What Is Terrorism?

After reading this chapter, you will be able to

- discuss the most universally accepted definition of terrorism, and competing definitions of terrorism proposed by various scholars and institutions;
- explain the history of terrorism and the different types of terrorism today, comparing old terrorism with new terrorism;
- discuss the fifteen causes that explain why people resort to terrorism; and
- describe the various facets of the terrorist's identity.

TERRORISM: ORIGIN OF THE WORD

To begin, it seems appropriate to define the term *terrorism*. Within terrorism lies the word *terror*. **Terror** comes from the Latin *terrere*, which means "frighten" or "tremble." When coupled with the French suffix *isme* (referencing "to practice"), it becomes akin to "practicing the trembling" or "causing the frightening." Trembling and frightening here are synonyms for fear, panic, and anxiety—what we would naturally call terror. The word terror is over 2,100 years old. In ancient Rome, the **terror cimbricus** was a state of panic and emergency in response to the coming of the Cimbri tribe killers in 105 BCE. This description of terrorism as being rooted in terror is an example of etymology. **Etymology** is the study of the origin and evolution of words. From this standpoint, language is organic, changeable, fluctuating, depending on the needs of thinkers and speakers over time and place.[1]

The word terrorism, in and of itself, was coined during the French Revolution's Reign of Terror (1793–1794). In the **Reign of Terror** (*Le Gouvernement de la Terreur*), a group of rebels, the Jacobins, used the term when self-reflexively portraying their own actions in—and explanations of—the French Revolution. The Reign of Terror was a campaign of large-scale violence by the French state; between 16,000 and 40,000 people were killed in a little over a year. It is not surprising, then, that the French National Convention proclaimed in

September 1793 that "terror is the order of the day." Maximilien Robespierre, a frontrunner in the French Revolution, declared in 1794 that "terror is nothing other than justice, prompt, severe, inflexible." The very first official definition of terrorism in French was provided several years later. In 1798, the French released the supplement for the dictionary of the **Académie Française**, an elite French learned body on matters dealing with the French language. In this supplement, the term was explained as the "système, régime de la terreur" (i.e., "government of terror"). The English version of the word terrorism is attributed to a British man's depiction of the bloodshed he had witnessed from afar in France, where the revolution was happening. Sir Edmund Burke commented on the French Revolution and warned about "thousands of those hell hounds called terrorists."[2]

TERRORISM: DEFINITION

While the Reign of Terror was a product of the French government, in modern times, terrorism denotes the killing of humans by nongovernment political actors for various reasons—usually as a political statement. This interpretation came from Russian radicals in the 1870s. Sergey Nechayev, the founder of People's Retribution in 1869, viewed himself as a terrorist. In the 1880s, German anarchist writer Johann Most helped promote the modern gist of the word by giving out "advice for terrorists."[3] Worldwide, many governments are incredibly averse to defining terrorism because they are worried about how an official definition of terrorism would expose the legitimacy of self-proclaimed combats of national liberation. In certain countries, the word has become virtually synonymous with political opponents. For instance, the Chinese call pacific Tibetan Buddhists vicious terrorists. In Zimbabwe, President Robert Mugabe regards the democratic opposition in a similar fashion.[4] Terrorism is a pejorative term. When people employ the term, they characterize their enemies' actions as something evil and lacking human compassion. Terrorism is considered worse than war, torture, or murder. A **pejorative term** is a term that is fraught with negative and derogatory meanings.[5]

Studies have found more than 200 definitions of terrorism. In fact, Simon (1994)[6] reports that at least 212 different definitions of terrorism exist across the world; 90 of them are recurrently used by governments and other institutions. Schmid and Jongman (1988),[7] two researchers at the University of Leiden (Netherlands), adopted a social science approach to figure out how to best define terrorism. They gathered over a hundred academic and official definitions of terrorism and examined them to identify the main components. They discovered that the concept of violence emerged in 83.5 % of definitions; political goals emerged in 65 %; causing fear and terror in 51 %; arbitrariness and indiscriminate targeting in 21 %; and the victimization of civilians, noncombatants, neutrals, or outsiders in 17.5 %. What Schmid and Jongman actually did was a content analysis of those definitions. A **content analysis** is a careful, thorough, systematic analysis and interpretation of the content of texts (or images) to identify patterns, themes, and meanings.[8] Merari (1993) found that, in the U.S., Britain, and Germany, there are three common elements that exist in the legal definitions of terrorism of those countries: (1) the use of violence, (2) political objectives, and (3) the aim of propagating fear in a target population.[9]

Definitions from Various Scholars and Institutions

Throughout the years, various scholars have attempted to define terrorism. Yet, the term is so loaded with conceptual problems that a totally accepted definition of it still does not exist. The irony is that the recurrent theme of terrorism has become the daily part of the political drama of modern times. One just needs to turn on the TV to hear about it constantly. Below is a list of definitions of terrorism by some of the most distinguished scholars and institutions on the matter:

- Walter Laqueur: "Terrorism is the use or the threat of the use of violence, a method of combat, or a strategy to achieve certain targets… [I]t aims to induce a state of fear in the victim, that is ruthless and does not conform with humanitarian rules… [P]ublicity is an essential factor in the terrorist strategy."[10]

- Bruce Hoffman: "Terrorism is ineluctably political in aims and motives, violent—or, equally important, threatens violence, designed to have far-reaching psychological repercussions beyond the immediate victim or target, conducted by an organization with an identifiable chain of command or conspiratorial cell structure (whose members wear no uniform or identifying insignia), and perpetrated by a subnational group or non-state entity."[11]

- Alex Schmid and Albert Jongman: "Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-)clandestine individual, group, or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal, or political reasons, whereby—in contrast to assassination—the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators."[12]

- David Rapoport: terrorism is "the use of violence to provoke consciousness, to evoke certain feelings of sympathy and revulsion."[13]

- Yonah Alexander: terrorism is "the use of violence against random civilian targets in order to intimidate or to create generalized pervasive fear for the purpose of achieving political goals."[14]

- Stephen Sloan: the definition of terrorism has evolved over time, but its political, religious, and ideological goals have practically never changed.[15]

- League of Nations Convention Definition of Terrorism (1937): terrorist acts are "all criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons or a group of persons or the general public."[16]

- U.S. Department of Defense Definition of Terrorism: terrorism refers to "the calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological."[17]

- U.S. Department of State: terrorism is "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine state agents."[18]

• Arab Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism: terrorism is "any act or threat of violence, whatever its motives or purposes, that occurs in the advancement of an individual or collective criminal agenda and seeking to sow panic among people, causing fear by harming them, or placing their lives, liberty or security in danger, or seeking to cause damage to the environment or to public or private installations or property or to occupying or seizing them, or seeking to jeopardize a national resources."[19]

As one can see, there are problems about attaining an all-inclusive definition. As Yasser Arafat, late Chairman of the PLO (the Palestine Liberation Organization), notably said in a 1974 speech before the United Nations, "[O]ne man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." This statement exemplifies the ease with which politicians' biases can influence their definitions of terrorism. In line with these contentions, a public opinion poll was conducted in Palestine on December 21, 2001. The poll found that 98.1% of the Palestinians surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that "the killing of 29 Palestinians in Hebron by Baruch Goldstein at al Ibrahimi mosque in 1994" should be called terrorism, whereas 82.3% of the same respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that "the killing of 21 Israeli youths by a Palestinian who exploded himself at the Tel Aviv Dolphinarium" should be called terrorism.[20] Trying to define terrorism is like being in an Alice-in-Wonderland universe; it is a concept that no one can clearly define and even involves actors that no one can specifically identify. While some definitions are precise, others lack important aspects of terrorism (e.g., global connections, ideological roots, etc.).

Most Universally Accepted Definition

There is no universally agreed-on definition of terrorism. At best, we have a "most universally accepted" definition of terrorism, which is the following: **terrorism** is the use of violence to create fear (i.e., terror, psychic fear) for (1) political, (2) religious, or (3) ideological reasons (**ideologies** are systems of belief derived from worldviews that frame human social and political conditions). The terror is intentionally aimed at noncombatant targets (i.e., civilians or iconic symbols), and the objective is to achieve the greatest attainable publicity for a group, cause, or individual. The meaning of terrorism is socially constructed.[21] Terrorism is different from murder, assault, arson, demolition of property, or the threat of the same; the reason is that the impact of terrorist violence and damage reaches more than the immediate target victims (e.g., government or military). It is also directed at targets consisting of a larger spectrum of society (e.g., civilians or even society as a whole). Terrorism is distinct from regular crime because of its powerful objectives. The change is desired so desperately that the inability to achieve change is perceived as a worse consequence than the deaths of civilians. Terrorist acts are both mala prohibita acts and mala in se acts. **Mala prohibita acts** are "crimes that are made illegal by legislation"; **mala in se acts** are crimes "that are immoral or wrong in themselves."[22]

Terrorism is, first and foremost, a method, and it is used in times of peace and conflict. A **terrorist organization** is an illicit clandestine organization that generally consists of planners, trainers, and actual bombers/killers. A terrorist organization can have various structures, such as an identifiable hierarchy of command, a horizontal structure where leaders

are non-identifiable or have no major role, or a cell structure where the terrorists can be "lone wolves." Terrorism is also asymmetric warfare. **Asymmetric warfare** refers to the use of random/unpredictable violence by a weak group (i.e., one with a smaller force) against a stronger power (i.e., military, government, or even society in general) to gain advantage. Asymmetrical warfare is fought between grossly unequal sides. The less powerful force does not attack the more powerful force under the conventional rules of war because it cannot win by following these tactics. The centrality of asymmetric warfare is the use of unexpected and unconventional tactics in combat. This is similar to the notion of **war without front lines**, a war waged in the shadows against an indescribable enemy, without a clear understanding of where it would lead or how it would end.[23]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE'S LIST OF CURRENT TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

This section lists both Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs) and Domestic Terrorist Organizations (DTOs)—that is, U.S. terrorist groups—that are currently active or believed to be active. Terrorist groups that are no longer operational were not included. The sources come from the U.S. Department of State:[24]

Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs)	Domestic Terrorist Organizations (DTOs)
Abu Nidal Organization (ANO)	Alpha 66
Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG)	Animal Liberation Front (ALF)
Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade (AAMS)	Army of God (AOG)
Al-Shabaab	Aryan Nations (AN)
Ansar al-Islam (AAI)	Black Liberation Army (BLA)
Army of Islam (AOI)	Coalition to Save the Preserves
Asbat al-Ansar	The Covenant, the Sword, and the Arm of the Lord (CSA)
Aum Shinrikyo (AUM)	Earth First!
Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA)	Earth Liberation Front (ELF)
Communist Party of the Philippines/	
New People's Army (CPP/NPA)	Greenpeace
Continuity Irish Republican Army (CIRA)	Hardesty Avengers

(Continued)

Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs)	Domestic Terrorist Organizations (DTOs)
Gama'a al-Islamiyya (Islamic Group)	Jamaat ul-Fuqra
HAMAS (Islamic Resistance Movement)	Jewish Defense League (JDL)
Harakat ul-Jihad-i-Islami/Bangladesh (HUJI-B)	Phineas Priesthood (Phineas Priests)
Harakat ul-Mujahidin (HUM)	Sea Shepherd Conservation Society (SSCS)
Hezbollah (Party of God)	
Indian Mujahideen (IM)	
Islamic Jihad Union (IJU)	
Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU)	
Jaish-e-Mohammed (JEM) (Army of Mohammed)	
Jemaah Islamiya organization (JI)	
Jundallah	
Kahane Chai (Kach)	
Kata'ib Hizballah (KH)	
Kongra-Gel (KGK, formerly Kurdistan Workers' Party, PKK, KADEK)	
Lashkar-e Tayyiba (LT) (Army of the Righteous)	
Lashkar i Jhangvi (LJ)	
Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)	
Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG)	
Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group (GICM)	
Mujahedin-e Khalq Organization (MEK)	
National Liberation Army (ELN)	
Palestine Liberation Front (PLF)	
Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ)	
Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)	
PFLP-General Command (PFLP-GC)	

Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs)	Domestic Terrorist Organizations (DTOs)
al-Qaida in Iraq (AQI)	
al-Qa'ida (AQ)	
al-Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP)	
al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb (formerly GSPC)	
Real IRA (RIRA)	
Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)	
Revolutionary Organization 17 November (17N)	
Revolutionary People's Liberation Party/ Front (DHKP/C)	
Revolutionary Struggle (RS)	
Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso, SL)	
Tehrik-e Taliban Pakistan (TTP)	
United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC)	

BRIEF HISTORY OF TERRORISM

Terrorism is an old tactic. Accounts of terrorism existed before the word itself was invented. This was confirmed by specific artifacts located fifty miles south of Mosul in Iraq. Assurnasirpal, the conqueror and king of Assyria (884–860 BCE), enforced his rule on conquered territories by erecting stone monuments. Written on them, in cuneiform, is the following:

> I built a pillar over against his city gate and I flayed all the chiefs who had revolted, and I covered the pillar with their skin. Some I walled up within the pillar, some I impaled upon the pillar on stakes… Many captives from among them I burned with fire, and many I took as living captives. From some I cut off their noses, their ears and their fingers, of many I put out the eyes. I made one pillar of the living and another of heads.

Assurnasirpal's exercise of terror is particularly obvious.[25] Several ancient writers in antiquity advocated **tyrannicide** (the killing of tyrants) as a way to have an ideal society and to please the gods. **Regicide** (the killing of kings) happened quite frequently during the Roman age. The best-known political tragedy in ancient Rome was perhaps the assassination of Julius Caesar in 44 BCE. Other Roman emperors also had a violent death: Caligula and Galba. In 9 CE, Germanic tribes conducted guerrilla attacks against passing Roman

brigades. In that year, Hermann the Cheruscan ("Arminius"), a Germanic "freedom fighter," deserted the Roman army and organized "the great revolt of Germania" (Gundarsson). In an extraordinary spectacle of Barbarian resistance to the Roman occupiers, Arminius's forces attacked Roman legionnaires as they passed through the deeply wooded region of Teutoburger Wald. Three Roman legions were entirely eliminated in the Battle of Teutoburger Wald; the Romans were immediately booted out of Germania and back past the Rhine. Approximately 15,000 Roman soldiers were killed and hundreds more slain after being taken prisoner. For the Romans, such Barbarian resistance would have been considered terrorism.[26]

Another early terrorist group was the **Sicarii** (66–73 CE), a Zealot-affiliated religious sect fighting against Roman occupiers in Palestine and Jerusalem (the City of David), Jewish traitors, and Jewish moderates who had sold their souls to Hellenistic influences. The Sicarii opposed the law that Jews pay taxes to Rome and refused to acknowledge the power of the Roman Emperor (Vitellius). They were persuaded that political change could come only through violent acts. Hence, they adopted terrorism as their tactic.[27] For example, after investigating a target's routine every day, hiding nearby a temple's entrance, they knew the perfect time to cut the target's throat. In fact, **sica** (the first four letters of the group's name) means "short sword." The Sicarii's most fundamental justification was that all means were legitimate to achieve political and religious liberation. They wanted to show the world who they were, but eventually the terrorists lost and committed mass suicide in Masada in 73 CE, which coincides with the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem by Titus (the Emperor's son).[28]

During the Middle Ages, in 11th century Persia, the **Assassins** were a religious sect striking terror against the empire of Saladin and resisted the armies of the Ottoman Empire. As Chaliand and Blin (2007)[29] noted in their influential book, *The History of Terrorism, from Antiquity to Al Qaeda*, the Assassins' assassination of Nizam al-Mulk, the Persian grand vizier of the dominant Turkish Seljuq sultans, was one of the chief terrorist attacks in human history. The word *assassin* allegedly comes from the drug hashish, which some scholars believe al-Sabbah's followers ate before committing acts of terrorism in the name of Allah. They called themselves **hashashins**—meaning "hashish eaters." The Assassins killed numerous people, including fellow Sunni Muslims and Christians. Suicide missions were customary, and some Crusader leaders were so frightened by the Assassins that they paid tribute to them; in exchange, the Assassins would not attack them. The Assassins were exceptionally good at doing disguise, stealth, and surprise killings. Therefore, the word **assassination** was invented to describe this tactic. A major part of the Assassins' belief was the paramount righteousness of their cause and procedure. To slay or be slain was seen as a positive gesture because it was done in the name of Allah and secured a place in paradise after death. As the Qur'an explains it, "Allah has purchased of the believers their persons and their goods; for theirs in return is the garden of Paradise: they fight in His cause, and slay and are slain: a promise binding on Him in truth" (Qur'an 9:111). This belief in ultimate justification and reward is adopted by many contemporary Islamist terrorists. The Assassins made a profound impact on the modern era.[30]

From the 13th to the 19th century, the **Thugs of India** were among the many worshippers of the Hindu Goddess Kali, the destroyer. The Thugs of India were also called Thuggees

or the Thuggee cult (from which the English word *thug* is derived). Thugs strangled sacrificial victims (typically travelers) with a phansi (a noose) in the name of Kali and then robbed, ritually mutilated, and buried them. Offerings were to be made to Kali. The number of Thuggee victims was, on average, 20,000 a year.[31]

The more "avant-garde" version of terrorism occurred during the French Revolution in the 1790s (as discussed in the first paragraphs of this chapter). Eighty years later, during the Franco-Prussian War (1870–1871), Germany faced drastic resistance from the locals in foreign territories it had occupied. The French guerrilla attacks and the asymmetric warfare during the Franco-Prussian War had a deep impact on the German General Staff. Protecting their homeland against the German soldiers, French and Russian peasants were considered terrorists or **franc-tireurs** ("free shooters").[32]

Terrorism became an issue on the international agenda in 1934, when the League of Nations took the first major step toward making terrorism highly illegal and punishable. In doing so, it drafted a convention for the prevention and punishment of terrorist acts.[33] A few years later, the **Stern Gang**, a militant Zionist group founded by Avraham Stern, was making headlines. The group's objective was to expel the British authorities from Palestine, allow unlimited immigration of Jews, and create a Jewish state. A similar Jewish terrorist group, **Irgun**, operated in the British mandate of Palestine between 1931 and 1948. A notorious Irgun act was the bombing of the King David Hotel (the headquarters of the British Forces in Palestine) in Jerusalem in 1946, killing ninety-one people.[34] To have a clear idea of what modern terrorism looks like, one needs to pay particular attention to the next two sections: the first section gives some descriptive statistics on terrorist attacks or casualties from the 1970s until today; the second section compares, in detail, "old terrorism" with "new terrorism."

STATISTICS ON PRESENT-DAY TERRORISM

Terrorism began to make headlines again in the 1970s and reached a pinnacle in the mid-1980s. From 1975 to 1984, the average number of reported terrorist attacks increased from ten per week to nearly ten every day.[35] In 1985, Jenkins observed that 10% of the world's countries accounted for 60% of the world's terrorist attacks.[36] Li and Schaub (2004)[37] examined international terrorist incidents within 112 countries from 1975 to 1997. They discovered that the Middle East had the highest proportion of international terrorist incidents. Europe ranked second. Africa, Asia, and the Americas experienced considerably fewer international terrorist attacks—approximately 69%, 65%, and 33%, respectively, in comparison with the Middle East. More than 80% of arrested terrorists in Europe and the U.S. are members of the Muslim Diaspora, mostly second- and third-generation immigrants.[38] **Diaspora** refers to the dispersal of an ethnic or religious group worldwide and away from a founded or ancestral homeland. Once applied to Jews only, the concept of Diaspora today applies to any ethnic or religious group.[39]

On 9/11, America experienced the worst terrorist attack on its soil, committed by Al Qaeda ("The Base"). On that fateful day, Al Qaeda killed more people than the Irish Republican Army had killed in thirty-five years. According to a 2006 Gallup poll, involving

over 50,000 interviews in various nations, 7% of the 1.3 billion Muslims in the world—90 million people—see the 9/11 attacks as "completely justified." The current Global War on Terror (GWOT), initiated by President George W. Bush, is the most all-encompassing counterterrorist campaign in history and the most important fight since the fall of the Berlin Wall.[40] Since then, the number of terrorist attacks worldwide has increased significantly. As a case in point, from 2001 to 2005 alone, they rose from 1,732 to 4,995. A year later, they rose to 6,659.[41]

RAND Corporation

RAND Corporation, a California-based nonprofit global policy institution, has been a major frontrunner in terrorism and counterterrorism studies since the 1970s. RAND, which stands for **R**esearch **AN**d **D**evelopment, is widely considered the yardstick of measure for comprehensive data on international and domestic terrorism. According to RAND Database of Worldwide Terrorism Incidents, the number of deaths as a result of terrorist attacks in Europe and North America from 2000 to 2010 was 4,873. Of those 4,873 people killed, 4,703 were casualties of attacks committed by Muslim terrorists. That is over 96%. On closer analysis, in the U.S., 3,000 people were killed by Muslim terrorists; in Russia and Eastern Europe, the number of deaths was 1,452; and in Western Europe, the number was 251. Only 170 terrorism casualties in the U.S., Russia, Eastern Europe, and Western Europe were not caused by Muslim terrorist attacks. Even if we remove the infamous September 11, 2001 attacks from this RAND statistic, the percentage of casualties due to Islamist terror is still 90%.

By comparison, RAND reports that, during the same period (2000–2010), the Madrid attacks alone (executed by an Al Qaeda–inspired terrorist cell on March 11, 2004) caused three times as many fatal human losses as the deaths of all combined attacks by the IRA, ETA, Corsican separatists, right-wing extremists, and all other non-Muslim terrorists in Europe.[42] ETA is an armed Basque terrorist organization active in France and Spain that has killed between 850 and 900 people since 1968.[43] Corsican terrorists have also been active in France and Corsica (an island that is French territory). Since the 1960s, separatists from the Front for the National Liberation of Corsica have attacked French mainlanders in their enduring fight for independence.[44] Yet, in both the ETA and Corsican cases, the terrorist attacks have produced starkly fewer casualties (comparatively speaking).

