

**INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND GLOBAL
TERRORISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY; A CRITICAL VIEW
ON UNSC COUNTER-TERRORISM FRAMEWORK.**

Innocent A. Ocholi

ocholi-intrel@adun.edu.ng (ocholi.innocentfs@gmail.com)
Department of International Relations
Admiralty University of Nigeria, Ibusa.

Nnamdi .S. Okonkwo, PhD

okonkwo-intrel@adun.edu.ng,okonkwonnamdis@gmail.com
Department of International Relations
Admiralty University of Nigeria, Ibusa.

ABSTRACT

At the end of the Cold War, the new European and global security environment underwent profound changes. In the new security environment, international terrorism represents one of the main threats at the global level, the others being the proliferation of chemical, atomic, and bacteriological weapons of destruction and organized crime. This study focuses on terrorism in the international community and the security arrangement that is put in place in order to curb the threat posed by terrorism. The research adopted the secondary sources of data collection and used the Rotational Choice Theory as its theoretical frame work. The research revealed that no place is safe, or no state is immune against terrorism in the 21st century and recommend among others, that nations have to join hands in the fight against modern terrorism to ensure the world is secured and for the war against terrorism to be won.

Keywords: Security, Terrorism, Global, Combat, Crime.



INTRODUCTION

Terrorism is not a new phenomenon in human experience and it is not unique to the 21st century. Its history can be traced to the 18th century during the Reign of Terror in the era of the French Revolution that overthrew the monarchy. Terrorism was also used as a weapon by the Zealots of Palestine in opposition to Roman rule, over 2000 years ago. Today, terrorist activities are found in one form or the other in almost any country of the world. According to Hoffman (2014) all terrorists share a mindset; they “live” in the future and are convinced that they will defeat their enemies and achieve their political goal.

Wellman (2012), believed that threats from terrorist organizations have increased globally over the last 30 years due to their access to advance technologies. This development has also made the Terrorist to be more destructive and elusive. With the advent of globalization which promotes global interdependence, more connected open borders and unfettered access to information technology (IT) efforts by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to maintain a secured world have become a difficult task. Global terrorism transcends national borders and by the 21st century, this phenomenon has become a shared concern among national and international security organizations. It is within this context that Hoffman (2014) noted that the globalized world today has to face and contend with persistent threats to international security from international terrorism.

Buzan (2010), noted that the dynamic nature of modern day terrorism has added a new dimension to the threats terrorists constitute to security officials. The activities of terrorist are so pervasive, that even when they are defeated and their plot foiled, the security agencies cannot go to sleep with both eyes as terrorist organizations are constantly changing and evolving new tactics, organizational structures and even tactical objectives. As such, terrorist groups and those whose duty it is to counter them are



constantly evolving strategically to stay one step ahead through the application of new technologies or operational tactics. Within this competitive context, terrorism has evolved over the years in stages with each stage emerging more dangerous and lethal than the preceding. The September 11, 2001 (9/11) terrorist attacks in the United States marked a turning point and a new reality in global terrorism. The world community in the wake of 9/11 found itself in an unprecedented international terrorism threat. The new reality was that international terrorism had changed. Before the 9/11 terrorist attack, it was convenient for many world leaders and international security organizations like the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to ignore or turn a blind eye to the unfolding global terrorism threat, as long as they were not the central focus of the attack.

In the beginning, the use of terror by radical Islamic minds of Muslim Communities globally referred to as “dawah” activities and the dogmatic radical principle of the movement which was anchored on the use of violence in “defense of Islam led to prevalence of terrorism”. This principle was viewed as theoretical until the death of nearly 3,000 civilians, the destruction of the World Trade Center building together with a part of the Pentagon building through suicidal attacks on September 11, 2001, that brought world leaders and the international community to acknowledge the imminent threat of terrorism to global security and international security organizations. Since then, members of the international Jihadist networks have not hesitated to apply the suicide attack method of modern terrorism in their local and global operations. Global terrorism became the main topic on the top agenda for many nations’ security agencies.

