A Conflict Theory and Historical Analysis on the Causalities of Terrorism
And the 9/11 attacks as a case study
Abstract

This thesis conducts a conflict theory on the causalities of terrorism. Through a historical analysis of the causes on 9/11 it shows that knowing the past is crucial to understanding the causalities of terrorism. This thesis contributes to research by presenting a methodology on terrorism conflict mechanisms, it highlights that grievances, frustration and goal incompatibility are the three main conflict causes. The rational-materialist perspective of this thesis is underpinned by an early Descartes rationalist mechanistic/metaphysical view from which its understanding of conflict mechanisms, cause and effect logics originate.

This thesis is positioned within the critical terrorism literature, and in opposition to the dominant state-centric narrative. It argues that it seems quite likely that the most reasonable possibility that heavily intertwined political elites, hegemonic corporations and neoliberalist policies actively produce and reproduce ways that stimulate terrorism. This answer seems as the most sensible due to the contradictions and illogicalities found throughout the literature, due to the lack of evidence supporting of the state assumptions. The historical analysis shows it would seem that a coordinated and intentional repression justified by counterterrorism seems likely to meet other interests than preached by politicians in favor of repressive ant-terrorism measurements.
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Introduction

This thesis is based upon two assumptions. Firstly, any form of violence to meet certain ends is a tragic act of expression and thus should be limited or even avoided as a leading doctrine. 9/11 or any other terrorist acts are among the greatest of crimes, and these principles that we hold for ourselves should equally be extended to others.

With the enormous increase of literature on terrorism since 9/11 it is rather shocking to see that there are still major unclarities and inconsistencies within this field of research. Most critically of these issues on which there should have been a consensus by now, and after nearly two decades of scholarly attention and huge investments, is whether the grievances of ‘terrorists’ are legitimate or not (Schmid, 2011) (Schmid and Forest, 2018). These issues were mentioned by Schmid as under-researched topics in 2011 were he mentioned a total of 50 gaps of knowledge in terrorism research, and still remain so and more in his recent publication with Forest (2018) where they mentioned 150 under-researched issued. They furthermore wrote about the need for understanding on the mechanisms of causality to understand the causes of terrorism, the relevance of revenge, state terrorism among many more.

Those are some of the main issues this thesis will be limited to (due to lack of time) and address through the conflict theory condensed in “Using Conflict Theory” by Bartos and Wehr, 2002, who based their book on the writings of famous classical-marxist theorists such as Weber, Durkheim and Dahrendorf and neo-marxists the likes of Collins and Himes (ibid, 2002, pp. i). While there are many different ways to understanding the Marxian conflict theory, this particular version by Bartos and Wehr is interesting as it is uses a causal approach (ibid, 2002, pp. 8) and thus could address the need for causality mechanisms behind the causes of terrorism conflicts (Schmid and Forest, 2018).

I have not been able to find significant usage of conflicts theories in the terrorism literature, and even if there were some used this theory can still shed new light on understanding terrorism.
Bartos and Wehr based their theory on a positivist paradigm, but admitted of certain weaknesses with such an approach, because it fails to recognize individuals as ‘true’ actors due to its rational and mechanistic perspective. However, I would argue that this way of viewing the world is a strength since it enables objective points of interval rather than subjective ones whereby some views reject any truth at all and instead regard about everything as a social construct. I argue that there can be certain facts when there is enough evidence for it, or when something seems highly plausible and alternatives as rather implausible. Taking such a point of departure allows us to draw a logical cause and effect as to why certain conflicts occur.

A cause-effect view on terrorism is not controversial at all, in fact it was the dominant within the US government and scholarship throughout much of the 20th century up until the mid-1970s (Jackson, 2016, pp. 52-54). It was recognized that fundamental causes of political violence by non-state actors mostly had structural origins in extreme poverty, inequality, extortion and torture (Lybrand, 1962) (Hosmer et al., 1962, pp. 2-3, 7-8). Terrorists were usually seen as an insurgency with legitimate objectives and grievances (Jackson, 2016, pp. 52). The first US conference on terrorism which, convened in 1972, upheld such similar views on terrorism that “nearly every variety of political and ethnic group is likely under certain (generally desperate) circumstances to resort to terrorism” and also that terrorism “is a tool not confined to opposition forces; it can also be applied by established regimes” (Perenyi 1972) (Jackson, 2016, pp. 54). The US government expressed that effective counter terrorism should address, without violence, the grievances that motivate terrorists and insurgents (Stampnitzky, 2013, pp. 64). However, after the mid-1970s this view changed to regarding non-state terrorists as evil, irrational in their motivations (Johnson, 1976) (Jackson, 2016, pp. 54), and as such the study of the reasons behind terrorism was discouraged (Jackson, 2016, pp. 56). After 9/11 terrorism researchers who tried to understand the grievances of terrorists were even more significantly mocked (Jackson, 2016, pp. 60).

Mathews and Sanders (2018) argue that the primary reasons for terrorism are behind strategic and economic ones, and to which I agree with to some extend however they do not mention at all
the importance of grievances which I argue to be far more important than the reasons they list. Explaining the motivations of terrorism cannot be done without understanding grievances. According to supposed years-long security policy expert Vad (2018) who merely repeated the typical state narrative that counterterrorism should be done through repression without even any thinking of grievances. Lacquer and Wall (2018, pp. 30-31) hold that it is ‘naïve’ to think that terrorism results from grievances such as injustice and cruelty, and to that I would say they seem to underestimate the importance of grievances, frustration and hostility.

Irwin and Gungwu (2003, pp. 157) emphasized that unless social, political and economic issues are addressed that populations will be much more likely to join Al-Qaeda like organizations, and wrote that (ibid, 2003, pp. 162-163) dissidents hate the US for its foreign harmful policies and nothing else (Makdisi, 2002). One of such hated US policies is on the broad support for dictatorial regimes in Muslim countries and thus preventing progression of these countries to a democracy (Irwin and Gungwu, 2003, pp. 163) “backing repressive regimes like Egypt and Saudi Arabia is certainly a leading cause of anti-Americanism in the Arab world” (Irwin and Gungwu, 2003, pp. 163) (Chomsky, 2004, pp. 116). A political double standard, can hereby be seen, and a hypocrite claim by Bush that the US is hated for its morals and values while violating those of others (Merskin, 2004) (Chomsky, 2004, pp. 116).

