



While scholars, journalists and policy-makers in Europe and America invariably describe Al Qaeda as a foreign, exotic threat that is difficult to understand, militants who identify with it routinely view their enemies in the most familiar of terms. Whether or not they really understand the west, these men's professions of intimacy with it hint at a more complex relationship. How does the radical Muslim's closeness to his enemy help us understand the character of globalised militancy today? And is it possible to find a global project to replace the murderous mayhem?

Blood Brothers

IT IS MEANINGLESS TO SEARCH FOR THE SOURCE of terrorist energies in some secret history or arcane text, the preserves of specialists on Islam or the Middle East. Indeed, given the many claims of familiarity and even fondness that militants make about their enemies, opposing them to the west for analytic, if not political, reasons becomes absurd. The task that confronts us is to forego the easy identification of Muslim militancy with some alien past or place, neither of which can account for the emergence of 'home-grown' militants integrated in Euro-American societies.

EQUALITY IN DEATH

Osama Bin Laden's rhetoric has consistently voiced a desire for global equality, in this case, that between Muslims

and Christians, or between the Islamic world and the west. Having accused America of hypocrisy as far as its advancement of this equality is concerned, Bin Laden turns his attention to the only form in which he thinks such freedom is possible: the equality of death. This is why he has repeatedly emphasised the need for an equivalence of terror between the Muslim world and America, as if this were the only form in which the two might come together and even communicate one with the other.

For Al Qaeda, terror is the only form in which global freedom and equality are now available. It therefore functions as the dark side of America's own democracy, as inseparable from it as an evil twin.

So in the aftermath of the 2005 Madrid bombings, Bin Laden issued a statement in which he defined terrorism as an effort to universalise security as a human right, if only by refusing to accept its monopolisation by the west. He said equality demanded that security should be enjoyed by all or by none: 'It is well known that security is a vital necessity for every human being. We will not let you monopolize it for yourselves ...' Quoted in Bruce Lawrence's edited volume, *Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden*, London: Verso, 2005.

In all this, Bin Laden has done nothing more than recognise the unity of a globe in which no man can be separated from any other, each one being held responsible for his fellows, with whose suffering he must identify. Such is the humanitarian logic that characterises global movements like environmentalism and pacifism as well. But this unity is made manifest by violence, which builds a bridge between enemies by demonstrating that all men are equal, if in death alone.

It is as if this macabre equivalence has replaced the equality that is supposed to exist between men and unite them as part of a single humanity. The militant's violence, then, ironically links the world's people together in a web of mutual obligation and responsibility. It is this web of universal complicity, after all, that allows American or British civilians to be killed in recompense for the killing of Muslims in Iraq.

The worldwide web of war spun by Al Qaeda exists as a kind of spectre of our global inter-relatedness, one that has as yet no specific political form of its own. And the militant's obsessive demands for equal treatment within this world, even if it be only in the form of a reciprocity of violence, represents the dark side of humanity's global brotherhood, whose reality

is the product of our increasingly inter-connected universe.

But this means that the same web of responsibilities and obligations linking the holy war to its enemies, also links them together as a community, even as a community of brothers. Are not Al Qaeda's victims said to be merely the counterparts of innocent Muslims killed elsewhere? They are therefore in some perverse way brothers at one remove, made even more like brothers by dying alongside suicide bombers and mingling blood.

BOUND TOGETHER

In the global perspective adopted by militant Islam, the peoples of the world are bound together in a web of mutual relations and complicities. For the moment this intimacy expresses itself in the most murderous way, though even here it represents what I have referred to as the dark side of another, more benign kind of relationship, like that of universal brotherhood.

Indeed Al Qaeda's actions and rhetoric continuously invoke the spectre of a global community that has as yet no formal existence of its own. And this is what allows its war to draw on the forms and even the vocabulary of other global movements such as environmental and pacifist ones, all of which are concerned with the fate of humanity as a whole.

In his more ironical moments, Bin Laden takes this language of global community so far as to put Al Qaeda and its American enemy on the same side of their mutual war, saying in a 2004 video, also quoted in the Lawrence volume, that President George Bush's administration's invasion of Iraq for power and profits contributed to the terror network's own aims: 'To some analysts and diplomats, it seems as if we and the White House are on the same team shooting at the United States' own goal, despite our different intentions.' And 'It truly shows that Al Qaeda has made gains, but on the other hand it also shows that the Bush administration has likewise profited.'