In the past, terrorist activities were only associated with the persistent Arab-Israeli conflict. Today the reality has changed. Terrorism has become a universally recognized crime that manifest in death and destruction. Every day the mass media is awash with



stories of either Al-Qaida bombing in Pakistan or the Taliban bombing and kidnappings in Afghanistan, ISIS ruthless killing in Iraq and Syria as well as Boko Haram and Ansaru insurgencies in the Northeast of Nigeria. As the Human Right Watch (2012) observed, terrorism today has changed, it has become more organized and more sophisticated and that only a few parts of the world have remained untouched by the current wave of terrorism in the 21st century.

As a fall-out of September 11, 2001, it is generally accepted that terrorism poses a major threat to global security and world peace. In response, the international community and their various security organizations and agencies such as United Nations Security Council (UNSC), European Union (EU), and African Union (AU) among others have all developed strategies and frameworks to deal with threats from global terrorism as well as seek to maintain peace and security in the world. Paramount among the articulated anti-terrorism strategies is the United Nations Security Council Global Counter-Terrorism Framework, within the context of International Security. The UNSC Global Counter-Terrorism Framework was developed to ensure mutual global survival and safety. The framework articulates military measures, diplomatic agreements such as treaties and conventions to deal with global terrorism. In the light of continued post 9/11 terrorist activities across the globe, inclusive of Boko Haram Terrorist activities in Nigeria, the question is how effective is the UNSC Global Counter-Terrorism Framework as an action plan to check the increasing tempo of global terrorism. It is this knowledge gap that this study seeks to fill with the examination of UNSC Global Counter-Terrorism Framework.

The objectives of this paper include;

- ❖ To analyze how these counter terrorism strategies have been able to curb or reduce the threat posed to world peace by terrorism.



- ❖ To explain how the impact of global terrorism has affected and changed the world in the current era of globalization in the 21st century.
- ❖ To proffer suggestions that would prevent global terrorism and help in maintaining international peace and security.

In line, with these objectives, the paper adopted the Ex Post Facto research design involving the use of secondary sources of data obtained from published books, scholarly journals, peer reviewed articles, newspapers, official documents, internet materials on global terrorism and the United Nations Security Council Global Counter Terrorism Framework. Since the focus of the paper is anchored on international relations perspective, data generated was analyzed via content analysis to answer the following research questions.

- ❖ What is the concept of International Security and how effective?
- ❖ What are the root cause(s) of terrorism as means to achieve political, economic or religious goals?
- ❖ How effective is the UNSC Global Counter-Terrorism Framework as a tool to curb Terrorism?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To analyze global terrorism in the 21st century, a good theoretical framework is that, which possess explanatory power needed for this study; the theoretical framework drawn up to achieve this task is the Rational Choice Theory. The theory holds that people will engage in crime after weighing the cost and benefits of their actions to arrive at a rational choice after perceiving that the chances of gain outweighs any possible loss or punishment. This theory was propagated by Cohen and Felson in 1979. The theory postulates that criminals must not only come to believe that their actions would be beneficial to themselves, their community or society but must also see that crime pays or is at least, a risk-free



way to better their situation. For criminal act to take place, the theory postulated that three conditions must be present namely:

Suitable targets or victims who put themselves at risks, the absence of capable guardians or police presence and finally a pool of unemployed and alienated offenders.

The decision to embrace terrorism according to the theory is the outcome of a rational decision making process based on a cost-benefit analysis. Cohen and Felson (1979) argued that the decision to conduct a terrorist act does not mean the perpetrators are “abnormal” or that they suffer from severe personality disorder, but rather a rational calculation of the cost and benefits of their choice of action and the perception that their “modus operandi” was the most effective method to achieve their political objectives. Thus Rational Choice Theory holds that people can be collectively rational, even when making what appear to be irrational decisions for themselves after perceiving that their participation is important and their personal contribution to the public good outweighs any concerns (Muller and Opp, 1986). The most prominent advocate in the application of Rational Choice theory in the field of terrorism is Martha Crenshaw (1998). The Rational Choice Theory from the foregoing is therefore the appropriate theoretical framework chosen for this study.

