

AFRICAN UNION

الاتحاد الإفريقي



UNION AFRICaine

UNIÃO AFRICANA

CAERT, BP 141 Bureau Poste El-Mohammadia Alger, Algérie, Tel +213 215201 10 Fax +213 215203 78
Email : admin@caert.org.dz

ACSRT / CAERT

African Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism

Terrorism

Bi-weekly Press Review

1 - 15 February 2015

Review no. 86



Press Review 1—15 February 2015

Table of Contents

	Pages
African Union	
- Experts Meeting On the Elaboration of Operational Documents for the Multinational Joint Task Force (mnjtf) of the Member States of the Lake Chad Basin Commission and Benin Against the Boko Haram Terrorist Group	4
Terrorism in Africa	
Cameroon	
- EXCLUSIF:LE NOUVEAU PLAN DE BOKO HARAM POUR ANNEXER LE CAMEROUN	7
Egypt	
- Opinion: The Muslim Brotherhood will never change	11
Libya	
- The Libyan Revolution and Its Aftermath describes the fragile state of post	13
Mali	
- Connexion des réseaux terroristes au sahel : La montée en puissance de Boko Haram, une source d'instabilité pour le Mali	15
- Incapacité à reconquérir le nord du Mali, mauvaise gouvernance financière, promesses électorales non tenues... IBK lâché par certains de ses soutiens religieux et politiques	19
Nigeria	
- Boko Haram s'internationalise	23
- Ban Ki-Moon Supports Regional Troops Against Boko Haram	26
- Nigeria postponing Feb. 14 vote amid Boko Haram violence	28
South Sudan	
- Kidnapping of Officials and Aid Worker is an Act of Terror	30
International Organizations	
UN	
- UN alarmed at rising attacks against schoolgirls worldwide	32
- Effective Response to Terrorism Must Leverage International Community's Resources, Examine All Aspects of Problem, Deputy Secretary-General Says At Briefing	34

Terrorism in the World

- ULTIMATE WEAPON OF THE GLOBAL ELITE	36
- "La rivalité entre sunnites et chiites amplifie la menace terroriste"	39
Canada	
- Le financement du terrorisme sous la loupe d'un comité	41
- Un observatoire sur la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent voit le jour au Québec	45
France	
- Spotlight: Terrorism battle requires fight against ideas	49
Iraq	
- Daech, la « start-up du terrorisme » devenue multinationale	51
- Opinion: ISIS's Glorification of Terror	55
Jordan	
- Opinion: Reaching Arab hearts and minds	57
Russia	
- Poutine et le « printemps islamiste»	60
Spain	
- SPAIN PROPOSES STANDARDIZATION OF EU COUNTER-TERRORISM LAWS	63
USA	
- Opinion/Editorial: Appropriate time to seek war powers against terrorism	65
- Himes: U.S. needs strategy to halt terrorism	67
- America's Counter-Terrorism Culture	69
- Rall: Why are we at war against ISIS	76
- L'Europe prête à lutter contre le terrorisme, les solutions demeurent insaisissables	78
- War on Radical Islam Is Not a CT Strategy	80
Yemen	
- GCC CALLS FOR UN ACTION	85
- Opinion: Yemen's chaos is a threat to the Arab world	88

Experts Meeting On the Elaboration of Operational Documents for the Multinational Joint Task Force (mnjtf) of the Member States of the Lake Chad Basin Commission and Benin Against the Boko Haram Terrorist Group

PRESS RELEASE

Experts of the four Member States of the Lake Chad Basin Commission - LCBC (Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria) and Benin gathered at the Palais des Congrès de Yaoundé, Cameroon, from 5 to 7 February 2015, to finalise the operational documents of the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) to fight against the terrorist group Boko Haram. They were assisted in this by experts of the African Union (AU) Commission. Experts and officials from other African regional organisations and bilateral and multilateral partners, particularly from the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU) and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), also took part in the meeting.

The meeting was opened by His Excellency Mr Edgard Alain Mebe Ngo'o, Minister Delegate at the Presidency of the Republic of Cameroon in charge of Defence. The opening session was also marked by speeches made by the representatives of the LCBC and the AU Commission. The speakers recalled the objectives of the meeting and the nature of the menace that should be confronted. They congratulated the Heads of States of the LCBC countries and Benin for their timely reaction to the threat of Boko Haram, and thanked the Chairperson of the AU Commission, Dr Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma, and the Peace and Security Council (PSC) of the AU for having put the question of the fight against Boko Haram at the top of the agenda of the 24th Summit of Heads of State and Government of the AU, held in Addis Ababa, on 30 and 31 January 2015. They reiterated their dismay at the despicable atrocities committed by Boko Haram and expressed their profound gratitude to all the forces already engaged in operations against the terrorist group.

Referring to the communiqué of the 484th meeting of the PSC held in Addis Ababa, at the level of Heads of State and Government, on 29 January 2015, which authorised the deployment of the MNJTF; the conclusions of the 5th meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Defence the LCBC Member States held in Niamey, Niger, on 20 January 2015; and the final communiqué of the extraordinary summit of the countries of LCBC held on 7 October 2014, as well as to other relevant decisions of the AU and the LCBC, the experts undertook an in-depth analysis of the nature and evolution of Boko Haram, the regional expanses of its activities in the Lake Chad Basin region, the logistical and operational capabilities of the group, and the impact of its atrocities on civilian populations, as well as on the social and economic infrastructures of the regions where it operates.

The experts finalised the draft concept of operation (CONOPS), defining the strategic coordination, elements of mission support and the rules of engagement that shall prevail in the conduct of military operations. In this regard, they recalled the mandate of the Force as follows:

- (i) create a safe and secure environment in the areas affected by the activities of Boko Haram and other terrorist groups, in order to significantly reduce violence against civilians and other abuses, including sexual- and gender-based violence, in full compliance with international law, including international humanitarian law and the UN Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP);
- (ii) facilitate the implementation of overall stabilization programmes by the LCBC Member States and Benin in the affected areas, including the full restoration of state authority and the return of IDPs and refugees; and
- (iii) facilitate, within the limit of its capabilities, humanitarian operations and the delivery of assistance to the affected populations.

The experts agreed to establish the Headquarters of the Force in N'Djamena, Chad, as per the conclusions of the 5th meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Defence of the LCBC Member States of 20 January 2015, and proposed the establishment of a central military command and a Joint Coordination Mechanism that will have control over troops contributed by the LCBC Member States and Benin. They defined the Area of Operation of the Force based on the current areas of activities of the terrorist group, while allowing the Force Commander to seek the authorisation of the competent authorities of the LCBC for the extension of this Area should it be necessary.

They highlighted the importance of denying Boko Haram of any support it might build on the instrumentalisation of Islam, whose disapproval of and distance from the criminal activities of the group they affirmed. They agreed, in the framework of their communications, to undertake sensitisation and counter-propaganda campaigns in this regard.

The representatives of Benin, Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria announced contributions of 8 700 military, police and civilian personnel. Recalling the integrated and multidimensional nature of the Force, they agreed that the various contributions would reflect the various military units and police and civilian capacities necessary for the effective implementation of the mandate of the Force. They tasked a small group to work, in the coming days, on these details and to prepare an initial budget before they forward the Concept of Operations to the PSC for approval and forward transmission to the UN Security Council.

The participants expressed their profound gratitude to the authorities and people of Cameroon for the warm welcome and all the practical arrangements made to ensure the success of the meeting. They thanked the AU Commission for its effective facilitation, through its experts, of the different working groups of the meeting,

and expressed appreciation to all the partners who have not waned in their multi-form supports to the efforts of the countries of the region and regional and continental organisations.

Terrorism in Africa

Cameroon

EXCLUSIF:LE NOUVEAU PLAN DE BOKO HARAM POUR ANNEXER LE CAMEROUN :: CAMEROON



D'après plusieurs informations, la dernière phase de l'opération d'envhaissement de la secte islamiste Boko Haram d'une partie du Cameroun se précise. Essuyant des pertes depuis quelques jours, la secte islamiste se prépare, d'après plusieurs informations, à frapper un grand coup qui pourrait être définitif.

Dans six semaines est fixée l'extermination des bases de la secte au Nigéria par l'armée. Celle-là même qui, à maintes reprises a essuyé des revers compterait aujourd'hui se rattraper ? D'après plusieurs stratégies, sans lâcher un tant soit peu la pres-

sion avec des attaques surprises en territoire camerounais, la secte islamiste compterait augmenter son effectif avec le ralliement de plusieurs mécontents du régime nigériens islamistes salafistes de préférence et plusieurs frères d'armes qui viendront de plusieurs fronts de l'Afrique. Jusqu'à présent, si des informations font état d'un désintérêt de Boko Haram pour le renversement du Président de la République du Cameroun S.E Paul Biya, par contre d'autres précisent avec quelques retenues que Boko Haram voudrait à l'observation s'installer dans une zone d'exploitation de richesses aux fins d'entretenir ses hommes. Cette dernière idée qui s'appuie sur l'existence jadis de la rébellion du biafra qui avait justement permis à beaucoup de dignitaires du Nord du Nigéria de s'enrichir et de financer Boko Haram lors de sa création.

Selon des recouplements, lorsque l'ancien chef de la nébuleuse néfaste Boko Haram Mohamed Yusuf est arrêté, torturé et éliminé par les autorités nigérianes en 2009, plusieurs hauts cadres et combattants de la secte prirent la poudre d'escampette pour se réfugier pour des uns au Cameroun et précisément dans les Monts Mandarás, à Tokombéré et à Fotokol. Sans avoir emmenés avec eux des armes, ils envisagèrent de reconstituer à partir du Cameroun la reconstruction de la nébuleuse.

La corruption qui favorisera le ravitaillement en armes venus du Soudan pour ravitailler les frères d'armes restés au Nigéria permettra à la secte en 2010 d'annoncer avoir trouvé un nouveau Chef ; Abubakar Shekau.

Un personnage fantasque qui va dévier les objectifs de la secte en posant des actes que le fondateur Mohamed Yusuf n'avait envisagé au départ. D'après des témoignages, Mohamed Yusuf, lorsqu'il crée Boko Haram qui signifie le rejet de la culture occidentale tirera son idéologie dans l'exploitation des richesses au Nigéria qui fait entretenir une gouvernance qui ne privilégie pas l'alternance du pouvoir qui devait selon plusieurs haut dignitaires du Nord du Nigéria faire la navette entre le Sud et le Nord à chaque fois. Cette élite du Nord consciente qu'il est utile d'avoir un moyen de pression sur le pouvoir d'Abuja afin de faire entendre leur volonté financera Mohamed Yusuf pendant des années. D'après nos informations, les trafics en tout genre qui avaient pour singularité la terre propice du Cameroun pour écouler leurs prébendes réussiront à renflouer les caisses de la secte pendant des années. Le Cameroun et le Nigéria, pays d'une corruption exagérée avaient permis la facilitation de cet enrichissement. Nos informateurs parlent alors de la vente de « Zoua-Zoua », de médicaments, de textiles, de réalisation de marchés fictifs au Nigéria, etc. comme moyens financiers ainsi que les raptus qu'on appelait auparavant « phénomène coupeurs de route ». Pour ce qui concerne les raptus, la rapine et autres phénomènes décriés à l'Extrême Nord, la création du GPIGN qui viendra être remplacé par le BIR, permettra d'éliminer le phénomène l'instant d'un répit.

De 2009 à 2011, les services de renseignement américains et français recensent alors la fortune de la secte islamiste Boko Haram l'estimant à 33 milliards de Fcfa. De quoi s'acheter un arsenal militaire important pour des attaques en territoire ni-

gérien. Abubakar Shekau, héritier de la nébuleuse, dans une nouvelle politique radicalise les adeptes et change ainsi les objectifs de départ en convaincant les « Boko Haramistes » du bien fondé de mener des attaques en territoire nigérian pour élargir le Khalifat qui ira en droite ligne avec les objectifs de la religion musulmane de faire le djihad afin de faire régner les préceptes de l'islam. Les soutiens de Boko Haram commencent alors peu à peu à se désolidariser de cette nouvelle vision. Mais naît en Afrique et dans le monde une idéologie musulmane qui va ainsi en droite ligne avec la « nouvelle folie de Shekau ». Avec AlQaeda qui ne cesse de rallier des radicalistes musulmans dans le monde entier qui quittent leurs pays pour aller faire le djihad dans toutes les zones de conflits dans le monde, Boko Haram trouve ainsi en cette organisation quelques atomes crochus et vice-versa.

L'égo d'Abubakar Shekau va encore augmenter lorsque Muhammar Khadafi tombe sous le coup de la manipulation du peuple par l'occident, ce qui occasionne une fuite vers certaines zones désertiques de certains Fedayins ou Moudjahidins décidés à faire régner la terreur chez tous ceux qui collaborent avec l'Occident.

AQMI (Al Qaeda au Maghreb Islamique) au Mali, en Algérie, en Libye réussit sa première incursion au Mali et oblige les autorités maliennes à une scission du pays. Les Shebabs en Somalie qui font régner depuis des lustres la terreur dans ce pays faisant fuir les dirigeants qui administrent le pays à l'étranger, constituent un soutien important dans le ravitaillement en armes des alliés. Au Soudan du Nord avec le gouvernement El Béchir, des sources confirment d'un trafic important d'armes pour des destinations inconnues. Pour des uns le Cameroun aura été l'un des points de passage de cet arsenal.

Entouré d'alliés supposés, Boko Haram se sent protégé. Abubakar Shekau pouvait alors envisager des menaces envers des dirigeants qui veulent l'empêcher de faire l'expansion de son œuvre diabolique.

Le dernier baroud d'honneur de Shekau

Aujourd'hui les nouvelles attaques de la secte islamiste du côté du Niger où les prisons sont des cibles privilégiées parce que du côté du Cameroun, le Tchad ayant déjà rejoint les rangs de la coalition anti-Boko Haram, convergent vers la certitude d'une volonté de recrutement imminent et immédiat de combattants presqu'obligés de rejoindre ses rangs pour un assaut fulgurant. A part cette méthode qui sort de l'ordinaire, la secte voudrait également créer un corridor important quittant d'abord le Nigeria et ses territoires rasés pour le Niger en passant par le Mali pour rallier la Libye. Ce corridor, s'il réussit à être créé va malheureusement voir les rangs de Boko Haram grandir considérablement avec l'acquisition d'un équipement militaire, « vestige » de la guerre toujours entretenue en Libye.

Nos sources, en rentrant dans une profonde analyse, voient cette prochaine attaque comme un moyen rapide de diviser le Cameroun afin de s'installer dans une zone pourvoyeuse de richesses pour compenser les pertes de ces derniers mois de conflit. Ils évoqueraient une probable installation de Boko Haram dans des

zones couvrant Zina-Makary avec un important arsenal militaire. Avec son immense fortune engrangée et la mauvaise gouvernance qui frappe tous les pays de l'Afrique Noire y compris le brandit du paravent islam pour convaincre plusieurs adeptes, la secte islamiste serait persuadé de réussir son coup. Un potentiel de recrutement d'au moins 80 000 hommes qui vont déserter leurs positons pour porter main forte à leur allié est envisageable.

Comme rapport de force, si plusieurs informations ont déjà réussies à recenser le personnel militaire camerounais, il serait important de noter que la nouvelle force internationale qui prend fonction avec ses 8 700 soldats est une bouée de secours à n'en point douter pour riposter contre ces bandits.

L'armée camerounaise, d'après des estimations serait constituée de 45 000 hommes. 15 000 gendarmes, 6 000 soldats recrutés au sein du Bataillon d'Intervention Rapide (BIR), 3 000 recrutés au sein de la Garde Présidentielle, 3 à 4 000 recensés dans l'Aviation et la Marine, 2 à 3 000 recensés et étant au service des hauts gradés ou effectuant des besognes qui n'auraient rien à voir avec la défense de l'intégrité nationale. Selon les mêmes estimations, le Cameroun en lançant un vaste recrutement dans les forces de défense compte dans les prochains jours voir entrer au sein de ses rangs 3 000 hommes et femmes ainsi que 2 000 soldats au sein du BIR.

A l'heure actuelle, le Cameroun possèderait 15 000 hommes et femmes opérationnels dans tous les corps de défense et sécurité. Avec un déploiement officiel de 6 000 hommes pour sauvegarder l'intégrité du territoire du côté de l'Extrême Nord, d'après des sources, notre armée éprouve d'énorme difficulté. D'après Stéphane Akoa, le Cameroun ne pourrait indéfiniment augmenter son personnel militaire pour cette guerre qui couté déjà assez au contribuable. L'expert précise même que si le Cameroun continue dans cette logique de remplacement des effectifs, il faudrait s'attendre à l'avenir à une situation incontrôlable.

De l'autre côté, des informations font état de ce que Boko Haram donnerait entre 400 000 à 500 000 Fcfa à ses recrues sans compter 20 000 Fcfa/Semaine et plusieurs autres cadeaux pour rejoindre ses rangs. La précarité de la vie et le sentiment d'injustice qui a grandi dans plusieurs pays africains ne permettent d'envisager l'avenir avec quiétude. Seulement au Libéria, la possibilité de recruter des miliciens pour des salaires de 50 000 Fcfa/mois pour combattre est un aveu certain pour l'entretien d'un conflit interminable qui s'est ouvert dans la sous-région Afrique Centrale. Le Cameroun sera-t-il capable de faire rallier à sa cause des volontés quand on sait qu'il a brillé par une diplomatie d'absence ? Just Wait and See.

<http://www.camer.be/>

Egypt

Opinion: The Muslim Brotherhood will never change

In March 2014 Saudi Arabia's Ministry of Interior issued a list of groups banned from operating within the Kingdom. The list, which was issued as part of a royal order, included groups such as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS,) Al-Qaeda, the Al-Nusra Front, Hezbollah in Saudi Arabia and the Houthi movement. But what was remarkable was that the Muslim Brotherhood was also included on this list of groups designated as terrorist organizations.

Fast-forward to today and France is considering the status of the Muslim Brotherhood. Prior to this, Britain set up a special commission to investigate the Islamist group's views and practices. In the Arab world, Egypt and the UAE of course, both regard the Brotherhood as an illegal and illegitimate group.

There is currently a global trend towards reconsidering the definition of the Brotherhood out of the sense that its very existence, ideology and activities represent a major source of harmful political activities and extremism.

Without people like Sayyid Qutb and Hassan Al-Banna, and books like *Milestones*, and *The Messages of Da'wa*, or concepts like *Al-Hakimiyyah* (divine rule) and *Ustaziatul Alam* (mastership of the world,) there would have been no Islamist terrorism today. There would be no terrorist chiefs like Osama Bin Laden, Ayman Al-Zawahiri, Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi or Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi. There would be no Khalid Islambouli, who assassinated President Sadat. There would be no jihadist ideologues like Abdullah Azzam, Abdul Majeed Al-Zindani.

All these figures initially drew their ideology from the Brotherhood source. The Brotherhood served as a social and educational incubator for even more dangerous views and ideologies. Even the Brotherhood's own views represent a destructive and misleading web of deception, the group forces its own worldview on its followers, ensuring that they view everything from just one narrow perspective.

