



**RESEARCH PAPER**

**Terrorism as a New Face of Warfare: Identifying Its Emerging Facets and Future Challenges**

Dr. Muhammad Nawaz <sup>1</sup> Muhammad Imran <sup>2</sup> Dr. Abdul Qadir Mushtaq <sup>3</sup>

1. Associate Professor , Department of Politics and IR , University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Ph. D Scholar , Department of Politics and IR , University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant professor , Department of History & Pak-Studies , Govt. College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan

**PAPER INFO**

**ABSTRACT**

**Received:**

August 17, 2017

**Accepted:**

December 13, 2017

**Online:**

December 30, 2017

**Keywords:**

Terrorism,  
Definition,  
Evolution,  
Emerging Facets,  
Future Challenges

**Corresponding**

**Author:**

progucuf@gmail.com

Terrorism is the most important problem of the today's world. It is not a new phenomenon in the national and international politics but it expanded in the post World War II period. Despite its growth as a multi-faceted political concept, it is not well-understood especially, in the Western World where every act of violence against state or society is considered terrorism. It has become all too pervasive in the post 9/11 period where anti-government protests, legitimate political movements and uprisings for independence, ethnic discriminations, domestic religious or sectarian acts and several other actions involving violence have been bracketed as terrorism. But the question regarding oppression of states against the innocent citizens demanding their right of self-determination is still unanswered. This paper is an attempt to identify the origins of terrorism as it has come to preoccupy the world in the post 9/11 period, its various dimensions and new faces, and to identify its emerging facets and future challenges

**Introduction**

Terrorism is one of the most extensively discussed issues of present times. Its recent symptoms have been described in incalculable books, articles, monographs, plays, films and novels at all possible levels. There is no denying the fact that terrorism is not a new and unprecedented phenomenon. The modern technology has made a great difference insofar the nature of terrorist operations are concerned. The underlying issues related to terrorism - political, moral or legal are not new. Terrorism is one of the most important and dangerous problems facing mankind today.

During the latter half of the twentieth century terrorism had become a dreaded phenomenon. Terrorism, in the post 2<sup>nd</sup> World War era, is continued to breed and expand, first as a resistance movements or part of anti-colonial guerrilla, and second as a protest against excessive political dispensations resulting in unresolved territorial disputes and problem of identity by large ethnic/communal minorities.

Despite its growth as a multi-faceted political concept, it is not well-understood or well portrayed particularly by the Western media which virtually presents any act of violence against the state or society as terrorism. This has become all too pervasive in the post 9/11 period where anti-government protests, legitimate political movements and uprisings for independence, ethnic discriminations, domestic religious or sectarian acts and several other actions involving violence have been bracketed as terrorism. But what remains unanswered is the oppression by the state against its bonafide citizens as well as the massive use of military against innocents like the Gaza massacre in Palestine where more than 1300 civilians were brutally massacred by Israel in 2009 (Movement, 2009). This vagueness and ensuing confusion has frequently resulted in militant protest, causing further alienation and spread of terrorism.

An older context as a champion of national liberation and self-determination with political legitimacy has been maintained by the revolutionary terrorism. It has gradually included ethnic separatist, sub-nationalist groups' and controversial radical elements with religious and ideological agendas outside the older framework and consequently, it posing new threats domestically and across the frontiers.

The existing context of terrorism frequently brings outside support and has strong international linkage as seems like Fourth Generation Warfare. Its operational methods and change in the nature of objectives are most obvious which seeks to overthrow the established political and social order with much lowered ethical and humanitarian concerns. This new face of terrorism exceptionally ruthless and dogmatic and is being frightened the world through its chaotic consequences therefore, it has considered the subject of negative criticism and public debate.

### **Terrorism**

Terrorism has become most controversial issue of the world today; therefore no one has defined it in a manner that could be universally acceptable even though most dictionaries defined it as an act of intimidating or frightening individuals and governments. On the one hand, the word defines evil-minded and heartless individuals and organizations with no perceived moral compass. On the other hand, freedom fighters with self-sacrificing emotions will give limb or life for a noble cause (Flower, 2003).