The application of the Rational Choice Theory, which is a popular theory in Criminology and Political Science, will provide scientific explanation for the motivation and causes of terrorism with its explanatory powers. For instance, when a typical terrorist event that involves hostage-taking or hostage-killing is examined. From an individualist rational point of view, the best choice would be to keep at least some of the hostage alive for bargaining purposes. Rational Choice sets in when the terrorist group make the choice to kill the entire hostage. While this killing may seem senseless or a product of deranged minds, it is a product of calculated response to circumstances confronting the terrorist. The apparent senselessness



of it all is the product of the group's collective judgment or rational choice about the most effective course of action that would have the most lasting impact on the observers as well as the group rational decision to make their ideological point that they are terrorists and not just ordinary criminals.

CONCEPT OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

While security denotes a situation which provides national and international conditions favorable to the protection of a nation, state, and its citizens against existing and potential threats, national security traditionally is understood as "the acquisition, deployment and use of military force to achieve national goals" (Held and McGrew, 1998:226). In the Contemporary political and scholarly discourse however, the concept of security cuts across many disciplines covering military protection, surveillance, protection of national values and human rights. According to Romm (1993), a nation is said to be secured when it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interest to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by war. It has also been defined as the absence of threats to acquired values and the absence of fear that such values will be attacked. Implicitly therefore, national security is the ability of a nation to preserve its internal values from external threats (Romm, 1993). In today's global community, a state cannot consider its security a function of the areas directly surrounding it alone, rather, the security of one is tightly linked to the security of all.

The concepts of security and insecurity are typical social science concepts that appear principally in the literature of social psychology, sociology, political science and allied courses. In the framework of Political Science, the concept of security according to Bar-Tal & Jacobson (1998), denotes a situation which provides national and international conditions favorable to the protection of a nation, state, and its citizens against existing and potential threats. Specifically, the situation of security assures a survival of a



state, its territorial integrity, repulsion of a military attack, defense and protection of citizens' life and property, protection of economic welfare and social stability (Haftendorn, 1991).

Security is an elusive subject for study, as some argue, it cannot be defined in any objective way and that any problem can become a security issue once it has been securitized by policy makers. Security, then, manifests itself tautologically since any problem that is labeled security is in fact a security concern. However, as Adrian Hyde-Price (2001), points out, this makes the security field entirely reactive to what policy makers deem a security threat and removes any independent analytical value. Such definitions of international security, therefore cannot help guide or inform policy, and although it may be of theoretical interest, this paper will instead focus on the more objective definitions of security that can be used for academic and policy analysis.

In his article "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" Roland Paris (2001) provides a basic but, nevertheless, useful definition: "a 'security threat' connotes some types of menace to survival." The dilemma lies in interpretation as there are three major aspects to the definition. First, there is a menace to survival, security is about threats and even threat perception. Second, security involves a referent object or unit of analysis in that the menace poses a threat to someone or something and is also posed by someone or something for instance, an attack by one state against another is a classic international security threat. Finally, discussions about security often include the means to secure the referent object from the threat, so a third area of debate is over the best response to a security threat. To use Buzan (1998), notion of "units of security" whereby states, individuals and societal groups can each be a referent object, so long as their actions regardless of whether they cause or are affected by the threat have an impact on the international system.



According to the UN Charter, the Security Council is afforded the right to interfere in any issue it deems a threat to international peace and security. When the international community decides to impose its will in order to mitigate a rising problem, it is because it views it as an international security issue, regardless of whether it originated as an internal problem. Moreover, individuals are frequently vulnerable to events and processes at the international level. This is compounded by the fact that states are often unable or unwilling to address vulnerabilities at the sub-state and individual level and therefore require assistance from the international community. The focus on the impact of a threat therefore allows for both international and unilateral responses, depending on the nature of the threat's actual or potential impact. There are times when international security will be primarily concerned with conventional military threats; however, there will also be occasions where the conditions for peace, in so far as they affect state stability, will be of primary salience.