**Research Problem**

Security practices against terrorism, and while fueled by an over-exaggeration of threats, have shown a lack evidence for their effectiveness hence an epistemological crisis in counterterrorism argued by Jackson (Jackson, 2015) (Heath-Kelly et al, 2015). Traditional or orthodox terrorism studies (OTS) largely neglects past knowledge whereby it imagines current ways of terrorism as new or historically unique (Jackson, 2015) (Heath-Kelly et al, 2015). There are indications that these horrors have advanced the interests of the western elites to maintain global dominance (McKeown, 2011) (Jackson, 2016, pp. 33, 57-58). Jackson has therefore expressed the need for the study of, from a historical-materialist perspective, how geostrategic interests benefit from and
drive counterterrorism (ibid, 2016, pp. 33). This thesis will thus address this knowledge gap by mainly building upon critical terrorism literature (CTS) and contribute to CTS.

According to McKeown (2011) the intersection of capitalism, imperialism and international class dynamics generate structural causes of state terrorism, and intensified by neoliberalism. He mentions the need to further address that issue for a more coherent understanding of state terrorism within CTS. Heller notes that (et al, 2012) discourses on counterterrorism affect audiences transnationally, and so stimulating acceptance for a global security system that is becoming increasingly more invasive, a phenomenon which requires further attention as well. CTS critiques traditional or orthodox studies on terrorism (OTS) for its narrow and state-centric approach, instead CTS focuses on a much broader study of terrorism that is based on historical, social and economic accounts (Jackson and Pisoiu, 2018, pp. 63-66). CTS is more concerned with the interests of communities and populations rather than those of governments, hence it has clear normative elements due to its commitment to increased emancipation through liberation from oppression by addressing sources of injustice, exploitation and suffering.

In 2014 at a conference (Heath-Kelly et al, 2015) (Jackson, 2016, pp. 37) of CTS scholars it was expressed that it is morally right to resist and oppose current counterterrorism policies as these have become too destructive and intrusive, thus assisting officials in designing those policies is discouraged by CTS academics since it can be seen as a validation of injustice. During the conference Richard Jackson and Mark Neocleous argued that the socially constructed enemy images in counterterrorism discourse are based upon ‘‘uncertainty, ambiguity, imagination and fantasy’’ to convince the target audience or the public of the need for extraordinary measures (Neocleous, 2015) (Jackson, 2015) (Heath-Kelly et al, 2015). Jackson (2016, pp. 249) has therefore argued that state narratives and counterterrorism ought to be criticized because it would lead to a better, more nuanced understanding of terrorism to emphasize how extraordinary measurements affect societies and its inhabitants.
According to the journalist Glenn Greenwald (2014, pp. 195, 202), who interviewed Edward Snowden, found that much of the mass surveillance by the NSA had very little to do with countering terrorism or protecting society (Jackson, 2016, pp. 519-520). The collected data, however, did meet political and economic interests through secretly monitoring foreign political leaders, political dissidents and activists to stimulate “passivity, obedience and conformity” which suggests that those who are “quiet, unthreatening and compliant” have “nothing to worry about” (ibid, 2016, pp. 520). Jackson (2016, pp. 520-521) argues that this occurrence fits in a neoliberal and bio-political power structure that normalizes docileness amongst its citizens sustained through capitalism, imperialism and discrimination. Counterterrorism risk prediction supports the government apparatus to process the normalization of legislative exceptionalism that compresses the human rights and democratic values it claims to protect (Neal, 2012) (Hale et al, 2013, pp. 149, 438). The normalization process and the anticipation of terrorism generates fear and anxiety of foreigners and nonconformists thus consequentially leading to an “inward-looking [attitude]” whereby “the cultural fixation with risk detracts attention from more severe and deeprooted global problems of poverty, malnutrition and disease” (Mythen and Walklate, 2008, pp. 227) (Jackson, 2016, pp. 523). Hence counterterrorism is loaded with contradictions that paradoxically aid terrorism in the spread of fear (Frank, 2015). Jackson recommends future researchers to continue study (counter-) terrorism as an instrument of power, and on its role in the creation of fear as part of the exercise of control over society (Jackson, 2016, pp. 523-524).

Counterterrorism is thus seen as a continuation of class conflict or class war and reflects a bourgeois ‘paranoia’ of the masses (Boukalas, 2015) (Neocleous, 2015) (Heath-Kelly et al, 2015), it serves as a modality, an expression of socio-political power (Fairclough, 2013, pp. 73, 79). It represents the elitarian vested interests in maintaining the status quo that is explanatory to the obsessive desire for the transition from a liberal state to a national security state with little judicial regulation (Herring and Stokes, 2011), reduced room for political debate or dissent as it was during the cold war (Jackson, 2005, pp. 183-184). Furthermore, McKeown (2011) noted that domestic and imperial class dynamics are dialectically intertwined, and thus should be considered within a study on terrorism. It can thus be seen that counterterrorism represents a
class conflict for agency and power in which the problem of terrorism is inflated through discourse.

This thesis will contribute to filling the knowledge gaps by conducting a historical analysis with a conflict theory on the causes of the terrorist attacks on 9/11. Key interests driving the causes will also be briefly touched upon.

**Objective**

The objective of this thesis will be to understand the causality of the roots of terrorism and interests involved that are mainly responsible for the manifestation of terrorism through a historical analysis with the conflict theory.

**Research Questions**

1. Which causal mechanisms can explain, and to what extent, the causes of terrorism?
2. What were the causes that led to the events of 9/11?
3. Which interests are involved that led to the occurrence of terrorism, and how do these interests affects the causes of terrorism?

**Delimitations and Limitations**

The purpose of this thesis will be to understand through a materialist perspective how and why terrorism occurs. This will be done through conflict theory based on mechanisms of causality, and then analyzed through elite theory to also address the geostrategic interests. In this manner, the research advice regarding under-researched issues by Schmitt (2011, 2018) and Jackson (2016, 33, 57-58) are followed. Furthermore, since a Classical continental rationalist (in the tradition of Descartes) approach will be taken, and which is quite unusual for critical terrorism studies, this thesis can contribute by emphasizing that there, to the extent of human senses, some plausibilities which ought to be taken into account. In this sense I mainly refer to the causal
mechanisms of the conflict theory of Bartos and Wehr (2002) that are considered as plausible, and on terrorism to legitimate reasons of which the importance should not be underestimated, which forms the primary underpinnings of this research.

Limitations are regarding the political nature of terrorism, hence there will be a variety of opposing views and so finding truly neutral information could be a problem. Since most information on terrorism is pro-state, and but a minority in the literature is really critical is another issue and one that is also impending the quality of the terrorism debate and research.

