

What Feeds Global Terror and What May Eradicate It in the Long Term?

M. Mustafa Erdogan*

Marmara University, Ressay Namik Ismail Sk. No: 1, 34590 Bahcelievler, Istanbul, Turkey
mustafaerdogdu@marmara.edu.tr

Abstract

The response of the US to the atrocity of September 11 was immediate, but did not come close to eradicating global terror. The overthrow of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq has neither crushed Al-Qai'da nor deterred terrorists from acting again in similar fashion elsewhere in the globe. It seems that the US is approaching the problem from the wrong end and responding not with wisdom but reflex. What the US has done, so far, is to fight the symptoms of global terror, but not its underlying reasons. The US has apparently diagnosed the problem wrongly and been using unsuitable means to solve it. What the US does is not much different from using a hammer to save the patient from a virus. This approach is likely to create more problems, rather than winning hearts and minds, which is crucial for curing this type of illness. Unless we understand the reasons and motivations of people who are prepared to transform themselves into living missiles, we are unlikely to find the right response to reduce the possibility that such acts will occur again. Thus, this paper first examines underlying reasons and motivations of suicide bombers and the environment that breeds such terror, and then develops long-term cures to solve this global problem.

1. Introduction

The response of the United States (US) to the atrocity of September 11 was immediate. Less than one month after the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the George W. Bush administration was already responding by announcing a “war on terror”, with every expectation that there would be vigorous military action against Al-Qai'da and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Even at that stage there was also talk of an attack on Iraq to terminate the Saddam Hussein regime. According to the US president, the world would be safer after the overthrow of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq. Consequently, regime changes in Iraq and Afghanistan are carried out by the US led “coalition”. These regime changes, however, have neither crushed Al-Qai'da nor deterred terrorists from acting again in similar fashion somewhere in the globe. Indeed, there have been far more attacks on Western interests across the world than in the equivalent period before September 11.

The audit of the “war on terror” since September 11 is as follows. In addition to termination of the Taliban and Iraqi regimes, many members of Al-Qai'da have been killed or detained and some paramilitary attacks have been prevented. During the course, thousands of Afghan and Iraqi civilians have been killed, thousands have been maimed and thousands have been left without family, home and work.¹ Afghanistan is unstable with Taliban forces still present, and the security

* I would like to thank Ziya Onis and David Pierce, whose extensive comments on the earlier versions of this article have been invaluable.

¹ According to a report prepared by the British affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), up to 55,000 people died in the course of the Iraq war, and the casualties are mostly Iraqi troops and civilians. Also some 20,000 civilians are reported to have been injured during the war. The worst hit were women and children. The numbers of civilian losses remain hard to verify. In the absence of official body counts, “the final toll will probably never be known” (IPPNW, 2003). The number of civilian casualties in Fallujah was clear at the time of writing. According to an unofficial estimate from Red Cross sources in Iraq, 800 civilians have been killed (Rogers 2004). The IPPNW report has warned that health conditions for those who survived has rapidly and seriously deteriorated. “Limited access to clean water and sanitation, poverty, malnutrition, and disruption of public services including health services continue to have a negative impact on the health of the Iraqi people.” Environmental damage, including extensive pollution of land, sea, rivers, and the atmosphere – some of which may have spilled over to neighboring countries – is also a major concern. Particularly worrisome are the remains of some of the military debris,

situation in Iraq is frankly dire.² Al-Qai'da, however, has not been destroyed. Its will to continue attacks is undiminished. Al-Qai'da has proved to be a many-headed hydra. Although many of Osama bin Laden's senior lieutenants killed or captured, and much of its financial resources uncovered and blocked, the organization has sprung up in a number of countries in a franchised form. As Spyer (2004) points out, "Al-Qai'da as organization is proving able to transform and adapt itself to events, making use of thousands of militants and supporters, members of different formal groupings—or of no grouping at all—to continue the war of Islamist terror..." When Al Qai'da is pressured, it splits off segments, or seeds, which grow into semi-autonomous operations.³ The recent attacks in Spain, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Thailand, Saudi Arabia, Chechnya and Iraq show that smaller organizations are able to carry out operations without overt help from Bin Laden.

This audit implies that the US is approaching the global terror from the wrong end and responding not with wisdom but reflex. What the US has done, so far, is to fight the symptoms of global terror. However, what needs to be done to bring a solution to this global problem is to tackle with its underlying reasons. The first thing to do in this respect is to make a diagnosis to understand what leads to global terror. The next stage is to identify the right means to prevent such acts occurring again. By focusing on September 11-type attacks, this article aims to identify socio-economic, political and ideological roots of global terror and aims to contribute its solution. Before engaging with these issues however we first need to define terror and find out what breeds international terror. This is necessary not only to understand the motivational forces of terrorist acts carried out so far, but also future similar acts that might be in the pipe line. After what breeds international terror is understood, it becomes possible to approach the issue with the correct means and eventually achieve the desired outcome.

2. How Do the September 11 Attacks Differ from Other Terrorist Acts?

According to Krueger and Maleckova (2002), more than one hundred diplomatic and scholarly definitions of terrorism exist. The definitions of terrorism used by scholars tend to place more emphasis on the intention of terrorist to cause fear and terror among a targeted population that is considerably larger than the actual victims of their attacks, and to influence the views of that larger audience. The actual victim of the violence is thus not the main target of the terrorist act.

Pasquino (1987: 240-1) defines terrorism as a series of acts intended to spread intimidation, panic, and destruction in a population. These acts can be carried out by individuals and groups opposing a state, or acting on its behalf. The amount of violence is often disproportionate, apparently random, deliberately symbolic: to hit a target which would convey a message to the rest of the population. Its goals are the awakening of public opinion to the injustices of the "system", the "punishment" of hated representatives of the system and their lackeys, and the expansion of political support for, and/or the defense of, their organizations. The ultimate goal is to muster enough support to overthrow the regime or at least to produce a revolutionary situation.

A broad framework of analysis is required if we are really to understand terrorism. There is not a single cause of terrorism: several conditions and determinants must be present. For state terrorism the most important conditions are the willingness and determination of the dominant groups to retain power against mounting opposition, even by violent means. For socio-political terrorism, it is inability to acquire sufficient support for radical changes in the light of mass passivity and élite unresponsiveness. However, Pasquino (1987: 241-2) underlines the point that

particularly depleted uranium used in weapons and armor, and material looted from nuclear power plant sites, much of which remains to be accounted for.

² The US has lost over 1,200 troops in dead and 8,500 in wounded in Iraq since the break-out of military action. Meanwhile over 15,000 more troops evacuated to the United States because of non-combat injuries and physical or mental health problems. Thus, total US casualties number 25,000 people (Rogers, 2004).

³ This process has accelerated since the US invasion of Afghanistan. In August 2004, the Associated Press reported: The West and its allies now face many "Al-Qai'das," splinter groups that are mostly unrelated to each other but are bound by the same hatred of the West - especially the US.

terrorism is never simply the response to socio-economic conditions of marginality. It is always the product of a political project. Be they in the service of the state or against the state, the terrorists pursue political goals.

In essence this way of fighting is very old. It used to be known as guerrilla warfare in honor of the Spaniards, who used it to great effect against Napoleon. But up-to-date technology has now revolutionized guerrilla warfare, turning it into something much more sinister and alarming. This change was pioneered by various nationalist movements rebelling against colonial powers after the Second World War. Among the earliest of these were the Israelis, blowing up hotels to get rid of the British. They were soon followed by the Algerians developing nail-bombs to get rid of the French, and then by the IRA, the Basque separatists and many other eager learners. Many such groups, too, have been successful and have finally formed governments themselves. Rebels such as Nehru and Mandela, who in early life were outcasts accused of terrorism, have later become deeply respected statesmen (Midgley, 2002). In short, the line between terrorism and resistance is often blurred and it is now notorious that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. Claiming that you have been attacked by terrorists is a claim to your own legitimacy and a denial of legitimacy to your attackers. Postulates such as the reservation of the legitimate use of violence to established states are rhetoric designed to bolster the position of states and deny the use of violence to revolutionaries. Redefinition and reinterpretation are endless (Hammel, 2003).

