Global Counterterrorism Forum: The Politics of Counterterrorism & Compliance

Master thesis

Demi van Klink

S1219545

First reader: Dr. Francesco Ragazzi

Second reader: Prof.dr. Petr Kopecky

June 6, 2017

No of words: 9997

Global Counterterrorism Forum

The Politics of Counterterrorism and Compliance

In 2011, the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF) was launched, aimed at providing an informal, a-political, multilateral counterterrorism platform to address 21st century terrorism. This forum was initiated by the United States. However, some of its members, including Russia and Qatar, have a disputable reputation with regard to counterterrorism and interests that are in contrast to those of the United States. This research helps understanding why states comply with the GCTF, despite having opposing interests. Furthermore, it provides important insights in the relatively new and underresearched topic of the GCTF. By conducting document analysis and interviews, this thesis examines the influence of several factors, such as international reputation, exclusion costs and close allies, on states' compliance with the GCTF.

***Keywords**: international organizations; compliance; counterterrorism; international reputation; exclusion costs; close allies; GCTF; Russia; Qatar*

1. Introduction

'The Global Counterterrorism Forum will only become more important in the years ahead.' These words were spoken by the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs during a meeting of the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF), of which the Netherlands is currently co-chair with Morocco (Dutch Government, 2015). Initiated by the Americans in 2011, the GCTF is an informal, multilateral counterterrorism platform, designed to address the global threat of terrorism in a coordinated way with a focus on capacity building and good practices. Moreover, it aspires to promote a strategic, long-term approach to violent extremist ideologies (GCTF, 2017). According to a principal architect of the GCTF, 'by the end of the decade following 9/11, it has become clear that the existing multilateral system to fight terrorism was not working; a dedicated, built-for-purpose global counterterrorism body was needed to fill the existing gap within international counterterrorism efforts' (Rosand, 2016). Moreover, it is designed to expand counterterrorism cooperation beyond the usual Western, industrialized countries and beyond the military and intelligence communities. For that reason, the GCTF comprises 29 members from all continents, including the Permanent Five of the UN Security Council – US, UK, France, China and Russia - as well as several key Muslim majority countries, such as Saudi Arabia and Qatar. Furthermore, the GCTF works extensively with non-GCTF members, ranging from Interpol to the African Union. Over the past couple of years, the GCTF has produced a large number of documents, good practices, recommendations and action plans, addressing a variety of counterterrorism topics, from foreign fighters to capacity building in the Horn of Africa (GCTF, 2017). Working groups are co-chaired by both Western and Muslim-majority countries, to stimulate mutual understanding. Hence, in the fight against Islamic State (IS) in Syria and Iraq, a platform such as the GCTF seems more relevant and promising than ever.

However, when taking a closer look at the founding members of the GCTF, it is puzzling to notice that its members include states with heavily opposing interests. First, while Western states such as the US aspire to fight extremist organizations as IS, it was revealed that GCTF-members Qatar and Saudi Arabia have provided IS with financial and logistic support (Wikileaks, 2014). Second, whereas the US and its allies fight the regime of Al-Assad in Syria, members Russia and Algeria publicly support this regime.

These puzzling remarks raise the question of why would states comply with the GCTF norms in terms of counterterrorism, while they are simultaneously actively undermining them? Can the GCTF be effective with regard to the diffusion of norms in global

counterterrorism? How can International Organization theories account for the existence and impact of this informal, unidentified institutional body?

Informal international organizations are increasingly becoming important in world politics (Vabulas & Snidal, 2013, p.194). Although this informal, multilateral organization has many members and has produced a variety of reports on best practices with regard to counterterrorism, very little is known about the influence of the GCTF in global politics. Additionally, while much research has been done to explain international cooperation in economic, environmental and human rights domains, little attention has been paid to multilateral efforts in the field of counterterrorism policies. This thesis aspires to examine whether theories that attempt to explain economic international cooperation can also account for cooperation in the domain of counterterrorism through the GCTF. It combines a variety of international variables, concerning elements such as international reputation, exclusion costs and close allies, to explain compliance by Russia and Qatar, states that directly undermine the GCTF-norms. In what follows, an overview of the existing literature on states' compliance with international regimes is provided. Subsequently, the theoretical framework and hypotheses are presented. The next section addresses the operationalization and methodology. Finally, the empirics are presented, followed by a conclusion. It is argued that, whereas the variable of close allies cannot convincingly explain the compliance behavior of states, the variables of international reputation and exclusion costs are a present factor in states' decision to comply with norms.

2. Literature review

For a long time, scholars of international relations have focused on explaining why international regimes emerge and why states decide to create or comply with them. In the field of international relations, international regimes are defined as a 'set of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge' (Krasner, 1982, p.185). Several schools of thought offer divergent explanations for the establishment of and compliance with international regimes. Some scholars claim that institutions do not make a difference. For example, the realist school argues that international regimes and institutions are of little interest, as states remain the principle actors. Compliance with international regimes or institutions is thus a reflection of power distribution and states' interests. International organizations are designed by great powers and reflect the national interests of these great powers (Mearsheimer, 1995).

According to Mearsheimer, institutions only have a limited impact (1995, p.49). As they have no autonomy and are used as a tool by powerful states, international organizations do not play a role in world politics. However, this raises the question of why states, both weak and powerful, would then accept institutions at all. Realists, emphasizing a misplaced reliance on international regimes, do not consider the utility of international institutions.

By contrast, neoliberal institutionalism claims that institutions do matter, even though states are aware that institutions restrict their freedom of action. Nevertheless, they suggest that states can mutually benefit from cooperation, as they assume that gains from cooperation are 'absolute'. Institutions can provide certain advantages that help states overcome problems of collaboration and coordination (Keohane, 1982). To explain why states establish international organizations, Keohane focuses on the demand side. Liberal institutionalism perceives cheating as the main obstacle of international cooperation. According to Keohane institutions are able to solve this problem, because they reduce transaction costs and improve the quality of information provided to states (1982, p.339). Additionally, institutions facilitate side-payments among states, as they provide a platform, which brings negotiators together on a variety of issues (Keohane, 1982, p.340). Moreover, institutions can facilitate the operation of reciprocity (Keohane and Martin, 1995, p.42). Nonetheless, this fails to explain why weaker states choose to cooperate in organizations that leave them worse off, as Barnett and Finnemore (1999, p.701) mention that international organizations often produce undesirable outcomes.

Whereas the scholars discussed above merely focus on international factors to explain the emergence of institutions, other scholars argue that domestic factors have to be taken into account as well. Drawing on liberal intergovernmentalism, Moravcsik argues that state behavior can be explained as a reflection of the rational actions of governments, which are constrained by domestic societal pressure and the strategic environment abroad (1993, p.474). Hence, international outcomes are the product of interactions between domestic groups and interstate negotiations. Dai (2005) also emphasizes the importance of domestic actors to explain international regimes. According to her, international agreements generate distributional consequences (Dai, 2005, p.363). These distributional consequences imply that some domestic actors within a state are able to gain from a government's decision to comply with an international agreement, whereas others will lose (Dai, 2005, p.364). As government officials desire to stay in office, they have to gain political support and respond to the preferences of different societal groups (Dai, 2005, p.365). Hence, the decision to comply with international regimes derives from domestic interest groups.

