Security After Terrorism:

Explaining differing security responses following large-scale terrorist attacks

Supervisor: Dr. Francesco Ragazzi
Second reader: Prof. Theo Brinkel

Abstract:

Norway, a country previously untouched by terrorism, experienced two devastating terrorist attacks in 2011 that claimed the lives of 77 people. Similar large-scale terrorist attacks have struck the U.K and France through the 2005 London bombings and the 2015 Paris Attacks respectively. Yet, the security responses in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks differ in all three European countries. By utilizing two distinctive theoretical frameworks, that of securitization theory and the strength of democratic institutions, this paper endeavours to determine which explanatory factor is the most satisfactory in answering why the security responses of these democracies differ. The paper finds that while securitization theory offers insight into why the security response differ in Norway and France, it is insufficient in its original form to explain the U. K's response. Furthermore, the paper also finds that the strength of a country's democratic institutions influences the states response to terrorism.

Keywords: Large-scale terrorist attacks, securitization theory, speech act, democratic institutions, security responses, France, the U.K, Norway.

Jarl Mattias Larsen
S1912437
M.Sc. Thesis Seminar: Radicalisation and Terrorism
Leiden University, 2017
Total word count: 8627

Introduction

In 2011, Norway experienced two devastating terrorist attacks that claimed the lives of 77 people. For Norway – a small and sparsely populated country – the atrocities proved to be the largest act of terrorism in the country's history (Waggoner, 2015, 186-187). The event, widely referred to in Norway as "22 July", first saw a car bomb detonate outside of the executive government quarter of Norway with the result of 8 dead, several seriously injured and causing significant material damage. Shortly after, the summer camp of the Labour Party's youth wing on the island of Utøya was attacked by a gunman that massacred 69 people – most them teenagers. The perpetrator of the attacks was identified as Anders Behring Breivik, a Norwegian right-wing extremist (Kolås, 2017:1). Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg, speaking at a memorial service two days after the attacks, stated the following: "We are still shocked by what has happened, but we will never give up our values. Our response is more democracy, more openness, and more humanity." (The Guardian, 2012). Subsequently, the Norwegian increase in security measures following the aftermath of the attacks, implemented by Stoltenberg's Second Government and its successor Solberg's Government, have been modest compared to other examples of European security responses. The 2015 Paris attacks, which claimed the lives of 130 people and injured over 300, resulted in the French government invoking a state of emergency – granting the authorities the ability to exercise a wide range of powers which previously would require judicial authorization (Amnesty International, 2016:5-6). The state of emergency in France, intended to be temporarily, was later extended to the presidential elections of 2017 (RFI, 2016). Likewise, the London bombings in 2005 led the U.K to introduce the 2006 Terrorism Act and the 2008 Counter-Terrorism Act, resulting in legislative changes and granting more power to U.K security services (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010:112).

This paper endeavours to answer the following question: What explains the difference in the extent of security measures implemented in Norway compared to France and the U.K. following their respective terrorist attacks? What factors can best explain Norway's security response – a response significantly 'softer' than its European counterparts? This paper does not seek to present Norway as a deviant or unique case that does not securitize. Indeed, Norway did experience a substantial increase in security measures in the aftermath of the Breivik attacks, which is elaborated upon later in the paper (in 'Scope and Limitations'). Nevertheless, the Norwegian

security response have been mild considering the devastation caused by Breivik. By testing two different theoretical frameworks, this paper finds that securitization theory aids in explaining differing security responses between Norway and France, yet falls short in its original form in explaining the U.K. Additionally, the strength of democratic institutions are found to be an explanatory factor in why security responses differ based on the strength of the democracy.

The paper will proceed as follows: In the following section, I introduce the literature on security and securitization, and the responses of democracies to terrorism. The third section will contain the theoretical frameworks and arguments that will be used to explain Norway's security response compared to France and the U.K. Next in section four, I introduce the operationalization of my arguments, object of study, data and methods, and the scope and limitations of my paper. The fifth section will contain empirical analysis through a securitization framework, while the sixth section will showcase the empirical analysis from an approach that emphasizes the strength of democratic institutions. Lastly, a conclusion will summarize the findings and consider the implications of the paper.

Literature review

Security and securitization theory

Since the early 1980s, the debate on the conceptions of security have been fierce and contentious. Cavelty and Mauer (2010:1-2) pinpoints one of the major debates to the conflict of whether the studies of security should be expanded beyond the traditional understanding of the concept related to the nation-state, interstate war, and threats of a military nature – a belief rooted in the historically dominant international relations approach of Realism. Ullmann (1983) was one of the earlier advocates that contested the predominant notion that security was restricted to be understood in purely military terms. Ullmann claimed that this view of security expressed a profound distorted and false image of reality that was both deceptive and troubling (Ullmann, 1983:129). Ullmann therefore set out to redefine security to incorporate threats that derives from other issues such as the demand for and scarcity of resources, population growth, and natural disasters. Cavelty and Mauer (2010:1) distinguished between two camps in this debate: the "traditionalists vs. wideners-deepeners". The traditionalists, as evident by the name, believed that there was no need to expand

the study of security beyond the traditional understanding of the concept. In contrast, the "wideners" believed that the changing security landscape warranted the addition of other risks to the board: economic, societal, political, and environmental issues. Furthermore, the "deepeners" thought it necessary to not only widen the conception of security, but also deepen the understanding of the concept by adding more levels of referent objects: international systems, international subsystems, units, subunits, and individuals (Cavelty and Mauer, 2010:1-2). The deviation from the traditional approach of security studies thus unlocked a broader agenda of security studies, which would be referred to as critical approaches to security (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010:5).