Terror that involves suicide attack is comparably recent phenomena and it is much more difficult to deal with. In order to understand this kind of act, let us look closely at the September 11 event. Unexpectedly, the attackers of September 11 were seemed to be completely integrated into German society or that of other Western countries. They belonged to middle and upper classes and many of them went to the disco at weekends, had girlfriends, and drank alcohol.⁴ In all these cases we are talking about people from modern, urban backgrounds, products of the more affluent Arab classes—a small segment, therefore, of Arab society. According to Kermani (2002), the attackers have combined with foreign, specifically Shi'ite, possibly even Christian motifs, as well as with modern elements, images and structures of thought. We see too how they have merged into a mixture incorporating anti-capitalism, the cult of martyrdom, Third World rhetoric, totalitarian ideology and science fiction. Kermani (2002) suggests that even in the way it is directed against an American-dominated modernity, the psychological profile of the attacks is a modern, Western one. Comparisons come to mind such as the Unabomber, the Aum Shinrikyo sect and, Timothy McVeigh. All these acts of terror bear witness to a generalized, pathological hatred which—unlike the hatred fuelling the attacks of the Red Army Faction, ETA, or the Palestinian Hamas—is no longer accompanied by a concrete, identifiable motive.

Until recently, social scientists thought that economic deprivation was a crucial determinant of hate crimes,⁵ but new evidence strongly challenges the empirical basis for this conclusion. Economists who have studied the German case, for instance, found no relationship between the unemployment rate and the incidence of ethnic violence across 543 counties in Germany. Rather than to economic conditions, the hate crimes literature points to a breakdown in law enforcement, as well as official sanctioning and encouragement of civil disobedience, as significant causes of the occurrence of hate crimes (Krueger and Maleckova, 2002).

Kermani (2002) argues that “[t]he crazed killer is a modern being—and not only when he belongs to a religious organization.” His explanation is that “[b]y means of a single act, the crazed killer acquires a surrogate for that which is lacking, almost by definition, in modern society: a

⁴ This seems as the act of pretending to integrate into the communities they live in an attempt to avoid suspicion and/or detection. According to J. M. Berger (2004), Al-Qai'da members are explicitly instructed on how to fit into Western societies, even at the expense of strict adherence to Shariah law. Berger suggests the ultimate infiltrators “...are not subject to any meaningful cultural repercussions for their acts. Nor are they subject to an inner moral conflict. The[y] are amoral machines by design, licensed to kill.”

⁵ Hate crimes are commonly defined as crimes against members of religious, racial, or ethnic groups because of their group membership, rather than because of their characteristics or actions as individuals (Krueger and Maleckova, 2002).

comprehensive framework of meaning in which the individual has his allocated place. The act is preceded by a phase of withdrawal, separation, subjectively perceived rejection or conscious isolation—even when the outward forms of bourgeois existence are being maintained. Stuck in a vacuum, the individual feels himself to be passive, anonymous, in every way forced to fend for himself. By shooting or bombing he endows himself with significance, becoming for a few seconds the total man of action, the avenger of an injustice which is overwhelmingly felt, but which neither his personality nor external circumstances have given him any chance of putting right. From being nobody, he raises himself to a god. However senseless his action might appear when viewed from the outside, it is from destruction itself that he wrests an ultimate meaning. His abstract antagonist—the state, humanity, the environment, evil itself—becomes briefly tangible in the form of those at whom his weapon is aimed.”

Before proceeding, some widespread misunderstandings need to be corrected. One of these misunderstandings is related to how meaningful to talk about a war with terrorism. Another one is related to Islam’s less than critically assumed role in September 11. Let us start from the first one. What is a war on terrorism? Is it really possible to make a war on terrorism? As Midgley (2002) points out, some wars are metaphorical—war on want, war on cancer or poverty or drugs or crime. Others are real ones, fought with bombs against actual foreign countries. For the first sort of war, you don’t need bombs. Actually these “wars” could just as well be called cures or remedies for the identified problems. Metaphorical Wars on Poverty or Crime are not really expected to come to an end at all—at least not before some rather rosy and distant future eventually winds up all these evils. Ordinary wars, on the other hand, finish when an enemy state officially surrenders. But even if Usama bin Ladin is caught, there is no reason to suppose that this would be the end of terrorism. In fact, as Levitt (2002) puts it, “unlike Polio or Small Pox, terrorism cannot be eradicated. There will always be grievances, causes, conditions that, coupled with a healthy dose of evil, will lead people to target civilian non-combatants for political purposes or even as a means in itself.”

Colonial powers always found it hugely difficult to accept that there was not some simple, drastic step which would promptly get rid of terror. For a long time it does not seem to have struck them that terrorism is a hydra which grows ten new heads for every one that you cut off—that people who are sickened by your punitive expeditions are likely to turn against you. You may get some satisfaction out of killing a few terrorists, but you are merely irritating the rest and the disturbance that you make is always liable to bring in new ones. We know that colonial powers had to get out in the end. As Midgley (2002) indicates, “this does not seem to be an encouraging example for the current project of declaring a full-scale ‘War against Terrorism’ and fighting it to a finish. That project is indeed extremely mysterious.” He rightly asks the question “What finish can there ever be to it?”

The other widespread misunderstanding that needs to be corrected is the assumed role of Islam in suicide bombers. Today, many associate suicide attacks with Islam. Historical realities, however, deny this association. As Kermani (2002) points out, “it was Christianity, along with the Shi’a, that developed the most distinctive theology of martyrdom.”⁶ Kermani (2002) underlines the point that “[i]n the modern period, suicide attacks—sacrificing one’s own life in order to kill unarmed or unprepared opponents or civilians—have long been a familiar component of cultures other than the Islamic; particularly of Japanese culture, which has given the phenomenon a name. A markedly greater number of suicide attacks were perpetrated by the Tamils in their fight for liberation in Sri Lanka.” According to Kermani (2002), “[t]wo or three decades ago, hardly anyone in a Muslim country would have had any understanding of the concept of the suicide attacker. Leaving aside the Sunni world to which the cult of martyrdom is in any case foreign, not even Shi’ite resistance fighters ever thought of strapping a bomb to themselves and setting it off in a department store.” The idea of martyrdom as a goal to aim for was imported into the Afghan war

⁶ Kermani (2002) quotes from the Letters of Paul, “(We are) always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body... For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus’s sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.” (Corinthians II, chapter 4, verses 10-12).

against the Soviet Union by Arab guerrillas—although, at the time, not even they saw it as the conscious bringing about of death by self-sacrifice. It is known that, back in the 1980s, Mujahedin representatives asked the Tamil Tigers if they could supply suicide attackers in exchange for money. In the Lebanese conflict, the Shi'ite Amal faction and Hezbollah have carried out fewer suicide attacks than, for example, the secular communist groups. The first Arab suicide attack in the conflict with Israel did not take place until the early eighties, by which time the conflict had already been under way for several decades, and it was carried out by the Syrian Nationalist Party which included a particularly high number of Arab Christians.

Kermani (2002) argues that “the idea of achieving redemption through destruction and collective salvation through self-sacrifice has its origins in modernity.” He suggests that Nietzsche stands more fundamentally for modes of thought which, on September 11, found expression in action. He refers to a key concept of his which was also taken up by Fascism—that of active nihilism. According to the logic of reverence for the creation that is expressed in the Old Testament or Koran, the utter destruction of oneself or of others is the most terrible thing of all, but in Nietzsche’s thinking it becomes salvation. The terrorists’ appropriation of a religious tradition is fundamentally no different from the way in which the Fascists made use of the obvious construct of an Aryan-German primeval history. It has scarcely more to do with the real history of the Sunni Arab world than the Valhalla mythology of the Nazis with real remembered German history. The images may be old, traditional or archaic, but the use of them is decidedly modern. This process is not exclusive to ideologies, it is also familiar from science fiction in which mythical images and configurations are projected onto futuristic scenarios.

