ISSUE 2 DECEMBER 2021

ILLUSTRATIO

ADELAIDE JOURNAL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

© Crown Copyright

University of Adelaide
sapere aude
PIRA
Politics & International Relations Association

ISSN: 2652-9424

Illustratio: Adelaide Journal of Politics and International Relations

EDITOR IN CHIEF

Mirco Di Giacomo BIntRel DipA

EDITORS

Scott Hanel

Maeve McNeilage BA BIntRel

Abby Oakey

Sam Osborne BA

Ngoc Lan Tran (Laura) BSocSc

COVER ART

Photo: 'Mod Unveils New Protection and Uniforms for Troops' by Defence Images (Licensed under CC BY-SA 2.0)

Disclaimer: All views expressed in the articles featured in Illustratio: Adelaide Journal of Politics and International Relations are those of the authors only and do not represent in any way the views of the University of Adelaide Politics and International Relations Association, Illustratio: Adelaide Journal of Politics and International Relations, the Editorial Committee, the Editors or the Editor in Chief.

© All rights reserved by the University of Adelaide Politics and International Relations Association (PIRA). Articles may not be copied, reproduced, distributed, or displayed without reference to the PIRA and the Journal.

Cover page licensed under CC BY-SA 2.0.

University of Adelaide Politics and International Relations Association: pira.editorinchief@gmail.com

CONTENTS

03 **EDITORIAL**
Mirco Di Giacomo

05 **TERRORISM: VIOLENCE IN SERVICE OF COMMUNICATION OR VIOLENCE IN SERVICE OF POWER?**
Brandon Musolino

12 **TERRORISM IS COMMUNICATION**
Alicia Turner

19 **ONLINE EXTREMIST PROPAGANDA AND SELF-RADICALISATION: THE EFFECT OF CONSPIRACY THEORIES AND MISINFORMATION CAMPAIGNS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF COVID-19**
Julia Pickersgill

27 **TERRORISTS & CITIZENSHIP REVOCATION: AN EFFECTIVE COUNTER-TERRORISM MEASURE?**
Nicholas Snow

37 **ADDRESSING THE INEQUALITY AMONG THE GLOBAL ORDER, WITHIN NATION-STATES AND BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL SOCIAL GROUPS WILL AID IN SUSTAINING A DURABLE PEACE**
Mitchell Grummisch

EDITORIAL

Mirco Di Giacomo

This is the second issue of Illustratio: Adelaide Journal of Politics and International Relations, and its publication represents the successful continuation of this Journal's vision to enable students to further develop their scholarly writing and consequently expand their academic skills through their participation in a form of peer-review and publication of their outstanding undergraduate and graduate level articles challenging concepts and exploring emerging ideas in the disciplines of political science, international relations, and cognate fields. This publication also represents an expansion of this Journal's vision, having opened submissions for the first time to papers not only from undergraduate but also from graduate (i.e. Honours) students, as well as, again for the first time, sourcing papers from multiple courses and course coordinators, allowing students greater access to publishing in Illustratio and greater diversity of papers being featured in the Journal. Further, Issue II is the product of the newly revised Editorial Guidelines and Policy & Procedure Manual, which among multiple reforms also allows, for the first time in the Journal's history, open submissions, of which we hope to see plenty in the next issue. It is thus with the awareness of what this publication represents and hope that the vision and project this Journal constitutes will continue long into the future of the University of Adelaide Politics and International Relations Association (PIRA), that I present to you Issue II of Illustratio, of which the Authors, participating Course-Coordinators, the Editorial Committee and the PIRA Executive should be very proud.

Issue II focuses on a new topic for this Journal: International Security. A critical theme which, alongside the pandemic, has dominated news in the last year(s): from the American withdrawal from Afghanistan to domestic tensions (with international impacts) across multiple nations, not to mention the ongoing and worldwide threat of terrorism. The papers featured in this Journal address the topic of International Security diversely, addressing the topic from multiple angles. The aforementioned theme of terrorism, is perhaps the most central of this Journal, with two authors – Musolino and Turner – addressing the question of whether terrorism is, at its core, 'communication.' Terrorism is also addressed in this Issue through an ethical lens, specifically in Snow's paper, exploring, through the employment of consequentialist paradigms, whether stripping terrorists of their citizenship is an effective measure. Meanwhile, Pickersgill adopts a more domestic, albeit still of international relevance, scale, namely considering the phenomenon of both left and right-wing political extremism, by addressing the emerging role of internet technology. Lastly, this Issue addresses the relationship between (in)equality and peace, namely in Grummisch's paper, which focuses directly on the matter.

As Editor in Chief of Illustratio I am grateful to the authors for their contributions, without whose papers Issue II would not have been possible. I also wish to thank the Editors I worked with in 2021:

Scott Hanel, Maeve McNeilage, Abby Oakey, Sam Osborne, and Ngoc Lan Tran (Laura), whose insightful, constructively critical and intelligent reviews of the papers featured in this Journal also made this publication possible. Lastly, I wish to thank Associate Professor Tim Legrand and Dr Tiziana Torresi for nominating the papers Issue II showcases.

I wish to conclude this editorial with an aspiration directed towards the readers of this Journal, the future Editorial Committee and prospective authors: *Sapere Aude*. These Latin words, which PIRA adopted as its motto, translate as 'Dare to Know:' it is thus my aspiration that this Issue, which embodies this motto, will serve as an inspiration to indeed 'dar[ing] to know,' through the pursuit of academic publishing.

Terrorism: Violence in Service of Communication or Violence in Service of Power?

Brandon Musolino

Abstract

Various considerations of "terrorism" as a concept have diluted its usefulness as a tool for analysis. This paper aims to separate terrorism as a form of communication from violence merely used as pursuit of "tangible power". This permits exploration of how different actors in different contexts, both state and non-state, use terrorism to induce specific responses from target populations. Discussion of theory and empirical evidence develops a nuanced approach to terrorism with communication at its centre.

Introduction

If terrorism is not communication, in service of what goals would perpetrators be employing their terror? To posit that terrorism is specifically a model of communication, the terms 'communication' and 'tangible power' will be defined. Violence in service of 'communication' will be defined as the use of violence to communicate a message to a population. Violence in service of 'tangible power' is employed towards the acquisition of direct power over others. In order to see communication as integral to 'terrorism' as a concept, the following analysis aims to establish a narrow argument. This argument suggests that terrorism deals primarily with communication rather than tangible power. Although partly flawed, this argument serves as a vehicle to analyse communicatory aspects of political violence. Indeed, communication can be present in campaigns focused on tangible power but analysis of empirical evidence draws out the particular elements to be considered 'terrorism.' Case studies from various periods in modern history are explored in order to evidence the predominance of communication within terrorism and satisfy grievances commonly conveyed by critical theorists. The Russian terror group of the late 1800s Narodnaya Volya can be analysed through Ronald Crelinsten's communication model where they are shown to reject tangible revolutionary aspirations in favour of merely 'creating terror.' David Lake's work permits a comparison in the way two different rational actors interact with a 'moderate' population. The terror network Al Qaeda is an innovator in using violence to communicate fear to a target population in order to provoke an exercise of tangible power against vulnerable moderates. The right-wing terrorist attacks of the 2019 Christchurch massacre can also be seen through the lens of Lake's rational extremism model; an actor is searching for a communicatory – rather than tangible – response from a target population. In isolating instances of communication as specifically 'terrorist,' the concept of 'state-based' terror becomes problematic. Scholarship of Martha Crenshaw challenges the idea that state actors – monopolists of power – pursue

the explicit goal of communicating with a domestic population. Nuance present in the overlap between 'state-sponsored' and traditional non-state terrorism must then be explored with respect to terrorist proscription. Application of theory to empirical examples will be combined with problematisation of state-based violence to present communication as the central ingredient within any broader consideration of terrorism as a concept.

Historical Evolution of Violence as Communication

In order to properly tie terrorist activity exclusively to a concept of communication, the idea of state-based terror must be problematised. As monopolists of power, state actors are typically looking less at communicating with a domestic population and more at exercising tangible power in order to reach goals. Martha Crenshaw's The Causes of Terrorism provides a theoretical base from which to distance the notion of communicatory violence from any concept of 'state-terror.' In relation to the position of the state, Crenshaw details how certain repressive state actors have "crushed [non-state] terrorist organisations" (Crenshaw 1981, p. 383). How can a state be considered 'terrorist' in the same vein as a non-state actor it is battling? A state's monopoly on tangible power is the defining factor in its position as something other than a terrorist actor. Simple empirical evidence of historical perpetrators of 'state terror' sees these actors use violence typically in service of tangible power. The Khmer Rouge of Cambodia destroyed over twenty percent of its domestic population during the Cambodian Genocide of the late 1970s (Spencer 2012). Similarly, the Nazi regime exterminated as many as 15 million civilians during the Holocaust (Paulsson 2011). It is difficult to see how such killing could be considered in service of communication; the population to be targeted with any communication is simply exterminated. This would suggest that killing is a means to an end rather than an exercise of violence as communication. Again, it is Crenshaw whose discussion of the 'new terrorism' orchestrated by non-state actors of the 2000s provides an interesting counterpoint to such historical examples (Crenshaw 2008). The increased threat posed by this 'new terrorism' is variously ascribed to the way in which "killing is an end in itself" for these actors and how "lethality is their aim rather than their mean" (Crenshaw 2008, p. 123). Most tellingly, the new terrorism threat is explicitly compared to modern warfare rather than the 'old terrorism' (Crenshaw 2008). Such analysis of this perceived threat suggests that it is the appearance of known traits of states – their supremacy in tangible power – that make these non-state actors so alarming to analysts. Traits of these actors suggest that they have moved beyond the sphere of what can be considered 'terrorism' and must be thought of differently. As per Crenshaw's (2008) analysis, the use of terror for the pursuit of tangible power, or simply terror itself, must be differentiated from terrorism as for communication.

Archetypal Islamist terror network Al Qaeda manipulates violence in service of both communication and tangible power. Historically, this group has targeted 'Western ideals' trough the infamous "9/11" attacks on the US. Scholar David Lake outlines a model where a "rational extremist" uses violence to entice a response from a "target population" (Lake 2002, p. 19). An actor is looking to "provoke a response from the target that, through its disproportionate and indiscriminate nature, punishes the broad population of which the [terrorist actor is] part" (Lake 2002, p. 19). Lake himself has formed this model specifically around target state responses to Al Qaeda and Islamist threats so its suitability for the empirical evidence need not be questioned. What can be expanded upon, however, is the type of

response drawn from the target state. Analyst Shlomo Shpiro outlines how Al Qaeda's most notorious attacks were filled with symbolism; they are perfect illustrators of violence in service of communication (Shpiro 2002). As a rational actor, Al Qaeda wishes to provoke a "massive retaliation" from the target population (Shpiro 2002, p. 80). The actor (Al Qaeda) intends to encourage the target state (the US) to exercise its monopoly on tangible power to suppress a moderate population: Muslim communities from whom Al Qaeda would like to draw support (Lake 2002). Much tangible power was indeed exercised by the US Government after Al Qaeda's attacks. Government departments were mobilised and a methodology of 'pre-emptive attack' was established (Terry 2013). Such empirical evidence enforces the ontological proposition that terrorist motives are tied solely to communication. Perpetrators maintain a reliance on other actors in order to exercise tangible power. Al Qaeda's efforts to use momentum gained by communication in order to provoke an exercise of tangible power solidify an exclusive relationship between terrorist actors and communication.