The field of critical approaches to security have primarily been focused around three schools of thought: The Aberystwyth School, Copenhagen School, and the Paris School. While the Aberystwyth and Copenhagen schools was largely entrenched in the international relations field of international security, strategic studies and peace studies, the Paris School drew from interdisciplinary approaches including political theory, sociology and criminology (C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006:446-449). The concept of "securitization" originated at the Copenhagen School and was derived from the combination of the theoretical work on different sectors of security by Barry Buzan (1991) and Ole Wæver's conceptualization of securitization (1995). Briefly summarized, securitization refers to when an issue is taken from being nonpoliticized or politicized to being securitized – thus being moved to the realm of emergency politics by presenting it as an existential threat (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010:75-77). Wæver (1995:54-55) argues that this makes security a speech act: "By uttering 'security', a state-representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever means are necessary to block it". The purpose of a successful speech act is to convince the audience to accept violations or limitations on established norms and rules (Heller, Kahl, Pisoiu, 2012:289).

Considerable criticism of the concept of securitization as a speech act has come from the Paris School. Bigo (2000:194-195) views Wæver's analysis as restricting the mechanisms of securitization to enunciation and discourse exclusively – consequently omitting semiotic non-linguistic factors such as gestures and symbols. Moreover, he argues that the mere knowledge of how to enunciate a security statement is not enough to securitize: The social position of the speaker and the recognised legitimacy that the individual has from other social actors determine its success.

Thus, Bigo argues, the process of securitization will never occur absent of groups and institutions that are accredited with deciding what security entails (Bigo, 200:195). Balzacq (2005), another affiliate of the Paris School, similarly contests the predominant focus of the concept is on the discursive element of the speech act. Instead, he argues that securitization would be better understood as a strategic practice in which its success depends on the context of the act, the dispositions of the audience (psychologically and culturally) and the participants power (Balzacq, 2005:172). A complementary stance is shared by McDonald (2008:573, as quoted in Heller, Kahl, Pisoui, 2012:292) who argues that "those interested in the construction of security must pay attention to the social, political and historical contexts in which particular discourses of security (even those defined narrowly in terms of the designation and articulation of the threat) become possible". Thus, for a securitization act to be successful, actors must be mindful of the cultural contexts and environments that influences the outcome (Heller, Kahl, Pisoui, 2012:292).

The views of the Paris School on the overly emphasis of the discourse component of the speech act is shared by Huysmans (2011), yet he fixates on the 'act' itself. According to Huysmans (2011:2-5), it is the 'act' itself – being the decision to create the securitizing move and subsequent consequences by the speaker– that carries the political investment of the speech act rather than the speech. However, Huysman (2011:6-9) further acknowledges that this stance encounters complications when regarding securitization from a more sociological and processual approach – thus to an extent invalidating the importance of the Copenhagen School's securitization theory. This approach views securitization as the result of ongoing processes that increase security through practices and the diffusion of technology, e.g. surveillance oriented such as CCTV cameras, that influence and affect everyday life. These continuous processes, which Huysman refers to as "little security nothings", gradually blur the line between normality and the exceptional. Therefore, the importance of the decision-making speech act is reduced to being only one of many small components that contribute to the ongoing securitization. Neal (2009:351-353) concurs with this line of thought in his criticism of securitization theory. The abovementioned processes and practices are not dependent on emergency and exceptions to occur, but rather through relations between differing fields of policy, technology and security professionals. Accordingly, securitization ensues through processes occurring internally and between different bureaucratic agencies rather than through the politicians uttering the speech act. This paper will apply

theoretical insight from the securitization theory and the contribution of its critics to examine whether this impacted the Norwegian security response after the 22 of July.

The response of democracies to terrorism

The problem of how liberal democracies can respond to terrorism while maintaining their democratic legitimacy and character have been greatly discussed by scholars. Wilkinson (1986:125, as quoted in Pedahzur and Ranstorp, 2001:1-2) was one of the earliest who articulated this problem: "The primary objective of counter-terrorist strategy must be the protection and maintenance of liberal democracy and the rule of law. It cannot be sufficiently stressed that this aim overrides in importance even the objective of eliminating terrorism and political violence as such". This was further reiterated by Chalk (1998:386-388) who proclaimed that adhering the constitutional principles of law and order was a requirement for any liberal democratic response to terrorism. Additionally, he stated that a liberal democracy's response should comply to three overarching principles: the response needs to be limited, credible, and accountable. Despite the view of such scholars, Tsoukala (2006:608) points out that most liberal democratic governments surmise that it is a necessity to cede some of its democratic nature to effectively fight terrorism. Thus, implementation of illiberal counter-terrorism policies and measures are justified by government officials to protect the security of citizens through effectively combatting the terrorist threat. Even so, Matthew and Shambaugh (2005:231) proposes that while democracies may infringe on their democratic values in short periods after an attack or incident, they also have inherent democratic characteristics in the forms of processes and mechanisms - e.g. transparency and accountability - that will prevent long term subversion of a state's democratic nature. In contrast, Neal (2012:273-274) contests the assumption that everything will return to as it used to be when sufficient time has passed since the emergency. Rather, legislative security changes introduced during the time of exception is prone to undergo normalization and thus, both in small incremental steps and making temporary laws lasting ones, which once was exceptional will become ordinary. Acts of normalization of such legislations are often undertaken by new governments that both wish to distance themselves from the previous regime and implement their own, lasting legislative changes.

Liberal democracies do not always respond similarly to acts of terrorism. Crelinsten and Schmid (1992:315, as quoted in Sederberg, 1995:299) states that it's the perception of the problem of terrorism that dictates the nature of response: If the state views terrorism as an act of war, it will pursue repressive methods to deal with the issue and if the state views terrorism as a crime, it will pursue solutions of a judicial nature. Traditionally, there have been three prominent models in the literature that categorizes the counter-terrorism strategies of states – the reconciliatory model, the criminal justice model, and the warfare model. The reconciliatory model addresses terrorism as a political problem, and the goal is to address the root causes of these problems, through for example political reform, and thus remove the terrorist threat. The criminal justice model treats terrorism as a crime with the goal being to penalize terrorists while complying to the rule of law. The last model of warfare treats terrorism as an act of war and thus uses military means to eliminate the terrorist threat (Perliger, 2012:493-494).