3. What Feeds Global Terror?

As Goh (2003: 81) suggests, “root causes” of terror may be divided into two elements: the socio-political conditions promulgating extremist actions and their supporters; and aspects of the victim’s character and behavior which provide foci for grievance and attack. In order to understand what feeds global terrorism in general and suicide terrorism in particular, we first need to identify motivations of the terrorists who carry out these acts. Terrorism is a very cloudy abstraction but one thing about it is certain. *It is fed from discontent and conflict.* Planchuelo (2001) seems right to suggest that “[o]nly those who have absorbed hate, have lost all hope, and have little to lose are prepared to die in the murder of others.” September 11 and following similar attacks bear witness to a generalized, pathological hatred. Thus, first thing to do is to understand what feeds this hatred and how they can find support from people. As Midgley (2002) suggests “[t]errorists are not isolated destructive individuals. Unless there is a fair mass of discontented people in the background to support them, even the most destructive individuals cannot usually raise the background resources that they need to do serious harm. They also greatly need moral support—a community that shares their aims.” Even if the Islamic global terror network is very much a hybrid phenomenon, it still needs a social and political base in order to become so dangerous. It needs movements in society which support it and countries that protect it.

In an attempt to understand the motivation behind September 11 attack, Harris assumes that the attackers had a fantasy ideology. According to Harris (2002), “the targets were chosen by Al-Qai’da not through military calculation—in contrast, for example, to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—but entirely because they stood as symbols of American power. They were gigantic props in a grandiose spectacle in which the collective fantasy of radical Islam was brought vividly to life: A mere handful of Muslims, whose will was absolutely pure, as proven by their martyrdom, brought down the haughty towers erected by the Great Satan.” Harris asks: What better proof could there possibly be that God was on the side of radical Islam and that the end of the reign of the Great Satan was at hand? Harris’s explanation is somewhat insightful. However, it has at least one very important failing. Although Harris recognizes that there must first be a pre-existing

collective need for this fantasy; he fails to identify what feeds it.⁷ In other words, he does not recognize the importance of *perceived injustice* and *humiliation* to build up that fantasy ideology. Anyone who could fly an airplane full of people into a building full of people has more than started to treat people (including themselves) as things. However, it is just possible that they started down that road when they felt themselves treated as things—inconveniences, troublemakers, irrelevancies. In order to understand what feeds global terror, it seems that we need to look at these rarely recognized issues of *perceived injustice* and *humiliation* and reveal their importance in building up such a fantasy ideology.

Discontent arises when the people who set and practice the rules are not perceived as just. As Davidman and Davidman (1998) suggest, “[j]ustice demands equality and fairness in all private transactions, wages, and property ownership, as well as equal opportunity for all to participate in the public benefits generated by society, such as social security, health care, and education.” Nevertheless, justice does not refer to equal distribution of resources and wealth. In other words, equality does not represent justice. For many different reasons, unequal distribution of resources and wealth can be perceived by people as just. It is very much related to perception and that perception is subject to change from one society to another and one period to another. It is expected in principle that justice requires equal rights among people. However, like in the case of distribution of resources and wealth, this is not always the case. We may choose to transfer some of our rights to our representatives to whom we believe can defend our rights. We even provide them with some privileges. Most of the people seem likely to accept even extreme inequalities provided that there is *the same set of rules* and *equal opportunities* for everybody. Therefore, it can be argued that although equal distribution of resources, wealth, and rights are extremely important sign posts to identify what is just, more critical is how legitimate the system is perceived by the people. When the people who set and practice the rules are not perceived as legitimate, discontent arises. Lack of peaceful alternatives for greater justice is likely to radicalize the situation and to push oppressed, disadvantaged groups and some opponents towards violent activities.

Suicide bombers clearly are not motivated by the prospect of their own individual economic gain, although it is possible that the promise of larger payments to their families may increase the willingness of some to participate in these lethal missions. Their primary motivation instead seems to result from their passionate support for the ideas and the aims of their movement. According to Krueger and Maleckova (2002), “[w]hile economic deprivation may not be associated with participation in terrorism and political violence at the individual level, it may nonetheless matter at the national level. If a country is impoverished, a minority of the relatively well off in that country may turn to terrorism to seek to improve the conditions of their countrymen.” As Kermani (2002) indicates, the feeling of being oppressed and exploited may not have its roots in the social backgrounds of terrorist organizations leaders, but it is nonetheless real and widespread. Osama bin Laden is not appealing to some imaginary working class, but to broad strands of society which feel genuinely oppressed and exploited—even if it is only a small minority that would turn to violence on that account. Nonetheless, their identification with the motives underlying such acts conceals a terrifying potential for the support of terror.

The political roots of global terrorism specifically thrive in the Arab region. *Jordan Times* (12 March 2004) seems right to suggest that “the continuation of conflicts in the Middle East, especially the Arab-Israeli deadlock and the Iraqi occupation, leads to radicalization of the entire region and makes the endeavors to reform it that much more difficult. The rise of political violence and even terrorism is directly linked to these festering conflicts.” This paper identifies the motives behind the support of terror as the *perceived* and *real* absence of fair distribution of resources, rights, and opportunities among countries and within countries. All these are related to how just

⁷ Moreover, it should always be born in mind that al-Qai'da employs violence in the service of an idea and as part of a political strategy, and not simply for destruction as an end in itself. The bomb in Madrid had a clear political aim, namely to weaken and divide the coalition in Iraq. Similarly, the attacks in Saudi Arabia, besides demonstrating the continued vigor of the organization, show al-Qai'da coming almost full circle, back to the goal of destabilizing the Saudi regime (Syper, 2004).

the world system runs. Thus, if the above identified motives behind the terrorist acts are correct, the answer for global terror must be to secure a just world system, which crucially depends on indiscriminate application of rules.

4. How Should We Approach Global Terror?

September 11, as Kermani (2002) suggests, “represents a kind of terrorism that can spring up anywhere in a modern society.” For those who see martyrdom as their release from an earthly vale of sorrows, death holds no terror—and that is something with which political rulers simply could not and cannot deal—death and torture being the ultimate means by which they assert their power. That was the experience of the Romans, and we experience it again today. What, then, can governments afflicted with this kind of trouble do about it? There really does not seem to be any short-cut solution available. The system analyst Allenna Leonard (2002) identifies five basic concepts which look helpful in this task. These are: *system*, *requisite variety*, *models*, *stability and equilibrium*, and *feedback*. Now, let us analyze global terror with the help of these concepts.

4.1 System

A system is a group of interacting, interrelated, and interdependent components that form a complex and unified whole.⁸ A whole system, like the planet, is made up of subsystems interacting with each other. What happens in one part affects the others whether anyone wants it or not. For instance, global warming exists and that opting out of its effects is not an option. Leonard says that the globalization of trade might be an unalterable fact, but a great error is made if we think that it is possible to limit the aspects of globalization that concern people to those that the World Trade Organization (WTO) agrees to acknowledge. The US and the West cannot accept ownership of some of its actions and disavow others. The statement “what goes around comes around” reflects this. It is not possible for them to impose their own terms on less developed countries, or to take what they want from them in terms of resources, labor and freedom from troublesome environmental regulations, without paying the costs one way or another. One way is to do something about helping them meet their basic needs. Another is trying to put up barriers—to terrorists, anti-biotic-resistant, boatloads of refugees and local civil wars—with the knowledge that they will not always be effective (Leonard, 2002).

The global economy is in the process of transformation with the increase in economic transactions and interdependencies. This process has many dimensions, including a reduction of barriers to the flow of goods, services, and finance. The reduction of these barriers often involves national legislation in combination with international regimes associated with deregulation that proscribe states from interfering with international economic flows. Arguably, the flow of capital and technology and information into the poorest countries would create economic value for the people and improve their absolute standard of living. But it is not enough to raise the tide of the whole globe without addressing the disparity by raising even higher each individual and nation on the bottom. If wealth and power flow only or primarily to the élites, the result will be neither justice nor democracy. Without just political and economic systems, it is unlikely that life quality of ordinary people in these poorest countries will improve.

