# TERRORISM AS A CONSEQUENCE OF RELIGIOUS FUNDAMENTALISM: THE CASE OF AL-QAIDA AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Manasseh E. Bassey *(Ph.D)*

Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State - Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

This paper explored into the rising incidence of religious borne terrorism across the globe. Many terrorist organizations across the world, notably, Al-Qaida, Taliban, Muslim brotherhood, Alshabab, ISIS, and others tie their ascendancy and actions to religion. They try to vent their anger on those they label as infidels or unbelievers and employ terrorism as a tool of violence to attack such people. Accordingly, the study adopted the Historical and descriptive approach to explain the factors surrounding such attacks by the Islamic fundamentalists. The paper observed that Islamic fundamentalist movements such as the Al-Qaeda, a terrorist organization confront constituted State authorities such as the United States of America and other countries to demand their objectives through violent means. Principally, Al-Qaida has accused the United States of America of desecrating the holy land of Saudi Arabia and depriving Palestinians of their right to freedom. The paper further found out that America's leading control of Saudi Arabia is a desecration of the holy lands of Mecca and Medina. Also the US support for Israel against Palestinian's bid for independence account for the spate of terrorist attacks against the United States of America, among others. The paper recommended, among other issues, that adopting a policy of military restraint rather interventionist foreign policy by the major world powers will help in no little way in reducing the menace of terrorist attacks.

**Keywords:** Terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism, Al-Qaida, frustration-aggression, conflict, Muslim world.

## INTRODUCTION

Many terrorist groups have sprung up across the globe using terrifying violence to express their grievances against their targets. Prominent among these groups have been Hezbollah, Alshabab,

Al-Qaeda, etc. to mention but a few. Most times, the principal targets of these attackers have been the developed countries of the world, especially the United States of America and her allies, which the terrorists perceive as enemies of their states. There have been series of attacks against the United States of America and prominent among these attacks are the 1986 bombing of the La Bella discotheque in Berlin, West Germany in which about 15 American soldiers died; the 1993 World Trade Centre (WTC) bombing which killed 6 and injured some, 1,000 people; the 1998 bombing of the American Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in which 250 people were killed and over 5,500 people were injured, etc but none was as alarming and as cataclysmic in terms of death toll and property destruction as the September 11, 2001 attacks.

The September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States of America witnessed the greatest death toll and destruction ever recorded by any terrorists' attacks since the beginning of terror attacks. Ever since then, terrorists have not rested in their oars. They still threaten fire and brimstone against the United States of America and her allies. It is against this background that this study seeks to investigate why terrorists especially those associated with Islamic fundamentalism, continue to target the United States of America as their main enemy. The September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Centre, New York, and Pentagon, Washington DC was a dramatization of the obsession with the United States of America by "Islamic fundamentalists" (Blair, 2001).

Islamic fundamentalists notably Al-Qaeda consider America's presence in their land especially Afghanistan as a source of powerlessness for their states. They see America's presence in the Arabian Peninsula as a desecration of their holy land. Al-Qaeda see the West especially America as pursuing western democratization and evangelization of the Islamic world especially Afghanistan by instituting changes that are not acceptable to them. Before the entry of the United States of America into Afghanistan to effect a democratic change, the country was governed by the Taliban which was accepted to Al-Qaeda and other Islamic fundamentalists. The Taliban was an Islamic fundamentalist political movement which spread from Pakistan into Afghanistan and formed a government ruling as the Islamic Emirates of Afghanistan September 1996 until December 2001, with Kandahar as its capital and Mohammed Omar as its spiritual leader. The Taliban was run according to the religious doctrines of Islam which was accepted by faith to the people. With the sacking of the Taliban and its subsequent replacement with a democratic government supervised by America, Al-Qaeda and the Taliban see America as dictating to their country and as a result controlling their countries through the indigenous rulers who they regard as stooges. The difference between the past and the present in terms of the composition of government thus constitutes a major source of hostility and discontentment in the minds of Islamic fundamentalists, notably Al-Qaeda operatives who seek to expel America and her influence from Afghanistan and from the Islamic world in general. In this regard, in his letter to the United States of America, Osama bin Laden stated:

> Under your supervision, consent and orders, the governments of our countries, which act as your agents, attack us on a daily basis; these governments steal our *Ummah's* wealth and sell them to you at a paltry price.

