ИOITƆƎⅬꟻƎꓤ 7/7 **REFLECTIONS**

7th July London Bombings: A Decade of Reflection

Edited by Dr Serena Hussain, Professor Mike Hardy and Fiyaz Mughal

Coventry University

CENTRE FOR **TRUST, PEACE & SOCIAL RELATIONS**

FAITH MATTERS

7/7 REFLECTIONS

7th July London Bombings: A Decade of Reflection

Edited By: Dr Serena Hussain, Professor Mike Hardy and Fiyaz Mughal

Foreword

Conflict and insecurity are not new or recent phenomena for people living with and for their families in their neighbourhoods. But when new and powerful forms of violence strike cities and their communities bringing distinctive challenges to people' everyday struggles –new questions are asked about relationships, prejudice, coexistence and policy interventions. And when the violence is associated with cultural difference more questions are posed about whether diversity itself strengthens and enriches human history, or whether differences are seen as unavoidable sources of conflict and antagonism.

For many the morning of July 7th 2005 in London was a game-changer in a game that has continued to be played out over the ten years that followed.

The *Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations* at Coventry University and *Faith Matters* share an interest and a scholarly responsibility to bring these questions to the public square –to open up to civil society, to the media, academia and to the social media airwaves, and to do so in a way that draws on a broad spectrum of ideas and opinions.

This set of articles is just that; not a single voice but the voices of several and indeed voices that need not always be in agreement. We hope that they will prove useful for improving understanding and bring greater respect for cultural differences. Our teams stand unequivocally against all forms of violence-bearing extremism and are in favour of promoting dialogue wherever conflict, the movement of people and differences in belief bring pressure on our living together peacefully.

We are indebted to Dr Serena Hussain who took a lead role in editing, though only the authors are responsible for the positions they present.

Mike Hardy and Fiyaz Mughal
July 2015

CONTENTS

Introduction

Serena Hussain, Centre for Trust Peace and Social Relations

On the 7th of July 2005, London experienced one of the most significant terrorist acts in the recent history of Great Britain. Multiple bomb attacks across London resulted in 52 fatalities and more than 700 injuries. To mark ten years since the event, this publication brings together a collection of short articles reflecting on both the 7/7 bombings and the decade that followed.

One of the most notable impacts of the attack has been on the perceptions of Muslims. Hardy describes how the 7/7 bombings reinforced existing concerns regarding the incompatibility of the West and the Islamic World. Critiquing Huntington's 'Clash of Civilisations' narrative, Hardy re-contextualises the events that took place in London, through exploring the interplay of a number of factors. Notions about monolithic Western and Islamic worlds are simply not accurate. Nowhere might this more apparent than in the UK itself, where British Muslims have their origins in an array of different lands, with a variety of rich traditions and approaches to religion.

Presenting 7/7 as evidence of a 'them' and 'us' dialectic has been particularly detrimental for integration in Britain, where the diversity which was set to flourish under Multiculturalism became a threat to British values. Furthermore, by framing the attacks and subsequent events in a global context, local realities are undermined and even ignored. What is important for the overwhelming majority of people, Hardy reminds us, is not taking a stake in a particular side but rather, having a stake *within* society.

It is precisely this stake that Qvortrup focuses on in his discussion of political participation. Drawing on quantitative data to illustrate his point, Qvortrup describes how countries with greater proportional representation have lower cases of terrorism. By accessing political processes in more meaningful ways, he suggests, actors are more likely to feel genuine empowerment through an ability to make changes legitimately; and thus less likely to resort to extreme acts. Yet the curtailment of civil liberties during the last decade, described in Sayyid's piece, has interdicted citizenship rather than strengthened democratic values.

In their observations from Northern Ireland, Monaghan and McIlhatton relay how Muslims replaced the Irish as *the* 'suspect community' in the aftermath of the July 7th bombings. Sayyid reminds us, however, that despite decades of terror attacks by Irish republicans there were no, 'repeated and insistent calls for Catholics to condemn the bombings. There was no scandal over the fact that many of the Irish Republicans were 'home grown' (after all Northern Ireland was part of the UK).'

The fact that the perpetrators of the London bombings were 'home grown', unlike the case of 9/11, led to an additional set of anxieties for security purposes. It was no longer enough to secure our borders from outside threats. The government's CONTEST strategy developed in response to the attacks outlined four approaches. Amongst these was PREVENT, under which government sponsored de-radicalisation initiatives fall. *Preventing Violent Extremism Together* placed its focus on working with Muslim communities to challenge extremist views from within. Miah's article

highlights how de-radicalisation overshadowed all public policy debates on Muslims including those relating to increasing social inequality and spiralling levels of poverty – echoing Hardy's concerns of downplaying the significance of the local milieu for understanding drivers and motivations of the very acts we reflect upon.

For Noortmann, the emphasis on de-radicalisation over the last ten years has hindered our understanding of terrorism. Linking acts of organised violence with radicalism and extremism has led to the focus of investigation being placed on expressions of radical political and religious beliefs, rather than violence itself. Concerns surrounding radical political views and the incitement of hatred have not only been in relation to Muslims in the years following 7/7. Copsy reflects on how far right groups launched aggressive campaigns for anti-Muslim mobilisation in the aftermath of the attack on London. Although such sentiments existed before 7/7, the event acted as a catalyst for greater support of the far right who played on fears of the clash narrative described above.

As a Sociologist of religion and an expert on the social and spatial trends of British Muslims, I witnessed how trajectories for academic investigation on Muslims became almost entirely driven by 7/7. However, it was not simply responding to policies addressing security concerns that changed the landscape of the study of Muslims in Britain. Previous concerns among Muslim advocacy organisations regarding discrimination in the education system and the labour and housing markets (most commonly explained as ethnic penalties)[1] had become overshadowed by such large-scale Islamophobic discourse, that the levels and kinds of prejudice Muslims had encountered previously, as ethnic groups, had shifted to something far more detrimental for inclusion and participation in all areas of public life.

When I visited schools in Oldham to conduct a study on intergroup perceptions, it struck me, for the first time, that there is a cohort of young Muslims who can barely remember what it was like to be part of a faith group who were not under such intense scrutiny. It reminded me of the well-known study entitled *Young Gifted and Black*[2] on the damaging effects of stereotyping. When Mac an Ghaill conducted his study on racial stereotypes of young people in British schools 'Asians' were perceived by authority figures as 'quiet achievers' who overwhelmingly exhibited good behaviour. Asian girls, and Muslims in particular, who were viewed as passive, almost 'docile' have now become potential 'Jihadi Brides' posing with Kalashnikovs on social media sites. How times have changed.

Rumsby's piece reflects on the how deeply entrenched stereotyping of the 'Other' remains within our post-colonial mindsets. Instructions to universities and now schools to identify those with extremist views coupled with institutional racism and stereotyping of children, is a particularly alarming development of the post 7/7 era. Distrust towards the 'Other' as a result of acts that threaten lives in the country also perpetuate distrust within communities against those very authorities that are in place to provide their security. Kroeger's reflection, as a scholar of trust, illustrate how for the first time in 2015, the UK has been classified as a 'distrusting society' according to the Edelman Trust Barometer. Yet despite this, Kroeger presents a powerful

---

[1] Modood, T. and Khattab, N. (2015) Explaining Ethnic Differences: Can Ethnic Minority Strategies Reduce the Effects of Ethnic Penalties? *Sociology* .doi: 10.1177/0038038515575858

[2] Mc an Ghaill, M. (1988) *Young Gifted and Black*. Open University Press.

reminder of how trust within society, 'due to its malleable and interactive is never irretrievably damaged'.

The necessity to find a balance between the moral panics we currently witness and ensuring our security remains. We cannot deny that that some of our young people are taking up the call of foreign militants to commit the kinds of violent acts that occurred ten years ago on our own soil. This has led to much introspection on the part of Muslims, resulting in a decade of unparalleled challenge and reflection. Hussain provides a particularly potent contribution for this. Despite polls conducted with the general public demonstrating only a small margin between those who do and do not believe Britain's Muslims are opposed terrorism, he writes, 'My hope is that out of all the tragedies we are seeing, we will begin to look to new horizons where Muslims define a positive story of life in Britain in tune with their faith'.

It is a sentiment reminiscent of a statement I heard at a recent Muslims in Britain Research Network Conference on Leadership[3], during which a presenters stated how British Muslims have probably learnt more during ten years of hardship than they would in a hundred years of ease. By reflecting on the events that took place ten years ago on this very day, this collection of short articles hopes to tease out not only the lessons we have learnt over the last decade, but also thoughts for how to approach the next stage of our journey in the post 7/7 era.

---

[3] Leadership in Britain, Muslims in Britain Research Network Conference. University of Central Lancashire, 1st April 2015

Home-grown terror and clashes within civilisations: Reflections ten years on from the July 7th 2005 terror attacks in London

Mike Hardy, Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations

The July 7th atrocities in London took the debate about terror in the UK into unchartered territory, navigation of which seems to have been helped by continued reference to Huntington's thesis of the 'Clash of Civilisations'. So in looking back over the ten years that have followed, I wanted to reflect on that changed context and on the challenges of giving credence to Huntington's clash narrative.

The wrong frame

The 7 July attacks by UK-born citizens of Islamic faith occurred the day after London had won its bid to host the 2012 Olympic Games, which had highlighted the city's multicultural reputation. The attacks became for many a highly significant watershed in both an emerging and also continuing struggle between the forces of prejudice and the forces for pluralism. Global landscapes of ideological contest had been set out and promoted it seemed and local horrific attacks were now being explained and placed clearly within an overarching frame of changing world order. This powerful association between these attacks and the notion of a seismic global contest, and the assertion that there had been a momentous step-change in everyday relations with Muslims has created major distractions to progress in cultural relations as well as to the way we speak our minds, choose our friends and participate in our communities.

The ten years since the attacks almost coincides with a 20-year anniversary of the thesis of the 'Clash of Civilisations', first publicly raised by Samuel P. Huntington in a 1993 article that appeared in *Foreign Affairs*, and further developed in his book '*The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*' in 1996. Huntington, though not without serious critics, had set out a theory that people's cultural and religious identities would be the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War world.[4]

So for many commentators the attacks in London, a truly global and open city, were in very simple terms, part of a predictable and inevitable consequence of a clash of civilisations and validated the notion that a 'radical Islam' had replaced communism as the principal global contest. It may be then that these attacks signalled a new clarity for some about the relationship between domestic affairs and foreign policies, and the impact of geo-politics on very local communities.

It was as if a light bulb had suddenly been turned on in the minds of many; our experience in the UK of tensions, conflict and terror on our streets had moved from perceived local racial prejudices, symptomatic of emerging and growing multi-cultural communities, riots in Lancashire towns as we appeared to struggle to cope with unfamiliar and new demographics in our towns, from nationalists working through three hundred years or more of discontent, from urban postcode gangs and

---

[4] Huntington, Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations?*, in Foreign Affairs, vol. 72, no. 3, Summer 1993, pp. 22–49
Huntington, Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1996

tribal football supporters and from class warfare and the trades unions. Now a fifth-column of UK-born erstwhile citizens had emerged to act out a global ideological contest in our very local neighbourhoods.

The attacks in London changed both the local and the global landscape. In Britain, that the attacks carried out by British-born Muslims intent on murder and mayhem, and the instability that would inevitably follow within both the nation and their own communities, immediately led many to harden their views on the state of the new multicultural Britain and its potential lack of viability. Globally, the attacks were seen in a very different context, no longer a part of a local journey of a learning and struggling multicultural Britain, but as part of a series in a global jihad from September 2001 in New York, through Madrid, Nairobi, London and elsewhere; the unleashing of a global contest between an ascendant 'West' and the often referred to 'Islam'. Neither term, 'West' and 'Islam' were used sensibly nor meaningfully, but that didn't seem to matter.

These events provoked belief and confidence in this notion of a worldwide contest for ideological supremacy and have been supported inexorably in the US and Europe by both the rise of neo-conservatism and an aggressively assertive press and media. The ten years that have followed the London attacks have created global and local landscapes in which it has been all too easy to simplify very complex and bizarrely connected events and occurrences. In Britain, a necessary counter-terrorist response, the CONTEST programme and especially PREVENT, appears to have both protected and provoked, helping to grow divisions in society and making a pluralist journey forwards more difficult. Regrettably, among the significant collateral consequences have been the hardening of prejudice, the growth in hate-crimes in very local neighbourhoods and the proposals of government policies both foreign and domestic that are more likely ideological than evidence–led.

We will never know whether or by how much the British-born murderers on that July 7th had already translated or planned to translate their personal disaffections and contexts into a global ideological contest or seek to help make the imagined (by some) clash of civilisations a reality –but it had that effect. In the ten years that have followed other events seem to have had a similar impact: the rise and fall of progressive movements across the Arab world and North Africa, the fall of autocratic regimes and the rise of chaos, the continued and powerful support for the defence of Israel, traumas in sub-Saharan Africa and the relative abandonment of regime-liberated populations, among others. Each has been presented as the unravelling of a major and unresolved global fault line –a single clash between singularly defined 'civilisations'.

Seeking to explain local actions such as the July 7th bombings by reference to Huntington's thesis is as challenging as seeking to validate the thesis using the same bombings as evidence. This article explores the context and debate around Huntington's work first, before returning to the 2005 London atrocities and their aftermath.

The danger of the imagined

So, when and where did the idea of a 'clash of civilisations' emerge?

Firstly, Huntington's thesis emerged as the dust settled over the victory of liberal capitalism over communism –following the events of late 1991 including the iconic unification of the two Germanys and the dismantling of the Soviet Union. The Gulf war over the invasion of Kuwait added to the sense of a 'Western' (if not US) global ascendancy.

At the same time, from the mid-1980s` there had unfolded a series of crises in the Middle East accompanied by a rise of militant Islamist movements against *Western* interests throughout the world. These began to be perceived as 'radical Islam' by many in the US and Europe, and began also to fill the gap left by communism as the single global ideological contest. The violent attacks on so-called western interests in Europe, Africa, and the Gulf region fuelled in turn a rise in faith-based neo-conservatism especially in the US.

Whether imagined or real, this desperate journey continued with the events of September 2011, the 'war on terror', then Madrid and London…and many saw confirmation that there was unleashed a global contest between liberal capitalism led by the ascendant USA with its allies and the Islamic world led by Bin Laden and the al-Qaeda movement.

The reality however is that there were, and are, even more serious clashes *within* civilisations, both in the 'West' and even more so within the Muslim world, as argued strongly within Amartya Sen's direct rebuttal of Huntington that 'diversity is a feature of most cultures in the world. (and that) Western civilization is no exception.'

In North America, Europe and Latin America, serious differences appeared between Christian fundamentalists and progressives, both in Protestant and Catholic communities. Experience in the US saw the role of the Christian right representing various church denominations become powerful in influencing both domestic and foreign debates. The US Administrations' stands on the teaching of religion in schools, abortion, same-sex marriage and stem cell research, as examples, illustrate the influence of right wing constituencies. In Europe tensions emerged and were played out around a growing crisis of identity among *European* Muslims (or indeed *Muslim* Europeans). This was complicated by local worries about illegal immigration. Europe was more complex because of post-colonial issues and the territorial proximity of Muslim and Muslim-majority countries and hence movements of people.

The powerful imaginations in the 'West' and within the Muslim world failed also to acknowledge the serious clashes *about* civilisation in the Islamic world itself. While it may have been the case that a small minority on Muslims may have been attracted to the idea of a 'worldwide caliphate' imbued with Islamic values, there have been very different realities on the ground. Indeed, as we have observed most recently, there are significant and telling differences between the approach taken by Bin Laden and al Qaeda to the notion of Caliphate, and that of ISIS from 2014.

Serious differences of the interpretation of Islam in Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia began to emerge and grow. The different interpretations of the practical application of Muslim values are present in the Middle East, among and within each Arab State, between Arab states and Iran, between the larger Middle East and Turkey, between Muslims in Pakistan and Muslims in India. Indeed, even amongst Malaysian and Indonesian Muslims.

In reality it is much more likely that it is clashes of local political interests that define and divide the conflict in the Middle East. Much of the root causes of these conflicts ultimately rest on tribal rivalry and clan contests for access to status, power, group privilege or a combination of all three.

So, the Palestinian Authority is divided by factionalism –between Fatah and Hamas – a schism that has little to do with Islamic values. In contemporary Iraq, violent clashes occur between Sunnis and Shiites, as well as among various local Sunni groups; and if these were not sufficiently challenging, we have criminals, traffickers and the exploiters who profit from the industry of conflict and chaos. Little of this relates to any significant extent, to rampant anti-Americanism, or a contest with the 'West'.

The Muslim world in the Middle East has effectively been marginalised by the coincidence of three issues: the Palestine-Israeli conflict –rooted in the early 20th Century; the intersection of energy-dependency and strategic military projection of the West, originating in the 1930s; and thirdly, the contested claims by Judaism, Christianity and Islam over the heritage of the region's holy sites. And what has been painfully missing has been a carefully designed and supported set of tribal and clan agreements, so crucial for any progress to be sustainable. All manners of agreements have so far unravelled because of these micro-dimensions of *clashes* within civilisations.