Analysis of the 2019 Christchurch right-wing terror attack reinforces the centrality of communication to violent events as a non-state actor looks to draw a similarly communicatory response from a target population. Contemporary news reports and academic analysis attest to the killer's goal – prominent in his self-proclaimed 'manifesto' – of heightening fear amongst a Muslim subset of the target state (O'Malley et al. 2019; Reicher et al. 2019). Analyst Stephen Reicher provides strong clues to goals of communication as he outlines an actor who identifies a (in the actor's view) "visible" and "obvious" 'problem' population (Reicher et al. 2019, p. 13). However, a return to the positivist analysis of David Lake's model of rational extremism sees the Christchurch actor looking to use his violence to communicate with a wider audience of moderates (O'Malley et al. 2019). Assuming the actor is rational, the Christchurch killer is fully aware of his lack of tangible power; as a (perceived by the actor) 'problem' population of Muslims and other non-Westerns will not be removed by the actor's deeds alone. Unlike Al Qaeda, which aims to draw an exercise of tangible power, this actor wishes to provoke a purely communicatory retaliation on the target population in order to gain moderates' sympathies. In line with a critical perspective, emphasis must be placed on how the social construction of terrorism relates to the political context of non-state terrorism (Stokes 2009). The way in which blame and the 'terrorist label' are applied to specific populations within Lake's rational model is exploited by the Christchurch killer. The response of the target population takes the form of contemporary news media reports. Popular news organisations such as the BBC stress explicit links between norms of the moderate population – domestic anti-Islam political rhetoric – and radicalisation of violent actors (Mao 2019). As a response, this reporting is not necessarily incorrect and is important to combating extremism from other angles. However, when viewed as a communication from a target population within a short-term rational framework, there is clear potential for the marginalisation of a moderate population. Contemporary articles from other influential media organisations such as the Sydney Morning Herald were explicit in outlining how external forces preyed on a vulnerable individual whose "radicalisation… had its roots in the confines of his bedroom" (O'Malley et al. 2019). This contrasting reporting appeases a moderate population, assuring them that they do not share commonalities with the terrorist actor and that they are not threatened by any response. This 'counter-communication' may not only be useful as part of a short-term response to terrorist atrocities but as a clear demonstration of how communication can be extracted from episodes of violence. In highlighting the relevance of communicatory responses to terrorism, the relationship between terrorism and communication is reinforced.

Communication within state-related violence

In order to properly tie terrorist activity exclusively to a concept of communication, the idea of state-based terror must be problematised. As monopolists of power, state actors are typically looking less at communicating with a domestic population and more at exercising tangible power in order to reach goals. Martha Crenshaw's The Causes of Terrorism provides a theoretical base from which to distance the notion of communicatory violence from any concept of 'state-terror.' In relation to the position of the state, Crenshaw details how certain repressive state actors have "crushed [non-state] terrorist organisations" (Crenshaw 1981, p. 383). How can a state be considered 'terrorist' in the same vein as a non-state terrorist actor it is battling? A state's monopoly on tangible power is the defining factor in its position as something other than a terrorist actor. Simple empirical evidence of historical perpetrators of 'state terror' sees these actors use violence typically in service of tangible power. The Khmer Rouge of Cambodia murdered over twenty percent of the country's population during the Cambodian Genocide of the late 1970s (Spencer 2012). Similarly, Nazi Germany's regime exterminated as many as 15 million civilians during the Holocaust (Paulsson 2011). It is difficult to see how such killing could be considered in service of communication; the population to be targeted with any communication is simply exterminated. This would suggest that such violence aims for a tangible end rather than mere exercise of violence as communication. These examples can be well ascribed to Crenshaw's (2008) concept of 'new terrorism,' which provides a useful counterpoint to the aforementioned historical examples. In fact, as Crenshaw's (2008, p. 123) notes, the increased threat posed by 'new terrorism' is variously ascribed to the way in which "killing is an end in itself" for these actors and how "lethality is their aim rather than their mean." Unsurprisingly, such 'new terrorism's' threat is explicitly compared to modern warfare rather than the 'old terrorism' (Crenshaw 2008). It thus follows that the appearance in non-state terrorist organisations of typical state traits – i.e. use of violence as a mean in itself (deriving, in the case of states, from supremacy in the realm of tangible power) – that makes such non-state actors particularly alarming. In fact, the emergence of such traits in these actors suggests that they have moved beyond the sphere of what traditionally is defined as 'terrorism' and hence must be thought of differently, as per Crenshaw's (2008) analysis, the use of terror for the pursuit of tangible power, or use of terror for its own sake, must be differentiated from the traditional accompanier of terrorism: communication.

Meanwhile, the concept of 'state-sponsored' terror introduces difficulty in regards to making a strict separation between communication and tangible power, as well as between state and non-state actors. Is a state sponsoring non-state terror organisations 'guilty' of terrorism? Or is it merely engaging in wider conflict between states? This phenomenon blurs the boundaries between state and non-state violence and is deeply engaged with the implementation of terrorist proscription. Proscription – which is the act of labelling an actor as 'terrorist' – as a counter-terrorism tool is an uncertain mix of both communicative processes and exercise of tangible power by the state. It is vulnerable to being hijacked in service of traditional statecraft. Lee Jarvis and Tim Legrand outline how, following an orthodox view, the act of labelling terrorist actors is typically considered a signal of "society's disavowal of a group's ideas and actions" and a precursor to government suppression of targeted actors (Jarvis and Legrand 2018, p. 202). Such suppression entails a state's exercise of tangible power – where membership, as well as financial and public support for these organisations are

criminalised (Jarvis and Legrand 2018; Crenshaw and LaFree 2017). It is important to note that non-state organisations are not the only actors subjected to proscription. The United States has maintained a list of 'state-sponsors of terrorism' since the late 1970s (U.S. Department of State, n.d.). Such broad powers have been applied widely to a variety of potential actors to an extent where the relevance of the 'terrorist label' to these state actions may be questioned. In a critique of the Clinton administration's policies toward state-sponsored terrorism, Thomas Badey highlights how the government had legislated what appeared to be an "automatic declaration of war" against state actors accused of terrorist involvement (Badey 1998, p. 53). Meanwhile, Badey notes how multiple states – including the US itself – maintain and have maintained relationships with and sponsorships of various non-state actors who could reasonably be considered 'terrorist' (Badey 1998). Thus, such broad employment of proscription, as well evident hypocrisy, can be seen as self-defeating, making the focus on the specific separation between communication and tangible power becomes a relevant response. If terrorism is exclusively concerned with communication, the overly expansive nature of proscription invites states to manipulate its implementation. In early 2020, the US assassinated Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps leader Qasem Soleimani after recently proscribing his organisation as terrorist (U.S. Drone Strike in Iraq Kills Iranian Military Leader Qasem Soleimani 2020). Iranian representatives decried an "obvious example of State terrorism" and expressed how proscription by one state of an official branch of another was a "breach of generally recognised principles of international law" (U.S. Drone Strike in Iraq Kills Iranian Military Leader Qasem Soleimani 2020, pp. 316-317). Terrorism-labelling and terrorism accusations in service of statecraft exemplify the messiness involved in exercises of proscription and its susceptibility to exogenous influence. Concepts of 'state-sponsored terrorism' tend to draw away from a targeted response to terrorism and are instead more involved with traditional areas of statecraft and diplomacy. Analysis of explicit communication through violence does not directly apply in such case(s) so it would be prudent to consider 'state-sponsored terrorism' differently. This concept is distanced from an idea of violence as communication and is consequently largely incompatible with any framework outlined in this analysis.

Conclusion

Communication is an essential component of terrorism as a concept and acknowledgment of its significance is essential. Historical examples provide relevant empirical evidence in order to separate violence in service of communication from violence in service of tangible power. The way in which Narodnaya Volya evolves from a revolutionary movement into an explicitly terrorist organisation is tied to a desertion of tangible power in favour of communication. David Lake's rational model allows a drawing out of the communicatory elements of both Islamist and right-wing actors as they interact with a moderate population. Communication through violence is largely absent in analysis of state-based actors who pursue policies of domestic destruction as an exercise of tangible power. The quirks of state-sponsored terrorism present difficulties to a concept of violence as communication; proscription strategies appear more an exercise of statecraft rather than any specific response to violence as a means of communication. A narrow distinction between communication and tangible power, and what constitutes 'terrorism,' is fundamental to this analysis. In fact, although intentionally flawed, this distinction is critical in expanding academic discourse and further highlighting the inherent connection between communication and the phenomenon of terrorism

References

Badey, T 1998, 'US anti-terrorism policy: The Clinton administration', *Contemporary Security Policy*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 50-70.

Crelinsten, R 2002, 'Analysing Terrorism and Counter-terrorism: A Communication Model', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 77-122.

Crenshaw, M, & LaFree, G 2017, *Countering Terrorism: No Simple Solutions, Brookings Institution Press*, Washington DC.

Crenshaw, M 1981, 'The Causes of Terrorism', *Comparative Politics*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 379-399.

Crenshaw, M 2008, 'The Debate over "New" vs. "Old" Terrorism', in I Karawan, W McCormack & S Reynolds (eds), *Values and Violence: Intangible Aspects of Terrorism*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 117-136.

Gunning, J 2007, 'A Case for Critical Terrorism Studies?', *Government and Opposition*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 363-393.

Hopkins, J 2009, *Terrorist mentality: A common link throughout history? A comparison of Narodnaya Volya, the French Reign of Terror, and the Muslim Brotherhood*, MA thesis, University of Kansas.

Jarvis, L & Legrand, T 2018, 'The Proscription or Listing of Terrorist Organisations: Understanding, Assessment, and International Comparisons', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 199-215.

Lake, D 2002, 'Rational Extremism: Understanding Terrorism in the Twenty-first Century', *Dialogue IO*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 15-28.

Mao, F 2019, 'Christchurch shooting: Australia's moment of hate speech reckoning', *BBC News*, 20 March 2019, viewed, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-47620391>.

Offord, D 1986, *The Russian Revolutionary Movement in the 1880s*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

O'Malley, N, Barlass, T & Begley, P 2019, 'White-bred terrorist: the making of a killer', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 August 2019, viewed, <https://www.smh.com.au/national/white-bred-terrorist-the-making-of-a-killer-20190806-p52ee7.html>.

Paulsson, S 2011, 'A View of the Holocaust', *BBC History*, 17 February 2011, viewed, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/genocide/holocaust_overview_01.shtml>.

Reicher, S, Haslam, A & Van Bavel, J 2019, ‘The road to Christchurch: A tale of two leaderships’, *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 13-15.

Shpiro, S 2002, ‘Conflict Media Strategies and the Politics of Counter-terrorism’, *Politics*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 76-85.

Spencer, P 2012, *Genocide Since 1945*, Routledge, Didcot.

Stokes, D 2009, ‘Ideas and Avocados: Ontologising Critical Terrorism Studies’, *International Relations*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 85-92.

Terry, J 2013, *The War on Terror: The Legal Dimension*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Blue Ridge Summit.

U.S. Department of State n.d., *State Sponsors of Terrorism*, U.S. Department of State, viewed 1 June 2021, <https://www.state.gov/state-sponsors-of-terrorism/>.

‘U.S. Drone Strike in Iraq Kills Iranian Military Leader Qasem Soleimani’, 2020, *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 114, no. 2, pp. 313-323.

Terrorism is Communication

Alicia Turner

Abstract

To understand terrorism, it is important to recognise that there is always a meaning being conveyed by terrorist groups in their acts of violence. This paper argues that the prominence of symbolism in terrorist networks, the language used by terrorist organisations and the term 'terrorism' itself, the reliance of terrorist groups on media coverage, the importance of social media networks to terrorist groups' operations, and the centrality of framing in determining whether state-sponsored or perpetrated political violence constitutes terrorism or not, all evidence that terrorism is communication.

The very definition of terrorism is a contested topic, and there is a multitude of theories that seek to explain the motivations behind the formation of terrorist groups and the acts they commit. This paper finds that terrorism is communication. It is in fact demonstrated that terrorists have audiences they intend to influence with messages embedded in their attacks, whether that be the group they target in the attack, their national government or the wider international system. This paper thus discusses the following: firstly, symbolism is a key technique used by terrorists to communicate their beliefs within their networks and to their victims; secondly, it is implied in the language surrounding terrorism, including the very name, that terrorism is intended to communicate terror to its audiences; thirdly, the way in which terrorist groups rely on the media indicates that their primary aim is the communication and dissemination of a message; and fourthly, the prominence of the use of social media in terrorist groups illustrates that communication is vital to the ongoing existence of terrorist groups, through their use of it for internal communication, as well as radicalising others and luring new members to join their group. Finally, this paper addresses whether a group the fact a group is described as terrorist or not is entirely reliant on how it is framed and communicated by state entities, especially in the case of state-sponsored or perpetrated terrorism.

The Collective Communication Model of Terrorism, developed by Fischer et al. (2010) illustrates the way in which terrorism operates as a means of communication. According to this model, terrorist groups commit violent acts as a means of communicating a message to an array of different audiences, including their targeted victims whom they perceive to be their enemies (Crelinsten 1997, p. 9). In such framework, the terrorist group is the sender of the message, the message is found within the act of violence itself, and the receiver is the targeted group of victims, and consequently (if the scale is

sufficient) the international community at large, which is forced to come to terms with resolving this issue and eliminating the threat of further violence (Fischer et al. 2010, p. 694). The receivers are tasked with the role of interpreting the symbolic, political message that accompanies the act of violence. This interpretation may be directly communicated by the terrorist organisation itself in words, or be represented implicitly in use of weaponry, whether and which specific landmarks, institutions and public figures were attacked, whether or not civilians were harmed and the use of symbols, among other factors (Fischer 2010, p. 695).