There are over hundred definitions of terrorism, which different states have forwarded and which goes well with their own interests. However, study restricts to only few commonly viewed definitions.

- a) In early 70's, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to establish an ad hoc committee and entrusted it with the task of finding definition for terrorism and measures to prevent it. Seven draft proposals were submitted by member nations. The definition which attracted unanimity underlined "terrorism as act of violence committed by a group of individuals, which endanger human lives and jeopardize fundamental freedom, the effects of which are not confined to one state". The draft proposals however excluded undeniable rights to self-determination under colonial and racist regimes from this definition (Laque, 1999).
- b) A finer definition of terrorism evolved after a lot of discussion i.e. "An act or threat of an act of violence by a group of trained individuals, having international linkage, to achieve political objectives. These groups could either be sponsored by state or non-state agencies. The sponsorship does not change the basic nature of terrorism" (Greenberg, 2004).
- c) United States code defines terrorism as, "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by sub national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience" (Congress, 2004).
- d) European Commission defines as "Terrorist offences include intentional acts, by their nature and context, which may be seriously damaging to a country or to an international organization, as defined under national law, where committed with the aim of:
  - 1) Seriously intimidating a population, or
  - 2) Unduly compelling a government or international organization to perform or to abstain from performing any act, or
  - 3) Destabilizing or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or international organization (European Commission, 2015).

### **Conclusions from the Prevalent Definitions**

If we critically analyze aforementioned definitions, following conclusions can be drawn:-

- a) The stated above definitions do not make a distinction between terrorism and the freedom movements.
- b) There is no a clear peculiarity between terrorism and legitimate insurgencies being forcibly suppressed by the states.

- c) These organizations can make an effort (USA, Israel and India etc feel that it is an attempt by terrorist) to justify the “means” (terrorism) in terms of the “end” (national liberation).
- d) Unpredictability, indiscriminateness and ruthless destructiveness are the common characteristics to all forms of terror.
- e) Although, in principle, arbitrary terror acts could not be morally justified, yet, on the other hand, several acts of regular or irregular war, insurgency and uprising, which were not involved indiscriminate terrorization of the people, might be revealed to be morally justified, were entitled as terrorism by opposing party.
- f) The idea that one person's ‘terrorist’ is another's ‘freedom fighter’ cannot be sanctioned. Freedom fighters don't blow up buses containing non-combatants; terrorist murderers do. Freedom fighters don't set out to capture and slaughter school children; terrorist murderers do.

### **Global Requirement of Defining Terrorism**

Terrorism, a buzz word now-a-days, has become a major threat that is being faced by world in one form or the other. Consequently, a major obstacle towards meaningful international counter measures is the absence of agreeable definition. Although, an internationally acceptable definition, as first attempt, was appreciated under the League of Nations, yet the draft written under the convention of 1937 was not come into existence. Unfortunately, the similar situation is being faced by the UN Members States as these are not having any agreed-upon definition. In order to effectively combating terrorism and for formulation of anti-terrorism laws an internationally acceptable definition is essential. Moreover, the existing definitions are seemed like biased, vague and based on self- interest of the states by which these are given. Similarly, those definitions that allow pursuance of guerrilla movements and freedom struggles are ambiguous because, these definitions are exploited by the terrorists in the name of freedom struggles.

The statement, “One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter,” has once again come into limelight following 9/11. In the struggle against terrorism, the problem of definition is a crucial element in the attempt to coordinate international collaboration. The question of a definition of terrorism has haunted the debate amongst the states for decades.

### **The Genesis and Evolution**

“Unwittingly, the media's appetite for superlatives, firsts and records, encourages not necessarily more but increasingly spectacular and brutal incidents” (Nacos, 1994). The study endeavors to review some historical events in order to assess the evolution of modern terrorist tactics and to track the development of

terrorist motivations over the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. In order to continue and to pursue their rational traditional terrorist organizations were operating in between 1968 to 2001.