Muslim Support for Terrorism in the U.S.

In 2009, Muslim Americans composed only 0.8% of the total U.S. population (this was the equivalent of roughly 2.4 million Muslims living in the U.S.).[45] Nevertheless, according to a report by the Pew Research Center (2007),[46] over twice as many Muslim Americans under the age of thirty as older Muslims think that suicide bombings are often or sometimes justifiable in the defense of Islam (15% vs. 6%). I could have included many statistics on terrorist attacks or support of terrorism in other places besides the U.S. and Europe (e.g., the Middle East, South Asia, Africa, or South America), but for lack of space and time, I deemed important to stick to the main issues of this chapter.

OLD TERRORISM VS. NEW TERRORISM

Walter Laqueur (1999),[47] a prominent terrorism expert, suggests that "there has been a radical transformation, if not a revolution, in the character of terrorism" (p. 4). Laqueur compares old terrorism with new terrorism. **Old terrorism** is terrorism that strikes only selected targets. **New terrorism** is terrorism that is indiscriminate; it causes as many casualties as possible. Another major feature of new terrorism is the increasing readiness to use extreme indiscriminate violence. Laqueur argues that "the new terrorism is different in character, aiming not at clearly defined political demands but at the destruction of society and the elimination of large sections of the population" (p. 81).[48] Terrorism has changed because of a paradigm shift. A **paradigm** is a pattern, worldview, or model that is logically established to represent a concept. A paradigm is a way of interpreting the world that has been accepted by a group of people and that can be useful for politicians and thinkers to design policy agendas. When a paradigm changes, the whole group experiences a **paradigm shift**.

Many scholars argue that the paradigm shift from old to new terrorism occurred at some point in the 1990s, with the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center in New York and the 1995 sarin gas attack in the Tokyo subway system by **Aum Shinrikyo** (a deadly Japanese cult).[49] Supporters of the concept of new terrorism identify the strict compliance with religion, predominantly radical Islam, as one of its main characteristics. While old terrorism was mainly secular in its focus and drive, new terrorism works hand-in-glove with religious fanaticism. New terrorism rejects all other ways of life and advocates a categorical and inflexible worldview consistent with the belief of the religion. New terrorism is also increasing.[50] Gurr and Cole (2000)[51] examined the sixty-four international terrorist organizations that existed in 1980; they found that only two of them were religious organizations (only 3% in total). By 1995, the number of religious terrorist organizations rose sharply to twenty-five out of fifty-eight (43% in total). It was an increase of 40% in just fifteen years.

Classical, Modern, and Postmodern Terrorism

For Ganor (2002),[52] the comparison between old and new terrorism can be articulated through the differences between classical, modern, and postmodern terrorism. **Classical terrorism** means that group warfare is direct; it is aimed at specific targets with few casualties (e.g., assassinations) or wreaks havoc on "non-significant" facilities. The damage is fairly low because the terrorist acts are perpetrated to achieve a specific political objective. In **modern terrorism**, a more indirect approach is used; attacks are more indiscriminate and destruction is much higher, inflicting hundreds of casualties. Although conventional weapons are used in modern terrorism, they are used to create mass fatalities. **Postmodern terrorism** has the objective of altering the reality of the conflict (with its enemy) by the very act of terrorism—such as using CBRN (chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons; pronounced C-BURN) weapons or attacks against symbols of the enemy—to materially demolish as much of their adversary as possible. The objective here is to eliminate the source of conflict itself.[53]

Four Waves of Terrorism

The comparison between old and new terrorism can also be explained through the evolution of terrorism in four waves, the Fourth Wave being new terrorism. The **First Wave** was in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The **Second Wave** was the colonial wave, confined within national geographical boundaries from 1921 until today. The **Third Wave** was the contemporary wave; it introduced international terrorism, crossing national boundaries, which began in the 1960s.[54] The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks gave rise to the Fourth Wave of terrorism (both for the U.S. and nations worldwide). The **Fourth Wave** is symbolized by religious justification for killing, international scope, unparalleled gory tactics and weapons, and dependence on technologies of modernity. The latter consists of communications, ease of global travel (i.e., moving across borders), and accessibility to finances and **WMDs** (weapons of mass destruction). In the Fourth Wave, terrorism has reached a global phase. The use of any weapon is justifiable. The "Other" is now a legitimate target. No distinction among targets should be taken into account. Terrorism, then, becomes **bellum omnium contra omnes** (the war of all against all). The Fourth Wave suggests a **Culture of Terror**, which refers to a collapse (both physically and figuratively) of America and the West through massive killings, the constant availability and uses of WMDs or CBRN weapons, and religious legitimation for terrorist attacks against civilians in any country that is considered Satan, infidel, or apostate (i.e., religious rebel). For example, the intent of Aum Shinrikyo to kill people in Tokyo subways in 1995 (through sarin poison gas attacks) was to punish everyone: infidels and faithful alike. This heralds the reality of sacred apocalyptic terrorism.[55]

Clash of Civilizations

Proposed by Samuel Huntington (1996),[56] the **Clash of Civilizations** posits that cultural and religious differences between civilizations worldwide have become the primary source of terrorism today. This can be easily observed in the concept of new terrorism. Terrorists want to produce a Clash of Civilizations or cause radical changes in the U.S. presence in the Middle East. The Clash of Civilizations is akin to the **War of Ideas**, where ideals and ideologies clash between the West and the Muslim world (which continues to oppose Western political forms such as democracy). Both the Clash of Civilizations and the War of Ideas give rise to a controversial concept: the **new world order**, a wide-ranging global agenda intended to change the world, establish new ideologies, and eventually replace sovereign nation-states.

Generally, religious terrorists compose their own community or population. They are not worried about upsetting their supporters with their terrorist attacks. They view themselves as people accountable only to God. New terrorists may not even deny responsibility for their acts of destruction. They oppose any type of negotiation.[57] As Morgan (2004)[58] explains it, "[T]oday's terrorists don't want a seat at the table; they want to destroy the table and everyone sitting at it" (p. 30).

Box 1.1   Jihad

Jihad is an Arabic word meaning "struggle." According to the Qur'an (where jihad appears forty-one times), Muslims have the duty of fighting enemies and invading non-Muslim territories to spread Islam. The belief is that the violent elimination of apostate regimes, the slaughter of the **People of the Book** (monotheistic non-Muslims, mostly Jews and Christians), and the removal of **kafir** (those who disbelieve in Allah) are justified in the cause of jihad. This has driven non-state actors (e.g., Al Qaeda) to commit terrorism.[59] The **greater jihad** is the struggle a person has within him- or herself to fulfill what is right. On account of human pride, selfishness, and sinfulness, believers must continually wrestle with themselves and accomplish what is right and good. The **lesser jihad** refers to the external, physical effort to defend Islam (including terrorism) when the Muslim community is under attack.[60]

The key characteristics of modern jihad ideology include (1) hakimiyya (true sovereignty of Allah over nation-states or civil laws), (2) Islamic society and upholding hisba (praising good, forbidding evil) by following the **sharia** (i.e., "Islamic law"; the required implementation of virtuous vs. materialistic, status-driven behavior based on group interpretation), (3) the necessity for jihad, (4) occupation of Muslim lands (used as justification for jihad as individual duty), (5) **martyrdom** (i.e., "dying or suffering as a hero"; martyrdom is associated with jihad and praised through videos, poetry, songs, and web postings), and (6) takfir (i.e., "disbelief in Allah"; non-Muslim governments are viewed as infidels and unwilling to be subdued by Islamic law. Therefore, it is an object of jihad).[61]

Jihadists have near enemies and far enemies. **Near enemies** are Muslim governments and forms of Islamic law that do not embrace the jihadist view. If non-Islamic powers or countries outside the jurisdiction of Islam (i.e., the West, the U.S., and Israel) do not embrace the jihadist view, they are referred to as the **far enemy**.[62]

Typically, radical Islam is singled out as the principal source of this Clash of Civilizations, with Al Qaeda being the foremost and most obvious example. Of particular relevance are members of the **mujahedin** (or **mujahideen**). The mujahedin are "Muslims doing the jihad" (see Box 1.1), or Muslims engaged in terrorist acts against the Western infidels to fulfill the new Islamic world order. The **new Islamic world order** refers to an expressed will to power and a tremendous ambition to rebuild a **Caliphate** (a great Arab-Muslim state).[63] Gunaratna (2007)[64] found that Al Qaeda recruits new affiliates from seventy-four different nations and among no less than forty different nationalities. Al Qaeda is an Islamist movement. A difference needs to be made between *Islamic* and *Islamist*. While **Islamic** means "Muslim-related," **Islamist** is an extreme version of Islamic and has connotations of militancy and terrorism. Therefore, there is a distinction between Islam and Islamism.[65]

In *The Terrorist Next Door*, Erick Stakelbeck (2011)[66] interviewed Al Qaeda prisoners about their motives to attack America and the West. Their response was that Islamist ideology

drives them to engage in terrorism—not the Israeli–Palestinian conflict or poverty. Another aspect of the Clash of Civilizations is the model of **Jihad vs. McWorld**, proposed by scientist Benjamin Barber (1995).[67] This model describes the struggle between jihad and "McWorld" (globalization and the political process controlled by corporations). For instance, Barbie dolls are perceived as anti-Islamic; importing them in Iran is punishable by law. In Saudi Arabia, the mutaween (the country's religious police) have announced that Barbie dolls, with their revealing clothing, endanger morality. The Muslim version of Mickey Mouse is not the same as its U.S. counterpart. The Muslim Mickey wears a Jellabiya (a long robe) and carries a misbaha (a necklace; prayer beads). In 2002, in Pakistan, crowds organized by Islamist groups destroyed and looted Kentucky Fried Chicken and McDonald's restaurants, while burning American flags.[68]

New Organizational Structures

Another major characteristic of new terrorism is its ultra-flexible networked and less hierarchical organizational structure, enabled by state-of-the-art technologies. Terrorist groups within these networks become very autonomous but are still connected through advanced communication and common objectives. In this manner, terrorist organizations can adjust more easily to various situations. Although members may communicate with their leaders, groups can operate independently.[69] From a social network perspective, new terrorist organizations adopt a mixture of the **hub and spoke design** (where nodes in the network communicate with the center) and the **wheel design** (where nodes communicate with each other without having to go through the center).[70] Arquilla, Ronfeldt, and Zanini (1999)[71] remark that terrorist leadership follows a "set of principles [that] can set boundaries and provide guidelines for decisions and actions so that members do not have to resort to a hierarchy—'they know what they have to do'" (p. 51).