The connection between terrorism and communication becomes clear when considering symbolism. Terrorists utilise symbolism to communicate the meaning of their violence that they wish to convey to their target audiences. Matusitz (2014, p. 39) suggests that they construct ideas of their own and other groups' identities through imagery and make specific decisions in their attacks, as to their victims and where and when it takes place, in order to maximise dramatisation and emphasise their message. In this way, terrorism is performative violence that is intended to manipulate their targeted audiences into seeing their truth by constructing a social reality for them (Matusitz 2014, p. 139). Oppedisano (2020, p. 577) claims that symbols are used to evoke an emotional response in people and push them to action, hence beginning a social transformation aligning to the terrorists' ideal vision. For example, Koch (2017, p. 15) demonstrates that right-wing extremist, nationalist groups use symbolism of the Crusades as a 'religious awakening … and moral justification of violence.' They construct the narrative that Muslims are invading Europe now just as their ancestors had done, and reference the Crusades as a golden era that they must return to in which their own ancestors had heroically fought them off to reclaim their rightful land (Koch 2017, p. 15). This achieves the terrorists' goals in two ways, by exacerbating Islamophobia, and creating unrest and fear in local Muslim populations. It can therefore be seen that, for terrorists, symbolism is an effective method of communication with other (and prospective) members of their terrorist networks as well as their victims.

The salience of communication in terrorism can also be recognised in the language used in terrorism discourse. The term terrorism itself implies that it is a strategy employed with the express purpose of creating terror in an audience. Terrorism, as society defines it today, derives from the so-called 'Reign of Terror' (also, more simply, know as 'The Terror') that characterised the aftermath of the French Revolution, wherein Robespierre and the Jacobins ruled with the intent of instilling a sense of fear in the French population in order to quell counterrevolutionaries (Erlenbusch 2015, p. 195). The terror that was disseminated throughout the state as a result of the mass executions was a message in itself; the message that there existed a power that could and would commit murder and other brutal acts for its beliefs, and that there was 'either virtue or the terror' for those who chose to resist (Rapoport 2008, p. 2089). This has continued to be a defining characteristic of all cases of terrorism thereafter, regardless of how the terrorist group chooses to manifest this power and what explicit goals it aims to achieve. Terrorism therefore inherently implies the communication of a message by virtue of its name.

The language utilised by early non-state terrorists reflects their aim of communication in their acts and threats of violence. The principle of 'propaganda of the deed' exemplifies this, which McCormick (2003, p. 476) suggests was characteristic of anarchist terrorist groups, originating with the Russian Narodnaya Volya. The term inherently implies with the use of the word 'propaganda' that there was a message that was to be communicated to the masses. This was most effectively achieved by 'breaking through to the deepest social strata' through violent means, whether that be via assassinations or

explosives (McCormick, 2003, 476). Their primary aim was to overthrow the Russian Empire, which was communicated with their attempted assassinations of Russian officials. However, Rapoport (2009, pp. 2089-2090) argues that the Narodnaya Volya prioritised the publicisation of their violence, so that it could reach as many people as possible and 'raise the consciousness of the masses.' They intended not only to inspire and terrorise the masses with their violence, but also government officials, 'whose sudden and violent deaths,' Sergey Nechaev, a Russian terrorist who inspired the Narodnaya Volya quotes, 'will also inspire the greatest fear in the government and … shatter its strength' (Lacqueur 2004, p. 74). This indicates that one of the most prominent aims of the group was to explicitly communicate their message through their violence against the government to the public in order to gain their support, or otherwise earn their fear.

The dissemination of terrorist groups' messages is made abundantly easier with the rising prominence of media, first print and now digital. This allows the immense amplification of one singular event, to be heard by not only the entire state but the world within a matter of days, if not hours. This can be seen to greatly advantage the terrorist groups, as Juergensmeyer (2000, p. 139) states that terrorism is ultimately 'the language of being noticed.' One of the greatest strengths of terrorist organisations is the spectacle, forcefully gaining the public's attention through methods such as bombings, plane hijackings or the taking of hostages. These shocking acts allow them to communicate their message to a great number of people all at once (Crelinsten 2002, p. 85). Robinson (2009, p. 1) suggests that terrorist groups therefore often take advantage of the mass media's supply of the 'oxygen of publicity' in order to 'generate a political impact that is greater than the investment required to carry out the attacks in the first place' (McCormick 2003, p. 479). Although news networks generally attempt to delegitimise the terrorist group by highlighting the upsetting consequences of their actions, they ultimately serve to focus attention on them and spread the terror that they aim to inspire, regardless of whether or not they adequately communicate their political goals (Crelinsten 2002, p. 9). Thus, while their exact goals may not be absorbed by everyone, the media's coverage of terrorist attacks serves as the platform for the communication of terrorist groups' messages to the masses, the main goal that these groups wish to achieve.

A case study demonstrating how the media impacts the communication of a terrorist group's messages can be seen in the coverage of Al-Qaeda's 9/11 terrorist attacks. The organisation was thrust into the global spotlight after 9/11 by media coverage, which caused a visceral reaction of panic and outrage in the US public. This served their goal of disorientating and striking fear, a key objective of terrorist groups, into both their direct target, the US via the attack, and their indirect target, the entirety of the West, via the amplified attention from the media (Neumann & Smith 2005, p. 577). The influence of the 9/11 attacks was also demonstrated by the thorough counter-terrorism strategy that was employed by the U.S. government soon after (Council on Foreign Relations 2021). Strict security measures in regards to identification and search of possessions at airports were implemented with the establishment of the Transportation Security Administration, and the USA PATRIOT Act (2001) was passed, which saw the strengthening of cooperation between law enforcement and intelligence agencies, banking institutions and regulators, domestic surveillance and penalties for terrorist acts (Council on Foreign Relations 2021). In the wake of 9/11, the US also began the so-called 'War on Terror,' militarily pursuing terrorists they believed to be associated with Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Iraq among other states. While Patwell, Mitman and Porpota (2015, p. 1125) argue that the media's

extreme amounts of coverage on Al-Qaeda failed to communicate the organisation's specific motives to the public, it is nevertheless clear that Al-Qaeda achieved their goal of striking fear into both the U.S. public as well as the government.

While the messages that news networks choose to disseminate about terrorists are out of the terrorist organisations' control, terrorists have managed to use other communication technologies to their advantage (Lieberman 2017, p. 101). The advent of the Internet has allowed terrorist networks to truly globalise and to promote their own rhetoric to the world (Robinson 2009, p. 1). Liberman (2017, p. 95) in fact observes that numerous terrorist organisations, notably ISIS, as well as multiple right-wing nationalist terrorist groups, such as The Proud Boys, utilise social media platforms and independently created websites in order to disseminate their messages in their own words to the world, and to radicalise civilians and recruit new members in efforts to further their cause. As the Internet is a worldwide phenomenon, they are also able to tailor their propaganda online in order to most effectively recruit people from different audiences around the globe (Lieberman 2017, p. 101). This is exemplified by ISIS highlighting 'jihad as a means of personal fulfilment' to Muslims in the West, as opposed to a duty to Arabic Muslims (Liberman 2017, p. 101). This is furthered by the internet-enabled ability of terrorists and the targeted (for recruitment) individuals to directly message one another, where the terrorist is able to gauge the individual's personality and craft a narrative which will create a sense of comfort and unity for them (Liberman 2017, p. 103). Notably, terrorist communities often congregate on social media, utilising specific accounts and pages in order to share information and propaganda within their networks to boost commitment to the cause (Moussaoui, Zaghdoud & Akaichi 2019, pp.1). It is clear that communication on social media is vital, then, to both sharing information between members of terrorist networks and recruiting new members.

Radicalisation is a necessary commitment for terrorist organisations both online and in real life to secure their ongoing survival, in which communication is essential. Doojse et al. (2016, p. 80) propose that terrorist groups target those who are vulnerable: those who feel personally insignificant in the society they live in, who feel a sense of non-belonging, or that their particular social demographic has been done an injustice. Terrorists take note of these feelings in individuals to sell them tailored narratives. For example, individuals feeling insignificant will be appealed to with stories of heroism and fighting the good fight, and those who feel prejudiced against will be told they can end discrimination and make a change (Doojse et al. 2016, p. 81). McCormick (2003, p. 493) discerns that, through the process of radicalisation, the individual's morals are challenged and reconsidered, to the point that the violence they previously thought incomprehensible becomes in the minds of radicalised individuals the only way to solve the issues that they perceive to plague the world. These ideas are bolstered by the perception of sharing the feelings of terrorists recruiting them, who to the recruited appear to be in similar situations as them, and thus to whom they come to share a connection and strong feelings of kinship through such lengths of communication (Lieberman 2017, p. 100). Communication and specific strategies of relationship-building, through such vehicles as social media or otherwise, are therefore a vital part of the continuing survival of terrorist groups.

Terrorism and communication are also fundamentally connected by the way that terrorist networks are entirely reliant on internal communication and community to function. Doojse et al. (2016, p. 79) note that over 95% of terrorist attacks are carried out in groups, and the group dynamic is therefore integral to most forms of terrorism. Communication within terrorist networks can range from mere

impersonal support to the establishment of close bonds between members in cells. For example, LaFree (2017, pp. 95-96) comments that the sharing of blueprints for improvised explosive devices may be the extent of support offered between terrorist groups without any need for actual personal communication. Within terrorist groups however, there are often close bonds shared by members of small cells who feel the rest of the world is against them (Crenshaw 1981, p. 393). Crenshaw (1981, p. 393) establishes that, in such cases, the terrorists' isolation from the outside world makes their only viable communication that which is with one another, allowing the blind reinforcement of their own 'self-righteousness, image of a hostile world and sense of mission' in an echo chamber of their own creation. The construction of a terrorist groups' identity is also vital to their commitment to the cause, most often achieved through means of communication. Communication can therefore be seen to be necessary to the continuation of terrorists' commitment to the cause, as without the unique socialisation processes they undergo and the strong sense of identity they feel while members, the values they had been led to live their life by may crumble.

The argument that terrorism is communication is further demonstrated by the case of state-sponsored or perpetrated terrorism. The state has a monopoly on the use of coercive violence and holds moral legitimacy in all its actions (Blakely 2012, pp. 63-64). This means that the determination of whether an act of political violence is considered terrorism or not is ultimately up to how the state chooses to frame it, how the media communicates it to the public and how the international system chooses to respond to it. Blakely (2012, p. 68) asserts that many states commit atrocities which would be considered terrorism if carried out by non-state actors, however, due to their choice to communicate them as 'necessary measures' to protect national security or simply 'police action,' they are not subject to this rhetoric. The state also holds the ability to separate itself from the crimes committed by shifting the blame onto the direct perpetrators of the violence and hiding its own sanctioning of the violence (Blakely 2012, p. 71). Due to this, many states' militaries have collectively committed countless human rights violations, sometimes sponsored or even perpetrated by democratic states, without being acknowledged for the terrorism that they themselves were facilitating (Stohl 2008, p. 5). Whether an act constitutes terrorism or not, then, is entirely based on how it is communicated, both from the perpetrating state to other states and to the public. The very nature of terrorism therefore is based on communication.

Conclusion

This paper thus concludes that symbolism is a key component in terrorist acts and is central in communicating the meaning of their violence; the term terrorism itself as well as the language used by terrorist organisations directly imply that acts of terror are attempts at communication; communication is vital to the continued existence of terrorist networks, as the dissemination of their own narratives is essential to recruiting new members for their organisation, and the sharing of information and bonds between members is necessary to ensure sustained commitment; and communication and framing are crucial in designating the terrorist label to an organisation. Therefore, terrorism is communication.

References

Blakely, R 2012, ‘State Violence as State Terrorism’, in Breen-Smyth, M (ed), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Political Violence*, Ashgate, Surrey, pp. 63-78.

Council on Foreign Relations 2021, *How 9/11 Reshaped Foreign Policy*, Council on Foreign Relations, viewed 16 November 2021, <https://www.cfr.org/timeline/how-911-reshaped-foreign-policy>.

Crelinsten, R.D. 2002, ‘Analysing Terrorism and Counter-terrorism: A Communication Model’, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 77-122.

Crelinsten, R 1997, ‘Television and terrorism: Implications for crisis management and policymaking’, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 8-32.