Saudi Arabia's antagonistic stance towards the Brotherhood is nothing new. After the Gulf War, the Brotherhood and Saudi Arabia shared a complex relationship that was formed under well-known historical circumstances, but the Brotherhood betrayed the Kingdom after it had initially sought its assistance. Following this, Saudi Arabia changed its view of the Islamist group and its followers and their relationship gradually changed from one of tacit trust to outright suspicion.

In a 2002 interview with Kuwait's *Alseyassah* newspaper, former Saudi Interior Minister and Crown Prince Naif Bin Abdulaziz, said: "I say it without hesitation: All of our problems . . . came from the Muslim Brotherhood. When their circumstances became tough and gallows were set up for them in their countries, they [Brotherhood] relied on the Kingdom, which saved their lives and their dignity and made them safe. We hosted them, which is our duty . . . We found work for

them . . . opened our schools and universities for them, but unfortunately they did not forget their previous links and were set on recruiting people and establishing [political] trends and turned against the Kingdom."

The former Crown Prince, may God rest his soul, ended his statement with a quote from the Qu'ran. "Is the reward for good [anything] but good?" [Surat Al-Rahman; Verse 55].

If the Brotherhood abandons its deceitful habits, then they are welcome. Otherwise, things will remain the same.

<http://www.aawsat.net/>

Libya

Book review: The Libyan Revolution and Its Aftermath describes the fragile state of post

February 12, 2015



A child looks at the portraits of some of the 1,200 victims of the 1996 Abu Salim prison massacre by the regime in the Libyan rebel stronghold of Benghazi on April 2, 2011. Odd Andersen / AFP

Among the various mementoes accumulated from many visits to Libya over the years, a massive broken padlock is the starker reminder of the 2011 revolution. I took it from the notorious Abu Salim prison in Tripoli shortly after the fall of the Qaddafi regime. Macabre on one level, it nevertheless seemed an apposite symbol of incarceration and liberation, a bolt of light after four decades of gloom and despair. The fact that it was made in Italy, the former colonial power and oppressor, only added to the symbolism.

Walking through the prison provided a brief, harrowing glimpse into the shattered lives of those who had dared to challenge the regime. The sickly smell of disease was over-powering. Bottles of medicine were scattered everywhere. We walked through the cells with a middle-aged Libyan man, a former prisoner who had come to revisit the scene of the crimes. He broke down in tears as we roamed through the complex, recalling the cruelty and injustice he had suffered.

Abu Salim occupies a prominent place in the hierarchy of atrocities perpetrated by the Qaddafi regime. It was here, in 1996, that 1,200 prisoners were killed in cold blood, mowed down by machine guns, forklifted into refrigerated trucks and driven away.

Libyans have long memories. The legacy of that massacre lived on, so much so that Abu Salim proved the touchpaper for the revolution. Street protests by relatives of those who had been killed swelled into a broader uprising that erupted in the eastern city of Benghazi in February 2011, fuelled by the arrest of one of the lawyers who represented the families. Then came Colonel Qaddafi's blood-curdling warning of more massacres, a strategic miscalculation that drew in Nato, hastened the demise of the regime and cost him his life.

Abu Salim had other unintended consequences. It incubated a generation of religious extremists, nurturing over many years the narrow Salafist ideology that is a significant, but by no means the only, reason for the country's current collapse into turmoil. In an intensely revealing chapter in *The Libyan Revolution and Its Aftermath*, Mary Fitzgerald, an Irish Times correspondent who has spent the past year living in Libya, chronicles the bewildering internal battles between the various militant factions whose attempts to reconcile differences within an umbrella movement failed and fractured, a microcosm of the new post-revolutionary Libya.

It isn't difficult to discern a visceral dislike of democracy among this constituency. Some sent death threats – the lingua franca of their political discourse – to members of the National Transitional Council, or what they called, in a play on its Arabic name, the Majlis Al Wadani – Pagan Council.

Death threats and executions have since proliferated in eastern Libya, the headquarters of both religious militants and separatists, notably the killing of the United States ambassador Chris Stevens in 2012. If anyone doubted that the jihadists of ISIL could extend their reach into Tripoli, the bloody January 27 attack on the Corinthia Hotel, long a redoubt for local politicians, diplomats and foreign businessmen, served as another reminder that when national politics stall, the terrorists move in.

The attack also revealed the deadly consequences of the Libyan state's loss of the monopoly of violence. Once the conservative hardliners had suffered heavy defeats in last summer's elections, they quickly revealed their true colours, refusing to recognise the results, forming the armed Libya Dawn Alliance and seizing Tripoli. The election winners relocated to the eastern city of Tobruk and took up the name Dignity. Hence the two parliaments, the two notional governments, the two leaders in two cities. A new Dawn in the West, Dignity in the East – with little prospect in the short term of realising either. Pity the ordinary Libyans, 400,000 of whom from a population of six million have been displaced.

Mali

Connexion des réseaux terroristes au sahel : La montée en puissance de Boko Haram, une source d'instabilité pour le Mali

Minimiser au départ par le pouvoir nigérian, qui misait visiblement sur un étouffement progressif, Boko Haram s'est bien enraciné dans le nord-est du Nigéria pour devenir la plus grande source d'instabilité pour la bande sahélo-saharienne. En dehors bien sûr du foyer libyen. Sa montée en puissance doit préoccuper les autorités maliennes à cause de sa connexion avec le Mujao et Aqmi au nord du pays.

Minimiser au départ par le pouvoir nigérian, qui misait visiblement sur un étouffement progressif, Boko Haram s'est bien enraciné dans le nord-est du Nigéria pour devenir la plus grande source d'instabilité pour la bande sahélo-saharienne. En dehors bien sûr du foyer libyen. Sa montée en puissance doit préoccuper les autorités maliennes à cause de sa connexion avec le Mujao et Aqmi au nord du pays.



Des islamistes de Boko Haram dans une vidéo de propagande publiée le 9 novembre 2014

«Nous sommes profondément horrifiés par la tragédie que Boko Haram continue d'infliger à nos populations. Kidnapper des jeunes filles dans les écoles, brûler des villages, terroriser des communautés entières et les tuer. Nous devrions tous déclarer cet état de fait comme inacceptable» ! C'est le coup de gueule de la présidente de la Commission de l'Union africaine (Ua), Mme Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma. C'était à l'occasion de l'ouverture du conseil des ministres de l'Ua en prélude au sommet des chefs d'Etat tenu les 30 et 31 janvier 2015 à Addis-Abeba.

La sud-africaine souhaite une action commune pour enrayer une menace devenue régionale. « A l'origine, cela semblait être un groupe avec un impact purement lo-

cal. Maintenant, on le voit s'aventurer de plus en plus loin en Afrique de l'ouest et du centre...» !

Aujourd'hui, l'Union africaine et les Nations unies n'ont plus le choix face à ce péril sociopolitique et économique. Elles vont devoir s'engager dans la lutte ! N'en déplaisent à Abuja. En effet, en pleine campagne électorale, une telle mobilisation générale n'est pas du goût du président Goodluck Jonathan car synonyme de son échec face au groupe terroriste.

Malheureusement pour lui, la menace d'instabilité voire de tragédie humaine que représente Boko Haram va au-delà du Nigéria. C'est la sécurité et la stabilité politique et économique de toute la bande sahélo-saharienne voire de toute l'Afrique qui est aujourd'hui en jeu.

Il est par exemple utopique de vouloir neutraliser le terrorisme dans le nord du Mali sans anéantir ses sources de financements. Et ce n'est en fait qu'un secret de polichinelle qu'il y a une connexion entre Boko Haram et des réseaux sahéliens comme AQMI et le Mujao qui écument le septentrion malien.

La présidente de la Commission de l'UA a donc raison de rappeler qu'on ne «doit pas voir le problème Boko Haram comme une seule menace pour le Nigeria et ses voisins. Si celle-ci n'est pas jugulée, nous serons tous en danger».

Un avis partagé par Ban Ki-moon qui dénonce «la brutalité sans nom» des miliciens de Boko Haram et estime qu'il faut une «coopération régionale et internationale» pour lutter contre cette organisation criminelle.

Boko Haram-Mujao-Aqmi : une connexion dangereuse pour le Mali

«Boko Haram est aujourd'hui une menace pour une grande partie de l'Afrique subsaharienne. Et il a toujours eu des connexions avec Aqmi et surtout avec le Mujao (Mouvement pour l'unicité et le jihad en Afrique de l'ouest) dont Gao est le principal sanctuaire depuis 2012», s'inquiète un jeune leader très actif dans les mouvements de défense de la Cité des Askia (Gao) pendant l'occupation Jihadiste. Une crainte partagée par d'autres leaders communautaires et des responsables d'Ong qui ne souhaitent pas ouvertement s'exprimer sur la question pour des «raisons de sécurité».

Même s'il ne les a pas ouvertement revendiqués, les récentes attaques contre les forces de la Minusma dans la région de Gao, notamment contre le contingent nigérien, sont imputés au Mujao par des experts militaires.

«Le Mujao a été très affaibli par l'opération Serval, mais il n'a pas été totalement anéanti parce qu'il est en connexion avec Boko Haram qui lui fournit non seulement des combattants, mais aussi les moyens logistiques», souligne un officier et ex-agent des services de renseignement maliens.

Un avis partagé par de nombreux experts des questions de sécurité dans la bande sahélo-saharienne. «Il y a beaucoup de similitudes entre les attaques contre le

contingent nigérien ainsi que les récentes opérations contre l'armée malienne à Nampala et à Ténenkou. Comme Boko Haram, ces assaillants se déplacent à motos pour perpétrer leurs attentats ou préparer les attaques», nous explique l'un d'eux.

«Une stratégie qui leur permet non seulement d'échapper à la surveillance aérienne, mais aussi de s'infiltrer dans les villes sans éveiller des soupçons. C'est ainsi qu'ils ont réussi à surprendre nos soldats à Nampala et à Ténenkou», poursuit-il.

On sait que, en 2012, des éléments de Boko Haram ont combattu aux côtés du Mujao qui disposait de 100 à 200 combattants à Gao. En janvier 2013, des hommes de l'organisation nigériane ont aussi participé à la bataille de Konna contre les forces armées maliennes et les soldats français de l'Opération Serval. En mars 2013, dans une étude pour Al Arabiya Institute for Studies, l'académicienne tunisienne Alaya Allani écrivait que le MUJAO comptait environ 1 000 combattants qui se composaient en partie d'éléments étrangers, dont 300 membres du Polisario et 200 hommes de Boko Haram.

Aujourd'hui, analyse l'officier de la S.E, la montée en puissance de cette organisation terroriste a donc de quoi inquiéter au Mali. «Récemment, des assaillants avaient tenté d'enlever des enfants dans plusieurs localités du nord du pays, comme le fait Boko Haram au Nigeria. Heureusement que la présence des groupes d'auto-défense ne leur facilite pas la tâche dans cette région», indique l'ancien officier de la S.E.

Pis, poursuit cet ex-agent des services secrets maliens, «les contingents nigériens (Ansongo) et tchadiens (Aguelhok) sont aujourd'hui indispensables à la Minusma. Ces deux pays sont plus que jamais menacés de nos jours par Boko Haram à leurs frontières avec le Nigeria».

La stratégie vise sans doute à les occuper plus sur leurs propres territoires. Cela peut les affaiblir au Mali où ils rappelleront sans doute leurs éléments les plus aguerris. Sans compter que les alliés de Boko Haram, comme le Mujao, peuvent aussi bénéficier de cette montée en puissance en termes de financement et de moyens logistiques.

Ce qui expliquerait sans doute la multiplication des attentats contre la Minusma et des attaques contre l'armée malienne.

Avec l'offensive militaire antiterroriste en engagée au nord du Mali par les forces onusiennes (Minusma) et françaises (Serval puis Barkhane), de nombreuses organisations terroristes comme Aqmi, Mujao et Boko Haram se sont davantage rapprochés pour ne pas être anéanties.

Les services de renseignement des pays du Sahel, notamment ceux de l'Algérie, ont toujours établi des relations très étroites entre Boko Haram, Aqmi et le Mujao.

Raison de plus pour que les Nations unies appuient l'UA dans la formation d'une force panafricaine contre ces illuminés nigérians ! C'est l'une des conditions sine qua non de la réussite des missions assignées à la Minusma !

<http://www.maliweb.net/>

Mali: Incapacité à reconquérir le nord du Mali, mauvaise gouvernance financière, promesses électorales non tenues... IBK lâché par certains de ses soutiens religieux et politiques

12 février 2015



L'élan populaire, qui a conduit au quasi plébiscite du candidat Ibrahim Boubacar Kéita, lors de la présidentielle de 2013 s'est, petit à petit, dissipé. Laissant derrière lui un goût de regret à peine voilé au point que de nombreux soutiens du chef de l'Etat n'arrivent plus à cacher leur déception.

Tel est le cas du président du Haut Conseil islamique, l'imam Mahmoud Dicko, qui vient de reconnaître que la gouvernance IBK ne marche pas comme souhaitée. Un discours similaire est tenu dans les milieux proches de l'abjecte junte de 2012.

Une chose est de conquérir le pouvoir, une toute autre est d'être en mesure de répondre aux attentes les plus urgentes de ses compatriotes car, dit-on, gouverner c'est prévoir, c'est apporter des solutions aux problèmes de ses concitoyens.

La résolution du problème du nord est aujourd’hui, à n’en point douter, une grosse épine dans le pied de nos gouvernants. Face à ce drame qui ne cesse d’endeuiller les paisibles populations, comme récemment avec les tragédies de Gao, Tabankort, Nampala, Ténenkou, etc, l’impuissance des dirigeants est patente et la déception des populations encore plus grande.

Or, faut-il rappeler que le candidat IBK avait été peint comme l’incarnation même de l’autorité et de la fermeté? C’est ainsi qu’il était apparu aux yeux de ses compatriotes comme la seule personnalité à même de « siffler la fin de la récréation ». « *IBK la solution !* » résonnait comme une sorte de formule magique du genre « *sésame, ouvres-toi !* » de la fable « *Ali Baba et les quarante voleurs* ».

C'est ce qui a fait que certains courants religieux et les milieux plus ou moins inféodés à la junte militaire d'alors se sont empressés de mouiller le maillot pour faire élire IBK à la tête du pays. Dans plusieurs mosquées et camps militaires, la consigne avait été formellement donnée de voter massivement pour le candidat du « *Mali d'abord* ». Mais après son élection, les fruits peinent à combler les attentes des fleurs. Les fleurs des belles promesses du « *pas un seul centimètre carré du pays ne sera cédé à personne !* ». Aujourd’hui, même si l'on est aveugle, l'on reconnaît aisément que la région de Kidal et plusieurs cercles des autres régions du Nord sont quasiment cédés à des bandes de criminels, terroristes et jihadistes.

L'impuissance face au drame du septentrion

Par ailleurs, après avoir été obligé de se mettre à dos le pouvoir kaki, alors sous la botte du capitaine-général putschiste Amadou Aya Sanogo, en décapitant toutes les reliques de la rétrograde et criminelle junte, qui a failli faire sombrer le Mali dans l'abîme en 2012, le président Ibrahim Boubacar Kéita n'a pas pu convaincre ses compatriotes sur sa maîtrise de la situation du pays. La timide embellie observée après le scabreux dossier de l'avion présidentiel et du contrat des équipements militaires semble désormais évanescante avec la situation au nord, qui s'aggrave ces dernières semaines, plongeant du coup tout le pays dans une troublante phase d'incertitude.

En effet, le casse-tête sécuritaire du septentrion malien provoque aujourd’hui plus qu'une insomnie chez la plupart des Maliens. Le récent drame de Gao l'atteste aisément. Les sages et les jeunes de la Cité des Askia pouvaient se désoler : »*C'est aux dirigeants d'assurer notre sécurité. C'est pour cela que nous les avons choisis. S'ils ne le font pas, nous prendrons nos responsabilités et ce n'est pas bon pour un Etat moderne* ».

Comme un avertissement adressé au président de la République, dont il a beaucoup contribué à l'élection à la magistrature suprême du pays, le président du Haut conseil islamique du Mali, Mahmoud Dicko, vient de sonner, lui-aussi, le tocsin de la grande déception qui envahit le peuple malien, composé à 90% d'adeptes de la religion musulmane. C'est le week-end dernier que cet imam que l'on dit très in-

fluent sur l'électorat a fini par jeter un gros pavé dans la mare en déclarant à la tribune d'un forum du mouvement Sabati 2012 que le chef de l'Etat « *a trébuché* » dans sa gestion du pouvoir.

Soutien et ami personnel de longue date du président de la République, Ibrahim Boubacar Kéita, le président de l'organisation faîtière de la communauté musulmane a mis à profit la tribune de ses protégés de Sabati 2012 pour rappeler le premier magistrat de la République à l'ordre. La rencontre se tenait devant près 300 délégués et invités de marque. Faut-il rappeler que c'est par conviction que Sabati 2012 a appelé les musulmans à voter Ibrahim Boubacar Kéïta, lors de la dernière élection présidentielle ? Même si le contexte n'y est pas favorable, l'actuel locataire du palais de Koulouba est, à leurs yeux, en train de perdre, peu à peu, la confiance du peuple malien. Pour, dit-on, des promesses non tenues.

Sabati 2012 resté sur sa faim

Le président du Mouvement Sabati 2012, Moussa Boubacar Ba, tout en reconnaissant que le président IBK est venu aux affaires dans un contexte particulièrement difficile, regrette tout de même l'état actuel de la nation : corruption généralisée, de nombreux militaires maliens faits prisonniers pendant que l'Etat relâche des terroristes incarcérés par nos forces armées, l'armée ne contrôle plus certaines localités du Nord...une année après son élection, la communauté internationale tourne dos au Mali.

Et pire, le projet de loi relatif au code de la famille serait à nouveau sur la table de l'Assemblée Nationale-et les députés sont prêts à le voter... Pour Moussa Boubacar Ba, « *Sabati 2012 a rempli sa part de contrat, la balle est désormais dans le camp du président IBK* ». Mais, malgré les difficultés du moment, qui ne sont pas insurmontables et pour éviter le chaos généralisé, le Mouvement Sabati 2012 renouvelle son soutien à IBK, en comptant sur un changement de méthode de gouvernance.

Même son de cloche chez le président du Haut Conseil Islamique du Mali, l'Imam Mahmoud Dicko. Il n'approuve pas du tout le mode de gouvernance actuel, où le chef de l'Etat est en passe de dévoyer du chemin sur lequel il a été placé (élu) par la majorité des Maliens. Pour l'Imam Dicko, connu pour son franc-parler, d'abord avec le défunt régime d'Amadou Toumani Touré, : « *la République se délabre* ». Et s'il doit choisir entre le Mali et son ami IBK, il préférerait le Mali d'autant que, dit-il, sa religion est au-dessus de tout.

