# AL-QAEDA AND ANARCHISM:
# A HISTORIAN'S REPLY TO TERROROLOGY

**James L. Gelvin**
**Department of History**
**University of California, Los Angeles**

According to an apocryphal story, Henry Kissinger/André Malraux/an unidentified journalist once asked Chinese premier Zhou Enlai about the significance of the French Revolution. Zhou reportedly replied that it was still too early to tell. Taking this story in its intended spirit, one might reasonably ask the following question: If it is too early to determine the significance of a phenomenon that had occurred a century and a half earlier, is it at all reasonable to attempt to determine the significance of one that is a mere two and a half decades old? More specifically, is it possible for historians and other social scientists writing six years after the attacks of 9/11 (when most turned their attention to the problem) to typologize and historicize the phenomenon of jihadi movements such as al-Qaeda?

Zhou's reported caution aside, it is not as if the freshness of the phenomenon has prevented everyone from journalists to historians to specialists in the newly reinvigorated field of "terrorology" from weighing in on the issue. Some have chosen to view contemporary jihadi movements as a phenomenon *sui generis*; for others, they are variations on one or another historical theme. Putting aside for the moment the "what went wrong" school of analysis, which presents jihadi movements as a manifestation or the logical culmination of a civilization gone bad,[1] two styles of *sui generis* narrative appear with some regularity. First, there are those accounts that focus on the genealogy of jihadi movements by applying a traditional history-of-ideas methodology. In these accounts, ideas evolve one from the other in a linear and progressive manner, somehow

radiating their influence across time and generations. Thus, the family tree of contemporary jihadi movements most frequently begins with ibn Taymiyya and runs through Muhammad ibn Wahhab, Mawlani Abul A'la Mawdudi, Sayyid Qutb, Muhammad al-Faraj, and Abdullah Azzam until it reaches Omar Abdul Rahman ("the blind sheikh"), Ayman Zawahiri, and Osama bin Laden.[2] Like all traditional history-of-ideas narratives, this one attempts to make up for what it lacks in sufficiency with an overabundance of necessity. (As will be seen below, a stronger case might be made for replacing the progressive chronological sequence with one that starts with bin Laden and continues back in time through ibn Taymiyya, and substituting the words "selected and drew from" for "influenced.")

Others have attempted to address this shortcoming by affixing to their narratives contingent external events that, they claim, have increased the availability of or receptivity to proto-jihadi or jihadi ideas. Thus, the now-familiar stories of a drunk American woman's abortive shipboard seduction of Sayyid Qutb (and the Cairene's reputed and less than convincing shock at the loose, small-town American values of the late 1940s [!]), the petrodollar-backed spread of Wahhabi doctrines, the hothouse atmosphere of Nasser's and Mubarak's jails, and America's covert support of Arab-Afghan mujahidin fighting the Soviet Union.[3] Unfortunately, accounting for the resonance of jihadi ideology (instead of, say, the Islamo-nationalism represented by Hamas or Hizbullah or a more "traditional" Islamist ideology such as that espoused by the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt) remains a problem here as well. And just what is the point of social science if every phenomenon belongs to its own distinct category?

If, on the other hand, contemporary jihadi movements are to be put into an already existing social science category, what category might that be? "Islamo-fascism" has achieved a certain cachet in right-wing political circles, but if one were to set aside the superficial and normative attributes contemporary jihadi groups and genuine fascist movements hold in common (i.e., their shared propensity for violence and general nastiness), it soon becomes apparent that the rubric "Islamo-fascism" is polemic masquerading as analysis, and that the only ones who would make a connection between the two disparate phenomena are those who know little about either Islamic movements or fascism. There is a similar problem of confusing the glitter with the gold when it comes to transforming "terrorism" from a tactic into a category of analysis (a problem matched only by the perennial dilemma of defining "terrorism" in the first place[4]), and the attempt to save terrorism as a transhistorical category by differentiating among "waves of terrorism" or between the "old terrorism" and the "new terrorism" only serves to demonstrate why political scientists and habitués of think-tanks should study more history.[5] In the end, one must agree with Walter Laqueur's assessment of thirty years ago that "a good case can be made for the comparative study of terrorism, but it should [be] apparent that not everything can be compared with everything else."[6]

There is, however, one comparative category that has achieved somewhat of a cult status that begs for further investigation: the jihadism promoted by al-Qaeda and its ilk, on the one hand, and anarchism, on the other. Soon after the events of 9/11, I began making the comparison myself in talks and written works. For example, in the Introduction to my *The Modern Middle East: A History*, I drew the distinction between

al-Qaeda and mass-based Islamist groupings such as Hamas and Hizbullah and wrote of the former,

> The preference of the leaders and adherents of al-Qaeda for action over ideology, their single-minded focus on resistance, their lack of programmatic goals, their pursuit of violence for its own sake, their use of a highly decentralized structure built upon semi-autonomous cells—all these factors align al-Qaeda with a type of movement that historically has had nothing to do with Islam at all: anarchism. Like other anarchist movements, al-Qaeda is reactive. It focuses solely on resisting what it considers to be an intrusive alien order and preserving a culture and life-style and the homeland of that culture and lifestyle its members believe to be under attack. And unlike other movements whose discourse al-Qaeda shares, al-Qaeda does not operate as a cog within the international state and economic systems. Rather, it wars on those systems.[7]

Although I have changed my mind about some of the particulars of my argument, overall I still think it stands.

In all modesty, I must add that I was hardly alone in viewing al-Qaeda in this way. Others also drew the comparison between al-Qaeda and anarchist organizations, particularly those anarchist organizations that emerged during the period between 1880 and 1920, the so-called heyday of anarchism: *The Economist* ("For Jihadist, Read Anarchist"); Graham Stewart for the *Times* of London ("Al-Qaeda, Victorian Style"); Niall Ferguson (who refers to al-Qaeda-style jihadism as "Islamo-nihilism…in the Nechaevan tradition"); John Gray ("The strategy [of al-Qaeda] is the same [as Conrad's *Secret Agent*]—to remake the world by spectacular acts of terror."); Ambassador James Dobbins ("If Al Qaeda has a historic antecedent that one can usefully point to, it's probably the anarchist movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth century."); Lee Harris in *Policy Review* (who speaks of the "Sorelian myth" guiding al-Qaeda's tactics); Ted Galen Carpenter for the McClatchy-Tribune News Service ("The closest historical analogy for the radical Islamic terrorist threat is neither the two world wars nor the Cold

War…It is the violence perpetrated by anarchist forces during the last third of the nineteenth century."), Malise Ruthven (the "The [jihadi] message of revolutionary anarchism that 'every system that permits some people to rule over others be abolished' owes more to radical European ideas going back to the Jacobins than to classical or traditional ideas about Islamic governance"), and so on.[8]

