IMPLICATIONS OF STATE AND STATE SPONSORED INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM FOR AFRICA: THE CASE OF LIBYA AND SUDAN

By

RICHARD OBINNA IROANYA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree: MASTER OF SECURITY STUDIES (MSS) in the Department of Political Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

November 2008

Study Leader: Prof. M. Hough

IMPLICATIONS OF STATE AND STATE SPONSORED INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM FOR AFRICA: THE CASE OF LIBYA AND SUDAN

By

RICHARD OBINNA IROANYA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree: MASTER OF SECURITY STUDIES (MSS) in the Department of Political Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

November 2008

Study Leader: Prof. M. Hough

ABSTRACT

Topic: Implications of state and state sponsored international terrorism for Africa: the case of Libya and Sudan

By: Richard Obinna Iroanya

Study Leader: Prof. M. Hough

Department: Political Sciences, University of Pretoria

Degree: Master of Security Studies

This study investigates and analyses the implications of state and state sponsored international terrorism for Africa. To realise this objective, the study focuses on international terrorist acts carried out by Libya and Sudan as well as those carried out by terrorist groups sponsored by them. The work examines new forms of terrorism, and attempts to develop a conceptual framework of state and state sponsored international terrorism. The focus is mainly on why states adopt or support terrorism as a means of achieving domestic and foreign policy objectives. The study also concerns itself with the measures in place to combat state and state sponsored international terrorism and further shows the extent to which sponsorship of international terrorism poses a threat to individual Africa countries in particular and the continent in general. The time period covered in this study is 1960 to 2006.

The significance of this study is threefold: first, its clarifications of the concepts of terrorism, state terrorism, and state sponsored international terrorism, are necessary for policy formulation and implementation as well as secondly highlighting specific opportunities that exist for Africa if the threat of state and state sponsored international terrorism is combated. Thirdly, its investigation and recommendations for a concerted effort in the fight against this phenomenon are also aimed at policy makers.

Key Terminology:

International state terrorism	International terrorism
State sponsored international terrorism	State terrorism
Sub-state international terrorism	Terrorism

OPSOMMING

Onderwerp: Implikasies van staats-en staatsondersteunde internasionale terrorisme in Afrika : die geval van Libië en Soedan

Deur: Richard Obinna Iroanya

Studieleier: Prof M Hough

Departement: Politieke Wetenskappe, Universiteit van Pretoria

Graad: Magister in Veiligheidstudies

Hierdie studie ondersoek en analiseer die implikasies van staats-en staatsondersteunde internasionale terreur vir Afrika. Om hierdie doel te bereik, fokus die studie op internasionale terreurdade wat uitgevoer is deur Libië en Soedan sowel as dade gepleeg deur terroriste groepe wat deur hulle ondersteun is. Die navorsing ondersoek nuwe vorme van terrorisme, en poog om 'n konseptuele raamwerk van staats-en staatsondersteunde internasionale terrorisme te ontwikkel. Die fokus is hoofsaaklik op waarom state terrorisme kies of ondersteun as 'n metode om binnelandse en buitelandse beleidsoogmerke te bereik. Die studie is ook gemoeid met die maatreëls om staats-en staatsondersteunde internasionale terrorisme te bekamp en toon verder die mate waartoe die ondersteuning van internasionale terrorisme 'n bedreiging vir individuele Afrikalstate en die kontinent in die geheel inhou aan. Hierdie studie dek die tydperk 1960 tot 2006.

Die belang van hierdie studie is drievoudig: eerstens, die verduideliking van die konsepte terrorisme, staatsterreur en staatsondersteunde internasionale terrorisme, is noodsaaklik vir beleidsformulering en implementering. Tweedens, beklemtoon dit ook spesifieke geleenthede wat in Afrika bestaan indien die bedreiging van staats-en staatsondersteunde internasionale terrorisme bekamp word. Derdens, is die studie se aanbevelings ook op beleidsmakers gemik.

Sleutelterme: Internasionale staatsterrorisme   Internasionale terrorisme

Staatsondersteunde internasionale terrorisme   Staatsterrorisme

Sub-staat internasionale terrorisme   Terrorisme

Table of Contents

CHAPTER FIVE: EVALUATION   115

ABSTRACT   122

BIBLIOGRAPHY   124

List of Tables

Page

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to so many people for the successful completion of this study. First and foremost I am grateful to the almighty Jehovah for the grace to carry out this work and for all the wonderful things he has done in my life. I am greatly indebted to my Study Leader, Prof. Mike Hough for his meticulous supervision, invaluable suggestions and useful advice. Without his guidance, this study would not have been a success. My cousin Jonas James Ifeagba provided invaluable support during critical moments in my life in South Africa; to him and his family, I remain very grateful. I have also enjoyed the friendship and support of Paschal Emeka Emeremadu and Benson Abacha Nwosu in the course of my studies in South Africa. I cannot fail to mention the Africa Institute of South Africa (AISA) for the opportunity to work, first as an Intern and later as a researcher. Apart from making me financially independent, the AISA also afforded me the opportunity to hone my research skills. To this end I remain grateful to the institute and to former colleagues. Among them are: Amanda Worthman, Prof. Korwa Adar, Prof. Francis Nwonwu, and Prof. Pierre Hugo. Others are, Dr. Biong Deng, Dr. Norman Mlambo, Dr. Sehlare Makgetlaneng, Yazini April, Check Achu, Faten Aggad and Kirstin Kilian. Finally, I am especially thankful to the AISA library staff for their efficiency and dedication to duty. Special mention must be made of Salamina Molamu, Elize Van As, Jack Motebajane, Sam Mokgohloa and Johnny Scheepers. Many thanks also go to Justa Kruger for assisting with the Afrikaans translation. To all those whose names I have not mentioned here, your importance is duly acknowledged and your place is in my heart.

INTRODUCTION

1.   OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This research sets out to investigate and analyse the implications of state and state sponsored international terrorism for Africa. In order to realise this objective, this study focuses on international terrorist acts carried out by states and those carried out by terrorist groups sponsored by states such as Libya and Sudan. The study also examines new forms of terrorism, and attempts to develop a conceptual framework of state and state sponsored international terrorism. The focus is on why states adopt or support terrorism as a means of achieving domestic, foreign and other policy objectives. The study also concerns itself with the measures in place to combat state and state sponsored international terrorism. It further shows the extent to which terrorist acts pose a threat to individual Africa countries in particular and the continent in general. The time period covered in the study is between 1960 and 2006.

The significance of the study is threefold: firstly, its clarifications of the concepts of terrorism, state terrorism, and state sponsored international terrorism, are necessary for policy formulation and implementation. Secondly, it highlights specific opportunities that exist for Africa if the threat of state and state sponsored international terrorism is combated. Thirdly, its investigation and recommendations of how state and non-state actors can collaborate in the fight against this phenomenon are also aimed at policy makers.

2.   RESEARCH PROBLEM

International terrorism has recently assumed centre stage in international political discourse following the events of September 11, 2001 (September 11) in the US. There is a growing fear that terrorist groups may in future acquire weapons of mass destruction (WMD) that could be used to cause more harm than the attacks of September 11. This fear increases with the realisation that there are certain countries in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia that conduct and support international terrorism. Consequently, this study specifically analyses the reasons and motives for viewing

certain states as supporters of international terrorism. One African country (Sudan) is still listed by the US State Department as a sponsor of international terrorism, while the second African country (Libya) was only recently removed from this list (May 2006). The study is based on the following propositions:

- State and state sponsored international terrorism is a weapon of domestic and foreign policy objectives.
- Control over state and state sponsored international terrorism is lacking or remains to a large extent ineffective.
- State and state sponsored international terrorism adversely impacts on the political, economic, social, and religious spheres of African countries.
- State and state sponsored international terrorism can only be combated through a concerted effort involving state actors, regional and international organisations, and non-state actors.

3.　RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study is descriptive and analytical in nature. Case studies of international terror incidents implicating Sudan and Libya are critically analysed. This analysis is done based on a suitable conceptual framework of international terrorism. A comparison of the two countries is also done with the view of identifying similar patterns of actions and intended objectives; impacts on the security and political economy of the two countries, as well as the embedded lessons for the rest of the African countries.

4.　SOURCES

This study is based on both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include official government documents relating to terrorism in general, and state and state sponsored international terrorism in particular. Other primary sources include United Nations (UN) resolutions and African Union (AU) documents relating to terrorism in general and state and state sponsored international terrorism in particular.

The research adopts a critical approach in the evaluation of secondary sources such as books, journal articles, periodicals, monographs, magazines and newspaper reporting, to develop a conceptual framework as well as a discussion and analysis of Libyan and Sudanese case studies. A major challenge that is envisaged in this study is the disagreement among scholars, commentators, and governments over the usage, application and interpretation of the concept of terrorism, state terrorism and state sponsored international terrorism. Against this background, official definition of terrorism by the *OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism*[1] serves as a guide to this study.

Scholarly works that deal with the issue of international state and state sponsored terrorism include, but not limited to, Wilkinson (2000), Hough (2002), Mamdani (2004), and Byman (2005). Each work identifies a particular aspect of the threat of international terrorism to the world in general and Africa in particular. Wilkinson, for example, examines the goal of "state and factional" international terrorism and the response of liberal democracies to the threat.[2] Similarly, Hough assesses the implications of the New York (September 11) terror attacks for Africa,[3] while Bayman examines the connection between "non-state" terror groups and the states that sponsor them as well as their motivation to engage in international terrorism.[4] Despite the existence of critical studies on international terrorism, little research has been done regarding the involvement of African states in international state and state sponsored terrorism. This study aims specifically at filling the gap in the existing scholarship.

5.   CHAPTER STRUCTURE

This study is structured as follows:
- Introduction
- Chapter 1: Terrorism and state and state sponsored international terrorism: A conceptual framework
- Chapter 2: Historical overview of state and state sponsored international terrorism

- Chapter 3: State and state sponsored international terrorism: The case of Sudan
- Chapter 4: State and state sponsored international terrorism: The case of Libya
- Chapter 5: Evaluation and conclusion.

Chapter one provides a conceptual overview of state and state sponsored international terrorism. This entails providing definitions of the main concepts involved in this study. It also looks at the various forms of terrorism, the reasons for the resort to terrorism by states, and the main challenges posed by this phenomenon to the peace and security of the African continent.

Chapter two provides an historical overview of international terrorism within the African context. This covers the period between 1960 and 2006. This chapter also examines various conventions, resolutions, and preventive measures adopted by the UN, the OAU and its successor organisation the AU, to combat state and state sponsored international terrorism.

Chapter three examines the involvement of Libya in international terrorism. It also entails a brief historical overview of Libya, which covers the period between 1960 and 2006. The focus is on the nature and style of Libyan political leaders, government policies and actions regarding international state and state sponsored terrorism. Case studies such as the Lockerbie bombing of the Pan AM airliner in 1988; the La Belle disco bombing in West Berlin in 1986; and the killing of opposition groups in exile are examined. Other case studies such as Libyan sponsorship of terrorist groups in Algeria, and the training and provision of training facilities and safe havens for terrorists are also analysed. Since Libya was recently removed from the US State Department's list of state sponsors of international terrorism, the research analyses why this has occurred in the light of the prevailing global war against terrorism (GWOT).

Chapter four examines the involvement of Sudan in international terrorism. This entails a brief historical overview of the country, the nature and style of its leadership, government policies and actions regarding state sponsored international terrorism.

Case studies such as the attempted assassination of President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, the provision of training facilities for terrorist groups, and the arming and sponsoring of terrorist groups in neighbouring countries such as Ethiopia and Eritrea, are also presented.

Chapter five forms a summary of the text and an evaluation of the assumptions formulated in the Introduction. This specifically entails evaluating whether state and state sponsored international terrorism is a means of achieving domestic and foreign policy objectives.

REFERENCES

[1] AU: *OAU Convention on Prevention and Combating of Terrorism*,
13 July 1999

[2] Wilkinson. P, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*. Frank Cass. London,
2000, p. 13

[3] Hough. M, "New York Terror: The Implications for Africa", *Africa Insight*. Vol. 32, No. 1, March
2002, p. 65

[4] Byman. D, *Deadly Connections: States That Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press,
New York, 2005, p. 10

Chapter 1

STATE AND STATE SPONSORED INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

"Terrorism has become a systematic weapon of war that knows no borders or seldom has a face" (Jacques Chirac)

1.   INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of terrorism is not new in international politics. Its history is extensive and dates back to Greek times. Sub-state groups have always used terrorism as a weapon of warfare against states whose policies they consider inconsistent with their aims and aspirations. During colonial times in Africa, for example, liberation movements in colonies such as Kenya and Algeria extensively employed terrorism as a strategy of warfare against colonial powers. Authoritarian states in different parts of the world continue to use terror to repress, eliminate, and exile opposition leaders and enforce obedience to their rules.

While domestic state terror is a common feature of politics in many African states, state engagement in and sponsorship of international terrorism is a relatively new development in Africa. Its development can be traced to the 1970s with the identification of Libya amongst other states as a sponsor of international terrorism by the United States (US) government in 1979.

Terrorism and state and state sponsored international terrorism in particular have received extensive attention in Western studies but comparatively little attention within Africa. Despite its long history and study, the terrain of terrorism remains a contested one, particularly with reference to its definitions. The concept is largely subjectively perceived, and often highly politicised and defined.

In this chapter, the concept of terrorism in general and state and state sponsored international terrorism in particular, are explored. The implications of state and state sponsored international terrorism with specific reference to Africa are also discussed and analysed.

2. THE CONCEPT AND TYPOLOGY OF TERRORISM

It has been pointed out that there is neither a generally accepted definition of terrorism nor a generally agreed method of categorising it. There are as many definitions of terrorism as there are authors and commentators. In their seminal work in 1988, Schmidst and Jongman stated that there were as many as 109 or more definitions of terrorism by academics, politicians, intelligence and security personnel, observers and journalists.[1]

2.1 Terrorism: a conceptual framework

Terrorism has been defined as "the deliberate use of intimidation and physical force by sovereign states and sub-national groups."[2] Although not explicitly stated, this definition tends to see terrorism as a strategy of warfare and clearly acknowledges that it is not employed by sub-state actors only but also by state actors. Its main weakness however, is that it tends to view terrorism as a thoughtless and irrational act of violence without a specific purpose or objective.

Wilkinson in his definition attempts to provide the missing link in the above definition. He agrees that terrorism is neither a philosophy nor movement but a method or strategy of warfare- "a systematic use of coercive intimidation, usually to serve political ends."[3] By this definition, Wilkinson disagrees that terrorism is a mindless and irrational act of violence that lacks specific objectives. On the contrary, it has an underlying reason, which is usually political in nature. Benjamin agrees with Wilkinson when he argues that terrorism is: "the deliberate and systematic murder, maiming, and menacing of the innocent to inspire fear for political ends"[4]

The definition of terrorism in the *United States Code, Title 22* (*US, Code Title 22*) is not radically different from the definitions so far considered. The document defines the concept as: "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience."[5] A vital omission from this definition is the exclusion or exoneration of state actors as perpetrators of terrorism at domestic and international levels.

The Organisation of African Unity (OAU), now the African Union (AU) provides what may be regarded as a more elaborate definition of terrorism. The *OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism, 1999* (The Algiers Convention) describes terrorism as:[6]

(a)   *Any act which is a violation of the criminal laws of a State Party and which may endanger the life, physical integrity or freedom of, or cause serious injury or death to, any person, any number of or group of persons or causes or may cause damage to public or private property, natural resources, environmental or cultural heritage and is calculated to:*

    (i)   *intimidate, put in fear, force, coerce, or induce any government, body, institution, the general public or any segment thereof, to do or abstain or abandon a particular standpoint or act according certain principles; or*

    (ii)   *disrupt any public service, the delivery of any essential service to the public or to create a public emergency; or*

    (iii)   *create general insurrection in a state;*

(b)   *any promotion, sponsoring, contribution to command, aid, incitement, encouragement, attempt, threat, conspiracy, organising, or procurement of any person, with the intent to commit any act referred to in paragraph (a) (i) to (iii).*

The difference between this definition and other definitions of terrorism already considered, lies in the fact that the peculiar African historical context appears to have heavily influenced the definition of the concept in the OAU document. For example, while the term "sub-state actor", includes known terrorist groups such as al Qaeda, and the so-called "freedom fighters" attempting to change the prevailing political situation in

a state by the use of force; the *OAU Convention* does not seem to agree that the latter group should be categorised as terrorists. Thus, Article 3 of the document states:[7]

> *Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 1, the struggle waged by peoples in accordance with the principles of international law for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces shall not be considered as terrorist acts.*

The definition provided by the OAU also acknowledges that not all acts of violence or crime constitute terrorism. The document notes that for an act to be regarded as "terrorist" it would need to satisfy certain criteria. First, it must be intended to intimidate, cause fear, coerce or force a government, body or institution or the general public to adopt or abandon a particular standpoint which otherwise it would not have taken or abandoned. Second, the presumed acts must be targeted at disrupting public order and service, or creating general insurrection in the state.[8] More importantly, the *OAU Convention* equally regards acts such as promotion, sponsoring, contribution to, command, aid, incitement, encouragement, attempt, threat, conspiracy, organising, or procurement of any person, with the intent to cause harm or realise a cause, as part and parcel of terrorist acts.[9]

The *OAU Convention* did not expressively include state and state sponsored international terrorism in its definition. However, the recognition of activities such as aiding, sponsoring, encouraging, conspiring, promoting and inciting of acts of terror are equally meant to address state and state sponsored international terrorism. This is because states' involvement in international terrorism often takes these identified forms. Against this background, the definition of terrorism as contained in the *OAU Convention* is employed throughout this study.

Terrorism is a form of political violence intended to advance social, political, economic or religious objectives.[10] It is different from organised crime or any other common law

offence. The difference between the two lies mainly in the motive behind the acts. While the underlying reason for terrorism may not necessarily be financial gain, but political, religious or ideological inducements, criminal syndicates engage in crimes for financial benefits. Similarly, Wilkinson notes that terrorism and guerrilla warfare are not the same even though guerrilla fighters sometimes employ terror tactics in their campaign.[11] In this regard Kiras notes that: "terrorism seeks to bring awareness to a political cause but rarely, if ever, results on its own in political change; guerrilla warfare by contrast, is an attempt to bring about political change by force of arms."[12] Boaz further insists that guerrilla fighters respect the rights of non-combatants to a large extent, while terrorists do not respect the rights of non-combatants, and do not have limits on means used which include widespread assassination, and deliberate killing of innocent civilian populations.[13]

Terrorism takes various forms depending on the objective it is intended to achieve. The next section examines the various typologies of terrorism.

2.2   Typologies of terrorism

In most cases terrorism is classified as domestic and international according to the purpose, motivation, nationality, and target of the terrorists. Scholars have also advanced a further classification of the concept, which includes "transnational" and "lonewolf" terrorism.

2.2.1   Domestic terrorism

Domestic terrorism refers to acts carried out by a group of individuals (usually citizens), who operate within a given state presumably without foreign support or control, against the government and in some cases citizens of the state. Their targets are only domestic targets aimed at wringing concessions from the government or forcing particular groups in the country to accede to the demands of the terrorists. [14]   Related to the concept of domestic terrorism is insurgency. Insurgency refers to "a rebellion or rising against any

government in power or a civil authority."[15] It is more advanced than random terror but can still include acts of terror. Domestic terrorism also includes the use of terror by the government of a state against its own citizens or a section of its population. This type of state terrorism falls outside the purview of this study.

2.2.2   International terrorism

As far as international terrorism is concerned, one of its distinguishing characteristics is that it is carried out across international boundaries; and may involve people of different nationalities who nevertheless, share a common vision of the world, common (perceived) enemies, ideology, and religious belief. The *US Code Title 22*, defines international terrorism as terrorism "involving citizens or the territory of more than one country"[16] Equally included in the definition of international terrorism by the US State Department is the deliberate targeting of foreign property, and military personnel (non-combatant) and ammunition not deployed in a conflict zone.[17] In addition, international terrorism constitutes a breach of accepted principles of international rule and conduct. Owing to disagreement over its precise definition, it is some times narrowly referred to as: "acts, which have been specifically identified and outlawed by international agreements."[18]

In the view of Jenkins, international terrorism refers to terror incidents that have clear international repercussions.[19] Wilkinson posits that international terrorism in its most obvious manifestation is "an attack carried out across national frontiers or against a foreign target in the terrorists' state of origin."[20] Hough elaborates further that such terror acts take three different forms: "international terrorism conducted by autonomous non-state actors; state-sponsored international terrorism conducted by people controlled by a sovereign state; and international state terrorism conducted by a state using its own agents for this purpose."[21] The second and third forms of international terrorism identified above, form the core focus of this study, and the nature of these forms will be discussed in more detail subsequently.

2.2.3   Transnational terrorism

Transnational terrorism has recently emerged as another type of terrorism. Some scholars however use the term synonymously with international terrorism. Gueli has attempted to distinguish between the two. According to him, "transnational terrorism implies acts of terrorism that exhibit domestic and international consequences, and that involves citizens or territory of one or more countries."[22] The definition is in line with the characterisation of a transnational offence by the *United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime* (the Palermo Convention).[23] According to the *Palermo Convention*, an offence is considered transnational if: [24]

- *It is committed in more than one State;*
- *It is committed in one State but has a substantial part of its preparation, planning, direction or control takes place in another State;*
- *It is committed in one State but involved an organised group that engages in activities in more than one State; or*
- *It is committed in one State but has substantial effects in another State.*

In addition, Hoffman tends to suggest that transnational terrorism is a calculated violent challenge to the US domination of global politics given the fact that the country has been the target of most terror attacks.[25] This is not completely accurate even though the US has suffered more international terror attacks than most countries. Northern African countries such as Algeria and Morocco have similarly been hard hit by transnational terrorism. The point must however be made to the effect that transnational terrorist groups such as al Qaeda affiliates are not linked to specific state sponsorship. Moreover, transnational terrorism is used to describe decentralised local groups loosely affiliated or motivated by religious ideology advocated by organisations such as al Qaeda.[26]

A good example of a transnational terrorist group is the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GSPC, also known as the al Qaeda Organisation in Islamic Maghreb), which is affiliated to al Qaeda. The GSPC is a group that operates across national boundaries of

countries in the Sahara region of Africa. Its membership is drawn from Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Mali and Niger and the Middle Eastern countries of Yemen and Saudi Arabia. Transnational terrorists tend to be united by common ideological and religious belief rather than economic or political reasons. In addition transnational groups tend to have the long-term aim of establishing a revolutionary supranational world order. [27]

2.2.4   Lone Wolf terrorism

The last type of terrorism is the so-called "lone wolf" terrorism. It is simply an act of terror committed by a single individual that may or not have links to any organisation. Such acts are usually domestic but may also have international repercussions, for example, when their victims include foreign nationals. Individuals who are opposed to specific environmental or social issues such as abortion and immigration policies of their countries often resort to this type of terrorism to draw attention to their cause. Timothy McVeigh who was convicted and executed in June 2001 for his role in the Oklahoma City bombing in the US in 1995, falls under this classification.[28]

Empirically speaking, it is almost impossible to separate the various forms of terrorism discussed in the preceding sections. In the context of a globalising world, acts of domestic terrorism may have international implications. There are also terrorist groups whose targets are purely national but which receive some form of international support, or attempt to achieve international publicity.[29] The next section of this study examines the objectives that state and non-state actors attempt to achieve through international terrorism.

3.   OBJECTIVES OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

The advent of contemporary international terrorism can be traced to the late 1960s, particularly, following the defeat of the combined forces of Arab states by Israel in the Six Day War in 1967. This proved to the Palestinians that it would be difficult to defeat Israel through conventional military methods. Thus, radical Palestinian groups such as al

Fatah, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO), and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), started carrying out several international terror acts such as hijackings, bombings and shootings of civilians to supplement the traditional methods of guerrilla border raids. The international implication of the sudden shift in tactics was that it attracted wider publicity and global attention to the Palestinian cause. Moreover, other militant groups in different parts of the world became influenced by what they saw as the success of the Palestinians in gaining widespread attention through international terror acts.[30]

In this regard, one important objective of international terror acts is the gaining of widespread publicity, which a terror group needs to achieve recognition by a national government or the international community. As Jenkins sustains, terrorists are not necessarily interested in the death of or harm done to victims. Rather, in one sense, international terror acts are a declaration of existence, solidarity, or opposition to a national government by a terror group and its sponsors.[31] Acts of international terror are aimed at publicising the grievances of a terror group and its capability and willingness to use force in advancing those grievances.

Demonstration of capability therefore systematically presents an international terror group as a formidable force that deserves recognition and respect by both the government it opposes and the international community at large. In another sense, publicising of cause and projection of capability are ultimately targeted at the psyche of the people or the audience (including government officials) who witness, hear and read about the terror incidents carried out by a terror group. Brutality exhibited in the acts instils fear in the minds of the people and causes them to over estimate the strength and membership of the group.[32] In this way, terrorist groups attempt to influence international and national public opinions regarding their cause. In some cases international terror acts turn public opinion in favour of the terrorists and in other cases such acts alienate the terrorists from the public or part of it.

State and non-state actors use international terror acts to bring about general disorder, weakening, and destruction of the social fabric of a target state.[33] This appears to be the main objective of groups such as al Qaeda in carrying out the September 11 attacks in the US. State sponsors of international terrorism intent on installing puppet government in other countries, use international terrorism to weaken areas that could serve the purposes of recruitment and training for groups they support. Hence, in the thinking of the US policy makers Africa provides "safe haven" for terrorists because so many of such areas exist in several African states.[34] This objective is also common with guerrilla groups using terror as part of their grand strategies.

International terrorism is designed to expose the security weaknesses of the target state, and prove that the state is incapable of protecting the lives and properties of its citizens. Terrorists believe that successful instilling of this belief will convince the citizens that their only guarantee of safety and security lies in supporting and joining the terrorist group. The situation in the Acholi region of Uganda is a classic example of this objective in practice.

State actors also employ international terrorism as a means of enforcing obedience, and securing cooperation, and commitment from its citizens at home and abroad. Acts of international terror aimed at enforcing obedience, respect, commitment and cooperation entails mysterious kidnapping and murder of so-called defectors and dissidents living in foreign countries. It also entails sudden but planned arrest, conviction and imprisonment of opposition leaders. In extreme cases, bodies of individuals who disappeared mysteriously in foreign countries are later found tortured to death in unusual places. It is important to point out that acts of terror that are intended to achieve this purpose are not intended to achieve international attention or widespread publicity and their victims are not randomly selected.[35]

Furthermore, international terrorism is sometimes intended to provoke the government of a state into adopting disproportionate repression and reprisal counter-terrorism measures.[36] By this, terrorists hope to make the government unpopular and achieve a

radical shift in the balance of support between them and the government. Such a radical shift may eventually lead to the defeat of the government. International terror acts intended to achieve this purpose are often directed against state assets such as oil and industrial installations, military installations, government officials, police and other law enforcement agents. Sometimes they are also targeted at foreigners especially, diplomats, tourists, expatriates and innocent civilians. As already stated this is meant to embarrass the government, expose its security lapses and provoke it into reacting massively and disproportionately and thereby attracting to itself, national and international condemnation.[37] The case of Israel and the Palestinian groups provide a good example.