In addition to the rationalist arguments of the scholars previously addressed, Abbott and Snidal (1998, p.6) claim that states accept institutions as it allows them to pursue their goals through the creation of collective goods and by solving coordination problems. Nevertheless, they recognize the constructivist approach that institutions are participants in social processes (Abbott and Snidal, 1998, p.8). The constructivist argument entails that states share principles about appropriate responses to a problem. Therefore, constructivists argue that international organizations are norm diffusers in the international system, teaching states their interests (Finnemore, 1996; Park, 2005). Consequently, institutions do not only matter because they reduce transaction costs or provide information: they contribute to ideas, norms and expectations as well (Abbott and Snidal, 1998, p.8). States accept, create and comply with institutions because it allows them to act as a community (Abbott and Snidal, 1998, p.24). Moreover, institutions help developing a community of norms and practices that define states; a function that Moravcsik and Keohane do not take into consideration. Constructivists thus focus on the role of international organizations in diffusing norms in the international system (Abbot and Snidal, 1998; Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998).

These theories have frequently been used to explain international cooperation in economic, environmental and human rights domains, but efforts to explain multilateral cooperation in the field of counterterrorism, such as the GCTF, are relatively new. Taking the existing literature on compliance with international regimes into account, classical realism fails to provide the conceptual tools to analyze compliance by both powerful and weak states, since they argue that institutions do not matter in world politics and are merely the reflection of powerful states' interests. By contrast, the school of neoliberal institutionalism claims that institutions do matter, because they produce beneficial outcomes for states. Nevertheless, they seem to disregard that institutions sometimes produce undesirable outcomes, leaving states worse-off. Hence, a combination of international variables is used to sufficiently explain counterterrorism cooperation and the phenomenon of the GCTF.

3. Theoretical framework

This thesis adopts a rationalist approach, focusing on a combination of international variables to explain states' compliance to GCTF-norms. Elements such as international reputation, exclusion costs and close allies are examined.

3.1 Hypotheses

International reputation

Several scholars link the membership of states to an international organization to states' efforts to enhance their reputation. Simmons (2000) argues that states make decisions that strengthen their markets: because they worry about their markets, they are concerned about their reputation. A state wants to obtain a respectable reputation for compliance among states, because it expects that its market will profit from it (Simmons, 2000). Hence, a state will comply with an institution, when it receives reputational benefits. Noncompliance is costly, because it damages a state's reputation. In addition, drawing on the credible commitment theory, Simmons and Danner (2010) claim that actors have difficulty reaching cooperative solutions in their mutual relationships, because they are not able to commit themselves credibly in advance to act in agreed ways. Hence, states run into the problem of cynical commitments: promises made by actors with no intention of living up to them (Simmons and Danner, 2010, p.232). Joining an institution is thus a form of self-binding commitment, as states attempt to persuade other actors that the government has committed itself to new standards of behavior. Finnemore and Sikkink agree, claiming that states that are insecure about their international status are expected to embrace international norms more thoroughly (1998, p.906). This results in the following hypothesis:

H1: States are more likely to comply with GCTF-norms if these norms reinforce their international reputation

Exclusion costs

Medina de Souza (2015) argues that states sometimes comply with international regimes, even though they do not provide benefits at all: instead, they obtain absolute losses. He stresses what he describes as the 'hidden dimension of institutional power' (Medina de Souza, 2015, p.158). Powerful actors reach an agreement first, because they have the ability to do it by themselves, which enables them to remove the option of the status quo from the set of choices of weaker states (Medina de Souza, 2015, p.160). Weaker states, to which a manipulated choice set is presented, can only choose from options that leave them worse-off. Weaker states can either decide to accept institutions or they can choose to be excluded (Medina de Souza, 2015, p.161). Hence, weaker states will accept international institutions because powerful states forced a choice between compliance and exclusion, while what they actually prefer is the status quo (Medina de Souza, 2015, p.157). In addition, Stone (2013,

p.125) claims that powerful countries have an advantage over weaker states in exerting informal power, as they have superior information, immediate access to personnel and greater cooperation with their requests. Moreover, powerful states can depend on deference from other states, which often prefer to avoid conflicts when their own key interests are not involved (Stone, 2013, p.125). The next hypothesis can be derived from these insights:

H2: Weaker states are more likely to comply with GCTF-norms, even if these norms are opposed to their own interests, when the costs of exclusion are higher than those of compliance

Close allies

Moreover, scholars stress the importance of geostrategic considerations to explain states' compliance. It is argued that geographic proximity plays an important role in motives to accept international institutions or comply with them, as globalization creates economic and political interdependence. Schimmelfennig (2006, p.51) claims that geography matters, because international interdependence increases with geographical proximity. Hence, member states are most interested in the policy interests of countries with whom they share a border or are in close proximity. Simmons also adds a geographical component to compliance, arguing that states comply with international norms if other states in their region comply as well (2000, p.819). Thus, reputation is clustered around regional principles of behavior (Simmons, 2000, p.820). Next to the geographical factor, Coggins (2011) argues that friendship matters, as states coordinate their behavior with states with which they have a friendly or special relationship. Therefore, by focusing on a combination of the strength of relationships between close and proximate allies and their compliance behavior, the following hypothesis is presented:

H3: States are more likely to comply with GCTF-norms, when their close allies also comply with these norms

In the section that follows, the presented hypotheses and subsequent variables are operationalized in order to explain how these hypotheses are measured.

4. Operationalization

Dependent variable

The primary dependent variable in this study is the decision to *comply* with norms produced by the GCTF. This concerns the active, serious commitment of states to the memoranda and good practices produced by the GCTF and the reflection of these norms in their national policies. Hence, the compliance of states with GCTF-norms is demonstrated in their national policies and legislation.

Independent variables

International reputation, exclusion costs and close allies are the independent variables, which are derived from the hypotheses as presented in the theoretical framework. The following section addresses the operationalization of these independent variables.

The first hypothesis focuses on *international reputation*. Downs and Jones (2002, p.96) argue that reputation concerns the degree to which a state is considered to be an honorable member of the international community and to which a state reliably upholds its international commitments. This refers to the extent to which a state receives reputational benefits. Evidence for this variable can be found in public statements by other states in the international community with regard to a certain state's reputation and credibility, and in interviews with experts who attended GCTF-meetings. If powerful states publicly express their gratitude for states' compliance, the hypothesis of international reputation can be confirmed.

With regard to the second hypothesis of *exclusion costs*, it is important to define what is meant by 'weak states'. This paper draws on the explanation provided by Simmons and Danner (2010, p.253), who refer to weak states as governments with characteristics such as weak accountability, weak democratic functions and a weak reputation for respecting the rule of law. The variable of exclusion costs is revealed by statements of powerful states such as the US with regard to international pressure to comply with GCTF-norms. Moreover, the costs of exclusion can be retrieved from interviews with experts that have participated in the process. This hypothesis can be confirmed if interviewees or documents refer to underlying, international pressure on weak states to comply.

