



Cost and taxpayer response to the war on terror: a comparative assessment

A.D. Zubairu, PhD^a, M.A. Dorayi^{*}

^a Department of Taxation, Faculty of Administration, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. Nigeria

^{*} Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The cost of National Security and the war on terror is a burden that falls on the Government and the Taxpayer as well going by the social contract theory. The objective of this research was to continue to build on the controversy related to the opinion of the tax payers contribution to the war on terror which is not only a national issue but also global. As such we asked the question; what is the opinion of the taxpayer regarding funding of the current terrorist acts prevailing in the Nigeria and we try to compare this to the opinions of The U.S and U.K Taxpayers. The Survey research method was used in this regard for to gather opinions of Nigerian citizens that both pay tax and are educated in such fields. A second methodology known as content analysis was used to collect responses from the west using the source www.bbc.com (from the year 2000 to 2015) Results prove that most Nigerians are positive about spendings on the war against terror unlike in the west where it is considered illegal occupation in many cases and Nigerians believe more resources should be allocated to the cause but opinions regarding embezzlement or diversion of such funds through corruption and conspiracy were raised by more than 50 percent of respondents in the Nigerian Case. Recommendations suggest that all of such spendings be made more transparent in Nigeria to add to the already existing positivity towards expenditure to the war on terror in Nigeria. Further research into the psychology of terrorists is also recommended in Nigeria as it was found to be given most attention in the west.

Key words: Terrorism, Tax, Resources, Allocation.

1. Introduction

Cost estimates are often ignored when war is debated due to sign of a wavering resolve but most people recognize that the costs in dollars, and especially in blood, are acceptable only as long as they are low. If the casualty estimates mount to the thousands, if oil prices skyrocket, if a war pushes the economy into recession or requires a large tax increase and if for example the United States becomes a pariah in the world because of callous attacks on civilian populations, then decision makers in the White House and the Congress might not post so expeditiously to battle (Steven et al 2002). This statement indicates that there

is also another dimension to the cost of terrorism which is the opinion of the taxpayer relating to the money spent in curbing terrorism. An essay by Bhowmick I.S (2014) explained that after 9/11, US taxpayers shell out \$10.5mn every hour to fund war against terror. In Nigeria, just like any other country faced with Terrorism Government spends on the fight against terrorism. According to the daily independent newspaper (2012) the terrorist activities of the Boko Haram sect have created a lot of distortions in the economic activities of the Northern region of Nigeria. The free encyclopedia (2015) explained Cost of Conflict as a tool which attempts to calculate the price of conflict to the human race. The idea is to examine this cost, not only in terms of the deaths and casualties and the economic costs borne by the people involved, but also the social, developmental, environmental and strategic costs of conflict and that In most cases organizations measure and analyze the economic and broader [development](#) costs of conflict.

McCarthy (2015) approximating the cost of global "War on Terror" operations (including both Afghanistan and Iraq) since 2001 believed that the cost had reached about \$1.6 trillion by 2014. When war funding approved by Congress for 2015 is taken into account, the total reaches \$1.7 trillion and that the majority of that funding, some \$1.562 trillion, has been allocated to the Department of Defense. The "War on Terror" according to McCarthy (2015) is therefore proving extremely expensive compared to past military campaigns. Putting the cost into context, the bill for the Vietnam War comes to about \$686 billion when adjusted for inflation.

Belasco A (2014) , a Specialist in U.S. Defense Policy and Budget published in December 8, The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11 for the Congressional Research Service. The report explained that Congress had approved appropriations for the past 13 years of war that total \$1.6 trillion for military operations, base support, weapons maintenance, training of Afghan and Iraqi security forces, reconstruction, foreign aid, embassy costs, and veterans' health care for the war operations initiated since the 9/11 attacks. Of this \$1.6 trillion total, estimates of the total is distributed as follows:

1. \$686 billion (43%) for Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) for Afghanistan and other counterterror operations received;
2. \$815 billion (51%) for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)/Operation New Dawn (OND);
3. \$27 billion (2%) for Operation Noble Eagle (ONE), providing enhanced security at military bases; and
4. \$81 billion (5%) for war-designated funding not considered directly related to the Afghanistan or Iraq wars.

source: Belasco (2014)

