Chapter Ten

Governance, Terrorism and Development in the 21st Century

Monday E. Dickson
Otoabasi E. Akpan

Introduction

Throughout history, power has more often than not been wielded through terror by inciting fear. Unarguably, all despotic societies have been founded on fear, as have so-called totalitarian regimes in the modern era. Hence, submission to the established order and to force has been most of humankind's sole avenue to security and, ultimately, to freedom (Chaliand & Blin, 2007, p. vii; Arnhart, 2016, p. 179). However, without reaching back to pre-history – itself ruled by terrifying insecurity, wild beasts, and other men, the use of terror to govern began at the very birth of organized society as a means of dissuasion or punishment (Hobbes, 1998; Chaliand & Blin, 2007). Therefore, what is now known as "terrorism" is nothing new. It has existed ever since human societies began to regulate the use of violence. In other words, terrorism predates by millennia the modern term used to describe it (Burgess, 2015).

Since the modern age, four waves of terrorism have washed over the international system, each with its special character, purposes and tactics. The first wave which began at the end of the nineteenth century was characterized by anarchism as a motive and assassination as a method. However, the Anarchist wave died away with the onset of World War I (WWI). The second wave known as "the anti-colonial wave" was primarily a reaction to decolonization after the World Wars and involved groups fighting for national self-determination (Whelan, 1992). The third wave, "the new left wave" emerged in the mid-1960s in response to the Vietnam War and was powered by the revolution in communications technology (Kaplan, 2018). This particular era was more transnational as airline hijacking was the most popular method used. The fourth wave code named "the religious wave," which started with the Iranian revolution in 1979 and grew significantly in the post–Cold War era involves religion more directly as a motive (Creshaw, 2001; Kaarbo & Ray, 2011).

According to Honig and Yahel (2019), the emergence of terrorist semi-states (TSS) in the 21st-century Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region and Pakistan means that the international system is already witnessing the beginning of a new (fifth) wave. TSS is a rebel group that has control over portions of a weak

state's territory, maintains governance there; launches terrorist attacks against third-party states; and gradually has a global wave or significant driving force. Before September 11, 2001 (9/11), the terms 'terrorist,' 'terrorism,' and 'terrorist activity' were reserved for other countries and Third World locations. Consequently, terrorism moved dramatically to centre stage after the 9/11 attacks, which followed an undoubted watershed in world affairs - the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the demise of the Soviet Union. Thus, 9/11 profoundly changed the course of history of the world and also brought terrorism to the forefront of both national and international consciousness.

Currently, the interconnections between governance, terrorism, and development have become increasingly salient, shaping both national and international policies. These three elements present a complex landscape where the failures of governance can facilitate the rise of extremist movements, while effective governance can act as a buffer against such threats.

Nature and Problem of Definition

Terrorism, of course, has a long history and takes many forms, natures and various conceptualizations. Though Edmund Burke coined the term in the 18th century to describe "*Robespierre's* reign of terror" during the French Revolution, acts of terrorism have been documented as early as 66 C.E. between the Zealots and the Romans (Robertson, 2007). Therefore, throughout history, particularly beginning with attempts in the 1920s and 30s, countless efforts have been made to formulate a generally acceptable definition of terrorism. Thereupon, several definitions have been proposed in the academic literature, national legislation and by regional and international organizations.

Yet, there is no single definition of terrorism that commands full international approval or acceptability. Despite these controversies, several definitions which underscore or approximate a clear understanding of terrorist acts have been put forward by states, international organizations, scholars and writers. For instance, terrorism is defined as "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience" (Pillar (2001, p.13). This definition which the US government uses in keeping statistics on international terrorism has four major elements. The first, ***premeditation***, means there must be an intent and prior decision to commit an act that would qualify as terrorism.

The second element, ***political motivation***, excludes criminal violence motivated by monetary gain or personal vengeance. Here, the concerns of terrorists are macro-concerns - about changing the political order. The third element, ***targets***, usually ***non-combatants***, means that terrorists attack people who cannot defend

themselves with violence in return. These are not just civilians but include military personnel who at the time of an incident are unarmed or off duty. The fourth element is ***secretiveness***, where perpetrators belong to clandestine groups or are secretly sponsored by states (Pillar, 2001; Mingst, 2014).

Another definition found in the *US Code of Federal Regulations* and endorsed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation defines terrorism as"the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, a civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives." The US Defense Department says that "terrorism is the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or intimidate governments or societies as to the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious or ideological." Broadly, terrorism is defined as the use of violence against non-combatants, civilians or other persons normally considered to be illegitimate targets of military action to attract attention to a political cause, forcing those aloof from the struggle to join it, or intimidating opponents into concessions.