Crenshaw, M 1981, ‘The Causes of Terrorism’, *Comparative Politics*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 379-399.

Doojse, B, Moghaddam, F, Kruglanski, A, de Wolf, A, Mann, L & Feddes, A, ‘Terrorism, radicalization and de-radicalization’, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, vol. 11, pp. 79-84.

Erlenbusch, V 2015, ‘Terrorism and revolutionary violence: the emergence of terrorism in the French Revolution’, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 193-210, https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2015.1049842.

Fischer, P, Fischer, J, Weisweiler, S & Frey, D, ‘Terrorism as Collective Communication: The Collective Communication Model of Terrorism (CCMT)’, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 692-703, https://doi-org.proxy.library.adelaide.edu.au/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00298.x

Juergensmeyer, M 2000, *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Koch, A 2017, ‘The New Crusaders: Contemporary Extreme Right Symbolism and Rhetoric’, *Perspectives on Terrorism*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 13-24.

Lacqueur, W 2004, Voices of Terror: Manifestos, Writings, and Manuals of Al Qaeda, Hamas, and Other Terrorists from around the World and Throughout the Ages, Reed Press, New York Reed Press.

LaFree, G 2017, ‘Terrorism and the Internet’, *Criminology and Public Policy*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 93-98.

Lieberman, A 2017, ‘Terrorism, the Internet, and Propaganda: A Deadly Combination’, *Journal of National Security Law and Policy*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 95-124.

Matusitz, J 2014, *Symbolism in Terrorism: Motivation, Communication, and Behavior*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham.

McCormick, G 2003, ‘Terrorist Decision Making’, *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 6, pp. 473-506.

Moussaoui, M, Zaghdoud, M & Akaichi, J 2019, 'A possibilistic framework for the detection of terrorism-related Twitter communities in social media', *Concurrency and Computation Research and Experience*, vol. 31, no. 13, pp. 1-20.

Neumann, P & Smith, M.L.R, 'Strategic terrorism: The framework and its fallacies', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 571-595.

Pattwell, A, Mitman, T & Porpora, D, 'Terrorism as Failed Political Communication', *International Journal of Communication*, vol. 9, pp. 1120-1139.

Oppedisano, F 2020, 'Visual Aspects of the Symbols of Terrorism. Identity, Representations, and Visual Statues', in Cical, E (ed), *Proceedings of the 2nd International and Interdisciplinary Conference* on Image and Imagination, Springer, Alghero, pp. 576-588.

Rapoport, D 2008, 'Terrorism', In Kurtz, L (ed), *Encyclopaedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, Elsevier, Los Angeles, pp. 2087-2104, https://doi-org.proxy.library.adelaide.edu.au/10.1016/B978-012373985-8.00175-6.

Robinson, P 2009, 'Editor's introduction: communicating terrorism', *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1-5, https://doi.org/10.1080/17539150902752416.

Stohl, M 2008, 'The Global War on Terror and State Terrorism', *Perspectives on Terrorism*, vol. 2, no. 9, pp. 4-10.

Online Extremist Propaganda and Self-radicalisation: the Effect of Conspiracy Theories and Misinformation Campaigns Within the Context of Covid-19

Julia Pickersgill

Abstract

In recent years, traditional and alternative social media platforms have become a breeding ground for extremist propaganda, particularly that of the far right. This paper examines the role of online conspiracy theories and misinformation campaigns in the phenomenon of self-radicalisation, more specifically within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Employing secondary literature on the topic, alongside a number of empirical studies, this paper thus demonstrates online activity of the far right is of growing concern in a global environment in which all the necessary ingredients for extremist radicalisation are present.

Introduction

The rise of social media as a political tool has been well documented, initially evaluated with great optimism as a means for the speedy, uninhibited spread of information (Tufekci 2018). However, in recent years, the dangers of such an unregulated phenomenon, and the risks it poses to democracy and security, have come to the forefront (Deibert 2019). Social media has now become a convenient environment for ideologically motivated extremists, in which misinformation campaigns and conspiracy theories flourish, and radicalisation is facilitated. This paper first presents several disclaimers regarding the availability of information surrounding ideologically motivated extremism, and then outlines the psychological nature of conspiracy theories, both as coping mechanisms for feelings of uncertainty and tools for extremist radicalisation, within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. This will lead into a critical analysis of the polarising effects of both social media itself and online extremist conspiratorial misinformation campaigns, and the modern intersection of news media and social media, all of which aids in radicalisation. This paper its analysis concludes with a case study of a current and prominent conspiracy theory, the 'COVID-19 hoax', and will discuss how ideologically motivated extremists have exploited fears regarding governmental overreach and xenophobia during this time to radicalise and recruit individuals online.

Scope of Study

The full extent to which online exposure to extremist content radicalises individuals is a subject of debate among scholarly literature (Davies et al. 2021, Walther & McCoy 2021, Conway 2017). However, there is a general consensus that it does, at the very least, have an influencing effect which may lead to “self-radicalisation” (Davies et al. 2021, p. 1). Extremist actors use the internet as a medium to promote certain ideologies and publicise their cause to a much greater audience than that to which they may access in the off-line realm. This is done in an attempt to gain momentum for their cause and “recruit sympathisers” (Davies et al 2021, p. 1). According to Davies, Wu, and Frank (2021, p. 1), the “online milieu” is the most frequently used for extremist recruitment in modern times, making it an apt subject of research. The online extremist content this paper discusses is that belonging to ideological extremists, that is, those of the far-left and far-right. It does not include any discussion of ethnic nor ideological religious extremism. This paper also limits its scope to Western democracies, principally the United States. Beliefs of the far-right tend to include, but are not limited to, white supremacy, “strident nationalism,” racism and xenophobia (with a strong emphasis on anti-Semitism), and fascism (Weimann & Masri 2021, p. 2). On the other side of the spectrum, beliefs of the far-left can be split into red and green extremism (Sproles 2019). Red extremism is concerned with economic and governmental matters, advocating “communism and syndicalism,” anti-fascism, and for some, anarchism (Ingelevič-Citak 2020, p. 1). Green extremism (otherwise known as ‘eco-terrorism’), however, centres ideologies such as “primitivism, animal liberation, and ecological protectionism” (Sproles 2020, p. 11).

Unfortunately, there exists a general lack of secondary literature regarding far-left extremists, which poses a limitation to the scope of study of the subject (Ingelevič-Citak 2020, Sproles 2020). Ingelevič-Citak (2020) theorises this may be due to the nature of how the far-left organises; most far-left websites are often written in native languages that are not English, contrary to the far-right, and there is usually no effort to translate these, making their international dissemination difficult (Ingelevič-Citak 2020). This, coupled with the conscious resigning from internet use of some far-left groups, further complicates the analysis of their online activity in comparison to the far-right, who have embraced the technology (Ingelevič-Citak 2020). Walther and McCoy (2021, p. 115) highlight the difficulty of tracking online far-left activity without similar research which exists for the far-right regarding “phrases, hate symbols, … numbers,” and other dog-whistles. Another explanation for the lack of research may quite simply be that the far-left is not as much a current threat as the far-right. According to a Guardian article, having analysed 900 extremist attacks, the Centre for Strategic and International Studies concluded that since 2010, 21 people had died in far-left plots. This figure pales in comparison to attacks from the far-right, whose death toll in the 10-year period amounted to 117, a difference of nearly 460% (Beckett 2020). Furthermore, according to the Anti-Defamation League (2020), 90% of extremist-linked killings in the US in 2019 were linked to far-right ideology. As such, while the lack of information on far-left extremism produces a challenge in establishing a balanced argument, it is clearly of greater importance to analyse the social media behaviours of the far-right, and the risk they pose in terms of online radicalisation.

The psychology of conspiracy theories and their role in extremist radicalisation

Using Zonis and Joseph's' (1994, p. 443) framework of "conspiracy thinking," and van Prooijen, Krouwel, and Pollet's (2015) own definition, this paper defines conspiracy theories as the belief that one or more powerful actors have, or currently do, operate in private, in order to achieve "hidden" and "malevolent" or corrupted goals (van Prooijen et al. 2015, p. 571). Conspiratorial beliefs are characterised by Rahman as "extreme overvalued beliefs," which are strictly "non-delusional" (Rahman 2018). The distinction between delusional and non-delusional beliefs is imperative, to allow for distinguishing between "idiosyncratic, psychotic" beliefs, and "shared subcultural beliefs or ideologies" – conspiracy theories – which Rahman (2018) identifies as the leading cause for global and domestic acts of political violence. The main characteristics of these 'overvalued beliefs' are that they are shared by a sub-group, and simultaneously increase in dominance and inability to be challenged over time after initial exposure (Rahman 2018). It is thus clear that conspiracy theories must be viewed seriously as tools of ideologically motivated extremists, especially regarding their use in online misinformation campaigns, rather than an amusing phenomenon of the intellectually inferior or mentally ill. The circumstances under which conspiracy theories most commonly arise are during times of social uncertainty (Mohammed et al. 2020), whether it be driven by economic crisis, the threat of war, or in the case of 2020, a global pandemic.

The Coronavirus pandemic, as a global health crisis producing massive uncertainty, is a helpful context within which to analyse conspiracy theories and their contribution to extremist radicalisation online. According to Zonis and Joseph (1994, p. 443), conspiracy thinking centres "explanatory reasoning," in which believers use the conspiracy to rationalise a state of affairs or personal sentiments. Further, the tendency to turn to conspiracy theories in times of crisis reflects what van Prooijen et al. (2015, p. 574) refer to as the cognitive process of "sense-making," in which simplistic solutions to complex issues are sought to 'make sense' of the instability a person may feel during times of political or social stress. In the case of the far-right, it is argued that sense-making processes often lead to conspiracy theories in which a high level of 'scapegoating' is present (Davies et al. 2021). According to Davies et al. (2021, p. 3), the cognitive procession from 'why is this happening?' to 'who is to blame?' is often inevitable, and exploited by far-right extremists "weaponising [public] fears" to place their political enemies – in the case of the pandemic, governments with 5G networks, and immigrants – at the centre of the blame. Anxious individuals online may fall prey to this tactic, and engage in a rhetoric in which existing far-right-leaning sentiments become amplified. With this in mind, the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic for extremist recruitment have arguably been enormous. Feelings of "powerlessness [and] social isolation" were among some of the most commonly reported during the height of the pandemic, feelings which Moulding, et al., argue are characteristic of those who subscribe to various conspiracy theories (Moulding et al. 2016, p. 346).

Further, due to lockdown ordinances, and a reduced economy causing mass loss of employment, international "total internet hits" increased by 50-70% in March of 2020 (Beech, 2020). This implies that globally, more people spent an increased amount of time online, where they could potentially be reached by extremist content. The correlation between the negative impacts of COVID-19, increased screen-time, and therefore increased potential interaction with extremist content is empirically demonstrated in the findings of a study conducted by Davies et al. (2021). The study, having monitored a number of extremist forums – two far-right, one far-left, and two jihadist – illustrates that each forum

showed an increase in posting after the declaration of COVID-19 as a pandemic by the WHO. It is thus clear that the conditions of the pandemic have fostered an online environment in which radicalisation is more likely, as not only has there been an increase in dissemination of extremist content, but the uncertainty and isolation it causes also renders individuals more susceptible to radicalisation through the ‘comfort’ of conspiracy theories.

Social media as a political tool for extremist recruitment

Social media itself as an online medium for communication is fraught with risks of radicalisation. According to Deibert (2019, p. 31-32), the very nature of the social media environment is to better disperse “divisive types of content,” including extremist content, rather than “calm, principled” accounts of more nuanced or “complex narratives.” The polarising character of social media is well documented in the available secondary literature – Piazza (2021, p. 3) argues the “deliberate dissemination” of misinformation online serves to directly increase “political polarisation” in society, and Beauchamp (2019) states it is easier to “inflame social divisions” on social media than it is “to mend them.” Indeed, online misinformation campaigns waged by ideologically motivated extremists reinforce “personal and group grievances,” which renders individuals more likely to become radicalised towards the extremist’s beliefs. The nature of this misinformation is “incendiary,” appealing to existing sentiments of injustice and “prejudices,” which in turn acts to further a “sense of outrage” felt by individuals, increasing levels of political polarisation. A sense of belonging and “group identification” is produced through interaction with this false and conspiratorial information, something particularly appealing in the wake of isolating coronavirus lockdowns (Piazza 2021, p. 3-4).