**Terrorism Definition**

Terrorism has many different definitions, but there is still not a single official, internationally accepted, legal definition for terrorism. According to Chomsky that is because it would frame the US and its allies (or client states) as prime actors of terror, and with the US itself even being the leading terrorist state (Chomsky, 2005, 2007). Chomsky writes that a definition is sought by the western elite that solely applies to the enemies of allied states and that it should not fit to violent acts carried out by the West. This phenomenon is not new as it was similarly done by the Imperialist Japanese in Manchuria and in eastern China who claimed to be defending the inhabitants against the ‘Chinese bandits’ (Chomsky, 2007). Another example was that during the WW2 trials at Nuremberg and in Tokyo there were no charges pressed for war crimes through aerial assaults as the Allies had killed more civilians that way than the Axis had (Chomsky, 2007). Only charges were pressed for crimes that solely applied to the Axis. So it seems that certain politically potent terms are indeed molded to fit certain interests (N. Fairclough, 2003), socio-politically shaped and constructed in the interest of the most powerful actor. As Boaz Ganor, executive director of the International Policy Institute for Counter-Terrorism, stated ‘*an objective definition of terrorism is not only possible; it is also indispensable to any serious attempt to combat terrorism*’ (Ganor, 2010).
In the following it may be clarified why there is not such an official definition yet for terrorism, and here I provide an illustrative quote by Chomsky (2005) ‘‘Norms are established by the powerful, in their own interests, and with the acclaim of responsible intellectuals.’’. A paper by Glennon Michael (2003) states that the most power states, such as the US, China and Russia, still do not infrequently violate international law when it comes to the use of force. Notably, Dwayne Winseck (2008) writes about the ‘Information Operations’ doctrine, adopted by the US in 2003, which authorized massive surveillance for the use of effective propaganda globally together with the mass media. It explains the increasing cooperation with national security agencies, and he mentions an information warfare impeding effective democracy even further.

**Structure**

The former chapters provided an overview of the research problems within the field of terrorism, the ones this thesis will aim to address and a general overview of the literature. The theoretical framework will describe a Marxian conflict theory based on mechanistic causalities by Bartos and Wehr (2002). Next, in the methodological framework chapter, a historical analysis will address the causalities of the 9/11 attacks as a case study to exemplify the use of the conflict theory for terrorism studies. The findings chapter will highlight the main key points and elements of the analysis, and then drawing upon closely related concepts which further clarifies the context of the thesis problems addressed. The conclusions will answer to, and summarize, the main research questions, research objective and provides suggestions and ideas for future research.
Analytical Framework

Marxian Conflict Theory

US politician Karl Rove in 2001 stated that trying to understand terrorism equates to sympathy for terrorism (Richardson et al., 2006, pp. 2). It was a prevailing view at the time, counter-narrative scholars were ridiculed thus greatly harming proper research on terrorism, and that view still has many followers up to this day (Jackson, 2016, pp. 60). Rove would be correct if one does not want to resolve the real issues causing terrorism. Ami Ayalon, Former head of Israel’s security services (Shin Bet) said that ‘’those who want victory’’ against terrorism without addressing grievances ‘’want an unending war’’ (Boggs, 2013, pp. 136) (Chomsky, 2003, pp. 115). Whenever there is terrorism, there are mostly, if not always, legitimate grounds for grievances and frustrations (Bartos and Wehr, 2002, pp. 73). Grievances can be casually interpreted in the sense that a logical pattern can be deduced from the effects that come from it. This chapter discussed how a causal approach can be undertaken to the study of a terrorist case and to terrorism in general.

Grievances, Goal Incompatibility and Frustration

Grievances and frustration are the two main causes of enduring hostilities (Bartos and Wehr, 2002, pp. 73). These are usually affected by an inability to meet certain goals, desires, and needs which understood in this theory as ‘goal incompatibility’.

Frustration builds up whenever one is prevented by someone else from needs and wishes (ibid, pp. 73). Frustration pressure increases if there is no way of expression oneself. Violence can come as a result due to such an intensity of desperation to release bottled up feelings. The concept of Grievances refers to experiences of being treated unjustly, and which will result in hostilities. Once these go unaddressed, a conflict is likely to materialize. Injustice in this sense is affected by goal incompatibility with a weaker actor wanting something essential from the
dominant party. The dominant group wishes to maintain the status quo for their own interests, and thus logically leads hostility due to the other party wanting to challenge the status quo.

Another very relevant term by Bartos and Wehr (2002, pp. 36) is that of ‘Absolute deprivation’ when one’s basic needs are in such a state of peril that it undermines any quality or ability for human life to survive, examples of absolute deprivation resulting from conflict would include food shortages, physical harm and psychological warfare such as the military doctrine of ‘shock and awe’ famously applied by the US Army during the invasion of Iraq in 2003 (Ullman and Wade, 1996, pp. xxvi) (Sepp, 2007) (Sanders, 2013). That kind of strategy based on rapid domination is regarded by some as a war crime, but by another name, and comparable to the standards on crimes of 9/11 (Sepp, 2007) (Whitetaker, 2003). It refers to the incitement of such fear throughout the population to prevent any opposition towards the aggressor (Ullman and Wade, 1996, pp. xxvi). Most forms of terrorism come from these absolute deprivations, hence the importance of this concept. In the next chapter I will further discuss some absolute deprivations which many renowned scholars, politicians and policy/field experts believe to have led to the events of 9/11.

Conflict Solidarity

Central to this conflict theory is the notion of ‘conflict solidarity’. Interaction stimulates conflict solidarity and communal values, but it depends on the flow of information and communication which can be restricted through censorship, repression thus consequently reducing the level of interaction (Bartos and Wehr, 2002, pp. 70-71). Interaction is also essential for the ability to form a group due to the necessary establishment of relations, shared group identity, common ideas and culture. When no external constraints are imposed on the members of the group there will be more opportunity for the flourishing of communal beliefs and other similarities such as norms, values and habits which increases the liking for one another. See image (ibid, pp. 71). If within the group those factors are much present then it is the more likely that solidarity will be high in the face of conflict “If the level of conflict solidarity within a group increases, the chances that it will engage in conflict behavior increase as well” (ibid, pp. 8).
The figure here is based upon the assumption of no outside forces disrupting the causality conditions. If any of the three increase, the other will as well. Those are the factors involved that affect whether there is a high level of group solidarity or not, in other words high group solidarity depends upon ‘‘if its members interact with each other frequently, if they like each other, and if they hold similar beliefs, values, and norms’’ (Bartos and Wehr, 2002, pp. 72). For conflict solidarity to emerge individuals should meet in small groups, ideally of 15-20 participants but definitely not more than 50 (ibid, pp. 72), for the development of shared group notions reflected in an ideology that supports a struggle and the members must be convinced that conflict is sufficiently effective to meet shared goals. Although, for groups to engage in brief conflicts purely solidarity can be enough, however that would not be possible if the conflict becomes protracted (ibid, pp. 74-77).