From the standpoint of D'Anieri (2012, p. 215), "Terrorism is the use of violence, or the threat of it, by non-governmental actors to change government policies by creating fear of further violence." This definition, though very brief stresses three key points. **First**, terrorism is a method, not a goal. Although some may perceive terrorism as senseless violence, most experts agree that terrorism is almost always a means to achieve particular goals. Laqueur (2001, p. 71) argues that terrorism "is not an ideology or a political doctrine, but rather a method, the sub-state application of violence or the threat of violence to sow panic and bring about political change". Robertson (2007, p. v) contends that "terrorism is a method to gain social, economic and political concessions and to provoke change, often through the appearance of government over-reaction or under-reaction to violence against civilians." Therefore, as a tactic or method, terrorism works quite similarly to any kind of coercive diplomacy or deterrence. The goal is to raise the costs of certain policies so that states will choose other policies.

Second, violence committed by a government is generally not labelled terrorism. By this portrayal, a government that bombs another country's population, even with Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), may not be seen as a terrorist, regardless of the magnitude of destruction. **Third**, the target of terrorism is usually not the immediate victims (those killed or maimed), or even their close relatives, but rather the broader society and the government (D'Anieri, 2012).

An internationally acceptable definition of terrorism unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council while acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, through Resolution 1566 is as follows:

> …criminal acts, including those against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public …intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act, which constitutes offences within the scope of and as defined in the international protocols relating to terrorism, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature (UNSCR, 1566).

It has been argued that the above explanation is non-exhaustive and its terms remain subject to the definition and scope in the provisions of existing counter-terrorism conventions (Becker, 2006). Moreover, the principal purpose of terrorism is not the actual destruction produced but its dramatic and psychological effects on the population and governments. In practice, the emphasis on government buttresses the assertion that "terrorism involves the systematic use of violence - often suicidal violence for political ends; or acts intended to produce fear that will change attitudes and behaviour toward government and their policies" (Hoffman, 1998).

Importantly, the various conceptual lenses through which terrorism can be looked at include:

- An act of terrorist violence can be criminal and political at the same time, making it a political crime or a criminal offence with political repercussions;

- An act of terrorism can be committed in the context of warfare and constitute a grave breach of the laws of war – a war crime;

- An act of terrorism can primarily be a propagandistic communication stunt to impress one audience or to reach other audiences which otherwise might not 'listen' to less violent protests; and

- An act of terrorist violence can also be interpreted as a sacrifice with religious connotations, whereby the terrorist offers innocent lives for the sacred cause or views himself as a martyr.

As trends in the use of terrorism change, one type of interpretation can become more appropriate than another.

Demystification of Theoretical Problem

Terrorism in the contemporary global context challenges many theoretical perspectives for understanding international politics and the dilemma of global security architecture. As a result, there is a wide variety of theoretical approaches to explaining the scourge of terrorism. Realism, also known as *realpolitik* or power theory is relevant.

There are many strands of realism. The core realists such as E. H. Carr (1964); Hans J. Morgenthau (1986); Kenneth N. Waltz (1979); and John J. Mearsheimer (2001), among others, agree on the following fundamental assumptions about the nature of international politics. The first assumption is that international politics are state-centric, because politics are about relations between organized social groups, and states are the primary organized social groups in the modern world. Here, a terrorist act is relevant when it is state-sponsored. The second is that international politics take place under the condition of anarchy. The third assumption asserts that the international political system is a self-help system, in which states can only rely on their own devices to guarantee their security and to make sure other states honour existing agreements. The fourth posits that, international politics involve an ongoing struggle among states for power and security.

Gilpin (1981, p. 7), however, validates the above assumptions when he said: "The fundamental nature of international politics has not changed over the millennia and international politics continue to be a recurring struggle for wealth and power among independent actors in a state of anarchy". Therefore, "terrorism is the violent consequence of a world divided into nearly two hundred nation-states. It represents the inevitable outcome of compulsive territorialization of human communities" (Khan, 2006, p. 1). Although terrorist groups are predominantly non-state actors, their activities are recognizable as a kind of political behaviour frequent in international politics. Thus, terrorism is ineluctably about power - the pursuit of power, the acquisition of power, and the use of power to achieve political change.

Besides, the frustration-aggression theory is prominent in the literature on political violence and terrorism. The theory was proposed by Ted Robert Gurr and popularized by J. C. Davies (1973) to include a gap between rising expectations and need satisfaction based mostly on deprivation. Gurr (1970) explores why people engage in political violence (riots, rebellion, coups, etc.) and how regimes respond. He argues that the primary source of the human capacity for violence is the frustration-aggression mechanism. According to him, frustration does not necessarily lead to violence, but when it is sufficiently prolonged and sharply felt by the relatively deprived masses, it often does result in anger and eventually violence.

Hence, "relative deprivation," would lead to frustration which in turn gives birth to violence. Put differently, just as frustration produces aggressive behaviour on the part of an individual, so too does relative deprivation predict collective violence by social groups. Therefore, the potential for collective violence varies strongly with the intensity and scope of relative deprivation among members of a collectivity.