Les regrets des soutiens putschistes et politiques

De la même façon, même dans les milieux militaires et politiques proches de l'ancienne junte, l'heure est à de lamentables regrets par rapport à ces dix huit premiers mois d'IBK à la tête du Maliba. Le parti SADI du bouillant Oumar Mariko, mentor du mouvement MP 22 (bras politique des putschistes) s'est empressé récemment de déclamer, du bout des lèvres, « *une mise au point* » pour se désolidariser des diatribes incendiaires des Pérignama Sylla demandant la démission d'IBK

pour incapacité à diriger le pays, combler les attentes placées en lui. Il semble que le parti SADI partage presque la même analyse, mais comme un pis-aller, faisant partie de la majorité présidentielle, il se refuse à emboucher publiquement la même trompette.

Quid des anciens affidés de Sanogo, qui seraient abasourdis par le démantèlement de leurs différents groupes de pression et d'intimidation ?

En clair, aujourd’hui, il sied que le pouvoir IBK se surpassé pour reprendre l’initiative afin de convaincre le peuple qu’il a des solutions à ses problèmes. Dans tous les cas, ce qui est sûr, c’est que loin d’être des menaces, ces critiques de plus en plus persistantes devraient être plutôt un viatique pour sonner une révolte chez le président IBK. S’il acceptait d’écouter son peuple et d’œuvrer dans l’intérêt de la Nation toute entière, tout le monde y gagnerait, lui-même le premier.

<http://maliactu.net/>

Nigeria

Boko Haram s'internationalise

10 FÉVRIER 2015



Des soldats nigériens en reconnaissance à la frontière avec le Nigeria.

Par Lyès Menacer

Après le Cameroun, le mouvement terroriste étend ses actions au Niger. Boko Haram a pris de court tout le monde en s'attaquant, durant le week-end et pour la première fois.

Boko Haram a pris de court tout le monde en s'attaquant, durant le week-end et pour la première fois, au Niger, au moment où toute l'attention était captée par le double-scrutin présidentiel et législatif du 14 février, reporté jusqu'au 28 mars prochain.

Certes, les spécialistes du terrorisme avaient signalé la présence de Boko Haram sur le sol nigérien, mais d'aucun n'a prévu que ce mouvement allait mener des attaques, qui lui ont d'ailleurs coûté cher à regarder le bilan officiel de ses pertes humaines. Jusqu'à samedi dernier, profitant de la faiblesse des États voisins aux frontières poreuses, Boko Haram s'était servi du Niger comme base-arrière pour faire transiter ses armes et pour aussi recruter des djihadistes ou en envoyer au Mali et en Libye.

Avant le Niger, Boko Haram a multiplié ses incursions en territoire camerounais, en s'attaquant à plusieurs villages du nord du Cameroun et enlevant des dizaines de

personnes. Si on peut expliquer, en partie, les raisons des attaques menées par ce mouvement au Cameroun, en remontant aux origines présumées de sa création, il est difficile de le faire pour le cas du Niger.

En effet, l'origine de ce mouvement islamiste, qui a obligé Abuja à repousser la date des élections présidentielle et législatives, ne remonterait pas à 2003, à en croire les chercheurs. «L'histoire de Boko Haram est floue, et les diverses recherches n'ont pas permis de remonter à ses origines. Selon plusieurs sources cependant, le groupe est né de l'action de quelques éléments extrémistes qui ont cherché à radicaliser des segments au nord du pays entre les années 1940 et 1990. Ses origines remonteraient aussi à un certain chef islamique camerounais, Muhammad Marwa, qui s'était installé à Kano dans les années 1980. Boko Haram aurait changé de forme depuis sa création en 2003», lit-on dans le numéro 59, datant de juin 2014, de la revue de l'Institut d'études et de sécurité (ISS).

Selon l'ISS, le mouvement islamiste a décidé de passer à l'action armée en 2009, après l'assassinat de son leader Mohammed Yusuf. En dehors de l'esprit de vengeance contre l'alliance Abuja-Yaoundé-Niamey, y-a-t-il d'autres explications à l'attaque de Boko Haram contre le Niger, qui partage avec le Nigeria une frontière longue de 1 479 km ? Abubakar Shekau, l'actuel leader de Boko Haram, avait, en effet, menacé les trois chefs d'Etat du Cameroun, du Nigeria et du Niger de leur livrer une guerre sans merci. La vidéo qu'il a postée, au lendemain du massacre de Baga (2 000 morts au moins), peut attester de cette hypothèse.

«Les rois d'Afrique, je vous défie de m'attaquer, je suis prêt», avait-il asséné dans cette vidéo, dans laquelle il avait revendiqué les tueries dans plusieurs villages de Baga qu'il a totalement rasé. Toutefois, il n'y a pas que la haine qui peut justifier une telle attaque sur les villages nigériens, frontaliers avec le Nord musulman du Nigeria, où Boko Haram a pris racine. Que cache donc l'action de Boko Haram en territoire nigérien, où l'armée française dispose de bases militaires dans le cadre de son opération Barkhane ?

Officiellement, Boko Haram demeure un groupe indépendant, surtout après avoir échoué à obtenir des financements de la part de la première nébuleuse terroriste islamiste Al-Qaïda à laquelle il avait fait allégeance durant quelques temps. Mais cela n'exclut pas une alliance stratégique de ce mouvement avec les autres groupes terroristes islamistes qui activent au Mali, au Niger, au Tchad et en Somalie. «Sous différentes dénominations, la secte Boko Haram avait déjà existé dans les années 1980. Et, sous différentes dénominations, elle existera toujours. Pour la réprimer, dans les années 1970 et 1980, l'armée avait tué quelques milliers de personnes», avait déclaré un responsable nigérian lors d'une rencontre sécuritaire organisée à Bamako. Mais cela n'a pas réglé le problème.

La répression menée par l'ancien président Olusegun Obasanjo n'a fait que radicaliser les membres de ce mouvement. Ce dernier a profité de la situation économique

du pays, de la corruption et d'une alliance conjoncturelle avec certains politiques locaux pour recruter et réorganiser sa base, dont on ignore le nombre exact d'éléments. Aujourd'hui, après avoir réussi à faire repousser la date de l'un des plus importants rendez-vous politique du Nigeria et ouvert, parallèlement, un nouveau front au Niger, Boko Haram serait-il tenté de sceller définitivement son alliance avec Al-Qaïda au Maghreb islamique et le Mouvement pour l'unicité et le jihad en Afrique de l'Ouest ? Cela semblerait être le cas. Et cette supposition avait déjà été émise par de nombreux chercheurs qui avaient averti contre un embrasement généralisé de l'ensemble de la région sahélo-saharienne.

L'«insertion (de Boko Haram) dans un djihadisme sous-régional aux connections globales, l'afflux d'armes libyennes en Afrique de l'Ouest et le recours aux attentats-suicides marquent, indubitablement, des nouveautés inquiétantes dans sa capacité de destruction et de nuisance. À cet égard, Boko Haram va encore faire parler d'elle dans les années à venir, et pas seulement au Nigéria ou au Mali», a résumé Antonin Tisseron, chercheur associé à l'Institut Thomas More, dans son analyse qui a été publiée en 2012 par Le Magazine de l'Afrique. Autrement dit, le pire est à venir.

<http://fr.allafrica.com/>

Nigeria: Ban Ki-Moon Supports Regional Troops Against Boko Haram

The United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, has expressed support for the establishment of a Multi-National Joint Task Force (MNJTF) to fight Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria's North-east region.

Ban made the affirmation while addressing newsmen on Saturday on the sidelines of ongoing African Union Assembly of Heads of State and Government in Addis Ababa.

The News Agency of Nigeria (NAN) reports that the AU Peace and Security Council at its 484th meeting, held on Jan. 29 at the level of Heads of State and Government, adopted a resolution to establish an initial 7,500 troops to combat the Boko Haram insurgents.

The resolution was sequel to a proposal presented to the council by countries in the Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC) and the Republic of Benin.

The LCBC countries - Nigeria, Cameroon, Niger and Chad - made the proposal for the continent to raise troops that could defeat the terrorist group currently expanding to borders of Cameroon and Chad.

It is believed that no fewer than 13,000 persons had been killed, while more than one million others displaced, since the group began attacks on villages in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa in 2009.

Ki-moon said: "I strongly support the AU's decision to establish a Multi-national Joint Taskforce, which is consistent with the UN Human Rights Policies. Regional and international efforts must focus on protecting communities in Northern Nigeria and across borders.

"The more than one million internally displaced people and refugees must be able to return home. We must stop the advance of this terrorist group. Once again, I repeat my call for immediate and unconditional release of those who have been abducted, particularly the girls from Chibok", the UN scribe said.

He noted that collaboration on peace and security had been one of the most important elements of the UN partnership with the AU. He disclosed that more than 80 per cent of U.N. peacekeeping operations were deployed in Africa.

"The UN Assembly in 2006 adopted a global counter terrorism strategy. Under this, we have established implementation taskforce and I, myself, established counter terrorism centres," he said.

According to him, addressing terrorism and extremism will uphold and respect human rights and protect the dignity of human lives. The UN scribe said Boko Haram, ISIL and all other terrorist groups had committed unspeakable brutality against humanity, adding that regional countries alone could not handle the situation.

"Therefore, I am asking that those terrorists should be addressed by regional and international coordination and cooperation. At the same time, the military means may not be the only solution. There should be a very careful analysis of the root causes why this kind of terrorist and violent extremism is spreading; it is another very important aspect. I am urging the whole international community which has capacity and influence to join hands as the UN is ready to fully cooperate with the AU," he said.

Ban Ki-moon expressed support for Nigeria and other African nations holding elections this year. "The AU has strong record of supporting democratic transitions. The AU and UN will work together to support member states to organise peaceful and credible polls," he said.

He urged African leaders and others around the world to respect constitutional and legal power limits by listening to their people and respect their aspirations being expressed through democratic processes.

<http://www.thisdaylive.com/>

Nigeria postponing Feb. 14 vote amid Boko Haram violence

February 7, 2015

DAKAR, Senegal (AP) — Nigeria's electoral commission will postpone Feb. 14 presidential and legislative elections for six weeks to give a new multinational force time to secure northeastern areas under the sway of Boko Haram, an official close to the commission told The Associated Press on Saturday.

Millions could be disenfranchised if next week's voting went ahead while the Islamic extremists hold a large swath of the northeast and commit mayhem that has driven 1.5 million people from their homes.

Civil rights groups staged a small protest on Saturday against any proposed postponement. Police prevented them from entering the electoral commission headquarters in Abuja, Nigeria's capital. Armed police blocked roads leading to the building.

Electoral officials were meeting with political parties Saturday, asking their views on a postponement requested by the national security adviser, politician Bashir Yusuf told reporters. He said the adviser argued the military will be unable to provide adequate security for the elections because of operations in the northeast.

The Nigerian official, who is knowledgeable of the discussions, said the Independent National Electoral Commission will announce the postponement later Saturday. He spoke on condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue.

A major offensive with warplanes and ground troops from Chad and Nigeria already has forced the insurgents from a dozen towns and villages in the past 10 days. Even greater military strikes by more countries are planned.

On Saturday, regional and African Union officials announced that Nigeria and its four bordering countries planned to deploy an 8,750-strong force against Boko Haram by next month. The plans, announced at the end of a three-day meeting in Cameroon, call for Chad and Nigeria to contribute 3,500 troops each, while Cameroon and Niger would contribute 750 each and Benin would contribute 250. The force would be headquartered in Chad's capital, N'Djamena. Details of funding, with the Africans wanting the United Nations and European Union to pay, may delay the mission.

Nigeria's home-grown extremist group has responded with attacks on one town in Cameroon and two in Niger this week. Officials said more than 100 civilians were killed and 500 wounded in Cameroon. Niger said about 100 insurgents and one civilian died in attacks Friday. Several security forces from both countries were killed.

International concern has increased along with the death toll: Some 10,000 killed

in the uprising in the past year compared to 2,000 in the four previous years, according to the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations.

The United States has been urging Nigeria to press ahead with the voting. U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry visited Nigeria two weeks ago and said that "one of the best ways to fight back against Boko Haram" was by holding credible and peaceful elections, on time.

"It's imperative that these elections happen on time as scheduled," Kerry said.

The elections had been called early. Elections in 2011 were postponed until April. May 29 is the deadline for a new government to be installed.

Officials in President Goodluck Jonathan's administration have been calling for a postponement.

Any delay is opposed by an opposition coalition fielding former military dictator Muhammadu Buhari, though the opposition stands to take most votes in the northeast.

Supporters of both sides are threatening violence if their candidate does not win. Some 800 people were killed in riots in the mainly Muslim north after Buhari, a Muslim, lost 2011 elections to Jonathan, a Christian from the south.

Analysts say the vote is too close to call, the most tightly contested election since decades of military dictatorship ended in 1999.

Jonathan's party has won every election since then but the failure of the military to curb the 5-year Islamic uprising, growing corruption and an economy hit by halved oil prices have hurt the president of Africa's biggest oil producer and most populous nation of about 170 million.

A postponement also will give electoral officials more time to deliver some 30 million voter cards. The commission had said the non-delivery of cards to nearly half of the 68.8 million registered voters was not a good reason to delay the vote.

<http://www.shepherdstownchronicle.com/>

South Sudan

South Sudan: Kidnapping of Officials and Aid Worker is an Act of Terror

The kidnapping of Dr. Chol Aruai, the Chairperson of National Bureau of Statistics and two workers of the international organisations by the rebels, was an act of terrorism which should be seriously condemned by the international community. The two persons who were kidnapped by the rebels are: 1. Mr. Mading Akueth (worker of Lutheran World Federation) and 2. Mr. Jacob Alier (worker of WFP).

On Tuesday, the UNWFP helicopter left Kongor to drop food in Uror and other rebel controlled areas before proceeding to Juba as per the agreement signed in Addis in 2014. According to the Agreement of Access to Humanitarian Assistance signed in Addis in 2014 by the Government of South Sudan and the rebels of Riek Machar, article two states that "no party to the conflict can commandeer, hijack and search vehicles and planes of the UN organisations in the process of the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the needy".

On Tuesday, Riek Machar's terrorists at Jiech Payam in Ayod County briefly detained the UNWFP helicopter and searched it in violations of the Agreement of Access to Humanitarian Assistance signed in Addis in 2014. After detaining the helicopter, they forcefully removed Dr. Chol Aruai, Mr. Mading Akueth and Mr. Jacob Alier in violation of the international norms, including the STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENT signed by the UN and the Republic of South Sudan in August, 2011.

The SOFA is what governed the relationship between UNMISS and the Republic of South Sudan. Article 11 of SOFA does not allow any armed group in South Sudan to enter by force into UN compounds or seize UN vehicles and planes. What the rebels did by detaining the UN helicopter and forcefully removing three persons were not only the violations of humanitarian laws but also the SOFA signed in 2011.

If we consider the rebels of Riek Machar as terrorists who are not bound by SOFA signed in 2011, what about the humanitarian laws which prohibit kidnapping, hijacking and seizure of UN vehicles and planes? There is no question that the brief detention of UN helicopter was an act of terrorism. Besides, forcefully removing persons from UN helicopter is another act of terrorism that violates the international humanitarian laws.

The kidnapping of Mading Akueth and Jacob Alier who work for Lutheran World Federation and WFP respectively demonstrates that they were targeted because they are Dinka. These two men are not officials of the Government of South Sudan. They work for international organizations and there was no justifiable reason for the rebels to kidnap them, apart from the fact that they are Dinka. Since targeting UN workers based on ethnicity is a violation of international laws, the UN must condemn the rebels for targeting the two workers because they are Dinka.

The world can attest that the Government of South Sudan has been observing all humanitarian laws since July, 9, 2011. For instance, the Government of South Sudan has never entered into UN compounds in the country to arrest Riek Machar's loyalists, who participated in the coup of December, 2013. This is because the Republic of South Sudan signed SOFA agreement with the UN in August, 2011.

What the UN should do, in order to punish the rebels for not observing humanitarian laws, is to indict the rebel commander, Gabriel Duop Lam, as a terrorist that must face international criminal law. Warlord Duop Lam is a well-known terrorist, who killed seven civil servants in cold-blood in Bor town in December, 2013. He began his rebellion by shooting two police officers because they happened to be Dinka.

The UN should not condone the kidnapping of international organizations' workers by the rebels because of their ethnicity. The kidnapping of Mading Akueth and Jacob Alier should not go unpunished. Riek Machar's terrorists commanded by warlord Duop Lam must be severely punished by the international community.

The author is an ambassador at the South Sudanese foreign ministry

The views expressed in the 'Comment and Analysis' section are solely the opinions of the writers. The veracity of any claims made are the responsibility of the author not Sudan Tribune.

<http://www.sudantribune.com/>

International Organizations

UN

UN alarmed at rising attacks against schoolgirls worldwide



Mary Altaffer

FILE - In this July 12, 2013 file picture, United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, right, holds Malala Yousafzai's hand while posing for photographers, at United Nations headquarters. Malala Yousafzai, the Pakistani teenager shot by the Taliban for promoting education for girls, addressed the United Nations. Girls in at least 70 countries have faced threats, violent attacks and other abuse for trying to go to school over the past five years, the United Nations human rights office said Monday Feb. 9, 2015. A report by the Geneva-based body noted that, despite some progress, girls still face difficulty getting an education in many countries around the world. (AP Photo/Mary Altaffer)

Posted: Monday, February 9, 2015 5:08 am | Updated: 8:02 am, Mon Feb 9, 2015.

BERLIN (AP) — Girls in at least 70 countries have faced threats, violent attacks and other abuse for trying to go to school over the past five years, the U.N. human rights office said Monday.

A report by the Geneva-based body noted that, despite some progress, girls still face difficulty getting an education in many countries around the world.

"Attacks against girls accessing education persist and, alarmingly, appear in some countries to be occurring with increasing regularity," the authors found.

The report cites as examples the kidnapping of nearly 300 schoolgirls in Nigeria last year, the shooting of education activist Malala Yousafzai in 2012 and the forced removal of girls from schools by the Somali extremist group al-Shabab in 2010.

"According to U.N. sources, more than 3,600 separate attacks against educational institutions, teachers and students were recorded in 2012 alone," it said.

The authors warned that the attacks have a "ripple effect" that sends a signal to parents of other girls that schools are not safe.

"The removal of girls from education due to fears for their security and concerns about their subsequent marriageability may result in additional human rights violations such as child and forced marriage, domestic violence, early pregnancy, exposure to other harmful practices, trafficking and sexual and labor exploitation," the report said.

The authors concluded that attacks against schoolgirls can't be prevented without addressing broader patterns of violence and discrimination against women and girls. They recommended devoting more money to helping that ensure girls can go to school without the threat of violence and promoting the benefits that universal access to education has for society as a whole.

<http://www.thepublicopinion.com/>

Africa: Effective Response to Terrorism Must Leverage International Community's Resources, Examine All Aspects of Problem, Deputy Secretary-General Says At Briefing

10 FEBRUARY 2015

Following are UN Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson's concluding remarks at an open briefing organized by the Counter-Terrorism Committee, in New York today:

Allow me to begin by thanking you Madame Chair, the Counter-Terrorism Committee and its Executive Directorate for having organized this important and timely briefing. I believe that the attendance in this room is a sign of the great interest among Member States to come to grips of this global threat.