It has also been noted that international terrorism is used sometimes to punish a hostile foreign government and the people that support it and its policies. In this regard, terrorists consider victims of terror incidents as being guilty of supporting a hostile government. Sometimes the victims are randomly selected based on their active or partial opposition to the terrorist group or their state sponsors, and obedience to the enemy government as well as providing information on the location, membership and operations of the group. Even where no such case exists, for example, where innocent foreign tourists who may not be aware of the terrorists' grievances against the government are killed, or where children are killed in bomb explosions, terrorists still consider the victims guilty of tacit support and cooperation with the perceived enemy state.[38] The bombing of US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 by al Qaeda operatives was intended to punish not only the US, but also the Kenyan and Tanzanian governments for their cooperation and good relations with the US.

International terror groups and their state sponsors see people working for governments of states that they oppose as enemies as well as those having the visas of or travelling to those states or with their national carriers.[39] Furthermore, wealthy individuals may also be targeted because of their wealth and life style which terrorists often consider as corrupt and immoral according to their religious belief. Often embassies, airlines, and companies suspected of belonging to an enemy foreign state are bombed because of their symbolic importance.

The next section of this study examines the concepts of international state and state sponsored terrorism.

4. INTERNATIONAL STATE AND STATE SPONSORED TERRORISM

The involvement of states in international terrorism takes direct and indirect forms. International state terrorism represents the direct involvement of states in acts of terror at the international level. State sponsored international terrorism refers to indirect involvement in international terror activities. In some cases however, a state can pursue both forms of involvement simultaneously. The degree of involvement of states in these two forms of international terrorism differs as well as the objectives pursued. The two forms or levels of state involvement in international terrorism are analysed below.

4.1 State sponsored international terrorism

The idea of designating sovereign states as sponsors of terrorism was initiated by the US in 1979 through the adoption of the *Export Administration Act of 1979*.[40] The Act was meant to prevent the export of certain technologies to states suspected of supporting terrorist groups. The US State Department listed Libya, Iraq, and Syria as state sponsors of international terrorism in 1979.[41] Cuba was added to the list in 1982, while Iran and North Korea were added to it in 1984 and 1988 respectively. In 1993, Sudan became the second African state to be listed as a state sponsor of terrorism by the US State Department. Iraq was removed from the list in 2004, while Libya was de-listed in May 2006.[42]

Boaz has suggested that state sponsored terrorism can be classified into three sub-divisions, namely, state supported terrorism, state operated terrorism and state perpetrated terrorism.[43] But from Boaz's explanation, "state operated terrorism" and "state supported

terrorism" are conceptually unclear. Nevertheless, he contends that these levels of state involvement in terrorism constitute what is commonly referred to as state sponsored international terrorism. While "state operated terrorism" and "state supported terrorism" may fall directly under state sponsored international terrorism, "state perpetrated terrorism" belongs to a different classification as will be shown in the next section of this chapter.

Hough sees state sponsored international terrorism as acts of terror conducted by people controlled by a sovereign state.[44] In addition to this, state sponsored international terrorism occurs when a state covertly provides financial assistance, ideological backing, military or logistical support to terrorist organisations operating mostly internationally. Byman defines state sponsorship of terrorism as "a government's intentional assistance to a terrorist group to help it use violence, bolster its political activities, or sustain the organisation"[45] He identifies six categories of state sponsorship of international terrorism, namely, strong, weak, lukewarm, antagonistic, passive and unwilling hosts. Strong supporters publicly support terrorist organisations with their resources, for example, Iran's support of Hezbollah. Strong supporters are also directly involved in the operations of terror groups that they support. Weak, lukewarm and passive supporters provide mainly verbal or moral support to terrorist groups. They may condemn acts of terror but do nothing to combat terrorism or prevent their territories from being used by terrorists. Antagonistic supporters such as Syria often attack, arrest or imprison members of terrorist groups that they support, especially if the groups fail to operate according to the terms of the supporters. Unwilling hosts such as Lebanon do not necessarily support international terrorist groups operating within their territories but they do not have the capability to expel or defeat the groups.[46]

State sponsored international terrorism equally involves using both print and electronic media to openly or systematically encourage and applaud particular terrorist operations rather than condemning such acts.[47] Often it entails overstating the reasons why terrorist groups resort to the use of terror to advance their cause, and calling on target countries to accede to the demands of the groups if they want to avoid future occurrences of terror. In

certain cases the state may use the media to praise suicide bombers as "martyrs" with the aim of inciting more of such acts.

Additionally, state sponsored international terrorism includes the harbouring of known terrorists and refusing to extradite them to countries where they have allegedly committed acts of terror to face legal trials.[48] This is despite the fact that the state harbouring these alleged terrorists may be a signatory to various international anti-terrorism regimes. Most often states deny the involvement of their citizens and other wanted persons living in their territories in terror acts, which they are suspected of having committed or masterminded. The situation may be aggravated if no formal extradition agreement exists between the state harbouring the terrorists and the target state where the terror activities were carried out. This form of state sponsored international terrorism was part of the reasons for the invasion of Taliban Afghanistan by the US towards the end of 2001 following the events of September 11.[49]

Related to the issue of harbouring terrorists is the provision of training facilities for terrorist organisations.[50] Sometimes the state sponsors of international terrorism may pretend to be unaware of the presence of such groups in their territories and therefore claim ignorance of the groups' activities. In some cases state sponsors of terrors do not hide their support of terror organisations. There are known international terrorist organisations having offices in several countries across the world. State sponsors of international terrorism often claim that they support the political aspirations of the terror groups. Although state sponsors of international terrorism may join other states in condemning international terrorism, they often justify acts of terror committed by those groups that they support as part of armed struggle for a "legitimate" cause.[51]

Furthermore, state sponsors of international terrorism in most cases allow terrorists access to their diplomatic structures in foreign countries. State sponsors of international terrorism assist terror groups operating under their control and direction to smuggle weapons into countries where they intend to carry out terror attacks through their embassies. On the same hand, through the issuing of diplomatic passports to terrorists,

state sponsors of international terrorism help conceal the identities of terrorists and their operations as well as facilitating their movement across national boundaries. Diplomatic support makes it difficult to suspect, investigate, arrest and prosecute alleged terrorists. In some cases terrorists seek refuge in embassies of countries that support, sponsor and sympathise with their cause.[52]

State sponsors of international terrorism train terrorists in specialised skills such as intelligence gathering, surveillance and mission-planning techniques.[53] Thus, it is not surprising to see terrorists carry out attacks with military precision using small arms and explosives, and evading arrest thereafter by relying on excellent intelligence networks.[54]

There are states which do not only sponsor international terrorism, but also carry out international terror acts. This form of state involvement in international terrorism is the focus of the next section.

4.2 International state terrorism

What Boaz has attempted to conceptualise, as "state perpetrated terrorism" is what is referred to in this study as international state terrorism. International state terrorism involves not only the recruitment, training, organising, planning, directing and controlling of terrorists and their activities in foreign countries but also the carrying out of such acts using own resources and trained agents.[55] International state terrorism is usually very potent because states have enormous financial, institutional, organisational, military, technological and personnel resources at their disposal. These resources are maximally employed to ensure the success of terror operations, and the state's secret services, agents, embassies abroad and other institutions are used in carrying out and directing terror activities.

Some scholars have also suggested that international state terrorism forms part of a state's overall covert operations.[56] According to Collins, international state terrorism is convert violence carried out by a state against non-combatants for the purpose of creating

an atmosphere of fear and of intimidating a wide audience, so as to advance a social or political agenda.[57]

International state terrorism takes different forms. In some cases authoritarian regimes use own trained state agents to abduct, torture, and assassinate disposed leaders and exiled opposition leaders living in foreign countries.[58] International state terrorism also takes the form of using foreign diplomatic offices to spy on, harass and intimidate exile communities or dissident groups in foreign countries. In other cases state agents are also used to bomb selected targets such as national carriers of perceived enemy states or social points such as discotheques and hotels often used by nationals of such countries. Other forms of international state terrorism include using state agents and soldiers to assist insurgent movements in neighbouring countries; hijacking; and the killing of leaders of foreign countries. The assassination of former Iranian Prime Minister Shapour Bakhtiar in Paris in 1991 by an Iranian hit squad using diplomatic cover is a classic example of international state terrorism. [59]

The tendency exists to confuse state sponsored international terrorism with international state terrorism. The two are conceptually different. In state sponsored international terrorism, a state uses its resources and expertise to assist a terror group without necessarily using its own trained agents or personnel to plan, organise or carry out the actual acts of terror. In international state terrorism, the state uses both its own resources, expertise and own trained agents to plan, organise and carry out terror activities.

Similarly, the objectives of both forms of terrorism may not necessarily be the same. Most often state sponsored international terrorism is intended to support a foreign group that shares common religious, ethnic and ideological beliefs while international state terrorism tends to have different objectives. Sometimes, international state terrorism may be targeted at exiled opposition leaders abroad. Secondly, it can also be directed against an unfriendly foreign government with the aim of overthrowing or destabilising it. Thirdly, it may also be used as a form of covert retaliation or punishment against a more powerful state.

4.3. **Motives underlying state and state sponsored international terrorism**

Terrorism is often described as mindless, senseless, and an irrational act of cowardice that has no objective. This description is understandable given that it is hard to link or explain how terror acts such as the killing of innocent bystanders, suicide bombings and bombing of airplanes, advance the causes of terror. It is even harder to understand why states engage in and sponsor international terrorism when they can use other means of statecraft to advance their domestic and foreign objectives.[60] No single theory capable of comprehensively explaining why states carry out and sponsor international terrorism exists. There are rather complementary theories attempting to provide an understanding of this phenomenon such as realism and systems theories.

International state terrorism is motivated by several factors. In the first place states need political, economic, diplomatic and conventional military power to advance their domestic and foreign policy objectives at the expense of other states. However, countries that carry out international terror acts often lack these necessary instruments for pursuing their policy objectives. Thus, they resort to international terrorism. In this sense, international state terrorism becomes war and politics by another means.[61] In 1986 for example, the US bombed Libya for its support and sponsorship of international terrorism. Since Libya cannot retaliate militarily against the US due to the unequal balance of military, political, social, economic and technological power, it resorted to international state terrorism by bombing US and other Western targets in countries such as Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. It also sponsored other terror groups fighting against the US and other Western countries.

International terrorism is often used by state and non-state actors to coerce the government of a state into making concessions to certain demands by the terrorists. Thus, terrorists use international terror acts such as hostage taking and kidnapping of diplomats as a means of strengthening negotiating positions with a superior opposition, usually a state actor. In some cases such demands include, but are not limited to, the release of

imprisoned members, return of occupied territory, publication of terrorist messages, and in case of criminal terror groups, payment of a ransom.[62]

Thus, state and state sponsored international terrorism are dynamic and based on a mutual relationship and understanding between states and a non-state terror groups. While providing the necessary prerequisites for a sustained international terror campaign for terror groups, states pursue their foreign policy goals in the process. These goals may include but are not limited to, domestic power consolidation and projection, regional hegemony, destabilisation of neighbouring countries and regime change, export of political ideology, internal security, and prestige.[63]

Wilkinson has identified seven requirements to ensure a successful international terror campaign. The first is main aim or motivation such as a desire to overthrow the government of a perceived enemy state for alleged social injustice. Other prerequisites include effective leadership to determine, incite and direct the terror campaign; good organisation; training in basic terror skills; funds; weapons and ammunitions; and access to target countries.[64] A state becomes a sponsor of international terrorism when terror organisations, which lack most of the aforementioned essential prerequisites, especially funding, training, weapons, and diplomatic access to other countries, seek their support and sponsorship. State support and sponsorship are easily obtained if a state shares the same vision, religion, ideology, and ethnicity or in the absence of these, common hatred for a target state.

In this regard, the realist paradigm provides the most appropriate explanation for state and state sponsored international terrorism for the purposes of power consolidation and projection; regional hegemony; destabilisation of neighbouring countries and regime change; export of political ideology; internal security; and prestige. Thus, state and state sponsored international terrorism would be regarded as part of offensive realism, where "structural constraints create preferences leading to covert action."[65] The theory however, falls short when applied to the study of other goals of state and state sponsored international terrorism such as covert retaliation against a superior power, support for

groups sharing common religion, ideology and ethnic origin, or global extension of worldview. These goals can best be explained using systems theory.

Based on systems theory, state and state sponsored international terrorism is a "mechanism by which a system (state) appropriates cultural norms and uses them to instruct policy as a method of ensuring system longevity."[66] Thus, engagement in state and state sponsored international terrorism becomes a means of legitimising domestic power through external support. Sponsorship of extra-systemic violence gives a state the appearance of a defender of common cultural and religious norms in the face of repression from a specified "other".

Thus, Libyan and Sudanese sponsorship of Palestinian terrorist groups such as the Abu Nidal Organisation and al Qaeda respectively, may have been intended to draw international support from fellow Arab and Islamic states. International support from states sharing common religious belief and ethnic origin could have been deemed necessary for legitimising the Islamist policies and authoritarian leadership styles of the governments of these African states and in turn ensuring their survival or longevity.[67] It can be recalled that Libya and Sudan faced and continue to face serious challenges from non-Muslims over policies of Islamisation introduced in Libya and Sudan in 1969 and 1983 respectively.

State and state sponsored international terrorism have several implications for states, regions and the international community. These implications are considered in the next section of this study.

4.4   Implications of state and state sponsored international terrorism

Terrorism in general and state and state sponsored international terrorism in particular, have several global and regional implications. It threatens global economic, political and social stability, as well as relations between countries. For example, the involvement of states in international terror plays a role in compounding the problem of evolving a

universally acceptable definition of terrorism. Similarly, state and state sponsored international terrorism increases global insecurity and threats, especially the chances of terrorists acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in terror attacks in any part of the world.

With specific reference to Africa, state and state sponsored international terrorism threatens the political stability of African states. Although political instability in most African states can be attributed to several historical, political, social and economic factors, it is argued that state and state sponsored international terrorism has the potential to exacerbate this challenge.[68] For example, state sponsored international terrorism targeted at opposition leaders living in exile may lead to increase violent demonstrations by, and multiplication of insurgent groups within the state. Even when government forces "succeed" in repressing opposition groups, such repressions can only be temporary. The tendency for future rebellion will remain high in the country. Similarly, state and state sponsored international terrorism directed at other states in the region equally have the capability of causing political instability, and possible military confrontation between the sponsoring state and the target state. In turn, regional peace and stability will be threatened.

State and state sponsored international terrorism have economic implications for African states that engage in it as well as for the entire region. In the African region for example, punitive economic measures such as multilateral and unilateral economic sanctions can cripple vulnerable economies of state sponsors of terrorism as well as impact negatively on those of other states in the region. This can be achieved through massive disinvestment from these countries, banning of imports and exports, flights from and to these states, and freezing of foreign assets.[69] This will have adverse effects on the populations of these countries. A good example of such adverse effects would be increased unemployment as a result of job losses and reduction in revenue generation by the concerned governments. Invariably, governments of these states may become unable to provide sustainable social services for their populations. Lack of sustainable social services may in turn trigger social instability.

The phenomena of state and state sponsored international terrorism have other implications for populations of African states that engage in it. In most cases the movement of nationals of African states suspected of engaging in and sponsoring international terrorism targeting foreign countries, may be restricted by the imposition of sanctions.[70] Thus, they may be refused entry visas by other countries and certain airlines may equally blacklist them as high security risk passengers. If their national airlines are banned, then it becomes difficult for them to move out of their countries.

The presence of terrorist groups in African countries that engage in state and state sponsored international terrorism may also negatively impact on the populations of these states in another sense. First, vulnerable groups in these African states such as the poor, children and the youth may be lured or deceived into joining terror groups either for monetary benefits or in the belief that they are fighting a just cause. Second, the exposure of youths to, and training in the use of violence, may provide the basis for the formation of insurgent movements. This is especially the case when the countries have renounced international state terrorism and ended sponsorship of terror groups. Mamdani attempts to make this point clear in his seminal work on the roots of terrorism.[71] At airports and other points of entry passport holders of African states accused of sponsoring international terrorism may be subjected to thorough searching, and interrogation, sometimes in complete violation of the rights of the travellers.

Similarly, state sponsorship of terrorism has implications for the external relations of African states that engage in it. This is because state and state sponsored international terrorism is regarded as a violation of the international code of conduct by states and attracts several punitive measures such as economic and diplomatic sanctions.[72] When African states are suspected of sponsoring international terrorism, they lose the support and trust of other states as rational actors in international relations. Thus, as mentioned earlier diplomats from suspect states may be treated with suspicion in their host countries and their movements in these countries becomes carefully monitored and curtailed.

Furthermore, host countries may considerably reduce diplomatic representation of African states suspected of sponsoring international terrorism. In some cases diplomats from and international agencies belonging to these, states may be expelled from other countries.[73] Also countries in other regions of the world may equally threaten to withdraw diplomatic immunities from suspect states' diplomats in order to institute criminal charges against them. Regional bodies such as the AU to which these countries belong may equally sever diplomatic relations with state sponsors of international terrorism or deny them leadership roles in regional bodies.

State and state sponsored international terrorism may also have an adverse military impact on African states that engage in it. Export of weapons and other military hardware and technologies to suspect states may be restricted, for fear that such technologies may be used for terror purposes.[74] Lack of necessary military technologies, advice and spare parts or replacements for ageing weapon systems belonging to these states may again affect the operational capabilities of their armed forces. In extreme cases African states that conduct and sponsor international terrorism may be exposed to military attacks by other countries as a form of warning.

Finally, it is important to add that state and state sponsored international terrorism has legal implications for African states that practice it.[75] This is more so in an era of transnational justice. Victims of terror attacks carried out by agents of state sponsors of terrorism or groups under the control of such states may institute legal actions against them. A guilty verdict may lead to the paying of huge compensation and application of several other punitive measures against these states by the international community. It is imperative to also add that although Africa is specifically referred to in this study, these implications can equally apply to other countries and regions of the world.

5.   CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the concepts of terrorism, international terrorism and state and state sponsored international terrorism have been explored. It is maintained that terrorism is not a senseless and irrational act as some posit, but a weapon or strategy of warfare that can be used on its own or as part of a broader strategy. Acts of terror whether domestic or international, state sponsored or orchestrated by non-state actors, have certain characteristics in common. Terrorism is characterised by violence, has psychological effects and mainly targets innocent or vulnerable people.

As a means of warfare it is used both by state actors and non-state actors to achieve socio-political, economic and religious objectives. The objectives of terrorism however, differ from one case to another. While state actors employ terror to achieve domestic policy aims such as ensuring obedience to their rule, and foreign policy objectives such as the overthrow of an unfriendly foreign government, sub-state actors often use it to wring concessions from governments they have declared war on. Such concessions may include, release of prisoners, recognition, and even payment of ransom. Terrorism also has other purposes such as causing disorder, achieving publicity, intimidation of targets, and punishment and cooperation, especially within its ranks.

The emphasis in this study is placed on international state terrorism and state sponsored international terrorism. These two concepts are mutually interrelated and in practice may not be completely divorced from one another. International state terrorism refers to a situation in which a state becomes directly involved in international terrorism by deploying its material and human resources to carry out acts of terror. State sponsored international terrorism on the other hand refers to a situation in which a state is indirectly involved in acts of terror. In this case the state uses its resources and expertise to assist a terrorist group without necessarily using its own trained agents or personnel to plan, organise or carry out the actual acts of terror.

The global, regional and country specific implications of state and state sponsored international terrorism are many. Politically, this phenomenon can have a negative impact on the overall development of states that practice it as well as on other states. For example it can turn international public opinion against state sponsors and result in the loss of international confidence as well as diplomatic isolation. It also has the capacity to cause political instability in states within the African region and in other parts of the world. State and state sponsored international terrorism may also result in economic sanctions, military confrontations, and gross human rights violations, which retard development. As pointed out earlier, the development of this phenomenon is relatively new in Africa. The next chapter will therefore examine the evolution of state and state sponsored international terrorism in the African region.

REFERENCES

[1] Schmidst. A. P, et al., *Political Terrorism*, SWIDOC Amsterdam and Transaction Books, 1988, p. 5

[2] *International Encyclopaedia of Government and Politics*, Vol. 2, Selen Press Inc. London and Chicago 1996, p. 1350,

[3] Wilkinson. P, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*. Frank Cass. London, 2000, p. 13

[4] Benjamin. N, (ed), *Fighting terrorism: how to democracies can defeat domestic and international terrorists*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 2001, p. 9

[5] *United States Code, Title 22, Section 2656f(a).*

[6] AU**:** *OAU Convention on Prevention and Combating of Terrorism*, 13 July 1999 http://untreaty.un.org/English/Terrorism/oau_e.pdf , accessed 21 September 2006

[7] *Ibid*

[8] *Ibid*

[9] *Ibid*

[10] Hewett. C, *Consequences of political Violence*, Dartmouth publications Company: England, 1993, p. 1

[11] Wilkinson. P*, op cit*, p. 13

[12] Kiras. J. D, "Terrorism and Irregular Warfare", in John Baylis, et al (eds.), *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies*, Oxford university Press: Oxford, 2002, p.211

[13] Boaz. G, "Countering State-Sponsored Terrorism", Herzlia: *ICT Papers*, The International Policy Institute for Counter-Terrorism, The Interdisciplinary Centre, 1997, p. 42

[14] Wilkinson. P, *op cit*, p. 19

[15] *Ibid* , p. 2

[16] *United States Code, Title 22 Section 2656f(d).*

[17] US: Department of State: *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003*, Washington DC, 2004, p. xii

[18] Jenkins. B. M, "International Terrorism: A New Mode of Conflict", in David Cariton and Carlo Shaerf (eds.), *International Terrorism and World Security*, Croom Helm: London, 1975, p. 20

[19] *Ibid*

[20] Wilkinson. P*, op cit*, p. 12

[21] Hough. M, "New York Terror: The Implications for Africa", *Africa Insight*. Vol. 32, No. 1, March 2002, p. 65

[22] Gueli. R, "Bin Laden and a-Qaeda: Challenging the assumptions of transnational terrorism"*, Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXV, No. 3, November 2003, p. 26

[23] UN: *The United Nations Convention Against transnational Organised Crime (the Palermo Convention*), Article 3(2)

[24] *Ibid*

[25] Hoffman. B, "Change and Continuity in terrorism", *Studies in conflict and Terrorism*, Vol. 24, No. 5, September/October, 200, p. 417

[26] Hough. M, "New Terrorism or New Perceptions? Some Observations Regarding Changing Views on Terror", *Strategic Review For Southern Africa,* Vol. XXVII, No. 2, November 2005, p. 8

[27] *Ibid*

[28] Wilkinson. P*, op cit,* p. 145

[29] Hough. M, 2002*, op cit*, p. 65

[30] Wilkinson. P, *op cit*, p. 28

[31] Jenkins. B. M, *op cit*, p. 16

[32] *Ibid*

[33] *Ibid*

[34] US: Department of State, *Country Report on Terrorism 2005*, Washington DC: 2006, p. 17

[35] *Ibid*

[36] Kiras. J. D*, op cit,* p.211

[37] *Ibid*

[38] Jenkins. B. M*, op cit,* p. 18

[39] *Ibid*

[40] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003*, *op cit*, p. x

[41] Collins. S. D, "Dissuading State Support of Terrorism: Strikes or Sanctions? (An Analysis of Dissuasion Measures Employed Against Libya)", *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, No. 27, 2004, p.

118

[42] US: Department of State, *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, Washington DC, 2006, p. 7

[43] Boaz. G*, op cit*, p. 7

[44] Hough. M, 2002, *op cit*, p. 65

[45] Byman. D, *Deadly Connections: States That Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005, p. 10

[46] *Ibid*

[47] *International Encyclopaedia of Government and Politics, op cit*, p. 1350

[48] Geldenhuys. D, "The Rule-Breaking Conduct of Qaddafi's Libya", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXV, No. 2, November 2003, p. 64

[49] Chien. A. J, "The Civilian Toll", *Institute for Health and Social Justice*, October 11, 2001

[50] *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism*, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers: Chicago & London, 1997, p. 680

[51] Byman. D*, op cit*, p. 189

[52] *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism*, *op cit*, p. 680

[53] *Ibid*

[54] *Ibid*, p. 681

[55] Hough. M, 2002*, op cit,* p. 65

[56] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1995*, Washington DC, 1996, p. 7

[57] Collins. S. D*, op cit,* pp. 1-18

[58] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global terrorism 1996*, Washing ton DC, 1997, p. 1

[59] *Ibid*

[60] Jenkins. B. M, *op cit*, p. 16

[61] Bayman. D, *op cit*, p. 37

[62] *Ibid*

[63] *Ibid,* p. 22

[64] Wilkinson. P, 2000, *op cit*, p. 62

[65] McAllister. B, "Extra-Systemic Conflict as a System Steering Solution: A Habermasian Analysis of State Sponsorship of Insurgency Movements*", Small Wars and Insurgencies*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 2006, p. 79.

[66] *Ibid*

[67] *Ibid*

[68] Jenkins. B, *op cit*, p. 16

[69] US*: Department of State, National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, *op cit*, p. 7

[70] *Ibid*

[71] Mamdani. M, *Good Muslim Bad Muslim: America, The Cold War and the Roots of Terror*, Pantheon Books: New York, 2004, p. 256

[72] US*: Department of State, Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003, op cit,* p. iv

[73] *Ibid*

[74] US: CRS Report for Congress: *International Terrorism: Treat, Policy, and Response*, January 2007, p. 1

[75] Geldenhuys. D, *op cit*, p. 58

Chapter 2

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IN AFRICA

1.   INTRODUCTION

International terrorism is not new to the African continent. Various forms of international terror incidents have occurred on the continent since colonial times. In the 1950s and 1960s, for example, several Africans countries were engaged in the struggle for independence. This struggle took various forms including the use of terror in countries such as Kenya, Algeria and to a certain extent Cameroon. Since terror incidents at this time included attacks on foreigners and foreign property and specifically aimed at influencing the policies of the colonial powers, they partially resemble the definition of international terrorism adopted for this study. With the gaining of political independence by most African states in the 1960s, the focus of terrorism on the continent began to dramatically shift from de-colonisation to other concerns such as oppression and political exclusion, ideology, religion and social inequalities. The end of the Cold War has also brought about various manifestations of international terrorism in Africa.

Africans have been grappling with the challenge of international terrorism and the ways of combating the phenomenon. Member states of the AU for example have initiated several measures aimed at combating it. Most of these states have also adopted and ratified several international protocols and conventions relating to international terrorism.

In this chapter, the evolvement of international terrorism in Africa is examined. This does not entail a detailed and chronological account of international terror incidents in Africa. Rather it discusses specific historical conditions, which gave rise to this phenomenon during the Cold War era; the post-Cold War period and in the new millennium. The trends of international terrorism on the continent, factors responsible for it, as well as

efforts at continental and international levels to address the challenge, are equally highlighted and discussed.

2. PATTERNS OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IN AFRICA

Trends concerning international terrorism in Africa have varied remarkably. Although non-state terror groups have been active in Africa since the 1950s, the phenomena of state and state sponsored international terrorism became noticeable on the continent from the early 1970s. International terrorism in Africa can be broadly studied within the context of three historical periods; the epoch of the Cold War, the post-Cold War era, and the new millennium. The trends and motivations of international terrorism in Africa during the Cold War period were markedly different from those of the post-Cold War era. The subsequent sections discuss the trends from the 1960s up to the end of the Cold War in 1989, the post-Cold War period, and trends in the new millennium.