Huntington was criticised by many, with evidence, with history, with ideology or with just simple logic.[5] Berman[6] went directly to the point arguing that distinct cultural boundaries do not exist in the present day. He argues there is no 'Islamic civilisation' nor a 'Western civilisation', and that the evidence for a clash is not convincing, especially when considering relationships such as that between the United States and Saudi Arabia. In addition, he cites the fact that many Islamic extremists spent a significant amount of time living and/or studying in the US and Europe. According to Berman, conflict arises because of philosophical beliefs various groups share (or do not share), regardless of cultural or religious identity.[7] Said (2001) argues that Huntington's categorisation of the world's fixed 'civilisations' forgets the reality of culture. Later, and more forcefully in 2004, he argues that the thesis of clash of civilisations is an example of 'the purest invidious racism, a sort of parody of Hitlerian science directed today against Arabs and Muslims'.[8]

Sen's (1999) thoughtful concern for comparing like-with-like highlighted how the practice of democracy that has won out in the modern 'West' was largely a result of a consensus that has emerged over a long gestation since the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution, and particularly in the last century or so. 'To read in this a

[5] See Sacks, Jonathan, The Dignity of Difference: How to Avoid the Clash of Civilizations, London, Continuum, 2002 ISBN 0-8264-6397-5

[6] Berman P., (2003) Terror and Liberalism, W W Norton and Co.
also Willis E., (2003). "Terror and Liberalism" by Paul Berman". Salon.com.

[7] see also Harris S (2005). The End of Faith: Religion, Terror, and the Future of Reason. W. W. Norton & Company. p. 134. and Russett, B. M.; Oneal, J. R.; Cox, M. (2000). "Clash of Civilizations, or Realism and Liberalism Déjà Vu? Some Evidence". Journal of Peace Research 37: 583–608.

[8] Said, E W. (2001). "The Clash of Ignorance". The Nation
Said, E. W. (2004). From Oslo to Iraq and the Road Map. New York: Pantheon, 2004.

historical commitment of the West—over the millennia—to democracy, and then to contrast it with non-Western traditions (treating each as monolith) would be a great mistake.'[9]

Chomsky's (2002) criticism argues that the clash narrative is simply a new justification for the United States 'for any atrocities that they wanted to carry out' now that the as the Soviet Union was no longer a viable threat.[10]

A changed Britain: real and imagined

Ten years on from the London of 2005, there are painfully more instances of British citizens turning to violence both in action and as statement, some clearly attracted to more militant Islamism, including the fanaticism of ISIS. The clash narrative emphasises how they have *changed sides*; how they have been radicalised, captured by 'grooming' and brainwashed. *Taking sides* in an imagined rather than a real divide has become very problematic and indeed may be a cause for alarm rather than a response to it. Taking sides has become critical within the security context, within community relations, for social workers, school teachers and university lecturers, a collateral consequence of this continuing *war* on terror framed as a global ideological contest.

Research in 2015 shows that real Britain is much more joined-up and coherent than the imagined clash narrative supposes. But disappointingly a third of all British Muslims feel under more suspicion in the past few years and over half non-Muslims felt Islam was incompatible with British Values. Most people in the UK think community relations have got worse in the ten years since the 7/7 bombings and that this last decade 'has been an anxious one for Britain', but interestingly, the research confirms that most people do not want a fearful society that turns on itself. Most British Muslims are clear that they want to be part of the solution, not part of the problem and that unifying voices should be louder for the anxious than those who talk about divide.[11]

Importantly, in 2015 most people agree that the British public does not hold ordinary British Muslims responsible for the terrorists behind the 7/7 bombings. But it is by a slim majority, with 51% in agreement, 22% disagreeing and 27% on the fence. British Muslims themselves, however, are less confident that people don't hold them responsible: only 40% agree, with more than a third (36%) disagreeing.[12]

The July bombings did change Britain, but so too over the following ten years did demographics and diversity. Britain became a more complex place, itself challenging the simplicity of a clash of civilisations narrative.

Britain is undoubtedly a substantially more diverse country than it was in 2005, and British Muslims much more numerous. Muslims now account for almost 5% of the population (12.4% of London's population). Almost half of all Muslims were born in the UK. But this is a very diverse community…. 68% from Asia, 32% non-Asian –

---

[9] Sen A (1999). "Democracy as a Universal Value". Journal of Democracy 10 (3): 3–17.
[10] Chomsky N (2002) Clash of Civilisations? India-Seminars.com/2002/509%20noam%20chomsky.htmchomsky.htm
[11] http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/anxious-decade/
[12] http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/anxious-decade/

and 8% or 1 in 12 are of 'white' ethnicities. 33% of Muslims are under 15 and Muslim's account for 8% of school age population.[13] It is the effects of this diversity as well as the impact on security that are under dispute. In the Britain of 2015, Muslims state that their only national identity is British, but Muslims are increasingly seen as synonymous with extremism and terrorism

The clash narrative has problematised growing diversity; rising net immigration, we are told by politicians and media is an inevitable symptom of diversity, that separation and division is worsening, that migrants should be made to do more to integrate, and that multiculturalism has failed.

Much available evidence however shows that the notion of an increasingly 'segregated Britain' – driven by communities who are 'unwilling to integrate' – has been greatly overstated. Finney and Simpson (2009) actually report an increase in ethnic mixing, greater tolerance in social attitudes and more mixed-ethnicity friendship groups among diverse communities in Britain since 2001. Where areas are not ethnically mixed, this is often found to relate to wider problems including wealth disparity, access to schools and availability of local resources, rather than due to resistance from minority communities to 'mix'.[14]

The response of white communities to ethnic diversity in their area is also an area of concern. But British Social Attitudes surveys show that although people are concerned about national immigration levels, they are more tolerant than ever of ethnic diversity in their local area.

Immigration and the accompanying growing diversity has had major impacts - it has contributed towards change in many areas across Britain. But immigration and ethnic diversity are dependent on a wide range of local factors, including the history of immigration, and wider socio-economic dynamics. In the ten years since the London bombings, many social engineering projects seeking to 'integrate' have somewhat missed the point about the causes of tension between Asian and white communities. The real issues which make it difficult for many people to mix are the lack of jobs, of decent schools, and spaces like youth centres where people can find common ground in their own time, so-called 'everyday integration', as well as problems caused by wider social class divisions. This reality is so far from the imagined: the government's rejection of multi-culturalism and the implicit promotion of fear of the other through a tough line on immigration; a forecast of major cuts to community organisations, legal aid and English language support, as well as sending a negative message about diversity in Britain today, are all derived from the clash narrative and work to undermine the slow but steady process of genuine integration in Britain's communities.

The UK-born Muslims who attacked and killed in London in July 2005 in many ways revived a discredited clash thesis and provoked a security response that reflects an imagined rather than a real world threat. Most commentators agree that the nationally initiated and funded PREVENT programme alienated Muslim communities across the land and it has been left to local partners to try to resolve the many issues that have

---

[13] http://www.mcb.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/MCBCensusReport_2015.pdf
[14] Finney N and Simpson L (2009) Sleepwalking to Segregation?: Challenging Myths About Race and Migration The Policy Press

resulted. Similarly, the absence of a national framework to help protect the jobs of poorer communities from direct competition from relatively footloose migrants has also been a long-standing problem that actually needs a national response. The pockets of disadvantage and alienation at the heart of many of our communities are often the result of deep-seated social and economic changes. And these have little to do with global ideological contests.

What is becoming clearer is that contemporary communities, whether local, national or regional seem to be engulfed by a division between those who have a stake, in the now or in the future, and those who feel they do not. This is sometimes expressed through race, faith, age or class, but not always and not inevitably. This is not a stake in terms of simple 'sides', between liberal capitalism and any other coherent ideology –this is a stake *within* –this is the stake that matters most to people, their families and their communities.

There is a need for a national and international agenda for this –leadership to support the creation of consistent and sustaining conditions that help local communities with the real tasks of living together peacefully, in spaces where rights are promoted and protected. These conditions and their promotion must be the next steps in this journey. They include a collaborating government, local and national, with the third sector and the private sector; aware local community activists, responsive (and clever) teachers and health workers, effective schools that embrace diversity in all its senses, giving confidence to young people and harnessing their aspirations for life. The conditions will include also a commitment of resource to provoke larger investments in the social capital likely to help, and in strategies for re-connecting the many groups and individuals who, for whatever reason, feel so disconnected. All this does not describe community and work-place relations designed to monitor and report or make sure that everyone is 'on side'.

Mike Hardy is Professor of Intercultural Relations and Executive Director of the Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations at Coventry University. He was awarded the OBE and appointed as Companion of Honour to the Order of St Michael and St George (CMG) for his work globally on intercultural relations. He is senior adviser to the Baku Process and to the World Forum on Intercultural Dialogue, and writes on identity and social cohesion.

Ten Years On, Where Are We in the Battle Against Extremism and Terrorism?

Fiyaz Mughal, Faith Matters

The Starting Steps of Prevent, (Preventing Violent Extremism)

10 years on from 7th of July 2005, where are we in the fight against extremism and terrorism is the question many people will ask this July on the 10th anniversary of the terrorist bombings in London? A legitimate question to ask, my feelings are that whilst significant strides have been made, there have also been drawbacks and new risks some of which I will explain here.

I have been involved in what can be termed 'tackling extremism' work since 2005 and just after the 7/7 bombings. As part of the 'Extremism Task Force' set up by the then Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Tony Blair MP, over a hundred members of Muslim communities were called to what was a summit at Windsor Castle where we spent three days reviewing some of the issues that may have led to grievances within Muslim communities, whilst looking at how local authorities, the police and statutory agencies could work closely with Muslim communities in tackling extremism. The shock of seeing so many Londoners lose their lives and being injured was a genuine game changer for many of us who wanted to stand up and to say, 'Not in Our Name.' There was also a genuine desire and willingness by many who took part to support and develop an open and transparent relationship with Government at the time.

The Extremism Task Force produced 64 recommendations[15] though the reality was that only a handful of them were implemented by the then Labour Government, with many good ideas being rejected and they never saw the light of day. The basis of the Extremism Task Force, I believe, was to be seen to consult with Muslims and to be seen to take action with the community against extremism. Yet it has to be said that many Muslims even after 7/7, felt that extremism was not a major issue within communities and that 7/7 was an isolated incident. These feelings were genuinely held and have significantly changed due to the number of plots and arrests and successful convictions that have taken place.

I remember listening to community members when the then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, the Rt. Hon. Hazel Blears MP, went round the nation in 2008 and 2009 talking to communities about Prevent, (then called Preventing Violent Extremism). Many within Muslim communities aired grievances and a sense that Muslims were being focussed on heavily by Prevent, leading to stresses on cohesion and a sense that all Muslim community communities were potentially suspect. Yet, the engagement work done by Hazel at the time and by former Ministers such as Shahid Malik, helped to bring some sections of Muslim communities on board the Preventing Violent Extremism agenda. Whilst many still remained unconvinced, there was a genuine desire by those ministers and by administrations at the time to reach out to and engage with Muslim communities. Furthermore, to ensure input from different sections of Muslim communities at a strategic level, ministers went one step further. For example, Hazel set up the Muslim

---

[15] http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/nov/11/terrorism.immigrationpolicy, (accessed 04/07/2015)

Women's Advisory Group[16] and the Young Muslim Advisory Group[17], whilst ensuring that Muslim councillors and key Prevent practitioners could also feed into her and her civil servants at the Department for Communities and Local Government through a national Prevent steering group. This genuine attempt at reaching out did win over and build friends within Muslim communities, both for ministers and for the agenda.

Yet, one of the most important factors in all of this work during 2008 – 2010 was the fact that social media platforms such as Twitter had not taken off and many were still new concepts. Social media had not pervaded the social space in the way that it has since 2010 and where it now plays a pivotal role in creating or destroying careers and in generating news stories. Social media has, in effect, become a significant driver for shaping social opinions and in challenging publicly aired views.

Prior to the national take up of social media platforms, extremism and extremist succour and support was mainly provided through web-sites, 'open' and 'closed' chat forums and one to one peer mentoring and friendship networks. Today, although these methods of ideological, tactical and psychological support for extremist narratives still play a part, the power of social media should not be under-estimated. One of the best examples of this was the @Shamiwitness[18] account which was one of the most influential ISIS supporting accounts, providing emotional support to individuals who were drawn to ISIS rhetoric and who thought about travelling to Syria. The notorious account was recently tracked to a resident in Bangaluru with charges being laid against local resident, Mehdi Biswas, which included 'Unlawful Activities under the Prevention (of Terrorism) Act' and with evidence amounting to some 35,000 pages and 122,000 tweets from the account. The 24 year old had initially admitted to a Channel 4 investigation that he indeed had run the @Shamiwitness account. This alleged ISIS poster boy had had a significant impact on providing an on-line emotional and psychological support network for many young individuals drawn to the videos and on-line messages of ISIS combatants.

The Policy Changes to Prevent Under the Coalition

The change from a Labour Government to a Coalition government in 2010 also meant that there was a significant time lag where a review of the Prevent strategy took place. In July 2011, the review of the Prevent strategy[19] under the new Government was undertaken leading to a new focus on the ideological challenge of terrorism and on working with sectors and institutions where there was a threat of radicalisation. It was a significant step away from the focus on violent extremism that the previous Labour Government had developed, with a laser like focus on how to tackle ideology now at the heart of the strategy. This was subsequently revised again and on the 12th of May 2015, the Prevent Duty for England and Wales[20] was published by the Home Office. It focuses on a 'risks based' approach within institutions and places a duty on

---

[16] http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7203925.stm, (accessed 04/07/2015)
[17] http://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/local-news/youth-mp-to-help-government-on-muslim-970068, (accessed 04/07/2015)
[18] http://www.channel4.com/news/isis-shami-witness-medhi-masroor-biswas-charged, (accessed 04/07/2015)
[19] https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97976/prevent-strategy-review.pdf, (accessed 04/07/2015)
[20] https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/417943/Prevent_Duty_Guidance_England_Wales.pdf, (accessed 04/07/2015)

statutory institutions such as schools and hospitals to prevent people from being drawn into extremism, meaning that behaviours, ideological statements or rhetoric could be seen as a set of indicators that a young boy or girl may have been drawn to extremism. This new statutory duty came into force on the 1st of July 2015, meaning that there will be an ongoing debate and discourse on the fine line between allowing discourse and challenging it versus reporting in specific individuals on the basis of the statutory duty.

Yet, there are some real risks a decade on after 7/7, that young people may be caught up in the actions of over-zealous teachers who on hearing the term 'Gaza', decide that a young boy or girl is potentially open to extremist narratives. This might sound laughable, yet, through the work undertaken in TELL MAMA[21], cases have been received where a discussion by young people about the human rights violations in Gaza have led to teachers writing to their parents and calling them in for an explanation on the back of non-threatening comments made by teenage students. In these specific cases, the young people concerned had no history of threatening behaviour and were merely raising the fact that Gazans live in pitiful conditions and that their plight resonated with them. Hardly aspiring young Jihadis or people espousing extremist tendencies.

The Fragmentation of Muslim Communities

After having worked with Muslim communities for over a decade, the experience that I have is one of fragmented communities, sometimes feeling leaderless and growingly disenfranchised given the consistent negative media headlines. A sense of despair has also descended on them around the pernicious extremism that is affecting young people in their midst, whilst politicians finger point at Muslim communities.

I sometimes describe Muslim communities through the analogy of a vase that is made up different glazes and materials, much like the diversity of Muslim communities. Yet, after the enormous pressures on the community, particularly after 7/7, when extremism and terrorism has become one of the core lenses through which Muslim communities have been viewed through given the raft of negative media stories, that vase has fallen splintering it into numerous pieces. The splintered pieces have developed a sense of urgency for other communities to engage with at an integration, civil society and statutory level, yet they also create an opportunity for social entrepreneurism and dare I say, a vacuum which others who are more socially antagonistic and reactionary can fill. Add in the world of social media, the ebb and flow of street based and on-line far right activism and stories and web-sites that insult Islam and Muslims and the reality is that there is an increased risk today then there was in 7/7. Sadly, after 10 years of work in this arena, this is an assessment that I have come to. There is a greater risk today even with the technological and intelligence advancements of the last decade in the field of counter-terrorism work.

The Globalisation of Hate

The slickness of ISIS propaganda that seems to be produced beyond Syria and Iraq has sadly attracted between 700 – 1000[22] people from our country, with the latest

---

[21] http://www.tellmamauk.org, (accessed 05/07/2015)
[22] http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-32026985, (accessed 05/07/2015)

being a family of three generations[23] from Luton, totalling 12 people. This coming after three women from Bradford are reported to have left for ISIS held territory with nine of their children[24]. It is precisely these kinds of examples that show a greater risk to Muslim communities today from the slick on-line extremist rhetoric of ISIS and the camouflage that they use of Islam to cover their intolerance, hate and nihilism, three things which are directly at odds with the practicality and protection of human life in Islam. Who would have thought that ten years from 7/7, there would be a state from which terrorism and extremism could be exported and where 700 British nationals would move to on the belief of a 'better life' or to fight for the so called Islamic State?

Earlier, I spoke of the pulls of social media and the on-line world which draws people in through the self-selectivity of material that they read. One of the clearest example of this has been the case of Glasgow born and bred Aqsa Mahmood. Thought to have become radicalised on-line, she left her Glasgow home in November 2013 and travelled to Syria alone, where she took to the on-line world and social media, in the hope of attracting others to the world of ISIS. Tweeting under the pseudonym of 'Umm Layth', which has now been deleted, she urged Muslims to heed the call of ISIS and to engage in violent activities.