The market’s capacity to steer the economy and bring new information to light is beyond question. But markets only respond to messages coded in the language of prices. They are insensible to their own external effects, those they produce in other domains (Habermas, 2000). Access to technology and knowledge has increasingly become critical factors for participation in economic prosperity. World society has been divided into those with and those without access to knowledge through the Internet. Lack of opportunity to access Internet and learn the skills to make use of this portal is the reality for large numbers of the poor and the educationally underserved.

⁸ Ecological systems and human social systems are living systems; human-made systems such as cars and washing machines are nonliving systems.

Many argue that while the rich are getting richer, so are the poor. Everyone is better off. But in fact the rising tide of the global economy is not lifting all boats. The trend in international inequality clearly shows the inadequacy of the rising-tide image: about 1.5 billion people or 1 out of every 4 people on earth are poorer in real terms today than they were 10 or more years ago. The processes for creating wealth are not available to the poor⁹ (Hug, 2000). In the period since the end of the cold war, the number of persons subsisting below the international poverty line¹⁰ rose from 1.2 billion in 1987 to 1.5 billion today and, if recent trends persist, will reach 1.9 billion by 2015 (Pogge, 2000).

Globalization is also associated with growing gaps in economic living standards within and between states. Even a modestly successful, financially independent life by US middle-class standards is available to only a small percentage of the human family. That is not necessarily bad in itself, but the ways people today have to secure that lifestyle are literally making the rich richer and the poor poorer. Consider some of these realities and the trends they reveal. The wealthiest 20 percent of the world's population (about 1.2 billion people) receive over 86 percent of the world's annual income. The poorest 1.2 billion people are living on about 1 percent. Over the last 30 years, statistics reveal an increasing concentration of wealth in the hands of a shrinking percentage of the global population. In today's world economy, wealth does trickle, but it trickles up, not down (Hug 2000). The income gap between the fifth of the world's people living in the richest countries and the fifth in the poorest was 74 to 1 in 1997, up from 60 to 1 in 1990 and 30 to 1 in 1960. Estimates for earlier times are eleven to one for 1913, seven to one for 1870, and three to one for 1820. The world's 200 richest people more than doubled their net worth in the four years to 1998, to more than \$1 trillion. The assets of the top three billionaires are more than the combined GNP of 48 poorest countries and their 600 million people (HDR, 1999: 3). Anyone with any connection to reality knows that those with the lion's share of the wealth call the shots in everything that matters and there can be no such thing as equal opportunity in a hopelessly inegalitarian society.

The incidence of severe poverty and growing gaps in economic living standards within and between states is importantly influenced by the existing global economic and social order. While the current system creates economic progress, it also rapidly increases inequality. The consequence is that the gains are huge at the top and minuscule or non-existent at the bottom of the global hierarchy. According to Roy (2004), “[i]nternational instruments of trade and finance oversee a complex system of multilateral trade laws and financial agreements that keep the poor in their Bantustans. Its whole purpose is to institutionalize inequity.” She demands answers to her questions: “Why else would it be that the US taxes a garment made by a Bangladeshi manufacturer twenty times more than a garment made in Britain? Why else would it be that countries that grow cocoa beans, like the Ivory Coast and Ghana, are taxed out of the market if they try to turn it into chocolate?”

It is very difficult to challenge the general perception that “the world order has the US label and nothing happens in the globe against its desire.” For many, negative developments in the world are related to the current world order and the US has the prominent responsibility for the result. It is very easy to understand why the general perception is like this. First of all, the extent of the US' power is unprecedented in human history. The latest increases¹¹ will take its military

⁹ The poorest 20 percent of the world's nations receive 1 percent of foreign direct investment, export 1 percent of the world's goods and services, and make up 0.2 percent of the world's Internet users, making the odds against their successful participation in the current global economy overwhelming (Hug, 2000).

¹⁰ Poverty is not defined merely by GDP, and deprivation can take many different forms. Economic poverty is not the only kind of poverty that impoverishes human lives. Human lives can be impoverished in many different ways. Politically unfree citizens—whether rich or poor—are deprived of a basic constituent of good living. The same applies to such social deprivations as illiteracy, lack of health care, unequal attention to the elementary interests of women and of young girls and so on (Sen, 2000).

¹¹ In February 2002, George W. Bush announced an increase in US military spending of 15 per cent, the biggest in 20 years, more than double the military spending in all of the European Union. The rise is \$36 billion for 2002, \$48 billion for 2003 and \$120 billion over the next five years, rising to a staggering two trillion over the next five years (*Observer*, February 10, 2002).

spending to 40% of the world-wide total, larger than the arms budgets of the next 19 states put together. According to Milne (2002), “[n]o previous military empire – from the Roman to the British – had anything like this preponderance, let alone America’s global reach ... A state with less than one 20th of the earth’s population is able to dictate to the other 95% and order their affairs in its own interests, both through military and economic pressure.” With its awful power the US is openly arrogating itself as the sole world leadership and dispensing with any restraint on its actions through the United Nations (UN) or other multilateral bodies. The US has spurned important multilateral regimes relating to arms control, the environment, war crimes, human rights,¹² and other emerging global issues¹³ (Spiro, 2000). This situation reveals the fundamental weakness of the global system: *the gap between entitlements to human rights and the availability of mechanisms to ensure respect for these rights*.

The US international policy (particularly since the fall of the Soviet Union), has manifested an arrogance towards its allies and proved itself to be interested only in increasing its own power, even stretching the limits of international law in order to defend its own interests (Planchuelo, 2001). The US is effectively challenging what has until now passed for at least formal equality between nations. The Bush administration’s attempt to orchestrate an international alliance in its war against terrorism after September 11, for instance, was presented as an ultimatum. Bush’s statement was that “[e]very nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.” There has been also a rising unilateralism under the Bush administration. The Pentagon and State Department have emphasized a more selective approach to gathering “revolving coalitions ... depending on the activity and the circumstances,” and asserted that the US will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary (Roy, 2003: 66-7). Moreover, Bush’s axis-of-evil speech did mark a very important change in American foreign policy from deterrence to a policy of active pre-emption of terrorism¹⁴ (*The Progressive*, 2002). Consequently, Bush administration went to war against Iraq, *regardless* of the facts¹⁵—and regardless of international public opinion.

The US reactions to the events of September 11, has been judged on perhaps the most obvious measure of legitimacy,¹⁶ their adherence to international law. There are two key legal issues related to the “war on terrorism”: the right to resort to the use of force, and the means employed in

¹² Roy (2003: 65) highlights the awful truth that in the decade of economic sanctions that followed the first Gulf war, Iraqi civilians have been denied food, medicine, hospital equipment, ambulances, and clean water—the basic essentials. About half a million Iraqi children have died as a result of the sanctions. Washington labeled the Taliban and al-Qai’da forces captured during the war in Afghanistan “unlawful combatants” or “battlefield detainees”, rather than prisoner of war (PoWs). This meant that they were not entitled to the full range of legal protection accompanying PoW status. Although the Bush administration gave detained public assurances that the prisoners would receive “humane treatment”, the conditions at the US Naval Base in Guantánamo Bay, where hundreds of detainees have been held, was harsh (Goh, 2003: 85). According to *Amnesty International* (2004), detainees have been held for over two years and denied the right to challenge the legality of their detention before an independent court or to talk to their families. Moreover, large numbers of prisoners after an uprising at the prisoners’ camp near Mazer-e-Sharif, have been killed (Goh, 2003: 85).

¹³ The US rejected to sign on to the Land Mines Convention and the Rome Treaty establishing an international criminal court, and the US failure to submit the Kyoto Protocol on global warming for Senate approval. It also explains Washington’s persistent refusal to conform US practices to international human rights regimes. The US stands alone with Somalia in not acceding to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Washington heavily qualified its acceptance of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and continues to defy that treaty’s prohibition of the execution of juvenile offenders (along with Iran, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia). Only the free-trade agreements—provided they are limited to trade and do not include the environment, labor issues, or human rights—pass muster under New Sovereignism because they are thought to serve American interests (Spiro, 2000).

¹⁴ Preventive war, Chomsky (2003) suggests, is “the supreme crime that was condemned at Nuremberg”.

¹⁵ Even after more than one year of occupation, no concrete evidence has still been found in relation to the US claim that Iraq had weapon of mass destruction.