2.1 The Cold War period: 1960-1989

The Cold War period was characterised by an ideological divide between the West and the East. This historical period has been described as a period of serious global uncertainty. Specifically, it was characterised by the fear of nuclear warfare between the two superpowers at the time, the US and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR or Soviet Union). It was also a period of increased international terrorism as some states supported several international terrorist groups. International relations among states were conducted within the context of this bi-polar structure of the international system.

During this time however, most African states, belonged to the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). NAM was not involved in the East-West ideological confrontation. In practice however, it was difficult to escape the implications of the Cold War. International terrorism in Africa during the Cold War period was mainly linked to radical ideologies, religious fundamentalism, and insurgencies. In 1987 for example, about 30 international

terror incidents were recorded on the continent.[1] The number increased to 52 in 1988 but slightly decreased to 48 in 1989.[2] Local insurgent groups in the southern parts of the continent committed most of these international terror attacks during the period.

2.1.1 Patterns of international terrorism in Africa during the Cold War

The ideological divide of the world into capitalist West and socialist East during the Cold War era had a tremendous impact on colonial and post-colonial Africa. The African continent for instance, was the theatre of several proxy wars between the two superpowers during the Cold War.

The earliest incidences of terrorism in Africa were noticed during the struggles for independence.[3] Nationalist leaders, fighting for the independence of their various countries perpetrated these terror incidents on the continent. Wilkinson describes these perpetrators as "nationalist terrorists" because they waged their struggle entirely in the territory they sought to liberate.[4]

The National Liberation Front (FLN) for instance, led the struggle for independence in Algeria. The organisation employed both political negotiations and an armed campaign in its struggle against the French. Through its military wing, the National Liberation Army (ALN), the FLN waged a protracted war of independence between 1954 and 1962. The war took the form of guerrilla warfare, but terror tactics such as bombing of civilian targets, and French airliners were also rampant.[5] In Kenya the *Mau-Mau* also waged a protracted war of independence against the British in the early 1950s. The *Mau-Mau* also employed terror as a method of warfare. Its main targets were British interests and civilians even though ordinary Kenyans were also attacked for not supporting the group in some cases.[6]

The impact of the Cold War continued to be felt in post-colonial Africa. Through the so-called national liberation movements in several African countries such as Angola and Mozambique, the superpowers fought proxy wars on the African continent. This was to

extend their influence over and organise the politics of newly independent Africans states according to their ideologies. These liberation movements employed the strategy of terror as part of a broader strategy of guerrilla warfare to achieve their econo-political objectives in the countries they operated.

In the 1970s, international terror incidents on the continent were mostly motivated by religious fanaticism, particularly Islamic fundamentalism.[7] However, Marxist ideology also played an important role at this time. The activities of Islamic fundamentalist movements in Egypt such as *Takfir Wa al Hijra*, *Al-Jihad*, *Jund Allah*, and *Jaysh al-Tahrir al-Islami*, began in the 1970s.[8] As early as 1973, an international terrorist group, the National Front for the Liberation of Morocco (FNLM) had attempted to assassinate the Late King Hassan II of Morocco. Similarly, the post-independent Islamic fundamentalist movement in Algeria can also be traced to the late 1970s although it culminated in the creation of the Armed Islamic Movement (MIA) in 1981.

Equally important to mention is the fact that wars in other regions fed into international terrorism in Africa during the Cold War. The Lebanese civil war in the 1970s for example had a tremendous impact on Islamic fundamentalist activities in Africa. The civil war sparked migration of many radical Islamic groups into North, Central, Horn, and West Africa in the 1970s, thus reinforcing the growth of Islamic fundamentalism and the increase in international terrorist attacks on the continent.[9] While many of the religious fundamentalist groups sought to establish secular states in some of the countries where they operated, some wanted to establish purely Islamic states.

The Afghan-Soviet war, which began in 1979 following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and lasted till 1989, also contributed immensely to the rise of international terrorism on the African continent during the Cold War. Many Islamic fundamentalists from different African countries such as Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco and Sudan, participated in the Afghan war. As the war drew to an end, these fundamentalists formed terrorist groups that continued to operate in Africa. The core of the MIA membership for example, was drawn mainly from Algerian Afghan war veterans. In this

regard it has been noted that, "after the withdrawal of the Soviets from Afghanistan in 1989, the contagion carried by returning veterans from that war spread particularly to northern Africa"[10]

In the 1980s, international terrorism in Africa was mostly linked to insurgencies in several parts of the continent.[11] Many African political activists were motivated by the revolutionary ideology of Marxism. On the basis of Marxist ideology, they sought to change the political, social and economic systems of their countries to extreme left models through the use of force. The result of this was bitter civil wars in several African countries. The Angolan civil war, which started in 1975 and ended in 1991, for example, was fought along ideological lines. Thus, it pitched the two rival superpowers in the world and their allies against each other through their proxies. While the USSR backed the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), the US and its allies supported the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA). Besides guerrilla tactics, the groups also employed terrorism as a method of warfare. Some of the attacks they carried out could be considered as international terrorist acts because they were directed against non-nationals and their properties.[12]

It was not only ideology that played a part in motivating international terrorism in Africa at this time. Religious fundamentalism equally contributed to the rise of international terrorism on the continent. It would also be recalled that, members of the Al-Jihad international terror group assassinated President Anwar Sadat of Egypt in 1981. In 1983 the military took power in Sudan and proceeded to declare the country an Islamic state, in complete disregard of the religious rights of non-Muslim inhabitants of the country.[13] This resulted in a bitter civil war between the government of Sudan and the Sudanese Peoples' Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), which is made up of mainly Christian southern Sudanese people. The conflict has not been fully resolved despite the signing of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) by the warring parties in 2005. The SPLM/A employed both terrorism and guerrilla strategy in its struggle. Some of its attacks were directed against foreign oil companies and expatriates. The government forces also used terror tactics as part of its counter insurgency measures against the SPLM/A.[14] This

conflict equally made weapons readily available to actual and potential terrorists on the continent as illegal weapons proliferation became rampant.

2.1.2 International state and state sponsored terror

As already noted, international terror attacks in Africa during the Cold War stemmed partly from internal civil unrest and spillover from regional wars because various insurgent groups and opposition forces employed terrorism as methods of warfare.[15] Islamic fundamentalist groups also used terror in attempting to achieve their objectives. Some of them were backed or supported by sovereign states particularly Libya and Sudan.

International state and state sponsored terrorism featured prominently in Africa during the Cold War. This phenomenon, usually associated with Middle Eastern countries became apparent in Africa as early as the 1970s even though the first African state, Libya, was only officially designated as a state sponsor of international terrorism by the US government in 1979. Libyan authorities employed international terrorism as a tool of domestic and foreign policy and Libyan involvement in international terrorism continued up to the late 1980s. Apart from using its own resources and own trained security personnel to carry out various acts of international terrorism in foreign countries, Libya also provided training, and various types of assistance to other international terrorist groups especially in the Middle East and even further afield in places such as the Philippines.[16]

Sudan was also identified by the US government as a state sponsor of international terrorism during the Cold War period. Although Sudan was officially designated as such in 1993, its involvement in international terrorism is traceable to the 1980s. The involvement of Libya and Sudan in international terrorism will be further examined in subsequent chapters of this study.

From the above discussion, it can be seen that international terrorism in Africa during the Cold War was initially linked to liberation struggles led by nationalist leaders in Africa. Ideology and religion, to a large extent, also played a significant role in motivating international terrorism on the continent during this period. One distinguishing fact about terror groups at this time was that they tended to have specific objectives and their attacks were carried out within the territories of the countries where they operated. Moreover, the insurgent groups in most cases had the backing of the two superpowers.[17]

2.2   Patterns of international terrorism in post-Cold War Africa: 1990-1999

The end of the Cold War in 1989 had an impact on the African continent in several ways. International terrorism in Africa was increasingly motivated by religion and ethnicity rather than ideology in the 1990s.

The immediate post-Cold War years (1990 to 1993) witnessed relatively low incidents of international terrorism on the African continent. Only three incidents of international terror occurred in Africa in 1991 as compared to 53, which were recorded in 1990.[18] The sharp decrease in the number of incidents of international terrorism in Africa in these years was caused partly by the ending of civil wars in countries such as Angola and the overthrow of the government of Mengistu Haile Mariam in Ethiopia in 1991.[19] The decrease however, could not be sustained for a long time as the number of international terror incidents on the continent began to rise again from 1993 and by 1999 had reached 52 terror incidents per year.[20] The table below shows the number of international terror incidents in Africa between 1995 and 1999.

Table 1.   Incidents of International Terrorism in Africa: 1995-1999

Year	Number of Incidents
1995	10
1996	11
1997	11
1998	21
1999	52

Source: Patterns of Global Terrorism 1995-2000, Washington DC: Department of State, 2001 (Contained in, Hough. M, "New York Terror: The Implications for Africa", *Africa Insight*. Vol. 32, No. 1, March 2002, p. 66).

A number of factors accounted for the increase in terror incidents (including international terrorism) in the region after the Cold War. One of the reasons was the increase in insurgencies in different African countries such as the DRC, Burundi, Somalia, Sudan, Liberia and Sierra Leone. As several observers have noted, "most terror attacks in Africa stemmed from internal civil wars and spillover from regional wars as rebel movements and opposition groups employed terrorism to further their political, social or economic objectives"[21]

The collapse of the Somali state in 1991 as a result of inter-ethnic wars provided international terrorist groups such as al Qaeda a "safe haven" and also a transit route in Africa. Al Qaeda operatives such as Ali Mohammed, Suleiman Abdullah, Wadih el-Hage and Fzul Abdullah who founded the Kenyan al Qaeda terrorist cell were once based in Somalia, and had entered Kenya from Somali territory to carry out the bombing of the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.[22]

It is important to mention that the increase in international terrorism on the continent was due mainly to the general characteristics of civil wars on the African continent. Snow has noted that insurgent groups, who fought these wars in Africa, lacked clear political objectives, military strategies, discernible political ideology, and appeal for popular support. [23] Consequently, there were indiscriminate attacks on innocent civilians, state and foreign assets, and hijacking of international aid workers. In Sierra Leone for example, the activities of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) are well documented by

scholars. They included the amputation of legs and hands of their Sierra Leonean and foreign civilian victims.   In contrast with insurgent movements of the Cold War period, Snow further observes that, "the new internal wars lack the sense of political and military orderliness that one associates with the Cold War era of national liberation that followed some variation of the Maoist mobile-guerrilla strategy."[24]

Another factor that led to the increase in international terrorism in Africa after the Cold War, is the emergence of radical Islamist groups intent on establishing Islamic states modelled on that of Afghanistan under the Taliban. The Algerian political violence of the 1990s included international terrorism as several foreign targets such as French aircraft; foreign citizens and Christian churches were also attacked as well as institutions and assets of the Algerian government. The international terror campaign was sparked off by the annulment of the general elections in Algeria in 1992, which arguably could have installed the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) in power in that country. Early results of the elections showed the party to be in the lead.[25] The government nullified the result mainly because the FIS had wanted to replace the existing secular political system with an Islamic state.[26]

Religiously motivated political violence was also experienced in East African countries, especially in Kenya and Tanzania in the 1990s. The Tanzania violence was organised around the National Association of Koran Readers in Tanzania (NAKRT, also called *Balukta*). This Islamic fundamentalist organisation was created in the 1980s to advance the course of Islamic militancy in the East and Horn of Africa. It was also alleged to have forged strong links with Iran and Sudan since the 1980s.[27] In April 1993, the Tanzanian government accused Iran and Sudan of sponsoring the *Balukta* and using it as a proxy to cause disorder in Tanzania with the aim of overthrowing its government.[28] The Tanzanian government consequently banned the organisation.

In 1998 the continent witnessed the most devastating international terror attacks in its history with the bombing of US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. According to official statistics released by the US State Department, the attack on its Kenyan and Tanzanian

embassies resulted in the death of about 308 people and injured about 5077 others.[29] The international terrorist group, al Qaeda led by Osama Bin Laden, who was based in the Sudan from 1991 to 1996, allegedly carried out the attacks.

Although Bin Laden moved his organisation from Sudan to Afghanistan in 1996, it is argued that al Qaeda was effectively organised into the potent force that it has become, in Sudan in the 1990s.[30] The international terror group has as its main goal, the establishment of a pan-Islamic Caliphate; the overthrow of regimes within the Muslim world it deems un-Islamic; withdrawal of western, particularly US forces from the Arabian Peninsula; and the destruction of the US for perceived acts of aggression against Muslims.[31]

Due to the problem of ineffective border control, al Qaeda operatives who carried out the US embassy bombings in 1998 were able to cross into Tanzania and Kenya from Somalia. One specific case worthy of mentioning was Khalifa Khamis Mohammed, a key suspect in the US embassy bombings, who was able to cross into Mozambique and subsequently South Africa after the attacks in 1998.[32] By the time Khalifa Khamis Mohammed was arrested in South Africa in October 1999, he had lived and worked in the country for one year with false identity documents.[33] Porous borders also worsen the problem of illegal weapons proliferation in Africa. This in turn facilitates the carrying out of international terror acts because it tends to make weapons and ammunitions readily available to terrorists.

It is important to mention that Libya and Sudan, two African countries listed by the US as state sponsors of international terrorism, began to publicly condemn and distance themselves from international terrorism or better concealed their involvement in international terrorism since the beginning of the 1990s.[34] The impact of sanctions on their respective economies and the need to redeem damaged international reputation accounted for the new policy position.

2.3 Trends in international terrorism in Africa in the new millennium: 2000-2006

International terror attacks in Africa have continued to rise in the new millennium even though comparatively some scholars have argued that Africa remains the region with the lowest incidents of international terrorism. By 2000 the number of international terrorist acts in Africa had reached 55 incidents per year[35] and impacted severely on the political and economic development of the African continent. For example, terrorist groups mounted violent campaigns that disrupted general elections in Zanzibar, Tanzania in 2000. The occurrence of international terrorist incidents on the African continent between 2000 and 2006 are summarised in the table below.

Table 2.   Incidents of International Terrorism in Africa: 2000-2006

Year	Number of Incidents
2000	55
2001	33
2002	6
2003	6
2004	9
2005	256 (US NCTC) and 7 (Rand Corporation)
2006	422 (US NCTC)

Sources: Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000-2006, Washington DC: Department of State; Hough. M, "New York Terror: The Implications for Africa", *Africa Insight*. Vol. 32, No. 1, March 2002, p. 66; Hough. M, "Global Conflict: Terrorism/International Terrorism and Crime: The Threat", Paper presented at SA National War College, 2006. The records of 256 and 422 terror incidents in Africa by the US government's National Counter-Terrorism Centre (NCTC) in 2005 and 2006 respectively comprise international, transnational and domestic terrorism and insurgent wars. The record of seven terror incidents in Africa by the Rand Corporation in 2005 focused mainly on terror attacks with international implications.

It can be observed from Table 2 that international terror incidents on the continent dropped significantly from 2001. This in part, can be attributed to the global war on terror (GWOT) being waged by the US and its allies and improved security measures in different African countries after September 11, 2001. After 2005, no reliable data on international terrorism in Africa exists, as international and domestic terrorism are no longer separated in US data gathering on terrorism.

Despite the GWOT, radical Islamic groups such as al Qaeda and its affiliates continue to carry out severe international terrorist acts on the continent and elsewhere in the world. In November 2002, al Qaeda terrorists allegedly bombed the Israeli owned Paradise Hotel in Mombassa, Kenya, and attempted on the same day to shoot down an Israeli airliner with a shoulder-held surface-to-air missile launcher. In Tanzania also, groups linked to al Qaeda, attacked moderate mosques in Dar es Salem and also bombed a tourist bar in Stone Town, in 2002.[36] The Tanzanian government also announced in May 2003 that it foiled a plot by a key al Qaeda member to attack Western interests in Tanzania. Sheik Ponda Isi Ponda was arrested in the same year because his underground Islamic militant group *Simba wa Mungu* (God's Lions) was accused of orchestrating attacks on foreigners and moderate Tanzanian Muslims and had links to the al Qaeda terror network. The Tanzanian government was also able to establish that al Qaeda operatives, Khalfan Khamis Mohammad, who was convicted in connection with the 1998 US embassy bombings, and Qaed Sanyan al-Harithi, another al Qaeda agent killed in Yemen in 2004, were linked to Sheik Ponda.[37]

Kagwanja also supports the assertion that the most potent terrorist groups in Africa, particularly in the Horn of Africa are local Islamists allegedly having links with al Qaeda.[38] One of these groups is *al Ittihad al Islamiya*, which portrays itself as the vehicle of Islamic extremism and a pan-Somali ideology. The group is listed by the US State Department among "Other Groups of Concern"[39] It has consistently encouraged attacks on foreigners, notably, the killing of an Italian nurse, Annalena Tonelli, two British teachers, Richard and Enid Eyeington, and a Kenyan aid worker, Florence Cheriyot in October 2003 and April 2004, respectively.[40] General elections in Zanzibar, Tanzania in October 2005 were also marred by terrorist attacks orchestrated by al Qaeda affiliate groups.[41] In the northern African countries of Algeria, Morocco and Egypt al Qaeda affiliate groups such as the al Qaeda Organisation in the Islamic Maghreb (also known as the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat, GSPC) has been carrying out terror attacks against foreign and national interests in North and West African countries. In June 2005, for example, this group attacked, a military remote outpost at el-Mreiti in Mauritania killing 15 soldiers not engaged in military combat.[42] Tourist destinations in Egypt

frequented by Westerners were attacked in April 2006. GSPC operatives also targeted a bus transporting foreign staff of a US company in Algeria in December 2006.[43]

It is important to highlight some of the terrorist groups that operate in Africa in the next section of this chapter.

2.4 International terrorist groups operating in Africa

International terrorism manifests in various ways in Africa according to the intent and purpose of the groups that carry out the acts. Among the most common manifestations as far as weapons used are concerned, are explosives and incendiary bombings, shooting attacks and assassinations, hostage taking, kidnapping, and hijacking.[44] Tables 2 and 3 below show terrorist groups operating in Africa according to the US State Department's classification during the period covered in this study.[45]

Table. 3   Terrorist Groups in Africa classified as "Foreign Terror Groups (FTOs)"

Group	Country Based
Armed Islamic Group (GIA)	Algeria
Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GSPC)	Algeria
Gama'a al-Islamiyya (IG)	Egypt
Al-Jihad (AJ),	Egypt
Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG or al-Jama'a al-Islamiyya al-Muqatila)	Libya
Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group (GICM)	Morocco

Source: US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2006*, Washington DC: 2007.

Table 4. Terror Groups in Africa classified as "Other Groups of Concern (OGC)"

Group	Country Based
Lord's Resistance Army	Uganda
Al-Ittihaf a-Islamiya (al Ittihad, AIAI)	Somalia
People Against Gangsterism and Drugs (PAGAD)	South Africa
Army for the Liberation of Rwanda (ALIR)	Rwanda
Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR)	Rwanda
Tunisian Combat Group (TCG)	Tunisia

Source: US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2006*, Washington DC: 2007.

The difference between terrorist groups in the two tables above tends to reside in the degree of importance attached to them by the US government based on the extent of their threats to the US. International terror groups that fall under the FTO classification are those already designated by the US Secretary of State pursuant to the provisions of the country's *Immigration and Nationality Act* as amended under its *Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act* of 1996.[46] These groups, in addition to being foreign, actively engage in international terrorist activities that threaten the security of US citizens or the national security of the US.[47]

A further distinction can also be made with respect to the scales of operation of the groups in the two tables. Although some of the groups under the FTO category are based in Africa, they extend their operations to different parts of Europe, Middle East, Asia (mainly in Afghanistan and Pakistan), and North America where they threaten US citizens and national interests. Terrorist groups that fall in the OGC category tend to limit their activities to the specific countries where they operate. In addition to this, terror groups in the OGC category also have political objectives that they seek to realise in the countries that they operate in. Thus, the LRA (Uganda), ALIR and FDLR (Rwanda), seek to overthrow the governments of Uganda and Rwanda respectively. Similarly, while *al Ittihad* seeks to establish an Islamic government in Somalia, the TCG equally seeks to overthrow the secular state of Tunisia and replace it with an Islamic state.[48]

From the two tables above, it can also be seen that international terrorism in Africa is presently motivated mainly by religious beliefs, especially a radical form of Islam. The terrorist groups are also transnational in nature. Transnational terrorism as already stated, refers to acts of terrorism that have domestic and international implications, and that involve citizens or territory of more than one country. Thus, though transnational terrorist groups in Africa are locally based, their activities cut across national boundaries, and their membership is drawn from several African and Middle Eastern Countries. They also receive funds and other forms of support from outside their areas of operation and have links to al Qaeda and other international terror networks. These groups also tend to have a

long-term goal of establishing revolutionary Islamic states in some countries. With the exception of the LRA which is believed to be sponsored by Sudan, other terrorist groups operating in Africa do not appear to have state sponsors within the continent.[49] However, they continue to receive support from a variety of sources, which include, but not limited to, al Qaeda; members in the Diaspora; various Islamic charitable organisations or NGOs.

In 2004, Sudan was taken off the list of countries not fully cooperating in US antiterrorism efforts.[50] However, it remains on the list of state sponsors of international terrorism because the US continues to have concerns over the presence of Palestinian rejectionist groups such as HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) in Sudan.[51] Sudan has also made little progress in stamping out LRA members in its territory. The US has also continued to place Sudan on its list of state sponsors of international terrorism because of Sudan's role in contributing fighters for the Iraqi insurgency.[52] Similarly, the US government further claims that significant gaps in the knowledge and capability required to identify, capture and disrupt jihadists both travelling to and returning from Iraq to Sudan still remain.[53]

It is imperative to examine, in the next section, the factors that facilitate the emergence of terrorist groups in Africa.

3.   FACTORS THAT PROMOTE AND LIMIT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IN AFRICA

Despite the achievement of political independence by African states, the end of the Cold War and the resolution of major conflicts in Africa such as those in Angola, Mozambique, the DRC, Liberia and Sierra Leone, Africa continues to experience international terrorism. Several factors promote and limit this phenomenon on the continent. These factors include, but are not limited to, the emergence of many radical

Islamic groups and the availability of funding through religiously based charity organisations and private companies. Other factors include sponsorship by states such as Sudan, porous borders, proliferation of illegal weapons, limited political space, the Middle East crises, information technology, and loopholes in the banking system of African countries.

Islamic charitable organisations are used as mechanisms for the spreading of Islamic religion in different parts of Africa. Through charitable works they help in alleviating the sufferings of the less privileged in different African societies thus, fulfilling one of the basic requirements of Islam. Radical Islamic fundamentalist groups however, exploit this practice. Thus, through some Islamic charitable organisations funds are channelled or diverted to terrorist causes. The African Muslim Agency provides an example of this. This Kuwaiti based charitable organisation provides social assistance such as construction of mosques, schools and hospitals to poor Muslim communities in Africa. However, the organisation is also alleged to provide funding to Islamic fundamentalist groups that operate in Tanzania.[54]

In 2003 it was also reported that, the CIFA Development Group and the Saudi-based petroleum company Oilcom were funding terror groups in Tanzania.[55] Equally implicated in the report was the *al Haramain* Islamic Foundation. This Saudi based Muslim charitable organisation build religious schools and social programmes for refugees in the Somali dominated *Dadaab* refugee camps in northern Kenya. The organisation was reported to have supported and worked closely with the terrorist group *al Ittihad* in providing fundamentalist Islamic education tailored toward making young refugees in Somali refugee camps future terrorists.[56] According to the UN Sanctions Committee, *al Haramain* Islamic Foundation also provides support for terrorist activities in other parts of the world.[57]

International terror agents such as those of al Qaeda also take advantage of loopholes in the banking system of most African countries. Through money laundering funds are channelled to terror purposes. Agents of *al Itttihad* for example are said to exploit the

shortcomings in Kenya's banking system to channel funds to terrorist causes. Furthermore, funds provided by the Somali Diaspora using the trust-based *Hawilaad* or *Hudi* banking system are also being diverted to international terror causes**.**[58]

It must also be added here that modern facilities such as information technology, especially the Internet, cable satellite televisions, and mobile telephones facilitate international terrorism on the African continent.[59] Through the Internet, terror groups claim responsibility for their actions, publicise their terror acts, issue warnings and the so-called "*fatwas*", or death threats to government officials, and citizens of foreign countries. The mobile telephone technology and e-mail help international terrorists to keep contact and organise, plan and carry out attacks on their targets. In some cases mobile telephones had also been used as bomb devices.

Limited political space for Islamic fundamentalist groups in various African countries to realise their political objectives often force these groups to resort to the use of international terrorism as a means of publicising their cause and seeking for political power.[60] The Kenyan political disturbances in the 1990s were caused by the refusal of the Kenya government to register an Islamic party, the Islamic Party of Kenya, (IPK). This party was founded by a radical Islamic cleric, Sheik Khalid Balala, who was suspected of having links to international terror networks. Attacks carried out by the IPK militants in August 1997, led to the burning down of police stations in Mombassa, the killing of six police officers and destruction of property belonging to local and foreign groups in the country. The attackers also killed about 100 non-Muslims and their actions displaced about 100,000 residents of the town.[61]

In several African countries such as Algeria radical Islamic parties are banned from participating in the electoral processes. Thus, the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS), which purportedly won the annulled general elections in Algeria in 1992, remained banned from participating in the political processes of Algeria. The war being waged by the transitional government of Somalia backed by Ethiopian forces and the US and also supported by Kenya against the radical Islamic group, Union of Islamic Courts (UIC); is

also an attempt to prevent, UIC from establishing a version of the Taliban government in Afghanistan in Somalia.[62]

The Middle East crises also feed into international terrorism in Africa in another sense. Apart from causing Islamic fundamentalist groups to migrate into Africa, it has also been reported that international terrorist groups such as Hezbollah exploit African natural resources in countries such as the DRC, Sierra Leone, and the Ivory Coast to finance their terrorist operations.[63] The US State Department has further reported that Hezebollah and al Qaeda continue to raise funds, and recruit new members, particularly in South Africa, Nigeria and other countries in the Trans-Sahara region of the continent.[64]

The problem of less effective measures in Africa is not limited only to international boundaries. Hough has observed that, "foreign property (including embassies) is often not as well protected as those in regions where international terror attacks are more frequent."[65] This makes them easy targets for international terrorists. The shifting of attention by terrorists to Africa may be due to the fact that after September 11, bombing in the US, the US and other Western countries tightened their homeland security thus, making it more difficult for international terrorists to operate. Ineffective security measures partly accounts for the bombing of tourist sites in Egypt, foreign property in Morocco and Algeria and the 2002 Mombassa bombing in Kenya.[66]

Efforts at combating international, transnational, state and state sponsored international terrorism are varied. The next section of this chapter examines some of these initiatives with the specific objective of identifying any specific focus on state and state sponsored international terrorism.

4.   INITIATIVES TO COMBAT INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM IN AFRICA

Efforts by individual African states to combat all forms of terrorism on the continent are varied. On the continental level the OAU and currently the AU have been playing the major role in attempting to combat international terrorism

4.1 The AU and the combating of international state terrorism in Africa

The combating of international state and state sponsored terrorism in Africa forms part of the broader counter-terrorism initiatives in Africa. Efforts to combat international state and state sponsored terrorism and all forms of terror acts in Africa are driven by the AU. The continental body strongly condemns all acts and forms of terrorism in Africa and elsewhere in the world. Thus, it has adopted an elaborate definition of the concept of terrorism to encompass state sponsorship and non-state terror activities.

