.

WAR ON TERROR

9/11 terrorist attacks shocked not only the United States but shocked all the nations. President Bush described the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the US-led coalition response as a 'new kind of war' against the global terror. Outlining the strategy for this global war, President Bush said that this "war on terrorism would be fought on a variety of fronts in different ways."⁶⁶ A link has been made between the rouge states,

⁵⁷ Laqueur, 'Postmodern Terrorism'

⁵⁸ Medd and Goldstein, 'International Terrorism...'; Gregory A. Raymond, "The Evolving strategies of Political Terrorism", in *the New Global Terrorism*, (eds.) Charles W. Kegley, Jr., (2003, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.)

⁵⁹ Medd and Goldstein, 'International Terrorism'; G. D. Bakshi, 'The face of the Fifth Horseman: Osama Bin Laden's Global Terror Network,' *Asian Journal of Terrorism and International Affairs*, Vol. 2, No. 5, 1999, p. 17-32; Deutsch, 'Terrorism'

⁶⁰ Laqueur, 'Postmodern Terrorism'; Kronin, 'Behind the Curve...'

⁶¹ Beck, 'Terror and Solidarity'; Beck, 'The Silence of Words...'; Kronin, 'Behind the Curve...'

⁶² Laqueur, 'Postmodern Terrorism'

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ The White House Office of the Press Secretary, *President freezes Terrorists' Assets*, 24 Sept 2001, World wide web page: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010924-4.html>

the terrorist groups and the WMD. It is warned that terrorists could now attack the United States and its allies with the WMD through their rouge allies though this argument is debatable.

How can we deter terrorists from resorting to the WMD (the three main WMD types being chemical, biological and nuclear) attacks? In the aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attacks, the states decided to take cautions as a response to the threat of increasing global terror and the proliferation of WMD. Before it is too late to act, the US decision is to remove this danger. Their first decision is to target terrorist finances by a broad based coalition of nations. International counter-terrorism cooperation on the financial fronts has started.

As a multilateral response, the United Nations has called to continue the efforts combating new threats and challenges on the basis of international law. The action undertaken in response to the terrorist attacks in the United States has seen the adoption of three major Security Council Resolutions (1368, 1373 and 1377) addressing terrorism in several ways respectively: readiness to take 'all necessary steps' to respond to the attacks and to combat all forms of terrorism; the prevention and suppression of the financing of terrorism; and the measures to eliminate international terrorism.

The war on terror as Colin Powell described, is at the top of the US foreign policy agenda as well as for most of the countries in the world. Before 9/11 counter-terrorism efforts were carried by individual states. Especially due to one man's terrorist is another's freedom fighter there was a difficulty for cooperation in counter-terrorism efforts. Furthermore, although there were terrorist attacks in many states especially in the Middle East and Africa, the West did not pay much attention and even supported citing human rights concerns and the lack of evidence. However, the terrorists exploited the tolerance of the Western culture as well as the benefits of globalization. With 9/11 the states realized that terrorism does not only affect individual states but all the states. With the change of perceptions new policies were developed.

Since September 11, 2001 everyone feels at risk. Thus, the perception of terrorist risks became important. The thing being different then earlier is the spread of fear. People started to see the world "as one big terrorist threat". In short, there is a perceived globality of risk.⁶⁷

From The US Perspective

US policy is to apply pre-emptive strike in order to prevent acts of terrorism, which is spelled out in many statements. The National Security Strategy (NSS)⁶⁸ supports pre-emptive war by saying that the United States "must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today's adversaries."⁶⁹ It argues that "the greater the threat, the greater the risk of inaction" The NSS further states,

⁶⁷ Beck, 'Terror and Solidarity'; Beck, 'The Silence of Words...'

⁶⁸ 'The National Security Strategy of the United States (NSS)' issued by the Bush administration (September 2002), from World Wide Web page [Http: // www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html).

⁶⁹ Ibid.