Types of Typologies of Terrorism

The patterns and the task of categorizing terrorism are constantly in motion. As a result, For instance, while scholars such as Kegley (2007); Goldstein and Pevehouse (2008); Russett, Starr and Kinsella (2010); and Kaarbo and Ray (2011), among others, had earlier identified two major types - international and state-sponsored terrorism, recent classification by Martin (2017) have added six types namely, the new terrorism, dissident terrorism, and religious terrorism. Others are ideological terrorism, criminal dissident terrorism and gender-selective terrorism. Let us examine them *seriatim:*

International terrorism

International terrorism is terrorist acts of violence that involve the citizens or territory of more than one country" (Viotti & Kauppi, 2001). It covers the categories of terrorist outfits outside the country of their origin or where they are active. It comprised "those terrorist acts that have clear international consequences. Kaarbo and Ray (2011) reveal that contemporary features of international terrorism include a strong connection to religion, a worldwide presence that uses globalization in a sophisticated way and an increase in the number of deaths of targeted civilians. Therefore, terrorism in the contemporary era is global, in the sense that with the death of distance orchestrated by globalization, border no longer serves as barriers to terrorist activities.

International terrorism in the past few decades was largely connected to Israel's invasion of Lebanon and US support for Israel and its involvement in the Lebanese Civil War. One of the most dreaded terrorist organizations then was Hezbollah, whose guerrilla arms inaugurated the tactic of massive truck or vehicle bombs. The American Embassy in Lebanon was bombed twice once in April 1983 with a loss of lives and in the year, the American Embassy in Kuwait was bombed (Crenshaw, 2001; 2006). These events, among others, led to the immediate withdrawal of American forces from Lebanon, which Hezbollah proudly regarded as a victory. Besides, the twin bombings of the American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 as well as the 9/11 attacks on the US attributed to Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda organization are clear examples of international terrorism.

Therefore, most prominent international terrorist groups such as the Taliban, Al-Qaeda, Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Khorasan Chapter of the

Islamic State and the recent Boko Haram, etc operate without commitment to any particular territory (and without well-defined territorial aspiration), and skilled in the use of transnational communications and financial networks as a means of coordinating and supporting the activities of dispersed operatives.

State-sponsored terrorism

State terrorism or state-sponsored terrorism has to do with international terrorist activity conducted by state officials or more often, the support of terrorist groups through the provision of arms, training, haven, or financial backing to fight against another government. The purpose is to weaken the control of the opposing government by hurting and embarrassing it. In this case, states are employing and using the actions of sponsored terrorist groups in surrogate warfare (Russett, Starr & Kinsella, 2010). As Martin (2016, p. 31) argues, "This type of terrorism is sponsored by the state and directed externally against adversaries in the international domain." For instance, during the height of the Cold War, Western states engaged directly in, and sponsored, many acts of terrorism in pro-insurgency and counter-insurgency campaigns in Latin America, Vietnam, Malaya and elsewhere. Stateterrorism can take other forms – such as institutionalized violence exercised against Palestinian civilians throughout Israel's 37-year occupation of the West Bank and Gasa Strip.

An alternative characterization of state terrorism implies "the use of terrorist groups or groups by states, usually under the control of the state's intelligence agency to achieve political aims" (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008, p. 201). This type of terrorism is usually committed by governments internally against domestic enemies. It involves states resorting to violence which they use as a weapon of internal repression and social control, and states providing funding, weapons, logistics, training and bases to terrorist groups (Carter, 2012).

The new terrorism

The 'new' or 'modern' terrorism arose during the end of the 20th century. It is the emergence of terrorist coalitions that do not answer fully to any government, that operate across national borders and have access to advanced technology. Consequently, new technologies of terror and their increasing availability, along with the increasing mobility of terrorists, raised chilling prospects of vulnerability to chemical, biological and other kinds of attacks, that will make the entire world possible victim inevitable (Clinton, 1998). This implies that new terrorism is reputedly distinguished from the old by a new structure, a new kind of personnel, and a new attitude toward violence. The new structure is a network, facilitated by information technology; the new personnel are amateurs, who often come together

in *ad hoc* or transitory groupings, and the new attitude is an increased willingness to cause mass casualties, perhaps by using chemical, biological, nuclear or radiological weapons (Tucker, 2010).

New terrorism is characterized by religious motivation, networked organizational structures, the tendency to launch mass casualty attacks and the possible use of weapons of mass destruction. For Martin (2016), 'new terrorism' is characterized by the threat of mass casualty attacks from dissident terrorist organizations, new and creative organizational configurations, transnational religious solidarity, and redefined moral justifications for political violence. Khan (2006) believes that modern or new terrorism involves the heartless killing of children throwing stones at tanks, deaths of pregnant women at security roadblocks, suicide bombings carried out in buses and discotheques, the terrorizing of luminous cities at night with bombing sorties, and the incineration of worshippers at mosques. These and other factors have made new terrorism more dangerous or at least more difficult to counter than its predecessors and every other form of terrorism.