¹⁶ Legitimacy is a key factor in the process of persuading others to subscribe to the international order established by the dominant power. It is the value that justifies the relationship between governed and governor. More broadly understood as the right to exercise the power of leadership or governance, legitimacy is based on consent and perceived concordance of values and identities in existing norms. For the governor, legitimacy also implies constraints on the exercise of power involving ideas of accountability and responsibility (Goh, 2003: 84).

the actual use of force. When rumors of war against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq emerged, the UN sought *process* (the continuation of inspections to find weapons of mass destruction) – while the US wanted *action* (a war to prevent a possible nuclear holocaust). The result was a confrontation of wills between the US and members of the Security Council in February 2003 when that body refused to support a collective action against Iraq. The war that followed, conducted without the blessing of UN action, but by a “coalition of the willing” (Hare and Forman, 2004).

Former the US National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski has argued that “[i]f America comes to be viewed by its key democratic allies in Europe and Asia as morally obtuse and politically naïve in failing to address terrorism in its broader and deeper dimensions ... global support for America's policies will surely decline. America's ability to maintain a broadly democratic anti-terrorism coalition will suffer gravely” (Brzezinski, 2002).

4.2 Variety and Requisite Variety

A situation can only be controlled if the variety of the controller matches the variety of the situation to be controlled. Leonard (2002) points out that a system with one variable, like the water level in a reservoir, can be kept under control with a simple machine that automatically opens or closes a gate when the desired level is reached. It is, however, impossible to control for every variable in complex systems. Thus, most variety is absorbed through relationships with other systems. Every society generates tremendous variety and tries to control it in its own way, through laws and customs. Internationally, powerful countries amplify their own variety by using their political and economic power to dominate weaker ones. Sometimes this is done directly; at other times through institutions like the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank. If individuals and groups in a culture find that it is difficult to express their variety through standard economic and political avenues, they will find other ways, including crime and ideologies that can engage in terrorism. International controls are mostly applied to governments on the assumption that they can contain the variety of their populations. That assumption, as Leonard (2002) indicates, is dangerously wrong. Many governments have factions they cannot afford to oppose and pockets outside the reach of their laws. In Iraq, there was a territory invaded by an army that could be opposed by another armed force. In terror situation, there is no army and no real territory. It is a battle for hearts and minds. It is possible that the effect of the Iraq war may be to make governments that want to sponsor terrorism create even stronger fire walls between themselves and their proxies in order to avoid Saddam's fate. However, this is likely to have an effect on governments, not on individual terrorists (Al-Khater, 2003).

As Planchuelo (2001) suggests, “no amount of military or police intelligence (even when the US is in a constant state of emergency powers) can guarantee that something similar [to September 11] will not happen in the future”. It is also worth noting that terrorism is no longer restricted to acts of violence. A computer hacker sitting in front of his/her home computer a world away could create havoc in another country's military or financial systems, especially in a country highly dependent on the digital revolution to run its systems like the US (Al-Khater, 2003).

Leonard (2002) indicates that when the US president Bush said “you are with us or you are with the terrorists”, he reduced the variety of other countries' responses to a binary choice and left no manoeuvring room for those whose populations are not unanimous in their support. He has also left little space for dissenting voices in the US or abroad, regarding the means he may choose. Moreover, the US strategy of strengthening primacy, intervening more assertively to protect security and interests, and adopting a more explicit ideological basis for foreign policy, can be expected to exacerbate extant problems (Goh, 2003: 92).

4.3 Model

A series of models usually begins with a metaphor to frame a situation which then becomes more elaborate. It selects some aspects and ignores others. The metaphor of war is a misleading one to guide a response to terrorist actions. “War” implies a contest between identifiable forces, a

tangible goal and a definitive solution. Forces have a chain of command and someone who can negotiate surrender or truce. Ordinary wars finish when an enemy state officially surrenders. War, however, is not a way to eradicate terrorism. The main reason for this is that terrorists do not compose a coherent nation and they would not have a country with identifiable borders that can be conquered. Moreover, we run big risks if we assume a chain of command or someone who has the authority to negotiate. We do not know that Usama bin Ladin is irreplaceable. Even if he is caught, there is no reason to suppose that this would be the end for terrorism. In fact, unlike metaphorical wars on cancer, or drugs or poverty, terrorism cannot be eradicated. There will always be grievances, causes, conditions that will lead people to target civilian non-combatants for political purposes or even as a means in itself. Unlike an actual war fought with actual bombs, this metaphorical war against terrorism can only be won by bringing a solution to the underlying problems that lead to discontent and conflict. Oppression, poverty, unfair distribution of income, and disrespect to differences can be identified as the structural causes of violence. If there were not these global problems, it would be very unlikely to witness September 11-type events. Thus, what needs to be done is to bring solutions to these tough and complex global problems.

Putting an end to global terrorism is a process that requires international collaboration and configuring international society in such a way that human rights violations are punished, that injustices receive compensation, and an end is brought to the abandonment and helplessness that brings multitudes of people to a state of such desperation that they are prepared to die through the murder of others. The UN and particularly the US do not seem to contribute enough in this respect. It can even be argued that the most important human right, “the right to life,” has been ignored in some countries. As Roy (2003: 65) documents, in the decade of economic sanctions that followed the Gulf war, Iraqi civilians have been denied food, medicine, hospital equipment, ambulances, clean water—the basic essentials. About half a million Iraqi children have died as a result of the sanctions. Not to allow similar human disasters, the UN should be reconfigured to be more democratic, more agile, with more power and executive strength. Its functioning should be distinct from the political interests of the different states, and should be based on the application of objective criteria in defense of human rights. This should be done in such a way that its functioning does not become so conditioned by the veto that the members of the Security Council wield, frequently used for the benefit of the strongest powers, and in detriment to human rights¹⁷ (Planchuelo, 2001).

4. 4 Stability and Equilibrium

In the aftermath of September 11, the question posed frequently was: Why do some people and particularly some people from Middle East hate Americans? To find an answer to this question requires particularly looking at the US Middle East policy. Along with other Western powers, the US has been supporting the so-called “moderate” regimes in the Arab world: regimes that usually consist of dictatorships that are favorable towards the interests of Western governments, and their businesses, and that deny their people the most basic attentions such as education or sanitary assistance (Planchuelo, 2001). A century ago Europe drew the map of the Middle East and Africa to set tribes against each other, and to maximize the accessibility and minimize the price of their resources. These have included the manipulation of governments and of groups reclaiming political Islamism against nationalist Arabic and leftist movements.

Historically, one of the foreign policy aims of the US and other imperial powers “has been to promote ‘stability’ in their client states. But it is not the ‘stability’ associated with stable systems that adapt to change and shift to maintain their equilibrium. It is the kind that presses harder on the lid, rather than turning down the heat. Many countries have seen traditional leaders bought off, or elected leaders overthrown in favor of more compliant rulers” (Leonard, 2002). The US has

¹⁷ According to Planchuelo (2001), in order for this to happen, a council that is integrated by authorities of indisputable international prestige, that in some cases could adopt provisional executive decisions, and whose judgements over others should necessarily be the subject of debate by the General Assembly, should be created.

invested a tremendous amount of financial capital in the Middle East, using its “check-book”¹⁸ as a key diplomatic instrument for promoting American interests in the region (Lasensky, 2002). China and the former Soviet Union got into the act as well. Successive governments seem to have decided that tyranny was preferable to anarchy—or even to messy young democracies that wanted to run things in their own interests. If a country was not compliant or was the client state of a competing power, money, arms and training were dedicated to replacing its government, or rendering it ungovernable, regardless of the misery unleashed on the populace. On top of this, Middle Eastern peoples have experienced the US as a party to Palestinian – Israel conflict – one that has historically been hostile to Palestinian nationalist commitments and aspirations. Thus, it is understandable that many Muslims in the Middle East countries feel humiliated by the prepotency with which Western countries intervene in their matters, applying their own criteria in order to assess their rights and needs, and those of Western allies. While there is such wide-spread resentment, it is increasingly difficult to preserve stability.