*Given the goals of rouge states and terrorists, the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past. The inability to deter a potential attacker, the immediacy of today's threats and the magnitude of potential harm that could be caused by our adversaries, potential choice of weapons do not permit that option. We cannot let our enemies to strike first.*⁷⁰

In a speech the US President addressed the US Congress in January 29, 2002; he referred to Iraq, Iran and North Korea as the "axis of evil". In explaining why he employed this phrase, President Bush stated that these countries possessed the WMD, they had developed long-range missile technologies to launch such weapons and had regimes enabling them to employ such weapons through missiles and other means. In 2003, the Bush administration pointed Iraq and behaved more softly against the other two countries. It is considered that Iraq continues to produce and possess the WMD and it has links with the terrorist organizations, including al Qaeda. It was assumed that there was an increasing risk that Iraq or al Qaeda attack with the WMD against the United States or its allies.

In short, what is new was to link the WMD, the rouge states such as Iraq, Iran and North Korea, the weak and failed states such as Afghanistan and Iraq, and the terrorists with importance of preemption. The Bush administration's new policy has made a clean break with the past traditions in international security. After the Cold War, new, unfamiliar threats replaced the old familiar one. The United States applied deterrence policy against strong states, but this policy considered not applicable to these new threats. The administration appears less confident that deterrence alone can protect the United States and its allies. As we have observed Al'Qaeda was not deterred by the US military capabilities. If deterrence cannot work alone, the administration suggests preemption as the only alternative. The NSS asserts the right for pre-emption and no restraint on the US power. Furthermore, it looks for alliance but will not be constrained by alliance. It prefers 'coalitions of willing' rather than traditional alliance. The first application of this policy is observed with the Iraq war in March 2003.

In addition, the National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (December 2002)⁷¹ had been issued slightly after the NSS. It has three pillars. First is "counter proliferation to combat weapons of mass destruction use" which calls three kinds of action: interdiction, deterrence and defense, but it reserves the right to respond to the use of WMD against the United States through preemptive measures.⁷² The second is "strengthened nonproliferation to combat WMD proliferation", which involves elements of diplomacy, multilateral regimes, threat reduction programs and controls on exports and nuclear materials.⁷³ The third is "consequence management to respond to WMD use".⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ 'The National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction' (December 2002), from World Wide Web page [Http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/WMDStrategy.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/WMDStrategy.pdf)

⁷² Ibid., p. 3.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 3-5.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 6.

From NATO's Perspective

There was a NATO support to the United States "war on terror" in the immediate aftermath of 9/11. NATO passed a resolution invoking for the first time Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which declared an attack on one member to be an attack on all. The terrorist attacks, the resolution stated, comprised such an attack. In 1949, NATO architects had intended Article 5 to commit the United States to providing for the security of NATO partners in Europe. When Article 5 was employed for the first time, its purpose was to make sure that the United States would not fight alone the war against terrorism.

At the January 1994 Summit, NATO has already recognized the proliferation of WMD as a direct security concern to the Alliance. On June 9, 1994, NATO Foreign Ministers meeting in Istanbul, they have published an '*Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction*'. They have identified in this document that some states (e.g., Iraq and North Korea) have not complied with and disregarded their international non-proliferation commitments and also, non-state actors, such as terrorists, may also try to acquire the WMD capabilities. In the highly increased technological developments and spread of technology it is more difficult to control the growth of the WMD and their delivery.⁷⁵

Furthermore, as agreed in NATO's new Strategic Concept, introduced in Rome Summit in 1991, approved in 1999 Washington Summit, NATO was going to respond to the changing security environment in Europe. The Alliance has committed itself to new activities in the interest of wider stability. This new Strategic Concept specified the elements of the Alliance broad approach to security.⁷⁶ The Alliance has contributed to peace and security in a stable international order. The WMD are therefore considered to pose a threat to the achievement of this order.

In a speech given by Lord Robertson⁷⁷, NATO Secretary General on June 20, 2002, terrorism is considered as the greatest security threat and should be the main focus of the activities of NATO. NATO has given new commitments supporting operations against terrorism 'undertaken by other international organizations and by coalitions involving Allies'. NATO will increase its military capabilities accordingly and will try to ensure flexible Alliance able to act rapidly. To increase its capabilities it has endorsed the principles of nation-specific commitments, role specialization and common acquisition and funding of key assets. Thus, NATO is in a process of rapid transformation to defend against terrorism and WMD.