Where I differ from most of the aforementioned, however, is what I mean by the term "anarchism." Most of those listed above do not use the term to delineate a distinct type of political phenomenon; rather, most adopt the assumptions of terrorology and compare the seemingly mindless violence perpetrated by the proverbial black-clad, bearded, bomb-wielding nineteenth-century anarchist of legend with the proverbial white-clad, bearded, bomb-wielding al-Qaeda operative of present. Hence, articles explaining the acts of 9/11 in terms of nineteenth-century anarchism almost inevitably include a list of what might literally be taken as anarchism's greatest hits, such as the following:

> Beginning in the 1880s…the world community of nations considered anarchism to pose the greatest threat to the internal political and economic order, and to international stability. Between 1894 and 1900, anarchist assassins had killed the President of France, the Empress of Austria and the King of Italy. In Russia, anarchists would assassinate numerous government ministers. In September 1901, anarchist Leon Czolgosz assassinated President William McKinley. McKinley's assassination came after a wave of anarchist terrorism in Europe. The political (and to some extent social and economic) consequences were similar in many respects to those of the 9/11 attacks.[9]

That the concept of anarchism is so easily shorn of any analytical utility in articles such as the above cannot just be blamed on the kudzu-like effect of the terrorology paradigm. Responsibility must also be borne by those social scientists who have studied the phenomenon and who cannot seem to agree on an acceptable definition. They, in

turn, might point to the difficulty of defining a phenomenon whose self-professed

adherents have included William Godwin and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Peter Kropotkin

and Mikhail Bakunin, Georges Sorel and Errico Malatesta, Noam Chomsky and Howard

Zinn, Emma Goldman and Sacco and Venzetti, Leo Tolstoy and Annie Besant,

Alexander Berkmann and Sergei Nechaev. No wonder, then, that even normally eloquent

spokesmen for the cause such as Daniel Guéron have been reduced to defining anarchism

affectively as a "visceral revolt."[10] As anarchist and convicted terrorist Emile Henry put

it (quite ironically, in light of the argument of this paper) on the way to the guillotine,

> Beware of believing anarchy to be a dogma, a doctrine above question or
> debate, to be venerated by its adepts as the Koran by devout Moslems.
> No! the absolute freedom which we demand constantly develops our
> thinking and raises it toward new horizons (according to the turn of mind
> of various individuals), takes it out of the narrow framework of regulation
> and codification. We are not 'believers!'[11]

Since no commonly-accepted definition of anarchism currently exists, perhaps the

following, culled from the literature of history and political science, might suffice:

Anarchism is an episodic discourse—a mode of conceptualizing the world which

provides its adherents with a prescription for action and which has been consistently

available to, but only sometimes adopted by, political actors in the modern world.[12]

(While not entirely necessary for a definition of anarchism, the notion that anarchism is

"consistently available to, but only sometimes adopted by, political actors in the modern

world" makes it possible for us to restore agency to its rightful owner. Adopting the

notion also enables us to forgo the commonplace but problematic attempt to carve up the

periodic eruptions of anarchism into discrete waves: While in such a reckoning the first

wave [1880-1920] might be uncontroversial, and the contemporary wave [say, 1989-

present] might prove arguable, the wave theory falls short when it comes to dealing with

Spain during the 1930s, the overly-romanticized events of 1968, and countless other localized and/or fleeting eruptions.)

To continue: Like similar discourses—racial anti-Semitism, for example— anarchism makes for itself the claim of being defensive in nature. Unlike racial anti-Semitism, however, anarchism is after a much bigger fish than society's outcasts: anarchism targets the very system that is, for anarchists, the wellspring of subjugation. (In this alone anarchism differs from nationalism, whose very *raison d'être* is the assertion of the right of a self-proclaimed "nation" to participate in the system.) That system has historically been identified with the oppression of nation-states, capitalism, or (more recently) globalization and neo-liberal economics, and the operant oppressor that is the immediate target of anarchist antipathy might be the state, the bourgeoisie, "the establishment," or multinational corporations and the International Monetary Fund.[13]

This brings us to the final two parts of our definition. While Eduard Bernstein's oft-cited adage, "the goal is nothing, the movement is all," might encapsulate the popular image of anarchism, the very structure of the world as constituted by anarchists requires them to delineate the contours of some sort of ideal "counter-community," either explicitly or implicitly.[14] Of course, those contours, and the tactics for bringing the counter-community into being (if, indeed, it does not already exist in some inchoate, unselfconscious form), have hardly been consistent over time. And so the final point: Unlike scientific socialism, which has created for itself an enclosed, "disarticulated" domain, complete with a language and worldview that is as at home in nineteenth-century Germany as it is in twentieth-century Cuba, anarchism rarely strays far from the cultural milieu in which anarchists are embedded. Thus, nineteenth-century European and New

World anarchist movements drew their rationale, vocabulary, and visions for the ideal

society from a variety of sources that today's anarchists might view as "quaint,"

including Christian communitarianism, Romanticism, socialism, and Liberalism.  As

Noam Chomsky has put it,

> There have been many styles of anarchist thought and action.  It would be
> hopeless to try to encompass all of these conflicting tendencies in some
> general theory or ideology.  And even if we proceed to extract from the
> history of libertarian thought a living, evolving tradition…it remains
> difficult to formulate its doctrines as specific and determinate theory of
> society and social change….One might, however, argue rather differently:
> that at every stage of history our concern must be to dismantle those forms
> of authority and oppression that survive from an era when they might have
> been justified in terms of the need for security or survival or economic
> development, but that now contribute to—rather than alleviate—material
> and cultural deficit.  If so,  there will be no doctrine of social change fixed
> for the present and future, nor even, necessarily, a specific and unchanging
> concept of the goals toward which social change should tend.[15]

Now, if we look at the discourse of al-Qaeda, we see that it hits the same three

marks as the anarchism of our definition (we shall, for the moment, set aside the etic task

of demonstrating al-Qaeda's episodic and articulative nature and concentrate on that

which is emic):

1. *anarchism makes for itself the claim of being defensive in nature*: As anyone who has

read al-Qaeda's pronouncements or watched its videos can attest, the struggle the

"Zionist-Crusader alliance" is waging against the Islamic umma—and the legality of and

obligation to self-defense—plays a central role in the group's polemics.  For example, in

his "Letter to Americans: Why do we Fight and Resist You?"—first released on the

internet in October 2002, then re-released in videotape form in January 2006, bin Laden

notes:

> Why are we fighting and opposing you?  The answer is very simple:
> Because you attacked us and continue to attack us.  You attacked us in

Palestine…You attacked us in Somalia; you supported the Russian atrocities against us in Chechnya, the Indian oppression against us in Kashmir, and the Jewish aggression against us in Lebanon. Under your supervision, consent and orders, the governments of our countries, which act as your agents, attack us on a daily basis. These governments prevent our people from establishing the Shari<sup>c</sup>a, using violence and lies to do so….[16]