**Group Organization and Mobilization**

Bartos and Wehr consider that conflict organization is necessary for any extended period of a violent conflict (ibid, 2002, pp. 76) which they refer to as the development of ideology or the process of group consent on ideas as generally accepted and consequently applied in group and conflict organization. More specifically, ideology comprises of a set of commonly accepted beliefs and ideas which are retracted into society or a group and define decision-making of the organizational structure. For example, whether a certain strategy is seen as rational to handle a conflict, e.g. aggressively or peacefully and based on which justifications and motivations. Organization progresses into conflict mobilization for resources such as manpower, equipment and allies (ibid, 2002, pp. 95-96). New enemies could be made in this process for the search of allies due to an antagonizing and coercive stance towards neutral parties such as Bush’s statement shortly after 9/11 ‘‘Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists’’. 
Gramsci and Althusser

Conflict organization is quite similar to Gramsci’s notion as both concepts refer to the phenomenon regarding the control of dominant discourse to influence populations for the effective production of generally acceptable assumptions, i.e. ideology or narrative. Gramsci (1971, pp. 144-147, 177-179) maintained that the state, a party, or a group for that matter, maintains power through a monopoly on the basis of violence and coercion. Althusser (2008, pp. 22-25) further developed Gramsci’s cultural hegemony with the idea of the repressive state apparatus (RSAs) and the ideological state apparatus (ISAs); whereby the former (RSAs) refers to the control by a police force and military while the latter (ISAs) concerns indoctrination through the education system, religion and the media.

Flawed notions of (counter-) terrorism

With regards to (counter-) terrorism this is notable on the factually flawed notion of the predictability of ‘radicalization’ that usually assigned to muslim communities as they are often regarded as ‘risky’ (Heath-Kelly, 2012, 2015) (Quareshi, 2015) (Dudenhoefer, 2018). Here the precautionary principle of the European Commission applies, which means that whenever there is insufficient evidence for any threats for potential sources of major adverse effects this principle can be called into effect (2000). According to Aradau and van Munster (2007) it makes decision-making decide on the basis of what is unknown, rather than what is known. It supports the claim by Jackson (2015) and Neocleous (2015) that counterterrorism is based on ambiguity and imagination rather than hard facts. This rejection of scientific knowledge in the combat on terror makes more sense when it seen as an expression of economic-political interests, and by Boukalas’s (2015) account it serves the accumulation of dominant capital by making economic crisis manageable through neoliberal restructuring to prevent escalation into political crises.

The highly uncapitalist acts of bailouts for too big to fail institutions are practical examples of Boukalas assertion in the current capitalist system (Ertürk et al, 2012) (Engelen, 2015, 2017). Furthermore, McKeown (2011) wrote that terrorism is actively produced since it is essential for the survival of the capitalist system as it is so instable in its current form. Giroux was (2005)
Thus it seems that there is governance through risk which serves the purpose of dealing with inherent the current systemic instabilities for the manufacture of consent of neoliberal policies that would make these weaknesses of the system more manageable to the benefit of the elite, but at the cost of the public. It shows that the idea of cultural hegemony is still highly relevant with regards to current counterterrorism as the repressive state apparatus and the ideological state apparatus are both sources of consensual support and as expressions of power for the transition to the national security state (Giroux, 2005).

**Conflict groups, Trigger Event and Resources**

Once party has gathered sufficient resources, mobilized its members, high conflict solidarity, and the organizational capacity it is likely to transform into a conflict group, and thus an upcoming armed engagement would be highly probable (Bartos and Wehr, 2002, pp. 79). When all causalities are in place it is likely too late to avoid conflict, and a trigger event would mean the start of the it (ibid, pp. 81-82). See arrows in the image (ibid, pp. 81) for clarification of the points discussed earlier.

**Methodological Framework**

The research paradigm adopted here in this thesis will adhere closest to early Descartes rational-materialism. By following this worldview it is assumed that there are certain realities that are
within human the capacity of human senses to know with a sufficiently high plausibility (Richardson and Weinberg, 1998).

An abductive approach will be undertaken since the combination of theoretical and analytical methods have not been entirely used in the literature as in the way used in this thesis. So the contribution here will be from a synthesis of approaching and discussing terrorism. Due do this unique approach, but also due to the gabs of knowledge in the literature and not wanting to claim absolute certainty, a deductive approach or an inductive is not chosen. Furthermore, Descartes himself used abductive reasoning too in his works (Aliseda, 2006, pp. 8-9).

Bartos and Wehr (2002, pp. 8-9) used a positivist approach for the conflict theory used in this study. However since rationalism and positivism paradigms share many similarities, with the main different being a more materialist approach in the original rationalism, it is possible to deviate from Bartos and Wehr’s approach. The ontology will be realist and the epistemology objective.

**Conflict Analysis**

The US was responsible for the atrocities of 9/11 as can be seen from declassified state documents. I am of course talking about the original 9/11 of the Coup d’état in Chile in 1973 against the democratically elected government under Salvador Allende for the purpose of installing Pinochet (Kornbluh, 1973), and who would become among the worst dictators in Latin American history (Dinges, 2005, pp. 3-4, 8, 184-186). Furthermore, as in accordance with Article 54:1 (2010) of the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions (1949) it is illegal in warfare to starve a population. Yet, which is precisely what happened from 1990 till 2003 in Iraq where over a million Iraqis had died and half a million children by 1998 due to US led economic sanctions (ICRC, 1999) (Bachman, 2017, pp. 74-78). In 1995 3.3 million people were at risk of malnutrition in Iraq (Cordesman, 2018, pp. 145-146).
According to Simon the reality of the motives was about the control of oil in the Gulf and it had nothing to do with human rights protection (Simon, 1994, pp. xvii-xx). Denis Halliday (Ahmed, 2003, pp. 138-139), UN Humanitarian coordinator resigned in 1998 because of what he described to be, on the economic sanctions which he was overseeing that was killing well over a million civilians and half a million children, a "a systematic program…of deliberate genocide." (Churchill, 2001) (Bachman, 2017, pp. 7-9). Saddam’s regime was not even affected by it, contrarily, it strengthened their position (Ahmed, 2003, pp. 138-139). Hans von Sponeck, the successor to Halliday, soon resigned as well as he described the situation a “true human tragedy” (Bachman, 2017, pp. 143-144) (Ahmed, 2003, pp. 118-119) (Halliday, 1999). US State Secretary Albright, responding to a question regarding the death of half a million children, said it was “worth the price” (Churchill, 2001) (Richman, 2004). Head of the World Food Programme, followed in the resignation of Halliday and Sponeck (Neilan, 2000).