IN TERROR TOGETHER

Islamic militants exhibit a perverse humanity by addressing their victims in the language of intimacy, reciprocity and equivalence. That this is not a merely rhetorical gesture becomes evident when we consider that such militancy, unlike all previous forms of terrorist or insurgent action, refuses to set up



an alternative utopia for itself, something that even anarchists are not immune to.

Unlike the members of religious cults or fringe political groups, few of Al Qaeda's killers display signs of entering some closed ideological world by cutting themselves off from their families or everyday life. This suggests that the Islam they seek to defend is not conceived as an ideology at all, because it does not provide a complete or alternative vision of the world into which the would-be bomber can retreat as into a fortress.

Thus Bin Laden defines his own militancy merely as the obverse of the violence he attributes to the west, his refusal to claim autonomy for jihad making for a curious identity between Muslims and their enemies: 'Since we have reacted in kind, your description of us as terrorists and of our actions as terrorism necessarily means that you and your actions must be defined likewise.'

Apart from strictly operational agreements, there is little unity of doctrine even between Bin Laden and his lieutenant, Ayman al-Zawahiri, while the religion they follow possesses no established tradition, being made up of fragments snatched from differing Islamic authorities. There are at most very general patterns of thought that are neither codified nor propagated in any systematic way.

Instead of being recruited to a well-defined movement, the jihad's disparate soldiers franchise Al Qaeda's expertise and brand name for a variety of equally disparate causes that exist comfortably within the structures of everyday life. Rather than offering an alternative to the world as it exists, these militants would transform it by a kind of internal convulsion, bringing forth its latent humanity by their acts of sacrifice.

IN SEARCH OF A PROJECT

Earlier movements of resistance or terror advanced critiques of existing conditions, such as capitalism or imperialism, and offered alternatives to them. This was the case with communists and anarchists as well as nationalists and fundamentalists. Like the more pacific global movements that are its peers, Al Qaeda offers no real criticism of existing conditions – apart from inveighing against them –

and possesses no alternative to take their place.

Deprived of the political and ideological unity available to regional or national movements, these latter-day militants live scattered among their enemies, whom they accuse only of heedlessness and hypocrisy. So Americans are accused not of believing in the wrong religion or ideology, but of being heedless and hypocritical about the beliefs they do hold.

Global movements like Al Qaeda's want not an alternative to America so much as the fulfilment of America's promise of freedom for all. Indeed by dying alongside their victims, Islam's militants demonstrate that they exist in the same world as these latter, and as members of the same humanity.

Is it possible to free this desire for equality from its murderous trajectory in militant Islam by offering it another project where it might seek fulfillment?

Like militancy itself, such a project would have to be global in scope and demand sacrifices of its adherents instead of merely bribing them with comforts. The problem, of course, is that apart from certain forms of humanitarian action like environmentalism or pacifism, both of which possess global potential, no such project exists in our world today.



Chatham House Events December 2008



DECEMBER 1 The Essential Role of Women in Post-Conflict Nation-Building

Zainab Salbi, Women For Women International,

Nemat Minouche Shafik, Department for International Development

DECEMBER 2 Barack Obama and the Difficult Task Ahead in the Middle East

Abdel Bari Atwan, Editor-in-Chief, Al-Quds Al-Arabi

DECEMBER 2 Toughness as Tactics: President Medvedev's Approach

Dimitri Trenin, Deputy Director, Carnegie Moscow Centre

DECEMBER 8 Universal Declaration of Human Rights Sixty Years On

Professor Francesca Clug, London School of Economics

DECEMBER 15 Shifting Fortunes in Financial Markets

Ahmet Akarli, Goldman Sachs, John Nugee, State Street Global Advisers,

Paola Subacchi, Chatham House

DECEMBER 17 How Can the West Most Effectively Engage With Iran?

Sir Richard Dalton, Professor Ali Ansari, Associate Fellows, Chatham, House

Chatham House has a worldwide reputation for furthering the understanding of international issues. An impartial research and membership organisation, independent of government and vested interests, it brings together people of all nationalities and from all walks of life.

Membership: +44 (0) 20 7957 5721 Meetings: +44 (0) 20 7314 3636

Conferences: +44 (0) 20 7957 5754 e-mail: contact@chathamhouse.org.uk