The third hypothesis is related to the role of *close allies*. According to Schimmelfennig (2001, p.49), national preferences largely mirror the geographic position of member states and their close allies. For that reason, this paper examines the relationship of

the analyzed states with neighboring and friendly countries. According to Digeser, 'friendship' between states entails open communication, a willingness to share information and a sense of mutual trust (2009, p.338). Additionally, friendships between states are characterized by a common legal, religious or cultural heritage and understanding of the institutions they pursue (Digeser, 2009, p.339). The expectation is that a state acts in accordance with their close ally and will therefore score the same on the variable of compliance with GCTF-norms. Confirmation of this hypothesis entails focusing on the explicitly mentioned role of close allies in governmental public statements or news reports.

5. Methodology

Case selection

This research focuses on the GCTF, analyzing why members comply with GCTF-norms in terms of counterterrorism, while simultaneously actively undermining them. Therefore, the object of study is a selection of members that undermine the GCTF, concerning Russia and Qatar. First, Russia undermines the GCTF by supporting the regime of Al Assad in Syria, which has been accused of using chemical weapons against its citizens (New York Times, 2017). By contrast, other GCTF-members, including the US, strongly oppose this regime. After the chemical attack in Syria, UK Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson even publicly branded Bashar al-Assad as a terrorist (Telegraph, 2017). Second, Qatar directly and indirectly finances IS in Syria, whilst other GCTF-members fight IS (Wikileaks, 2014).

Data analysis & generation

As a method of analysis, this paper relies on process-tracing to track the process of compliance by members of the GCTF. The method of process-tracing allows to identify the intervening causal processes between an independent variable and the outcome of the dependent variable (George and Bennett, 2005, p.206).

This paper is a qualitative case study, based on a combination of documentary collection methods and semi-structured interviews. The evidence for this research is drawn from primary as well as secondary sources. Primary sources such as GCTF recommendation and policy reports, governmental reports and documents, speeches, press releases and public statements are used to discover the underlying motivation for acceptance of and compliance with the norms of the GCTF. Secondary sources include national newspapers, academic articles and policy reports. Secondary sources facilitate finding underlying arguments that are

not always explicitly stated by governmental actors. Moreover, to enrich the data collected through documents, semi-structured interviews are conducted with experts, embassy employees and representatives of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Dutch National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism (NCTV) and the International Center for Counterterrorism (ICCT) that were involved with GCTF-meetings. Interviews can help uncover latent motivations for states to comply.

6. Empirical section

6.1 Compliance

The primary dependent variable in this research concerns whether or not states comply with agreements and norms produced by the GCTF. This involves the active, serious commitment of states to the memoranda and good practices produced by the GCTF and the reflection of these norms in their national policies. To establish the extent to which Russia and Qatar comply with GCTF-norms, this research draws on the conclusions of the 2015 US Country Report on Terrorism, which evaluates states' policies to combat terrorism. The results of Russia and Qatar's compliance with GCTF-norms are reflected in table 1.

Table 1: Compliance with GCTF by Russia and Qatar (US Department of State, 2015)

GCTF	Russia (5 out of 7)	Qatar (6 out of 7)
Prohibition on providing information and weapons to terrorists and terrorist organizations	X	X
Criminalization of collaboration with organizations that commit a terrorist crime	X	X
Criminalization of terrorism-linked cyber offenses	X	X
Consistency of counterterrorism measures with international law	-	X
Countering the financing of terrorism	X	-
Adoption of legislation to counter violent extremism	X	X
Financial support to GCTF-inspired institutions	-	X

X = compliance
- = noncompliance

As table 1.1 demonstrates, Russia and Qatar are mostly compliant with the GCTF memoranda, but not fully. Russia uses its terrorism legislation to prosecute political opposition, thus not acting fully in accordance with international law (US Department of State, 2015). Moreover, in Qatar, individuals continue to serve as a source of financial support

for terrorists (US Department of State, 2015). Taking this into account, they have an overall-score of compliance with the GCTF.

Nevertheless, outside of the GCTF, both states actively undermine these norms as Russia supports Al-Assad's regime in Syria, whereas Qatar financially supported terrorist organizations. The remainder of the empirical section addresses the variables of international reputation, exclusion costs and close allies to explain why, despite having opposing interests, Russia and Qatar still comply with the GCTF.

6.2 International reputation

Internationally, both Russia and Qatar have dubious reputations regarding counterterrorism. A state wants to obtain a respectable reputation for compliance among states (Simmons, 2000). Becoming a GCTF-member could offer those reputational benefits: GCTF-meetings give states the opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to counterterrorism. Although the GCTF presents itself as an informal, a-political platform for experts to discuss terrorism-related issues, in reality, meetings do not always have an a-political character. According to interviewee 1, a Dutch expert who attended GCTF-meetings in Morocco in 2015, 'very few people from the field participated in these meetings; they were mostly representatives of ministries. The meetings functioned as an opportunity to make political statements, or express gratitude to certain countries' (Annex A). Consequently, GCTF-meetings present a chance for states to address the problem of cynical commitments, as it enables members to demonstrate their commitment to counterterrorism and present themselves as a respectable member of the international community. Hence, members can use the forum as a tool to add credibility to the commitments they make, simply by participating. Noncompliance is costly, because it damages a state's reputation (Simmons, 2000, p.820). This section first addresses Qatar and Russia's commitment to reliably uphold their commitments, before analyzing the extent to which they received reputational benefits through statements other GCTF-members.

6.2.1 Russia

Commitment

As a major global player, Russia presents itself as a leading nation, 'at the forefront of the fight against terrorism', according to interviewee 2, the First Secretary of Political Affairs at the Russian Embassy in The Hague (Annex B). Putin's 2015 annual state of the nation address underlined Russia's leadership in the fight against terrorism (Sputnik News, 2015). Putin's eagerness to take the lead in counterterrorism has been part of a broader strategy, as

Russia seeks to re-legitimize itself through counterterrorism. Putin has exclusively been framing Russia's war in Chechnya as a terrorist threat, resulting in severe international criticism (Notte, 2016, p.60). Hence, when the US proclaimed the War on Terror against transnational Islamist terrorism after the events of 9/11, Putin seized the opportunity to change international perceptions of Russia's conflict in Chechnya (Notte, 2016, p.60). Claiming that the terrorist threat from Chechnya was similar in nature to the universal terrorist threat of Al-Qaeda, Putin attempted to legitimize Russia's war in Chechnya. This strategy entails that Russia's support for the War on Terror would be regarded as fully consistent with Putin's attempts to contain the rise of Islamist extremism and its spillover into Chechnya, thus legitimizing Russia's actions (Notte, 2016, p.60). GCTF-membership fits well into this strategy of legitimation through counterterrorism, explained interviewee 3, an employee at the NCTV of the Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice. 'GCTF-membership gives Russia the chance to present the topic of foreign fighters in a broader context, demonstrating that each state has problems with that phenomenon, not just the Russians' (Annex C).