How a young Glaswegian can become the poster woman for ISIS says a lot about the power of the on-line world and social media. It has become the medium through which ideas and thoughts can be echoed, in the hope that they take root in the minds of people. Today's world is one of short sound-bites and inspirational quotes and statements in 140 characters where the desire to receive the most 'retweets' drives many young people on-line. Much of the context is and can be lost in these short bite-sized discussions meaning that the frame through which decisions are made and feelings elicited, becomes smaller over time. Could this be one reason why people like Aqsa decided that their future lay elsewhere? We can only but guess. However, one thing is certain. The future is one of uncertainty and within that turbulent position, we have to make some sense of the world and anchor young people so that they are safeguarded against those who seek to manipulate them.

Fiyaz Mughal OBE is the Director of Faith Matters, a not for profit organisation that works with faith communities on integration, cohesion, Preventing Extremism and tackling hate crime projects in the United Kingdom and the Middle East.

---

[23] http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/yes-we-have-joined-isis-say-missing-british-family-of-12-who-fled-to-syria-luton-islamic-state-isis-isil-iraq-10365915.html, (accessed 05/07/2015)
[24] http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3128149/They-Syria-say-police-speaking-one-three-mothers-left-UK-9-children-amid-fears-joining-Isis.html, (accessed 05/07/2015)

Catalysing the Far Right? Some Reflections on the Tenth Anniversary of 7/7

Nigel Copsey, University of Teesside

The response of the far right to 7/7 was immediate. Contesting an upcoming local council by-election in the Becontree ward of Barking and Dagenham, an expedient British National Party (BNP) distributed one of its most notorious leaflets to date. Featuring a graphic picture of the bombed London bus, the leaflet was emblazoned with the slogan 'Maybe now it's time to start listening to the BNP'. Attention-grabbing for sure, and roundly condemned at the time, this leaflet signalled Nick Griffin's determination to make British Muslims the country's number one enemy. Accordingly, after 7/7 the BNP 'went all out to tap the rich vein of anti-Muslim sentiment'[25]. At the 2006 local elections, dubbed 'a referendum on Islam' by Griffin, the BNP's tally of councillors increased to over fifty. Momentarily the BNP cast its ugly shadow over Britain's political landscape.

With aggressive Islamophobia now a growth industry on the far right, within a few years other organisations arrived on the scene, not least the foot-soldiers of the English Defence League (EDL). Openly hostile to Islam, the EDL and its offshoots raised the spectre of violent conflict and community polarisation. Yet despite the (sometimes violent) intervention of the far right, relations between Muslims and non-Muslims did not deteriorate into a downward spiral of 'cumulative extremism'. All the same, and regardless of the recent demise of both the BNP and the EDL, aggressive anti-Muslim hostility obviously persists to this day[26].

On the tenth anniversary of 7/7, it is worth reflecting on the extent to which the London bombings galvanised Britain's far right. How far did this singular event catalyse an aggressive Islamophobia?

It now seems rather odd but a decade or so earlier the BNP's newspaper, *British Nationalist*, had proclaimed that the 'BNP has no quarrel with Muslims; in fact, we have a great deal of respect for their brave resistance to Israeli oppression'[27]. Note the word 'Israeli'. These comments were made when John Tyndall was leader of the party, a man who had once opined that '… the Jews realise that by mixing the Black and White races they will set in motion a process which will destroy the whole structure of White civilisation, and undermine White world-leadership which will subsequently pass directly into their hands!'[28]. Dethroned by Nick Griffin in 1999, Tyndall would later take issue with Griffin for 'singling out Islam as a special enemy of Britain'[29]. For Tyndall, the central issue was not a religious creed but *multi-*

---

[25] Humayun Ansari, 'Islamophobia and the British National Party', in Humayun Ansari & Frid Hafez (eds.) *From the Far Right to the Mainstream: Islamophobia in Party Politics and the Media* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2012), p. 176.

[26] For the most recent report on anti-Muslim incidents, see Mark Littler and Mathew Feldman, *Tell MAMA Reporting 2014/2015: Annual Monitoring, Cumulative Extremism, and Policy Implications* (Teesside University: Centre for Fascist, Anti-Fascist and Post-Fascist Studies, 2015).

[27] *British Nationalist*, September 1993, p.3.

[28] *Combat*, no.4, Autumn 1959.

[29] John Tyndall, 'The Party I Want', *Spearhead*, no. 427, September 2004, p. 7.

racialism (which in his mind was a Jewish conspiracy). Even so, Tyndall's BNP had, from time to time, engaged in anti-Islamic mobilisation.

Prior to a BNP demonstration in Dewsbury in 1989, party activists had apparently circulated a rumour that a copy of the Qu'ran would be burnt (a response to the public burning of *The Satanic Verses* by British Muslims); it had also campaigned against the building of mosques, for instance in Bethnal Green (1994), Newham (1996), and Morden (1997). But even if the BNP's engagement with Islamophobia was on the rise, Tyndall's continued presence at the party helm imposed limits on its expression.

Of course things would change under Nick Griffin. Cultivating the *faux* appearance of 'moderation', Griffin was intent on moving the party away from its ideological roots in biological racism and conspiratorial anti-Semitism. With the BNP abandoning its policy of forcibly repatriating non-whites, campaigning against the Islamic faith allowed the BNP to further deny that it was racist, maintain an outward air of respectability, and yet still exploit white resentment against Muslim communities, primarily those of South Asian origin (in other words the object was to use Islamophobia as a 'cover' for racism). There was an element of hypocrisy in all this too: when leading the NF's 'political soldier' wing in the 1980s Griffin had supported Ayatollah Khomeini's fundamentalist regime in Iran; he had also pursued financial backing from Colonel Gaddafi.

By the turn of the century, however, Griffin sensed that the wider cultural environment had become increasingly receptive to anti-Islamic sentiment. In the wake of the 2001 riots, for example, Griffin had blamed certain Islamic fundamentalists, such as Abu Hamsa and Omah Bakri, for stirring up trouble amongst Muslim youth in northern towns and cities. For Griffin, these fundamentalists were intent on turning Britain into an Islamic state[30]. Following the riots, which Griffin in a *BBC Newsnight* interview had been careful to blame on Muslims rather than Asians, the BNP had received sympathetic approaches from a small number of Sikhs. As a consequence, in July 2001 the party had formed an 'Ethnic Liaison Committee', deliberately appealing to non-whites (particularly diasporic Sikh and Hindu nationalists) who shared the BNP's concerns over Islam.

If what was unfolding was a *strategic* response to the political marginality of Tyndall's BNP, it was equally an *expedient* reaction to external events. And here it is hard not to overdo the significance of 9/11. The dramatic terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon brought public fear and hostility to Islam to the fore. The BNP was unlikely to pass up this opportunity, and swiftly responded by launching a national campaign against Islam. However, since the BNP had turned its back on the traditional 'march and grow' strategy of the past, this campaign principally took the form of circulating inflammatory leaflets and pamphlets. One particularly noxious leaflet declared that 'Islam really does stand for Intolerance, Slaughter, Looting, Arson and Molestation of Women'. The point that I am making here is that the BNP had a history of Islamophobia prior to 7/7 and actually had one prior to 9/11. It is worth recalling that Griffin's comments in a speech to supporters that Islam was a 'wicked, vicious faith', comments that were exposed in BBC documentary and which subsequently gave rise to two legal trials, were made not in the wake of 7/7 but in 2004.

---

[30] See *Identity*, issue 12, August 2001, pp. 4-5.

So what of the significance of 7/7? To what extent was it a defining moment for Britain's far right? What is for sure is that the BNP's Nick Griffin had convinced himself that 7/7 totally transformed the existing situation: 'All is Changed, Utterly Changed', he wrote[31]. There were, for him, three 'enormous differences between the attacks on London and 9/11'. First and foremost, there was the very *ordinariness* of the perpetrators. They did not conform to the media stereotype of an Abu Hamza type Islamic extremist, 'long-bearded, Hook-handed, one eyed ranting lunatic in white robes […]', as one BNP website article put it[32]. Far from it - they were young, ordinary British-born Muslims, indistinct from the wider Muslim population. Second, Griffin maintained, Britain is a less diverse society than the US and here Muslims constitute the largest minority block, and therefore the 'immigration problem' on British soil is overwhelmingly a Muslim one. Third, 7/7 clearly was not a one-off but part of an on-going terror campaign with no end in sight. When taken together, these three 'facts' meant that Britain was facing a 'long' and 'sporadic' civil war which, invoking the apocalyptic language of Enoch Powell, 'can only end in the loss of rivers of blood'[33].

Unsurprisingly, Griffin seized on the very ordinariness of the perpetrators to validate his claim that the threat not only came from recognisable Islamic extremists but from all Muslims. The basis for his homogenising claim was that the Qu'ran was not a book of peace but an aggressive, hate-ridden, evil text. For Griffin, the essential nature of Islam is *extremist* – 'Mohammedanism is a militant and proselytising faith', inherently incompatible with Western civilisation[34]. It followed that there can be no such thing as a 'moderate' Muslim. All Muslims are potential terrorists, even 'the cricket-playing boy who worked in the corner chippie'.[35]

Indeed, Griffin argued, differentiating between 'moderates' and 'militants' was impossible given those that appear 'moderate' are likely to be 'simulating' it because 'under the Islamic tactic of *al-Taqiya',* devotees 'simulate softness and weakness in order to buy time to strengthen their position relative to the kuffars'[36]. So it was 'not a matter of "moderates" we can get along with and "extremists" we can expel', the BNP explained. In the end, 'large numbers [of Muslims] cannot stay here without their presence leading to endless bloodshed and terror'[37].

Yet Muslims were not the only ones to blame. Look no further than the 'liberal-left' politicians who had created the failed multicultural experiment in the first place, in other words, as one BNP high-ranking official described them, the 'New Left fascists', 'tolerance freaks' and 'diversity nazis'[38]. If BNP stalwarts had always understood the evildoers as Jews, Griffin was trying to encourage them to think differently. To those on the far right who still sympathised more with the Arab than

---

[31] See Nick Griffin, 'All is Changed, Utterly Changed', *Identity*, issue 57, August 2005, pp. 4-7.
[32] As cited in C. Wood and W. M. L. Finlay, 'British National Party representations of Muslims in the month after the London bombings: Homogeneity, threat, and the conspiracy of tradition', *British Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 47, 2008, pp. 707-726 (quote at p. 714).
[33] Griffin, 'All is Changed, Utterly Changed', p. 4.
[34] Ibid., p. 6.
[35] Ibid., p. 4.
[36] Ibid., p. 6.
[37] '"Islam – A Vicious & Wicked Faith"?', *Identity*, issue 57, August 2005, p. 26.
[38] See website quotation extract in Wood and Finlay, 'British National Party representations of Muslims in the month after the London bombings', p. 718.

the (conspiratorial) Jew, Griffin declared that 'professional anti-Semites' had to recognise that the Muslim world 'is in the middle of a fundamentalist religious revival […]'[39].

What would dominate politics for decades to come was not some monolithic Jewish conspiracy, Griffin would later assert, but the 'clash of civilisations' between Islam and the West. '*This* is the threat than can bring us to power. *This* is the Big Issue on which we must concentrate in order to wake people up and make them look at what we have to offer all round'[40]. Griffin even believed that the situation had changed to such an extent that Jews would buy into the BNP's anti-Islamic campaign - the BNP campaigned in Jewish areas in London in 2008 (albeit to no avail).

Nonetheless, that the BNP's adoption of an aggressive Islamophobia was taking effect is without doubt. In one YouGOV survey (2009), 79% of BNP voters agreed with the statement that 'even in its mildest form, Islam poses a serious danger to Western civilisation' (44% for full sample). Voter studies also confirmed that the BNP gained most traction in areas with large Muslim communities (the BNP and the presence of non-Muslim Asians exhibited no such relationship and support for the BNP was actually lower in those areas with large Black populations)[41]. But there were obvious limits to BNP support. The Achilles' heel was that its brand remained toxic – for all the changes in style, presentation and message, the BNP still carried too many negative connotations (Griffin was cruelly exposed as a 'smirking extremist' on *Question Time* in 2009)[42]. New competition for aggressive Islamophobia also emerged in the form of the EDL, which unlike the BNP, favoured direct action on the streets. Although it is important to note that the EDL did not emerge in response to 7/7, nor for that matter was it simply a BNP offshoot, it reproduced much of the BNP's shrill Islamophobic discourse.

As an academic who has studied Britain's far right for over two decades, I have noted the ways in which my subject has changed in form over the years. Undoubtedly, the adoption of aggressive Islamophobia has been one of the more obvious shifts: if 7/7 was the not the cause, it was certainly a catalyst. But this shift should also be understood in terms of broader international trends. Needless to say, similar developments have been in evidence on the far right elsewhere. As Nick Griffin wrote in 2006, 'From those who back the Front National and the Vlaams Belang, to those who work with American Renaissance, a growing number are now rowing in the same direction as we are, working to ensure that we fight and win the Clash of Civilisations where it matters – in our own homelands'[43]. Yet Griffin lost control of the oars of his boat in 2010, eventually parting company with the BNP in 2014. The

---

[39] Griffin, 'All is Changed, Utterly Changed', p. 5.
[40] Nick Griffin, Chairman's Article: 'Our Fight in the Culture Clash', *Identity*, issue 64, March 2006, p. 8.
[41] See Matthew Goodwin, *New British Fascism: Rise of the British National Party* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), p. 177.
[42] On the Griffin's performance on *Question Time*, see Nigel Copsey and Graham Macklin, '"THE MEDIA = LIES, LIES, LIES!" The BNP and the media in contemporary Britain', in Nigel Copsey and Graham Macklin (eds.) *British National Party: Contemporary Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), pp. 81-102.
[43] Nick Griffin, 'Our Fight in the Culture Clash', p.8.

EDL, as well as successor organisations such as the BNP-EDL hybrid 'Britain First'[44], have also run aground.

Does this mean that the potential for far-right Islamophobia is now exhausted? Whilst some of this potential is currently finding a more respectable home in UKIP, a resurgent far right remains a possibility over the longer term. Much will be contingent on external events facilitating such resurgence - the aftershocks of an event similar in scale to 7/7, perhaps?

Nigel Copsey is Professor of Modern History at Teesside University and co-director of Teesside University's Centre for Fascist, Anti-Fascist and Post-Fascist Studies. Professor Copsey has published widely on Britain's far right and its opposition. His major publications are Anti-Fascism in Britain (2000) and Contemporary British Fascism: the British National Party and the Quest for Legitimacy (2004; 2008). He is also co-editor of several volumes on British fascism and anti-fascism. His most recent co-edited volume (with John Richardson) is Cultures of Post-War British Fascism (2015).

---

[44] On Britain First see Chris Allen, 'Britain First: The Frontline Resistance to the Islamification of Britain', *The Political Quarterly*, vol. 85, no. 3, July-September 2014, pp. 354-361.

The 7/7 bombings: An Attack on Trust

Frens Kroeger, Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations

The London bombings have had a lasting effect on life in the United Kingdom in a variety of ways. While some of these have been discussed widely in the academic and public spheres, an aspect though significant, yet largely neglected, is that of trust.

The 7/7 bombings were as much an attack on trust as they were an attack on people, places, and objects. Whatever their contribution to the wider long-term development, key statistics show that the United Kingdom as a whole is a less trusting society today than it was ten years ago. Both trust in key institutions and generalised trust in unknown others have declined steadily, prompting the Edelman Trust Barometer to classify the UK as a 'distrusting society' in 2015, for the first time. Furthermore, surveys often report that respondents perceive social diversity and immigration as complications in rebuilding this trust[45].

Our observations will be concerned mainly with the issue of generalised trust, i.e. (how) can we trust unknown others in our society? As such, our questions are not geared towards the institutional level (what can be done by 'the government', 'the authorities'?, etc.), but rather address the individual level: how is our individual experience of trust affected by an attack such as the 7/7 bombings, and what are rational strategies for dealing with these effects in our daily lives?

Why attack trust? Why is it central to our way of life?

Life in communities depends crucially on the link between **trust and cooperation**[46]. While cooperation without trust is of course possible, it tends to be distant and narrowly interest-based. Trust has the ability to turn this into relationships with long-term reciprocity and open time horizons, making them richer, 'thicker' and more reliable. In the terms of classical sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies, without trust we may build societies, but never communities. The rich texture of close collaboration and mutual enrichment that characterises functioning communities would be lost. And this makes trust a welcome target for some.

On an individual level, too, **trust as a basic sense of security** is essential to our ability to cope with the world around us[47]. A lack of basic trust in others would be paralysing. How could you ever leave the house, let alone cross the road or turn your back to strangers if you could not be confident that they will not run you over, stab you in the back, or detonate a bomb on your bus? The 7/7 bombers clearly chose 'soft targets' like buses and underground trains not merely because they have lower levels

---

[45] See Edelman Trust Barometer 2014: UK Data (2014). Available at http://www.slideshare.net/Edelman_UK/edelman-trust-barometer-2014-uk-data, and Edelman Trust Barometer 2015: Global Results (2015). Available at http://www.edelman.com/insights/intellectual-property/2015-edelman-trust-barometer/trust-and-innovation-edelman-trust-barometer/global-results/.

[46] McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 38: 24-59.

[47] On basic trust in the world around us, see Luhmann (1979: ch. 1) and especially Giddens's (1991) concept of 'ontological security'. Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. Chichester: Wiley.Chapter 1. Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity.

of security than high-profile public events. This choice was also intended to demonstrate that our normal, everyday lives have become unsafe.