In Nigeria the cost of Terrorism was highlighted in the observation concerning what is the cost of fighting terrorism in Nigeria published on thursday 18th June 2015 by the CBN believing that the war against Boko Haram is expected to cost 30 million dollars per year, according to Chad's Head of Security, Sanusi Abdullahi. Nigeria's new President Buhari met with defence ministers from Chad, Niger, Cameroon and Benin to chalk out plans to take on the extremists. Despite the fact that it was reported that the U.S has

pledged 5 million dollars to help combat Boko Haram, Many of the opinions centered on the question; can Nigeria and West Africa afford this war on terror? Some other perceptions are centred on the fact that terrorism has come to stay just like taxation itself is one of the constants of life as stated by Benjamin Franklin in his letter to Jean-Baptiste Le Roy since 13 November 1789 that; *In this world nothing can be said to be certain, except death and taxes*". Taxes which would or would not be allocated to sponsor the war against terror.

The objective of this research is to compare the perception of the western world to the average Nigerian citizen with regards to cost of the war on terror since every employed citizen or business pays tax to Government. The study included a content analysis to come to grip with a western experience and uses the survey research method, in Nigeria. While the content analysis is focused strictly on BBC news official website for data the survey takes its design by sampling opinions of lecturers from the Nasarawa State University, Keffi that teach courses such as Strategic Management, and courses related to National Security. A different research design could for example involve experiences form National Security Agencies and Military Officers from the Defence Academy with a larger sample frame that can cut across more geographical grounds instead of using simple content analysis for a western perspective.

2. Literature Review

Justification of the tax payers relationship with Government include that there must be satisfactory element with citizens concerned. Taxes are not paid to the Private Sector. Therefore a theory related to the concept of National Security cost and tax was found appropriate. The free encyclopedia (2015) described the social contract theory In moral and political philosophy. According to the free encyclopedia social contract or political contract is a theory or model, that originated during the Age of Enlightenment and typically addresses the questions of the origin of society and the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual. The world's earliest version of the social contract theory is however found in the 2nd century BC text of earlier Buddhism and Mahāvastu.

Social contract arguments typically posit that individuals have consented, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of the ruler or magistrate (or to the decision of a majority), in exchange for protection of their remaining rights. The question of the relation between natural and legal rights, therefore, is often an aspect of social contract theory. According to Jean-Jacques since 1762 the social contract theory can be defined loosely as a sort of hypothetical or actual agreement between society and its state. This agreement has been said to be responsible for the bases of our moral decisions and stances. Thomas Hobbes lived from 1588 to 1679, and John Locke lived from 1632 to 1704 (The free encyclopedia 2015).

The social contract theory according its proponents (Hobbes and Lockes) publishing in 2005 has its roots in Sovereignty and Security' Hobbes believed the incentive is built into the social system by the very nature of our existing among each other. The need for an agreement between government and employee naturally exists for us to form some sort of agreement to treat each other with basic respect and follow certain basic rules. That is, we find it most advantageous to form a social contract to base our lives in general and our moral judgments. Despite the fact other philosophers like David Hume heavily criticised

Hobbes version of the social contract by firstly pointing out that there had never been a situation called the state of nature' and that nobody had consented to a social contract, mainly because the social contract was purely hypothetical. The following quote explains nicely Hume's thoughts about why we agree to the state:

"Men, therefore, are bound to obey the magistrates, only because they promise to it: and if they had not given their word, either expressively or tacitly, to preserve allegiance, it would never have become a part of their moral duties.

However we are of the opinion that there is and has always been a social contract once citizenship and nationality is observed because citizens pay taxes.

According to the New Internationalist Magazine (2008) the word 'tax' first appeared in the English language only in the 14th century. It derives from the Latin taxare which means 'to assess'. Before that, English used the related word 'task', derived from old French. For a while, 'task' and 'tax' were both in common use, the first requiring labour, the second money (New internationalist magazine 2008). 'Tax' then developed its meaning to imply something wearisome or challenging. So words like 'duty' were used to suggest a more appealing purpose. Political spin has just as long a history as taxation, and neither has been detained unduly by the meaning of words. Also from the new internationalist magazine (2008) it was elaborated that China has one of the longest of all written records, and we know that taxes were levied here some 3,000 years ago as the Empire was being established. Powers (usually military) that were able to impose taxes created the first bureaucracies to collect and administer them. Under the Egyptian Pharaohs 'scribes' were charged with raising funds in any way practicable, including a tax on household cooking oil. Regular audits were conducted to ensure that oil was not recycled – perhaps the first historical record of 'avoidance'. The 'Book of Genesis' in The Bible suggests that a fifth of all crops should be given to the Pharaoh. The city states of Ancient Greece imposed eishpora to pay for wars, which were numerous; but once a war was over any surplus had to be refunded. Athens imposed a monthly poll tax on foreigners. Imperial Rome used tribute extracted from colonized peoples to multiply the bounty of empire. Julius Caesar imposed a one-per-cent sales tax; Augustus instituted an inheritance tax to provide retirement funds for the military. However, human bondage remained the most lucrative form of tribute for both Greece and Rome (New internationalist magazine 2008).