For bin Laden and his supporters, the current worldwide conspiracy against Islam, led by the United States, is but the latest manifestation of an assault that has been ongoing since at least the time of the *reconquista*. According to Ayman Zawahiri, "Shaykh Abdullah Azzam…constantly repeated and affirmed that the Muslims are in sin from the fall of Spain until today, because they have not performed their personal duty of freeing the lands of Islam from the infidels."[17]

Of course, declaring a defensive jihad against the enemies of Islam serves as a mobilizational tool as well: As Azzam argues above, an assault on the Islamic community transforms jihad from a duty that might legally be delegated to other members of the Islamic community (*fard kifaya*) to one that must be borne by each individual (*fard <sup>c</sup>ayn*). And neither bin Laden nor Zawahiri have been shy about touting the obligations incurred by individual Muslims as a result of this assault:

Religious scholars throughout Islamic history have agreed that *jihad* is an individual duty when an enemy attacks Muslim countries. This was related by the Imam ibn Qudama in "The Resource," by Imam al-Kisa'i in "The Marvels," by al-Qurtubi in his exegesis, and by the Sheikh of Islam when he states in his chronicles that "As for fighting to repel an enemy, which is the strongest way to defend freedom and religion, it is agreed that this is a duty. After faith, there is no greater duty than fighting an enemy who is corrupting religion and the world.

On this basis, and in accordance with God's will, we pronounce to all Muslims the following judgment:

To kill the American and their allies—civilians and military—is an individual duty incumbent upon every Muslim in all countries, in order to liberate the al-Aqsa Mosque and the Holy Mosque from their grip, so that

their armies leave all the territory of Islam, defeated, broken, and unable to threaten any Muslim.[18]

But there is a danger in reading too much into the utilitarian function of defensive jihad: polemical pieces are, after all, polemical pieces, specifically designed as calls to action. Furthermore, it would not serve any good purpose to discount either the coherence and inner logic of the discursive field in which defensive jihad is situated or the historical antecedents and discursive tropes from which bin Laden and Zawahiri have chosen to draw. Defensive jihad, in other words, is an integral part of, not just a handy derivation from, the discourse of al-Qaeda-style jihadism.

2. *anarchism targets the very system that is, for anarchists, the wellspring of subjugation*: In the broadest sense, al-Qaeda spokesmen rail against the international system which, they argue, is a tool of the Zionist-Crusader alliance and is rigged against Islam. The United Nations, which preserves Zionist-Crusader dominance, is a particular target of vituperation:

> The West is still living with the complex of racial superiority, and looks upon the rest of the peoples arrogantly from on high, and feels that it is on top and the others beneath them. This view of the peoples as inferior dominates them, and the residues and shadow of past centuries, when the sun didn't set on what were called their colonies, in which sat their gluttonous armies which occupied countries, sucked the peoples' treasures, and enslaved them—these residues and shadows continue to dominate them. Thus, the people, as they see them, are white—and they're the masters—and colored—and they're the slaves—which is why the West created organizations and made laws which preserve and protect its doctrine of enslavement of the peoples. It created the United Nations for this purpose, and the right of veto is nothing but glaring proof of that and nothing but sanctification of the defense of this tyrannical, dictatorial doctrine which considers Jihad in the path of Allah and defense of one's self and homeland to be terrorism….And I say, clarifying their domination of the Security Council, that Crusader International and pagan Buddhism hold the five permanent seats and what is called the privilege of the right of veto in what is called the Security Council. America and Britain represent the Protestant Christians, Russia represents the Orthodox

> Christians, and France represents the Catholic Christians, while China represents the Buddhists and pagans of the world…The United Nations is an organization of unbelief and he who is pleased with its laws is an unbeliever, and it is a took used to implement Zionist/Crusader resolutions, including the declarations of war against us and the division and occupation of our lands. It is a Zionist/Crusader war against the Muslims.[19]

It was thus the Great Powers that created the United Nations and have dominated it ever since, just as it was the United Nations that created the State of Israel and has shielded it ever since. But the true perfidy of the Great Powers goes back further: Even before the creation of the United Nations, the Great Powers, sanctioned by an international system they had created in the first place, ensured the enervation of the Islamic world by creating "dozens of states and mini-states"[20] in Muslim territory. "You should understand," Zawahiri recently protested, "that we are a single nation, who do not recognize the Sykes-Picot Agreement, Percy Cox maps, and Durand lines."[21]

But the argument presented by al-Qaeda spokesmen goes deeper than just complaints about the balance of power within the international system. After all, if that were the sole complaint, al-Qaeda's objections to the contemporary state system would be indistinguishable from those lodged by the Third Worldists of the mid-twentieth century. Instead, as had been the case with the anarchists of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it is the very building block of that system—the nation-state—and the ideological glue that holds the nation-state together—nationalism—that raises al-Qaeda hackles. According to bin Laden, "Fighting should be for the sake of the one God. It should not be for championing ethnic groups or for championing the non-Islamic regimes in all Arab countries, including Iraq." And then there is Louis Attiya Allah, a

frequent spokesman for al-Qaeda, who wrote in the online magazine, *sawt al-jihad* (*The Voice of Jihad*),

> The (Arab) nation states…are a Western model that the West created to allow it to build up its general colonialist plan for the Islamic East. These countries have no religious foundation, and have neither a right to exist nor a popular base. They were forced upon the Muslim peoples, and their survival is linked to the Western forces that created them. Therefore, the general aim of the jihad and the Mujahideen is to strike at the foundations and infrastructure of the Western colonialist program or at the so-called world order—or, to put it bluntly, to defeat the Crusaders in the battle that has been going on for over a century. Their defeat means, simply, the elimination of all forms of nation-states, such that all that remains is the natural existence familiar to Islam—the regional entity under the great Islamic state.

And finally, ʿAbd al-Rahman ibn Salim al-Shamari, writing in the same venue:

> And these are the lessons we learned: The collapse of national identities. When these are opposed to the Sharia or attempt to rival it, and when they cause division among people and [provide a basis for] allegiances, then these national identities should fall and Arab nationalism first and foremost.[22]

It should be recalled here that a rejection of the nation-state and nationalism does not necessarily flow from so-called Islamist discourse. Most politically-active Islamists have made their peace with the system, at least ostensibly. Indeed, the Taliban itself asserted its right to represent Afghanistan at the United Nations up through the bitter end (a right opposed by the United States, of course). Hassan al-Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt—an organization that is usually cited as the precursor or of contemporary Islamo-nationalist groups—put it this way:

> *Wataniyat al banin*, i.e., the love for one's country and place of residence, is a feeling hallowed both by the commands of nature and the injunctions of Islam. Bilal...and the Prophet himself approved of this kind of *wataniyah* when they expressed their tender love for their home town of Mecca.