Nevertheless, when comparing Russia's participation in the GCTF to that of other members, its leading role remains fairly limited: it is not actively engaged with GCTF-inspired institutions, such as Hedayah, the International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law (IIJ) and the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF). Many other GCTF-members are actively involved with these institutions as board members or through sponsorship. Furthermore, within the GCTF itself, Russia is not a working group leader or co-chair, nor does it seek to become one in the future (Interviewee 2, Annex B).

Although Russia is not actively searching for a leading role within the GCTF, it still upholds the frame of a nation dedicated to counterterrorism. President Putin expressed his intentions to 'engage in active, joint work in the GCTF' in accordance with the principles of international law (Obama White House, 2013). Another statement was made jointly with the EU in 2014, declaring Russia's commitment to intensify its cooperation with the EU in the UN framework and other multilateral forums, the GCTF in particular (Kremlin, 2014).

In short, these statements reveal Russia's aspirations to tackle the problem of credible commitments and re-legitimize its counterterrorism policies, by expressing its dedication to international counterterrorism efforts through the GCTF. The following section analyzes whether this commitment is recognized by other states and translated into reputational benefits.

Reputational benefits

According to Simmons (2000), a state wants to obtain a respectable reputation for compliance, because it expects that it will profit from it. It is evident that Russia's GCTF-membership has contributed to Russia's reputation. Despite the annexation of Crimea in 2014, a US report claimed that Russia nevertheless expressed a willingness to cooperate on counterterrorism issues, praising its participation in the GCTF (US Department of State, 2015). Interviewee 3 acknowledged that Russia's membership generates a certain credibility with regard to international cooperation on counterterrorism issues: 'At least you will not be accused of a lack of willingness to participate' (Annex C).

The reputational benefits that Russia received, translated into material benefits as well. In an interview with The Wall Street Journal, US President Trump suggested that counterterrorism cooperation is reason enough to lift the sanctions imposed on Russia by the Obama Administration (The Wall Street Journal, 2017). According to Trump, 'if Russia is helping us and committed, why would anybody have sanctions on somebody doing some really great things?' (The Wall Street Journal, 2017). Although the US-Russian relationship was negatively affected by the US bombing of Syrian military bases following a poison attack, these sanctions were not re-imposed. Even though Trump stated that US-Russian relations were at an 'all time low' after the bombings, he quickly tweeted that 'things will work out fine between the US and Russia' (Reuters, 2017). 'Trumps bromance with Putin is back on track,' according to Adrienne Watson, deputy communications director at the Democratic National Committee, who argued that Trump has opted for a strategy of appeasement with regard to Russia (The Washington Post, 2017).

In sum, Russia's compliance with the GCTF generated credibility, thus enhancing its reputation. Moreover, the US has publicly and explicitly recognized Russia's counterterrorism efforts. Taking these considerations into account, the first hypothesis can be confirmed for Russia, as it is likely that GCTF-membership contributed to Russia's international reputation.

6.2.2 Qatar

Commitment

For the Qatari government, directing the focus of attention away from the allegations of financing terrorism has become a priority, in order to improve Qatar's international reputation. In the past years, Qatari officials have repeatedly denied any government involvement with the financial support of terrorist organizations. For instance, during a visit to Germany in 2014, the Qatari emir assured Chancellor Merkel that his country does not

provide financial aid to violent extremists: 'Qatar has never supported and will never support terrorist organizations' (Blanchard, 2014, p.7). Another example of public denial is the open letter written by the ambassador of Qatar to Canada, in which he highlights the measures Qatar has taken against terrorism. 'These are not the policies and initiatives of a 'state-sponsor of terrorism' […] These are the actions of a nation firmly committed to ending the terrorist threat around the world' (The Star, 2017).

In order to present a counter frame to the accusations of terrorist financing, Qatar is promoting itself as a country dedicated to counterterrorism. During a UN meeting, the Permanent Representative of Qatar considered counterterrorism a state priority (UN CTITF, 2017). Additionally, Qatar's emir emphasized his support for counterterrorism efforts, 'within the framework of international legitimacy', in a UN meeting (General Assembly of the United Nations, 2016). GCTF-membership has provided Qatar with the opportunity to prove its new commitment. It has expressed its dedication to the forum not only by becoming a member, but also by providing significant financial support, as Qatar pledged 5 million dollar to finance the GCTF fund (GCTF, 2013). Interviewee 4, an employee at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs responsible for GCTF meetings, confirmed that Qatar has repeatedly made considerable donations to the GCTF (Annex D).

Nevertheless, Qatar's commitment remains restricted compared to many other members, because it is currently not a working group leader or a co-chair. However, this is due to capacity problems, not a lack of will, explained interviewee 5, the Secretary of Political and Security Affairs at the Dutch embassy in Qatar (Annex E). Qatar has a small ministry and a limited staff, which makes it difficult to become a working group leader or co-chair. Instead, Qatar hosted a GCTF-meeting in 2014. 'Hosting a meeting is relatively easy for Qatar, because that only requires money and a conference room,' as explained by interviewee 5 (Annex E). Hosting a GCTF-meeting gives Qatar the opportunity to attract international attention to its counterterrorism efforts.

Reputational benefits

Consequently, Qatar has been repeatedly demonstrating its commitment to GCTF-norms to enhance its international reputation. Projecting a positive image abroad has even become a national priority: its aspirations to positively influence its image internationally is reflected in the government's key strategic documents: the Qatar National Development Strategy 2011-2016. It describes Qatar's ambitions to improve the country's image (General Secretariat for Development Planning, 2011, p.210). This is of great importance, because despite the fact that

several other Gulf states have been accused of terrorist financing, much of the brunt of public criticism has been taken by Qatar (Dorsey, 2015, p.426). German Development Minister Mueller even claimed that Qatar was the 'keyword' when it comes to terrorist financing (Reuters, 2014).

However, it is likely that Qatar's counterterrorism efforts resulted in reputational benefits. In March 2014, the US Treasury Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence described Qatar as a 'permissive' terrorist financing jurisdiction', but stressed that Qatar in other respects has been a constructive partner in counterterrorism (Blanchard, 2014, p.7). Later that year, the improvement in credibility and appreciation of Qatar's counterterrorism efforts became visible as US Ambassador to Qatar, Shell Smith, argued that Qatar's efforts take on 'increased importance', as violent extremists are expanding their operations in Syria (US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 2014). Shell Smith continued saying that the US government was grateful and confident that the Qatari's have 'the will to deliver on the commitments made' (US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 2014). The US thus perceived Qatar as a credible actor, dedicated to new standards of behavior. Another example can be retrieved from the 2015 US Country Report on Terrorism, declaring that 'the US and Qatar have a strong partnership in the fight against terrorism' (US Department of State, 2015).

Finally, Germany publicly apologized to Qatar for Minister Muellers public allegations of terrorist financing. Chancellor Merkel stated that the emir of Qatar had reassured her that combatting IS 'is much the task of Qatar as it is of other countries', adding that she had no reason not to believe him (Reuters, 2014).