Dissident terrorism

These are terrorist acts committed by non-state movements and groups, and so-called lone-wolf extremists against governments, ethno-national groups, religious groups, and other perceived enemies (Martin, 2016). In most cases, dissident terrorism is not always directed against a government or national symbols but against entire population groups - people who are perceived to be enemies. Therefore, it is usually characterized by extreme repression and violence on a massive scale. Interestingly, dissident terrorism is a distinct typology, among other typologies of terrorism, that encompasses sub-national political violence. State repression and exploitation are frequently cited as grievances to explain why non-state actors resort to political violence. An example illustrating this grievance-related concept is the rebellion in Mexico which started on January 1, 1994, waged by a dissident group who called themselves the Zapatista National Liberation Front.

Religious terrorism

Religious terrorism means “terrorism motivated by an absolute belief that another worldly power has sanctioned and commanded - the application of terrorist violence for the greater glory of the faith ...and is usually conducted in defence of what believers consider to be the one true faith” (Cliteur, 2017, p. 1). This can be communal, genocidal, nihilistic, or revolutionary ...and can be committed by lone wolves, clandestine cells, large dissident movements, or governments (Martin, 2006; 2008; 2011). This type of terrorism produces radically different value systems, mechanisms of legitimation and justification, concepts of morality and, world view; [consequently, religious terrorism] “represents a very different and

possibly far more lethal threat than that posed by more familiar, traditional terrorist adversaries" (Hoffman, 2009). About two decades after 9/11, bombs are still exploding and innocent people are being killed by terrorist groups in Africa, and Western and Islamic societies. Most of these sinisterly threatening events are motivated by religious claims. Hence, religious terrorism though not new has become one of the predominant models for political violence in the modern world (Masaeli & Sneller, 2017).

The nature of religious terrorism rests on many arguments of which three are very relevant to this chapter. The first argument is that religious terrorists have anti-modern goals of returning society to an idealised version of the past and are, therefore, necessarily anti-democratic and anti-progressive. The second argument is that religious terrorists employ different kinds of violence than the previous or old terrorists. For religious terrorists, violence is ... a sacramental act or divine duty executed in direct response to some theological demand as opposed to a tactical means to a political end (Agboboa, 2013). The third argument is that religious terrorists can evoke total commitment and fanaticism from their members, and are characterised by the suspension of doubt - in contrast to the supposedly more measured attitudes of secular groups.

Ideological terrorism

Since the dawn of the 21st century and after the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US, terrorism is now being explained by the 'evil mindset' of the perpetrators. As put by Kudnani (2012) and Jansson (2020), "terrorism became an 'evil ideology' ...and radicalisation discourse eventually focuses on individual, the ideology and the group the individual associates with, rather than the "root causes" of terrorism. past. Ideology has been defined as "a set of ideas, doctrines and beliefs that characterizes the thinking of an individual or group and may transform into political and social plans, actions or systems" (Stepanova, 2008, p. 28). Therefore, ideological terrorism refers to ....terrorism motivated by political systems of belief, that champion the self-perceived inherent rights of a particular group or interest in opposition to another group or interest (Martin, 2017). It has been established that ideological violence is terrorism. Among the instances of ideological violence is terrorism committed by Right-wing extremists who have killed as many people in the United States as Muslim extremists in recent years.

Criminal dissident terrorism

Terrorism in general is considered a wide range of criminal acts with a focus on the use of violence. As a result, terrorists engage in violent criminal behaviour to meet political ends by putting pressure on decision-makers and society. Conversely, criminals at times resort to political violence in disguise of terrorist groups or groups

to intimidate government officials. By focusing on political leaders and general community members, terrorists or criminals spread fear throughout society to increase attention to their political cause. This type of terrorism is solely profit-driven and can be some combination of profit and politics. For instance, traditional organized criminals accrue profits to fund their criminal activity and for personal interests, while criminal-political enterprises acquire profits to sustain their movement (Martin, 2016). As put by Viotti & Kauppi (2013, p. 362) "Terrorists tend to be more motivated by political objectives than criminals who pursue essentially economic goals." Therefore, far from wanting to overthrow the capitalist system, criminal terrorists embrace the market system and exploit it to their advantage. Terrorist organizations operating in such countries as Afghanistan, Colombia, Peru, and Lebanon, which are the source of much of the world's illicit drugs, may become involved in the drug trade.

Gender-selective terrorism

Gender-selective terrorism or what Martin (2006, p. 209) calls "gender-selective violence" refers to "systematic terrorism or violence directed against men and women that specifically target them because of their gender." It may be directed against men because of the perceived threat posed by males as potential soldiers or sources of opposition. It is directed against women to destroy an enemy group's cultural identity or terrorize the group into submission. This type of terrorism can occur in a variety of environments, usually as the result of political conflict (including genocide), or an enemy male population within traditional cultures and belief systems. This can occur when dissident movements such as enthronement *militias* specifically target women of an enemy group as a method to terrorize them or destroy the group's identity. The government may also violently repress identifiably unacceptable behaviours among women. Some examples of gender-selective terrorism against men include the killing of thousands of military-age Kurdish males by the Iraqi army during the Anfal Campaign in 1988 (Human Rights Watch, 1993). The killing of more than 7,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys by Bosnian Serb security forces in Bosnia Herzegovina in July 1995 (Stites, *et al.*, 2005).