The AU's efforts at combating all forms of terrorism in Africa began in the 1990s. In 1992, for example, the continental body (then OAU) adopted a resolution aimed at encouraging and enhancing co-operation and co-ordination among African states in the fight against all forms of terrorism on the African continent.[67] Member states of the OAU supported international sanctions against Libya in the 1980s and 1990s due to Libya's involvement in international terrorism both as a sponsor and as a perpetrator. At a later stage however, OAU members also called for the revoking of the international sanctions against Libya when it appeared that the country had abandoned international terrorism as a weapon of foreign policy.[68]

In 1994 African states adopted the, *OAU Declaration on the Code of Conduct for Inter-African Relations,* in Tunis (Tunisia).[69] This declaration condemned and rejected all forms of religious extremism involving the use of terrorism. Further efforts include the adoption of the *OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism* at its 35th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government in Algiers in 1999. This document also called the *Algiers Convention* has remained the most comprehensive document dealing with the issues of terrorism in Africa even with the

transformation of the OAU to the AU in 2001. It has, been signed and ratified by 47 African states while 36 have acceded to it.[70]

With specific reference to the prevention and combating of state and state sponsored international terrorism on the African continent and elsewhere in the world, the *Algiers Convention* provides that, "State Parties undertake to refrain from any acts aimed at organising, supporting, financing, committing or inciting to commit terrorist acts, or providing havens for terrorists, directly or indirectly, including the provision of weapons and their stockpiling in their countries and the issuing of visas and travel documents"[71]

In addition to demanding cooperation among member states of the OAU in areas such as exchange of information, border control, and intelligence gathering on the activities of terrorist groups in Africa; the *OAU Convention* further provides that states parties should, "prevent their territories from being used as a base for the planning, organisation or execution of terrorist acts or for the participation or collaboration in these acts in any form whatsoever"[72]

The *Constitutive Act of the African Union* also provides for, "respect for the sanctity of life, condemnation and rejection of impunity and political assassination, acts of terrorism and subversive activities"[73], among its member states. The AU Peace and Security Council (AUPSC) is, "mandated to request all member states to report annually on the steps they have taken to prevent and combat terrorism, and specifically, to implement the Algiers Convention."[74]

Member states of AU are also encouraged to sign and ratify all twelve international conventions and protocols relating to international terrorism as part of efforts towards the combating of terrorism in general and state and state sponsored international terrorism in particular. African states also support UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 1373, which was adopted on 28 September 2001, as a result of the September 11, 2001 terror attacks in the US. This resolution was adopted in the spirit of Chapter VII of the Charter of the UN and is supposed to be binding on all member states. Specifically, UNSC 1373

aims at preventing terrorists from travelling freely across national borders. It encourages governments to cooperate in sharing information, arresting, detecting and detaining of suspected terrorists. It is also targeted at preventing terrorists and their sponsors from finding "safe haven" in any region of the world; raising and transferring funds easily; and acquiring weapons for their nefarious acts. Furthermore, the resolution also urges states that do not have laws criminalizing active and passive terrorist activities including support to terrorists, to enact such laws and also to become party to all relevant international instruments relating to terrorism.[75]

The AU has taken a number of practical measures to ensure the implementation of the *Algiers Convention* and Security Council Resolution 1373. The adoption of the *Plan of Action of the African Union* (*AU Plan of Action*) in 2002 forms part of these practical measures. Other measures contained in the *AU Plan of Action* are measures relating to the establishment of a counter-terrorism co-operation framework in Africa.[76]

This co-operative framework entails the ratification of the *Algiers Convention* of 1999 and relevant instruments relating to terrorism by member states, and the provision of a single African list of persons, groups and entities involved in terrorist acts under the aegis of the AUPSC. Further measures include joint police and border controls, legislative and judicial measures, exchange of information, coordination at regional, continental and international levels and suppressing of the financing of terrorism.[77] The *Plan of Action* also reiterated the role of the AUPSC; and the AU Commission, and the need to establish an African Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism (ACSRT), as an institution of the AU Commission to strengthen the capacity of the continental body in the prevention and combating of terrorism in Africa.[78]

The AU continued its search for ways and means of combating terrorism on the continent in 2003. A *Report of the Meeting of Experts to Consider Modalities for the Implementation of the AU Plan of Action on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism in Africa* was drafted in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) between 28-29 October 2003. The report reiterated the importance of the signing and ratification of the 1999 *Algiers Convention*

and twelve other international conventions and protocols relating to terrorism by member states. It further outlined modalities for police and border control; suppressing of the financing of terrorism through cooperation with international financial institutions of member states; and reporting and co-ordinating measures.[79]

As a further effort at combating and preventing terrorism in Africa, the AU at its Third Ordinary Session held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia on 8 July 2004, adopted a *Protocol to the OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism in Africa*. The main purpose of adopting this Protocol was to enhance the effective implementation of the *Algiers Convention* of 1999. The Protocol emphasised the commitment needed from member states and mechanisms for the implementation of the *OAU Convention*, the role of the AU Commission, continental mechanisms for co-operation and coordination; and the settlement of disputes among member states. These cooperation and coordination initiatives in combating international terrorism involve collaboration with other continental bodies too. This is the focus of the next section of this chapter.

4.2 Cooperation between the AU and the international community in the combating of terrorism

The AU has adopted a multilateral approach to the combating of international terrorism. Thus, it encourages regional and international co-operation. The continental body has entered into cooperative and technical partnerships with several international bodies. It has, for example, partnership agreement with the European Union (EU).[80] Under this partnership, the EU provides technical assistance; enhanced information sharing and support to the AU's Africa Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism (ACSRT) currently based in Algeria. It also provides support to member states of the AU on the implementation of international counter-terrorism agreements.[81] Similarly, in 2005, the AU employed experts to draft counter-terrorism "Model Law" which would assist member states in designing legislation to implement counter terrorism commitments including money laundering.[82]

As part of the effort to effectively implement the *Algiers Convention* and UNSC Resolution 1373, member states of the AU have also been cooperating with the US government in the combating of terrorism in Africa. Du Plessis has observed that the US cooperation and assistance to Africa in this regard is, "concentrated on the northern and eastern parts of Africa, the regions from which American interests have been threatened and attacked the most on the continent".[83] Under The East Africa Counter-Terrorism Initiative (EACTI), the US provides military training for coastal security, aviation security, border control, police training, and capacity building against terrorist financing for countries in the Horn of Africa. These countries are: Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.[84] Similarly, under the Trans-Sahara Counter terrorism Initiative (TSTCI) the US provides training and equipment programme to enhance the capacity of the African states in the Sahel region to combat terrorism. Countries benefiting from this initiative are Algeria, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, as well as Nigeria and Senegal.[85]

5.   CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the evolvement of international terrorism on the African continent has been examined. The trends in international terrorism on the continent as well as efforts at continental and international levels to combat the phenomenon, have been highlighted and discussed.

Based on this examination, it can be seen that the genesis of terrorism in Africa is traceable to armed struggles for independence in some African states. While the struggle was aimed at political emancipation from colonial domination, nationalist leaders who led the struggle used terrorism as part of their broader strategy of guerrilla warfare. The activities of the various liberation movements in Africa during the colonial time represented some form of international terrorism because they were targeted against foreign interests and civilian populations and aimed at wringing concessions from the colonial powers. The Kenyan and Algerian experiences provide examples in this regard.

The trends in international terrorism in Africa have changed markedly. Although non-state terror groups have been active on the continent since the 1960s, the phenomena of state and state sponsored international terrorism became noticeable in Africa from the early 1970s. These trends have been broadly studied in the context of three historical periods; the epoch of the Cold War; the post-Cold War era and the new millennium. It has been observed that the trends and motivations of international terrorism in the region during the Cold War period were markedly different from those of the post-Cold War era and in the new millennium. During the Cold War period international terror groups and insurgent groups that used terror as a strategy of warfare were organised along a particular ideology. Their activities were also limited to the territories of the states where they operated. In most cases insurgent groups that used terror tactics were supported by either of the two superpowers in the world.

In the post-Cold War era, it has been shown that international terrorism in Africa was motivated mainly by religion, especially a radical form of Islam. International terror groups carrying out terrorist acts are mainly locally based but have links to the al Qaeda international terror network. Those falling under the FTO category tend to have a long-term goal of establishing Islamic states in countries that they operate and their activities have become more lethal than those of the Cold War period. These groups appear not to have state sponsors in Africa. Factors contributing to their persistence include the availability of funds through, for example, charitable organisations, money laundering, porous borders, limited political space, illegal weapon proliferation, information technology, and the Middle East crises.

Efforts to combat international terrorism in Africa are led by the AU. Apart from strongly condemning terrorism in its entirety, the AU and African states are practically committed to combating the scourge of international terrorism both in Africa and elsewhere in the world. The US Department of State acknowledged this and went further to specifically mention fifteen African countries that have made significant efforts in combating international terrorism, namely, Comoros, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali,

Mauritania, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.[86]

The next chapter of this study examines the role of Libya in supporting international terrorism. In this regard, Libya's political history will be briefly examined as well as motivations for engaging in international terrorism and the impact of this on its political and socio-economic development.

REFERENCES

[1] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1988*, Washington DC, 1989, p. 41

[2] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1989*, Washington DC, 1990, p. 40

[3] Wilkinson. P, *Terror Versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*, Frank Cass Publishers 2000, p. 19

[4] *Ibid*

[5] Lawless. R. I, "Algeria: History", *The Middle East and North Africa* 53rd Edition, Routledge: London and New York, 2007, p. 174

[6] Blacker. J, "The demography of Mau Mau: fertility and mortality in Kenya in the 1950s: a demographer's viewpoint", *African Affairs* Vol. 106, No. 423, 2007, pp. 205-227

[7] Wilkinson. P, "Current and future trends in domestic and international terrorism: Implications for democratic government and the international community", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, November 2001, p. 109

[8] Swart. G, et al, "Egypt: Pharaohs and Fundamentalists"? *Africa Insight,* December 2003, P. 79

[9] Kitissou. M, "Political Violence, Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism in Africa in the Global Context", *African Renaissance*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2005, p. 21

[10] Cilliers. J, "Terrorism and Africa", *African Security Review,* Vol. 12, No. 4, 2003, p. 94

[11] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000*, Washington DC, 2001, p. 3

[12] Cilliers. J, *op cit*, p. 92

[13] Ofcansky. T, "Sudan: Recent History", *Africa South of the Sahara* (36th Edition), Routledge: London and New York: 2007, p. 1132

[14] UN: *United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs-Integrated Regional Information Networks* (IRIN), 28 February 2002.

[15] *Ibid*

[16] Byman. D, *Deadly Connections: States That Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005, p. 290

[17] Snow. D. M, *Uncivil Wars: International Security and the New Internal Conflicts*, Lynne Rienner, Colorado, 1996, p. 106

[18] Hough. M, "New York Terror: The Implications for Africa", *Africa Insight*. Vol. 32, No. 1, March 2002, p. 66

[19] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1991*, Washington DC, 1992, http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/terror_91/africa.html , accessed 19 August 2008

[20] *Ibid*

[21] *Ibid*

[22] US: *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon The United States*, New York, 2004, p. 68

[23] Snow. D. M, *op cit,* p. 106

[24] *Ibid*

[25] Lawless. R. I, *op cit,* p. 178

[26] Quandt. W. B*, Between Ballots and Bullets,* Brookling Institution Press*,* 1998*,* p. 62

[27] Kagwanja. P, "Counter-terrorism in the Horn of Africa: New security frontiers, old strategies", *African Security Review*, Vol. 15, No. 3, 2006, p.75

[28] *Ibid*

[29] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global terrorism 1998*, Washington DC, 1999, pp. 15 - 17

[30] Kitissou. M, *op cit*, p. 21

[31] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000*, *op cit*, pp. 131 -132

[32] Rifer. M, "SADC and Terrorism: Where is the regional strategy?" *Africa Security Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2005, p. 108

[33] US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000*, *op cit*, pp. 131 -132

[34] *Ibid*

[35] Hough. M, 2002, *op cit*, p. 66

[36] The Jamestown Foundation, "Tanzania: Al Qaeda's East African Beachhead?" *Terrorism Monitor*, Vol. 1, Issue 5, 7, November, 2003, p. 1

[37] *Ibid*

[38] Kagwanja. P, *op cit*, p. 75

[39] US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2006*, Washington DC: 2007, http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/crt/2006/82738.htm , accessed 19 August 2008

[40] *Ibid*

41   Kagwanja. P, *op cit*, p. 75

42   US: Department of State*, Country Reports on Terrorism 2005*, Washington DC, 2006, p. 16

43   US: Department of State, "Public Announcement: Middle East and North Africa", 14 May 2007

44   Wilkinson. P, *op cit*, p. 13

45   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2007*, Washington DC, 2008, p.267

46   US: CRS Report to Congress, *The "FTO LIST" and Congress: Sanctioning Foreign Terrorist Organisations*, October 2003, p. 1

47   US: *Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, 8 U.S.C 1189*

48   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2006, op cit*

49   *Ibid*

50   US: Department of State*, Country Reports on Terrorism 2005, op cit*, p. 176

51   *Ibid*

52   *Ibid*

53   *Ibid*

54   The Jamestown Foundation, *op cit,* p. 1

55   *Ibid*

56   *Ibid*

57   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2004, op cit*, p. 68

58   *Ibid*

59   Hough. M, "International Terrorism: Contemporary Manifestations in Africa", *Strategic Review of Southern Africa*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, 2001, p.126

60   *Ibid*

61   Kagwanja. P, *op cit*, p, 77

62   *Ibid,* p. 76

63   *Washington Post*, 30 December, 2001

64   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2005, op cit*, p. 45

65   Hough. M, 2002, *op cit*, p. 66

66   *Ibid*

67   Du Plessis. I, " The Impact of a war on terror on African security", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, May 2005, p. 53

68   Lawless. R. I, "Libya: History", *The Middle East and North Africa* 53rd Edition, Routledge: London and New York, 2007, p. 749

69   AU: The *OAU Declaration on the Code of Conduct for Inter-African Relations*, Tunis 1994.

70   Alpha. O. K, **"**Preventing and Combating Terrorism in Africa", http://www.africa-union.org/Terrorism/terrorism2.htm, accessed 21 May 2007

71   AU: *OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism, 1999*

72   *Ibid*

73   AU: Article 4 of the Constitutive Act of the African Union, http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/AboutAu/Constitutive_Act_en.htm. Accessed 22 May 2007

74   Alpha. O. K, *op cit*

75   UN: United Nations Security Counter-Terrorism Committee, "What does CTC ask of States?" http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373/ask.html, accessed 21 May 2007

76   *Ibid*

77   AU: Plan of Action of the African Union High-Level Inter_governmental Meeting on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism in Africa, Algiers, Algeria, 11-14, September 2002

78   *Ibid*

79   Sturman. K, "The AU Plan of Action on Terrorism: Joining the global war or leading an African Battle?" *African Security Review* Vol. 11, No. 4, 2002, p. 7

80   EU: Press Release 367: "The EU and Africa: Towards a Strategic Partnership", *Council of the European Union*, Brussels, 19 December 2005

81   *Ibid*

82   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2005, op cit*, p. 46

83   Du Plessis. I, *op cit*, p. 57

84   *Ibid*

85   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2005, op cit**, p. 48-58

86   *Ibid*

Chapter 3

INTERNATIONAL STATE AND STATE SPONSORED TERRORISM: THE CASE OF LIBYA

1.   INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses Libya's involvement in international terrorism both as a state sponsor and supporter of international terror groups as well as a perpetrator of international terrorist acts. Specifically, the chapter examines the various acts of international terrorism committed by the Libyan state against Libyan dissidents in foreign countries as well as acts of terrorism committed by non-state groups supported by Libya. Furthermore, the type of support that Libya rendered to international terror groups; its motivation for involvement in international terrorism; as well as the reason why it was removed from the US list of state sponsors of international terrorism in 2006, are also discussed and analysed.

2.   HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN LIBYA

Before discussing the involvement of Libya in international terrorism, it is necessary to briefly look at Libya's political development. Such historical insights assist in understanding the reasons behind the country's involvement in international terrorism.

2.1   The colonial period

Libya has a long history that extends to the Phoenician and Greek times. It was occupied and controlled by the Roman Empire in 96 BC and remained part of the empire until its

decline in the 5th century AD.**¹** Consequently, the Arabs, at about the mid-7th century AD invaded and occupied territories that now form modern day Libya. The Arab invaders Islamized the original Berber inhabitants. With time almost the entire population have become Arabs. At various times in its history Libya was also conquered by Spain and the Ottoman Empire. It came under Ottoman rule in the 16th century AD and remained under the control of the empire until 1911 when the Italian forces defeated the Ottoman forces and occupied the country.**²** The territory was formally ceded to Italy by the Ottoman Empire in 1912 following the signing of a peace treaty.

The period of Ottoman rule was characterised by oppression, corruption and the resultant strong agitation for independence by Libyan nationalists.**³** The period also witnessed the emergence of a powerful politico-religious sect called the Sanusi Order, which became the vanguard of the Libyan liberation movement. This sect united various groups in Libya agitating for the independence of the country from Italian colonisation until the outbreak of World War II. The struggle for independence was mostly motivated by the fact that despite the signing of a peace treaty between Italy and the Ottoman Empire in 1912, the empire did not recognise the sovereignty of Italy over Libya.**⁴** Thus, it provided support to various Libyan liberation groups.

2.1.1 Independence period: 1943-1969

Consequent upon the defeat of Italy by the Allied forces in 1943, Italy lost its control over the three main Libyan territories of Tripolitania, Cyrenaica and Fezzan. The British and French forces occupied and administered these territories under UN Trusteeship. In 1949 however, the UN General Assembly voted in favour of granting full independence to Libya, which was granted in 1951. The Emir of Cyrenaica Muhammed Idris el Mahdi el Sanussi (King Idris I) who was head of the Sanussi Order became the ruler of the newly independent state, which adopted: "The United Kingdom of Libya," as its official name.**⁵**

Libya at the time of independence was one of the poorest countries in the world. Its economy was based on agriculture and it depended heavily upon aids from the international community to survive.[6] The country's average *per capita* income at this time was less than US$50 per annum; its capital formation was zero or less; and there was an absence of skilled labour in the country.[7] The newly independent state was confronted with numerous challenges such as dynastic rivalries, poverty and political instability. It was also militarily too weak to defend itself against any external aggression.

Thus, for reasons of economic and military aid, Libya's foreign policy after independence was mainly pro-Western. It entered into several cooperative agreements including military pacts with countries such as the US and Britain, and at a later stage, France. Under pacts with Britain and the US in 1953 and 1954 respectively, these countries were allowed to maintain military bases in Libya in exchange for economic and defence aid.[8] Libya's pro-Western foreign policy meant that it was not deeply involved in the politics of the Arab world at the time, much to the dislike of the majority of its citizens and other Arab states such as Egypt.

From 1959 Libya began to gradually transform from an agro-based economy into an oil-based economy, due to the discovery of oil in the country at this time.[9] The increased revenue from oil had a tremendous impact on Libyan politics and the economy. While it brought about increased economic activities and improved standards of living to some citizens, it also resulted in not only an unequal distribution of wealth but also corruption, and opposition to the rulership of King Muhammad Idris I. Other factors that impacted severely on the country were the rise of Arab nationalism or pan-Arabism, championed by President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt; the Six-Day War between the Arabs and Israel; and the pro-Western stance of King Idris' government.

2.1.2 The overthrow of King Idris I

The opposition to King Idris's government and dissatisfaction with unequal wealth distribution in the Libyan state culminated in the military *coup d'etat* of 1 September

1969, carried out by young army officers known as the Revolutionary Command Council (RCC). The military take-over was led by Colonel Muammar al-Qaddafi. King Idris I was consequently exiled to Egypt where he died in 1983.[10] The overthrow co-incidentally happened at the time of growing Arab nationalism among Libyan youths. Thus, the RCC leaders exploited this to legitimise and consolidate their hold on power.

The new regime established a one party state in theory. In practice however, power lay with the RCC. It went further to nationalise foreign owned businesses and property, especially those belonging to Jews, Italians and other Europeans still living in the country. The US and Britain were asked to close their military bases in Libya before the expiration dates of the agreements establishing them. In keeping with its political ideology of pan-Arabism, the regime placed strong emphasis on the Arabic language and a return to fundamental precepts of Islam in social life. Consequently, street signs and public notices were written in Arabic only, alcohol was forbidden, and bars, nightclubs and casinos were closed.[11]

In 1973, the regime launched a "Cultural Revolution". The aim of this was to encourage Libyans to reject all foreign ideologies and practices, whether Soviet Socialism or Western capitalism, and to adopt a new society based on the precepts of Islam and pan-Arabism. As a replacement or alternative to capitalism, materialism, and communist atheism, the regime presented its "Third International (Universal) Theory".[12] In 1976, it published the "Green Book", which was a blueprint for the social and economic transformation of Libya as the first step towards the realisation of a "new society" premised on Islamic tenets. A second step was the renaming of the state in March 1977. Thus, the official name was changed to Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. At a later stage in April 1986 the prefix, "Great" was added to the official name.[13] Thus, officially the state is now called the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

2.2   **The Libyan political system**

By the end of the 1970s, Libya under the dictatorial leadership of Qaddafi had formed a new political system, which it claimed was based on "popular democracy." Presently, the country is administered through a complex set of "assemblies and committees". There are for example, "popular committees" for people at the grass-roots or local government levels and also "basic people's congresses" and "popular congresses" for provincial administration. At the national level there is the General People's Congress (GPC), which can be likened to a national parliament, and the General People's Committee, which corresponds to a cabinet. The General Secretariat has replaced the RCC, which used to be the supreme political leadership in the country.[14] By international standards Libya cannot be considered a democratic state, but a dictatorial state that has remained under the rule of one man since 1969. Consequently, gross human rights abuses, oppression and victimisation have forced opposition groups to flee into exile.

The subsequent sections of this chapter will discuss cases of international terrorism involving Libya; its motivations for involvement in international terrorism; and reasons why it has been taken off the list of states that sponsor international terrorism by the US government.

3.   **LIBYAN MOTIVATION FOR INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM**

Several factors motivated Libya to sponsor and carry out international terrorist acts. Among the reasons behind Libyan sponsorship and involvement in international terrorism, were strategic interests, the spread of politico-religious ideology, domestic power consolidation, and international prestige. These factors are discussed in the next section of this chapter.

3.1 Motivations for involvement in international terrorism

Libya was the first African state to be designated a state sponsor of international terrorism by the US government. The Libyan involvement in international terrorism dates back to the early 1970s. Libya was not only a state sponsor and supporter of international terrorism in the 1970s and 1980s but also carried out terrorist activities through its own trained agents during this time. Its support and sponsorship of international terrorism involved, amongst others, the arming, training, and inspiring of several terrorist groups as well as insurgent movements in several parts of the world.

Sponsorship of international terrorism was not an end in itself to Libyan policy makers. In fact it was part of Libyan strategy for realizing its foreign and domestic policy objectives. The relationship between Libya and the groups it sponsored and supported was therefore, mutually beneficial. While Libya trained, armed and sheltered international terrorist groups, these groups in turn served the country's interests loyally. The sponsored terrorist groups helped to attack perceived Libyan foreign enemies; assassinate Libyan dissidents who lived abroad; and in the process advanced the interests of the regime in Libya. Libyan strategic interests entailed destabilisation or weakening of neighbouring states, regional power projection, regime change, and influencing of opposition forces in neighbouring countries. Its ideological considerations involved the search for means of enhancing its international prestige and the internationalising of its political doctrine. Libyan domestic interests entailed both the means of consolidating the power base and achieving maximum control over national territories.

Qaddafi's regime sought to consolidate its power base by trumpeting the revolutionary card as the only solution to the many political, economic and social problems confronting Libya. The regime estimated that the success of its "revolution" would depend on the extermination of enemies of the revolution because they were "instruments in the hands of imperialists." The closure of the US and British military bases in Libya cited in preceding sections was also done to pacify Libyans and the rest of the Arab world that Libya was ready to jettison pro-Western policy and move towards closer relations with

the Arab world.[15] The sole aim of this pacification was the consolidation of the domestic power base through international support from leading Arab states.

The regime created a number of revolutionary committees and strategies to defeat imperialism and Zionism. Venturing into international terrorism was one of these strategies. Many terrorist groups such as Black September, the Abu Nidal Organisation (ANO), Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General command (PFLP-GC), and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) were inspired to attack Israeli and Western interests as a form of *jihad* against Western imperialism and Zionism.[16] Since it appeared that Libyans and indeed the Arab world were opposed to imperialism and Zionism represented by the US and Israel respectively, Libyan support for Palestinian terror groups was aimed at attracting the support and praise of Arab states. Such a move was also aimed at portraying the Libyan leader as "heir" to Nasser on Arab affairs. The pursuit of Arab unification and the declaration of Libya as an Islamic state to be governed by the precepts of the Holy Koran were also intended to portray the country as a champion of the Arab cause.[17]

Libya's involvement in international terrorism was further motivated by strategic considerations. Primarily, Libya had sought to project power globally, weaken neighbouring states, shape their politics, and eventually cause regime change in these states. Thus, in the 1970s Qaddafi publicly stated that Libya had a religious duty towards all revolutions, especially in Africa, Asia and Latin America. As part of its design for global recognition and power projection, Libya occupied the Aouzous Strip in Chad in 1973. It claimed that the area was ceded to Libya by France based on an unratified agreement between France and Italy in 1935. Analysts have however suggested that Libyan occupation was motivated more by mineral deposits found in the region than by any agreement between the former European colonial powers.[18]

In 1976, Libya also tried to annex parts of Niger's territory close to it. When the Niger government resisted its attempts, Libya started sponsoring insurgent groups to overthrow the government. Attempts were also made to bring about regime changes in Sudan,

Somalia, Algeria, Mauritania, Senegal, Mali, and Tunisia through various insurgent groups operating in these countries at this time. Apart from this, Libya was also linked to attempts to assassinate the presidents of Egypt, Tunisia and Chad as well as King Hassan of Morocco at various times in the 1970s and 1980s.[19]

On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Libyan revolution in 1989, Libya called for the extension of the Libyan revolution to every part of the world.[20] The tenets of the Libyan revolution are based on the "Third Universal Theory" contained in the "Green Book." Libyan leaders regarded the Third Universal Ideology as the basis of a new world order in which Libya would play a leading role. As a practical attempt to realise this ambition and enhance the international prestige of Libya in the community of nations, the Libyan government established revolutionary committees (consisting of non-Libyans) in a number of foreign countries.[21] Furthermore, Libyan authorities also provided moral and financial support to several insurgent movements in Africa, the Middle East, Europe, Asia, the South Pacific and Latin America for the purpose of extending Libyan political doctrines to other parts of the world. Libyan non-governmental organisations were involved in these attempts as well as in providing humanitarian assistance to less privileged Muslim communities in other countries thus, extending Libyan doctrines in the process.

The factors discussed above are by no means exhaustive. Those discussed are however, representative of the three major motivations of strategic concerns, ideological considerations and domestic politics.

