



From Terrorism to Politics

Anisseh Van Engeland
and
Rachael M. Rudolph

ASHGATE e-BOOK

FROM TERRORISM TO POLITICS

Ethics and Global Politics

Series Editors: Tom Lansford and Patrick Hayden

Since the end of the Cold War, explorations of ethical considerations within global politics and on the development of foreign policy have assumed a growing importance in the fields of politics and international studies. New theories, policies, institutions, and actors are called for to address difficult normative questions arising from the conduct of international affairs in a rapidly changing world. This series provides an exciting new forum for creative research that engages both the theory and practice of contemporary world politics, in light of the challenges and dilemmas of the evolving international order.

Also in the series

Emerging Conflicts of Principle

International Relations and the Clash between Cosmopolitanism
and Republicanism

Thomas Kane

ISBN 978 0 7546 4837 6

The Ethics of Foreign Policy

Edited by David B. MacDonald, Robert G. Patman and Betty Mason-Parker

ISBN 978 0 7546 4377 7

Who's Afraid of Children?

Children, Conflict and International Relations

Helen Brocklehurst

ISBN 0 7546 4171 6

Old Europe, New Security

Evolution for a Complex World

Edited by Janet Adamski, Mary Troy Johnson and Christina M. Schweiss

ISBN 0 7546 4644 0

Peaceful Resistance

Advancing Human Rights and Democratic Freedoms

Robert M. Press

ISBN 0 7546 4713 7

The Ethics of Refugee Policy

Christina Boswell

ISBN 0 7546 4519 1

From Terrorism to Politics

ANISSEH VAN ENGELAND

European University Institute, Italy

and

RACHAEL M. RUDOLPH

Emory and Henry College and West Virginia University, USA

ASHGATE

© Anisseh Van Engeland and Rachael M. Rudolph

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Anisseh Van Engeland and Rachael M. Rudolph have asserted their moral right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

Published by

Ashgate Publishing Limited

Gower House

Croft Road

Aldershot

Hampshire GU11 3HR

England

Ashgate Publishing Company

Suite 420

101 Cherry Street

Burlington, VT 05401-4405

USA

Ashgate website: <http://www.ashgate.com>

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Engeland, Anisseh, van

From terrorism to politics. - (Ethics and global politics)

1. Political parties - History - 21st century 2. Political parties - History - 20th century 3. Terrorists 4. Political sociology 5. Nonviolence

I. Title II. Rudolph, Rachael M.

324.2'18

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Engeland, Anisseh van.

From terrorism to politics / by Anisseh van Engeland and Rachael M. Rudolph.

p. cm. -- (Ethics and global politics)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7546-4990-8

1. Political violence--Cross-cultural studies. 2. Political parties--Cross-cultural studies. 3. Terrorism--Cross-cultural studies. I. Rudolph, Rachael M. II. Title.

JC328.6.E54 2008

322.4'2--dc22

2008002371

ISBN 978-0-7546-4990-8

Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall.

Contents

<i>About the Authors</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xiii</i>
Introduction:	
The Transition Process <i>Rachael M. Rudolph</i>	1
1 A Successful ‘Turn Over’: the African National Congress Moves from Sabotage to a Legitimate Political Force and from Apartheid to Democracy <i>Anisseh Van Engeland</i>	13
2 Hezbollah: from a Terrorist Group to a Political Party – Social Work as a Key to Politics <i>Anisseh Van Engeland</i>	29
3 Political Movements in the Making: the Irish Republican Army and Sinn Féin <i>Anisseh Van Engeland</i>	51
4 A Political Movement to make Peace or War? Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) and Batasuna – the Impossible Truce <i>Anisseh Van Engeland</i>	67
5 The Islamic Resistance Movement in Palestine (Hamas): a Successful Transition, but will it Survive? <i>Rachael M. Rudolph</i>	81
6 The Islamic Jihad Movement in Palestine: a Wild Card in Palestinian Politics? <i>Rachael M. Rudolph</i>	97
7 The Islamic Salvation Front: Transition FIS-Style <i>Rachael M. Rudolph</i>	119
8 Failed Attempts: the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC) and the Union Patriótica (UP) <i>Anisseh Van Engeland</i>	135