Conceptualising Governance

Governance refers to the structures, processes, and mechanisms through which power and authority are exercised in society. It encompasses how decisions are made, how policies are implemented, and how various actors (such as governments, civil society, international organizations, and private sector entities) interact and cooperate. The complexity of governance has increased significantly in the 21st century, particularly in the context of the challenges posed by terrorism and its

Similarly, France has experienced significant govern
about its integration policies and responses to social un
the Charlie Hebdo attacks in 2015 highlighted
government's historical neglect of suburban area
immigrants reside, has fostered a sense of excl
Moreover, systemic failures in social policy, includi
employment opportunities for youth in these area
radicalization of individuals who feel disconnected fr
of effective communication and engagement between
these communities has further exacerbated grievance
solace in extremist ideologies (Délanoë, 2020). Th
(*laïcité*) policy has been perceived as antagonistic to
fueling resentment and alienation. This combination o
perceived governmental hostility acts as a breeding gro

In Belgium, governance failures, particularl
structure, have created significant challenges in
radicalization and terrorism. The Brussels attacks
consequences of inadequate governance and the lack o
policies. Dens and de Bie (2018) reveal that Belgium's
has hindered effective collaboration between fe
authorities, leading to gaps in intelligence-sharing a
Furthermore, the neglect of marginalized communities
Antwerp, has fostered a breeding ground for radic
failure to effectively tackle socioeconomic disparitie
feeling disenfranchised and vulnerable to extremist infl

Africa has been vulnerable to terrorism as terro
part of the history of the turbulent and underdevelo
bolstered the above avouchment. The first was the 1
Embassy in Khartoum, Sudan that led to the murde
Sudan, Cleo A. Noel, and his deputy, George Moore, t
and two Saudi diplomats as well as US citizens (Korn,
in Sudan in the 1990s where Osama bin Laden operate
Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak was organized. T
foray against Washington which took place in Somali
The fourth was the murderous and near-simultaneous
Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tan
which 224 people were killed and more than 5,000 othe

Although there have been a myriad of terrorist at
more decades ago, recent statistics show that Africa

intersection with development. From the traditional state-centred point of view, governance has been viewed as the formal exercise of political power by states or governments. Here, governance involves the legal, institutional, and bureaucratic processes through which governments enact laws, policies, and regulations, and ensure the implementation and enforcement of these measures (Kooiman, 2003). The state remains the principal actor, and governance is largely synonymous with government. Therefore,

In the globalized world, governance has become more complex and involves multiple actors and levels, where decision-making authority is shared among different levels of government (local, state, national, international) and non-state actors such as international organizations, NGOs, and private corporations (Bache & Flinders, 2004). In the 21st century, governance has been increasingly intertwined with issues of terrorism and development. The evolving nature of global security challenges, particularly the rise of transnational terrorism, has brought new complexities to the governance-development nexus. Terrorism, as a global security threat, challenges the capacity of states to govern effectively and impacts the broader development agenda.

The Nexus of Governance, Terrorism and Development

The interplay between governance, terrorism, and development has emerged as a critical area of study in recent years. This nexus is complex, as each element influences and is influenced by the others, shaping the landscape of global security and socio-economic progress. Studies have shown that weak governance failures have contributed significantly to the emergence of terrorism, particularly in Western nations where political, social, and economic conditions create environments conducive to extremist ideologies.

In the United Kingdom, governance failures have manifested through a lack of effective integration policies for immigrant communities. The rise of homegrown terrorism, particularly after events such as the 7/7 bombings in 2005, has been linked to the alienation and marginalization of Muslim communities in cities like London and Birmingham. According to a report by the Home Office (2017), the failure to address social inequalities and provide adequate support systems has led to feelings of disenfranchisement among young Muslims, making them susceptible to radicalization. Tilly (2019) highlights how the lack of political representation and engagement in local governance contributes to a sense of injustice and grievance among marginalized groups. This disconnect has pushed individuals toward extremist narratives that promise a sense of identity and purpose. The UK's counter-terrorism strategy has faced criticism for disproportionately targeting Muslim communities, exacerbating feelings of alienation rather than fostering inclusion (Spalek, 2017).

terrorist attacks resulting in a total of 944 deaths. While 91 out of the 153 terrorist attacks were launched against Civilian targets, 51 targeted Military/Security Forces. Six attacks targeted International Organisations and five attacks targeted Government Institutions/Officials. The attacks by Boko Haram and JNIM were mainly against Military/Security Forces, whilst Al-Shabaab, Mai-Mai and other unknown groups mostly targeted civilians (ACSRT/CAERT, 2020).