*Wataniyat al-hurriyya wa'l-'izza*, i.e., the desire to work for the restoration of the honour and independence of one's country is a feeling approved by the Qur'an...and by the Ikhwan [Muslim Brotherhood]....[23]

The differing approaches taken by al-Qaeda and Islamo-nationalist organizations with regard to the nation-state problem is perhaps most visible when it comes to the Palestine issue. While al-Qaeda spokesmen have articulated their support for the liberation of Palestine from the start, they have been less than enthusiastic about the strategy and goals of the largest and most powerful Islamist organization working for that end, Hamas. Even though Hamas has, to date, refused to recognize Israel, sign on to a two state solution, or repudiate its strategic commitment to jihad or its commitment to establishing an Islamic state in all of Palestine, it has reached agreement with secularists (brokered by the duplicitous Saudi regime, no less), "entered polytheistic councils," based its right to rule on *vox populi* rather than divine commandment, privileged the bond of nationality over the sacred bond of religion, and, overall, transformed a front in the struggle to liberate all Islamic lands from Spain to Bosnia to Kashmir into just another movement for national liberation. "Bush…has threatened Hamas," Zawahiri wrote in a "friendly" message to his brethren,

…with stopping aid in case it does not recognize Israel, give up its struggle and abide by the agreements signed between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. And in this context, it is important to warn my brothers in Palestine from a few things so they would understand the dimensions of the American conspiracy against them.

The first thing is that reaching power should not be used to submit to those conditions. Reaching power should be used to apply God's law in the land…

The second matter is that we must understand the realities and dimensions of the conflict. The reality of the conflict is that the Israeli occupation of Palestine is in the forefront of the Crusaders' mission against Islam and Muslims. The dimensions of the conflict include the confrontations between the world-wide Muslim community on one side and the Christian West on the other side. So Palestine is the worry for all

Muslims.  It is impossible to do jihad there with a narrow and secular nationalistic way of thinking, which pushes aside Sharia and respects the seculars' influence in Palestine.  On the other hand, every Muslim in Palestine is a part of the world-wide Muslim community and is responsible for supporting all of this community's issues.

The seculars in the PA have sold Palestine.  Recognizing and legitimizing [their powers] is against the way of Islam.  In the eyes of Islam, they are criminals,  Palestine does not belong to them, nor is it a property that they can simply abandon.  Sharing one legislative council and regarding their position of selling Palestine, which is against Islam, as a legitimate stand while accepting that the final judge between us and them is the number of votes is a clear opposition of Quranic teachings.

If we accept their authority and their system, then we've accepted their signed agreements.  This also means if those criminals win majority in any future elections, then we will have to accept their position of selling out Palestine.  It is not the right of any Palestinian or non-Palestinian to give up a grain of Palestinian soil….

It is very dangerous to accept to join these secular councils on the basis of a secular constitution, and on the basis of the Madrid, Oslo Roadmap agreements other agreements professing surrender….

The third matter is that we give the rule of Sharia in hopes of getting back a piece of Palestine, the Crusading West will not be satisfied….So why sell our faith for the sake of materialistic rewards….

The fourth matter: There have been a few official statements that accept and respect the agreements signed between the PA and Israel.  This means that those who released those statements accept the Madrid, Oslo, and Roadmap agreements along with others that admit surrender.  This is a dangerous deal which should be dropped immediately.

One may wonder, for what gains are the Sharia given up?  And for what gains has the surrendering agreements been accepted?  Is it for 80 seats in Gaza?...

So if the faith is all to Allah and the word of God is highest, then earth is liberated, injustices are lifted, and all that is sacred is protected. But if we sacrifice our Sharia rule, and legitimize those who sell their nations and sign agreements of surrender, in hopes of liberating earth, alleviating injustice or protecting, then we will lose our faith and our lives. In the meantime, earth will still be occupied, injustices present and sacredness violated.[24]

No shrinking violet, Hamas has not hesitated to return al-Qaeda's scorn in spades.

In a manner reminiscent of nineteenth- and twentieth-century leftist polemics, Hamas

spokesmen have accused al-Qaeda of adventurism, calling it "destructive and

isolationist" and warning of the threat posed by the spread of al-Qaeda-style jihadism in

the occupied territories (targeting both al-Qaeda and the Palestinian born and bred Hizb al-Tahrir, whose ideology overlaps with that of al-Qaeda). And Hamas has not hesitated to go beyond verbal duals by confronting al-Qaeda-style jihadis both in and outside the occupied territories directly. Hamas leaders, like those of Hizbullah and analogous Iraqi groups, have recognized al-Qaeda as more than an irritant or a rival for the hearts and minds of their constituencies, but rather as an adversary on the most elemental ideological level.[25]

3. *the very structure of the world as constituted by anarchists requires them to delineate the contours of some sort of ideal "counter-community," either explicitly or implicitly*: Much (probably altogether too much) has been made of the call by a number of al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda associated spokesmen for a re-establishment of an Islamic caliphate as the centerpiece of their vision of a counter-community. For example, according to a New York Times report filed during the Summer of 2007, "Last year, a leaked Marine intelligence report conceded that the war in Anbar was effectively lost, and that it was on course to becoming the seat of the Islamic militants' plans to establish a new caliphate in Iraq."[26] The problem with such stories is not that they falsely denote al-Qaeda designs; rather, the problem with such stories is that they do not accurately connote al-Qaedist aspirations. For al-Qaeda, liberation of a piece of Islamic territory from the clutches of the Zionist-Crusader conspiracy and its local henchmen (whether that territory be in or coincide with the current boundaries of states such as Afghanistan, Iraq, or, most recently, Somalia) will lead to the establishment of an operational base—an "amirate" in al-Qaeda parlance—from which Muslims might launch their struggle to liberate the

remainder of Islamic territory.[27]  Once that is accomplished, it will be possible to re-establish a caliphate.

Whatever caliphate the future holds in store, however, should not be mistaken for an Islamic "state" writ large.  The caliphate under discussion is not analogous to the sort of state al-Qaeda spokesmen reproach Hamas or Hizbullah or the Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt for advocating.  Rather, in the al-Qaeda imagination it seems that the caliphate might be defined as a territorial expanse freed from the constraints of the nation-state system and ordered and administered according to the precepts of Islamic law.  The use of the word "seems" is appropriate here because al-Qaeda spokesmen and texts have differed on exactly what it is they mean by a caliphate.  At times, they define "caliphate" in the above terms.  At other times, the term is deployed metaphorically to connote "Islamic rule that will respect the rights and honors of its citizens, fight corruption and spread justice and equality," a place "in whose shade will retire every Muslim—nay, every wronged one and seeker of justice on the face of this earth."[28]  At still other times, it has the eschatological ring of post-millennialism:

> So I say that, in general, our concern is that our umma unites either under the Words of the Book of God or His Prophet, and that his nation should establish the righteous caliphate of our umma, which has been prophesied by our Prophet in his authentic hadith: that the righteous caliph will return with the permission of God.[29]

Whatever the case, the vagueness or even inconsistency of al-Qaeda pronouncements about the future probably has more to do with the difficulty of coming up with an entirely original program for governance-cum-disciplinary mechanism from a vantage point located within the existing nation-state system than with maintaining a purposeful tactical ambiguity.  It is, in fact, this very problem with which all anarchist movements (not to

mention all Islamo-nationalist movements as well, in spite efforts of apologists like Hassan al-Banna) have had to contend.