In November 1999 also UN sanctions were initiated against Afghanistan aim at Osama Bin Laden and several other Al-Qaeda members (Ahmad, 1999). All UN agencies and NGOs that were working there expressed serious concern since the country was already devastated by wars for over the past few decades. The sanctions created another humanitarian crisis of increased child mortality rated and starvation. The sanctions were made particularly worse due to a drought in 2001 which caused food to be so scarce that people were reported to be eating plant roots (Ahmad, 2001). Furthermore, in 1991 Human Rights Watch reported widespread human rights abused by both the Soviet, Pakistani and US supported groups, even encouraging attacks with concern for the innocent Afghan population (HRW, 1991). Image here is a general overview of the theory with a sequence of the main causes and effects (Bartos and Wehr, 2002, pp. 81).
Causalities of 9/11

The motivations that were expressed by Osama Bin Laden for the attacks on 9/11 were quite detailed and are considered by several credible and renown scholars, politicians and policy/field experts as reasonable, and far from insane (Lybrand, 1962) (Pape, 2005) (Cannistraro and Giraldi, 2017). Cannistraro and Giraldi (2007) Agree that the main reasons behind terrorism is because of the grievances and they wrote “studies as well as the practical experience of CIA officers who have worked against terrorists and terrorist support groups reveal that terrorists are sane and rational, motivated and intelligent” which corresponds to the dominant discourse on terrorism of the US government several decades ago, and as mentioned earlier in this thesis (Lybrand, 1962) (Hosmer et al., 1962, pp. 2-3, 7-8) (Jackson, 2016, pp. 52-54). Bin Laden listed the following reasons for the attacks:

1. U.S. troops were on Saudi soil, thus desecrating holy ground;

2. the U.S. invaded Iraq and waged the Persian Gulf War;

3. Palestinians had been evicted from their homeland and IDF occupying troops were in Palestine; and

4. U.S. support for corrupt regimes in Muslim nations, beginning with Saudi Arabia.


In the next four paragraphs each of these reasons will be discussed.

Robert Pape (2005, pp. 51-54), notes that Al-Qaeda’s attacks started when the US deployed troops in Bahrain, Qatar and most importantly Saudi Arabia, (Chalmers, 2007, Chapter 1) considered the holy land of Islam ‘’The targets that al-Qaeda has attacked...both suggest that al-Qaeda’s principal motive is to end foreign military occupation of the Arabian Peninsula and other Muslim regions (Pape, 2005, pp. 51)’’. According to Robert Pape suicide terrorism is not primarily done by Islamic fundamentalists, but the secular and Marxist group of the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka (ibid, 2005, pp. 145, 182). The so called ‘moneyed muslims’ shared much of the
same reasons against US foreign policy due to the aid of dictatorial regimes in the Middle East and preventing the development of democracies (Rai and Chomsky, 2002, pp. 34).

Cannistraro and Giraldi (2007) wrote that US foreign policy remains the primary root cause of terrorism. Former US politician Ron Paul of the House of Representatives, shared much the same views and more in detail that “Radical Islamic terrorism is for the most part a reaction to foreign interventionism. It will never be defeated until this simple truth is understood.” (2017). He also expressed some of what causes terrorism ‘our arrogant policy of bombing nations that do not submit to our wishes. This generates hatred directed toward America . . . and exposes us to a greater threat of terrorism, since this is the only vehicle our victims can use to retaliate against a powerful military state’” (Paul, 2003).

Robert Pape (2005, pp. 51-54), notes that Al-Qaeda’s attacks started when the US deployed troops in Bahrain, Qatar and most importantly Saudi Arabia, (Chalmers, 2007, Chapter 1) which is considered the holy land of Islam ‘The targets that al-Qaeda has attacked...both suggest that al-Qaeda’s principal motive is to end foreign military occupation of the Arabian Peninsula and other Muslim regions (Pape, 2005, pp. 51)’. Moreover, according to Robert Pape suicide terrorism is not primarily done by Islamic fundamentalists, but the secular and Marxist group of the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka (ibid, 2005, pp. 145, 182).

**Historical Analysis**

**The British Creation of Saudi Arabia and Wahhabism**

Before the Great War the Ottoman Empire was the dominant Islamic power, and main adversary of the British, in the Middle East (Halliday, 2001, Introduction) (Dodge, 2011). Based on the age-old doctrine of ‘divide-and-conquer’ initially supported the Hejaz and were promised an independent state from modern-day Oman and Yemen to the Borders of Turkey (Al-Rasheed, 1997, pp. 45-46, 65-67) (Vassiliev, 2013, pp. 202-203). However, in 1915 the British signed a
treaty with the rulers of the tribe Saud (the royal house of the Saud) effectively making them a British protectorate (Razzak, 1997, pp. 32) (Troeller, 2013). Every month after the treaty, the Saudi’s were given 5000 pounds per month as well as significant military support to conquer the central Arabian peninsula and establish Saudi Arabia (al-Rasheed, 2010, pp. 83-85). After the devastation of Ottoman Empire in WW1, the British broke that promise with Hejaz in support of the Saudi’s instead carved the lands of the Middle East between themselves and France (Voll, 2009). This drastic change of London’s strategic policy in the Middle East was conducted chiefly since the Wahhabists were much more tolerant about starting wars with other Islamic states (Al-Rasheed, 1997, pp. 191-192), which was in contrast to most other Muslims strongly that opposing warfare between fellow Muslims (Ebrahim, 2015, pp. 96) (Talal, 2003, pp. 211-213) (Voll, 2009).

The historic resonance of the Saudi’s gaining control of most of the Arabian Peninsula instead of Hejaz cannot be understated. Rulers of the tribe of Saud were adherents to Wahhabism, the most radical and violent Islamic sect, while Hejaz were much more moderate (Voll, 2009). In fact, the founder of Wahhabism, Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1703-1792 AD), was considered by most contemporary Muslims of his time as too extremist and violent and he was excommunicated (Jonathan, 2016, pp. 252) (Ebrahim, 2015, pp. 97) (Talal, 2003, pp. 222). Even his own father and brother opposed his ideas (Hourani, 1992, pp. 257-258).