In Northern Ireland, terrorist organizations killed more than 3000 individuals in between 1969 to 1997, ultimately, a peace agreement named as Good Friday was signed, and moved towards the political process. Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) capitalized terrorist access in 1972 during Munich Olympic and slaughtered of the Israeli Olympic team. In 1974, Yasser Arafat, in the UN General Assembly, clearly demonstrated the world community to decide between an "olive branch or a freedom fighter's gun (Hoffman, 1999). The RAND-St Andrews Chronology of International Terrorism believes that the number of organizations conducting international terrorism increased from 11 to 55 during 1968 to 1978; moreover, 30 out of 55 organizations were based on ethno nationalist or separatist organizations. According to Hoffman (1999) this rise was a direct reaction to the success of the PLO.

During 1960 to 1970, development of separatist organizations were taken place, consequently, many of the terrorist organizations consisted of individuals from same religion challenged each other. Their avowed aims were political instead of religious and their membership could be defined by reference to the cleavages in their societies.

The cultural motivation, as opposed to rational or psychological, was the main characteristic in the growth of terrorist groups as several observers traced it back to the loss of Muslim prestige in the crushing defeat of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war (Roche, 2004). A resurgence of Islamic fundamentalism was emerged after this war as this loss of prestige was itself seen as precursor of revolutionary trends in Muslim countries, for example in Iran where Shah was overthrown in 1979 and many Gulf and African Muslim States.

### **Birth of Israel and Terrorism**

The Balfour Declaration of 1917 sowed the seeds for a separate homeland for Jews. Aided by both the US and Britain, Jews immigrated to Palestine in huge numbers. The Arabs decided to face this peril of disguised colonialism by uniting themselves in the Arab league in 1945 (Thompson, 2004). Britain withdrew its forces and left Palestine under the trusteeship of the United Nations. During 1947, a Commission was formed for Palestine which suggested its partition. However, British troops left the country on 5 May 1948, thus facilitating for Jews to establish an independent Jewish State, Israel, on the same day. Since then Middle East has been the hotbed of wars and several Intifada (uprisings by Palestinians termed as terrorism by the U.S. and Israel) at regular intervals.

Three main groups, when the intifada was loosely organized, participated in the movement, the Islamic Resistance Movement, or Hamas, the United

National Command, which included the principal factions of the PLO and the Islamic Jihad. The main theme of these groups was to establish an Islamic state that would include all of historical Palestine. In order to achieve their goal, if necessary, these groups would approve of an armed struggle. In 1988, a new policy was approved by the PLO as it would support to a solution that would allow a Palestinian state to coexist with Israel.

A new trend in the intifada movement significantly differentiated it between militant and moderate factions as the Islamic groups grew in strength therefore, decreasing popular participation increased violence. The Israeli government, in order to contain intifada supported violence, increased security forces presence and made actions such as enforce economic sanctions, deport suspects, closed universities, expended Israeli settlement in Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

### **Soviet Invasion and Rise of Militant Islam**

The Soviet Government, on 25 December 1979, decided to invade in Afghanistan and continued almost a decade of occupation, as ground realities, such as increasing activities of People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) against the repressive regime of Mohammed Daoud Khan, triggered this invasion. The Afghan President ordered to arrest the PDPA members, in retaliation, a coup that was neither widespread nor popular initiated by Afghan Army stormed the presidential palace and killed President Daoud. Meanwhile, deteriorating political chaos enabled Mr. Amin, a Presidential deputy, to attain power. A unilateral Soviet invasion in a non-aligned Islamic country and installation of a puppet regime were the political tactics to secure communist theory in Afghanistan (Thompson, 2004). But the American and Pakistani supported Mujahadeen were used as a favorite tool for defeating Soviet Union; consequently, Soviet left Afghanistan on 15 February 1989 (Ewans, 2002).

After the departure of Soviet troops, a civil war, among the different tribal leaders over the diverse religious differences, started in Afghanistan which was advantageous to a new emerged group 'the Taliban' (Marsden, 1998). At the end of 1991, the final agreement, about the current situation of Afghanistan, was mutually reached by Russia, Pakistan, America and Saudi Arabia without reference to the Mujahadeen and the Afghan Government (Lansford, Watson, & Covarrubias, 2009). Consequently, the said agreement led Afghanistan into a Taliban regime; it was predominantly a fundamentalist Islamic movement supported by Afghan Pushtons who were educated from religious institutions (Madrssas).

