Why Radical Counterterrorism Strategies Are Created: The Comparison Based on the United States and France

Xu Liu[1,a,*]

[1]*Leeds International Study Centre, Wellington Place, Leeds, UK*
a. X.Liu2574-ISC@student.leedsbeckett.ac.uk
*corresponding author

Abstract: In the international community, the United Nations has carried out a series of resolutions and conventions in coordinating, preventing, and combating terrorism, and countries have actively cooperated in the fight against terrorism. However, the counter-terrorism policy of the United States is more radical than that of other developed countries. Using a comparative case study approach, the article analyses the reasons behind the US's aggressive counter-terrorism policy by comparing France's counter-terrorism policy after the November 13 terrorist attacks with that of the US. The article argues that the US counter-terrorism policy is partly a means of defending its hegemonic position and protecting its strategic interests, compared to France's prioritization of domestic counter-terrorism due to factors such as its history of terrorism and geopolitics. On the other hand, the US counter-terrorism strategy is also about promoting American values and democracy on a global scale. At the same time, it should not be overlooked that the US's strong economic and military power, as well as its diplomatic influence at the international level, support the US in its war on terror and trade embargo against countries such as Iran and Syria. This study aims to identify the reasons for the US's radical counter-terrorism policies by comparing the contrasting counter-terrorism policies of the US and France, which are also developed countries, and to provide a case study for a later study of a rational counter-terrorism landscape.

Keywords: terrorism, hegemony, national security, global governance

1. Introduction

Terrorism is a global phenomenon that poses a major threat to international peace and security. Over the past few years, many countries around the world have been subjected to acts of terrorism, which have caused widespread damage. The international community has responded to this threat by implementing various measures to combat terrorism [1]. On the one hand, the United Nations has played an important role in coordinating and combating terrorism and has adopted several resolutions and conventions to prevent and combat terrorism. One of the most important of these resolutions was adopted after the September 11 attacks in the United States in 2001. This resolution requires all member states to take measures to prevent and stop the financing of terrorism, deny haven to terrorists, and cooperate in the exchange of information on terrorist activities. In addition, the international community has established other bodies to combat terrorism, such as the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). The former is primarily responsible for

policies to combat the financing of terrorism, while the latter provides a platform for communication among countries to coordinate their efforts to combat terrorism. Despite these efforts, terrorism remains a serious threat. International attention to terrorism is ongoing and multilaterally coordinated efforts are made to prevent and combat this threat [2]. In studies of the US response to terrorist militancy, the dominant view of previous research has been that US counter-terrorism policy can be reduced to three perspectives: military solutions, intelligence gathering, and diplomatic cooperation. Firstly, the US believes that a military solution is necessary to combat terrorism. This has led to the use of military force in conflicts such as the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Secondly, intelligence gathering is considered an important component of US counter-terrorism policy, which has led to the use of surveillance technology and the expansion of intelligence agencies.

Finally, some scholars have highlighted the importance of diplomacy and international cooperation in the fight against terrorism. This includes US efforts to build partnerships with other countries to negotiate multilateral solutions to terrorism. These studies all focus their perspectives primarily on ideology, the impact of 9/11, and the influence of interest groups on US counter-terrorism policy [3]. On the one hand, the influence of neoconservative and hawkish ideology on US foreign policy has meant that conservatives tend to be more supportive of military force and harsher responses to terrorism than liberals. On the other hand, previous studies have collectively referred to the impact of the September 11 attacks on policy change and the development of new strategies. In addition, researchers have examined the influence of interest groups, such as the military-industrial complex, on US counter-terrorism policy. This includes the role of lobbying and campaign contributions in influencing policy decisions. However, there are common gaps in these studies. There are significant methodological challenges in measuring US attitudes towards terrorism, including the difficulty of defining terrorism, the impact of social desirability bias, and the complexity of the problem. At the same time, US domestic politics, including election cycles and partisan politics, likewise create volatility in the formulation of US counter-terrorism policy.

This research focuses on a comparative case study approach that compares France, also a developed country, with the United States. Firstly this study will compare the differences between the counter-terrorism policies of the two countries in the context of the terrorist attacks of 11.13 in France and 9.11 in the United States. And then it will further analyze the reasons for the radical counter-terrorism policies adopted by the United States. Finally, this study will attempt to present a rational counter-terrorism landscape. The study of US counter-terrorism policy can have practical implications for policymakers, security practitioners, and civil society groups. Research can provide insight into the effectiveness of different approaches to counter-terrorism, identify areas of improvement, and inform policy decisions. Practical implications can also include identifying best practices, analyzing the impact of counter-terrorism policies on civil liberties and human rights, and developing strategies to prevent radicalization and violent extremism. In terms of the theoretical implications, the study of US counter-terrorism policy can also have theoretical implications for understanding the nature of terrorism, the dynamics of conflict, and the role of the state in managing security threats. Theoretical implications can include exploring the relationship between terrorism and political violence, examining the causes and consequences of state responses to terrorism, and analyzing the impact of counter-terrorism policies on international relations.