Thanks to the extremist views of the Saudi’s the UK could finally achieve its original goals of ‘divide-and-conquer’ in the Middle East under the disguise of Jihadism (Al-Rasheed, 1997, pp. 65-67). Indeed, as mentioned before, with Saudi-Arabia as a puppet-state to do Britain’s dirty work throughout the Middle Eastern region, the UK maintain a policy of separation and control of the Arab states to impose its will (Troeller, 2013, pp. xx-xxi, 166) (Safran, 1988, pp. 2-4, 57-58). In 1932 the tribe of Saud formed Saudi Arabia as a recognized state and continued to hold close ties with London up till the present. Furthermore, since the 1960’s, with the discovery of oil, Britain and with the US provided the Saudi regime with weaponry in return for oil (Bronson, 2008, pp. 95-96) (Quandt, 2010, pp. 2-3, 31-34). In 1985 for example, the British received
600,000 barrels of oil per day in exchange for military equipment (Valentine, 2015, pp. 74). Over a period of twenty years of oil for weapons the British arms corporation gained 43 billion GBP (ibid, pp. 74). According to Sam Perlo-Freeman of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI, 2009), all wars in the Middle East were supplied by foreign-made weaponry. In 1990 the British Foreign Office referred to the UK-Saudi relation as ‘’a house built on two solid pillars’’ (Valentine, 2015, pp. 74-75). These trade deals, and the previously mentioned, aided the spread of Wahhabism as Saudi Arabia given the capacity to do so (Commins, 2006, pp. 190-192). The spread of Wahhabism laid the ‘fruits’ for grievances to take grasp and develop into organisations such as the Taliban and ISIS (Al-Ibrahim, 2015).

The Palestinian Exodus, The Nakba

Perhaps I might be seen in this thesis as appearing too anti-Western narrative, and that may be true, but these are accounts that too often go unheard (Aruri, 2001, pp. 78, 108). Furthermore, as the stronger powers the West and the Israeli have a certain obligation to let voices of dissent heard, and in which they have often failed, as far too often it is actively suppressed knowledge. With the memories of the Jewish holocaust so fresh in the one’s minds, how could something so eerily similar to that have happened so soon after it? It is difficult to comprehend.

In the Belfoud Declaration, addressed to Lord Rothschild, the UK granted the Jews control over Palestina, and stated ‘’[HM] Government view with favour…it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine. ‘’ (Embassy of Israel in Cyprus, 2017).
The Nakba known as a catastrophe, a disaster, to the Palestinian people and the Arab World were over 700,000 Palestinians were expelled or had to flee their homes (McDowall et al, 1987, pp. 10) (William, 2004, pp. 270). More than 400 Palestine villages and cities were either completely destroyed, much in ruins or left uninhabitable (Aruri, 2001, pp. 50) (Morris, 2004, pp. 342). Causes to the Nakba, included psychological warfare and massacres often targeted at civilians, many of whom women and children. The massacre at Deir Yassin was among the worst ones during the war when (Aruri, 2001, pp. 46-47), after a Jewish victory, at least 107 men, women and children were butchered when grenades were thrown into homes or shot on the streets (Barakat, 2016) (Morris et al, 2004, pp. 97-98). 150 more bodies were found to be disemboweled and decapitated, according to J. Reynier of the International Red Cross (Brooks, 2008, pp. 297). Cases of rape and mutilation were also reported (Morris et al, 2004, pp. 113). Also in a fishing village ‘‘some 200 unarmed Tantura villagers, mostly young men, were shot dead after the village had surrendered’’ (Pappé, 2001).

The initial 700,000 refugees of the war has risen most recently to nearly 5 million, with about a million being state-less (Bocco, 2009). The map next here shows the drastic reduction of Palestine territory (Bader, 2017).
Most of the grievances and frustrations started with goal incompatibility between the foreign elites and the population of the target country. See the image here below (Bartos and Wehr, 2002, pp. 48).
The image above shows the causal mechanisms (causes and effects) leading up to 9/11 (Source: my own). Mostly, if not completely, are the causalities about grievances, frustrations and hostilities originating from goal incompatibilities imposed by mainly first the British through their support of the Sa’uds and then followed by the US significantly after WWII.

There is an overall cause and effect process described here above, and starting with goal incompatibility, leading to grievances as basic needs are harmed, followed by frustration as needs are unaddressed, this may develop into desperation when personal attempts fail to resolve the unmet needs. The situation may then simulate conflict solidarity among an affected population due to similar interests, ideas and shared experiences of oppression which can go progress into conflict preparation (organization, mobilization) which eventually ends in conflict behavior to address goal incompatibility to fulfill the desired, previously lost needs.
Findings

The analysis of the previous chapter found that the causes of terrorism emerged first through the goals of the UK and the US which greatly harmed the populations in the Middle East. Secondly, those were followed by grievances of the damage and harm that those caused. Third, frequently the victims seemed to be ignored and often their voices were not heard as the violence stimulating violent behavior of the political actors, and others, of all sides merely continued (Mckeown, 2011). Reflecting back on the literature review, it is clearly so that the Western governments suppress the experiences of the Arab civil society on (counter-) terrorism (Heath-Kelly, 2015). The facts seem to be conveniently hidden, concealed behind a veil of Eurocentric ideology, cultural hegemony. It shows that concepts such as Said’s (1973) Orientalism and postcolonialism are still highly relevant today, as these can help us recognize the stereotypes and the social framing. These notions are further discussed below as they are so intertwined and highly relevant with the findings of this thesis.

Critical Theory

Critical theorists of the Frankfurt School, based on Marxist thought, typically believe it is due to elite-controlled social institutions that indoctrinate a ‘false consciousness’ or an ideology which deludes the general population of their own interests (Geuss, 1981, pp. 12). Friedrich Engels (1893) provided quite an extensive definition on ideology ‘Ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously, indeed, but with a false consciousness and related to the concept of false consciousness. The real motives impelling him remain unknown to him, otherwise it would not be an ideological process at all. Hence he imagines false or apparent motives.’. One of such ways used to control the beliefs of the public was through the ‘fabrication’ of consumers as referred to by Thorstein Veblen (1923, pp. 306), or creating new ‘wants’ and popularizing obtaining material goods as the good life. Herbert Marcuse, also a critical theorist and academic of the Frankfurt school, wrote about the stimulation of consumerism as a way of domination of the poor by the rich. He called it ‘false needs’ that are imposed upon the public as a form of social control to prevent people from attempting to fulfill common interests and thereby continuing a perpetual cycle of injustice and misery (Marcuse,
1964, pp. 7), but also to distract people from upsetting the interests of the political-elite. This concept of false needs is further exemplified with a quote from Bernays (1955, pp. 37)

“We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of. This is a logical result of the way in which our democratic society is organized. Vast numbers of human beings must cooperate in this manner if they are to live together as a smoothly functioning society.’’