Je tiens aussi à saluer la présence de Son Excellence Madame la Ministre de la justice de la France. Merci, Madame, de nous avoir rejoints aujourd'hui pour nous faire part de l'expérience de votre pays dans la lutte contre le terrorisme.

Les attaques terroristes perpétrées récemment au Nigéria et à Paris et les actes barbares de l'ISIS -- ou plutôt «Daech » -- démontrent de façon très claire que nous devons rester vigilants, déterminés et solidaires.

The international community must remain united in countering this threat. I can assure you all that the United Nations remains determined to work closely with Member States to strengthen capacities to prevent and combat terrorist groups and violent extremism.

In our responses to the threat, let us be aware that these extremist groups want to spread fear by competing in brutality. They seek to divide. They aim to polarize.

In our responses, we must not fall into their trap. We must stand fast for the values that are the cornerstones of the United Nations and of democratic societies. We must continue to be guided by our fundamental belief in human rights, and the principles of due process and the rule of law.

The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy makes clear that States cannot afford to deal with countering terrorism in isolation, or solely through military action which is sometimes necessary. A truly effective response must leverage the resources of the international community and look at all aspects of the problem, including the underlying factors leading to the recruitment of new terrorists.

The threat posed by terrorism can seem overwhelming, particularly to States with a weak criminal justice system. Several United Nations entities -- coordinated through the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force -- seek to strengthen national criminal justice systems. They do so by providing technical assistance and specialized training to criminal justice practitioners. This aims to enable them to respond to the complex nature of terrorist crimes in an accountable and transparent manner.

Recently, the United Nations organized training for Nigerian law enforcement and security officials in upholding human rights and the rule of law while fighting Boko Haram. A number of United Nations entities are developing a capacity-building programme under the umbrella of the [Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force] Working Group on Foreign Terrorist Fighters.

There is no standard, no universal solution to the complex and global threat of terrorism. While continuing to strengthen our cooperation, we must also take into account the context of each Member State and region. A worrying factor in several cases is the destructive interaction between organized crime and terrorism, as well as the linkage being established between extremist groups.

It is now crucially important to let every terrorist and terrorist group hear the same message from Member States, the United Nations, organizations and partners everywhere: the world stands united in denouncing and rejecting your atrocities. We will not accept to have societies living in fear and division. We will build a world of rule of law in which terror has no appeal and no place. We will be more determined than ever stand up for our common humanity. These are fundamental principles. Nothing you do to destruct, destabilize and destroy can take these values away from us.

<http://allafrica.com/stories/201502111114.html>

Terrorism in the World

TERRORISM: ULTIMATE WEAPON OF THE GLOBAL ELITE

12 FEBRUARY 2015



The usual definition of a ‘terrorist’ is simple: a person who uses violence in the pursuit of a political objective.

By this definition, the two major categories of terrorist are those political leaders who perpetrate state terror by attacking other countries (ranging from launching a war, perhaps following a false flag operation, to conducting a drone strike) – see the classic book '[The Real Terror Network: Terrorism in Fact and Propaganda](#)' – and those political leaders who use military violence in defense of a political objective. For insight into the damaged psychology of violent political leaders, see '[Understanding Obama and other People Who Kill](#)'. For much greater detail, see '[Why Violence?](#)'

However, the narrower Western public perception of a ‘terrorist’ is someone who attacks civilian targets usually, but not always, in the West (that is, far away from any war zone). This is why US drone strikes on civilians in countries like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen, for example, do not attract similar condemnation. Nor is there any condemnation of the Western use of terrorist groups as proxies in the war against the Syrian government. Consequently, groups like al Qaeda, Islamic State, al-Shabab and Boko Haram are labelled ‘terrorist’, essentially because they are presented as targeting and attacking ‘our’ civilians (or, as in the case of the girls kidnapped in Nigeria in 2014, ones with whom we are allowed to identify).

In his extensive research in the discipline of critical terrorism studies, Professor

Richard Jackson recently concluded that ‘every major terrorist attack on Western targets since 2001, including the attacks in Bali, Madrid, London and Boston, has been claimed by the perpetrators to be revenge for Western military intervention in the Middle East. Even the beheadings of Western hostages were justified by Islamic State captors as a response to US bombing. In fact, every major academic study of the past ten years has confirmed that Western military intervention and its policies in the Middle East, including support for the state of Israel, is the primary motivation for anti-Western terrorist attacks. In 1996, a major study by the CATO Institute concluded that U.S. military intervention overseas was the primary driver of anti-American terrorism. The [Chicago Project on Suicide Terrorism](#) has drawn the same fundamental conclusion.

Professor Jackson goes on to say ‘There is plenty of good research and information which could help to make reasonable and effective policies’. But, as Professor Jackson also knows, we would be naïve to believe that Western elites have any interest in such policies. And here’s why.

Terrorism is the global elite’s ultimate weapon and a primary instrument for achieving its policies. That is, terrorism enables the elite to manipulate geostrategic events in order to extend and consolidate its political, economic and social control over national societies and their resources. Here’s how it works.

Western elites and their allies wage war, in one form or another, on countries in other parts of the world (the Middle East and Africa being the preferred targets at the moment) specifically in order to induce a violent retaliation, including by groups which are secretly supported, materially and militarily, by these elites. See, for example, [‘A Shameless Movement: Boko Haram and the Politics of Terror’](#). Elites also conduct false flag operations, such as 9/11 – see, for example, [‘The Destruction of the World Trade Center: Why the Official Account of 911 Cannot Be True’](#) – and the attack on Charlie Hebdo – see, for example, [‘Charlie Hebdo Massacre: Another Staged Event to Incite War and Destroy Freedom?’](#) – to provoke public outrage. They then use the public outrage generated by these retaliations and the false flag operations to justify the continuation of their military attacks. This enables them to expand elite control both in the regions under attack and also domestically.

By harping on the ‘threat of terrorism’ to scare domestic populations, Western elites and their allies are able to maintain their perpetual war in pursuit of control of essential diminishing natural resources – particularly fossil fuels, strategic minerals and water – while increasing their social control of domestic populations through increasingly repressive domestic legislation that guts human rights and civil liberties, including those in relation to dissent, while increasing the powers of ‘intelligence’ services and the police as they consolidate the surveillance state. See, for example, [‘How Australia just became a “national security state”’](#).

Needless to say, the elite makes good use of its paid agents in academia, think

tanks, the corporate media and elsewhere to make sure that you are kept carefully misinformed and told what to think and how to react.

If you are inclined to resist the elite use of terror against the rest of us, you are welcome to sign the online pledge of '[The People's Charter to Create a Nonviolent World](#)'.

Terrorism is intended to frighten and kill fellow human beings. Those who conduct terrorism and those who endorse it are badly psychologically damaged.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/>

"La rivalité entre sunnites et chiites amplifie la menace terroriste"

Tous les ambassadeurs de Belgique se retrouvent cette semaine à Bruxelles pour les traditionnelles journées diplomatiques. Cette année, l'actualité de la menace terroriste s'est imposée à l'ordre du jour et le Coordinateur européen de la lutte antiterroriste, le Belge Gilles de Kerchove, était l'invité de la première journée ce lundi.



Gilles de Kerchove, le coordinateur européen de la lutte antiterroriste

Gilles de Kerchove a livré son analyse de l'évolution du monde musulman devant les ambassadeurs réunis à Bruxelles. Selon lui, plusieurs facteurs sont à prendre en compte pour comprendre la menace terroriste. Tout d'abord, il y a le rapport de force entre sunnites et chiites, souvent simplifié à la lutte entre Arabie Saoudite et Iran.

Rivalité entre sunnites et chiites

Pour le coordinateur européen de la lutte antiterroriste, cette rivalité entre sunnites et chiites amplifie la menace terroriste parce que les sunnites craignent de perdre la main : "*Une grande partie de l'explication tient à la perception du monde sunnite qu'il est en train de perdre la partie. Et l'on voit l'Iran devenir progressivement la puissance régionale majeure. Dans le même temps, les sunnites sont considérablement divisés face à un Iran dont ils perçoivent qu'il est en train de devenir de plus en plus important. (...) Ça pourrait expliquer la tentation de soutenir des groupes plus extrémistes pour une sorte de harcèlement par procuration de l'Iran*".

Et le principal groupe soutenu par les pétromonarchies sunnites n'est autre que l'organisation État islamique, qui combat les régimes chiites, ou perçus comme tel, en Irak et en Syrie.

Expansion vers l'Afrique

L'expansion de l'idéologie saoudienne radicale, le wahhabisme, est un autre facteur de danger mis en avant par Gilles de Kerchove. Le wahhabisme est une vision fondamentaliste de l'islam qui se répand particulièrement aujourd'hui en Afrique : *"Des pays comme la Mauritanie par exemple, où il y avait un islam malékite ou soufi extrêmement modéré, en vingt ans, c'est devenu un pays tout à fait différent, très conservateur. C'est en train de se passer au Mali, au Niger, ... Et il y a un investissement considérable du golfe sur l'est de l'Afrique. Tout ça a des conséquences comme les conséquences de la publication de Charlie Hebdo dans les rues de Niamey, avec des morts, des églises incendiées"*.

La Belgique est représentée par plus d'une centaine d'ambassades et de consulats généraux à l'étranger. Pour Gilles de Kerchove, le personnel diplomatique constitue une source précieuse d'information et de compréhension des zones sensibles : *"A travers la présence sur le terrain, à travers la maîtrise des langues, à travers les contacts que nos diplomates peuvent nouer, on a un enrichissement considérable de notre identification des problèmes"*.

<http://www.rtbf.be/>

Canada

Le financement du terrorisme sous la loupe d'un comité

13 février 2015



Agrandir

Le ministre des Finances Joe Oliver a insisté sur «l'urgence» d'agir contre le financement du terrorisme dans une lettre qu'il a fait parvenir au président du comité des finances de la Chambre des communes.

PHOTO CHRIS YOUNG, LA PRESSE CANADIENNE

(OTTAWA) Une récente hausse des signalements de transactions financières qui seraient liées au financement du terrorisme au Canada incite le ministre des Finances Joe Oliver à demander à un comité parlementaire de se pencher sur ce phénomène et de proposer des mesures pour tarir ces sources de financement illicites.

Dans une lettre qu'il a fait parvenir hier au président du puissant comité des finances de la Chambre des communes, James Rajotte, le ministre Oliver soutient qu'il s'agit d'une question urgente à la lumière de la découverte par la Gendarmerie royale du Canada (GRC) d'une cellule terroriste active à Ottawa.

La semaine dernière, la GRC a déposé des accusations contre trois individus soupçonnés d'être des sympathisants du groupe armé État islamique. L'un d'eux, Awso Peshdary, résidant d'Ottawa âgé de 25 ans, a été accusé d'avoir participé à une

activité d'un groupe terroriste et d'avoir facilité une activité pour un groupe terroriste.

Deux autres hommes d'Ottawa, John Maguire, 24 ans, et Khadar Khalib, 23 ans, ont aussi été accusés dans le cadre de l'enquête de la GRC. Ces deux individus sont considérés par la GRC comme des membres actifs du groupe armé État islamique. John Maguire aurait été tué en Syrie, mais la GRC affirme ne pas détenir de preuves incontestables à cet égard.

Question urgente

«La récente découverte par la GRC d'une cellule terroriste de l'EI oeuvrant au Canada démontre qu'on ne peut pas surestimer l'importance et l'urgence de cette question», affirme le ministre Oliver dans sa missive, que *La Presse* a obtenue.

«Dans un environnement de plus en plus dangereux où les menaces à la sécurité prennent une importance croissante, je crois que votre étude serait extrêmement opportune et qu'elle fournirait des conseils sur la façon dont nous pouvons continuer à être vigilants à l'égard de gens qui envisagent d'abuser de notre système financier afin de commettre des actes terroristes, tant au pays qu'à l'étranger», ajoute le grand argentier du pays.

Plus précisément, le ministre Oliver souhaite que le comité étudie l'effet du flux de fonds illicites sur les économies mondiales, propose des moyens d'améliorer les capacités d'intervention du Centre d'analyse des opérations et déclarations financières du Canada (CANAFFE), évalue la coopération et les échanges de renseignements entre le Canada et ses principaux partenaires dans la lutte contre le financement d'activités terroristes, entre autres choses.

À la réunion des ministres des Finances des pays du G20, à Istanbul, la semaine dernière, la question du financement du terrorisme et des produits de la criminalité figurait en tête de liste des priorités à l'ordre du jour. Les ministres de ces pays se sont engagés à l'unanimité à «approfondir la coopération dans la lutte contre le financement du terrorisme».

234 alertes

Dans son dernier rapport déposé au Parlement, le 20 novembre dernier, CANAFE a indiqué avoir transmis, en 2014, 1143 signalements relativement à des transactions financières suspectes aux services de police et aux organismes de sécurité nationale afin de les aider dans leurs enquêtes. De ce nombre, 234 alertes portaient sur le financement du terrorisme et d'autres menaces à la sécurité du Canada. Les autres avaient trait à des cas de blanchiment d'argent.

En 2013, CANAFE avait transmis 919 cas de renseignements financiers aux autorités policières. Il a été impossible de savoir hier soir combien concernaient les activités terroristes en 2013.

Des environnementalistes craignent d'être visés

Des groupes environnementaux s'inquiètent de la portée du nouveau projet de loi antiterroriste et des impacts qu'il aura sur le mouvement environnemental et sur les manifestants canadiens.

Le projet de loi C-51 définit entre autres le terrorisme comme le fait d'«entraver le fonctionnement d'infrastructures essentielles». Il accorde aussi au Service canadien du renseignement de sécurité (SCRS) le pouvoir de prendre lui-même des mesures contre des menaces potentielles au pays et à l'étranger pour les «réduire» et les perturber.

Le document précise qu'il est entendu que sont exclues les activités licites de défense d'une cause, de protestation, de manifestation d'un désaccord ou d'expression artistique».

Mouvement antipétrole

Des groupes environnementaux craignent néanmoins que ces nouveaux pouvoirs soient utilisés pour nuire aux opposants de l'industrie des sables bitumineux.

«C'est un cadeau préélectoral à l'industrie pétrolière, affirme Keith Stewart, directeur de la campagne Énergie chez Greenpeace Canada. Cela veut dire que le SCRS et la GRC vont activement tenter de nuire à quiconque dit qu'on devrait agir pour lutter contre les changements climatiques.»

Les craintes de Greenpeace sont alimentées entre autres par un document dévoilé par *La Presse* lundi, dans lequel la division du renseignement de la GRC s'intéresse à ce qu'elle appelle le «mouvement antipétrole canadien».

Cette «Évaluation des renseignements relatifs aux infrastructures essentielles» décrit les préoccupations du corps policier à l'égard d'une «faction petite, mais enclue à la violence». Elle s'attarde aussi à des organismes comme Greenpeace et à leur financement, dont une partie proviendrait d'organisations étrangères.

Selon M. Stewart, l'analyse du corps policier fédéral est inquiétante en ce qu'elle englobe tout le monde sous l'étiquette de mouvement antipétrole: «les manifestants pacifiques et ce qu'ils appellent des "extrémistes violents"», dit-il.

Un porte-parole du ministre de la Sécurité publique, Steven Blaney, affirme que les changements ont pour but de «protéger les Canadiens contre la menace du terrorisme djihadiste qui évolue constamment».

«Une chasse aux sorcières»

Mais Steven Guilbault abonde dans le même sens que son collègue de Greenpeace. Le directeur principal d'Équiterre souligne que les groupes environnementaux sont déjà les cibles d'attaques verbales des ministres conservateurs et de vérifications de l'Agence du revenu du Canada. «C'est une véritable chasse aux sorcières», dit-il.

cières, et là, en donnant des pouvoirs accrus aux forces de sécurité, on ouvre la porte à d'autres abus», dénonce M. Guilbault.

<http://www.lapresse.ca/>

Un observatoire sur la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent voit le jour au Québec

11 février 2015 à 13 h 36 HNE

Création de l'Observatoire sur la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent

Constatant un manque d'information et de recul au sujet de la radicalisation et de l'extrémisme, en particulier ceux à caractère politico-religieux, un regroupement de chercheurs annonce la création d'un observatoire destiné à nourrir le débat public et le replacer sur les rails.

Piloté par les professeurs Sami Aoun, David Morin et Stéphane Leman-Langlois, de même que par l'analyste et blogueur Stéphane Berthomet, l'Observatoire sur la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent (OSR) vise à « observer, documenter, comprendre et analyser les phénomènes de radicalisation et d'extrémisme violent au Québec et au Canada ».

« On sent un emballement, il est temps de mettre un peu d'analyse là-dedans. »—
Stéphane Berthomet

Le professeur David Morin estime qu'on a assisté à des « glissements » au cours des derniers mois. En outre, des politiques publiques ont été adoptées sans que le problème réel ne soit encore défini.

« C'est comme si le médecin vous prescrit des antibiotiques sans qu'on sache quel est le bobo exactement. »—*David Morin*

« Tout ce qui a l'air radical devient radical violent, lance pour sa part le professeur Stéphane Leman-Langlois. Depuis 2001, on a ce problème-là, c'est clair, mais depuis le mois d'octobre, il y a eu un regain dans le nombre de signalements. Pas seulement des signalements du public, mais des signalements qui sont faits par des policiers eux-mêmes quand ils sont sur le terrain. »

Les services de renseignement croulent donc sous une masse d'informations de valeur inégale. « Cela devient pratiquement impossible à gérer. Trop d'information, c'est exactement comme pas assez, cela fait disparaître de l'information qui est utile », souligne M. Leman-Langlois.

« Déjà, de trouver un terroriste, c'est comme trouver une aiguille dans une botte de foin. Mais là, la botte de foin est de plus en plus grosse, mais il n'y a pas plus d'aiguilles qu'il y en avait avant. »—*Stéphane Leman-Langlois*

Informer et baliser

Donnant l'exemple du travail réalisé par le service de police de la Ville de New York après le 11 septembre, Stéphane Leman-Langlois estime que pour « faire le ménage » dans tous les signalements reçus, il faudra mettre des balises et éta-

blir des critères. « Ne nous envoie pas un signalement juste parce qu'un gars avec une barbe prend des photos du métro : ce n'est pas assez, il va falloir qu'il y ait d'autres choses », illustre-t-il.

S'intéressant plus précisément à la radicalisation « à caractère politico-religieux » et en particulier le « radicalisme islamique », l'OSR veut, en plus de contribuer au débat public, « proposer des pistes de solutions et d'actions en vue de lutter contre ces phénomènes ». L'Observatoire travaillera notamment en partenariat avec les divers corps de police et les services de renseignement.

« Il n'est pas question de se substituer à la police », précise David Morin, qui souhaite offrir une « profondeur d'analyse » tout en commençant à agir en parallèle.

« Nos partenaires s'attendent à une diffusion d'informations, explique le professeur Leman-Langlois. Que peut-on contribuer dans la réponse, la définition du problème? »

Des notes d'analyse et des documents seront publiés sur les réseaux sociaux et un site Internet qui sera mis en ligne au cours des prochains mois. L'OSR organisera aussi des conférences, des ateliers, des formations et des simulations.