How did the 7/7 bombings undermine trust in the UK?

Successfully destroying trust within a community, then, means isolating individuals in more sense than one. A total lack of trust, if it were to manifest, would break down communities and leave individuals incapacitated. While the London bombers could not utterly destroy all trust, their attacks were highly destructive of trust particularly for three reasons.

Firstly, they represent an attack on **trust at multiple levels**[48]. It may not have greatly affected our trust in those immediately around us – those in our family, and those of whom we have intimate knowledge. But trust based on kinship was central to pre-modern societies and communities. Modern societies depend on trust in those we do *not* know. An attack such as that of July 2005 is intended to call into question our ***trust in unknown (or generalised) others***. What is more, it has the potential to undermine our ***trust in institutions***, particularly those related to state and government, that are designed to keep their citizens secure and safe from bodily harm. Lastly, the bombings were carried out in order to undermine ***trust in the wider systems*** that modern societies are founded on. We need to trust impersonal systems working quietly in the background in order to calmly board not only planes, but also buses or underground trains. Attacks such as these call into question this largely unquestioned confidence. And if these systems don't work, who says it will remain safe to, say, drink water from the tap in your own home?

Thus, a one-off event like the London bombings can wreak havoc with public trust on a broad scale, on multiple levels and in manifold respects. This is further complicated by the fact that the forms of trust described – trust in generalised others, in specific institutions, and in wider societal systems – are **interconnected across levels**[49]. System trust in particular has strong knock-on effects. Why trust the institutions which are meant to monitor, police, and stabilise those systems if they seem to be failing? How can we trust others if we feel we live in an increasingly unpredictable environment? And how stable is our basic sense of trust if previously unquestionable certainties such as the safety of our food or transport may come into question?

Secondly, the attacks clearly sought to emphasise a definition of **trust and distrust based on similarities vs. differences**[50]. Both in practice and in research, many subscribe to the idea that we are likely to trust those who we perceive to be similar to

---

[48]On trust in generalised others, in specific institutions, and in wider societal systems, see Rotter (1971), Bachmann and Inkpen (2011), and Giddens (1990), respectively. Rotter, J.B. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. *American Psychologist* 26: 443-52. Bachmann, R. and Inkpen, A.C. (2011). Understanding Institutional-based Trust Building Processes in Inter-organizational Relationships. *Organization Studies* 32: 281-301. Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

[49] On the links between forms of trust across multiple analytical levels, see Kroeger (2012). Kroeger, F. (2012). Trusting organizations: The institutionalization of trust in interorganizational relationships. *Organization* 19: 743-63.

[50]On trust based on similarity and homophily, see Zucker (1986) and Brewer (1981). Zucker, L.G. (1986). Production of Trust: Institutional Sources of Economic Structure, 1840-1920. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 8: 53-111. Brewer, M.B. (1981). Ethnocentrism and its role in interpersonal trust. In Brewer, M.B. and Collins, B.E. (eds.). *Scientific Inquiry and the Social Sciences*. New York: Jossey-Bass. 345-59.

ourselves and, inversely, unlikely to trust those who appear different. Similarities are interpreted as signals that the other is predictable, their reasoning comprehensible, that they may even share the same moral world view. Terror attacks, in their general thrust to divide and create the potential for radicalisation on both sides, seek to create distrust based on perceived difference.

As 'homegrown' terrorists from non-white ethnic backgrounds, the bombers emphasised their 'different' looks and beliefs, but simultaneously the fact that they – superficially – appear like many others within UK society. (One of the bombers stressed this similarity by referring to himself 'and thousands like me' in a recorded video message.) In addition, the July 2005 bombings became linked to pre-existing negative discourses around immigration and general xenophobia[51]. This further helped the attacks in constructing an image of Foucault's 'Other' within the same society, simply speaking of 'us vs. them', often rooted in superficial differences such as appearance. Based on our observations on the role of trust in society, those distrusted are invited less often to take part in and contribute which in turn increases exclusivity.

Such social exclusivity represents a further complication: the shift towards trust emphasising superficial similarities is exacerbated by the relationship between **trust and Matthew effects**, that is, the susceptibility of trust to vicious as well as virtuous cycles[52]. In this case: the less trust is extended to an individual or group, the less rich and rewarding interaction is likely to take place, which in turn creates fewer and fewer opportunities for displaying trustworthiness and building trust with one another. Thus it is easy for trust to spiral downwards, and it may become increasingly difficult to reverse the direction of this spiral as well as the divide between the communities involved.

What can we do to re-stabilise trust?

Lacking trust in a community or society is a complex problem with no simple solution. However, as previously indicated, trust on the individual level depends strongly on the definitions and interpretations we attach; furthermore a coherent case can be made for trust, and against distrust, as a rational individual strategy. Again, we draw our conceptual clues from trust research.

First, does distrust increase safety? Is the individual likely to be safer because they place less trust in unknown (and 'different') others?

---

[51]As a particularly blatant example, see the attempt by the British National Party to instrumentalise the attacks for their own political aims, printing flyers with the picture of the bombed bus and the slogan 'Maybe now it's time to start listening to the BNP'.

[52]On vicious as well as virtuous cycles in trust building, see Ferrin et al. (2008) and Kroeger (forthcoming). On Matthew effects, see Merton (1968); the term is derived from Matthew 25:29: 'For to everyone who has will more be given, and he will have an abundance. But from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away'. Ferrin, D.L., Bligh, M.C. and Kohles, J.C. (2008). 'It Takes Two to Tango: An Interdependence Analysis of the Spiraling of Perceived Trustworthiness and Cooperation in Interpersonal and Intergroup Relationships'. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 107: 161-178. Kroeger, F. (forthcoming). 'The escalation and collapse of system trust: From the financial crisis to society at large'. *European Management Journal*. Merton, R.K. (1968). 'The Matthew Effect in Science'. *Science* 159: 56-63.

This is highly unlikely to say the least. In the wake of attacks such as the London bombings, distrust tends to become ingrained institutionally. Thus, public institutions, such as the police, seek to assert greater control over potential sources of danger through strategies of monitoring, prevention, etc. This points us towards the complex relationship between **trust and control**[53]. Whereas traditional studies emphasised that control can substitute for trust (i.e., high levels of control make trust superfluous), in the present case we may view control as the institutionalisation of distrust, which can substitute for, and render largely unnecessary, distrust at the individual level. What is more, institutional strategies can actively facilitate trust at the individual level, due to the psychological effects of being able to assume an increased predictability of the shared environment. In purely rational or strategic terms, there are thus likely to be *more*, not fewer grounds for trusting others in the wake of an attack such as the London bombings.

It should also be noted that an attack of this kind does not offer rational grounds for distrusting central institutions or even broad societal systems. The likelihood of falling victim to a terrorist attack, which in the UK is statistically lower than being struck by lightning, tends to be vastly overestimated. Conceptually, in this regard we are dealing with a question of **hope rather than trust**[54]**,** and distrusting institutions and authorities will not increase our individual safety either.

Second, is distrust of others, particularly of those who appear different from ourselves, simply a 'natural' and unavoidable reaction to an attack such as the 7/7 bombings? We have mentioned the idea that trust builds on similarities, and that an attack like the London bombings increases the risk of intensifying distrust of those perceived to be different. However, this trajectory is anything but automatic. The superficial definitions of similar/trustworthy and different/untrustworthy are malleable constructs, and what is perceived and selected as a similarity or a difference is open to definition. It is an individual definitional choice, for instance, whether a fellow citizen is interpreted as different due to his/her race or religion, or as similar in his/her desire for peaceful coexistence.

Furthermore, not all trust research subscribes to the idea of trust based on pre-existing similarities. Counter to this idea, trust is not the automatic result of external antecedents, but depends on the *active* use the trustor and trustee make of them. Consider, for instance, that trust can be based equally not on similarity, but on complementarity. Innovation, creativity, and even safety can be founded on the combination of different perspectives and the increased ability to prepare for all eventualities. The insight that diverse societies do better, confirmed by academic research time and time again, can be applied to the issue of trust too, depending on the interpretations and actions of individuals.

This opens up great scope for reflexive and **active trust**[55]. Trust is built over time, based on experience. Far from being inevitable, the vicious cycles of trust mentioned

---

[53]On trust and control, see Bijlsma-Frankema and Costa (2005). Bijlsma-Frankema, K. and Costa, A.C. (2005). Understanding the Trust-Control Nexus. *International Sociology* 20: 259-82.

[54]On the distinction between trust and hope, see Luhmann (1988). Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, Confidence, Trust: Problems and Alternatives. In Gambetta, D. (ed.). *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. Oxford: Blackwell. 94-107.

[55]On active trust, see Möllering (2006: chapters 4 and 5). Möllering, G. (2006). *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

above can be broken by initiating interaction with unknown others, even if they lack superficial similarities with ourselves. Whether this leads to the eventual establishment of a trusting relationship or not, the notion of active trust means that interactions and events can be triggered which enable the potential trustor to make an informed decision; they can even bring about situations specifically to test the trustworthiness of others at comparatively low levels of risk. If that trust is honoured, stakes can rise incrementally over time. At the core of active trust lies the idea that trust as well as distrust should be earned rather than inferred on the basis of third-party information.

A particularly effective, if slightly more risky, strategy of active trust is **presumptive trust** or '*as if* trust'[56]. Here, the trustor does not wait for confirmatory information, but instead begins the relationship with a trusting stance. That is, he or she acts *as if* trust were both present and justified in the relationship. It has been observed empirically that the act of granting trust quickly in this way is likely to be requited in kind. Presumptive trust can thus act as a self-fulfilling prophecy, actively bringing about the trustworthy behaviour which it presumes. While the risks associated with such presumptive trust need not be high (as it, again, typically starts out with comparatively low stakes), it creates the potential for virtuous cycles of trust in which the degree of trust increases over time.

Hope for trust?

Whilst noting how central trust is both to our communities and our individual lives within them, and how destructive of this trust the 7/7 bombings have been, it has also become evident that trust, due to its malleable and interactive nature, is never irretrievably damaged.

The ideas discussed in the last section also challenge some common, if unspoken, assumptions underlying much of public discourse. Distrust of others, and especially of those different from ourselves, is not the solution. It is not likely to make us safer, and it is neither a 'natural' nor a rational reaction to the threat posed by attacks like the 7/7 bombings. While they did great harm, trust is not simply an uncontrollable emotional reaction. By reminding ourselves that trust is malleable, and that we stand to gain much from rebuilding trust within and between our communities, we can build trust purposefully and proactively. Even on the societal level, trust always depends on the awareness and the willingness of individuals to act in good faith. It is only if we fail to do so that the attacks of 7 July 2005 will have achieved their goal of lastingly damaging trust in our society.

Frens Kroeger is a Research Fellow at the Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations at Coventry University. His research interests revolve around the issue of trust, particularly trust which relates not only to individuals but to groups, communities and institutions. His work has been published in some of the leading journals and handbooks in the field. Frens is an alumnus of Corpus Christi College Cambridge. Before joining CTPSR, he held lectureships at DeMontfort University Leicester and the University of Surrey.

---

[56]On presumptive or 'as if' trust, see Möllering above, and Kramer (1999). Möllering, G. (2006). *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. Kramer, R.M. (1999). Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Emerging Perspectives, Enduring Questions. *Annual Review of Psychology* 50: 569-98.

Interdicting Citizenship: A Decade after 7/7

Salman Sayyid, University of Leeds

What a difference a decade makes

The fear of 'home-grown' terrorists, the struggles over British values, and the curtailment of civil liberties are being played out in the shadow of the 7/7 bombings. It is curious to note that throughout much of the 1970s and 1980s, Britain experienced a determined bombing campaign at the hands of Irish Republicans, but these bombings did not (either individually or collectively) seem to generate the same kind of questions and interrogations. There were not repeated and insistent calls for Catholics to condemn the bombings. There was no scandal over the fact that many of the Irish Republicans were 'home grown' (after all Northern Ireland was part of the UK). Bombings in London were not presented as a crisis of multi-faith Britain. Nor were the bombings, the support for the bombers, or the existence of an Irish Nationalist movement seen as something requiring lectures on British values. So, what is different?

The official answer given out by governments of various hues, and their supporters among opinion-makers, is that the threat faced by Muslim extremists is of a different order altogether. The IRA may have been associated with Catholics but it was not motivated cosmologically. The unprecedented nature of the threat from violent Islamists is that their violence is fuelled by religious sentiment. Part of the horror of 7/7 was that these were suicide bombers; they were willing to die to kill. The bombings of 7/7 seemed to confirm that the attacks on Washington and New York on 9/11 were not unique, but part of an ongoing series.

The decade after 7/7 has seen the hegemony of the master-narrative of religious motivations. A stubborn insistence has been placed on this diagnosis, in disregard of all evidence to the contrary. The consequence has been a decade spent pursuing policies that assume there are conveyor belts by which moderate Muslims are transported, from mosques to training camps in Iraq, Syria, or Afghanistan, and back again.

The assault on Muslim civil society is manifested in many different ways. For example, Muslims are amongst the largest charity givers in the UK in per-capita terms, and 3% of charities are probably Muslim, but nearly 75% of all charities being investigated by the Charity Commission are Muslim. Schools in Birmingham have had their board of governors removed on the back of a fake memo and an over-zealous neo-conservative Education Secretary. The head of the Metropolitan Police Community Engagement, Commander Chishty, has reportedly defined radicalisation among Muslims as being expressed by a refusal to drink alcohol or shop at Marks & Spencer, and has argued that the police have moved into the private space of Muslims in order to pre-empt early signs of radicalisation. Muslim pupils, as young as 5 or 6, have been subject to surveys, without parental consent, checking for signs of radicalisation. We wait for the announcement of tests for detecting a radicalised foetus.

Democracy as spectator sport

The 7/7 bombings have played a pivotal role in transforming the relationship between state and society. Many of these changes were already on the way, but the response to the 7/7 bombing has accelerated the process. Democracy has become a slogan more than a practice. Democracy is praised and, in its name, various anti-terrorist measures are initiated. In its name, support for these measures is mobilised, and, in its name, its foundations are hollowed out. The emergence of government initiatives to strengthen civic solidarity and produce a citizenry which is fully signed up to core British values has been in operation for a decade. Despite the glossy brochures, there is little reason to assume that this endeavour has not been deeply undermined by the systematic discrepancy between the rhetoric of an inclusive citizenry and the realities of social exclusion.

A vibrant democracy requires an engaged, well-informed and active citizenry. By threatening any challenges to the official version of the causes of extremism, and by limiting the possibility of dissent or diversity of views, democracy is hollowed out and becomes just another spectator sport held every four–to-five years during election time. Narrowing the range of opinions and debate not only subverts democracy, but also undermines the ability to find imaginative solutions to the problems that ten years of government policies of PREVENT and its related programmes have done little to resolve.

Canaries in a coal mine

In the decade after 7/7, Muslims have seen a massive curtailment of their freedoms to challenge prevailing views, to maintain their privacy, and to express themselves politically. The combination of legislation and the spread of the meme 'if you are not doing anything wrong, you have nothing to hide', are used to expand state authority and facilitate its intrusion into more and more areas of people's lives. The focus on extremism and de-radicalisation, while overwhelmingly targeted at Muslims, is hollowing out democracy, as secret trails and extensive surveillance become part of the 'normal'. This is a normality that the revelations from Snowden and official reports on rendition and torture do not seem to be able to disrupt.

The threat of Muslim radicalism has been used to drive forward legislation in which liberal rights have been curtailed, initially only for violent extremists but then for everyone. The incident involving Walter Wolfgang in 2005 is an apt metaphor for this process. Mr. Wolfgang, an octogenarian, was ejected from the Labour Party conference for heckling the then Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw. When he tried to return to the conference, he was stopped by a police officer who used powers given to him by anti-terror legislation. The fact that anti-terrorism legislation was used against an 80-year-old holocaust survivor, who had been a member of the Labour Party for half a century, shows how easy it is, once laws are in place, to stretch them beyond their original remit. While the headlines may focus on dealings with Muslim extremists, the small print affects everybody – Muslim and non-Muslim.

New kind of state

State-making has been linked to war-making. Different kinds of states emerge in the context of different kinds of wars. The war on terror is producing a new

configuration of state. This new type of state is characterised by a strengthening of the executive branch of government at the expense of the legislature. It is also characterised by the proliferation of semi-clandestine agencies with minimal oversight, which are involved in the surveillance and policing of ever-increasing numbers of suspects. As a result of this type of state, traditional political parties are being weakened, both in terms of their memberships and their ability to act as effective conduits for turning popular demands into policy reforms. There is also an emergence of a cadre of secureaucrats and the securitisation of more and more government functions – e.g. the way the duty of combating radicalisation has been made the responsibility of bodies such as nurseries (!), schools, universities, the NHS, local councils, and the media.

In this emerging war-on-terror state the fundamental belief of democracy - that the government works for the people - has been turned on its head. Many features that used to be associated with the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe are increasingly characteristic of the kind of Britain that has emerged in the last ten years – specifically, the secret and mass collection of data on individuals by a state spying on its own population in a massive and clandestine way; the confinement of debate and dissent against government policies around its counter-radicalisation agenda to an increasingly narrow range of opinions; the mobilisation of much of the national media to such an agenda in which dissent is treated as borderline treason; and the willingness to solicit children as potential informers on their parents and vice versa. These aspects are not the stuff of some dystopian novel but the lived experience of many Muslims.