With the decline of Rome in Europe, 'spiritual' and 'temporal' powers were not always easy to distinguish. Religious institutions rivalled and sometimes surpassed political ones in their material power. To secure this, they imposed forms of taxation. In Latin America the Aztec, Olmec, Maya and Inca cultures all seem to have raised forms of taxation, usually in association with ritual observance. Both Hindus and Buddhists sustained their temples and monasteries with contributions of time, skill and resources from the faithful (New internationalist magazine 2008)

Asuquo (2014) explained that the Nigerian tax system has undergone several reforms geared at enhancing tax collection and administration with minimal enforcement cost. The recent reforms include the introduction of TIN, (unique Taxpayer's Identification Number which became effective since February 2008, automated tax system that facilitates tracking of tax positions and issues by individual taxpayers, e-

payment system which enhances smooth payment procedure and reduces the incidence of tax touts, enforcement scheme (Special Purpose Taxation officers), these are special tax officers in collaboration with other security agencies to ensure strict compliance in payment of taxes.

The tax authority now has autonomy to assess, collect and record tax. This enabling environment which came into being on the basis of (Section 8(q) of FIRS Establishment Act of 2007) has led to an improvement in tax administration in the country and the Nigerian tax system has undergone significant changes in recent times. The tax laws are now constantly being reviewed with the aim of repealing obsolete provisions and simplifying the main ones. Under current Nigerian law, taxation is enforced by the 3 tiers of government, i.e. federal, state, and local governments, with each having its sphere clearly spelt out in the Taxes and Levies (approved list for Collection) Despite this improvement, there are still a number of contentious issues that require urgent attention and among them is the issue of the appropriate tax authority to administer several taxes. The crisis between Lagos State and the federal government on the tax jurisdiction of VAT in the state is still a contentious issue that has been taken to the courts. Other states like Ogun, Oyo and Benue have joined Lagos state, while states like Abia, have gone against this (Asuquo 2014).

Also according to Asuquo (2014), believes there is also the issue of multiple taxes administered by all the three tiers of government which sometimes imposes welfare cost. Furthermore, the issue of the paucity of a data base, which contributes to tax avoidance in the country. The issue of corruption is still a perennial issue in the country; this reduces the confidence and trust of the taxpayers in discharging their civic duty. The issue of infrastructural development is also a crucial issue, in Nigeria, the level of infrastructural facilities is in a deplorable state, most of the facilities are often privately sourced, thus a number of people wonder what the taxes collected are used for, hence the tendency to evade tax payment. Furthermore, the problem of the tax language that is legally codified makes it difficult for an average Nigerian to understand (Asuquo 2014).

According to Novolson (2013) the Social psychology of Terrorism from the Library of Congress (2013); while the social sciences researcher defines a terrorist action as the calculated use of unexpected, shocking, and unlawful violence against noncombatants (including, in addition to civilians, off-duty military and security personnel in peaceful situations) and other symbolic targets perpetrated by a clandestine member(s) of a subnational group or a clandestine agent(s) for the psychological purpose of publicizing a political or religious cause and/or intimidating or coercing a government(s) or civilian population into accepting demands on behalf of the cause there is no other standard definition except the cited the U.S. Department of State in 1998 defining terrorism as "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience." Novolsov (2013) also added that although an act of violence that is generally regarded in the United States as an act of terrorism may not be viewed so in another country, the type of violence that distinguishes terrorism from other types of violence, such as ordinary crime or a wartime military action, can still be defined in terms that might qualify as reasonably objective.