From The European Perspective

9/11 also influenced the European states. After 9/11, the fight against terrorism became a priority for all the European Union member states. The European Union is committed to jointly combating terrorism. After 9/11 the European Council decided

⁷⁵ 'NATO's Approach to Proliferation', NATO Basic Fact sheet, NATO Office of Information and Press, No: 8 (September 1995)

⁷⁶ 'The Alliance Strategic Concept', NATO Press Release, (24 April 1999), from World Wide Web page [Http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm](http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm), April 04, 2001

⁷⁷ 'Tackling Terror: NATO'S new Mission', (20 June, 2002), Speech by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson, at the American Enterprise Institute's New Atlantic Initiative, Washington, DC, from world wide web page [Http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020620a.htm](http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020620a.htm), February 14, 2005

to harness all the previous measures to combat terrorism.⁷⁸ They have decided on wide range of measures such as judicial cooperation, cooperation between police and intelligence services, prevention of financing of terrorism, strengthen the control at external borders and to improve cooperation with the United States for effective combating. Furthermore, the European Council adopted the Declaration on Combating Terrorism on March 2004⁷⁹, in the aftermath of terrorist attacks in Madrid in order to build the plan that they have decided after 9/11. Here, the European Council has given seven objectives to combat terrorism. These objectives are as follows:

1. *To deepen the international consensus and enhance international efforts to combat terrorism,*
2. *To reduce the access of terrorists to financial and economic resources,*
3. *To maximize the capacity within EU bodies and Member states to detect, investigate and prosecute terrorists and to prevent terrorist attacks,*
4. *To protect the security of international transport and ensure effective systems of border control*
5. *To enhance the capability of the EU and of Member states to deal with the consequences of a terrorist attack*
6. *To address the factors which contribute to support for, and recruitment into, terrorism*
7. *To target actions under EU external relations towards priority Third Countries where counter-terrorist capacity or commitment to combating terrorism needs to be enhanced.*

In short, the EU supports the key role of the UN and full implementation of UN conventions on terrorism. Furthermore, the Report on the implementation of the Declaration on Combating Terrorism requested "the Political and Security Committee to elaborate the conceptual framework identifying the main elements of the European Security and Defense Policy dimension of the fight against terrorism."⁸⁰ The EU Plan action on combating terrorism also reflected this request.⁸¹ The EU has taken steps to have a common legislation to combat terrorism, exchange information between member states, freezing the assets of terrorists' activities and financing of terrorism.

Meanwhile, in December 2003 European Security Council has agreed on a strategy. The European Security Strategy (ESS) has been written shortly before the Constitution.⁸² The document emphasizes several points: "The end of the Cold war has left the United States in a dominant position as a military actor. However, no single country is able to tackle today's complex problems on its own."⁸³ "Europe should be

⁷⁸ 'Extraordinary Council Meeting: Justice, Home Affairs and Civil Protection', issued by The European Council, (20 September, 2001) from World Wide Web page [Http: //www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/12019.en1.pdf](http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/12019.en1.pdf), November 30, 2004.

⁷⁹ 'Declaration on Combating Terrorism', issued by The European Council, (25 March 2004) from World Wide Web page [Http: //www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/79635.pdf](http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/79635.pdf), November 30, 2004.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ 'European Plan of Action on Combating Terrorism', issued by The European Council, (25 March 2004) from World Wide Web page [Http: //www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/EU-planofAction10586](http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/EU-planofAction10586), November 30, 2004.

⁸² 'The European Security Strategy' issued by the European Security Council, Brussels, (2003), from World Wide Web page [Http: //www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf](http://www.ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf), April 30, 2004.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 1.

ready to share in the responsibility for global security and in building a better world,"⁸⁴ i.e., Europe should take responsibility for global security.