As a result, Islamic fundamentalists prominently Al-Qaeda seeks to expel western influence, especially those of America and non Muslim countries from their territory. They seek to apply violent means (terrorism) to resist America's incursion in the Islamic world. Arising from this, many Islamic fundamentalists justify their violent reactions against America by pointing to the plights of the Palestinian refugees who lost their homeland when the modern state of Israel was established in 1948, and to the continued support of the US to Israel in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Thus, to the Islamic fundamentalists, the US position in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict constitutes a serious source of hostility toward the United States of America. Thus, the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States of America, among other attacks, was one way of avenging America for the series of wrongs done to the Muslim world, which the fundamentalists hold the United States of America wholly responsible.

Most importantly, Islamic fundamentalists notably Al-Qaeda view the sacking of the Taliban led regime of Afghanistan as an abuse of their religion. They reject in its entirety the replacement of their religious-based regime (theocracy) with western systems and values such as democracy and capitalism. They see America as dictating to their country. Thus, the United States of America's entry into Afghanistan to ensure regime change detests the Islamic fundamentalists who employ terrorism as an instrument of coercion to resist such influence in their land.

Arising from this, the question is: how justifiable is the claim by Al-Qaeda that America's replacement of the Taliban-led regime with a democratically elected government in Afghanistan is responsible for the powerlessness of that State? Or to what extent is the fact that the exploitation of the economic resources of Afghanistan by the United States of America as alleged by the fundamentalists is responsible for the underdevelopment of Afghanistan? Flowing from this problematic, which formed the bedrock of this paper, it could further be asked:

i. To what extent is terrorism by the Islamic fundamentalists a reaction to American influence in the Muslim world?
ii. To what extent has the replacement of the Taliban led regime with a democratically elected government in Afghanistan by the United States of America constituted a source of powerlessness for that state, as claimed by Al-Qaida?
iii. What threat has Islamic terrorism posed to American interests?
iv. Why has the US continued to relate with some countries in the Muslim world in spite of the spate of terrorist attacks against her by Islamic fundamentalists?

Consequent upon the above, the objectives of this paper were set to:

i. Find out the extent to which terrorism by Islamic fundamentalists is a reaction to American influence in the Muslim world.
ii. Assess the extent to which the replacement of the Taliban led regime with a democratically elected government in Afghanistan by the United States of America constitutes a source of powerlessness for that state as claimed by Al-Qaida.
iii. Examine how Islamic terrorism has posed as threat to American interests.
iv. Establish why the US has continued to relate with some countries in the Muslim world in spite of the spate of terrorist attacks against her by Islamic fundamentalists.

The analysis of this paper covers specifically the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States of America by Al-Qaeda terrorist group and the reactions by America following the attacks. It also discusses the period of the US involvement in the former Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan to the period leading to an after the September 11 attacks on the United States of America.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The analysis of paper finds expression within the ambit of the frustration and aggression theory as popularized by Ted Gurr (1970). The theory was originally developed by Dollard and his research associates in the 1930s and later expanded and modified by scholars like Yale and Berkowitz. According to these theorists, aggression is always the result of frustration. Hence, an individual whose basic desires are thwarted and who consequently experience profound sense of dissatisfaction and anger is likely to react to his condition by directing aggressive behavior at what is perceived as being responsible for thwarting those desires, or at a substitute. Thus, in Gurr's (1970) point of view, "relative deprivation is a perception of thwarting circumstance". This is to say that when a man is deprived of his desire, he feels thwarted or frustrated because he has been deprived the right of possession.

The tenets and basic assumptions of the frustration/aggression theory are that:

i.      Aggression is always the result of frustration.
ii.     The greater the perceived importance of the desire, the more vigorous the aggressive response.
iii.    The greater the discrepancy between what men seek and what seems attainable, the greater their anger and their propensity towards violent reactions.
iv.     Emphasizes on relative deprivation gap between expectations and capabilities.

In analyzing the subject matter within the context of the theory, terrorist activities seen as aggression springs from denial or deprivation seen as frustration. Without the perceived United States domination of the Arab world mostly the Palestine, there would not have been terrorist attacks on the West. Thus the continued attacks by terrorist organizations against the United States of America and her citizens on one hand and Israel and her citizens on the other hand stem from the perceived deprivation of Palestinians from their homeland. The gap between this expectation and realization brings in frustration which gingers aggressive dispossession towards the United States of America and her allies by terrorists. Against this background, terrorism is seen as an effective tool by terrorist to rid themselves and others of what they consider as oppression and an only way for an oppressed group to prevail against a heavily armed government.