2.   How U.S. and French Foreign Strategies Differ

Against the backdrop of the international community's common approach to counter-terrorism, the United Nations and other counter-terrorism organizations have formulated corresponding resolutions and conventions, and cooperation between countries to jointly combat terrorism has become the mainstream thinking of most countries. But the US, as a developed country on a par with the UK and France, has often been criticized for not working closely enough with its allies in terms of

coordination, even though it has been actively leading the war on terror. Other developed countries, such as France and the UK, have taken a more cooperative approach, sharing intelligence with other countries and coordinating their efforts [4]. At the same time, the United States' aggressive military intervention and intelligence gathering on terrorism, as well as its strict immigration policies, all point to a more aggressive attitude towards terrorism compared to other developed countries. Take, for example, the terrorist attacks in Paris, France, on 13 November 2015, which were carried out by ISIS militants and left 130 people dead. The terrorist attack was the worst attack on French soil since World War II and sparked solidarity and support from around the world. In terms of the response to terrorist events, the United States saw a major shift in policy towards terrorism following the September 11, 2001 attacks [5]. Since then, the United States has declared a "global war on terror" and has launched military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq. France, on the other hand, has historically taken a more law enforcement approach to terrorism than the United States. The French police arrested and killed members of the terrorists a few days after the attacks through a massive manhunt. This means that France is primarily concerned with addressing terrorism that occurs within the country, and the main fight against terrorism lies in tracking down and arresting terrorist suspects. In terms of the use of military force by the US and France, the US is more willing to use military force in the fight against terrorism, while France is more cautious. Although France has been involved in military interventions in Mali and the Sahel, it generally prefers to work through international organizations such as the United Nations.

The United States, on the other hand, has expanded its fight against terrorism to include interventions abroad. In the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the US has concentrated its military interventions mainly on ground forces and special forces, as well as on aerial programs to combat terrorism. At the same time, the US has made extensive use of drones to conduct targeted strikes against terrorism. Of course, this US approach to counter-terrorism, which may cause casualties to civilians, has been controversial and questioned by the international community. Finally, in terms of the two countries attitudes to the immigration policy debate, the US counter-terrorism policy is much harsher on immigrants. France has a large Muslim population and has always taken a peaceful approach to the issue of Muslim integration and radicalization [6]. France has one of the largest Muslim populations in Europe, and there is concern that some members of this population may be susceptible to radicalization. The French government has therefore implemented policies aimed at preventing radicalization and detecting potential terrorists within the Muslim community. The US, on the other hand, has imposed a direct travel ban on Muslim-majority countries. In short, while both the US and France are committed to combating terrorism, the US tends to favor military intervention and active surveillance measures, while France is more focused on law enforcement and international cooperation.

3.   Genesis of Radical Counterterrorism: An In-Depth Analysis Based on the United States

For France, a history of domestic terrorism, a large Muslim population, and France's geopolitical factors have combined to lead to a high priority for domestic counter-terrorism policy. But unlike France's concerns, the United States travel ban has resulted in it not having a Muslim population problem, while its geographical location is not a geopolitical factor. More, the main purpose of US counter-terrorism operations abroad is to protect US interests abroad and the need for reliable intelligence. In other words, US counter-terrorism is for example to achieve its hegemony, thus maintaining US dominance in global affairs and promoting the solidity of its values and ideology.

3.1. Counterterrorism as a Tool to Enhance International Discourse

As the US uses military and economic power to project its influence and protect its strategic significance around the world, its aggressive counter-terrorism policy is in part a means for the US to defend its hegemonic position. On the one hand, the US protects its strategic interests by waging a war against terrorism through military force in areas such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria. On the other hand, the US has imposed economic sanctions on countries such as Iran and North Korea. In the case of Iran, the most recent round of sanctions was imposed in 2018 after the US withdrew from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), also known as the These sanctions targeted Iran's oil, banking, and shipping industries, as well as other sectors of its economy. The US government has cited concerns about Iran's nuclear program, support for terrorism, and human rights abuses as reasons for imposing these sanctions. The US has cited concerns about Iran's nuclear program, support for terrorism, and human rights abuses as reasons for imposing these sanctions [7]. The US counter-terrorism strategy has taken on a larger dimension than the French sanctions, which only target terrorist organizations, and the US aims behind them cannot simply be defined as combating terrorist activities. Finally, the war on terror is also used as a means of promoting American values and fostering democracy and human rights on a global scale. The US has used the War on Terror as a means to promote its values and foster democracy and human rights in countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq. By promoting these values, the US has been able to maintain its position as a global leader and exert its influence in the region [8]. Overall, the War on Terror is associated with US hegemony as the US uses it to project its power and influence globally, protect its strategic interests, and promote its values and leadership.