The process of radicalisation is further aided and abetted through social media ‘algorithms.’ This can be easily corroborated by an analysis of the YouTube ‘recommended’ algorithm, in which viewers are “drive[n]… toward extremist content” through the platform recommending “edgier” and “edgier” videos in a bid to maintain their attention (Tufekci 2018). However, not only do these algorithms (otherwise known as “filter bubbles”) expose viewers to increasingly extremist content; they also serve to steer users towards spaces in which they feel “comfortable and ideologically aligned” (Deibert 2019, p. 32), such that their political views are rarely challenged, and are, in fact, often amplified. The constant flow of media characteristic to these platforms fosters an environment conducive to the accelerated spread of conspiracy theories and misinformation. Factchecking tools encounter difficulty in matching the pace of these disseminated falsehoods, and further, it has been shown that public attempts to debunk social media misinformation can, somewhat counterintuitively, serve to “facilitate [its] diffusion” to a wider audience (Deibert, 2019, p. 32). Tufekci (2018) argues that even though this fact-checking technology exists, as argued before, “belonging is stronger than facts,” and polarised media consumers would rather protect a sense of “’in-group’ belonging” than conscientiously consume proven-true content. As such, users with moderate left- or right-wing beliefs may be inadvertently drawn to extremist spaces, insulated in online echo chambers which facilitate political polarisation, and further, radicalisation, through the “vilifying” of “members of opponent communities” (Piazza, 2021, p. 4).

Misinformation campaigns and conspiracy theories propagated by ideologically motivated extremists also serve to undermine the authority of mainstream social media, encouraging a move towards alternative social media. The modern intersection of news media and social media has created an environment in which the dissemination of 'fake news' is easy and common, with little to no regard for standards of credibility and gatekeeping characteristic of traditional news media (Tufekci, 2018). According to a group of researchers at Oxford University, social media is an "important source" of news in the United States, with Twitter and Facebook coming to the forefront, considered by "an increasing number of users" as disseminators of global news (Narayanan et al. 2018, p. 1). Indeed, a study from Reuters Digital News Report reveals 48% of "US respondents" reported using Facebook as their main news source, often indirectly when "brows[ing] … for other purposes." However, news on social media is prone to "sensationalist, conspiratorial … fake news" (Narayanan et al. 2018, p. 1), which actively work to "delegitimise and build distrust" in mainstream social media, encouraging the shift of users to alternative social media, such as "BitChute, Gab, Parler, and Telegram," in which extremist misinformation runs amok (Walther & McCoy 2021, p. 100-101). For right-wing social media users, especially in the US, this shift is endorsed by elected political actors, who view the censorship of politically-inflammatory speech on mainstream social media as a violation of their right to free speech (Walther & McCoy, 2021). The unfortunate consequence of this is that moderate right-wing users may potentially become exposed to more aggressive extremist misinformation campaigns in smaller, less left-wing, echo chambers. Studies show that while levels of conspiracy thinking in far-right and far-left circles are generally similar, those with moderate-right views are more likely to "endorse … conspiracy theories" and "espouse conspiratorial views" than the moderate-left (van der Linden et al. 2021, p. 23). This implies a greater propensity for those consuming right-wing content to become radicalised into extremist views through exposure to their conspiracy theories on alternative social media platforms.

<u>A case study: COVID-19 in the United States</u>

The Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic provided far-right extremists with significant opportunity to spread radicalising misinformation and conspiracy. Examples of sense-making behaviours, conspiracy thinking, and the preying upon feelings of uncertainty and fear have all been prominent, and well-documented in the literature on the topic. This short case study will focus on the implications COVID-19 has had for far-right extremists and radicalisation efforts in the US. Christou (2020) argues the far-right aversion to traditional science manifests not only in the rejection of the discipline, but also in a development of an entirely new "scientific rhetoric" which serves to provide an "alternative explanation." In the case of the pandemic, this alternative explanation conveniently centres enemies of the far-right as inventors and spreaders of the infection, developing a rhetoric which calls for direct action against these exact enemies, including the US government, 5G network operators, immigrants, and more-specifically, east-Asian Americans and immigrants. The conspiracies and misinformation employed ranges from claims stating the virus is but a "deep state control tactic" designed to numb the mental acuity of US citizens and "train" them into "obedient slaves," to the slightly less egregious rejection of masks as an effective means for preventing transmission (Walther & McCoy 2021, p. 113). Davies et al. (2021, p. 5) argue the "discourse" surrounding COVID-19 involves topics that are "well-treaded territory for the right," such as distrust of government and a vigilance against government

overreach, and xenophobia. As such, feelings of uncertainty produced by the pandemic (and the disorganised response of the US government) coupled with sense-making behaviours that often follow these feelings may lead individuals into becoming ideologically aligned with the far-right. As established before, the uptick in screen time produced by the pandemic means an increased likelihood of contact with far-right propaganda on social media, which may serve as a radicalising experience that, ultimately, produces risks for the remote, online radicalisation of moderate right-wing individuals into far-right extremists.

Conclusion

It is thus clear the dangerous effect of far-right activity on social media, especially in terms of radicalising individuals through conspiracy theories and misinformation campaigns on both mainstream and alternative platforms. This is clearly elucidated through the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, in which all the necessary ingredients for radicalisation through conspiracy and misinformation on social media are present at once. The isolation produced by stay-at-home ordinances, coupled with increased internet usage and the general uncertainty brought about by the pandemic created an environment in which online misinformation and conspiracy disseminated by extremists flourished. Indeed, activity on extremist forums increased during this time. Furthermore, the recent phenomenon of social media partially replacing traditional news media, which has been encouraged by some political actors, has had negative implications for fact-checking and information gate-keeping norms, which would have traditionally curbed extremist attempts at waging these misinformation campaigns. Therefore, the propensity for those belonging to the United States' moderate-right to actively engage with these radicalisation tools through mainstream and alternative social media is a serious national security threat which should be monitored carefully.

References

Murder and Extremism in the United States in 2019 2020, ADL Centre on Extremism, pp. 1-34, <https://www.adl.org/media/14107/download>.

Beauchamp, Z 2019, 'Social media is rotting democracy from within', *Vox*, 22 January, <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/1/22/18177076/social-media-facebook-far-right-authoritarian-populism>.

Beckett, L 2020, 'Anti-fascists linked to zero murders in the US in 25 years', *The Guardian*, July, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jul/27/us-rightwing-extremists-attacks-deaths-database-leftwing-antifa>.

Christou, M 2020, ‘Is the radical right spreading the coronavirus?’ *Open Democracy*, May, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/countering-radical-right/radical-right-spreading-coronavirus/>.

Conway, M 2017, ‘Determining the Role of the Internet in Violent Extremism and Terrorism: Six Suggestions for Progressing Research’, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, vol. 40, no. 1.

Davies, G, Wu, E, and Frank, R 2021, ‘A Witch’s Brew of Grievances: The Potential Effects of COVID-19 on Radicalization to Violent Extremism’, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, pp. 1-24.

Deibert, R. J. 2019, ‘The Road to Digital Unfreedom: Three Painful Truths About Social Media’. Journal of Democracy, vol 30, no. 1, pp. 25-39.

Ingelevič-Citak, M 2020, ‘Jihadist, far-right and far-left terrorism in cyberspace – same threat and same countermeasures?’, *International Comparative Jurisprudence*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 154-177.

Beech, M 2020, ‘COVID-19 Pushes Up Internet Use 70% And Streaming More Than 12%, First Figures Reveal’, *Forbes*, 25 March, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/markbeech/2020/03/25/COVID-19-pushes-up-internet-use-70-streaming-more-than-12-first-figures-reveal/>.

Mohammed, A, Garry, A, Mohamed, R, and Andary, A 2020, ‘Extremist Manifestation: Translation of Conspiracy Theories’, *American Counterterrorism Targeting & Resilience Institute*, pp. 1-27.

Moulding, R, Nix-Carnell, S, Schnabel, A, Nedeljkovic, M, Burnside, E E, Lentini, A F, and Mehzabin, N 2016, ‘Better the devil you know than a world you don't? Intolerance of uncertainty and worldview explanations for belief in conspiracy theories’, *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 98, pp. 345-354.

Narayanan, V, Barash, V, Kelly, J, Kollanyi, B, Neudert, L-M, and Howard, P. N. 2018, ‘Polarization, Partisanship and Junk News Consumption over Social Media in the US’, *Oxford University*, Comprop Data Memo, pp. 1-6, <http://blogs.oii.ox.ac.uk/comprop/wp-content/uploads/sites/93/2018/02/Polarization-Partisanship-JunkNews.pdf>.

Piazza, J A 2021, ‘Fake news: the effects of social media disinformation on domestic terrorism’, *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict*, pp. 1-24.

Rahman, T 2018, ‘Extreme Overvalued Beliefs: How Violent Extremist Beliefs Become “Normalized”’, *Behavioural Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1-11.

van der Linden, S, Panagopoulos, C, Azevedo, F, and Jost, J 2021, ‘The Paranoid Style in American Politics Revisited: An Ideological Asymmetry in Conspiratorial Thinking’, *Political Psychology*, vol. 42, no.1, pp. 23-51.

Sproles, L A 2019, ‘When Creativity Bites: an Analysis of Far-Left Online Communiques’, Master’s thesis, University of Nebraska, pp. 1-55.

Tufekci, Z 2018, 'How social media took us from Tahrir Square to Donald Trump', *MIT Technology Review*, 14 August 14, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2018/08/14/240325/how-social-media-took-us-from-tahrir-square-to-donald-trump/>.

van Prooijen, J-W, Krouwel, A, and Pollet, T 2015, 'Political Extremism Predicts Belief in Conspiracy Theories', *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 570-578.

Walther, S, and McCoy, A 2021, 'US Extremism on Telegram: Fuelling Disinformation, Conspiracy Theories, and Accelerationism', *Perspectives on Terrorism*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 100-124.

Weimann, G, and Masri, N 2020, 'The Virus of Hate: Far-Right Terrorism in Cyberspace', International Institute for Counterterrorism, pp. 1-24, <https://www.ict.org.il/images/Dark%20Hate.pdf>.

Zonis, M, and Joseph, C 1994, 'Conspiracy Thinking in the Middle East', *Political Psychology*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 443-459.

Terrorists & Citizenship Revocation: An effective counter-terrorism measure?

Nicholas Snow

Abstract

The implementation of citizenship revocation legislation has become commonplace among states around the world, including in Australia. These states contend that citizenship is a privilege afforded by states, rather than a right – a privilege that can be rescinded. This essay investigates these governments and, with a particular focus on Australia, explores the current framework and justification for such legislation, and critically analyses its corollaries. Through this investigation, the paper determines that citizenship revocation legislation is inherently flawed and has no place in modern democratic societies. The politicisation and subjectivity of the concept of terrorism, issues with citizenship and statelessness, and states' abilities to reconcile their international obligations, including their human rights obligations, all fetter any potential successful implementation of the legislation. Ultimately, the essay provides an important critique of unethical legislation that undermines modern democratic society.

Introduction

In 2015 new legislation was enacted allowing the Australian Home Affairs Minister to strip Australians of their citizenship if they satisfied certain requisites (Australian Citizenship Amendment (Allegiance to Australia) Act 2015 (Cth)). The core belief of legislation such as this is that citizenship is a privilege, and those having their citizenship stripped have acted against their allegiance to their nation and should therefore no longer be afforded the protections and benefits of its citizenry (Coyne & Kfir 2019). Much of this legislation was aimed at 'foreign fighters' – state nationals travelling overseas to fight for terrorist organisations. This paper rejects these policies, contending that citizenship revocation holds no place in state practice. Current practice and legislation are first outlined before contending that their justification has no empirical founding. This paper then argues that the subjective nature of terrorism itself is a fundamental flaw of the legislation, and that issues of citizenship and statelessness render the policies incompatible. Lastly, the paper contends that the policies are also irreconcilable with international obligations, fuel the terrorist narrative, are detrimental to international cooperation, and are problematic from a human rights perspective.

Current Practice, Legislation & Justification

Since the attacks of 11 September 2001, successive Australian governments have sought to utilise legislation to effectively counter terrorism on Australian soil and abroad (Kfir 2019, p. 14). In 2015, the Turnbull Government enacted the previous Abbot Government's legislation, the Australian Citizenship Amendment (Allegiance to Australia) Act 2015 (Cth), which permitted dual citizens to lose their Australian citizenship if they engaged in 'proscribed' activities, including engaging in or financing terrorism and "fighting for, or being in the service of, a declared terrorist organisation" (section 35(1)(b)(ii)). The object of the legislation, according to section 4 of the Act, is to recognise that citizens may "repudiate their allegiance to Australia" by engaging in conduct that is "incompatible with the shared values of the Australian community."