Often, new terrorists only come together to commit their terrorist acts and then disassemble. They do not receive training or logistical support from state supporters. Rather, they depend on support networks and instructions on the web. By using information and communication technologies, new terrorists can communicate secretly and reduce distances more easily. Their massive range of communication toolkit includes mobile phones, satellite phones, and the web to prepare for their upcoming terrorist attacks, communicate with other terrorist factions, and spread their message across the globe.[72] The financing of new terrorism does not stem from funds received from state backers; it comes from illegal channels such as drug trafficking, credit card fraud networks, and money laundering. Conversely, their financing is sometimes based on legal business investments, donations from the wealthy, and charities.[73]

WHY DOES TERRORISM EXIST? FIFTEEN CAUSES

Why do people resort to terrorism? The reasons are complex and plentiful. The factors that motivate people to join and remain in terrorist groups can be religious, economic, social, psychological, retaliatory, and so forth. Below is a list of fifteen causes, based on an extensive

examination of journal articles and books on terrorism written by various experts on the matter.

Religion: religious fanaticism is an extreme sense of ideological zeal complemented by a focused and unrelenting set of activities that express the high dedication of one or more people to their own belief system(s). Radical religious Islamism has been identified as a root cause of terrorism. The Islamist attacks against civilians from Glasgow to Jakarta confirm that many Islamists are ideologically determined to engage in terrorism.[74] In the early 1950s, Hizb ut-Tahrir (The Liberation Party) advocated the collapsing of Arab regimes and the formation of an Islamic state. In 1952, Jordan and all other Arab states banned the party. Ironically, European countries such as Great Britain have permitted Islamic parties to establish ideological roots. Ex-Islamist Ed Husain, the author of *The Islamist*, argues that this British course of action was a blunder, as proved by the 2005 London bombings committed by Islamist terrorists.[75] Mohammed Atta, a leader of the September 11, 2001 attacks, carried with him writings from the Holy Qur'an that urged him and others to stay firm in their desire to carry out the attacks and pursue the rewards of martyrdom.[76] Based on Islamic writings, one of the rewards of martyrdom is a place in heaven (for men), with 80,000 servants and 72 virgins.[77] As one Hamas fighter said, "Before I start shooting, I start to concentrate on reading verses of the Qur'an because the Qur'an gives me the courage to fight the Israelis."[78] Some Christians have also committed acts of religious extremism. For example, in the U.S., radical Christian killers have been involved in abortion-clinic bombings and militia actions. Likewise, in Northern Ireland, Catholics and Protestants have perpetrated terrorist acts.

Oppression: terrorism can be the result of groups' portrayal of governments (and their actors) as oppressive. Terrorism, then, feeds on the desire to reduce the power of opponents. In autocratic societies, military-occupied areas, or even in the international arena where political expression is limited, groups opposing the current state of affairs may engage in terrorism as a principal method of expression and not as a last resort. Especially in the case of nationalist-separatist movements (e.g., ETA, Hamas), terrorists often invoke the unfairness of their treatment by governments that deprive them of identity, dignity, security, and freedom as the main reason for joining terrorist groups.[79] Chechen Black Widows are reported to retaliate against Russians for their own experience of rape by the Russian military or for the deaths of their husbands and male family members and friends. Consequently, the Black Widows turn to terrorism as a way to reclaim their personal or family honor.[80] In the late 1800s, Andrei Zhelyabov, a leader of People's Will (a terrorist organization) and the architect of many political assassinations (e.g., the bombs that killed Czar Alexander II), resorted to terrorist activities as a promise to revenge the many crimes by the monarchist regime that he experienced directly. His favorite aunt was raped by her land master (and it was ignored by the police); because he took part in a harmless protest against arbitrary grading practices, he was expulsed from his university without right to reapply; and finally, he sat in jail for four months for sending a kindly note to an imprisoned friend. These feelings of oppression shaped and reinforced Zhelyabov's determination to use terrorism against the ruling elite.[81]

Historical grievances: terrorists target governments and groups they view as responsible for historical injustices. Chechen terrorists have defended their terrorist attacks by

alluding to Russia's long-lasting rejections of Chechen desire for independence, and the old and cruel history of Russian invasion of Chechnya dating back to the 17th century.[82] The Basque separatist movement ETA, Sikh extremists (in India), the IRA, the ANC (in South Africa), and pro-Palestinian terrorist groups have all looked for vengeance for historical grievances.[83] Reports on Palestinian suicide bombers systematically refer to historical grievances, such as resentment, humiliation, sorrow, and the aspiration for vengeance and retaliation. Resentment and revenge are a major principle in the writings of the Shi'ite thinkers of jihad. Jihadists exploit collective narratives of humiliation and revenge to rationalize the need to kill themselves, civilians, and even fellow Muslims, as is the case in Iraq.[84] For Crenshaw (1981),[85] avenging comrades or the community is "the single common emotion that drives the individual to become a terrorist" (p. 394).

Violations of international law: in the terrorist's mind, a wrong can be the violation of some basic right treasured by the terrorist. The right may have been infringed on by a historical incident, such as a war or multiple violations of international law (e.g., genocide and unlawful dispossession of local inhabitants). The **international rule of law** is the standard by which all nations are subject to and bound by supranational legal covenants. Enduring conduct such as extended military occupation or foreign domination in violation of U.N. resolutions may be a major cause. According to Imre, Mooney, and Clarke (2008),[86] Palestinians demanded but were not granted justice through the U.N. and other legal channels. Other examples of violations of international law include the failure of Britain to protect the rights of Palestinians after the Balfour Declaration (1917), the failure of the Paris Peace Conference to grant Arab autonomy under the Treaty of Sèvres (1920), and the annexation of Palestinian territory by Jews in the 1940s and the resulting eviction of thousands of Palestinians from their land.

Relative deprivation: multiple scholars have found a strong link between poverty and terrorism.[87] In view of the 70% adult unemployment rate in Gaza, the GDP of less than $1,000 throughout the Palestinian Territories, the very limited economic opportunities due to the unsettled Israeli–Palestinian conflict, and the cultural prominence of the male wage-earner role, it is easy to allude to the possibility that relative deprivation has helped trigger Palestinian terrorism.[88] Sageman (2004)[89] describes how the Core Arabs (from Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Yemen, and Kuwait) sent abroad to study by their rich families were rejected, under-employed, and possibly discriminated against. Hence, they found themselves in a state of relative deprivation in comparison with the natives of their host countries. The Maghreb Arabs living or born in France may experience such relative deprivation too. In both cases, the Arabs' perception of relative deprivation may have been assuaged by their espousal of radical Islam; this is a way for them to rebuild their dignity, to be "born again," and to disseminate their values. In Peru, the popularity of the Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) in the 1960s, where government economic restructurings initially gave hope but then failed, is another historical case of relative deprivation.[90]

Hatred toward the global economic hegemony: countries that express hatred toward the global economic hegemony will produce more terrorist groups. The background that gave birth to Al Qaeda, namely Afghanistan and Pakistan, symbolizes this notion.[91] Many terrorists abhor the World Trade Organization (WTO). According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the September 11, 2001 attacks shattered $16 billion of private and

government property, including structures, computer equipment, and software. The loss is of the same degree as that caused by Hurricane Andrew in 1992 and the California earthquake of 1994.[92]

Financial gain: terrorism can be used for sheer financial gain. Generally, corporate hostage taking in Central and South America, and hostage taking by the Abu Sayyaf group in the Philippines, happens more out of a desire to earn a ransom than achieving political goals. In 1987, the Iran-Contra scandal concluded with an arms-for-hostage deal, even when the Reagan administration initially refused to negotiate with terrorists.[93] After Palestinian bombers commit suicide, their families earn subsequent social status and are usually secured a financial reward.[94]

Racism: racism can be a powerful method for dehumanizing adversaries and accomplishing moral disengagement. Gottschalk and Gottschalk (2004)[95] found that both Palestinian and Israeli terrorists draw on stereotypes and racism to dehumanize the other group. Similarly, the FBI-watched **Aryan Brotherhood** (a group of devious bikers formed in U.S. prisons) identifies with Nazi ideals (as noticed with their Nazi symbols) and has vowed to remove the Jewish and Black races out of the earth.

Guilt by association: for terrorists, you are the company that you keep. For example, the 2004 Madrid train bombings were executed by an Al Qaeda–inspired terrorist cell. One of the motives was Spain's involvement in the Iraq War, where the country had troops. Likewise, since decolonization in continents like Africa and South America, the West has been the target of terrorist attacks because it has been accused of making local minorities of Westernized people become comprador ruling elites. **Comprador ruling elites** are Third World ruling elites perceived to be in power (despite being shady, incompetent, and sanguinary) because the West put them or has kept them in power. In exchange, those elites fulfill the economic needs of the West. Because they have become Westernized in the process, the comprador ruling elites are culturally close to those in power in the West. Accordingly, the latter is blamed for the substandard quality of Third World governance because of a partnership between corrupt Third World elites and their backers in the West.[96]

Supporting sympathizers: because terrorism is the weapon of the oppressed, an important goal is to push the stronger power (e.g., U.S.) into unleashing against the terrorists' perceived support base. Such acts of retaliation, cruelty, and counterterrorism often turn the stronger power into a support for sympathizers, like a recruiting driver for the terrorist cause. For example, a chief Al Qaeda objective would have been to trigger U.S. retaliation so that the U.S. was seen as violently repressive.[97]

Mortality salience: mortality salience refers to anxiety over one's own death. Research by Tom Pyszczynski and his colleagues (2006)[98] examined the effect of mortality salience on Iranian and U.S. students and their respective espousal of martyrdom (terrorism) or extreme military intervention (counterterrorism). When Iranian students answered questions about their own demise, they rated the student who advocated martyrdom as higher than the student who opposed it. However, among politically conservative U.S. students, mortality salience increased advocacy for extreme military interventions by U.S. forces.

Narcissism: people with certain narcissistic dispositions are more prone to committing terrorist acts.[99] Suellwold (1981)[100] observed a high percentage of angry paranoids

among members of the Baader-Meinhof Group, a German terrorist group active from the 1970s to the 1990s. A common characteristic among many of these terrorists is a propensity to externalize—to look for outside sources to blame for personal inadequacies. Without being bluntly paranoid, terrorists over-rely on the ego defense of projection. Other prominent characteristics were a defensive grandiosity and a larger-than-life self-absorption with little concern for others' feelings. Crenshaw (1990)[101] observed various self-satisfying or self-aggrandizing motives for resorting to terrorist behavior and an increase in personal status for terrorists whose actions are praised by their communities, or at least by their fellow group members. Lastly, by analyzing the social backgrounds of forty neo-Nazi males, together with two case studies, Hamm (2004)[102] concluded that his subjects aspired to fame within their subculture and that "this insatiable need to be famous was, in fact, so strong that it outweighed every other motivational factor" (p. 337).