Although the al-Qaeda vision of counter-community remains ambiguous, its strategy for bringing that counter-community about is less so. While historians have regarded the violence perpetrated by nineteenth-century anarchist groups in a number of ways—from being a "free-floating signifier" whose only meaning was that which pre-existing scripts infused it with to being a "symbolic-expressive performance"[30]—a number of anarchist theorists have emphasized the instrumental function of violence. I am referring here to the "propaganda of the deed" of Errico Malatesta, Johann Most, Georges Sorel, et al. For many nineteenth-century anarchists, the more outrageous the violence they perpetrated the better, because such violence would not only inflict damage on the targeted enemy, it and subsequent reprisals (although the deed itself was usually presented as reprisal) and repression undertaken by the enemy would reify the boundaries between the counter-community and the enemy, potentially spark a revolutionary upsurge or the ever-elusive holy grail of a "general strike," present the counter-community with its own mythogenesis, and forge bonds of resistance and confute the target's claim to invincibility by displaying its vulnerability. In this vein, here is how bin Laden described the deed perpetrated by the nineteen hijackers of 9/11:

> They struck at the very heart of the Ministry of Defense, and they hit the American economy right at its heart, too. They rubbed America s nose in the dirt, and wiped its arrogance in the mud. As the twin towers of New York collapsed, something even greater and more enormous collapsed with them: the myth of the great America and the myth of democracy. It became clear to all that America's values are the lowest, and the myth of the "land of the free" was destroyed, as was the myth of American national security and the CIA, all praise and glory to God. One of the most important positive effects of our attacks on New York and Washington was to expose the reality of the struggle between the

> Crusaders and the Muslims, and to demonstrate the enormous hostility that the Crusaders feel towards us.  The attacks revealed the American wolf in its true ugliness.  The entire world woke up from its slumber, and the Muslims realized the importance of the doctrine of friendship and the enmity in God.  The spirit of brotherhood in faith amongst Muslims was strengthened, which can be considered a great step towards unification of the Muslims under the word of God and establishing the rightly guided Caliphate with the permission of God.[31]

Substitute "bourgeoisie," "proletariat," and "socialism," for "Crusader,"

"Muslim," and "rightly guided Caliphate" and you pretty much have Sorel.

Of course, whether or not the reader is convinced that jihadism as represented by al-Qaeda hits the same three marks as anarchism—that it, like anarchism, makes for itself the claim of being defensive in nature; that it, like anarchism, targets the very system that is, for it, the wellspring of subjugation; and that for it, as for anarchism, the very structure of the world it constitutes requires its adherents to delineate the contours of some sort of ideal "counter-community," either explicitly or implicitly—matters only if the reader accepts our definition of anarchism in the first place.  And this is not the end of our problems.  While it might seem easy to compare the discourse of jihadism as espoused by al-Qaeda and its ilk with that of anarchism, see how we stand, and call it a day, such a comparison presumes the discourse of al-Qaeda to be coherent and consistent.  Such coherence and consistency cannot be taken for granted.  As far as the former is concerned, Olivier Roy (who just might know) and John Gray (who probably does not), have written that the term "al-Qaeda" no longer refers to a distinct entity but has become "a brand name ready for franchise."[32]  Dr. Zawahiri's "brotherly" admonitions to (former gangbanger) Abu Mus$^c$ab al-Zarqawi seem to demonstrate how far local franchisees might stray from the original vision of al-Qaeda's founders.[33]  Even were we to attempt to get around this problem by restricting our sampling to the inner core of founders—say,

to bin Laden and Zawahiri (as we have, for the most part, done)—we would find that the two draw from different sets of referents (bin Laden's animosity toward the Saudi regime, Zawahiri's immersion in the internecine Islamist squabbles in Cairo) and from intellectual traditions that might be aligned but are hardly identical. And while we are on the subject of cherry-picking "authentic" spokesmen, it should be added that limiting our sample to some "real" or "original" inner circle involves the privileging of one group of "al-Qaedists" over other adherents and groups who have appropriated the same name—a choice that may be defensible, but a choice nonetheless. (Ever helpful, bin Laden himself has complicated matters by denying the existence of an entity called "al-Qaeda":

> So the situation isn't like the West portrays it, that there is an "organization" with a specific name [such as Al Qaeda] and so on. That particular name is very old. It was born without any intention from us. Brother Abu Ubaida al-Banshiri, may God have mercy on him, created a military base to train the young men to fight against the vicious, arrogant, brutal, terrorizing Soviet empire, which was a truth to all observers. So this place was called "The Base", as in a training base, so this name grew and became. We aren't separated from this Islamic nation.[34])

Then there is the problem of consistency: One need only compare bin Laden's original declaration of war against the Americans, written in August 1996 (which calls for jihad against the Americans to redress grievances about which only Saudi nationals could possibly care), with his rambling videotape message of June 2007 (which justifies jihad against Americans on the basis of everything from genocide committed against the original inhabitants of North America and the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to corporate control of America and America's contribution to global warming) to see how far a little historicization and contextualization can go.[35] While none of these problems may prove insurmountable, their presence deserves to be acknowledged nonetheless.

On a totally different level, analysts of al-Qaeda-style jihadism face another

problem as well: Assuming that al-Qaeda-style jihadism falls into the category of

anarchism, and assuming that anarchism is a structurally distinct episodic discourse

"available to, but only sometimes adopted by, political actors in the modern world," it

might be asked what is it that has sparked this particular anarchist episode?  In other

words, why now?  Once again, I entered the lists on this one early:

> The recent reappearance of anarchist movements (al-Qaeda is just
> one among many) is directly related to the purported transformation of the
> international system that coincided with the end of the Cold War—a
> transformation that goes under the rubric of "globalization"….For many,
> globalization represents the homogenization of cultures, the influence of
> distant, unelected corporate technocracies and international financial
> institutions (the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade
> Organization), and an expanding commercialization and commodification of
> culture at the expense of "authentic" indigenous cultures.  For many,
> globalization is little more than a fig leaf for American imperialism.  This
> rejection of "American globalization" certainly exists in the Middle East,
> but it also exists in places as diverse as Latin America (hence, the recent
> resurgence of "neo-populism" in Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, and other places
> in the region) and Europe (it was not, after all, an "Islamo-fascist" who
> burned down a McDonald's in France).  On the broadest level, the United
> States has become the principal target of anger because of what it
> represents: the foremost military, economic, and, arguably, cultural power in
> the world today (and by cultural power I am referring to America's ability to
> impose its cultural standards and icons—from Mickey Mouse to Michael
> Jordan—worldwide).  Other places that have recently experienced jihadist
> outrages, such as England and Spain, have been targeted because of their
> willingness to participate in a New (American) World Order….[36]