« Ce qu'on veut faire, c'est un endroit centralisé, un *one-stop shop* où on pourrait avoir de l'information sur ce qu'est la radicalisation. Quand on modifie la définition, ça donne quoi comme résultat d'observation? Qui se radicalise? »—
Stéphane Leman-Langlois

« Il faut faire comprendre la différence entre radical et criminel, entre radicalisme et terrorisme », souligne David Morin, rappelant que le radicalisme n'est pas seulement religieux, mais peut aussi être politique ou environnemental.

Nuances nécessaires

Sans nier que la radicalisation existe dans nos sociétés, le professeur Leman-Langlois tempère l'impression actuelle voulant que, notamment, plus d'Occidentaux aillent combattre à l'étranger. Il rappelle qu'avant le groupe armé État islamique ou Al-Qaïda, des gens sont allés combattre notamment en Afghanistan, au Kosovo, en ex-Yougoslavie ou même en Irlande du Nord.

La différence? Des lois renforcées, des arrestations et la présence de militants radicaux sur les réseaux sociaux font en sorte de gonfler ces statistiques.

« De dire qu'aujourd'hui, il y en a X et qu'avant, il y en avait zéro, c'est parce qu'avant, on ne les comptait pas. »— *M. Leman-Langlois*

De même, le chercheur s'étonne du récent épisode qui a vu une administration municipale montréalaise interdire le projet de centre communautaire d'un imam dont les propos, notamment sur les femmes, les homosexuels et la

démocratie, ont provoqué un tollé.

« C'est un discours complètement débile, pas question de l'appuyer. [Mais] il n'y a aucune radicalisation violente là-dedans, il n'a jamais dit un seul mot qui pourrait, même avec beaucoup de gymnastique intellectuelle, nous mener vers une violence », nuance le chercheur, rappelant qu'un discours semblable a existé et existe encore parfois au Québec.

« On est soudainement comme un bloc uniforme avec nos belles valeurs traditionnelles. Les femmes n'ont le droit de vote que depuis 1940, mais c'est comme si on avait inventé cela », lance M. Leman-Langlois, tout en précisant qu'il parle en son nom propre et non celui de l'OSR.

Les axes de recherche de l'OSR

L'état du phénomène de radicalisation et de la violence extrémiste au Québec et au Canada

Les causes de la radicalisation et les conditions du passage à l'action violente

La géopolitique de la radicalisation et les enjeux des débats théologico-politiques sur le radicalisme islamiste

Les réseaux et sources de financement des organisations radicales

L'utilisation d'Internet et des réseaux sociaux dans les phénomènes de radicalisation et leur couverture par les médias traditionnels

Les politiques et les programmes de prévention et de lutte à la radicalisation, incluant les programmes de dé-radicalisation

Source : Observatoire sur la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent

Éviter la récupération

Un projet de loi déposé l'an dernier par l'ex-députée Fatima Houda-Pepin, cité en exemple récemment dans les médias et la classe politique, proposait notamment de « confier au premier ministre le mandat de procéder à des recherches-actions » pour « identifier et documenter les manifestations d'intégrisme religieux » sur le terrain.

Le projet de loi, mort au feuilleton avec le déclenchement des dernières élections générales, aurait imposé la création d'un « centre de recherche-action » et la présentation d'un rapport annuel à l'Assemblée nationale.

Le nouvel Observatoire sur la radicalisation et l'extrémisme violent est toutefois une démarche indépendante, résultat d'une volonté de chercheurs univer-

sitaires de s'impliquer dans le débat public, souligne David Morin. Tout de même, des ministères constituent des partenaires possibles de l'Observatoire, pour discuter notamment de questions de sécurité publique.

« On veut vraiment éviter la récupération, donc on fait bien attention là-dessus », souligne pour sa part Stéphane Leman-Langlois, observant que l'étiquette « radical » sert à justifier toutes sortes de politiques.

« Les gens, quand ils ont peur et qu'on leur dit qu'on fait quelque chose, ils ne regardent pas de trop près pour voir si ce quelque chose là va être efficace ou si cela va leur coûter trop cher en argent ou en droits. »

<http://ici.radio-canada.ca/>

France

Spotlight: Terrorism battle requires fight against ideas

February 6, 2015



The [attack](#) on a newspaper office in Paris shows us that the war with Islamist terrorism is not just something going on in Syria. As President Obama said, "these kinds of attacks can happen anywhere in the world."

President Obama strongly condemned the shooting [and said](#) that the United States would "provide any assistance needed to help bring these terrorists to justice." Immediately recognizing that this domestic incident as an act of terrorism was a turnaround for the White House. The administration initially hesitated to use that label after the [2009 Ft. Hood](#) massacre and the [2013 Boston Marathon](#), waiting until an international connection could be proved.

However, incidents like these are terrorist acts on their face, whether or not the attackers are formally connected to the Islamic State, al Qaeda or any other such group. For several years al Qaeda has promoted [small-scale](#), fast attacks in western cities — so-called jihad-in-place — through its English-language publication Inspire. This is the magazine that ran an article on how to build the type of pressure cooker bomb that [Dzhokhar and Tamerlan Tsarnaev](#) allegedly used in Boston. We saw the same dynamic at work in the October 2014 attack in Ottawa, Canada, by home

grown radical [Michael Zehaf-Bibeau](#). Jihad-in-place is safer for terrorists, since they risk capture traveling to and from hotspots like Syria and Afghanistan. It is harder for security forces to [detect and prevent](#). And it can be very effective.

Jihad-in-place works best when there are pre-existing radical networks inside a target country. France has more than its share of home grown extremists, and there is no question about the motive for the Charlie Hebdo attack. The terrorists were captured on [video shouting](#) the Islamist battle cry "Allahu Akbar." Ft. Hood shooter [Nidal Hasan](#) said the same thing when he opened fire, though this was later [downplayed](#) in an attempt to strip away the inspiration for his act of "[workplace violence](#)." But as the number of such attacks increases, it becomes less credible to write them off as isolated incidents. They occur in different locations, but they are linked by a common ideology, and a common enemy, western civilization. This radical extremist outlook is the collective root cause of Islamist terrorism. The fact that the Paris jihadists targeted a magazine shows that they believe in the war of ideas literally.

The Charlie Hebdo attack shows once again that the terrorists will not limit their struggle to active war zones like Syria and Iraq. It also demonstrates the interconnectedness of violent radical groups motivated by the same ideals and pursuing the same goals, whether or not they are technically members of the same organization. And it tells us that the war on terrorism cannot simply be won by sending fleets of drones to Yemen or dropping remotely guided munitions in Syria. Unless we address the ideological root causes of Islamist extremism, the terrorists will keep seeking ways to bring the war home to us.

James S. Robbins, author of "The Real Custer: From Boy General to Tragic Hero," is a member of USA TODAY's Board of Contributors.

<http://www.dnj.com/opinion/>

Daech, la « start-up du terrorisme » devenue multinationale

Jérôme Fritel : « L'Etat islamique gagne entre 500 000 et 1 million de dollars par jour rien qu'avec les revenus du pétrole. Sur toute la zone qu'il contrôle, il existe une activité économique légale »



une soirée spéciale à l'Etat islamique, avec trois documentaires inédits, dont celui de Jérôme Fritel, *Daech, naissance d'un Etat terroriste*. Une enquête qui révèle l'empire financier dont dispose l'organisation dirigée par Abou Bakr Al-Baghdadi, devenue « aussi riche qu'un Etat africain ». Le réalisateur a enquêté durant un mois en Irak.

Au début de votre reportage, vous racontez qu'à ses débuts, Daech était une « start-up du terrorisme », comment s'est passée sa mutation en « multinationale » ?

L'histoire de Daech se décompose en deux parties. La première commence fin 2011, lorsque les Américains quittent Bagdad avec le sentiment du devoir accompli. A ce moment-là, ceux qui comptaient al-Qaïda, et qui s'étaient réfugiés dans la clandestinité, ont pu reprendre leurs offensives sur le pays. Ils étaient à ce moment -là totalement absents des radars, mais ce n'était qu'un leurre. En réalité, ils avaient déjà commencé à infiltrer la ville de Mossoul et toute sa région. On estime qu'à cette époque, il tirait de cette seule zone 8 millions de dollars de revenus mensuels. Un argent qui provenait de l'extorsion, une espèce d'impôt révolutionnaire, et de la contrebande de pétrole. Ils se sont alors associés avec les anciens baasistes de l'armée de Saddam Hussein, avec qui ils partageaient un ennemi commun : le pouvoir chiite de la capitale. Ce sont ces prémisses que j'appelle « start-up » car cette partie va permettre d'expliquer la tournure des événements un peu plus de

deux ans plus tard.

Les membres de Daech infiltrent ensuite l'opposition syrienne, comment se déclate cette intervention ?

Lorsque la guerre civile éclate en Syrie en mars 2011, Al-Baghdadi décide d'envoyer un de ses commandants, d'origine syrienne, pour aller y faire le djihad. Il arrive avec plusieurs centaines de combattants et avec des moyens financiers et militaires qui vont lui permettre de rapidement monter en puissance et de prendre le pas sur les autres mouvements de l'opposition. Al-Baghdadi a demandé à ses hommes d'apparaître camouflés et de prendre un autre nom, le front Al-Nosra, un mouvement qui finira par vouloir voler de ses propres ailes. Les combats entre la branche dissidente et le canal historique verront la victoire du leader de Daech et la réunification des deux entités. Nous sommes début 2014, les combattants réinvestissent alors l'Irak et prennent la région de Falouja, majoritairement composée de sunnites, historiquement hostile au pouvoir de Bagdad.

Vous décrivez la bataille de Mossoul en juin 2014, comme un des moments clés de l'ascension du mouvement, vous parlez même d'une non-bataille...

C'est leur véritable coup de maître. La ville était prête à se donner à eux et est tombée sans combattre. Cela a duré à peine 36 heures. Ce sont les anciens officiers de Saddam Hussein, qui ont fait la différence car eux possédaient une véritable stratégie militaire. Ensuite les choses ont mal tourné. Il y a eu des règlements de compte entre certains d'entre eux et des soldats de l'EI, qui ont une fois de plus tourné à l'avantage des djihadistes. C'est en s'installant physiquement à Mossoul que la start-up, qui avait déjà bien grossi à la faveur de la guerre civile syrienne, est devenue une multinationale. Elle a récupéré pour trois milliards de dollars d'armement, quasi neuf, de l'armée nationale irakienne, laissé par les Américains à leur départ. C'est une chose de contrôler une partie de la Syrie avec quelques villes moyennes, mais cela en est une autre de prendre le contrôle de la deuxième ville d'Irak, avec presque trois millions d'habitants.

L'Etat islamique va alors se lancer dans une campagne de propagande inédite, comment s'articule ce dispositif stratégique ?

C'est l'une des grandes forces de Daech et une de ses grandes différences par rapport à al-Qaïda. En choisissant de porter le fer contre les régimes henniens de Damas et de Bagdad, deux gouvernements chiites, plutôt que contre les ennemis lointains, il leur a fallu s'assurer un ancrage territorial et faire venir tous les volontaires. Et pour être sûr de les mobiliser, ils ont mis sur pied une communication digne de professionnels. Ils ont dans leurs rangs des gens qui maîtrisent parfaitement les techniques de communication modernes, avec des spécialistes des réseaux sociaux, qui leur permettent de diffuser leurs messages dans le monde entier et à très grande vitesse. C'est une chose qu'al-Qaïda n'a jamais pu faire, devant se contenter de vidéos enregistrées dans une grotte et diffusées via Al-Jazeera. Ils ont même instauré

un fonctionnement identique à celui d'une série télévisée. Le documentaire tout à leur gloire, *Flames of War*, en est au quatrième ou cinquième épisode et les gens attendent la suite. Quand on voit que même pour les exécutions des otages, ils tournent avec deux ou trois caméras et du matériel dernier cri, on réalise l'importance de leur puissance économique.

Quels peuvent être les moyens de les assécher financièrement ?

Cela me semble très compliqué. Les différentes projections montrent que l'Etat islamique gagne entre 500 000 et 1 million de dollars par jour rien qu'avec le pétrole. Si l'on prend en compte les réserves du sous-sol, nous arrivons à des montants qui atteignent les 2 000 milliards de dollars. Sur toute la zone qu'il contrôle, il existe une activité économique légale, qui était là avant lui car Mossoul est une plaque tournante du commerce de la région. Il y a quatorze banques sur place, la plupart sont des succursales dont la maison mère est à Bagdad ou dans les pays du Golfe. Et si pour l'instant la communauté internationale n'a pas mis tous ces établissements sur la liste noire, c'est que cela risquerait d'impacter directement le commerce de tout le pays. Or, les autorités internationales veulent lutter contre Daech sans pénaliser les populations, déjà contraintes de vivre sous leur joug. Si celles-ci sont déstabilisées, alors vous prenez le risque de pousser ces gens dans les bras de votre ennemi. C'est très compliqué car à la différence d'al-Qaïda, qui fonctionnait comme une mafia avec des comptes numérotés ou des mécènes extérieurs plus faciles à identifier, Daesh est une véritable entreprise tentaculaire. Il faut savoir que depuis le 11-Septembre 2001 et le régime de sanctions imposées par l'ONU contre les trésoriers du terrorisme, il y a eu 100 millions de dollars bloqués par les institutions internationales. 100 millions en 13 ans. Aujourd'hui, nous sommes face à une organisation qui a des revenus dix ou cent fois supérieurs, mêlée à des revenus d'une économie locale et légale, alors comment isoler ce qui est illégal et ce qui ne l'est pas ? Pour l'heure, personne n'a la solution et lorsque l'on voit les résultats obtenus avec al-Qaïda, on peut craindre que cela relève quasiment de la mission impossible. Le seul moyen, et c'est ce que fait la coalition, c'est de restreindre l'étendue géographique de Daech de manière à diminuer son pouvoir financier. Il faut bien saisir la nature de cet ennemi. Nous ne sommes plus face à un adversaire qui est financé par l'extérieur, Daech s'autofinance à près de 95 % et face à cela, il n'y a pas encore de stratégie globale.

Avez-vous eu des contacts avec des membres de l'organisation lors du tournage de votre documentaire ?

Non aucun et ce n'était pas du tout notre démarche. Nous avons passé un mois sur place avec Stéphane Villeneuve, avec qui j'ai tourné, et nous nous étions fixés de ne pas mettre les pieds dans la zone contrôlée par Daech, déjà pour des raisons de sécurité évidente. Nous ne sommes pas suicidaires et de toute façon, on ne peut pas travailler. Ensuite, il est très compliqué de rentrer en contact avec ses membres et de faire le tri entre les combattants, les sympathisants et ceux qui font du business. Nous avons pu rencontrer un trafiquant d'armes en Turquie, qui

nous a expliqué comment circule le pétrole et surtout les quantités.

En voyant à l'image certains habitants, presque plus que de la peur, c'est la lassitude que l'on peut lire sur leur visage...

La peur est omniprésente. Voire la terreur, c'est palpable. Mais effectivement, au-delà de cela, il y a eu une lassitude extrême de cette population irakienne, qui a le sentiment de vivre dans un état de guerre depuis trente ans. Ils ont eu dix ans de guerre Iran-Irak. A peine était-elle terminée que Saddam Hussein envahissait le Koweït provoquant la première guerre du Golfe et dix ans d'embargo, qui ont mis à genoux les Irakiens. Ensuite, il y a eu l'arrivée des Américains puis l'insurrection contre eux. C'est une succession de violences et de vie quotidienne extrêmement compliquée. Quand vous rencontrez une personne de 40 ans aujourd'hui, il n'a connu que ça. Son seul espoir, c'est de fuir loin de tout ça.

<http://www.lopinion.fr/>

Opinion: ISIS's Glorification of Terror

The barbaric and deviant nature of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), or indeed any other terrorist group spreading destruction and devastation, is clear for all to see. In all the footage of slaughter that members of these groups have posted—whether in Pakistan, Syria, Iraq or Europe—the abnormal, inhumane and un-Islamic mentality of those responsible for these crimes is as clear as day.

The appalling way in which Jordanian pilot Muadh Al-Kasasbeh was killed confirms the criminal mentality of those who planned and carried out this barbaric execution. However there are also indications that they took pleasure in and glorified these deviant practices, in a similar way to all aberrant criminals and professional killers.

Acts like this do not happen without preparation. It was clear that the perpetrators had thought through and prepared the stage for their crime, including obtaining all the required equipment and tools. This terrible crime was carefully filmed, and its announcement was followed by a carefully worded statement justifying it. They cherish murdering their victims in strange and unusual ways, basking in the horror and disgust that this no doubt elicits across the world. They deceive themselves into thinking that this will earn them power and prestige.

The manner in which ISIS executes its captives, from the first killings of Western journalists and aid workers to more recent events, indicate that its methods are becoming more and more shocking. This is because, simply put, horror and terror is ISIS's main message and logic.

ISIS went even further this time by embedding their atrocious video with the names and addresses of Jordanian pilots it said are taking part in the international airstrikes against the extremist organization. It also alleged to offer a financial reward to anyone who manages to kill any of the pilots it has placed on this 'Wanted' list. The terrorist group is trying to give the impression that its alleged state is an entity with intelligence capabilities. It is unclear just how accurate this information is at this time, although even if it is correct it was most likely obtained from the Jordanian pilot himself through torture.

Jordan responded swiftly to the news of the pilot's execution. Immediately following the release of the footage, Amman confirmed that its response would be "harsh" and "earth-shaking." Jordanian authorities subsequently executed two terror convicts, Sajida Al-Rishawi and Ziyad Al-Karboli. Jordan had delayed the execution of Rishawi for eight years although she was sentenced to death in 2006 after being found guilty of taking part in terrorist attacks on three Amman hotels resulting in the death of 56 people.

The Jordanian authorities said ISIS had killed Kasasbeh on January 3, that is to say just a few days following his capture. This means that the terrorist group was lying when it claimed it was ready to release Kasasbeh in exchange for Rishawi. This only serves to confirm that it is impossible to rely on the words and promises of terrorists or negotiate with them. Those standing behind terrorism have sick mentalities and are armed with misguided ideology. The only solution is to fight terrorism relentlessly and defeat all those who adhere to its deviant ideologies.

The execution of Kasasbeh, particularly the brutal way in which this was carried out, could mark an important turning point in the war on ISIS. The widespread shock towards this death has served to turn even more people away from such groups and their practices, increasing support for the war against them. The other message that this crime sends to the world is that Muslims are also victims of terrorism. In fact, Muslims are the first victims of terrorism and every time that a Westerner or Asian is executed, you can be sure that more Muslim lives were claimed by less publicized acts of terrorism. The world should bear in mind that a few weeks before 17 civilians were killed in terrorist attacks in Paris at least 150 people, including 134 children, were killed in a Peshawar school massacre. Terrorist crimes claim Muslims' lives in Egypt, Iraq, Syria and Somalia on a daily basis. If terrorist attacks have affected some Western countries, they have not spared the majority of Arab and Muslim countries.