Although the Australian Citizenship Amendment (Strengthening the Citizenship Loss Provisions) Bill 2018 lapsed at dissolution (Parliament of Australia 2018), the Australian Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Cessation) Act 2020 (Cth) was enacted on the 18th of September 2020. This act reworded the previous methods of revocation, permitting the possibility to revoke citizenship "for certain conduct […] if the Minister is satisfied you have repudiated your allegiance to Australia and that it would be contrary to the public interest for you to remain an Australian citizen" (s 32A). It also removed the previous stipulation that the revocation would be automatic, instead placing the decision under the discretion of the Minister for Home Affairs (Parliament of Australia 2020). However, only dual nationals can be stripped of their citizenship. Nationals only citizens of Australia are tried under the Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth) and penalised accordingly.

Internationally, other countries have enacted similar legislation enabling governments to strip nationals of their citizenship. Much like the Australian justification, these laws have been enacted to respond to national security concerns regarding "'foreign fighters,' terrorist attacks in Western nations, and planned or attempted attacks on home soil" (Pillai & Williams 2017, pp. 845-846). European nations which have enacted analogous legislation include Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK. Since the enactment of the legislation in their respective countries, Australia has revoked the citizenship of at least nine nationals; Belgium, 21; France, 16; The Netherlands, 16; and the UK, over 172, including 104 in 2017 alone (Bolhuis & van Wijk 2020, p. 351). In Bahrain, authorities revoked 738 citizenships from 2012 to 2018 (Human Rights Watch 2018) – using it as a 'sectarian tool' to 'crack down on dissent' from and silence the opposition (Ibrahim 2020).

Justification & Empirical Evidence

The common trend for these policies is a rationalisation under national security, with additional powers required to respond to 'new' challenges of returning foreign fighters, attacks on Western nations, and planned or attempted attacks on home soil (Pillai & Williams 2017, p. 846). While the policies do also carry a symbolic rationale, the national security rationale is in no way founded by empirical evidence. Currently, there is little evidence supporting the notion that such legislation has actively dissuaded terrorists from acting, or nationals from radicalising (Coyne & Kfir 2019). Arguably, those interested in joining extremist groups or becoming foreign fighters are "unlikely to be deterred

by the threat of having their citizenship revoked" (Coyne & Kfir 2019). In Australia, the 2015 Citizenship Act amendment was justified as a preventative measure "designed to bite early" (R v Elomar, [79]). However, submissions to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security's inquiry into the amendments were "sceptical as to whether the threat of citizenship revocation would actually deter terror-related conduct" (Kayis 2016, p. 17). Kfir and Coyne (2019) argued that "there is no substantive evidence" supporting citizenship revocation as a deterrent and that, in some cases, "numerous ISIL recruits [have burnt] their passports to highlight their commitment to ISIL/al-Qaeda." In lieu of current legislation and practice, a "successful debriefing" of individuals "who have been seduced by the ISIL narrative" would prove a far better counter-terrorism measure, providing insight into extremist methods employed by terrorist organisations from those directly influenced by them.

Terrorism as a Political Concept

Arguably the greatest issue with terrorist citizenship revocation is the subjective nature of terrorism and its accompanying politicking. Before anyone can be stripped of their citizenship, the 'terrorists' need first be identified as such. Therefore, defining terrorism is the first step in citizenship revocation. While academic definitions of terrorism and terrorists are diverse and "far from systematic" (Mueller 2006 and Lustic 2006 in Crenshaw & LaFree 2017, p. 100), citizenship revocation's main flaw is that these definitions are ultimately subjective, and thus susceptible to the discretion of states.

Clearly, the decision as to who constitutes a terrorist lies with the state. This, however, permits states to abuse such powers for personal gain. Jenkins posits that "some governments are prone to label as terrorism all violent acts committed by their political opponents," and that "terrorism is what the bad guys do" (Jenkins 1980, p. 1). Such acts are justified through negative labelling of the individuals as "murderers, gunmen, saboteurs, terrorists, criminals or kidnappers" (Zerfass & Holtzhausen 2014, p. 526). Therefore, states can effectively label any members of ideological, political, or social groups as terrorists and consequently denationalise them. For example, following Myanmar's coup d'état, overthrown elected members of parliament have been labelled as terrorists by the de facto martial government after forming a 'National Unity Government' (The Guardian 2021). Although the de facto government is yet to revoke their citizenship, officially designating elected MPs as terrorists is clearly just a political tactic employed to delegitimise and suppress a rival political group, exemplifying the exploitability of citizenship revocation legislation.

This is also demonstrated in Bahrain, where authorities "seem intent on earning the dubious honour of leading the region in stripping citizenship" (Human Rights Watch 2018). In May 2018, Bahraini courts revoked 115 citizenships in a single mass-trial including 53 life sentences on terrorism-related charges (Amnesty International 2018), and in April 2019 revoked a further 138 citizenships in a mass-trial where 139 nationals were convicted of terrorism charges (Amnesty International 2019). Although the state ultimately has discretion when defining terrorism, both mass-trials have been described as "a mockery of justice," "unfair," and "ludicrous" by Amnesty International (Amnesty International 2018; 2019). This is a clear indication as to why citizenship revocation policies are seriously hampered by the political and subjective nature of terrorism, and why such policies are ineffective in countering terrorism.

Citizenship & Statelessness

Citizenship is most easily defined as "a bundle of privileges, powers and immunities" (Lavi 2011, p. 790) afforded to a person by a state and, in international law, is recognised as a membership to a sovereign state (UN High Commissioner for Refugees, 2005). However, conceptually, citizenship is also seen as "an identity, [and] an expression of one's membership in a political economy" (Kymlicka 2003, p. 268). While states are free to determine their citizenship recognition and withdrawal conditions, universally ratified international law provides that "everyone has the right to a nationality" and that "no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality" (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Art. 15). Further, two UN Conventions have attempted to reduce global statelessness, though fewer than 100 states have ratified each of these (UNHCR n.d.). Therefore, international law asserts very little effective control over citizenship and affords states substantial discretion (Forcese 2014, pp. 559-560). The only additional unambiguous universal law is that states may revoke nationality, so long as it is not "arbitrary," according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Art. 15)

Statelessness

When citizens are stripped of their citizenry, and are not citizens of any other state, they are rendered stateless. The UN defines a stateless person as someone "not considered as a national by any state under the operation of its law" (Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, Art. 1(1)). In practice, some states including the UK and Australia will not revoke citizenship where it will produce de jure statelessness, while others are "less attentive to the issue of statelessness" (Forcese 2014, pp. 563-564). Without nationalities, stateless persons are not afforded the rights of any citizenry. Statelessness negatively affects the individual's education, employment, social welfare, housing, healthcare, and their civil and political rights including freedom of movement, freedom from arbitrary detention, and political participation (UNHCR n.d.). Stateless persons are also often alienated from the community and can become displaced persons.

Locally, the answer is clear. Australia has signed and ratified both the Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the subsequent Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness and is therefore prohibited from revoking citizenship such that it would result in statelessness. For other non-party states including the USA, China, Russia, and India, there is no legal framework preventing state-instigated statelessness.

Despite the ostensible legality of statelessness, whether states should revoke citizenship is a resounding 'no.' Arguments of traditional Westphalian sovereignty and a state's right to decide its own citizenry do not suffice. The argument presented by Australia and other states in accordance with this that citizenship is a privilege, not a right, and therefore is revocable is profoundly untrue and a clear violation of a fundamental human right (UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights n.d.).

Reconciling International Obligations

Alongside their obligation to not leave persons stateless, states must also adhere to other international obligations which cannot be reconciled or are not easily reconcilable with the notion of stripping nationals of their citizenship. Issues of terrorism 'exportation,' offloading terrorists to other states, international cooperation, fuelling the terrorist narrative, and human rights violations are interrelated with stripping nationals of their citizenship.

Exporting Terrorism & International Cooperation

Stripping terrorists of their citizenship does not fix the issue; rather, it merely "reflects a pass the buck mentality" (Paulussen 2018) where the burden is discharged onto another state. If nationals are stripped of their citizenship while in the revoking state, the terrorist is either left stateless or is deported; if they are in a 3rd party state, such as foreign fighters in the Levant, they often disappear off the radar and are effectively "allowed" to stay in an "international army of jihadists" where they "can continue to commit crimes" (Paulussen 2016, p. 19), contravening Australia's international obligation to not export terrorism (Carroll 2018).

If, in Australia's case, they are dual nationals, they will likely either return to the state of their remaining citizenship or be forcefully extradited there. This is often seen as 'offloading' the terrorist to the remaining state and can damage international cooperation and relations. This is evidenced by the recent example of Suhayra Aden, an 'ISIS Bride' who, until 2020, carried both Australian and New Zealand citizenship (Welch, Dredge & Dziedzic 2021). Ms Aden was born in New Zealand and moved to Australia when she was six, living there until travelling to Syria using her Australian passport in 2014 before her recent arrest after attempting to enter Turkey from Syria (Thwaites 2021). New Zealand felt it was more appropriate for Australia to accept responsibility for the individual, as her travel was facilitated using her Australian passport. The Prime Minister of New Zealand, Jacinda Ardern, said of the incident that Australian PM Scott Morrison was "abdicating responsibility" of Ms Aden and that Australia was "exporting its problems to New Zealand" and "did not act in good faith" by 'rac[ing] to revoke citizenship' (Welch, Dredge & Dziedzic 2021).

Fuelling the Terrorist Narrative

Revoking citizenship of terrorists, particularly foreign fighters, can also further the terrorist narrative (Lucanus 2020). Generally, violent religious extremist narratives, particularly the Salafi-jihadi narrative, adheres to an "us versus them" world view (Kfir 2019, p. 22). Terrorist narratives are a "rendering of events, actions and characters in a certain way" to persuade through identification (Maan 2015, p. 1). Thus, the binary narratives of religious extremists resonate with those that identify as victims of an oppressive 'enemy.' Violent extremist organisations, including ISIS, use counter-terrorism policies and legislation such citizenship revocation to advance a narrative that certain communities are unfairly

targeted as "problem communities" and are systematically marginalised (Kohut et al. 2007; Kebbel & Porter 2012, p. 212; Cherney & Murphy 2017, p. 1023).

Contrastingly, the de-radicalisation of these terrorists and development of counter-narratives has greater strategic value to undermine extremism (Reed, Ingram & Whittaker 2017, pp. 9-10). For example, Al-Qaeda's first American foreign fighter, Bryant Viñas, became a vital collaborator and informant on Al-Qaeda's operations in the Pakistani borderlands after his arrest and successful de-radicalisation after fighting for the group from 2007-2008 (Viñas & Silber 2018). Although non-repressive measures such as this "will not lead to the end of terrorism as such," they are aimed at combating causes, not symptoms (Paulussen 2016, p. 24). It is these preventative policies, rather than reactive ones, that should be the basis of state policy and legislation.

Human Rights Issues

Alongside concerns regarding statelessness, other problematic human rights issues associated with citizenship revocation policies include non-refoulement and ne bis in idem principles. Bolhuis and van Wijk (2020, pp. 352-363) posit that these issues present themselves when nationals are denied their citizenship while inside or outside of the depriving state. If they are in the depriving state upon deprivation, the individual will "typically also lose legal residence and be ordered to leave" (Bolhuis & van Wijk 2020, p. 352). The individual can leave independently, be extradited, or expelled. Extradition and expulsion carry a high risk of non-refoulement violations, as the individual may be subject to persecution in the requesting (in extradition cases) or accepting (in expulsion cases) state (Bolhuis & van Wijk 2020, p. 354), a scenario evidenced in Daoudi v. France. If the individual is deprived of their citizenship whilst outside the depriving state and in the state of their residual nationality, they will either "continue to live there and be left alone" or face a criminal trial. As it is likely a criminal trial was required to revoke their citizenship in the depriving state initially, any additional trial in the residual state would contravene ne bis in idem obligations if charged with the same crime (Bolhuis & van Wijk 2020, p. 359). If they are deprived while in a third state, the individual will likely either disappear from the radar, as mentioned previously regarding exporting terrorism, or will be expelled or extradited, carrying the same issues as mentioned. Clearly, citizenship revocation policies are highly problematic from human rights perspectives and are inherently irreconcilable with states' international obligations.