The only limit to the expansion of the state has been in the field of economic regulation, where, apparently, state authorities cannot (or should not) do anything to undermine the workings of the free market. The strong state and free market model of governance has become increasingly entrenched in the wake of 7/7, with most mainstream political parties signing up to it. A future beckons of a creeping soft totalitarianism, fortified by the lure of conspicuous consumption and shops full of shiny things to buy. It is ironic that in the year of celebrations of 800 years of Magna as one great founding moment of British democracy - when state authority was made subject to law and arbitrary powers were checked - we are witnessing the exact opposite: the Home Secretary and other Ministers are increasingly making grabs to define and legally enforce their understanding of British values, their understanding of who historically was or was not a terrorist, and their understanding of what radicalisation is.

From 1945 to 1979, Britain, like much of Western Europe, was governed by principles through which it sought to differentiate itself from the excesses of totalitarianism of the Nazi and Communist regimes. The belief in liberal rights (where the state tried to guarantee freedom of expression and other activities that could check the growth of state power and discipline its populations) went hand-in-hand with a commitment to social rights (in which the state took the responsibility to ensure that its population had full employment, decent housing, etc.).

The end of the Cold War consolidated the retreat from social rights, as there was no Soviet Union to compete with, in regard to who could provide better economic and social conditions. The war on terror has signalled the retreat from a commitment to liberal rights, in which the ability to organize, in a peaceful manner, against actions of

the strong, whether it is government or co-operations, has radically circumscribed. For ten years, in a series of small steps, we have arrived at a tipping point in which the balance between the state and the people is now tilting in the direction of authoritarianism.

Looking ahead

The various de-radicalisation programmes sold by a mix of well-meaning idealists and snake oil merchants are not going to deliver a society that is secure and at peace with itself. What is needed is a re-invigoration of citizenship in which diversity and multiculturalism are dependant not on signing up to specific values but on the cultivation of a democratic practice.

Since 7/7 we have seen policies that seek to interdict citizenship gain the upper hand over policies that promote and sustain citizenship. Governments with more confidence in the people, and with greater connections with the Muslim community, would have realised that there is no straightforward conveyor belt from criticism of government policy, to radicalisation, to violence. By assuming there is a seamless movement between recognising that something is not right to acts of violence, the de-radicalisation narrative is increasing the likelihood of extremist violence rather than limiting it. Instead of informationals that reek of Soviet style propaganda directed at Muslims, or sermons about how Islam is being distorted, those who are serious about reducing the threat of violence would do better to facilitate the mechanisms of influencing and changing policy by non-violent means. Ten years after 7/7, what the country needs is less de-radicalisation and more democracy.

Dr Salman Sayyid is currently based in the University of Leeds. From 2010 to 2013 he was the inaugural Director of the International Centre for Muslim and non-Muslim Understanding in Australia. Dr Sayyid's numerous publications been translated into a number of languages including Spanish, Persian, Turkish, Portuguese, and Arabic. His first book: 'A Fundamental Fear' was upon publication nominated for British Sociological Association's prize for the best first monograph, however, subsequently it was banned by the Malaysian government. His most recent book 'Recalling the Caliphate' was published last year. He is a founding editor of the 'ReOrient: The Journal of Critical Muslim Studies' and is a frequent contributor to international and national media.

Fear and Hope – the Legacy of 7/7

Dilwar Hussain, New Horizons in British Islam and the Centre of Trust Peace and Social Relations

The ten years in the aftermath of the terror attacks in London appear to have been a long and winding journey for British Muslims. Prior to 7/7, we saw the events of 9/11 and since, the brutal murder of Lee Rigby. The sense of outrage and shock generated by these events was repeated as we saw videos of British citizens beheaded, and more recently gunned down in Tunisia, not to mention the issue of people leaving Britain to either fight alongside ISIL or reside in Iraq or Syria.

In recent polling by the think tank British Future[57], a majority of people (54%) think community relations have got worse, not better in the ten years since the 7/7 bombings. British Muslims agree, with 56% thinking that relations have worsened over the last ten years. The poll found that a majority of respondents (56%) agree that British Muslims are opposed to the terrorist ideology behind the 7/7 bombings. But with such a small margin and three in ten (31%) saying they neither agree nor disagree, it is clear that there is an urgent need to do more to build trust between communities in Britain.

Having said that, the vast majority of people, of all faiths and none, want to find a way for citizens of this country to get along better. We have seen this spirit in the many, diverse and creative initiatives that have sprung up post-7/7 to bring people together and to develop understanding, trust and peace.

This contrast between fear and hope is an important thread that runs through the last decade. We saw images of havoc on the public transport system, blood-soaked machetes, EDL protests and counter-protests, arson attacks, and hundreds of hostile, puzzled and angry faces. But we have also seen images of a resilient and defiant London, communities of all faiths walking to Woolwich to lay wreaths of flowers in memory of Lee Rigby, images of ordinary members of the Muslim community and Imams standing up to preachers of hate on the radio, TV and on social media, of faith leaders standing together time and time again, and the abiding image of a mosque in York disarming EDL protesters with an invitation to join them for a very English cup of tea. More recently as one Tunisian gunned down Britons, we saw other Tunisians stand up to form a human shield to protect other tourists.

Some asked, following the 7/7 bombings: 'where is the Muslim condemnation of terrorism?'; however, the murder of Lee Rigby unified Muslims across Britain and brought out a collective voice on a scale, and at a pace, that we haven't seen before. The voice of Muslims on Twitter, Facebook and in the media again and again rejected the messages of doubt and hate that emanated from some quarters. I was national president of the Islamic Society of Britain at the time, and was inundated with messages of support from the public.

Which is why, while being open-eyed about the challenges, in 20 years of voluntary

---

[57] The polling was carried out by Survation for British Future from 8-15 May 2015. 3,977 GB adults were surveyed online. The data was released on 2nd July 2015. http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/anxious-decade/ (Accessed 2 July 2015).

work with Muslim communities across the country, I have never felt more confident of our place in this country. My hope is that out of all the tragedies we are seeing, we will be able to look to a new horizon where Muslims define a positive story of life in Britain in tune with their faith.

One of the important tasks for the journey is to think long and hard about how we as British Muslims can give living meaning to the values of Islam and read them afresh in modern times; how we can live Islam in the context of modern Britain and without leaving behind the core principles of the faith, adapt our practice to a British setting, as every Muslim culture before us has done – in China, Bosnia, India, Turkey and so on.

Why does that matter? Because Muslims – as a diverse set of people who are defined by their culture as well as their faith – will find it difficult to address the chaos and uncertainty of the age unless they can somehow dive deep into the traditions of Islam and their proud roots in this country to find ways of giving those traditions and roots meaning in the context of Britain today. It is not by leaving their faith, but by living their faith in Britain, that they can bring hope for the future. This will require some confident and critical thinking in order to work out what the tradition actually says and how it speaks to our time. But has this process of contextual and critical thinking become more difficult now than before 7/7?

This is where I need to return to the contrast between fear and hope. Some Muslims have clearly felt that they are under the critical eye of society and that under such pressure it is difficult to be self-critical as well. The feeling of vulnerability and the focus on prejudice and Islamophobia has, for some, become a rallying cry to a sense of disempowering victimhood. But others (including myself) have argued that this behaviour is too passive and risks stripping away our sense of agency and hope. When you have agency, and recognise that you have that agency, you can start to reclaim your destiny and also be confident enough to say that part of the change process will involve being self-critical. In fact, the Qur'an asserts that, 'God will not change the condition of a people until they begin changing themselves'[58]; in other words, that a consistent ethical outlook implies that not only must you challenge wrongdoing on the outside but also challenge wrongdoing when you find it inside.

Prejudice often leads to Muslims feeling a greater sense of estrangement from society, which in turn can fuel the distance between 'us' and 'them', thus creating even greater alienation and potentially greater prejudice and discrimination. The above cycle needs to be broken at multiple points. A singular strategy is not enough. Identifying prejudice can only be a start, as important as it is. At the end of the day, Muslims face it, and know that it exists – but the real question is what works best to combat prejudice, to shift public opinion and to build greater trust? And here it is important to point out that far from resisting the self-critical questions and conversations, engaging with them may be the very thing that helps to build trust, as a self-questioning attitude shows signs of humility, introspection and taking responsibility, rather than arrogance and denial.

Many different voices have called for some sort of Reformation within Islam. But it is not always clear what this actually means. One can assume that it implies that Islam

---

[58] Qur'an, 13:11.

should modernise and come to terms with the modern world, modern notions of equality, human rights, democracy, etc. Perhaps it is also often about a meeker, milder and cuddlier brand of Islam – but would we get the latter through a Reformation? In Europe, the Reformation led to a tremendous amount of bloodshed and upheaval – the 30 Years War for example – and a long-standing tension between Catholics and Protestants. Some of the more literalist and fundamentalist Christian views stem from the reformed end of the spectrum, albeit a pre-modern notion of reform. The parallel among Muslims would be Wahhabism, and its similarity to a Cromwellian form of austere, puritan Protestantism.

The European Reformation emerged from a particular cultural, political and religious history and context, and some Muslims may fear that reforming Islam is a way of imposing a Eurocentric view on how Muslims should be, and that this may somehow pull Muslims too far away from their own tradition. Having said this, coming to terms with changes in the modern world just cannot be ignored. So how can we keep the baby while we throw out the bathwater? And ensure that change occurs on Islam's own terms, and not by imposition from outside?

Reform is possible without 'a Reformation'. Reform (*islah*) and renewal (*tajdid*) are essential underpinnings of Islamic thought – Islam's own tools for rejuvenation, not external impositions – that are meant to be constant forces of change (*taghyir*). Islam also has intellectual tools such as *ijtihad* (creative thinking to deal with new challenges). These tools were designed to create a spirit of incremental reform. It is a well-known legal maxim in the Shariah that a fatwa can change with time and place. This is starkly demonstrated by the story of Imam Shafi'i travelling from Iraq to Egypt and re-writing some of his teachings in the light of the new context. It is crucial to point out that fatwas are legal opinions, the application of jurisprudence, that build up a body of *man-made* rules and regulations for human conduct. This body of teachings, and the tradition that emerges from it, cannot claim divinity, even if it relies on what the followers of the faith may regard as divine revelation.

The body of the tradition is thus fallible, contextual and open to argument, and should be constantly replenished through new debates, discussions and *ijtihad*. Yet, because there has been a lack of confidence in Muslim thought in recent centuries and the spirit of *ijtihad* has arguably been suppressed in the name of following a tradition that can assert a time-bound snapshot of a 'Muslim identity', many scholars will use ancient texts to pluck out fatwas for today leading to highly incongruous application, out of context, of viewpoints whose time may have come and gone. In a post-Caliphate world that has experienced globalisation, urbanisation and international conventions and treaties, fatwas from even a decade ago can seem widely off the mark.

Having emphasised the need for reform, even before one gets to such issues where genuine reform may be necessary, there is much merit in exploring the depth and breadth of historical Muslim tradition. Debates such as female leadership of prayers, shortening the times of fasting during long days, consuming non-ritually slaughtered meat, what constitutes adequate sartorial covering, etc., are all debates that are often seen as controversial today in some circles, yet have a rich plurality of opinion within Muslim history. There is also selective application of *ijtihad*. A paper presented to a European council of scholars a few years ago on calculation of prayer times contained detailed scientific data on light levels, the different degrees of latitude and longitude, and the effects these would have on the visibility of the sun. Alas, when the

discussion turned to the banning of religious symbols in France, which was topical at the time, there were no papers on French history, secularism or identity. Instead the vacuum was mainly filled by polemical discussion. Similarly, if we look at the realm of Economics, the amount of *ijtihadi* energy that has been poured into the subject, from even conservative scholars, is remarkable. This has allowed Muslims in the modern day to take out insurance, mortgages, deal in the stock market, and even change the way zakat is administered. Yet raise the issue of gender equality, or why there is no categorical prohibition of domestic violence, and the issue becomes 'complicated'.

Tradition is important, because people who have no sense of history cannot appreciate the future. But a pre-occupation with what has passed at the cost of neglect of the present , let alone the future, is not healthy. I like the analogy of driving a car – the rear view and wing mirrors tell you what you have left behind, and should be checked before a manoeuvre, but the windscreen, which is far bigger, is the main focus, as it allows you to look ahead.

Ijtihad is thus essential and use of this intellectual tool needs to be consistently enhanced. Furthermore, our approach to religious texts is crucial. Muslims believe the Qur'an to be eternally relevant. And if a finite text is to have infinite relevance, its meaning has to be constantly unfolded; it has to be constantly read and reread, in ways that are meaningful and relevant – which also necessitates a keen understanding of the context. Thus, what it means to be a Muslim needs to be subtly redefined for every age; it is not necessarily the case that history is the only receptacle of authenticity – authenticity is about following the spirit of Islam and this will have different expressions in changing contexts.

I would argue that such debates have at the same time become more difficult today and more necessary, indeed inevitable, as a result of the twists and turns that the British Muslim community has faced in the decade following 7/7. Some are now more defensive, erecting higher walls and entrenching themselves. They have given up on the idea that Islam and 'The West' can be reconciled. The politics of modern Muslim identity have often emphasised the status quo over change, for fear of being subverted by the 'Other' (often the 'Western Other'). When religious and spiritual teachings become embroiled in perpetuating a defensive form of distinctiveness, they can often be usurped for communitarian ends. Yet others look to the challenges Muslims face and realise that they need to be confronted head on. They see how a new generation of children are torn by contradictory teachings they are receiving, things that inherently 'don't work' in a British setting. Furthermore, they see in the challenges not only difficulties but also opportunities. For reform and contextualisation of Islam are on-going existential pursuits, not ones to be instrumentalised for security or policy concerns.

In contextualising Islam in Britain today, reformers see an opportunity to construct a new identity where Muslims can feel at home, rooted. They see a new future where people of different faiths and beliefs can work together to shape new ideas and dreams for a shared and inseparable future. Perhaps 7/7 and other events like it accelerated that realisation that the division between 'us' and 'them' is not one about two distinct camps, of 'Muslims' and 'non-Muslims', but is more about the people who want to share the planet in peace and those who revel in conflict.

The years following 7/7 remind us of what needs to be done, but they remind us too

of how far we have come, as Muslims and as Britons and what real potentials there are for a body of contextual Islamic teachings to emerge. As Sunder Katwala of British Future has said, '[...] we still need to build more trust [...] Some non-Muslims want to know, "Do you really want to be one of us?" Some Muslims are asking "are you really going to let us?" The answer to both should be an emphatic yes.'

Dilwar Hussain is Chair of New Horizons in British Islam, a charity that works for reform in Muslim thought and practice, and a Research Fellow at the Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations, Coventry University.

Prevent and the Muslim Problematic

Shamim Miah, University of Huddersfield

Four British Muslims born, educated and brought up in Britain embarked upon a journey in July 2005. The purpose of the journey would radically change the way all British Muslims are framed within government policies and the public imagination. Three of the four bombers, Muhammad Siddique Khan, Hasib Hussain, and Shahzad Tanweer, were raised as Muslim, while the fourth, Jermain Lindsay, was a convert to Islam. All are considered to be Britain's 'home-grown terrorists', responsible for conducting some of the worst acts of terrorism in mainland Britain.

The key question arising from the London bombings, similar to the current debates over young men and women traveling to join ISIS, was why seemingly 'normal' Muslim men born and educated in Britain would want to cause such mass harm to their fellow citizens, and indeed, fellow Muslims. One of the answers to this question revolves around broader issues regarding loyalty, citizenship and patriotism – similar to the way in which David Cameron shaped the current conversation on ISIS[59]. In fact, the government applied the same logic of spatial segregation to explain the 2001 race riots which led to urban disorder, with the view that cultural self-segregation contributed towards the London bombings.

In response to the terrorism and extremism agenda, the government published one of its central programmes for tackling *violent* extremism. It recognised, in light of the taskforce report, that not all forms of extremism should be the target of policy – only violent forms of extremism. *Preventing Violent Extremism: Winning Hearts and Minds*[60] was published in April 2007. The Prevent approach was part of the CONTEST strategy, an overarching government approach to counter-terrorism, initially developed in 2003, and subsequently revised in 2006, 2009 and more recently in 2011.

As the title of the above Prevent programme demonstrates, the government was interested in winning *'hearts and minds'* of British Muslims away from the violent extremist narrative of the al-Qaeda. One of the central features of the government, *'hearts and minds'* is its discourse on integration, which is articulated through the prism of the Fundamental British Values debate -   drawing upon the ideas of British-ness and Neo-liberalism.

The Prevent strategy is seen by many as one of the key features of government counter-terrorism policies. It has come to reflect government's *soft* approach to counter-terrorism, which aims at tackling self-segregation through education and community development. It is hoped that this approach will complement the government's *hard* approach, which involves responding to acts of criminal violence through the Police, Counter-terrorism officials and most crucially a raft of anti-terror legislation, including: the Crime and Security Act 2001 (connected with the internment of foreign national terror suspects), the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 (placing terror suspects under control orders), the Terrorism Act 2006 (clamping

---

[59] David Cameron's speech was given at the GLOBSEC (2015) *Global Security Conference*. Bratislava.
[60] Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (April 2007).

down on extremist influences with the introduction of acceptable and unacceptable behaviours), the Counter-Terrorism Securities Act 2015 (placing public duty on schools and other institutions to prevent extremism), and the pending Extremism Bill, mentioned in the recent Queen's Speech, aimed at extending powers to the Home Secretary to ban extremist groups.