Perliger (2012:494-498) criticizes the abovementioned models as insufficient due to a combination of the model neglecting certain factors and its low resolution. Instead, she proposes a model of a two-dimensional space that draws on two vectors, the legal vector and the operational vector, to situate a state's response to terrorism. Additionally, Perliger (2012:526-527) finds that the nature of a state's democracy decides on its security response to terrorism: Weaker democracies are more likely to respond forcefully, while strong democracies are more likely to utilize reconciliatory measures and avoid the use of hard-line acts – conclusion reached by Fimreite et. al. as well (Fimreite, Lango, Lægreid, Rykkja, 2013:852). Yet, it is not a given that strong democracies will avoid maximizing their legal and operational powers to combat terrorism under certain conditions. The possibility of this occurring is when the "struggle against terrorism takes place in a separatist context, in socially and geographically peripheral regions, and when the violence is exercised by groups representing the interests of ethnic minorities" (Perliger, 2012:527). This paper applies the theoretical framework and findings mentioned by Perliger above to examine whether this affected Norway's security response after the Breivik-attacks.

Theoretical frameworks and arguments

Securitization

The first of the theoretical frameworks that will be applied to this papers empirical analysis is securitization. Peoples and Vaughan-Williams (2010:83) states that one of the contributions of securitization theory was that it emphasized how security is not necessarily an innately positive concept. Securitizing issues and events leads to emergency politics that set aside otherwise necessary policymaking mechanisms like deliberation, participation and bargaining due to restricted time and space, and thus a militarized mode of thinking takes their place. In the context of this paper, securitization will not be referencing how actors securitize issues that have previously been outside of the realm of security. Terrorist attacks are inherently security issues since they directly pose an existential threat to a referent object – people – and as some would argue – to the state itself. Instead of looking at how issues are securitized, this paper will primarily utilize the speech act component of securitization to see whether the speech act was utilized by actors referencing to the attacks as justification for the implementation and usage of exceptional measures. Additionally, the theoretical framework introduced here will draw on the Paris School's criticism and contribution to securitization theory; namely that the social, political, historical and cultural context surrounding the interaction between speaker and audience impacts the success chances of the speech act. Taking these considerations into account, the paper arrives at its argument to explain the difference in security responses in Norway compared to the U.K and France:

> *Norway did not implement security measures equal to those of France and the U.K since securitization attempts either never took place or were impeded by Norway's socio-political culture.*

Strength of democratic institutions and the rule of law

The second theoretical framework that will be applied in this paper is that of the strength of democratic institutions and the rule of law. This concept is constructed upon the literature of how democracies responds to terrorism, and Perliger's (2012) findings on how strong democracies are less likely to indulge in the use of hard-line measures in addressing terrorism. In additional to what

was introduced in the literature review, Perliger (2012:489-499) finds two major contributing factors that influence the reaction to terrorism in democratic countries: "(1) the level of institutionalization of democratic foundations; and (2) the features of terrorism, and the way they impact threat perception regarding the danger for the stability of the socio-political order". An assessment of the strength of the rule of law will be guided by Belton's (2005:3) characterizations of the rule of law: "First, as ends-based definitions make clear, the rule of law is not a single, unified good but it is composed of five separate, socially desirable goods, or ends: (1) a government bound by law, (2) equality before the law, (3) law and order, (4) predictable and efficient rulings, and (5) human rights." With this theoretical framework in mind, the paper arrives at the following alternative argument to explain the difference in security responses in Norway compared to the U.K and France:

> *Norway securitized less than France and the U.K due its strong democratic characteristics and adherence of the Rule of Law.*

Operationalization of concepts

Securitization

When operationalizing the concept of this papers main argument, it is necessary to reiterate that securitization is a speech act. Thus, any attempt at securitization needs to include uttering the words security as a component when calling for more security responses. Another necessary requirement of the operationalization of securitization is that the actors showcase the potential for more terrorist attacks as an existential threat to the referent object – i.e. the people of the nation and the nation itself. Therefore, the measurement of securitization per the utilized operationalization will apply to any attempt made by state-actors to call for security in the aftermath of terrorist attacks by referring to the existential threat that they face. Empirical observations of this concept will primarily be looked at either in Parliament debates, in which either participant of the interaction may assume the role of speaker, or in the public domain in which a state-actor acts as the speaker with the public being the audience.

Strength of democratic institutions and the rule of law

The operationalization of the concept in my alternative argument draws on the previously introduced characteristics of the rule of law by Belton (2005:3) and Perliger's (2012:498) proposed spatial model on the scope of democratic responses to terrorism. The main point, 'a government bound by law', will be measured on whether the government adheres to the established judicial system or invokes a state of exception in which emergency powers can be utilized. On Perliger's (2012:498) model, this can range from "no specific or general legislation against terrorism" to "state of emergency, special emergency legislation; use of military courts" along the Legal Vector, and "no use or very limited use of any type of violent or law keeping forces/Negotiations/Political reform" to "full use of military forces and covert organizations" along the Operational Vector. 'Human rights' will be measured by whether the government actively infringes upon civil liberties and human rights when addressing issues of terrorism. Measurement of the strength of democratic institutions and the rule of law will utilize empirical observations found in primary documents and secondary sources.