Conclusion

Ultimately, citizenship revocation regimes and their accompanying legislation are ineffective as counter-terrorism measures and should not be implemented by states. While current practice sees a plethora of states, especially Western states, adopting citizenship revocation policies, their justification for doing so is empirically unfounded. Stripping 'terrorists' of their citizenship is a fundamentally flawed practice, as the state determines who is or is not a terrorist, a subjectivity undermined by potential abuse. Finally, the policies are also irreconcilable with international obligations. Issues of human rights violations, fuelling the terrorist narrative, exportation of terrorism, deterioration of international

cooperation, and statelessness are direct consequences of citizenship revocation regimes. Revocation legislation as such has no place in modern state practice, particularly in progressive liberal democracies such as Australia.

References

Amnesty International (2018), *Bahrain: Citizenship of 115 people revoked in 'ludicrous' mass trial,* Amnesty International, 16 May, viewed 1 June 2021, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/05/bahrain-citizenship-of-115-people-revoked-in-ludicrous-mass-trial/>.

Amnesty International (2019), *Bahrain: Mass trial revoking citizenship of 138 people "a mockery of justice"*, Amnesty International, 16 April, viewed 1 June 2021, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2019/04/bahrain-mass-trial-revoking-citizenship-of-138-people-a-mockery-of-justice/>.

Australian Citizenship Amendment (Allegiance to Australia) Act 2015 (Cth).

Bolhuis, M. P., & van Wijk, J. (2020), 'Citizenship Deprivation as a Counterterrorism Measure in Europe; Possible Follow-Up Scenarios, Human Rights Infringements and the Effect on Counterterrorism', *European Journal of Migration and Law*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 351, 352-363, 359.

Carroll, J. (2018), 'Terrorists Stripped Bare', ANU National Security College, 10 August, viewed 2 June 2021, <https://nsc.crawford.anu.edu.au/news-events/news/12980/terrorists-stripped-bare>.

Cherney, A. & Kristina Murphy, K. (2017), 'Police and community cooperation in counterterrorism: evidence and insights from Australia', *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, vol. 40, no.12, p. 1023.

Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness signed, 30 August 1961, 989 UNTS 175 (entered into force 13 December 1975).

Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, signed 28 September 1954, 360 UNTS 117 (entered into force 6 June 1960), Art. 1(1).

Coyne, J. & Kfir, I. (2019), 'Australia's citizenship-stripping legislation may be doing more harm than good', *Australian Strategic Policy Institute*, 8 August, viewed 1 June 2021, <https://www.aspistrategist.org.au/australias-citizenship-stripping-legislation-may-be-doing-more-harm-than-good/>.

Daoudi v France (Chamber Judgement) (European Court of Human Rights, Chamber I, Case No 19576/08, 3 December 2009).

Forcese, C 2014, 'A Tale of Two Citizenships: Citizenship Revocation for Traitors and Terrorists', *Queen's Law Journal*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 559-560.

Human Rights Watch 2018, 'Bahrain: Hundreds Stripped of Citizenship', *Human Rights Watch*, viewed 31 May 2021, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/07/27/bahrain-hundreds-stripped-citizenship>.

Ian Lustick 2006, *Trapped in the War on Terror* cited in Crenshaw, M & LaFree, G 2017, *Countering Terrorism*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington.

Ibrahim, A 2020, 'Activists Condemn Bahrain's use of citizenship revocation', *Al Jazeera*, 12 November, viewed 19 November 2021, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/11/12/bahrain-activists-condemn-citizenship-revocation-against-dissent>.

Jenkins, BM 1980, 'The Study of Terrorism: Definitional Problems', *RAND Corporation*, p. 1.

Kayis, D 2016, 'Citizenship and Terrorism: A critical analysis of the 2015 Australian Citizenship Act Amendments', *UNSW Law Journal Student Series*, vol. 16, no. 6, p. 17.

Kebbell, M & Porter, L. 2012, 'An intelligence assessment framework for identifying individuals at risk of committing acts of violent extremism against the West', *Security Journal*, vol. 35, no. 3, p. 212.

Kfir, I & Coyne, J 2019, 'Submission to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Intelligence and Security in respect to a review of the Australian Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Cessation) Bill 2019, Parliament of Australia, < https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Intelligence_and_Security/CitizenshipCessation>

Kfir, I 2019, '18 years and counting: Australian counterterrorism, threats and responses,' *Australian Strategic Policy Institute*, April, viewed 28 June 2021, pp. 14, 22.

Kohut, A et al. 2007, *Muslim Americans: Middle Class and Mostly Mainstream*, Pew Research Center.

Kymlicka, W 2003, 'New forms of Citizenship' in Courchene T. J. & Savoie D. J. (eds.), *The Art of the State: Governance in a World Without Frontiers*, Institute for Research in Public Policy, Montreal, p. 268.

Lavi, S 2011, 'Citizenship Revocation as Punishment: On the Modern Duties of Citizens and Their Criminal Breach', *University of Toronto Law Journal*, vol. 61, no.4, p. 790.

Lucanus, A 2020, 'Letting Go of the Bad Eggs', *Australian Institute of International Affairs*, 30 September, viewed 2 June 2021, <https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/letting-go-of-the-bad-eggs>.

Maan, A 2015, *Counter Terrorism: Narrative Strategies*, University Press of America, p. 1.

Mueller, J & Stewart, M G 2012, 'The Terrorism Delusion: America's Overwrought Response to September 11', *International Security*, vol. 37, no. 81.

Mueller, J 2006, *Overblown: How Politicians and the Terrorism Industry Inflate National Security Threats, and Why We Believe Them* cited in M & LaFree, G 2017, *Countering Terrorism*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington.

Parliament of Australia, 'Australian Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Cessation) Bill (2020)

Parliament of Australia, Australian Citizenship Amendment (Strengthening the Citizenship Loss Prevention) Bill (2018)

Paulussen, C 2016, 'Repressing the Foreign Fighters Phenomenon and Terrorism is Western Europe: Towards an Effective Response Based on Human Rights', *International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague*, viewed 28 May 2021, pp. 19, 24.

Paulussen, C 2018, 'Countering Terrorism Through the Stripping of Citizenship: Ineffective and Counterproductive', *International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague*, viewed 28 May 2021, <https://icct.nl/publication/countering-terrorism-through-the-stripping-of-citizenship-ineffective-and-counterproductive/>.

Pillai, S & Williams, G 2017, 'The utility of citizenship stripping laws in the UK, Canada and Australia', *Melbourne University Law Review*, vol. 41, no. 845, pp. 845-846.

R v Elomar (2010) 264 ALR 759, [79].

Reed, A., Ingram, HJ & Whittaker, J 2017, Countering Terrorist Narratives, *European Parliament*, pp. 9-10.

The Guardian 2014, 'French ISIS fighters burn their passports', *The Guardian*, 20 November, viewed 30 May 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2014/nov/20/french-isis-fighters-burn-passports-video>.

The Guardian 2021, 'Myanmar junta labels opposition government of ousted MPs a "terrorist" group', *The Guardian*, 9 May, viewed 1 June 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/may/09/myanmar-junta-opposition-government-mps-terrorist-group>.

Thwaites, R 2021, 'How Australia stripped alleged Isis fighter of citizenship without evaluating her case', *The Guardian*, 11 March, viewed 1 June 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2021/mar/11/how-australia-stripped-alleged-isis-fighter-of-citizenship-without-evaluating-her-case>.

UNHCR n.d., ‘UN Conventions on Statelessness’, UNHCR, <https://www.unhcr.org/en-au/un-conventions-on-statelessness.html>.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, ‘What is Statelessness?’, UNHCR (Online Document, n.d.) <https://www.unhcr.org/ibelong/wp-content/uploads/UNHCR-Statelessness-2pager-ENG.pdf>.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Nationality and Statelessness: A Handbook for Parliamentarians (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2005).

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, GA Res 217A (III), UN GAOR, UN Doc A/810 (10 December 1948), Art. 15.

Viñas, B.N., & Silber, M. (2018), ‘Al-Qa’ida’s First American Foreign Fighter after 9/11’, Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, vol.11, no. 8.

Wagner, M. (2014), ‘“We are coming for you”: American suicide bomber who threatened U.S. burned passport returned to U.S. for months before Syria attack’, The New York Daily News, 30 July, viewed 1 June 2021, <https://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/american-suicide-bomber-syria-threatens-video-article-1.1885341>.

Welch, D., Dredge, S., & Dziedzic, S. (2021), ‘New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern criticises Australia for stripping dual national terror suspect’s citizenship’, ABC News, 16 February, viewed 2 June 2021, <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-02-16/jacinda-ardern-australia-stripping-dual-national-turkey-terror/13159300>.

Zerfass, A. & Holtzhausen, D. (eds.) (2010), The Routledge Handbook of Strategic Communication, Taylor & Francis, London, p. 526.

Addressing the Inequality Among the Global Order, Within Nation-states and Between Individual Social Groups Will Aid in Sustaining a Durable Peace

Mitchell Grummisch

Abstract

This paper states that inequality that exists between and within nation-states plays a substantive role in the absence of a durable peace. Thus, exploring the international order of nation-states and perceived inequality within countries and between social groups, this article concludes that reducing inequality at the global, nation-state, and localised level should be "a security concern."

Introduction

The inequality that exists between and within nation-states plays a substantive role in the absence of a durable peace. Prevailing multi-disciplinary articulations on the inequality-conflict nexus favour the causal relationship that severe inequality can lead to conflict as a result of collective group mobilisation in response to perceived grievances. Scholars such as Stewart (2004, 2008) and others contend that it is horizontal inequalities (HIs), meaning inequalities between defined identity groups, that largely drive new and resurgent conflict (pp. 12-14). Here, HIs are broadly categorised through relative access to political, economic, social, and cultural opportunities, recognition, and resources (Stewart 2008, p. 13). Current scholarly debate tends to apply this approach to individual conflicts and countries, without a corresponding analysis of the relationship that inequality between nation-states among the global order has on creating and maintaining wider HIs within countries. Without an adequate investigation into the relationship between inter-state inequality, HIs, and the connection to conflict, there can only be assumptive explanations given as to the cause of a group's perceived grievances.

This article argues that the current global order and the process for designating rules and regulations are unequal and governed by predominantly developed countries who benefit from increasing globalisation and maintenance of the status quo. This is demonstrated first by highlighting that inequality between countries fosters elitism and autocratic rule as a means of securing the legitimate authority and resources of the state, further cultivating inequality within their countries. The point is

further corroborated by identifying that HIs within countries can act as a significant factor in mobilising socially constructed identity groups over a perceived grievance to engage in conflict. This research highlights recent conflicts in Angola, Sierra Leone, and Rwanda and analyses the role inter- and intra-state inequality may play in the occurrence of conflict. This article finds that inequality between and within countries contributes to power competition, perceived grievances, and group mobilisation in defence of their in-group needs. This approach suggests additional avenues of analysis by examining the effectiveness of reducing social group distinctions and the extent to which this contributes to reducing conflict. This article concludes by suggesting that inequality between and within countries promotes grievance and competition, and thus, needs to be addressed if a durable peace is to prevail.

Institutionalised inequality through the monopoly of power and regulatory capture

High inequality between nation-states is sustained through global institutional approaches toward economic governance, sovereignty, and international relations. The political-economic order that has dominated the realm of international relations since the end of the Second World War and the advent of nuclear deterrence has largely prevented inter-state conflict. Instead, disputes, negotiations, and resolutions commonly take place within shared social institutions, where there has long existed high inequality between nation-states (Pogge 2008a, p. 205). Here, a long history of colonial and more recently, neoliberal approaches to global governance have solidified the unequal power structures that favour Western countries (Kreutzmann 2008, p. 676; Piketty 2020, p. 648). This inequality, whether through access to resources, availability of foreign investment and trade opportunities, or in global decision-making bodies largely favours developed countries in the global north (Kreutzmann 2008, p. 676). This distributive injustice is, as Rawls argues, both inherently negative in itself, and by its effect on the social structures among people and states (Rawls 1999, pp. 113-114). For example, the ability of any of the permanent five members on the United Nations Security Council to wield veto power over any substantive resolution, or the conditionality imposed upon states by membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO) to configure internal economic policies (Hurrell 2001, p. 41). In the case of the WTO, many developed states also retain veto power, while the internal dispute mechanism allows for third-party lobbying which disproportionately reflects the interests of advanced industrial nation-states (Smith 2004, p. 564). Collectively, these states maintain the global order through a monopoly of power over setting rules and normative procedures that have been achieved and remain secured by vast military and economic strength (Pogge 2008a, p. 206). Advanced economies continue to maximise this advantage by limiting the decision-making abilities of other nation-states. In this context, dominant states are driven by a traditional realist approach, namely countering military threats and the maintenance of the status quo (Booth 1991, p. 318). Often, this is undertaken through the guise of benign market forces or as a moral imperative to maintain global security from nuclear proliferation and wider violent conflict.

