

Introduction

Terrorism is a very difficult and delicate issue to handle. Both in terms of their motivation to do so and in terms of the effect a terrorist act has on both individuals and the country at large. As I will elaborate in greater detail later on, we might see that the motivation to carry out a terroristic act is both divided in terms of personal and religious reasons. To have a better understanding concerning terrorism I find it important to emphasize four different types of terrorist groups outlined by Audrey Kurth Cronin (Baylis and Smith 2005). In a historical point of view Kurth Cronin argues in favor of four types of terrorist organizations operating around the world; *left-wing terrorists* which is intertwined with the communist movement, *right-wing terrorists* who is drawn towards fascistic thoughts, *ethnonationalist/separatist terrorists* which is accompanied by the decolonization and *religious* or “*scared*” *terrorists* who acts according to their religious beliefs and according to Kurth Cronin, currently the most significant one (Baylis and Smith 2005). The present US president George W. Bush introduced the term ‘Global War on Terror’ (GWOT) after the attack on 9/11. He described his quest to eradicate people, groups, and governments whom his administration designated as presenting a threat to liberty and the ‘Western way of life’ which gave the European Union (EU) a new set of security and justice issues (Cini 2007). Due to this, the GWOT is “... likely to be the largest foreign and security challenge for the EU in the medium and long run” (Cini 2007: 247-248). If this is true, how does the EU combat terrorism? What do they emphasize? Do they focus on symptoms, or do they stress the causes?

In this essay I shall elaborate in greater depth on these questions and give an analysis concerning the reasons for their chosen path of legislation.

What is actually terrorism?

To fully answer and understand the questions rose above, the term terrorism needs to be clarified in greater extent. Surprisingly this expression is not as clear as it might seem to be. Everyone (at least many of us) will first and foremost characterize terrorism by the use of violence, but the unclearness starts when the issues concerning the *purpose* towards which violence is used,

and the *motivation* behind it appears. One of the main goals for terrorists is to bring forth political change for the purpose of obtaining power in order to right the perceived wrong. Even though these acts have some impact on e.g. inhabitants, it appears to be the weakest form of irregular warfare. This is because these organizations – like Al Qaeda – lack the broader support or consensus of the population that characterizes insurgencies and revolutions, and because their goals for change often are absolute and based on radical ideas. To state some kind of definition on what terrorism is, I have chosen to use James D. Kiras wording; terrorism is “... *the use of violence by sub-state groups to inspire fear, by attacking civilians and/or symbolic targets, for the purpose such as drawing widespread attention to a grievance, provoking a severe response, or wearing down their opponent’s moral resolve, to effect political change*” (Baylis and Smith 2005: 482).

EU – which focus on terrorism?

As the United States, the EU has great focus on combating terrorism. But which focus should be stressed? Even though there was terrorism prior to 1968, James D. Kiras (2005) emphasize that there are three factors that led to the birth of *transnational* terrorism: the expansion of air travel; the wider availability of television news coverage; and broad common political and ideological interests. By having these upcoming changes, it allowed terrorism to grow from a local and regional phenomenon into wider spread of terrorism into a global scale.

To be able to face the challenges concerning transnational terrorism, EU has possibly three choices; focus on the symptoms, stress the causes or perhaps a cross between them. By symptoms we stress the issue on *how* to combat terrorism implied that terrorism has become a “natural” part of the society. When referring to causes we emphasize the issue to understand *why* terrorism has become a part of our daily life.

The focus on symptoms

As mentioned above, symptoms emphasizes on how EU can combat terrorism. This focus is utterly important. The reason for this is the logic that inhabitants

see concrete actions from their respective governments. As for an example we could look at the invasion of Afghanistan. After 9/11 USA declared war on Afghanistan on the basis of Article 51 (that of self-defence) of the UN Charter to remove the Taliban regime even though the Security Council did not authorize it. After the removal of the form of government nearly all the EU's member states provided military and logistical support to the UN and NATO-controlled ISAF efforts. According to Robert Dover was this important because it showed solidarity with the USA, and to contribute to "...high-end military operations financially, providing some military capabilities, and offering post-conflict reconstruction support" (Cini 2007: 248).

The EU is clearly not without considerable potential in relation to the use of force, as we have seen in for instance Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Democratic Republic of Congo and in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Hill and Smith 2005). To be able to respond to threats to its security the EU constructed a European Security Strategy (ESS), which is widely seen as a reply to the USA's National Security Strategy of 2002 (Cini 2007) and identifies five key threats: terrorism, weapons of mass destructions, failed states, organized crime and regional conflicts (Hill and Smith 2005).