9	Transition in the Philippines: the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF), the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) and Abu Sayyaf's Group (ASG) <i>Rachael M. Rudolph</i>	151
10	Terrorism all the Way! Nihilist Groups: the Example of Al Qaeda <i>Anisseh Van Engeland</i>	171
Conclusion:		
	Toward a Transition Theory and its Implications <i>Rachael M. Rudolph</i>	181
	<i>Bibliography</i>	191
	<i>Index</i>	211

About the Authors

Anisseh Van Engeland is a Max Weber Fellow at the European University Institute in Italy. She holds a PhD in Political Sciences and is an international law jurist. She holds a Master's degree in Law from Harvard Law School, a Master's in International Relations from Paris II Assas and a Master's in Iranian Studies from Paris III Sorbonne.

Rachael M. Rudolph will graduate in Spring 2008 with her Doctorate of Philosophy from West Virginia University, where she is also an instructor for the Department of Political Science. Her dissertation is entitled *Political Development of Islamic Resistance: Toward A Theory of Islamic Political Development*. She obtained her Master's degree in International Affairs from the School of International Service, American University.

This page intentionally left blank

Foreword

The aim of this book is to explain through a series of comparative case studies how ‘terrorist’ organizations become political parties. Each chapter is devoted to a movement using political violence whose story is illustrative of a step of this evolution from a ‘terrorist’ group to a political party. Each case is different and there is no solution for a transformation as such. There are, however, similar characteristics among those groups who have made the transition. An emphasis will be put on these common trends, such as the existence of a political platform in the cases of Hamas, Hezbollah, the ANC and IRA/Sinn Féin. These movements will be studied in contrast to other groups that have a so-called political programme but are destructive, like Al Qaeda: these movements are nihilist groups and do not present the characteristics that could turn them from terrorist organizations into legitimate political actors.

The book wishes to demonstrate and explicate the process of becoming a legitimate political force. A comparative approach is therefore necessary, keeping in mind, however, that each group was created within its own context, which results in differing stories and methods. For example, Hamas and Hezbollah were successful through the development of social networks within civil society while others, such as the IRA, were successful through disarmament. In addition, we seek to examine the failures, such as the attempt of the Union Patriótica (UP), the political party linked to FARC, to assert itself as a political party. Finally, it is necessary to examine groups that have become a political force or have a political influence without relinquishing the use of violence.

Some groups have been able to perform a full transformation to political party despite their amazing record of violence. The ones that were successful in this ‘makeover’ were usually groups that had a political platform, such as Hezbollah, the African National Congress (ANC), Hamas and IRA/Sinn Féin. Some groups preferred to have an influence over politics without creating a political party, thus keeping their terrorist line (the Palestinian movements, ETA and the IRA). While other groups were successful in their transformation, other attempts failed, as FARC’s experience demonstrates. Finally, there are terrorist nihilist groups that simply cannot integrate into the political process.

The approach of the book is innovative: the conversion of terrorist groups into political groups has hardly been analysed or studied because there is puzzlement among scholars as to how such moves have progressed. The ANC in South Africa was the first to make the transition whereby a former ‘terrorist’, Nelson Mandela, became one of the most loved leaders in the world. This process needs to be analysed in order to encourage other groups to relinquish violent and extremist methods. It is also essential to explain the process of transformation so as to encourage governments to open the political space to these atypical parties. An example of such an unsuccessful opening to these new types of political parties was that in Colombia, where the failure of the political party Union Patriótica was caused not only by the

blurred origin and mission of the party but also by an intolerant government that buried many hopes for peace. Moreover, lack of recognition by the international community of groups who make the transition could result in them giving up on the democratic process and thus resorting once again to violence.