Now, technology and mobility have amplified everyone’s variety. It isn’t possible simply to send the gunboats when situations start to simmer. Lids work reasonably well for official actions undertaken by governments. But they are very porous when it comes to containing determined private groups who operate underground. For systemic stability, essential variables need to be kept within prescribed limits. It is flexible, adaptive and robust against disturbances. In a country, it would make sure that everyone had enough to survive and that competing interests could interact and solve their own problems. Troubled waters and squeaky wheels would get oiled. Low-key responses would be favoured. Infrastructure would be developed to move more and more sources of disagreement into agreed means of resolution (Leonard, 2002). What happened in the Middle East, however, was very different.

4. 5 Feedback

The most effective way to operate in a complex environment is through “error controlled negative feedback”. This is the dynamic that turns a furnace on and off through a thermostat. In more complex situations, measures are devised to report on whether a goal is getting closer or further away, and to give the operator time to adjust the input accordingly. Its results tend toward stability. In a negative feedback environment, when you have a conflict situation or an outburst, it is interpreted as an error signal. Questions are asked about what kind of input led to the unwelcome output. Means are put in place to adjust the input and deal with the unwelcome output (Leonard, 2002). It is clear that the Bush administration has not taken into consideration almost any negative feedbacks when it decided to go to war with the regime in Iraq. Despite the largest-ever world-wide anti-war demonstrations in February 2003, for example, the US went war with Iraq in the third week of March 2003.

Positive feedback, is praising someone for a good job. It is doing more of whatever you were doing to increase the effect. As Leonard (2002) points out, positive feedback in a conflict situation escalates the conflict rather than settling it. Increasing levels of retaliation can go on until one or another of the parties is beaten down or until exhaustion sets in. Scott Atran (2003) observes, “[m]assive retaliation further increases people’s sense of victimization and readiness to behave according to organizational doctrines and policies structured to take advantage of such feelings. In a poll of 1179 West Bank and Gaza Palestinians in spring 2002, 66% said army operations increased their backing for suicide bombings. By year’s end, 73% of Lebanese Moslems considered suicide bombings justifiable. This radicalization of opinion increases both demand and supply for martyrdom operations. A December 2002 UN report credited volunteers with swelling and reviving Al-Qai’da in 40 countries. The organization’s influence in the larger society—most significantly its directing élites—increases in turn.”

¹⁸ Since 1973, U.S. economic and military aid to the Middle East has topped \$100 billion. In the past decade, Israel and its neighbors have consumed between one-fourth and one-third of the total American foreign aid budget (Lasensky, 2002).

In March 2002, the Gallup organization released the results of polling in nine predominantly Muslim countries. In only two of them did the proportion of respondents with a “very favorable” opinion of the US exceed a tenth of the population: Lebanon, where the number was 18 percent, and Kuwait, where it was 11. But these pro-American respondents were themselves offset by the 30 percent of Lebanese and 23 percent of Kuwaitis who recorded their opinion of Americans as very unfavorable. In Saudi Arabia, meanwhile, a mere 7 percent said they held a very favorable view of Americans, with seven times that number, or 49 percent, at the opposite end of the spectrum; in Pakistan, Gallup had to report an asterisk under “very favorable”, signifying a response of less than 1 percent. With the exception of Turkey, the news was hardly any better elsewhere. When asked specifically about the September 11 attacks, pluralities or bare majorities in most of the nine countries did say they found them “totally unjustifiable”—but much higher proportions condemned the US military action in Afghanistan as itself totally unjustifiable. The most startling results were for Kuwait, where a mere 26 percent of respondents found the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon totally unjustifiable, while over twice that number, 55 percent, applied this judgment to America’s actions in Afghanistan (Muravchik, 2002). Since there was so much opposition towards the will of the US to occupy Iraq, the results of a similar poll after the occupation of Iraq would hardly be favorable for the US.

5. The Way to Eradicate Global Terror in the Long Term

Real peace outlaws systematic hatred and requires that we treat other parties with some respect in our thoughts. As Leonard (2003) rightly suggests, “[n]o amount of security can eliminate the micro-revolts of terrorism as long as there are people who are willing to die to inflict damage. The only way is to eliminate the sources of hopelessness and rage that fuel such profound discontent.” As Hare and Forman (2004) indicate, “[m]any people around the world perceive an unjust social and economic order imposed on them by forces that are, at best, indifferent to their development needs.” Pogge (2000) points to the unacceptable situation that some 840 million persons are today chronically malnourished, 880 million without access to health services, one billion without adequate shelter, 1.3 billion without access to safe drinking water, two billion without electricity, and 2.6 billion without access to basic sanitation.¹⁹ Solution to this global problem is, indeed, not beyond our reach. As Pogge (2000) indicates “one percent of the developed countries’ GNP—less than half the ‘peace dividend’—could greatly reduce world hunger within a few years, allowing expenditures to decline significantly thereafter.” According to *HDR* (1998: 30), “[t]he additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, basic health care for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is ... less than 4% of the combined wealth of the 225 richest people in the world.”

Terror literature points out that there is little direct connection between poverty, education, and participation in or support for terrorism (Krueger and Maleckova, 2002). As argued earlier, people likely to accept even extreme inequalities provided that there is *the same set of rules* and *equal opportunities* for everybody. Rather than equality, therefore, perceived justice that prevails in the system is the most important issue affecting people’s participation in global terrorism and political violence. Lack of peaceful alternatives for greater justice is likely to radicalize the situation and to push oppressed, disadvantaged groups and some opponents towards violent activities.

The Middle East seems to have the most fertile land for the seeds of global terror to germinate. Because, there are many unsolved conflicts in this region. Arab-Israeli deadlock and the Iraqi occupation are high in the agenda, not to mention many US bases in the region to control oil

¹⁹ Such severe poverty has consequences: World-wide, 34,000 children under age five die daily from hunger and preventable diseases. Roughly one third of all human deaths, some fifty thousand daily or eighteen million annually, are due to poverty-related causes. Two out of five children in the developing world are stunted, one in three is underweight and one in ten is wasted. One quarter of all children between five and fourteen, 250 million in all, are compelled to work, often under harsh conditions, as soldiers, prostitutes, or domestic servants or in agriculture, construction, textile, or carpet production. If they survive long enough, many of them will join the currently 850 million illiterate adults (Pogge, 2000).

interests.²⁰ These are the political problems come out very often and has a tremendously negative effect on how the West and particularly the US is perceived in the Muslim world. In the Arab view, the indifference the US has shown to the plight of the Palestinians and its refusal to rein in Israel are the primary factors that fuel extremism. In the words of *Al-Quds al-Arabi* (March, 13, 2004), “[s]o long as the US Administration continues to take a biased stand in favor of Israel, and so long as the Arab region continues to be ruled by corrupt, clannish dictatorships, which enjoy the West’s support, extremist groups, both leftist and Islamic extremists, will have a suitable climate for recruiting angry and frustrated youths and motivate them to carry out sanguinary acts.”

Injustices together with hunger and acute poverty, feed the paranoia which fears and hates the West, and early indoctrination creates suicide bombers. You must invest in ideology that persuades somebody to sacrifice his/her life for a superior goal. For the organizer of suicide bombers, this type of ideology is free, is part of the culture where God, religion, tradition, authority still have a strong impact on the education of the people. Most people in the Middle East grow up in a culture where suicide attackers are really heroes and suicide is better than surrender.

A leading analyst of post-9/11 global fractures, Gilles Kepel (2004), underlines the important point that “weapons cannot be an end in themselves, only a means.” To eradicate terrorism we must engage civil society and win *hearts* and *minds*. This paper suggests that there are three main ways of bringing solution to hopelessness and rage. The first one of them is to be inclusive so that all people benefiting equitably as with all other people. The second one is to redistribute wealth in a “fair” way. The third one is to equip people with the knowledge and skills to come over their problems.