Case Selection

The objects of study in this paper was chosen, slightly influenced by the logic of Most Similar Systems Design, due to a set of shared traits, yet different outcomes: (1) The three countries are all European. This is the result of the assumption that these countries are thus more similar in terms of history, culture and socio-political systems in contrast to what would be the case if the study consisted of more different cases e.g. Norway, the U.S and Russia. (2) The three countries all experienced devastating terrorist attacks of somewhat comparable magnitude: the lives of more than 50 people were lost in all cases. (3) All the countries are active participants in the "War on Terror". However, the cases differ in one major regard concerning the terrorist attacks committed: France and the U.K experienced attacks carried out by Jihadist perpetrators, while the Breivik attacks in Norway were the product of a right-wing extremist. While this goes against the characteristics of Most Similar Systems Design, it nevertheless provides an interesting comparative angle. Furthermore, the study could have expanded upon the cases selected, following the similar selection pattern, by including for example Belgium, yet too many inclusions would weaken and reduce the overall empirical analysis by making it less specific.

Data and Methods

Data generation and analysis

The study will mainly utilize primary sources as to generate data. These sources will be NOU reports (Official Norwegian Reports), including the 22. July Commission Report, and U.K Terrorism Acts. Additionally, transcripts of speeches and addresses by Norwegian, British and French state-officials will be analysed. Furthermore, parliamentary debates in Norway and the U.K will be utilized to determine if there were calls for security measures or successful/attempted securitization speech acts.[1]

The data analysis of this paper will follow the framework of sociological analysis and thus utilize its three levels: The textual level, contextual level and interpretive level (Ruiz, 2009:3). The paper will first through textual analysis define the discourse – since the discourse itself is the object of study. Yet, as Ruiz (2009:4) states, this does not mean that the discourse is objective – what constitutes as important and relevant in the discourse is interpreted by the analyzer. This type of analysis will be often utilized in this paper due to its reliance on primary sources, in addition to parliamentary debates being transcribed as to allow for textual analysis. The others level of sociological analysis, contextual and interpretive, will allow the paper to provide an understanding of how the discourse is framed and explanations for the emergence of the discourse (Ruiz, 2009:3).

Scope and Limitations

This paper is inevitably restricted by time and space, and thus aims to answer the research question by utilizing two specific frameworks. Naturally, there are other frameworks that could have been utilized as well to derive other explanations, yet the paper had to restrict the number of concepts utilized as to allow for more in-depth analysis. This is a significant limitation of the paper as it only provides a specific set of explanations to a question that requires the combination of many more to answer satisfactory. It may be the case that the largest explanatory factor for the differing security responses is omitted from this paper – e.g. that of the nature of the perpetrators. Additionally, the findings of the paper are not intended to be generalizable – the results are

---

[1] Linguistic difficulties prohibit this for French Parliamentary Sessions

dependent on the context of the cases and the interpretation of the author in these specific cases. The paper also suffers from a language barrier regarding the French language, and is therefore unable to analyse and utilize French documents and sources.

What arguably constitutes as the main limitation of the study, or at least what could become the main point of critique, is the subjective interpretation of how much Norway securitized in the aftermath of the attacks. Some may argue that Norway's security response shared too many similarities with France and the U.K for it to be considered substantially different. Indeed, such criticism is valid. Norway was amongst the European countries which introduced new counter-terror laws and increased security measures following 9/11 (Fimreite, Lango, Lærgreid, Rykkja, 2013:840). Additionally, Norway did experience a substantial increase in security measures in the aftermath of the Breivik attacks: In 2013, legislative changes criminalized the planning and preparation of terrorist activities, and criminalized the recipient of terror training (Stortinget, 2013). Furthermore, the Norwegian Police Security Service (PST) was allocated more resources and legislative changes enabled the Norwegian military to assist the police if needed (Regjeringen, 2017). Despite this, the paper would still characterize the Norwegian response as one markedly different from the security responses in France and the U.K following their respective terrorist attacks.

Differing Security Responses: Securitization

The main argument proposed in this section is that the different security responses in the U.K, France and Norway can be explained by the lack of securitization attempts in Norway following the 2011 Breivik attacks. Per securitization theory as developed by Buzan and Wæver, securitization speech acts serve as one of the main causes of implementation of security and exceptional measures, and thus a difference in securitization attempts and their successes between the countries would explain the differing responses.

Securitization and Exceptional Measures: The U.K

The implementation of counter-terrorist policies, measures and the invocation of a state of emergency is not a recent occurrence in EU countries, yet the introduction of legislation that infringes on civil rights and the increase of power for security agencies has been increased after

the onset of the War on Terror – France and the U.K included (Tsoukala, 2006:607-608). Historically, the conflict in Northern Ireland has generated a substantial amount of antiterrorist legislation in the UK which supplied the possibility for exceptional measures during exceptional periods (Tsoukala, 2006:609). It is unsurprising thus, given its experience with terrorism, that U.K government officials are preoccupied with security. Indeed, following the terrorist attack in the U.S, the then Home Secretary stated the following after encountering opposition in passing an emergency anti-terrorism legislation – and thus committed a securitizing speech at by referring to an existential threat and uttering the words "secure ourselves" – which projected a message to the audience that the security of the people was dependent on the legislation passing (The Independent, 2001):

> God willing there won't be an attack on us over Christmas and New Year, because all those who tell me we are not [under threat] are the ones who do not have the security and intelligence information which for my sins I carry… That information tells us that because of our alliance – quite rightly – with the United States and because of our vulnerability we are at risk. And it is on those grounds we act to secure ourselves.

Even so, following the 2005 London bombings, there was an absence of a forceful, securitizing speech-act by Prime Minister Tony Blair in both his addresses to the public and to the House of Commons (BBC, 2005; The Guardian, 2005). In his address to the public, Blair stated that "We must be clear about how we win this struggle. We should take what security measures we can." (BBC, 2005). However, excluding this small mention of the importance of increased security measures, Blair's statement was void of any attempts at securitization and mentions of the need of exceptional measures. Following Huymans thoughts on the speech act as earlier referenced, the 'act' itself never occurred – that being the decision to utilize the opportunity for a securitizing move. The Prime Minister's address to the House of Commons, although omitting any mention of security directly, resembled more of a securitizing speech act. Blair reiterated the need for a counter-terrorism bill, which was already in the making (Terrorism Act 2006a), and emphasized that if security agencies required additional powers to prevent further attacks it should be granted. The Terrorism Act 2006 was later passed – one of the consequences being that the maximum period of detaining suspects believed to be affiliated with terrorism was changed from 14 to 28 days (Terrorism Act 2006b:23).