Another reason for the lack of scholarship on the topic is that scholars do not believe terrorist groups can be redeemed, despite the example of the ANC. However, the failure of FARC to insert itself into the national political game demonstrates that there are limits to this process of (re-)integration into political life; therefore it is essential to study in depth why some movements made it and others failed.

It is also very important to understand how well-established democracies react to this phenomenon. For example, the US still considers Hezbollah to be a terrorist group (it was put back on the national terrorist list after 9/11) while the EU considers it to be a political party. Moreover, the states of the Middle East and Central Asia view Hamas as a political party and liberation organization rather than a terrorist organization. The attitude of Western governments does indeed affect the success or failure of the newly transformed group. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the history of these groups in order to understand how two legitimated groups were elected fairly and according to democratic rules but were rejected by Western and (sometimes) local powers. The legitimacy given by the international community is important in the groups' overall political success. One explanation for the rejection of the West could be the Hitlerian shadow of 1933 – the memory that Hitler came legally to power, using the democratic system. This study will therefore propel the question of what political pluralism means and entails in the context of the aftermath of 11 September 2001. In this spirit, it will analyse the reactions post-9/11 regarding the emergence of atypical political parties and how they question the legitimacy, interests and motivations behind the transformations.

The book will also be a presentation of how terrorist groups see the world in which they live; how they perceive their role; how they wish to change the society in which they live; and what contribution they think they can make to this world, other than using violence. Much of the recent literature fails to examine the world through the milieu of those who are actually engaged in the political violence deemed to be terrorism. This is problematic in the sense that states cannot expect to prevent groups from resorting to violence if they do not understand the milieu through which these individuals and groups are operating. Therefore, this book seeks to examine the process 'through their eyes'; that is, how the political world is and why it is valuable to participate in politics. The authors will raise further questions, attempting to identify the interests of these groups in making the transition into political groups and asking whether these changes can be permanent. The book will also raise the issue of disarmament: can a political group have an armed branch and maintain its stance as a political party, or is disarmament necessary? Does the group really have an interest in disarming? Finally, where is the group going to gain legitimacy if it has no possibility of threatening the world or leading impressive parades and actions?

We will also analyse political legitimization strategies, which are necessary for the transition from violent opposition organization to political party. Successful groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah gained legitimacy within civil society, which was achieved largely through the development of communal and international networks.

These networks supported not only the victims of wars but also segments of the populations that the governing authorities of Lebanon and Palestine were unable to provide for. Others, such as the ANC, were perceived as leading a just war, which raises the issue of self-determination and legitimacy of the use of force. It will then be essential to look at the failure of FARC and the almost-failure of the IRA/Sinn Féin to reconvert due to a lack of legitimacy within their respective societies and their very dubious pasts; their recent actions looked more like criminal acts than any kind of self-determination struggle. Legitimacy and how it is obtained are important criteria in the transition from violent organization to political party.

A comparative case study approach will enable us to understand what similarities and differences exist in the process of politicization, as violent groups have indeed different stances regarding not only the use of violence but disarmament, and we also examine the role of politics, social actions and political programmes. In the end, however, groups with differing strategies and stories have successfully made the transition from violent opposition to legitimate political parties. These groups share common grounds such as the role played in civil society and the need to be acknowledged by people as a political party; that is, in the need for legitimacy. We will also discover that most of the groups turned political following a survival strategy; that is, the movements reached a point in history when the use of political violence was even less welcome than usual.

Anissh Van Engeland

Rachael Rudolph

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Patrick Hayden for his patience and help during the writing of this book. They would also like to thank the team at Ashgate Publishing, Donna Elliott, Kirstin Howgate, Helen Harvey, Margaret Younger and Maureen Mansell-Ward for their understanding and support.

Rachael M. Rudolph would like to especially thank her family and friends for their support during the arduous writing process.

Anisseh Van Engeland-Nourai would like to thank her family and Frank Boas.