The first solution is applicable with little input and positive outcomes are likely to be huge. This solution is mainly related to acknowledging rights for everybody and showing respect for differences (religion, race, culture, sex). Since this is very much related to how we see people and relate ourselves with them, we do not require much resource. What we need here is mainly to change our attitude. Although that requires little resources, it is hardly easy to change people’s attitudes. What the US can do in this respect is to change its foreign policy radically to increase its respect for international laws, be much more constructive and inclusive. Otherwise, eradication of global terror is likely to be far in the sight. If the current priorities of US foreign policy continue, as Goh (2003: 92) suggests, “[o]ver the longer run, the effectiveness of the exercise of American power will be affected by the negative assessments of and ‘blowback’ from its actions in response to terrorism. Increased friction with its international allies and friends, and rising concern with the costs of more overseas intervention and the possibility of further terrorist attacks at home will serve to constrain Washington’s policy choices”.

The second solution is probably the most difficult one to apply among the three. Difficulties for this solution are not only related to enforceability but also to decision making process since fairness is very much related to perception and thus subjective. Another thing to consider is that, even if we may be willing to share what we have, there will be always people against complying with what is suggested, not to mention unwillingness in the receiving end. The third solution requires more resources compare to the first solution, but much less compare to the second. It is probably the easiest one to apply among the three since resistance would be minimal. This solution has a distinct advantage. Giving something to someone would reduce what we have. On the other hand, equipping people with knowledge and skills has a very much different effect. There would not be any reduction in what we have. But the total outcome would increase.

As Miller (1997) suggests, “[i]lliteracy is an enduring disability”. Education, on the other hand, is antidote of this “disability”. Education enables individuals to enhance their capabilities and functionings through equipping them with the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes they need to live in dignity, to improve their own lives, and to contribute to the development of their communities and nations. Mednick (2003) points out that “[a]n educated person is not condemned to fate, but

²⁰ The US bases in Saudi Arabia is particularly annoying for Muslims since there is the holly land for Muslims there.

imbued by a rich imagination of possibilities”. An educated person not only knows how to read and write and compute but also “can apply learning to mend and repair a broken world”.

Education is a central vehicle to achieve several important aims. First and foremost, education supplies people with the entrepreneurial skills of “achievers”, capable of looking after themselves. The point is just as applicable to nations. In the long run, both economic and social well-being of individuals and nations depend importantly on intelligent and forward-looking investments in the development of skills, and search for innovations (Onis and Erdogdu, 2002). Results of many studies confirm the social profitability of investing in education.²¹ Raw materials are much less important in today’s world for economic development.²² Nowadays, rather than raw materials human capital is important and an educated and skilled workforce is the engine that drives growth machine.

Second, education is crucial to reduce inequalities and prejudices that lead to injustices (Erdogdu, 2004a). Stratification and social class inequality, as Post (1996) suggests, are human inventions and produced entirely by those artificial inequalities of intelligence. Since inequalities of intelligence are closely related to education, it is possible to reduce it through provision of equal access to education. Third, peace and order will best be maintained by means of a profound re-education of the people to “reasonableness” (Carrig, 2001). What we know is grounded in our beliefs, values, worldviews and ways of being in everyday experiences (Tettegah, 2002). People are all products of cultural conditioning, they have a resulting worldview with values and beliefs that operate outside the level of conscious awareness, often resulting in the erroneous assumption that the nature of reality and truth are universal and shared by everyone. A well-designed multicultural education puts one’s community in global perspective and allows students to see civilization as a mosaic of traditions ultimately sharing the same cosmic destiny. As Ognibene and Paulli (2002) suggests, civic virtue is enhanced when schools help students develop values, beliefs and dispositions that promote the common good. If social justice is the agenda, then it is crucial to create educational projects and curricula that actively engage conflict and dissenting perspectives across different groups. In order to use education as part of a strategy to reduce terrorism, Krueger and Maleckova (2002) suggest that the international community should not limit itself to increasing years of schooling, but should consider very carefully the content of education.

These are the solutions require considerable amount of time to see the positive results. Redistribution of wealth is the most difficult to apply and its outcomes are the least clear among the three. The best strategy, therefore, seems to focus on inclusiveness and equipping people with the knowledge and skills. While the first one would likely to be more effective in the short term, the third one would most likely be more effective in the long term. For the best results, the three solutions need to be seen as complementary.

6. Conclusions

Terrorism is a very cloudy abstraction but one thing about it is certain: It is fed from discontent and conflict. Discontent and conflict arise, particularly, when the people who set and practice the rules are not perceived as legitimate. Many people around the world perceive an unjust social and economic order imposed on them by forces that are, at best, indifferent to their needs. We live in a world where inequality is deeply entrenched and widely supported, and where most efforts seem to

²¹ Among the three main levels of education, primary education continues to exhibit the highest social profitability in all world regions. However, results indicate that the returns by level of education are sensitive to countries’ economic status. According to results, low-income countries benefited most from investments to expand primary education, while in middle-income countries, it was investments to expand secondary education that brought the highest social returns. In the high-income countries, investing to expand coverage in higher education yielded the best returns. Investments with poor social returns include expansion of higher education in low- and middle-income settings and expansion of secondary education in high-income settings.

²² Advanced economies depend mostly on the service sectors, which constitute up to 80 percent of their GDPs. For example, companies like Microsoft, Sun, and McDonal’s are the main constituents of the US economy. Raw material is no longer the biggest share of the value of manufactured goods as before. The raw material value of a computer is very small indeed. Its value is mainly in its engineering, which requires more brains and technology than material.

contribute to the efficient management of inequality. The path of economic development that defines early 21st-century globalization is associated with growing inequalities of wealth and power within and between states and it is a path toward greater and greater inequality. In other words, the current direction of globalization is increasing the economic and social injustice being done to the vast majority of the human family today. Billions of people trapped in poverty worldwide feel the injustice intensely as they glimpse the lifestyles of the rich and famous of the world. The viciousness of the circle is continually reinforced by inequalities of wealth and power among states. Moreover, the way many international conflicts were resolved hardly contributed to the healing of the wounds or established the base for national reconciliation. One of the fundamental weaknesses of the international order is the gap between entitlements to human rights and the availability of mechanisms to ensure respect for these rights. Access to justice remains unequal for both economic and political reason and cultural and social discrimination is widespread. Moreover, even basic human rights are disrespected not only by less developed but also by leading nations. The lack of access to justice for the underprivileged is a growing problem, and there is no supra-national organization to take on the burden of justice.

Most people seem likely to accept even extreme inequalities provided that there is *the same set of rules* and *equal opportunities* for everybody. Therefore, it can be argued that although equal distribution of resources, wealth, and rights are extremely important sign posts to identify what is just, more critical is how legitimate the system is perceived by the people. In any event, the lack of peaceful alternatives to change is likely to radicalize the situation and to push some opponents towards violent activities. Injustices together with hunger and acute poverty, feed the paranoia which fears and hates the West, and early indoctrination creates suicide bombers. We know that there are people who are willing to die to inflict damage. In terror situation, there is no army and no real territory. No amount of intelligence and security can guarantee that a suicide attack similar to September 11 will not happen in the future. There does not seem to be any short-cut solution available. We cannot undo what has been done, but it is possible to reduce the possibility of September 11-type atrocities occurring again.

The US administration has so far made a wrong diagnosis of the situation and failed to recognize that global terrorism is a hydra which grows ten new heads for every one that you cut off. The current US strategy of responding by announcing a “war on terror” has been unintentionally creating new terrorist groups. War is not a way to eradicate terrorism. The main reason for this is that terrorists do not compose a coherent nation and they would not have a country with identifiable borders that can be conquered. Unlike an actual war fought with actual bombs, this metaphorical war against terrorism can only be won by bringing a solution to the underlying problems that lead to discontent and conflict. Thus, it needs to be a battle for *hearts* and *minds* eliminating the sources of hopelessness and rage that fuel profound discontent.