The CONTEST strategy, revised in 2009 (CONTEST 2), further intensified the grip on Muslim communities by extending surveillance and governance to target any verbal expression of dissent. This practice targets any Muslim seen to question or even undermine liberal values. The shift from violent extremism as enshrined in the CONTEST 1 to an emphasis on vaguely-defined notions of extremism in CONTEST 2 has been one of the most controversial features of the counter-terrorism strategy:

> We will also continue to challenge views which fall short of supporting violence and are within the law, but which reject and undermine our shared values and jeopardise community cohesion – the strong and positive relationships between people of different ethnic, faith and cultural backgrounds in this country. Some of these views can create a climate in which people may be drawn into violent activity[61].

The focus on Muslim communities shifted significantly from a legalistic approach to counter-terrorism, as identified with the CONTEST 1 whereby the emphasis was placed upon tackling violent extremism, either through actively promoting, propagating and participating in *violent* extremism[62]. CONTEST 2, however, viewed challenges to fundamental British values (FBV) as deeply problematic. Indeed, the idea of FBV as a guiding principle of counter-terrorism strategy reflects wider political debate and a broader integration agenda within public discourse. Thus, it wasn't surprising to note that the revised Prevent Strategy published under the Tory-led coalition government in June 2011further advocated the notion that al-Qaeda-esq ideology can be challenged and undermined by the British ideology of shared values. It argued, moreover, that 'Prevent depends upon a successful integration policy'[63].

Prevent and the values debate

In the last decade there has been a consensus amongst both New Labour and the Tory-led coalition government to frame the Prevent discourse through the lens of British values. Violent extremism in general, and extremism in particular, are seen as arising largely due to the weakening of collective identity and poor sense of attachment to the neo-liberal state. These political actors draw mainly on the communitarian approach, which argues that a decline in moral standards and an increase in social ills are largely due to the expansion of citizens' rights. According to the communitarian logic, civil rights need to be balanced with responsibilities; it's only through a collective political project that the social problems in society can be addressed.

Recent debates on FBV including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance for tackling extremism in schools, are part of an on-going discourse. This can be traced back to Tony Blair's seminal speech to the Runneymede Trust after the London bombings in 2005, followed by Gordon Brown's speech at the Fabian Society's New Year's conference. Since then David Cameron

---

[61] HM Government (2009: 88).
[62] HM Government (2006).
[63] HM Government (2011: 6).

both in his Munich speech[64] and most recently at GLOBSEC[65], has continued the trend of framing the broader question of terrorism within the context of British values.

There are a number of problems associated with the 'British values' debate for the Prevent agenda. Firstly, the idea of British-ness is framed as an oppositional position for the Muslim problematic. In fact, there seems to be a consensus on British values by most political actors; indeed, a certain moral panic can nevertheless has been generated through the 'suspect' Muslim presence. Secondly, there are also a number of fundamental flaws in the way in which shared values are conceptualised, especially given the starting premise of the debate. It is difficult to see how the values discussed by the above political actors are 'shared values'. Instead, it is clear from the style and content of the debate that these are essentially values enforced by a politically dominant class onto a powerless minority group. The theoretical positioning of British values is an 'absolutist position' based upon the dominant values of the host society. This position can be contrasted with a 'cultural relativist' approach which sees the 'shared values' as impossible to achieve. In order to provide an exit between the 'absolutist' and 'cultural relativist' approach, a 'limited relativist' position can be used for an inclusive political project, which views shared values as a collective project that is on-going and negotiated by all concerned. In short, 'shared values' should be a dynamic and revisable conversation which is negotiated and re-negotiated – it should not be based upon a set of criteria which is fixed and bounded. Finally, the 'British-ness' debate views Islam through an Orientalist lens - Islam is essentially different from Western secular mores and it is only through adopting an enlightened Western secular world-view that Muslims can have a future in the West.

Prevent: good Muslims and bad Muslims
Prevent, since its inception, has had a tendency to play into the idea of the 'Good Muslim and Bad Muslim' debate – thus further demonising and fostering the idea of a 'suspect community'. Indeed, the definition of 'Good Muslim' has often been fluid and loosely defined and has often been subject to change. Under CONTEST 1, for example, a number of national Muslim representative organisations were considered to be the 'Good Muslims', only to find themselves outside the government's sphere of influence. A number of organisations have gone through this process throughout the duration of Prevent, including from the Muslim Council of Britain, British Muslim Forum, Sufi Muslim Council, the Quilliam Foundation. This was part of the government's wider strategy of 'winning hearts and minds'[66]. In many respects the ideas underpinning the government's desire to promote 'Good Muslims' were based upon a wider global strategy, as seen in the much-cited RAND Report, aptly titled *Building Moderate Muslim Networks*[67], which actively aimed to promote alternative moderate voices as a way of countering the 'radical' or 'extremist' voices within the Muslim communities.

Since the publication of CONTEST 2 in 2011[68], there has been a significant shift away from the RAND Report logic; that is to say, there are 'moderate' or 'liberal' Muslims who governments can work with or indeed promote. The shift in this logic has translated into the idea that 'all Muslims are essentially' 'bad' unless or until they

---

[64] David Cameron (2011).
[65] David Cameron (2015).
[66] *Preventing Violent Extremism: Winning Hearts and Minds* action plan (April 2007).
[67] RAND Report (2007). *Building Moderate Muslim Networks*.
[68] CONTEST 2 (July 2011).

have proved they are 'good'. A recent example in support of this view is the letter written, in the wake of the *Charlie Hebdo* shootings in France, by the former Communities Secretary, Eric Pickles. Addressing over 1,000 mosques and community organisations in the UK, Pickles asked for more to be done to root out violent extremism and thereby prove their 'good' Muslim status. Similar sentiments were also echoed by David Cameron's recent speech which suggested Muslims were 'quietly condoning' violent extremism associated with ISIL.

Prevent and the question of securitisation

> There is strong evidence that a significant part of the Prevent programme involves the embedding of counter-terrorism police officers within the delivery of local services, the purpose of which seems to be to gather intelligence on Muslim communities, to identify areas, groups and individuals that are 'at risk' and to then facilitate interventions, such as the Channel programme[69].

The above sentiments expressed by Arun Kundnani as early as 2009 in his detailed report, *Spooks: How not to Prevent Extremism*, made a lasting impression in the way the Prevent initiative is perceived. Indeed, Prevent in some sections has long been associated with 'spying' on Muslim communities. Similar claims are also made especially in light of Prevent being a public duty for schools, colleges and universities. The recent Counter-terrorism and Securities Act[70] has raised a number of important questions relating to the government's counter-terrorism strategy. The Prevent strategy has generated considerable attention within academic and public policy discourse. This has led some to argue that Prevent not only responds to radicalisation through racialised assumptions but also through securitisation, grounded upon 'intelligence gathering', 'spying' and 'surveillance'. It is also argued that the role of securitisation within education has further blurred the boundaries between education, securitisation and counter-terrorism. Paradoxically, these policies have been developed and implemented at a time when neo-liberal discourse has signalled the notion of post-racism and de-racialisation within the sphere of education.

Re-thinking Prevent
The inception of Prevent has further intensified the framing of the Muslim community through the lens of the 'problematic'. As a result, Muslims are no longer established communities of faiths with vibrant and complex histories but rather problems that need to be addressed. The Prevent discourse views Muslims only through their 'Muslimness', which is often defined by political actors and the security services rather than through Muslim agency. It also establishes the view of 'Muslim' as the only subject position that Muslims can hold. Thus, public policy debates are no longer about social inequality, anti-Muslim racism or even spiralling levels of poverty, but rather about questions of governing the Muslim problematic. Such policies are not grounded upon well-informed policy analysis but rather on the political construction of Muslims as the 'Other'.

Dr Shamim Miah, senior lecturer University of Huddersfield. He is the author of Muslims, Schooling and the Question of Self-Segregation (Palgrave). His academic interests include race, religion and education policy.

---

[69] Arun Kudnani (2009).
[70] Counter-terrorism and Securities Act (2015).

'He Didn't Even Look Like a Muslim': Terror and Stereotypes in post-7/7 British Society

Charlie Rumsby, Centre for Trust Peace and Social Relations

It is September 2005. I am a first-year student at London's School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS); the campus is situated moments away from Russell Square and Tavistock Square, two places where bombs were detonated on July 7th 2005. It is my second week and I am impressed by the crowd congregated for the School's Union General Meeting. I walk in on a discussion and hear a series of exchanges growing in intensity around the death of Jean Charles de Menezes, the innocent Brazilian shot at Stockwell tube station by the metropolitan police, and the need to fight Islamophobia. I sit down and listen, naively feeling confused about the correlation being proposed about the Stockwell killing and Islamophobia. I respond by raising my hand and, without thinking through my contribution, say:

'I am confused by this debate; the police did not kill Jean Charles de Menezes because he was a Muslim, they killed him because they wrongfully thought he was a suicide bomber, I mean, he did not even look like a Muslim'.

As soon as I had spoken, a girl wearing a Hijab walked towards me with great intent and took the mic from my hand. She immediately challenged me about my stereotyping of what a Muslim 'looks like'. What struck a chord deeply with me was what she said next, 'You don't know what it is like; sitting on the tube and having everyone look at you suspiciously'. She was right, I didn't. But living in London during 7/7, being present in the city when Menezes was shot, and studying so close to the two sites of destruction, I was afraid. I had even got off an underground train early that summer in a moment of 'terror' that a suicide bomber was on board - albeit not someone in Islamic dress, but a white male with a rucksack chanting to himself about a controversial political sentiment.

Ten years on from the tragic events that took place in London in the summer of 2005, I have spent some time reflecting on my personal experience of the event. The insidious but powerful public discourse pertaining to 'counter terrorism' in Britain plays a role in creating a deep-seated terror in the minds of men and women. The routinisation of fear through continual reminders of 'potential' terrorists living in Britain, for example, undermines one's confidence in interpreting the world. Thus terror becomes diffused through subtle messages[71]. Language and symbols around 'security', 'safety patrols' and 'random checks' for instance, are utilized to normalise a continual police presence in major stations. Moreover, in Britain today, men and women are encouraged to engage in forms of surveillance that identify security threats based on an idea of what is suspicious..

---

[71]Green, L. (1994) 'Fear as a Way of Life.' *Cultural Anthropology* [online] 9 (2), 227–256. available from http://www.jstor.org/stable/656241?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [18 June 2015].

The Other Question …

Terror is intangible as a concept; yet you know it when it has you in its clutches. Terror is akin to fear, and like pain, is overwhelmingly present to the person experiencing it, but it may be scarcely perceptible to anyone else and almost defies objectification[72] Over time, I came to realise that terror's power, its 'matter-of-factness'[73] is exactly about doubting one's own observations of reality. The routinisation of terror is what fuels its power, as Green comments 'such routinization allows people to live in fear with a facade of normalcy, while that terror, at the same time, permeates and shreds the social fabric'[74].

Studying at SOAS, I became aware of how I had unconsciously developed a colonial mind-set while growing up. I lived in Coventry, a city with a fractured manufacturing industry and at times intense job insecurity, until I was 18 years old. I come from a community where only half a dozen people I know went on to university, while most of our families had left school early and worked in factories or other service-sector jobs. Before arriving in London I had no education about colonial Britain, Britain's role in the politics surrounding the fight for oil in the Middle East, or the rationale behind the cold war. I was largely ignorant of geopolitical history and discourses, influenced instead by tabloid newspapers like *The Sun*, disaffected members of community, and the rhetoric of right-wing politicians. These sources were mostly predisposed to negative stereotyping and repeated discursive conjunctures about the threat of foreigners; first the threat of South Asians, and later refugees from Kosovo and the former Soviet bloc.

Bhabha's argument that the prominent ambivalent nature of the stereotype, which is at one moment fetishised and another feared[75], was (in hindsight), central to the construction of regimes of truth about the 'Other' in the society I grew up in. The South Asian community was largely polarised into the 'disrespectful Asian': those who bore too many children, drained the system, did not speak English, (often, but not always, referring to those from Pakistani, Muslim heritage), and the 'respectful Asian': who worked as doctors, lawyers and owned the corner shop (usually from an Indian, Hindu background). When the Kosovars arrived, they were to be feared for the same reasons as the 'disrespectful Asian'. As long as these representations were repeated they also gained legitimacy. They were, of course, always blown out of proportion; for instance, the tale that 'they' would 'take your daughters' was widely circulated after a teenage girl in the community had a relationship with a Kosovar. Ironically, those who ended up working in close proximity with foreigners would accept them but, when speaking about the 'problem' of foreigners in their presence

---

[72]Green (1994: 230). Green, L. (1994) 'Fear as a Way of Life.' *Cultural Anthropology* [online] 9 (2), 227–256. available from http://www.jstor.org/stable/656241?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [18 June 2015].

[73]Green (1994: 230). Green, L. (1994) 'Fear as a Way of Life.' *Cultural Anthropology* [online] 9 (2), 227–256. available from http://www.jstor.org/stable/656241?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [18 June 2015].

[74]Green (1994: 231). Green, L. (1994) 'Fear as a Way of Life.' *Cultural Anthropology* [online] 9 (2), 227–256. available from http://www.jstor.org/stable/656241?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [18 June 2015].

[75]Bhabha (1994: 19). Bhabha, H. (1994) 'The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism.' in *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 95–120.

would say things like: 'I mean, I'm not speaking about you, you're alright, it's the ones not like you'.

For Bhabha:

'it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and marginalisation; produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in *excess* of what can be empirically proved or logically construed'[76].

These stereotypes have not lost their currency in the British imagination. The Polish and Romanian have over time walked in the shadows of those who have been through processes of subjectification before them. I would argue that in the wake of a tragedy like 7/7 new stereotypes have been made - only this time, the 'Other' constitutes someone who not only can be identified by race but also ideology, namely Islamic extremism. The suspicion that surrounds another terrorist attack manifests a low-intensity panic in the shadow of waking consciousness[77].

Counter Terrorism and the Production of Terror

'Monsters exist, but they are too few in number to be truly dangerous. More dangerous are the common men, the functionaries ready to believe and to act without asking questions'. Primo Levi

The last ten years have seen the perpetrators of the 7/7 bombings identified. They were described as 'young Britons who had led apparently ordinary lives'[78]. Yet the description of 'British values' promoted by David Cameron over the last five years is in conflict with the description of the 7/7 bombers. According to David Cameron's government, British values do not engender terrorist ideologies. This is where the ambivalence of the terrorist is most noticeable; they were British citizens, had British passports, but did not hold British values and thus their true 'British-ness' is problematized.

Counter terrorism includes the practice, military campaigns, techniques, and strategy that government, military, police and business organizations use to combat or prevent terrorism. It has resulted in extensive surveillance of Muslims in Britain. In 2006 the government launched the Preventing Violent Extremism Programme (Prevent), intended to discover and change Muslims who were not committing crimes but who were considered at risk of radicalisation. Under Prevent, teachers, youth workers and so on are supposed to report young people for crimes like handing out Hizb ut-Tahrir leaflets in response to leafleting by the BNP, or expressing

---

[76]Bhabha (1994: 18). Bhabha, H. (1994) 'The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism.' in *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 95–120.
[77]Green (1994: 231). Green, L. (1994) 'Fear as a Way of Life.' *Cultural Anthropology* [online] 9 (2), 227–256. available from http://www.jstor.org/stable/656241?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents [18 June 2015].
[78](BBC 2005). BBC (2005) *7 July Bombings* [online] available from http://bbc.in/1QtmJ4k [12 June 2015].

'strong views' on Palestine[79]. Despite the official position that radicalisation is a theological not a political phenomenon, Prevent interventions often end up targeting political ideas: Kundnani cites a case where a youth worker was assigned to mentor a young person identified as being at risk 'in a bid to change his views about the war in Afghanistan'[80]. Under the counter terrorism and Security Act, voluntary organisations in receipt of Prevent funding have been increasingly expected to cooperate in a process of intelligence gathering[81]. In his book *The Muslims are Coming*, Arun Kundnani argues that schemes like Prevent became the principal way in which the government related to British Muslims, constructing them as a 'suspect community'[82]. Kundnani points out that under Prevent, 'British Muslims became, in the imagination of counter terrorism officials, not citizens to whom the state was accountable but potential recruits to a global insurgency'[83].

Identifying extremists by varying means and methods in institutional settings is becoming the norm. Moreover, while the majority of Britons do not see Muslims as terrorists or terrorist sympathisers, the number leaning towards this persuasion has doubled since 7/7[84]. Troublingly, large segments of British society today believe that Muslims possess dual loyalties, and the number of those who see Islam as a menace to Western liberal democracy has risen sharply[85].

So what is causing this change in public discourse? No doubt 'counter terrorism' activities are informing the discursive ideas of what constitutes a 'good' or 'bad / extremist' Muslim. Yet, I would argue that particularly in popular discourse, the years since 7/7 have seen the distinction of 'good' and 'bad' Muslim become more blurred and narrow, taking on a colonial discourse of the 'Other'. This is exemplified in the reporting of the murderer of Lee Rigby as having a 'Muslim appearance' by political correspondent Nick Robinson.

---

[79]Graham-Leigh (2014). Graham-Leigh, E. (2014) *Book Review: The Muslims Are Coming! Islamophobia, Extremism and the Domestic War on Terror* [online] available from http://bit.ly/1fdMJjf [16 June 2015].