**CONCEPTUALIZING TERRORISM**

Terrorism is difficult to define. In other words, there is no commonly accepted definition of the concept. Terrorism is tied to human behavior. Thus for Griset (2008), human behavior has always been hard to predict, control and comprehend. Relatively rare behavior like terrorism is even harder to understand. This is so because the adversarial and political postures embedded in the practice of terrorism make it unlikely that a universally accepted definition or a widely shared strategy for controlling it will soon emerge. Terrorism is an ideological and political concept (Griset, 2008:3). The meaning given to the concept is part of a person's or nation's philosophy. Thus, the determination of the right definition of terrorism is subjective and not likely to be reached by consensus. Therefore, if you disagree with my position, you are a terrorist; if you agree with my position, you are not a terrorist (Cooper, 2001). Yet the cliché that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" provides little help in achieving definitional precision. Repressive regimes call those who struggle against them terrorist, but those who commit violence to topple those same regimes call themselves freedom fighters (Hoffman, 2006). Let us now look at a few of these definitions: for Lacqueur (2001:79) terrorism is "the use of covert violence by a group for political ends. Hoffman (2006:41) defines the concept as the "deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or threat of violence in the pursuit of political change". For Stern (2003:xx), it is "an act or threat of violence against noncombatants with the objectives of exacting revenge, intimidation or otherwise influencing an audience".

Some definitions specifically include religious motivations, others include hate, millenarian and apocalyptic groups. Not everyone agrees that people who employ terrorist tactics on behalf of animals or the environment are terrorists. Several definitions refer only to non-state actors, whereas others include state sponsored terrorism (Mahan and Griset, 2008). Kydd and Walter

(2011:394) defined terrorism "as the use of violence against civilians by non-state actors to attain political goal, Rouke (2008:316) while recognizing the lack of conscious in the definition of terrorism, defines the concept as:

> Violence carried out by individuals, nongovernmental organizations, or covert government agents or units; that specifically target civilians; uses clandestine attack methods such as car bombs and hijacked airliners and attempt to influence politics.

This definition stresses that terrorism focuses on harming some people in order to create fear in others by targeting civilians and facilities or systems, such as transportation on which civilians rely. The objective of terrorist is not just killing and wounding people and destroying physical material. Instead the true target is the emotions of those who see or read about the act of violence and become afraid or dominated, (Rouke, 2008:316).

On his part, de Mesquita (2003) defines it as any act of violence undertaken for the purpose of altering government's political policies or acts that target those who do not actually have the personal authority to alter or entries governmental authorities.

By this definition, it is evident that terrorism encompasses all violent acts that are not motivated by the injury the specific individuals actually victimized by the act but rather are designed to influence the behavior of others, particularly policymakers.

Collapsing all the definitions into one whole, we adopt, Cooper's definition as "the international generation of massive fear by human beings for the purpose of securing or maintaining control over other human beings (Cooper 2001:883). For the purpose of this chapter, we adopt Cooper's definition as our working definition although like him, we recognize that no single definition will ever be satisfactory to everyone.

## TERRORISM: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Terrorism is deeply in history. The Jewish Zealots of the first century, also known as the Sicarii, constituted one of the earliest large scale terrorist organizations. Their goal was to prevent Roman rule over Judaea (now Israel). They died for their efforts in a mass suicide at Masada in 20 AD but not before they had incited an insurrection of the populace against the roman occupation of Judaea. This was followed by Gunpowder plot by Guy Fawkes in Great Britain in the 17th century. Although the Gunpowder or Papacy plot was foiled, Fawkes and his associates justified their actions in terms of religion (Griset 2008:36). It was termed the "holy terror".

Religious motives are often cited as a justification for much of contemporary terrorism. Many terrorist groups of today such as Al-Qaida, Taliban, ISIS, Alshabab, etc. all draw their motives from religion. For example Doran (2002) argued that Osama bin Laden's primary motive on 9/11 terrorist attacks was to overthrow the pro-US governments of some Arab and Muslim nations, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Pakistan. Religious and political motivations are often difficult to separate.