Sensation-seeking: another variable suggested as a reason for being drawn to the path of terrorism is sensation-seeking. Here, sensation-seeking denotes the inherent risk and excitement that a terrorist career may provide. Researchers contend that it is highly plausible that sensation-seekers are more likely to join an organization that uses violent tactics.[103] Sensation-seeking entails personal reward, including the thrill of the combative lifestyle and a feeling of empowerment through violence. The appeal and excitement of terrorism, perhaps the fascination for some individuals, lie in part in the physical danger it involves. Some terrorists have been reported to be stress-seekers seeking to increase the emotional intensity or the level of activation of the organism. Stress-seekers meticulously plan their behavior, respond more to internal than external necessities, and frequently repeat stressful activities. Moreover, repetition of the stressful situation becomes not only addictive and fanatical but also escalatory; the stress-seeker is forced to perform more to achieve the same high.[104]

Failure of conventional channels of expression: in democratic civilizations, the use or threat of using terrorist violence is seen by some scholars, like Chomsky (2006),[105] as the definitive failure of conventional channels of political expression and legitimate systems of authority. A related concept is the **Death of Statecraft**, whereby diplomats fail to negotiate with their counterparts or nation-states do not attempt at engaging in communicative action. As a result, people deploy more lethal actions. Terrorism, then, becomes a by-product of violations of diplomacy and other forms of political expression.[106]

Communication and publicity: this is a major premise of this book, and several chapters are devoted to communication and publicity. In essence, by killing adversaries or innocent civilians, terrorists seek to publicize their cause, communicate demands, air grievances to bulldoze authorities, sway the public policy agenda, or gain concessions. If publicity is constrained or unsatisfactory to the group's tactical goals, the group's terrorist violence will probably escalate. After the British press and population reacted to the London terrorist bombings of July 7, 2005 (and the failed attacks two weeks later) with defiance and a stiff upper lip, **Ayman al-Zawahiri**, Al Qaeda's new #1 (also called "the Egyptian doctor"), felt compelled to issue additional threats through the Qatar-based Al Jazeera TV station.[107]

CASE STUDY: ANDERS BEHRING BREIVIK'S MANIFESTO

On July 22, 2011, **Anders Behring Breivik**, then only 32 years old, was the perpetrator of two successive terrorist attacks on the government, the civilian population, and a summer camp in Norway. In total, 77 people were killed and 151 were injured. This was the most devastating attack on Norwegian soil since World War II. In his 1,500-page manifesto, titled *2083: A European Declaration of Independence*,[108] in which he slightly modified his name to Andrew Berwick, he describes his reasons for taking actions against Europe's real enemies. One of the reasons, writes Breivik, is "the rise of cultural Marxism/multiculturalism in Western Europe." This is made clear in the following excerpt:

> Multiculturalists/cultural Marxists usually operate under the disguise of humanism. A majority are anti-nationalists and want to deconstruct European identity, traditions, culture and even nation states. As we all know, the root of Europe's problems is the lack of cultural self-confidence (nationalism). Most people are still terrified of nationalistic political doctrines thinking that if we ever embrace these principles again, new "Hitler's" will suddenly pop up and initiate global Armageddon... Needless to say; the growing numbers of nationalists in Western Europe are systematically being ridiculed, silenced and persecuted by the current cultural Marxist/multiculturalist political establishments. This has been a continuous ongoing process which started in 1945. This irrational fear of nationalistic doctrines is preventing us from stopping our own national/cultural suicide as the Islamic colonization is increasing annually. This book presents the only solutions to our current problems. You cannot defeat Islamisation or halt/reverse the Islamic colonization of Western Europe without first removing the political doctrines manifested through multiculturalism/cultural Marxism.

The "rise of cultural Marxism/multiculturalism" has somewhat of a correlation with the "hatred toward the global economic hegemony" mentioned as one of the fifteen causes in the previous section. On looking at the list of victims who fell at the hands of Breivik, one would quickly notice that few of them were actually Muslims or Arabs. Rather, many victims were young Norwegians with left-wing tendencies. A deduction could be that Breivik's reason to kill them had to do with guilt by association. From this vantage point, it is not just Muslim immigrants who pose a threat to European values, but also those who support Islamic immigration. Based on the excerpt above, it also seems like Breivik was attempting to break the sacred cow of the political left: multiculturalism, or what he refers to as "cultural Marxism." The latter, he claims, would eventually lead to "national/cultural suicide." By extension, racism was another cause or motivator for the Norwegian terrorist to enact his "final solution." In any case, as he expressed it clearly, he was convinced that his manifesto "presents the only solutions to our current problems."

THE TERRORIST IDENTITY

By and large, **identity** refers to the distinct personality of a person. It is a set of characteristics, called **identity cues**, which a person has. These identity cues (e.g., skin color, style of dress, communicative style, sexual orientation, family background, etc.) make him or her definitively recognizable or known. There are three categories of human identity: natural (or innate) identity (born with an identity, at least some aspects of it, such as gender or race), ascribed identity (an identity attributed by others), and self-ascribed identity (an identity that one has created for oneself).[109] So, who is the terrorist? What is his or her identity? Long-established research on terrorism has indicated that the terrorist identity tends to be ascribed or self-ascribed.[110]

Ascribed Terrorist Identity

During the Cold War against the Soviet Union, Ronald Reagan and others in the White House frequently referred to the Afghan fighters as freedom fighters and mujahedin. However, twenty years later, after nineteen skyjackers—instructed by the late Osama bin Laden, the six-foot-five Afghan man hiding in a cave (and later in a compound in Pakistan)—reduced key U.S. symbols into shambles, their act was labeled terrorism by the George W. Bush administration.[111] President Bush employed the terms *terrorists* and *axis of evil*. What followed immediately after 9/11 was a rhetorical process of legitimizing the terrorism label. Politicians and media pundits made public statements intended to validate the label. Press conferences, State of the Union addresses, and Al Qaeda videos served to legitimate labels in remarkable and effective ways.[112] In regard to the conflict with Osama bin Laden, Pilon (2001)[113] quotes Attorney General John Ashcroft, at a National Press Club luncheon, as saying that Americans were "at war against international terrorism." The axis of evil became the presidential refrain.

U.S. presidential ascriptions of terrorists' identities and methods have focused immensely on the unacceptable levels of death and destruction caused by terrorism. They stress the unacceptable aspect of terrorist incidents through the use of descriptors such as terrorism, terrorist act, massacre, atrocity, tragedy, calamity, indiscriminate slaughter, ruthless murder, butchery, cruel oppression, monstrous brutality, intimidation, subjugation, suppression, suffering, persecution, tyranny, horror, scourge, treachery, barbarism, acts of savagery, evil, and sadism.[114] Likewise, as Reverend Jerry Falwell said on *60 Minutes* in 2002, "I think Muhammad was a terrorist. I read enough of the history of his life written by both Muslims and non-Muslims, that he was a violent man, a man of war." It is very simple: if Robin Hood steals and keeps all the goodies, then it is a crime. If Robin Hood steals from the rich and gives the goodies to the poor, then he would be a terrorist to one side and a hero to the other side.

Self-Ascribed Terrorist Identity

We use political labels: we refer to the bad ones as terrorists. They do not. The terrorists, as their opponents call them, rarely identify themselves as such. Generally, they use other terms or terms pertaining to their situation, such as enemy combatants, freedom

fighters, guerrillas, liberators, militants, paramilitary groups, patriots, revolutionaries, rebels, separatists, unlawful combatants, vigilantes, or any word with a similar meaning in other languages and cultures. While some Western pundits call militant groups and individuals in the Arab world terrorists, the latter call themselves mujahedin (jihadi terrorists), **Fedayeen** (suicide squads who are not bombers), and so forth. In fact, such Arabic words have entered the English lexicon for the past few decades.[115]

Based on unstructured interviews with Irish and European terrorists, Taylor and Quayle (1994)[116] reported that many respondents became terrorists as a result of their own creation of a new identity. Strentz (1981)[117] classifies three types of self-ascribed terrorist identity. The Leader is the chief ideologue and commander of the terrorist group and views him- or herself as the Anointed One chosen for bringing political, social, or ideological change. The Idealist is usually portrayed as a young, naïve, or oppressed person attracted to a terrorist organization. Just like the Leader, he or she hopes to create political, social, or ideological change. However, the Idealist does not give orders but follows them. The Opportunist displays antisocial traits, suffers from identity confusion, or does not see him- or herself as fitting any major personality mold in current society. By joining a terrorist organization, the Opportunist aspires to gain a sense of purpose and self-worth—"a place in the sun."[118] Typically, he or she already has a track record of criminal conduct that predates his or her membership with the terrorist organization.

A thorough study of terrorists' self-ascribed identities examined Germany's **Baader-Meinhof Group**, also called the **Red Army Faction**, one of Europe's most vicious post–World War II terrorist organizations. Researchers methodically reviewed major documents for each terrorist: perinatal, pediatric, preschool, lower school, grade school, high school, and university records. Researchers also interviewed the terrorists' relatives, neighbors, and classmates. Remarkably, no psychological differences emerged between the Baader-Meinhof Group terrorists and demographically matched controls. This is evidence that terrorists' behavior is sometimes rooted in the identity type they create for themselves later in life.[119] Let us look at this in further detail. Böllinger (1981)[120] conducted interviews with eight members of the German terrorist group. Böllinger found that some of the respondents' over-controlling parents, preventing them from becoming autonomous, led to identity crises. These youths became Idealists willing to engage in violent struggle and sacrificing their lives in attacks. Causing drastic societal change by liberating themselves and joining a terrorist organization was a major motive for such youths.

By the same token, those respondents with identity confusion saw themselves as Opportunists. After being distressed by a sense of isolation, they took part in terrorist acts as an adaptive response to the discomfort of anomie.[121] **Anomie** is a sense of social confusion and separation, a reaction against or withdrawal from the mainstream controls of society. The name Baader-Meinhof is a combination of the two founders' last names: Andreas Baader and Ulrike Meinhof. Baader was a historian's son, and Meinhof was an art historian's daughter. Meinhof was a graduate student in philosophy. Originally, the two founding members had no ill intentions and were actually peacemakers, taking reasonable political actions. Because their peaceful efforts were fruitless, Baader and Meinhof started to wear their Leader's hat: they recruited new members, radicalized their organization, and committed extremely violent acts.[122]

This anecdote is evocative of the works of psychiatrist Frantz Fanon (1965),[123] who posited that extreme self-determination to create change frees not only the body but also self-identity. Menachem Begin (1977),[124] Prime Minister of Israel from 1977 to 1983, confirmed this mode of thinking with his maxim, "We fight, therefore we are." In their tenacious search for identity, people turning to terrorism may act alone (e.g., Charles Bishop, the 15-year-old who crashed his airplane into a bank in 2002, leaving a suicide note in which he acknowledged he had identified with Al Qaeda) or may be enthusiastic about joining groups—a move offering an immediate grafting of identity.[125]

Terrorists' Educational and Family Backgrounds

Contrary to popular opinion, many terrorists come from mainstream educational and family backgrounds. The Aum Shinrikyo sect was composed of many specialists, including scientists and engineers. Scores of Baader-Meinhof terrorists were noticeably middle class. More recently, thorough studies of Islamist terrorists have categorized them as middle class, with a large percentage of engineers and physicians. Osama bin Laden came from a family with exceptional wealth in Saudi Arabia. Many terrorists have been exposed to the academic and cultural milieus of the West. As a case in point, terrorist Mohammed Atta came from a middle-class Egyptian background. Although he became a well-respected academic in Germany (and throughout the Western academic world), he was found to be a suspected mastermind of the September 11, 2001 attacks. He was flying the plane that crashed into the North Tower.[126]

Sageman (2004)[127] observed that 73% of the jihadists he studied were married and most of them had children. They came from upper- or middle-class families. Only a fairly small proportion (27%) came from working-class or poor families. This challenges assumptions that terrorism is a result of personal poverty or deprivation (although some cases are, of course). Bakker (2006)[128] noticed comparatively high levels of marriage among jihadists. An important conclusion here is that family commitments have certainly not prevented people from espousing jihad. Sageman also found that many jihadist marriages are to wives who share deep-seated ideological beliefs defending jihadism (or that the wives' families adopt those beliefs). Hence, marriage is essentially a supporting environment for jihadist views, and not a restraining influence.