> There is then the issue of further anti-terrorist legislation . . . It will give us an opportunity, in close consultation with the police and the agencies, to see whether there are additional powers which they might need to prevent further attacks . . . If, as the fuller picture about these incidents emerges and the

investigation proceeds, it becomes clear that there are powers which the police and the intelligence

agencies need immediately to combat terrorism, it is plainly sensible to reserve the right to return to

Parliament with an accelerated timetable (The Guardian, 2005).

Following the London bombings, U.K has implemented several legislative changes that grants security agencies exceptional measures. Particularly, the Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Act, introduced in 2012, is prominent in this regard: Faced with individuals that the state is unable to prove are affiliated with terrorist activities, the state may still invoke measures for a two-year duration on the individual – which may include electronic tagging, required regular reporting to the police, barred from travelling abroad, and being prohibited from specific locations (Lister, 2015:5-6). As Home Secretary Theresa May stated in a parliamentary debate concerning the TPIMs: "They provide some of the strongest restrictions available in the democratic world and some of the strongest possible protections that our courts will allow. (Parliament Publications, 2014: Column 229). Yet, in contrast to what the paper may have expected, there have been no distinct securitizing speech act moves in the U.K following the terrorist attack of 2005. This supports the arguments made by Huysman and Neal in that the decision-making speech act is reduced in importance regarding securitization, and the explanatory factors should be accredited to processes and practices that increase security – i.e. the diffusion of surveillance technology and interactions between different fields of policy and security agencies. Thus, the paper infers that the increase in security measures undertaken by the U.K following the 2005 London bombings is the result of securitization through processes and practices rather than through speech acts. Yet, this argument can be refuted. The absence of one explanatory factor does not automatically make another right – it isn't necessarily one or the other. Additionally, the research of the paper has its limitations and may have missed attempted or successful securitizing speech acts committed by prominent members of government.

Securitization and Exceptional Measures: France

As with the U.K case, France have had its own share of experiences related to terrorism. During the 1980s and early 1990s, France was considered by some to be a "haven for international terrorists" due to its lacking capacity in combating terrorism, yet the late 90s saw drastic improvements on this front after conducting several successful counterterrorist operations –

amongst them prevention of planned terrorist attacks against the World Cup in 1998 and against the Strasbourg cathedral in 2000 (Shapiro and Suzan, 2003:68-69). One of the main French counterterrorism legislations, Law 86-1020 of September 9, 1986, resulted in the creation of new governmental bodies dedicated to handling terrorist elements – UCLAT and SCLAT – in addition to centralizing all judicial affairs regarding terrorism (Shapiro and Suzan, 2003:76-77). In recent years, France declared a state of emergency following the Paris attacks in 2015 – one which has been prolonged several times and is still in full effect. The state of emergency has allowed for exceptional measures to be undertaken by security agencies: Searches without warrants, house arrests, prohibiting meetings being amongst these (Boutin and Paulussen, 2016:1). Additionally, legislative measures such as a new counterterrorism law was passed, Law 2016-731 of June 3, 2016, further augmenting the powers of security agencies in terms of surveillance, searches and arrests (Boutin and Paulussen, 2016:3).

In stark contrast to the case of the U.K, France have experienced prominent securitizing speech acts moves in the aftermath of the attacks in 2015. In a speech before a joint session of Parliament, President Francis Hollande committed a securitizing move through a speech act by declaring the necessity and urgency for several security responses and measures (France Diplomatie, 2015). Additionally, he repeatedly states that it is necessary for the protection and safety of citizens, thus referencing to the existential threat to the people of France. The securitizing move made by Hollande intended to remove all barriers against emergency politics and his speech implies that a forceful response is prioritized rather than upholding democratic values. The findings of this subsection support the original securitization theory and thus the paper finds it plausible that a major explanatory factor for France's intense security response following the Paris bombings is the speech act by Hollande. The following are noteworthy excerpts from his speech (France Diplomatie, 2015):

> France is at war. . . It is therefore urgent for us to defend ourselves, on a long-term basis. What's at stake is the protection of our fellow citizens and our ability to live together . . . I ordered the immediate reestablishment of border controls and I proclaimed a state of emergency, as recommended by the Prime Minister. It is now effective throughout France, and I expanded the ability to carry out police searches in every department of continental France . . . In accordance with these principles, we will provide the means to once again guarantee the safety of our fellow citizens . . . And since the threat is going to continue and we will be involved in the fight against Daesh for a long time abroad and at home, I also decided to substantially strengthen the resources available to the justice system and the security forces.