Consequently, these bombings and other attacks clarified more than ever that terrorism is a global phenomenon and evidence has emerged of terrorist networks involved in some African nations and the African continent have experienced high levels of terrorism. Thus, Africa has since been described as the world's 'soft' underbelly for global terrorism (Susan Rice cited in Solomon, 2015, p. 7). This is evident in the plethora of vulnerabilities it confronts including physical, legal and financial safe havens and an ample supply of arms and ammunition. Accordingly, Africa's physical haven or ungoverned spaces refer to places such as the *Sambisa* forest in Nigeria, exploited by terrorists who use the space to train, mobilise and operate and where the relevant national government is either unwilling or unable to exercise control (Sage, 2005). According to Lyman (2009), the source of terrorist activities in Nigeria has been traced to tensions between the Muslim and Christian populations, which often lead to violence.

Impact of Terrorism on Contemporary World Order

Since the emergence of the present world order, the consequences of terrorism have been felt in virtually every facet of life as well as every corner of the globe. Glaringly, terrorism has changed most events and is the focus of most discussions in the contemporary international system. As Shashi Shukla aptly observes:

> Terrorism ...has acquired new dimensions given technological and societal changes. The nature, targets and rhetoric of international terrorism have changed dramatically since the end of the Cold War and the emergence of globalisation. Terrorism is no longer a domestic phenomenon but global in scope and reach. The harm caused by international terrorist movements has been described as 'transnational harm' that poses a serious challenge to national and international security. It has affected international relations in two significant ways. One, it has eradicated the distinction between state and individual; and two, it has also ended the distinction between external and internal security (Shukla, 2006, p. 165).

Therefore, though an old phenomenon, terrorism has evolved into an international network that threatens international peace, democracy and development. Efforts to maintain international peace and security by relevant authorities, particularly by the UN Security Council and regional organizations have been undermined by the activities of terrorists who use violence through the deployment of advanced technologies and other sophisticated methods to unleash terror on countries and citizens of the targeted states (Matseketsa & Mapolisa, 2013). The 9/11 terrorist attacks on the soil of the US; the 2004 Madrid terrorist attacks; series of terror attacks in London, particularly the 2005 and 2007 bombings; the 2008 terror attacks in Mumbai, India; and recent ISIS Attacks Surge in Iraq amid debate on US Troop are a few examples terrorist activities that have caused severe harm on these countries with horrendous and raging effects for global peace and security. Earlier, Andrew Linklater (cited in Shukla, 2006) had described the 'deliberate' harm caused by international terrorist movements as cross-border or transnational harm that poses a serious challenge to national and international security.

Similarly, as Wagner (2003) notes, the scourge of terrorism has changed in many profound ways. For instance, insecurity now permeates every part of the globe. As a result, business cum economic activities between and among nations as well as groups and organizations had been routinely halted, thereby distorting the growth and overall development of these nations. Terrorist incidents have economic consequences by diverting foreign direct investment (FDI), destroying infrastructure, redirecting public investment funds to security, or limiting trade (Enders & Sandler, 1996). When considering a business trip, people now routinely factor into the equation whether the destination and business environment are safe.

Furthermore, terrorism has led to a significant shift in bilateral relations between and among nations in the international system. This is evident in the relations between the United States and Europe, Russia, and China as a result of terrorist activities and the global war on terror (GWT), in the immediate post-9/11 era, particularly the debate on the US-led war on Iraq in 2003. It has been argued that the US unilateral use of force to prosecute GWT in the Persian Gulf and other regions of the world has undermined the maintenance of global peace and security and increased terrorist activities around the globe. Indeed, the war on terrorism has changed the underpinnings of the post-ColdWar as well as the 21st century's geo-political arena. In a related development, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights emphasizes the consequences of terrorism in the following words, terrorism has a direct impact on the enjoyment of many human rights, in particular the rights to life, liberty and physical integrity. Terrorist acts can and have destabilized governments, undermined civil society, jeopardised peace

and security, threatened social and economic development, and may especially negatively affect certain groups (Fact Sheet, 2008).

In Nigeria, terrorist acts such as the remotely-contrived bombings of public institutions and population centres essentially in parts of Nigeria's Northern states and the various kidnapping activities bythe Boko Haram sect, constitute a serious national security threat. Thus, terrorism has not only undermined national security but has hampered meaningful development in Nigeria by violating human rights, displacing residents, discouraging trade and investment; local and foreign, threatening livelihood, and amplifying casualties. Indeed, terrorist activities have paralysed almost all sections of the country. It had breached public peace, threatened the unity of the nation and impeded the economic progress and development of Nigeria. Terrorism undermines the legitimacy of governments and challenges their ability to provide security and stability. In regions affected by terrorism, weak governance structures often create a fertile ground for extremist ideologies to flourish.