### **Kashmir and Terrorism**

The incident of 9/ 11 has changed the direction of world politics, at the same time; Pakistan faced two possible situations, first, to protect the authenticity of Kashmir movement and Kashmiri freedom fighter, second, to preserve it from the new definition of terrorism. The people's struggle, before 9/11, under alien

occupation, against the racism and for the right of self-determination by using of political violence was acceptable practices under the UN conventions.

The Indian occupied forces, the Kashmiri people are struggling for their right of self-determination. Unfortunately, the struggles for their rights unquestionably fall into this category. Illogically, the US, after attack on Indian parliament on 13 December, 2001, under the heavy influence of Indian propaganda, has set the new rules that "no cause justifies violence". The whole international community, consequently, tends to view the militant freedom movement of the Kashmiri in the context of terrorism.

President Musharaff was under growing international pressure to reverse Pakistan's long standing policy of backing Kashmiri insurgency. On 12 Jan 2002, President delivered a speech and declared "no organization will be able to carry out terrorism on the pretext of Kashmir". Realizing international community's concern that militancy is no longer an option, President Musharraf forwarded many proposals for resolution of the dispute such as demilitarization and self-governance, etc while India remained silent on these proposals (Hussain, 2009).

### **Terrorism and Ideology**

This is relatively a new type of terrorism, which is based on ideological or religious beliefs. The influence of this type of terrorism could be localized or may well be international, depending upon the nature and popularity of the cause. The localized type of this can be seen in states having ethnic or religious diversity like what is presently experienced in southern Thailand and in southern Philippine or Ex Yugoslavia. The means employed by IMT are similar to those of PMT with the exception of territorial gains. In this context, the relevant examples are Al-Qaida related groups like Jemmah Islamiyah (JI) operating in countries like Indonesia, Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand. The groups like Black September in Italy. Most of these groups seek to put an end to the Western influence in certain Arab countries and solidarity among Muslim countries by resorting to terrorism. As the events of September 11 prove, this is the most ominous development that poses a serious challenge to global peace and security. There are more than a dozen militant religious groups in the world today, including identity Christians, ultra nationalist Jews, radical Sikhs, New age Cults and Islamic Fundamentalist. Whereas secular terrorists tend to view indiscriminate violence as immoral and counterproductive, religious groups may see it not only as morally justified but also as a necessary means of achieving their ends (Hoffman, 1999).

### **Role of USA**

The event of 9/11 changed the thinking of Americans over night and they start believing themselves the victim of terrorism and their administration situated all atrocities to backyard which they had been committing in the name of liberation and promoting peace and democracy in the world. Consequent to terrorist acts, US

made many counter terrorism policies. However, these policies took major shift in their implementation post 9/11. They act preempt and hesitant on various directions domestically and internationally. The major policy decision, that effected entire world especially post 9/11, were Presidential Decision Directive 39, 9/11 Commission and its recommendations, Homeland Security Act and America National Security Strategy (Kraft, 2008).

### **America's National Security Strategy**

In the series of efforts to eliminate terrorism from its root, the US formulated another broader strategy known as National Security Strategy. Fundamental nature of this strategy was to seek and support democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny all over the world. At present the fundamental character of regimes matters as much as the distribution of power among nations. Therefore, the US set goal to prevail democracies and democratic norms all over the globe so that different nations conduct themselves responsibly in the international system. They considered it the best way to provide enduring security to American people. They set following objectives outlined in that strategy:

- a. Champion aspirations for human dignity.
- b. Strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against the US and its friends.
- B. c. Work with others nations to defuse regional conflicts all over the world, prevent enemies from threatening the US and its allies.
- a. Ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade, expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy.
- C. Develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power; transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century.
- D. Engage the opportunities and confront the challenges of globalization.