The starting point to bring a solution to global terror appears as making sure that there is a sincere effort to reduce inequalities and particularly opportunity inequalities. This effort needs to be accompanied with advancing the benefits of globalization while eradicating the deep contradictions in the distribution of resources, wealth, rights, and power. The long-term aim would have to be the gradual elimination of the social divisions and stratification of world society and an inclusive global community, within which political agents might, as equals, negotiate their differences. That requires an enormous effort, but it is something that can be done. One of the obvious means to achieve that aim is an international organization, which has the legitimacy and power to frame a “global constitution” and make sure individual countries obey that constitution. Such an international organization may configure international society in such a way that human rights violations are punished, that injustices receive compensation, and an end is brought to the abandonment and helplessness that brings multitudes of people to a state of such desperation that they are prepared to die through the murder of others. It might be possible to reconfigure the UN to be more democratic, more agile, with more power and executive strength. This should be done in such a way that its functioning does not become so conditioned by the veto that the members of

the Security Council wield, frequently used for the benefit of the strongest powers, and in detriment to human rights.

This paper regards education as the key to eradicate terrorism. Because, no other institution has so pivotally placed to bring an end to the structural causes of violence (oppression, poverty, unfair distribution of income, and disrespect to differences). First and foremost, education supplies people with the skills of “achievers”, capable of looking after themselves so that they can look at their future with hope. Second, education helps to reduce inequalities and prejudices that lead to injustices. It is possible to reduce inequalities through provision of equal access to education. Third, peace and order will best be maintained by means of a profound re-education of the people to “reasonableness” and social justice. Civic virtue is enhanced when schools help students develop values, beliefs and dispositions that promote the common good. Implementing a culturally responsive approach to early childhood education can affirm children’s own cultural identity and help develop their understanding and appreciation of other cultures. Thus, education is a global public good and requires public support at the global level.

References

- Al-Khater, Khalit (2003) Thinking about Arab-American Relations: A New Perspective, *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Volume 7, No. 2, June.
- Al-Quds al-Arabi* (2004) “Editorial: ‘The Bloody Bombings in Madrid’”, March 13.
- Amnesty International* (2004) “The Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula: Human rights fall victim to the ‘War on Terror’”, Available at <http://www.amnestyusa.org/news/document.do?id=C13C133900EB68F680256E940042031D>
- Atran, Scott (2003) “Genesis and Future of Suicide Terrorism”, *Science*, 299, pp. 1534-1539. Available at <http://www.interdisciplines.org/terrorism/papers/1>
- Berger, J. M. (2004) “al Qaeda and the Assassin Cult: Fighting the Eternal War”, October 12, Available at http://intelwire.egoplex.com/2004_10_12_exclusives.html
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew (2002) “Confronting Anti-American Grievances”, *the New York Times*, September 1.
- Carrig, Joseph (2001) “Liberal impediments to liberal education: the assent to Locke”, *The Review of Politics* Vol. 63, No. 1, Winter, pp. 41-76.
- Chomsky, Noam (2003) “Noam Chomsky on America's Past 11 Months Jihad Unspun” *Veterans For Peace*, August 16, Available at http://www.veteransforpeace.org/Noam_Chomsky_081603.htm
- Davidman, Patricia T. and Leonard Davidman (1998) “On the teaching and personal construction of educational equity”, *Multicultural Education*, Vol. 5, No. 3, Spring, pp. 18-22.
- Erdogdu, M. Mustafa (2004) “Positive Externalities of Education and their Effects on Economic Development” (in Turkish) *Economic ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Cilt II, No 2, August, pp.27-57.
- Giroux, Henry A. (2002) “Democracy, freedom, and justice after September 11th: rethinking the role of educators and the politics of schooling”, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 104, No. 6, September, pp. 1138-62.
- Goh, Evelyn (2003) “Hegemony constraints: the implications of 11 September for American power”, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 77-97.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2000) “Crossing globalization’s valley of tears”, *New Perspectives Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 4, Fall, pp. 51-57.
- Hammel, Gene (2003) July, 23.
- Hare, D. Austin and Johanna Mendelson Forman (2004) “A 21st century mission? The UN high-level panel report”, 25November 04, Available at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-6-27-2246.jsp>
- Harris, Lee (2002) “Al Qaeda’s Fantasy Ideology”, *Policy Review*, No. 114, Aug./Sept., pp. 19-36.
- HDR (Various Years) *Human Development Report*, UNDP, New York, Oxford.

- Hug, James E. (2000) "Educating for justice", *America*, Vol. 182, No. 18, May, pp. 16-22.
- IPPNW (2003) "Continuing Collateral Damage: The Health and Environmental Costs of War on Iraq 2003," *International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War*, Available at <http://www.antiwar.com/ips/lobe111203b.html>
- Kermani, Navid (2002) "Roots of terror: suicide, martyrdom, self-redemption and Islam", 21 February, Available at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/issue-5-57.jsp>
- Krueger, Alan B. and Jitka Maleckova (2002) "The Economics and Education of Suicide Bombers: Does Poverty Cause Terrorism?", *The New Republic*.
- Lasensky, Scott (2002) "Underwriting Peace in the Middle East: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Limits of Economic Inducements", *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Volume 6, Issue 1, March.
- Leonard, Allenna (2002) "After the cataclysm: a systems analysis", 27 September, Available at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/debate-2-48.jsp>
- Levitt, Matthew A. (2002) "The Political Economy of Middle East Terrorism", *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Volume 6, Issue 4, December.
- Mednick, Fred (2003) "Combating Terror with Education", *Teachers Without Borders*, 27 September, Available at http://www.pbs.org/teachersource/whats_new/social/dec01.shtm
- Midgley, Mary (2002) "Understanding the 'war on terrorism'", October 25, Available at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/debate-2-48.jsp>
- Miller, Berna (1997) "Educating the 'other' children", *American Demographics*, Vol. 19, October, pp. 49-54.
- Milne, Seumas (2002) "Can the US be defeated?", *The Guardian*, February 14.
- Morris, Paul (1996) "Asia's Four Little Tigers: a comparison of the role of education in their development", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 95-109.
- Muravchik, Joshua (2002) "Hearts, minds, and the war against terror", *Commentary*, Vol. 113, No. 5, May, pp. 25-30.
- National Security Strategy for Combating Terrorism* (2003) U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC, February, Available at <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/strategy/>, pp. 13.
- The Observer*, 10 February.
- Ognibene, Richard and Kenneth Paulli (2002) "Civic Virtue, Social Justice and Catholic Schools", *Momentum (Washington, D.C.)*, Vol. 33, No. 3, Sept./Oct., pp. 40-4.
- Onis, Ziya and M. Mustafa Erdogan (2002) "September 11 and Balanced Globalization" (in Turkish), *Foreign Policy*, January/February, pp. 14-22.
- Pasquino, Gianfranco (1987) "Terrorism", *Political Science and Political Theory*, (Ed.) Jessica Kuper, Routledge & Kegan Paul: London and New York.
- Planchuelo, Gregorio (2001) "The attack on 11th September and the new world order" October, 8; Available at <http://www.opendemocracy.co.uk/debates/debate-2-49.jsp>
- Pogge, Thomas W. (2000) "The moral demands of global justice", *Dissent*, Vol. 47, No. 4, Fall, pp. 37-43.
- Post, David (1996) "The massification of education in Hong Kong: effects on the equality of opportunity, 1981-1991", *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol. 39, Spring, p. 155-74.
- The Progressive* (2002) "The Naked Empire", Vol. 66, No.11, November, pp. 7-9.
- Rogers, Paul (2004) "No direction home", 25 November, available at <http://www.opendemocracy.net/themes/article-2-2245.jsp>
- Roy, Arundhati (2003) *War Talk*, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Roy, Arundhati (2004) "The New American Century" January 22, *The Nation*, Available at <http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0122-14.htm>
- Sen, Amartya Kumar (2000) "Will there be any hope for the poor?", *Time*, Vol. 155, No. 21, May 22, pp. 94-5
- Spiro, Peter J. (2000) "New sovereigntists: American exceptionalism and its false prophets", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 6 Nov./Dec., pp. 9-15.

Spyer, Jonathan (2004) "The al-Qai'da Network and Weapons of Mass Destruction," *Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal*, Vol. 8, Num. 3, September.

Tettegah, Sharon (2002) "Computer Mediated Social Justice: A New Model for Educators", <http://www.opendemocracy.co.uk/debates/debate-2-49.jsp>, *TechTrends*, Vol. 46, No. 5, Sept./Oct., pp. 27-33.

The Voice of Russia (various dates) available at <http://www.vor.ru>