Krueger and Maleckova's (2003)[129] study of 129 Hezbollah terrorists who died in action in the Middle East from 1982 to 1994 revealed that they had received better education and had earned more than non-terrorist Lebanese of the same age group and regional background. Pape's (2005)[130] study of suicide terrorists found that many of them came from privileged backgrounds. By the same token, research on non-jihadist terrorist groups generates similar results. For example, Hewitt (2003)[131] observed that members of the **Weather Underground**, a U.S. radical left organization that committed terrorist acts against the U.S. government, came mostly from middle- and upper-class families.

The Gender of the Terrorist

Since the beginning of modern terrorism, women have sometimes been the leaders and intellectual drivers, as it was the case in the U.S.-based Weather Underground, in Italy's Red Brigades, and Germany's Baader-Meinhof Group. As one can expect, the majority of

female terrorists have been followers.[132] According to Harmon (2000),[133] today "more than 30% of international terrorists are women, and females are central to membership rosters and operational roles in nearly all insurgencies" (p. 212). Other figures range from 20% to 30% for many domestic and international terrorist groups. In general, left-wing organizations have exceedingly more female members than right-wing ones.[134] There are a few possible explanations for gender differences between ordinary crime and terrorism: terrorist actions (e.g., making bombs explode) may require less physical ability than many ordinary crimes (e.g., robbery); women may be tactically valuable because they can approach targets more closely without experiencing the same degree of scrutiny as men.

These differences imply that, in regard to gender, terrorism resembles white-collar crime more than other types of crime.[135] Between 1985 and 2006, 225 female suicide bombers from various terrorist organizations were identified and dozens of women were arrested after the suicide missions failed.[136] Pape (2005)[137] gathered data on 462 suicide bombers between 1980 and 2003 (including both genders). Fifty percent of the cases involved Muslim terrorists in Lebanon and Palestine who were linked to Al Qaeda, and most of the rest were Kurds, Chechens, and Tamil Tigers. Pape found that the proportion of women differed significantly across these groups, ranging from no women among the Al Qaeda terrorists to over 50% of women for the Chechens and Kurds.

The Age of the Terrorist

Mahan and Griset (2007)[138] observed that suicide terrorists are typically male aged 17 to 23. In his study of suicide terrorists, Pape (2005)[139] found that the average age ranged from 21.1 years for Lebanese Hezbollah and Palestinian terrorists to 29.8 years for Chechens. Part of this age difference lies in the median age differences in the populations from which suicide terrorists came: the median ages of the Lebanese and Palestinian groups were roughly ten years younger than that of the Chechens. In brief, in comparison with the results for regular crime, the correlation between age and terrorism seems to be stronger than the correlation between gender and terrorism. Pape also confirmed that, put side-by-side with men, women terrorists are on average older. For instance, the 48 women suicide terrorists in his survey were much older than the 213 men. Over 60% of the males were between 19 and 23, and only about 25% were 24 or older. On the other hand, only 40% of the females were between 19 and 23 and almost 50% were 24 or older. Part of this age difference lies in the fact that female suicide terrorists are sometimes widows of men killed by the government or the military. This situation is so common among female Chechen suicide bombers that they are often referred to as **Black Widows**. Finally, the average age of the left-wing terrorist is usually lower than other kinds of terrorists. In fact, many of them do not even have a high-school diploma.[140]

SUMMARY

Terrorism is an ancient practice that has existed for over 2,000 years. There is no universally agreed-on definition of terrorism. At best, there is a "most universally accepted" definition of it,

which is the following: terrorism is the use of violence to create fear (i.e., terror; psychic fear) for (1) political, (2) religious, or (3) ideological reasons. Of particular relevance is the comparison between old and new terrorism. While old terrorism strikes only selected targets, new terrorism is indiscriminate; it causes as many casualties as possible. New terrorism is synonymous with Sam Huntington's (1996) "Clash of Civilizations," the idea that cultural and religious differences between civilizations across the world have become the primary source of terrorism today. This chapter also lists and describes fifteen causes that explain why people resort to terrorism. The last section of this chapter deals with the terrorist identity. Many terrorists have an ascribed identity (i.e., it is imposed on them) or self-ascribed identity (i.e., they choose it). In addition, many of them come from middle- and upper-class backgrounds, are young, and increasingly include females.

KEY TERMS

anomie   21

assassination   8

asymmetric warfare   5

bellum omnium contra omnes   12

caliphate   13

Clash of Civilizations   12

classical terrorism   11

content analysis   2

Culture of Terror   12

Death of Statecraft   18

diaspora   9

etymology   1

far enemy   13

Four Waves of terrorism   12

greater jihad   13

hub and spoke design   14

identity   20

identity cues   20

ideologies   4

international rule of law Islamist   13

jihad   13

Jihad vs. McWorld   14

lesser jihad   13

mala in se acts   4

mala prohibita acts   4

martyrdom   13

modern terrorism   11

mujahedin   13

near enemy   13

new Islamic world order   13

new terrorism   11

new world order   12

old terrorism   11

paradigm   11

paradigm shift   11

pejorative term   2

People of the Book   13

postmodern terrorism   11

regicide   7

Reign of Terror   1

sharia   13

terror   1

terror cimbricus   1

terrorism   4

terrorist organization   4

tyrannicide   7

War of Ideas   12

wheel design   14

WMDs   12

ENDNOTES

1. Burgess, Mark (2003). *A Brief History of Terrorism*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Defense Information (CDI); Tuman, Joseph S. (2009). *Communicating Terror: The Rhetorical Dimensions of Terrorism* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

2. Burke, Edmund (1790). *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (Ed. C. C. O'Brien, 1969, London: Penguin Books); Shane, Scott (2010, April 3). Words as Weapons: Dropping the "Terrorism" Bomb. *The New York Times*, p. WK1; Tuman, Joseph S. (2003). *Communicating Terror: The Rhetorical Dimensions of Terrorism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

3. Crenshaw, Martha (1995). *Terrorism in Context*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

4. International Bar Association (2003). *International Terrorism: Legal Challenges and Responses*. Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers; Moeller, Susan D. (2002). A Hierarchy of Innocence: The Media's Use of Children in the Telling of International News. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 7*(1), 36–56.

5. White, Jonathan R. (2011). *Terrorism & Homeland Security* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

6. Simon, Jeffrey D. (1994). *The Terrorist Trap*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

7. Schmid, Alex, & Jongman, Albert (1988). *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature*. Amsterdam: North Holland, Transaction Books.

8. Berg, Bruce L. (2009). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

9. Merari, Ariel (1993). Terrorism as a Strategy of Insurgency. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 5*(4), 213–251.

10. Laqueur, Walter (1987). *The Age of Terrorism* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little & Brown, p. 143.

11. Hoffman, Bruce (2006). *Inside Terrorism* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press, p. 43.

12. Schmid, Alex, & Jongman, Albert (1988). *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, and Literature*. Amsterdam: North Holland, Transaction Books, p. 28.

13. Rapoport, David C. (1977, November 26). The Government Is Up in the Air over Combating Terrorism. *National Journal, 9*, 1853–1856.

14. Alexander, Yonah (1976). *International Terrorism: National, Regional and Global Perspectives*. New York: Praeger, p. xiv.

15. Sloan, Stephen (2006). *Terrorism: The Present Threat in Context*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

16. League Convention (1937). Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism. Article 1(2)

17. Joint Chiefs of Staff DOD (2008). *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*. Washington, D.C.: DOD.

18. U.S. Department of State (1996). *Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1995*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.

19. Arab Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism (1998). *Arab Convention on Terrorism*. Cairo: Council of Arab Ministers of the Interior and the Council of Arab Ministers of Justice.

20. Khalil Shikaki (2001, December 21). Palestinian Survey Research, http://www.pcpsr.org.survey/polls/2001/p3a.html.

21. Barnett, Brooke, & Reynolds, Amy (2009). *Terrorism and the Press: An Uneasy Relationship*. New York: Peter Lang; Hoffman, Bruce (2006). *Inside terrorism* (2nd ed.). Columbia University Press; Jenkins, Brian (1983). Research in Terrorism: Areas of Consensus, Areas of Ignorance. In Burr Eichelman, David A. Soskis, & William H. Reid (Eds.), *Terrorism: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 153–177). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association; Schmid, Alex P., & de Graaf, Janny (1982). *Violence as Communication: Insurgent Terrorism and the Western News Media*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

22. Rush, George E. (2002). *The Dictionary of Criminal Justice* (5th ed.). Guildford, CT: McGraw-Hill, pp. 204–205.

23. Hoge, James F., Jr., & Rose, Gideon (2001). *How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War*. New York: Public Affairs; Mansdorf, Irwin J., & Kedar, Mordechai (2008). The Psychological Asymmetry of Islamist Warfare. *Middle East Quarterly, 15*(2), 37–44; White, Jonathan R. (2011). *Terrorism & Homeland Security* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

24. U.S. Department of State (2011, September 15). *Foreign Terrorist Organizations*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State. Retrieved December 18, 2011 from http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm

25. Roux, George (1966). *Ancient Iraq*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.

26. Gibbon, Edward (1974). *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. New York: AMS Press; Imre, Robert, Mooney, T. Brian, & Clarke, Benjamin (2008). *Responding to Terrorism*. Farnham, England: Ashgate; Laqueur, Walter (1999). *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction*. London: Oxford University Press; Wells, Peter S. (2003). *The Battle That Stopped Rome*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

27. Matusitz, Jonathan (2008). Similarities between Terrorist Networks in Antiquity and Present-Day Cyberterrorist Networks. *Trends in Organized Crime, 11*(2), 183–199; Matusitz, Jonathan (2011). Social Network Theory: A Comparative Analysis of the Jewish Revolt in Antiquity and the Cyberterrorism Incident over Kosovo. *Information Security Journal: A Global Perspective, 20*(1), 34–44.