### **Muslim World Post 9/11**

The US provocative action in the name of war against terrorism resulted loss of many innocent lives and resentment all over the Muslim world. It brought the world again to cross road of clash of civilization. However, with continues defeats at this front, west has realized that what they are fighting is a dangerous ideology akin to those that produced so much havoc and misery in the 20th century and gave it the name of Islamic fascism. Its objectives have been quitted with Nazism and communism (Barqi, 2006, Septembar 19). The US relates, terrorism associated with Islamic world and considered that Islamic madressahs are the breeding grounds of terrorists. However, Muslim community believes that it is not the madressas or Islamic clerics, who are turning out more terrorist but it is

the presence of the US military forces itself in their countries procreating more terrorists (Haq, 2006, January 29). In reality, terrorism and Islam are two different mindsets as such poles apart (Aziz, 2006, January 20 ). Actually it is not religion that makes terrorists rather it is the poverty, unemployment and lack of education which makes the terrorists. In a broader sense ideology and beliefs matters more than social or economic status, age or agenda to become a terrorist. The event of 9/11 has affected entire Muslim community and its effects are still hurting their interests worldwide. The ongoing GWOT in two brotherly Muslim countries has ignited the hatred among youth and gave birth to new concepts of revenge as suicide bombing and target killing.

### **Afghanistan**

The US invaded Afghanistan with code name "Operation Enduring freedom". The purpose of this operation was to target Osama Bin laden and his terrorist network Al-Qaeda, as well as the Taliban government which allegedly provided support to Al-Qaeda and gave them safe haven (Musharraf, 2006). All kind of sophisticated warheads, regardless of place, city and the level of forces of down below, were used to destroy the targets. Allied forces, moreover, despite lucrative monitoring reward offers and physical control, are until to date unable to achieve the prime objective which is to defeat Al-Qaeda and Taliban. The process has caused destruction of Afghanistan and death of thousands of innocent people (GROUP, 2003). According to Professor Marc Harold of the University of New Hampshire "more than 3500 civilians were killed during afghan war from 7 October to 7 December 2001, greater than 9/11 attacks" (Fisk, 2005). Similarly, statistics reveals during Taliban reign country was far more progressive and stable as compare to present times. President Karzai and Asharaf Ghani governments which exercises rule of the law only around Kabul area has failed to exercise effective administration resulted assimilation of entire country with different war lords. According to the US Drug Control Program the production of opium in Afghanistan was reduced to 94% during Taliban government as compare to today where it had increased to 80% (Fisk, 2005). It is beyond any doubt that US misadventure in Afghanistan has not only widened the gap between the US and Muslim world but also fuelled the terrorism activities around the world.

### **Iraq**

Iraq, once the cradle of civilization, centre of Muslim super power, greatest seat of Muslim learning, became completely ruin after the invasion of the US. America has done all this in the name of freedom and liberation of Iraqi's, which proved with time false and furtherance of their hidden agendas. The sad part of story is that more than 56 Muslim states watched the scene with assort of helplessness and failed to take any action (Lieberfeld, 2005). As a result, country is divided and killings are norm. So far there are conflicting reports on the number of Iraqi civilian deaths and injuries. According to British medical general "the Lancet"

“there has been over 6, 55,000 deaths recorded in Iraq since the US invasion of March 03, to which about 600000 due violence” (Bakerp & Hamilton, 2009).

The graving tragedy Iraqi people are facing today, is violence and civil war. President Bush described the violence in Iraq as being a “Comma” (Bakerp & Hamilton, 2009). It is general perception all over the world today that Iraq and Iraqi were actually far better off under Saddam Hussein then under the US occupation and that the Bush administration batter wake up from its prolonged state of denial over its rapid descend into unbridled anarchy and violence (Bakerp & Hamilton, 2009). Now, favorable voices against the US illegal occupation over Iraq have been raised even in America and Democratic Senator John Kerry said, “Iraq war had worsened terrorism and that the Bush administration had squandered the nation’s moral authority. They tell us we are making progress in Iraq and that there is no civil war. That is a lie. There is a civil war and it is costing American and Iraqi lives every single day and we must change course in Iraq” (Trotta, 2013).

Failure of Iraq invasion has changed the tone and tempo of President Bush to extent that he agreed completely with the top Republican Senator that if the plan is not now working and America needs to adjust he is ready to support. Ex Defense secretary Donald Rumsfield said the military is looking at this various sensitivities and we are looking around corners up head and asking ourselves how we would do things. General Cassey said its tough nut, whether or not bring in more troops will have any significant effect over violence in Iraq (Cassey, 2006).