The 18th century challenged the divine rights of kings, arguing against a society of privilege and in favour of a political system that recognized the equality of men. Terrorists of the 18th and 19th centuries fought against a system that conferred amazing riches on a few and subjected all others to hard work and deprivation. Thus, not only have hereditary rulers and their representatives been targeted for assassination by terrorists who reject the existing governments but in addition revolutionary governments have themselves turned on their citizens, launching terrorist attacks of breath-taking cruelty and slaughtering untold members of civilians. It was through the state sponsored terrorism that in July 14, 1789, a French mob attacked the Bastille prison in Paris, massacring the soldiers stationed there. The rioters later walked through the streets carrying the heads of the prison commandant and several of the guards on pike. The mob was supported by a group of radical revolutionaries, who soon gained control of the government. In October of the same year, the radicals forced King Louis XVI and the Royal family to move from Versailles to Paris; later the king unsuccessfully tried to flee. He ultimately was tried by the revolutionary court and in January 21, 1793, was executed (Mahan and Griset, 2008:48).

Like modern terrorists, the French revolutionaries took advantage of technological advances. Joseph Guillotine's invention of a new execution technology served in no little measure as it was a perfect fit for France's ruthless state sponsored terrorism. This was followed by the White terror with victims of the reign of terror attacking the former terrorists. The Russian terrorist group known as the Narodnaya Volya which existed from 1878 to 1881 was also another terrorist group in the history of terrorism. The group, a secret society of about 500 members targeted only high profile officials. This group was different from the state-sponsored terrorists in the French revolution that jailed and killed thousands of their countrymen. As reported by Lacqueur, if ten or fifteen pillars of the establishment were killed at the same time, the government would panic and would lose its freedom. At the same time, the masses would wake up". Thus, the Noradnaya Volya counted on the toppling of tsar's regime as a result of their assassinations. This method of terrorism came in the wake of the land distribution which was at the heart of the struggle in Russia in 1861. Tsar Alexander II abolished serfdom and lifted strict controls over freedom of speech and assembly. These progressive actions were influenced by the ideas of the European Enlightenment, but they proved to be tsar's undoing and led eventually to his assassination (Lacqueur, 1977:34).

Part of the history of terrorism could be discovered from the adoption of nationalism, and the desire for independence from colonial rulers were at the heart of the social, economic, political and religious struggles as in India. India under British rule since 1857 adopted isolated instances of terrorism from the beginning of British colonialism. This massive nonviolent resistance to colonial rule led the British to withdraw from India in 1947 and India became independent. Also, Algeria through its National Liberation Front (FLN) attacked the French colonial rule by attacking military installations, police installations and public utilities in 1954. This was inspired by Frantz Fanon's Wretched of the Earth. Other countries which also achieved their freedom through terrorism took their inspiration from the writings of Germany's Karl Marx, Russia's Vladimir Lenin and China's Mao Zedong. These writings were carefully studied by Fidel Castro who launched the Cuban Revolution of 1959.

Although many argue that terrorism has increased as technology has advanced, the fact remains that terrorists have always had weapons, transportation, and communication – no matter how rudimentary. Thus, from the sword of the Zealots Sicarii to the dagger of the Assassins to silk scarf noose of the thugs, terrorists have used whatever technology was available to them. Contributing in this direction, Rapoport, (1984:659), argues that "the critical variable cannot be technology; rather the purpose and organizations of particular groups and the vulnerabilities of particular societies to them are decisive factors". That way, understanding the culture, religion, politics, economics and ideology of a country and its people is the best way to comprehend the phenomena of terrorism.

## TERRORISM AS A CONSEQUENCE OF ISLAMIC FUNDAMENTALISM

America's foreign policy in the Islamic World seems to breed a sense of imperial domination in the minds of Islamic fundamentalists in the Islamic World. The United States of America holds close ties with many of the countries in the Islamic World which many fundamentalists see as something that should not be done. The United States of America contributes more than one billion US dollars (precisely $1.3b) to Egypt's annual budgets. More than that, America contributes immensely to the development of many of the States in the Islamic World, notably, Jordan, Turkey, Pakistan etc, and even sends troops to many of the Islamic States when they request, for example, Saudi Arabia. These intervention measures of the United States of America are detestable to the Islamic fundamentalists as they see such intervention as a ploy by the US to control the governments and administration of those states. As a result, Islamic fundamentalists seek to use violent measures to resist America's romance with Islamic States. Also, America's Meddlesomeness of her penchant for regime change in the Islamic world (as in Afghanistan, Iraq, etc.) is seen to have a negative impact on the religion and culture of the Islamic world. Similarly, America is blamed for what some call 'Americanization of the Islamic world'.