28. Ben-Yehuda, Nachman (1998). Where Masada's Defenders Fell. *Biblical Archaeology Review 24*(6), 32–39; Laqueur, Walter (1999). *Terrorism and History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Roth, Cecil (1959). The Zealots in the War of 66–73. *Journal of Semitic Studies, 4*, 332–355.

29. Chaliand, Gérard, & Blin, Arnaud (2007). *The History of Terrorism, from Antiquity to Al Qaeda*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

30. Anderson, Sean K., & Sloan, Stephen (2003). *Terrorism: Assassins to Zealots*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press; Lewis, Bernard (1987). *The Assassins: A Radical Sect in Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press; Martin, Gus (2010). *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

31. Martin, Gus (2010). *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

32. Nabulsi, Karma (1999). *Traditions of War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Ticehurst, Rupert (1997). The Martens Clause and the Laws of Armed Conflict. *International Review of the Red Cross, 317*, 125–134.

33. Sinclair, Andrew (2003). *An Anatomy of Terror: A History of Terrorism*. London: Macmillan.

34. Hoffman, Bruce (1999). *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

35. Risks International. (1985). *Major Incidents of Terrorism: 1970–1984*. Alexandria, VA: Risks International.

36. Jenkins, Brian M. (1985). Terrorism Prone Countries and Conditions. In Ariel Merari (Ed.), *On Terrorism and Combating Terrorism* (pp. 25–40). Frederick, MD: University Publications of America.

37. Li, Quan, & Schaub, Drew (2004). Economic Globalization and Transnational Terrorist Incidents: A Pooled Time Series Analysis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 48*(2), 230–258.

38. Bakker, Edwin (2007). *Jihadi Terrorists in Europe*. The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations; Sageman, Marc (2008). *Leaderless Jihad: Terror Networks in the Twenty-First Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

39. Braziel, Jane Evans (2008). *Diaspora: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

40. Jackson, Richard (2005). *Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

41. Martin, Gus (2010). *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

42. RAND (2011). *RAND Database of Worldwide Terrorism Incidents*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation. Retrieved April 6, 2011 from http://www.rand.org/nsrd/projects/terrorism-incidents.html

43. Pontvieux, Delphine (2010). *ETA—Estimated Time of Arrest*. Chicago: Miss Nyet Publishing.

44. Martin, Gus (2010). *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

45. Pew Research Center (2009). *Mapping the Global Muslim Population*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Available at http://pewforum.org/newassets/images/reports/Muslimpopulation/Muslimpopulation.pdf

46. Pew Research Center (2007). *Muslim Americans: Middle Class and Mostly Mainstream*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center. Available at http://pewresearch.org/assets/pdf/muslim-americans.pdf

47. Laqueur, Walter (1999). *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction*. London: Oxford University Press, p. 4.

48. Laqueur, Walter (1999). *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction*. London: Oxford University Press, p. 81.

49. Carter, Ashton B., Deutch, John, & Zelikow, Philip (1999). Catastrophic Terrorism. *Foreign Affairs, 77*(6), 80–94; Hoffman, Bruce (1998). *Inside Terrorism*. London: St. Andrew's University Press; Laqueur, Walter (2003). *No End to War: Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Continuum.

50. Juergensmeyer, Mark (2000). *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

51. Gurr, Nadine, & Cole, Benjamin (2000). *The New Face of Terrorism: Threats from Weapons of Mass Destruction*. London: I.B. Tauris.

52. Ganor, Boaz (2002). Defining Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorist Another Man's Freedom Fighter? *Police Practice and Research, 3*(4), 287–304.

53. Sinai, Joshua (2004). Forecasting Terrorists' Proclivity to Embark on CBRN Warfare. *International Studies Review, 7*, 133–154.

54. Rapoport, David (1988). Introduction. In David Rapoport (Ed.), *Inside the Terrorist Organizations* (pp. 2–10). New York: Columbia University Press.

55. Crelinsten, Ronald D. (1988). Images of Terrorism in the Media: 1966–1985. *Terrorism, 12*, 167–198; Jenkins, Brian M. (2000). Terrorism. In Edgar F. Borgotta (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Sociology* (pp. 3137–3141). New York: Macmillan; Lifton, Robert J. (2000). *Destroying the World to Save It: Aum Shinrikyo, Apocalyptic Violence, and the New Global Terrorism*. New York: Picador; Rapoport, David (1988). Introduction. In David Rapoport (Ed.), *Inside the Terrorist Organizations* (pp. 2–10). New York: Columbia University Press; Weigert, Andrew J. (2003). Terrorism, Identity, and Public Order: A Perspective from Goffman. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 3*(2), 93–113; Wittebols, James H. (1991). Politics and Coverage of Terrorism: From Media Images to Public Consciousness. *Communication Theory, 1*, 253–266.

56. Huntington, Samuel P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

57. Hoffman, Bruce (1995). "Holy Terror": The Implications of Terrorism Motivated by a Religious Imperative. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, 18*(4), 271–284; Whine, Michael (2002). *The New Terrorism*. Herzliya, Israel: International Policy Institute for Counter Terrorism.

58. Morgan, Matthew J. (2004). The Origin of the New Terrorism. *Parameters, XXXIV*(1), 30–31.

59. Imre, Robert, Mooney, T. Brian, & Clarke, Benjamin (2008). *Responding to Terrorism*. Farnham, England: Ashgate.

60. Martin, Gus (2010). *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

61. Ansari, Hamied (1984). The Islamic Militants in Egyptian Politics. *International Journal of Middle East Studies, 16*, 136–140; Zeidan, David (2001). The Islamic Fundamentalist View of Life as a Perennial Battle. *Middle East Review of International Affairs, 5*(4), 10–21.

62. Gerges, Fawaz (2005). *The Far Enemy: Why Jihad Went Global*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

63. Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2004). From the Depths of Despair: Performance, Counterperformance, and "September 11." *Sociological Theory, 22*(1), 88–105; Sageman, Marc (2004). *Understanding Terror Networks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

64. Gunaratna, Rohan (2007). Ideology in Terrorism and Counter Terrorism: Lessons from Combating al Qaeda and al Jemaah Islamiyah in Southeast Asia. In Anne Aldis & Graeme Herd (Eds.), *The Ideological War on Terror: Worldwide Strategies for Counterterrorism* (pp. 21–34). New York: Routledge.

65. Badran, Margot (2001). Understanding Islam, Islamism, and Islamic Feminism. *Journal of Women's History, 13*(1), 47–52.

66. Stakelbeck, Erick (2011). *The Terrorist Next Door: How the Government Is Deceiving You about the Islamist Threat*. New York: Regnery Publishing.

67. Barber, Benjamin R. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Crown.

68. Jandt, Fred (2010). *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; Le Feber, Walter (2002). The Post September 11 Debate over Empire,

Globalization, and Fragmentation. *Political Science Quarterly, 117*(1), 9–10; Zirinski, Roni (2005). *Ad Hoc Arabism: Advertising, Culture, and Technology in Saudi Arabia*. New York: Peter Lang.

69.   Gunaratna, Rohan (2002). *Inside Al Qaeda. Global Network of Terror*. London: Hurst; Spencer, Alexander (2006). Questioning the Concept of "New Terrorism." *Peace Conflict & Development, 8*, 1–33.

70.   Simon, Steven, & Benjamin, Daniel (2000). America and the New Terrorism. *Survival, 42*(1), p. 70.

71.   Arquilla, John, Ronfeldt, David, & Zanini, Michele (1999). Networks, Netwar and Information-Age Terrorism. In I. O. Lesser, B. Hoffman, J. Arquilla, D. F. Ronfeldt, M. Zanini, & B. M. Jenkins (Eds.), *Countering the New Terrorism* (pp. 39–88). Santa Monica: RAND.

72.   O'Brien, Kevin A. (2003). Information Age, Terrorism and Warfare. *Small Wars and Insurgencies, 14*(1), 183–206; Tsfati, Yariv, & Weimann, Gabriel (2002). WWW.Terrorism.com: Terror on the Internet. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, 25*(5), 317–332.

73.   Raphaeli, Nimrod (2003). Financing of Terrorism: Sources, Methods, and Channels. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 15*(4), 59–82.

74.   Imre, Robert, Mooney, T. Brian, & Clarke, Benjamin (2008). *Responding to Terrorism*. Farnham, England: Ashgate; Prus, Robert (2005). Terrorism, Tyranny, and Religious Extremism as Collective Activity: Beyond the Deviant, Psychological, and Power Mystiques. *The American Sociologist, 36*(1), 47–74.

75.   Husain, Ed (2007). *The Islamist: Why I Joined Radical Islam in Britain, What I Saw Inside and Why I Left*. New York: Penguin.

76.   Islam, Muhammad Q., & Shahin, Wassim N. (2001). Applying Economic Methodology to the War on Terrorism. *Forum for Social Economics, 31*(1), 7–26.

77.   Hadith #2687: "The smallest reward for the people of Heaven is an abode where there are 80,000 servants and 72 houri [virgins], over which stands a dome decorated with pearls, aquamarine and ruby, as wide as the distance from al-Jabiyyah to San'a."

78.   Jaffar (2000, October 23). Interview with Jamil Hamad: First Person: I Shot an Israeli. *Time*.

79.   Crenshaw, Martha (1986). 1986. The Psychology of Political Terrorism. In Margaret G. Hermann (Ed.), *Political Psychology* (pp. 379–413). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; Post, Jerrold M., Sprinzak, Ehud, & Denny, Laurita M. (2003). The Terrorists in Their Own Words: Interviews with 35 Incarcerated Middle Eastern Terrorists. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 15*, 171–184; Taylor, Maxwell, & Quayle, Ethel (1994). *Terrorist Lives*. London: Brassey's.

80.   McCauley, Clark, & Moskalenko, Sophia (2008). Mechanisms of Political Radicalization: Pathways toward Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 30*(3), 415–433.

81.   Tessendorf, K. C. (1986). *Kill the Tzar! Youth and Terrorism in Old Russia*. New York: Atheneum.

82.   Tishkov, Valery (2004). *Chechnya: Life in a War-Torn Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

83.   Imre, Robert, Mooney, T. Brian, & Clarke, Benjamin (2008). *Responding to Terrorism*. Farnham, England: Ashgate.

84.   Hafez, Mohammed M. (2007). Martyrdom Mythology in Iraq: How Jihadists Frame Suicide Terrorism in Videos and Biographies. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 19*(1), 95–115; Moghaddam, Fathali (2007). Mayhem, Myths, and Martyrdom: The Shi'a Conception of Jihad. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 19*(1), 125–143.