In sum, Qatar's compliance with counterterrorism norms are increasingly recognized and appreciated in public statements. Interviewee 1 stressed: 'The very fact that Qatar is a member of the GCTF gives the country a certain international reputation, you cannot deny that' (Annex A). Interviewee 4 even confirmed that within the GCTF, Qatar obtained the reputation of donating generously (Annex D). Considering that powerful states, including the US and Germany, have explicitly expressed their gratitude for Qatar's compliance with the GCTF, the first hypothesis can be confirmed: it is likely that international reputation is a present factor in Qatar's compliance.

6.3 Exclusion costs

This section examines whether Russia and Qatar are more likely to comply with the GCTF, even if these norms are opposed to their own interests, when the costs of exclusions are higher than those of compliance. Both Russia and Qatar can be defined as a 'weak state', according to the definition of Simmons and Danner (2010, p.253), as their governments share characteristics of weak accountability, weak democratic functions and a weak reputation for respecting the rule of law. Because they are weaker states, they do not have enough power or leverage to set up an institution such as the GCTF, contrary to the US, which is a powerful state. Although the GCTF seems to be a costless organization with non-binding memoranda and no political costs, weaker states are nevertheless disadvantaged if they participate. Stone (2013, p.125) argues that powerful states have an advantage over weaker states in exerting informal power, because they possess superior information, immediate access to personnel and greater cooperation with their requests. Additionally, powerful states can rely on deference from other states, which often prefer to avoid conflicts when their own key interests are not involved (Stone, 2013, p.125). Hence, participation in an informal organization can impose political costs, despite its non-binding character. This paragraph explores whether Russia and Qatar prefer a status quo, a situation in which the GCTF does not exist, before addressing the exclusion costs, arguing that both states would be worse-off if they were excluded from the forum, due to international pressure.

6.3.1 Russia

Preference of status quo

Even today, the American influence on the GCTF is obvious, according to interviewee 1, who described the forum as an 'American party'. He claimed that the forum is merely a center for American lobbyists (Annex A). For that reason, interviewee 1 assumed that Russia has no interest in becoming actively involved within the GCTF (Annex A). This aversion against US domination within the forum is subtly reflected in a statement of the Russian Representative at the Ministerial meeting, advocating that members should not feel 'antagonized' when they interact with the 'so-called coalition against IS they are not part of' (GCTF, 2016). This refers to the US-led coalition, of which Russia is not a member.

Instead of an American-dominated forum to address counterterrorism issues, Russia prefers a wide anti-terrorist coalition, advocating that it should be conducted under leadership of the UN instead of the US, 'to avoid politicization and double standards' (GCTF, 2016). Interviewee 2 referred to Putin's proposal of a wide coalition to replace the US-led anti IS-

coalition (Annex B). This initiative was not supported in the UN, 'for obvious political reasons' (Annex B). This means that Russia, unlike the US, is not powerful enough to set up an institution. Taking these considerations into account, it can be concluded that Russia prefers a situation in which the status quo continued, without the GCTF.

Costs of exclusion

Despite the fact that Russia prefers another institution to the GCTF, it nevertheless joined the US-led GCTF. This can be explained by exclusion costs; exclusion from this forum would be costlier than compliance. First, the GCTF lowers information costs. Interviewee 6, a program manager at the ICCT, argued that the GCTF is a platform that facilitates informal information exchange (Annex F). If Russia would be excluded, it would not be able to access the expertise produced by the forum, which interviewee 3 described as 'the fear of missing out' (Annex C). Russia perceives the GCTF as a useful platform for experts to discuss practical issues, despite considering the forum as a subsidiary structure to support UN activities (Interviewee 2, Annex B). Non-members cannot access the knowledge hub produced by the forum (Interviewee 4, Annex D). Since the GCTF lowers information costs, it is likely that the costs of exclusion become higher than those of compliance, because non-members do not have access to the knowledge produced in the meetings and will therefore be disadvantaged in combatting terrorist issues domestically.

Second, a US-dominated forum threatens Russia's influence over other regions, especially Middle Eastern countries, many of which are GCTF-members. During Putin's presidency, Russian relations with Gulf States have remarkably improved. The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states form an important market for Russian exports, as well as a source of investment for the Russian economy (Strategic Culture Foundation, 2016). In fact, Russia considers its influence in the Middle East as an important asset in its competition with the US (Mead, 2014, p.76). Putin vowed that Russia would always be a 'reliable ally' to the 'Islamic world' (Kremlin, 2016). If Russia were to be excluded from the forum, the American influence on the Middle East would likely increase. Dmitri Trenin, director of Moscow's Carnegie Center, emphasizes Putin's aim to restore Russia as a global major power. 'For him to be able to operate in the Middle East, in competition with the US, is a badge of being a major power' (Carnegie Moscow Center, 2016). Allowing the US to be part of a global platform with Middle Eastern countries without Russia would disadvantage the Russians.

Moreover, Russia does not want to risk its relations with China, which is also a GCTF-member. Interviewee 3 pointed out: 'What if China joins and the Russians do not? Then

Russia would take the risk that China bonds with the US and EU and suddenly forms a bloc within the United Nations' (Annex C). All permanent members of the UN are included in the forum: hence, Russia cannot stay behind.

In sum, it is likely that exclusion costs affect Russia's decision to comply with the GCTF. Even though Russia prefers the status quo, exclusion from the GCTF is more costly than participation. The costs of participation remain considerably low, because the decisions are non-binding. Moreover, member states themselves can decide how much money they want to invest in initiatives (Interviewee 6, Annex F). Russia does not fund any of the GCTF-inspired institutions. By contrast, the costs of exclusion are much higher: Russia risks its influential position in the Middle East, as well as possible rival alliances in the UN. Thus, regarding the underlying pressure of these costs for Russia to comply, this hypothesis can be confirmed: it is likely that exclusion costs played a role in Russia's compliance behavior.

6.3.2 Qatar

Preference of status quo

Despite presenting a balance of Western and Muslim majority countries, the GCTF offers predominantly western views on terrorism, because it is dominated by the Americans (Interviewee 5, Annex E). The Qatari government wanted to influence this: Mutlaq bin Majed al-Qahtani, the Qatari Foreign Minister's special envoy on counter-terrorism and dispute's settlements, has publicly warned against linking violence and terrorism with religion, beliefs and ideologies (Gulf Times, 2017).

Interviewee 5 confided that the establishment of the GCTF led to concerns by Qatar about a Western focus on Islam-inspired terrorism (Annex E). Since the topics in the GCTF covered merely issues of terrorism related to Islam, Qatar was not completely satisfied with the GCTF's focus. Hence, participating in a forum that portrays the Islam negatively is not Qatar's preferential choice. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Qatar prefers the status quo, a situation in which the GCTF does not exist.

Exclusion costs

Nevertheless, being excluded from the forum could generate considerable costs for Qatar. The emirate is highly dependent on the US for its security, as Qatar is the host of nearly 10,000 US military forces at its military facilities, including the regional headquarters for US Central Command (Katzman, 2016, p.13). The US and Qatar have had a formal Defense Cooperation agreement since 1992: ever since, Qatari leaders view the US as the 'guarantor of Gulf

security' (Katzman, 2016, p.13). US Ambassador to Qatar, Shell Smith, referred to this agreement as the central pillar of US-Qatar partnership (US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 2014). Consequently, with regard to military issues, the stakes for Qatar are extremely high. 'If the Americans invite you to the GCTF, you will participate. It is an offer you cannot refuse,' said interviewee 5, implying that there are considerable disadvantages if Qatar turned the offer down (Annex E). Since the GCTF is an American initiative, the Americans had the power to invite states to become a member. It is of vital importance to the Qatari government to maintain good relations with the US. Hence, even though Qatar was not supportive of this Western dominated forum, declining the offer could generate severe consequences.