3.2 Libyan sponsorship and support for international terror groups

This section discusses the various types of sponsorship and support that the Libyan state rendered to several international terrorist organisations. From the discussions on the meaning of state sponsorship and support for international terrorism, Libya, during the period under study, demonstrated characteristics that cut across four of the six categories of supporters of international terrorism discussed in chapter one. The six categories of

state supporters of international terrorism discussed are: strong, weak, lukewarm, antagonistic, passive and unwilling hosts.[22] Libya fell into the category of strong supporter of international terrorism because it supported and sponsored major Palestinian terror groups such as the ANO and the Black September as well as the IRA, (Northern Ireland), Armenia Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA, Turkey), and the Basque Separatist Movement (ETA, Spain). Other terror groups include, Action Directe (France), Red Brigades (Italy), Baader-Meinhof Gang (Germany), the Japanese Red Army and the Peruvian Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA).[23] The relationship between Libya and Middle Eastern terror groups was motivated by the common objective of "destroying and punishing moderate Arab states and groups for compromising the struggle against Israel for the sake of regional peace."[24]

3.2.1 Practical training of international terrorists

Training was one of the most common forms of support that Libya provided to international terrorist groups. Given that effective training is an important requirement for successful terror and revolutionary campaigns, Libya built training facilities at Tocra, Ras Hilas, Tarhuna, Zuwarah, Zawia, Sinawan, Baida, Tobruk and Sahba regions of its territory in the 1980s. By early 1980 these training centres numbered about 20 and offered six-month infantry courses to international terrorists. Palestinian, Cuban, and Libyan instructors were used in these training exercises.[25] The courses involved both the process of indoctrination and physical fitness. Further training was given to terrorists on the handling of small weapons such as machine guns and in the making of bombs and other explosive devices.

Furthermore, terrorists were also trained in surveillance and counter-surveillance techniques, information gathering and concealment tactics. The majority of the recruits were drawn from impoverished regions of Libya, zealous students, migrant workers, and other volunteers from different parts of the world.[26] Among the various international terrorist groups that trained in Libya were the ANO, the PFLP-GC, PIJ, ETA (also called Basque Fatherland and Liberty), Tunisia Resistance Army (TRA), Front for the

Liberation of Egypt (FLE), New People's Army (Communist Party of Philippines), and the Irish Republican Army (IRA).[27]

3.2.2   Funding, arms supply and logistical assistance

The provision of funds, arms and logistical support were other forms of assistance that Libya rendered to international terrorist organizations. Through arms supplies to international terrorist groups, they were able to carry out deadly attacks on their targets. In the 1970s and 1980s Libya supplied arms to the IRA in Northern Ireland and in 1972, Qaddafi was quoted as saying: "we consider the struggle in Ireland, a national one…we help the free Irish to free themselves from Britain…there are arms and there is support for the revolutionaries in Ireland."[28]

On 29 March 1972, the Irish Navy intercepted a ship carrying five tons of weapons from Libya to the Provisional IRA (PIRA).[29] Libya continued to provide arms to the PIRA even in the 1980s. As Byman has observed, arms supplied to PIRA by Libya during the 1980s, enabled the movement to pose a far greater threat to British forces and the Provisional IRA's rivals in Northern Ireland.[30] In October 1987, French Naval authorities intercepted a ship, the Eksund II, carrying about 150 tons of arms and explosives from Libya to the PIRA. Further investigation into the incident showed that the shipment was the fifth such delivery.[31]

Financial assistance was an equally important aspect of Libyan support for international terrorist groups. Libyan financial support enabled terrorist groups to buy weapons, air tickets to target countries and positions, and even training and bomb making material. Furthermore, terrorists used Libyan money to conduct recruitment, ensure a supply of false documents, and maintenance of safe houses.[32] Libya supported the PIRA in the 1970s with about US$3.5 million, which greatly assisted the group in its struggle against British authorities at the time. It was also reported that Libya contributed over US$50 million to various Lebanese terrorist groups; about US$100 million to the Black

September organization; and US$40 million to various insurgent movements using terrorism as part of their warfare strategies.[33]

Apart from arms supply and financial assistance, Libya also provided logistical support to terrorists, which facilitated their operations. These forms of assistance were mostly indirectly provided. In some cases Libya provided international passports, both ordinary and diplomatic ones, to international terrorists. According to Byman, in most cases these documents were either stolen or forged. Nevertheless, they facilitated the free movement of terrorists from one country to another. Libyan diplomats and intelligence officers also acted as recruiters or talent spotters, identifying potential new members on the groups' behalf. [34]

Libyan companies such as Libyan Arab Airlines (LAA), and other front companies and non-governmental organizations were also used to support international terrorist acts. For example in 1986, a LAA flight from Cyprus smuggled aboard six terrorists who attacked a British military base in the country. Libyan companies such as Exo-Commerce, Sarra and Neutron International offered jobs and legitimate documentation to terrorists masquerading as employees.[35] Libyan charitable organizations such as the Islamic Call Society were also used to recruit and fund terrorists, particularly in Africa.[36]

3.2.3   Diplomatic support

Libya also used its influence and prestige to officially support and advance the cause of international terrorist groups. Terrorists seek diplomatic recognition because it improves the chances of realising their objectives. Thus, the recognition by and support of a state does not only legitimise a group's cause and methods but also help the group to attract more recruits and money. Libyan diplomatic support for various Palestinian groups included allowing them to establish representative offices in Tripoli. Thus, until 1998, Palestinian groups such as the ANO, PFLP, and PIJ, had offices in Libya.[37]

Although Libya was aware of the terrorist activities of these groups, it claimed to support their political aspirations. In an interview in the 1970s, Qaddafi, in defence of his country's support for international terror groups maintained that: "there is a big difference between supporting liberation movements, the just cause of people fighting for freedom and supporting terrorism."[38] Similarly, Libya used its media and other international fora to denounce the counterterrorism efforts of countries such as Israel, the US, Britain and France.

3.2.4   Provision of safe haven for terrorists

Libya provided sanctuary to numerous international terrorists, especially those belonging to groups such as ANO, PFLP-GC and the PIJ. Libya also harboured Ilich Ramirez Sanchez (Carlos the Jackal) in the 1970s and 1980s. After the hijacking of OPEC ministers in Vienna, Austria in 1975, the terrorists had flown to Libya first and then to Algeria. After releasing all their hostages, the terrorists were alleged to have received money and sanctuary in Libya. When three members of the Black September group imprisoned in Germany for the massacre of the Israeli Olympic team were released by German authorities in exchange for the release of hostages of a Lufthansa plane hijacked by the Arab National Youth Organisation for the Liberation of Palestine (ANYOLP), they also received sanctuary in Libya.[39]

The provision of sanctuary to terrorists by Libya facilitated international terrorist activities in many ways. First it enabled terrorists to plot, recruit, proselytise, network, and raise money. More importantly it helped wanted terrorists to escape arrest, enjoy normal life, dictate the pace of operations and retain the initiative. Members of the ANO, PFLP-GC, PIJ and various other groups remained in Libya until they were ready to strike their targets. In addition to support rendered to organisations involved in terrorism, Libya also used state agents and resources to directly commit certain acts of terrorism. The next section provides an overview of actual incidences of terrorism linked to Libya directly, or to Libyan support of international terror organisations.

4   CASE STUDIES OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORIST
ACTS INVOLVING LIBYA

Libyan involvement in international terrorism extended to almost every continent of the world. Consequently, the country was listed by the US State Department as a state sponsor of international terrorism in 1979 and remained on the list until May 2006. Libyan involvement in international terrorism can be divided into two types. First, Libya strongly supported and sponsored various terrorist groups in several parts of the world. Secondly, Libya used its own trained agents to carry out acts of international terrorism. Case studies of these two types of involvement in international terrorism are discussed below.

4.1   Libyan international terrorist acts

As part of its strategy to achieve foreign and domestic policy objectives, Libya used its specially trained secret service agents to carry out acts of terrorism with international implications. These attacks were directed not only at Western targets but also against Libyan dissidents living abroad.

4.1.1   International terror attacks against Libyan exiles

The overthrow of King Idris I brought about dictatorial rule in Libya under the leadership of Qaddafi. Many Libyans who opposed the authoritarian regime were consequently declared "enemies of the revolution" or "stray dogs." Several of them were killed but some managed to escape to exile in Europe and the US. These Libyan exiles included former members of the regime who defected and were forced to leave the country or face assassination or long-term imprisonment. These exiles formed various associations, which continue to oppose the regime until the present time.[40]

International terror attacks on Libyan dissidents living abroad, especially in the US and Europe, but also in other African countries such as Egypt and Tunisia, were common during the 1970s, 1980s and to some extent the 1990s.[41] Libyan Special Intelligence Service (SIS) agents carried out these attacks on behalf of the Libyan government. The attacks arguably intensified after the abortive attempt to overthrow the regime on 13 August 1975. This attempt was allegedly made by *al-Tajamu al-Watani al-Libi* (The Libyan National Rally).[42] The failed attempt resulted in massive execution, oppression and intimidation by the Qaddafi regime. The precision with which attacks against Libyan dissidents in the US were carried out, made Western powers suspect that Libyan agents had access to visa files stored in the US embassy in Tripoli. This was more so given the fact that in December 1979 Libyan fundamentalists inspired by the revolutionary ideology of the government had attacked and looted the US embassy in Tripoli.[43]

After successful containment of opposition forces within the country, the Libyan government was reported to have declared that, "the revolution has destroyed those who oppose it inside the country and it must pursue the rest abroad."[44] Similarly, in 1979 the US State Department published a *communiqué* issued by pro-Qaddafi Libyans in the US, which clearly stated that, "physical liquidation is the final stage in the dialectic conflict between the revolution and its enemies when all other means of liquidation (social, economic and political) have failed."[45] After these declarations it was reported that more than eight Libyan opposition leaders were killed in several European cities between March and May 1980, and many others were attacked, harassed, or threatened during the same period. According to an official report of the British government in 1981, more than 11 Libyan dissidents were killed between 1980 and 1981.[46]

In April 1980 the Libyan government ordered all Libyan exiles to return home by 10 June 1980, "beyond which date the regime could not undertake to protect them from the revenge of the revolutionary committees."[47] Attacks on Libyan dissidents abroad, intensified following an abortive attempt by the National Front for the Salvation of Libya (NFSL) to overthrow Qaddafi's regime in March 1984. Qaddafi went ahead to justify the regime's use of terror against Libyan dissidents abroad in his address to the GPC in

March 1985. He argued that Libya reserved the right to exterminate its opponents both within and outside the country. He likened Libyan dissidents abroad to European terror groups such as the Red Army Faction (RAF) in Germany, the Red Brigades (RB) in Italy and the Irish Republican Army (IRA) in Northern Ireland. Furthermore, Qaddafi threatened to increase Libyan support for these terrorist groups if European governments continued to protect Libyan dissidents in their respective countries. Thus, in March 1986, the GPC announced the formation of suicide commandos to attack American and Zionist interests worldwide.[48] Amnesty International reported that the Libyan government assassinated at least 25 of its political opponents abroad between 1980 and1987.[49]

Libyan attacks against its citizens in exile continued well into the 1990s. In December 1993 for instance, former Libyan minister Mansur Kikhia, who defected, disappeared in Cairo on his return from the US after attending a conference of Libyan opposition leaders in that country. It was later alleged that Libyan agents kidnapped him. Similarly, Ali Muhammad Abu Zayd, a founding member of the NFSL was murdered in London in November 1995. According to statements released by the leadership of the NFSL, Libyan authorities were behind the murder. In May 1997, the house of another prominent Libyan dissident, Abd al-Mun'im al-huni, was bombed in Cairo in what was believed to be an attempted murder. Libyan secret agents were also alleged to have bombed the house.[50]

Through these numerous international terror attacks against opposition forces, the Libyan government under the leadership of Qaddafi has been able to consolidate power domestically. Opposition from within and outside the country against the regime may have been considerably weakened but it has not been completely eliminated.

4.1.2 Libyan international terrorist attacks aimed at foreign countries

As noted earlier, Libyan international terror acts were not directed only at the country's dissidents living abroad. It was also targeted against African, Asian and Western powers. Among the numerous acts of terrorism committed by the Libyan state were attempts to assassinate heads of state of various African, Middle Eastern and Western countries. For

example, as mentioned earlier, there was an attempt by Libyan trained agents in collaboration with a local insurgent group to assassinate the Late King Hassan II of Morocco on 3 March 1973.[51] Similarly, there was evidence as has been stated previously, indicating that Libyan agents had, at various times in the 1970s and 1980s attempted to assassinate the late President Anwar Sadat of Egypt and his successor President Hosni Mubarak. There were also other attempts on the lives of former President Gaafa Nimeiri of Sudan, Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia, and former King Hussein of Jordan. Furthermore, former US President Ronald Reagan also claimed that a Libyan hit squad had been sent to assassinate him in 1981.[52]

The killing of a British policewoman on 18 April 1984 at the Libyan embassy in London was also regarded as an act of terrorism. The incident occurred when the British police besieged the embassy to prevent Libyan demonstrators from attacking the building. A gunman fired shots from inside the embassy, which killed the police officer and injured about 11 others. Libyan diplomats were held responsible for the death of the police officer by British authorities.[53] In 1986, two US soldiers and a civilian were also killed and about 200 others wounded when a West Berlin (La Belle) discotheque regularly used by US military officers stationed in Germany was bombed. Libya initially denied involvement in the incident. It was however, revealed in November 2001 in a Berlin court, during the trial of suspects arrested in connection with the incident, that Libyan secret agents and a Libyan embassy staff planned the attack.[54] In West Africa, Senegalese authorities arrested two Libyan agents and a Senegalese at Darkar airport smuggling arms aboard a flight to Benin on 20 February 1988. They were believed to have been planning to attack Western targets in the country.[55]

The Lockerbie and Niger Bombings in 1988 and 1989 respectively, remain perhaps the most cited of all Libyan international terrorist acts. In the Lockerbie incident, an explosive destroyed Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie in Scotland on 21 December 1988. The flight was on its way to New York. About 259 people on board the aircraft were killed as well as 11 people in Lockerbie village.[56] On 13 November 1988, Scottish and American courts issued international warrants for the arrest of two Libyan officials

for their role in the Lockerbie incident. The Libyan nationals implicated in the act were Abd al-Basit al-Megrahi, then a senior Libyan intelligence officer, and Al-Amin Khalifa Fhimah, stationed at the Libyan Arab Airlines (LAA) office in Malta. Both the US and Scottish authorities alleged that the attack was planned at the highest levels of the Libyan government. The US government further accused Said Rashid, a leading organiser of Libyan subversive operations and a confidante of Qaddafi, of orchestrating the attack.[57]

Despite sustained international pressure mounted on Libya to hand over Abd al-Basit al-Megrahi and Al-Amin Khalifa Fhimah for trial in Scotland, it refused to hand over the suspects until 1999. The suspects were subsequently tried in The Hague (Netherlands) under Scottish laws. Abd al-Basit al-Megrahi was convicted of killing 270 people while Al-Amin Khalifa Fhimah was acquitted for lack of evidence against him.[58] Libya's refusal to hand over the suspects, led to the adoption of UNSC Resolution (UNSCR) 731 which demanded that Libya surrendered the two terror suspects for trial in the US or Britain as well as pay compensation to victims of the attack and to fully cooperate with investigations into the incident.[59] Non compliance with the UNSCR 731 resulted in the imposition of sanctions against Libya under UNSCR 748 and UNSCR 883 in 1992 and 1993 respectively. The US also imposed secondary sanctions against Libya in July 1996 for the same reason.[60]

In the Niger incident, explosives also destroyed UTA Flight 772 over Niger on 19 September 1989. The flight was on its way to Paris from Congo (Brazzaville). About 171 people were killed in the incident.[61] After a series of investigations, a French Judge indicted four Libyan officials of masterminding the international terror attack on 30 October 1991. In the arrest warrant, French authorities detailed how Libyan officials recruited three Congolese nationals to plant a bomb on the aircraft. Libyan officials accused of orchestrating the attack were Abdallah Sannusi (a brother-in-law of the Libyan leader and Deputy Commander of the Libyan Intelligence Services); Ibrahim Nayli (Representative of the Libyan intelligence in Athens); Abdal-Azragh (First Secretary in the Libyan embassy in Brazzaville); and Abass Musbah (Libyan intelligence officer in Brazzaville). Equally implicated in the attack was a former deputy foreign

minister of Libya, Musa Kusa.**62** Although Libyan authorities refused to surrender the men for trial in France, they were nevertheless tried, convicted and sentenced *in absentia* to life imprisonment by the French courts.**63**

This section has examined international terrorist acts committed by Libya using its own trained agents and in pursuit of its own foreign and domestic policies. The next section will examine international terrorist acts committed by groups sponsored and supported by Libya.

4.2 Libyan sponsored international terrorist acts

While international terrorist groups supported by Libya differed radically in terms of their organisations, geographical locations, religious and ideological beliefs, motivations and goals; they tended to be united by a common belief in the use of violence to achieve political, social and economic ends. It is important to mention however, that not all acts of international terrorism carried out by these groups were supported or sponsored by Libya or in furtherance of Libyan policy objectives. In fact as much as these groups were under the influence of Libya, some of them retained a reasonable degree of independence. Thus, in some cases they engaged in international terror attacks to further their own objectives without seeking Libyan consent or approval. One of such groups was the Abu Nidal Organisation (ANO).**64**

4.2.1 International terrorist acts in the 1970s

In the 1970s international terrorist groups sponsored by Libya were very active in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, North and South America following a Libyan call, for an "upsurge of revolutionary will" among Palestinians. Thus, in response to this, members of the Black September took members of the Israeli Olympic team in Munich Germany hostage on 5 September 1972. The hostage drama took a deadly turn when German police tried to rescue the athletes and their coaches. Consequently, 11 members of the Israeli team and one German police officer were killed in the incident. The German

police were however, able to kill five members of the group and arrested three that survived the attack. Libya praised the terrorists and honoured the five that died in the attack with a public funeral in Libya.[65]

Members of the Black September group also stepped up their attacks against Arab countries such as Saudi Arabia. In March 1973 for example, the group attacked the Saudi Embassy in Khartoum, Sudan. Three foreign diplomats, two Americans and a Belgian, were killed. Similarly, Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) led by George Habash carried out attacks on Qiryat Shemona in Israel as part of the strategy of the Libyan government to escalate the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.[66]

4.2.2   International terrorist acts in the 1980s

Among the major international terror attacks carried out by the ANO under the influence of the Libyan government, include the December 1985 Rome and Vienna airports attacks. In September 1986 the ANO attacked the Neve Shalom synagogue in Istanbul Turkey and hijacked Pan Am Flight 73 in Karachi, Pakistan.[67] Furthermore, the ANO attacked and hijacked a Greek cruise ship The City of Poros in Athens on 11 July 1988. About nine people were killed and 100 others wounded in the attack[68]

As a result of Libya's military adventure in neighbouring Chad during the 1970s and 1980s, France provided military support to the Chadian government which helped it to defeat insurgent forces sponsored by Libya and more importantly, to defeat the Libyan army in 1987. In retaliation for the French military support for the Chadian government, Libya sponsored a series of attacks on French targets. For example, a terrorist group Popular Struggle Front (PSF) backed by Libya attacked a café in Djibouti in the Horn of Africa, killing 11 people. Five of those killed were French citizens.[69]

Similarly, another Libyan backed group, the Armenia Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA), killed two French *gendarmes* in Beirut, Lebanon in October 1987. The ANO also carried out a series of attacks on behalf of Libya in 1987. One of such acts

was the hijacking of a ship in the Mediterranean Sea in November 1987 resulting in the abduction of French and Belgian passengers. It was not only French interests that Libyan proxies attacked during this time. Two terrorists sponsored by Libya shot a British soldier near Limassol in Cyprus, injuring him and a companion in the same period.[70] Members of the ANO simultaneously attacked the British Sudan Club and the Acropole Hotel in Khartoum on 15 May 1988, killing about eight people among them five UK citizens.[71]

The US government also claimed that Libya was linked to Egypt Revolution (ER), a group that unsuccessfully attempted to kill three US diplomats in Egypt in 1987. The group was also blamed for the bombing of World Vision offices in Chad in October 1987.[72] In 1988, groups sponsored by Libya attacked several US targets in Europe and South America. According to US authorities, these attacks were used to mark the second anniversary of the US reprisal attack (Operation El Dorado Canyon) on the Libyan capital Tripoli on 13 April 1986.[73] The US had attacked Libya for its sponsorship of international terrorism, especially the La Belle (Berlin) discotheque bombing in April 1986.

The US government reached this conclusion after observing similar patterns in the attacks and based on claims made by a Japanese Red Army (JRA) member responsible for the attack. He claimed that the attack was revenge for the US attack on Tripoli in 1986.[74] Besides, the attacks were carried out in the same month and some of them on the same day. For example on 14 April 1988, the Organisation of Jihad Brigades (linked to the JRA) bombed the US Officers Club (USO) in Naples, Italy. The attack killed a US servicewoman and four other people.[75] On the same day, the Colombian terrorist group M-19 bombed a US Information Service (USIS) building in the Colombian capital.[76] Another group of terrorists also bombed a US Air Force post in Spain on 15 April 1988.[77] Attacks against US targets continued in South America with the Peruvian Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) bombing two USIS centres in Lima on 16 April 1988. Further attacks against the US occurred on 19 April 1988 in Costa Rica when groups linked to Libya bombed the USIS bi-national cultural centre in the country.[78]

4.2.3   International terrorist acts in the 1990s

With regard to international state terrorism, Libya continued to use its own trained agents to carry out assassination, intimidation, harassment and kidnapping of Libyan dissidents abroad throughout the 1990s. Instances of these terrorist acts have been discussed in previous sections of this chapter. Libya also continued to support several international terrorist groups during this period. In early 1992 for example, the Libyan leader gave assurance through intermediaries that he would reveal information about his dealings with the IRA in exchange for improved relations with Britain.[79] Palestinian groups such as ANO, PIJ, and the PFLP-GC equally continued to receive support from Libya until 1997.[80] By mid-1998 however, Libya expelled ANO and other international terror groups as a demonstration of its resolve to abandon international terrorism as a weapon of foreign policy. Collins has noted that only two international terror incidents involving Libyan sponsored groups occurred during this period.[81]

This section has examined international terrorist acts committed by terrorist groups sponsored and supported by Libya during the 1970s, 1980s and, to an extent, the 1990s. The instances cited are by no means exhaustive. International terrorist incidents perpetrated by these non-state groups had Libyan links. The next section of this chapter discusses why Libya was removed from the list of state sponsors of international terrorism by the US government in 2006.

5.   REMOVAL OF LIBYA FROM LIST OF STATE SPONSORS OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Libya could be said to have begun repudiating the use of terrorism as a strategy for achieving foreign policy goals towards the end of l989. The gradual shift away from the use of international terrorism as a means of achieving policy objectives was a result of several factors. First there was a steady decline in revolutionary and ideological fervour in Libya during this time. Secondly, Libya had suffered severe military repercussions from the US, and unilateral and multilateral economic sanctions from the international

community. These military and economic repercussions, most probably indicated to Libyan authorities that continued sponsorship of, and support for international terror groups, would bring about heavier costs to the country.

Thus, on 25 October 1989, Qaddafi publicly admitted that Libya had assisted groups accused of terrorism. However, he maintained that support for such groups was stopped the moment it was discovered that they were doing more harm than good and were working for themselves rather than for the collective interest of all Arabs.[82] Consequently, by the 1990s, Libya had considerably reduced its sponsorship of international terrorism as exemplified by the expulsion of the ANO and other radical Palestinian groups from Libya in 1998.[83] However, as noted earlier, international state terrorism, especially against Libyan dissidents abroad continued throughout the 1990s.

Nevertheless, after 27 years, Libya was finally removed from the US State Department's list of state sponsors of international terrorism. Several factors accounted for the decision to remove Libya from this list and to restore full diplomatic relations with the country. Apart from Libya's renunciation of international terrorism, it also accepted responsibility for previous terrorist acts and complied with UNSC Resolution (UNSCR) 731.[84] Libya also embarked on the elimination of its weapons of mass destruction programme and continues to cooperate with the US in the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). Beside these efforts, strong international lobbying by African and European states as well as multinational oil companies for the removal of sanctions against Libya and restoration of full diplomatic relations with the state influenced the decision to remove Libya from the list.[85]

The US State Department in its annual reports on terrorism during the 1990s acknowledged that Libya was gradually renouncing international terrorism. After September 11, 2001, Qaddafi condemned the terrorist acts, and stated that the US had the right to retaliate militarily against those responsible for the attack. He also directed Libyan intelligence services to share information on the al Qaeda-linked Libyan group, the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG).[86]

As a practical assurance to the international community that its renunciation of terrorism was not mere rhetoric Libya decided to finally resolve the Lockerbie issue. Thus, on 13 August 2003, its delegation signed an agreement to pay about US$2.7 billion in compensation to the families of the 270 victims of the 1988 Pan Am Lockerbie bombing.[87] A letter accompanied the agreement to the UNSC on 16 August 2003. In the letter Libya formally accepted responsibility for the Lockerbie bombing, renounced terrorism and agreed to continue cooperation in the war on terror and to take practical measures to ensure that such cooperation was effective. UN imposed sanctions were consequently lifted after Libya paid the compensation in 2003.[88]

With respect to the bombing of the French UTA airliner in 1989 Libya paid about US$170m in compensation to the victims of the attack on 9 January 2004 through its international NGO, the Qaddafi International Foundation for Charitable Associations (QIFCA). This was in addition to the U$35m it had already paid French authorities on behalf on the victims.[89] Similarly, Libya accepted responsibility for the killing of a British policewoman in 1984 and compensated her family. The QIFCA and Lawyers representing non-US victims of the 1986 La Belle discotheque bombing in West Berlin Germany also reached an agreement in which Libya paid about US$35m in compensation to the victims of the attack in September 2004.[90] Furthermore, on 19 December 2004, Libya indicated that it would want to eliminate its weapons of mass destruction and non-Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) class missiles. It was reported that the US, Britain and relevant international agencies worked with Libya to eliminate these weapons in a transparent manner.[91]

Libya maintained its cooperation with the US in its GWOT with the firm assurance that Libyan territory would no longer serve as a safe haven for international terrorists. Therefore, in May 2005, Libya repatriated Mohammed Yousri Yassi, a member of the terrorist cell that carried out attacks on tourists in Cairo, Egypt on 7 and 30 April 2005. Furthermore, Libya was also instrumental in the repatriation of Abderrak al-Para, a member of GSPC for his role in the kidnapping of Western tourists in Algeria in 2003.[92]

Finally, international pressure from European and African countries as well as multinational companies equally played a part in the decision to lift sanctions against Libya. This is because international sanctions placed on Libya severely affected multinational oil companies from the US and Europe and the supply of oil and gas from Libya to Europe.[93] These sanctions were however, removed in 2003.[94] Thus, on 15 May 2006 Libya was finally removed from the US State Department's list of state sponsors of international terrorism.[95]

6.   CONCLUSION

This chapter focused on Libya's direct involvement in international terrorism as well as terrorism perpetrated by groups that it sponsored and supported, especially during the 1970s and 1980s. A brief historical background of Libya was provided to explain why the country ventured into international terrorism, especially after the overthrow of King Idris I by the RCC led by Qaddafi in 1969. It has been shown that Libya was a poor country dependent on international aid to survive at the time of gaining political independence. Due to this challenge, it adopted a pro-Western foreign policy much to the dislike of other Arab nations such as Egypt. At the time of the military take-over in 1969, Arab nationalism championed by President Nasser of Egypt was at its peak and Libyan youths were motivated by it. The need to foster Arab unity, defeat imperialism and Zionism contributed to Libya adopting international terrorism as part of its foreign policy.