Generally speaking a terrorist is an individual who carries out or threatens to carry out acts of terror, for hire or not for hire (Novolsov 2013). The act of harming or killing others, who are direct enemies or innocent victims, may be for monetary gain, gain of group principle, gain of personal principle, or any

combination. Commonly, terrorists are seen as psychopathic or having a religious or political cause. Yet, if we look at the individual players, we may see the level of management in conducting these activities is greater than one expected from psychopaths. Another common assumption is that terrorists use force or threat of force instrumentally in a conscious and premeditated fashion because they misguidedly think that it will enhance their probability of achieving a certain political or religious goal or set of goals. Psychological goals of terrorism include that it is an outlet for anger Convenient vehicle for change Stirs up enthusiasm & excitement Source of hope for the future Provides a sense of power A sense importance & purpose by an identification with a holy cause Overcoming feelings of incompetence: feeling potent/strong (Novolsov 2013).

Stiglitz and Blimes (2014) believe the opposition to the [Afghanistan war](#) stems from numerous factors, including the view that the [U.S. invasion of Afghanistan](#) was [illegal](#) under international law and constituted an unjustified aggression, the view that the continued military presence constitutes a , the view that the war [does little to prevent terrorism but increases its likelihood](#), and views on the involvement of [geo-political and corporate interests](#). Also giving rise to opposition to the war are [civilian casualties](#), the [cost to taxpayers](#), [the length of the war](#) to date, and the estimates by many that it could last for many more decades.

Form the economic costs of the War of the Iraq war: An appraisal three years after the beginning of conflict by Bilmes, and Stiglitz (2014) reflected that as America was preparing to go to war in Iraq, there were few discussions of the likely costs. When Larry Lindsey, President Bush's economic adviser, suggested that they might reach \$200 billion, there was a quick response from the White House: that number was a gross overestimation. Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz claimed that Iraq could "really finance its own reconstruction," apparently both underestimating what was required and the debt burden facing the country.

Terrorist incidents impose large direct costs upon individuals and societies. Indeed, the imposition of economic and noneconomic costs is clearly a purpose of terrorist violence. The costs imposed by a single incident of terrorism are generally not large in relation to the size of the economy in question. In the case of the 9/11 attacks in the United States, while the personal costs borne by those directly involved are immense and can linger for substantial periods of time, and while the magnitude of loss measured in dollars appears huge—\$33 to \$36 billion in New York City alone, according to estimates by economists at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (Gold 2005)

Cordesman (2007) believed the economic cost of the war is less important than the human costs but at the same time however, the dollar cost of the war is scarcely something that U.S. strategy and military planning can ignore. There is no end in sight to either the conflict in Iraq or Afghanistan, and there is no way to predict the final cost in either blood or dollars. Estimates of expenditures being issued by the U.S. government understated the real cost of operations because they included only current obligations, not the cost in terms of worn equipment, future replacements, paying the long-term costs of increased pensions and payments for killed and wounded, and paying for a long list of additional costs such as support by the national intelligence agencies but at the same time, the dollar cost of the war is scarcely something that U.S. strategy and military planning can ignore (Cordesman 2007). There is no agreement as to how the dollar cost of the Iraq War and other recent U.S. conflicts should be costed, and there is no way

to predict their ultimate cost (Cordesman 2007) The same is true of the conflict in Afghanistan and the overall war on terrorism. What is clear is that the cost of the Iraq War in dollars has been much greater than the Bush Administration planned in going to war.

According to Gold (2015) The question of how security is financed is one of long standing, with numerous economic implications. Governments rarely finance wars through taxation, and the war against terror is no exception. In the U.S the Bush Administration had adopted a tax-cutting agenda prior to 9/11, and has expanded rather than cut back on this policy despite the rapid growth of security-related spending since the terrorist attacks. The combination of spending growth and tax cuts has led to high federal budget deficits, which have increased the likelihood of significant upward movements in interest rates. Only one war in United States history, the Korean War, was wholly financed by taxation (Gold 2015). However, there has been a trickle-down effect from the federal tax cuts. The 1991 Gulf War was largely funded by contributions from members of the coalition that fought with the United States. Every other war since the American Revolution was financed largely by some combination of debt issuance and new money creation (Gold 2015)