"Security is a precondition of development,"⁸⁵ i.e., military power is required for defense of economic interests. The document stated those economic interests: "Energy dependence is a special concern for Europe. Europe is the world's largest importer of oil and gas. Imports account for about 50% of energy consumption today. This will rise to 70% in 2030. Most energy imports come from the Gulf, Russia and North Africa."⁸⁶

The key threats are 'terrorism committed to maximum violence', the proliferation and availability of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, regional conflicts, the weakening of the state system (state failure), privatization of force and organized crime.⁸⁷ Thus, it is considered that global terrorism poses a growing strategic threat to whole Europe. The most frightening scenario is one in which terrorist groups acquire weapons of mass destruction.

Dealing with terrorism may acquire a comprehensive approach based on intelligence, police and judiciary, military and other means. "Our traditional concept of self-defense ... was based on the threat of invasion. With the new threats, the first line of defense will be abroad."⁸⁸ " ... we should be ready to act before a crisis occurs."⁸⁹ In short, Europe must be ready for 'preventive' wars. "Preventive engagement can avoid more serious problems in the future."⁹⁰

"It is in European interest that countries on our borders are well-governed."⁹¹ New frontiers bring the EU closer to troubled areas. "Our task is to promote a ring of well governed countries..."⁹² "The development of a stronger international society, well functioning international institutions and a rule-based international order is our objective,"⁹³ i.e. the EU is looking for an effective multilateral system. "We need to be more active, more coherent and more capable"⁹⁴ in order to contribute to effective multilateral system.

Furthermore, the Draft treaty establishing constitution for Europe⁹⁵ commits the EU to the eventual framing of a common defense policy. Article 40.1 reaffirms the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) whose operations may be used 'outside the Union for peace-keeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security', i.e., it legitimizes outside operations. "The performance of these tasks shall be undertaken using capabilities provided by the Member states," thus not by NATO. In other words, a European army will be formed independent of NATO. Nevertheless, "This will lead to common defense" (Article 40.2) which will be com-

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 1

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 2

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 2

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 3-4

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 7

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 7

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 11

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 7

⁹² Ibid., p. 8

⁹³ Ibid., p. 9

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 11

⁹⁵ *The Draft treaty Establishing Constitution for Europe'*, European Convention, (2003)

patible with the policy of NATO. "Member states shall undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities," i.e., will increase their military expenditures progressively (Article 40.3).

Article 40.4 asserts that the CSDP decisions to be adopted by the Council of Ministers. "The Council of Ministers may entrust the execution of a task... to a group of member states (Article 40.5) "which will establish structured cooperation within the Union framework." (Article 40.6) This means that without interference from other member states, which are less enthusiastic about militarizing the EU, the hardcore EU nations (especially France and Germany) will be able to intervene abroad.

They will work in close cooperation with NATO (Article 40.7), but not under the control of NATO or the United States. The European parliament will have no saying in the security and defense policy, but shall be kept consulted. (Article 40.8) Furthermore, the spirit of the solidarity clause contained in the draft treaty specifies that "if one of the Member States is the victim of a terrorist attack, the Member States shall mobilize all instruments at their disposal, including military resources" in order to prevent the terrorist threat. Thus, the EU takes the responsibility to contribute to long-term actions and fight for the prevention of terrorism.

Nevertheless, as stated by Antonio Vitorino, European Commissioner for Justice and Home Affairs in an international conference in 2003, there seems a misunderstanding between the United States and the EU cooperation on counter-terrorism activities. Namely, the United States thinks that Europe is under estimating terrorist threats, while Europeans feel that the United States has over reacted to these same threats and placed basic freedoms at risk.⁹⁶ He mentions that both sides are taken steps to remove this misunderstanding such as agreements were signed between the EU and the United States to share intelligence and to improve cooperation since 2001.

CONCLUSION

In the current security environment, the focus has shifted from state territorial security to broader and deeper security dimensions and towards global security interdependence. Only military means for addressing security threats and challenges is increasingly perceived to be ineffective. Today, terrorism has a strong transnational dimension. As recognized by the US, NATO and the EU there is need for global action to address this threat.