Hyde-Price asserts, "Security involves preventing war through military preparations to deter armed aggression from within and without and, more positively, fostering conditions conducive to building a legitimate and enduring peace order." This can be demonstrated by considering two questions. First, what does it matter if immediate inter- or intra-state violence is prevented but a global environmental catastrophe fails to be averted? Conversely, what does soil erosion matter if the earth has been destroyed in a nuclear holocaust? While extreme, these two examples demonstrate that neither military nor non-military threats are unimportant and one cannot be forgotten at the expense of the other. An integrated definition should, therefore, include those challenges that could threaten the international system either through direct violence between states or by means of state instability, particularly state implosion. This recognizes that international security can be affected by non-military threats as well as state and/or non-state groups. Further, an integrated



definition acknowledges that although unilateral responses may be in order at times, many issues affecting current international security involve and indeed require an international response.

CONCEPT OF GLOBAL TERRORISM

Understanding how to define terrorism is notoriously difficult. It is one of the most contested concept and obviously complex. Governments characteristically define terrorism as something only their opponents can commit and as something only those who seek to change policies or to attack a given political system or status quo can engage in. The Department of State (1997) defines terrorism as acts carried out by “sub national groups or clandestine agents.” This definition is obviously unsatisfactory. When the military rulers of Argentina caused thousands of their suspected opponents to disappear in order to spread fear among other potential dissidents, this was state terrorism. As Israeli and U.S political scientists Neve Gordon and George Lopez (2000) respectively say, Israel’s practice of state sanctioned torture also qualifies as political terrorism. It is well known that torture is not only used to extract information or to control the victim, it is a population as a whole. Carl Wellman (1979), offers a wide definition of terrorism: terrorism he suggests “is the use or attempted use of terror as a means of coercion. But this definition is so wide that, as he admits, it includes non-violent acts that almost no one else would count as terrorism. Wellman writes: “I often engage in terrorism myself, for I often threaten to flunk any students who hands in his paper after the due date. Anyone who doubts that my acts are genuine instances of the coercive use of terror is invited to observe the panic in my classroom when I issue my ultimatum.” For Wellman, ‘coercion, actual or attempted, is the essence of terrorism.’ Coady (1985) defines terrorism as the tactic or policy of engaging in terrorist acts, and as a terrorist act ‘a political act, ordinarily committed by an organized group, which involves the intentional killing or other severe harming of noncombatants. Coady does not think the intent to spread fear



should be part of the definition of terrorism. Among the reasons for this is that, instead of spreading fear and demoralization, the terrorist acts may rise to defiance and a strengthening of resolve. Also the blowing up of a U.S marine barrack in Lebanon in October, 1983, where a truck with explosives was driven into a marine compound and exploded killing 241 persons most of them U.S marines. The U.S state department classifies this attack as terrorism with the marine as clearly the intended target.

Global terrorism is defined as act of crime or violence intended to further political and/or religious ideologies in any part of the world. Terrorism can consist of threats, violence or intimidation to coerce a government, group or society in general. Global terrorism comes in many forms including suicide bombings and attacks on foreign lands. One major example of global terrorism is the September 11, 2001 attacks where members of a terrorist group called Al Qaeda flew planes into the World Trade Center in New York City. Not all terrorism takes place on such a large scale, however, and it is more common to see suicide bombers killing civilians and other groups of people in countries around the world. In September 2014, the biggest display of terrorism took place in the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, also known as ISIL.

The group intends on overthrowing the current government through violent acts, mainly directed at their rivals the Shia which is the other dominant religion of the region. Terrorists groups like this often recruit members, especially from countries in which they intend to attack to gain access or inside information. When terrorism takes place, it affects not just the country in which the violence or threats is taking place, but involves many other countries. Stricter security measures and global cooperation is often required to try and prevent the terrorist groups from succeeding in their cause.