Libya's involvement in international terrorism has been discussed under two broad categories, namely, international terrorist acts committed by the Libyan state and international terrorist acts carried out by groups sponsored and supported by Libya. In the first category Libya used its own trained agents and material resources and institutions to carry out acts of terrorism. Such international terrorist acts targeted Libyan dissidents who lived in foreign countries such as Britain, the US, Egypt, and Tunisia. Among the terrorist acts carried out by Libyan agents were assassinations, bombing, kidnappings, murder, and arson. The numerous incidents of international terrorism carried out by

international terror groups sponsored and supported by Libya such as the ANO, Black September, PFLP-GC and several others, were subsequently also discussed.

From the 1990s Libya began to repudiate international terrorism as a means of advancing its foreign policy objectives in global politics. Sustained condemnation of international terrorism; cooperation with the US in its GWOT; payment of compensation to victims of the Lockerbie, UTA, and German discotheque bombings; as well as for the killing of British policewoman in 1984, contributed to the lifting of sanctions on Libya by the UN. They equally contributed to the eventual removal of Libya from the list of state sponsors of international terrorism by the US. Other equally important explanations of why Libya was removed from the list of state sponsors of international terrorism include abandonment of WMD projects, and pressure from European and African leaders, as well as multinational oil companies.

Libya was not the only African country that was designated as a state sponsor of international terrorism by the US State Department. Sudan was also designated as such in 1993 and has remained on the list since then. The next chapter of this study will examine the involvement of Sudan in international terrorism.

REFERENCES

1   Lawless. R. I, "Libya: History", *The Middle East and North Africa* 53rd Edition, Routledge: London and New York, 2007, p. 744

2   Crozier. B (ed.), "Libya's Foreign Adventures", *Conflict Studies*, No. 41, December 1973, p. 1

3   Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 744

4   *Ibid*

5   Deeb. M. J, *Libya's Foreign Policy in North Africa*, Westview Press: Oxford, 1991, p. 29

6   *Ibid*

7   Kezeiri. S, "Libya", in James D. Tarver (ed.), *Urbanization in Africa: A handbook*, Greenwood Press: London, 1994, p. 213

8   Deeb. M. J, 1991, *op cit*, pp. 30-31

9   The Economist Intelligence Unit, "Libya: Country Profile", *The Economist*: London, 2006, p. 4

10 *Ibid*

11 Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 745

12 *Ibid*

13 *Ibid*

14 *Ibid*

15 Deeb. M. J, 1991, *op cit*, p.54

16 St John. R. B, *Qaddafi's World Design: Libyan Foreign Policy, 1969-1987*, Saqi Books, London, 1988, p. 21

17 Geldenhuys. D, "The Rule-Breaking Conduct of Qaddafi's Libya, *Strategic Review For Southern Africa*, Vol. XXV, No. 2, 2003, p. 62

18 *Ibid*, p. 60

19 *The Europa World Year Book 2000,* Europa Publications, London, p. 2289

20 Geldenhuys. D, *op cit*, p. 62

21 *Ibid*

22 Byman. D, *Deadly Connections: States That Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005, p.15

23 *Ibid,* p. 59

24 *Ibid*

25 Francis. S. T, "Libya's Empire of Terror", *Africa Insight*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1982, p. 7

26 *Ibid*

27 *Ibid*

28 *Ibid*, p. 9

29 *Ibid*

30 Byman. D, *op cit*, P. 60

31 *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism,* Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers London, 1997, p. 384

32 *Ibid*

33 Francis. S. T, *op cit*, p. 5

34 Byman.D, *op cit*, p. 61

35 *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism, op cit,* p. 383

36 *Ibid*

37 US: Department of State*, Patterns of Global Terrorism 1997*, Washington DC, 1998, p. 7

38 Francis. S. T, *op cit*, p. 5

39 *Ibid*, p. 9

40 Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 747

41 Wilkinson. P, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*. Frank Cass. London, 2000, p. 63

42 Deeb. M. J, "Political and Economic Developments in Libya in the 1990s", in Yahia H. Zoubir (ed.), *North Africa in Transition: State, Society, and Economic transformation on the 1990s*, University Press: Florida, 1999, p. 81

43 Francis. S. T, *op cit*, p. 10

44 Geldenhuys. D, *op cit*, p. 57

45 *Ibid*

46 *Ibid*

47 Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 747

48 St John. R. B, "Terrorism and Libyan foreign policy 1981-1986", *The World Today*, Vol. 42, No. 7, 1986, p. 111

49 Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 747

50   Deeb. M. J, 1999, *op cit*, p. 85.
51   Francis. S. T, *op cit*, p. 6
52   *The Europa World Year Book 2000, op cit,* p. 2289.
53   St John. R. B, *Historical Dictionary of Libya* (3rd Edition) The Scarecrow Press: Maryland and London, 1998, p. xxxii
54   Geldenhuys. D, *op cit*, p, 58
55   US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1988*, Washington DC, 1989, p. 51
56   Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 749
57   *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism op cit*, p. 386
58   Geldenhuys. D, *op cit*, p, 59
59   Lawless. R. I, *op cit,* p. 750
60   *Ibid*
61   *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism, op cit,* p. 386
62   *Ibid*
63   Geldenhuys. D, *op cit*, p, 58
64   *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism, op cit,* p. 385
65   Francis. S. T, *op cit*, p. 9
66   *Ibid*
67   US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1988*, *op cit*, p. 55
68   *Ibid*
69   *International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism, op cit,* p. 384
70   *Ibid*
71   *Ibid*
72   *Ibid*
73   *Ibid*
74   US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1988*, *op cit*. p. 45
75   *Ibid*, p. 52
76   *Ibid*
77   *Ibid*
78   *Ibid*
79   Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, pp. 748-749
80   US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1997*, *op cit*. p. 7
81   Collins. S. D, "Dissuading State Support of Terrorism: Strikes or Sanctions? (an Analysis of Dissuasion Measures Employed Against Libya", *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 27, No. 1-8, 2004, p.5
82   St John. R. B, *op cit*, p. xxvi
83   Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 751
84   *Ibid*, p. 749
85   *Ibid*
86   *Ibid*, p. 754
87   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2004*, Washington DC, 2005, p. 89
88   Lawless. R. I, *op cit*, p. 755
89   *Ibid*, p. 756
90   *Ibid*
91   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2004*, *op cit*, p. 89
92   *Ibid*
93   Lawless. R. I, *op cit,* p. 750
94   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2004*, *op cit*, p. 89
95   CNN, 15 May 2006

Chapter 4

INTERNATIONAL STATE SPONSORED TERRORISM: THE CASE OF SUDAN

1.   INTRODUCTION

Sudan remains the only African state still listed as a state sponsor of international terrorism by the US State department. Unlike Libya which sponsored as well as carried out international terrorist acts using its own trained agents, Sudan's involvement in international terrorism centred more on sponsorship of international terrorist groups. This chapter specifically discusses the various terrorist groups supported and sponsored by Sudan. The different types of support that Sudan rendered to these groups, and why despite its seemingly cooperative efforts in the global war against terrorism, it remains on the list of state sponsors of international terrorism, are also addressed.

2.   HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SUDAN

Sudan's involvement in international terrorism can be traced to the 1980s. It was however, in 1993 that it was listed by the US State Department as a state sponsor of international terrorism. Several factors motivated Sudan to adopt international terrorism as an instrument of foreign and domestic policies. A brief examination of the political developments in the country will assist in understanding some of the apparent reasons behind Sudan's involvement in international terrorism.

2.1   **The colonial period and post-independence developments**

Sudan is located in the Horn of Africa. It is the largest country in Africa covering an estimated geographical area of 2,505,813 sq km.[1] Sudan is a multi-ethnic state, and shares borders with Chad and the Central African Republic (CAR) in the west, Egypt and Libya in the north, Ethiopia and Eritrea in the east, and Kenya, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) in the south. The country has a long history that dates back to biblical times. According to historical and archaeological findings an earlier Nubian valley civilization called Kush existed from 806 to 308 BC.[2] Sudan once formed part of the Christian kingdom of Nubia, which was later conquered by Islamic forces that invaded it from Egypt. The Muslim Arab invaders thus replaced Christianity with Islam in Sudan.

During the 1500s, however, the Funj conquered much of Sudan thereby forcing the original inhabitants to settle in the southern parts of the country. These original groups included the Dinka, Shilluk, Nuer, and Azande. The Egyptians however, recaptured Sudan in 1874, but following the occupation of Egypt by Britain in 1882, it became obvious that Egypt would lose Sudan. Thus, in 1898 Britain took over the administration of Sudan, but administered the territory jointly with Egypt. This has been referred to as the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan colonisation, which lasted until 1956 when Sudan declared its independence.[3]

Since independence the country has remained mainly a theocratic state, ruled according to the precepts of Islamic or Sharia Law although its constitution has provisions for respect for freedom of thought, religion, and association. By international standards, Sudan is not regarded a democracy even though its current leader was elected in a popular election. This is due to the fact that the present leadership transformed from a military regime to civilian administration through an electoral process that was largely fraudulent. Moreover, even the so-called Government of National Unity (GONU) is composed of both civilians and military officers, especially from the ruling party (the

National Congress Party, NCP).[4] At best Sudan is a "pariah"[5] state whose political system can be described as civil-military.

2.1.1 The independence period

As a result of serious agitation for independence by several Sudanese groups especially in the 1950s, Egypt and Britain granted self-governing status to the country in 1953. Sudan proclaimed its independence on 1 January 1956. Since independence, Sudan has been a very volatile country, ruled by a series of unstable parliamentary governments and military regimes. Of its 51 years of existence, more than 40 years have been spent fighting one form of war or the other. The country was plunged into its first civil war shortly after independence in 1956. The civil war pitted the ruling Arab northerners against the black southerners. The war ended in 1972, after the signing of the *Addis Ababa Peace Agreement* between the Sudanese government led by General Ja'afar Mohammed Numeiri who seized power in 1969, and the Anya-Nya separatist group. It is estimated that between 750,000 and 1,500 000 southern Sudanese people died during the first civil war.[6]

In 1983 however, General Ja'afar Mohammed Numeiri abrogated the *Addis Ababa Peace Agreement*, which granted self-government to the south. Numeiri's regime not only invaded the southern region and brought it under the control of the northern/Arab dominated central government, but also imposed Islamic law on the southern people, who are predominantly Christians and animists.[7] Numeiri's commitment to Islamisation was supported mainly by Islamic fundamentalists in the northern parts of the country such as Sheik Hassan al-Turabi of the Muslim Brotherhood. Ofcansky has argued that "the harsher penalties of the new code were enforced regardless of, and even contrary to, the teachings of the Sharia itself."[8] This development led to the formation of the Southern Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) by John Garang de Mabior and other military officers from southern Sudan. The country was therefore plunged back into civil war in 1983[9]

2.1.2　　　　　　The second civil war and the coup of 1985

The outbreak of war coupled with harsh economic conditions in the northern parts of the country resulted in general strike action and severe opposition to Numeiri's regime in the 1980s. This prompted the overthrow of the regime on 6 April 1985 by Lt-General Abd ar-Rahman Swar ad-Dahab who was then the country's Minister of Defence.[10] The military regime proceeded to organise general elections in April 1986. About 40 political parties contested the election. None of them won an outright majority of seats in the Sudanese National Assembly to form the government. The three leading political parties were the Umma Party (UP) led by Sadiq al-Mahdi; the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) led by Osman al-Mirghani; and the National Islamic Front (NIF) led by Sheik Hassan al-Turabi. The UP won 99 seats at the general elections while the DUP and NIF won 63 and 51 seats respectively. Consequently, the UP and DUP formed a coalition government led by Sadiq al-Mahdi as Prime Minister.[11] Elections did not take place in the southern parts of the country due to the civil war.

In 1987 attempts were made to resolve the civil war. The government, proposed the abrogation of religiously based laws that were unacceptable to the people of southern Sudan. New laws based on Sudanese legal heritage were proposed to replace those unacceptable to southern Sudanese and non-Muslims. This implied that people of Sudan were to be exempted from Sharia prescriptions for punishments and the system of *zakat* (alms) only in southern regions. Sharia would however, continue to be applied in the predominately Muslim northern regions of the country. The proposals were rejected by the SPLM/A, which sought the total abrogation of Sharia law in Sudan as a precondition for the holding of a peace conference to resolve the conflict. All the political parties launched several peace initiatives in countries such as Ethiopia and Kenya during this time. But the NIF refused to endorse those agreements, which called for the abrogation of Islamic law in the country.[12]

2.1.3   The regime of Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir

The coalition government of Mahdi was very weak. It was unable to withstand severe opposition from Islamic fundamentalist political parties and sections of the Sudanese military. It was not surprising therefore that on 30 June 1989 Brigadier (later Lt. General) Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir ousted the elected government in a bloodless military *coup*. He proceeded to suspend Sudan's Constitution and political parties; closed down newspapers; and dissolved the National Assembly and Council of Ministers. Thereafter, he proclaimed Sudan an Islamic state and placed Sheik Hassan al-Turabi in charge of "Sudan's redesign." Al-Turabi said he turned to Islam because, "without Islam, Sudan has no identity, no direction" thus, he called the new regime "an Islamic experiment that was envisioned to lead to a new national consensus."[13]

In place of the governance institutions he dissolved, al-Bashir constituted a 15-member Revolutionary Command Council (RCC). The new regime was quickly recognised by Chad, Egypt, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, and Saudi Arabia. Al-Bashir's regime sought a military solution to the war in the southern region of the country and did very little to abrogate the offensive Islamic law introduced in southern Sudan. Instead, in 1991 the regime introduced a new penal code still based on Islamic law. However, it stated in principle that the codes would not apply in southern regions, namely Equatoria, Upper Nile, and Bahr al-Ghazal. In practice however, only five of the 186 articles of the penal code were not to apply to these regions and also to non-Muslims living in the northern parts of the country, particularly Khartoum. Thus, the SPLM/A rejected the new penal code and continued to wage war against the government in the southern parts of the country.[14]

In March 1996 legislative and presidential elections were held in the country. Al-Bashir transformed himself from a military leader to an elected president of Sudan for five years. He secured about 75.7 percent of the votes. The NIF, which changed its name to the National Congress Party (NCP) in order to dilute its image as an Islamic fundamentalist party and also to attract more members, won the majority of seats in the National

Assembly. Islamic fundamentalist leader Sheik Hassan al-Turabi was also elected as president of the National Assembly.[15]

Due to al-Turabi's strong influence in al-Bashir's regime, he was regarded as the *de facto* ruler of Sudan and he never ceased to champion pan-Arabism and Islamic fundamentalist movements in Sudan and in the Horn of Africa. His strong influence prevented the government from seeking a peaceful resolution to the conflict in the south. In 1999, however, al-Bashir removed al-Turabi from his government and placed him under house arrest. By the time he was released in 2003, the government had already reached a number of agreements with the SPLM/A in an attempt to end the civil war.[16]

2.2   The Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA) 2005

As al-Bashir's regime was unable to achieve a decisive military victory in the civil war against southern rebel forces led by the SPLM/A, it began to seek for a peaceful solution to the conflict. Thus, a series of peace talks between the government and SPLM/A were held in countries such as Eritrea (2000), Kenya (2001 and 2002), and Libya (2001). These initiatives could not hold an agreement due to several reasons, which included strong Islamic fundamentalist influence. However, on 9 January 2005, after three years of intensive negotiations, the SPLM/A and the Khartoum government signed a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), thus ending the two-decades-long civil war. The war resulted in the death of more than 2,500,000 people; four million internally displaced people, and another one million refugees.[17] The CPA provided for the sharing of oil wealth between the Khartoum government and the SPLM/A, as well as partial autonomy and the right to secede for southern Sudanese people, depending on the result of a referendum to be held after six years.[18]

Shortly after the signing of the CPA and the swearing in of John Garang as the First Vice President of Sudan and President of the Government of Southern Sudan (GOSS), Garang was killed in a helicopter crash. His deputy, Commander Salva Kiir Mayardit was later sworn in as the new Vice President of Sudan and President of the GOSS. Relative peace

and stability therefore exists in the southern parts of the country as a result of the CPA. The possibility of resurgence of armed conflict in the future cannot however, be completely ruled out. This is because certain aspects of the CPA, which have not been effectively implemented, remain a source of future conflict.[19]

2.3 **The Darfur crisis**

As mentioned earlier, Sudan is a very volatile country. Just as its civil war in the south appeared to be ending with the signing of the CPA, another war intensified in the north-western region of Darfur. This was due to the inability of the government to prevent a rebellion in the region against the Sudanese government over political and economic marginalisation and suppression in 2003. Pro-government Arab militias called the *Janjaweed* have continued to carry out massacres against the black populations in the region. It is alleged that the government armed these Arab militias as part of its counter insurgency measures against two rebel factions in the region, namely, the Justice and Equity Movement (JEM) and the Sudan Liberation Movement (SLM).[20] The war has been described as genocide by the US government and other Western powers. It was estimated that up to 200,000 civilians had been killed and more than one million people displaced since the war began in 2003.[21]

Ironically while the war in the southern region of Sudan was fought against black Christian and animist populations, the Darfur conflict is being fought against black Muslims. Despite international condemnation of the crisis; a UN Security Council Resolution demanding that Sudan stop the Arab militias; and the Darfur Peace Accord (DPA) signed in Abuja, Nigeria in May 2006, the war has not ended. The deployment of the African Union (AU) Mission in Darfur (AMIS) was unable to dissuade, discourage or prevent killings, extortions, and maiming of vulnerable civilian populations perpetuated by the *Janjaweed* and other rebel groups in the conflict. Hence, the international community called for the replacement of AMIS with a more robust hybrid peacekeeping force under the supervision of the UN.[22] The UN peacekeepers have been deployed to the region, after much opposition from the Khartoum government. The next section of this

chapter will examine the motivating factors behind Sudan's involvement in international terrorism.

3.   SUDAN'S MOTIVATIONS FOR INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AND TYPES OF SPONSORSHIP AND SUPPORT

From the brief historical overview of Sudan it can be seen that by the 1990s the country was experiencing not only economic hardship but also political instability and a protracted civil war in its southern regions. The need to end these conditions, coupled with a determined resolve to spread radical Islamic fundamentalism in the Horn of Africa and beyond, acted as motivations for Sudan to become a state sponsor of international terrorism. The subsequent sections of this chapter will examine the motivations, and types of support that Sudan rendered to international terrorist groups particularly in the 1990s.

3.1   Motivations for support

As stated earlier, Sudan was designated a state sponsor of international terrorism by the US government in August 1993. However international terrorist acts had occurred in the country long before 1993. This is because as far back as 1973 members of the Black September terror group based in Libya abducted and killed the US Ambassador to Sudan and his *Charge d'Affairs* in Khartoum. The eight terrorists were convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment but their sentences were later commuted and some of them got away with the murder.[23] Although the Sudanese government was not implicated in the terrorist act, the commuting of the sentences of the terrorists by the Sudanese state was not well received by the international community. Several reasons motivated Sudan to become a state sponsor of international terrorism. Among these reasons are strategic considerations, the spreading of politico-religious ideology; domestic power consolidation, especially the defeat of the SPLM/A; and enhancement of international prestige.

3.1.1 The spread of radical Islamic fundamentalism

Sudan's involvement in international terrorism became clear in late 1991 when as a predominantly Sunni Muslim country, it forged strong links with Iran, a Shiite Muslim nation and a sponsor of international terrorism. Sunni and Shiite sects of Islam are often antagonistic of each other. This is what made the relationship between Sudan and Iran suspicious.[24] Links between the two theocratic countries were strengthened with the visit of the Iranian President Ali Akhbar Hashemi Rafsanjani accompanied by his Defence and Intelligence Ministers and the Commander of the Revolutionary Guards to Khartoum in 1991. The two countries signed a number of bilateral economic and military agreements during the visit.[25]

It is argued that the relationship between Sudan and Iran was based on a common vision and a passionate disdain for neighbouring secular states as well as a strong desire to extend radical Islamic fundamentalism beyond their respective borders. The Islamic regime in Sudan aimed at spreading radical Islamic fundamentalism and projecting its powers throughout the Horn of Africa, but lacked the necessary resources to achieve this goal. Thus, Sudan hoped to obtain the necessary financial and military resources to achieve this goal by forging closer relations with Iran. Similarly, Iran welcomed the new development because it saw Sudan as a gateway to the Middle East and Africa, in its attempt to extend the Shiite doctrine of Islam and support for Hezbollah in its campaign against Israel.[26]

During the early 1990s, Iran supplied military hardware, terrorist training expertise and badly needed oil to the Sudanese regime, which greatly assisted the regime in prosecuting its war against the SPLM/A in the southern region of the country. In return the Iranian government used Sudan as a conduit to funnel assistance to international terrorist and radical Islamic organisations especially Hezbollah, operating in, and transiting through Sudan to the Middle East.[27]

3.1.2   Strategic considerations

Sudan's strategic interests lie mainly in its region of the Horn of Africa. The Horn of Africa is arguably the most unstable region on the African continent, with all or most countries in the region, without any exception, experiencing one form of political violence or the other. Mukwaya has pointed out that, "two types of conflict have been common in this region: intra-and inter-state conflicts."[28] Eritrea and Ethiopia went to war in 2001 over the disputed Badme border area. Somali is a failed state in the region and Sudan has been in crisis since independence in 1956. Chad is almost on the brink of a civil war and even inter-state war with Sudan. Ethiopia is at the moment carrying out a military campaign in Somali. Countries in this region often accuse each other of sponsoring insurgency movements in their respective territories. Sudan happens to be the worst culprit in this regard, its relations with its neighbours such as Uganda, Eritrea and Chad continue to experience periods of tensions. With respect to Uganda, Sudan sponsors the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), which employs terrorism as a means of fighting the Ugandan government[29]

The massive support given to the LRA by Sudan is intended to disrupt Uganda and make it unsafe for southern rebels particularly the SPLM/A to establish a base there. Secondly, the support is also intended to keep the Ugandan forces and government occupied with domestic affairs and unable to provide support to the SPLM/A. These reasons also partly account for Sudan's support to the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) and the Eritrean Islamic Jihad (EIJ), which are extremist Islamic factions in Eritrea.[30] Sudan accuses Eritrea of providing support to the National Democratic Alliance (NDA), which is a coalition of opposition political parties in Sudan of which the SPLM/A is also a member. Members of the NDA live in exile in Eritrea.[31]

It is further suggested that attacks against Eritrea using the ELF and the EIJ as proxies, are most probably intended to force the Eritrean government to expel exiled Sudanese opposition politicians from the country.[32] The attacks may also be aimed at overthrowing the Eritrean government and extending Sudan's influence and power in Eritrea. Sudan

envisaged that support from an Eritrean government under Sudan's influence would assist in defeating the SPLM/A rebellion in southern Sudan.

3.1.3 Consolidation of domestic power base

Domestic power consolidation is another reason that motivated Sudan to venture into sponsorship of international terrorism. As mentioned earlier al-Bashir came to power through a military *coup*. On assumption of power, he declared Sudan an Islamic state to be ruled according to the precept of Sharia Law. By this declaration, al-Bashir sought to attract the support of strong Islamic fundamentalist politicians such as Sheik Hassan al-Turabi, and factions of the Muslim Brotherhood in the military whose influence over northern Islamic parties was enormous. In effect while al-Bashir was president of the country, al-Turabi and other Islamic fundamentalists were the *eminence grise* behind the government of Sudan.[33] Through Turabi's Islamist networks, the Sudanese government sought to consolidate domestic power by fortifying the domestic economy and the military. According to Ajawin and de Waal, Sudan received a considerable amount of financial support from radical Islamic financial groups during the 1990s to sustain its domestic economy. It is further argued that by 1999 Sudan's national budget was just US$884 million and yet the government was able to sustain a major war and infrastructural development projects. While Sudan's official military spending was just US$242 million, actual expenditures were undoubtedly far higher, estimated at up to US$1 billion.[34] Turabi's Islamist networks were instrumental in setting up Sudan's domestic armaments industry and its off-budget security agencies.

Thus, the Sudanese military is dominated by radical Islamic fundamentalists Arabs from the north and are alleged to be the source of instability in the country because they want Sudan to remain an Islamic state. Past civilian administrations were overthrown mainly due to their hesitance to introduce Islamic law in the country. When Nimeiri came to power in 1969, radical Islamic groups within the army mounted pressure on him to Islamise Sudan. He eventually succumbed to their pressure in 1983 when he abrogated the *Addis Ababa Peace Accord* of 1972 and introduced Islamic law in Sudan. Nimeiri

was overthrown mainly due to opposition to his regime mounted by al-Turabi's faction of the Muslim Brotherhood, which argued that it had not been properly consulted in the formulation of Sudan's policy of Islamisation.[35]

The overthrow of the civilian administration of Prime Minister Sadiq al-Mahdi in 1989 was also as a result of its vacillation over Islamisation. This can be seen from the fact that one of the first announcements of al-Bashir's regime was to declare Sudan an Islamic state, with Islamic law extending to the northern and southern parts of the country. Al-Bashir realised that to consolidate his hold on power, he needed the support of the radical Islamic fundamentalists in the Sudanese military and politics. So far this has succeeded in keeping him in power for eighteen years. Sponsorship of international terrorist groups was a means of demonstrating the regimes' commitment to the cause of spreading Islamic fundamentalism beyond the borders of Sudan.[36]

As pointed out earlier, several factors motivated Sudan to become involved in international terrorism as a weapon of furthering its foreign policy objectives. The factors discussed above are only some of these. The subsequent sections will examine the various types of support that Sudan rendered to international terrorist groups.

3.2. Sudan's sponsorship and support for international terror groups

From the discussions on the meaning of state sponsorship and support for international terrorism, it can be seen that Sudan's support of international terrorism was strong and in some cases sometimes passive and lukewarm.[37] Sudan's role in international terrorism, especially its relationship with Iran in the 1990s, caused the country to have hostile relations with countries in the Horn of Africa, and even outside the continent. It also led to the imposition of sanctions against Sudan. First, by resolution 1070 (1996) the UN imposed air sanctions against Sudan. Secondly, the US government imposed unilateral economic sanctions against Sudan in May 1997. Unlike Libya that was not only a vocal supporter of international terrorism, but was practically engaged in it, there is no evidence

to suggest that Sudan used its own trained agents to commit acts of terror outside Sudan. The various types of support Sudan rendered to international terrorist groups are examined below.