15

The scarcity of Norwegian securitizing speech acts

Compared to its two European counterparts, Norway's experience with terrorism pre-2011 has been extremely limited. Minor incidents have taken place, and it was first in 2012 that someone was incarcerated for planning acts of terrorism. While Norway participated in the War on Terror and introduced counterterrorism legislature in the aftermath of 9/11, the changes were more modest than those of other countries (Fimreite, Lango, Lærgreid, Rykkja, 2013:841-843). Despite this, Norway saw an increase in security measures following the Breivik attacks of 2011.[2] However, similarly to the U.K, there was a notable absent of any securitizing speech acts by governmental officials following the attacks. Instead of calling for more security or emphasizing the need to defend against an existential threat, Norwegian state officials followed a pattern of focusing on solidarity and unity - as evident by Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg's speech two days following the attacks where "more democracy" was the primary message. (The Guardian, 2012). Indeed, only miniscule portions of the post-2011 addresses to the public included any mention of security measures. During a national commemoration speech, a month after the attack, Stoltenberg stated that "Our third mission is to create safety. Good readiness/preparedness creates safety. Visible police create safety." (Regjeringen, 2011).[3] At a commemoration speech three years later, the new Prime Minister Erna Solberg proclaimed that "The tragedy showed us that it is necessary to strengthen the readiness/preparedness in Norway. Better intelligence, more police and a stronger readiness/preparedness culture is crucial to prevent and limit our weakness." (Regjeringen, 2014). These two are the only discursive elements post-2011by prominent Norwegian officials that have stated the need for more security measures. However, they do not fulfill the criteria of a securitizing move: They do not reference to an existential threat, invoke the need for exceptional measures nor does neither utter the word "security".

Equivalently, there have been few calls for the introduction of emergency politics and drastic security measures. Yet, some have been made. The Minister of Justice and Public

---

[2] This is covered under the section of «Scope and Limitations»

[3] This speech and subsequent quoted portions in this subsection have been translated from Norwegian to English by the author of this paper and may thus be found unsatisfactory by someone fluent in both languages, yet it will suffice for the purpose of this paper.

Security Grete Faremo stated the following during a Parliamentary debate on March 8, 2012 (Stortinget, 2012:[11:19:22]): "It is crucial for our security that we have a service which is prepared to carry out its societal assignments in a good way. An external and impartial review will give us answer if the situation regarding resources and competence in PST is satisfactory – especially from a preventive perspective, as the Parliament requests." This was one of the few instances where security was uttered as something essential and needed. Additionally, The Official Norwegian Reports, namely the 22. July Commission Report, was void of any definite calls for substantial increases in security measures as well – it namely called for a legislative change that would make receiving terrorist training a punishable offence and that increased effectiveness in coordination between different security agencies was a necessity to prevent similar atrocities happening in the future (NOU, 2012:458-460). The lack of securitization attempts might be explained by Norway's socio-political culture: Norwegians in general have a great deal of trust in the government and in political institutions. Additionally, even post-2011, few Norwegians expressed fear concerning potential future terrorist acts or even perceived it as a threat (Fimreite, Lango, Lægreid, Rykkja, 2013:848-849; Waggoner, 2015:198).

The contributions to securitization theory by Balzacq and McDonald, as previously referenced, illustrates why these factors may have deterred securitization efforts. Balzacq and McDonald emphasized that the cultural, historical and psychological context surrounding the audience of a speech act was crucial in determining the outcome. This paper would argue that securitization efforts through speech acts never occurred in Norway since the context surrounding the audience, that being the people, would severely diminish the success chances of potential acts. Norway's lack of historical experience with terrorism would likely make the population less inclined towards accepting drastic security measures despite the large-scale attack. Additionally, Norwegians trust in government and institutions, which implies transparency and openness, would probably be incompatible with hard-line security measures for the people. Lastly, the psychological factor is arguably the most important. Securitizing moves through speech acts are completely dependent on the audience possessing a fearful mindset – how can state officials convince the audience to accept exceptional measures to combat an existential threat if the audience does not even perceive the threat to begin with? These findings lend support to the main argument of this paper: Norway did not implement security measures equal to those of France and the U.K since securitization attempts either never took place or were

impeded by Norway's socio-political culture. However, similarly to the U.K case, the weakness of this argument is that the paper's research might be limited in terms of scope and thus may have overlooked conflicting data.

Differing Security Responses: Strength of Democratic Institutions and the Rule of Law

The alternative argument proposed in this section is that the different security responses in the U.K, France and Norway can be explained by the strength of the country's democratic institutions and its adherence of the rule of law. Utilizing findings by Perliger, it is assumed that states that have strong democratic institutions and adherence of the rule of law are less likely to use hard-line measures to combat terrorism, and vice versa.

Disparity in adherence of democratic institutions and the rule of law

The empirical discussion of the previous section has informed adequately enough that one can pinpoint France, the U.K and Norway to the traditional models that explain the responding strategies of democracies to terrorism. Unsurprisingly France have adopted the warfare model by its treatment of terrorism as an act of war – as evident by the previously referenced Hollande's speech. France has also adopted the most distinctive repressive measures due to its implementation of the state of exception, infringing on civil liberties in the process, and thus by extension not completely adhering to democratic norms and the rule of law due to its earlier introduced definition which labels "human rights" as a component of the rule of law. Furthermore, the Freedom House Index report of 2017 gave France an aggregate score of 90 in which 100 indicates the maximum level of freedom. While in isolation it impressive and indicates that France almost fully adheres to its democratic institutions, it is still lower than the U. K's and Norway's scores which were 95 and 100 respectively (Freedom House Index, 2017:21-24). Additionally, the state of emergency indicates that France does not have a government that is bound by law. The nature of the state of emergency is that it allows for exceptional measures – measures that bypass entrenched judicial and legal frameworks. The state of emergency is designated for short periods of time only, yet it has been in effect since 2015 and thus gradually some of the exceptional measures implemented might become normalized.

Finally, France can be situated at both extreme ends of Perliger's operational and legislative vectors. If one were to categorize France as a weak democracy – at least weaker than previously - Perliger would find support for her argument that weaker democracies are more likely to use hard-line measures, and vice versa.