CAUSES OF TERRORISM;

Lack of democracy, denial of civil liberties and the disregard for rule of law are preconditions for many forms of domestic terrorism, (Crenshaw 1990). The relationship between government coercion and political violence is essentially shaped like an Inverted-U; the most democratic and the most totalitarian societies have the lowest levels of oppositional violence. Moderate levels of coercive violence from the government tend to fuel the fire of dissent, while dissident activities can be brought down by government's willingness to resort to extreme forces of coercive brutality. According to Gupter (1990), such draconian force is beyond the limits of what democratic nations are willing to use: and rightfully so.

According to Jamieson (1989), failed or weak states lack the capacity or will to exercise territorial control and maintain a monopoly of violence. This leaves a power vacuum that terrorist organizations may exploit to maintain safe havens, training facilities and bases for launching terrorist operations. On the other hand, terrorists may also find safe havens and carry out support functions in strong and stable democracies due to the greater liberties that residents enjoy there.

For Engene (1998), rapid modernization in the form of high economic growth has also been found to correlate strongly with the emergence of ideological terrorism, but not with ethno-nationalist terrorism. This may be particularly important in countries where sudden wealth (e.g. from oil) has precipitated a change from tribal to high-tech societies in one generation or less. When traditional norms and social patterns crumble or are made to seem irrelevant, new radical ideologies (sometimes based on religion and/or nostalgia for a glorious past) may become attractive to certain segments of society. Modern society also facilitates terrorism by providing access to rapid transportation and communication, news media, weapons, etc.



In addition to these, Schmid and Jongman (1998) inform that illegitimate or corrupt governments frequently give rise to opposition that may turn to terrorist means if other avenues are not seen as realistic options for replacing these regimes with more credible and legitimate government, or at least regime which represents the values and interests of the opposition movement.

Thus Mohammed and Al-Abdullah (2002), opine that powerful external actors upholding illegitimate governments may be seen as an insurmountable obstacle to needed regime change. Such external support to illegitimate governments is frequently seen as foreign domination through puppet regimes serving the political and economic interests of foreign sponsors.

UNITED NATION SECURITY COUNCIL GLOBAL COUNTER TERRORISM FRAMEWORK

The UN Security Council has, in this context, developed cooperation with the regional organizations, while seeking to strengthen and improve the framework of this cooperation. A variety of arrangements have, therefore, been implemented, sometimes in the form of support lent by a regional organization to the UN (a good example is the United Nations operation Artemis in Democratic Republic of Congo), but most often in the form of UN support for regional organizations: co-deployment, successive rotations and deployments, operational or budgetary support (AMISOM), exclusive management by the regional organization within the framework of a UN mandate (NATO International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan). These experiences have posed new challenges for the Security Council with respect to partnership arrangements, as in the case of the AU/UN hybrid operation in Darfur (UNAMID).

The involvement of regional organizations in peacekeeping can lead to political difficulties: lack of resources available to the regional organization (troops, equipment, military expertise,



budget), pressure to provide predictable and sustainable funding, lack of oversight by the Security Council with respect to the operations that it has authorized, strategic differences between the regional organization and the Security Council, etc. However, the role of regional organizations in peacekeeping and international security is destined to continue growing with a view to promoting subsidiary as well as the accountability of regional actors. France contributes to this through the organizations to which it belongs, as well as through its support for implementing regional security architecture, as for example in Africa in support of the African Union's efforts.

PREVENTION OF TERRORISM VIA THE UNSC GLOBAL COUNTER TERRORISM FRAMEWORK.

Below are the eight categories from a Toolbox of Measures to Prevent and Suppress Terrorism, which was developed by the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in Vienna.

Politics and Governance (e.g. negotiations, amnesty), Economic and Social (e.g. asset freezing, grievance removal), Psychological-Communicational-Educational (e.g. use of 'wanted' posters), Military (e.g. rescue operations), Judicial and Legal (e.g. use of crown witnesses, witness protection), Police and Prison System (e.g. stationing liaison officers abroad), Intelligence and Secret Service (e.g. 'Rasterfahndung', infiltration), others (e.g. immigration measures, victim support). The UN high commissioner for human rights Mello (2002), states that there are four pillars on which successful preventive national anti – terrorist measures should be built , they include ; Good governance , Democracy, Rule of law and Social justice . Why these four? The reasons are simple, Mello further explains,

- ❖ When governance is bad, resistance against corrupt rule gains followers and support.