Furthermore, in a report to the Trilateral Commission by S. Huntington et al. (1975, pp. 113) it was argued that governance problems stemmed from an ‘excess’ of democracy, and therefore they recommend some level of ‘moderation in democracy’. This is in stark contrast to the view in ancient Greece by Aristotle, who believed in a participatory democracy, although only for all free men, but that wealth equality was necessary for a functioning democracy (Aristotle, 2013, pp. 115-117), to guarantee equal political power of the participators in the democratic system. In his eyes, if the financial inequality would be too great, in a functioning democracy without limitations, the numerically superior poor would then rebalance the prosperity distribution of society through reform and thus the rich would lose their wealth. As Wodak stated (Wodak, 2001 pp. 7), by creating awareness critical theorists seek to liberate oneself from domination by eliminating any kinds of delusion, thus also through Fairclough’s CDA. Additionally, Foucault viewed power (Rabinow, 1984, pp. 72-73) as constricting and as a means to control others, concealing, preventing and repressing people’s opportunities. This thesis will therefore expose forms of power, by studying the Dutch counterterrorism strategy, that contribute to a constriction on civil liberties unfairly on the basis of democratic values and international law. Regarding power, Samuel Huntington wrote ‘‘Power remains strong when it remains in the dark; exposed to the sunlight it begins to evaporate’’ (Huntington, 1981, pp. 75).
Propaganda

While most of the intellectuals and scholars discussed in the following paragraph are of Anglo-Saxon origin, they nevertheless had a huge impact on the world and thus of course also on the Netherlands. As Chomsky (1999, pp. 46) stated “The United States is surely the most important case to study if we hope to understand the world of today and tomorrow”, and to that quote I would add that because of its incomparable power and influence the US today is still of much importance for the research topic of this thesis. A similar case can be made regarding scholars of the British Empire and their effect on the present-day, so this thesis will mention key US and British intellectuals to contextualize the modern socio-political context of the Netherlands.

Modern academic thought and literature on propaganda and controlling the general public’s mind goes as far back as at least early modern history which has set the stage for the dynamics of contemporary socio-politics. John Locke (1695, pp.146), who is regarded as the ‘Father of Liberalism’ and among the most influential Enlightenment thinkers (Julian, 2010, pp. 291), wrote that ordinary civilians are ought to be told by their rulers what to think to bring them obedience. On a similar note, David Hume was surprised over the fact how the masses were controlled by the few who ruled them, as he expressed in the following (1777, pp. 38) “the easiness with which the many are governed by the few; and the implicit submission, with which men resign their own sentiments and passions to those of their rulers”, and saw a paradox in the power of a government as can be noticed in the quote “Force is always on the side of the governed, the governors have nothing to support them but opinion”, and as a Tory Hume was in favor of a strong traditionalist, conservative monarchist-ruled government (Mossner, 1950, pp. 75). The academic debate of controlling the population and reducing their political influence continued onwards throughout history and into the 20th century with leading and well-respected intellectuals such as (Edgett, 2009) Edward Louis Bernays (Bernays, 1928, pp. 9) who discussed a phenomenon that he called ‘the engineering of consent’ and noted in his book Propaganda “The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country”. Walter Lippman, regarded as a highly influential media reporter during the Cold War era, called ‘Father
of Modern Journalism’ and still popular among politicians (Snow, 2003, pp. 30-31) referred to the general population as a ‘‘bewildered herd’’ and that ‘‘The public must be put in its place’’ (Lippman, 1925, pp. 145). In the 20th century in reaction to the increasing liberties of common people and since in most western states the legal capability of coercive armed force by the state had been eroded through popular movements (Chomsky, 1995), therefore made the political elite in the UK and the US develop many of the most advanced propaganda techniques.

**Postcolonialism**

Postcolonialism is the theoretical lens through which Eurocentric dominant narratives are countered by an in-depth socio-historical perspective to present an improved, more nuanced understanding of non-western cultures and peoples (Said, 1978, pp. 14-15). A key focus area of this theory is on of the consequences of Western imperialism on their former colonies (Said, 1978, pp. 13-14). Postcolonialists argue that non-European cultures have been inaccurately portrayed through western literature, art, education and society by neglecting the richness and diversity of these cultures and instead they have been usually presented as exotic, mysterious, identical to one another, dangerous and most importantly as the ‘other’, unlike ‘us’ and distinctly different from the West (Said, 1978, pp. 1-3, 249-250). That is contrasted with much detailed attention in western scholarship for western cultures. Thereby, through the highly biased, simplistic and shortsighted focus of western intellectuals, politicians were able to legitimize the idea of western cultural superiority while regarding other cultures as inferior (Said, 1978, pp. 14, 108-109). In turn this Eurocentric view contributed to discrimination and a frequent hostile attitude towards particularly Islamic peoples (Said, 1978, pp. 27). According to Foucault (1980, pp. 52) knowledge and power are intertwined, one cannot exist without the other and vice versa or as he wrote ‘‘The exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power’’. Therefore, those with the most power control knowledge, and the knowledge of the weaker entities are, as a result, less heard or in Said’s words: ‘‘Europe is powerful and articulate; Asia is defeated and distant’’ (Said, 1978, pp. 57). Foucault’s notion of power and knowledge is the cornerstone of postcolonialism on which Said expanded to include the concept of ‘imagines geographies’. This concept refers to the representation of cultures as a form of power to subdue or control the way they are perceived.
(Said, 1978, pp. 53-55). Imagined geography develops through art, literature and the media to produce justification for control over the other, and applied in a contemporary context can supports a potential securitization act.