3.2. Values Support from the Nation

The US is a global superpower and is seen by some as a symbol of Western culture and values, which makes it a prime target for extremist groups that oppose However, American nationalism and American values require that when the United States is attacked by terrorism, the government should take the means to protect the interests of its citizens and national security. American nationalism is a political ideology that emphasizes the primacy of the United States, its culture, its people, and its interests [9]. American nationalists believe in the exceptional nature of the United States, that it is a unique country with a special destiny, and that its interests should take precedence over those of other nations. Thus when the United States suffered the egregious terrorist attacks of September 11, contrary to the beliefs of American nationalists, they believed that the country should take a strong hand in combating terrorism. On the other hand, American values are the core beliefs and principles of the American way of life. They include, among others, freedom, democracy, equality, individualism, opportunity, justice, and the rule of law. These values are enshrined in the US Constitution and are fundamental to the American national identity. The values of freedom, democracy, and human rights, which are central to US national identity, require the US to take a strong stand against terrorism and to use all necessary means to protect its citizens. in short, the US has a strong sense of national identity and pride in its values, such as Therefore, when these values are targeted by terrorist groups, it can result in a strong emotional response from Americans.

3.3. Powerful National Comprehensive Strength

The US has a wide range of resources and capabilities that can be used to support radical US counter-terrorism policies, including the War on Terror and economic sanctions [10]. First, the US has substantial military resources. The US has advanced armament facilities such as a large number of weapons, aircraft, ships, and other equipment. This allows the US to project military power around the world and to respond quickly and decisively to threats. In other words, the US has the military

capability to wage a war on terror. Second, the US has the intelligence capabilities to support its fight against terrorism. Its sophisticated intelligence agencies, including the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Joint Security Investigation Agency, among others. These agencies collect and analyze intelligence on terrorist organizations and other threats, which helps the US identify and disrupt potential attacks. Third, the strong economic power and financial institutions of the US can be used to undermine the financial position of terrorist organizations and states that support terrorism, such as the economic sanctions the US has imposed on Iran. In addition, the US can similarly restrict terrorist financing through means such as asset freezing. Finally, the US diplomatic resources internationally and the public at home support its counter-terrorism policies by providing soft support. On the one hand, strong US diplomacy helps the US negotiate with other countries, build alliances, and promote US interests around the world. At the same time, a diplomacy is an important tool for the US to combat terrorism and support economic sanctions. On the other hand, the support of the American public provides the US government with long-lasting political capital to sustain this counter-terrorism policy in the long term.

4.   Conclusions

As a global superpower, the United States has a more aggressive policy towards terrorism than other developed countries. By way of comparison with the events of 11.13 in France, France has historically taken a more law enforcement approach to terrorism, focusing on tackling terrorism at home and working through organizations such as the United Nations. The US, on the other hand, has expanded its fight against terrorism to include military interventions abroad and has been criticized for its coordinated cooperation with allies. The paper's interpretation of the US's assertive counter-terrorism policy is that the US wants to defend its hegemonic position by using military and economic power to project its influence and protect its strategic interests. This is reflected in the US military interventions in areas such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria, as well as in the economic sanctions imposed on countries such as Iran. In contrast to the French approach, which is mainly aimed at terrorist organizations, the purpose behind the US cannot be defined simply as combating terrorist activities. In addition, the US war on terror is used as a means of promoting American values and fostering democracy and human rights around the world. By promoting these values, the US has been able to maintain its position as a global leader and make the most of its influence. But on the other hand, the US's political and economic power, strong military solutions, intelligence-gathering, and diplomatic cooperation capabilities have also underpinned its aggressive counter-terrorism policies. The article compares French and US counter-terrorism policies through a comparative case study approach. The article further examines the reasons for the radical counter-terrorism policies of the US and discusses the theoretical and practical implications of studying US counter-terrorism policies. Future research will focus on gaining insight into the effectiveness of different counter-terrorism approaches across countries, best practices, and the relationship between terrorism and political violence to further propose a rational counter-terrorism landscape.

References

[1]   Martini, A. (2021) The UN and coUNter-terrorism: Global hegemonies, power, and identities. Routledge.
[2]   Den Boer, M., & Wiegand, I. (2015) From convergence to deep integration: Evaluating the impact of EU counter-terrorism strategies on domestic arenas. Intelligence and National Security, 30(2–3), 377–401.
[3]   McCracken, T. (2011) Ten years on Obama's war on terrorism in rhetoric and practice. International Affairs, 87(4), 781–801.
[4]   Peter, F. (2008) Political rationalities, counter-terrorism and policies on Islam in the United Kingdom and France. In The Social Life of Anti-Terrorism Laws). transcript Verlag, 79–108.
[5]   Muzzatti, S. (2017) Terrorism and counter-terrorism in popular culture in the post-9/11 context. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Oxford University Press.

[6]   Orttung, R. W., & Makarychev, A. (2006). National counter-terrorism strategies: Legal, institutional, and public policy dimensions in the US, UK, France, Turkey, and Russia. IOS Press.

[7]   Kaleem, A. (2021) The hegemony of Prevent: Turning counter-terrorism policing into common sense. Critical Studies on Terrorism, 15(2), 267–289.

[8]   Jackson, R. (2018) Writing the war on terrorism: Language, politics, and counter-terrorism. Manchester University Press.

[9]   Peace, A. L. S. A. for F. and S. P. C. E. for I. (2004) America right or wrong : An anatomy of American nationalism: An anatomy of American nationalism. Oxford University Press.

[10]   Soros, G. (2004) The bubble of American supremacy: Correcting the misuse of American power. Westview Press Inc.