More than that, many of the fundamentalists consider US relationship with their states as measures meant to enrich the leaders of the states concerned without necessarily addressing the problems of the common man or the citizens of such states. Islamic fundamentalists see the West as interfering unnecessarily in the affairs of Muslim States. They see America's foreign policy in the Islamic World as imperialism which must be resisted. To the fundamentalists, America's foreign policy in the Islamic World is tantamount to mass slaughter, massacre of Muslims and under-development of Islamic States. In this regards, Roy blames the US for;

> The millions killed in Korea, Vietnam and Cambodia, the 17,500 killed when Israel backed by the US invaded Lebanon in 1982, the 200,000 Iraqis killed in Operation Desert Storm, the thousands of Palestinian who have died fighting Israeli occupation of the West Bank, and the millions who died in Yugoslavia, Somalia, Haiti, Chile, Nicaragua, Elsalvado, the Dominican Republic and Panama, at the hands of all terrorists dictators and genocidists whom the American government supported, trained, bankrolled and supplied (*The Guardian,* London, 29 September, 2001, p. 63).

Islamic fundamentalists hold America accountable for the destruction of the lives and property of Muslims in the Islamic World. Principally, Islamic fundamentalists' grouse against the United States of America stems from America's support for Israel in the Israeli – Palestinian conflict. The United States of America has been accused by the Islamic fundamentalists of giving financial and military support to Israel in the conflict which has rendered millions of Palestinians dead and deprived them of their land. Islamic fundamentalists see America's support for Israel in the conflict against Palestine as a humiliation of their Muslim brothers and sisters in the West Bank. More so, they see United States of America as frustrating the efforts of Palestine to attain independence and statehood which has long been sought for.

Thus to the fundamentalists, eradicating or at least curbing Islamic fundamentalism against the United States of America entails reducing the humiliation, despair and rage that drive many Palestinians to support militant Islamic groups like AI-Qaeda, Hamas and Islamic Jihad. In his letter to America, Osama Bin Laden stated:

> You attacked us in Palestine, Palestine, which has sunk under military occupation for more than 80 years. The British handed over Palestine, with your help and your support, to the Jews, who have occupied it for more than 50 years overflowing with oppression, tyranny, crimes killing, expulsion, destruction and devastation. The creation and continuation of Israel is one of the greatest crimes, and you are the leaders of its criminals

and of course there is no need to explain and prove the degree of American support for Israel. The creation of Israel is a crime which must be erased. Each and every person whose hands have become polluted in the contribution towards this crime must pay its price, and pay for it heavily (*The Guardian,* 8 October, 2001:2).

Apart from the case of Palestine, fundamentalists of the Islamic countries also hold America accountable for the role in the escalation of crisis in that region. Contributing to this, Eminue (2005) noted that the escalation of the Middle East crisis is also accountable, at least in part, for the terrorist attack on the United States, widely perceived by both sides as the only credible reconciliation or mediator. The crisis reached a head in 1947 when a Committee of the United Nations recommended that Palestine be partitioned into Jewish and Arab States, with Jerusalem as an international city. While the Jews accepted the plan, the Arabs rejected it, and on 14 May 1948, David Ben Gurion formally announced the establishment of the State of Israel, thus setting the stage of the conflict that has lulled till this day. Although a number of wars have been fought since then in which Israel, though small in number but cohesive in spirit and military power, has always defeated its more numerous Arab States that surround it as well as increased its original (1948) boundaries, the major roadblock seems to hinge on deciding the future of the territories (the Golan Heights, the West Bank, Gaza Strip, etc) that Israel occupied and controlled since its defeat of Egypt, Syria and Jordan in the Six Day War of 1967. The most turbulent of these territories had been Palestine on the West Bank that neither the Camp David Accord between Ehud Barak and Yasser Arafat under the aegis of United State President Bill Clinton nor subsequent proposals between Israel Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon nor the Palestinian Leader, Yasser Arafat, has been able to produce a breakthrough.