Fighting terrorism requires international efforts involving more than just security and military operations but also fighting the misguided ideology that is held, and spread, by these terrorists. We must pursue their ideologies and drain their sources of funding if we want to truly defeat them. Terrorism cannot and will not be defeated if the international community solely focuses its efforts on ISIS in Iraq and Syria, disregarding what is happening in Libya and remaining silent on what terrorists are doing in Egypt. Neither will terrorism be crushed if attacks on Islam continue. These attacks only serve to provoke moderate Muslims and indeed create sympathy for the practices of extremists and terrorists. This is not to mention that they provide terror preachers and ideologues with weapons to attract Muslim youth who feel wronged and marginalized.

The war on terror requires broad international cooperation and a clear sense of discrimination between the terrorist minority and the one and a half billion Muslims who condemn terrorist ideology and declare themselves innocent of the obscene acts of ISIS and its ilk.

<http://www.aawsat.net/>

Jordan

Opinion: Reaching Arab hearts and minds

The killing of Jordanian pilot Muath al-Kaseasbeh has shocked the world. But it's not enough to be disgusted. It's time to come up with a new strategy in the fight against Islamist terror, writes DW's NaserSchruf.



Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, al Shabab, Taliban militants and the self-proclaimed "Islamic State" (IS) in particular: Terror groups are increasingly controlling political events in many Muslim countries. All these groups claim to refer to a "pure" and "true" Islam to justify their destructive and inhuman warfare: They say they are taking the Quran and the words of Prophet Mohammad literally.

But the attempts at justifying the public burning of Jordanian pilot Muath al-Kaseasbeh has proven that the jihadists interpret the prophet's traditions as they see fit. Mohammad has been quoted as saying: "No one but God has the right to use fire as punishment."

Criticism from within 'IS'

IS has broken that rule and rejects any form of criticism - also from its own peers - by making use of theologically complex evasion tactics on Twitter. According to the usually well-informed Syrian Observatory for Human Rights which is associated with the Syrian opposition, the terrorists plan to put a cleric on trial who was linked to the group yet came forward to criticize the burning on religious grounds.

Do Islam and the Sharia law really justify terror? I don't think it's constructive to

debate this again and again. Islam is also what believers and those who refer to the religion make of it. And the majority of Muslims in the Arab world is against terror just like the majority of the people in Western countries - and not just since the brutal killing of the Jordanian pilot.

No long-term strategy

What's lacking is a long-term and credible international strategy against terror - there are a number of challenges that need addressing: First, the strategy needs to deal with the terrorists' successes in terms of recruiting new fighters- not only in the Arab world but also in Western countries. Second, the strategy has to find a solution to the shockingly professional and successful misuse of Internet and social media for hate speech and recruitment - that's unfortunately very popular among young people. And third, it needs to tackle the dangerous ability especially of IS to form new alliances and create new operating fields for its terror - from Sinai in Egypt to Libya and Algeria to Sub-Saharan Africa.

It's part of the terror organization's routine to spread terror by distributing its horrifying actions on video tape. But the group didn't factor in the hefty backlash when Muslims and even IS supporters criticized the burning of another Muslim. This horrible event and the disgusted reactions by people could be an opportune moment to put the joint fight of Western and Islamic States against IS on firm footing:

First, military pressure on IS has to be increased by specifically targeting troops and military positions - but without taking citizens in Iraq and Syria hostage. There can be no airstrikes on residential areas such as what happened in IS stronghold Raqqa. These kinds of attacks only lead people to resent the anti-IS coalition and makes them cross over to the IS.

Second, it's up to religious institutions and dignitaries in the region to draw a clear line between Islam and IS terror. The Al Azhar mosque in Cairo which is the main source of legislation for millions of Sunnis could play a leading role. However, the statement by high-ranking scholar Ahmed al-Tajib who wants to "kill, crucify [IS members] or cut their limbs off" is not the right way. Revenge doesn't lead forward; if at all it provokes a greater degree of barbarization and violence.

And copying IS methods is the wrong approach anyway, if one wants to overcome terror and violence in people's heads. There needs to be an alliance of those who understand religion as a moral and civilized guideline for their actions, as basis for peace and mutual respect. Sunnis and Shiites have to be part of that round table as well as Christians, Yazidis and others.

Winning people's hearts and minds

It's not enough to merely distance oneself from IS. It's about showing numerous

desperate young people in the region a form of religion that's not based on exclusion, terror and violence. It's about speaking to their hearts and minds. Especially young people in the Arab world often live in a social climate mired in conflicts - without any hope of prosperity, education or development, without any true right of participation in their societies.

The "Arab Spring" hasn't been able to change that. And as long as it's going to stay that way, it won't be possible to contain terror and violence - even if the anti-terror alliance were to release bombs over Syria and Iraq for the next 30 years.

<http://www.dw.de/opinion-reaching-arab-hearts-and-minds/a-18243786>

Poutine et le «printemps islamiste»

Chaque attaque terroriste perpétrée par des radicaux islamistes dans les pays occidentaux suscite des réactions toujours plus franches et cyniques en Russie. Ces réactions émanent tant des politiques aux manettes que de millions de zombies bédouinants, que le pouvoir manipule à l'envi via les programmes de télévision. Aujourd'hui, sous une lumière crue, la Russie de Poutine montre sa «gueule asiatique», dont les contours furent esquissés, il y a près d'un siècle, par Alexandre Blok dans son poème épique *les Scythes*. Elle regarde durement ses «partenaires stratégiques dans la lutte contre le terrorisme international» et se réjouit du malheur des autres. Depuis les messages anonymes de robots informatiques interagissant avec des serveurs jusqu'aux déclarations publiques essaimées par des célébrités du monde du spectacle et des représentants de la garde rapprochée de Poutine, en Russie, on se répand en invectives contre ceux qui sont tenus responsables d'avoir provoqué, et poussé à bout, des représentants opprimés de l'Orient musulman.

Sans la moindre dissonance cognitive, la diplomatie russe, sous la houlette de Sergueï Lavrov, alimente la propagande et fait la leçon aux pays touchés par les attentats. Le lexique utilisé est le même à peu de choses près, seule l'indication du lieu varie, ce qui donne : «*La tragédie de Boston [Londres ou Paris] met en exergue une nouvelle fois la nécessité que nous avons à coopérer étroitement en matière de lutte contre le terrorisme international. Il convient d'affranchir nos relations de tout ce qui les encombre artificiellement, de ce qui porte atteinte à la confiance mutuelle et empêche les services de renseignement de coopérer efficacement : listes noires, sanctions économiques, tentatives visant à l'isolement d'une grande puissance et de son dirigeant national.*» Avec insistance, les services russes se chargent de faire comprendre aux «partenaires» que s'ils ne se comportent pas comme il faut, ils auront des ennuis encore plus graves la prochaine fois.

Simple et dépouillé, ce raisonnement a prévalu après le double attentat du marathon de Boston le 15 avril 2013, qui fut perpétré par les frères Tsarnaev, originaires du Nord-Caucase, et pour lequel Djokhar Tsarnaev a comparu devant la justice américaine début janvier. A l'époque, les principaux experts de la Russie à Washington s'étaient empressés d'apporter des éléments de cadrage. Ils dressaient un seul et même constat : «*La priorité de notre coopération avec la Russie réside dans la lutte contre le terrorisme. Tout le reste est secondaire et sans rapport avec les objectifs relevant de la sécurité nationale des Etats-Unis. Poutine est le garant de cette coopération et il ne faut pas venir l'agacer avec des sottises comme "la liste Magnitski" [liste noire établie par Washington de personnes liées à l'assassinat d'un juriste dénonçant la corruption en Russie, ndlr]. Sinon, il se fâchera, ne nous protégera plus et nous serons victimes de nouvelles attaques à l'explosif, commises par toutes sortes de Tchétchènes et Kirghiz.*» Le choc provoqué aux Etats-Unis par les attentats de Boston était si grand et la pression exercée par le lobby poutinien si

forte que l'aile conservatrice américaine se rallia au raisonnement des démocrates au pouvoir. Ce qui donna lieu à une somme de considérations, toutes aussi «pragmatiques» les unes que les autres, publiées dans la presse. Ce nouveau consensus de Washington, syndrome d'un lien de dépendance établi entre des questions fondamentales relevant de la sécurité des Etats-Unis et le bon vouloir de Poutine s'est révélé si profond qu'aujourd'hui encore, une forme de tabou pèse sur plusieurs interrogations restées en suspens au sujet des attentats d'avril 2013. Se pose en particulier la question des pérégrinations de Tamerlan Tsarnaev en 2012.

Officiellement, Moscou avait averti en 2011 et à deux reprises le FBI et la CIA que Tamerlan Tsarnaev était en contact avec des groupes islamistes. Les deux agences menèrent des interrogatoires sans toutefois réunir suffisamment de preuves pour procéder à son arrestation. Ce qui est frappant dans cette affaire, c'est l'incroyable aplomb avec lequel Tsarnaev, au terme de ces interrogatoires, a pu sans entraves se rendre en Russie, non sans ignorer quel traitement, hors de portée des pratiques d'instruction et de procédure pénale, la Russie réserve aux islamistes. Détenteurs - à la différence des autorités américaines - d'informations sur Tsarnaev, qui était répertorié dans toutes les banques de données, les services russes ne pouvaient pas faire autrement que de placer l'intéressé sous contrôle renforcé dès que celui-ci poserait le pied à l'aéroport de Cheremetievo, à Moscou en janvier 2012. Des agents du centre de lutte contre l'extrémisme de la république du Daguestan (dans la Fédération russe) ont agi et mis au jour l'existence de plusieurs rencontres entre Tamerlan Tsarnaev et deux individus suspectés d'appartenir à un groupe islamiste de résistance armée. Ces deux individus ont fini par être neutralisés. Le premier a été neutralisé le 19 mai et le second le 14 juillet 2012. Tout de suite après, Tamerlan Tsarnaev s'est évaporé dans la nature, introuvable et, officiellement, ne pouvant faire l'objet d'aucun interrogatoire. Les services daguestanais en conclurent que l'intéressé avait pris le maquis.

En réalité, il était à Moscou. Le 17 juillet 2012, il se présenta à l'aéroport de Chermietievo pour prendre, sans encombre, un vol le ramenant aux Etats-Unis. Comme s'il allait à la rencontre du destin. Comment a-t-il pu rester en vie et quitter Moscou sans être inquiété ? Une histoire incroyable qui a conduit une journaliste russe de *Novaïa Gazeta* à la commenter en ces termes : «*Celui qui a fait sauter les bombes à Boston avait été programmé depuis longtemps.*» (1)

En décembre, l'économiste russe Andrei Illarionov, ancien conseiller de Poutine, a livré son analyse du conflit militaire dans l'est de l'Ukraine en appelant les dirigeants européens à la vigilance : «*Je crois que les Etats et gouvernements européens ne seront pas très étonnés s'ils voient, disons à l'horizon de l'année 2015, un mouvement politique ressemblant à un "printemps islamique" émerger non pas dans les pays arabes, mais en Europe même. Ce mouvement pourrait chercher à déstabiliser certains pays européens. Avec pour objectif de détourner l'attention et d'absorber l'énergie des dirigeants européens au moment où Poutine cherche à réaliser son projet impérial, ou néo-impérial, dans l'espace post-soviétique.*» (2) Les

attentats terroristes de Paris seraient-ils annonciateurs de ce «*printemps islamique*» en Europe ? L'enquête et les différentes arrestations qui ont eu lieu non seulement en France mais aussi en Allemagne et en Belgique apporteront des éclaircissements, y compris s'agissant des ressortissants russes qui figuraient au nombre des suspects. Le traitement que le Kremlin a réservé à la tuerie de *Charlie Hebdo* en orientant la propagande dans les médias russes est proche du schéma retenu il y a deux ans au moment du double attentat de Boston. Et, cette fois, le crédit de sympathie recueilli au profit des assassins s'affiche encore plus nettement. L'éventail des réactions va de «*évidemment, ce n'est pas bien de tuer, mais...*» à des graffitis «*nous sommes tous des Kouachi*» sur des murs de Grozny, capitale de la Tchétchénie.

Les frères Kouachi en France, à l'instar des Tsarnaev aux Etats-Unis, sont les symboles d'un monde qui se relève et se bat dans les rues de Paris et de Boston, ainsi que dans les rues de Donetsk, dans la partie orientale de l'Ukraine, contre les forces coalisées de la globalisation, de l'atlantisme et... du satanisme ! C'est dire dans quel obscurantisme ravageur la propagande du Kremlin est en train de plonger la Russie !

http://www.liberation.fr/monde/2015/02/03/poutine-et-le-printemps-islamiste_1194963

Spain

SPAIN PROPOSES STANDARDIZATION OF EU COUNTER-TERRORISM LAWS

FEBRUARY 14, 2015



Spain's Mariano Rajoy. File photo.

Ahead of the informal meeting of EU Heads of State and Government, Spain's Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy defended the importance of improving cooperation on counter-terrorism issues. He also expressed his support for further progress on the economic union and said he is not contemplating "a scenario in which Greece does not meet its commitments".

In statements to the media before the start of the meeting, Rajoy said that the fight against Jihadi terrorism will be one of the core topics of discussion at the event. Following a request from the President of the European Council, Rajoy provided an introduction on this topic to explain Spain's experience and the agreement reached with the PSOE [Spanish Socialist Workers' Party] to achieve greater effectiveness in this regard.

Greece must meet its commitments

Rajoy said that Europe has "an enormous amount of solidarity with Greece". In this regard, he pointed out that only the European Union is lending Greece money – over 200 billion euros. He also recalled that "Spain has provided 26 billion euros – 7 billion in bilateral loans and 19 billion as a guarantee from the European Stability

Mechanism (ESM)".

He stressed that Greece will not repay the capital until 30 years from now and the ESM interest until 10 years from now; which in his opinion "are magnificent terms".

Rajoy said we must wait for the Government of Greece to "clearly state" what it wants, but that it must meet the commitments it made at the time. "The important thing is for agreements to be kept. Provided that happens, we will all try to be constructive", he said.

"It will be impossible to build Europe if we all decide to break our commitments. Therefore, I hope people will be sensible and show common sense because I cannot contemplate a scenario in which Greece fails to meet its commitments", he added.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/14022015-spain-proposes-standardization-eu-counter-terrorism-laws/>

Opinion/Editorial: Appropriate time to seek war powers against terrorism

, February 12, 2015 12:15 am

After months of prodding from Sen. Tim Kaine and others, President Obama this week finally presented Congress with the draft of a document calling for approval of U.S. action against the Islamic State (ISIS/ISIL).

The president asked for congressional authority for military action, but pledged not to engage in a lengthy ground war.

Mr. Kaine argues that current U.S. involvement against the brutal terrorist group exceeds approved parameters.

The question is important because it addresses the crucial issue of proper authority and balance of power.

Congress must vote to declare war, but today's ongoing battle against terrorism is a different animal, unanticipated by the Framers of the Constitution. Quick decisions from the president and commander-in-chief responding to rapidly changing conditions are advantageous in this new kind of "war." So are multinational military coalitions in which the U.S. provides support that falls short of the full commitment usually associated with declarations of war.

Yet these conditions create ambiguity. They also foster mission creep, in which U.S. action originally envisioned as narrowly limited eventually expands in breadth and depth, escalating in geographical reach and in American resources committed to action.

Meanwhile, after every escalation, we wonder: Is it war now ?

This question of committing U.S. lives or treasure to the fight deserves to be addressed by Congress and the American people.

While noting that he has some problems with the details of the draft authorization of force, Mr. Kaine rightly zeroed in on the fundamental issue of democratic process and proper balance of power. "... [W]e can now focus on having the proper debate and vote the American people and our service members deserve," he said in a recent press release.

"I look forward to a robust debate ... that will inform the American public about our mission and further refine this authorization to ensure that the U.S. is vigorously assisting nations willing to battle their own terrorist threat rather than carrying the

unsustainable burden of policing a region that won't police itself."

Should the U.S. be involved in the battle against ISIS?

Yes.

The terrorist group is aggressive and vicious. Its immolation of a captured Jordanian pilot is just one example of its brutality.

When the king of Jordan visited the U.S. earlier this month, "it was just absolutely painful to talk" with him about the murder, Mr. Kaine said at the time.

Another example is ISIS's attempted genocide of the Yazidis, a group linked to Zoroastrianism and living in Iraq. President Obama authorized humanitarian aid drops and targeted airstrikes to try to assist them last year.

The U.S. has good reason for continued involvement, not only to protect innocent victims who live in the terrorists' path in the Mideast but also to contain a group that, if allowed to gain strength, could come after us here at home.

<http://www.dailypress.com/>

Himes: U.S. needs strategy to halt terrorism

February 13, 2015

This week, President [Barack Obama](#) formally asked Congress to authorize U.S. military force against the Islamic State. His request is long overdue and demands thorough scrutiny. Appropriately, the debate will focus enormous attention on boots on the ground, geographies and timelines. But I fear that, as usual, there will be little discussion of a long-term strategy to stop terrorism at its source.

As a member of the [House Intelligence Committee](#), I am immersed in the remarkable counter-terrorism work of our military, law enforcement and intelligence communities. Every week, terrorists are killed, their networks damaged and their plans disrupted. But as was true with body counts in Vietnam, tactical success can hide larger strategic failure.

What is our long-term plan -- our strategy -- for achieving a world free of violent Islamic extremism? Looking around the world, I don't see one.

In Syria, our fight against [Bashar al-Assad](#) and the Islamic State puts us squarely on both sides of a civil war. In Libya, we helped replace a murderous tyrant with bloody chaos. In Egypt, we arm and fund a regime that is becoming as autocratic as its reviled predecessors. And as recent events in Paris, Nigeria and Yemen show, our hammering at global terror networks has not solved the core problem -- instead, it has splintered them into smaller but still lethal shards.

So, what's the alternative?

As a starting point, before joining anyone's fight against a tyrant or militants of any stripe, or wading into centuries-old sectarian quarrels, we must keep firmly in mind that these struggles are fundamentally not ours to win. The history of the last 14 years has demonstrated the limits of our ability to craft outcomes in the region. As Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya show, we can remove any regime we choose, but we are rarely good at controlling what happens next.

Crucially, we must get serious about addressing the underlying conditions that allow the Islamic State and other terrorist groups with obscene ideologies to thrive. These conditions are many, but include decayed and oppressive political regimes, resentment of Western "success," an absence of economic opportunity and the fact that our allies in the region continue to fund these groups.

Terrorism -- whether it's driven by ideology, religion or ethnicity -- flourishes in societies where a lack of adequate governance erodes basic accountability, economic opportunity and respect for religious and ethnic minorities. A successful counter-terrorism strategy must address failed governance head on.

Friend and foe alike, but particularly allies like Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Pakistan,

must understand that it is essential to U.S. national security that they make progress toward more accountable and responsive governance. It is, of course, in their long-term self-interest to do so. The aspirational spirit of Tahrir Square or of the early protests in Syria can be temporarily crushed or bought off, but it will not go away. And if the United States is seen as supporting the quashing of that spirit, our long-term interests suffer.

The depth of our engagement with parties in the region should be conditioned on the degree to which they reflect the values that undergird our own political stability. These values include pluralism, respect for the individual and government accountability. Regional leaders should decide whether they will evolve in the direction of South Korea or end up like Qaddafi's Libya or Assad's Syria.