The paper would argue that the U.K have adopted the criminal justice model in combating terrorism both prior and post the 2005 London bombings. The objective of the U.K have been to penalize individuals affiliated with terrorism, yet within legal boundaries as illustrated by the quote of There May in the previous section. While the TPIMs and the prolonged detention from Terrorism Act 2006 are examples of security measures that infringe upon the civil liberties of individuals, it is still within the framework of the law and thus can't be considered as exceptional measures. The U. K's aggregated score on the Freedom House Index is higher than France, and its security response is less hard-lined – thus again supporting Perliger's argument. Both Fimreite et. al. (2013:851) and Waggoner (2015:200) both claim that Norway adopted the reconciliatory model following 2011 – albeit Waggoner is less explicit than Fimreite et. al. in her conclusion. However, following the definition of the reconciliatory model previously used, this paper would argue that Norway adopts strategies from both the criminal justice and the reconciliatory model. Indeed, the trial of Breivik have been applauded as "an example of a performance of justice and as a trial that focused on the democratic values of Norwegian society – contrary to Breivik's values." (Graaf, Heide, Wanmaker and Weggemans, 2013:16). While Norway has in the aftermath of the attacks introduced legislation that focuses on penalizing terrorist affiliated individuals, it has been relatively limited similarly to other types of security measures taken. Norway is arguably the best case for Perliger's argument that strong democracies avoid hard-line measures given its Freedom House Index score of a 100 in addition to meeting all the criteria for adherence of the rule of law. These findings lend support to the alternative argument of this paper: Norway securitized less than France and the U.K due to its strong democratic characteristics and adherence of the rule of law. Nevertheless, the argument loses strength due to limitations on its specificity and the lack of supporting evidence to decisively infer that it is the strength of the democratic institutions that limits the severity of security measures implemented. Lastly, similarly to the papers main argument, the strength of Norway's democratic institutions might serve as a correct explanatory factor, yet its significance might be miniscule compared to other factors with greater explanatory power.

Conclusion

This paper has endeavoured to utilize two different theoretical frameworks to determine why Norway's security response following the large-scale terrorist attack of 2011 was relatively modest compared to its European counterparts the U.K and France. The main theoretical framework was that of securitization and the speech act as developed by the Copenhagen School in combination with latter contributions from the Pars School and other scholars. This framework was utilized to test empirical data, mostly state-official addresses, to determine if speech acts could be an important explanatory factor in explaining the differing security responses amongst the three European countries. Surprisingly, the U.K showed little signs of securitization through speech acts even though a substantial amount of security measures were implemented prior to and following the 2005 London bombings, thus granting more support to sociological theory that explains securitization through constant processes and practices. On the other hand, France had explicit speech acts which arguably played a major role in the securitization of France after the Paris attacks of 2015. Lastly, the papers argument is strengthened by the lack of securitization speech act attempts in Norway following the 2011 Breivik attacks – attempts which were likely deterred due to a combination of historical, cultural and psychological factors. In conclusion, the securitization framework succeeds in explaining the stark contrast between Norway and France, but has its limitations when including the U.K in the equation.

The alternative theoretical framework utilized was that of the strength of democratic institutions and the rule of law. The empirical findings of the paper reflect the arguments posed by Perliger on how democracies respond to terrorism – strong democracies avoid the use of hard-line measures and weak democracies are more prone to use repressive methods in combating terrorism. Thus, in conclusion, the alternative argument offered is supported by the empirical findings, yet its limitations make it inferior to the main argument in terms of explanatory power. Finally, one must be wary when deriving policy implications from this paper. Due to its interpretive nature, the paper's findings are not designed to be generalizable. The interpretation of the author and the exclusion of several factors that could have influenced the result makes it ill-advised to blindly project the findings and style of this paper and apply it somewhere else – despite how similar the cases may seem. However, the paper does highlight and further reinforce

theories such as Perliger's and it showcases that while securitization through speech acts may function as decisive contributors in states securitising, it also suggests it's not applicable everywhere.

References

Amnesty International (2016). "Upturned Lives: The disproportionate impact of France's State of Emergency", *Amnesty International Publications,* pp. 1-38.

Balzacq, T. (2005). "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context". *European Journal of International Relations,* 11(2), pp. 171-201.

BBC (2005). "Full Text: Blair speech on terror". [online] Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4689363.stm [Accessed on 01.06.2017]

Belton, R. K. (2005). "Competing definitions of the rule of law: Implications for practitioners", *Rule of Law Series, Carnegie Papers,* Number 55, pp. 1-35.

Bigo, D. (2000). When Two Become One: Internal and External Securitisations in Europe. In: Kelstrup, M. and Williams, M, eds., *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration, Power, Security and Community.* London: Routledge, pp. 171-205.

Boutin, B. and Paulussen, C. (2016). "From the Bataclan to Nice: A Critique of France's State of Emergency Regime." *ASSER Policy Brief*, No. 2016-01, pp. 1-5.

Buzan, B. (1991). *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Studies in the Post-Cold War Era, 2nd edition,* Boulder: CO

C.A.S.E. Collective (2006). "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto". *Security Dialogue,* vol. 37(4), pp. 443-487.

Cavelty, M. D. and Mauer, V. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies.* Abingdon, UK, and New York: Routledge.

Chalk, P. (1998). "The Response to Terrorism as a Threat to Liberal Democracy". *Australian Journal of Politics and History,* Vol. 44(3), pp. 373-388.

Crelinsten, R. D. and Schmid, A. P. (1993). "Western Responses to Terrorism: A Twenty-five Year Balance Sheet". *Terrorism and Political Violence,* Vol. 4(4), pp. 307-340.

Fimreite, A., Lango, P., Lægreid, P., Rykkja, L. (2013). "After Oslo and Utøya: A Shift in the Balance Between Security and Liberty in Norway? *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism,* 36:10, pp. 839-856.

France Diplomatie (2015). "Speech by the President of the Republic before a joint session of Parliament (Versailles, November 16, 2015)." [online] Available at http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/defence-security/parisattacks-

paris-terror-attacks-november-2015/article/speech-by-the-president-of-the-republic-before-a-joint-session-of-parliament [Accessed on 04.06.2017]

Freedom House Index (2017). "Freedom in the World 2017". pp. 1-24.