Let us conclude by drawing a comparison on the recent measures taken as a response to global terrorism. The states have decided to take actions against terrorists and their supporters. International cooperation is emphasized in combating terrorism. However, we found out that the response of the US emphasized preponderance of US power, especially military power and preemptive strike. Many analysts pointed out the unilateralist tendencies of the US perception of the war on terror. This was more significant as the US President, in the war against terrorism gave anti-terrorism ultimatum that was with us or against us ultimatum. The United States has applied

⁹⁶ Conference Report: Toward Worldwide Security – Building Transatlantic Agenda, Brussels, 17 November, 2003, www.ewi.info/pdf/WSI%20web%20Comple%20Report.pdf

this new policy in Iraq emphasizing 'the risks of inaction are far greater than the risks of action.' The NSS (2002) outlined this new policy of the US.

Similarly after 9/11, the fight against terrorism became a priority for all the European Union member states. As the European Security Strategy makes clear, the European Union cannot ignore danger of terrorism and the proliferation of WMD. The European Union is committed to jointly combating terrorism. They have supported the key role of the UN and full implementation of UN conventions on terrorism. They seek an effective multilateral response to these threats.

Furthermore, preemptive strike or preventive defense rise as viable security strategies with the spread of information technology, the WMD and directly related to globalization-the technologies for creating these weapons have become easily accessible.

We cannot be sure if all these developments will foster peace or not. There is a global effort to combat terrorism. However, as some analysts point out there is declining support on war on terror due to unilateralist tendencies of the US policies. Moreover, homeland security gains importance while the threat of terrorism increases. As stated by Kay, nation-state is vital for defense against asymmetric challenges (mainly international terrorism) for homeland security.⁹⁷ Nations prefer to fight with terrorism abroad and not face it in their homeland. They try to increase border controls and transportation. Thus, there is cost of getting security for individual freedom.

The response of states to 9/11 terrorist attacks also provides interesting points about the relation between globalization and terrorism. In the *post-sovereign globalised world* states remain as important agents of security and try to shape the impact of globalization process on terrorism. In other words, although globalization generates security problems, the strong states try to shape and master its impact on terrorism.

Finally, we have to emphasize that content of terrorism has changed and became more challenging. With its changing content global terror affects directly or indirectly more countries in the global village. There should be a universal fight with global terrorism. Furthermore as Kaldor, Held and Mc Grew and Beck advise, there is a need for cosmopolitan approach in the worldwide struggle against global terror in the 21st century- where all human beings will have equal moral respect and concern, pushing towards extended governance by international law and towards the common acceptance of international human rights standards.⁹⁸ As a last but not least, the emphasis on national sovereignty and the reluctance of states to be involved when the threat did not seem to be in their homeland would jeopardize the cooperation among states. What will make all of us secure are the collective activities that are directed against the new threats such as global terror.

Due to new characteristics of terrorism, and its relations with globalization, the terrorist threats require a complex response of transnational cooperation. As Cha and Beck indicates cooperation is necessary not only between the traditional allies

⁹⁷ Kay, "Globalization, Power...", p. 21.

⁹⁸ Mary Kaldor, 'The power of Terror', in *Re-ordering the World: The Long-term Implications of September 11th*, (ed.) Mark Leonard, (2002, London: Foreign Policy Center), p. 21-8; Held and McGrew, 'The End of...'; Beck, "Terror and Solidarity"; Beck, "The Silence of Words..."

but many nations such as Russia, NATO and the EU.⁹⁹ Today terrorists also use the positive points of globalization for their actions. For example, they can easily spread the fear around the world through media. They use globalization of transformation, communication, information, technology and finance.¹⁰⁰ Global terror as well as other risks requires transnational cooperation, because the states cannot deal with these threats through sovereign means.¹⁰¹ The new threats cannot be conducted by old measures, generally what is known as neo-realist premises. The old state-centric approaches that place main emphasis on military in order to have national security have become insufficient. Though states remain as important agents of security, they have to cooperate in the *post-sovereign globalized world*. The traditional security is not irrelevant but has to expand.

⁹⁹ Beck, 'The Silence of Words...'; Cha, 'Globalization and the Study...'

¹⁰⁰ Medd and Goldstein, 'International Terrorism...'; Deutsch, 'Terrorism,'; Paul J. Smith, 'Transnational Security Threats and State Survival: A Role for the military?' *Parameters: US Army War College*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 2000, p.: 77-93.

¹⁰¹ Beck, 'The Silence of Words...'