To Frank Boas
To My Family

Introduction: The Transition Process

Rachael M. Rudolph¹

There has been an increase in participation of resistance movements in the political process. At the heart of their participation and this phenomenon in particular is the democratization process. Embedded in democratization are authoritarian breakdown, democratic transition and democratic consolidation.² Democratic consolidation is an analytically differentiated aspect of the process of democratization. The processes of transition and consolidation overlap and sometimes coincide, but they are conceptually distinct.

Transition to democracy is concerned with the installation of democratic institutions, whereas consolidation is concerned with making democratic institutions enduring and functional and connecting them to civil society. Neither of the two processes, according to O'Donnell and Schmitter, is linear in nature.³ Thus, transition and consolidation must be studied separately but concurrently. Studies of transition emphasize factors such as the absence of a strong middle class, the prevalence of an authoritarian political culture, economic dependency, and the role of political elites. Consequently, the transition process becomes the product of strategic calculation by political elites. It makes it a 'volunteeristic' understanding of democracy. As this book demonstrates, however, factors influencing transition are not just limited to the aforementioned but encompass all political actors connected to society, including violent and non-violent resistance groups.

This book demonstrates that volunteerism is heavily dependent on the political and social interactions of all political actors and not just the political elite; and, largely, that the ultimate decision is effected by the public call for political participation. It therefore reinforces scholars of consolidation who emphasize the constraints socio-economic structures and political institutions and historical context place on the choices political actors make; that is, how choice interacts with context in the democratization process. Finally, this book attempts to articulate a theory of transition of resistance movements to political parties, which is separate but a concurrent part of the transition to and consolidation of democracy.

1 With special thanks to the blind reviewer for Ashgate, my family and friends for their valuable assistance with this project.

2 Encarnacion, Omar G. (2000). 'Review: Beyond Transitions: The Politics of Democratic Consolidation', *Comparative Politics*, 32, 4.

3 O'Donnell, Guillermo and Philippe Schmitter (1986), *Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press).

Theories of Transition

What political factors and conditions guarantee the surest and safest path toward the consolidation of systematic transitions to democracy? At stake in transitions is the creation of a new political and socio-economic order, intense struggles over economic resources, and the emergent institutional infrastructure of new democracies that engage all the major domestic and international political actors.⁴ Transitions are important for the stability and survivability of both states and actors participating in the democratization process. Therefore, understanding the political and socio-economic factors that aid transitions is important.

Through a review of the existing literature on transitions, Encarnacion identifies three theoretical trends in understanding the political factors that determine the success or failure of attempts at dual transitions. Dual transitions refer to states that simultaneously adopt democratic political and liberal economic institutions and policies.⁵ The first theoretical trend posits the importance of sequencing political and economic reforms, with priority going to the task of consolidating the new democracy. The second trend posits the relevance of a technocratic policy-making style that emphasizes a consultative approach to the formulation and implementation of economic reform involving state, capital, and labour. The last theoretical trend in understanding the political factors that determine the success or failure of transitions posits that the development of institutions, especially intermediate arrangements linking state and civil society, facilitate a favourable environment for social interaction and negotiation.⁶

Unfortunately, studies on the democratization process over-emphasize the socio-economic argument. For example, Acemoglu and Robinson argue that regime changes are more likely during recessionary periods because costs of political turmoil to the rich and poor are lower during such episodes.⁷ Haggard and Kaufman argue that transitions in Latin America occurred during times of economic crises.⁸ They also argue that socio-economic structure is crucial to identifying politically relevant groups and their policy preferences and in understanding political alignments and conflicts.⁹ While Haggard and Kaufman are concerned with the mediating role played by representative institutions in general and political parties in particular in shaping policies, they argue that institutional landscapes are important in determining policy preferences, choices, and outcomes in transition societies.¹⁰

Economic-oriented explanations have a tendency to emphasize the absence of state bureaucratic capacities and the strength of traditional modes of political

4 Encarnacion, Omar G. (1996). 'Review: The Politics of Dual Transitions', *Comparative Politics*, 28, 4.

5 Encarnacion *supra* note 4.

6 *Id.*

7 Acemoglu, Daron and James A. Robinson (2001), 'A Theory of Political Transitions', *The American Economic Review*, 91, 4.