Graaf, B., Heide, L., Wanmaker, S., Weggemans, D. (2013). "The Anders Behring Breivik Trial: Performing Justice, Defending Democracy." *ICCT Research Paper,* pp. 1-20.

Heller, R., Kahl, M., Pisoui, D. (2012). "The 'dark' side of normative argumentation – The case of counterterrorism policy". *Global Constitutionalism,* 1:2, pp. 278-312.

Huysmans, J. (2011). "What's in an act? On security speech acts and little security nothings". *Security Dialogue,* vol. 42(4-5), pp. 371-384.

Kolås, Å. (2017). "How critical is the event? Multicultural Norway after 22 July 2011", *Social Identities,* pp. 1-15.

Lister, C. (2015). Returning Foreign Fighters: Criminalization or Reintegration? *Policy Briefing, Foreign Policy at Brookings,* pp. 1-14.

Matthew, R. and Shambaugh, G. (2005). "The Pendulum Effect: Explaining Shifts in the Democratic Response to Terrorism". *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy,* Vol. 5(1), pp. 223-233.

McDonald, M. (2008). "Securitization and the Construction of Security." *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(4), pp. 563-587.

Neal, A. (2009). "Securitization and risk at the EU border: the origins of FRONTEX". *Journal of common market studies,* 47(2), pp. 333-356.

Neal, A. (2012). "Normalization and Legislative Exceptionalism: Counterterrorist Lawmaking and the Changing Times of Security Emergencies". *International Political Sociology,* Vol. 6, pp. 260-276.

NOU (2012). "Rapport fra 22. Juli-kommisjonen". *Norges offentlige utredninger.* [online] Available at https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/bb3dc76229c64735b4f6eb4dbfcdbfe8/no/pdfs/nou201220120014000dddpdfs.pdf [Accessed on 03.06.2017]

Parliament Publications (2014). "Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures debate". Available at https://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmhansrd/cm140121/debtext/140121-0003.htm

Pedahzur, A., and Ranstorp, M. (2001). "A Tertiary Model for Countering Terrorism in Liberal Democracies: The Case of Israel", *Terrorism and Political Violence 13,* no. 2, pp. 1-26.

Peoples, C. and Vaughan-Williams, N. (2010). *Critical security studies: an introduction.* London; New York: Routledge.

Perliger, A. (2012). "How Democracies Respond to Terrorism: Regime Characteristics, Symbolic Power and Counterterrorism", *Security Studies,* 21:3, pp. 490-528.

Regjeringen (2011). "Tale ved nasjonal minnemarkering for 22.7.2011". [online] Available at https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/statsministerens-tale-ved-nasjonal-minne/id652655/?regj_oss=1 [Accessed on 03.06.2017]

Regjeringen (2014). "Tale ved markering av treårsdagen for 22. juli". [online] Available at https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/Tale-pa-minnemarkering-for-trearsdagen-til-22-juli/id765389/ [Accessed on 03.06.2017]

Regjeringen (2017). "Oppfølgning etter 22. Juli: De viktigste tiltakene." [online] Available at https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/samfunnssikkerhet-og-beredskap/innsikt/oppfolging-etter-22-juli/id2508054/ [Accessed on 11.03.2017]

RFI (2016). "France to extend state of emergency until presidential election". [online] Available at http://en.rfi.fr/france/20161116-france-extend-state-emergency-until-presidential-election [Accessed on 11.03.2017]

Ruiz, J. R. (2009). "Sociological Discourse Analysis: Methods and Logic", *Qualitative Social Research,* Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 1-21.

Sederberg, P.C. (1995). "Conciliation as Counter-Terrorist Strategy". *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 32(3), pp. 295-312.

Shapiro, J. and Suzan, B. (2003). "The French Experience of Counter-terrorism". *Survival,* Vol. 45(1), pp. 67-98.

Stortinget (2012). "Stortinget – Møte torsdag den 8. mars 2012 kl. 10." [online] Available at https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Publikasjoner/Referater/Stortinget/2011-2012/120308/1/ [Accessed on 02.06.2017]

Stortinget (2013). "Endringer i straffeloven 1902 og straffeloven 2005 mv. (forberedelse av terror m.m.). [online] Available at https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Saker/Sak/?p=57325 [Accessed on 11.03.2017]

Terrorism Act 2006 (2006a). Available at http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/11/pdfs/ukpga_20060011_en.pdf

Terrorism Act 2006 (2006b). "Terrorism Act 2006: Explanatory Notes". Available at http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/11/pdfs/ukpgaen_20060011_en.pdf

The Guardian (2005). «Full text: Tony Blair's statement to MPs". [online] Available at https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2005/jul/11/uksecurity.terrorism [Accessed on 01.06.2017

The Guardian (2012). "'Answer hatred with love': how Norway tried to cope with the horror of Anders Breivik". [online] Available at https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/apr/15/anders-breivik-norway-copes-horror [Accessed on 11.03.2017]

The Independent (2001). «Blunkett warns of attack at Christmas". [online] Available at http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/blunkett-warns-of-attack-at-christmas-9162966.html [Accessed on 01.06.2017]

Tsoukala, A. (2006). "Democracy in the Light of Security: British and French Political Discourses on Domestic Counter-Terrorism Policies". *Political Studies,* Vol. 54, pp. 607-627.

Ullmann, Richard H. (1983). Redefining Security. *International Security,* Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 129-153

Waggoner, K. G. (2015). "What can government talk tell us about punitiveness? The case of Norway post 22 July 2011", *Criminology & Criminal Justice,* Vol. 15(2)*,* pp. 186-204.

Wilkinson, Paul. (1986). *Terrorism and the Liberal State.* Houndsmill: Macmillan.

Wæver, Ole (1995). Securitization and Desecuritization. In: *On Security.* Edited by Ronnie Lipschutz. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 46-86.