85.   Crenshaw, Martha (1981). The Causes of Terrorism. *Comparative Politics, 13*(4), 379–399.

86.   Imre, Robert, Mooney, T. Brian, & Clarke, Benjamin (2008). *Responding to Terrorism*. Farnham, England: Ashgate.

87.   Harmon, Christopher C. (2000). *Terrorism Today*. London: Frank Cass; Hasisi, Badi, &, Pedahzur, Ami (2000). State, Policy, and Political Violence: Arabs in the Jewish State. *Civil Wars, 3*, 64–84; Schmid, Alex (1983). *Political Terrorism: A Research Guide to the Concepts, Theories, Databases and Literature*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

88.   Bennet, J. (2004, July 15). In Chaos, Palestinians Struggle for Way Out. *The New York Times, 1*, 10–11.

89.   Sageman, Marc (2004). *Understanding Terror Networks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

90.   Palmer, David Scott (1995). Revolutionary terrorism of Peru's Shining Path. In Martha Crenshaw (Ed.), *Terrorism in Context* (pp. 249–308). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

91.   Louw, P. Eric (2003). The "War against Terrorism": A Public Relations Challenge for the Pentagon. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies, 65*(3), 211–230.

92. International Monetary Fund. (2001, December 18). *World Economic Outlook: The Global Economy after September 11*. Press release.

93. Islam, Muhammad Q., & Shahin, Wassim N. (2001). Applying Economic Methodology to the War on Terrorism. *Forum for Social Economics, 31*(1), 7–26.

94. Bouhana, Noémie, & Wikström, Per-Olof H. (2008). *Theorizing Terrorism: Terrorism as Moral Action*. London: University of College London Research Reports.

95. Gottschalk, Michael, & Gottschalk, Susan (2004). Authoritarianism and Pathological Hatred: The Social Psychological Profile of the Middle Eastern Terrorist. *American Sociologist, 32*, 38–59.

96. Louw, P. Eric (2003). The "War against Terrorism": A Public Relations Challenge for the Pentagon. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies, 65*(3), 211–230; Lulat, Y. G.-M. (2005). *A History of African Higher Education from Antiquity to the Present: A Critical Synthesis*. Santa Barbara: Praeger.

97. Bassiouni, M. Cherif (1979). Prolegomenon to Terror Violence. *Creighton Law Review, 12*(3), 745–780; Kelly, Michael J., & Mitchell, Thomas H. (1981). Transnational Terrorism and the Western Elite Press. *Political Communication and Persuasion, 1*(3), 269–296; Thornton, Thomas Perry (1964). Terror as a Weapon of Political Agitation. In Harry Eckstein (Ed.), *Internal War: Problems and Approaches* (pp. 71–99). New York: The Free Press.

98. Pyszczynski, Tom, Abdollahi, Abdolhossein, Solomon, Sheldon, Greenberg, Jeff, Cohen, Florette, & Weise, David (2006). Mortality Salience, Martyrdom, and Military Might: The Great Satan Versus the Axis of Evil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(4), 525–537.

99. Post, Jerrold M. (1987). Rewarding Fire with Fire: Effects of Retaliation on Terrorist Group Dynamics. *Terrorism, 10*, 23–36.

100. Suellwold, Liselotte (1981). In Herbert Jäger, Gerhard Schmidtchen, & Liselotte Suellwold (Eds.), *Analysen Zum Terrorismus 2: Lebenslauf-Analysen*. Darmstadt, Germany: Deutscher Verlag.

101. Crenshaw, Martha (1990). Questions to Be Answered, Research to Be Done, Knowledge to Be Applied. In Walter Reich (Ed.), *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind* (pp. 247–260). New York: Cambridge University Press.

102. Hamm, Mark S. (2004). Apocalyptic Violence: The Seduction of Terrorist Subcultures. *Theoretical Criminology, 8*(3), 323–339.

103. Victoroff, Jeff (2005). The Mind of the Terrorist: A Review and Critique of Psychological Approaches. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 49*, 3–42; Zuckerman, Marvin (2002). Genetics of Sensation Seeking. In Jonathan Benjamin, Richard P. Ebstein, & Robert Belmaker (Eds.), *Molecular Genetics and the Human Personality* (pp. 193–210). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Publishing.

104. Crenshaw, Martha (1990). Questions to Be Answered, Research to Be Done, Knowledge to Be Applied. In Walter Reich (Ed.), *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind* (pp. 247–260). New York: Cambridge University Press; Klausner, Samuel Z. (1968). The Intermingling of Pain and Pleasure: The Stress-Seeking Personality in Its Social Context. In Samuel Z. Klausner (Ed.), *Why Man Takes Chances: Studies in Stress Seeking* (pp. 137–168). New York: Doubleday.

105. Chomsky, Noam (2006). *Failed States: The Abuse of Power and the Assault on Democracy*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

106. Imre, Robert, Mooney, T. Brian, & Clarke, Benjamin (2008). *Responding to Terrorism*. Farnham, England: Ashgate.

107. Oliver, Mark (2005, August 4). Al-Qaeda Warns of More London Destruction. *The Guardian*, p. A1.

108. Breivik, Anders Behring (2011). *2083: A European Declaration of Independence*. Retrieved December 18, 2011 from http://www.kevinislaughter.com/wp-content/uploads/2083 + - + A + European + Declaration + o f + Independence.pdf

109. Afshar, Halah, Aitken, Rob, & Franks, Myfanwy (2005). Feminisms, Islamophobia and Identities. *Political Studies, 53*(2), 262–283; Lichtensetin, Heinz (1961). Identity and Sexuality. A Study of Their Interrelationship in Man. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 9*, 179–260; *New Oxford American Dictionary* (2010). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

110. Bakker, Edwin (2006). *Jihadi Terrorists in Europe, Their Characteristics and the Circumstances in Which They Joined the Jihad: An Exploratory Study*. The Hague: Clingendael Institute; Lifton, Robert J. (2000).

Destroying the World to Save It: Aum Shinrikyo, Apocalyptic Violence, and the New Global Terrorism. New York: Picador; Sageman, Marc (2004). *Understanding Terror Networks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; Sageman, Marc (2008). *Leaderless Jihad*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

111. Best, Steven, & Nocella II, Anthony J. (2004). Defining Terrorism. *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal, 2*(1), 1–18.

112. Heath, Robert L., & O'Hair, Dan (2008). Terrorism: From the Eyes of the Beholder. In Dan O'Hair, Robert Heath, Kevin Ayotte, & Gerald R. Ledlow (Eds.), *Terrorism: Communication and Rhetorical Perspectives* (pp. 17–41). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

113. Pilon, R. (2001, December 10). *Right, Center, and Left Support Free and Open Debate in Wartime: Dissent Does Not Give Aid, Comfort to Enemy*. Remarks delivered at the National Press Club meeting, Washington, D.C., by the vice president for legal affairs and director, Center for Constitutional Studies, Cato Institute, Washington, D.C.

114. Winkler, Carol (2008). Recalling U.S. Terrorism History in Contemporary Presidential Discourse. In Dan O'Hair, Robert Heath, Kevin Ayotte, & Gerald R. Ledlow (Eds.), *Terrorism: Communication and Rhetorical Perspectives* (pp. 193–217). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

115. Abrahamian, Ervand (2008). *A Modern History of Iran*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Rea, Tony, & Wright, John (1993). *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

116. Taylor, Maxwell, & Quayle, Ethel (1994). *Terrorist Lives*. London: Brassey's.

117. Strentz, Thomas (1981). The Terrorist Organizational Profile: A Psychological Role Model. In Yonah Alexander & John Gleason (Eds.), *Behavioral and Quantitative Perspectives on Terrorism* (pp. 86–104). New York: Pergamon.

118. Taylor, Maxwell, & Quayle, Ethel (1994). *Terrorist Lives*. London: Brassey's.

119. McCauley, Clark (2002). Psychological Issues in Understanding Terrorism and the Response to Terrorism. In Chris E. Stout (Ed.), *The Psychology of Terrorism: Theoretical Understandings and Perspectives*, Vol. III. Psychological Dimensions to War and Peace (pp. 3–29). Westport, CT: Praeger.

120. Böllinger, Lorenz (1981). Die entwicklung zu terroristischem handeln als psychosozialer prozess: Begegnungen mit beteiligten. In H. Jäger, G. Schmidtchen, and L. Süllwold (Ed.), *Analyzen zum terrorismus 2: Lebenslaufanalysen*. Darmstadt, Germany: DeutscherVerlag.

121. Victoroff, Jeff (2005). The Mind of the Terrorist: A Review and Critique of Psychological Approaches. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 49*(1), 3–42.

122. McCauley, Clark & Segal, Mary D. (1989). Terrorist Individuals and Terrorist Groups: The Normal Psychology of Extreme Behavior. In Jo Groebel & Jeffrey F. Goldstein (Eds.), *Terrorism* (pp. 39–64). Seville, Spain: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.

123. Fanon, Frantz (1965). *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: MacGibbon and Kee.

124. Begin, Menachem (1977). *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun*. Jerusalem: Steimatzky's Agency.

125. Rosenberg, Debra, Waddell, Lynn, & Smalley, Suzanne (2002, January 21.). A Troubled Teenager's Tragic Flight Plan. *Newsweek*.

126. Lifton, Robert J. (2000). *Destroying the World to Save It: Aum Shinrikyo, Apocalyptic Violence, and the New Global Terrorism*. New York: Picador; Sageman, Marc (2008). *Leaderless Jihad*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; Stout, Chris E. (2002). *The Psychology of Terrorism: Theoretical Understandings and Perspectives*, Vol. III. Psychological Dimensions to War and Peace. Westport, CT: Praeger.

127. Sageman, Marc (2004). *Understanding Terror Networks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

128. Bakker, Edwin (2006). *Jihadi Terrorists in Europe, Their Characteristics and the Circumstances in Which They Joined the Jihad: An Exploratory Study*. The Hague: Clingendael Institute.

129. Krueger, Alan B., & Maleckova, Jitka (2003). Education, Poverty and Terrorism: Is There a Causal Connection? *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 17*(4), 119–144.

130. Pape, Robert A. (2005). *Dying to Win*. New York: Random House.

131. Hewitt, Christopher (2003). *Understanding Terrorism in America: From the Klan to al Qaeda*. London: Routledge.

132. Nacos, Brigitte L. (2005). The Portrayal of Female Terrorists in the Media: Similar Framing Patterns in the News Coverage of Women in Politics and in Terrorism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 28*, 435–451.

133. Harmon, Christopher C. (2000). *Terrorism Today*. London: Frank Cash.

134. Nacos, Brigitte L. (2005). The Portrayal of Female Terrorists in the Media: Similar Framing Patterns in the News Coverage of Women in Politics and in Terrorism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 28*, 435–451.

135. Forst, Brian (2008). *Terrorism, Crime and Public Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

136. Von Knop, Katharina (2007). The Female Jihad: Al Qaeda's Women. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 30*, 397–414.

137. Pape, Robert A. (2005). *Dying to Win*. New York: Random House.

138. Mahan, Sue G., & Griset, Pamala L. (2007). *Terrorism in Perspective* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

139. Pape, Robert A. (2005). *Dying to Win*. New York: Random House.

140. Laqueur, Walter (1987). *The Age of Terrorism* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little & Brown.