In terms of development, terrorism poses significant challenges, disrupting economic growth, undermining governance, and exacerbating social inequalities. The impact of terrorism is multifaceted, affecting both immediate and long-term development goals. According to Enders and Sandler (2006), terrorism has severely disrupted economies, particularly in developing countries, leading to the destruction of infrastructure, deterring foreign investment, and reducing tourism, which is vital for many economies.

It has, however, been argued that a spectacular and established consequence of terrorism is the rise of a new phenomenon in wealthier societies. According to Nassar (2010, p. 39), "terrorism has an immediate impact on social cohesion. People affected by the violence of terror spontaneously join together to help out the victims and their relatives. In a way, everyone becomes a victim and feels an affinity with all other victims". This is evident in the aftermath of 9/11 where people joined to help out the direct victims and the displaced persons. Moreover, in the aftermath of the attacks, Americans joined together in raising the national flag. The rush on flags was so great that many stores ran out. Under the slogan of "united we stand," people everywhere joined in harmonious patriotism that unified the nation in ways not seen before. Thus, along with social cohesion comes an enhanced sense of patriotism. Both oppressed and attacked societies experience this phenomenon.

Conclusion

Since the 21st century and subsequent 9/11 terrorist attacks on the then-sole superpower, terrorism has become a global threat. Terrorism has spread to nearly all parts of the world and thereby remains a major concern for the world community, including African and Asian countries. Exploration and critical assessment of the

nature, perspectives and *modus operandi* of terrorist organizations reveal that while there is no single satisfactory cause that explains terrorism, ideological factors, religion, poverty, globalisation, grievances and cultures of violence, as well as irredentist movements, have contributed to outbreaks of terrorist violence. The chapter unravelled the many faces of terrorism, its disparate motives and tactics as well as implications for national/global security, peace and development in the contemporary global environment. While the US-led global war on terror supported by nearly all nations of the globe thrives, there is the need to build a more effective, pragmatic and multilateral approach to counter terrorist activities. A more robust method for maintaining international peace and security should be designed such that terrorists will find it very difficult to operate at the micro and macro levels. In new areas where violence is escalating, regional or continental and global counter-terrorism efforts should hasten to tackle the problem before it becomes a fully blown catastrophe.

REFERENCES

Acsrt/Caert. (2020). Africa recorded a total of 153 terrorist attacks resulting in a total of 944 deaths. Retrieved from https://caert.org.dz/?p=3263.

Agbiboa, D. E. (2013). No retreat, no surrender: Understanding the religious terrorism of Boko Haram in Nigeria. *African Study Monographs, 32*(2), 65-84.

Bache, I., & Flinders, M. (2004). *Multi-level governance*. Oxford University Press.

Brian, T. (2010). Erasing the steps of Kingdom: Indigenous autonomy in Chiapas, Mexico and the Zapatistas' reconception of power. *Honors Theses, Paper 572*.

Brion, R. (2017). Radicalization in Belgium: A governance perspective. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 29*(4), 641-661.

Burgess, M. (2015). A brief history of terrorism. Retrieved from https://www.poso.org/investigation/2015/02/.

Carr, E. H. (1964). *The twenty years' crisis, 1919–1939: An introduction to the study of international relations*. Harper Torchbooks.

Carter, D. B. (2012). A blessing or a curse? State support for terrorist groups. *International Organization, 66*(1), 129-151.

Chaliand, G., & Blin, A. (Eds.). (2007). *The history of terrorism: From antiquity to Al Qaeda*. University of California Press.

Clinton, B. (1998, September 21). Remarks by the president to the opening session of the 53rd UN General Assembly.

Cliteur, P. (2017). Biblical stories and religion as the root cause of terrorism. In M. Masaeli & R. Sneller (Eds.), *The root cause of terrorism: A religious studies perspective* (pp. 1-26). Cambrdge Scholar Publishing.