3.2.1   Transit route for international terrorists

Sudan's relationship with Iran in the 1990s resulted in the use of Sudanese territory as a transit route by several terrorist groups supported by Iran. According to US State Department reports on international terrorism in the early 1990s, Sudan allowed Iran to funnel resources to the Palestinian extremist groups that it supports, particularly Hezbollah.[38] Members of these groups passed through Sudan into the Middle East to carry out terror acts. While some returned to Iran after their missions, others were believed to live inside Sudan. The Sudanese regime allowed Sudan to serve as a meeting point for all extremist groups supported by Iran. The Iranian embassy in Khartoum was used to funnel money, and other resources to these terrorists. Among Iranian officials identified by the US government to be responsible for the operations of Iranian backed terrorists in the Middle East was Majid Kamal (then Iranian Ambassador to Sudan).[39] It has also been reported that individuals who were active participants in the Iraqi insurgency have returned to Sudan and could use their knowledge to conduct terrorist acts or pass such knowledge to others.[40]

3.2.2   Harbouring, training, and supply of arms to international terrorists

Laqueur once argued that Sudan had become for terrorists, what the Barbary Coast, was for pirates of another age, namely a safe haven.[41] What informed Laqueur's argument was the fact that most of the terrorists expelled from Libya in the early 1990s, relocated to Sudan with the full knowledge of the Sudanese government, which claimed to support the political aspirations of these groups. The presence of terrorist groups such as Lebanon's Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad (PIJ), Egypt's Gama'at al-Islamiyya (IG) and the Palestinian Islamic Resistance Movement (HAMAS) were noticed in Khartoum in the 1990s.[42] These terrorist organisations did not target Sudan for any act of terrorism. Rather

Sudan was used as a base to plan their operations, and recruit new members. They equally used Sudan to network, raise money and also to escape arrest and enjoy respite from the authorities of countries where they had committed acts of terror. The Islamic government in Sudan claimed that these groups were not international terrorist groups but political movements fighting for a just cause. Sudanese president al-Bashir went further to state publicly that it was Sudan's duty to protect *Mujahedin*s (Islamic fighters) who sought refuge in Sudan.[43]

Apart from sheltering the so-called *Mujahedins* the Sudanese government also harboured other notorious terrorists from Europe. One of these terrorists was Carlos the Jackal who was driven from Libya. According to US government reports, Carlos the Jackal relocated to Sudan in 1993 with the full knowledge and protection of senior officials of the NIF (now NCP) and the Sudanese government. Until he was repatriated to France in 1994 Carlos the Jackal lived like a lord in Sudan; and "bragged about his ties to senior government officials, carried a weapon, and flaunted Sudanese laws."[44] The personal behaviour of Carlos the Jackal, which became embarrassing to the Sudanese government, probably led to his expulsion. This is because his departure did not signal any change or shift in foreign policy of Sudan. Sudan also harboured Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, who was convicted in 1995 for his role in the bombing of the World Trade Centre (WTC) in 1993. According to investigations by US intelligence, Rahman had obtained his visa for the US in Khartoum.[45]

Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda terrorist group were also harboured and protected by the Sudanese government between 1991 and 1996.[46] Bin Laden financed, recruited, transported, and trained Arab nationals who volunteered to fight in Afghanistan during the Afghan war with the Soviets in the 1970s and early 1980s. It was during this time that he founded the al Qaeda terrorist group, which has become an operational hub for Islamic extremists particularly those of the Sunni Muslim sect. Osama bin Laden was stripped of his Saudi citizenship in 1994 by the government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Members of the bin Laden family also disowned him for his role in international terrorism. Following on his rejection by both the government of Saudi Arabia and his

family, bin Laden moved to Sudan with his organisation. It was alleged that he moved large amounts of gold into Sudan. In fact al Qaeda was built into a formidable multinational terror organisation in Sudan. The organisation is known to have sent trainers and fighters to countries such as Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Bosnia and Hergovina, Chechnya, Somali, Sudan, and Yemen, Philippines, Egypt, Libya, Pakistan, and Eritrea.[47]

The relationship between Sudan and Iran on the one hand, and Sudan and Osama bin Laden on the other hand, resulted in the establishment of terrorist training camps in different parts of northern Sudan in the 1990s. Members of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard were involved in the training of radical Islamic fundamentalist groups in the country.[48] This was believed to be part of the agreements reached between Sudan and the Iranian government. It was also reported that Syrians, Palestinians and Iranians infiltrated schools in Sudan in search of recruits for terrorist training. The type of training provided at the various camps in Sudan was paramilitary in nature. Members of HAMAS, Hezbollah, PIJ and IG also maintained training camps in Sudan. The ultimate goal of the connections between Sudan, Iran, bin Ladin, and Palestinian terrorist groups, was the spreading of radical Islamic fundamentalism in Africa and the Middle East. Among some of the terrorist training camps established in Sudan was the Merkhiyat Popular Defence Camp, which was located in the northwest of Khartoum.[49]

3.2.3 Provision of diplomatic and logistic support

Sudan used its influence and prestige to back and advance the cause of international terrorist groups such as HAMAS, ANO, PIJ and Hezbollah. The importance of diplomatic support to international terrorist movements cannot be overemphasised. Terrorists seek diplomatic support because it increases their chances of realising their objectives and provides justification of the means employed in the process. Thus, the recognition and support of a state does not only legitimise a group's cause and methods, but also helps the group to attract more recruits and money. Sudan's diplomatic support for various Palestinian groups included allowing them to establish representative offices

in Khartoum. President al-Bashir once declared that it was the duty of Sudan to protect all *Mujahedins* who seek refuge in Sudan. The protection, which the Sudanese president referred to, also included diplomat support.[50]

Thus, Sudan provided travel documents for international terrorists, which enabled them to move to other countries such as Ethiopia, the US and even India. In most cases some of these documents included diplomatic passports. For example, when the attempt to assassinate Egyptian president, Hosni Mubarak in Ethiopia in 1995 failed, one of the suspects fled back to Sudan using a Sudanese passport and airline. Similarly, a Sudanese national who pleaded guilty to various charges of complicity in the failed New York City terrorist attack in February 1995, informed US authorities that a member of the Sudanese Mission to the UN in New York was aware of the plot and had offered to facilitate access to the UN building.[51]

Sudan equally provided terrorists employment opportunities until they were ready to carry out their acts of terror. Employment enabled them to move around and identify potential targets. Sudanese registered NGOs were mostly used for this purpose. Thus, in October 2004, the Sudanese based NGO, Islamic African Relief Agency (IARA) was declared as a supporter of terrorism by the US government because of its support for the al Qaeda group.[52]

From the foregoing discussions it can be seen that Sudan provided various types of support to international terrorist groups, which enabled them to proselytise, recruit new members, and raise money. The next section examines terrorist activities carried out by some of the groups supported and sponsored by Sudan.

4.   CASE STUDIES OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM INVOLVING SUDAN SPONSORED GROUPS

As already stated in the preceding sections, Sudan maintained close links with Palestinian groups such as ANO, Hezbollah, PIJ and HAMAS. It also supported armed insurgent

movements on the African continent such as the LRA in Uganda, and the EIJ in Eritrea as well as the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) in Ethiopia. While Sudan supported the Islamic based groups as part of its grand strategy to further its policy of spreading radical Islamic fundamentalism, it supported groups such as the LRA, which is a Christian based organisation for the sole purpose of destabilising Uganda and preventing it from supporting the SPLM in Southern Sudan.[53]

4.1.   International terrorist acts carried out by groups supported by Sudan: 1993-1999

HAMAS enjoys a special relationship with the Sudanese government. In October 1994, a HAMAS operative carried out a suicide attack on a bus in Tel Aviv, which left 22 people dead while several others were injured. In an interview on the suicide attack Hassan al-Turabi, leader of the ruling NIF (now NCP) publicly stated that the attack was "an honourable act."[54] Such a statement was meant to incite other militant groups to carry out similar attacks on Israel and other Western countries particularly the US.

One of the most notable international terror incidents, which were linked to Sudan, was the attempted assassination of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak on two occasions. The first was in New York, when terrorists planned to bomb the UN building. Sudan was linked to the plot when a Sudanese national pleaded guilty to the charges of complicity in the failed attempt. The suspect confessed that a member of the Sudanese Mission to the UN had assisted them in the plot. In 1996, US investigators corroborated the allegations of the suspects when they linked two Sudanese diplomats in New York to a terrorist cell that planned to bomb the UN building and assassinate President Hosni Mubarak in New York.[55]

The plot to kill the Egyptian president in Ethiopia was hatched in Sudan. According to Western, Egyptian and Ethiopian intelligence sources it was done with the full knowledge of the Sudanese government. Members of Gama'at al-Islamiyya (IG) that were harboured in Sudan planned the assassination. Sudan was implicated because its state owned airline

had carried the attackers' weapons to Ethiopia, and when the attempt failed, one of the militants escaped to Sudan using a Sudanese airways flight and an international passport.[56]

Even though Sudan denied complicity in the attack, it nevertheless refused to turn over the suspects to Ethiopian authorities despite repeated requests also from the OAU and the UN. This prompted a number of UNSC resolutions against Sudan in 1996.[57] These resolutions demanded among other things, that Sudan ceased its support to international terrorist organisations, and that it handed over the three Egyptians (members of the IG) linked to the assassination attempt. Sudan's non-compliance with these resolutions led to the imposing of a series of sanctions by the UN, which lasted until late September 2001.[58]

In 1998 the African continent witnessed one of the most devastating terrorist attacks in its history when members of the al Qaeda terrorist group allegedly bombed the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. Although Sudan expelled bin Laden from its territory in 1996, the organisation continued to have links with Sudan due to the presence of some its members. These al Qaeda members, who were operating from Sudan along its borders with Kenya, and Somalia, were alleged to have helped to carry out the simultaneous attacks on the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. These operatives took advantage of the porous borders and the failed state of Somalia to penetrate into Tanzania and Kenya. In the 1990s, the Sudanese government also provided military support to the Somali Islamic Union and Somalia National Alliance as they battled for control of the country against other clan lords.[59]

In August 1998 the US accused Sudan of involvement in chemical weapons development. On this basis the US conducted military air strikes against the al-Shifa pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum, which was associated with bin Ladin's terrorist network and believed to be involved in the manufacture of chemical weapons to deter the US from attacking Sudan.[60]

4.2   International terrorist acts in the new millennium

Consequent upon the bombing of the al-Shifa pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum in 1998, Sudan tempered its involvement in international terrorism. However, certain terror incidents have been linked to Sudan in the new millennium.

In 2001, a Sudanese born suspect arrested in a foiled plot to bomb the US embassy in New Delhi, confessed to Indian investigators interrogating him that Sudanese diplomats in New Delhi had given him explosives and detonators,[61] thus, implicating Sudan in the failed terrorist attack. So far the Sudanese government had refrained from using its own trained agents in carrying out international terrorist acts. However, it provided diplomatic, training, arms, money and logistic support to radical Islamic fundamentalists groups. It is also suspected that the government may still have some links with al Qaeda even though it expelled the organisation from Sudan in 1996.

A US federal judge ruled in March 2007 that the Sudanese government contributed to the terrorist bombing of a US Navy ship, USS Cole on 12 October 2000 which resulted in the death of 17 American sailors. The USS Cole was stationed at Yemen's port Aden when a small boat carrying explosives attacked it. Lawyers for the family members of the 17 US sailors who died in the attack argued that the attack could have been averted had the Sudanese government not allowed terrorist training camps to operate within Sudan's borders; if the Sudanese government had not given diplomatic passports to members of the al Qaeda group; and if the Sudanese government had not provided the terrorists with diplomatic pouches to ship the explosives and weapons without being searched. The lawyers backed their argument in court with a classified Canadian intelligence report, testimonies from other trials on terrorism and the US State Department annual reports on terrorism.[62]

This section has examined some international terrorist acts committed by members of various international terrorist groups supported by Sudan, particularly in the 1990s and to a lesser extent in the 21st Century. Obviously there may be other cases in which Sudan's

involvement may be difficult to establish. The next section will examine why Sudan is still listed as a state sponsor of international terrorism by the US State Department despite the fact that it seems to be cooperating in the global war against terror.

5. SUDAN'S CONTINUED LISTING AS A STATE SPONSOR OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

As noted in the previous sections, Sudan was designated a state sponsor of international terrorism in 1993 by the US State Department. This is not however to argue that Sudan's involvement in international terrorism only commenced in 1993. It has been mentioned that when Libya began closing down some of its terrorist camps in the late 1980s, several terrorists of Middle Eastern origin surfaced in Sudan. Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman and Ayman Zaawahri who were leaders of the sect that assassinated President Anwar Sadat of Egypt, were harboured in Sudan before 1993. Carlos the Jackal was also living in Sudan before 1993 and bin Laden began living in Sudan in 1991. The subsequent sections of this chapter will examine the efforts of Sudan so far to redeem its image as a state sponsor of international terrorism and why despite its efforts, the US government still designates it as a state sponsor of international terrorism.

5.1 Attempts to redeem Sudan's image

Sudan's effort to redeem its image as a state sponsor of terrorism can be said to have begun in 1995 after the failed attempt to assassinate President Mubarak in Addis Ababa in 1995. The Sudanese President al-Bashir was quick to condemn the failed attempt and to deny Sudan's involvement in the plot. Against the background of accusations from Egypt, Ethiopia and the UN, al-Bashir dismissed the head of Sudan's National Intelligence and Security Services (NSIS). A new visa policy was also introduced to control the movement of nationals from Arab states in the Middle East into Sudan. Thus, with the exception of Iraq, Libya and Syria, all nationals from other Arab states were required to obtain a visa to enter Sudan. The efforts were not taken seriously but regarded

as a public relations exercise because the three countries exempted from the new policy, were designated as state sponsors of international terrorism. Sudan however, argued that the three countries were exempted due to bilateral agreements between Sudan and the governments of these states.[63]

A further attempt to renounce terrorism is linked to the decision of President al-Bashir to dissolve the Sudanese National Assembly upon proclamation of a state of emergency in 1999. The decision was taken due to power struggles between al-Bashir and the speaker of the Sudanese National Assembly, Hassan al-Turabi.[64] It will be recalled that since the NCP (formerly NIF) came to power in 1989, al-Turabi and his radical Islamic fundamentalists had been the *de facto* rulers of Sudan. Al-Turabi as leader of the NIF (NCP), in 1989, extended an invitation to bin Laden and his al Qaeda organisation to establish themselves in Sudan. This was done on the understanding that bin Laden and al Qaeda would help the Sudanese government in the war against the SPLM/A, and also to undertake some road construction in Sudan. In return, bin Laden and his group would be allowed to, "use Sudan as a base for worldwide business operations and for preparations for jihad."[65] Al-Turabi's dismissal in 1999 was seen as an attempt by President al-Bashir to assert his authority firmly and to woo the West with the aim of redeeming the pariah image of Sudan.

By 2000 Sudan had begun to discuss and explore means of cooperation with the US on the combating and preventing of international terrorism. Thus, after the September 11 terror attacks in the US, Sudan was among the first countries to condemn the attacks and to pledge its commitment to fighting terrorism and to fully cooperate with the US in its campaign against terrorism.[66] The government of al-Bashir also investigated and arrested radical Islamic fundamentalists suspected of involvement in terrorist activities. With regard to obeying UNSC Resolutions 1044, 1054 and 1070 which demanded that Sudan handed over suspected terrorists linked to the failed assassination attempt on President Mubarak of Egypt, Sudan constantly maintained that its investigations had found no trace of the three people in Sudanese territory. Its efforts and cooperation in combating terrorism were seen as encouraging by the UN. It did not therefore come as a surprise

when in September 2001 the UN proceeded to lift the sanctions it had placed on Sudan in 1996.

As an assurance to the international community of its commitment to fighting terrorism and redeeming its image as a state sponsor of terrorism, Sudan in 2003 ratified the *International Convention for Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism*. This was followed by ratification of the *OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism*; and the *Convention of the Organisation of Islamic Conference on Combating Terrorism*. The Sudanese government also issued a decree establishing an office for combating international terrorism inside the country. Similarly, in an attempt to end hostilities and normalise relations with its neighbours, Sudan in 2003 signed a counter terrorism cooperation agreement with a number of countries in Africa and the Middle East. These countries included Algeria, Ethiopia and Yemen.[67] The Sudanese government also intensified efforts to ensure that Sudanese territory would no longer serve as a base for international terrorist groups. Thus, between May and December 2003, Sudanese law enforcement agents arrested dozens of terrorists training in Sudan. Saudi nationals among those arrested were deported to Saudi Arabia to face trial based on a bilateral agreement between Saudi Arabia and Sudan.[68]

Sudan continued its commitment and cooperation at combating international terrorism in 2004, by co-hosting a three-day workshop on international cooperation on counter-terrorism and the fight against transnational organised crime with the UN Office on Drug Control. Member states of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) participated in the workshop. Participants at the workshop also adopted the *Khartoum Declaration on Terrorism and Transnational Organised Crime*.[69] Furthermore, Sudanese authorities also arrested, prosecuted and convicted Eritreans who had hijacked a Libyan aircraft and forced it to land in Khartoum in August 2004.[70]

Sudan also participated in regional efforts to end its long-running civil war in 2005. The signing of the CPA is also regarded as an attempt to end involvement in international terrorism. This is because the Sudanese government used these terrorists as part of its

strategy in the war against the SPLM/A in southern Sudan. Following the CPA, the SPLM/A in November 2005, invited the rebel forces of the LRA and the Ugandan government to peace talks in Juba, the capital of the Government of Southern Sudan.[71]

5.2   Why Sudan is still designated a state sponsor of international terrorism

The efforts and commitment of Sudan in combating and preventing terrorism are not in doubt from discussions in the preceding section. The US government has even acknowledged and commended Sudan's efforts in this regard. For example, the US government in May 2004 "certified to Congress a list of countries not fully cooperating in US antiterrorism efforts. For the first time in many years, this list did not include Sudan."[72] Despite this, Sudan is still designated a state sponsor of international terrorism by the US government. There are several reasons for this.

The first reason is that the US government appears sceptical about Sudan's commitment to combating international terrorism. This can be seen from the fact that it abstained from voting when the UN Security Council removed sanctions (UN) against Sudan in 2001.[73] Sudan's fight against terrorism appears to be a continuation of President al-Bashir's fight with radical Islamic fundamentalist and architect of Islamism in Sudan, Hassa al-Turabi. Since al-Turabi's departure from the government in 1999, Sudanese Islamic fundamentalists loyal to him have turned their attention to the government of al-Bashir. Moreover, since the dismissal of al-Turabi there have been a number of reported cases of attempted *coups* against the government. Thus, it stands to reason that the presumed fight against terrorism may in fact be a strategy for regime survival. It can also be seen as a means of asking the US government to lift its unilateral economic sanctions against Sudan imposed since 1997. The presumed fight against terrorism may also be aimed at securing arms from the US rather than a genuine commitment to the combating and preventing of terrorism globally, and within the African continent.

Secondly, a number of international terrorist groups such as HAMAS continue to maintain a presence in Sudan. In 2006, for example, HAMAS representatives were received in Khartoum as Palestinian Authority officials by the Sudanese government.[74] Although HAMAS' offices in Khartoum have been closed since 2004, the US appears not to be convinced about the relationship between Khartoum and HAMAS. Furthermore, it has been reported that active participants in the Iraqi insurgency have returned to Sudan and may be in a position to use their expertise to conduct attacks within Sudan or to pass on their knowledge.[75]

The action of expulsion and public expression of support gives mixed signals to international observers on Sudanese relations with HAMAS. The possibility exists that Sudan may have pretended to succumb to US pressure by asking HAMAS to close down its office in Khartoum just to please the US government, while the relationship between Sudan and HAMAS continued underground. Apart from the presence of HAMAS in Sudan, the activities of some Sudanese registered NGOs with connections to the government of Sudan remain yet another reason why Sudan is still listed as a state sponsor of international terrorism. In October 2004, for example, the US designated a Khartoum based NGO, the Islamic African Relief Agency (IARA) a supporter of terrorism, basically because of its involvement with al Qaeda.[76]

Even though there is no evidence linking Sudan and al Qaeda in the past five years at least; Sudan's previous involvement with bin Laden remains a stumbling block in the objective assessment of its role in international terrorism.[77] There are still pockets of al Qaeda sympathisers and members in Sudan and the government of Sudan has not renounced the policy of Islamisation in a multi-ethnic and religious society. This policy remains at the root of radical Islamic fundamentalism and source of civil war in Sudan.

Sudan has also made little progress in stamping out LRA members in its territory. The US has also continued to place Sudan on its list of state sponsors of international terrorism because of Sudan's role in contributing fighters for the Iraqi insurgency.[78] Similarly, the US government further claims that significant gaps in the knowledge and

capability to identify, capture and disrupt *jihadists* both travelling to and returning from Iraq to Sudan, still remain.[79] In 2006 it was reported that bin Laden and other senior al Qaeda members called for the expansion of al Qaeda's presence in Sudan in anticipation of the deployment of UN peacekeepers in the region. This tends to suggest that individuals linked to al Qaeda are still present in Sudan and may have taken steps to establish an operational network in Darfur.[80] Furthermore, the US government also claimed that there was evidence that individuals who actively participated in the Iraqi insurgency have returned to Sudan and were in position to carry out terrorist operations in Sudan or to pass on their knowledge.[81]

The humanitarian disaster which the conflict in Darfur has created, also accounts for why Sudan may still be listed as a state sponsor of international terrorism. The US government has noted that, "the flow of weapons and personnel between Sudan and most of its western, southern, and eastern neighbours has weakened international efforts to stabilize the region."[82] Furthermore, it notes that Sudan has continued to back terrorist groups such as HAMAS, although it appears to have restricted its operations to fundraising. However, the Sudan backed LRA continues to be a threat to Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Southern Sudan, despite Sudan's effort to mediate in the conflict between the LRA and the Ugandan government.[83]

Sudan has agreed to the deployment of a hybrid UN peacekeeping force in Darfur to replace the AMIS and to protect the lives of civilians in the area and help bring peace to the region. It does appear therefore, that the US may remove unilateral economic sanctions placed on Sudan if it fully cooperates to ensure the success of the UN peacekeeping mission in Darfur. This may pave the way for the eventual removal of Sudan from the list of state sponsors of international terror.

6.   CONCLUSION

This chapter has focused on Sudan's involvement in international terrorism. It was noted that unlike Libya, Sudan has not used its own trained agents to carry out international

terrorist acts. A historical background of Sudan has been provided to explain why Sudan ventured into the sponsorship of international terrorism. It has shown that the domination of the Sudanese army and politics by radical Islamic fundamentalists and their desire to Islamise Sudan, contributed to the adoption of international terrorism as a weapon of foreign policy. Strategic considerations, the need to win the civil war, and spread Islamic political ideology, were other motivations that pushed Sudan into using international terrorism as a weapon of foreign policy. It also attempted to destabilise the governments of neighbouring states so as to deny the SPLM/A a base in the Horn of Africa.

Some incidents of international terrorism involving groups supported by Sudan were also discussed. One such incident was the attempted assassination of President Mubarak in 1995, in Ethiopia and in the US. Similarly, attempts to bomb the US embassy in New Delhi in 2001 also had a link to Sudan. This is because the terrorists arrested confessed that Sudanese diplomats had given them some form of assistance.

Sudan's efforts to redeem its image as a state sponsor of international terrorism have also been discussed. These attempts include, the signing and ratification of 12 of the 13 international protocols and conventions relating to international terrorism; strengthening of its legal system to effectively combat terrorism; and condemnation of terrorist acts in countries such as the US. Other efforts include the hosting of workshops on terrorism; the arrest, detention, trial and sentencing of terror convicts; and deportation of nationals of foreign countries training as terrorists in Sudan. Based on these efforts, the UN lifted sanctions against the country in 2001.

This chapter has equally shown why despite Sudan's effort in combating terrorism the US has not removed the country from its list of state sponsors of international terrorism. Some of the reasons suggested include scepticism and mistrust of Sudan's efforts; the continued presence of international terrorist groups such as HAMAS in Sudan; the humanitarian disaster in Darfur; and the refusal of Sudan to allow a full strength deployment of UN peace-keepers in the region. These suggestions were based on recent pronouncements on Sudan by the US government.

Involvement in state and state sponsorship of international terrorism has severe repercussions for countries that engage in them. The next chapter of this study will appraise the assumptions formulated in the introduction to this study.

REFERENCES

1 Allan. J. A, "Sudan: Physical and Social Geographical", *Africa South of the Sahara* (36th Edition), Routledge: London and New York, 2007, p. 1130

2 Benjamin. M. B, "The Sudan People's Liberation/Army (SPLM/A) and the Peace Process", in Korwa G. Adar, et al, *Sudan Peace Process: Challenges and Future Prospects*, Africa Institute of South Africa , Pretoria, 2004, p. 38

3 *Ibid*, p. 40

4 Gurtong Peace Trust: Government of National Unity (GONU) http://www.gurtong.org/resourcecenter/gov/Newcabinet_list.asp, accessed 23 December 2007

5 *Los Angeles Times,* "Official Pariah Sudan valuable to America's war on terrorism", 29 April 2005,

6 *Ibid,* p. 44

7 Ofcansky. T, "Sudan: Recent History", *Africa South of the Sahara* (36th Edition), Routledge: London and New York, 2007, p. 1132

8 *Ibid*

9 Benjamin. M. B, *op cit*, p. 45

10 Ofcansky. T, *op cit*, p. 1132

11 *Ibid*

12 *Ibid,* p. 1133

13 Viorst. M, "Fundamentalism in Power: Sudan's Islamic Experiment", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 74, Issue 3, May/June 1995, p. 45-58.

14 Ofcansky. T, *op cit*, p. 1135

15 *Ibid*

16 BBC, "Sudan: Country Profile", http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/country_profiles/820864.stm, accessed 23 December 2007

17 Benjamin. M. B*, op cit,* p. 48

18 CPA: *The Comprehensive Peace Agreement Between the Government of the Republic of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement / Sudan People's Liberation Army* Nairobi, 9 January 2005

19 Human Rights Watch, "The Impact of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the New Government of National Unity on Southern Sudan", *Human Rights Report*, Number 1, 2006, p.13

20 UN: *Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to the United Nations Secretary-General, Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1564 of 18 September 2004*. Geneva, 25 January 2005, p. 1

21 *The New York Times*, "Talking Darfur to Death", 31 March 2007

22 Ofcansky. T, *op cit*, p. 1141; see also UN Security Council Resolution 1564, 18 September 2004

23 Long. A, "Sudan: A Survey of Terrorism and Human Rights", *Human Rights & Human Welfare: Review Digest*: Human Rights & The War on Terror, 2007, p. S-40

24 Greenberger. R. S, "Arab Nightmare: Sudan's Links to Iran Cause Growing worry over Islamic Terrorism", *Wall Street Journal*, 18 August 1993, p. 1

25 Littleton. M, "Is Sudan Terrorism's New Mecca?" *Global Security Report,* 1997, p. 5

26 *Ibid*

27 US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1996,* Washington DC, 1997, p. 7

28 Mukwaya. A. A. K, "The Politics of International terrorism in the Security Complexes in the Greater Horn of Africa: An overview from Uganda under the Movementocracy", *African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 7, Nos. 1&2, 2004, pp, 35-56

29 Ofcansky. T, *op cit*, p. 1141

30 *Ibid*

31 *Ibid*

32 *Ibid*

33 De Waal. A, "Sudan: International Dimensions to the state and its Crisis", Crisis States Research Centre*, Occasion Paper* 3, April 2007, p. 7

34 Yoanes. A and de Waal. A, *When Peace Comes: Civil Society and Development in Sudan*, Trenton NJ, Red Sea Press, 2002, pp. 43-44

35 Ofcansky. T, *op cit*, p. 1132

36 Jaber. M, "Iran and Sudan Behind Mubarak Assasination Plot?, *International Review*, August 1995, p. 1

37 Byman. D, *Deadly Connections: States That Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press, New

York, 2005, p.15

[38] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1993,* Washington DC, 1994, p.7

[39] *Ibid*

[40] US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2006*, Washington DC, 2007, p. 148

[41] Liqueur. W, "Postmodern Terrorism: New Rules for an old Game", Foreign Affairs Vol. 75, Issue 5, September/October 1996, p.24-36

[42] Littleton. M, *op cit*, p. 6

[43] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1994*, Washingon DC, 1995, p. 6

[44] *Ibid*

[45] *Ibid*

[46] De Waal. A, *op cit*, p. 18

[47] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1998*, Washington DC, 1999, p. 2

[48] Miller. J, "Faces of Fundamentalism", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 74. No. 6, 1994, p. 130

[49] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1994*, *op cit*, p. 6

[50] *The U.S. News*, "A timeworn terrorism List", 20 May 2002

[51] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism" *Patterns of Global Terrorism* 1995, Washington DC, 1996, p. 6

[52] US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2004*, Washington DC, 2005, p. 90

[53] Ofcansky. T, *op cit*, p. 1141

[54] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1994, op cit*, p. 6

[55] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism* 1995, op cit, p. 6

[56] *Ibid*

[57] UN: UN Security Council Resolutions 1044, 1054, and 1070 1996.