And once again, I was not alone in linking al-Qaeda and globalization.[37]  Who, after all,

can blame those of us who jumped on this bandwagon?  Haven't eruptions of anarchism

historically coincided with revolutionary (as least as gauged by historians)

transformations or disruptions in the international economic and/or state systems?  Didn't

such a transformation/disruption take place in the aftermath of the global economic crisis

of the 1970s and the collapse of the Soviet Union, out of which the discourse of

globalization emerged?  Doesn't the fact that al-Qaeda's discourse is anti-systemic tell us

all we need to know about what triggered its formation in the first place?  Haven't bin

Laden and Zawahari themselves railed against the American/Western attempts to impose

"secularism, moral dissolution, military capitulation, political affiliation, [and] economic

looting," on the Islamic world in order "to turn the Muslim nation into a humiliated,

obedient, and defenseless herd?"[38]  And didn't al-Qaeda attack the very symbols of

American economic and military hegemony—the World Trade Center and the

Pentagon—on 11 September ("As for the World Trade Center, the ones who were

attacked and who died in it were part of a financial power….It wasn't a children's

school!")?[39]  Absolutely.  Nevertheless, this time I would like to amend what I had

written earlier.

The linkage between globalization and al-Qaeda-style jihadism is not causal,

whatever I may have implied in the selection cited above and whatever the even more

extravagant claims that have been made by others.[40]  Not only do such claims ignore the

human factor, they fully deserve the labels "instrumentalist" and "reductionist."

Furthermore, the very assumption that the question "why now?" has an answer is itself

problematic for two reasons.  First, it assumes that systemic values as articulated by the

system's beneficiaries are hegemonic and that opposition to the system is both

exceptional and pathological.[41]  More particularly, since anarchism both articulates with

its immediate environment and is consistently available to political actors in the modern

world, chances are that someone would have articulated an Islamic anarchism sooner or

later, globalization or no globalization.  Someone very well may have done so before this

current eruption—although, if such were the case, few, if any, noticed.  After all, no one

has achieved the sort of notoriety bin Laden, Zawahiri, and at least nineteen others have achieved.

Rather than attributing al-Qaeda-style jihadism to globalization, then, it might be more appropriate to set our sights a little lower: It is not that globalization spawned al-Qaeda-style jihadism; instead, it is the resonance al-Qaeda actions has among (predominantly) Muslim populations that might be attributed to the effects of (what falls under the rubric of) a globalization that, for many outside the West, has had baleful consequences, to say the least.[42]  In the end, it has been those actions that have enabled al-Qaeda to carve out a niche for itself and for its brand of jihadism in an already crowded public sphere among those alienated from both the current global economic and state systems, on the one hand, and the non-anarchist alternatives to those systems, on the other.

---

[1] For the problem of using either religion or Islam as a unit of analysis, see James L. Gelvin, "The Power of Religion: Why We Don't Have a Clue and Some Suggestions to Clue Us in," www.humnet.ucla.edu/ humnet/religion/gelvin.html; for the transformation of the meaning and function of Islam in the Middle East during the nineteenth century, see Gelvin, "Secularism and Religion in the Arab Middle East: Reinventing Islam in a World of Nation States," in Derek R. Peterson and Darren Walhof (eds.), *The Invention of Religion: Rethinking Belief and Politics in History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002), 115-130.

[2] See, for example, Quintan Wiktorowicz, "A Genealogy of Radical Islam," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 24 (2005), 75-97.

[3] This is the path taken by Lawrence Wright in his *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda and the Road to 9/11* (New York: Vintage, 2007).

[4] See Alex P. Schmid, "Frameworks for Conceptualising Terrorism," *Terrorism and Political* Violence 16 (2004), 197-221; Omar Malik, *Enough of the Definition of Terrorism* (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2001.

[5] For example, the proposition that the current "fourth wave" of terrorism might be distinguished from earlier "waves of terrorism" by its religious nature is easily dismissed not only because it overlooks acts of violence committed in previous eras in the name of what are commonly labeled "religions," it also reifies the (disputed) category of "religion" and ignores the capacity of competing structures of knowledge and social practice to shape "religion" in the modern world.  See Gelvin, "Secularism and Religion," op. cit. Overall, the literature critiquing terrorology is as immense as the literature of terrorology.  A good place to start is Charles Tilly, "Terror, Terrorism, Terrorists," *Sociological* Theory 22 (March 2004), 5-13; Joseph Massad, "Introduction: The Opposite of Terror," in *The Persistence of the Palestinian Question: Essays on*

*Zionism and the Palestinians* (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), 1-10.  For waves of terrorism, see David C. Rapoport, "The Four Waves of Rebel Terror and September 11," *Anthropoetics* 8 (Spring/Summer 2002), www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap0801/terror.htm.   For "old terrorism" and "new terrorism," see Walter Laqueur, *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction* (London: Oxford, 1999); David Tucker, "What's New about the New Terrorism and How Dangerous is It?," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 13 (2001), 1-14.  For critiques of the "new terrorism" idea, see Alexander Spencer, "Questioning the Concept of 'New Terrorism,'" *Peace, Conflict, & Development* 8 (January 2006), http://www.peacestudiesjournal.org.uk; Albert J. Bergesen and Omar Lizardo, "International Terrorism and the World System," *Sociological Theory* 22 (March 2004), 38-52.

[6] Walter Laqueur, "Interpretations of Terrorism: Fact, Fiction, and Political Sense," *Journal of Contemporary History* 12 (January 1977), 11.   It's not as if "terrorology" has not had its moments.  For example, working from the data of  Bruce Hoffman, it appears that one untried tactic in the "war against terrorism" would be to offer would-be terrorists small business loans.  According to Hoffman, "ninety percent of all terrorist groups collapse within a year, and only half of the hardy remainder make it through another decade (Rapoport, 'The Four Waves')."  In contrast, only eighty percent of small businesses collapse within three years.  Needless to say, the data for both sets of statistics are suspect.

[7] James L. Gelvin, *The Modern Middle East: A History*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 7.

[8] "*The Economist*, 18 August 2005; *Times on Line,* 5 August 2005; "Clashing Civilizations or Mad Mullahs: The United States between Informal and Formal Empire," in *The Age of Terror: America and the World after September 11*, ed. Strobe Talbott and Nayan Chanda (New York: Basic Books, 2001), 119; *Al Qaeda and What It Means to be Modern* (New York: The New Press, 2003), 22; "Moral Clarity and the Middle East," (Speech given by James Dobbins at The American Strategy Program, New America Foundation, August 24, 2006); "Al Qaeda's Fantasy Ideology," *Policy Review* (August/September 2002), http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3459646.html; http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=6656; Malise Ruthven, "*A Fury for God: The Islamist Attack on America* (London: Granta Books, 2004), 91.

[9] Scott Atran, "Facing Catastrophe—Risk and Response: The 9/11 and 11-M Commissions' Blind Sides," (AEI-Brookings Joint Center Policy Matters 05-05), http://aei-brookings.org/policy/page.php?id=207.