Reverberations from suicide bombing, incursions and assassinations initiated by Palestinian militants and retaliatory strikes carried out by Israeli authorities have left not only Palestine but the whole of the Middle East as volatile as ever. Just as the Muslim Shiite group (Hezbollah) backed by Syria and Iran had waged a war of attrition that forced Israel to end its 12-years occupation of South Lebanon in May 2000, and just as Iranian militant teenagers steeped in Islamic radicalism died as human minefield sweepers during the Iraq War, considering themselves "martyr bombers", Hamas and the Islamic Jihad Movement have since the 1993 Oslo Peace Accord which the Palestinians had not fully accepted, dispatched suicide missions by volunteers and trained fanatical militants into Israel.

While the Arab-Muslim World venerated suicide bombers in glowing nationalistic terms, the United States of America, the West and Israel branded them terrorists and had even called on the former Palestinian Leader, Yasser Arafat, whom the New York Times described as the "Chief of

Terrorism" to crack down on them, apparently without much success. Islamic militants sworn to the destruction of Israel not only use explosives to blow up themselves – and Israelis – but Palestinian gunmen have staged suicide shooting raids they have hope of surviving. Explanation of these bizarre actions lies in the fact that although Islam expressly forbids suicide, it nevertheless, promises that a martyr – one that dies in the process of carrying out a "Jihad" or holy war – will be rewarded with an instant ticket to paradise (Heaven): a tempting offer indeed for some young Islamic militants. United States unflinching and unqualified support for the State of Israel, from President Harry Truman to President George W. Bush, thus remains a major motivation for terrorist attacks. In his first verified statement since the September 11, 2001 attacks, bin Laden said:

> Thanks be to God. What America tastes now is only a copy of what we have tasted… God has blessed a group of vanguard Muslims to destroy America… I swear to God that America will not live in peace until peace reigns in Palestine… (*The Guardian,* 8 October, 2001:2).

Al-Qaeda spokesman, Suleiman Abu Ghaith, attributing the September 11 attacks to continued Israeli occupation of Arab land, warned Muslims in US and UK not to travel by plane or live in skyscrapers (an obvious reference to the WTC), adding that:

> Al-Qaeda organization orders the infidels – particularly the Americans and the British to leave the Arabian Peninsula… The storm, especially the aircraft storm, will not claim until you… stop your assistance to the Jews, end the siege imposed on the Iraqi people and stop your support for the Hindus against the Muslims in Kashmir (*The Guardian*, 15 October, 2001:4).

According to Amuwo (2002), the US interest in the Islamic world is essentially to maintain a stranglehold on the region's immense oil and gas reserves, a foreign policy orientation that, over the past several decades, has translated into the US supporting the most politically closed, demented and venal kingdoms and autocracies in much of that part of the world. Principally because of Washington's multi-faceted support – including military – the civil societies and people of that region of the world have remained largely oppressed.

It has been argued that for almost a generation, the region's authoritarian rulers have defied predictions of their downfall. Syria, a secular republic, has already produced a dynasty. Iraq, Egypt and Libya threaten to do so (The Economist, 2 February, 2002 p. 38). Islamists are angry that, so far, they have proved incapable of harnessing (their) people's frustration'. And they lay

the blame, as well as seek to visit the iniquity of this incapacitation, on the United States of America.

**CONCLUSION**

This paper has discussed the influence of Islamic fundamentalism on terrorism. It has been observed that terrorist organizations notably Al-Qaida which is the major focus of this study has been employing violence to fight against countries notably the United States of America and her allies for what they termed desecration of the holy places (Mecca and Medina), and for frustrating the bid of Palestinians to gain independence in their land, among others.