To be clear, we shouldn't repeat the Bush administration's mistake of expecting that democracy will be achieved quickly. It won't. But visible progress should determine the degree of our military and non-military foreign aid, our trade preferences and the depth of our alliances. Our own progress toward energy self-sufficiency opens the door to this stance as never before.

We must also get serious about demanding that our supposed allies in the fight against terrorism stop arming and funding extremists and stop encouraging illiberal ideologies such as [Wahhabism](#). Regimes in the Gulf, Pakistan and others will defend these activities in the name of stability. But as the Pakistanis are learning, such stability is illusory. To paraphrase Churchill, these regimes are feeding a crocodile hoping it will eat them last.

None of this is to suggest that we slow the pace of our military and covert operations against terrorists that are actively planning attacks on Americans. Security is a basic, non-negotiable obligation. But if we continue these operations without an overarching strategy, Congress will be having the same tactical debate over airstrikes, arming so-called moderates and whether to commit U.S. ground forces for decades to come.

[Jim Himes](#) represents Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District, which includes Greenwich, Stamford, Norwalk and Bridgeport. He sits on the [House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence](#) and is ranking member of the [National Security Agency](#) and Cybersecurity Subcommittee.

<http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/->

America's Counter-Terrorism Culture

09 February, 2015

Countercurrents.org

The core issue of my article was really very simple: Can a society with counterterrorism as a core political and cultural value widely practiced be democratic, given that counterterrorism necessarily leads toward undemocratic practices at home and abroad? Moreover, even if we accept counterterrorism as a necessary evil, has it been effective inn the last 15 years? Studies show that terrorism has been rising not declining, while the political and economic costs to society have been immense.

Is America a model democracy, the epitome of an pluralistic and open society, the example for the rest of the world to emulate, or is it a paranoid society in search of enemies that the US government must create in order to preserve the anachronistic political, social and economic status quo against the tide of history? If you lived in the US during the first fifteen years of the 21st century, you probably noticed that government at all levels, the mass media, businesses and churches are all concerned about terrorism to the degree that this has become an obsession and national hysteria deeply imbedded in the culture. In fact, the culture of counterterrorism is so deeply imbedded in America that one finds it throughout the educational system in courses taught from elementary school to graduate school; in Christian churches and Jewish synagogues that see Islam as the source of terrorism, as though there is a “terrorism gene” in the DNA of those espousing Islam as their faith.

A pluralistic society like the US has many layers of history and culture that reflect the diversity of the various ethnic groups living here from the Native Americans and African-Americans to the Europeans, Asian and Latin Americans. One layer of contemporary American culture, a predominantly political one on top to the consumerism layer, is counterterrorism that feeds off the mass psychology of fear. Counterterrorism has become an industry in itself and a lucrative one at that because the government has been throwing billions to everyone from surveillance specialists to the common media propagandist and consultant for hire.

That counterterrorism is an integral part of the dominant culture ought to concern all citizens, even the financial and political elites that enjoy most of society's privileges under such culture.

Does the majority of the American people really feel and living in a democracy when the counterterrorism has converted society into a police state? George W. Bush used to say that “they”, namely militant Muslims, hate our freedom. In other words, they are just jealous and all of the actions across the Islamic world are driven by jealousy for the American way of life; a way of life that is an anathema of course for the vast majority of Muslims. Bush's comment assumes that at least the

majority of Americans are really convinced they are free and that the rest of the world is not, at least Muslims are not enjoying the same precious freedoms as American Christians and Jews.

While most Americans feel that they are free to shop as a way of life, if they have money of course, do they believe that their voice makes any difference in political, social or economic affairs? No doubt, many Muslims would probably empathize with Americans on this issue. Do American citizens believe that the social contract is for them as the Founding Fathers intended, at least as Thomas Jefferson did, or has the social contract become a business one for the socioeconomic elites that exert dominant influence in the political arena at all levels and have a paternalistic attitude toward the middle class and workers? In this domain many Muslims would also empathize with Americans who feel that their government represents the elites.

Americans have as part of their ideology the “Exceptionalism” doctrine that goes back to the 19th century. The institutionalization of counterterrorism plays right into the ideology of “American Exceptionalism” as well as the Cold War anti-Communist campaign that Truman unleashed in 1947 – Truman Doctrine. I suppose if everyone is a citizen of a quasi-police state operating in the name of safety and security then no one is a prisoner of an illiberal regime because of the collective nature of the police state methods that the state imposes on society. In other words, Americans living under a counterterrorism regime, which necessarily requires police state measures, believe that they are “free”.

Perhaps Americans are not as free as Norwegians under a totally different model of democracy. For the most part, Americans are convinced of what their government and media tell them, namely, that their “freedom” must be restricted for their own good. Under rigid security measures extending from illegal surveillance to drone warfare carried out in Africa and parts of the Middle East, the US is always fighting to preserve the freedom for all at home and all freedom-loving people across the world! Rhetoric aside, in the final analysis, freedom to an American in the early 21st century means living within the very rigid confines of counterterrorism institutions. The trick is to keep the public convinced that counterterrorism is not a fad, but a way of life for a very long time. The way to achieve the goal is to make counterterrorism an integral part of the mainstream culture.

It is simply impossible to turn on the radio, TV, read a newspaper or news magazine, go to a mainstream online news outlet and not have to encounter the chronic crisis America is facing with Islamic terrorism. It is as though government and media are expecting a repeat of 9/11 on a daily basis; at least this is what they want the masses to believe when they turn on the radio or TV, or read any of the newspapers. Never mind all of the real problems in the lives of the average American, such as declining living standards because the government has clipped the social safety net in order to provide more assets to the corporate welfare system, everything from bailouts to tax relief, to tax loopholes that permit corporations and indi-

viduals to stash their money abroad and avoid paying taxes. As long as we promote counterterrorism, who cares about the poverty rate, lack of proper funding for education, expensive health care costs, etc.

Economic and social issues affecting the working class and middle are not an issue worthy of discussion for mass media or the two political parties that represent the financial elites, whereas terrorism and an imminent Muslim threat, lately combined with a revived Russian one, are significant. After all, terrorism and the Russians assisting the Russian-speaking minority in Ukraine poses a threat to US national security, thus to the life of the car transmission worker in Indiana, to the retired grandmother in Omaha, to the college student who cannot afford tuition or housing in New York city. Social and economic problems are not at issue, but the Islamic terrorists, many of which the US and its allies helped create in the last thirty years, those are real threats. What about economic and social news affecting the ordinary citizen? The media deals with corporate business news and with the lives of celebrities, and that ought to be sufficient. Believe it or not, this works because people internalize external problems, blaming themselves because they are not billionaires or movie stars.

Never mind that the reality of upward socioeconomic mobility looks increasingly bleak because the top one percent of Americans own half of the wealth and the only support for government spending is in the parasitic defense sector and tax breaks to the rich and corporations that contribute to the rising public debt and result in massive transfer of wealth from the lower classes to the financial elites. This is not an issue worthy of discussion because there are terrorists running loose in Iraq and Syria, terrorists that the US and its regional allies were assisting just two years ago.

The police must rule out terrorism, as though it is the first suspect in any routine fire in a train station in New York, Washington or any major city. The same assumption holds true for the typical psychologically disturbed gun enthusiast who opens fire on a crowd of people. There is something very curious about a society where authorities find it necessary to rule out the “terrorism theory” first even on the most obvious and routine cases of homicide, arson, and other crimes that never required such an ideological filter 20 years ago. Unique in American society, the counterterrorism theme finds expression in books, magazines, video games, movies, TV shows, and even toys. This theme is so pervasive in the political mainstream and socio-cultural milieu that the unsuspecting citizens assumes terrorists are waiting just around the corner to deliver harm to innocent Americans because they are evil and hate America. Is it safe to take the subway in Washington DC or New York without assuming a terrorist may have placed a bomb under your seat?

The institutionalization of counterterrorism is not simply in the domain of foreign intelligence gathering and domestic security, but in every sector of society from media and education, to social organizations and culture. Practically all government agencies are part of the counterterrorism prism. Not just Homeland Security, the

FBI, NSA, and the CIA, but every single federal and local law enforcement agency has counterterrorism as a theme around which its activities revolve. Everything from Airport Security to the Social Security, from the Department of Energy to banking regulatory agencies is focused on anti-terrorism. Counterterrorism people are also in all media outlets to “advise” on how to present domestic and international news stories. For example, the Russian-speaking minority in eastern Ukraine is made up of “terrorists”, as are the Palestinians, as are the tribes fighting against the US-EU imposed regime in Libya, as are the rebels in Colombia, etc.

The mainstream media has no other focus than terrorism as the core of its message. Not just FOX and CNN, but all mainstream news outlets focus on this theme as though there is nothing else taking place in the US or the world. The American people are bombarded by counterterrorism “news and analysis” 24 hours a day seven days a week, and if that is not enough, there are the motion pictures and TV shows. I am amazed that living under such a culture of mass-media-manufactured fear and hysteria about terrorism that people can still trust anyone including their loved ones. There is something seriously wrong with a society’s sense of balance when the mass media presents even the weather report from a “crisis” perspective as though people can actually do something about nature that is presented as “enemy force”. What is a person to think when even national holidays become “crisis management” affairs, when the symbol of American democracy, the White House today in comparison with the 1970s resembles a military/police fort?

When I walk into Pentagon City Mall and see all of those people shopping, I wonder how many of them are making a living as a result of the terrorism industry that the US has created. I wonder how many of them are thinking that they are safe and secure because the US government together with the media and business has created a culture of counterterrorism and institutionalized it as a way of life. If they really believe it, then government and media have succeeded in mass indoctrination. Do they even think about terrorism as an issue as they window-shop from one store to the other? I wonder if the counterterrorism regime and culture never existed, would the Pentagon City Mall shoppers think differently about the social contract and about their role as citizens toward the state.

Is a “Muslim terrorist” more likely to be a threat to Pentagon City Mall shoppers, or a psychologically unbalanced ordinary American indoctrinated in the counterterrorism ideology, believing that guns are the simple solution to complex problems that befall the individual and society collectively? Ironically, the counterterrorism culture feeds the aggression proclivities in individuals while suppressing the rational and creative tendencies that cannot survive the weight of an institutional structure demanding conformity and not questioning. We are now at a point where glorification of counterterrorism pays, while criticizing it is tantamount to treason.

The American Sniper motion picture that glorifies a soldier shooting Iraqis, including children, is a reflection of American values today molded by the counterterrorism culture. The real American sniper claimed to have killed 255 people. He

bragged that he loved it because killing was fun, just another recreational activity no different than hunting deer. US Navy Seal Chris Kyle wrote “I hate the damn savages. I couldn’t give a flying fuck about the Iraqis.” When Obama recently tried to lessen the anti-Islam bias by noting Christians killed Muslims in the name of God during the Crusades, the conservatives and many media outlets insisted there is no moral equivalence, and the president has no right to insult Christians in such manner. The US media simply assumes that the Western Judeo-Christian culture is free of war crimes, when in fact during the last five centuries Christians have killed the overwhelming majority of people on this planet, beginning with the trans-Atlantic slave trade to the Jewish Holocaust.

The missionary aspect and ideological inspiration of America’s “war on terror” is itself a continuation of a long-standing US foreign policy tradition that dates to the Wilson administration. Announcements from the Bush White House that the enemies of the US are “evil” and if grouped together they constitute “the Axis of Evil” makes one wonder not just about the moral standards US policymakers, the media and all propagating such notions, but about the level of political maturity and sense of realism. Is the issue of combating non-conventional warfare a religious and moral one, Armageddon about to descend upon humanity, or is this a matter of policy and strategy that government must analyze and arrive at the best possible solution for the benefit of all of its citizens and not just the defense industry?

If only the rest of the nations behaved exactly as the US wishes in everything from their domestic economic and social policies to their foreign and defense policies, then they would not be “evil” and targeted for regime change by Washington. This is not to absolve other nations and organized guerrilla groups of responsibility for their actions. Nor is this a defense of random acts of violence or even organized ones en masse that lack a grassroots support and have as a goal publicity rather than social change. Having said this about the futility of what the US calls “terrorism” as a military means to a political end that is almost never achieved, if “the terrorist enemy” kills x number of people and US military retaliation is 100 times x , then what does this reveal about the US and its resolve to find a constructive solution to a political problem? Of course in the absence of retaliation against “the enemy”, the culture of anti-terrorism could not be justified, hence the need to continue the vicious circle that government and the media project as necessary.

It is true that the mass media in most of the world is very biased, slanted to favor the political and social status quo, lacking in serious news and analysis, focused instead on business and entertainment. Mainstream media is simply an instrument of the status quo rather than one that critiques the status quo or promotes social justice. It is just as true that the message the US culture of anti-terrorism sends to the rest of the world is military solutions work against any enemy of the state baptized “terrorist”, while human rights and social justice need not be considered. In other words, the US anti-terrorism culture has global consequences, especially when the US encourages military solutions only to the complex problem of militant

conduct among young Muslims who see right through the hypocrisy of US foreign policy.

At the urging of the US, the UN adopted 16 conventions against terrorism, but the poor countries, especially African countries, have resisted pouring precious assets in this area because health needs – infectious diseases especially – as well as primary food needs take precedence. Besides the poor nations that are forced to spend resources on what the US defines as “terrorism” and to divert resources from human needs, all countries have become more militarized as a result of the US global counterterrorism campaign. Just as disturbing, many countries have been using the “war on terror” to violate their citizens rights; after all, the US does not observe human rights, according to the Senate Intelligence report on CIA torture of political prisoners.

It is up to the American people to change the destructive culture of counterterrorism that is a pretext for preserving the political, economic and social status quo and makes society more dangerous rather than safer. The first step to change is to become aware of what the anti-terrorism culture is all about, rather than accepting the incessant indoctrination of media, government, business, and social-cultural organizations. Social justice cannot possibly be realized under counterterrorism regime. Under the current legal system and political-cultural climate, it is very difficult for anyone who does not wish to be isolated from the mainstream to speak out against the culture of counterterrorism.

Of course, there are academic works on the subject, and of course there are blogs that express opposition to the status quo under the counterterrorism culture that has resulted in quasi-police state practices, everything from denying human rights to cops shooting down unarmed black youths as though they are the terrorists. A society that does not permit dissident voices to be heard not in the periphery but within the mainstream as part of the debate about the social contract, a society that treats dissidents as unpatriotic, pro-terrorist elements that the FBI must place under watch, such a society is authoritarian and has no political or moral authority to preach democracy to anyone in the world unless it first begins to practice it for itself.

Mass killings in the form of state-sanctioned warfare have always carried a sense of glory, virtue, and honor, although the end result is mass destruction. By contrast, individual acts of political violence, including political acts the state labels “terrorism”, imbue the general public with extreme fear, categorical condemnation, and demands for severe punishment of the ‘criminals’ behind the random acts of political violence. Historically, terrorism has never accomplished the goal of social justice that it ostensibly intended by using ‘unconventional warfare’. This is because the state and established institutions targeted by terrorist organizations is far more powerful instrument of violence on a sustained basis than any individual organization.

The state mobilizes public support for itself and institutions it protects, while the majority of the population falls in line with the state that presents itself as 'protector' of public interest. It would be naive to deny that the state has every right to protect its people and its national sovereignty combating any threats from hostile forces. However, there is a huge difference between the state's right to self defense within its own borders, and unleashing a global "war on terror" that violates the national sovereignty and rights of innocent people, while at the same time promoting a culture of counterterrorism. Without engaging in lengthy analysis of 'the ethics of counterterrorism', analysis that can be approached from different ideological and political perspectives, the bottom line is that counterterrorism measures used as a pretext for police state methods benefits the political, economic, and social status quo. At the same time, counterterrorism precludes democratic practices, societal progress to the benefit of all people, and social justice, while it maintains a "military-solution based foreign policy" that invariably results in disaster for all parties concerned.

<http://www.countercurrents.org/kofas090215.htm>

Rall: Why are we at war against ISIS

14 February 2015

Is there any justification for bombing ISIS?

There isn't any Congressional authorization, much less a declaration of war. Is there even a good reason for the U.S. to be involved?

There is no better time to ask this question than now, as much of the world (me included) is disgusted by the Islamic State's beheadings of two kidnapped Japanese nationals.

It is easy to forget that, for Americans, going to war was, until recently, an act undertaken only after every other alternative had been thoroughly explored and completely exhausted. Hard to imagine now, but the United States did not declare war against Germany after its U-boat torpedoed and sank the RMS Lusitania in 1915, killing 1,198 passengers, including 128 Americans. Instead, President Woodrow Wilson demanded compensation and a promise from Germany not to do it again.

War has since become much too easy.

We go to war fast, without national discussion — much less debate. We go to war indiscriminately. We war against several nations (Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria), at the same time we're warring against a tactic (terrorism), as well as various so-called "non-state actors" (discrete branches of al-Qaida, Khorasan, Abu Sayyaf). So much war, we think it's normal that when someone/something/some group does something we deem wrong, like slitting the throats of reporters as GoPros record the bloodshed in glorious high resolution, war is the knee-jerk response.

In one day over the past weekend, the U.S.-led coalition carried out 27 airstrikes against ISIS-held territory in Syria and Iraq. We have no way to know how many ISIS soldiers, or civilians, were killed or wounded in those bombardments.

U.S.-led forces are responsible for at least 16,000 airstrikes against ISIS in the last six months, killing an unknown number of people — but guesstimates logically begin in the tens of thousands, including civilians. Despite all that carnage, the air campaign has not had the desired effect: ISIS is stronger than ever.

American war officials concede that the air war is failing. "I think [the war against ISIS] may require a forward deployment of some of our troops," Hagel told CNN. "I would say we're not there yet. Whether we get there or not, I don't know."

"This is going to be a long, nasty, dirty war that in many ways is going to look a lot like the first go-around in Iraq," Stephen Biddle, ex-adviser to Army General David Petraeus, told U.S. News & World Report.

But ... why?

Why are we in this “long, nasty, dirty war” against ISIS?

No one is arguing that the Islamic State is run by nice people. ISIS has carried out ethnic cleansing, enslaved women, raped children, slaughtered POWs in summary executions and Talibanized areas under their control, imposing their brutal, medieval version of Sharia on citizens accustomed to modern life under socialist, secular states.

But ISIS is not alone in its barbarism.

Saudi Arabia routinely carries out public beheadings and floggings, as well as crucifixions, and treats women like dirt. Yet we don’t bomb them. To the contrary, the Saudis are close allies. President Obama cut short important diplomatic trips in order to join the Saudis as they mourn their dead king.

Another close U.S. ally, the government of the Central Asian republic of Uzbekistan, either boils or freezes political dissidents to death, depending on the government’s mood. Quirky! No air raids there either.

Among the worst nations on earth for human rights abuses are Yemen and Pakistan, both of which, like ISIS, are fundamentalist Islamist regimes, but receive hundreds of millions of dollars in American weapons and cash.

So what’s special about ISIS?

War is serious business. It takes lives, costs money, destroys infrastructure and the environment, and creates new problems, including laying the ground for future wars. The least — the very least — we can do is think about it, and talk about it, before starting one.