[10] *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice*, trans. Mary Klopper (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970) 13.

[11] Ibid., 3-4.

[12] David E. Apter, "The Old Anarchism and the New—Some Comments," in *Anarchism Today*, ed. Apter and James Joll (London: MacMillan, 1970),  2, 5, 10; Laqueur, "Interpretations," 4-5.

[13]Guérin, *Anarchism*, viii; Apter, "The Old Anarchism," 2-3; Rudolf de Jong, "Provos and Kabouters," in *Anarchism*, ed. Perlin (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1979) 3; D. Novak, "The Place of Anarchism in the History of Political Thought," *The Review of Politics* 20 (July 1958), 310-1.  Also see the marvelously titled, "Social Anarchism: An Atavistic Ideology of the Peasant," by Peter E.B. Coy, *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 14 (May 1972), 133-49.

[14] Sharif Gemie, "Counter-community: An Aspect of Anarchist Political Culture," *Journal of Contemporary History* 29 (April 1994), 349-367; Jeffrey S. Juris, "Violence Performed and Imagined: Militant Action, the Black Bloc and the Mass Media in Genoa," *Critique of Anthropology* 25 (2005), 415-6; Sedgwick, Mark.  "Al-Qaeda and the Nature of Religious Terrorism,"*Terrorism and Political Violence* 16 (Winter 2004), 795-814.

[15] Guérin, *Anarchism*, vii-viii.  See also Apter, "The Old Anarchism," 2-3; Laqueur, "Interpretations," 14.

[16] bin Laden, "Why We Are Fighting You [Why do we Fight and Resist You?]," in *The Al Qaeda Reader*, ed. Raymond Ibrahim (New York: Broadway Books, 2007), 197-9; *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook: 2006 Messages from Al-Qaeda Leadership*, ed. Laura Mansfield (N.L.: TLG Publications, 2007), 21-3. Translated documents contained in edited or Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service collections have been checked with Arabic originals whenever possible. I have tried to keep the spelling and grammar of used by the translator, even when execrable.

[17] Zawahiri, "Supporting the Palestinians," 9 June 2006, in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook* 173.

[18] bin Laden, "The World Islamic Front," 23 February 1998, in *Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden*, ed. Bruce Lawrence (London: Verso, 2005), 60-1.

[19] bin Laden, "O, People of Islam," 23 April 2006, in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 120-4. See also Zawahiri, 10 September 2006, and Zawahiri, "Realities of the Conflict between Islam and Unbelief," 29 December 2006, in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 386-7, 505-6. Interestingly, Niall Feguson, of all people, concurs with bin Laden's assessment of Western motivations: "True, no one today would be so crass as to call occupying and governing Afghanistan 'the White Man's burden.' Even the British Prime Minister Tony Blair's messianic speech at the Labour Party conference on October 3 talked innocuously about 'partnership,' 'the politics of globalization' and 'reordering the world.' Yet the content of that speech was pure Kipling—albeit translated into politically correct language for the benefit of his congenitally anti-imperialist audience….According to Mr. Blair, [Bosnia, Kosovo, East Timor, Sierra Leone, etc., do not count] as imperialism because we have gone into these places not to exploit them economically (as in the bad old days) but to prevent them either from harboring terrorism or from menacing their neighbors. We are, he argues, 'bringing' such countries democracy and freedom….(But) the 'deal' Mr. Blair describes is not a new kind of colonialism at all. It is almost exactly what the late-Victorian generation of British imperialists said they were doing. Indeed, that is the whole point of Kipling's poem 'The White Man's Burden.'" Ferguson, "Clashing Civilizations," 121-3.

[20] bin Laden, "O People of Islam," 124.

[21] Zawahiri, "Four Years after the Tora Bora Battles; From Tora Bora to Iraq," 12 April 2006, Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 90. In addition to the famous (but stillborn) Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916, negotiated between Britain and France, Zawahiri is alluding to the activities of the first British high commissioner to Iraq, Percy Cox, and the 1893 boundary line established between British India and Afghanistan.

[22] bin Laden (19 January 2003), *Voice of Jihad* 6 (December 2003), Voice of Jihad (August/September 2004), in Brad K. Berner, *The World According to Al Qaeda* (n.l.: Booksurge, 2005), 147-8. On 22 October 2007, bin Laden reiterated the message in a tape released to al-Jazeera: "The interest of the Islamic nation surpasses that of a group - it is more important than that of a state….Some of you have been lax in one duty, which is to unite your ranks... Beware of division... Muslims are waiting for you to gather under a single banner to champion righteousness." See BBC report at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/ 7057282.stm.

[23] Cited in Robert P. Mitchell, *The Society of the Muslim Brothers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 265.

[24] Zawahiri, 4 March 2006, in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 69-74. See also bin Laden, "O People of Islam," 23 April 2006; Zawahiri, "Supporting the Palestinians," 9 June 2006; Zawahiri, "The Zionist Crusader War in Gaza and Lebanon," 27 July 2006; Zawahiri, "Realities of the Conflict between Islam and Unbelief," 29 December 2006; Zawahiri, "Eid al Adha Message," 29 December 2006; in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook,* 122, 174-5, 224, 507-9, 548-9. For a parallel condemnation of Islamo-nationalism in the Sudan, see Abu Bakr Naji, *The Management of Savagery: The Most Critical Stage Through Which the Umma Will Pass*, trans. William McCants (Cambridge, Ma: John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University, 2006), 3-4.

[25] See, *inter alia*, Anders Strindberg and Mats Warn, "Realities of Resistance: Hizballah, the Palestinian Rejectionists, and al-Qa'ida Compared," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 34 (Spring 2005), 1-19. On the relationship between Hamas and al-Qaeda variety, see Saleh al-Naami, "Hamas Versus Al-Qaeda," *Al-Ahram Weekly Online* 853 (12-18 July 2007); Bernard Rougier, *Everyday Jihad: The Rise of Militant Islam among Palestinians in Lebanon* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), particularly 155-168; Steven Erlanger and Hassan M. Fattah, "Jihadist Groups Fill a Palestinian Power Vacuum," *New York Times* (31 May 2007); Carolynne Wheeler, "Palestinians back Caliphate over Politics, *Daily Telegraph Online* (27 August 2007). On the Hizbullah/al-Qaeda competition, see Rayan Haddad, "Al Qaïda/Hezbullah: la concurrence à distance entre deux logiques d'action jihadistes différentes pour la capitation des cœurs et des esprits de l'Umma," *Cultures and Conflicts* 66 (été 2007), 157-77. Interestingly, Zawahiri has identified as the strength of Islamo-nationalist movements and the weakness of al-Qaeda the latter's lack of a mass base and institutionalized popular support system. In his "Knights under the Prophet's Banner," he writes, **"**The jihad movement must dedicate one of its wings to work with the masses, preach, provide services for the Muslim people, and share their concerns through all available avenues for charity and educational work. We must not leave a single are unoccupied. We must win the people's confidence, respect, and affection. The people will not love us unless they felt that we love them, care about them, and are ready to defend them….We must not blame the nation for not responding or not living up to the task. Instead, we must blame ourselves for failing o deliver the message, show compassion, and sacrifice." Laura Mansfield, *His Own Words: A Translation of the Writings of Dr. Ayman al Zawahiri* (n.l.: TLG Publications, 2006), 209.