Globalisation, as a neoliberal process of increasing capital flows and market openness, has largely favoured developed economies, often at the expense of those in the global south. Pogge (2010) argues that this sustained process of “regulatory capture,” whereby the powerful, both individuals and organisations, are increasingly incentivised to manipulate the global order and shape the rules in their favour (pp. 536-537). States who lack equal position, power, or voice are coerced into an inherently

conformist system that perpetuates wider inequalities. The result is one in which dominant states and wealthy elites mobilise in defence of their perceived security needs, specifically, the preservation of their wealth and power. In effect, inequality between states impinges on individual state sovereignty and the agency of the political communities within. Poku and Therkelsen (2016) contend that this has left many of the world's poorest countries with little option, but to adopt policies that discourage protectionism (pp. 266, 274) and promote extractive institutions (Acemoglu & Robinson 2012, p. 343). These processes remain largely undemocratic and lacking in accountability or transparency. This ongoing effort to retain an unequal global order promotes the ideals of peace-building and economic prosperity for all, while in effect imposing deep and exploitative inequalities. Alternative opportunities for developing countries are further diminished through strict trade barriers and export demands that are imposed by predominantly developed countries seeking to protect their economic superiority or extract commodities at the best price (Pogge 2008b, p. 71). In this context, inequality between countries perpetuates top-down neo-colonial relationships that inherently curtail the power of developing states to make decisions as sovereign actors or pursue what limited advantage they may hold. As a result, many developing countries are left to undertake economic strategies that favour natural resource extraction and export while encouraging power competition, further increasing economic, social, political, and ecological inequalities within the countries themselves.

Cascading inequality drives competition and localised conflict

Inequality between countries fosters power and wealth competition and accumulation within nation-states. The necessity of cooperation and integration into the international system has winners and losers. Those worse off are often already categorised as having high poverty, poor institutional capacity, and diverse socio-political and economic as well as ethno-religious identity groups (Acemoglu & Robinson 2012, pp. 430-431). The lack of comparative access to global decision making, and related inability to equally influence the setting of rules encourages countries and their prospective leaders to seek out advantages wherever possible. At the state level, this can foster autocratic rule whereby elites who assume the authority of the state and its resources have the international recognition and power to borrow and sell on behalf of their people (Pogge 2008a, p. 29; Acemoglu & Robinson 2012, p. 344). Here, wealthy elites are incentivised to exploit their country's natural and human resources (Pogge 2008a, p. 206) to the ultimate benefit of foreign interests (Pogge 2008b, p. 72), and among those who belong to the ruling elite's social class, ethnic group, or political ideology (Stewart 2008, p. 13). These events can deliver vital national income and fund social improvements to overcome widespread poverty. However, improvements in those conditions that cause poverty do not necessarily equate to a reduction in the gross inequalities that can cause civil and regional conflict.

When left unaddressed, those who are deprived often seek to rebalance the social order in their favour. Similarly, elites act to maintain their unequal advantage, as has been the case in much of sub-Saharan Africa (Acemoglu & Robinson 2012, pp. 344-345). At the sub-national level, such motivation for power and wealth accumulation often results in deeper social, political, and economic inequalities and thus a repetitious cycle of competition, oppression, and potential conflict (Stewart & Langer 2008, p. 64). This view represents the rational actor approach in the inequality-conflict relationship (Cramer 2005, p. 3). If perceived inequalities are such that the opportunity to act exists and the benefits

outweigh the cost, then a regime-changing conflict can take place. In a similar vein, in Angola and Sierra Leone, diamond extraction and export have long been a source of finance for governments, rebel groups, and terrorist organisations alike (Tidwell & Lerche 2004, p. 50). Here, mineral wealth has been seized by powerful groups and exported to wealthy countries. Consequently, profits have been used to sustain regional and intra-state conflict (Stewart 2004, p. 273). Inequality-driven competition and conflict are scarcely limited by state boundaries; transnational identity groups such as those based on ethnicity or religion are often regional if not global. Again, it is the international arms trade centred in and protected by powerful nation-states such as the United States, Russia, China, and those in the European Union that benefit from these relationships. Despite dominating the neoliberal social institutions that promote equality and justice, it remains the same comity of nations that oppose any significant reform (Pogge 2008a, p. 113). The status quo continues to benefit those in the global north and wealthy elites in positions of power in the global south. However, the resultant inequality that perversely impoverishes billions of people while blocking any real means of equitable resolution will continue to aggrieve the dispossessed and foster deeper conflict between the perceived winners and losers.

Social group cohesion through perceived grievance

Perceived inequality between cohesive identity groups fosters new and resurgent intra-state and regional conflict. Socially constructed identity groups, who develop over shared religious, ethnic, racial, and regional affiliations, can form irrespective of state-defined borders (Fukuda-Parr, Langer, & Mine 2013, p. 2) and act as a cohesive device that aids wider group mobilisation (Mancini 2008, pp. 106-107). These identity groups, which bind individuals and their perceived exposure to HIs, provide the salience of group mobilisation and increase the likelihood of violent conflict (Stewart 2008, p. 10). Here, inequality between individuals and groups may take the form of gross disparity in access to resources and opportunities that foster resentment and grievance. This can increase competition for resources, recognition, and rights, degrade social cohesion, and ultimately impact the state's ability to exercise its legitimate authority and maintain a modicum of peace. In this sense, the security of the state is intimately connected to the inequality experienced between groups, and thus, is a matter of wider human security. Human security has, since its first articulation in development-securitisation discourse in the 1994 Human Development Report, established that the concept of security extends beyond inter-state conflict and maintaining territorial protection (Persaud 2016 p. 141). Moreover, it establishes that threats to individual and collective wellbeing extend to unequal access to employment, income, health, education, and environmental opportunities that are necessary to live a free and productive life (Stewart 2004, p. 262). This moved away from a traditional realist international relations perspective and has placed the human condition of individuals as central to ongoing theoretical and policy approaches to security, conflict, and development. More than just physical protection, human security encompasses a range of social, economic, and political factors that dictate how individuals and social identity groups live and interact within the context of state sovereignty (Persaud 2016 p. 141). This approach acknowledges the state as a primary agent in security discourse; however, it places individual and identity group needs as the referent object to be secured. In this context, poor and unequal access to opportunities and outcomes among individuals and groups represent a major threat to their wellbeing with wider implications for more traditional state-centric approaches. When groups

perceive an unjust grievance through political exclusion, economic disparity, or cultural persecution, they are far more likely to act in the common defence of their communities' human security needs. This can be exacerbated in states with multi-dimensional poverty and overlapping identity groups such as Rwanda (Takeuchi 2013, p. 48), yet also applicable to countries with particularly affluent regions such as the Basque region of Spain (Stewart 2004, p. 274). In each case, perceived grievances brought on by inequality led to violent conflict.

In Rwanda, a post-colonial republic, there remains a long history of political, socio-economic, and cultural inequality among the two dominant ethnic groups: the Tutsi minority and the majority Hutu. Despite independence, colonial-era policies of discrimination have enabled both groups to routinely seek a redistribution of political power, economic resources, and social opportunities through violent conflict (Takeuchi 2013, pp. 41, 45). In each case, both groups perceived that their culturally defined ethnic group was under threat and that the inequality was sufficient to mobilise collectively (Stewart 2004, pp. 269-270). The resultant periodic violence culminated in widespread genocidal civil conflict. The Tutsi victory in 1994 has since secured the domination of all political and security sector positions of power (Takeuchi 2013, p. 50). Moreover, changes to quotas for education and improved economic opportunities largely favour Tutsi-concentrated urban areas (Takeuchi 2013, p. 48). As a result, there has been no resurgence of widespread violent conflict, however, extant and increasing HIs among Hutus in a country with a history of ethnic-based civil war and power competition presents a risk to renewed conflict. Subsequent constitutional changes that have criminalised promoting ethnic divisions may be contributing to the disruption of identity group mobilisation. As the case of Rwanda shows, inequality within countries continues to be a source of ongoing conflict, in particular when real or perceived injustice is concentrated upon a cohesive identity group. Reducing these inequalities among individuals and groups would aid in a reduction of perceived collective grievances that drive competition and conflict, further diluting the salience of identity group mobilisation and contributing to a durable peace.

Conclusion

Inequality continues to provide the salience of socially constructed identity groups to mobilise in defence of their perceived security needs. This article has illustrated that, among the international order of nation-states, the unequal governance structure that determines normative relations and regulates socio-political and economic decision-making largely favours those with superior military and economic strength. Through globalisation, this process has integrated much of the world's economic activity and left developing countries with little practical alternative, but to adopt exploitative policies that can exacerbate wider regional and national inequalities. Next, this article illustrated that inequality between countries within the international order encourages autocratic elitism to maximise power and wealth accumulation through legitimate means. In turn, this can result in the further unequal concentration of resources and opportunities and lead to wider competition and contestation. Lastly, this article illustrated that the perceived inequality within countries and between social groups acts as a cohesive element in mobilising the aggrieved in defence of their human security needs. Addressing inequality at the global, nation-state, and localised level in favour of greater political voice and access to social and economic opportunities may aid in achieving reduced identity group mobilisation and

conflict. More research is needed to identify the effectiveness of reducing identity group distinctions as in the case with Rwanda, and to what extent this approach has had on sustaining peace. Ultimately, reducing inequality at every level should be a security, if not a moral concern for anyone wishing to live in a free, just, and rules-based society.

References

Acemoglu, D, & Robinson, J 2012, *Why Nations Fail*, Crown Publishing Group, London.

Booth, K 1991, ‘Security and emancipation’, *Review of International Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 313-326.

Cramer, C 2005, *Inequality and conflict*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva.

Fukuda-Parr, S, Langer, A, & Mine, Y 2013, ‘Introduction: Disentangling the linkages between horizontal inequalities and political institutions’, in Y Mine, F Stewart, S Fukuda-Parr, T Hurrell, A 2001, ‘Global Inequality and International Institutions,’ *Metaphilosophy*, vol. 32, no. 1-2, pp. 34-57.

Kreutzmann, H 2008, ‘Dividing the World: conflict and inequality in the context of growing global tension’, *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 675-689.

Mancini, L 2008, ‘Horizontal inequality and communal violence: Evidence from Indonesian districts’, in F Stewart, *Horizontal inequalities and conflict*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 106-131.

Persaud, R 2016, ‘Human Security’ in A Collins, *Contemporary Security Studies*, 4th edn, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 139-153.

Piketty, T 2020, Capital and ideology, *Belknap Press*, Cambridge.

Poku, N, & Therkelsen, J 2016, ‘Globalization, development, and security’ in A Collins, Contemporary Security Studies, 4th edn, *Oxford University Press*, Oxford, pp. 263-274.

Pogge, T 2008a, *World poverty and human rights*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Pogge, T 2008b, ‘Growth and Inequality: Understanding Recent Trends and Political Choices’, *Dissent*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 66-75.

Pogge, T 2010, ‘Keynote address: Poverty, climate change, and overpopulation’, *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 525-542.

Rawls, J 1999, *The law of peoples*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Smith, J 2004, 'Inequality in international trade? Developing countries and institutional change in WTO dispute settlement', *Review of International Political Economy*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 542-573.

Stewart, F 2004, 'Development and security', *Conflict, Security & Development*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 261-288.

Stewart, F 2008, 'Horizontal Inequalities and conflict: An introduction and some hypotheses' in F Stewart, *Horizontal inequalities and conflict*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 3-23.

Stewart, F & Langer, A 2008, 'Horizontal inequalities: Explaining persistence and change, in F Stewart, *Horizontal inequalities and conflict*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 41-52.

Takeuchi, S 2013, ''Twin countries' with contrasting institutions: Post-conflict state-building in Rwanda and Burundi', in Y Mine, F Stewart, S Fukuda-Parr, T Mkandawire, & S Ogata, *Preventing Violent Conflict in Africa*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 40-57.

Tidwell, A & Lerche, C 2004, 'Globalization and conflict resolution', In*ternational Journal of Peace Studies*, vol. 9, no.1, pp. 47-59.

University *of* Adelaide

PIRA

Politics & International Relations Association

ISSN: 2652-9424