<http://www.rockdalenews.com/section/10/article/21776/>

L'Europe prête à lutter contre le terrorisme, les solutions demeurent insaisissables (ANALYSE)

2015-02-09



MUNICH, 8 février (Xinhua) -- Face à l'accroissement des menaces terroristes, les pays européens devraient mettre au point une stratégie pour mener une guerre contre le terrorisme, qu'ils ne peuvent pas se permettre de perdre.

Dans un discours prononcé à la 51e Conférence de Munich sur la sécurité, qui s'est terminée dimanche, le secrétaire d'Etat américain John Kerry a appelé à des efforts conjoints pour lutter contre le terrorisme et a ajouté qu'il faut lutter "avec chaque fibre de notre être."

La préoccupation de M. Kerry sur le terrorisme a été partagée par de nombreux participants à la conférence. Le Rapport de sécurité de Munich 2015 publié par la partie organisatrice de la conférence a présenté un rapport sur le terrorisme avec le titre "Guerre contre le terrorisme: Sommes-nous en train de la perdre ?"

"Le nombre de groupes djihadistes s'est multiplié au cours des dernières années, tout comme le nombre de militants et d'attaques dans le monde entier", déclare le

rapport, dans lequel le but de la guerre contre le terrorisme menée par les Etats-Unis a été décrit comme "insaisissable".

La Belgique et la France ont été mises en état d'alerte après que le groupe militant Etat islamique (EI) a averti de son intention de lancer des attaques terroristes dans les deux pays. Le groupe, qui n'a attiré presque aucune attention lors de la conférence de sécurité il y a un an, a été au centre des discussions liées au terrorisme à la conférence sur la sécurité cette année.

Elisabeth Guigou, président de la Commission de l'Assemblée nationale française des Affaires étrangères, a déclaré que quelque 1.400 personnes venant de la France ont suivi l'idéologie de l'EI, et 400 personnes ont même quitté la France pour l'Irak.

"Je pense que nous devons nous demander quelles en sont les raisons ..." a-t-elle indiqué.

Andreï V. Kortunov, directeur général du Conseil des affaires internationales de Russie, a accusé les Etats-Unis d'être responsables du terrorisme. Selon lui, les actions militaires des États-Unis "détruisent les États", "libèrent les forces radicales" et le terrorisme trouve une proie facile dans ces pays.

En commentant sur la guerre américaine contre le terrorisme, il a dit: "Certainement, ils ne réussissent pas à supprimer les sources de terrorisme et ici, une plus grande coopération internationale est absolument nécessaire."

Haïder Al-Abadi, le Premier ministre de l'Irak, a mis en garde lors de la conférence de sécurité que l'Irak a été confrontée à "une formidable nouvelle génération de terreur", qui menace la région et le monde.

Parlant de la lutte contre le terrorisme, M. Abadi a déclaré: "Nous ne devons et ne perdrions pas la guerre".

<http://french.xinhuanet.com/>

War on Radical Islam Is Not a CT Strategy

Published: February 9, 2015

Editor's Note:

When Fareed Zakaria asked President Barack Obama in an interview broadcast [February 1st](#), “Are we in a war with radical Islam?” it touched off a new round of a rhetorical spat that occasionally erupts in American political discourse. The issue is finding accurate definitions of terms to describe and discuss organizations like Al Qaeda, ISIS (Daesh) and their ilk. [Obama responded](#) that he doesn’t “quibble with labels” and seeks not to conflate violent extremism with the faith followed by over a billion Muslim adherents, saying, “It’s very important for us to align ourselves with the 99.9 percent of Muslims who are looking for the same thing we’re looking for – order, peace, prosperity.” Meanwhile a choir of voices in opposition — who can fairly be described as ready to admonish Obama on almost any position he adopts — expressed support for using language such as “radical Islam” and “religious war.”



The Zakaria Q&A gave rise to commentary that illuminated President Obama’s position. [Peter Beinart](#), writing in *The Atlantic* deconstructed the “radical Islam” debate saying that, “The rhetoric has become largely an end in itself,” adding, “What Republicans are really declaring war on is ‘political correctness.’ They’re sure that liberal sensitivities about Islam are hindering the moral clarity America needs to win. Just don’t ask them how.” Beinart went on to note that unlike the notion of “radical Islam” as an identifiable enemy ISIS and Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula are actu-

al organizations. He said, “Reasonable people can delineate where they begin and end, and thus craft specific strategies for fighting them. Good luck doing that with ‘radical Islam.’”

Ambassador Richard LeBaron, founding Coordinator of the [US Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications Strategy](#), wrote another thoughtful contribution to the conversation. LeBaron, a Nonresident Senior Fellow at [the Atlantic Council](#), served a 30-year diplomatic career abroad and in Washington including numerous “Near East” assignments, such as Ambassador to Kuwait and posts in Tel Aviv (DCM) and Cairo. LeBaron laid out sound reasons for eschewing the “radical Islam” label and, importantly, provided answers to the tough question, “So what can we do?” Today we are pleased to share his essay with you here.

Declaring War on Radical Islam Is Not a Counterterrorism Strategy

Richard LeBaron

Some members of Congress and noisy portions of the media and blogosphere are vexed by President Barack Obama’s refusal to declare war on “radical Islam.” Their distress seemed to be only exacerbated by the President’s measured and sensible response to Fareed Zakaria during a [CNN interview last Sunday](#) when asked, “Are we in a war with radical Islam?” The President’s response, worth rereading in full, was just what it should be: a serious discussion with the American people about a complex problem with no easy solutions, including a clear explanation of why terminology can be dangerous.

ZAKARIA: Lindsey Graham says that he's bothered by the fact that you won't admit that we're in a religious war. There are others who say that the White House takes pains to avoid using the term "Islamic terrorists." So my question to you is are we at – are we in a war with radical Islam?

OBAMA: You know, I think that the way to understand this is there is an element growing out of Muslim communities in certain parts of the world that have perverted the religion, have embraced a nihilistic, violent, almost medieval interpretation of Islam. And they're doing damage in a lot of countries around the world.

But it is absolutely true that I reject a notion that somehow creates a religious war because the overwhelming majority of Muslims reject that interpretation of Islam. They don't even recognize it as being Islam.

And I think that for us to be successful in fighting this scourge, it's very important for us to align ourselves with the 99.9 percent of Muslims who are looking for the same thing we're looking for – order, peace, prosperity – and so I don't quibble with labels. I think we all recognize that this is a particular problem that has roots in

Muslim communities, and that the Middle East and South Asia are sort of ground zero for us needing to win back hearts and minds, particularly when it comes to young people.

But I think we do ourselves a disservice in this fight if we are not taking into account the fact that the overwhelming majority of Muslims reject this ideology.

ZAKARIA: Others say that you downplay the importance of terrorism. You want to downgrade it as a threat to the United States.

OBAMA: Look, I have to talk to the families of those who are killed by terrorists. I have to talk to the families of soldiers of ours who fought to make sure that Al Qaeda couldn't carry out attacks against us again.

So I think I'm pretty mindful of the terrible costs of terrorism around the world.

What I do insist on is that we maintain a proper perspective and that we do not provide a victory to these terrorist networks by overinflating their importance and suggesting in some fashion that they are an existential threat to the United States or the world order.

You know, the truth of the matter is that they can do harm. But we have the capacity to control how we respond in ways that do not undercut what's, you know, what's the essence of who we are. That means that we don't torture, for example, and thereby undermine our values and credibility around the world.

It means that we don't approach this with a strategy of sending out occupying armies and playing whack-a-mole wherever a terrorist group appears, because that drains our economic strength and it puts enormous burdens on our military.

What's required is a surgical, precise response to a very specific problem. And if we do that effectively, then ultimately these terrorist organizations will be defeated because they don't have a vision that appeals to ordinary people. It is – it really is, as it has been described in some cases, a death cult or a entirely backward-looking fantasy that can't function in the world. When you look at ISIL, it has no governing strategy. It can talk about setting up the new caliphate, but nobody is under any illusions that they can actually in a sustained way feed people or educate people or organize a society that would work.

And so we can't give them the victory of overinflating what they do and not – and we can't make the mistake of being reactive to them. We have to have a very precise strategy in terms of how to defeat them.



Here are three more reasons not to declare a “war on radical Islam”:

There is no consensus on the definition of “radical Islam.” ISIS or al-Qaeda or al-Shabab provide an easy answer to this question and it is clear that we are at war with these groups. But being in a fight with specific groups and specific people in those groups is a lot different from being at war with a certain nebulous space on the spectrum of Muslim belief. Who will be the authority in the United States who will decide what is acceptable for Muslims to believe and what is not? Americans have never been comfortable with government making judgments about religious belief, but at the same time, a considerable body of conservative opinion appears to believe that Islam in any form is sympathetic to violence against non-believers. Will US Muslims be subjected to loyalty tests? Will we close our borders to Muslim students who wish to study at our universities? Who will provide guidance to the US military and intelligence apparatus on identifying the “enemy”? Will we rely on authoritarian regimes in Egypt or the Gulf to define “true Islam”?

There is no implicit change to US foreign policy after having declared a war on “radical Islam.” Could we deal with Jordan, which tolerates elements of the Muslim Brotherhood, but at the same time has been subjected to the butchery of ISIS? How about Saudi Arabia, a country wedded to a form of Islam that many Muslims find extreme? Would we need to reject any notion of reaching agreements with Iran because of their official religious stands? Would the millions of Egyptians who believe in a very traditional form of Islam become the enemy along with the jihadists attacking Egyptian institutions? Do we put a new list of countries on the terrorism list? Would we only deal with so-called “moderate Muslims,” whatever that may mean?

Declaring rhetorical wars would be a victory for the terrorists we want to defeat, [as the President said in his interview](#). Their objective is to be seen as the legitimate face of and defenders of Islam. For a superpower like the United States, or even a power like France, to declare war on radical Islam serves to legitimize a group of people that we should be making every effort to marginalize. The Western media—not to mention politicians—have an obligation to treat the topic with a greater degree of seriousness and less vacuous name-calling. Media outlets need to think through how their dramatic descriptions of ISIS murders (and not just whether to show the acts) may act to encourage these publicity-hungry terrorists. Fear mongering is terrorism's oxygen and their recruitment tool. They need to be pushed to the margins in all possible ways.

So What Can We Do?

The United States and its allies are in a conflict with certain groups who would like to convince the world that they are the true representatives of Islam. We will succeed in that war only if we stay focused on the key element of counterterrorism strategy: excellent intelligence gained through maintenance of a first-rate intelligence community and sharing of intelligence with others; the ability to project deadly force when needed against specific groups and targets who wish us harm; and enlistment of Muslim and non-Muslim countries and communities around the world to do their fair share in combatting terrorism and addressing its root causes—be those poor governance, weak states, religious incitement, or psychologically marginalized individuals looking for outlets for their rage.

Preventing the attraction to terrorism, as opposed to attacking known terrorists, is a long-term project that requires a serious approach. The contrived debate about labelling terrorism is both counterproductive and at odds with an American value system that separates religious belief from political considerations. Those actually doing the fighting against terrorists deserve better than bumper sticker slogans to guide their actions. They should not be asked to fight a dimly understood religious war.

Richard LeBaron, US Ambassador (ret.) was the founding Coordinator of the US Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications Strategy. He is a Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council.

Source: [AtlanticCouncil.org](http://atlanticcouncil.org)

<http://susris.com/2015/02/09/>

Yemen

YEMEN: GCC CALLS FOR UN ACTION

FEBRUARY 14, 2015



Yemen

An emergency meeting of foreign ministers of the six-nation Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) here on Saturday expressed deep concerns over the worsening political and security situation in Yemen and asked the United Nations to intervene immediately.

Qatari Foreign Minister Khaled Al-Attiyah, who chaired the extraordinary meeting, called on the international community, particularly the UN Security Council (UNSC), to solve the crisis in Yemen.

Al-Attiyah said: “The will of the Yemeni people should be honored in line with the GCC-sponsored initiative for peace and its executive mechanism, as well as the recommendations of the national dialogue.”

The GCC ministers mulled a proposal to formulate a common strategy to respond to the crisis.

Prince Abdulaziz bin Abdullah, deputy foreign minister, led the Saudi delegation to the meeting.

The GCC foreign ministers, who asked the warring parties in Yemen to fully abide by the relevant UN resolutions and to comply with the provisions of the GCC initiative, hoped that the people of Yemen will find a consensus-based solution to the current political impasse.



Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)

The GCC said that the Gulf bloc remains committed to a stable, peaceful and democratic Yemen, which is in the interest of global peace and security.

The extraordinary meeting, chaired by Qatar's Foreign Minister Al-Attiyah, discussed "the latest developments in Yemen," said a SPA report.

Speaking to Arab News, a senior GCC official said that coordination among the six member states was under way to formulate a firm stance toward the situation in Yemen.

The source said that a GCC action plan may be announced soon, which will go beyond just taking some measures or closing the diplomatic missions in that country.

"This Houthi coup is a dangerous escalation, which we reject and is unacceptable," said the official before the meeting started in Riyadh.

The GCC foreign ministers also urged the UN to take measures against the Houthi power grab and restore legitimacy to Hadi's outgoing government.

Saudi Arabia has joined several Western states in evacuating staff from Yemen after a power grab by the rebels.

The official said the GCC is aware of Iran's role in the current turmoil in Yemen, reiterating what has become a common belief over a strong link between the Houthis and Tehran.

Yemen shares a 1,770-km border with GCC states mainly Saudi Arabia to the north and with Oman to the east.

A 2012 Gulf-sponsored initiative facilitated a smooth transition of power in Yemen following a public uprising that demanded the departure of former president Ali Abdullah Saleh.

The meeting was attended by Sheikh Khalid bin Ahmed bin Mohammed Al-Khalifa, foreign minister of Bahrain; Yusuf bin Alawi bin Abdullah; Omani minister responsible for foreign affairs; Anwar bin Mohammed Gargash, UAE's foreign minister; Sheikh Sabah Khaled Al-Hamad Al-Sabah, first deputy premier and foreign minister of Kuwait; and Abdullatif Al-Zayani, GCC secretary general.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/>

Opinion: Yemen's chaos is a threat to the Arab world

The Houthi movement succeeded in misleading the entire Yemeni political establishment for about 141 days. They misled outgoing president AbdRabbuh Mansur Hadi (who is currently still under house arrest). They misled the UN assistant secretary-general and special adviser on Yemen, Jamal Benomar. They also signed a pact with Hadi, the inappropriately named “peace and partnership agreement.” And with that, everyone thought this “partnership” with the upper echelons of power in the country represented the upper limit of Houthi ambition. But these dupes would all soon discover the true extent of the Houthi deception—that this agreement with Hadi was but the first nail in the coffin of the Yemeni state. But then of course came the final reveal, with the Houthis openly pursuing a coup in the country and eventually making a unilateral constitutional declaration that effectively gave them, and them alone, complete political control of the country.

The danger posed by the current situation in Yemen is not the responsibility of Saudi Arabia or the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) alone; it is the responsibility of the international community as a whole, which will sooner or later get burned by the fires spreading outwards from Sana'a. Now that alarm bells are ringing in the capitals of the world’s major political powers, we need a definitive, unified Arab stance on the Houthi takeover. This is certainly not the time for internal bickering, as some Arab countries are doing right now; once the international community sees a clear Arab response it will step up its own efforts to ostracize the Houthis internationally, and upend their heavy-handed approach to politics.

In any case the foreign ministers of the GCC’s member states are due to meet next Saturday to discuss the latest developments in the crisis. Based on available information, the ministers will likely explore future responses to the crisis, whether these take the form of political, economic, or even security measures. They will also be working out a timetable to be presented to the Arab League which will deal with deciding on a clear stance toward the coup and a strong response that will support the legitimate political powers in the country and further increase the Houthis’ isolation—instead of the usual inappropriate and spineless methods adopted by some Arab countries when dealing with major developments.

Now, if the worst happens and extremist groups start fighting for the scraps from a decimated Libyan table, the countries of the Gulf should not think themselves safe due to their geographical location, nicely tucked away in the Arabian Peninsula and away from the Arab Maghreb, for whom the situation is the same when it comes to Yemen. Conversely, then, the Arabs of the Maghreb should not be lulled into a false sense of security, and think of themselves as far away from this country which has provided such fertile ground for terrorists and terrorism. Indeed, it is this very point that has made the current crisis in Yemen such a pressing issue for the UN Security Council: many of the major terrorist operations that have recently taken place have their origins in Yemen. And so it would be the height of naïveté to believe that be-

ing thousands of miles away from the country will help anyone avoid the scourge of terrorism and those who practice it. Have they not learned the lessons from Iraq and Syria, where terrorism incubated for years and is now spreading like wildfire across the globe?

Here it is perhaps worth noting how the Saudi and wider Gulf response to the crisis is not, as some contend, tinged with a sectarian bent. After all, Sunni Saudi Arabia and the other Gulf countries dealt for years with the ruling Shi'ite Zaydis during the Mutawakkilite Kingdom—from the Imamate all the way up to the modern Yemeni republic. Moreover, half of the Yemeni budget is bankrolled by Gulf countries. As for Gulf opposition to the Houthi coup, it is a purely political, and inescapable, position. After all, Iran is clearly now attempting to impose its own political agenda onto the region, among its more general attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of Arab states.

We have a saying in the Arab world, “the worst disaster is the one that brings laughter.” In light of this let us remind ourselves of some of the recent comments made by UN special envoy Benomar, who came all the way from one end of the Arab world (the Maghreb) to solve a problem in the other (the Mashreq). He told journalists on Sunday he was “happy to announce to you that all political parties have agreed to return to table for talks” in order to solve Yemen’s crisis. Can you imagine? The UN’s special envoy, “happy” that the Houthis have agreed to resume dialogue when they are the ones who have, since the beginning, carried out acts of violence, looted, raided, and forced their own reality on the ground by force of arms, only then agreeing to talk, and subsequently reneging on every agreed-upon issue while attempting once again to force the reality on the ground using violence. This process was basically repeated until, eventually, the Houthis spread their influence throughout the country and forced a *coup d'état*—all the while taking part in “talks” and engaging in “dialogue.”

As for the UN envoy, he is of course “very happy” and still believes in this latest round of “talks” with the Houthis—which he has labeled “a positive step.”

<http://www.aawsat.net/>

Disclaimer of Liability and Endorsement

While the African Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism (ACSRT) strives to make the information on this publication as timely and accurate as possible, the ACSRT makes no claims, promises, or guarantees about the accuracy, completeness, or adequacy of its contents, and expressly disclaims liability for errors and omissions in its contents. No warranty of any kind, implied, expressed, or statutory, including but not limited to the warranties of non-infringement of third party rights, title, merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose or freedom from computer virus, is given with respect to the contents of this publication or its links to other Internet resources.

It should be noted that any opinions expressed are the responsibility of the authors and not of the African Centre for the Study and Research on Terrorism (ACSRT), its publication board, its management or any funder or sponsor of the ACSRT, nor that of the African Union Commission (AUC),

Reference in this publication to any specific commercial product, process, or service, or the use of any trade, firm or corporation name is for the information and convenience of the public, and does not constitute endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the ACSRT and AUC.