[26] John F. Burns, "Showcase and Chimera in the Desert, *New York Times* (8 July 2007), http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/08/weekinreview/08burns.html.

[27] "The general concept of the mujahidin in Iraq and Afghanistan is the establishment of an Islamic emirate in each of the two countries, which will be the launching pad for defense of Islam and Muslims and a step toward the revival of the caliphate." Zawahiri, 10 September 2006, in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 421. See also Zawahiri, "Knights," in Mansfield, *His Own* Words, 209, 214-5.

[28] Zawahiri, 4 March 2006; Muhammad Khalil el-Hukaymah and Zawahiri, "Communique from Those Adhereing to the Covenant in the Egyptian Islamic Group," 5 August 2006; in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 61, 234.

[29] bin Laden, 21 October 2001, in Lawrence, *Messages to the* World, 121.

[30] Lay, "Beau Geste," 80-2, 91; Juris, "Violence Performed," 415-6.

[31] bin Laden, 14 February 2003, in Lawrence, *Messages to the* World, 194-5. See also: Zawahiri, "Knights under the Prophet's Banner," in Mansfield, *His Own Words*, 109; bin Laden, "Elegizing the Ummah's Martyr and Commander of the Martyrdom-Seekers" (30 June 2006) and "Knowledge is for Acting Upon: The Manhattan" (6 September 2006) in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 203, 337; Naji, *Management of Savagery*, 9-10. In his "Al Qaeda and the Nature of the Religious Terrorism," Mark Sedgwick comes to much the same conclusion, although he gets there by a very different route. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16 (Winter 2004), 795-814.

[32]Olivier Roy, "The Business of Terror: Al Qaida Brand Name Ready for Franchise," *Le Monde diplomatique* (English Edition: September 2004), http://mondediplo.com/2004/09/02alqaida; John Gray, "Look Out for the Enemy Within," *The Observer* (10 July 2005), http://observer.guardian.co.uk/comment/ story/0,,1525183,00.html. See also Rayan Haddad, "Al Qaïda/Hezbullah: la concurrence à distance entre deux logiques d'action jihadistes différentes pour la capitation des cœurs et des esprits de l'Umma," *Cultures and Conflicts* 66 (été 2007), 157-77.

[33] See, for example, Zawahiri to Zarqawi, 11 October 2005, in Mansfield, *His Own* Words, 250-79.

[34] Brad K. Berner, *Jihad: Bin Laden in His Own Words: Declarations, Interviews and Speeches* (n.l.: BookSurge, 2006), 127-8.

[35] Magnus Ranstorp's analysis of bin Laden's fatwa of 22 February 1998—which, among other things, Ranstorp identifies as an effort to legitimize the right of an upstart to issue a fatwa in the first place— provides an exemplary (and, unfortunately, all too uncommon) demonstration of how one might historicize and contextualize al-Qaeda statements. "Interpreting the Broader Context and Meaning of Bin-Laden's *Fatwa,*" *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 21 (1998), 321-330.

[36] Gelvin, *Modern Middle East*, 5.

[37] See, *inter alia*, Stanley Hoffman, "Clash of Globalizations," *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2002), http://www.cfr.org/publication.html?id=4763; John Gray, *Al Qaeda and What It Means to be Modern* (New York: The New Press, 2003), 75-7; Ferguson, "Clashing Civilizations," 121-3; Christopher Coker, "Globalisation and Insecurity in the Twenty-First Century: NATO and the Management of Risk," Adelphi Paper 345 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 17; Daniel L. Byman, "Al-Qaeda as an Adversary: Do We Understand Our Enemy," *World Politics* 56:1 (2003) 139-163; Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism," *International Security* 27:3 (Winter 2002/03), 30-58; Bergesen and Lizardo, "International Terrorism," 42-3. Much of the literature on al-Qaeda and globalization fits into the terrorology mold and links the latter with the former not as stimulus/response but rather instrumentally. It should be added that while Cronin's work in particular addresses the globalization/al-Qaeda link, her assumptions about globalization-as-progress (like those of many of her colleagues) make her predecessors among the modernization and secularization theorists appear progressive.

[38] For Zawahiri on globalization in general, see "Four Years after the Tora Bora Battles," in Mansfield *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 87; "Knights," in Mansfield, *His Own Words*, 203. For the problem of economic globalization, see bin Laden, 21 October 2001 and 26 December 2001, in Lawrence, *Messages*, 119, 150, and Zawahiri, 4 March 2006, in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 65. For the problem of political globalization, see bin Laden, 21 October 2001, in Lawrence, *Messages*, 150; Zawahiri, "Four Years After," in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 102-3, and "Knights," in Mansfield, "*His Own Words*, 21, 38; Naji, *Management*, 5; al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia, in Berner, *World*, 251. For the problem of cultural globalization, see bin Laden, "Resist the New Rome," 4 January 2004, in Lawrence, Messages, 214, and "Moderate Islam is a Prostration to the West," in Ibrahim, *Al Qaeda Reader*, 37; Zawahiri, "Four Years After," 108-9, in Mansfield, *Al Qaeda 2006 Yearbook*, 108-9, and Ibrahim, *Al Qaeda Reader* 187-8; al-Nida, 25 April 2003, in Berner, *World*, 182.

[39] bin Laden, 21 October 2001, in Lawrence, *Messages*, 119.

[40] According to Christopher Coker, for example, globalization "engenders the need for *expressive violence* (ritualistic, symbolic and communicative). It engenders terrorism. It creates a sense of powerlessness for those left on a planet where there is no viable alternative to the orthodoxies of the World Bank. It focuses even more attention on America and the 'Americanisation' seeping out of the satellite and cable networks like toxic waste. The expressive violence of the World Trade Center attack had meaning for the victim (anxiety and humiliation) and for the perpetrator (status, prestige and reputation in the Islamic world). And the choice of target, the WTC, a global icon, shows how globalisation gives expressive violence greater symbolic force than ever." Coker, "Globalisation," 17.

[41] See Laqueur, "Interpretations of Terrorism," 4-9; James L. Gelvin, "The Politics of Notables Forty Years After," *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin*, 40 (June 2006), 19-31. For the opposite viewpoint, see Cronin, "Behind the Curve," cited above.

[42] Although awkward, the wording here is intentional. For the gap between the claims made by globalization enthusiasts and the reality, see James L. Gelvin, "Globalization, Religion, and Politics in the

Middle East: The Current Crisis in Historical Perspective," *Global Development Studies* (Winter 2004/Spring 2005), 1-22.