The focus on causes

To understand the causes behind terrorism it is important to look in greater detail into the individuals' motivation to carry out these types of attacks. James D. Kiras (2005) stress that to describe the growth of terrorism into a global phenomenon we have to focus on three areas; *culture, economics* and *religion*.

Culture

The spread of free market capitalism and social changes concerning globalization can seem to overwhelm the ethnic identity or religious values of smaller groups who believe that they are the losers in the new international system. This may lead to conflicts in smaller regions but in a global scale, the number of civilizations is limited, which may lead to what Huntington refers as 'a clash of civilizations'. Where individuals within a culture perceive their civilization to be "... weakened, insecure, or stagnant, and interaction is high

between weak and strong civilizations, conflict may be inevitable” (Baylis and Smith 2005: 485).

Economic

In essence, the economic explanation could be argued to be linked towards wealth which is further interlinked with personal security and violence. The reason for this is that if a minority has little possible opportunity to obtain wealth in an increasingly global society, many will leave and seek to other regions or countries to pursue better opportunities. However, this may not be attainable, and if so, individuals may turn to violence for criminal reasons (e.g. personal gain) or political reasons (e.g. terrorism).

Religion

This type of terrorism is often known as ‘new’ terrorism. The reason for this is the increasing usage of religious motivating factors. For instance there are several authors that claim that terrorist motivated by promises of rewards in the afterlife – religious motivating factors – is the underlying explanation of the global jihad “movement” (Baylis and Smith 2005). Audrey Kurth Cronin (2002) argues that in contrast to secular terrorism which has had as its goal the pursuit of power in order to correct flaws within the society, religious terrorists do not seek to modify but rather to replace the normative structure of society.

So what is the EU actually having their focus on?

EU has incorporated several measures to cope with the increasingly threats of terrorism such as Maastricht Treaty under Title VI, Europol, a board consisting of JHA (Justice and Home Affairs) ministers, multiple systems to handle information exchange e.g. Schengen Information System (SIS II) and EU Visa Information System (VIS) and so on. The point here is not to elaborate indefinitely, but to illustrate that the EU has established several “*symptom methods*” concerning fighting terrorism. There are few measurements within the EU that deal specifically on the causes which I implied above. I believe the reason for this is that when a country is attacked by terrorists, the government, or in this case the EU, is forced to have mechanisms to respond. Inhabitants

expect the government to respond with force (hence in different degrees) to reprove the accountable. Both the EU and the US seem to have greater focus on how they should react to a terrorist attack, hence the suggestion in 9/11 Commission Report (2004) that what is needed is a "...broad political-military strategy that rests in a firm tripod of policies; ... protect against and prepare for terrorist attack".

However, even though the EU has been forced to respond in different areas, the dissimilarities to the US are distinct. Both have democracy and stability as their primarily goal, but the EU has according to Anders Kjølberg (2006) – a senior researcher from the Norwegian Defence Research Establishment – a greater width in how to defeat terrorism. He believes that transnational terrorism is dealt with a higher degree of cause analysis in the EU than in the US who rather emphasizes the symptoms.

Concluding remarks

As for some finalizing comments I strongly believe that the main focus in the EU is on symptoms. This is based on the external institutions that are incorporated and interlinked within member states (Europol, SIS II etc.). One of the reasons for this is the importance to have a method to react if a country has been attacked. Secondly, I believe that by having external reactions, the inhabitants are feeling the security they need, and jurisdictions that handle these specific scenarios.

References

Dover, Robert. 2007. "The EU's Foreign, Security, and Defence Policies." In *European Union Politics*, Cini, Michelle. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Howorth, Jolyon. 2005. "From Security to Defence: the Evolution of the CFSP." In *International Relations and the European Union*, Hill, Christopher and Michael Smith. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Kiras, James D. 2005. "Terrorism and globalization." In *The Globalization of World Politics*, Baylis, John and Steve Smith. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Kjølberg, Anders. 2006. "USA og Europa: Fortsatt hand i hand?" *Kortinfo fra DNAK*, 5: 1-4

Norton & co. 2004. *9/11 Commission Report*. [Online]. USA: The US Commission. Available from URL: <http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report_Ch12.htm>. [Downloaded 31.10.2007]

Ucarer, Emek M. 2007. "Justice and Home Affairs." In *European Union Politics*, Cini, Michelle. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.