[80]Kundnani (2009: 179). Kundnani, A. (2009) *The Muslims Are Coming!: Islamophobia, Extremism and the Domestic War on Terror* [online] available from http://www.versobooks.com/books/1765-the-muslims-are-coming [18 June 2015].

[81]Husbands and Alam (2011). Husbands, C. and Alam, Y. (2011) *Social Cohesion and Counter-Terrorism: A Policy Contradiction?*

[82]Kundnani (2009: 8). Kundnani, A. (2009) *The Muslims Are Coming!: Islamophobia, Extremism and the Domestic War on Terror* [online] available from http://www.versobooks.com/books/1765-the-muslims-are-coming [18 June 2015].

[83]Kundnani 2009: 163). Kundnani, A. (2009) *The Muslims Are Coming!: Islamophobia, Extremism and the Domestic War on Terror* [online] available from http://www.versobooks.com/books/1765-the-muslims-are-coming [18 June 2015].

[84]Ansari (2013). Ansari, H. (2013) *Islamaphobia Rises in British Society* [online] available from http://bit.ly/1ToQHVZ [16 June 2015].

[85]Ansari (2013). Ansari, H. (2013) *Islamaphobia Rises in British Society* [online] available from http://bit.ly/1ToQHVZ [16 June 2015].

It is now well established how political discourse, the media and policy have constructed Islam and Muslims as a threat[86]. It becomes impossible to speak of the securitised group without implying the security threat. The surveillance of everyday life, to identify a potential threat, and the requirement of individuals and even the general public to be engaged in policing new spaces of potential terror is something which has allowed for an engendering of terror in the minds of the general population. This engendering of terror is particularly identifiable in the creation of a suspicious 'Other'.

The concept of securitisation might be paralleled to that of a moral panic [87] where the media overstates a social problem, providing the chief means by which an issue or group is spoken about, which relies upon the primary definitions of the state and its agencies, politicians, the police, etc.[88]. The media representation of Muslims has been primarily influenced by counter terrorism policy[89], so that these ideological constructions of Muslims provide a popular 'permission to hate'[90].

The counter terrorism movement in the UK has acted pervasively to encourage a public policing of 'anyone acting suspiciously'. You only have to be in a train station or on a bus to be informed of one's duty to 'report any suspicious behaviour to a member of station staff or the police'. It is not only 'suspicious behaviour' but also any items of luggage left unattended. Gone are the days of innocent lost property. The surveillance of everyday life, to identify a potential threat, and the requirement of individuals and even the general public to be engaged in policing new spaces of potential terror is something that has allowed for an engendering of terror in the minds of the general population.

---

[86](Hussain and Bagguley 2012: 4). Hussain, Y. and Bagguley, P. (2012) 'Securitised Citizens: Islamophobia, Racism and the 7/7 London Bombings.' *The Sociological Review* 60 (4), 715–734 See also: Abbas (2004); Brighton (2007); Antonsich (2010); Kundnani (2009); Nickels et al. (2009); and Poynting and Mason (2006). Abbas, T. (2004) 'After 9 / 11 : British South Asian Muslims, Islamophobia, Multiculturalism, and the State.' *American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* [online] 21 (3), 26–38. Available from: http://fatih.academia.edu/TahirAbbas/Papers/259056/After_9_11_British_South_Asian_Muslims_Islamophobia_Multiculturalism_and_the_State. Antonsich, M. (2010) 'Multicultural Horizons. Diversity and the Limits of the Civil Nation.' in *Nations and Nationalism*. vol. 16 (4). 783–784. Brighton, S. (2007) 'British Muslims, Multiculturalism and UK Foreign Policy: "Integration" and "Cohesion" in and beyond the State'. in *International Affairs*. vol. 83 (1). 1–17. , H.C., Thomas, L., Hickman, M., and Silvestri, S. (2009) *A Comparative Study of the Representations of 'suspect' Communities in Multi-Ethnic Britain and of Their Impact on Irish Communities and Muslim Communities: Mapping Newspaper Content*. Working Papers. vol. 44. Poynting, S. and Mason, V. (2006) 'Tolerance, Freedom, Justice and Peace? Britain, Australia and Anti-Muslim Racism since 11 September 2001.' *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 27 (4), 365–91.
[87](Critcher, 2008) quoted in Hussain and Bagguley (2012: 6). Hussain, Y. and Bagguley, P. (2012) 'Securitised Citizens: Islamophobia, Racism and the 7/7 London Bombings.' *The Sociological Review* 60 (4), 715–734.
[88](Critcher, 2008, Hall et. al. 1978: 57). Ibid.
[89] (Nickels et al. 2009). , H.C., Thomas, L., Hickman, M., and Silvestri, S. (2009) *A Comparative Study of the Representations of 'suspect' Communities in Multi-Ethnic Britain and of Their Impact on Irish Communities and Muslim Communities: Mapping Newspaper Content*. Working Papers. vol. 44.
[90] (Poynting and Mason 2006: 367)Ibid. Poynting, S. and Mason, V. (2006) 'Tolerance, Freedom, Justice and Peace? Britain, Australia and Anti-Muslim Racism since 11 September 2001.' *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 27 (4), 365–91.

The reality is that the reminders of 'suspiciousness' and the likelihood of actually encountering an act of terror are completely disproportionate to the probability. Instead, what happens is a public policing of an unlikely event and in turn an internalisation of terror. Subjectively, the mundane experience of terror, the constant reminder to look over your shoulder, police standing on station concourses, wears down one's responsiveness to it[91].

Research conducted by Hussain and Bagguley (2012) into 'securitised citizens: Islamophobia, racism and the 7/7 London bombings' identifies that is not just the white working class who demonstrated Islamophobia or racism, but also non-Muslim ethnic groups, showing that these feelings are not reserved for one social grouping. The concluding remarks to their research are extremely useful in summing up how the routinisation of terror has power to shred society's social fabric:

'The events of 7th July 2005 were quite exceptional. How the wider society such as sections of the media, agencies of the state and politicians respond to such key events is critically important to how the social groups deemed responsible are defined and treated in the long run. This is not just a matter of media reporting and public policy, but is also enacted in specific local contexts between different racialised and religiously defined groups. These local enactments and experiences are the final outcome of broader processes of securitisation, racialisation and Islamophobia'[92].

It is particularly important in response to tragic events like 7/7 to think through together with diverse communities how the media and public policy fuel terror. Although the question remains; how to overcome terror? Linda Green's research in Guatemala[93] is instructive. Breaking the silence of terror is needed. Bhabha (1994) argues the point of intervention should shift from the *identification* of images as positive or negative, to an understanding of the *processes of subjectification* made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse[94]. Admitting that I had exited a train early in response to terror is difficult and embarrassing. Yet seeking to understand how terror was internalised made me aware that I live in a society where I am encouraged to live in suspicion and, I am instructed how to view the 'Other'.

Engaging in community-based conversations led by interfaith movements and civil society organisations will inevitability help to construct alternative discourses which are so important to prevent the stigmatisation of certain groups. However, the motive of initiatives should not be to police but rather assist communities to identify how they experience terror. Breaking the silence will disempower terror's insidious grip and demystify a community's worries.

---

[91](Green 1994). Green, L. (1994) 'Fear as a Way of Life.' *Cultural Anthropology* [online] 9 (2), 227–256. available from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/656241?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents> [18 June 2015].
[92](Hussain and Bagguley 2012: 30). Hussain, Y. and Bagguley, P. (2012) 'Securitised Citizens: Islamophobia, Racism and the 7/7 London Bombings.' *The Sociological Review* 60 (4), 715–734.
[93]Linda Green 'Fear as a Way of Life' *Cultural Anthropology* 9(2): 227-256 Green, L. (1994) 'Fear as a Way of Life.' *Cultural Anthropology* [online] 9 (2), 227–256. available from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/656241?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents> [18 June 2015].
[94]Bhabha (1994). Bhabha, H. (1994) 'The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism.' in *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 95–120.

This reflection on my experience of 7/7 allowed me to understand the role of my education and time at SOAS for 'decolonising my mind'. In doing so I was able to identify the impact of counter terrorist strategies in producing in me an internalised form of terror.

As society is made up of disparate communities, I urge us, in the spirit of Primo Levi's words quoted at the beginning of the second section of this article, to remember that danger exists in our ability not to question. To go with the status quo is to leave ideological constructions of otherness fixed.

Charlie is a PhD candidate at the Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations. Her research looks into the everyday experiences and consequences of statelessness in Southeast Asia. Charlie completed her BA in Social Anthropology and Development at London's School of Oriental and African Studies before completing a MA in Development and Rights in the Anthropology Department at Goldsmiths College.

Organised Violence and Social Cohesion

Math Noortmann, Centre for Trust Peace and Social Relations

Violence is most alarming when it is organised. The calculated infliction of extreme physical pain, indiscriminate killings, and assassinations or the threat thereof, is indeed most widely associated terrorist acts like those of 7/7. [95] However, organised violence is structural and systemic, and affects the social cohesion of communities and societies in many unexplored ways.[96] The differences and commonalities in organised violence between generations, across cultures, and across violent impetuses - political, commercial, and social - are not extensively investigated.

The default positions of organised violence and social cohesion are on the opposite sides of the equation: criminalisation and adjudication on one side; and negotiation and mediation on the other. Where organised violence reflects a serious fracture in what is otherwise considered to be a - socio-politically speaking - cohesive social whole, the logics of the appropriateness and consequentialism, and even of arguing seems to fail.[97] What communities, societies, and violent agents are in for is a process of reconciliation that establishes a new social equilibrium.

'Violence' and 'social cohesion' pose vexed questions in their own individual capacities, complicating the already complex nature of the linkage. Both are widely yet fragmently debated. Academics differ mostly on conceptual, theoretical and methodological grounds, while policy-makers and professionals differ as to solutions and countering strategies. In order to understand the violence/social cohesion complexity, one must investigate the different academic and non-academic outlooks and come to a comprehensive and robust trans-disciplinary and actionable approach. Furthermore, any attempts at capturing and mapping accounts of violent agents, to provide empirical basis to debates, raise difficult questions on how far we should engage with violent actors such as terrorists.[98]

On violence

Violence is understood and explained differently in academia depending on the disciplinary and paradigmatic outlook. There is, however, general agreement that each methodological approach has its own advantages and disadvantages[99] and that there are no single-factor explanations for understanding resort to violence.[100]

---

[95] Bryan S. Turner, ed. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology* (Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 652. Alan Page Fiske and Tage Shakti Rai, *Virtuous Violence: Hurting and Killing to Create, Sustain, End, and Honor Social Relationships* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). 2

[96] For reports on the impact of counter-terrorism on communities in various European countries see http://www.strategicdialogue.org/publications/

[97] Thomas Risse, 'Constructivism and International Institutions: Towards Conversations across Paradigms,' in *Political Science; State of the Discipline*, ed. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002).

[99] For a critical assessment of economic, psychological and sociological explanations see respectively: Larry J. Ray, *Violence & Society* (London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE, 2011). on the Gini coefficient; Randy Borum, "Understanding Terrorist Psychology," in *The Psychology of Counter-Terrorism*, ed. Andrew Silke (London, England ; New York: Routledge, 2011). on psychology; and

[100] "Understanding Terrorist Psychology," 24.

On the definitional level, a sharp conceptual distinction is generally drawn between 'minimalist' and 'comprehensive' violence. While the former is prominent in criminal conceptions of violence,[101] the latter - which includes inter alia Galtung's far reaching idea of 'structural violence'[102]– provides a range of justifications for the violent agent.[103] The idea that violence is counter-human, requires investigations into the 'pathways' and 'influences' that 'allow' individuals to cross the non-violent/violent threshold. Individual accounts and collective narratives of violent agents and groups become most important as a basis for understanding. [104]

In society we are confronted with different kinds of violence. Based on the motives of the violent agent and the purpose of their acts, we differentiate between the 'social' violence of gangs and hooligans[105] and the 'political' and 'economic' violence of terrorist and criminal actors respectively. A better understanding of the different motives, ideas and beliefs of these dissimilar violent actors and their groups would enable policy-makers, enforcement agencies and community leaders to diversify proactive and responsive strategies.

As psychological profiling of the violent agent is considered to be virtually impossible and (economic) inequalities do not tell the whole story, it is necessary to understand violence as the common language of the violent agent. Studying the entrenched narratives on violence (1) generate new insights into the framing and ethics of violence from within and (2) improve the dialogue with (potentially) violent groups and individuals in order to enhance social cohesion.

On violence and social cohesion

Social Cohesion has its limits; it ends where 'normative clashes [become] violent'.[106] In other words, the outbreak of violence indicates the breakdown of 'mediating institutions' within communities and societies. Yet even when such thresholds have been crossed approaches for reconciliation remain.

The practical consequences for reconciliation align with the typology of mediation suggested by Berger and can be qualified as:
1. *imperative*, i.e. imposed by political and legal authorities,
2. *pragmatic* i.e. un-coerced interaction between victim and perpetrator, and
3. *dialogic,* i.e. engaging normative differences head on.[107]

The latter approach, addresses the base-line problematic, which is the normative differences between (potentially) violent agents and their communities and societies.

---

[101] Stephen Jones, *Understanding Violent Crime*, Crime and Justice (Buckingham England ; Phildelphia: Open University Press, 2000).

[102] Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of peace research* 6, no. 3 (1969). For a critical reflection on Galtung's concept see Andrew Dilts et al., "Revisiting Johan Galtung's Concept of Structural Violence," *New Political Science* 34, no. 2 (2012).

[103] Fiske and Rai, *Virtuous Violence : Hurting and Killing to Create, Sustain, End, and Honor Social Relationships.*

[104] Vittorio Bufacchi, *Violence and Social Justice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

[105] Richard Giulianotti, Norman Bonney, and Mike Hepworth, *Football, Violence, and Social Identity* (London ; New York: Routledge, 1994).

[106] Peter L. Berger (1998) *The Limits of Social Cohesion: Conflict and Mediation in Pluralist Societies* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press).

[107] Idem pp. 366 - 368

Normative adjustments which reconcile different values and outlooks are required. *Dialogic reconciliation* is therefore not about 'talking to' or 'negotiating with' 'the enemy' as Jonathan Powell suggests.[108]

Reframing terrorism as organised violence

One of the most significant consequences of the 7/7 attacks for the discourse on violence is that it has become fragmented and has lost significance in debates on terrorism. Adding 'ism' as a suffix to the otherwise impersonal terms 'radical' and 'extreme', provide the latter nouns with a derogative as well as a dogmatic and cult status. Radicalism and extremism however do not necessarily lead to violence, nor need acts of violence be extreme or radical. Post 7/7 (counter) terrorism discourse, however, have improperly linked violence with radicalism and extremism, thereby shifting the focus of investigation to expressions of radical political and religious beliefs.

Professor Math Noortmann is an expert in transnational law and non-state actors. He leads the research group on Armed Violence and Illicit Activities at the Centre for Peace Trust and Social Relations. Professor Noortmann is the Editor in Chief of the Ashgate series on Non-State actors in International Law, Politics and Governance.

---

[108] Jonathan Powell (2014) *Talking to Terrorists : How to End Armed Conflicts* (London: The Bodley Head).

Reflections from Northern Ireland

Rachel Monaghan and David McIlhatton, Ulster University

Extremely aggressive attacks and security breaches have demonstrated in recent years that securing our life-world is highly complex and uncertain, and that governments face unprecedented local, national and global challenges. Global terrorism has resulted in the instilment of fear, loss of life and destruction of property. Moreover, the intended and unintended consequences of terrorist actions have impacted significantly on the capacity and capability of urban areas to function in a manner that attracts investment, promotes socio-economic well-being, develops social relations and cohesion and delivers prosperity.

The complex and ever changing nature of contemporary security challenges has been furthered by the rapid evolution of ideology, behaviour and action, coupled with the emergence of new forms of terrorist tactics and technology. The United Kingdom (UK) and its interests overseas have not escaped the attention of terrorist threats and attacks and has been a central target over the past 50 years. Indeed, the period 1969-1998 saw significant escalation of Northern Ireland Related Terrorism (NIRT) which emerged predominantly from the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) and loyalist proscribed organisations such as the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF), Ulster Defence Association (UDA) and the Ulster Freedom Fighters (UFF).

Northern Ireland related terrorism and mainland Great Britain

The majority of NIRT occurred within Northern Ireland itself. However, there were numerous occasions when both loyalist and republican activity centered on targets within mainland Great Britain during this period and which resulted in significant loss of life and destruction of property. In the 1970s, the IRA targeted key government buildings in central London, public houses in Guildford and detonated bombs in Birmingham. These attacks resulted in multiple fatalities and wounded hundreds of others. The IRA continued their bombing campaign in to the 1980s and in July 1982, two bombs exploded in Hyde Park and Regent's Park in London killing 11 British soldiers. Further attacks were carried out in December 1983 and October 1984 killing 11 people. The bomb attack in December 1983 targeted a key retail hub, Harrods department store, with the October 1984 attack targeting the conference of the ruling Conservative party.