8 Haggard, Stephan and Robert R. Kaufman (1995), *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

9 Haggard and Kaufman, *supra* note 8.

10 *Id.*

interaction, such as clientelism and the inhibition of governments on carrying out unpopular privatization programmes and other economic policies aimed at enhancing the market economy.¹¹ Breaking away from the traditional socio-economic arguments regarding transitions, scholars such as Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter emphasize political elites as the central protagonists in transitions to and consolidation of democratic regimes.¹² Haggard and Webb argue that the establishment of credibility of reform and the institutionalization of its gains requires building support for the political programme through the party system and with the electorate at large.¹³ Przeworski takes this further by arguing that consolidation is dependent on self-interested, spontaneous compliance that emanates from political actors who come to view democracy as serving long-term economic needs.¹⁴ He also advances policy prescriptions for successful reform in consolidating democracies. This approach, according to Encarnacion, is called social democratic because it recommends consultation with representational institutions and compensation and incentives for those social groups most directly affected by reform.

The consultative style of policy-making, broadly conceptualized as 'concertation', is viewed as ideally suited for democratizing societies. In discussing policy-making styles, Pereira, Maravall and Przeworski posit that out of all the styles available to politicians, concertation is the best. It will not only improve reform but will also build political bases of support for the particular reform strategy. Politically, concertation is credited with unifying fragmented national elite.¹⁵ It also assists in the construction of democratic institutions, most notably by facilitating the cross-class consensus.¹⁶ As Argentina demonstrates, there are high political costs associated with policy-making styles that are secretive and fail to incorporate civil society into the process.¹⁷

Theorizing about concertation, according to Encarnacion, is incomplete. Pereira, Maravall and Przeworski demonstrate its usefulness as a policy mechanism but they do not examine why this style is possible. It is assumed that political actors, out of their own volition and appreciation of political democracy, will enter into bargains and compromises with one another.¹⁸ The institutional framework thought to be ideal for concertation is a hierarchical structure.¹⁹ The organizational strength of

11 Encarnacion *supra* note 4.

12 O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe Schmitter and Laurence Whitehead (eds) (1986), *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy*. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press).

13 O'Donnell et al. *supra* note 12.

14 Przeworski, Adam (1991), *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin American* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Cited in Encarnacion *supra* note 4.

15 Pereira, Luiz Carlos Bresser, Jose Maria Maravall and Adam Przeworski (1992), *Economic Reform in New Democracies: A Social Democratic Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

16 *Id.*

17 Encarnacion *supra* note 4.

18 *Id.*

19 Haggard and Kaufman *supra* note 8.

bargaining partners enhances cooperation; the higher the degree of centralization the higher the likelihood of concertation.²⁰ Lange, however, suggests that centralized bargaining might actually be the outcome rather than the cause of concertation, as centralization actually took place at the time of the creation and adoption of concertation institutions and practices.²¹ Prior to bargaining, practices, according to Encarnacion, were decentralized. Concertation is actually facilitated by the prevalence of a significant degree of institutionalized interaction between the representatives of state organizations and the most powerful socio-political non-state actors.²²

The cases herein reify democratization scholars. First, they demonstrate that socio-economic institutions are important to the transition process. The rise of and popular support for many of these groups is due to the socio-economic situation in the societies in which they live. Second, the cases demonstrate that political actors' participation in the transition process is important. Without their participation, democratization and later consolidation would be unstable. Finally, the cases demonstrate that policy-making styles such as concertation are prevalent among the groups, which is a style that is conducive to the democratization and consolidation process. This book, however, adds to the literature in the sense that the transition of opposition groups to political parties must be studied as a separate but concurrent part of the transition process to democracy. It is a process in its own right and this book seeks to identify generalizable characteristics that enable the transition to a political party. The inclusion and participation of opposition actors, of resistance groups, is important to both the democratization and consolidation process.