Following defeats after defeats in combating terrorism, President Bush unveiled his new Iraq policy on 10 January 2007. According to this policy US would send more 21000 troops to Iraq in order to stabilize the government and combating violence in the country. The National Intelligence Estimate painted a grim picture of the prospects for the embattled Presidents new way forward policy in Iraq and opined that Iraqi leadership is incapacitate in averting disaster and nearly four year old conflict bears the hallmark of civil war(Board, 2007). This is the future of the US led war on terror in Iraq according to their own estimates.

### **Arab Spring**

The revolutions that swept through the Arab region since 2011 challenged prevailing paradigms and strategies concerning (counter-) terrorism that had been developed for decades. This is partially in response to the changing (and more brutal) face of terrorism in the region, but particularly among the ‘new’ regimes the understanding of what constitutes terrorism and best approaches to counter terrorism (CT) and violent extremism (CVE) has been changing. Throughout the Arab uprisings the issue of terrorism in the Arab region has acquired new dimensions, as demonstrated by the rise of the so-called “Islamic State” (IS) in Iraq and Syria and the proliferation of newly established violent extremist groups in Tunisia, Libya and Egypt. The region is now faced with a form of hybrid terrorism,

in which transnational organized crime, in particular arms and drugs trade and human trafficking, is interlinked with ideologically-rooted terrorist networks (Boserup, 2015). Criminal and terrorist groups cooperate in the recruitment of new members as well as in the provision of necessary financing and weaponry. Such new face of terrorism is transient and transnational, with violent actors, affiliations and modus operandi adapting quickly to new political and security environments.

The phenomenon can be found throughout the Middle East and North Africa and it poses a significant threat to the post-Arab spring transitions in a number of countries, notably Tunisia, Libya and Egypt. Egypt serves as a relevant case in point to analyze the issue. In the aftermath of the January 2011 revolution that toppled the Mubarak regime, the country witnessed a significant proliferation of violent jihadi groups and an expansion of their activities in many cities as well as in the Sinai Peninsula. In the Sinai, a wide range of violent extremist groups is active with various local, regional and international aspirations. The linkages between these groups and criminal organizations, for example indicated by cash flows and smuggling activities, are of specific concern to (local) policy makers.

### **The Changing Face of Terrorism**

While a few years ago most attention was focused on Al-Qaeda, nowadays Islamic State (IS) receives most media and political attention. However, Al-Qaeda is still an important player in the region. The competition and differences between both organizations were existed, as well as the indirect ties of both to other organizations in the region. It is difficult to measure the extent of the genuine support to IS or Al-Qaeda by the local population in the region; especially because the people have few alternatives and therefore the support might be a matter of survival rather than conviction. The deteriorating living conditions for the local population in areas that are under the control of the terrorist organizations contribute to the local support for extremists.

The emerging violence in the post-Arab spring region was also a changing view of terrorism. The disbanding armies in Iraq, Syria and Yemen provided the various rebel groups with many weapons and military know-how. In addition, essential financial and political support is given by governments in the region to fighting groups in various ways. Foreign involvement (for example by the US, Russia and Iran) contributed to more violence as well, combined with an influx of foreign fighters from many different countries. The speed with which the situation in the post-Arab spring countries is deteriorating and leading to political instability and unrest which is being exploited by extremist organizations to their own benefit, 'easy solutions' such as decapitating the Assad regime in Syria may only create more problems. While military involvement (air strikes) from foreign countries may provide some short-term successes in combating terrorists, only political negotiations can offer a long-term success. The difficult question is, however, who should be at the negotiation table? The fighting groups are too

fragmented and many of them are classified as terrorists and freedom fighter by many countries, which do not make them a realistic negotiation partner.

### **Drivers for Radicalization**

The external and internal drivers for violent extremism are living in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). It argued that both parties are facing a shared threat and have shared responsibilities for the drivers of/toward violent extremism. Youth in the MENA region faces a crisis, which has become a condition conducive to radicalization. Problems occur as a result of an absence of economic and political prospects and perceived isolation. The disillusioned youth has easy access to information via internet and social media. How these communication platforms are being exploited by Salafist extremists for 'kidnapping moderate Islam' and offering the youth tools for self-radicalization.