- ❖ When unpopular rulers cannot be voted away in democratic procedures, advocates of political violence find a wide audience.
- ❖ When rulers stand above the law and use the law as a political instrument against their opponents, the law loses its credibility.
- ❖ When long-standing injustices in society are not resolved but allowed to continue for years, without any light in sight at the end of the tunnel, we should not be amazed that desperate people, and some others championing their cause, are willing to die and to kill for what they perceive to be a just cause.

These four principles are the foundation on which one should build policies aimed at the prevention and suppression of domestic terrorism

Economic and social measures: Let us look at the second category where prevention and countermeasures might be of use: economic and social measures. Again, these are broad and somewhat diverse categories. Much attention is currently being paid to the suppression of the financing of terrorism. This is an important way of starving terrorists and their supporters of their funding. Countries with a ‘youth bulge’ a relatively open system of higher education and high unemployment rate among university graduates would seem to be at a higher risk of seeing young men attracted to political violence, including terrorism. Poverty might also indirectly contribute to terrorism in that, some relatively well-to-do young men and women strongly identifying with the fate of the poor begin to act as self-appointed champions of their cause, without being part of their class or ethnic group and often without asking them whether it is in their best interest. They then, recruit young people on the margins of society from impoverished shanty towns, some of them petty criminals and indoctrinate them and use them for their purposes.



Psychological-Communicational-Educational measures:

Terrorism is more than violence. The direct targets of violence are not the primary targets, they serve mainly as message generators to impress, coerce or terrorize one or several audience, sometimes simultaneously. A recent unpublished study of five terrorist groups found that terrorist propaganda is the key to escalation as it leads to recruitment both of members and supporters and helps in raising funds. Israel's counter-terrorism strategy, for instance, includes efforts to strengthen the psychological resilience of its own civilian population through a campaign of education in schools (Tucker 2003).

Military measures: For many people, a war on terrorism model appears to be the preferred model. The war model is, in some quarters, more popular than a lower-key law enforcement model. However, when the terrorists are elusive, avoid confrontation and prefer the asymmetrical strategy of attacking civilians, the role the military can play against a clan destine organization controlling no specific territory might be limited. At times the use of the armed forces might even be counter-productive, especially when terrorists try to militarize a conflict situation in the hope that overreaction of the security forces would drive the population in their arms as the government is perceived as making little or no distinction between supporters of the terrorists and the population at large. The terrorists risk, however, that the military response might crush the terrorist organization without mobilizing popular support. Such has been the case in Argentina between 1976 and 1983.

Judicial and legal measures: If one view's act of terrorism not primarily as act of warfare but as violations of the public order and act of serious crime, a judicial response in the framework of a criminal justice model is called for. Terrorists challenge the monopoly of violence which the state claims. By levying 'revolutionary taxes', they also challenge the state's prerogative of taxation. Faced with a domestic terrorist challenge, the state,



certainly the liberal-democratic state, ought to react within the limits of the rule of law while adhering to basic human rights and humanitarian law standards.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After the September 11, 2001 attack a new reality emerged with the United Nations Security Council developing a Global Counter Terrorism Framework which contained coordinated measures and actions to be taken to prevent global terror. This framework and strategy have greatly reduced the incidence of global terrorism. It is within this framework that, Osama Bin Laden, the master – mind of the September 11, 2001 suicide attacks in the US was eliminated with the cooperation of the intelligence network of Pakistan. The United Nations Security Council Global Terrorism Framework provides a benchmark and template for preventing and fighting global terror.