With regard to these considerations, the costs of exclusion for Qatar are high. Qatar could risk its military agreement with the US if it does not maintain a good relationship. By contrast, the costs of compliance remain relatively low, considering the wealth of Qatar and the fact that Qatar is not a working group leader or a co-chair. Thus, the costs of exclusion outweigh the costs of participation. Moreover, as interviewee 5 indicated international pressure by the Americans to comply, the second hypothesis can be confirmed: it is likely that exclusion costs are present in Qatar's compliance behavior.

6.4 Close allies

The GCTF depicts itself as an a-political forum, as interviewee 4 claimed, employee at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Annex D). Considering the fact that the Netherlands is currently co-chair of the GCTF, it is important to take into account that this is how the Netherlands would like to present the forum. Moreover, the notion that the GCTF is merely a forum where bridges are built, was rejected by interviewee 1, who attended meetings as a counterterrorism expert. He claims that the meetings create a sense of the West versus the rest: 'Even during coffee breaks, participants only communicate with people from their own camps' (Annex A). This implies that participation in GCTF-meetings facilitates coordinated behavior with close allies. According to Digeser (2009), close alliances entail open communication, the willingness to share information and mutual trust, as well as a common legal, religious or cultural heritage and understanding of the institutions they pursue. This section analyzes whether states are more likely to comply with the GCTF, if their close allies also comply with these norms.

6.4.1 Russia

Currently, Russia is increasingly actively engaged with non-Western countries, cultivating several bilateral partnerships (The Carnegie Moscow Center, 2016). In Asia, Russia's main partner is China, in the security, economic and political domain. Additionally, Russia has good relations with Japan, India, Pakistan, Algeria and Egypt, which are also GCTF-members (Welt, 2017, p.27). In particular, a special relationship consists between Russia, India and China, who form a trilateral forum for foreign policy and practical cooperation (Embassy of the Russian Federation in Washington DC, 2016).

In recent history, India and China have expressed their support for the formation of a broad counter-terrorist front with a leading role for the United Nations, which was proposed by Russia in the General Assembly (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, 2016). Within the GCTF, China and Russia are becoming more vocal, expressing their statements more explicitly (interviewee 3, Annex C). Moreover, the Russian and Chinese security services are intensifying their cooperation in the domain of counterterrorism, which includes the exchange of intelligence information (Sputnik News, 2016). Hence, to a certain extent, it can be concluded that coordination of behavior is present among Russia's partners within the GCTF.

Nevertheless, these partnerships cannot be classified as close alliances. Drawing on the definition of Digeser (2009), close alliances entail open communication and a sense of mutual trust. Apart from intelligence exchange with China, Russia is reluctant to share intelligence with other states (Carnegie Endowment, 2017). Moreover, according to Ying, China is not even interested in a formal alliance with Russia, nor does it want to form an anti-US or anti-Western bloc (2016, p.97). Second, the role of Russia's partners is not explicitly mentioned with regard to GCTF compliance. For that reason, there is no convincing evidence that the factor of close allies affects Russia's decision of compliance.

6.4.2 Qatar

In recent years, Qatar is seeking to play the role of a diplomatic mediator in the region, which is reflected in their mediating role in Middle Eastern conflicts, such as Lebanon and Yemen. The Qatari government aspires to make Qatar a recognized 'brand' (Khatib, 2013, p.419). Part of this strategy is to embed itself within the international community as a key center for dialogue (Brannagan & Giulianotti, 2015, p.710). This strategy avoids taking sides to maintain its position of neutrality. This essentially entails that Qatar closely coordinates its actions with its allies, but more importantly, it coordinates its behavior with its 'enemies'.

Traditionally, Saudi Arabia played a leading role in conflicts across the Middle East. Nonetheless, Saudi Arabia's mediating role has been weakened by a perceived lack of neutrality (Khatib, 2013, p.419). Qatar is currently seeking to fill the vacuum in the Arab world by presenting itself as an alternative to the Saudi Kingdom and as a potential new leader in the Middle East (Khatib, 2013, p.419). This is reflected in the Qatar National Vision 2030, highlighting Qatar's aim to improve its position and assume a larger leadership role within the international community (General Secretariat for Development Planning, 2011, p.210).

In order to become a leader in the global community, Qatar has developed a delicate balancing strategy towards regional allies such as Saudi Arabia and Western partners such as the US and the UK, 'keeping its allies close and its enemies even closer' (Cooper and Momani, 2011, p.114). With regard to regional allies, Qatar became a member of a military alliance of thirty-four Islamic states led by Saudi Arabia to fight terrorism (US Department of State, 2015). Interviewee 5 described Saudi Arabia as a 'big brother' to Qatar: 'Even though they do not always get along, they are economically interdependent and share the same interests' (Annex E). Saudi Arabia and Qatar thus closely coordinate their actions. Other Gulf States follow their lead, as Kuwait, the UAE and Qatar tend to copy each other's behavior (Interviewee 5, Annex E).

Additionally, within the GCTF, Turkey is one of Qatar's closest allies, according to interviewee 5: 'They are intensively cooperating in Syria, both support the Muslim Brotherhood and their security services closely work together on information exchange' (Annex E). Turkey's special relationship with Qatar becomes evident from a statement by the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, who stated that Turkey's relationship with Qatar 'continues perfectly in every field' (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016). In fact, Turkey plans to establish a military base in Qatar to protect the country against external threats (Middle East Institute, 2016). Strengthening ties with Turkey is a strategy of Qatar to keep its options open with regard to the dominant Saudi position (Middle East Institute, 2016). Hence, Turkey and Qatar's relationship can be characterized as a close alliance.

However, as previously mentioned, Qatar does not only take its allies into account: it also considers the position of its 'frenemies', the US in particular (Cooper and Momani 2011, p.114). The relationship between the US and Qatar can best be described as a strategic friendship. After the 1990-92 Gulf War, the US military bases were moved from Saudi Arabia to Qatar (Cooper and Momani, 2011, p.123). These military bases were of vital importance to American military objectives in Afghanistan and Iraq. After the invasion of Iraq, President

Bush made a statement on Qatar: 'You made some promises to America and you kept your promises. We are honored to call you a friend' (Cooper and Momani, 2011, p.123). Nevertheless, the definition of 'friendship' between the US and Qatar is disputable, as Boyce (2013, p.377) puts it: 'The Americans find the Qatari the most challenging of their allies, never quite sure whether to bomb them or embrace them.' When the GCTF was founded, the membership was allocated by the US, who wanted to include Muslim majority countries. Considering US' military interests in Qatar, the emirate was a natural ally (Interviewee 5, Annex E).