[58] UN: UN Security Council Resolution 1564, 18 September 2004, op cit. see also, George. A. L, David. C and Julian. W, "The Sanctions decades: Assessing the UN Experience of the 1990s", *International Studies Association*: Working Papers, 2000, p. 5

[59] de Waale. A, *op cit*, p. 14

[60] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1998*, *op cit*, 1999, p. 7

[61] Long. A, *op cit.* p. s-40

[62] The Associated Press, "Judge: Sudan liable in USS Cole attack", 14 March 2007

[63] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism "*Patterns of Global Terrorism* 1995, *op cit,* p. 6

[64] BBC, *Timeline: Sudan: A Chronology of Key Events*, 3 August 2007

[65] US: *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks* Upon *The United States*, New York, 2004, p. 57

[66] Long. A, *op cit,* p. s-40

[67] US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003*, Washington DC, 2004, p. 7

[68] *Ibid*

[69] US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2004, op cit*, p. 90

[70] *Ibid*

[71] *International Crisis Group*, "Policy Briefing: Peace in Northern Uganda?" *Africa Briefing,* No. 41, 13 September 2006, p. 12-13

[72] *Ibid*

[73] BBC News, "UN Lifts Sanctions on Sudan", 28 September 2001

[74] US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism* 2006, Washington DC 2007, available on, http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/crt/2006/82736.htm, accessed 12 November 2007.

[75] *Ibid*

[76] Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2004, op cit*, p. 90

[77] US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2005*, *op cit*, p.175

[78] *Ibid*, p. 176

79   *Ibid*
80   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2006*, *op cit*, p. 147
81   *Ibid*
82   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2005*, *op cit*, p.175
83   US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2006*, *op cit*, p. 147

Chapter 5

Evaluation

## 1.	Summary

The use of international terrorism in advancing foreign policy objectives will remain the focus of study for a very long time. The disparity between states in terms of balance of power; propagation of politico-religious ideology and consolidation of domestic power would remain motivating factors for the use of international terrorism by states. The implications of state and state sponsored international terrorism are wide ranging as the examples of Libya and Sudan show. In this chapter, summaries of the previous chapters are presented and assumptions formulated in the introduction of the study tested.

Chapter one of this study discussed and analysed the concept of international terrorism, state and state sponsored international terrorism and related concepts. It showed that terrorism is not a senseless and irrational act as some argue, but a weapon or strategy of warfare that can be used on its own or as part of a broader strategy. It is characterised by violence, has psychological effects and mainly targeted at innocent or vulnerable people. An analysis of international state terrorism and state sponsored terrorism showed that the two concepts are mutually interrelated and in practice may not be completely divorced from each another. International state terrorism refers to a situation in which a state becomes directly involved in international terrorism by deploying its material and human resources to carry out acts of terror. State sponsored international terrorism on the other hand refers to a situation in which a state is indirectly involved in terror acts, by providing various forms of assistance to international terrorist organisations.

Chapter two focused on certain specific historical conditions that gave rise to the phenomenon of international terrorism in Africa during the Cold War, the post-Cold War era and in the new millennium. It was observed that the trends and motivations of

international terrorism in the region during the Cold War period were markedly different from those of the post-Cold War era and in the new millennium. During the Cold War period international terror groups and insurgent groups that used terror as a strategy of warfare had focus and were organised along a particular ideology. Their activities were also largely limited to the territories of the countries where they operated. In most cases insurgent groups that used terror tactics were supported by either of the two superpowers. In the post-Cold War era, international terrorism in Africa was motivated mainly by religion, especially a radical form of Islam. International terror groups are based in different countries but have links to the al Qaeda international terror network. Factors contributing to their persistence include the availability of funds through, for example, charitable organisations, money laundering, porous borders, and limited political space. Other factors include illegal weapon proliferation, information technology, and the Middle East crises. Similar trends are also observed in the new millennium. Terrorist groups that operate on the African continent such as the al Qaeda Organisation in the Islamic Maghreb are transnational and have links with the al Qaeda.

Chapter three discussed and analysed the involvement of Libya in international terrorism. Libya ventured into international terrorism in 1969 after a military take-over led by Qaddafi. It was motivated mainly by the need to foster Arab unity, and defeat imperialism and Zionism. The country did not only sponsor international terrorist groups, but also carried out international terrorist acts by using its own trained agents, material resources and institutions. Its international terrorist acts targeted Libyan dissidents who lived in foreign countries. International terror groups sponsored and supported by Libya such as the ANO, Black September, and PFLP-GC also carried out several acts of international terror against perceived Libyan enemies. In the 1990s, however, Libya began to distance itself from international terrorism. It was eventually removed from the list of state sponsors of international terrorism by the US government in 2006. Several factors contributed to its removal from the list. These include sustained condemnation of international terrorism; cooperation with the US in its GWOT; willingness to pay compensation to victims of the Lockerbie, UTA, and German discotheque bombings and abandonment of its WMD projects.

Chapter four focused on Sudan's involvement in international terrorism. Unlike Libya, Sudan has not used its own trained agents to orchestrate international acts of terror. Sudan's involvement in international terrorism was motivated by the domination of the Sudanese army and politics by radical Islamic fundamentalists; the desire to Islamise Sudan; and strategic considerations. Some incidents of international terrorism involving groups supported by Sudan include the attempted assassination of President Mubarak in 1995 in Ethiopia, and attempt to bomb the US embassy in New Delhi in 2001. Sudan's efforts to redeem its image include the signing and ratification of international protocols and conventions relating to international terrorism; strengthening of its legal system to effectively combat terrorism; and condemnation of terrorist acts in countries such as the US. Other efforts include the hosting of workshops on terrorism; the arrest, detention, trial and sentencing of convicted terrorists and deportation of nationals of foreign countries training as terrorists in Sudan. These efforts have so far failed to persuade the US to remove Sudan from its list of state sponsors of international terrorism, possibly because the US government is still sceptical of Sudan's commitment to the combating of international terrorism, the continued presence of international terrorist groups such as HAMAS in Sudan, and the humanitarian disaster in Darfur.

2.   TESTING OF THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

Several assumptions were formulated in the Introduction to this study. It is therefore important to evaluate these based on the findings of the research.

2.1.   International terrorism as a weapon of domestic and foreign policy

Assumption: "State and State sponsored international terrorism is a weapon of domestic and foreign policy objectives".

Jenkins has shown that despite the lethality and inhuman nature of international terrorism, it is not carried out solely for the sake of destruction.[1] Thus, international terrorism has underlying causes, intentions, motivations and objectives intended to be

realised by states and groups engaged in it. A critical review of sources shows that Libya and Sudan used international terrorism to pursue foreign policy objectives. The two countries were also motivated to engage in international terrorism by similar goals. These goals included consolidation of domestic power, spreading of Islamic fundamentalism, regional hegemony, and retaliation against more powerful states.[2] The assumption formulated in this regard, can therefore be verified.

2.2. Implications of international state terrorism

Assumption: "State and state sponsored international terrorism adversely impacts on the political, economic, social, and religious spheres of African countries"

The identification of Libya as a state sponsor of international terrorism resulted in sanctions being imposed on it by the US and later by the UN. These sanctions led to severe shortages of spare parts in all sectors of the Libyan economy- industry, agriculture, healthcare and the military. By 2001 the total damage inflicted upon Libya by sanctions was estimated at about US$24 billion.[3] A breakdown of the losses shows that the agricultural sector alone lost about US$6 billion. The Libyan health sector was among the worst hit by sanctions as drugs and medical equipment were in short supply.[4] The transport and telecommunication sectors lost about US$3 billion, and the oil industry lost about US$5 billion. The military could not replace some of its equipment due to the unavailability of spare parts. Its efficiency was therefore severely affected. Table 5 summarises the impact (in financial terms) of sanctions on Libya as a result of it being identified as a state sponsor of international terrorism.

Table 5: Total Libyan Financial Losses resulting from the Damage caused by the Implementation of Security Council Resolutions 748 (1992), and 883 (1993), in USD

Total Losses	Amount (USD)
General People's Committee for Health and Social Welfare	1,286,923,077
General People's Committee for Agriculture	1,419,950,913
General People's Committee for Livestock	5,892,027,300
General People's Committee for Transportation and Communications	2,949,560,284
General People's Committee for Industry and Mining	5,447,462,154
General People's Committee for Finance and Trade	1,509,000,000
General People's Committee for Energy	5,137,000,000
Total	23,641,923,728

Apart from financial implications many countries also severed diplomatic relations with Libya.[5] Sudan not only suffered from UN sanctions aimed at its exports and imports but also from the freezing of its assets by the US government as a result of being identified as a state sponsor of international terrorism.[6] Although the continued support of China to the Sudanese government appears to cushion some of the adverse effects of sanctions on Sudan, several reports confirm that the country has suffered tremendous losses as a result.[7] State and state sponsored international terrorism therefore have severe political, regional, economic and social implications for countries that engage in it. The assumption formulated in this regard can therefore also be verified.

2.3 Inadequate legal framework to combat international state and state sponsored terrorism

Assumption: "Control over state and state sponsored international terrorism is lacking or remains to a large extent ineffective"

From the examination of both primary and secondary sources it can be seen that while the international community acknowledges the involvement of some states in international terrorism, it is divided on how to handle the issue. While there are international conventions and protocols dealing with various forms of international terrorism, none exist that deal mainly with state and state sponsored international terrorism. Also, the definition of international terrorism remains a contested terrain. The definition is further complicated by the clandestine use of force (covert action) by some states in furtherance of foreign policy objectives. These actions share some features of international terror, thus causing the boundary between covert action and international terrorism to become blurred to some extent. Consequently, evolving a common legal framework to deal with the situation remains a daunting challenge for the international community. The definition of terrorism by the AU which was

adopted for this study, did refer to sponsorship of international terrorism in general, but failed to mention international state and state sponsored terrorism.[8] The assumption as formulated above can therefore be verified.

2.4. Combating state and state sponsored international terrorism demands concerted effort

Assumption: "State and state sponsored international terrorism can only be combated through concerted efforts involving state actors, regional and international organisations and non-state actors".

States are normally referred to as rational actors in international relations. What this implies in principle is that acts such as international terrorism or its sponsorship, are not expected to be carried out by states. When states become involved in international terrorism, it breaks the rules of international relations. Byman succinctly observes that due to enormous resources at the disposal of states it is difficult to combat state sponsored international terrorism.[9] The abandonment of international terrorism by the Libyan regime, demonstrates that it is only through concerted efforts by states, regional and international bodies, and non-state actors, that international state and state sponsored terrorism can be defeated. Sanctions imposed on Libya were respected to a large extent by many states, thus inflicting severe damage on the country, politically, socially, and economically. Sudan is also charting a new course following its condemnation by many states and regional organisations. For example, its deprivation of the AU chairmanship was in part due to its damaged international reputation as a state sponsor of international terrorism. The assumption formulated here, can thus also be verified.

3.   CONCLUSION

One of the major challenges in combating international terrorism is the lack of a universally acceptable definition. While the definition of the concept as put forward by the AU is to a large extent adequate for dealing with non-state groups, it provides an insufficient basis for combating state and state sponsored international terrorism.

Thus, it is important that consensus be reached regarding the definition of state sponsorship of international terrorism. The redefinition of international terrorism should provide a sufficient legal basis for dealing with groups using terrorism to advance their political causes, as well as countries that provide support to them.

In practice it is difficult to prove the involvement of states in international terrorism. In this regard, it becomes necessary that African states establish, maintain and strengthen international counterterrorism cooperation among themselves and international partners. International cooperation would lead to the enhancement of the counterterrorism capabilities of several African countries. Thus, initiatives such as the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Initiatives (TSTCI) and the African Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism (ACSRT) should be expanded. Similarly, international cooperation on intelligence sharing between and among African states needs to be improved. African states, in cooperation with the international community, should also seek to fully realise the strategies outlined in the *AU Plan of Action,* such as the establishment of a Conflict Early Warning System (CEWS). When fully operational, CEWS will not only help to prevent conflicts but also state and state sponsored international terrorism.

Diplomatic isolation of African countries identified and proven to be sponsoring international terrorist groups would also signal the preparedness of the AU to combat international state and state sponsored terrorism on the continent. In this regard, African states should be pressured to ratify all international protocols dealing with the combating of international terrorism. This will help ascertain the commitment of African states to repudiate all forms of international terrorism on the continent and globally.

REFERENCES

[1]   Jenkins. B. M, "International Terrorism: A New Mode of Conflict", in D. Cariton and
C. Shaerf (eds.), *International Terrorism and World Security*, Croom Helm: London, 1975,
p. 16

[2]   Byman. D, *Deadly Connections: States That Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press,
New York, 2005, p. 10

[3]   Wohlmuth. K et al, (eds.), *Africa's Reintegration Into The World Economy:
Part B: Country Cases*, LIT Verlag Munster-Hamburg-London, 2001, pp 560-561

[4]   US: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury: *Terrorist Assets Report
Calendar Year 2001Annual Report to the Congress on Assets in the United States of Terrorist
Countries and International Terrorist Program Designees,* Washington DC, 2002, p. 11

[5]   Deeb. M. J, "Political and Economic Developments in Libya in the 1990s", in Zoubir.Y. H,
(ed.) *North Africa in Transition: State, Society, and Economic Transformation in the 1990s*, University Press of
Florida, 1999, p. 80

[6]   US: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, Annual Report 2007

[7]   US: Office of Foreign Assets Control 2001, *op cit, p.*

[8]   AU**:** *OAU Convention on Prevention and Combating of Terrorism*, 13 July 1999

[9]   Byman. D, op cit, p. 15

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

PROTOCOLS, DECLARATIONS, AGREEMENTS AND CONVENTIONS

AU: *Article 4 of the Constitutive Act of the African Union*, http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/AboutAu/Constitutive_Act_en.htm, accessed 22 May 2007.

AU: *OAU Convention on Prevention and Combating of Terrorism*, 13 July 1999.

AU: *Plan of Action of the African Union High-Level Inter-Governmental Meeting on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism in Africa*, Algiers, Algeria, 11-14 September 2002.

AU: *The OAU Declaration on the Code of Conduct for Inter-African Relations*, Tunis 1994.

CPA: *The Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement / Sudan People's Liberation Army*, Nairobi, 9 January 2005.

UN: *The United Nations Convention Against transnational Organised Crime (the Palermo Convention)*, Article 3(2).

UN: *UN Security Council Resolution 1564*, 18 September 2004.

UN: *UN Security Council Resolutions 1044, 1054, and 1070* 1996.

UN: *United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs-Integrated Regional Information Networks* (IRIN), 28 February 2002.

UN: United Nations Security Counter-Terrorism Committee, "*What does CTC ask of States?*" http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373/ask.html, accessed 21 May 2007.

US*:*   *United States Code, Title 22, Section 2656f(a).*

COMMISSIONS, INQUIRIES AND ANNUAL REPORTS

EU: Press Release 367: "*The EU and Africa: Towards a Strategic Partnership*", Council of the European Union, Brussels, 19 December 2005.
        Report 2007", Washington DC, 2008

UN: *Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to the United Nations Secretary-General, Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1564 of 18 September 2004*. Geneva, 25 January 2005

US: "*The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon The United States*", New York, 2004

US: CRS Report for Congress: *International Terrorism: Threat, Policy, and Response*, January 2007.

US: CRS Report to Congress, *The "FTO LIST" and Congress: Sanctioning Foreign Terrorist Organisation*s, October 2003

US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1993,* Washington DC, 1994.

US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism* 1994, Washington DC, 1995.

US: Department of State, "Overview of State Sponsored Terrorism", *Patterns of Global Terrorism* 1998, Washington DC, 1999.

US: Department of State, "*Public Announcement: Middle East and North Africa*", 14 May 2007

US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism* 2004, Washington DC, 2005.

US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism* 2005, Washington DC: 2006

US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism* 2006, Washington DC 2007, available on, http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/crt/2006/82736.htm, accessed 12 November 2007.

US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism* 2006, Washington DC, 2007.

US: Department of State, *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, Washington DC, 2006.

US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1988*, Washington DC, 1989.

US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1989*, Washington DC, 1990

US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism* 1991, Washington DC, 1992

US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism* 1995, Washington DC, 1996.

US: Department of State, *Patterns of Global terrorism* 1996, Washington DC, 1997.

US: Department of State: *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003*, Washington DC, 2004.

US: Department of the Treasury, *Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC)*

US: Department of the Treasury, *Terrorist Assets Report Calendar Year 2001 Annual Report to the Congress on Assets in the United States of Terrorist Countries and International Terrorist Program Designees*, Washington DC, 2002

US: Department of State, *Country Reports on Terrorism* 2007, Washington DC, 2008

SECONDARY SOURCES

BOOKS AND YEARBOOKS

Yoanes. A and de Waal. A*, When Peace Comes: Civil Society and Development in Sudan*, Trenton NJ, Red Sea Press, 2002

Allan. J. A, "Sudan: Physical and Social Geographical", *Africa South of the Sahara* (36ᵗʰ Edition), Routledge: London and New York, 2007

Benjamin. M. B, "The Sudan People's Liberation/Army (SPLM/A) and the Peace Process", in Korwa G. Adar, et al (eds.), *Sudan Peace Process: Challenges and Future Prospects*, Africa Institute of South Africa, Pretoria, 2004

Benjamin. N, (ed), *Fighting terrorism: how to democracies can defeat domestic and international terrorists*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 2001

Boaz. G, "Countering State-Sponsored Terrorism", Herzlia: *ICT Papers*, The International Policy Institute for Counter-Terrorism, The Interdisciplinary Centre, 1997

Byman. D, *Deadly Connections: States That Sponsor Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005

Deeb. M. J, "Political and Economic Developments in Libya in the 1990s", in Yahia H. Zoubir (ed.),   *North Africa in Transition: State, Society, and Economic transformation on the 1990s*, University Press: Florida, 1999

Deeb. M. J, *Libya's Foreign Policy in North Africa*, Westview Press: Oxford, 1991

Hewett. C, *Consequences of Political Violence*, Dartmouth publications Company: England, 1993

Jenkins. B. M, "International Terrorism: A New Mode of Conflict", in David Cariton

and Carlo Shaerf (eds.), *International Terrorism and World Security*, Croom Helm: London, 1975

Kezeiri. S, "Libya", in James D. Tarver (ed.), *Urbanization in Africa: A handbook*, Greenwood Press: London, 1994

Kiras. J. D, "Terrorism and Irregular Warfare", in John Baylis, et al (eds.), *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2002

Lawless. R. I, "Libya: History", *The Middle East and North Africa* 53rd Edition, Routledge: London and New York, 2007

Mamdani. M, *Good Muslim Bad Muslim: America, The Cold War and the Roots of Terror*, Pantheon Books: New York, 2004

Quandt. W. B, *Between Ballots and Bullets*, Brookling Institution Press, 1998.

Schmidst. A. P, et al., *Political Terrorism*, SWIDOC Amsterdam and Transaction Books, 1988

Snow. D. M, *Uncivil Wars: International Security and the New Internal Conflicts*, Lynne Rienner, Colorado, 1996

St John. R. B, *Historical Dictionary of Libya* (3rd Edition) The Scarecrow Press: Maryland and London, 1998

St John. R. B, *Qaddafi's World Design: Libyan Foreign Policy, 1969-1987*, Saqi Books, London, 1988

The Europa World Year Book 2000, Europa Publications, London.

Wilkinson. P, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*. Frank Cass. London, 2000

Wohlmuth. K, et al, (eds.), *Africa's Reintegration Into The World Economy: Part B: Country Cases*, LIT Verlag Munster-Hamburg-London, 2001

DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPAEDIA

International Encyclopaedia of Government and Politics, Vol. 2, Selen Press Inc. London and Chicago 1996

International Encyclopaedia of Terrorism, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers: Chicago & London, 1997

JOURNAL ARTICLES, PERIODICALS, MONOGRAPHS AND REFERENCE WORKS

Alpha. O. K, **"**Preventing and Combating Terrorism in Africa", http://www.africa-union.org/Terrorism/terrorism2.htm, accessed 21 May 2007.

Blacker. J, "The demography of Mau Mau: fertility and mortality in Kenya in the 1950s: a demographer's viewpoint", *African Affairs* Vol. 106, No. 423, 2007

Chien. A. J, "The Civilian Toll", *Institute for Health and Social Justice*, October 11, 2001

Cilliers. J, "Terrorism and Africa", *African Security Review,* Vol. 12, No. 4, 2003

Clapham. C, "Terrorism in Africa: Problems of Definition, History and Development", *South African Journal of International Affairs,* Vol. 10, No. 2, 2003

Collins. S. D, "Dissuading State Support of Terrorism: Strikes or Sanctions? (An Analysis of Dissuasion Measures Employed Against Libya)", *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 27, No. 1-8, 2004,

Crozier. B (ed.), "Libya's Foreign Adventures", *Conflict Studies*, No. 41, December 1973

De Waal. A, "Sudan: International Dimensions to the state and its Crisis", Crisis States Research Centre*, Occasion Paper 3*, April 2007

Du Plessis. I, "The Impact of a war on terror on African security", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, May 2005

Francis. S. T, "Libya's Empire of Terror", *Africa Insight*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1982

Geldenhuys, D, "The Rule-Breaking Conduct of Qaddafi's Libya, *Strategic Review For Southern Africa*, Vol. XXV, No. 2, November 2003

George. A. L, et al, "The Sanctions decades: Assessing the UN Experience of the 1990s", International Studies Association: *Working Papers*, 2000

Greenberger. R. S, "Arab Nightmare: Sudan's Links to Iran Cause Growing worry over Islamic Terrorism", *Wall Street Journal*, 18 August 1993

Gueli. R, "Bin Laden and al Qaeda: Challenging the assumptions of transnational Terrorism"*, Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXV, No. 3, November 2003

Hoffman. B, "Change and Continuity in terrorism", *Studies in conflict and Terrorism*, Vol. 24, No. 5, September/October, 2000

Hough. M, 'New York Terror: The Implications for Africa', *Africa Insight*. Vol. 32, No. 1,

March 2002

Hough. M, "International Terrorism: Contemporary Manifestations in Africa", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, 2001

Hough. M, "New Terrorism or New Perceptions? Some Observations Regarding Changing Views on Terror", *Strategic Review For Southern Africa,* Vol. XXVII, No. 2 November 2005

Human Rights Watch, "The Impact of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the New Government of National Unity on Southern Sudan" *Human Rights Report*, Number 1, 2006

International Crisis Group, "Policy Briefing: Peace in Northern Uganda?" *Africa Briefing*, No. 41, 13 September 2006

Jaber. M, "Iran and Sudan Behind Mubarak Assassination Plot?, *International Review*, August, 1995

Sturman. K, "The AU Plan of Action on Terrorism: Joining the global war or leading an African   Battle?" *African Security Review* Vol. 11, No. 4, 2002

Kagwanja. P, "Counter-terrorism in the Horn of Africa: New security frontiers, old strategies", *African Security Review*, Vol. 15, No. 3, 2006

Keenan. J, "Terror in the Sahara: the Implications of US Imperialism for North and West Africa", *Review of African Political Economy* (ROAPE) No. 101, 2004

Kitissou. M, "Political Violence, Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism in Africa in the Global Context", *African Renaissance*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2005

Lawless. R. I, "Algeria: History", *The Middle East and North Africa* 53rd Edition, Routledge: London and New York, 2007

Liqueur. W, "Postmodern Terrorism: New Rules for an old Game", *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 75, Issue 5, September/October 1996

Littleton. M, "Is Sudan Terrorism's New Mecca?" *Global Security Report,* 1997

Long. A, "Sudan: A Survey of Terrorism and Human Rights", *Human Rights & Human Welfare: Review Digest: Human Rights & The War on Terror*, 2007

McAllister. B, "Extra-Systemic Conflict as a System Steering Solution: A Habermasian: Analysis of   State Sponsorship of Insurgency Movements*, Small Wars and Insurgencies*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 2006

Miller. J, "Faces of Fundamentalism", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 74. No. 6, 1994

Mukwaya. A. A. K, "The Politics of International terrorism in the Security Complexes

in the Greater Horn of Africa: An overview from Uganda under the Movementocracy", *African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 7, Nos. 1&2, 2004

Ofcansky. T, "Sudan: Recent History", *Africa South of the Sahara* (36th Edition), Routledge: London and New York: 2007

Rifer. M, "SADC and Terrorism: Where is the regional strategy?" *Africa Security Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2005

St John. R. B, "Terrorism and Libyan foreign policy 1981-1986", *The World Today*, Vol. 42, No. 7, 1986

Swart. G, Solomon. H and Botha. A, "Egypt: Pharaohs and Fundamentalists"? *Inside AISA*, December 2003

The Economist Intelligence Unit, "Libya: Country Profile", *The Economist*: London, 2006

The Jamestown Foundation, "Tanzania: Al Qaeda's East African Beachhead?" *Terrorism Monitor*, Vol. 1, Issue 5, 7, November, 2003

Viorst. M, "Fundamentalism in Power: Sudan's Islamic Experiment", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 74, Issue 3, May/June 1995

Wilkinson. P, "Current and future trends in domestic and international terrorism: Implications for Democratic government and the International Community", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, November 2001

NEWSPAPERS AND ONLINE NEWS ARTICLES

BBC News, "UN Lifts Sanctions on Sudan", 28 September 2001

BBC, "Sudan: Country Profile",

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/country_profiles/820864.stm, accessed,

23 December 2007

BBC, "Timeline: Sudan: A Chronology of Key Events", 3 August 2007 http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/country_profiles/820864.stm, accessed,

23 December 2007

Frontline Online, "Ambush in Mogadishu: US charges relating to Osama Bin Laden's connections to 1993 Mogadishu attack",

http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/ambush/readings/indictment.html,

accessed, 6 June 2007

Gurtong Peace Trust: Government of National Unity (GONU)

http://www.gurtong.org/resourcecenter/gov/Newcabinet_list.asp, accessed,

23 December 2007.

Los Angeles Times, "Official Pariah Sudan valuable to America's war on terrorism", 29 April 2005

The Associated Press, "Judge: Sudan liable in USS Cole attack", 14 March 2007

The New York Times, "Talking Darfur to Death", 31 March 2007

The U.S. News, "A timeworn terrorism List", 20 May 2002