In counter-terrorism efforts, it is crucial to uphold democratic principles, maintain moral and ethical standards while fighting terrorism. Increased repression and coercion are likely to feed terrorism rather than reduce it. Extremist ideologies that promote hatred and terrorism should be confronted on ideological grounds by investing more effort into challenging them politically and not only by the use of coercive force. The time is ripe to strengthen the international legal and institutional architecture, also at the regional level, including guarantees that basic human rights are not bluntly violated again in the name of democracy. It is time to reinvent solutions for balancing out the rights of responsible sovereign states with human rights even beyond state borders. It is time for negotiation and compromise through vigorous diplomatic action grounded in international values and principles.



REFERENCES

- Barry, B. (1998) international peace and security in the 21st century, in state craft and security; the cold war and beyond; Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- BarTal, A., & Jacobson (1998) Psychological perspective on security, applied psychology 471(1).
- Buzan, B. (1991), new patterns of global security in the twenty first century, international affairs: royal institute of international affairs, 4.
- Cameron, W. and Connick, J. (1954), Concepts of security and insecurity, American journal of sociology, 59 (6).
- Carl, W. (1979) On terrorism itself .Journal of value inquiry 13, (4)
- Coady, A. (1985) The morality of terrorism. Philosophy 60 (January): 47-69.
- Cohen, L. and Marcus, F. (1979), Social change and crime rate trends: a routine activity approach. American sociology review, 44: 588-605.
- Crenshaw M. (1990) the logic of terrorism: terrorist behaviours as a product of strategic choice, in Reich W. (Ed) Origins of terrorism: psychologies, theologies, ideologies, states of mind; Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Ellen, B, Salemink, .O and Erksen,.H.(2010),A world of insecurity: Anthropological perspectives on human security; London; Blackwell.
- Ganor, B. (2005) terrorism as a strategy of psychological warfare in: Daniel y. (Eds) The trauma of terrorism; New York: Haworth press.
- Ganor, B. (2009) terrorism in the 21st century; New York: Haworth press
- Gordon, N. and George, A. (2000), terrorism, in the Arab–Israeli conflict “ethics in international affairs, ed.AndrewValls.
- Hoffman, B. (1988) inside terrorism; New York: Columbia university press.



- Human right watch (2012), spiraling violence: Boko Haram attacks and security force abuses in Nigeria. United States of America: human rights watch October.
- Hyde-price, A. (2001) security studies in the 21st century in Europe's new security challenges; New York: Colombia university press.
- Jenny, T. (1986) Pacifism and the just war: a study in applied philosophy; New York: Blackwell.
- Kolodziej, E. (2005) security and international relations; Cambridge: Cambridge university pres.
- Lanham, R.and Littlefield, H. (1991) The security puzzle: theory building and discipline in international security, international studies quarterly 35(1).
- Laqueur, W. (1999) The new terrorism: fanaticism and the arms of mass destruction; New York; Oxford university press.
- Lesser, B. (1999), Countering the new terrorism, retrieved from www.rand.org/publications.
- Lippmann, W. (1944) US foreign policy; London: Harnish Hamilton press
- Martha, C. (1998) The logic of terrorism: terrorist behaviour as a product of strategic choice, in Walter, R. (Ed) origins of terrorism; New York: Woodrow Wilson center press.
- Muller, E. and Karldieterop, P.(1986) "rational choice and rebellious collective action."American political science review. 80.
- Nigerian Crime News, May 31, 2011; USCIRF, March 20, 2012.
- Paris, R.(2004) Still an inscrutable concept"securitydialogue35: 370-372.
- Richard, C. (1994) Terrorism in an unstable world; Cambridge: routledge publication.
- Romm, JJ (1993) Defining national security: the non-military aspect; New York: council of foreign relations press.
- Stern, J. (2004) Getting and using the weapons, in: Howard R,(Ed) Terrorism and counter-terrorism—understanding the new security environment; New York: MC



- Tucker B. (2003), strategies for countering terrorism: lessons learnt from the Israeli experience.
- U.S department of state (1997), patterns of global terrorism; Washington D.C.: Department of state publications.
- Virgina, H. (2008) How terrorism is wrong; New York: Oxford University press.
- Yoram, D. (2014), non-state actors and terrorism in international law; Jerusalem: Center for public affairs.