The paper observed that America's interventionist measures in the Islamic world are detestable to the Islamic fundamentalists as they see such interventions as a ploy to control the government and administrations of those stalks. Accordingly, terrorism seeks to use violent means or measures to resist America's romance with Islamic States. Islamic fundamentalists consider US relationship with their states as measures meant to enrich the leaders of the states concerned at the expense of the citizens of such states. That being the case, they see US presence in their land as victimization of their people. Based on this, the paper submits that adopting counter terrorism measures should include adopting a policy of military restraint rather than interventionist foreign policy by the major world power. Attempts should also be made at improving the living conditions of citizens in less prosperous countries as this will greatly reduce the tendency of adopting terrorism as an option of frustration.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Given the high incidence of religiously inspired terrorism across the globe, this paper recommends as follows:

(i) Adopting a policy of military restraint rather than interventionist foreign policy by the major powers of the world will help in no little way in reducing the menace of terrorist attacks.

(ii) Western countries and major powers of the world should learn to respect the sovereign sanctities of other nations. Taking up arms against a sovereign and embarking on regime change as in Afghanistan and in other Muslim countries, is counterproductive. The social values of the Muslims countries should be respected and countries should be left alone to run their governments the way they understand it.

(iii) Offensive publications and cartoons against other people's religions should be stopped. The international community should begin to imbibe the culture of religious tolerance in the interest of global peace.

(iv) National legislation compelling banks managers to disclose private bank accounts of those suspected to be linked to or funding terrorist organizational should be put in place. Similarly, state sponsors who provide safe havens, explosives, financial resources and diplomatic support to terrorists should be penalized.

(v) The international community should embark on useful and meaningful dialogue with aggrieved nations on the way forward with a view to looking into their plights. Countering terrorism should be the prerogative of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice or appropriate international Tribunal and should not be left to the whims and caprices of any state no matter its status.

(vi) No religion should be made to assume a higher dimension over the other. Therefore, the idea of Pan Islamic ideology which breeds religious fundamentalism and terrorism should be stopped; people should be allowed to choose their religion without let or hindrance.

**REFERENCES**

Amuwo, A. (2002). The Political Economy of Terrorism. *Africa Development*. 27(1): 205-235.

Barber, R. R. (1992). Jihad vs McWorld. *Atlantic Monthly*, 269(3): 53-65.

Bueno de Mesquita, E. (2003). *Principles of International Politics: People's Power, Preferences and Perceptions*. Washington DC.: CQ Press.

Cooper, H. H. A. (2001). Terrorism: The Problem of Definition Revisited. *American Behavioural Scientists*, 44(6): 881-893.

Doran, M. (2002). Somebody Else's Civil War. *Foreign Affairs*, 8(3): 22-42.

Eminue, O. (2005). International Terrorism and the September 11, 2001 Attacks on the United States: Global Strategic Analysis of the Motivation, Causes, Reactions and Consequences. *Journal of Africa in a New World Order,* 1(1): 110-132.

Enders, W. and Sandler, T. (2005). After 9/11: Is it all Different Now? *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(2): 259-277.

Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Human Rights Watch (2006). *Children's Right - Child Soldiers.* New York: HRW.

Kydd, A. H. and Walter, B. F. (2006). The Strategies of Terrorism. *International Security,* 31(1): 49-80.

Lacqueur, W. (2001). *.A History of Terrorism.* New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Lopez, G. A. and Stohl, M. S. (1989). *International Relations: Contemporary Theory and Practice*. Washington D. C.: CQ Press.

Mahan. S. and Griset, P. L. (2008). *Terrorism in Perspective*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Minst, K. A. and Snyder, J. L. (2011). *Essential Readings in World Politics*. London: W. W. Norton and Company.

Rapoport, D. C. (1984). Fear and Trembling: Terrorism in Three Religious Traditions. *American Political Science Review*, 78(3): 658-677.

Ray, J. L. (1992). *Global Politics*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Roy, A. (2009). The Algebra of Infinite Justice. *The Guardian,* London, 29 September.

Rourke, J. T. (2008). *International Politics on the World Stage.* Boston: McGraw Hill.

Stern, J. (2003). *The Ultimate Organizations in Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*. New York: Harper Collins.

Terrorism Research Centre (2006). *Terrorism Group Profiles*, 6 November.

The Economist, 2 February, 2002 p. 38

*The Guardian,* London, 29 September, 2001, p. 63

*The Guardian,* London, 8 October, 2001 p. 2

*The Guardian*, London, 15 October, 2001 p. 4

Wilkinson, P. (1984). State Sponsored International Terrorism: The Problem of Response. *World Today*, July, 298.

Zedalis, D. (2004). *Female Suicide Bombers*. Carlisle: All Strategic Studies Institute.