Also, according to Gold (2015) even when economies recover from specific terrorist incidents, they might still bear substantial costs in the long term. These costs emanate from the implicit taxation imposed by the measures taken to fight terrorism, the opportunity costs of anti-terrorist actions that influence economic growth, and the methods adopted to finance anti-terrorist activities (Gold 2015). Overall defense program will require extensive further spending increases if all programs currently in place are carried out. Gold (2015) further explained that with tax cuts, high deficits, and demands for spending growth in other areas, this is a classic recipe for a budgetary "train wreck." The need to control access explains the elaborate selection processes and the resort to violence on the part of terrorist groups who provide such goods, even when this behavior does not appear to bring them close to their stated objectives. They are, instead, devices that serve to bind members to the group and make it difficult for members to leave, thereby providing a solution to the "free rider" problem inherent in all public goods production. The relationship is that when Governments supply public goods, their activities are financed via taxation.

Regarding the war against terror in Iraq not only that there was no connection between Al-Qaida and Iraq so too for the costs (Blimes and Stiglitz 2013). It now appears that Lindsey was indeed wrong by grossly underestimating the costs. Congress has already appropriated approximately \$357 billion for military operations, reconstruction, embassy costs, enhanced security at US bases and foreign aid programs in Iraq and Afghanistan. This total, which covers costs through the end of November 2005, includes \$251bn for military operations in Iraq, \$82bn for Afghanistan and \$24bn for related foreign operations, such as reconstruction.

Generally speaking Sandler, et al (2008) discussed lost GDP estimating the annual and capitalized five-year losses in GDP associated with transnational terrorist incidents on a country's soil. At the outset, believing we should expect such losses to be rather modest unless a country is plagued with transnational terrorism or else experiences a spectacular terrorist event such as 9/11 (Sandler et al 2007). Most transnational terrorist incidents kill on average less than one person and have limited economic consequences (Sandler et al 2008).

The group of researchers utilize the findings from a study by Blomberg, Hess, and Orphanides (henceforth BHO) in 2004 that estimates the losses in per capita income growth for countries experiencing one or more transnational terrorist events in that year. They also looked into a panel study of 177 countries for the 1968-2000 sample period. These authors show that each year of transnational terrorism results, on average, in a fall in income per capita growth of just 0.048%, which is similar to other findings that puts this loss at 0.038%. To be able to use BHO's findings to compute terrorism-induced GDP losses, we need the population (Pop), the per capita GDP in 2005, and the growth rate of per capita GDP between 2004 and 2005 in percent (denoted by 2005 growth/100) for all countries experiencing transnational terrorism during 2001-2005.

United States Department of State Publication Bureau of Counter terrorism Released June 2015 that the UK actively met its obligations to restrict terrorist financing, including funding to extremist groups operating in Syria and Iraq, under UN Security Council Resolutions (UNSCRs) 2170 and 2178 and in the second half of 2014, the UK placed asset freezes on six ISIL-affiliated individuals: Hassan Nur, Nasser Muthana, Aseel Muthana, Ruhul Amin, Reyaad Khan and Abdul Rahman Benhammedi and that the UK Charities Commission also worked to counter terrorist financing and finally of the regulator's 85 open compliance cases as of October, 37 are Syria-related investigations.

Regarding the responses to the cost of the War against terror Modae Aston and Jeffery blache conducted a study in 1999 that tried to discover the responses to actions of the U.S on the war against Terrorist actions that are transnational in nature. They used a Survey research method just as we also used for this research and they found that more taxpayers complained on the invasion of Iraq than any other military occupation of the U.S.

3. Methodology

The methodology used for this study also included the Survey Research Method sampling opinions of taxpayers regarding their satisfaction concerning the money spent on the war on terror in Nigeria. As such the following are the questions that were issued out to respondents which in this case were the Lecturers of the Nasarawa State University teaching courses such as Security Studies and Strategic planning etc We found that such courses are offered in undergraduate post graduate Diploma Masters of Science PhD and Diploma Level etc as such our sampling was purposeful but cut across all levels of education mentioned above and the various departments and Faculties in the University offering such courses. Our data gathered are therefore presented below using all 10 questions from questionnaires issued out. The researchers also collected all responses from 90 M.Sc and Ph.D students studying such courses in addition to 60 lecturers teaching such courses across the University. Data gathered from the survey is elaborated below:

Table 1: Response to the question: Do you believe the war on terror in Nigeria is worth the tax you pay for National Security?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	119	79.8
Disagree	27	20.2
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

From Table 1 it is clear that 79.8% of Nigerians believe that tax paid for National Security is justified while 20.2% believe otherwise.