Another strategic partnership can be found in the UK. From the British side, UK Defense Secretary Fallon stated that Qatar is 'one of the UK's most important allies in the region' in the fight against violent extremism (UK Government, 2016). Qatar's prime minister made a similar statement on its relationship with the UK, arguing that 'along our British allies, Qatar is a member of the GCTF' (The Guardian, 2014). However, relying on the definition of Digeser (2009), they do not share the same legal, religious and cultural heritage, unlike Qatar's Gulf allies. More importantly, they do not share a common understanding of the institutions they pursue, as some groups are considered to be terrorist organizations by the US and UK, whereas Qatar considers them to be legitimate Arab movements, such as Hamas (Katzman, 2016, p.15).

In short, the hypothesis of close allies can be discarded for Qatar. First, the UK and US cannot be characterized as close allies of Qatar. Second, although there are indications that Qatar coordinated its compliance behavior with its close allies such as Turkey and the Gulf states, their role was not explicitly mentioned. Therefore, their influence on Qatar's compliance cannot be confirmed. The overall findings of this section are summarized in table 2:

Table 2: Findings on hypotheses

Hypotheses	Russia	Qatar
H1: international reputation	Confirmed	Confirmed
H2: exclusion costs	Confirmed	Confirmed
H3: close allies	Rejected	Rejected

7. Conclusion

This research has generated insights in the relatively new field of international counterterrorism cooperation. By addressing the question of why states comply with GCTF-norms in terms of counterterrorism, despite simultaneously actively undermining them, it has explored the underresearched topic of the GCTF. First of all, the hypothesis of close allies cannot convincingly explain Qatar and Russia's decision to comply with the GCTF. Both Russia and Qatar have not explicitly referred to the role of their close allies and therefore do not seem to have based their decision on the behavior of these allies. Another important implication of this analysis is that the variables of international reputation and exclusion costs are of high importance with regard to states' compliance in the GCTF. The US and other states have publicly and explicitly expressed their gratitude for Russia and Qatar's compliance, which contributed to the improvement of their international reputation. Furthermore, it is likely that exclusion costs affect Russia and Qatar's compliance behavior, as exclusion from the GCTF imposes considerable risks. The central claim of this paper is therefore that states will comply with counterterrorism organizations when they expect that their international reputation will benefit from it and when they fear that the exclusion costs are higher than the costs of compliance.

This research has demonstrated that theories that attempt to explain international cooperation in the economic, environmental and human rights domains can also account for cooperation in the field of counterterrorism policies. Therefore, some recommendations for further research include examining whether these variables could account for compliance with other informal institutions outside of the domain of counterterrorism as well. Additionally, in order to increase the generalization of these findings, the variables of international reputation and exclusion costs could be applied to other cases, similar to the GCTF.

Moreover, this research has mainly focused on interviews with Dutch experts and Ministry staff, as the Netherlands is currently the co-chair. More interviews could be conducted with representatives of other GCTF-members, in order to obtain a more balanced perspective on GCTF compliance. Finally, due to language restrictions, I was not able to access Arabic or Russian documents or newspapers. Future research could also include these sources to expand the collection of data.

8. Bibliography

Abbott, K. & Snidal, D. (1998). Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(1), pp. 3-32

Barnett, M. & Finnemore, M. (1999). The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. *International Organization*, 53, pp. 699-732

Blanchard, C. (2014). Qatar: Background and US Relations. Available at: https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL31718.pdf [accessed April 25, 2017]

Brannagan, P. & Giulianotti, R. (2015). Soft Power and Soft Disempowerment: Qatar, Global Sport and Football's 2022 World Cup Finals. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), pp. 703-719

Boyce, G. (2013). Qatar's Foreign Policy. *Asian Affairs*, 44(3), pp. 365-377

Carnegie Endowment (2017). Intelligence Sharing With Russia: A Practitioner's Perspective. Available at: http://carnegieendowment.org/2017/02/09/intelligence-sharing-with-russia-practitioner-s-perspective-pub-67962 [accessed June 4, 2017]

Carnegie Moscow Center (2016). A Five-Year Outlook for Russian Foreign Policy: Demands, Drivers and Influences. Available at: http://carnegie.ru/2016/03/18/five-year-outlook-for-russian-foreign-policy-demands-drivers-and-influences-pub-63075 [accessed April 28, 2017]

Coggins, B. (2011). Friends in High Places: International Politics and the Emergence of States from Secessionism. *International Organization*, 65(3), pp.433-467

Cooper, A. & Momani, B. (2011). Qatar and Expanded Contours of Small State Diplomacy. *The International Spectator*, 46(3), pp. 113-128

Dai, X. (2005). Why Comply? The Domestic Constituency Mechanism. *International Organization*, 59(2), pp. 363-398

Digeser, P. (2009). Friendship Between States. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(2), pp. 323-344

Dorsey, J. (2015). How Qatar is its Own Worst Enemy. *The International Journal of the History of Sport,* 32(3), pp. 422-439

Downs, G. & Jones, M. (2002). Reputation, Compliance and International Law. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 31(S1), pp. 95-114

Dutch Government (2015). Speech Minister Koenders at Foreign Terrorist Fighters Working Group. Available at: https://www.government.nl/documents/speeches/2015/06/08/speecht-minister-koenders-at-foreign-terrorist-fighters-working-group [accessed March 5, 2017]

Embassy of the Russian Federation in Washington DC (2016). Key foreign policy outcomes for 2016. Available at: http://www.russianembassy.org/article/key-foreign-policy-outcomes-for- 2016 [accessed April 30, 2017]

Finnemore, M. (1996). *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.

Finnemore, M. & Sikkink, K. (1998). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*, 52(4), pp. 887-917

GCTF (2013). Fourth Ministerial Plenary Meeting. Available at: https://portal.thegctf.org/documents/10162/62315/13Oct31_Co-Chairs+Summary_Fourth+Ministerial+Plenary.pdf [accessed April 2, 2017]

GCTF (2016). Statement as delivered by the Russian Federation at the Seventh Ministerial Plenary of the Global Counterterrorism Forum. Available at: https://www.thegctf.org/Activities/Activities/ArtMID/493/ArticleID/22/Seventh-GCTF-Ministerial-Meeting-adopts-Life-Cycle-Toolkit-and-Framework-Documents [accessed April 2, 2017]

GCTF (2017). Background and Mission. Available at: https://www.thegctf.org/About-us/Background-and-Mission [accessed February 27, 2017]

General Assembly of the United Nations (2016). Qatar: H.H. Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad Al-Thani, General Debate of the 71st Session. Available at: https://gadebate.un.org/en/71/qatar [accessed April 25, 2017]

General Secretariat for Development Planning (2011). *Qatar National Development Strategy 2011-2016*. Available at: www.gsdp.gov.qa [accessed May 1, 2017]

George, A. & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

The Guardian (2014). Qatar and the UK stand together in the fight against terrorism. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/oct/28/qatar-uk-fight-against-terrorism [accessed May 2, 2017]

Gulf Times (2017). Qatar voices concern over linking terror with religion. Available at: http://www.gulf-times.com/story/534244/Qatar-voices-concern-over-linking-terror-with-reli [accessed May 2, 2017]