Crenshaw, M. (2001). Why America? The globalization of civil war. *Current History, 100*(650), 426-439.
D'Anieri, P. (2012). *International politics: Power and purpose in global affairs* (2nd ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
Davies, T. R. (1973). Aggression, violence, revolution and war. In J. N. Knutson (Ed.), *Handbook of political psychology* (pp. 234-260). Jossey-Bass.
Délanoë, A. (2020). Socio-political exclusion and the radicalization process in France. *Journal of Terrorism Research, 11*(1), 67-81.
Enders, W., & Sandler, T. (1996). Terrorism and foreign direct investment in Spain and Greece. *Kyklos, 49*(3), 331-352.
Goldstein, J. S., & Pevehouse, J. C. (2008). *International relations* (8th ed.). Pearson Longman.
Gilpin, R. (1981). *War and change in world politics*. Cambridge University Press.
Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton University Press.
Hobbes, T. (1998). *Leviathan*. Oxford University Press.
Hoffman, B. (1998). *Inside terrorism*. Columbia University Press.
Hoffman, B. (2009). What is terrorism? In R. J. Art & J. Jervis (Eds.), *International politics: Enduring concepts and contemporary issues* (9th ed., pp. 174-180). Pearson Longman.
Human Rights Watch. (1993). *Genocide in Iraq: The Anfal campaign against the Kurds*. https://www.refworld.org/docid/47fdfb1d0.html [Accessed May 24, 2020].
Jansson, J. (2020). *Terrorism, criminal law and politics: The decline of the political offence exception to extradition*.Routledge.
Kaarbo, J., & Ray, J. L. (2011). *Global politics* (10th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
Kaplan, J. (2018). Waves of political terrorism. In W. R. Thompson et al. (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford University Press.
Kegley, C. W. (2007). *World politics: Trends and transformation* (11th ed.). Thomson Wadsworth.
Khan, A. L. (2006). *A theory of international terrorism: Understanding Islamic militancy*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. Sage Publications.
Korn, D. A. (1993). *Assassination in Khartoum*. Indiana University Press.
Kundnani, A. (2012). Radicalization: The journey of a concept. *Race and Class, 54*(2), 3-35.
Lyman, P. N. (2009). The war on terrorism in Africa. In J. W. Harbeson & D. Rothchild (Eds.), *Africa in world politics: Reforming political order* (4th ed., pp. 276-304). Westview Press.

Margolin, J. (1977). Psychological perspectives in terrorism. In Y. Alexander & S. M. Finger (Eds.), *Terrorism: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 273-274). John Jay.

Martin, G. (2006). *Understanding terrorism: Challenges, perspectives, and issues* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Martin, G. (2008). *Essentials of terrorism: Concepts and controversies*. Sage Publications.

Martin, G. (2011). *Terrorism and homeland security*. Sage Publications.

Martin, G. (2017). Types of terrorism. In M. Dawson, D. R. Kisku, P. Gupta, J. K. Sing, & W. Li (Eds.), *Developing next generation counter-measures for homeland security threat prevention* (pp. 1-16). IGI Global.

Masaeli, M., & Sneller, R. (2017). Introduction: Religion – Between violence and non-violence. In M. Masaeli & R. Sneller (Eds.), *The root cause of terrorism: A religious studies perspective* (pp. viii-xiv). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Matseketsa, B., & Mapolisa, T. (2013). The effects of terrorism on international peace and security and the educational system in Africa. *International Journal of Advance Research, 1*(8), 694-710.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. Norton.

Mingst, K. A. (2014). *Essentials of international relations* (3rd ed.). W. W. Norton & Company.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1986). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace* (6th ed.). Knopf.

Nassar, J. R. (2010). *Globalization & terrorism: The migration of dream and nightmares* (2nd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Pham, P. J. (2014). Terrorism and counter-terrorism in Africa: Evolving focus. In J. J. Hentz (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of African security* (p. 43). Routledge.

Pillar, P. R. (2001). *Terrorism and U.S. foreign policy*. Brookings Institution Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity, and accountability*. Open University Press.

Robertson, A. E. (2007). *Global issues: Terrorism and global security*. Facts On File.

Russett, B., Starr, H., & Kinsella, D. (2010). *World politics: The menu for choice* (9th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Sage, A. (2005). Terrorism threats and vulnerabilities in Africa. In A. Le Sage (Ed.), *African counter-terrorism cooperation: Assessing regional and subregional initiatives* (p. 1). National Defence University Press.

Shukla, S. (2006). Emerging new trends of terrorism: Challenges before the United Nations. *The Indian Journal of Political Science, 67*(1), 165-176.

Simpson, P. (1986). Just war theory and the IRA. *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 3*(1), 73-88.

Solomon, H. (2015). *Terrorism and counter-terrorism in Africa: Fighting insurgency from Al Shabaab, Ansar Dine and Boko Haram*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Spalek, B. (2017). The counter-terrorism strategy and community relations: The case of the UK. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 29*(3), 470-488.

Stepanova, E. (2008). *Terrorism in asymmetrical conflict: Ideological and structural analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Stites, E., Lautze, S., Mazurana, D., & Anic, A. (2005). Coping with war, coping with peace: Livelihood adaptation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1989–2004. *Feinstein Famine Center Paper.*

Tilly, C. (2019). Governance and the emergence of terrorism: A political economy perspective. *Critical Studies on Terrorism, 12*(1), 1-18.

Tucker, D. (2010). What is new about new terrorism and how dangerous is it? *Terrorism and Political Science, 13*(Autumn), 1-14.

Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2001). *International relations and world politics: Security, economy, identity* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.

Wagner, D. (2003). Terrorism's impact on international relations. *International Risk Management Institute*. https://www.irmi.com/articles/commentary

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley.

Whelan, A. (1992). Self-determination and decolonization: Foundations for the future. *Irish Studies in International Affairs, 25*, 25-51.