There could be a relationship between regional problems which are also caused by the 'fragmented Islamic theatre' in the region, and various interpretations of Islam fighting each other. IS thrives on the (perceived) grievances by suggesting that the (Salafist) Islam provides solutions for every problem, bridging the inter-Islamic disputes as well. Each radicalization process is an individual one, and is shaped by the surrounding context, which makes it difficult to generalize drivers and root causes (as well as potential counter-policies).

In countries such as Iraq, Syria and Yemen the social pact between government and population has eroded, ending into a complete collapse of the state. Especially, in Syria far more innocent people have lost their lives because of the 'fight against terrorism' rather than because of terrorism itself. One should consider that it is also a human right to be protected against terrorist attacks. More attention for victims is required as well. Only one general conclusion is obvious: it is still difficult to understand violent extremism in the Arab region and how to counter it. Experimenting with various policy instruments and more research are required to gain more insights.

### **Future Challenges**

Taking into account the preceding discussion and the emerging international situation, terrorism is likely to remain at the global center stage and occupy the world as a foremost challenge at least in the foreseeable future (for 10 years onwards). Some of the reasons for this situation stem from the following issues:

- Non Resolution of Palestine issue and the US one sided role
- Non-Resolution of Kashmir issue
- War in Afghanistan and Pakistan's tribal region and the US NATO excessive use of military force
- The role of religious clergy and radicalization in the Muslim world

- Divisions within Muslim world
- Non-delineation between legitimate uprisings and terrorism
- Global consensus on defining 'terrorism'

It is evident that the advancements in technology will play a dual role as it may be extensively used by insurgent and other terror groups to their advantage. Also, global vulnerabilities on land, at sea and in the air will continue to be exploited by terror networks. A case in point is the recent (26/11) attacks in Mumbai. But perhaps the most terrifying future challenge would be threat of a nuclear weapon in the hands of terror group or smuggling and detonation of a dirty bomb in major city (urban) centers of the world.

### **Conclusion**

Terrorism is in fact a global phenomenon. Hardly any country of the world has escaped from the clutches of terrorism. Even the most prosperous countries are tightly in the grips of terrorism. In spite of all means they are even unsuccessful to contain terrorism. The problem is being faced by every country infested with terrorism, as to the preservation of core values, the law and maintenance of the economic level which otherwise may lead to a nation becoming a failed state. The problem of terrorism is required to be tackled more on political level. Steps should be taken to win the confidence of largely the innocent people and thereby making the terrorist isolated. Terrorism is basically a result of political, social, economic and administrative malaise particularly in developing democratic countries. Therefore any state wanting to counter terrorism has to evolve measure, to be a mixture of political, social, economic and administrative and military actions. It is rather impossible to defeat terrorism simply by military action alone.

The span of effects of terrorism is much too large to combat by the single dimension of military action. Although military action may form a base for other actions it is the psychological warfare, which will have an acceptable and healing effect on victims of terrorism. To make the psychological instrument of states-craft more dynamic in influencing the behavior of people, it is necessary to develop a strategy aimed at affecting the manner in which they define a relevant situation. Traditionally, the attempts to influence this definition are made by materially changing the situation through military or diplomatic action. However psychological operations do not manipulate the material situation, but rather influence the way in which material situations are perceived and interpreted. The public, as long as it is not more than just an irritant, will tolerate terrorism. Harsh counter measures taken by the government will be criticized. But whenever terrorism becomes more than a nuisance, there will be pressure on the government for very strict control. This will help the terrorist to make the society more authoritarian and more brittle and therefore more vulnerable. Terrorism is a symptom of decline of order. Any nation can exist without freedom, but without order, existence as a democracy is doomed.

## **Recommendations**

In the light of the discourse, following are some recommendations:

- a. The world should reach a consensus on the definition of terrorism.
- b. The United States should review its National Security Strategy particularly with respect to Middle East. Unquestioning support to Israel is persistently fuelling terrorism in the Muslim world.
- c. United States must resolve the issue in Afghanistan through political dialogue with all internal and external stakeholders. Excessive use of military force will be a repeat of Soviet mistake that led to Kremlin's collapse and end of cold-war.
- d. The issue in Kashmir must be resolved. The new United States administration can play an effective role in this regard. Failure to do so will certainly continue to benefit Jihadi/Militant organizations.
- e. Muslim countries must try to root out extremism from their societies. This can be done internally with the help of religious clergy and scholars and externally through the forum of OIC.
- f. As initiated by King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia, interfaith dialogue between Muslim, Christians and Jews must continue.