Table 2: Response to the question: Do you believe that more financial resources should be allocated to the war on terror?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	85	56.7
Disagree	65	43.3
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

Table 2 justified that 56.7% of Nigerians believe more finance should be allocated to the war against terror while 43.3% believe otherwise.

Table 3: Response to the question: Do you believe Government is not spending enough financial resources on the war on terror?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	120	80
Disagree	30	20
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

From Table 3 it can easily be seen that 80% of Nigerians believe Nigeria is not spending enough money to curb terrorism while 20% feel otherwise.

Table 4: Response to the question: do you believe that the government should continue spending on tackling security?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	89	59.3
Disagree	61	40.7
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

From Table 4 it is clear that 59.3% believe that the Government should continue spending on tackling security while 40.7% believe otherwise.

Table 5: Response to the question: Do you believe the results of the war on terror in Nigeria are worth the tax you pay for National Security?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	79	52.7
Disagree	71	47.3
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

From Table 5 it is clear that both opinions are almost the same, while 52.7% agree, 47.3% think otherwise.

Table 6: Response to the question: Do you believe Nigeria should assist other countries in the War against terror financially?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	76	50.7
Disagree	74	49.3
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

Table 6 indicates that 50.7% believe that Nigeria should assist other countries on the war against terror financially while 49.3% believe otherwise.

Table 7: Response to the question: Do you believe other countries should assist Nigeria Financially on the war against terror?

Options	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	95	63.3
Disagree	55	36.7
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

Table 7 indicates that 63.3% of the respondents believe that other countries should assist Nigeria financially on the war on terrorism while 36.7% believe otherwise.

Table 8: Response to the question: Do you believe the war on terror deserves the greatest allocation of resources?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	76	50.7
Disagree	74	49.3
Total	150	100

Source: Survey (2015)

50.7% believe that the war on terrorism deserves the greatest allocation of resources in Nigeria while 49.3% believe otherwise.

Table 9: Response to the question: Do you believe that the private sector should contribute income to government on the war on terror?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	129	86
Disagree	21	14
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

From Table 9 it is easy to see that 86% of Nigerians believe that the private sector should contribute to war on terror while 14% believe otherwise.

Table 10: Do you believe we have the resources to win the war against terror?

Option	Respondent	Percentage
Agree	145	96.7
Disagree	5	3.3
Total	150	100

Source: Questionnaire Administered (2015)

Table 10 shows that 96.7% of Nigerians believe that we have the resources to win the war against terrorism while 3.3% believe otherwise.

The Second Methodology used in this study was content analysis employed to interpret international viewpoints. We used the U.S and the U.K specifically for a geographical location. For Content and in order to get opinions of the western world we observed reference to terrorism responses and changes in behaviour from occupation of Afghan Syria and Iraq for 15 years (2000 to 2015) using the source: www.bbc.com alone to observe such responses. Therefore the purposeful decision may have formed another limitation to the study with respect to this second methodology. The responses from www.bbc.com. BBC Online, formerly known as BBCi, is the brand name and home for the BBC's UK online service is a large network of websites including such high profile sites as BBC News and Sport, the on-demand video and radio services co-branded BBC iPlayer, the pre-school site CBeebies, and learning services such as Bitesize. The BBC has had an online presence supporting its TV and radio programmes and web-only initiatives since 1994 but did not launch officially until December 1997, following Government approval to fund it by TV licence fee revenue as a service in its own right. Throughout its short history, the online plans of the BBC have been subject to harassment from its commercial rivals, which has resulted in various public consultations and government reviews to investigate their claims that its large presence and public funding distorts the UK market. However We focused specifically on BBC online through www.bbc.com and viewed in the category section opinions of terrorist responses.