The Prime Minister at the time, Margaret Thatcher, narrowly escaped that particular bomb. In 1989, the IRA once again targeted mainland Great Britain, killing 10 soldiers and wounding more than 30 in a bomb attack at the Royal Marines School of Music in Deal, Kent. Bomb attacks in the 1990s resulted in significant fatalities also, although there appeared to be a shift in target selection with the majority of attacks focusing on the London financial district and Downing Street. In February 1991, the IRA launched homemade mortar shells at No 10 Downing Street. In April 1992, a large bomb was detonated in London's financial district killing three people and resulting in significant damage in the area. In Bishopsgate in the City of London, a large vehicle Bourne Improvised Explosive Device was detonated killing a photographer and causing over £350 million of damage. In 1996, the IRA ended a 17-month ceasefire when a significant bomb exploded in London's financial district

killing two people and once again causing significant damage to buildings and infrastructure in that area.

However, a cessation of violence in 1998 came about as a result of the Belfast Agreement which saw 30 years of sectarian violence (commonly known as 'The Troubles') come to an end. This agreement was ratified by a referendum in May 1998 which consequently set up a power-sharing assembly to govern Northern Ireland by cross-community consent. In recent times however, Northern Ireland has continued to experience terrorist activity and has experienced high profile attacks including the killings of Ronan Kerr and Stephen Carroll (both Police Officers) and David Black (Prison Officer), the gun attack on Massarene Barracks in Antrim which saw 2 soldiers killed, as well as multiple bomb attempts in Belfast in 2013. In mainland Britain, multiple attacks by the Real IRA in 2000 occurred, including a rocket attack on the Secret Intelligence Service's headquarters in London.

International terrorism and the United Kingdom

Contemporary threats against the UK and its interests overseas emerge from two main sources. International terrorism remains a serious and ongoing threat with much of this threat coming from Islamist extremists, particularly those inspired by the ideology of Al Qaida and emanating from the federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) of Pakistan. In more recent times, affiliate groups have emerged pledging allegiance to Al Qaida, diversifying the threat from mainly Pakistan to numerous areas in the Middle East and Africa. These affiliate groups include Al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), the Al Nusrah Front in Syria, Al Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb in North Africa, and Al Shabaab in East Africa. The recent instability within the Middle East, and in particular Syria and Iraq, has led to socio-political vacuums in which other terrorist groups such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) have gained a great deal of traction. Much of the international terrorism in the UK has originated from UK residents who have become radicalised through contact with other extremists and online radicalisation via the internet.

As discussed, the United Kingdom has experienced both domestic (e.g. terrorism associated with Northern Ireland, animal rights extremism, far right and anarcho-communism) and international (e.g. Iranian Embassy siege and terrorism directed at the Israeli Embassy) terrorism, however, the attacks aimed at civilians during the morning rush hour in London in July 2005 marked a distinct shift in the nature of terrorism in the UK. These attacks were the UK's first experience of suicide bombers and also the first by religiously motivated terrorists in the name of Islam. The July 7 bombings represented the changing face of international terrorism whereby home-grown terrorists linked to violent radical Islamist networks, in this case Al-Qaeda, engaged in terrorism on their home soil. 7th July 2005 highlighted the Islamist extremist threat to the UK with multiple bomb attacks across London resulting in 52 fatalities and over 700 injuries.

In contrast to their more traditional counterparts such as the Provisional IRA, a number of observations can be made regarding the 7th July bombings. Firstly, as Wilkinson[109] notes such 'new' international terrorism has adopted 'a policy of mass killings as an integral part of its strategy'[1] and points to Osama Bin Laden's fatwa of

---

[109] Wilkinson, P. (2207) Introduction. In P. Wilkinson (ed.) Homeland Security in the UK (pp. 3-22). Abingdon: Routledge.

1998, which declared that 'it is the duty of all Muslims to kill US citizens – civilian or military, and their allies –everywhere'. Secondly, the 'new' international terrorism is not limited to securing change in a particular state or region but rather seeks to establish a pan-Islamist Caliphate. Thirdly, according to this position, the 'new' international terrorism involves a far-reaching network of affiliates, cells and supporters around the world (for a more detailed discussion see Wilkinson, 2007).

The advent of this 'new' international terrorism in the UK meant that the July 7 bombings represented the deadliest terrorist attack since the 1988 Lockerbie bombing. They were followed two weeks later by the failed 21/7 attacks, which again saw would-be suicide bombers target the capital's public transport system. The attacks were unsuccessful after the bombs failed to explode. Further attacks by Islamist terrorists included the 2007 London car bombs, which were disarmed before detonation, the 2007 Glasgow Airport attack, the failed 2008 Exeter bombing and the murder of Lee Rigby in 2013.

Thus, the threat from terrorists has remained persistent at a time when the threat from terrorism associated with Northern Ireland has been decreasing. Moreover, security policies enacted within Northern Ireland during the Troubles, such as internment without trial and the Prevention of Terrorism Act, more generally, resulted in the construction of the Irish as a suspect community within the UK and resulted in support for the republican movement[110]

Similar measures have been adopted with respect to perceived Islamist extremists including the detention without trial of foreign suspects (deemed unlawful), the over-policing of Muslim communities as evidenced by police stop and search statistics and high-profile raids. As Pantazis and Pemberton[111] contend, the 7th July Bombing set the in motion the replacement of the Irish by Muslims as the 'suspect community' within the UK.

Dr Rachel Monaghan is a Senior Lecturer in Criminology at Ulster University. Her research interests focus on the area of political violence, informal justice, single-issue terrorism, counter-terrorism and crime and insecurity.

Dr David McIlhatton is currently based in the Built Environment Research Institute at Ulster University with research interests in security, counter terrorism, critical infrastructure protection and innovation.

---

[110] Hillyard, P. (1993) Suspect Community: People's Experiences of the Prevention of Terrorism Acts in Britain. London: Pluto Press.
[111] Pantazis, C. and Pemberton, S. (2009) 'From the 'old' to the 'new' suspect community', British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 49(5): 646–666.

'The Arts of Peace': Political institutions and participation (not surveillance and force) can reduce terrorism

Matt Qvortrup, Centre for Trust Peace and Social Relations

'Any cretin can throw a bomb – it is, however, a thousand times more difficult to dismantle one', said Hans Magnus Enzensberger, a German writer[112]. It is a sad reflection on the attempts to make our societies more secure that most Governments have opted for the option of the 'cretin' and have tended to dismiss the 'thousand times more difficult' task of securing peace through other means.

Looking back over the past ten years - both here and abroad - the policies pursued have been characterised by increased surveillance (in Britain in the form of the *Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act 2014*) and a preference for dealing with terrorism and violence through military action (the examples are too legion).

The effects of the policies pursued have not been impressive. And this is putting it mildly. If we use the figures from the *Institute for Economics and Peace's Global Terrorism Index* we have seen an 80 percent increase in the numbers of terrorist attacks if we exclude Syria and Nigeria. If we include these countries there has been a seven-fold increase[113].

What is so odd – and indeed, sad, - is that social science – in the form of constitutional engineering[114] – actually has made considerable strides in developing political means of reducing the threat of domestic terrorism (acts of political violence perpetrated against fellow citizens).

Hobbes and us

Nowadays political scientists and *ditto* philosophers tend to be interested in abstract issues of politics. There is nothing wrong with that but there is a marked contrast between this sometimes otherworldly pursuit and the practical interests of the classics.

Thomas Hobbes – perhaps the greatest philosopher writing in the English language – devoted his greatest work *Leviathan* (1651) to developing what he called 'the Arts of Peace'[115]. For Hobbes it was self-evident that 'Peace' was the goal 'for which end [institutions of government] were instituted'[116], and the great man stated confidently that there was 'a fundamental Law of Nature, which commandeth to seek peace'[117]. 364 years on it is high time to go back to Hobbes' ambition and to carry the baton forward.

---

[112] H.M. Enzensberger (1999) *Zickzack*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, p.57 (My translation MQ, in the original – *'Jeder Kretin kann eine Bombe werfen. Tausendmal schwieriger is es, sie zu entschärfen'*)

[113] Based on http://economicsandpeace.org/research/iep-indices-data/global-terrorism-index (Accessed 5th June 2015)

[114] Taagepera, R., & Qvortrup, M. (2012). 'Who Gets What, When, How–Through Which Electoral System'. *European political science*, *11*(2), 244-258

[115] Thomas Hobbes (1996) [1651] *Leviathan* (Edited by Richard Tuck), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p.71

[116] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.131

[117] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p. 106

Hobbes fundamentally believed that political institutions could be designed in such a way that the risk of civil war could be avoided. His solution to the problem was to transfer all powers to a 'Great Leviathan', that 'Mortall God'[118], who would then be authorised to deal with threats to the peace. Up to a point Hobbes got it right. He rightly identified that institutions and constitutional mechanisms could. Hobbes wanted an authoritarian ruler. He was happy to renounce his freedoms for the sake of security.

In a democratic society we are less willing to do so. Our task is more difficult than Hobbes'; we need to square the circle of democracy and peace. Can we develop the 'Arts of Peace' for our time?

Though most people are not aware of this, there is a way of squaring this circle; political institutions such as legislatures and electoral systems. These are generally seen as mere frameworks for governance. They are – as the reader shall see shortly – much more than that; these mechanisms can help alleviate terrorism. First we need to consider why some – such as the 7/7 bombers – resort to terrorism.

Terrorism is lack of influence

Terrorism is despicable and like war it is hard to justify it. Killing, maiming and slaughtering fellow human beings is repugnant. But sometimes individuals (and governments!) feel compelled to pursue violence as a means to gain influence. Terrorism is not perpetrated out of a simple and perverse desire to kill. Terrorism is an act of desperation; a gruesome last resort of those who have no other way of influencing the political system.

'What can I do mother, if there is no other way?', is how Vladimir Lenin's brother, Alexander Ulyanov, responded to his mother's question before he was executed for his part in the planned assassination of Tsar Alexander III in 1887[119]. Alexander – like modern day terrorists – resorted to violence because he perceived that 'there is no other way'. The task, therefore, is to provide them with 'another way'; a peaceful one; one that is based on democratic politics. This is where political institutions come in.

Some electoral systems – the so-called majoritarian systems – tend to exclude many groups in society. Other more proportional electoral systems, on the other hand, allow more parties and hence more groups to be represented. And, the evidence suggests that countries with more proportional systems have lower levels of terrorism because these countries' systems enable minority groups to get represented.

Denmark is one of the countries with the lowest levels of terrorist attacks[120]. It is also one of the countries with the largest number of elected representatives with another

---

[118] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p. 120
[119] Alexander Illich Ulyanov cited in Charles Townshend (2008) *Terrorism: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 58
[120] http://www.rand.org/nsrd/projects/terrorism-incidents.html (Accessed 5th June 2015).

ethnic heritage[121]. One of them is Fatma Øktem, a Muslim woman of Turkish heritage who represents the Centre-right party *Venstre* in the Danish parliament.

She is in no doubt that the greater opportunities for representation in the Folketinget, the national legislature, is one of the reasons for the low number of terrorist attacks in her parents' adopted country, 'Well, I am responsible for the low number of terror attacks. That someone like me can be elected to parliament means that I can channel the views of, well, people like me, into the political system. This means that we are less likely to see violence', she says[122]. Of course, its sceptics are likely to object that this is a selective example. A conversation with a politician does not constitute incontrovertible evidence. What are needed are hard facts and statistics.

Turning to quantitative data, we find support for Ms Øktem's perception. Statistically speaking, countries with majoritarian systems, such as Britain, France and Canada, have had much higher levels of domestic terrorism than countries with proportional electoral systems such as Sweden, Finland and Austria, to name but a few[123]. Simply eyeballing statistical data is not likely to convince the doubters however.

If we apply a statistical method known as Pearson's correlation coefficient (R), a way of measuring an association between two variables, we find that there is a negative correlation between the number of political parties and the number of domestic terrorist attacks.

There are a number of ways in which we can measure how proportional political systems are. This is a bit technical, but please don't be too frightened. The most commonly used measures are the *Laakso-Taagepera Effective Number of (Parliamentary) Parties*[124] (ENP) and the *Disproportionality – Index* (Disp)[125]. The former is a mathematical measure of the number of parties and the latter measures the disproportionality of an electoral outcome; or, put differently, the disparity between the percentage of votes a party receives and the percentage of seats a party gets in the resulting legislature.

To test whether countries with proportional representation are less likely to experience terrorist incidents, we correlate the number of terrorist incidents with these two measures. The basic rule of thumb in such calculations is that a correlation – or 'R' – of less than .20 is no correlation, whereas an R of more than .50 is a very good correlation.

Based on the data reported in Table One, we find strong correlations between these variables and low levels of terrorism.

---

[121] Karen Bird (2003)"Comparing the political representation of ethnic minorities in advanced democracies." In *Annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association Winnipeg*, pp. 1-33. 2003.

[122] Fatma Øktem, MF, personal communication 4th June 2015.

[123] Li, Q. (2005). Does democracy promote or reduce transnational terrorist incidents?. *Journal of Conflict resolution*, *49*(2), 278-297.

[124] Laakso, M., & Taagepera, R. (1979). Effective number of parties: A measure with application to West Europe. *Comparative political studies*, *12*(1), 3-27.

[125]Gallagher, M. (1991) 'Proportionality, Disproportionality and Electoral Systems.' *Electoral Studies* Vol. 10(1), pp.33–51.

Table One: Statistical Relationship Terrorism and Political Indices

Country	Disp.	ENP	Domestic Terror
Austria	1.3	2.9	2
Belgium	5.2	7	48
Denmark	1.8	4.9	14
Finland	3.2	4.9	1
France	21.9	2.3	731
Germany	4.6	3.4	298
Greece	7.4	2.2	196
Iceland	1.9	4	0
Ireland	6.6	3.4	11
Italy	7	5.3	122
Luxembourg	3.4	3.4	2
Netherlands	1.1	4.7	33
Norway	3.4	5.4	5
Portugal	1.3	2.6	16
Spain	4.3	2.5	237
Sweden	1.8	4.2	31
Switzerland	2.5	5	35
United Kingdom	17.7	2.2	128
Correlations (R)		.74	.50

All significant at 0.01
Sources: RAND Database of Worldwide Terrorism Incidents,
http://www.rand.org/nsrd/projects/terrorism-incidents/. Accessed 7th November 2014
and Qvortrup (2012) Terrorism and political science. *The British Journal of Politics
& International Relations*, *14*(4), 503-517

Of course, a correlation does not establish a fact, so it is necessary to go through each variable one by one.

We would expect a high number of represented parties to correlate with lower levels of terrorism, as representation provides a smaller group with a voice and a channel through which they can voice their grievances. This is also supported statistically by the data in Table One.

There is a strong inverse correlation of R= -.50 between the number of terrorist incidents and the effective number of parties (ENP). This means that more partiers are associated with a lower risk of terrorist incidents. That this relationship is statistically significant at the 0.01 level further supports this correlation, and is in line with evidence from Northern Ireland that shows that the number of terrorist incidents dropped considerably after the number of represented parties in the Northern Ireland Assembly rose[126].

---

[126] Qvortrup, Matt. "T-Test for Terrorism: Did the introduction of proportional representation reduce the terrorist threat? A time-series case study of Algeria and Northern Ireland." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 38(4) 293-304

The inverse relationship between domestic terror incidents and the Effective Number of (Parliamentary) Parties is further strengthened by the strong *positive* correlation between Gallagher Disproportionality[127] and the number of domestic terrorist incidents. With a Pearson Correlation Coefficient of R=.74 it is difficult to dismiss the proposition that the fairness of the political system is associated with the level of terrorism. The conclusion that there is a strong (and statistically significant) association between disproportionality and the number of terrorist incidents, is consistent with the fact that countries with high levels of terrorist incidents are also the countries that score highest on the Gallagher Disproportionality Index, e.g. Britain (17.7), France (21.9) and – to a degree Greece (7.4). That the lowest numbers of terrorist incidents take place in countries with low levels of disproportionality, e.g. Denmark (1.8), Sweden (1.8) and the Netherlands (1.1) rather supports this.

Conclusion

Thomas Hobbes wanted to create the 'Arts of Peace' – he probably did. But his solution was to trade in our freedom for security. In this day and age we want to have both democracy and peace; we want to have a fair political system that allows citizens to make decisions, as well as wanting to eliminate terrorism.

How can this be done? People resort to terrorism when they are deprived of meaningful influence on issues they care deeply about. It is for this reason that the choice of electoral system has a direct impact on the level of political violence. In political systems where many groups are represented, these groups are less likely to resort to political violence. This is because they are less likely to be excluded from political influence. It is this logic that explains why countries with proportional representation – which typically have more political parties – have suffered fewer terrorist attacks.

Electoral systems are but one institution that can facilitate peace. There are others: parliamentary procedure, federal institutions and even referendums. We are only beginning to understand the logic and the science of reducing terrorism but we have made a valuable first step towards a new 'Arts of Peace'.

'Why is there not world peace?' Albert Einstein was once asked. 'Because', said the esteemed scientist, 'Because, political science is infinitely more difficult than physics'. The task of developing the 'Arts of Peace' is a daunting one. But, then again, where would we be if we weren't challenged to do difficult things? And what could be more worthwhile than contributing to lever levels of political violence? After all, as the *Quran* says, 'Whoever saves one [human being], it is as if he had saved mankind entirely'[128].

Dr Matt Qvortrup is Professor of Applied Political Science and International Relations at the Centre for Trust, Peace and Social Relations at Coventry University. His most recent book is Referendums and Ethnic Conflict, University of Pennsylvania 2014. His article 'Terrorism and Political Science' was awarded the prize as best article by the Political Studies Association in 2013.

---

[127] Gallagher, M. 1991. 'Proportionality, Disproportionality and Electoral Systems, p.33.
[128] Quran 5:32