**References**

- Aziz, S. (2006, January 20 ). Islam and Terrorism, *Daily Times* , IX.
- Bakerp, J. A., & Hamilton, L. H. (2009). *The Iraq Study Group Report*, Washington: United States Institute of Peace.
- Barqi, S. J. (2006, Septembar 19). Facism, *The Dawn* , IX.
- Board, E. (2007). New Iraq Report Lays Bare Challenge to Bush Plan, *Daily Times* .
- Boserup, R. A. (2015). *Unstable Authoritarianism: A New Hybrid in Arab Politics*. Copenhagen: Eurographic.
- Cassey, G. (2006). War on Terror in Iraq, *The News* , XV.
- Commission, E. (2015). On Combating Terrorism and Replacing Council Framework Decision , *Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council*.
- Commission, E. (2015, March 15). *On Combating Terrorism and Replacing Council Framework Decision*. Retrieved April 14, 2017, from EUR-Lex: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32017L054>.
- Congress, U. (2004). *Legislative Requirements and Key Word*, Retrieved March 12, 2017, from Government of United States of America: <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/65464.pdf>.
- Ewans, M. (2002). *Afghanistan: A Short History of Its People and Politics*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Fisk, R. (2005). *The Great War For Civilization: The Conquest of The East*, London: Harper Perrenial.
- Flower, M. R. (2003). The War on Terrorism and its Consequences for International Law, *Strategic Digest* , 33 (2). 32-43.
- Greenberg, J. D. (2004). Divided Lands, Phantom Limbs: Partition in the Indian Subcontinent, Palestine, China, and Korea. *Journal of International Affairs* , pp. 61-75.
- GROUP, P. (2003, June). *Security Analysis on the International Regional and Domestic front*. Retrieved March 13, 2016, from Defence Journal: <http://www.defencejournal.com/2003/june/securityanalysis.htm>.
- Haq, I. u. (2006, January 29). Islam and Terrorism, *Dawn* , XI.
- Hoffman, B. (1999). *Holy Terror*, New York: Colombia University Press.

- Hoffman, B. (1998). *Inside Terrorism*, Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Hussain, S. R. (2009). Resolving the Kashmir Dispute: Blending Realism with Justice, *Pakistan Development Review* , 48 (4), pp.1007-1035.
- Kraft, Y. A. (2008). *Evolution of U. S. Counterterrorism Policy*, London: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Lansford, T., Watson, R. P., & Covarrubias, J. (2009). *America's War on Terror*, Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Laque, W. (1999). *The Age of Terrorism*, New York: Little Brown & Company.
- Lieberfeld, D. (2005). Theories of Conflict and The Iraq War, *International Journal of Peace Studies Volume 10*.
- Marsden, P. (1998). *The Taliban: War Religion and the New Order in Afghanistan*, London: Zed Books.
- Movement, S. S. (2009, January 21). *Israel: Thousands March in Jaffa against Gaza Massacre*, Retrieved April 12, 2017, from Socialist World: [http://www.socialistworld.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=3405](http://www.socialistworld.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3405).
- Musharraf, P. (2006). *In The Line of Fire*, London : Simon & Schuster.
- Nacos, B. (1994). *Terrorism and the Media*, Columbia : Columbia University Press.
- Roche, R. S. (2004). Toward a Scientific Theory of Terrorism, *Sociological Theory* , 22 (1), pp.1-4.
- Thompson, P. (2004). *The Terror Timeline*, New York: Regan Books.
- Trotta, D. (2013, March 14). *Iraq War Costs U.S. more than \$2 Trillion: Study*, Retrieved April 18, 2017, from REUTERS: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-iraq-war-anniversary/iraq-war-costs-u-s-more-than-2-trillion-studyidUSBRE92D0PG20130314>.