**Cultural Hegemony**

Antonio Gramsci was one of the earliest scholars to write about the term ‘hegemony’, influenced by Karl Marx, and he referred to it as cultural domination by the elite over the rest of society (Gramsci, 1971, pp. 125). It is closely linked to ideological domination, but here he emphasized on how also culture facilitates elite power. According to him it is embedded throughout every segment of society in the form of art, literature, education and the media to support the existing domination structure (Heywood, 1992, pp. 7). Ideology becomes ‘common sense’ when recognition fails of one’s own presupposition and assumption of existence (Heywood, 1992, pp. 12). Furthermore, according to Gramsci, the ruling by force was by the political sphere and the civil society was ruled by consent and repeatedly reaffirmed through culture and social institutions to manufacture legitimacy of the political-elite (Heywood, 1992, pp. 100-101. Trade unions and political parties are supposedly concessions from the elite (Gramsci, 1971, pp. 121). Essentially what Gramsci argued is that knowledge itself is socially constructed to legitimize existing social systems (Heywood, 1992, pp. 100-101). Moreover, he believed that there was a class alliance between segments of society with mutual interests, e.g. In the apartheid system of South Africa, between elite-whites and working-class whites versus the black majority (Hall, 1996, pp. 426). Gramsci’s valuable ideas and insight on power and injustice, even though a bit ethnocentric, significantly inspired postcolonial studies on colonial domination, studies on the legacy of western imperialism and discourses on the oriental ‘other’.

**Orientalism and Clash of Civilizations**

Edward Said, regarded as one of the founders of postcolonial studies (Mazrui, 2005), through his book ’Orientalism’ he writes that European powers have misrepresented Asian, Middle Eastern, African civilizations through historical contradictions as distinctly different from the West (Said, 1978, pp. 20-21, 36-39). Said mainly focused on the Middle East, building from Gramsci’s point
on the factors of cultural hegemony, he argued that the (miss) representation of the orient was significantly due to European art and cultural institutions. He mentioned the term ‘Orientalism’ (Said, 1978, pp. 2-3) and it refers to a generally patronizing portrayal of mainly Middle Eastern, but also North African and Asian civilizations through exaggerates and distorted views which emphasize these cultures as exotic, uncivilized, backwards and threatening (Said, 1978, pp. 26-27). Joseph-Ernest Renan for example coined the term cultural identity as a reason to assign people based on their culture to a certain economic role within the imperial system, or as he phrased it: ‘‘The regeneration of the inferior or degenerate races, by the superior races is part of the providential order of things for humanity. Pour forth this all-consuming activity onto countries, which, like China, are crying aloud for foreign conquest. Nature has made a race of workers, the Chinese race, who have wonderful manual dexterity, and almost no sense of honour; govern them with justice, levying from them, in return for the blessing of such a government, an ample allowance for the conquering race, and they will be satisfied; a race of tillers of the soil, the Negro; treat him with kindness and humanity, and all will be as it should; a race of masters and soldiers, the European race. . . . Let each do what he is made for, and all will be well.’’ (Said, 2000, pp. 418-419)

This circulation of colonial representation of other cultures has contributed to discrimination, prejudice and conflict between east and west. It created the notion of a so called East-West dichotomy where the West is regarded as rational, advanced and superior while the East as conservative, unsophisticated and subordinate (Barnett et al., 2000, pp. 99). Said further clarifies this through the following:

‘‘...but what seems to have influenced Orientalism most was a fairly constant sense of confrontation felt by Westerners dealing with the East. The boundary notion of East and West, the varying degrees of projected inferiority and strength, the range of work done, the kinds of characteristic features ascribed to the Orient: all these testify to a willed imaginative and geographic division made between East and West, and lived through during many centuries.’’ (Edward Said, 1979, pp. 201)
Additionally, Said argues that the US interpretation of the Arabs is more politicized due to its relation with Israel, and the way the media portrays the Palestinians as war-like and suicide-bombers opposite to the presentation of the ‘just’ and ‘peaceful’ Jewish state (Said, 1978, pp. 27). In his other book ‘Covering Islam’ Said wrote that Fundamentalism and Islam have been represented, even before 9/11, as essentially the same (Said, 1997, pp. xiv-xvi, 9) and that often Arab people were considered guilty of a certain attack rather than innocent until proven guilty such as with the Oklahoma City bombing that killed 168 people which was actually perpetrated by non-muslim whites.

Samuel Hunington’s book “The Clash of Civilizations” is counter to Said’s work, as according to Hunington the world is divided into eight different cultural identities (Huntington, 1997, pp. 43-44) which would be the main case for conflict. Hunington focuses especially on a western and non-western distinction (Huntington, 1997, pp. 20-21). This descriptive hypothesis seems like a simplification of the world while providing provocations for warfare on the basis that ‘they are not like us’ as expressed in Said’s criticism (Said, 2001) of Hunington’s book. Especially when one considers a statement such as ‘The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power.’ (Huntington, 1997, pp. 217) and without providing any sources this claim seems more like provocation or Islamophobia. Even more worrying is that this book has sharply risen in popularity after the 9/11 attacks, and that Hunington’s ideas have been expressed by several politicians as a reason for Western exceptionalism (Said, 2001) and discrimination towards Muslims and. According to Chomsky, Huntington eludes the realities behind international terrorism for solely blaming Islam for it while western countries have contributed to much of the origins of terrorism and are among its main actors (Chomsky, 2001). Furthermore, Chomsky believes that the book can be used to justify conflict rather than looking how one can coexist in peace.
Conclusion

This thesis found that the main causes of perpetuated Islamist terrorism are mostly related to grievances, frustration and their inabilities to get heard about these problems. The historical analysis helped show many contradictions regarding terrorism, and that it cannot be studied without also the role of the West in its creation. While 9/11 was a great crime, it is still dwarves the horrors and misery the people of Palestine, Iraq and Afghanistan have faced in the years prior to the attacks. Nothing justified terrorism, but understanding where it comes from is crucial in studying it.

As Mckeown (2011) argued, terrorism has actively been produced by a Western elite class dominated system of global corporate capitalism. If the British never broke their promise with Hejaz then likely we would have never had the Saudi’s ruling the central Arabian Peninsula, and more importantly the spread of their violent Wahhabist ideology would have been avoided. The Saudi’s would not have had the resources and capability to take control of the Central Arabian Peninsula on their own. The British played a vital role in that.

Much of the literature discussed in this thesis seems to agree that there are other interests involved than protecting the people. Only then would it make sense why the West keeps stimulating terrorism through violent repression, support, warfare, but also why the US suddenly changed their policy on terrorism in the mid-1970s. Since, before that change they were much more peacefully oriented. However as ,it seems now that there is no end in sight to terrorism, and due to continues activation and production of the conflict mechanisms, the future looks very bleak. As the literature in the thesis showed, the question is not if we are going to be a national security state, but what kind of one.

More research needs to be done through historical analyzes with conflict theory. Even more importantly, if we want terrorism to stop, we need to stop conducting it. If we understand the past, we can understand the present and the consequences that are likely to follow.
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