Democratic Consolidation

Scholars of democratic consolidation emphasize the constraints on socio-economic structures, political institutions and historical context on the choices political actors make;²³ that is, how choice interacts with context in the democratization process. Democratic consolidation is when all politically significant groups regard its key political institutions as the only legitimate framework for political contestation and adhere to democratic rules of the game. The existing political institutions are regarded as acceptable and without legitimate alternatives; and, all politically significant groups respect and adhere to a specific set of norms.²⁴

20 Wilensky, Harold (1976), *The 'New Corporatism,' Centralization, and the Welfare State* (Beverly Hills: Sage).

21 Lange, Peter (1987), 'The Institutionalization of Concertation', *Working Paper 26*, Duke University Program in International Political Economy. Cited in Encarnacion *supra* note 4.

22 Encarnacion *supra* note 4.

23 Encarnacion *supra* note 4.

24 Encarnacion *supra* note 2; Gunther, Richard, P. Nikiforos Diamandourous and Hans-Jürgen Puhle (eds) (1995), *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press); Mainwaring, Scott and Timothy Scully (eds) (1995), *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America* (Stanford: Stanford University Press.); Buchannon, Paul G. (1995), *State,*

Gunther, Diamandorous and Puhle posit that democratic consolidation rests on the adoption of democratic institutions, processes, and values by the political class and the masses.²⁵ Mainwaring and Scully argue that the institutionalization of political organizations in the party system is critical to consolidation.²⁶ Morlino argues that crises and intermediary institutions such as parties and organized interests inform an understanding of democratic consolidation. Democratic consolidation, he argues, is anchored in consensus and legitimation, party system and party organization, and the relationships of organized and unorganized interest groups to parties and the state.²⁷ Democratic transition and consolidation should be examined or thought of in developmental terms, according to Richard Sklar and Larry Diamond.²⁸ This is because all systems evolve over time in fragments or parts.

Given that democratic consolidation is concerned with making democratic institutions both enduring and functional and connecting them to civil society, the transition of opposition groups, violent and non-violent groups in particular, to political parties are an important phenomenon to the process. As the cases herein demonstrate, these quasi-political actors are concerned with change in the governing institution of society in which they are part. They are widely connected to the masses and form part of civil society. Their participation in civil society and desire for participation within the governance system demonstrates that they regard political institutions as the only legitimate framework for political contestation and adherence to the democratic rules of the game. Therefore, the participation of both violent and non-violent opposition groups in the political system should be regarded as a positive phenomenon that can only lead later to democratic consolidation, after the state's transition to democracy.

Political Parties

The development and formation of political parties and the political space for them to participate are important for the transition process to and consolidation of democracy.²⁹ As the aforementioned literature demonstrates, explanations of transition and survival have emphasized socio-economic and cultural factors, thereby overlooking the institutional effects of inclusive and competitive political parties.

Labor, Capital: Democratizing Class Relations in the Southern Cone (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press); Jelin, Elizabeth and Eric Hershberg (eds) (1996), *Constructing Democracy: Human Rights, Citizenship and Society in Latin America* (Boulder: Westview Press); and Morlino, Leonardo (1998), *Democracy between Consolidation and Crisis: Parties, Groups and Citizens in Southern Europe*. (New York: Oxford University Press).

25 *Supra* note 23.

26 *Id.*

27 *Id.*

28 Sklar, Richard (1987), 'Developmental Democracy', *Contemporary Studies in Society and History*, 29.

29 Lai, Brian and Ruth Melkonian-Hoover (2005), 'Democratic Process and Regress: The Effect of Political Parties on the Transition of States to and Away from Democracy', *Political Research Quarterly* 58, 4.