4. Discussion

Form the statistics gathered, 80% of Nigerians believe Nigeria is not spending enough money to curb terrorism while 20% feel otherwise. No such responses were acquired from respondents of the West as we found through the simple content analysis that no responses emerged negative in this regard but the percentage was found to be close to the opinions of studying the wholistic approach to terrorism by respondents in the U.K and U.S that Government responses should not be based on violence. 79.3% of Nigerians believe that the Government should continue spending on tackling security while 40.7% believe otherwise. 52.7% agree, 47.3% think otherwise. 86% of Nigerians believe that the private sector should

contribute to war on terror while 14% believe otherwise. 50.7% believe Nigeria should assist other countries on the war against terror financially while 49.3% believe otherwise. 63.3% of the respondents believe that other countries should assist Nigeria financially on the war on terrorism while 36.7% believe otherwise. 63.3% of the respondents believe that other countries should assist Nigeria financially on the war on terrorism while 36.7% believe otherwise. 86% of Nigerians believe that the private sector should contribute to war on terror while 14% believe otherwise. 96.7% of Nigerians believe that we have the resources to win the war against terrorism while 3.3% believe otherwise.

The western responses to terrorism carry more negative impact than the opinions of Nigerians with regards to support of Government spendings because to curb terrorism because out of 251 responses from the BBC official website 75 were all negative towards Government spending against the war on terror. Of these 75 opinions most were interpreted by Military Officials that lead the occupation or had a role to play. 79.8% of Nigerians believe that tax paid for National Security is justified while 20.2% believe otherwise. Generally speaking Nigerians were found to be more optimistic and positive towards spending on curbing terrorism by their Government. Most Nigerians therefore believe violence can end terrorism while the Western opinion is that the Government is as much to blame and we found that there are more sympathizers in the Western world than Nigeria. The idea of Private sector supporting Government to fight terrorism in the western world was nil but most Nigerians believed it was feasible regardless as 56.7% of Nigerians believe more finance should be allocated to the war against terror while 43.3% believe otherwise.

5. Concluding Remarks

In Conclusion Taxpayers of Nigeria justify and support spending to tackle terrorism and support the need for even more spending and private Sector collaboration, and so forth but the western mentality does not support much spending for curbing terrorism instead the Psychology of a terrorist is given more attention in the West but most Nigerians support more spending on arms as the solution or might be ignorant of the holistic approach to terrorism that taxes Government responses into account. Our recommendations revolve around transparency in Government spendings towards the cause in Nigeria because most of the fears of Nigerian tax payers are of corruption, that is, diversion of money allocated to tackling terrorism for other purposes especially personal gains or embezzlement of such funds from interviews conducted. We also recommend a study based on the psychology of terrorism be conducted in Nigeria to understand the mind of the terrorist rather than continue to spend on terrorism through military operations.

Bibliography

Asuquo, R.G (2014). Tax System in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges published on March 24, 2014 by in the vanguard newspaper

Belasco .A. (2014) The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11. A publication for the Congressional Research Service.

Central Bank of Nigeria CBN (2015) What is the cost of fighting terrorism in Nigeria published Thursday 18th June 2015 by the CBN.

Cordesman .A. (2007) The Uncertain Cost of the Global War on Terror. Center for Strategic and International Studies Washington, DC

Daily independent News Nigeria 2012 (<http://dailyindependentnig>).

Gold .D. (2005) The Costs of Terrorism and the Costs of Countering Terrorism. International Affairs Working Paper. March 2005

Global Initiative Against Transnational Organisational Crime GIATOC (May 2015) "Libya: a growing hub for Criminal Economies and Terrorist Financing in the Trans-Sahara". A policy brief.

Gregory A.R (2014) Tax System in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges published March 24, 2014 in the vanguard newspaper

McCarthy, N. (2015). The War On Terror Has Cost Taxpayers \$1.7 Trillion" A report published in the Fobbes Magazine. February 2015 edition.

Novolsov .F. (2013) the Social psychology of Terrorism. Library of Congress USA

Stiglitz J.E and Bilmes .L. (2008) The Economic Costs of the Iraq War: An Appraisal Three Years after the Beginning of the Conflict Kennedy School, Harvard University, Columbia University USA

Steven Cay .C. Martin B. Malin W. D. Nordhaus J.D. (2002) Costs, Consequences, and Alternatives. A publication of the War with Iraq committee on international security.

Todd Sandler, Daniel G. Arce, Walter Enders 2008 The Challenge of Terrorism copenhagen consensus 2008 terrorism challenge Paper published for the copenhagen consensus centre

The free encyclopedia (2015) Cost of Conflict www.wikipedpedia.com

The free encyclopedia (2015) The Social Contract (Du contrat social ou Principes du droit politique) Wrtngs of Rousseau .J. First published 1762.

Sourjya Bhowmick (2014), Hindustan Times News. www.Hindustantimesnews.com.