Katzman, K. (2016). Qatar: Governance, Security and US Policy, Congressional Research Service Report, Available at: http://www.refworld.org/docid/58d903774.html [accessed April 25, 2017]

Khatib, L. (2013). Qatar's Foreign Policy: The Limits of Pragmatism. *International Affairs*, 89(2), pp. 417-431

Krasner, S. (1982). Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables. *International Organization*, 36(2), pp. 185-205

Kremlin (2014). Joint EU-Russia Statement on Combatting Terrorism. Available at: http://static.kremlin.ru/media/events/eng/files/41d4b9fc4bb11a050563.pdf [accessed April 25, 2017]

Kremlin (2016). Vladimir Putin sent greetings to Russia-Islamic World Strategic Vision Group meeting participants. Available at: http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/52016 [accessed May 2, 2017]

Keohane, R. (1982). The Demand for International Regimes. *International Organization*, 36(2), pp. 325-355

Keohane, R & Martin, L. (1995). The Promise of Institutionalist Theory. *International Security,* 20(1), pp. 39–51

Mead, W. (2014). The Return of Geopolitics: The Revenge of the Revisionist Powers. *Foreign Affairs, 93*, pp. 69-79

Mearsheimer, J. (1995). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security,* 19(3), pp. 5-49

Medina de Souza, I. (2015). An Offer Developing Countries Could Not Refuse: How Powerful States Created the World Trade Organisation. *Journal of International Relations and Development,* 18, pp. 155–181

Middle East Institute (2016). Turkey and Qatar's Burgeoning Strategic Alliance. Available at: http://www.mei.edu/content/article/turkey-and-qatar-s-burgeoning-strategic-alliance [accessed June 4, 2017]

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (2016). Joint Communiqué of the 14th Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Russian Federation, the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China. Available at: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjdt_665385/2649_665393/t1356652.shtml [accessed April 30, 2017]

Moravcsik, A. (1993). Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, pp. 473-524

New York Times (2017). Worst Chemical Attack in Years in Syria; U.S. Blames Assad. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/04/world/middleeast/syria-gas-attack.html?_r=0 [accessed May 24, 2017]

Notte, H. (2016). Russia in Chechnya and Syria: Pursuit of Strategic Goals. *Middle East Policy*, 23(1), pp.59-74

Obama White House (2013). Joint Statement of the Presidents of the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Cooperation in Countering Terrorism. Available at: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/05/26/fact-sheet-us-russia-agreements-and-joint-statements [accessed April 25, 2017]

Park, S. (2005). Norm Diffusion within International Organizations: a Case Study of the World Bank. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 8, pp. 111-141

Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016). Speech by H.E. Mevlüt Cavusoglu, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey at the Opening Session of the Eighth Annual Ambassadors Conference. Available at: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/default.en.mfa [accessed April 30, 2017]

Reuters (2014). Emir assures Merkel Qatar doesn't fund extremists in Syria, Iraq. Available at: http://www.reuters.com/article/uk-iraq-crisis-germany-qatar-idUSKBN0HC18T20140917 [accessed May 2, 2017]

Reuters (2017). Trump Says 'Things Will Work Out Fine' Between US and Russia. Available at: http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-russia-idUSKBN17F1R9 [accessed May 26, 2017]

Rosand, E. (2016). Minding the Gap: A Multi-Layered Approach to Tackling Violent Extremism. *RUSI NEWSBRIEF*, pp. 24-26

Schimmelfennig, F. (2006). The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union. *International Organization*, 55(1), pp. 47-80

Simmons, B. (2000). International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs. *American Political Science Review*, 94(4), pp. 819-835

Simmons, B. & Danner, A. (2010). Credible Commitments and the International Criminal Court. *International Organization*, 64(2), pp. 225-256

Sputnik News (2015). Russia Shows Responsibility, Leadership in the Fight Against Terrorism. Available at: https://sputniknews.com/russia/201512031031168929-putin-russia-terrorism-fight [accessed May 7, 2017]

Sputnik News (2016). China, Russia Interested in Boosting Cooperation in Fighting Terrorism. Available at: https://sputniknews.com/military/201612231048903131-china-russia-fighting-terrorism [accessed June 4, 2017]

The Star (2017). Your letters: Qatar does not support terrorism in any form. Available at: https://www.thestar.com/opinion/letters_to_the_editors/2017/04/19/your-letters- qatar-does-not-support-terrorism-in-any-form.html [accessed May 2, 2017]

Strategic Culture Foundation (2016). FM Lavrov on Visit to UAE, Oman: Russia, GCC Members Inch Closer to Each Other in Times of Hard Choices. Available at: http://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2016/02/03/lavrov-visit-uae-oman-russia- gcc-members-inch-closer-each-other-times-hard-choices.html [accessed April 26, 2017]

Stone, R. (2013). Informal Governance in International Organizations: Introduction to the Special Issue. *The Review of International Organizations*, 8(2), pp. 121-136

Telegraph (2017). Boris Johnson offers Russia a deal to end Syria crisis, saying 'they still have time to be on the right side of the argument'. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/04/15/boris-johnson-hits-back-telling-russians-still-have-chance-end [accessed May 24, 2017]

UK Government (2016). Defense Secretary discusses tackling terrorism with Qatar. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/defence-secretary-discusses-tackling-terrorism-with-qatar [accessed May 2, 2017]

UN CTITF (2017). Press release: Qatar supports the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre. Available at: https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/ctitf/en/Pressrelease_Qatar_supports_UNCCT [accessed April 25, 2017]

US Department of State (2015). Country Reports on Terrorism 2015. Available at: https://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/2015/index.htm [accessed April 25, 2017]

US Senate Foreign Relations Committee (2014). Statement of Dana Shell Smith, Ambassador Designate to the State of Qatar. Available at: https://www.foreign.senate.gov [accessed April 20, 2017]

Vabulas, F. & Snidal, D. (2013). Organization Without Delegation: Informal Intergovernmental Organizations (IIGOs) and the Spectrum of Intergovernmental Arrangements. *The Review of International Organizations*, 8(2), pp. 193-220

The Wall Street Journal (2017). Trump Opens to Shift on Russia Sanctions, 'One China' Policy. Available at: https://www.wsj.com/articles/donald-trump-sets-a-bar-for-russia-and-china-1484360380 [accessed April 28, 2017]

The Washington Post (2017). Trump and Putin Discuss Cease-fire in Syria in First Conversation Since U.S. Airstrikes. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/russias-putin-to-talk-with-the-leaders-of-the-west--separately/2017/05/02/d77dd446-2ecd-11e7-a335-fa0ae1940305_story.html?utm_term=.95a134a83083 [accessed May 26, 2017]

Welt, C. (2017). Russia: Background and US Interests. Available at: https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R44775.pdf [accessed April 25, 2017]

Wikileaks (2014). Email from John Podesta to Hilary Clinton. Available at: https://wikileaks.org/podesta-emails/emailid/3774 [accessed February 27, 2017]

Ying, F. (2016). How China Sees Russia: Beijing and Moscow Are Close, but Not Allies. *Foreign Affairs,* 95, pp. 96-105